TITLE: Trends in patient attachment to an aging primary care workforce: a population-based serial cross-sectional study in Ontario, Canada

Kamila Premji[1,2] MD, PhD(c) – corresponding author, kpremji2@uottawa.ca, 500-267 O'Connor Street, Ottawa, Ontario, K2P 1V3, 613-760-3707

Michael E Green[3,4,5] MD, MPH

Richard H Glazier[3,6,7] MD, MPH

Shahriar Khan[3,4] PhD

Susan E Schultz[3] MA, MSc

Maria Mathews[1,8] PhD

Steve Nastos[9] MA

Eliot Frymire[4] MA

Bridget L Ryan[1,8] PhD

[1] Department of Family Medicine, Western University, London, Ontario

[2] Department of Family Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario

[3] ICES

[4] Health Services and Policy Research Institute, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario

[5] Department of Family Medicine, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario

[6] Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, Ontario

[7] Department of Family and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario

[8] Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics at Western University

[9] Economics, Policy & Research, Ontario Medical Association, Toronto, Ontario

ABSTRACT

Background: Population aging is a global phenomenon. Resultant healthcare workforce shortages are anticipated. To ensure access to comprehensive primary care, which correlates with improved health outcomes, equity, and costs, data to inform workforce planning are urgently needed.

Objectives: To explore temporal trends in early career, mid-career, and near-retirement comprehensive primary care physician characteristics, the medical and social needs of their patients, and the workforce's capacity to absorb patients of near-retirement physicians. Gender-based workforce trends and trends around alternative practice models were also explored.

Design: A serial cross-sectional population-based study using health administrative data.

Setting: Ontario, Canada, where most comprehensive primary care is delivered by family physicians (FPs) under universal insurance.

Participants: All insured Ontario residents at three time points: 2008 (12,936,360), 2013 (13,447,365), and 2019 (14,388,566) and all Ontario physicians who billed primary care services (2008: 11,566; 2013: 12,693; 2019: 15,054).

Exposure(s): Changes in the comprehensive FP workforce over three time periods.

Main Outcome(s) and Measure(s): The number and proportion of patients attached to near-retirement comprehensive FPs; the number and proportion of near-retirement comprehensive FPs; the characteristics of patients and their comprehensive FPs.

Results: Patient attachment to comprehensive FPs increased over time. The overall FP workforce grew, but the proportion practicing comprehensiveness declined from 77.2% (2008)

to 70.7% (2019), with shifts into other/focused scopes of practice across all physician career stages. Over time, an increasing proportion of the comprehensive FP workforce was near retirement age. Correspondingly, an increasing proportion of patients were attached to near-retirement comprehensive FPs. By 2019, 13.9% of comprehensive FPs were 65 years or older, corresponding to 1,695,126 (14.8%) patients. Mean patient age increased, and near-retirement comprehensive FPs served markedly increasing numbers of medically and socially complex patients.

Conclusions and Relevance: Primary care is foundational to high-performing health systems, but the sector faces capacity challenges as both patients and physicians age and fewer physicians choose to practice comprehensiveness. Nearly 15% (1.7 million) of Ontarians with a comprehensive FP may lose their physician to retirement by 2025. To serve a growing and increasingly complex patient population, innovative solutions that extend beyond simply growing the FP workforce are needed.

INTRODUCTION

Primary care is the foundation of high-performing health care systems worldwide,[1] and can be defined by four core functions ("the 4 Cs") articulated by Starfield and others: first *Contact* access to the healthcare system, *Continuity* (long-term person-focused care), *Comprehensiveness* (meeting the majority of each patient's physical and mental health care needs, including prevention, acute care, chronic care, and multimorbidity care), and *Coordination* of care across the healthcare system, including specialty care, hospitals, home care, and community services and support.[1 2] Access to primary care is associated with improved health outcomes, improved health equity, and reduced health system costs.[3-9]

An essential enabler of primary care access is an adequate health human resource (HHR) supply, but many jurisdictions are grappling with current and impending shortages. For example, 14.5% (4.6 million) Canadians are without a primary care provider.[10] Virtually every country world-wide is experiencing population aging,[11] with a high burden of medical complexity[12-15] and a HHR workforce that is aging into retirement.[16-18] Concurrently, many countries, including Canada, the United Kingdom, and the United States, are experiencing challenges attracting incoming physicians to primary care as a specialty,[19-22] and among those who do, a declining proportion are providing primary care reflective of Starfield's "4 Cs" (hereafter referred to as "comprehensive primary care"); instead, primary care physicians are increasingly limiting their scope of work to subspecialized areas such as sports medicine, dermatology, or palliative care, or to episodic acute care settings, such as walk-in clinics.[23-29] Moreover, the concentration of women in primary care may further reduce HHR capacity, as women primary care physicians have been found to spend more time with patients[30] and receive more patient requests outside of appointments than men.[31 32]

