

Dermatologist Practices During Total Body Skin Examinations: A Survey Study

Evan A. Rieder MD,^a Euphemia W. Mu MD,^a Jenny Wang BS,^a David E. Cohen MD,^a Darrell S. Rigel MD,^{a,b} and Mary L. Stevenson MD^a

^aThe Ronald O. Perleman Department of Dermatology, New York University School of Medicine, New York, NY

^bRigel Dermatology Group, New York, NY

ABSTRACT

Though screening for skin cancer is an essential practice in dermatology, limited data are published on dermatologists' total body skin examination (TBSE) behaviors. We surveyed 6500 dermatologists on their TBSE practices, including questions about less commonly examined body sites. We found varied TBSE practices among all dermatologists and discrepancies in examinations between dermatologists of opposite genders.

J Drugs Dermatol. 2018;17(5):516-520.

INTRODUCTION

Screening for skin cancer is an essential practice in dermatology.¹ However, limited data are published on dermatologists' total body skin examination (TBSE) practices,² and no data are published on how TBSE practices vary by physician demographics. We report TBSE trends in a sample of U.S. dermatologists.

A total of 6500 U.S. dermatologists who were part of a private online meeting planning group database were emailed a questionnaire assessing their TBSE practices, including questions about less commonly examined body sites, chaperone use, and barriers to practice. We assumed most dermatologists consistently examined the head, neck, trunk, and extremities, so examination of these areas was not queried. Statistical analyses were performed using Stata 11.0 for Mac (Stata Corp, College Station, TX). Categorical variables were compared with the χ^2 test, and *P* values below 0.05 were significant.

Of the dermatologists emailed, 623 responded (9.6%): 53% (*n*=331) males and 46% (*n*=288) females. Prior studies validate that our study sample size is large enough to be representative of the surveyed population. Standard statistical analysis for a suggested sample size of proportions with 95% confidence requires a target response rate of at least 363 respondents.³ Most respondents (77%) worked in private practice; 52% had practiced for at least twenty years. Providers reported examining the scalp, interdigital spaces, cutaneous lips, and nails in >75% of cases, the ocular canthi and bulbar conjunctiva in >50% of cases, and the oral mucosa and gingivae, palpebral conjunctiva, and external genitalia in <50% of cases. The scalp and genitalia were examined more often in male than female patients (*P*=0.001) (Table 1).

Compared to male dermatologists, female dermatologists reported more frequently examining the scalp (*P*<0.001),

interdigital spaces (*P*<0.001), cutaneous lips (*P*=0.015), and nails (*P*=0.001; Table 2), but these differences in examination patterns normalized when physicians were sorted by years in practice. During examinations, practitioners reported utilizing chaperones infrequently: 47% of respondents reported always having a chaperone present, and 27% of respondents had a chaperone present for patients of the same sex (*P*<0.005). The greatest impediments to TBSEs included patient preference or refusal (reported by 85% of respondents), patient embarrassment (31%), and time constraints (30%). Patient embarrassment was the only impediment significantly different between practitioners of different genders (*P*<0.001, 40% of male dermatologists vs 19% of female dermatologists).

Our survey found practice differences between male and female dermatologists. We speculate that differences in training, patient preference, and patient and provider comfort contribute to disparities in TBSE practices. Female providers may report more comprehensive examinations than their male counterparts due to recent increases in female dermatology residents and residency training initiatives emphasizing more comprehensive physical exams.⁴ Female practitioners also report seeing fewer patients per hour than their male counterparts, which may allow for additional examination time per patient.⁵

In summary, we found varied TBSE practices reported in a large sample of U.S. dermatologists. Discrepancies exist in TBSE practices between dermatologists of opposite genders. Study limitations include small sample size, over-representation of later career practitioners, selection bias, recall bias, and an inability to account for the nature of the doctor-patient interpersonal interaction during clinical visit.

TABLE 1.**Body Site Examination Frequency by All Practitioners (N=623) Compared Between Female versus Male Patients**

