Title: Characterizing emergency clinician engagement with social drivers of health data among patients with opioid use disorder

Authors: Melanie F. Molina, MD, MAS[1]; Samuel D. Pimentel, PhD[2]; Cynthia Fenton, MD[3]; Julia Adler-Milstein, PhD[3,4]; Laura M. Gottlieb, MD, MPH[5,6]

Author Affiliations:
[1]Department of Emergency Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, California, USA
[2]Department of Statistics, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California, USA
[3]Department of Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California, USA
[4]Center for Clinical Informatics & Improvement Research, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California, USA
[5]Social Interventions Research and Evaluation Network, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California, USA
[6]Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of California, San Francisco, San Francisco, California, USA

Address manuscript correspondence to:
Melanie F. Molina, MD, MAS
UCSF Department of Emergency Medicine
Room L-126, Box 0209
505 Parnassus Avenue
San Francisco, CA 94143
Tel: 512-294-4366
Email: melanie.molina@ucsf.edu

Key words: social drivers of health, electronic health records, emergency medicine, opioid use disorder, documentation, review, medication for opioid use disorder

Funding: Dr. Melanie Molina is supported by the National Institute on Drug Abuse (K23DA060993) and the Harold Amos Medical Faculty Development Program. These funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication. Dr. Melanie Molina had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Word count: 4,101

ABSTRACT

Objectives
To characterize emergency department (ED) clinician engagement with electronic health record (EHR)-based social drivers of health (SDOH) data; test whether engagement differs in encounters with opioid use disorder (OUD); and, among OUD encounters, assess whether engagement is associated with medications for OUD (MOUD) treatment.

Materials and Methods
We conducted a cross-sectional study of adult ED encounters (January 2023–October 2024). OUD encounters, identified with a structured phenotype, were matched (1:2) to non-OUD encounters. Audit logs captured clinician engagement with structured SDOH questions (“SDOH Wheel”), ICD-10 Z codes in the Problem List, Social History free text, and social work notes. Engagement was any SDOH documentation or review of preexisting SDOH data during the encounter. Logistic regression estimated associations.

Results
Among 17,103 encounters (5,701 OUD; 11,402 non-OUD), clinician SDOH documentation was rare (<1%). Clinicians most often reviewed Z codes (610/620; 98.4%), followed by the SDOH Wheel (1,103/3,953; 27.9%), social work notes (1,711/10,670; 16.0%), and Social History free text (232/6,942; 3.3%). Engagement occurred in 19.5% of encounters and was higher with OUD (26.6% vs 16.0%; adjusted odds ratio [aOR] 1.91, 95% CI 1.77–2.07). Among OUD encounters, engagement showed no clear association with MOUD (aOR 1.11, 95% CI 0.84–1.47), yet racial and ethnic disparities persisted.

Discussion
ED clinicians infrequently document but do review structured, accessible SDOH data. Engagement is higher in OUD encounters yet shows no definitive link with MOUD, while disparities persist. Interface designs that surface SDOH and targeted EHR decision support warrant evaluation to inform equitable, time-sensitive ED care.

BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE

Over the last decade, electronic health record (EHR)-based social drivers of health (SDOH) documentation tools have rapidly proliferated,[1] driven in part by reimbursement and accreditation policies that incentivize identifying and addressing patient-level adverse SDOH, or social risks, in clinical settings.[2–4] Structured EHR-based SDOH data are intended to improve outcomes by informing clinical decisions around treatment and resource linkages. Yet relatively little research has examined clinician engagement with available SDOH data or how engagement with SDOH data affects care, in part, because of difficulties assessing when and how clinicians use EHR-based information. The capacity to leverage audit log data—systematic records of user activities—however, is likely to help researchers overcome these barriers. In fact, one new study used audit log data to examine both clinician documentation of SDOH data and review of prior SDOH data[1] and found that both measures were associated with lower risk of hospital readmission.[5] The use of audit log data and other EHR-facilitated data tools to better understand the impacts of SDOH data documentation is especially critical in the context of recent federal proposals to decrease SDOH-related healthcare incentives.[6]

The emergency department (ED) often serves as the primary healthcare access point for vulnerable populations,[7] including those with a high prevalence of adverse SDOH,[8] making it an important place for social risk screening and interventions. To explore how ED clinicians engage with EHR-based SDOH data and whether engagement impacts clinical treatment decisions, we selected opioid use disorder (OUD) as a condition-specific use case. OUD afflicts approximately 2.7 million people in the US,[9] and evidence-based medications for OUD (MOUD), such as buprenorphine and methadone,[10] are increasingly administered in the ED.[11] Since adverse SDOH are common among patients experiencing OUD and affect treatment outcomes,[12,13] one might expect that ED clinicians would engage more with SDOH data during encounters with patients diagnosed with OUD compared to those without and then use SDOH information to guide treatment decisions.

