increased by restricting the cohort to those diagnosed with status epilepticus who had received a benzodiazepine. Excluding patients without benzodiazepine treatment underestimated the degree of undertreatment. Also, ESO may not be nationally representative; thus, generalizability is unknown because studies comparing ESO patients with the broader prehospital population are lacking.

This study suggests that reasons for the variation in care between emergency medical service agencies should be examined to improve the real-world prehospital care of patients with status epilepticus.
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Changes in COVID-19 Vaccine Intent From April/May to June/July 2021
Since May 2021, the US has offered COVID-19 vaccines to all adults, yet only 66% of adults were fully vaccinated by September 25, 2021. The Delta variant surge heightens the importance of vaccination.
To optimize outreach and understanding, we assessed the degree to which an individual’s intent to vaccinate changes over time and assessing factors that relate to rising vaccine likelihood are critical. For example, whether individuals who are initially “unsure” or “unlikely” will eventually be vaccinated is unknown. Most studies of vaccine intent are cross-sectional and cannot assess these changes.

Using data from a nationally representative longitudinal study of adults in the US, we assessed individual-level change in vaccine intent and uptake between April 2021 and July 2021 and characteristics of individuals who reported an increase in vaccine likelihood or uptake.

**Methods** | The Understanding America Study (UAS) repeatedly surveyed a probability-based internet panel of approximately 9000 US adults (aged ≥18 years). Panelists were recruited using address-based sampling, allowing for valid statistical inferences and avoiding coverage problems from convenience web-based panels. Internet-enabled tablets were provided if needed. Respondents received $20 per 30-minute survey time. Panelists were surveyed beginning March 10, 2020, initially biweekly and monthly after February 17, 2021, in English or Spanish about COVID-19. Overall, 89% of panelists consented to participate in the longitudinal survey. Each survey wave, about one-fourteenth (1/28 since February 17, 2021) of these consenting panelists were invited daily on a rolling basis to complete surveys over 2 weeks.

We analyzed 2 UAS waves, April 14, 2021, to May 25, 2021 (70% completion rate), and June 9, 2021, to July 20, 2021 (67% completion rate), focusing on respondents who were unvaccinated in April/May. For each wave, we asked panelists whether they received a COVID-19 vaccine; if they had not, they were asked “How likely are you to get vaccinated?” (response options: “very likely,” “somewhat likely,” “unsure,” “somewhat unlikely,” or “very unlikely”). We compared intentions in April/May with vaccination uptake or intentions in June/July and used robust Poisson regression to assess demographic predictors of vaccine intentions in June/July among respondents who were unsure, somewhat unlikely, or very unlikely in April/May. Analyses accounted for survey sampling weights, using 2-sided significance levels of .05, with significance defined as 95% CIs not containing 1 (SAS, version 9.4 [SAS Institute Inc]).

Participants provided written informed consent. The University of Southern California’s institutional review board approved the study.

**Results** | The April/May survey included 6052 respondents (including 2039 who were unvaccinated) and the June/July survey included 5839 respondents (5747 with vaccination/likelihood responses), and 1683 of these respondents (weighted N = 1967) also met the April/May inclusion criteria (reported being unvaccinated). The mean time between surveys was 56.5 (SD, 4.6) days. The analytic sample was 55.6% women (mean age, 44.9 [SD, 16.1] years).

The likelihood of vaccination among unvaccinated respondents remained the same or changed only somewhat for the majority of individuals between April/May and June/July (Table 1). Of the 564 participants who were somewhat or very likely to get vaccinated in April/May, 257 (45.6%) reported being vaccinated by June/July, 211 (37.3%) remained somewhat/very likely, and 96 (17.0%) became unsure/somewhat/very unlikely in June/July. Of the 1403 of 1967 respondents (71%) in April/May who were very or somewhat unlikely or unsure about getting a vaccine, 1199 (85.5%) remained so in June/July, 102 (7.3%) reported being vaccinated by June/July, and 101 (7.2%) became somewhat/very likely in June/July. Results for individual likelihood response categories are shown in Table 1. Factors significantly related to rising likelihood included being aged 50 to 64 years, being in an urban/suburban location, being Asian, and having a Democratic party affiliation (Table 2).

