The Addiction Psychiatrist as Dual Diagnosis Physician: A Profession in Great Need and Greatly Needed
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Addiction is the number one cause of premature illness and death in the U.S., especially among people with mental illness. Yet American medicine lacks sufficient workforce capacity, expertise, training, infrastructure, and research to support treatment for people with co-occurring addictions and mental illness. This essay argues that the addiction psychiatrist is essential in dual diagnosis care. (Journal of Dual Diagnosis, 9:260–266, 2013)
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Substance use disorders are the leading cause of premature illness and death in the U.S. (Mokdad, Marks, Stroup, & Gerberding, 2004). Although people with addictions are still primarily cared for outside of insurance coverage and physician-directed care (Altman et al., 2012), addictions generate a major portion of disease, injury, and early mortality, including cancer, stroke, heart and lung diseases, dementia, HIV, and hepatitis, and many accidental and deliberate forms of injury, such as domestic violence (McGinnis & Foege, 1999). Meanwhile, the economic and social costs of viewing addiction as a criminal-legal problem rather than as an illness have been staggering (Altman et al., 2012; Pew Center on the States, 2009). The “War on Drugs” has cost an estimated $1 trillion since 1970 and has made the U.S. the world’s leader in per-capita incarcerations (DrugWarFacts, 2012; The Sentencing Project, 2006). States are beginning to spend as much on incarceration as providing college education (DrugWarFacts, 2012; Kingkade & McGuinness, 2012). These trends contribute to skyrocketing health and education expenses for families, harming their economic vitality and educational attainment, with no measureable benefits on preventing or reducing addictions over the last quarter century. Addiction problems are compounded by the large overlap with mental illness, termed co-occurring disorders or dual diagnosis (Kessler et al., 1994). The majority of patients with addiction who are seeking treatment experience one or more mental illnesses, and most patients with mental illness have one or more addictions (Grant, 1996; Grant, Hasin, Chou, Stinson, & Dawson, 2004; Kessler, 2004; Kessler et al., 1994; Lasser et al., 2000).

In this essay I argue for the reinvigoration and expansion of addiction psychiatry. Health care for addictions and dual diagnosis patients in the U.S. has long been inadequate due to a lack of integration of mental health and addiction services (Drake et al., 2001). A declining psychiatric workforce, punctuated by extremely low production of formally trained and certified addiction psychiatrists, may undermine integrated dual diagnosis care further.

Building a strong workforce of certified addiction psychiatrists could address the problem of dual diagnosis. Currently, psychiatric addictionology has insufficient numbers and resources to provide an adequate educational and consultative impact within medical schools and psychiatry departments (Renner, 2004). Despite health services research delineating the need to integrate approaches to addictions and mental health (Drake et al., 2001), very few physicians are trained to deliver both addictions and mental health care. Addiction psychiatrists rarely appear in addiction treatment centers or even in integrated dual diagnosis programs (Chambers, Connor, Boggs, & Parker, 2010).

THE ADDICTION PSYCHIATRIST AS DUAL DIAGNOSIS PHYSICIAN

Physicians become addiction psychiatrists by completing four goals: (a) general psychiatry residency training (4 years);
ADDICTION PSYCHIATRY: HISTORY, WORKFORCE SIZE, AND TRAINING INFRASTRUCTURES

After the American Society of Addiction Medicine first established a certification exam for physicians in addictionology in 1986, the American Board of Psychiatry and Neurology recognized addiction psychiatry as an ABMS subspecialty in 1993 (Galanter, 2011). Over 5 years, 1,776 addiction psychiatry certificates were awarded by exams without training requirements to seed the field (Galanter, Dermatis, & Calabrese, 2002). Subsequently, when fellowship training became required, new entries into the subspecialty sharply declined. From 1998 to 2002, fewer than 190 physicians graduated from addiction psychiatry fellowships nationwide (Tinsley, 2004). In the 2000s, fellowship numbers remained stagnant, filling only 55% of 108 positions in 2003 (Juul, Scheiber, & Kramer, 2004) and 47% of 116 positions in 2006 (McNamara, 2007). In 2000, only 1% of all U.S. psychiatry residents were enrolled in addiction psychiatry fellowships (Tinsley, 2004), decreasing to 0.8% by 2009 (Hales & Delanoche, 2009). Also by 2009, the number of addiction psychiatry programs and positions offered had fallen to 44 programs and 90 positions, with 74% (67) positions filled (Galanter, 2011). With fewer than 50 addiction psychiatry fellowship graduates per year since 1998, these data suggest that fewer than 1,000 physicians in the U.S. have ever been formally trained and certified in addiction psychiatry. These numbers compare with 4,162 physicians receiving American Society of Addiction Medicine certification by 2007, about half of whom were psychiatrists (McNamara, 2007).