| Body Site and Examination Frequency | Female Patient | | Male Patient | | P* |
|-------------------------------------|----------------|-----|--------------|-----|-------|
| | No. | (%) | No. | (%) | |
| Scalp | | | | | 0.001 |
| ≤25% | 74 | 12 | 36 | 6 | |
| 26-75% | 93 | 15 | 83 | 13 | |
| >75% | 422 | 68 | 471 | 76 | |
| Unknown | 34 | 5 | 33 | 5 | |
| Interdigital Spaces | | | | | 0.986 |
| ≤25% | 60 | 10 | 61 | 10 | |
| 26-75% | 58 | 9 | 61 | 10 | |
| >75% | 468 | 75 | 466 | 75 | |
| Unknown | 37 | 6 | 35 | 5 | |
| Cutaneous Lips | | | | | 0.767 |
| ≤25% | 10 | 2 | 12 | 2 | |
| 26-75% | 25 | 4 | 31 | 5 | |
| >75% | 545 | 87 | 542 | 87 | |
| Unknown | 43 | 7 | 38 | 6 | |
| Oral Mucosa | | | | | 0.759 |
| ≤25% | 348 | 56 | 334 | 53 | |
| 26-75% | 117 | 19 | 116 | 19 | |
| >75% | 120 | 19 | 135 | 22 | |
| Unknown | 38 | 6 | 38 | 6 | |
| Ocular Conjunctiva | | | | | 0.919 |
| ≤25% | 186 | 30 | 184 | 30 | |
| 26-75% | 93 | 15 | 101 | 16 | |
| >75% | 308 | 49 | 300 | 48 | |
| Unknown | 36 | 6 | 38 | 6 | |
| Palpebral Conjunctiva | | | | | 0.908 |
| ≤25% | 304 | 49 | 299 | 48 | |
| 26-75% | 79 | 13 | 87 | 14 | |
| >75% | 201 | 32 | 201 | 32 | |
| Unknown | 39 | 6 | 36 | 6 | |
| Nails | | | | | 0.853 |
| ≤25% | 19 | 3 | 24 | 4 | |
| 26-75% | 69 | 11 | 69 | 11 | |
| >75% | 498 | 80 | 489 | 78 | |
| Unknown | 38 | 6 | 41 | 7 | |
| Genitalia | | | | | 0.001 |
| ≤25% | 327 | 52 | 258 | 41 | |
| 26-75% | 128 | 21 | 157 | 25 | |
| >75% | 132 | 21 | 169 | 27 | |
| Unknown | 36 | 6 | 39 | 6 | |

*P values obtained from χ^2 tests.

© 2018-Journal of Drugs in Dermatology. All Rights Reserved.

This document contains proprietary information, images and marks of Journal of Drugs in Dermatology (JDD).

No reproduction or use of any portion of the contents of these materials may be made without the express written consent of JDD.

If you feel you have obtained this copy illegally, please contact JDD immediately at support@jddonline.com

TABLE 2.**Body Site Examination Frequency Among All Patients Compared Between Female versus Male Practitioners**

| Body Site and Examination Frequency | Female Patient (n=288) | | Male Patient (n=331) | | P* |
|-------------------------------------|------------------------|-----|----------------------|-----|--------|
| | No. | (%) | No. | (%) | |
| Scalp | | | | | <0.001 |
| ≤25% | 8 | 3 | 27 | 8 | |
| 26-75% | 30 | 10 | 49 | 15 | |
| >75% | 239 | 83 | 233 | 70 | |
| Unknown | 11 | 4 | 22 | 7 | |
| Interdigital Spaces | | | | | <0.001 |
| ≤25% | 9 | 3 | 50 | 15 | |
| 26-75% | 17 | 6 | 38 | 11 | |
| >75% | 251 | 87 | 221 | 67 | |
| Unknown | 11 | 4 | 22 | 7 | |
| Cutaneous Lips | | | | | 0.015 |
| ≤25% | 0 | 0 | 9 | 3 | |
| 26-75% | 6 | 2 | 17 | 5 | |
| >75% | 271 | 94 | 283 | 85 | |
| Unknown | 11 | 4 | 22 | 7 | |
| Oral Mucosa | | | | | 0.72 |
| ≤25% | 151 | 52 | 175 | 53 | |
| 26-75% | 58 | 20 | 66 | 20 | |
| >75% | 67 | 23 | 68 | 20 | |
| Unknown | 12 | 4 | 22 | 7 | |
| Ocular Conjunctiva | | | | | 0.259 |
| ≤25% | 139 | 27 | 100 | 30 | |
| 26-75% | 33 | 15 | 48 | 15 | |
| >75% | 104 | 54 | 154 | 49 | |
| Unknown | 12 | 4 | 22 | 6 | |
| Palpebral Conjunctiva | | | | | 0.41 |
| ≤25% | 304 | 48 | 154 | 47 | |
| 26-75% | 79 | 11 | 51 | 15 | |
| >75% | 201 | 36 | 104 | 31 | |
| Unknown | 39 | 4 | 22 | 6 | |
| Nails | | | | | 0.001 |
| ≤25% | 2 | 1 | 12 | 3 | |
| 26-75% | 18 | 6 | 48 | 15 | |
| >75% | 257 | 89 | 249 | 75 | |
| Unknown | 11 | 4 | 22 | 7 | |
| Genitalia | | | | | 0.229 |
| ≤25% | 99 | 34 | 131 | 40 | |
| 26-75% | 88 | 31 | 81 | 24 | |
| >75% | 90 | 31 | 98 | 30 | |
| Unknown | 11 | 4 | 21 | 6 | |

*P values obtained from χ^2 tests.