OBJECTIVES

In this study, we addressed three novel research questions using ED visit EHR data. First, we characterized ED clinician engagement with EHR-based SDOH data by assessing overall documentation and review. Second, we examined whether ED clinician engagement with SDOH data was associated with OUD—a condition highly impacted by SDOH.[14] Given documented disparities in ED-based OUD care,[15] we also evaluated how engagement with SDOH data varied by patient age, race and ethnicity, and insurance status. Third, we determined whether engagement with SDOH data in patients with OUD was associated with downstream clinical action by assessing the association between engagement with SDOH data and MOUD treatment, which could inform the design of future interventions to optimize ED-based OUD care delivery.

METHODS

Design, setting, and study sample

We conducted a cross-sectional study of adult ED visit encounters at the University of California, San Francisco (UCSF) Medical Center from January 1, 2023 through October 17, 2024—five years after the systemwide rollout of new SDOH documentation tools. UCSF Medical Center is a quaternary academic center and houses UCSF Health's only adult ED, which serves over 40,000 patients annually and has used the Epic EHR since 2012. We included encounters for adults (≥18 years) meeting an EHR-derived phenotype for OUD, plus propensity score-matched encounters without OUD. The OUD phenotype was adapted from a previously validated computable structured phenotype[16] and broadened to improve sensitivity and align with our EHR, as formal OUD documentation is often incomplete due to stigma and variable clinical practices. Our site-adapted OUD phenotype consisted of any of the following criteria, applied to the entire hospital encounter unless otherwise specified: (1) one or more International Classification of Diseases, Tenth Revision (ICD-10) codes indicating OUD, withdrawal, or overdose in encounter (discharge) diagnoses, problem lists, or past medical history; (2) active prescriptions for buprenorphine or methadone preceding the index ED visit encounter; (3) positive urine toxicology results for methadone, fentanyl, or heroin; (4) addiction care team consultation notes with reason for consult containing "heroin", "opioid", "opiate", "Narcan", and/or "fentanyl"; (5) chief complaint containing "heroin", "opioid", "opiate", and/or "OUD", "fentanyl" (excluding use together with phrases suggesting therapeutic use or or emergency medicine services-only administration), "fentanyl use", and/or mapping to an ICD-10 code for OUD; (6) reason for visit free text containing the same key words as in (5); or (7) ED clinician notes (including triage nursing notes) containing "OUD", "opioid use disorder", "opioid use d/o", "COWS" (Clinical Opiate Withdrawal Scale), "fentanyl", and/or "heroin".

To compare engagement with SDOH data among patients with versus without OUD, we designed a matched non-OUD comparison group. We used propensity scores to match each OUD patient to two patients without OUD. We estimated propensity scores using logistic regression on all ED encounters during the study period using age, ED arrival time, language, interpreter need, marital status, race and ethnicity, sex assigned at birth, gender identity, sexual orientation, insurance type, and zip code (coarsened by grouping zip codes fewer than 100 visits). To ensure covariate balance, we imposed a fine balance constraint on the interaction of race and ethnicity, marital status, sex assigned at birth, sexual orientation, and an indicator for rare zip codes.[17,18] The UCSF Institutional Review Board approved this study, and we followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guidelines.

Selected EHR-based SDOH data field types

ED clinicians can interface with four distinct types of SDOH data within the EHR. These include two structured data sources: (1) Implemented in Epic in 2018, structured social history questions (i.e., the "Epic SDOH Wheel") capture information on housing, transportation, and financial status.[1] These fields offer responses ranging from "Never true" to "Often true" with a "Declined to Answer" option. UCSF Health encourages clinical staff to complete SDOH data fields in both inpatient and outpatient settings, though there is no official ED-based documentation workflow. Nevertheless, the SDOH data fields are easily visible to ED clinicians in Epic's storyboard; (2) Structured social risk ICD-10 Z codes enable clinicians to document adverse SDOH as part of the past medical history and can populated in any clinical setting. ED clinicians can view and edit these codes as part of the patient's problem list directly from the ED navigation screen without opening a patient's chart. Two unstructured SDOH data fields include: (3) The free text "Social History" field that is a subsection of the Patient History; and (4) Social work free text notes, which are only available for patients evaluated by social work.

Definitions and measures

Using audit log data, we assessed whether one or more of these SDOH data types were documented or reviewed by at least one ED clinician during the ED encounter (time-bound from ED arrival to disposition). Any documentation or review event occurring after the ED encounter was excluded. "Clinicians" included attending physicians, resident physicians, and advanced practice providers. Given multiple handoffs occur during a single ED visit, we only included clinicians assigned to the care team for more than 10 minutes or if they authored/cosigned a note during the encounter from the EHR's ED context.

