

Are primary care virtual visits associated with higher emergency department use? A cross-sectional analysis from Ontario, Canada

Tara Kiran^{1,2,3,4} MD MSc

Michael E. Green^{5,6,7} MD MPH

Rachel Strauss³ MPH

C. Fangyun Wu³ MSc MA

Maryam Daneshvarfard² MScCH

Alexander Kopp³ BA

Lauren Lapointe-Shaw^{3,4,9} MD PhD

Lidija Latifovic^{2,8} MSc

Eliot Frymire^{6,7} MA BEd

Richard H. Glazier^{1,2,3,4} MD MPH

¹Department of Family and Community Medicine, St. Michael's Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

²MAP Centre for Urban Health Solutions, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, Ontario

³ICES Central, Toronto, Ontario

⁴Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

⁵Dept of Family Medicine, Queen's University, Kingston, ON.

⁶Health Services and Policy Research Institute, Queens University, Kingston, ON

⁷ICES Queens, Kingston, Ontario

⁸Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON

⁹Department of Medicine, University of Toronto and University Health Network

Corresponding author

Tara Kiran, MD, MSc

MAP Centre for Urban Health Solutions, St. Michael's Hospital

Unity Health Toronto
30 Bond St., Toronto, ON Canada M5B 1W8
tara.kiran@utoronto.ca

Manuscript word count: 3297 words

Number of Tables: 2

Number of Figures: 3

Funding statement

This study was supported by ICES, which is funded by an annual grant from the Ontario Ministry of Health (MOH) and Ministry of Long-Term Care (MLTC). This study also received funding from Ontario Health, the Canadian Institutes of Health Research funding reference number SOP 162662, and the INSPIRE Primary Health Care Research Program which is funded through the Health Systems Research Program of the Ontario Ministry of Health (MOH). The opinions, results and conclusions reported in this paper are those of the authors and are independent from the funding sources. No endorsement by ICES, Ontario Health, or the Ontario MOHLTC is intended or should be inferred.

Parts of this material are based on data and information compiled and provided by Ontario Ministry of Health (MOH) and the Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI). The analyses, conclusions, opinions and statements expressed herein are solely those of the authors and do not reflect those of the funding or data sources; no endorsement is intended or should be inferred.

Drs. Kiran and Glazier are supported as Clinician Scientists by the Department of Family and Community Medicine at the University of Toronto and at St. Michael's Hospital. Dr. Kiran is the Fidani Chair of Improvement and Innovation in Family Medicine at the University of Toronto. Michael Green is supported by the Brian Hennen Chair in Family Medicine at Queen's University.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare no conflicts of interest

Data sharing: The data sets from this study are held securely in coded form at ICES. Data-sharing agreements prohibit ICES from making the data sets publicly available, but access may be granted to those who meet pre-specified criteria for confidential access, available at www.ices.on.ca/DAS. The complete data set creation plan, and underlying analytic code are available from the authors upon request, understanding that the programs may rely upon coding templates or macros unique to ICES.

Author contributions

TK and RG conceived of the study. All authors helped design the study. FW, AK, RS and LL conducted the analysis. All authors helped interpret the data. TK and RS drafted the manuscript and all authors critically reviewed it. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Key points

Question

Do family physicians who provide more care virtually have higher emergency department visit rates among their patient panel?

Findings

In this cross-sectional study from Ontario, Canada, we examined data from February to October 2021 for 12,951,063 patients attached to 15,155 family doctors and found that physicians who provided a high proportion of virtual care did not have higher emergency department visits than those who provided the lowest levels of virtual care. This finding remained true after adjusting for patient characteristics.

Meaning

Our findings refute hypotheses that emergency department use is being driven by family physicians providing more care virtually.

Keywords

Primary care, Virtual care, Emergency department use, Service utilization, COVID-19

Abstract

Importance: The COVID-19 pandemic has resulted in increased use of virtual care, however, few studies have looked at the association between virtual primary care visits and other healthcare use.

Objective: To determine whether there was an association between a high proportion of virtual visits in primary care and more emergency department visits

Design: A cross-sectional study, using routinely collected data

Setting: Ontario, Canada

Participants: Ontario residents alive on March 31st 2021 and family physicians with at least 1 visit claim between February and October 2021.

Exposure: Family physicians stratified by the percentage of total visits that were virtual (phone or video) between February and October 2021

Main outcome(s) and measure(s): We calculated the emergency department visit rate for each stratum of family physician virtual care use. We used multivariable logistic regression models to understand the relative rate of patient emergency department use after stratifying for rurality and adjusting first for patient characteristics and then the 2019 emergency department visit rate.

Results: We analyzed data for 15,155 family physicians and 12,951,063 Ontarians attached to these physicians. The mean number of emergency department visits was highest among patients whose physicians provided only in-person care (470.3 ± 1918.8 per 1,000) and was lowest among physicians who provided >80 to <100% care virtually (242.0 ± 800.3 per 1,000). After adjustment for patient characteristics patients seen by physicians with >20% of visits delivered virtually had lower rates of emergency department visits compared to patients of physicians who provided >0%-20% virtually (e.g. >80 to <100% vs >0%-20% virtual visits in Big Cities, Relative Rate (RR) 0.80 [95%CI 0.76-0.83]). This trend held across all rurality strata and after adjustment for 2019 emergency department visit rates. In

urban areas, there was a gradient whereby physicians providing the highest level of virtual care had the lowest emergency department visit rates.

Conclusions and Relevance:

Physicians who provided a high proportion of care virtually did not have higher emergency department visits than those who provided the lowest levels of virtual care. Our findings refute hypotheses that emergency department use is being driven by family physicians providing more care virtually.

Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic resulted in a seismic shift in how primary care was delivered. Shortly after a global pandemic was declared in March 2020, the amount of care delivered virtually—by phone or video—increased 56-fold, comprising over 70% of all primary care visits.¹ More than two years into the pandemic, virtual care continues to comprise a substantial portion of visits.² Research has found that most patients feel comfortable with virtual care, like its convenience, and want it to continue.³⁻⁶ However, there are concerns about the impact of virtual primary care visits on care quality including on patient safety,⁷ equity in access,^{8,9} effective chronic condition management,¹⁰ and healthcare utilization.¹¹ Effects have been hard to untangle due to the simultaneous impact of the pandemic on care.

The proportion of primary care delivered virtually varies by jurisdiction and practice and is influenced by factors such as reimbursement and overhead, patient and provider access to technology and infrastructure, provider access to personal protective equipment, provider health concerns, and patient and provider preference.¹²⁻¹⁷ There have been concerns that in some practices, the proportion of virtual visits is too high resulting in an increase in other health system use. However, few studies have looked at the association between virtual primary care visits and other healthcare use. One such study found high practice telehealth use was associated with a small increase in emergency room visits and hospitalizations for ambulatory care sensitive conditions compared with low practice telehealth use.¹¹

In Ontario, Canada, provincial authorities had initially directed family physicians to adopt a virtual-first approach to seeing patients as a safety precaution when COVID-19 case counts were high. This approach meant physicians were to perform the initial assessment remotely and then bring patients into the

office for an in-person visit only if warranted. However, by fall 2021, authorities were concerned that many family physicians were doing too much virtual care and that this was making it difficult for patients to access in-person care, resulting in increased emergency department use. In October 2021, the provincial medical officer of health and the regulatory college issued a joint statement encouraging more use of in-person care.¹⁸ It is unclear, however, whether high use of virtual care was driving perceived increases in emergency department visit volumes.

We undertook a cross-sectional study using routinely collected data to understand whether there was an association, ecologically and at a practice-level, between a high proportion of virtual visits in primary care and more emergency department visits.

Methods

Context and Setting

Ontario is Canada's largest province with a population of 14.8 million in 2021.¹⁹ Physician and hospital visits, including emergency department care, are fully insured and free at the point-of-care for all permanent residents through the Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP). Just over 80% of the population is formally enrolled to a family physician practicing in a Patient Enrolment Model where, depending on the model of care, between 15% to 70% of payment is via capitation (adjusted for patient age and sex) with some fee-for-service and incentive payments.²⁰ The remaining population either are unattached or see a family physician practicing fee-for-service. Approximately one quarter of the population lives in rural communities with fewer than 30,000 people, where health services are structured differently.²¹ Rural emergency departments are staffed by family physicians and although emergency department volumes are relatively low, visit rates are much higher than in urban areas, due in part to the limited

availability of other after-hours care.²² Temporary virtual care billing codes were introduced for phone and video visits in Ontario on March 14, 2020 and, during the study time period, paid the same amount as an equivalent in-person visit. Initially, the same billing code was used for phone and video.

Study Design

We examined primary care and emergency department visit trends between January 2019 and October 2021. We then conducted a cross-sectional, population-based analysis using linked health administrative data to examine the association between the proportion of care delivered virtually at the primary care physician-level and emergency department visit rates between February and October 2021 in Ontario, Canada.

Datasets were linked using unique encoded identifiers and analyzed at ICES. ICES is an independent, non-profit research institute whose legal status under Ontario's health information privacy law allows it to collect and analyze health care and demographic data, without consent, for health system evaluation and improvement.

Study Population

We examined visit trends for all residents in Ontario. For the cross-sectional analysis, we included family physicians with at least 1 home, office, or virtual visit claim between February and October 2021. We included permanent residents of Ontario who were alive as of March 31st 2021. We assigned Ontario residents to a family physician using enrolment tables from the Ontario Ministry of Health; for those not enrolled, we assigned them to the family physician who billed the maximum value of 30 common primary care fee codes billed within the previous 2 years (eExhibit 1). We excluded residents who we

could not assign to a family physician or whose family physician did not have any visit claims during the study period.

We categorized physicians as practicing traditional fee-for-service or in one of the following three types of Patient Enrolment Models: *Enhanced fee-for-service* (Comprehensive Care Model, Family Health Group) where fee-for-service comprises approximately 80% of income; *Non-team capitation* (Family Health Network, Family Health Organization) where capitation comprises approximately 70% of income; and *Team-based capitation* (Family Health Team) where capitation comprises approximately 70% of income and physicians also have access to an interprofessional team funded through the Ministry of Health.

