only by the issue's table of contents. Furthermore, only Scimago-indexed dermatology journals were considered, whereas many other metrics exist for evaluating journal influence.³ Nevertheless, our study provides valuable insight into a wide spectrum of dermatology article types as well as the types favored for publication by particular journals, laying the groundwork for future analysis as new journal editors have opportunities to shape dermatology research and discourse.

Mindy D. Szeto, BS, BA, Steven M. Lada, BS, Sameeha S. Husayn, BS, Colby L. Presley, BS, BA, Michelle Militello, MS, and Robert P. Dellavalle, MD, PhD, MSPH^{c,d}

From the School of Medicine, ^a University of Colorado Anschutz Medical Campus, Aurora, Colorado; the College of Osteopathic Medicine, Rocky Vista University, Parker, Colorado^b; and the Department of Dermatology, University of Colorado School of Medicine, ^c and the Dermatology Service, Rocky Mountain Regional Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Aurora, Colorado.^d

Authors Szeto and Lada are co-first authors.

Funding sources: None.

Conflicts of interest: Dr Dellavalle is an editor or reviewer for a number of academic journals and receives editorial stipends, expense reimbursement for meetings, or royalties from a number of academic publications. Authors Szeto, Lada, Husayn, Presley, and Militello have no conflicts of interest to declare.

IRB approval status: Not applicable.

Reprints are not available from the authors.

Correspondence to: Robert P. Dellavalle, MD, PhD, MSPH, Department of Veterans Affairs Rocky Mountain Regional Medical Center, Department of Dermatology, Dermatology Service, 1700 N Wheeling St, Room E1-342, Aurora, CO 80045

E-mail: robert.dellavalle@cuanschutz.edu

REFERENCES

- Arndt KA. Information excess in medicine. Overview, relevance to dermatology, and strategies for coping. *Arch Dermatol*. 1992; 128(9):1249-1256.
- SJR: Scientific Journal Rankings. Scimago Journal & Country Rank. Available at: https://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php. Accessed January 28, 2020.
- 3. Saha S, Saint S, Christakis DA. Impact factor: a valid measure of journal quality? *J Med Libr Assoc.* 2003;91(1):42-46.

Factors associated with leaving against medical advice among patients hospitalized for dermatologic conditions

To the Editor: Despite the substantial burden of skin disease in hospitalized patients and the association of leaving against medical advice (AMA) with worse outcomes, little is known regarding leaving AMA among patients hospitalized for dermatologic conditions. ^{1,2} Our objective was to determine factors associated with leaving AMA in patients hospitalized for dermatologic conditions.

In this retrospective case-control study of the National Inpatient Sample (2009-2015), patients hospitalized for dermatologic conditions were identified using primary International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision-Clinical Modification code/clinical classification software. Rao-Scott chi-square test, t test, and analysis of variance were used for unadjusted comparisons by discharge status and trends over time. Weighted multivariable logistic regression was used to determine factors associated with leaving AMA. Variables significant on univariate analysis were initially included in the multivariable model; the Akaike information criterion was used to determine variable inclusion for collinear covariates comparing independent multivariable models. Analyses were performed in SAS 9.4 Institute, Cary, NC) using procedures/weighting for nationally representative estimates.

A total of 4,523,930 patients were hospitalized for dermatologic conditions, and 66,091 (1.46%) left AMA. The rate of leaving AMA increased from 2009 (1.44%) to 2015 (2.22%; P < .001)(Supplemental Table I; available via Mendeley at https://doi.org/10.17632/7wn6m5n5kj.1). subcutaneous infections were the most common diagnoses (Table I). In multivariable analysis, young adult (adjusted odds ratio [aOR], 1.41; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.33-1.50) men (aOR, 1.56; 95% CI, 1.50-1.63) with insurance status of uninsured (aOR, 1.91; 95% CI, 1.74-2.09) or Medicaid (aOR, 1.77; 95% CI, 1.66-1.90) were most likely to leave AMA (Table II). Patients with lower income (aOR, 1.28; 95% CI, 1.16-1.41) and those admitted emergently (aOR, 1.79; 95% CI, 1.59-2.01) had greater odds of leaving AMA. Patients undergoing a major procedure (aOR, 0.38; 95% CI, 0.35-0.40) were less likely to leave AMA. Patients in urban teaching (aOR, 1.51; 95% CI, 1.34-1.70) and nonteaching (aOR, 1.70; 95% CI, 1.52-1.91) hospitals were more likely to leave AMA

