

# Acceptability and Use of Evidence-Based Practices for Firearm Storage in Pediatric Primary Care



Rinad S. Beidas, PhD; Shari Jager-Hyman, PhD; Emily M. Becker-Haimes, PhD; Courtney Benjamin Wolk, PhD; Brian K. Ahmedani, PhD; John E. Zeber, PhD; Joel A. Fein, MD; Gregory K. Brown, PhD; Courtney A. Gregor, BA; Adina Lieberman, MPH; Steven C. Marcus, PhD

From the Department of Psychiatry (RS Beidas, S Jager-Hyman, EM Becker-Haimes, CB Wolk, GK Brown, CA Gregor, and A Lieberman), Department of Medical Ethics & Health Policy (RS Beidas), University of Pennsylvania Perelman School of Medicine; Division of Emergency Medicine, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia (JA Fein); School of Social Policy and Practice, University of Pennsylvania (SC Marcus), Philadelphia, Pa; Center for Health Policy and Health Services Research, Henry Ford Health System (BK Ahmedani), Detroit, Mich; and Center for Applied Health Research, Baylor Scott & White Health (JE Zeber), Temple, Tex

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

Address correspondence to Rinad Beidas, PhD, Department of Psychiatry, Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, 3535 Market St, 3rd Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19104 (e-mail: [rbeidas@upenn.edu](mailto:rbeidas@upenn.edu)).

Received for publication March 30, 2018; accepted November 11, 2018.

## ABSTRACT

**OBJECTIVE:** Promoting safe firearm storage in pediatric primary care is one way to address youth suicide by firearm. The study objective was to determine the perspectives of primary care physicians (PCPs) and leaders of primary care practices regarding the acceptability and use of screening, counseling, and firearm locks—all components of an adapted evidence-based intervention known as the Firearm Safety Check.

**METHODS:** In 2016, an online survey was conducted in two large US health systems. PCPs ( $n = 204$ ) and leaders ( $n = 57$ ) from 83 clinics were invited to participate. Respondents included 71 clinics (86%), 103 PCPs (50%), and 40 leaders (70%). Main outcomes included acceptability (6-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating better acceptability) and use of the 3 intervention components (4-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating greater use), as measured by an adapted validated instrument.

**RESULTS:** Analyses were conducted in 2017. PCP acceptability of screening (mean = 4.28; standard deviation [SD] = 1.12)

and counseling (mean = 4.56; SD = 0.89) were high, but acceptability for firearm lock provision was more neutral (mean = 3.78; SD = 1.16). Most PCPs endorsed sometimes screening (85%) and counseling (80%). Few PCPs offered firearm locks to caregivers (15%). Leaders reported consistent information.

**CONCLUSION:** The acceptability of screening for firearms and safe storage counseling was high; both components were used commonly but not routinely. The acceptability of providing firearm locks was neutral, and use was rarely endorsed. This study provides important insights about areas of focus for future implementation efforts from policy and research perspectives.

**KEYWORDS:** evidence-based practice; firearm safety; pediatric primary care

**ACADEMIC PEDIATRICS** 2019;19:670–676

## WHAT'S NEW

Evidence-based practices for safe firearm storage endorsed by the American Academy of Pediatrics are variably considered to be acceptable and are inconsistently implemented in pediatric primary care, highlighting the importance of efforts to actively increase the use of these intervention components as a universal suicide prevention strategy.

SUICIDE IS THE second leading cause of death among young people 12 to 24 years old in the United States.<sup>1,2</sup> Firearms are the most common and lethal method; over 85% of attempts by firearm result in death.<sup>3,4</sup> Access to firearms is a robust, yet modifiable, risk factor for suicide.<sup>5,6</sup> Given that 1 in 3 homes in the United States contains a firearm,<sup>7</sup> widespread implementation of

evidence-based approaches to reducing access to firearms is essential.<sup>8</sup> Youth suicide prevention strategies have been successfully implemented in behavioral health settings;<sup>9</sup> however, only one-third of youth who attempt suicide have received behavioral health treatment in the 12 months preceding.<sup>10</sup> In contrast, 3 out of 4 youth who die by suicide have visited primary care in the year prior to their death<sup>11</sup>; therefore, primary care settings may be an important setting to explore implementation of universal suicide prevention strategies.