An ED clinician documentation event occurred if SDOH data (whether adverse or not) were entered into any of the following data fields: (1) the SDOH Wheel, (2) the Problem List (Z codes, usually adverse by definition), (3) the Social History subsection of the Patient History (free text). We defined two types of review events. Field review occurred when a clinician reviewed an SDOH data field regardless of whether it contained data (possible for the SDOH Wheel, Social History free text, and Problem List; social work notes have no blank data field). Data review occurred when the clinician reviewed an SDOH data field with preexisting data. Review events occurred if the ED clinician: (1) hovered over or clicked any section of the SDOH Wheel; (2) marked the Social History free text field as reviewed; (3) viewed the Problem List from the ED navigation screen (via a hover pop-up) or marked it as reviewed; or (4) opened a social work note (data review only). We assessed both field and data review events. However, we defined ED clinician "engagement" with SDOH data as one or more instances in which the clinician documented or reviewed any SDOH data (i.e., data review) during the ED encounter.

For the structured data types (i.e., SDOH Wheel and Z codes), we categorized the SDOH data into financial, housing, transportation, food, and safety domains. For the SDOH Wheel, in addition to the simple presence or absence of SDOH data, we were able to further specify whether SDOH data were present and adverse (i.e., documented social risks). We therefore defined a sub-measure of engagement, "risk engagement," as engagement with the SDOH Wheel when adverse SDOH data were present.

For each ED encounter, we also extracted patient age, gender, self-reported race and ethnicity, language, insurance class as well as MOUD treatment, defined as either an ED order to administer buprenorphine or methadone, or an ED-initiated outpatient prescription for buprenorphine (ED clinicians cannot prescribe methadone). Since patients could have multiple ED encounters during the study period, and our focus was on

clinician behaviors, we derived our measures at the encounter level rather than the patient level. We counted documentation and review measures once per encounter, regardless of how many clinicians were involved.

Outcomes

Our primary outcome was overall ED clinician engagement with SDOH data during the ED encounter (research question 1). We then compared engagement with SDOH data between patients with and without OUD (research question 2), and, among patients with OUD, examined its association with MOUD treatment (research question 3). Finally, to understand whether previously documented social risks affected MOUD treatment, we also assessed whether risk engagement was associated with MOUD (research question 3).

Statistical analysis

We used descriptive statistics to summarize ED clinician documentation, field and data review, and engagement with each SDOH data field at the encounter level across all encounters (research question 1). Results were stratified by patient group (OUD versus non-OUD) and SDOH domain. We then used multivariable logistic regression to assess whether ED clinician engagement with SDOH data differed among encounters with patients experiencing OUD compared to matched controls (research question 2) and whether MOUD treatment differed among OUD encounters with engagement and/or risk engagement (research question 3). We adjusted for key patient demographic characteristics known or hypothesized to be associated with SDOH engagement and MOUD treatment, including age, race and ethnicity, sex, and insurance status.[5,19,20]

We conducted several sensitivity analyses. For the MOUD treatment model, we excluded encounters where patients met the OUD phenotype solely because they were already on MOUD to assess whether engagement with SDOH data was associated with MOUD initiation. For both the engagement and MOUD treatment models, we attempted mixed-effects analyses clustered by clinician, but they could not be fit due to clinicians being cross-classified across encounters. Therefore, to verify the robustness of our findings, we compared models with and without clinician fixed effects using likelihood-ratio tests. All statistical analyses were performed using R statistical software version 4.4.2 (R Project for Statistical Computing).

RESULTS

ED encounter characteristics

Of 70,880 total ED encounters during the study period, we analyzed 17,103: 5,701 (33%) with OUD matched to 11,402 (67%) without OUD. **Supplementary Appendix A** shows the frequency of each OUD phenotype criterion across OUD encounters. Among the analyzed encounters, there were 477 unique clinicians, with a median (IQR) of 13 (2-85) encounters per clinician. There were 10,468 unique patients; 74% of these patients had a single ED encounter, another 20% had 2-3 encounters, and the remaining 7% had 4 or more. 43.8% of encounters were with patients who were White, 26.4% with patients who were Black, and 12.0% with patients who were Hispanic/Latino/a/x; 60.8% were with patients who were male; 51.7% were with patients enrolled in Medicaid. MOUD treatment was present in 387 (2.3%) encounters, 362 (93.5%) of these meeting the OUD phenotype and 25 (6.5%) not (**Table 1**).

