

# Integrating Preconception Risk Assessment and Counseling with Primary Health Care: A Feasibility Assessment

Anne L. Dunlop,<sup>1,2</sup> Susana Alfonso,<sup>1</sup> Nora Hansen,<sup>1,2</sup> Dionne Williams,<sup>3</sup> Ariela L. Marshall,<sup>4</sup> Victoria M. Anderson<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Family & Preventive Medicine, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA

<sup>2</sup> Department of Gynecology & Obstetrics, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA

<sup>3</sup> Emory Family Medicine at Dunwoody, Emory Healthcare, Atlanta, GA

<sup>4</sup> Division of Hematology, Oncology & Transplantation, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN

## ABSTRACT

**Background:** Professional association recommendations call for integrating preconception health promotion with primary care, yet there are scarce tools and implementation research to support practices in doing so.

**Purpose:** To evaluate the feasibility of integrating a preconception health digital risk assessment and virtual coaching into women's primary care encounters.

**Methods:** In the Emory Family Medicine Clinic (Atlanta, Georgia), female patients 21-40 years of age with a well-woman or chronic condition encounter scheduled between 9/1/2022 and 5/1/2023 were invited to participate. Consenting patients were provided the *Frame Your Future* weblink to complete the digital risk assessment followed by virtual counseling, and their family physicians were provided with a pdf summary to discuss during the primary care encounter. Demographic and clinical information was collected via medical record abstraction and patient and physician experiences via survey.

**Results:** Of 46 enrolled patients, 44 (96%) made a Frame account, 38 (86%) completed the risk assessment, 34 (89%) completed virtual coaching, and 24 (71%) had a physician discuss their preconception health assessment during the primary care encounter. Nearly 80% of patients reported an increase in confidence in discussing fertility with their physician, and 50% reported they would not otherwise have brought up fertility and preconception health during the encounter. Both patients and physicians were satisfied with the process and viewed it as helping motivate positive changes in patient health and health behaviors.

**Conclusion:** The completion of preconception digital risk assessment and virtual counseling facilitates discussion of preconception health during primary care encounters and shows promise for improving women's health.

## 1 Introduction

2 The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the American College of Obstetrics and Gynecology  
3 (ACOG) recommend preconception health promotion for all persons of reproductive capability and age.<sup>1,2</sup> In  
4 2006, a Select Panel recommended the provision of preconception health promotion (risk assessment, health  
5 education and risk-specific counseling) *as part of primary care* for all individuals capable of becoming pregnant  
6 with the goal of improving health and reproductive outcomes (to include having desired, well-timed pregnancies  
7 that end in healthy maternal and infant outcomes).<sup>3</sup> Although patients express interest in preconception  
8 counseling, less than 14% of US ambulatory visits include any.<sup>4-7</sup> Competing demands for health care provider  
9 attention along with lack of knowledge and consensus on the screening and counseling approach, and failure to  
10 recognize all individuals for whom services are indicated (*e.g.*, those who are unmarried, in same-sex  
11 relationships, gender diverse) are barriers to the broad provision of preconception health promotion.<sup>8-11</sup> Those  
12 who receive care in community primary care clinics, rather than in dedicated women's health settings, are  
13 particularly affected by these barriers,<sup>12</sup> emphasizing the importance of identifying strategies to systematically  
14 implement such services in clinics that serve low-access populations.<sup>13,14</sup> Despite these recommendations, calls  
15 to action, and evidence based guidelines, there is little health services research to guide implementation.<sup>15,16</sup>

16 To fill this gap, Frame in partnership with clinicians with expertise in reproductive health created a  
17 preconception health risk assessment and counseling package that includes a standardized web-based screening  
18 questionnaire (with embedded skip logic and conditional branching) followed by a virtual coaching session. Since  
19 2020, individuals have been able to use the Frame website ([www.frameyourfuture.com](http://www.frameyourfuture.com)) to create an account,  
20 complete the digital risk assessment, and access health education and coaching without a physician. Frame has  
21 been evaluated for client acceptability as both a direct-to-consumer assessment tool and as a tool integrated  
22 with health care provider assessments in fertility, gynecology, and women's health clinics.

## 23 **Purpose**

24 To evaluate the feasibility and acceptability of integrating Frame’s preconception health digital risk assessment  
25 and coaching package into primary health care encounters at a family medicine clinic.