In the context of an aging population and shifting workforce demographics, HHR planning requires an understanding of the needs of patients who will soon lose their primary care provider due to retirement, as well as an understanding of the capacity of the remaining and incoming workforce. To anticipate future workforce needs, previous studies often use high-level supply indicators such as number of primary care physicians, and high-level demand indicators such as patient visit rates and durations.[33-36] In-depth analyses tend to be limited to sub-jurisdictional populations, such as the neighborhood[36] or early career clinicians,[24] and do not directly link supply (individual clinicians) to demand (patients served by clinicians).

We conducted an in-depth exploration linking supply and demand at a health system planning level in Ontario, Canada. We examined temporal trends in early career, mid-career, and near-retirement primary care physician characteristics, the medical and social needs of patients attached to these physicians, and the workforce's capacity to meet the needs of patients of near-retirement physicians. We explored hypothesis-generating differences in gender-based workforce trends, including differences in care provision,[30 31] and trends around alternative practice models, such as team-based care. As Canadian healthcare planning and delivery are provincial jurisdiction, we focused on the province-level (Ontario). In Ontario, most comprehensive primary care is delivered by family physicians (FPs), most physician services and nearly all residents are covered by government insurance, and health services data are stored centrally in health administrative datasets.

METHODS

The use of data in this study was authorized under section 45 of Ontario's Personal Health Information Protection Act (PHIPA) and did not require review by a research ethics board or

informed consent. This study followed the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guideline.[37]

Study Design, Population, and Data Sources

We conducted a serial cross-sectional population-level analysis using health administrative data housed at ICES. The study population included all registered Ontario residents covered by the Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP) at three time points: March 31, 2008 (12,936,360), March 31, 2013 (13,447,365), and March 31, 2019 (14,388,566) and all Ontario physicians who billed primary care services (2008: 11,566; 2013: 12,693; 2019: 15,054).

Physician-level and patient-level data came from nine databases which were linked using unique encoded identifiers and analyzed at ICES (Supplement: eMethods).

Outcomes and Covariates

The primary outcomes were the number and proportion of patients attached to a near-retirement age comprehensive FP over three time points, and the number and proportion of near-retirement age comprehensive FPs over three time points. Based on previous literature finding the average Ontario FP retires at age 70.5 years (with women retiring on average 5 years earlier than men)[38] and accounting for the time needed to train new physicians,[39] three different "near-retirement" physician age cut-points were examined: $\geq$ 55 years, $\geq$ 65 years, and $\geq$ 70 years. Comprehensive FPs were defined by applying a previously validated algorithm described below in the Analysis section.[29]

We described the characteristics of both comprehensive FPs and their attached patients over the three time points. Physician characteristics served as exploratory indicators of both supply and, for near-retirement physicians, anticipated demand based on the populations of patients they serve. Patient characteristics served as indicators of demand based on medical and sociodemographic complexity. Detailed data source, cohort, and covariate definitions can be found in the Supplement (eMethods).

Analysis

For our patient cohort, we created cross-sections of patients attached to comprehensive FPs at three time points: 2008, 2013, 2019.

We began by applying our previously validated algorithm for primary care physician attachment[40] to the population of OHIP-registered Ontario residents; identifying patients attached to a physician providing longitudinal primary care services based on billing codes and physician-level continuity of care (see Supplement eMethods – continuity of care). We removed patients seen at Community Health Centres because they cannot be attached to a specific physician, patients that the algorithm attached to non-FPs such as pediatricians and surgeons, and patients attached to a FP with missing covariates.

We next created the cohort of FPs linked to the attached patients we identified (2008, 2013, 2019). We stratified our patient and FP cohorts by physician practice type (scope). For this, we used a previously published algorithm for determining comprehensiveness of primary care practice, where physicians are identified as providing comprehensive care if more than half of their services were for core primary care and if these services fell into at least 7 of 22 activity areas.[29] This resulted in four groups of patients with attachments to four types of FP practice

scopes: Comprehensive, Focused (for example, sports medicine or palliative care), Other, and those who worked less than 44 days/year. Focusing on the "comprehensive FP" group, we described the characteristics of these physicians and their patients.

