

Authors' Response to "Appreciating the LoTP Study: Further Refining Scope-of-Practice Analysis"

Patricia A. Carney, PhD^a; Lars E. Peterson, MD, PhD^{b,c}; Alan B. Douglass, MD^d; Stephanie E. Rosener, MD^{e,f}; W. Perry Dickinson, MD^d; Mark T. Nadeau, MD, MBA^g; Karen B. Mitchell, MD^h; Colleen Conry, MD^d; James C. Martin, MDⁱ; M Patrice Eiff, MD^a

AUTHOR AFFILIATIONS:

^a Department of Family Medicine, School of Medicine, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR

^b American Board of Family Medicine, Lexington, KY

^c Department of Family and Community Medicine, College of Medicine, University of Kentucky, Lexington, KY

^d University of Colorado School of Medicine, CU Anschutz Medical Campus, Denver, CO

^e Department of Family Medicine, Mountain Area Health Education Center, Asheville, NC

^f Family Medicine, University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, NC

^g Family Medicine Residency Program, University of Texas Health Science Center, San Antonio, TX

^h Student and Resident Initiatives, American Academy of Family Physicians, Leawood, KS

ⁱ Long School of Medicine, University of Texas Health Science Center, San Antonio, TX

HOW TO CITE: Carney PA, Peterson LE, Douglass AB, et al. Authors' Response to "Appreciating the LoTP Study: Further Refining Scope-of-Practice Analysis". *Fam Med.* 2025;57(9):380–381.

doi: [10.22454/FamMed.2025.719664](https://doi.org/10.22454/FamMed.2025.719664)

PUBLISHED: 22 September 2025

© Society of Teachers of Family Medicine

TO THE EDITOR:

We appreciate the thoughtful comments regarding comparisons that could be made regarding single-site program length and fellowship or "track-specific" training.¹ The objective of the pilot was to study training length as 3 versus 4 years of training.² It may not be evident in the scope of practice paper, but many of the 4-year programs offered "areas of concentration" that allowed residents to focus on a specific area of interest to them, which may be less formal but does represent a "training track." As we mentioned in the original paper, the benefits of undertaking lengthened training

include that residents retain their continuity patients for an additional year while also getting training in areas important to their future careers. The Accreditation Council for Graduate Medical Education Advancing Innovation in Residency Education (AIRE) family medicine effort is also studying different training model length approaches, which will also contribute importantly to these efforts.

REFERENCES

1. Lockwood ER. Appreciating the LoTP study: further refining scope-of-practice analysis. *Fam Med.* 2025;57. doi: [10.22454/FamMed.2025.270596](https://doi.org/10.22454/FamMed.2025.270596)

2. Carney PA, Valenzuela S, Dinh DH. Impact of training length on scope of practice among residency graduates: a report from the

Length of Training Pilot study in family medicine. *Fam Med.* 2025;57(8):1-14.