Several studies have examined the effectiveness of screening for firearms, counseling, and/or the provision of storage devices in pediatric primary care. The 2 studies in which free firearm storage devices were provided demonstrated improvement in safe firearm storage practices.<sup>12,13</sup> A third study, which focused on counseling and provision of coupons for firearm safety devices, found no effect

with regard to changes in safe firearm storage.<sup>14</sup> A final study focused on counseling without free firearm locks did not find improvements in safe firearm storage.<sup>15</sup> Taken together, these results and a systematic review suggest that providing free firearm storage devices may be an important component of evidence-based approaches to promote firearm safety.<sup>16</sup>

Few safe firearm storage interventions have been tested in primary care as a universal approach to suicide prevention. The Safety Check is an evidence-based prevention program guided by social cognitive theory.<sup>12,17</sup> There were multiple components of the original Safety Check intervention; 3 components are related to firearms and include screening for access to firearms, brief counseling regarding safe storage, and provision of firearm locks (ie, cable locks). In a cluster randomized controlled trial, guardians of children 2 to 11 years of age who received the Safety Check intervention were 21.4% more likely to store their firearms safely than guardians in the control group 6 months following. An adapted Safety Check, the Firearm Safety Check, focuses on suicide prevention and targeting adolescents but has not been tested.

## OBJECTIVE

The objective was to survey primary care physicians (PCPs) and leaders of primary care practices in 2 large, nationally representative health systems from geographically (ie, urban vs rural) and socioeconomically distinct areas. The primary objective was to understand the acceptability of 3 firearm components of the adapted Safety Check intervention (ie, screening for the presence of firearms in the home, brief counseling, and firearm locks) in pediatric primary care and to understand how frequently PCPs endorse using these practices. We also explored the acceptability and perceived use of these components from the perspective of leaders of practices, given that they are important individuals who can increase implementation of evidence-based practices based on their beliefs and behaviors.<sup>18</sup> Finally, we sought to understand factors that predict PCP acceptability and use of each of the 3 practices.

## METHODS

### PARTICIPANTS

Participants were drawn from the 83 primary care practices serving youth in 2 large health systems, Henry Ford Health System (HFHS) and Baylor Scott & White Health (BSW), which are part of the Mental Health Research Network ([www.mhresearchnetwork.org](http://www.mhresearchnetwork.org)). Both health systems have large health maintenance organization health plans that cover a portion of patients with health insurance, but they also provide services for a wide range of patients with other types of insurance, similar to the vast majority of systems around the country. Because both systems offer a diversity of services, they cover the majority of practices operated nationally.

HFHS serves 1 million patients annually throughout southeast Michigan (ie, the Detroit metropolitan area). Services are provided by 1200 physicians in 4 large medical hospitals, a psychiatric hospital, and 36 medical clinics. Although HFHS has been a leader in suicide prevention in behavioral health settings,<sup>19</sup> it had not yet implemented suicide prevention efforts in pediatric primary care at the time of this study. BSW has a very large service area across central Texas (29,000 square miles); it operates 12 hospitals and 140 clinics with more than 1200 physicians. Both sites have Level 1 trauma centers, emergency room facilities, and at least 40 medical specialties. Because we focused our inquiry on the primary care sites we did not include emergency department physicians. These 2 health systems were selected to participate in this study based on their diversity (eg, race/ethnicity; rural vs urban; geography) and generalizability so that findings may be most representative of the larger US health care landscape.

A Virtual Data Warehouse at each system includes information about patient service use as derived from electronic health records. The Virtual Data Warehouse was used at each site to identify PCPs who had seen 100 or more youth patients (ages 12 to 24 years) within the preceding year. Eligibility for responding to the survey was based on physician-level criteria. Leaders were physician managers of primary care practices where youth were seen (ie, pediatrics, family medicine, internal medicine, and adolescent medicine) who were also identified within each system.

### PRIMARY DATA

We developed 2 parallel surveys for PCPs and leaders to query acceptability and use. Acceptability questions were adapted from an existing measure.<sup>20</sup> (Surveys are available from the authors by request.) We asked respondents to report on the acceptability of the intervention components with regard to both the general population and with youth that they perceived to be at high risk for suicide. Responses were provided using a 6-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree). PCPs reported about their own use of these 3 intervention components using a 4-point Likert scale (0 = never to 4 = always). Leaders reported on their perceptions of PCP behavior in the practices they directed. Specifically, they reported on the percentage of providers in their practice who used each of the 3 components (0%, 1–24%, 25–50%, 51–74%, or 75–100%) and the frequency of how often they believed the PCPs used each of the components, reported on a 4-point Likert scale (1 = rarely to 4 = always).