Analysis

Trends in primary care and emergency department visits

We used physician billing claims to count primary care visits weekly by type: office, home, virtual and total. We used the National Ambulatory Care Reporting System to assess emergency department visits weekly (total and stratified by triage level). For context, we included data on COVID-19 case counts in Ontario using publicly available COVID-19 surveillance data from Public Health Ontario.²³

Cross-sectional description of physicians by virtual care use

For each family physician, we calculated the total volume of visits that were in-person (office and home) and virtual (phone and video) between February and October 2021. We then calculated the percent of all visits that were delivered virtually during that period and stratified physicians into the following

groups *a priori*: 0% virtual (100% in-person), >0-20%, >20-40%, >40-60%, >60-80%, >80-<100%, and 100% virtual.

We described patient and physician characteristics as of March 31st, 2021 within each stratum of virtual care use. We assessed physician characteristics using the provider databases. We assessed patient age, sex, and postal code using the provincial registry of all individuals eligible for OHIP coverage. We used postal code and 2016 Canadian census data to derive neighbourhood-level income quintile. We assessed rurality using patient and physician postal code and the Rurality Index of Ontario (RIO) score, where areas with a score of 0 are considered big cities, 1-9 are small cities, 10-39 are small towns, and 40 or more are rural areas.²⁴ Patient postal code and the Ontario Marginalization Index^{25,26} were used to assess neighbourhood-level material deprivation and ethnic diversity. We assessed whether patients registered for OHIP within the last ten years, a proxy for recent immigration. Finally, we used the Johns Hopkins Adjusted Clinical Group method to assess patient co-morbidity and morbidity (ACG® System Version 10).²⁷ We used the Johns Hopkins ACG® System Aggregated Diagnosis Groups to categorize co-morbidity as 0 (no comorbidity), 1-4 (low comorbidity), 5-9 (moderate comorbidity) and 10+ (high comorbidity). Morbidity was assessed using corresponding Resource Utilization Bands (RUBs) categorized as 0-1 (non-user/healthy user), 2 (low morbidity), 3 (moderate morbidity) and 4+ (high morbidity).²⁸

Variation in virtual care use

For physicians in a Patient Enrolment Model, we examined the variation in virtual care use between physicians in the same practice group and between physicians in different practice groups, stratified by the type of Patient Enrolment Model. For this analysis, the percentage of total visits that were virtual was modeled as a continuous variable for each physician. To understand how much of the total variance

in virtual visits was attributable to physician group and practice type, we calculated an intraclass correlation coefficient from a three-level (patient, physician and group), intercept-only mixed linear model with virtual visit rate as the outcome.

Cross sectional association between virtual care and other health care use

We examined healthcare use of patients attached to family physicians within stratum of virtual care use. The primary outcome was the rate of emergency department visits per 1,000 patients. We compared this across levels of family physician virtual care use between February and October 2021. For each stratum, we assessed the number of emergency department visits for every patient of physicians in the stratum and calculated the average number per patient. We also assessed the following contextual information: i) the percent of patients with a primary care visit, ii) the average number of primary care visits, and iii) the percentage of visits to the usual family physician between February and October 2021. Usual family physician was the physician a patient saw the most over the two years prior to March 31, 2021. Secondary outcomes included the percent of patients with an ambulatory care sensitive condition-related hospital admission, derived from the Canadian Institute for Health Information's Discharge Abstract Database (eExhibit 2), and specialist visits, ascertained from physician billings. We examined bivariate associations overall and separately for each rurality stratum.

Next, we wanted to understand whether the associations observed in 2021 reflected historical associations that pre-dated the pandemic and widespread adoption of virtual care. To do so, we examined the absolute and relative differences in the emergency department visit rate between February and October 2021 and the corresponding period (February to October) in 2019 for each stratum of family physician virtual care use.

Finally, we aimed to understand the relationship between physician virtual care use and patient emergency department visits after adjustment for potential confounders. We constructed two multivariable logistic regression models with physician-level virtual care proportion as a 5-level categorical exposure and volume of patient emergency department visits as the outcome. In Model 1, we adjusted for patient age, sex, neighbourhood income quintile, recent registration, co-morbidity, and healthcare use, and stratified by rurality. Model 2 included the same covariates and further adjusted for the emergency department visit rate in 2019, to account for potential pre-existing patterns. All analyses were performed in SAS EG 7.1.

Sensitivity Analysis

We performed sub-group analyses where we used a previously-published algorithm²⁹ to restrict our cohort to comprehensive primary care physicians, active as of March 31, 2019, the most recent year where the data for the algorithm was available.

Ethics Approval

The use of the data in this project is authorized under section 45 of Ontario's Personal Health Information Protection Act (PHIPA) and does not require review by a Research Ethics Board.

Results

Primary Care and Emergency Department Visits Over Time

Total primary care visits dropped at the onset of the pandemic but returned to average pre-pandemic levels by fall of 2020 (Figure 1a). The proportion of virtual primary care visits peaked in the first two weeks of the pandemic at 82% but was 49% by October 2021. Emergency department visits dropped at

the start of the pandemic and remained lower than 2019 volumes throughout the study period (Figure 1b). Trends in ED visit rates were similar for Canadian Triage and Acuity Scale (CTAS) levels 2,3, and 4 (Appendix, eExhibit 3) with dips visually corresponding to increases in COVID numbers (Figure 1c). Periods with a higher proportion of virtual primary care visits visually related to higher numbers of COVID cases and lower ED visit rates (Figures 1 c and d).

Physician and Patient Characteristics

We analyzed data for 15,155 family physicians who had at least one office, home, or virtual claim between February and October 2021 and 12,951,063 Ontarians who were attached to these physicians (Table 1). The majority of physicians provided between 40-80% of care virtually; only 400 physicians provided 100% of care virtually while 2,691 provided between >80 to <100% of care virtually. A higher proportion of the physicians who provided >80% virtual care were 65 years or older, female, and practicing in big cities. Most physicians who provided 100% of care virtually worked traditional fee-for-service and had a panel size of less than 100; more of their patients were recent registrants and lived in a neighbourhood in the lowest income quintile and a neighbourhood that was more ethnically diverse (Appendix, eExhibit 4). Patient co-morbidity and morbidity were similar across strata.

Variation in the proportion of virtual care

Among physicians practicing in a patient enrolment model, we found substantial variation in the proportion of virtual care provided both between and within groups of physicians (Figure 2). The variation was not explained by practice model (Interclass Correlation Coefficient for practice model = 0.5%); physician group accounted for almost one-third of the observed variation between all physicians (Interclass Correlation Coefficient for physician group = 30.5%).

Health Service Utilization

Compared to patients whose physicians provided 40-60% of care virtually, patients whose physicians provided >80% of care virtually had a higher mean number of primary care visits per patient and lower continuity; they did not have substantially different referral rates to specialists or rates of hospital admission for ambulatory sensitive conditions (Table 2).

The mean number of emergency department visits was highest among patients whose physicians provided only in-person care (470.3 ± 1918.8 per 1,000) and was lowest in the >80-<100% virtual care group (242.0 ± 800.3 per 1,000) (Table 2). Emergency department use decreased as physician percent of virtual care increased, except among physicians who provided 100% of care virtually where ED rates were 287.1 ± 1048.9 per 1000. Emergency department visits in 2019, prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, demonstrated a very similar pattern. Between 2019 and 2021, there was an overall 13% decrease in the mean number of emergency department visits (2019: 309.6 ± 965.4 , 2021: 268.9 ± 903.2). Visits decreased across all levels of physician virtual care use, apart from a slight increase among patients attached to physicians who provided 0% virtual care; the absolute and relative decrease was smallest among patients of physicians who provided 100% virtual care followed by those whose physicians provided 80-<100% virtual care. The crude association between the proportion of care delivered virtually and ED use was consistent by rural strata (eExhibit 7).

Regression Findings

Regression modeling excluded patients of physicians providing 0 or 100% virtual care ($n= 1,395$ and 400 , respectively). We found that after adjustment for patient characteristics, patients seen by physicians who had more than 20% visits virtually had lower rates of emergency department visits when compared to patients of physicians who provided the least percentage of virtual care (>0-20%) (Figure 3a). For

example, patients who lived in big cities who provided >60-80% of care virtually had almost 20% lower rate of emergency department visits compared to those who were seen by a physician providing >0-20% of care virtually. This trend held across all region types. In both big and small cities, we observed a gradient such that patients whose corresponding physicians provided the highest level of virtual care had the lowest rates of emergency department visits. These patterns remained even after further adjusting the model for patient emergency department visit rates in 2019 (Figure 3b).

Sensitivity analysis

Overall, results were consistent in the sensitivity analysis limited to comprehensive family physicians (n=9,462) (eExhibit 5 and eExhibit 6).

Discussion

The expansion of virtual care during the pandemic opened new modes of access for patients and allowed family physicians to care for people while reducing the risk of COVID transmission. Nonetheless, some policymakers became worried that virtual care was being used inappropriately, leading to an increase in emergency department use. Our findings refute this hypothesis. First, we examined population-based trends in emergency department and primary care visits before and after the pandemic. We found emergency department visit rates were lower than in the pre-pandemic period; increases in emergency department use seemed to coincide with decreasing COVID cases and did not coincide with more virtual primary care. Second, we conducted a cross-sectional analysis of 12,951,063 million patients attached to 15,155 family doctors who practiced between February and October 2021. We found that, at the population level, physicians who provided a high proportion of virtual care did not have higher emergency department visits than those who provided the lowest levels of virtual care. This

finding remained true even after adjusting for patient characteristics with differences largely following pre-pandemic patterns.

Comparison with other studies

Prior to COVID-19, several studies suggested virtual care could reduce emergency department and other hospital use, specifically for rural populations,³⁰ older populations,³¹ and following a natural disaster.³² Following COVID-19, a US study examining virtual care use and hospital visits for ambulatory-care sensitive conditions (ACSC) found that practices with high virtual care use had a small increase in ACSC visits compared to those with medium virtual care use, but differences disappeared when acute and chronic ACSC were evaluated separately.¹¹ Other studies suggest that virtual care use during the COVID-19 pandemic was higher among patients who were sicker, suggesting it supported care continuity when COVID-19 cases were high.^{1,33} In US studies, virtual care often includes a high portion of video unlike in Ontario where most virtual care was delivered by phone.³

Strengths and Limitations

We conducted a population-based analysis that included data on all family physicians in Canada's largest province who were practicing in the study period. We examined emergency department use along with other health service use and looked back to the pre-pandemic period to understand if associations may have pre-dated the pandemic. Our findings were consistent when we limited our analysis to physicians meeting criteria for practicing comprehensive care. We examined virtual care use using new billing codes but unfortunately these do not distinguish between video and phone visits. Billings also do not capture other aspects of care such as email with patients or care provided by non-physician team members. We examined a nine-month period of the pandemic and findings may not reflect evolving practice patterns. Finally, our study is limited to administrative data and does not shed light on why

there are differences in the amount of care delivered virtually, appropriateness of virtual care for specific circumstances, and whether that care meets patients' needs.