## 26 **Methods**

### 27 **Design Overview**

28 Eligible participants were identified through chart review of patients scheduled with participating family  
29 physicians between 9/1/2022 and 5/1/2023. Consenting patients were asked to complete the Frame digital risk  
30 assessment and a virtual health coaching session prior to their primary care encounter, and their physicians  
31 were provided a pdf summary of identified preconception and fertility risks and notes from the virtual coaching  
32 session to facilitate provision of preconception health promotion during the primary care encounter. Patient  
33 participants were asked to complete surveys immediately and one month after the virtual coaching and  
34 immediately following the primary care encounter. Participating physicians were also asked to complete a  
35 survey immediately following the primary care encounter. Medical record abstraction was used to collect  
36 participant demographic information and clinical characteristics. This study was reviewed and approved by the  
37 Institutional Review Board of Emory University; written informed consent was obtained from research  
38 participants.

### 39 **Setting**

40 This study was conducted in Emory Family Medicine Clinic in Dunwoody, Georgia, a residency training site that  
41 serves patients of diverse ages, educational levels, genders and insurance status.

### 42 **Participants**

43 Eligibility for patient participation included: (1) Assigned female at birth (regardless of gender identity); (2)  
44 Between 21-40 years of age; (3) English-speaking (as Frame is available in only English); (4) Scheduled for an

45 annual wellness and/or a follow-up for a chronic health condition with physicians who agreed to take part in the  
46 study (two faculty, five family medicine residents); (5) Not pregnant, diagnosed with infertility, or have  
47 undergone sterilization at the time of enrollment; (6) Capacity to consent.

## 48 **Procedures**

49 After review of scheduled patients, those who appeared eligible were contacted by a research team member via  
50 phone to explain the study, complete eligibility screening and informed consent. Those who consented were e-  
51 mailed a link to the Frame web portal, which they could use to create a profile, complete the digital risk  
52 assessment, and authorize their physician to access their report. Participants were then able to schedule a  
53 virtual coaching session with a Frame health coach after which the physician's team was provided with a link to  
54 a Physician Dashboard with a pdf summary; clinical staff also downloaded this pdf, provided a hard copy to the  
55 physician during the scheduled encounter, used the "sticky note" function in the electronic health record to  
56 indicate that the summary was available for the encounter.

## 57 **Data Collection**

58 *Patients.* Prior to the digital assessment, participants completed a survey adapted from the 5-item Perceived  
59 Efficacy of Patient-Physician Interaction (PEPPI) to measure baseline confidence in talking with their provider  
60 about fertility and understanding factors that impact fertility. Following coaching, participants were e-mailed  
61 links to repeat the PEPPI (to assess for change) and to complete a 2-item survey to assess satisfaction with the  
62 coaching. During the month after coaching, participants were offered asynchronous coaching support via e-mail  
63 and text and at the end of the month, satisfaction with coaching and health status was assessed via repeat  
64 survey. After the primary care encounter, participants were e-mailed a 7-item survey to assess understanding of  
65 next steps, impressions of whether the digital assessment and coaching facilitated conversations with the  
66 provider, intended and undertaken health and health care behaviors, and needed information and supports.  
67 Patients were provided two \$25 electronic gift cards for completion of the one-month post-coaching and the

68 post-encounter surveys. The research team completed medical record abstraction to gather sociodemographic  
69 and clinical data.

70 *Physicians.* Following the primary care encounter, participating physicians were sent a link to an 8-item survey to  
71 capture whether the Frame assessment was discussed and, if so, perceptions regarding whether its discussion  
72 facilitated aspects of the encounter or changes in patient care.

## 73 **Data Analysis**

74 Using collected data, we assessed: (1) Rates of participant completion of the digital risk assessment and having  
75 a review of the assessment during the primary care encounter, and whether there were differences by  
76 sociodemographic (age group: 21-29, 30-40; insurance status: government, private; education level: high school  
77 or less, some college or more) or clinical characteristics (presence of chronic health conditions) using Student's t-  
78 test or Wilcoxon test (for continuous measures) and Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test (for categorical  
79 measures), as appropriate for the data. (2) Change in confidence and health literacy via tabulating and  
80 comparing responses to confidence and literacy questions prior to and immediately following coaching. (3)  
81 Patient satisfaction with and perceived utility of Frame by tabulating the patient post-coaching and post-primary  
82 care encounter questionnaires. (4) Primary health care provider satisfaction with and perceived utility of Frame  
83 was by tabulating physician responses to questionnaires completed after each encounter with an enrolled  
84 participant. (5) The needed inputs for implementation of Frame into primary health care by collecting  
85 coordinator and health care provider feedback regarding perceived facilitators and barriers.

## 86 **Results**

87 During the recruitment period of 9/1/2022 through 5/1/2023, 214 (85%) of 251 eligible patients were contacted  
88 by the research team; the remainder could not be reached. Of these, 89 patients (42%) expressed interest in the  
89 study and were e-mailed the consent form. Of those expressing interest, 46 (52%) consented and were enrolled.