Less than 25% of all 184 American Psychiatry Residency Training Programs in the U.S. offer addiction fellowships (ACGME, 2013; www.acgme.org). In 2009, less than a third of U.S. medical schools and only 28 of 50 states offered an addiction psychiatry fellowship (Galanter, 2011). Large disparities across the states in addiction psychiatry training infrastructures punctuate weak overall workforce production (Figure 1). Only 9 states offer more than 0.05 fellowship positions per 100,000 population (i.e., 1 per 2 million), with New York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts together accounting for a third. The U.S. has a capacity to produce about one addiction psychiatrist for every three million people, while actually filling about 75% of this capacity, producing one addiction specialist for every four million. Given that approximately 25% of the U.S. population suffers with some form of addiction, and addictions collectively represent the leading cause of premature illness and death (Altman et al., 2012; Mokdad et al., 2004), these numbers reflect major health care workforce failures.

The emerging iatrogenic prescription drug epidemic may be related to the deficiency of addiction psychiatrists. Over the last 15 years, fivefold increases in opioid prescribing in primary care (CDC, 2011; Governale, 2010; Lembke, 2012) have resulted in proportional fivefold increases in unintended overdoses and deaths due to prescription drugs (CDC, 2011). By 2010, enough opioid medications were prescribed in the U.S. to maintain every adult on 6 opioid pills a day for a month (CDC, 2011), and Americans were more likely to die from poisoning, often by a prescription drug overdose than from a car accident or suicide (Minino, Murphy, Xu, & Kochanek, 2011). People with mental illness, at the center of this epidemic, are disproportionally vulnerable to and negatively impacted by these prescribing practices (Becker et al., 2009; Boscarino et al., 2010; Richardson et al., 2012). Among returning combat veterans with high rates of dual diagnosis, lethal opioid overdoses are occurring in alarming rates in the context of inadequate mental health and addictions expertise and treatment services at Veterans Administration (VA) hospitals (Bohnert et al., 2012; Institute of Medicine, 2012; Seal et al., 2012; Wallace, West, Booth, & Weeks, 2007). National VA hospital pharmacy data from 2010 characterizes the prescription and dispensation of opioid medications to veterans nationwide. Prescription data like these, and national measures of public health rankings (e.g., from the United Health Foundation, 2009), can be assessed in conjunction with population densities of addiction psychiatry training position offered (Figure 1) across the states, to probe for possible relationships been these measures and the strength of addiction psychiatry training infrastructures.
ADDICTION PSYCHIATRIST AS TRANSLATOR AND EDUCATOR OF ADDICTION NEUROSCIENCE

The view of addiction as a moral-criminal-legal problem rather than a treatable illness is rooted in a general lack of knowledge, even within the medical profession, regarding neural mechanisms and anatomy that underlie the disease. The concept that addiction is an illness explains the involuntary nature of addiction and its prevalence in people with mental illness and adolescents (Altman et al., 2012; Chambers, Krystal, & Self, 2001; Chambers, Taylor, & Potenza, 2003; Renner, 2004). The stigma rooted in lack of understanding addiction as a biomedical problem presents a major barrier to recruiting educational and economic support for expanding evidence-based treatments and increasing professional expertise. Beyond their importance in representing addictionology as a branch of psychiatry and medicine, addiction psychiatrists are needed to educate the public, other physicians, and mental health professionals about addiction neuroscience and its translation to clinical phenomenology and treatment.

The training of physician-scientists in the U.S. is in decline, despite calls from trainees, educators, and scientists to increase neuroscience training of psychiatrists (Naftolin, Lockwood, & Sobel, 2004; Roffman et al., 2006; Rosenberg, 1999). A direct connection between the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) and addiction psychiatry training programs or trainees has never been established. In 2011, only 59 investigators in the U.S. with MD or MD/PhD degrees were NIDA grant awardees with projects on the basic neuroscience of addictions (R01 or K-Awards). Within this set, only 12 (20%) had primary appointments within psychiatry departments, whereas 80% had appointments in basic science or clinical departments of medical schools (e.g., biochemistry, anesthesia, radiology) that do not treat dual diagnoses or addictions and do not train physicians in these treatments. No addiction psychiatrists were funded to do basic neuroscience in addictions. These trends suggest that NIDA funding for basic translational neuroscience in addiction is not supporting education or research in addiction psychiatry programs.