Physician analyses were stratified by physician sex and physician age, including the three "near-retirement" cut-points. Proportions and means with standard deviations were reported for each time point (2008, 2013, 2019).

RESULTS

Patient Cohort

Excluding long-term care home residents, the population of OHIP-eligible Ontario residents in the patient cohort over time was 12,863,036 (2008), 13,371,946 (2013), and 14,312,309 (2019), of whom the following were attached to a comprehensive FP: 2008: n = 9,537,353 (77.3%); 2013: n = 10,398,003 (85.1%); 2019: n = 11,480,975 (86.1%) (Figure 1a).

Physician Cohort

The overall FP workforce grew from 9,944 physicians in 2008 to 13,269 in 2019 (Figure 1b). The proportion of FPs practicing comprehensive primary care declined from 77.2% in 2008 (n = 7,673) to 70.7% in 2019 (n = 9,377) (Supplement: eFigure 1).

Table 1 stratifies comprehensive FP data by age and sex. The mean (SD) physician age remained relatively stable over time (2008: 50.3 (11.0) years; 2013: 51.4 (11.8) years; 2019: 49.7 (12.9) years). The mean age (SD) for female physicians was lower than for males at each time point (2008 male 53.0 (10.9) years, female 46.0 (9.7) years; 2013 male 54.7 (11.6) years, female 47.2 (10.6) years; 2019 male 53.1 (13.2) years, female 46.3 (11.6) years). Career stage (years in

practice) closely followed physician age group for both males and females, and the youngest cohort (age <35) comprised an increasing proportion of the workforce over time, shifting from 7.7% in 2008 to 15.1% in 2019. The older cohorts were also found to comprise an increasing proportion of the workforce over time, and the absolute numbers of older physicians increased.

Among family physicians with patient attachments, a shift away from comprehensiveness and into other/focused scopes of practice was seen across all physician age groups, with the most pronounced shifts in the youngest and oldest physician groups (Supplement: eTable 1). Instead of comprehensive primary care, these FPs increasingly worked in focused or other scopes of practice. The proportion of FPs identified as practicing exclusively without patient attachments or in low-continuity ("walk-in clinic") settings fluctuated: 2008: 7.2% (n = 715), 2013: 4.9% (n = 558); 2019: 5.2% (n = 688) (Figure 1b).

Temporal Trends of Near-Retirement Comprehensive Family Physicians and their Patients

When looking at our three near-retirement cut-points (55+, 65+, 70+) over time, an increasing proportion of the comprehensive FP workforce was near retirement age (Figure 2). Correspondingly, an increasing proportion of patients were attached to near-retirement comprehensive FPs (Table 2). In the 55+ age group, the proportion of comprehensive FPs increased from 35.7% in 2008 to 38.2% in 2019. In 2019, this corresponded to 3,586 physicians and 4,935,992 (43.0%) patients (2019). In the 65+ group, the proportion increased from 10.0% in 2008 to 13.9% in 2019 (1,307 physicians, 1,695,126 (14.8%) patients). In the 70+ age group, the proportion increased from 4.6% in 2008 to 6.4% in 2019 (599 physicians, 666,000 (5.8%) patients).

Temporal Characteristics of Comprehensive Family Physicians and their Patients

Comprehensive FP Capacity/Workload

Table 1 shows the mean (SD) roster size for the total population of comprehensive FPs remained consistent over time (2008: 1213 (927); 2013: 1272 (909); 2019: 1209 (837)). Male FPs had consistently larger roster sizes in each age group and at each time point. Both male and female FP roster sizes followed an inverted U pattern with FP age, with practice sizes starting and ending smaller at the extremes of FP age and peaking during mid-career. This pattern was observed at all three time points with older (65+) male and female physicians and younger (<35) male and female physicians caring for larger roster sizes over time.

Working full time equivalent (FTE) also followed an inverted U pattern according to FP age (Table 1). Older physicians increasingly practiced FTE (2008: 58.4%, 2013: 67.0%, 2019: 72.6%). This was driven by an increasing proportion of female FTE comprehensive FPs. Among younger physicians, by 2019, females comprised the majority of FTE workforce (52.2% of FTE comprehensive FPs <35 years; 55.2% of FTE comprehensive FPs 35-44 years).

Mean (SD) annual core primary care visits provided per patient declined over time (Table 1): 2008: 7.3 (3.1) visits; 2013: 6.5 (2.6) visits; 2019: 6.0 (2.3) visits. In most comprehensive FP age groups, male and females provided similar numbers of annual visits. Older physicians provided more annual visits compared with their younger counterparts.