Table 1. Emergency Department Encounter Characteristics, by Opioid Use Disorder Status

	Total Encounters N (%)	**OUD Phenotype Met n (%)**	**OUD Phenotype Not M n (%)**
Overall	17103 (100%)	5701 (33.3%)	11402 (66.7%)
Unique Patients[a]	10,468 (100%)	2,757 (26.3%)	8,042 (76.8%)
Age, Mean (Std. Dev.)	51.1 (16.1)	51.1 (16.0)	51.1 (16.2)
Race and Ethnicity			
White	7487 (43.8%)	2524 (44.3%)	4963 (43.5%)
Asian	1029 (6.0%)	337 (5.9%)	692 (6.1%)
Black or African American	4510 (26.4%)	1484 (26.0%)	3026 (26.5%)
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	2057 (12.0%)	676 (11.9%)	1381 (12.1%)

Multi-racial	720 (4.2%)	250 (4.4%)	470 (4.1%)
Native American, Alaska Native, or Other Pacific Islander	179 (1.0%)	65 (1.1%)	114 (1.0%)
Other[b]	1121 (6.6%)	365 (6.4%)	756 (6.6%)
Sex			
Male	10403 (60.8%)	3478 (61.0%)	6925 (60.7%)
Female	6618 (38.7%)	2187 (38.4%)	4431 (38.9%)
Other[c]	82 (0.5%)	36 (0.6%)	46 (0.4%)
Insurance			
Medicaid	8850 (51.7%)	2950 (51.7%)	5900 (51.7%)
Medicare	5658 (33.1%)	1886 (33.1%)	3772 (33.1%)
Commercial	1914 (11.2%)	638 (11.2%)	1276 (11.2%)
Other[d]	681 (4.0%)	227 (4.0%)	454 (4.0%)
MOUD Treatment	387 (2.3%)	362 (6.3%)	25 (0.2%)

Abbreviations: OUD, opioid use disorder; MOUD, medication for opioid use disorder

[a]331 unique patients had OUD status that changed over time.

[b]Included “Other”, “Unknown/Declined”, “Southwest Asian and North African”

[c]Included “Choose not to disclose”, “Declines to answer”, “Something else”, “Unknown”

[d]Included “Other” and “Worker’s Comp”

ED clinician documentation and review

The percentage of total encounters for which ED clinicians *documented* SDOH data across any data field (excluding social work notes since these were documented by social workers whose job includes documenting social history) was very low (<1%). When we examined review of the SDOH data fields, regardless of whether they contained SDOH data (i.e., field review), clinicians most often reviewed the Problem List data field (16,607/17,103; 97.1%), followed by the SDOH Wheel data fields (3,723/17,103; 21.8%), and the Social History free text data field (621/17,1013; 3.6%); there was no specific data field to review for social work notes (i.e., if no social work note existed, we could not assess whether the clinician looked for it) (**Figure 1**).

Figure 1. Emergency Department Clinician SDOH Data Field Review, by Type



Abbreviations: SDOH, social drivers of health

When we examined ED clinician review behavior of data fields with preexisting SDOH data (i.e., data review), we saw similar trends (**Figure 2**). Clinicians most often reviewed Z codes (610/620; 98.4%), followed by the SDOH Wheel data (1,103/3,953; 27.9%), social work notes (1,711/10,670; 16.0%), and Social History free text data (232/6,942; 3.3%). Summing across all documentation and data review activities, engagement with SDOH data was present in 19.5% (3,343/17,103) of all encounters. Engagement was greater in encounters with patients experiencing OUD (26.6%; 1,515/5,701) compared to non-OUD (16.0%; 1,828/11,402).

Figure 2. Emergency Department Clinician SDOH Data Review, by Type



Abbreviations: SDOH, social drivers of health; SW, social work

Regardless of whether reviewed or not, preexisting data were available in the SDOH Wheel prior to the index visit for 3,953 encounters. This included 3,143 encounters containing data related to patient finances, 1,159 related to housing, 3,273 related to transportation, and 3,276 related to food. The SDOH Wheel most often contained housing data (38.9%), followed by food (29.6%), finance (29.2%), and transportation (28.3%). The most common preexisting Z codes related to housing (405), followed by food (182), finance (82), and safety (28).

The subset of encounters in which providers engaged with SDOH Wheel data specifically when there were social risks already documented (i.e., risk engagement) was 29.5% (975/3,301) and was also higher in encounters with patients experiencing OUD: 31.1% (466/1,496) versus 28.2% (509/1,805).

Associations with clinician engagement with SDOH data and MOUD treatment

After adjusting for age, race and ethnicity, sex, and insurance status, we found that clinicians were more likely to engage with SDOH data for patients with OUD (OR 1.91, 95% CI 1.77-2.07), and for Black/African American (OR 1.20, 95% CI 1.09-1.31), muti-racial (OR 1.35, 95% CI 1.13-1.63), Native American, Alaska Native, or Other Pacific Islander (OR 2.28, 95% CI 1.65-3.14), female (OR 1.19, 95% CI 1.10-1.28), and Medicare (OR 1.25, 95% CI 1.13-1.38) patients. They were less likely to engage with SDOH data for patients with Asian (OR 0.83, 95% CI 0.70-0.99) and other race (OR 0.57, 95% CI 0.46-0.70), and for those with commercial (OR 0.69,