90 Of the 46 enrollees, 44 (96%) made a Frame account, 38 (86%) completed the digital risk assessment and 34  
91 (89%) completed the virtual health coaching. Of those completing coaching, 24 (71%) had their assessment  
92 discussed during a primary care encounter (**Figure 1**). Among the 10 who completed coaching but did not have it  
93 discussed: 4 had rescheduled their appointment such that it occurred prior to their coaching session, 5 canceled  
94 their appointment, and 1 missed their appointment. Among the 34 participants who completed coaching, 31  
95 (91%) engaged with their health coach via text or e-mail at least once during the month following.

96

97 Sociodemographic and clinical characteristics of the 46 consenting participants (overall and according to  
98 whether they completed coaching and discussion of the assessment with their physician) are given in **Table 1**.  
99 Approximately two-thirds were between 30 and 40 years of age, three-quarters had some college or higher  
100 education, half were non-Hispanic Black, one quarter had government insurance, two-thirds had no prior birth,  
101 80% had a diagnosis of one or more chronic medical conditions and almost half used a prescription medication  
102 regularly. There were significant differences in the percentage who completed the virtual coaching session by  
103 patient race-ethnicity (52% for non-Hispanic Black patients, 86% for Hispanic patients, 92% for white patients)  
104 and parity (84% and 50% for those without and with a prior birth, respectively). There were also significant  
105 differences in the percentage who had their assessment discussed with their physician by insurance type (33%  
106 and 62% for those with public and private insurance, respectively) and parity (63% and 29% for those without  
107 and with a prior birth, respectively).

108

109 Of the 34 participating patients who completed virtual coaching, 29 completed both a baseline and post-  
110 coaching confidence and literacy survey; of these, 79% showed an increase in confidence in talking about  
111 fertility with a health care provider and 66% showed an increase in confidence around understanding factors  
112 that impact their fertility (**Table 2**).

113 Fourteen participants completed the immediate post-coaching survey; of these, 13 reporting being 'Very  
114 Satisfied' and 1 reporting being 'Satisfied'. **Table 3** shows narrative responses of patients' perceptions of gaining  
115 knowledge from their coach, connecting with their coach on a personal level, and being linked to resources or  
116 motivated into action by their coach. Of the 31 participants who completed the one-month post-coaching  
117 survey, 22 (71%) reported that their health had improved (2 significantly, 5 moderately, 15 slightly).

118

119 Of the 24 participants who completed the post-primary care encounter survey, 50% indicated they would not  
120 have brought up their fertility during the physician encounter otherwise, whereas 3 (12%) were unsure and 9  
121 (38%) indicated they would have brought up fertility issues anyhow. Nearly all (11 of 12) of those who would  
122 not have brought up fertility and all (3) who were 'unsure', had at least chronic medical conditions; this set of 15  
123 patients received lifestyle counseling (6), new diagnoses (2), referrals for care (2), changes in medications (2) or  
124 contraceptives (2), discussed changes in timing of planned childbearing (4), and received vaccinations (2). Two  
125 patients with multiple chronic conditions asked about why fertility preservation and reproductive health  
126 maximization had not been addressed in previous primary care visits to the practice. A substantial percentage  
127 (20, 83%) reported they made specific changes as a result of the encounter (**Table 4**), with the most common  
128 changes being lifestyle related such as increasing physical activity (11), reducing alcohol (3), marijuana (2), and  
129 tobacco (1).

130

131 Physician survey responses are given in **Table 5**. Of the 23 surveys completed, none indicated disagreement  
132 with any of the questions about the utility of Frame. Overall, physician survey responses had a favorable  
133 impression, with the following strongly agreeing or agreeing that Frame: made the patient more engaged in  
134 care (20, 88%); helped the patient be healthier, better informed, and enhanced quality of the visit (19, 83%);  
135 made the visit more efficient (17, 80%); helped provide the best care (16, 70%); and improved clinical outcomes

136 (11, 48%). All (100%) surveys indicated that a specific care activity occurred during the encounter as a result of  
137 discussion of the Frame assessment, including: discussion of lifestyle modifications (12, 52%), with topics of  
138 counseling including obesity and overweight (5 encounters), excessive alcohol use (2 encounters), marijuana use  
139 (3 encounters), and tobacco use (2 encounters). Other specific care activities included: ordering laboratory  
140 studies or evaluations to address symptoms or concerns for 6 encounters (26%), including hormone or  
141 endocrine testing for irregular cycles, following up on past diagnoses of iron-deficiency anemia and pre-  
142 diabetes; discussing the timing of childbearing for 5 encounters (22%); diagnosing a new condition or changing  
143 medications (to a medication safer in pregnancy among those planning to have a child in the near future) which  
144 was documented for 4 encounters (17%); changing contraceptive method to be more compatible with their  
145 reproductive desires, referring the patient to another type of provider (such as an obstetrician-gynecologist,  
146 fertility specialist, geneticist, or social worker), as well as providing indicated vaccines, each of which was  
147 documented for 3 encounters (13%).