Table I. Sociodemographic, clinical, and hospital characteristics of patients hospitalized for dermatologic conditions

Patient characteristics Sex	(95% CI) (n = 66,091)	% (95% CI) (n = 4,457,839)
		70 (9570 CI) (II - 4,457,839)
	((02 ((00 ((00)	F0 62 (F0 2F F0 00)
Male	66.03 (65.06-66.99)	50.62 (50.35-50.89)
Female	33.97 (33.01-34.94)	49.38 (49.11-49.65)
Age (050) CIV	45.03 (44.60 45.46)	56.61 (56.00 57.14)
Average, y, (95% CI)	45.03 (44.60-45.46)	56.61 (56.09-57.14)
0-17	0.76 (0.59-0.92)	6.65 (5.88-7.41)
18-39	37.45 (36.15-38.75)	14.94 (14.61-15.27)
40-59	45.58 (44.48-46.68)	30.13 (29.66-30.59)
60-79	13.49 (12.70-14.28)	30.28 (29.88-30.67)
≥80	2.73 (2.39-3.06)	18.01 (17.51-18.51)
Race	/	(
White	62.05 (59.04-65.05)	69.69 (68.13-71.26)
Black	19.37 (17.64-21.11)	14.74 (13.68-15.79)
Hispanic	12.88 (11.07-14.70)	10.44 (9.36-11.53)
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.87 (0.62-1.13)	1.45 (1.25-1.65)
Native American	0.83 (0.58-1.08)	0.82 (0.61-1.02)
Other	4.00 (2.73-5.27)	2.86 (2.39-3.34)
Quartile of income, percentile		
0-25th	39.26 (36.61-41.91)	30.97 (29.48-32.45)
26th-50th	25.69 (23.66-27.73)	25.45 (24.36-26.53)
51st-75th	20.86 (19.44-22.29)	23.70 (22.73-24.66)
76th-100th	14.18 (12.67-15.70)	19.89 (18.24-21.55)
Primary payer		
Medicare	24.99 (23.93-26.05)	46.34 (45.55-47.14)
Medicaid	32.21 (30.12-34.30)	16.41 (15.70-17.12)
Private insurance	12.42 (11.46-13.39)	25.52 (24.84-26.20)
Self-pay	23.69 (21.93-25.45)	7.45 (6.97-7.92)
No charge	2.02 (1.46-2.57)	0.81 (0.61-1.00)
Other	4.67 (3.96-5.38)	3.48 (3.16-3.79)
Type of admission		
Emergent	94.19 (93.48-94.91)	84.15 (83.44-84.86)
Elective	5.81 (5.09-6.52)	15.85 (15.15-16.56)
Dermatologic condition		
Melanoma	0.14 (0.07-0.21)	0.51 (0.45-0.57)
Other nonepithelial skin cancer	0.33 (0.23-0.42)	1.18 (1.08-1.29)
Skin/subcutaneous infection	75.90 (74.90-76.90)	61.70 (61.06-62.35)
Inflammatory skin condition	2.33 (2.07-2.60)	3.61 (3.50-3.73)
Chronic skin ulcer	17.81 (16.91-18.71)	26.87 (26.24-27.49)
Other skin disorder	3.49 (3.14-3.84)	6.13 (5.88-6.38)
Weekend admission		
No	74.50 (73.74-75.26)	79.68 (79.52-79.85)
Yes	25.50 (24.74-26.26)	20.32 (20.15-20.48)
Underwent major surgical procedure		
No	91.07 (90.46-91.67)	77.09 (76.68-77.50)
Yes	8.93 (8.33-9.54)	22.91 (22.50-23.32)
Number of chronic conditions		
0-1	20.28 (19.26-21.29)	20.35 (19.70-21.00)
2-4	44.05 (42.99-45.10)	30.19 (29.73-30.65)
5 or more	35.68 (34.47-36.89)	49.46 (48.68-50.25)
Number of diagnoses	•	
0-1	2.74 (2.34-3.13)	1.78 (1.62-1.95)
2-4	22.21 (21.14-23.28)	17.50 (16.95-18.04)
5 or more	75.05 (73.79-76.31)	80.82 (80.06-81.38)