Implications for Policy

The pandemic resulted in the widespread adoption of virtual care, which is here to stay. In Ontario, billing for virtual care that was introduced on an emergency basis in the pandemic will become permanent in October 2022 with new billing codes that provide lower remuneration for phone appointments compared to in-person visits. However, two years into the pandemic, there continue to be news reports of emergency departments being overwhelmed and some continue to speculate that one contributing factor is patients not being able to see their physician in-person.³⁴ Mixed methods research is needed to better understand patients' experience accessing their family physicians, reasons for seeking care in the emergency department, their views on virtual care, and drivers of physician-level variation in virtual care provision. Researchers and policy-makers should be mindful of different patient subgroups where virtual care can either facilitate access (e.g. in rural areas) or be a barrier (e.g. for those with language or sensory barriers).

Conclusion

We found that, at the population level, physicians who provided a high proportion of virtual care did not have higher emergency department visits than those who provided the lowest levels of virtual care. Further, during the first 18-months of the pandemic, emergency department visit rates were lower than pre-pandemic levels and periods where emergency department visit rates were highest did not coincide with higher rates of virtual care use. Our findings refute hypotheses that emergency department use is being driven by family physicians providing more care virtually.

References

1. Glazier RH, Green ME, Wu FC, Frymire E, Kopp A, Kiran T. Shifts in office and virtual primary care during the early COVID-19 pandemic in Ontario, Canada. *CMAJ*. 2021;193(6):E200-E210.
2. Canadians' Health Care Experiences During COVID-19. Canada Health Infoway. <https://www.infoway-inforoute.ca/en/component/edocman/resources/reports/benefits-evaluation/3828-canadians-health-care-experiences-during-covid-19>. Published 2022. Accessed July, 2022.
3. Agarwal P, Wang R, Meaney C, et al. Sociodemographic differences in patient experience with primary care during COVID-19: results from a cross-sectional survey in Ontario, Canada. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(5):e056868.
4. Nguyen M, Waller M, Pandya A, Portnoy J. A Review of Patient and Provider Satisfaction with Telemedicine. *Curr Allergy Asthma Rep*. 2020;20(11):72.
5. Eze ND, Mateus C, Cravo Oliveira Hashiguchi T. Telemedicine in the OECD: An umbrella review of clinical and cost-effectiveness, patient experience and implementation. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(8):e0237585.
6. Guinart D, Marcy P, Hauser M, Dwyer M, Kane JM. Patient Attitudes Toward Telepsychiatry During the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Nationwide, Multisite Survey. *JMIR Ment Health*. 2020;7(12):e24761.
7. Khoong EC, Sharma AE, Gupta K, Adler-Milstein J, Sarkar U. The Abrupt Expansion of Ambulatory Telemedicine: Implications for Patient Safety. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2022;37(5):1270-1274.
8. Eberly LA, Kallan MJ, Julien HM, et al. Patient Characteristics Associated With Telemedicine Access for Primary and Specialty Ambulatory Care During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2020;3(12):e2031640.
9. Zhang D, Shi L, Han X, et al. Disparities in telehealth utilization during the COVID-19 pandemic: Findings from a nationally representative survey in the United States. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2021:1357633x211051677.
10. Carr MJ, Wright AK, Leelarathna L, et al. Impact of COVID-19 restrictions on diabetes health checks and prescribing for people with type 2 diabetes: a UK-wide cohort study involving 618 161 people in primary care. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2022;31(7):503-514.
11. Li KY, Ng S, Zhu Z, McCullough JS, Kocher KE, Ellimoottil C. Association Between Primary Care Practice Telehealth Use and Acute Care Visits for Ambulatory Care-Sensitive Conditions During COVID-19. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(3):e225484.
12. Dupraz J, Le Pogam MA, Peytremann-Bridevaux I. Early impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on in-person outpatient care utilisation: a rapid review. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(3):e056086.
13. Chu C, Cram P, Pang A, Stamenova V, Tadrous M, Bhatia RS. Rural Telemedicine Use Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic: Repeated Cross-sectional Study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2021;23(4):e26960.
14. Almathami HKY, Win KT, Vlahu-Gjorgievska E. Barriers and Facilitators That Influence Telemedicine-Based, Real-Time, Online Consultation at Patients' Homes: Systematic Literature Review. *J Med Internet Res*. 2020;22(2):e16407.
15. Adepoju OE, Tran L, Agwuncha R, et al. Associations between Patient- and Provider Level Factors, and Telemedicine Use in Family Medicine Clinics. *J Am Board Fam Med*. 2022;35(3):457-464.
16. Alami H, Gagnon MP, Wootton R, Fortin JP, Zanaboni P. Exploring factors associated with the uneven utilization of telemedicine in Norway: a mixed methods study. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak*. 2017;17(1):180.

17. Liu L, Goodarzi Z, Jones A, Posno R, Straus SE, Watt JA. Factors associated with virtual care access in older adults: a cross-sectional study. *Age Ageing*. 2021;50(4):1412-1415.
18. COVID-19 UPDATE REGARDING THE PROVISION OF IN-PERSON AND VIRTUAL CARE. CPSO. [https://www.cpso.on.ca/en/News/COVID-19-Updates/Information-for-Physicians/COVID-19-update-regarding-the-provision-of-in-\(1\)](https://www.cpso.on.ca/en/News/COVID-19-Updates/Information-for-Physicians/COVID-19-update-regarding-the-provision-of-in-(1)). Published 2021. Accessed June, 2022.
19. Population estimates on July 1st, by age and sex1, 2, 3, 4. Statistics Canada. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/t1/tbl1/en/tv.action?pid=1710000501&pickMembers%5B0%5D=1.7&pickMembers%5B1%5D=2.1>. Published 2021. Accessed June, 2022.
20. Kiran T, Kopp A, Moineddin R, Glazier RH. Longitudinal evaluation of physician payment reform and team-based care for chronic disease management and prevention. *Cmaj*. 2015;187(17):E494-e502.
21. Population distribution of Ontario in 2016, by rural/urban type. Statista Research Department. <https://www.statista.com/statistics/608698/population-distribution-of-ontario-by-rural-urban-type/>. Published 2022. Accessed July, 2022.
22. Kiran T, Moineddin R, Kopp A, Glazier RH. Impact of Team-Based Care on Emergency Department Use. *Ann Fam Med*. 2022;20(1):24-31.
23. Ontario COVID-19 Data Tool. Public Health Ontario. <https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/data-and-analysis/infectious-disease/covid-19-data-surveillance/covid-19-data-tool?tab=trends>. Published 2022. Accessed July, 2022.
24. Kralj B. *Measuring rurality - RIO 2008_BASIC : methodology and results*. Toronto, Ont.: Ontario Medical Association Economics Department; 2013.
25. Matheson FI, Dunn JR, Smith KL, Moineddin R, Glazier RH. Development of the Canadian Marginalization Index: a new tool for the study of inequality. *Can J Public Health*. 2012;103(8 Suppl 2):S12-16.
26. Ontario Marginalization Index (ON-Marg). Ontario Community Health Profiles Partnership. <https://www.ontariohealthprofiles.ca/onmargON.php>. Accessed July, 2022.
27. Johns Hopkins ACG® System. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University. <https://www.hopkinsacg.org/>. Accessed July, 2022.
28. Term: Resource Utilization Bands (RUBs). University of Manitoba. <http://mchp-appserv.cpe.umanitoba.ca/viewDefinition.php?definitionID=104613>. Published 2015. Accessed July, 2022.
29. Schultz SE, Glazier RH. Identification of physicians providing comprehensive primary care in Ontario: a retrospective analysis using linked administrative data. *CMAJ Open*. 2017;5(4):E856-e863.
30. Dayal P, Chang CH, Benko WS, et al. Hospital Utilization Among Rural Children Served by Pediatric Neurology Telemedicine Clinics. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2(8):e199364.
31. Shah MN, Wasserman EB, Gillespie SM, et al. High-Intensity Telemedicine Decreases Emergency Department Use for Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions by Older Adult Senior Living Community Residents. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2015;16(12):1077-1081.
32. Friedman RSC, Carpenter DM, Shaver JM, McDermott SC, Voelkel J. Telemedicine Familiarity and Post-Disaster Utilization of Emergency and Hospital Services for Ambulatory Care Sensitive Conditions. *Am J Prev Med*. 2022;63(1):e1-e9.
33. Stamenova V, Chu C, Pang A, et al. Virtual care use during the COVID-19 pandemic and its impact on healthcare utilization in patients with chronic disease: A population-based repeated cross-sectional study. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(4):e0267218.
34. Crawley M. Family doctors deny they're causing Ontario's emergency room problems. CBC NEWS. <https://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/toronto/ontario-hospital-emergency-room-family-doctors-1.6516769>. Published 2022. Accessed July, 2022.

Table 1. Physician and Practice Characteristics by the Percent of Care Provided Virtually, between February 1 and October 31, 2021, in Ontario, Canada.