148

149 The narrative comments that were provided by physicians following the encounters are given in **Table 6** grouped  
150 according to major themes. Physicians noted benefits in enhancing patient motivation, providing opportunity to  
151 discuss important health issues, improving care efficiency, and offering a professional and personalized  
152 approach to discussing fertility and preconception issues. In particular, physicians indicated that the Frame  
153 assessment provided the opportunity to candidly discuss sensitive lifestyle topics (weight and obesity, substance  
154 use) relevant to reproductive health and helped to prioritize addressing long-standing concerns about irregular  
155 cycles that had previously gone unaddressed.

156

157 To assess needed inputs for implementation of Frame in primary health care, the clinical coordinators had  
158 several observations. They noted that when performing outreach to invite patient participation, many eligible



159 patients reported that they were not planning a pregnancy and, thus, were not interested. When the team  
160 further explained that the study was looking at the underlying health of patients of reproductive age, regardless  
161 of current or future pregnancy intentions, some who were initially disinterested expressed interest. A summary  
162 of lessons learned, based on our study team's discussion of narrative comments from the clinical coordinator  
163 team, is found in **Table 7**.

164

## 165 Discussion

166 This feasibility assessment sought to evaluate the integration of preconception health risk assessment and  
167 coaching into women's primary health care encounters at a family medicine clinic. We found that both  
168 participating patients, who were individuals assigned female at birth between 21-40 years of age who had a  
169 scheduled annual wellness and/or follow-up appointment for a chronic health condition, and their primary  
170 health care physicians viewed the process of patients' completing an online reproductive health risk assessment  
171 and virtual coaching session in advance of a primary care encounter in a positive manner. From a patient  
172 perspective, the process enhanced confidence in discussing and understanding fertility risks with their health  
173 care provider and helped them gain new health information, establish referral to health resources, and  
174 motivated health behaviors and actions. Notably, more than half of participating patients reported making  
175 lifestyle improvements, nearly a third reported adjusting their birth control and/or prescription medications,  
176 and a quarter reported making changes in their planned timing of childbearing. From a physician perspective,  
177 the process was viewed as rendering visits more efficient and helping patients be more engaged, better  
178 informed and healthier. In particular, physicians noted the process to improve patient motivation and provide  
179 opportunity for discussing sensitive lifestyle topics during the primary care encounter.

180 Additional important findings include that participant sociodemographic and clinical characteristics associated  
181 with completion of the virtual coaching and physician discussion of the coaching during the encounter. For

182 completion of the virtual coaching, patient race and ethnicity (non-Hispanic Black patients having lower  
183 completion), insurance type (those with government insurance having lower completion), and parity (those with  
184 prior births having lower completion) were significantly or nearly significantly associated. Both insurance type  
185 and parity were also significantly associated with physician completion of discussion of the assessment, but  
186 participant race and ethnicity was not. The reduction in non-Hispanic Black patient completion of the virtual  
187 coaching after completion of the digital assessment implies that getting input from Black women into the  
188 assessment questions, the assessment and coaching process, and the scheduling of coaching may yield  
189 information that would make the Frame process more culturally-congruent or trusted. It is well-known that the  
190 cultural tailoring of electronic approaches for the delivery of health interventions is essential for uptake.<sup>17</sup> That  
191 nulliparous patients were more likely to complete the coaching may suggest that they are more concerned  
192 about their reproductive health and/or fertility compared to parous patients. That patients covered by  
193 government health insurance were less likely to complete the coaching session and have physician discussion at  
194 a primary care encounter may suggest that these patients, who generally of lower income with fewer internet,  
195 computer, phone, and transportation resources relative to privately-insured patients encountered more  
196 barriers. Future studies with low-income primary care populations might involve allowing patients to complete  
197 the assessment and schedule the virtual coaching session on-site using a kiosk or tablet rather than in the home  
198 setting prior to the scheduled appointment.

199 The findings of this study contribute to the growing body of literature supporting the feasibility and importance  
200 of integrating preconception health promotion into primary care practice. Qualitative studies of female and  
201 male primary care patients in Georgia and New York support that both are receptive to the inclusion of  
202 reproductive health screening assessments and counseling in primary care practice<sup>18,19</sup> and that knowledge of  
203 preconception health risks improves with brief counseling in the primary care setting.<sup>20</sup> A cohort study of 300  
204 reproductive aged women in a Canadian primary care practice that implemented a preconception intervention  
205 using a three-part model (pre-encounter risk assessment via a tablet, discussion of results with primary care

206 provider, followed by receipt of handouts with risk assessment results and key messages) was effective in  
207 identifying preconception health risks, with primary care providers and patients reporting health and practice  
208 benefits.<sup>21</sup> We could not identify studies that have investigated preconception health promotion among gender  
209 diverse patients, indicating that studies that include these individuals are needed to inform best approaches.