### SECONDARY DATA

To identify factors associated with acceptability and use of the 3 intervention components, we supplemented the survey data with information derived from an electronic health record, including PCP demographics (age, gender, race, ethnicity, and specialty); patient demographics (age,

gender, race, ethnicity, and Patient Health Questionnaire-9 scores<sup>21</sup>); and volume of caseload encounters related to self-inflicted injury and suicide.<sup>1</sup> We also obtained 5-year, county-level youth (ages 12–24 years) suicide death data for each PCP's practice county from the National Vital Statistics System.<sup>1</sup>

## PROCEDURE

A brief survey was e-mailed to eligible PCPs and leaders from the study investigator at their health system in 2016. The Tailored Design Method<sup>22</sup> was used; eligible participants received no more than 6 contacts by phone or e-mail. The study was approved by the appropriate institutional review boards. Participants received \$10 for participation. Survey participation was completed between October and December 2016.

## STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

Analyses were conducted in 2017 using SPSS Statistics 24. Initial analyses compared the characteristics of PCPs and leaders who completed the survey to those who did not using *t*-tests and chi-square tests. Next, we compared mean scores on the 3 intervention components that pertained to general versus high-risk youth using paired-sample *t*-tests and difference scores for both PCPs and leaders. Linear and logistic regression analyses examined each individual predictor of PCP acceptability (measured continuously) and frequent use (having a score greater than 3). Given the sample size and the need for a parsimonious model, we included only 1 covariate (health system) in each model, due to the possibility that this would be the largest source of systematic variance. In order to identify the independent contributions of each variable with the outcomes of interest and to avoid collinearity, we reported estimates for each variable while controlling for health system. Missingness was handled via listwise deletion due to low rates of missing data.

## RESULTS

Of the 83 eligible clinics, 71 (86%) clinics had at least 1 respondent participate. Of the 204 PCPs and 57 leaders who were eligible, 103 PCPs and 40 leaders participated, reflecting a response rate of 50% for PCPs and 70% for leaders. Results comparing PCP and leader survey responders to non-responders revealed no differences, except that older PCPs were less likely to complete the survey relative to younger PCPs ( $t$  [141] = 2.44;  $P$  = .02) (Supplementary Table online). Ten PCPs completed the survey anonymously, and we were not able to link their responder status with the information extracted from the medical record. Results comparing anonymous to non-anonymous responders revealed no differences.

The PCP sample included 62 females (60%). Mean age was 44.1 years old (standard deviation [SD] = 12.8). The racial/ethnic composition was 54% white, 24% Asian, 7% black or African American, and 2% other (eg, American Indian); 13% elected not to disclose their race/ethnicity, and 4% identified as Hispanic and/or Latino. The leader

sample included 13 females (33%). Mean age was 52.8 (SD = 9.3). Racial/ethnic composition was 70% white, 10% Asian, 5% black or African American, 2.5% multiracial, 2.5% other, 2.5% missing, and 7.5% elected not to disclose. Of the overall sample, 3% identified as Hispanic and/or Latino.

## USE AND ACCEPTABILITY OF FIREARM SAFETY CHECK INTERVENTION COMPONENTS

### SCREENING

Most PCPs ( $n$  = 88; 85%) endorsed screening for firearms. Two-thirds of PCPs screened at a low frequency, whereas approximately one-third frequently screened. Similarly, most leaders reported that PCPs in their practices screened with low frequency, and a quarter of leaders reported that PCPs screened most of the time; only 3 leaders (8%) reported that PCPs did not screen for firearms at all. The majority of PCPs ( $n$  = 77; 75%) and leaders ( $n$  = 30; 75%) reported that screening was acceptable to them (ie, average acceptability score  $\geq$  3.5) (Table 1).

### COUNSELING

The majority of PCPs ( $n$  = 83; 80%) engaged in counseling with regard to safe firearm storage. Many PCPs discussed safe storage at low rates; fewer reported frequently providing counseling. Similarly, leaders reported that PCPs engaged in some counseling ( $n$  = 30; 75%). Most leaders reported that PCPs provided counseling with low frequency. Fewer reported that PCPs frequently provided counseling. Eight leaders (20%) reported that PCPs did not provide brief counseling regarding safe firearm storage. Overall, most PCPs ( $n$  = 91; 88%) and leaders ( $n$  = 32; 80%) reported that counseling was acceptable to them (ie, average acceptability score  $\geq$  3.5) (Table 1).