Physician % Virtual Care	0%	>0-20%	>20-40%	>40-60%	>60-80%	>80-<100%	100%	Total
No. Physicians	N=1,395	N=1,447	N=1,861	N=3,099	N=4,262	N=2,691	N=400	N=15,155
No. Patients	N=82,689	N=771,808	N=1,633,324	N=3,229,223	N=4,657,341	N=2,511,964	N=64,714	N=12,951,063
Physician Age								
≤44	629 (45.1)	529 (36.6)	792 (42.6)	1,412 (45.6)	1,868 (43.8)	984 (36.6)	149 (37.3)	6,363 (42.0)
45-64	550 (39.4)	646 (44.6)	788 (42.3)	1,323 (42.7)	1,890 (44.3)	1,160 (43.1)	133 (33.3)	6,490 (42.8)
65-74	148 (10.6)	202 (14.0)	221 (11.9)	300 (9.7)	421 (9.9)	427 (15.9)	81 (20.3)	1,800 (11.9)
≥75	50 (3.6)	70 (4.8)	60 (3.2)	64 (2.1)	83 (1.9)	120 (4.5)	37 (9.3)	484 (3.2)
Physician Sex								
Female	526 (37.7)	499 (34.5)	778 (41.8)	1,590 (51.3)	2,393 (56.1)	1,355 (50.4)	214 (53.5)	7,355 (48.5)
Male	869 (62.3)	948 (65.5)	1,083 (58.2)	1,509 (48.7)	1,869 (43.9)	1,336 (49.6)	186 (46.5)	7,800 (51.5)
Primary Care Model								
PEM: Non-team capitation	14 (1.0)	148 (10.2)	354 (19.0)	788 (25.4)	1,267 (29.7)	570 (21.2)	11 (2.8)	3,152 (20.8)
PEM: Enhanced fee-for-service	31 (2.2)	194 (13.4)	332 (17.8)	492 (15.9)	923 (21.7)	777 (28.9)	32 (8.0)	2,781 (18.4)
PEM: Team-based capitation	31 (2.2)	102 (7.0)	377 (20.3)	980 (31.6)	1,172 (27.5)	360 (13.4)	12 (3.0)	3,034 (20.0)
Traditional fee-for-service	816 (58.5)	827 (57.2)	665 (35.7)	674 (21.7)	741 (17.4)	904 (33.6)	285 (71.3)	4,912 (32.4)
Missing	503 (36.1)	176 (12.2)	133 (7.1)	165 (5.3)	159 (3.7)	80 (3.0)	60 (15.0)	1,276 (8.4)
Location of Practice								
Big cities	567 (40.6)	623 (43.1)	736 (39.5)	1,266 (40.9)	2,217 (52.0)	1,565 (58.2)	251 (62.8)	7,225 (47.7)
Small cities	297 (21.3)	381 (26.3)	458 (24.6)	816 (26.3)	1,194 (28.0)	778 (28.9)	86 (21.5)	4,010 (26.5)
Small towns	303 (21.7)	258 (17.8)	373 (20.0)	629 (20.3)	523 (12.3)	228 (8.5)	31 (7.8)	2,345 (15.5)
Rural	210 (15.1)	185 (12.8)	294 (15.8)	388 (12.5)	328 (7.7)	120 (4.5)	32 (8.0)	1,557 (10.3)
Missing	18 (1.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	18 (0.1)
Patient Panel Size								
<100	773 (55.4)	592 (40.9)	450 (24.2)	469 (15.1)	479 (11.2)	584 (21.7)	242 (60.5)	3,589 (23.7)
100-499	72 (5.2)	230 (15.9)	235 (12.6)	278 (9.0)	363 (8.5)	350 (13.0)	54 (13.5)	1,582 (10.4)
500-999	18 (1.3)	127 (8.8)	261 (14.0)	608 (19.6)	897 (21.0)	493 (18.3)	25 (6.3)	2,429 (16.0)
1000-1499	21 (1.5)	120 (8.3)	356 (19.1)	722 (23.3)	1,214 (28.5)	546 (20.3)	9 (2.3)	2,988 (19.7)
1500-1999	≤5	85 (5.9)	225 (12.1)	489 (15.8)	697 (16.4)	348 (12.9)	≤5	1,855 (12.2)
≥2000	≤5	117 (8.1)	201 (10.8)	368 (11.9)	453 (10.6)	290 (10.8)	≤5	1,436 (9.5)
Missing	503 (36.1)	176 (12.2)	133 (7.1)	165 (5.3)	159 (3.7)	80 (3.0)	60 (15.0)	1,276 (8.4)

Note: Ontario residents who were not attached to a primary care physician or whose physician did not have claims during the study period were excluded.

PEM= Patient Enrolment Model




Figure 1. Primary Care Visits, Emergency Department Visits, and Percent of Total Primary Care Visits Delivered Virtually, January 2019 to October 2021.

(A): Weekly primary care visits, by type of visit, over time. (B): Comparison of weekly emergency department visits during the Pre-COVID-19 period (January 2019 – October 2019) and the COVID-19 period (January 2020 to October 2021). (C): Comparison of weekly emergency department visits and COVID-19 case counts between January 2020 and October 2021. (D): Comparison of weekly emergency department visits and percent of primary care visits that were virtual between January 2020 and October 2021.




Figure 2. Variation in the Percent of Virtual Visits between Physicians in the Same Group and between Physicians in Different Groups, Stratified by Type of Patient Enrolment Model, February and October 2021

The black line represents the mean ratio for the practice group. Each group can have 3 or more mos. Each dot represents a physician. Physicians within the same practice group are represented on the same vertical line. We calculated an intraclass correlation coefficient from a three-level, intercept-only mixed linear model to understand how much of the total variance in virtual visits was attributable to physician group and practice type. We found the variation was not explained by model of care (ICC: 0.5%), whereas a high proportion of variation was explained by specific practice group the physician belonged to (ICC:30.5%).

Table 2. Patient Health Service Utilization Stratified by the Rostered Physician’s Percent of Care Provided Virtually During The Eight-Month Period Between February 1 and October 2021

Physician % Virtual Care	0%	>0-20%	>20-40%	>40-60%	>60-80%	>80-<100%	100%	Total
No. Patients	N=82,689	N=771,808	N=1,633,324	N=3,229,223	N=4,657,341	N=2,511,964	N=64,714	N=12,951,063
Primary Care Services								
Any primary care visit, n (%)	46,285 (56.0)	476,755 (61.8)	1,011,337 (61.9)	2,015,294 (62.4)	2,998,836 (64.4)	1,652,188 (65.8)	40,898 (63.2)	8,241,593 (63.6)
Number of primary care visits per patient, mean ± SD	2.5 ± 4.9	2.5 ± 4.2	2.4 ± 3.9	2.3 ± 3.7	2.6 ± 3.9	2.9 ± 4.3	3.1 ± 5.34	2.5 ± 3.9
Percent of visits with most responsible family physician*, mean ± SD	47.9 ± 44.8	66.09 ± 40.3	70.0 ± 38.2	71.7 ± 36.7	71.5 ± 36.8	67.9 ± 38.9	39.5 ± 42.5	70.0 ± 37.8
Other Health Care Use								
Any specialist visits, n (%)	31,481 (38.1)	290,308 (37.6)	621,311 (38.0)	1,251,610 (38.8)	1,855,914 (39.8)	1,012,442 (40.3)	25,745 (39.8)	5,088,811 (39.3)
Ambulatory care-sensitive condition visits, n (%)	324 (0.4)	2,085 (0.3)	4,104 (0.3)	7,761 (0.2)	9,608 (0.2)	4,699 (0.2)	114 (0.2)	28,695 (0.2)
Emergency Department Utilization, February to October 2019/2021								
Total visits per 1,000, 2021, mean ± SD†	470.3 ± 1918.8	309.8 ± 1087.0	295.3 ± 1036.1	283.5 ± 919.7	253.4 ± 825.4	242.0 ± 800.3	287.1 ± 1048.9	268.9 ± 903.2
Total visits per 1,000, 2019, mean ± SD†	468.3 ± 1850.5	360.6 ± 1100.1	346.5 ± 996.9	329.0 ± 985.8	290.1 ± 934.2	272.0 ± 843.2	294.0 ± 891.4	309.6 ± 965.4
Absolute difference 2021 vs 2019 (95% CI)	2.0 (-14.1, 18.1)	-50.7 (-54.2, -47.3)	-51.3 (-53.6, -49.0)	-45.5 (-47.0, -44.0)	-36.7 (-37.9, -35.5)	-30.0 (-31.4, -28.5)	-6.9 (-16.8, 3.0)	-40.7 (-41.44, -40.0)
Percent change 2021 vs 2019 (95% CI)	0.4 (-3.0, 3.9)	-14.1 (-15.0, -13.2)	-14.8 (-15.4, -14.2)	-13.8 (-14.3, -13.4)	-12.7 (-13.0, -12.3)	-11.0 (-11.5, -10.5)	-2.4 (-5.8, 1.1)	-13.2 (-13.4, -12.9)

*Among patients with 2 or more visits between February and October 2021; †This includes only patients whose attached physicians had claims in both 2021 and 2019.

Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; CI, confidence interval




Figure 3. Adjusted Relative Rates of Patient Emergency Department Visits by Percent of Total Visits Delivered Virtually by Family Physicians, Stratified by Rurality. Reference = Physicians Where Virtual Care Comprises between >0 to 20% of Total Visits.

Model 1: Adjusted for patient age, sex, neighbourhood income quintile, recent registration, co-morbidity and morbidity.

Model 2: Adjusted for patient age, sex, neighbourhood income quintile, recent registration, co-morbidity, morbidity and rate of emergency department visits in 2019.

Appendix

eExhibit 1. Billing Codes Used to Determine the Usual Family Physician for Not Enrolled Patients.

eExhibit 2. Ambulatory Care Sensitive Condition Related Hospital Admissions Used as Secondary Outcomes to Examine Healthcare Utilization of Patients Attached to Family Physicians within Each Stratum of Virtual Care Use.

eExhibit 3. Weekly Emergency Department Visits by Canadian Triage and Acuity Scale (CTAS) Level, January 2019 to October 2021.

eExhibit 4. Patient Characteristics by the Percent of Physician Primary Care Provided Virtually, between February 1 and October 31, 2021, in Ontario, Canada.

eExhibit 5a. Physician and Practice Characteristics by the Percent of Care Provided Virtually, Comprehensive Family Physicians, between February 1 and October 31, 2021, in Ontario, Canada.

eExhibit 5b. Characteristics of Patients Attached to Comprehensive Family Physicians by the Percent of Physician Primary Care Provided Virtually, between February 1 and October 31, 2021, in Ontario, Canada.

eExhibit 6. Health Service Utilization of Patients Attached to Comprehensive Family Physicians Stratified by the Attached Physician's Percent of Care Provided Virtually, between February 1 and October 2021, in Ontario Canada.

eExhibit 7. Patient Health Service Utilization Stratified by the Attached Physician's Percent of Care Provided Virtually, between February 1 and October 2021, in Ontario Canada, by Rurality.

eExhibit 1. Billing Codes Used to Determine the Usual Family Physician for Not Enrolled Patients.