210 The study is not without limitations. The study was a small feasibility study and, as such, was of relatively small  
211 sample size and did not include longer-term and time-intensive data collection and a comparison group (of  
212 similar patients not receiving the intervention) to assess patient behavior and/or health changes over time  
213 following the intervention. While the patient sample was diverse with respect to age, race-ethnicity, education  
214 and insurance status, it was limited to those assigned female at birth with specific appointment types (wellness  
215 exam or follow-up for a chronic health condition).

216 Our findings support the feasibility of integrating preconception health risk assessment and counseling into  
217 primary health care, with important lessons learned. From a market feasibility perspective, our coordinator  
218 team's experience in recruitment and outreach demonstrated that the framing of preconception health risk  
219 assessment is important for promoting patient interest. It has been long-recognized that the social marketing of  
220 preconception health risk assessment and counseling is challenging given the diverse audience (encompassing  
221 all individuals of reproductive age and capability) and a diverse set of health conditions and behaviors.<sup>22</sup> A  
222 particularly challenging group for reaching with preconception health messaging are those who are not currently  
223 or in the near future planning to become pregnant.<sup>23</sup> From a technical feasibility perspective, our experience  
224 supports the efficiency in having patients complete the online risk assessment and virtual coaching session but  
225 notes that technical tools (such as electronic prompts and embedded links) help the coordination of patient  
226 scheduling and the delivery of completed reproductive health risk assessments to the health care provider at the  
227 time of the primary care encounter. Given "attrition" from those eligible to those interested among this sample  
228 of female primary care patients, it is clear that more feasibility and implementation research is needed to both  
229 target the reproductive risk assessment to patients who might not see themselves as being in need of

230 preconception or reproductive health care as well as to understand barriers patients may face in completing  
231 online digital assessments. More research is also needed to optimize the workflow for implementing the Frame  
232 program into primary care visits, especially for patients with limited access to electronic resources.

## 233 Conclusion

234 **The problem.** Despite recommendations, there is scarce health services research to guide the implementation  
235 of preconception health promotion in primary care settings. This feasibility study sought to evaluate the  
236 integration of an online preconception health risk assessment and coaching into women’s primary health care at  
237 a family medicine clinic.

238 **Key findings.** Female patients and their physicians were highly satisfied with the process of patients’ completing  
239 digital risk assessment and counseling prior to the encounter and discussing the assessment during a primary  
240 health care encounter. Both patients and physicians viewed the Frame assessment and discussion as being  
241 important for improving and/or motivating changes in the patient’s health or health care. Several physicians  
242 noted that the process improved patient motivation around lifestyle, improved efficiencies in the clinic, and  
243 provided an opening or opportunity for working on lifestyle and reproductive health considerations. To improve  
244 uptake, there is room for improving messaging around reproductive health promotion, especially for patients  
245 who are not planning to become pregnant in the near future.

246 **Implications for research and practice.** Primary care practices should seek to engage their patients in  
247 preconception digital risk assessment and virtual counseling as a means of providing preconception health  
248 promotion as recommended by CDC and ACOG. Future research should involve a larger and more diverse  
249 sample of primary care patients (to include male and gender diverse individuals) and follow-up over a longer  
250 timeframe with more rigorous assessment of longitudinal changes in health behaviors and/or reproductive  
251 health outcomes.

## References

1. Hood JR, Parker C, Atrash HK. Recommendations to improve preconception health and health care: strategies for implementation. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)*. 2007;16(4):454-457.
2. ACOG Committee Opinion No. 762: Prepregnancy Counseling. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2019;133(1):e78-e89.
3. Johnson K, Posner SF, Biermann J, Cordero JF, Atrash HK, Parker CS, Boulet S, Curtis MG. Recommendations to improve preconception health and health care—United States. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*. 2006;55(4):1-23.
4. Stones RE, Stulberg DB, Bello Kottenstette JK. Patient Experiences with Pregnancy Planning and Perspectives on Reproductive Care in Community Health Centers: A Qualitative Study of African American Women in Chicago. *Womens Health Issues*. 2017;27(3):322-328.
5. Bello JK, Rao G, Stulberg DB. Trends in contraceptive and preconception care in United States ambulatory practices. *Fam Med*. 2015;47(4):264-271.
6. Marshall CJ, Huma Z, Deardorff J, Britton LE. Prepregnancy Counseling Among U.S. Women With Diabetes and Hypertension, 2016-2018. *Am J Prev Med*. 2021;61(4):529-536.
7. Manze MG, Romero DR, Sumberg A, Gagnon M, Roberts L, Jones H. Women's Perspectives on Reproductive Health Services in Primary Care. *Fam Med*. 2020;52(2):112-119.
8. Akers AY, Gold MA, Borrero S, Santucci A, Schwarz EB. Providers' perspectives on challenges to contraceptive counseling in primary care settings. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)*. 2010;19(6):1163-1170.
9. Chuang CH, Hwang SW, McCall-Hosenfeld JS, Rosenwasser L, Hillemeier MM, Weisman CS. Primary care physicians' perceptions of barriers to preventive reproductive health care in rural communities. *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. 2012;44(2):78-83.
10. Bello JK, Adkins K, Stulberg DB, Rao G. Perceptions of a reproductive health self-assessment tool (RH-SAT) in an urban community health center. *Patient education and counseling*. 2013;93(3):655-663.