### FIREARM LOCK PROVISION

Less than 10% of PCPs distributed firearm locks. Leaders expressed similar perceptions, with only 3 reporting that PCPs ever offered firearm locks. Overall, 64% of PCPs ( $n$  = 66) and 65% of leaders ( $n$  = 26) reported that firearm lock provision was acceptable to them (ie, average acceptability score  $\geq$  3.5) (Table 1). For PCPs and leaders, firearm lock acceptability ratings were significantly lower than both the acceptability of screening rating (PCP:  $t$  [97] = 3.50,  $P$  = .001; leader:  $t$  [37] = 2.91;  $P$  = .006) and counseling rating (PCP:  $t$  [97] = 6.16,  $P$  < .001; leader:  $t$  [37] = 3.00,  $P$  = .005).

### COMPARATIVE ACCEPTABILITY

Table 1 shows the mean acceptability ratings for screening, counseling, and firearm lock provision as a universal prevention strategy as well as for high-risk youth from the perspectives of PCPs and leaders. Paired-sample *t*-tests comparing acceptability for general versus youth at high risk for suicide demonstrated that both PCPs and leaders found all 3 intervention components to be significantly more acceptable for high-risk youth than for the general youth population (all  $P$  < .001).

**Table 1.** Safety Check Use and Acceptability for PCPs and Leaders

	PCPs (n = 103)					Leaders (n = 40)				
	Frequency of PCP-Reported Intervention Use					Frequency of Leader-Reported PCP Intervention Use <sup>†</sup>				
	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Most of the Time	Always	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Most of the Time	Always
Screening	11 (10%)	29 (28%)	29 (28%)	20 (19%)	10 (9%)	3 (1%)	8 (20%)	17 (43%)	10 (25%)	0 (0%)
Counseling	15 (15%)	20 (19%)	34 (33%)	23 (22%)	6 (6%)	8 (20%)	8 (20%)	15 (38%)	7 (18%)	0 (0%)
Firearm locks	88 (85%)	6 (6%)	1 (1%)	2 (2%)	0 (0%)	35 (88%)	1 (0.03%)	1 (0.03%)	1 (0.03%)	0 (0%)

  

	PCP Acceptability <sup>‡</sup>				Leader Acceptability <sup>‡</sup>			
	High-Risk Youth <sup>§</sup>	General Youth	Point Estimate of the Difference	Test Statistic (DF)	High-Risk Youth	General Youth	Point Estimate of the Difference	Test Statistic (DF)
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (95% CI)		Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (95% CI)	
Screening	5.40 (0.76)	4.30 (1.10)	1.10 (1.34–0.85)	<i>t</i> (96) = 8.82**	5.46 (0.80)	4.13 (0.96)	1.32 (1.69–0.96)	<i>t</i> (36) = 7.45**
Counseling	5.39 (0.76)	4.56 (0.89)	0.84 (1.02–0.65)	<i>t</i> (96) = 8.81**	5.51 (0.61)	4.21 (0.87)	1.31 (1.61–0.99)	<i>t</i> (36) = 8.54**
Firearm locks	4.65 (1.42)	4.66 (1.42)	0.89 (1.10–0.6)	<i>t</i> (96) = 8.15**	4.92 (1.23)	3.70 (1.14)	1.22 (1.49–0.94)	<i>t</i> (36) = 8.99**

PCP indicates primary care physician; SD, standard deviation; CI, confidence interval; DF, degrees of freedom.

Four PCPs did not report on screening practices, 5 PCPs did not report on counseling practices, 6 PCPs did not report on firearm lock provision practice, and 2 leaders did not report on their PCPs' practices related to screening, counseling, or firearm provision.

<sup>†</sup>Leaders reported on the rates of screening, counseling, and firearm lock provision among the PCPs in their practice.

<sup>‡</sup>Acceptability was measured using a 6-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree); higher scores indicate higher acceptability.

<sup>§</sup>High-risk youth are those considered at risk for suicide.

\*\**P* < .001.

#### PREDICTORS OF PCP INTERVENTION ACCEPTABILITY

After controlling for health system, linear regression analyses indicated that higher PCP ratings of screening acceptability were associated with not owning a firearm and a higher proportion of ethnic minority youth in one's caseload. Having a family member or close friend who had attempted suicide was associated with higher ratings of counseling acceptability (Table 2).

#### PREDICTORS OF PCP INTERVENTION USE

After controlling for health system, logistic regression analyses indicated that frequent use of screening (ie, most of the time or always screen) was more likely among PCPs who reported higher screening acceptability, those with a family member or close friend who had attempted suicide, and those with a higher proportion of females on their caseload. Frequent use of brief counseling was more likely among PCPs who reported higher acceptability (Table 2).