95% CI 0.60-0.80) and other insurance (OR 0.27, 95% CI 0.19-0.38). When clinicians engaged with SDOH data, they were somewhat more likely to order or prescribe MOUD (OR 1.11, 95% CI 0.84-1.47). Engagement with previously documented social risk data (i.e., risk engagement) was linked to lower MOUD use (OR 0.87, 95% CI 0.54-1.42), while engagement with non-adverse SDOH data was linked to higher MOUD use (OR 1.90, 0.65-5.57). MOUD treatment was less likely for Asian (OR 0.45, 95% CI 0.24-0.83), Black/African American (OR 0.71, 95% CI 0.54-0.93), and Hispanic/Latino/a/x (OR 0.48, 95% CI 0.32-0.72) patients (**Table 2**). Results were similar after removing encounters where patients met the OUD phenotype only because they were already on MOUD (5,372 encounters, or 94.2% of total OUD encounters). In this analysis, patients with commercial insurance were also less likely to receive MOUD (OR 0.60, 95% CI 0.38-0.92).

Adding clinician fixed effects to the models produced similar results. Engagement patterns persisted, but the lower engagement for Asian patients was no longer statistically significant (OR 0.83; 95% CI 0.69–1.00). Seventy-four (15.5%) of the 477 fixed effects were significant in the engagement model. Medicare patients were newly less likely to receive MOUD (OR 0.68; 95% CI 0.49–0.96), while MOUD treatment disparities persisted for Asian (OR 0.47; 0.24–0.95), Black/African American (OR 0.64; 0.47–0.86), and Hispanic/Latino/a/x patients (OR 0.48; 0.30–0.75). Overall, engagement with SDOH data was now slightly associated with lower MOUD treatment (OR 0.87; 95% CI 0.63–1.21). However, the associations were stronger based on whether SDOH data were adverse or not: clinicians engaging with non-adverse SDOH data were more likely to order or prescribe MOUD (OR 3.19; 0.90–11.29), whereas clinicians engaging with adverse SDOH data were not (OR 0.80; 0.45–1.41). In the MOUD model, only 6.2% of the 387 clinician fixed effects were significant—close to the 5% expected by chance—and a likelihood-ratio test showed that adding fixed effects did not improve model fit.

Table 2. Association of Patient Characteristics with Clinician Engagement and MOUD Treatment

	Engagement OR (95% CI)	**MOUD Treatment OR (95% CI)**
Age	1.00 (1.00-1.01)	0.99 (0.98-1.00)
Race and Ethnicity		
White	Reference	Reference
Asian	0.83 (0.70-0.99)	0.45 (0.24-0.83)
Black or African American	1.20 (1.09-1.31)	0.71 (0.54-0.93)
Hispanic or Latino/a/x	0.95 (0.83-1.08)	0.48 (0.32-0.72)
Multi-racial	1.36 (1.13-1.63)	0.71 (0.40-1.25)
Native American, Alaska Native or Other Pacific Islander	2.28 (1.65-3.14)	0.76 (0.27-2.16)
Other[a]	0.57 (0.46-0.70)	1.18 (0.80-1.76)
Sex		
Male	Reference	Reference
Female	1.19 (1.10-1.28)	0.92 (0.73-1.16)
Other[b]	1.26 (0.74-2.16)	0 (0-2.61$_E$198)[d]
Insurance		
Medicaid	Reference	Reference
Medicare	1.25 (1.13-1.38)	0.76 (0.56-1.03)
Commercial	0.69 (0.60-0.80)	0.69 (0.47-1.01)
Other[c]	0.27 (0.19-0.38)	0.87 (0.52-1.45)
Encounter Phenotype		
Non-Opioid Use Disorder	Reference	-
Opioid Use Disorder	1.91 (1.77-2.07)	-
Engagement	-	1.11 (0.84-1.47)
Risk Engagement		
SDOH Absent	-	Reference
SDOH Present and Non-Adverse	-	1.90 (0.65-5.57)

SDOH Present and Adverse	-	0.87 (0.54-1.42)

Abbreviations: MOUD, medications for opioid use disorder; OR, odds ratio; SDOH, social drivers of health
[a]Includes “Other”, “Unknown/Declined”, “Southwest Asian and North African”
[b]Includes “Choose not to disclose”, “Declines to answer”, “Something else”, “Unknown”
[c]Includes “Other” and “Worker’s Comp”
[d]Confidence interval uninformative due to no MOUD treatment events for individuals in this category

DISCUSSION

In this cross-sectional study of 17,103 ED encounters examining clinician engagement with EHR-based SDOH data, we found that engagement occurred in approximately one fifth of encounters, almost exclusively driven by SDOH data review rather than documentation activities. Clinicians most frequently reviewed the Z code and SDOH Wheel data. Engagement was higher in encounters with patients experiencing OUD compared to matched controls. Among patients with OUD, engagement was positively associated with MOUD, yet treatment disparities persisted for Asian, Black/African American, and Hispanic/Latino/a/x patients.