11. Manze MG, Calixte C, Romero DR, Roberts L, Perlman M, Langston A, Jones HE. Physician perspectives on routine pregnancy intention screening and counseling in primary care. *Contraception*. 2020;101(2):91-96.
12. Hall KS, Patton EW, Crissman HP, Zochowski MK, Dalton VK. A population-based study of US women's preferred versus usual sources of reproductive health care. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2015;213(3):352.e351-314.
13. Bronstein JM, Felix HC, Bursac Z, Stewart MK, Foushee HR, Klapow J. Providing general and preconception health care to low income women in family planning settings: perception of providers and clients. *Matern Child Health J*. 2012;16(2):346-354.
14. Wilensky S, Proser M. Community approaches to women's health: delivering preconception care in a Community Health Center model. *Womens Health Issues*. 2008;18(6 Suppl):S52-60.
15. Frayne DJ. Preconception care is primary care: A call to action. *American Family Physician*. 2017;96(8):492-494.
16. Physicians AAOF. Preconception care (position paper). In:2015.
17. Joo JY, Liu MF. Culturally tailored interventions for ethnic minorities: A scoping review. *Nursing open*. 2021;8(5):2078-2090.
18. Manze M, Romero D, Sumberg A, Gagnon M, Roberts L, Jones H. Women's perspectives on reproductive health services in primary care. *Family Medicine*. 2020;52(2):112-119.
19. Dunlop AL, Logue KM, Miranda MC, Narayan DA. Integrating reproductive planning with primary health care: an exploration among low-income, minority women and men. *Sexual & Reproductive Healthcare*. 2010;1(2):37-43.
20. Dunlop AL, Logue KM, Thorne C, Badal HJ. Change in women's knowledge of general and personal preconception health risks following targeted brief counseling in publicly funded primary care settings. *American Journal of Health Promotion*. 2013;27(3\_suppl):S50-S57.

21. Montanaro C, Lacey L, Robson L, Estill A, Vukovic S. Preconception care: A technology-based model for delivery in the primary care setting supported by public health. *Maternal and child health journal*. 2019;23:1581-1586.
22. Lynch M, Squiers L, Lewis MA, Moultrie R, Kish-Doto J, Boudewyns V, Bann C, Levis DM, Mitchell EW. Understanding women's preconception health goals: audience segmentation strategies for a preconception health campaign. *Social Marketing Quarterly*. 2014;20(3):148-164.
23. Mitchell EW, Verbiest S. Effective strategies for promoting preconception health—from research to practice. *American Journal of Health Promotion*. 2013;27(3):S1-S3.

## Tables

**Table 1.** Sociodemographic and Clinical Characteristics of Participants Overall and by Completion of Frame Virtual Coaching and Discussion of Assessment with Physician