## DISCUSSION

Youth suicide by firearm is a public health crisis<sup>23</sup>; experts have called for research<sup>24</sup> focused on implementing evidence-based interventions to decrease access to firearms.<sup>25</sup> This study is among the first to examine the acceptability and use of 3 firearm safety components as a universal suicide prevention strategy in pediatric primary care from the perspective of PCPs and leaders of primary care practices. Two components of the Firearm Safety Check intervention<sup>12</sup>—screening for firearms and brief counseling on safe firearm storage—were endorsed as acceptable interventions that were sometimes used. On the other hand, providing families with firearm locks, was less frequently used; acceptability ratings were also more neutral. This is of interest given a

review<sup>16</sup> suggesting that provision of storage devices may be an important component of reducing access to firearms. These findings suggest that PCPs are inconsistently and not routinely implementing evidence-based practice components as recommended by the American Association of Pediatrics guidelines for firearm safety promotion<sup>26</sup> and underscores the importance of active implementation efforts to increase firearm safety promotion in pediatric primary care.

Both PCPs and leaders of primary care practices reported that screening and brief counseling were generally acceptable. Nevertheless, despite the high acceptability ratings, the majority of PCPs reported that they did not routinely screen or counsel, and this was corroborated by their leaders. These results are supported by work<sup>27</sup> surveying PCPs about screening more broadly. It is possible that PCPs are willing to use these interventions only with youth they perceive to be at risk for suicide. Alternatively, PCPs may not use these intervention components systematically. Given the widespread variability in use of evidence-based practices in medicine, understanding physician decision making about which interventions to implement and with whom is of great priority. Another explanation is that physicians do not know the importance of these interventions in reducing suicide risk. A national survey that included health care providers found that 2 out of 3 physicians did not agree that having a firearm in the home increases the risk of suicide,<sup>28</sup> suggesting that education on the link between firearms and suicide is necessary.

The provision of firearm locks was less frequently endorsed and rated as more neutral by both groups. Lower acceptability rates may reflect perceptions that giving out storage devices is not feasible, may reflect uncertainty toward the provision of these locks, or may reflect physician perceptions that parents are not interested in these

**Table 2.** Predictors of Primary Care Physicians' Use of Safety Check Interventions and Intervention Acceptability for General Population

	Average Acceptability Items <sup>†</sup>			Use <sup>‡</sup>	
	Screening <i>B</i> -Statistic (SE)	Counseling <i>B</i> -Statistic (SE)	Firearm Locks <i>B</i> -Statistic (SE)	Frequent Screening <sup>  </sup> Odds Ratio (95% CI)	Frequent Counseling Odds Ratio (95% CI)
<b>Health System<sup>§</sup></b>					
System (HFHS = 1, BSW = 0)	0.43 (0.22)	0.19 (0.18)	0.41 (0.24)	1.28 (0.54–3.04)	0.97 (0.40–2.35)
<b>Safety Check Acceptability</b>					
Screening acceptability	...	...	...	1.83 (1.12, 2.98)*	...
Counseling acceptability	...	...	...	...	3.45 (1.66–7.18)**
<b>Provider Characteristics</b>					
Age	–0.003 (0.01)	<0.001 (0.01)	<0.001 (0.01)	0.98 (0.94–1.02)	0.99 (0.95–1.03)
Male gender	–0.45 (0.24)	–0.16 (0.20)	–0.02 (0.27)	0.55 (0.20–1.53)	0.52 (0.19–1.44)
Non-minority (white)	–0.35 (0.24)	–0.10 (0.20)	0.28 (0.25)	0.96 (0.38–2.45)	0.46 (0.18–1.20)
Pediatrician	0.48 (0.24)	0.28 (0.18)	–0.19 (0.47)	1.21 (0.46–3.14)	1.59 (0.61–4.14)
Patient total	<0.001 (0.001)	<0.001 (0.001)	<0.001 (0.001)	1.00 (1.00–1.01)	1.00 (1.00–1.00)
Years in practice	–0.02 (0.01)	–0.01 (0.01)	–0.01 (0.01)	0.95 (0.89–1.00)	0.95 (0.89–1.00)
Own/have a firearm in home	–0.62 (0.24)*	–0.11 (0.61)	0.12 (0.28)	2.38 (0.86–6.54)	0.92 (0.34–2.45)
Personal experience with suicide	0.17 (0.29)	0.47 (0.23)*	0.29 (0.31)	2.94 (1.02–8.49)*	1.65 (0.56–4.82)
<b>Patient Caseload Characteristics<sup>¶</sup></b>					
Percent young (<18 years)	0.05 (0.04)	0.04 (0.03)	–0.04 (0.04)	0.96 (0.82–1.13)	1.03 (0.88–1.20)
Percent female	0.16 (0.11)	0.12 (0.09)	0.08 (0.11)	1.88 (1.12–3.15)*	1.50 (0.95–2.39)
Percent ethnic minority	0.13 (0.05)*	0.05 (0.05)	0.03 (0.06)	1.06 (0.85–1.32)	1.03 (0.83–1.28)
Percent clinical PHQ (score > 9)	–0.11 (0.78)	0.42 (0.66)	1.49 (0.82)	0.16 (0.004–5.71)	0.15 (0.01–4.68)
<b>County Characteristics</b>					
CDC suicide estimate	–0.04 (0.05)	0.01 (0.04)	0.01 (0.05)	0.88 (0.71–1.09)	0.95 (0.78–1.16)