This hypothesis-generating work has important implications for designing user interfaces to improve SDOH engagement and clinical care in ED settings. While ED clinicians rarely document structured SDOH data, they do actively review it when it is easily accessible within their clinical workflows. The dramatic difference in review rates between the Problem List (97.1%) and other SDOH data fields is at least partially explained by structural advantage: the Problem List is visible from the ED navigation screen, meaning it does not require additional chart navigation. Furthermore, the Problem List summarizes the patient’s Past Medical History, which helps ED physicians make quick management decisions for undifferentiated patients.[21] By extension, Z codes included on the Problem List are likely to receive more attention. The ease of locating and viewing information appears critically important in the time- and resource-constrained ED environment, suggesting that strategic placement of SDOH information in frequently accessed EHR components could substantially increase clinician awareness of patients’ social risks.

The higher engagement rates in encounters with patients experiencing OUD compared to matched controls supports our hypothesis that clinicians do consider SDOH information relevant to treating patients with conditions known to be influenced by SDOH, such as OUD. The positive association between engagement with SDOH data and MOUD treatment may serve as a marker for clinician attentiveness to whole-person care. However, the concerning trend toward decreased MOUD treatment when clinicians specifically engaged with adverse SDOH data raises an important question: are clinicians less likely to administer MOUD when they perceive patients to have social risks? Prior work has identified concerns about follow-up care as a key barrier to ED provider readiness to initiate MOUD,[22] and patients with OUD and adverse SDOH are known to struggle with care continuity.[14] Determining whether engagement with SDOH data itself influences treatment decisions merits further investigation through prospective controlled studies. Nevertheless, even after we adjusted for SDOH data engagement, we found persistent racial disparities in MOUD treatment, consistent with prior literature.[19,20] Addressing deeply entrenched racial disparities in MOUD access is likely to require more systemic interventions than simply surfacing SDOH data to clinicians’ awareness.

To our knowledge, this is the first study to explore documentation and review of EHR-based SDOH data in the ED setting. The low documentation rates we observed across all SDOH data fields are consistent with prior studies showing low SDOH-related Z code documentation in ED encounters nationally[23] and likely reflect competing priorities, time constraints, and lack of incentives for ED clinicians to document SDOH. It is possible that ED clinicians preferentially document SDOH information in unstructured clinician notes,[24] which were not included in this study. However, based on our findings, it is clear that ED clinicians most often review structured SDOH data fields (Problem List, SDOH Wheel), underscoring the importance of structured SDOH documentation. In the future, ambient scribe technology may offer a way systematically do this without increasing documentation burden.

While prior studies evaluating similar SDOH data engagement measures in inpatient settings offer few directly comparable results, they suggest key workflow differences between ED and inpatient care. One study examining inpatient documentation and review behavior found that the Social History free text field was reviewed more frequently than the SDOH Wheel (14.4% versus 0.03%), and social work notes were reviewed

by non-social work clinicians in 70% of encounters.[1] However, that study was conducted just one year after the SDOH Wheel was implemented, when both clinicians and staff were likely still adapting to the new tool. Furthermore, documentation and review events were counted regardless of user type, and only specific “Mark as Reviewed” actions were included. While including all users, as opposed to clinicians only, might have increased the signal of engagement events, review of the data in the absence of actively clicking “Mark as Reviewed” may have led to underestimation. Another inpatient study examining documentation and review of structured SDOH fields (again, using “Mark as Reviewed”) found low overall rates of engagement (8.4% of hospitalizations).[5] Because we focused on clinicians only, included both active review actions and hovering behaviors in our engagement measures, and examined multiple SDOH data types, our findings differ. Regardless, these differences suggest that inpatient clinicians tend to review unstructured social work notes, while time-pressed ED clinicians prefer easily accessible structured data.

Moving forward, it will be critical to develop actionable, social risk-informed treatment recommendations that both address racial and ethnic disparities in MOUD access and are tailored to the time- and resource-constrained ED environment. Clinical decision support tools are widely used, electronic health record (EHR)-embedded tools that guide clinical decision-making using order sets, reminders, and alerts. They have been shown to be effective at influencing clinical care, especially when developed with user (e.g., clinician and patient) input[25–30] and may provide one avenue for achieving this goal while maintaining the benefits of SDOH data visibility for whole-person care.