In the patient cohort (Table 2), at all near-retirement physician cut-offs (55+, 65+, 70+), a declining proportion over time made a high number (5+) primary care visits in the preceding year, but these proportions remained consistently over 50% in all near-retirement groups and at each time point.

Comprehensive FP Practice Settings

A declining proportion of comprehensive FPs over time practiced in fee-for-service (FFS) models of care. Alternate payment plan models (APPs), specifically capitation/team-based models of care, were an increasingly common setting over time (Supplement: eFigure 2). In these APP models, physician compensation is primarily a lump sum payment per attached patient, with or without additional government funding for interdisciplinary health professional supports. In 2008, most comprehensive FPs worked in FFS-based models (76.6%), but by 2019, most practiced in APPs (55.4%). This shift was seen across all comprehensive FP age groups (Supplement: eTable 2). Correspondingly, an increasing proportion of patients were served in APP models: 2008: 26.5% (n = 2,526,116); 2013: 54.3% (n = 5,643,862); 2019: 61.5% (n = 7,064,109).

Over time, a stable majority of comprehensive FPs practiced in large urban and urban settings (Supplement: eTable 3A). After a decline in 2013, an increasing proportion and number practiced in rural/remote areas by 2019, but numbers did not return to 2008 levels (2008: 6.7%, n = 513; 2013: 5.1%, n = 410; 2019: 5.3%, 492). Trends around age and sex of rural comprehensive FPs resembled trends seen in the overall comprehensive FP population (Supplement: eTables 3B, 3C).

Patient complexity

The mean age (SD) of comprehensive FPs' patients increased over time (Table 1): 2008: 33.5 (13.2) years; 2013: 36.5 (12.1) years; 2019: 38.1 (12.0) years. When stratified by physician age and sex, each physician age group served increasingly older patients. Male physicians cared for slightly older patients than did women in each physician age group and at each time point.

The number and proportion of patients aged 65 and older increased over time in each near-retirement group (Table 2). This number nearly quadrupled in the oldest (70+ years) FP group (2008: N = 45,414, 2019: N = 176,473).

Comprehensive FPs cared for a stable mean (SD) proportion of female patients over time (Table 1) (2008:53.2% (12.9); 2013: 53.1% (12.5); 2019: 52.9% (12.0). Female comprehensive FPs had a greater proportion of female patients than male physicians at all time points and in all age groups. The overall proportion of female patients was higher in younger physician age groups at all time points, equalizing as physicians aged.

When examining the patient cohort by near-retirement physician age groups, the proportion of female patients also remained stable at each time point (Table 2), with slightly lower proportions of female patients in the oldest near-retirement group.

Over time, an increasing proportion of comprehensive FPs' practices were comprised of the highest morbidity patients (Resource Utilization Band (RUB) 4+): 2008: 16.5%; 2013: 18.1%; 2019: 19.8% (Table 3). When stratified by comprehensive FP age and sex, older male physicians cared for higher proportions of the highest morbidity patients than did older female physicians in 2008 (65-69 years) and 2013 (65-69 years, 70+ years), but by 2019, males and females cared for similar proportions of highest morbidity patients within each and across all physician age groups.

Table 2 shows the number and proportion of highest morbidity patients attached to near-retirement physicians grew over time. By 2019, 983,818 patients in the highest morbidity patients were attached to a physician aged 55+, representing 19.9% of all patients attached to a 55+ physician. 350,439 were attached to a 65+ physician (20.7% of patients attached to a 65+

physician). 146,298 were attached to a 70+ physician (22.0% of patients attached to 70+ a physician), representing a tripling of the absolute number.

While proportions of patients with chronic illness (COPD, CHF, diabetes, frailty, mental illness) remained relatively stable over time, the absolute numbers increased markedly in each near-retirement group (Table 2).

The proportions and means of socially complex patients cared for within each comprehensive FP age and sex group increased over time for most indicators (Table 3) and the number of higher social complexity patients increased markedly over time for most near-retirement groups (Table 2).

DISCUSSION

In our population-level serial cross-sectional analyses, the proportion of patients attached to a comprehensive FP in Ontario, Canada, grew over time. However, we found an increasing proportion of the comprehensive FP workforce is nearing retirement. Given the average FP retires at age 70.5 years,[38] we anticipate that by 2025, nearly 1.7 million Ontarians may lose their comprehensive FP to retirement, eroding gains made to date.