SE indicates standard error; CI, confidence interval; PCP, primary care physician; HFHS, Henry Ford Health System; BSW, Baylor Scott & White Health; PHQ, Patient Health Questionnaire; CDC, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

<sup>†</sup>Acceptability was measured using a 6-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree); higher scores indicate higher acceptability. Parameters reflect linear regression coefficients for each predictor.

<sup>‡</sup>"Frequent use" was defined as use "most of the time" or "always." Due to the low frequency of reported physician use of the gun lock provision component of the safety check, we did not examine predictors of the use of this intervention component. Parameters reflect odds ratios from logistic regressions.

<sup>§</sup>Each predictor was examined independently, controlling for health system. Two PCPs who responded to the survey elected not to identify the health system in which they worked and were excluded in regression analyses via list-wise deletion.

<sup>||</sup>Frequent use was defined as use "most of the time" or "always."

<sup>¶</sup>Coefficients reflect the effect of a 10% increase on a PCP's caseload.

\* $P < .05$ , \*\* $P < .01$ .

locks.<sup>29</sup> Other safety items, such as bicycle helmets, are provided at cost by a number of hospitals nationally, suggesting a potential model to support the provision of firearm securing devices. Qualitative work suggests that the provision of firearm locks is acceptable and in fact desirable from the perspective of parents who own firearms.<sup>30</sup>

Another consideration in the widescale deployment of a suicide prevention strategy in pediatric primary care is the perception that these strategies may be more acceptable for high-risk youth rather than universally. Limiting the firearm components of the Firearm Safety Check to high-risk youth may dampen the public health impact. This approach assumes that PCPs are able to accurately screen and identify high-risk youth, which is counter to extant literature.<sup>31,32</sup> Given that currently up to 40% of adolescents who die by suicide do not have a mental health diagnosis,<sup>10</sup> screening for depression alone will likely not capture the total population of potential individuals who could benefit.<sup>33</sup> Thus, a universal strategy in which all youth and families are screened for depressive symptoms, suicidal ideation and behavior, and firearms in the home represents the approach with the most promise.

We identified several factors that were related to use of screening and counseling in PCPs including acceptability and personal experience. Acceptability of interventions is an

important target for future implementation strategies, or the active process of integrating evidence-based practice into usual care.<sup>34</sup> Potential approaches include engaging in activities to increase buy-in (eg, patient testimonials, clinician fact-sheets) and making it easier to implement (eg, prompts for screening, counseling scripts in the electronic health record).<sup>30</sup> Given that PCPs with personal experience with suicide were more likely to use screening and counseling, strategies to increase awareness and personal salience of the impact of suicide, such as narrative approaches, are worthy of study.<sup>35</sup>

The debate over how to decrease firearm injury and mortality is a politically charged topic in the United States. Although there are no state or federal laws prohibiting physicians from engaging in firearm-related inquiries, many erroneously believe that the law precludes them from discussing these topics, which may impact acceptability of firearm-related interventions.<sup>36</sup> More research exploring the interplay between political climate and social views with regard to firearm rights and the implementation of firearm safety storage interventions in pediatric primary care are needed. In order to move the needle on this important topic, community-partnered research is sorely needed. One exemplar of such partnership includes innovative work conducted by Barber and colleagues<sup>37</sup> in collaboration with firearm shop owners and instructors.

This study has several strengths, including the inclusion of 2 large health systems from geographically distinct locations serving patients representative of both ethnic minorities and regions (ie, urban and rural<sup>38</sup>) and national gun ownership patterns, as 37% of participating physicians endorsed having firearms in their homes, and gun ownership rates in Michigan and Texas are 29% and 36%, respectively.<sup>39</sup>

### LIMITATIONS

First, all associations are correlational. Second, we relied on PCP and leader self-report. We do not know how concordant these reports are with actual practice, although the variability in responses suggests that effects of social desirability were limited. Third, we do not know what kinds of screening and/or counseling PCPs are using in their practice. Fourth, we do not know how reliable leader report is with regard to PCP behavior. Finally, this study only reports on behavior in 2 large health systems.