Fee code	Description
Primary Care Codes	
A001	MINOR ASSESS.-F.P./G.P.
A002	Family Practice & Practice in General - Enhanced 18 month well baby visit
A003	GEN. ASSESS. -F.P./G.P.
A007	INTERMED.ASSESS/WELL BABY CARE-F.P./G.P./PAED.
A903	GEN/FAM PRACT-PRE-DENTAL/OPER.ASSESS LIMIT 2 PER YEAR/PT
E075	GERIATRIC GENERAL ASSESSMENT PREMIUM
G212	D./T. PROC.-ALLERGY-HYPOSENSITIZATION INJECTION PLUS BASIC
G271	D./T. PROC.-CARDIOV.-ANTICOAGULANT SUPERVISION
G372	D./T. PROC.-INJECTIONS-INTRADERMAL/MUSCULAR ETC. EA. ADD.
G373	D./T. PROC.-INJ. INTRADERMAL/MUSC. BASIC FEE (SHICK TEST)
G365	D./T. PROC.-GYNAECOLOGY-PAPANICOLAOU SMEAR
G538	D&T IMMUNIZATION-WITH VISIT, EACH INJECT.
G539	Injection of unspecified agent - sole reason (first injection)
G590	INFLUENZA AGENT +VISIT
G591	Injection of influenza agent - sole reason
K005	INDIVIDUAL CARE PER 1/2 HR
K013	COUNSELLING-ONE OR MORE PEOPLE-PER 1/2HR.
K017	ANNUAL HEALTH EXAM-CHILD AFT. 2ND BIRTHDAY.
P004	OBS.-PRENATAL CARE-MINOR PRENATAL ASSESS.-SUBSEQ.PRENAT.VIS.
K130	Periodic health visit - adolescent
K131	Periodic health visit - adult aged 18 to 64 inclusive
K132	Periodic health visit - adult 65 years of age and older
K030	DIABETIC MANAGEMENT FEE
K080	Minor assessment - Covid, Virtual
K081	Intermediate assessment - Covid, Virtual
K082	Primary mental health care - Covid, Virtual
Paediatric Codes	
A261	MINOR ASSESS.-PAED.
A268	Paediatrics - Enhanced 18 month well baby visit
K267	ANNUAL HEALTH EXAM-CHILD-AFT. 2ND BIRTHDAY PAED.
K269	ANNUAL HEALTH EXAM-PAEDIATRICS-ADOLESCENT-OFFICE

eExhibit 2. Ambulatory Care Sensitive Condition Related Hospital Admissions Used as Secondary Outcomes to Examine Healthcare Utilization of Patients Attached to Family Physicians within Each Stratum of Virtual Care Use.

Most responsible diagnosis	International classification of diseases (ICD)-10-CA ^a code
Asthma	J45
Diabetes	E10.0, E10.1, E10.63, E10.64, E10.9, E11.0, E11.1, E11.63, E11.64, E11.9, E13.0, E13.1, E13.63, E13.64, E13.9, E14.0, E14.1, E14.63, E14.64, E14.9
Congestive heart failure	I50, J81
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease	J41, J42, J43, J44, J47, with CCI ^b exclusion 1IJ50, 1IJ76, 1HB53, 1HD53, 1HZ53, 1HB55, 1HD55, 1HZ55, 1HZ85, 1HB54, 1HD54

^a An enhanced version of ICD-10 developed by the Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI) for morbidity classification in Canada

^b Canadian Classification of Health Interventions



eExhibit 3. Weekly Emergency Department Visits by Canadian Triage and Acuity Scale (CTAS) Level, January 2019 to October 2021.

eExhibit 4. Patient Characteristics by the Percent of Physician Primary Care Provided Virtually, between February 1 and October 31, 2021, in Ontario, Canada.

Characteristic, n (%)	Percent Virtual Care of Primary Care Physician							Total
	0%	>0-20%	>20-40%	>40-60%	>60-80%	>80-<100	100%	
Age	N=82,689	N=771,808	N=1,633,324	N=3,229,223	N=4,657,341	N=2,511,964	N=64,714	N=12,951,063
18	11,599 (14.0)	136,211 (17.6)	307,286 (18.8)	615,844 (19.1)	852,541 (18.3)	412,339 (16.4)	10,696 (16.5)	2,346,516 (18.1)
9-29	14,175 (17.1)	107,928 (14.0)	222,336 (13.6)	423,268 (13.1)	627,804 (13.5)	361,294 (14.4)	10,954 (16.9)	1,767,759 (13.6)
30-44	18,044 (21.8)	154,324 (20.0)	319,894 (19.6)	637,641 (19.7)	967,437 (20.8)	551,582 (22.0)	15,833 (24.5)	2,664,755 (20.6)
45-64	21,457 (25.9)	217,806 (28.2)	449,237 (27.5)	898,003 (27.8)	1,316,447 (28.3)	730,943 (29.1)	17,145 (26.5)	3,651,038 (28.2)
65-74	8,724 (10.6)	87,499 (11.3)	185,928 (11.4)	370,765 (11.5)	508,476 (10.9)	263,437 (10.5)	5,938 (9.2)	1,430,767 (11.1)
75+	8,690 (10.5)	68,040 (8.8)	148,643 (9.1)	283,702 (8.8)	384,636 (8.3)	192,369 (7.7)	4,148 (6.4)	1,090,228 (8.4)
Sex								
Female	37,134 (44.9)	375,362 (48.6)	820,252 (50.2)	1,669,636 (51.7)	2,470,394 (53.0)	1,307,088 (52.0)	34,284 (53.0)	6,714,150 (51.8)
Male	45,555 (55.1)	396,446 (51.4)	813,072 (49.8)	1,559,587 (48.3)	2,186,947 (47.0)	1,204,876 (48.0)	30,430 (47.0)	6,236,913 (48.2)
Neighbourhood-level income quintile								
(lowest)	21,468 (26.0)	188,496 (24.4)	340,108 (20.8)	580,649 (18.0)	782,862 (16.8)	473,926 (18.9)	18,230 (28.2)	2,405,739 (18.6)
	17,266 (20.9)	164,458 (21.3)	332,357 (20.3)	617,686 (19.1)	870,823 (18.7)	494,764 (19.7)	13,576 (21.0)	2,510,930 (19.4)
	15,646 (18.9)	155,461 (20.1)	341,044 (20.9)	666,171 (20.6)	942,534 (20.2)	510,991 (20.3)	12,547 (19.4)	2,644,394 (20.4)
	14,969 (18.1)	141,287 (18.3)	324,103 (19.8)	685,002 (21.2)	993,671 (21.3)	515,099 (20.5)	10,214 (15.8)	2,684,345 (20.7)
(highest)	12,634 (15.3)	119,845 (15.5)	291,727 (17.9)	671,129 (20.8)	1,055,796 (22.7)	510,846 (20.3)	9,958 (15.4)	2,671,935 (20.7)
Missing	706 (0.9)	2,261 (0.3)	3,985 (0.2)	8,586 (0.3)	11,655 (0.3)	6,338 (0.3)	189 (0.3)	33,720 (0.3)
Material Deprivation quintile								
(least deprived)	15,355 (18.6)	126,998 (16.5)	306,477 (18.8)	738,019 (22.9)	1,234,895 (26.5)	609,098 (24.2)	13,683 (21.1)	3,044,525 (23.5)
	14,157 (17.1)	142,477 (18.5)	330,767 (20.3)	698,625 (21.6)	1,028,992 (22.1)	538,541 (21.4)	10,845 (16.8)	2,764,404 (21.4)
	14,556 (17.6)	143,940 (18.6)	328,007 (20.1)	620,901 (19.2)	871,073 (18.7)	475,116 (18.9)	11,627 (18.0)	2,465,220 (19.0)
	15,894 (19.2)	157,907 (20.5)	324,888 (19.9)	583,408 (18.1)	765,832 (16.4)	443,258 (17.6)	12,155 (18.8)	2,303,342 (17.8)
(most deprived)	19,541 (23.6)	186,363 (24.1)	327,345 (20.0)	559,404 (17.3)	728,276 (15.6)	433,939 (17.3)	15,934 (24.6)	2,270,802 (17.5)
Missing	3,186 (3.9)	14,123 (1.8)	15,840 (1.0)	28,866 (0.9)	28,273 (0.6)	12,012 (0.5)	470 (0.7)	102,770 (0.8)
Ethnic Diversity quintile								
(least diverse)	12,908 (15.6)	142,811 (18.5)	350,356 (21.5)	641,513 (19.9)	618,362 (13.3)	202,198 (8.0)	6,382 (9.9)	1,974,530 (15.2)
	12,470 (15.1)	136,906 (17.7)	322,545 (19.7)	642,478 (19.9)	726,978 (15.6)	274,019 (10.9)	5,966 (9.2)	2,121,362 (16.4)
	13,694 (16.6)	127,214 (16.5)	271,540 (16.6)	602,331 (18.7)	864,782 (18.6)	408,716 (16.3)	9,656 (14.9)	2,297,933 (17.7)
	16,790 (20.3)	144,724 (18.8)	276,943 (17.0)	610,992 (18.9)	1,060,728 (22.8)	599,754 (23.9)	15,649 (24.2)	2,725,580 (21.0)
(most diverse)	23,641 (28.6)	206,030 (26.7)	396,100 (24.3)	703,043 (21.8)	1,358,218 (29.2)	1,015,265 (40.4)	26,591 (41.1)	3,728,888 (28.8)
Missing	3,186 (3.9)	14,123 (1.8)	15,840 (1.0)	28,866 (0.9)	28,273 (0.6)	12,012 (0.5)	470 (0.7)	102,770 (0.8)