Characteristic	All Participants N = 46	Completed Virtual Coaching			Discussed Assessment with Physician		
		Yes N = 34	No N = 12	p-value	Yes N = 24	No N = 22	p-value
Age in years							
Mean age +/- sd	31.5 ±5.9	31.4 ±6.0	31.7 ±5.8	0.911	32.1 ±5.9	30.9 ±6.0	0.489
Age group							
21-29 y	17 (37%)	14 (82%)	3 (18%)	0.489	12 (71%)	5 (29%)	0.053
30-40 y	29 (63%)	20 (69%)	9 (31%)		12 (41%)	17 (59%)	
Education level							
High school or less	11 (24%)	7 (64%)	4 (36%)	0.425	3 (27%)	8 (73%)	0.055
Some college or more	33 (72%)	26 (79%)	7 (21%)		20 (61%)	13 (39%)	
Missing	2 (4%)						
Racial/ethnic group							
Non-Hispanic Black	21 (46%)	11 (52%)	10 (48%)	<b>0.027*</b>	10 (48%)	11 (52%)	0.668
Non-Hispanic White	13 (28%)	12 (92%)	1 (8%)		7 (54%)	6 (46%)	
Non-Hispanic Other	5 (11%)	5 (100%)	0 (0%)		4 (80%)	1 (20%)	
Hispanic, Any race	7 (15%)	6 (86%)	1 (14%)		3 (42%)	4 (58%)	
Insurance type							
Public	12 (27%)	6 (50%)	5 (50%)	0.052	3 (33%)	9 (66%)	<b>0.044*</b>
Private	34 (73%)	28 (82%)	6 (18%)		21 (62%)	13 (38%)	
Prior births							
None	32 (70%)	27 (84%)	5 (16%)	<b>0.027*</b>	20 (63%)	12 (17%)	<b>0.034*</b>
One or more	14 (30%)	7 (50%)	7 (50%)		4 (29%)	10 (71%)	
Chronic conditions							
Mean number ± sd	2.0 ± 1.5	2.2 ± 1.5	1.3 ± 1.3	0.069	2.3 ± 1.6	1.6 ± 1.3	0.093
Any chronic condition							
Yes	37 (80%)	29 (78%)	8 (12%)	0.211	21 (57%)	16 (43%)	0.276
No	9 (20%)	5 (56%)	4 (44%)		3 (33%)	6 (66%)	
Prescription medications							
Yes	22 (48%)	17 (77%)	5 (23%)	0.619	12 (55%)	10 (45%)	0.758
No	24 (52%)	17 (71%)	7 (29%)		12 (50%)	12 (50%)	



**Table 2.** Participant Confidence and Literacy around Discussing Fertility Health – From Baseline to Immediately Post-Coaching (29 respondents)

<i>Question: How confident are you in talking with your provider about your fertility on a scale of 1-10 with 1 being not at all confident and 10 being very confident?</i>	
Baseline score = 6.4	Post-coaching score = 9.2
23 (79%) with pre-post increase in confidence score 43% average increase in confidence score	
<i>Question: How confident are you in understanding factors that impact your fertility health on a scale of 1-10 with 1 being not at all confident and 10 being very confident?</i>	
Baseline score = 5.9	Post-coaching score = 8.4
19 (66%) with pre-post increase in confidence score 43% average increase in confidence score	

**Table 3.** Patient Narrative Responses Post-Coaching, Organized by Theme

<b>THEME: Gain in Knowledge</b>
My coach was very knowledgeable.
My coach gave me good advice.
She offered real time, attainable information and suggestions.
I was able to learn many new things and have my questions answered.
During the coaching session, a lot of factors were explained and my questions answered. The process was thoroughly explained and I understand the following next steps.
I felt incredibly informed.
<b>THEME: Connected on Personal Level</b>
My coach and seemed to understand some of the concerns I had.
My coach is the best! She was excellent in creating a warm, informative, non-judgmental environment for me to share my reproductive goals. We also connected on a cultural level, which I appreciated and valued.
She is very attentive, helpful, and willing to do things in an alternate format (text and phone instead of e-mail).
I think my coach was a great coach with a lovely attitude and very personable.
I felt heard and respected.
<b>THEME: Linked with Resources or Motivated Action</b>
I am satisfied with the work my coach and I did together because she was very detailed and thought outside the box. What was especially nice was although we spoke about women’s health, I was also able to talk about other health concerns of mine. My coach was even able to assist me in finding a therapist to help me work through some mental health struggles as well.
I felt empowered after our call and also called to make some steps toward making space in my life for expanding my family in the future if I choose to do so.

**Table 4.** Patient-reported Activities or Change Following Discussion of Frame with Physician

Activity or Change	Number (%)
Improved lifestyle	13 (54%)
▪ Increased physical activity	11
▪ Improved diet	10
▪ Plan to lose weight	9
▪ Reduce alcohol	3
▪ Reduce marijuana	2
▪ Reduce tobacco	1
Began taking prenatal vitamin	10 (42%)
Looked into benefits and coverage	10 (42%)
Had conversation with partner	8 (33%)
Scheduled additional physician visit	8 (33%)
Adjusted medications	7 (29%)
Adjusted birth control	7 (29%)
Changed timing of planned childbearing	6 (25%)
Began tracking ovulation	5 (21%)
Pursued additional fertility testing or work-up	4 (17%)
Discussed chronic condition management with provider	3 (12%)
Began trying to conceive	3 (12%)
Pursued egg preservation	1 (4%)