### CONCLUSIONS

Pediatric PCPs are asked to accomplish many tasks in each brief visit, and time is the major rate-limiting factor with regard to implementing prevention practices in primary care.<sup>40</sup> However, given their potential to improve both the short- and long-term health outcomes of youth, the integration of evidence-based practices such as the Firearm Safety Check and other interventions may warrant prioritization in pediatric primary care. Future studies are needed that consider a community-partnered approach among stakeholders to test both the impact of the Firearm Safety Check on youth patient suicide outcomes and its implementation processes.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to the Mental Health Research Network and Gregory Simon, MD, MPH, for support of this project. We are also grateful to feedback from Garen Wintmute, MD; Marian Betz, MD; and Megan Ranney, MD, MPH, on the design of the study.

*Authorship statement:* R.S.B. is the principal investigator of the study. She conceptualized and designed the study, oversaw the design of the data collection instruments, coordinated and supervised data collection, reviewed and assisted with interpretation of analyses, and drafted the initial manuscript. C.B.W. is the project director. She assisted with conceptualization of the study, designed the data collection instruments, coordinated and supervised data collection, and assisted with writing the methods section of the manuscript. E.M.B.-H. assisted with design and methods with regard to data collection instruments, carried out analyses, wrote the results section of the manuscript, and closely reviewed the manuscript. B.K.A., G.K.B., J.A.F., S.J.-H., S.C.M., and J.E.Z. contributed to the conceptualization and design of the study, drafted portions of the manuscript, and critically reviewed the manuscript for important intellectual content. C.A.G. and A.L. assisted with design of the data collection instruments, coordinated and supervised operations and data collection, and closely reviewed the manuscript for important intellectual content. All authors approved the final manuscript as submitted and agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

*Financial disclosure:* This study was funded by the National Institutes of Health, R21 MH 109878.

### SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Supplementary data related to this article can be found online at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acap.2018.11.007>.

### REFERENCES

1. National Center for Health Statistics. *International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM)*. Atlanta, Ga: US Department of Health and Human Services; 1996 (updated 2011).
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Fatal injury data. Available at: <https://www.cdc.gov/injury/wisqars/fatal.html>. Accessed September 22, 2017.
3. Steinbrook R, Redberg RF. Firearm injuries as a public health issue. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2013;173:488–489.
4. Spicer RS, Miller TR. Suicide acts in 8 states: incidence and case fatality rates by demographics and method. *Am J Public Health*. 2000;90:1885–1891.
5. Miller M, Azrael D, Barber C. Suicide mortality in the United States: the importance of attending to method in understanding population-level disparities in the burden of suicide. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2012;33:393–408.
6. Anglemeyer A, Horvath T, Rutherford G. The accessibility of firearms and risk for suicide and homicide victimization among household members: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med*. 2014;160:101–110.
7. Hepburn LM, Miller M, Azrael D, et al. The US gun stock: results from the 2004 National Firearms Survey. *Inj Prev*. 2007;13:15–19.
8. Steinbrook R, Stern RJ, Redberg RF. Firearm violence: a JAMA Internal Medicine Series. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2017;177:19–20.
9. Glenn CR, Franklin JC, Nock MK. Evidence-based psychosocial treatments for self-injurious thoughts and behaviors in youth. *J Clin Child Adolesc*. 2015;44:1–29.
10. Brent DA, Baugher M, Bridge JA, et al. Age- and sex-related risk factors for adolescent suicide. *J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry*. 1999;38:1497–1505.
11. Luoma JB, Martin CE, Pearson JL. Contact with mental health and primary care providers before suicide: a review of the evidence. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2002;159:909–916.
12. Barkin SL, Finch SA, Ip EH, et al. Is office-based counseling about media use, timeouts, and firearm storage effective? Results from a cluster-randomized, controlled trial. *Pediatrics*. 2008;122:e15–e25.
13. Carbone PS, Clemens CJ, Ball TM. Effectiveness of gun-safety counseling and a gun lock giveaway in a Hispanic community. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2005;159:1049–1054.
14. Grossman DC, Cummings P, Koepsell TD, et al. Firearm safety counseling in primary care pediatrics: a randomized, controlled trial. *Pediatrics*. 2000;106:22–26.
15. Stevens MM, Olson AL, Gaffney CA, et al. A pediatric, practice-based, randomized trial of drinking and smoking prevention and bicycle helmet, gun, and seatbelt safety promotion. *Pediatrics*. 2002;109:490–497.
16. Rowhani-Rahbar A, Simonetti JA, Rivara FP. Effectiveness of interventions to promote safe firearm storage. *Epidemiol Rev*. 2016;38:111–124.
17. Bandura A. *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall; 1986.
18. Aarons GA, Ehrhart MG, Farahnak LR, et al. Aligning leadership across systems and organizations to develop a strategic climate for evidence-based practice implementation. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2014;35:255–274.
19. Coffey MJ, Coffey CE. How we dramatically reduced suicide. Available at: <https://catalyst.nejm.org/dramatically-reduced-suicide/>. Accessed November 16, 2018.
20. Eckert TL, Miller DN, DuPaul GJ, et al. Adolescent suicide prevention: school psychologists' acceptability of school-based programs. *School Psychol Rev*. 2003;32:57–76.
21. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2001;16:606–613.
22. Dillman DA, Smyth JD, Christian LM. *Internet, Mail and Mixed-Mode Surveys: The Tailored Design Method*. 3rd ed. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons; 2009.
23. National Action Alliance for Suicide Prevention. A prioritized research agenda for suicide prevention: an action plan to save lives. Available at: <https://actionallianceforsuicideprevention.org/>