LIMITATIONS

As a single-site study conducted at an academic medical center, our findings may not be generalizable to other practice settings, particularly community EDs or those serving different patient populations. However, the fundamental EHR data types we studied—problem lists, social work notes, and SDOH documentation fields—are present in most Epic instances and other EHR systems, even when specific tools like the SDOH Wheel are not activated. While we were unable to cluster models by clinician, we verified robustness by adding clinician fixed effects. The shift to a negative overall link between engagement and MOUD may have been due to most SDOH Wheel data being adverse: with adverse SDOH data dominating, the overall engagement association was diluted, while the risk engagement associations were strengthened. Although EHR audit log data enabled us to measure documentation and review behaviors, the data do not provide a window into clinicians’ decision-making processes or motivations for engaging with SDOH data. This limitation is particularly relevant to understanding the relationship between risk engagement and MOUD treatment, where qualitative research with clinicians might explore whether and how clinicians consciously factor adverse SDOH into their treatment decisions.

Other limitations stem from our measures of SDOH data engagement. While we could track when clinicians accessed the problem list containing Z codes, we cannot guarantee they specifically reviewed the Z codes themselves versus other diagnoses. Additionally, because the SDOH Wheel was the only data field that distinguished between present, absent, and adverse SDOH data, we were likely insufficiently powered to detect significant associations between engagement and MOUD treatment. Nevertheless, our ability to classify the SDOH data within the SDOH Wheel provided a unique level of granularity that strengthened our analyses. Lastly, we were unable to categorize unstructured SDOH information from social work notes or the free text social history field into specific domains. However, these unstructured data fields represented a small proportion of overall engagement events in our sample, and categorizing SDOH domains was not the primary objective of this study.

CONCLUSION

In summary, ED clinicians review previously documented EHR-based SDOH data in about 20% of encounters. They rarely document new SDOH information in the chart. They are more likely to review structured SDOH data fields, which are quickly accessible in ED clinical workflows. Clinicians who engaged with SDOH data were also more likely to order or prescribe MOUD, though racial and ethnic disparities in MOUD treatment persisted even when controlling for SDOH data engagement. Our findings suggest that strategic user interface design—e.g., prioritizing data visibility and workflow integration—could enhance SDOH engagement and potentially influence clinical care delivery. However, the causal relationship between SDOH data engagement and OUD-related treatment decisions should be the target of future research. Clinical decision support

interventions, for instance, could be leveraged to optimize SDOH data presentation in time- and resource-constrained ED settings, to help reduce disparities and improve care.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

MFM, LMG, JAM conceived the study. MFM obtained research funding. MFM supervised the data collection and CF extracted the data. SDP provided statistical advice on study design and analyzed the data. MFM drafted the manuscript, and all authors contributed substantially to its revision. MFM takes responsibility for the paper as a whole.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST SATEMENT

None

DATA AVAILABILITY

The data underlying this article cannot be shared publicly in order to protect the privacy of individuals represented in the dataset.

REFERENCES

1. Wang M, Pantell MS, Gottlieb LM, Adler-Milstein J. Documentation and review of social determinants of health data in the EHR: measures and associated insights. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2021;28(12):2608-2616. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocab194

2. Schoenbaum AE, Stephenson L, Evans J. Addressing Social Determinants of Health (SDOH) in Healthcare Part 2 | HIMSS. HIMSS. August 4, 2023. Accessed February 12, 2024. https://www.himss.org/resources/addressing-social-determinants-health-sdoh-healthcare-part-2

3. Carrier S. CMS Shifts Focus to SDoH with Proposed 2024 Updates. Harmony Healthcare. March 3, 2023. Accessed February 12, 2024. https://harmony.solutions/cms-focus-on-sdoh-2024/

4. Gottlieb LM, DeSilvey SC, Fichtenberg C, Bernheim S, Peltz A. Developing National Social Care Standards. *Health Affairs Forefront*. doi:10.1377/forefront.20230221.857308

5. Iott BE, Adler-Milstein J, Gottlieb LM, Pantell MS. Characterizing the relative frequency of clinician engagement with structured social determinants of health data. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*. 2023;30(3):503-510. doi:10.1093/jamia/ocac251

6. Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services. FY 2026 Hospital Inpatient Prospective Payment System (IPPS) and Long-Term Care Hospital Prospective Payment System (LTCH PPS) Proposed Rule — CMS-1833-P Fact Sheet. Accessed August 22, 2025. https://www.cms.gov/newsroom/fact-sheets/fy-2026-hospital-inpatient-prospective-payment-system-ipps-and-long-term-care-hospital-prospective

7. Kellermann AL, Hsia RY, Yeh C, Morganti KG. Emergency care: then, now, and next. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2013;32(12):2069-2074. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.2013.0683

8. Molina MF, Li CN, Manchanda EC, et al. Prevalence of Emergency Department Social Risk and Social Needs. *West J Emerg Med*. 2020;21(6):152-161. doi:10.5811/westjem.2020.7.47796

9. CDC. Disease of the Week - Opioid Use Disorder. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. August 30, 2022. Accessed April 30, 2023. https://www.cdc.gov/dotw/opioid-use-disorder/index.html