ADDICTION PSYCHIATRY: NEED FOR REVITALIZATION

A realistic dialogue is needed for counteracting three major dynamics driving workforce failures in addiction psychiatry. First, addiction psychiatry draws its recruits from general psychiatry, which is itself facing unprecedented challenges (Katschnig, 2010). As the number of American students entering psychiatry has declined since 1990 (Hales & Delanoche, 2009), medical schools have reduced psychiatric education in core curricula (Cutler, 2012). Psychiatry is now in the poorest condition among all major medical fields in terms of having the most unfavorable balance of aging workforce and average incomes (Figure 2; MGMA, 2012). In Indiana, for
FIGURE 2  Indices of workforce vitality across major physician specialties. MGMA data from 2012 reveals psychiatry to be (a) among the lowest-reimbursed medical specialties (as with other primary care specialties) with (b) the most advanced age of workforce suggestive of a medical profession in decline.
example, about half of all psychiatrists are within a decade of the retirement age of 65, with only about a third as many in practice ages 30 to 34 compared to ages 50 to 54 (Chambers et al., 2010; MGMA, 2012). Similar trends are affecting social workers, psychologists, and nurses, endangering the entire behavioral health field (Lewis, Sheff, Richard, Brandt, & Zollinger, 2012).

Second, the behavioral health system of the U.S., including research, professional training, and clinical care, remains firmly entrenched in a segregated view of addictions and mental illnesses as unrelated entities (Gonzales & Insel, 2004; O’Brien et al., 2004). Even as most behavioral health patients live with dual diagnosis (Grant, 1996; Grant et al., 2004; Kessler, 1994; Lasser et al., 2000), and despite mounting evidence suggesting the biological interrelatedness of these diseases (Chambers, 2013; Chambers et al., 2001; D’Souza et al., 2005; Lappalainen et al., 1998; Zhang, Stein, & Hong, 2010), NIDA, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism still primarily fund research that focuses on drug abuse or alcohol abuse or mental illness as separate disorders. Similarly, clinical funding streams, professions, and treatment infrastructures remain segregated. Thus, despite an evidence-based consensus that integrated dual diagnosis services are the most effective and efficient standard of care (Drake et al., 2001; Drake & Wallach, 2000; Minkoff & Cline, 2004), the great majority of patients with co-occurring mental illness and addiction are still unable to access integrated treatments (Power & Demartino, 2004).

Third, without parity for addictions treatment reimbursement from both private and public insurers, addiction psychiatry expertise remains rare and financially unsupported. Fellowship training in addiction psychiatry does not significantly increase earning potential of psychiatrists in distinction to subspecialty training in all other medical fields where further training can double or triple incomes (MGMA, 2012). Meanwhile, no generally recognized clinical-professional standards or privileges empower, support, and require the unique expertise that addiction psychiatrists offer. Insurance companies are as likely to deny addiction treatment provided by an addiction psychiatrist as that provided by an obstetrician. With the exception of a required ACGME quota of two certified faculty addiction psychiatrists per addiction psychiatry fellowship, no standards of hospital accreditation or health insurance programs require addiction, mental health, or dual diagnosis treatment programs or medical schools to have addiction psychiatrists. Further, increasing medical school and undergraduate loan debt rules out careers in addiction psychiatry (let alone psychiatry) for many. While the median medical student loan debt increased from about $24,000 in 1985 to $117,000 in 2003 (Jolly, 2005), the costs of undergraduate education have risen similarly, burdening many residents with debts of $250,000! Under these conditions, few can afford an additional sacrifice of another $100,000 necessary for pursuing addiction psychiatry training.

ADDICTION PSYCHIATRY: CREATING A NEW INITIATIVE

New initiatives are needed for reinvigorating and expanding addiction psychiatry as a strategy for avoiding the vast expenditures now spent on illness, injuries, and incarcerations resulting from iatrogenic and untreated addictions. An action plan might include (a) establishing student loan repayment programs for addiction psychiatry fellows; (b) establishing addiction treatment standards (including opiate maintenance programs) that require integrated dual diagnosis capabilities with certified addiction psychiatrists; (c) achieving parity of insurance coverage for dual diagnosis and addiction treatment, contingent on provision of care by certified addiction psychiatrists; (d) strengthening the American Psychiatric Association and ACGME standards for educational requirements in additions in psychiatry training; (e) enhancing accreditation standards by the Liaison Committee on Medical Education, whereby American medical schools should include addiction psychiatry training programs; and (f) initiating extramural National Institutes of Health granting programs and policies to foster research training for addiction psychiatry fellows, enhancing success rates of basic and clinical neuroscience grant applications from departments that train addiction professionals and treat patients, and creating grant programs explicitly focused on dual diagnosis. Implementing measures like these with modest goals (e.g., of tripling the number of addiction psychiatrists and expanding fellowships to the majority of U.S. medical schools and psychiatry residencies) would require collaboration among many stakeholders and organizations spanning psychiatry, medical education, research, and the insurance industry. Reinvigorating and growing addiction psychiatry could promote a healthier population, a better economy, and a better quality of life in the U.S.
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