- sites/actionallianceforsuicideprevention.org/files/Agenda.pdf. Accessed November 16, 2018.
24. Ahmedani BK, Vannoy S. National pathways for suicide prevention and health services research. *Am J Prev Med*. 2014;47:S222–S228.
  25. Simonetti JA, Mackelprang JL, Rowhani-Rahbar A, et al. Psychiatric comorbidity, suicidality, and in-home firearm access among a nationally representative sample of adolescents. *JAMA Psychiatry*. 2015;72:152–159.
  26. Council on Injury, Violence, and Poison Prevention Executive Committee. Firearm-related injuries affecting the pediatric population. *Pediatrics*. 2012;130:e1416–e1423.
  27. Frankenfield DL, Keyl PM, Gielen A, et al. Adolescent patients—healthy or hurting? Missed opportunities to screen for suicide risk in the primary care setting. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med*. 2000;154:162–168.
  28. Conner A, Azrael D, Miller M. Public opinion about the relationship between firearm availability and suicide: results from a national survey. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018;168:153–155.
  29. Horn A, Grossman DC, Jones W, et al. Community based program to improve firearm storage practices in rural Alaska. *Inj Prev*. 2003;9:231–234.
  30. Wolk CB, Van Pelt A, Jager-Hyman S, et al. Stakeholder perspectives on implementing a firearm safety intervention in pediatric primary care as a universal suicide prevention strategy: a qualitative study. *JAMA Network Open*. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2018.5309.
  31. Leslie KR, Chike-Harris K. Patient-administered screening tool may improve detection and diagnosis of depression among adolescents. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)*. 2017;57:1–4.
  32. Gadamski AM, Fothergill KE, Larson S, et al. Integrating mental health into adolescent annual visits: impact of previsit comprehensive screening on within-visit processes. *J Adolesc Health*. 2015;56:267–273.
  33. The Joint Commission. Sentinel event alert: new alert focuses on suicide ideation. *Jt Comm Perspect*. 2016;36:12–17.
  34. Powell BJ, McMillen JC, Proctor EK, et al. A compilation of strategies for implementing clinical innovations in health and mental health. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2012;69:123–157.
  35. Kilaru AS, Perrone J, Auriemma CL, et al. Evidence-based narratives to improve recall of opioid prescribing guidelines: a randomized experiment. *Acad Emerg Med*. 2014;21:244–249.
  36. Wintemute GJ, Betz ME, Ranney ML. Yes, you can: physicians, patients, and firearms. *Ann Intern Med*. 2016;165:205–213.
  37. Barber C, Frank E, Demicco R. Reducing suicides through partnerships between health professionals and gun owner groups—beyond docs vs glocks. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2017;177:5–6.
  38. Fontanella CA, Hiance-Steelesmith DL, Phillips GS, et al. Widening rural-urban disparities in youth suicides, United States, 1996–2010. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2015;169:466–473.
  39. Kalesan B, Villarreal MD, Keyes KM, et al. Gun ownership and social gun culture. *Inj Prev*. 2016;22:216–220.
  40. Yarnall KS, Pollak KI, Østbye T, et al. Primary care: is there enough time for prevention? *Am J Public Health*. 2003;93:635–641.