Continued

AMA inpatients, % Routinely discharged inpatients, Patient characteristics (95% CI) (n = 66,091) % (95% CI) (n = 4,457,839)

Patient characteristics	(95% CI) (n = 66,091)	% (95% CI) $(n = 4,457,839)$
Number of procedures		
0-1	82.76 (81.14-84.37)	69.57 (68.83-70.31)
2-5	14.83 (13.60-16.06)	24.71 (24.22-25.20)
5 or more	2.41 (1.91-2.91)	5.72 (5.41-6.03)
Hospital characteristics		
Bed size		
Small (1-249 beds)	11.01 (9.31-12.70)	13.26 (12.42-14.09)
Medium (250-424 beds)	28.70 (25.62-31.79)	25.16 (23.87-26.45)
Large (>424 beds)	60.29 (56.96-63.62)	61.58 (60.05-63.11)
Hospital type		
Rural	9.37 (8.27-10.48)	13.19 (12.34-14.04)
Urban nonteaching	44.28 (40.85-47.71)	41.66 (39.97-43.35)
Urban teaching	46.35 (42.75-49.95)	45.15 (43.40-46.89)

AMA, Against medical advice; CI, confidence interval.

than those in rural hospitals. Diagnoses, chronic conditions, and procedures per age group are provided in Supplemental Table II (available via Mendeley at https://doi.org/10.17632/7wn6m5n5kj.1).

The rate of AMA discharge among patients hospitalized with skin disease (1.46%) is similar to that of all hospitalized patients (1.44%).³ As for other conditions, patients who were either uninsured or insured by Medicaid were more likely to leave AMA.^{1,3} Patients often cite financial reasons for leaving AMA; education regarding the financial implications of leaving AMA is important in improving rates of safe discharge.⁴

Fewer diagnoses, chronic conditions, and procedures in young adults may increase rates of leaving AMA. Possible explanations for the increased likelihood of leaving AMA in urban hospitals include more options for dermatologic care, differing patient populations, and differences in provided services. Study limitations include inability to evaluate disease severity, reliance on National Inpatient Sample coding, and lack of information regarding the reasons/ consequences of leaving AMA. This study is a broad description of leaving AMA for skin disease, and disease-specific studies are needed to identify targeted strategies.

Patients leaving AMA have increased risk of 30-day mortality and disproportionately taxing hospital readmissions, and patients hospitalized for dermatologic conditions have substantial readmission rates.^{1,5} Understanding contributors to

leaving AMA is critical in developing interventions to limit early termination of treatment and improve health care service use.

We would like to acknowledge the Medicine, Society, and Culture program in the Department of Bioethics at Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine for supporting our access to this database.

Raghav Tripathi, MPH, ^{a,b} Rishabh S. Mazmudar, BS, ^{a,b} Jeremy S. Bordeaux, MD, MPH, ^{a,b} and Jeffrey F. Scott, MD^{a,c}

From the Department of Dermatology, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, Cleveland, OH^a; Department of Dermatology, University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center, Cleveland, OH^b; and Department of Dermatology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD.^c

Funding sources: None.

Conflicts of interest: None disclosed.

IRB approval status: Not required for the use of this publicly available, deidentified database.

Reprints are not available from the authors.

Correspondence to: Raghav Tripathi, MPH, Department of Dermatology, University Hospitals Cleveland Medical Center, Lakeside 3500, 11100 Euclid Ave, Cleveland, OH 44106

E-mail: Raghav.Tripathi@case.edu

Table II. Multivariable logistic regression model for leaving against medical advice in patients hospitalized for dermatologic conditions