10. National Institute on Drug Abuse. Effective Treatments for Opioid Addiction. National Institute on Drug Abuse. November 1, 2016. Accessed April 30, 2023. https://nida.nih.gov/publications/effective-treatments-opioid-addiction

11. D’Onofrio G, O’Connor PG, Pantalon MV, et al. Emergency department-initiated buprenorphine/naloxone treatment for opioid dependence: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2015;313(16):1636-1644. doi:10.1001/jama.2015.3474

12. Men F, Fischer B, Urquia ML, Tarasuk V. Food insecurity, chronic pain, and use of prescription opioids. *SSM Popul Health*. 2021;14:100768. doi:10.1016/j.ssmph.2021.100768

13. Doran KM, Rahai N, McCormack RP, et al. Substance use and homelessness among emergency department patients. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2018;188:328-333. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2018.04.021

14. Jalali MS, Botticelli M, Hwang RC, Koh HK, McHugh RK. The opioid crisis: a contextual, social-ecological framework. *Health Research Policy and Systems*. 2020;18(1):87. doi:10.1186/s12961-020-00596-8

15. Shastry S, Carpenter J, Krotulski A, et al. Disparities in Treatment and Referral After an Opioid Overdose Among Emergency Department Patients. *JAMA Network Open*. 2025;8(7):e2518569. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2025.18569

16. Chartash D, Paek H, Dziura JD, et al. Identifying Opioid Use Disorder in the Emergency Department: Multi-System Electronic Health Record-Based Computable Phenotype Derivation and Validation Study. *JMIR Med Inform*. 2019;7(4):e15794. doi:10.2196/15794

17. Pimentel SD, Kelz RR, Silber JH, Rosenbaum PR. Large, Sparse Optimal Matching with Refined Covariate Balance in an Observational Study of the Health Outcomes Produced by New Surgeons. *J Am Stat Assoc*. 2015;110(510):515-527. doi:10.1080/01621459.2014.997879

18. Rosenbaum PR, Ross RN, Silber JH. Minimum Distance Matched Sampling With Fine Balance in an Observational Study of Treatment for Ovarian Cancer. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*. 2007;102(477):75-83. doi:10.1198/016214506000001059

19. Barnett ML, Meara E, Lewinson T, et al. Racial Inequality in Receipt of Medications for Opioid Use Disorder. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2023;388(19):1779-1789. doi:10.1056/NEJMsa2212412

20. Holland WC, Li F, Nath B, et al. Racial and ethnic disparities in emergency department–initiated buprenorphine across five health care systems. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2023;30(7):709-720. doi:10.1111/acem.14668

21. King BL, Meyer ML, Chari SV, et al. Accuracy of the electronic health record's problem list in describing multimorbidity in patients with heart failure in the emergency department. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(12):e0279033. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0279033

22. Hawk KF, D'Onofrio G, Chawarski MC, et al. Barriers and Facilitators to Clinician Readiness to Provide Emergency Department–Initiated Buprenorphine. *JAMA Network Open*. 2020;3(5):e204561. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2020.4561

23. Molina MF, Pantell MS, Gottlieb LM. Social Risk Factor Documentation in Emergency Departments. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2023;81(1):38-46. doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2022.07.027

24. Mehta S, Lyles CR, Rubinsky AD, et al. Social Determinants of Health Documentation in Structured and Unstructured Clinical Data of Patients With Diabetes: Comparative Analysis. *JMIR Med Inform*. 2023;11:e46159. doi:10.2196/46159

25. Tcheng JE, Bakken S, Bates DW, et al. *Optimizing Strategies for Clinical Decision Support: Summary of a Meeting Series*. National Academy of Medicine; 2017. https://nam.edu/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/Optimizing-Strategies-for-Clinical-Decision-Support.pdf

26. O'Connor PJ, Sperl-Hillen JM, Rush WA, et al. Impact of electronic health record clinical decision support on diabetes care: a randomized trial. *Ann Fam Med*. 2011;9(1):12-21. doi:10.1370/afm.1196

27. Gilmer TP, O'Connor PJ, Sperl-Hillen JM, et al. Cost-effectiveness of an electronic medical record based clinical decision support system. *Health Serv Res*. 2012;47(6):2137-2158. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2012.01427.x

28. Ash JS, Sittig DF, Guappone KP, et al. Recommended practices for computerized clinical decision support and knowledge management in community settings: a qualitative study. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2012;12:6. doi:10.1186/1472-6947-12-6

29. Ash JS, Sittig DF, Dykstra R, et al. Identifying Best Practices for Clinical Decision Support and Knowledge Management in the Field. *Stud Health Technol Inform*. 2010;160(Pt 2):806-810.

30. Bright TJ, Wong A, Dhurjati R, et al. Effect of clinical decision-support systems: a systematic review. *Ann Intern Med*. 2012;157(1):29-43. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-157-1-201207030-00450