

1 Title: A Cross-Sectional Analysis of Disparities in Biopsy Result Disclosure for Patients with
2 Limited English Proficiency

3 Authors: Joseph Dan Khoa Nguyen, BS¹, Erica Mark, MD², Seth Martin, MD¹, R. Hal Flowers,
4 MD¹

5 Affiliations: 1. University of Virginia, Department of Dermatology, Charlottesville, VA 22903,

6 2. Kaiser Permanente, Department of Internal Medicine, Oakland, CA 94611

7 Author Contributions: J.D.K.N., E.M., S.M., and R.H.F. designed research; J.D.K.N., E.M., and
8 S.M. performed data collection; J.D.K.N., E.M., and S.M. analyzed data; J.D.K.N., E.M., and
9 R.H.F. wrote the paper, and J.D.K.N., E.M., S.M., and R.H.F edited the paper.

10 ORCID IDs: Joseph D. K. Nguyen: 0009-0008-1585-7230; Erica Mark: 0000-0002-2578-082X;

11 Seth Martin: 0000-0001-8292-4140

12 Statements and Declarations: The authors have nothing to disclose.

13 Keywords: dermatology, English, interpreter, language, translation

14

15 Corresponding author:

16 Joseph Dan Khoa Nguyen

17 1215 Lee St, Charlottesville, VA 22903

18 jdn4de@virginia.edu

19 **Abstract:**

20 Patients with limited English proficiency (LEP) receiving care from language-discordant
21 providers experience worse outcomes in healthcare quality, safety, and satisfaction, so
22 optimizing medical care for patients with LEP is an integral topic for quality improvement. At
23 our institution, biopsy results are disclosed via telephone unless discussed during an
24 appointment. In this retrospective cohort study, we aimed to quantify the relative lag time in
25 telephone-based biopsy result disclosure when interpretation services were utilized compared to
26 when they were not. A total of 12,372 patient interactions were analyzed; 250 patients (2.02%)
27 required interpreters, and most of these patients spoke Spanish (196, 78.4%). Other languages
28 spoken included Tagalog, Ukrainian, Serbian, Russian, Punjabi, Mandarin, Kurdish, Farsi,
29 Nepali Arabic, and American Sign Language. The mean delay from provider result release to
30 disclosure for patients who required an interpreter was 55.0 hours compared to 36.6 hours for
31 those who did not, respectively ($p < 0.001$). For those requiring a Spanish interpreter, this delay
32 was 60.2 hours ($p < 0.001$). For non-Spanish interpretation, the delay was 36.6 hours ($p = 0.99$).
33 Patients requiring a Spanish interpreter experienced increased mean wait times for receiving
34 biopsy results compared to those who spoke English. Possible reasons include increased
35 communication burden for clinicians when using interpreters, insufficient provider awareness of
36 delays, and patient socioeconomic factors. Future research may analyze the impact of delayed
37 result disclosure, optimal disclosure methods, and initiatives to reduce disparities in time to
38 result disclosure for LEP patients.

39

40 **Background:**

41 Patients with limited English proficiency (LEP) receiving care from language-discordant
42 providers are more likely to have worse outcomes in healthcare quality, safety, and satisfaction
43 compared to LEP patients or those fluent in English receiving care from language-concordant
44 providers [1-3]. LEP refers to individuals who speak English “less than very well [4].” In 2013,
45 25.1 million U.S. residents were considered to have LEP [4]. The Joint Commission’s Sentinel
46 Event Database reveals that communication issues are the most common root cause of serious
47 patient safety events [5], so optimizing medical care for patients with LEP is an integral topic for
48 quality improvement.

49 At our academic medical center, biopsy results are generally disclosed via telephone unless
50 discussed during an appointment. Our institution does have widely used interpretation services
51 that are offered for all patients, both for in-person visits and telephone calls. In this retrospective
52 analysis, we aimed to quantify the relative lag time in telephone-based biopsy result disclosure
53 when interpretation services were utilized compared to when they were not. To the authors’
54 knowledge, this is the first paper exploring disparities in telephone-based biopsy result disclosure
55 for patients requiring interpretation services.

56

57 **Methods:**

58 **Participants:**

59 This study was deemed exempt by the University of Virginia Institutional Review Board. This
60 study is a retrospective cohort study of patients who received telephone-based biopsy disclosure
61 at an academic medical center. Inclusion criteria were disclosure of biopsy result by telephone,
62 disclosure by a physician, and recorded interpretation status.

63 Data Collection:

64 Deidentified patient data from January 2019 - December 2021 were extracted from Epic.

65 Measures:

66 Data collected from Epic included time of finalized biopsy reports, time of biopsy report
67 finalization, time of patient receiving results, and interpretation utilization.

68 Analysis:

69 Data were exported to R, version 4.0.2. The primary outcome was lag time, defined as the time
70 from when the biopsy report is finalized to when patients receive the results (through phone call).
71 Lag time comparisons were made via Wilcoxon Rank Sum tests between patients requiring
72 interpretation vs no interpretation, and between patients requiring Spanish interpretation vs non-
73 Spanish interpretation vs no interpretation. In this analysis, all patients who utilized
74 interpretation services were included, including patients using an American Sign Language
75 interpreter, to effectively assess the impact of interpretation services on biopsy result disclosure
76 lag time.