© 2018-Journal of Drugs in Dermatology. All Rights Reserved.

This document contains proprietary information, images and marks of Journal of Drugs in Dermatology (JDD).

No reproduction or use of any portion of the contents of these materials may be made without the express written consent of JDD.

If you feel you have obtained this copy illegally, please contact JDD immediately at support@jddonline.com

DISCLOSURES

The authors have no relevant conflicts of interest to declare.

REFERENCES

1. Moran B, McDonald I, Wall D, et al. Complete skin examination is essential in the assessment of dermatology patients: findings from 483 patients. *Br J Dermatol*. 2011;165(5):1124-1126.
2. Lakhani N, Saraiya M, Thompson T, King S, Guy G. Total body skin examination for skin cancer screening among U.S. adults from 2000 to 2010. *Prev Med*. 2014;61:75-80.
3. Phillips PP, Phillips JJ, Aaron B. Survey Research Design. In: *Survey Basics*. Alexandria, VA: ASTD. 2013:71.
4. Bae G, Qiu M, Reese E, Nambudiri V, Huang S. Changes in sex and ethnic diversity in dermatology residents over multiple decades. *JAMA Dermatology*. 2016;152(1):92-94.
5. Jacobson CC, Resneck JS, Kimball AB. Generational differences in practice patterns of dermatologists in the United States: implications for workforce planning. *Arch Dermatol*. 2004;140(12):1477-1482.

AUTHOR CORRESPONDENCE

Evan A. Rieder MD

E-mail:..... evan.rieder@nyumc.org

SUPPLEMENTARY APPENDIX

Survey Instrument

Thank you for agreeing to participate in this short survey. All responses are anonymous and no identifying information including email addresses, IP addresses, or personal information from respondents will be collected. We estimate that the total time required to complete this survey is less than five minutes.

1. What is your gender?
 - Male
 - Female
2. What is your level of training?
 - Resident dermatologist
 - Attending dermatologist
 - Academic faculty group practice
 - Private practice
 - Outpatient hospital-based clinic
 - Other
3. How many years have you been practicing?
 - Less than 5
 - 5 to 10
 - 11 to 20
 - Greater than 20
4. Assuming an adult patient has no personal or family history of skin cancers, how often would you perform a total body skin examination (TBSE)?
 - Every 3 to 4 months
 - Every 6 months
 - Annually
 - Every 2 to 3 years
 - Rarely / never
5. Assuming an adult patient is at high risk for skin cancers (family history of skin cancer, history of sunburns, actinic damage, dysplastic and/or multiple nevi, fair skinned), but has no personal history of skin cancer, how often would you perform a TBSE?
 - Every 3 to 4 months
 - Every 6 months
 - Annually
 - Every 2 to 3 years
 - Rarely / never
6. Please mark the percentage of time you routinely examine the following parts of the body for female patients (Never, 1-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76-99%, always on dropdown menu)
 - Scalp
 - In between toes
 - Cutaneous lips
 - Inner oral mucosa and gingivae
 - Ocular canthi and bulbar conjunctiva
 - Palpebral conjunctiva
 - Nails
 - External genitalia
7. Please mark the percentage of time you routinely examine the following parts of the body for male patients (Never, 1-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76-99%, always on dropdown menu)
 - Scalp
 - In between toes
 - Cutaneous lips
 - Inner oral mucosa and gingivae
 - Ocular canthi and bulbar conjunctiva
 - Palpebral conjunctiva
 - Nails
 - External genitalia
8. When performing a TBSE, please indicate what % of the time do you have a chaperone present:
 - for patients of the same sex (answers: Never, 1-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76%-99%, always)
 - for patients of the opposite sex (answers: Never, 1-25%, 26-50%, 51-75%, 76%-99%, always)
9. You have decided that a patient is an appropriate candidate for a TBSE. What are the major impediments to not performing a TBSE. Please check all that apply.
 - your embarrassment
 - patient's embarrassment
 - lack of chaperone
 - time constraints
 - patient refuses/patient chooses not to have exam
 - practice financial limitation: needing to hire additional staff to chaperone
 - practice financial concern: inadequate reimbursement for time-intensive examination
 - lack of evidence/clear consensus guidelines for utility of TBSE in improving outcomes