Critical Care Obstetrics and Gynecology ISSN 2471-9803

iMedPub Journals www.imedpub.com

Vol.7 No.9:54

## Adolescent Risk Behavior Interventions in Primary Care

## Tim David\*

iMedPub LTD, 483, Green Lanes, London, UK

Received: December 08, 2021; Accepted: December 21, 2021; Published: December 29, 2021

\*Corresponding author: Tim David

iMedPub LTD, 483, Green Lanes, London, UK

**Citation**: David T. (2021) Adolescent Risk Behavior Interventions in Primary Care. Crit Care Obst Gyne Vol.7 No.9:54

## Introduction

The principal determinants of early mortality among teenagers in the United States are risk behaviors, which are defined as purposeful engagement in some sort of conduct that entails possible negative repercussions or losses as well as perceived good outcomes or benefits. Overdoses, motor vehicle collisions, and other accidental injuries are among the main causes of mortality among teenagers aged 12-17, according to recent statistics from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. It's critical to identify adolescents who are involved in risky behaviors so that we can direct them to proper therapies and avoid unfavorable outcomes. Well-child screenings are one approach for doing so. Well-child screening takes place during an annual appointment with a medical provider, during which physicians can screen for pertinent medical problems as well as psychological concerns in order to give proactive advice that can help maintain good health. Developmental/behavioral assessments, physical examinations, and specific screening procedures are all part of well-child screening. Within this environment, a discussion of risk-associated behaviors is inevitable, and physicians are typically asked to screen kids for these behaviors. In reality, the majority of teenagers (81.7 percent of adolescents aged 12-17 in the United States in 2018) get a well-child visit, making this healthcare touch point excellent for engaging youngsters. Electronic screening techniques are increasingly being employed to inform anticipatory counseling. McCarty et al. [[4]] discuss utilizing a stepped-wedge cluster-randomized trial design to test the impact of a bundled, sophisticated intervention to detect risk behaviors among teenagers in a primary care clinical setting in this issue of the Journal of Adolescent Health. The intervention comprised motivational interviewing training for clinicians and an automated screening and feedback tool that tracked the quality of treatment and services provided. The authors expected that by combining these interventions, they would be able to reduce teenage risk behaviors over time. Counseling levels, teenage satisfaction, patient centeredness, and adolescent health risk ratings were all assessed as outcomes. Adolescents who received the intervention indicated a greater rate of clinician counseling for revealed risk behaviors and showed a slight drop in risk scores compared to those who did not get the intervention. These findings are promising. Given the rise in early mortality among children and adolescents as a result of risky behavior, the wellchild visit should be designed to detect and change harmful

behaviors wherever feasible. The present study is an example of how to improve this healthcare touch point by including Motivational Interviewing (MI) into clinician training, a strategy that has become a common initial step in engaging teenagers and changing their health behaviors. MI was created as a way to reduce client apprehension about therapy and increase overall motivation to accept treatment. MI has undergone several adaptations over the years, shifting from an emphasis on treatment involvement to a variety of medical and public health uses. The faithfulness to the model is a key concern in the use of MI. In general, MI training benefits from a multimethod approach that includes didactic teaching, in-person training, and practise and booster sessions. Most training involves continuing supervision and monitoring for follow-up success, and there is a risk of reverting to pertaining habits. It's challenging to keep interventions going to keep assessing drift and addressing future training requirements. Future packaged treatments, such as McCarty et al.'s, should explore ways of on-going training and follow-up to ensure high fidelity to the model and long-term impact. Another aspect to consider is that this study's recruitment took place at a variety of locations, with large variations in the number of patients recruited at each location. As this packaged intervention is studied further, it will be critical to evaluate the tools' validity in clinical settings with a variety of demographic and risk characteristics. The participants in this study were mostly white teenagers. Because racial/ethnic minority adolescents have been demonstrated to underutilize health services and have more barriers to treatment involvement, it's critical to ensure that the intervention and screening methods are culturally responsive. In example, one study indicated that racial/ethnic minorities use and use health information differently outside of medical contacts . This shows that bundled, primary care-based treatments may have varying effects on various groups of adolescents, resulting in differing health outcomes after medical visits. To summarise, this complicated intervention must be implemented and evaluated in a number of clinic settings. Furthermore, for a bigger, more diversified audience of teens, certain cultural adjustments may be required. To prevent teenage risk behaviour, we need

Vol.7 No9:54

innovative primary care models. Primary care is an essential place for prospective intervention since it allows young people to be frequently assessed for behaviours and matched with appropriate treatment. Complex treatments, such as the approach outlined by McCarty et al., highlight how science may assist teenagers achieve better results. Their strategy has been demonstrated to be compatible and easy to integrate with current care models,

as well as improving adolescent outcomes, which is a positive discovery. However, the risk decrease in this trial did not last longer than three months. Future research is needed to better understand how this and other complex interventions may be administered with integrity and in a way that fulfils the needs of those who receive them.