Recent Registrant (<10 years)								
Res	7,765 (9.4)	72,718 (9.4)	144,967 (8.9)	233,795 (7.2)	403,698 (8.7)	267,726 (10.7)	8,443 (13.0)	1,139,112 (8.8)
Non-Res	68,636 (83.0)	624,350 (80.9)	1,318,635 (80.7)	2,652,901 (82.2)	3,790,998 (81.4)	2,030,442 (80.8)	50,453 (78.0)	10,536,415 (81.4)
Missing	6,288 (7.6)	74,740 (9.7)	169,722 (10.4)	342,527 (10.6)	462,645 (9.9)	213,796 (8.5)	5,818 (9.0)	1,275,536 (9.8)
Morbidity (Resource Utilization Band)								
0 (non-user)	4,328 (5.2)	59,639 (7.7)	130,063 (8.0)	271,999 (8.4)	379,715 (8.2)	201,771 (8.0)	3,914 (6.0)	1,051,429 (8.1)
1	5,217 (6.3)	51,449 (6.7)	107,877 (6.6)	204,767 (6.3)	279,644 (6.0)	144,922 (5.8)	3,927 (6.1)	797,803 (6.2)
2	17,557 (21.2)	166,766 (21.6)	354,856 (21.7)	687,322 (21.3)	969,771 (20.8)	507,882 (20.2)	13,855 (21.4)	2,718,009 (21.0)
3	38,020 (46.0)	358,321 (46.4)	752,307 (46.1)	1,484,831 (46.0)	2,192,581 (47.1)	1,209,498 (48.1)	31,395 (48.5)	6,066,953 (46.8)
4	11,435 (13.8)	95,981 (12.4)	205,958 (12.6)	415,068 (12.9)	608,355 (13.1)	329,302 (13.1)	8,585 (13.3)	1,674,684 (12.9)
5 (highest user)	6,132 (7.4)	39,652 (5.1)	82,263 (5.0)	165,236 (5.1)	227,275 (4.9)	118,589 (4.7)	3,038 (4.7)	642,185 (5.0)
Co-Morbidity (Adjusted Diagnoses Groups)								
0	4,347 (5.3)	59,866 (7.8)	130,708 (8.0)	273,501 (8.5)	381,607 (8.2)	202,442 (8.1)	3,924 (6.1)	1,056,395 (8.1)
1-4	44,431 (53.7)	396,784 (51.4)	839,609 (51.4)	1,627,346 (50.4)	2,284,776 (49.1)	1,202,766 (47.9)	32,437 (50.1)	6,428,149 (49.9)
5-9	26,680 (32.3)	255,438 (33.1)	539,600 (33.0)	1,081,818 (33.5)	1,615,004 (34.7)	890,759 (35.5)	22,758 (35.2)	4,432,057 (34.8)
10	7,231 (8.7)	59,720 (7.7)	123,407 (7.6)	246,558 (7.6)	375,954 (8.1)	215,997 (8.6)	5,595 (8.6)	1,034,462 (8.0)
Chronic Conditions								
Hypertension	20,185 (24.4)	187,063 (24.2)	385,037 (23.6)	737,439 (22.8)	1,025,070 (22.0)	550,637 (21.9)	13,168 (20.3)	2,918,599 (22.8)
DM	10,862 (13.1)	95,571 (12.4)	192,845 (11.8)	359,838 (11.1)	503,761 (10.8)	286,148 (11.4)	6,986 (10.8)	1,456,011 (11.1)
HF	2,983 (3.6)	16,652 (2.2)	35,249 (2.2)	66,556 (2.1)	84,626 (1.8)	41,660 (1.7)	983 (1.5)	248,709 (1.9)
MI	1,120 (1.4)	9,454 (1.2)	20,156 (1.2)	38,179 (1.2)	47,613 (1.0)	23,262 (0.9)	493 (0.8)	140,277 (1.1)
Asthma	12,831 (15.5)	118,029 (15.3)	248,568 (15.2)	490,870 (15.2)	726,260 (15.6)	395,342 (15.7)	10,339 (16.0)	2,002,239 (15.5)
OPD	6,148 (7.4)	57,388 (7.4)	124,824 (7.6)	232,495 (7.2)	284,035 (6.1)	139,636 (5.6)	3,539 (5.5)	848,065 (6.5)
Mental health	22,285 (27.0)	157,060 (20.3)	335,569 (20.5)	663,481 (20.5)	994,442 (21.4)	549,442 (21.9)	16,756 (25.9)	2,739,035 (21.4)
Rurality								
Big cities	36,934 (44.7)	298,760 (38.7)	545,498 (33.4)	1,122,929 (34.8)	2,033,696 (43.7)	1,259,491 (50.1)	37,770 (58.4)	5,335,078 (41.1)
Small cities	21,951 (26.5)	221,397 (28.7)	444,488 (27.2)	955,035 (29.6)	1,534,725 (33.0)	867,594 (34.5)	16,362 (25.3)	4,061,552 (31.5)
Small towns	13,144 (15.9)	171,619 (22.2)	428,365 (26.2)	809,967 (25.1)	802,412 (17.2)	298,358 (11.9)	4,845 (7.5)	2,528,710 (19.5)
Rural	10,660 (12.9)	80,032 (10.4)	214,973 (13.2)	341,292 (10.6)	286,508 (6.2)	86,521 (3.4)	5,737 (8.9)	1,025,723 (7.9)

eExhibit 5a. Physician and Practice Characteristics by the Percent of Care Provided Virtually, Comprehensive Family Physicians, between February 1 and October 31, 2021, in Ontario, Canada.

Physician % Virtual Care	0%	>0-20%	>20-40%	>40-60%	>60-80%	>80-<100%	100%	Total
No. Physicians	N=117	N=544	N=1,118	N=2,265	N=3,432	N=1,881	N=105	N=9,462
No. Patients	N=46,747	N=661,761	N=1,476,716	N=2,966,294	N=4,422,486	N=2,386,349	N=51,668	N=12,125,959
Physician Age								
≤44	33 (28.2)	114 (21.0)	378 (33.8)	875 (38.6)	1,319 (38.4)	599 (31.8)	43 (41.0)	3,361 (35.5)
45-64	34 (29.1)	258 (47.4)	512 (45.8)	1,076 (47.5)	1,674 (48.8)	862 (45.8)	30 (28.6)	4,446 (47.0)
65-74	37 (31.6)	124 (22.8)	179 (16.0)	256 (11.3)	369 (10.8)	335 (17.8)	23 (21.9)	1,323 (14.0)
≥75	13 (11.1)	48 (8.8)	49 (4.4)	58 (2.6)	70 (2.0)	85 (4.5)	9 (8.6)	332 (3.5)
Physician Sex								
Female	31 (26.5)	150 (27.6)	438 (39.2)	1,152 (50.9)	1,953 (56.9)	967 (51.4)	68 (64.8)	4,759 (50.3)
Male	86 (73.5)	394 (72.4)	680 (60.8)	1,113 (49.1)	1,479 (43.1)	914 (48.6)	37 (35.2)	4,703 (49.7)
Primary Care Enrolment Model								
Non-team capitation	8 (6.8)	126 (23.2)	317 (28.4)	727 (32.1)	1,190 (34.7)	532 (28.3)	11 (10.5)	2,911 (30.8)
Enhanced fee-for-service	19 (16.2)	155 (28.5)	297 (26.6)	457 (20.2)	876 (25.5)	725 (38.5)	23 (21.9)	2,552 (27.0)
Team-based capitation	12 (10.3)	60 (11.0)	286 (25.6)	814 (35.9)	1,044 (30.4)	321 (17.1)	9 (8.6)	2,546 (26.9)
Traditional fee-for-service	78 (66.7)	203 (37.3)	218 (19.5)	267 (11.8)	321 (9.4)	303 (16.1)	62 (59.0)	1,452 (15.3)
Missing	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.0)
Rurality of Practice (RIO)								
Big cities	54 (46.2)	240 (44.1)	430 (38.5)	925 (40.8)	1,797 (52.4)	1,113 (59.2)	66 (62.9)	4,625 (48.9)
Small cities	19 (16.2)	146 (26.8)	296 (26.5)	643 (28.4)	1,018 (29.7)	558 (29.7)	25 (23.8)	2,705 (28.6)
Small towns	25 (21.4)	111 (20.4)	250 (22.4)	459 (20.3)	403 (11.7)	143 (7.6)	7 (6.7)	1,398 (14.8)
Rural	19 (16.2)	47 (8.6)	142 (12.7)	238 (10.5)	214 (6.2)	67 (3.6)	7 (6.7)	734 (7.8)
Patient Panel Size								
<100	57 (48.7)	61 (11.2)	81 (7.2)	122 (5.4)	116 (3.4)	89 (4.7)	35 (33.3)	561 (5.9)
100-499	30 (25.6)	103 (18.9)	106 (9.5)	169 (7.5)	239 (7.0)	200 (10.6)	32 (30.5)	879 (9.3)
500-999	9 (7.7)	85 (15.6)	201 (18.0)	490 (21.6)	802 (23.4)	443 (23.6)	20 (19.0)	2,050 (21.7)
1000-1499	15 (12.8)	104 (19.1)	321 (28.7)	654 (28.9)	1,152 (33.6)	520 (27.6)	9 (8.6)	2,775 (29.3)
1500-1999	-	79 (14.5)	212 (19.0)	469 (20.7)	675 (19.7)	341 (18.1)	-	1,785 (18.9)
≥2000	-	112 (20.6)	197 (17.6)	361 (15.9)	447 (13.0)	288 (15.3)	-	1,411 (14.9)
Missing	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.0)

eExhibit 5b. Characteristics of Patients Attached to Comprehensive Family Physicians by the Percent of Physician Primary Care Provided Virtually, between February 1 and October 31, 2021, in Ontario, Canada.