**Discussion** | For most individuals, reported likelihood of receiving the COVID-19 vaccine remained stable between April 2021 and July 2021. However, individuals who were unsure or somewhat/very unlikely in April/May 2021 and who were middle-aged, in an urban/suburban area, Asian, and Democrat were most likely to report being vaccinated or switching to somewhat/very likely by July 2021, suggesting that some groups are “moveable” toward vaccination. Structural barriers may remain because many individuals who were somewhat/very likely in April/May remained unvaccinated in June/July.

Study limitations include providing only English-language and Spanish-language surveys, self-reported metrics, and small sample sizes for subgroups.

### Table 1. Vaccinated or Intent to Get a Vaccine in June/July 2021 Among Unvaccinated Respondents in April/May 2021 (N = 1967)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood of vaccination in April/May 2021</th>
<th>Likelihood of vaccination in June/July 2021, No. (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely</td>
<td>720 (83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unlikely</td>
<td>59 (23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>38 (14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely</td>
<td>16 (5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very likely</td>
<td>19 (7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood categories combined</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Somewhat unlikely</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Somewhat likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
<th>Vaccinated</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very unlikely, somewhat unlikely, or unsure</td>
<td>1199 (85)</td>
<td>101 (7)</td>
<td>103 (7)</td>
<td>1403</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat likely or very likely</td>
<td>96 (17)</td>
<td>211 (37)</td>
<td>257 (46)</td>
<td>564</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although outreach, education, and reducing barriers may nudge “moveable” demographic groups toward vaccination, more intensive strategies (eg, mandates) may be needed for resistant groups.

### Table 2. Change in Intent in June/July 2021 Among Unvaccinated Respondents Who Did Not Intend to Get a Vaccine in April/May 2021 (Weighted N = 1403)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Participants who intend to get a vaccine in June/July 2021b</th>
<th>Adjusted rate, % (95% CI)c</th>
<th>Adjusted risk ratio (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>778</td>
<td>14.3 (9.3-21.9)</td>
<td>1 [Reference]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>13.6 (8.4-22.1)</td>
<td>0.95 (0.65-1.41)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age, y</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-49</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>11.2 (7.3-17.2)</td>
<td>1 [Reference]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-64</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>17.8 (10.4-30.7)</td>
<td>1.59 (1.03-2.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥65</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>13.6 (7.8-23.8)</td>
<td>1.21 (0.71-2.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school or less</td>
<td>712</td>
<td>15.1 (9.7-23.5)</td>
<td>1 [Reference]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>9.5 (5.8-15.6)</td>
<td>0.63 (0.39-1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or more</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>18.9 (10.8-33.2)</td>
<td>1.25 (0.80-1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geographic location</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>9.2 (4.8-17.7)</td>
<td>1 [Reference]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban/suburban</td>
<td>1062</td>
<td>21.2 (15.2-29.5)</td>
<td>2.31 (1.23-4.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race and ethnicity</strong>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>10.5 (5.4-20.6)</td>
<td>0.92 (0.47-1.81)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Asian</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36.5 (20.1-66.2)</td>
<td>3.20 (1.76-5.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic Black</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>13.6 (7.7-24.2)</td>
<td>1.19 (0.67-2.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic White</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>11.4 (7.9-16.4)</td>
<td>1 [Reference]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>8.9 (2.6-30.5)</td>
<td>0.78 (0.22-2.70)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Political affiliation</strong>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican party</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>10.6 (6.5-17.1)</td>
<td>1 [Reference]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic party</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>19.4 (11.3-33.5)</td>
<td>1.84 (1.11-3.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>13.3 (8.3-21.3)</td>
<td>1.26 (0.79-2.01)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Did not intend in April/May 2021: individuals who responded “unsure,” “somewhat unlikely,” or “very unlikely” to get a vaccine in April/May.

b Intend to get a vaccine in June/July 2021: individuals who responded “vaccinated” or “very likely” or “somewhat likely” to get a vaccine in June/July.