77

78 **Results:**

79 A total of 12,372 patient interactions were analyzed; 250 patients (2.02%) required interpreters,
80 and most of these patients spoke Spanish (196, 78.4%). Other languages spoken included:
81 Tagalog (n=1), Ukrainian (n=2), Serbian (n=2), Russian (n=2), Punjabi (n=1), Mandarin (n=5),
82 Kurdish (n=1), Farsi (n=11), Nepali (n=5), Arabic (n=12), and ASL (n=10). The mean delay
83 from provider result release to disclosure for patients who required an interpreter was 55.0 hours

84 compared to 36.6 hours for those who did not; median delays in disclosure were 23.0 hours and
85 17.0 hours, respectively ($p < 0.001$; 95% CI: [-31.4, -9.2]). For those requiring a Spanish
86 interpreter, the mean delay was 60.2 hours ($p < 0.001$; 95% CI: [-36.7, -10.5]). For non-Spanish
87 interpretation, the mean delay was 36.6 hours ($p = 0.989$, 95% CI: [(-12.8, 12.9)]) (Figure 1).

88

89 **Discussion:**

90 Based on this data, our study demonstrated a disparity in callback times for patients requiring a
91 Spanish interpreter. Patients requiring a Spanish interpreter had average wait times 23.6 hours
92 (64.4%) longer than those who spoke English or required a non-Spanish interpreter. While
93 receiving a result roughly one day later is unlikely to significantly alter management decisions,
94 the consistent pattern of delays in disclosure of results to patients requiring Spanish interpreters
95 is a notable finding that warrants further investigation. Of note, this delay may lead to delaying
96 future diagnostic and therapeutic procedures, potentially negatively influencing patient
97 outcomes.

98 Prompt result disclosure to LEP patients requires increased provider time and interpreter
99 availability, creating a communication burden for clinicians [6]. Clinicians report lapses in
100 professional interpretation, communication delays, and feelings of dissatisfaction and
101 ineffectiveness when utilizing a telephone interpreter [7]. Delays in receiving medical results can
102 be stressful for patients [7]. Increased provider awareness of the tendency to inadvertently or
103 advertently delay these call-backs may help them take steps to alleviate the discrepancy in their
104 own practice. While it is plausible that the logistical barriers in using interpretation services may
105 contribute to the delay in call-backs, this does not explain why it only affects patients requiring

106 Spanish interpreters. One plausible explanation for this phenomenon is socioeconomic factors,
107 such as the inability to pay telephone bills or answer calls during work hours, may limit access to
108 effective and timely telephone-based communication. Additionally, the sample size of patients
109 requiring non-Spanish interpretation was very small and may not accurately reflect
110 communication delays in this population. Future studies may be helpful in further characterizing
111 and defining this disparity.

112 Limitations of this study include: 1) a lack of information on specific diagnoses, as certain
113 diagnoses (e.g. malignancy) may be prioritized over others, leading to shorter callback times, 2)
114 data was from a single center, making it difficult to extrapolate findings across multiple clinical
115 settings, and 3) relatively few patients (~2%) required an interpreter. Future research may
116 analyze other departments and institutions, the impact of delayed result disclosure, optimal
117 disclosure methods, and initiatives to ensure timely delivery of results for all patients.

118

119 **New Contribution to the Literature:**

120 To the authors' knowledge, this is the first paper exploring disparities in telephone-based biopsy
121 result disclosure for patients requiring an interpreter. This paper illuminates a disparity in
122 callback times for patients requiring a Spanish interpreter, which warrants further investigation.

123


124 **References:**

- 125 1. Hilfinger Messias DK, McDowell L, Estrada RD. Language interpreting as social justice
126 work: perspectives of formal and informal healthcare interpreters. *ANS Adv Nurs Sci.*
127 2009;32(2):128-43. <https://doi.org/10.1097/ANS.0b013e3181a3af97>. [PMID: 19461230]
- 128 2. Bischoff A, Denhaerynck K. What do language barriers cost? An exploratory study among
129 asylum seekers in Switzerland. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2010;10:248. [https://doi.org/](https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-10-248)
130 [10.1186/1472-6963-10-248](https://doi.org/10.1186/1472-6963-10-248). [PMID: 20731818]
- 131 3. Floyd A, Sakellariou D. Healthcare access for refugee women with limited literacy: layers of
132 disadvantage. *Int J Equity Health.* 2017;16:195. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-017-0694-8>.
133 [PMID: 29126420]
- 134 4. Zong J, Batalova J. The Limited English Proficient Population in the United States in 2013.
135 2015. [https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/limited-english-proficient-population-united-](https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/limited-english-proficient-population-united-states-2013)
136 [states-2013](https://www.migrationpolicy.org/article/limited-english-proficient-population-united-states-2013). Accessed on March 8, 2022.
- 137 5. Dingley C, Daugherty K, Derieg MK, Persing R. Improving Patient Safety Through Provider
138 Communication Strategy Enhancements. In: *Advances in Patient Safety: New Directions and*
139 *Alternative Approaches (Vol. 3: Performance and Tools)*. Henriksen K, Battles JB, Keyes MA,
140 Grady ML, editors. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; 2008;
141 <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK43663/>.
- 142 6. Völkel G, Fürstberger A, Schwab JD, et al. Patient Empowerment During the COVID-19
143 Pandemic by Ensuring Safe and Fast Communication of Test Results: Implementation and
144 Performance of a Tracking System. *J Med Internet Res.* 2021;23:e27348;
145 <https://doi.org/10.2196/27348>. [PMID: 33999836]

146 7. Gutman CK, Klein EJ, Follmer K, et al. Deficiencies in Provider-Reported Interpreter Use in a
147 Clinical Trial Comparing Telephonic and Video Interpretation in a Pediatric Emergency
148 Department. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf.* 2020;46:573-580;
149 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcjq.2020.08.001>. [PMID: 32888814]

150

151 **Figure 1:** Median and interquartile ranges (IQRs) of lapsed time from provider result release to
152 patient biopsy report disclosure across patients requiring no interpreter, any interpreter, Spanish
153 interpreter, or non-Spanish interpreter.



Comparisons made with Wilcoxon tests