Cosmetic Dermatology Training During Residency: Outcomes of a Resident-Reported Survey
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INTRODUCTION

In 2016 dermatologic surgeons performed 7 million cosmetic treatments. As demand increases dermatologists may devote a significant proportion of their practice to the treatment of cosmetic conditions; therefore it is imperative dermatology residents be educated about cosmetic procedures and achieve proficiency as they progress through residency. Our study aimed to assess dermatology residents’ educational exposure to cosmetic dermatology and to elicit their perceptions on the effect of various teaching strategies for developing procedural skills.

METHODS

An 18 question survey was created using SurveyMonkey® and sent electronically to 1,266 dermatology residents (of approximately 1,350 dermatology residents in the United States and Canada) using the American Society for Dermatologic Surgery (ASDS) database. The survey requested information about cosmetic dermatology training during residency. All data retrieved were anonymous.

RESULTS

Two hundred sixty-eight residents responded to the survey (21% response rate). Ninety-four percent of residents receive didactic instruction in cosmetic dermatology, and 91% receive hands-on cosmetic training during residency. Figure 1 depicts resident level of participation in the most frequently performed cosmetic procedures. Forty-one percent of survey participants perceive their program as supportive of cosmetic training, while 38% and 22% view their program as neutral or unsupportive. Residents in supportive programs were more frequently provided lectures from core faculty on cosmetic dermatology topics (70% vs 31%, p<0.001) and hands-on cosmetic procedure training (100% vs 69%, p<0.001) as compared to residents in unsupportive programs (Table 1). Ninety-nine percent of respondents plan to incorporate cosmetic procedures into their future practice. Anticipated procedures to be performed are shown in Table 2. Eight-nine percent of residents reported hands-on training as the most effective teaching method for developing procedural proficiency, and over 90% believe hands-on cosmetic dermatology training should be a residency requirement.

CONCLUSION

The majority of dermatology residents are educated on cosmetic dermatology topics using a variety of teaching approaches. Residents overwhelmingly identified hands-on training as the most valuable strategy for developing procedural proficiency and want more hands-on cosmetic training during residency. Our study showed 10% of residents have no hands-on cosmetic experience and 22% perceive their residency programs as unsupportive of cosmetic dermatology education, which may present barriers to advancing educational opportunities for residents. Study limitations include selection bias. Providing safe and competent patient care should serve as the impetus for expanding cosmetic dermatology training for residents.

Table 1: Resident perception of program’s support by provision of lectures and hands-on training.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lectures, n (%)</th>
<th>Overall (n=167)</th>
<th>Supportive (n=109)</th>
<th>Unsupportive (n=58)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Core faculty</td>
<td>94 (56.3)</td>
<td>76 (69.7)</td>
<td>18 (31.0)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliated private practice</td>
<td>54 (23.2)</td>
<td>39 (35.8)</td>
<td>15 (25.9)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Off-site conferences</td>
<td>83 (49.7)</td>
<td>58 (53.2)</td>
<td>25 (43.1)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any lectures</td>
<td>156 (93.4)</td>
<td>105 (96.3)</td>
<td>51 (87.9)</td>
<td>0.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands-on training</td>
<td>149 (89.2)</td>
<td>109 (100.0)</td>
<td>40 (69.0)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*among those who did not feel neutral about program support

Figure 1. Resident level of participation by cosmetic procedure

Figure 2. Anticipated cosmetic procedures to be performed in future clinical practice
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