c Mutually adjusted for all the factors in the table.

d Race and ethnicity were selected as a category by the Understanding America Study survey developers because of known disparities in health metrics resulting from structural racism. Survey respondents self-reported responses to these survey questions. Race and ethnicity were selected in this analysis because racial and ethnic minoritized groups are known to be disproportionately infected by SARS-CoV-2, and because prior studies have shown lower COVID-19 vaccination rates among these groups. The “other” category refers to individuals who self-reported a different race (American Indian or Alaska Native [n = 6], Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander [n = 1], or multiple races [n = 44]); sample sizes were too small to analyze separately.

e Individual characteristics were missing for less than 0.1% of respondents, with the exception of political affiliation, which was missing for 14.5% of respondents.

Although outreach, education, and reducing barriers may nudge “moveable” demographic groups toward vaccination, more intensive strategies (eg, mandates) may be needed for resistant groups.
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Platelet-Rich Plasma Injection vs Sham Injection and Tendon Dysfunction in Patients With Chronic Midportion Achilles Tendinopathy

To the Editor The recent study about injection of platelet-rich plasma (PRP) and tendon dysfunction in patients with chronic midportion Achilles tendinopathy confirmed findings of a recent meta-analysis. However, we believe that this article did not confirm or invalidate the effectiveness of PRP, which remains controversial. In addition to the lack of information about the exact composition of PRP used, the use of local anesthetic with lidocaine that may alter PRP effects, and failure to perform ultrasound-guided injection of PRP, this study would not confirm or invalidate the effectiveness of PRP, which remains controversial. In addition to the lack of information about the exact composition of PRP used, the use of local anesthetic with lidocaine that may alter PRP effects, and failure to perform ultrasound-guided injection of PRP, this study would have benefited from a precise description of tendinopathy subtypes (ie, nodular, fissuration, calcification, or neovascularization) in addition to knowledge about different medical and rehabilitation treatments undertaken by these patients. Also, therapies that may alter tendon metabolism, such as previous corticosteroid injections or fluorquinolones, should have been reported.

In addition, the study participants may not have been representative of typical patients undergoing this treatment because they had a mean age of 52 years, had a mean body mass index greater than 30 (calculated as weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared), had long-term symptoms (24 months), and may have undergone a variety of previous treatments. Indeed, tendinopathies should be first managed with a comprehensive framework for at least 3 months, including education about the condition, load monitoring, and specific exercises aimed at restoration of tendon function, based on knowledge of the different phases of tendon healing. This program should also be performed after PRP injection, including standardized submaximal eccentric-based rehabilitation programs, as described for patellar tendinopathy after PRP injections.

To conclude, we believe there is an urgent need for randomized clinical trials in this field that include precise lesion description, PRP characterization, ultrasound-guided injection, and an adapted concomitant rehabilitation program.
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Author Affiliations: Swiss Olympic Medical Center, Lausanne University Hospital, Lausanne, Switzerland (Greumaux); Santy Orthopedic Center, FIFA Medical Center, Lyon, France (Noël); Department of Physical Medicine, Rehabilitation and Sports Trauma, University Hospital of Liège, Liège, Belgium (Kaux).

To the Editor As clinical researchers in the area of orthobiologics, which includes the use of PRP in musculoskeletal conditions, we believe there were numerous methodological errors in the recent article about PRP injection vs sham and tendon dysfunction in patients with chronic midportion Achilles tendinopathy.

The current literature on PRP for tendinopathy and other musculoskeletal conditions is flawed by the lack of appropriate quantification and definition of PRP used in the studies, resulting in conflicting results. These problems date back more than 5 years, with experts urging more appropriate and diligent quantification in publications on the efficacy of PRP. A collaborative symposium published in the Journal of the American Academy of Orthopedic Surgeons specifically outlined “minimal reporting standards” for clinical studies evaluating PRP. Unfortunately, the article by Dr Kearney and colleagues contains no description of the PRP product that was injected and used a product called Glo PRP, which is not approved by the US Food and Drug Administration in the United States.
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