**Table 5.** Physician Responses About Extent of Agreement with Statements About Frame

Statement	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree/Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Helped me provide the best care possible	7 (30%)	9 (40%)	7 (30%)	0	0
Made the visit more efficient	4 (23%)	13 (57%)	6 (26%)	0	0
Made my patient more engaged in care	9 (39%)	11 (49%)	4 (23%)	0	0
Improved clinical outcomes	2 (9%)	9 (39%)	12 (52%)	0	0
Helped patient be healthier	4 (23%)	15 (65%)	4 (23%)	0	0
Helped patient be better informed	11 (49%)	8 (35%)	4 (23%)	0	0
Enhanced quality of the visit	10 (44%)	9 (39%)	4 (23%)	0	0

**Table 6.** Physician Narrative Responses Following Frame Discussion with Patients, Organized by Theme

<b>THEME: Patient Motivation or Opportunity</b>
Patient was motivated to discuss preconception and family planning.
This patient came to the appointment more motivated than in previous visits, and specifically interested in learning more about WHY she has experienced irregularities in her periods/dysfunctional uterine bleeding. We were finally able to focus our attention on this problem and do a more thorough work-up. Also, she was interested in her family history (which includes sickle cell disease) and understood the importance of preconception visits for testing when she is ready to have a family. She also seems to understand and be more motivated to address these topics.
<b>THEME: Providing an Opening or Opportunity</b>
It was very helpful to go through the patient's complicated psych regimen to help her understand how critical it would be to involve her psychiatrist with changing medications before she becomes pregnant in the future. We were also able to identify some red flags with the patient's menstrual cycle so that she could be aware that coming off birth control in advance of desiring pregnancy and tracking her cycle to ensure ovulation and assess for other diagnoses could be a helpful step.
This patient, by participating in Frame, was more ready/willing to discuss her weight (being obese) and to begin to address lifestyle factors for reducing her weight to a healthier value to improve her fertility and future pregnancy outcomes. Prior to this visit she had been reluctant/opposed to such discussions.
The Frame evaluation was extremely helpful in evaluating this patient and facilitated a thorough preconception evaluation including ordering lab work and an endometrial biopsy for a problem identified. We were also able to identify some fertility risk factors and provide education on fertility expectations and advice for trying to conceive, as well as lifestyle modifications that will be important to optimize fertility. The patient was extremely appreciative of the thorough care she received.
The information provided by Frame helped me to understand my patient's family planning goals so that we were able to have a discussion about PCOS lifestyle modifications to improve fertility, obtained fasting insulin and discussed possibly starting metformin to restore ovulatory function, and we discussed her prior OCP and unwanted side effects so we were able to find an alternative for now while she is not actively trying to conceive, as this could help us treat her iron deficiency (also important prior to pregnancy) and prevent endometrial cancer.
<b>THEME: Clinical Efficiency</b>
It didn't slow the encounter at all, actually helped me understand high priority items and their family planning goals, helped take off a bit of me.
I felt like it made me more efficient as it made my conversation more ....efficient, impactful, efficacious
This visit was a great example of how Frame can help us to incorporate comprehensive preconception care for eligible women into an annual physical visit. Fertility is something that is not always touched on in an annual physical, but that may be the opportunity for preconception care with many patients. In this patient's case, she had vitamin D deficiency which is now being corrected to optimize fertility, and we were able to discuss optimal timing on how to try to conceive and identify the fertile window, as well as additional labs we could get as part of preconception care – all without adding too much time to her annual visit.
<b>THEME: Personalization</b>
This may seem like a small thing but it is huge that even the assessment "looks pretty and nice" when these patients aren't used to this type of attention to detail and personalization, considering their income and what they can afford in the world of healthcare. Frame is providing care for these Emory patients in a unique and special way, specifically considering that many of them are on Medicaid and typically will just get a packet of papers handed to them on government services. What they are used to is very different from the personalized care that Frame is offering.

**Table 7.** Lessons Learned in Implementing Frame Assessment and Discussion in Primary Care

<b>Framing the Preconception Health Risk Assessment and Counseling to Patients</b>
Framing the program around reproductive health promotion, rather than pregnancy or fertility planning, is important in helping patients view preconception health risk assessment and counseling as of relevance to them.
<b>Communication with Patients to Arrange Pre-Encounter Completion of Risk Assessment and Coaching</b>
A direct line of communication to the coordinator team, via Google voice and patient portal messaging, is important for timely, direct communication to allow for optimal scheduling of the components of the intervention.
An automated way for notifying the coordinator team of patient-initiated changes in scheduled appointments (such as through the electronic medical record system) can contribute to optimal ordering of the components of the intervention.
<b>Prompting Health Care Provider to Access and Review the Preconception Health Risk Assessment</b>
An automated way for notifying the health care provider of the availability of the preconception health risk assessment summary, and in supporting the health care provider to review the summary via a link within the electronic medical record, can contribute to clinical efficiency.

## Figure Legend

**Figure 1.** Participant recruitment flowchart

## Figures

**Figure 1.** Participant recruitment flowchart