Characteristic, n (%)	Percent Virtual Care of Primary Care Physician							Total N=12,012,021
	0%	>0-20%	>20-40%	>40-60%	>60-80%	>80-<100	100%	
Age	N=46,747	N=661,761	N=1,476,716	N=2,966,294	N=4,422,486	N=2,386,349	N=51,668	
18	5,900 (12.6)	115,509 (17.5)	277,180 (18.8)	567,973 (19.1)	812,766 (18.4)	394,966 (16.6)	8,678 (16.8)	2,182,972 (18.2)
19-29	6,510 (13.9)	92,402 (14.0)	200,461 (13.6)	388,821 (13.1)	595,219 (13.5)	340,662 (14.3)	8,594 (16.6)	1,632,669 (13.6)
30-44	8,980 (19.2)	131,614 (19.9)	289,588 (19.6)	585,789 (19.7)	919,525 (20.8)	520,693 (21.8)	12,330 (23.9)	2,468,519 (20.5)
45-64	13,929 (29.8)	188,939 (28.6)	407,221 (27.6)	827,379 (27.9)	1,251,073 (28.3)	696,286 (29.2)	13,555 (26.2)	3,398,382 (28.3)
65-74	6,027 (12.9)	75,225 (11.4)	167,328 (11.3)	337,959 (11.4)	480,164 (10.9)	250,916 (10.5)	4,995 (9.7)	1,322,614 (11.0)
75+	5,401 (11.6)	58,072 (8.8)	134,938 (9.1)	258,373 (8.7)	363,739 (8.2)	182,826 (7.7)	3,516 (6.8)	1,006,865 (8.4)
Sex								
Female	21,331 (45.6)	321,021 (48.5)	741,288 (50.2)	1,536,715 (51.8)	2,352,148 (53.2)	1,245,292 (52.2)	27,910 (54.0)	6,245,705 (52.0)
Male	25,416 (54.4)	340,740 (51.5)	735,428 (49.8)	1,429,579 (48.2)	2,070,338 (46.8)	1,141,057 (47.8)	23,758 (46.0)	5,766,316 (48.0)
Neighbourhood-level income quintile								
(lowest)	10,563 (22.6)	158,908 (24.0)	304,381 (20.6)	531,181 (17.9)	736,255 (16.6)	447,800 (18.8)	15,183 (29.4)	2,204,271 (18.3)
	9,165 (19.6)	141,667 (21.4)	300,837 (20.4)	567,104 (19.1)	825,310 (18.7)	470,882 (19.7)	11,060 (21.4)	2,326,025 (19.3)
	8,990 (19.2)	135,671 (20.5)	308,776 (20.9)	611,370 (20.6)	895,940 (20.3)	487,454 (20.4)	9,859 (19.1)	2,458,060 (20.5)
	9,589 (20.5)	121,326 (18.3)	294,905 (20.0)	631,854 (21.3)	947,742 (21.4)	490,899 (20.6)	7,797 (15.1)	2,504,112 (20.8)
(highest)	8,194 (17.5)	102,309 (15.5)	264,254 (17.9)	617,078 (20.8)	1,006,194 (22.8)	483,467 (20.3)	7,648 (14.8)	2,489,144 (20.7)
Missing	246 (0.5)	1,880 (0.3)	3,563 (0.2)	7,707 (0.3)	11,045 (0.2)	5,847 (0.2)	121 (0.2)	30,409 (0.3)
Material Deprivation quintile								
(least deprived)	10,154 (21.7)	110,985 (16.8)	281,815 (19.1)	687,175 (23.2)	1,184,049 (26.8)	577,501 (24.2)	10,814 (20.9)	79,839 (0.7)
	8,765 (18.7)	123,833 (18.7)	301,672 (20.4)	646,076 (21.8)	980,348 (22.2)	511,812 (21.4)	8,416 (16.3)	2,862,493 (23.8)
	8,331 (17.8)	124,415 (18.8)	296,005 (20.0)	568,649 (19.2)	826,842 (18.7)	453,413 (19.0)	9,163 (17.7)	2,580,922 (21.5)
	8,651 (18.5)	134,756 (20.4)	290,618 (19.7)	528,426 (17.8)	721,805 (16.3)	421,322 (17.7)	9,757 (18.9)	2,286,818 (19.0)
(most deprived)	9,446 (20.2)	160,018 (24.2)	295,382 (20.0)	512,930 (17.3)	684,187 (15.5)	411,430 (17.2)	13,221 (25.6)	2,115,335 (17.6)
Missing	1,400 (3.0)	7,754 (1.2)	11,224 (0.8)	23,038 (0.8)	25,255 (0.6)	10,871 (0.5)	297 (0.6)	2,086,614 (17.4)
Ethnic Diversity quintile								
(least diverse)	7,156 (15.3)	115,340 (17.4)	292,122 (19.8)	552,978 (18.6)	558,944 (12.6)	186,743 (7.8)	4,143 (8.0)	79,839 (0.7)
	7,169 (15.3)	116,771 (17.6)	285,005 (19.3)	576,798 (19.4)	682,543 (15.4)	256,267 (10.7)	4,099 (7.9)	1,717,426 (14.3)
	8,341 (17.8)	109,844 (16.6)	250,549 (17.0)	559,715 (18.9)	823,205 (18.6)	385,319 (16.1)	7,750 (15.0)	1,928,652 (16.1)
	10,814 (23.1)	126,308 (19.1)	259,401 (17.6)	578,766 (19.5)	1,017,812 (23.0)	567,822 (23.8)	12,563 (24.3)	2,144,723 (17.9)
(most diverse)	11,867 (25.4)	185,744 (28.1)	378,415 (25.6)	674,999 (22.8)	1,314,727 (29.7)	979,327 (41.0)	22,816 (44.2)	2,573,486 (21.4)

Missing	1,400 (3.0)	7,754 (1.2)	11,224 (0.8)	23,038 (0.8)	25,255 (0.6)	10,871 (0.5)	297 (0.6)	3,567,895 (29.7)
Recent Registrant (<10 years)								
Res	2,837 (6.1)	64,105 (9.7)	133,551 (9.0)	218,543 (7.4)	385,788 (8.7)	252,241 (10.6)	6,906 (13.4)	1,063,971 (8.9)
Ho	40,843 (87.4)	535,101 (80.9)	1,190,507 (80.6)	2,433,106 (82.0)	3,595,887 (81.3)	1,929,755 (80.9)	40,066 (77.5)	9,765,265 (81.3)
Missing	3,067 (6.6)	62,555 (9.5)	152,658 (10.3)	314,645 (10.6)	440,811 (10.0)	204,353 (8.6)	4,696 (9.1)	1,182,785 (9.8)
Morbidity (Resource Utilization Band)								
0 (non-user)	3,042 (6.5)	53,011 (8.0)	116,461 (7.9)	249,471 (8.4)	360,035 (8.1)	194,220 (8.1)	3,361 (6.5)	979,601 (8.2)
1	2,626 (5.6)	44,215 (6.7)	96,865 (6.6)	188,203 (6.3)	265,028 (6.0)	137,891 (5.8)	3,150 (6.1)	737,978 (6.1)
2	9,685 (20.7)	142,365 (21.5)	318,821 (21.6)	629,548 (21.2)	918,005 (20.8)	480,722 (20.1)	10,875 (21.0)	2,510,021 (20.9)
3	22,524 (48.2)	308,709 (46.6)	683,961 (46.3)	1,368,890 (46.1)	2,085,460 (47.2)	1,148,901 (48.1)	25,066 (48.5)	5,643,511 (47.0)
4	5,898 (12.6)	80,837 (12.2)	186,546 (12.6)	380,537 (12.8)	579,236 (13.1)	312,847 (13.1)	6,868 (13.3)	1,552,769 (12.6)
5 (highest user)	2,972 (6.4)	32,624 (4.9)	74,062 (5.0)	149,645 (5.0)	214,722 (4.9)	111,768 (4.7)	2,348 (4.5)	588,141 (4.9)
Co-Morbidity (Adjusted Diagnoses Groups)								
0	3,058 (6.5)	53,201 (8.0)	116,978 (7.9)	250,775 (8.5)	361,757 (8.2)	194,831 (8.2)	3,366 (6.5)	983,966 (8.2)
1-4	24,958 (53.4)	337,144 (50.9)	753,137 (51.0)	1,488,427 (50.2)	2,161,033 (48.9)	1,136,125 (47.6)	25,142 (48.7)	5,925,966 (49.0)
5-9	14,917 (31.9)	220,459 (33.3)	493,326 (33.4)	999,668 (33.7)	1,540,214 (34.8)	849,104 (35.6)	18,600 (36.0)	4,136,288 (34.0)
10	3,814 (8.2)	50,957 (7.7)	113,275 (7.7)	227,424 (7.7)	359,482 (8.1)	206,289 (8.6)	4,560 (8.8)	965,801 (8.0)
Chronic Conditions								
Hypertension	13,146 (28.1)	161,768 (24.4)	350,579 (23.7)	676,513 (22.8)	972,746 (22.0)	525,617 (22.0)	10,873 (21.0)	2,711,242 (22.6)
MI	6,821 (14.6)	82,520 (12.5)	175,651 (11.9)	330,527 (11.1)	478,984 (10.8)	273,799 (11.5)	5,977 (11.6)	1,354,279 (11.2)
CHF	1,978 (4.2)	13,945 (2.1)	31,544 (2.1)	59,835 (2.0)	79,818 (1.8)	39,321 (1.6)	820 (1.6)	227,261 (1.9)
AMI	714 (1.5)	8,019 (1.2)	17,897 (1.2)	34,266 (1.2)	44,602 (1.0)	21,978 (0.9)	401 (0.8)	127,877 (1.1)
Asthma	7,405 (15.8)	102,415 (15.5)	226,508 (15.3)	452,736 (15.3)	690,691 (15.6)	375,572 (15.7)	8,202 (15.9)	1,863,529 (15.3)
OPD	3,865 (8.3)	48,970 (7.4)	111,406 (7.5)	210,552 (7.1)	266,783 (6.0)	131,864 (5.5)	2,725 (5.3)	776,165 (6.5)
Mental health	11,249 (24.1)	131,914 (19.9)	302,105 (20.5)	611,709 (20.6)	946,647 (21.4)	515,357 (21.6)	12,559 (24.3)	2,531,540 (21.0)
Locality								
Big cities	20,502 (43.9)	261,133 (39.5)	513,917 (34.8)	1,065,398 (35.9)	1,951,424 (44.1)	1,196,905 (50.2)	32,308 (62.5)	5,041,587 (42.0)
Small cities	13,519 (28.9)	201,308 (30.4)	421,487 (28.5)	907,415 (30.6)	1,485,352 (33.6)	833,369 (34.9)	12,408 (24.0)	3,874,858 (32.3)
Small towns	7,545 (16.1)	148,806 (22.5)	389,245 (26.4)	727,505 (24.5)	746,817 (16.9)	279,701 (11.7)	3,510 (6.8)	2,303,129 (19.2)
Rural	5,181 (11.1)	50,514 (7.6)	152,067 (10.3)	265,976 (9.0)	238,893 (5.4)	76,374 (3.2)	3,442 (6.7)	792,447 (6.6)

eExhibit 6. Health Service Utilization of Patients Attached to Comprehensive Family Physicians Stratified by the Attached Physician’s Percent of Care Provided Virtually, between February 1 and October 2021, in Ontario Canada.