Patient demographics	Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)	P value
Sex	<u> </u>	
Male	1.56 (1.50-1.63)	<.00
Female	Reference	
Age, y	nererence	
0-17	0.06 (0.04-0.07)	<.00
18-39	1.41 (1.33-1.50)	<.00
40-59	Reference	~.oo
60-79	0.37 (0.34-0.39)	<.00
≥80	0.13 (0.11-0.15)	<.00
Race	0.13 (0.11 0.13)	<.00
Non-Hispanic White	Reference	
Black	0.995 (0.918-1.079)	.910
Hispanic	0.91 (0.81-1.02)	.089
Asian/Pacific Islander	0.77 (0.60-0.97)	.029
Native American	1.03 (0.81-1.31)	.836
Other	1.16 (0.99-1.36)	.066
Quartile of income,	1.10 (0.55-1.50)	.000
percentile		
0-25th	1.28 (1.16-1.41)	<.00
26th-50th	1.15 (1.03-1.27)	.0102
51st-75th	1.05 (0.97-1.13)	
76th-100th	Reference	.211
	Reference	_
Primary payer Medicare	Doforonco	
Medicaid	Reference	- 00
Private insurance	1.77 (1.66-1.90)	<.00?
	0.48 (0.44-0.52)	
Self-pay	1.91 (1.74-2.09)	<.00
No charge Other	1.43 (1.20-1.71) 0.97 (0.85-1.10)	<.00°
	0.97 (0.65-1.10)	.007
Admission type	1 70 (1 50 2 01)	- 00:
Emergent	1.79 (1.59-2.01)	<.00
Elective	Reference	_
Dermatologic condition	0.72 (0.42.1.26)	255
Melanoma	0.73 (0.42-1.26)	.255
Other nonepithelial skin cancer	0.74 (0.52-1.04)	.078
Skin/subcutaneous infection	1.19 (1.12-1.27)	<.00
Inflammatory skin condition	0.81 (0.71-0.93)	.003
Chronic skin ulcer	Reference	_
Other skin disorder	0.89 (0.79-1.02)	.086
Hospitalization details		
Underwent major surgical procedure		
No	Reference	_
Yes	0.38 (0.35-0.40)	<.00
Number of chronic	0.50 (0.55 0. 1 0)	~.00
conditions		
0-1	Reference	
2-4	1.33 (1.24-1.42)	<.00
5 or more	1.04 (0.96-1.13)	.336

Continued

Table II. Cont'd

Patient demographics	Adjusted odds ratio (95% CI)	P value
Hospital type		
Rural	Reference	_
Urban nonteaching	1.70 (1.52-1.91)	<.001
Urban teaching	1.51 (1.34-1.70)	<.001

Cl. Confidence interval.

REFERENCES

- Glasgow JM, Vaughn-Sarrazin M, Kaboli PJ. Leaving against medical advice (AMA): risk of 30-day mortality and hospital readmission. J Gen Intern Med. 2010;25(9):926-929.
- Arnold JD, Yoon SJ, Kirkorian AY. The national burden of inpatient dermatology in adults. J Am Acad Dermatol. 2019; 80(2):425-432.
- 3. Ibrahim SA, Kwoh CK, Krishnan E. Factors associated with patients who leave acute-care hospitals against medical advice. *Am J Public Health*. 2007;97(12):2204-2208.
- Schaefer GR, Matus H, Schumann JH, et al. Financial responsibility of hospitalized patients who left against medical advice: medical urban legend? *J Gen Intern Med*. 2012;27(7): 825-830.
- Zhang M, Markova A, Harp J, Dusza S, Rosenbach M, Kaffenberger BH. Dermatology-specific and all-cause 30-day and calendar-year readmissions and costs for dermatologic diseases from 2010 to 2014. *J Am Acad Dermatol*. 2019;81(3): 740-748.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaad.2020.06.086

Characterization of real-world patients with psoriasis and without a history of depression: The Corrona Psoriasis Registry



To the Editor: Patients with psoriasis are 1.5-times more likely to have concomitant depression (odds ratio, 1.57; 95% confidence interval, 1.40-1.76)¹ than individuals without psoriasis. There are limited real-world data describing the characteristics of patients with psoriasis with depression vs those without depression, and no available data regarding antidepressant use in these cohorts. The main objective of this cross-sectional study was to explore these gaps.

Data were derived from the Corrona Psoriasis Registry—a prospective, multicenter, observational, disease-based registry.² Our analysis included enrollment data on 5835 patients starting from the launch of the registry in April 2015 through September 2018. Patients were stratified by the presence or absence of a self-reported history of depression (yes/no). Patients were also classified into 3 groups: (1) no history of depression, (2) history of depression and taking antidepressants,