Physician % Virtual Care	0%	>0-20%	>20-40%	>40-60%	>60-80%	>80-<100%	100%	Total
No. Patients	N=46,747	N=661,761	N=1,476,716	N=2,966,294	N=4,422,486	N=2,386,349	N=51,668	N=12,125,959
Primary Care Services								
Any primary care visit, n (%)	26,862 (57.5)	411,991 (62.3)	921,775 (62.4)	1,858,118 (62.6)	2,855,323 (64.6)	1,569,605 (65.8)	32,277 (62.5)	7,675,951 (63.9)
Number of primary care visits per patient, mean ± SD	2.3 ± 4.0	2.4 ± 3.9	2.4 ± 3.8	2.3 ± 3.6	2.6 ± 3.8	2.9 ± 4.2	2.8 ± 4.5	2.5 ± 3.9
Percent of visits with usual family physician ^a , mean ± SD	53.3 ± 45.2	67.7 ± 39.8	70.3 ± 38.1	71.7 ± 36.8	71.8 ± 36.6	68.2 ± 38.8	40.0 ± 43.0	70.4 ± 37.6
Other Health Care Use								
Any specialist visits, n (%)	18,601 (39.8)	249,150 (37.6)	563,324 (38.1)	1,150,948 (38.8)	1,763,140 (39.9)	959,637 (40.2)	20,368 (39.4)	4,725,168 (39.4)
Ambulatory care-sensitive condition visits, n (%)	164 (0.4)	1,734 (0.3)	3,675 (0.2)	6,968 (0.2)	9,030 (0.2)	4,393 (0.2)	91 (0.2)	26,055 (0.2)
Emergency Department Utilization, February to October 2019/2021								
Total visits per 1,000, 2021, mean ± SD ^b	348.0 ± 1204.0	287.2 ± 981.7	282.4 ± 1005.9	274.7 ± 893.5	248.9 ± 810.0	238.0 ± 780.5	262.1 ± 972.0	259.8 ± 864.4
Total visits per 1,000, 2019, mean ± SD ^b	387.9 ± 1293.1	335.5 ± 1023.4	330.3 ± 959.2	317.4 ± 945.7	284.1 ± 911.7	268.7 ± 828.6	282.2 ± 853.4	298.4 ± 920.0
Absolute difference 2021 vs 2019 (95% CI)	-39.9 (-54.3, -25.6)	-48.3 (-51.8, -44.9)	-47.9 (-50.2, -45.6)	-42.7 (-44.2, -41.2)	-35.2 (-36.4, -34.0)	-30.8 (-32.3, -29.3)	-20.0 (-30.2, -9.9)	-38.6 (-39.3, -37.9)
Percent change 2021 vs 2019 (95% CI)	-10.3 (-13.8, -6.8)	-14.4 (-15.4, -13.4)	-14.5 (-15.2, -13.9)	-13.5 (-13.9, -13.0)	-12.4 (-12.8, -12.0)	-11.5 (-12.0, -10.9)	-7.1 (-10.7, -3.5)	-12.9 (-13.2, -12.7)

^a Among patients with 2 or more visits between February and October 2021

^b This includes only patients whose attached physicians had claims in both 2021 and 2019.

Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; CI, confidence interval

eExhibit 7. Patient Health Service Utilization Stratified by the Attached Physician’s Percent of Care Provided Virtually, between February 1 and October 2021, in Ontario Canada, by Rurality.

Physician % Virtual Care		0%	>0-20%	>20-40%	>40-60%	>60-80%	>80-<100%	100%	Total	
RIO 0	No. Patients	N=36,934	N=298,760	N=545,498	N=1,122,929	N=2,033,696	N=1,259,491	N=37,770	N=5,335,078	
	Primary Care Services									
	Any primary care visit, n (%)	21,703 (58.8)	193,025 (64.6)	356,675 (65.4)	728,409 (64.9)	1,332,732 (65.5)	828,922 (65.8)	24,402 (64.6)	3,485,868 (65.3)	
	Number of primary care visits per patient, mean ± SD	2.7 ± 5.1	2.8 ± 4.6	2.8 ± 4.3	2.6 ± 4.0	2.7 ± 4.0	2.9 ± 4.3	3.2 ± 5.3	2.7 ± 4.1	
	Percent of visits with usual family physician ^a , mean ± SD	52.6 ± 44.6	64.3 ± 41.0	68.1 ± 39.3	70.6 ± 37.5	70.7 ± 37.3	68.0 ± 39.0	45.5 ± 43.0	69.1 ± 38.4	
	Other Health Care Use									
	Any specialist visits, n (%)	14,756 (40.0)	115,206 (38.6)	211,626 (38.8)	446,582 (39.8)	833,316 (41.0)	519,624 (41.3)	15,286 (40.5)	2,156,396 (40.4)	
	Ambulatory care-sensitive condition visits, n (%)	139 (0.4)	766 (0.3)	1,250 (0.2)	2,606 (0.2)	4,027 (0.2)	2,430 (0.2)	67 (0.2)	11,285 (0.2)	
	Emergency Department Utilization, February to October 2019/2021									
	Total visits per 1,000, 2021, mean ± SD ^b	393.3 ± 1914.7	252.3 ± 933.9	242.0 ± 1120.6	240.6 ± 853.4	223.0 ± 776.2	221.7 ± 760.2	245.2 ± 795.7	231.4 ± 852.2	
	Total visits per 1,000, 2019, mean ± SD ^b	414.3 ± 2018.2	293.4 ± 937.8	279.9 ± 906.7	275.8 ± 883.0	256.5 ± 855.4	251.0 ± 798.4	257.3 ± 782.6	265.5 ± 879.2	
	Absolute difference 2021 vs 2019 (95% CI)	-21.1 (-47.0, 4.9)	-41.0 (-45.8, -36.3)	-37.9 (-41.8, -33.9)	-35.2 (-37.6, -32.9)	-33.5 (-35.1, -31.9)	-29.3 (-31.2, -27.3)	-12.1 (-22.8, -1.3)	-34.1 (-35.2, -33.1)	
	Percent change 2021 vs 2019 (95% CI)	-5.1 (-11.1, 1.1)	-14.0 (-15.5, -12.5)	-13.5 (-14.9, -12.2)	-12.8 (-13.6, -12.0)	-13.1 (-13.7, -12.5)	-11.7 (-12.4, -10.9)	-4.7 (-8.8, 0.6)	-12.9 (-13.2, -12.5)	
	RIO 1-9	No. Patients	N=21,951	N=221,397	N=444,488	N=955,035	N=1,534,725	N=867,594	N=16,362	N=4,061,555
Primary Care Services										
Any primary care visit, n (%)		12,886 (58.7)	145,329 (65.6)	290,727 (65.4)	622,460 (65.2)	1,023,111 (66.7)	588,907 (67.9)	10,546 (64.5)	2,693,966 (66.3)	
Number of primary care visits per patient, mean ± SD		2.5 ± 4.4	2.7 ± 4.2	2.7 ± 4.1	2.6 ± 3.9	2.8 ± 4.1	3.1 ± 4.5	3.4 ± 6.0	2.8 ± 4.1	
Percent of visits with usual family physician ^a , mean ± SD		45.7 ± 44.6	64.5 ± 40.7	66.2 ± 39.3	69.2 ± 37.6	70.9 ± 37.0	67.5 ± 38.8	32.4 ± 41.1	68.6 ± 38.2	
Other Health Care Use										
Any specialist visits, n (%)	8,120 (37.0)	83,129 (37.5)	169,962 (38.2)	371,052 (38.9)	601,803 (39.2)	341,899 (39.4)	6,405 (39.1)	1,582,370 (39.0)		

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.09.08.22278709>; this version posted September 9, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

Percent of visits with usual family physician ^a , mean ± SD	40.6 ± 42.8	70.7 ± 38.6	74.9 ± 35.5	75.1 ± 34.7	74.9 ± 35.0	70.5 ± 38.8	25.4 ± 38.5	73.7 ± 36.08
Other Health Care Use								
Any specialist visits, n (%)	3,632 (34.1)	26,165 (32.7)	74,416 (34.6)	121,089 (35.5)	104,309 (36.4)	31,792 (36.7)	2,204 (38.4)	363,607 (35.4)
Ambulatory care-sensitive condition visits, n (%)	62 (0.6)	244 (0.3)	639 (0.3)	991 (0.3)	815 (0.3)	265 (0.3)	14 (0.2)	3,030 (0.3)
Emergency Department Utilization, February to October 2019/2021								
Total visits per 1,000, 2021, mean ± SD ^b	872.8 ± 2751.1	539.5 ± 1532.7	459.9 ± 1369.8	461.6 ± 1304.3	456.6 ± 1227.1	465.8 ± 1319.2	567.1 ± 1264.2	471.0 ± 1341.4
Total visits per 1,000, 2019, mean ± SD ^b	737.3 ± 1896.7	667.7 ± 1716.2	570.5 ± 1401.4	569.8 ± 1556.9	548.9 ± 1772.0	530.2 ± 1312.4	570.1 ± 1224.3	572.6 ± 1589.5
Absolute difference 2021 vs 2019	135.5 (83.2, 187.8)	-128.2 (-144.3, -112.0)	-110.6 (-119.1, -102.0)	-108.2 (-115.2, -101.1)	-92.4 (-100.5, -84.2)	-64.5 (-76.9, -52.1)	-3.0 (-53.7, 47.8)	-101.6 (-105.9, -97.5)
Percent change 2021 vs 2019	18.4 (10.1, 26.8)	-19.2 (-21.4, -17.0)	-19.4 (-20.7, -18.0)	-19.0 (-20.1, -17.9)	-16.8 (-18.1, -15.5)	-12.2 (-14.4, -9.9)	-0.5 (-9.3, 8.6)	-17.8 (-18.4, -17.1)

^a Among patients with 2 or more visits between February and October 2021

^b This includes only patients whose attached physicians had claims in both 2021 and 2019.

Abbreviations: SD, standard deviation; CI, confidence interval

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation	Page No
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract	1
		(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	4, 5
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	6,7
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	7
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	8,9
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	7-9
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	8
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	9-11
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	9-11
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	12
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	NA
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	9-11
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	12
		(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	12
		(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	
		(d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	NA
		(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	12
Results			
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	13
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	NA
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	NA
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders	13
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included	14, 15

		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized	
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period	
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses	15
Discussion			
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives	3,15
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias	16
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence	17
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results	
Other information			
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based	2

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.