This number may be an underestimate for several reasons. First, half of all comprehensive FPs are now female, and female FPs retire on average 5 years earlier than males.[38] Second, a decreasing proportion of FPs are practicing comprehensive family medicine. This trend was seen across every physician age group, indicating practicing FPs are leaving comprehensive primary care earlier in their careers than in previous years while a smaller proportion of incoming FPs are choosing to enter comprehensive practice. Third, due to limitations in data availability for more recent years, our analyses predate the COVID-19 pandemic, and surveys from Ontario indicate

the pandemic has hastened retirement plans, with almost double the usual proportion of FPs closing their offices during the pandemic (3%, compared with the usual rate of 1.6%/year),[41] and one in five indicating an intention to retire within five years.[42]

Several other trends identified likely apply to other jurisdictions nationally and internationally and, when taken together, indicated limited capacity in the workforce to absorb the workload of near-retirement physicians. Comprehensive FPs cared for increasingly older groups of patients with increasing complexity over time. As of 2019, all physician age groups served similar proportions of complex patients, and near-retirement physicians cared for an increasing number and proportion of older patients with increasing medical and social complexities. Females, who comprised an increasing proportion of the comprehensive FP workforce, served similar proportions of highest morbidity patients but smaller roster sizes compared with males, which may reflect previous research finding women primary care physicians spend more time with and receive more requests from patients.[31 32] That said, both the oldest and youngest male and female comprehensive FP groups served increasingly larger rosters, and an increasing proportion of older (65+) physicians practiced FTE.

Ontario continues to add a net positive number of FPs to the workforce each year, but this number has declined from 453 in 2017 to 303 in 2020.[43] Over the past 7 years, a smaller proportion of medical school graduates ranked family medicine as their first choice discipline,[44] echoing trends in other jurisdictions including the United Kingdom and the United States.[20-22] The future supply of incoming FPs may therefore be inadequate to meet needs identified in our study, especially considering the 1.6 million Ontarians already without a regular primary care provider in our 2019 cohort.

Solutions to FP workforce shortages identified in the literature focus on addressing deterrents to the practice of comprehensive primary care, including perceived poor respect for primary care as a profession, inadequate compensation, inadequate training supports for developing and maintaining comprehensive skills, and inadequate administrative and interdisciplinary health supports to manage increasing patient complexity.[21 24 45-49] Our finding of a shift toward APP models underscores the desire among comprehensive FPs for financial stability and team-based supports. Further, we identified large numbers of patients with chronic diseases and complex social needs, all of which are highly amenable to team-based care.[50-52]

There are some limitations to our study. The FTE indicator is based on physician billings and excluded non-billable administrative time. Almost half of Canadian FPs report 10-19 hours per week of administrative tasks,[53] so the indicator may underestimate workload, and thus the number of FTE FPs. Rural FPs often practice in both primary care and hospital settings;[54] since the comprehensiveness algorithm is based on primary care billings,[29] it may underestimate the number of rural comprehensive FPs. Further, the rurality index scores and methodology have not been updated since 2008. Some physician analyses could not be fully stratified by both age and sex due to small cell sizes. Community Health Centre patients are not included and we did not examine other clinicians who may provide primary care; however, these clinicians are the main primary care source for only a small minority of Ontarians.[55 56] Finally, our analyses do not account for the rise of virtual care and its potential impact on capacity.[57-59]

CONCLUSIONS

Primary care faces many capacity challenges as physicians age into retirement and fewer choose to enter or remain in comprehensive practice. Incentives and supports are needed to grow the comprehensive FP workforce to serve a growing and increasingly complex patient population.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Author Contributions:

Concept and design: Premji, Green, Glazier, Ryan

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors

Drafting of the manuscript: Premji

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors

Statistical analysis: Premji, Khan, Ryan, Green, Glazier

Obtained funding: Green, Glazier

Administrative, technical, or material support: Frymire, Khan

Supervision: Ryan, Mathews

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: None declared.

Funding/Support: This study was supported by the INSPIRE PHC (Innovations Strengthening Primary Health Care Through Research) Research Program, which is funded through the Health Systems Research Program of the Ontario Ministry of Health (MOH) and the Ontario Ministry of Long-term Care (MLTC). It was also supported by ICES, which is funded by an annual grant from the Ontario MOH and MLTC. Dr. Premji was also supported by the PhD Family Medicine program at the University of Western Ontario, and by the Junior Clinical Research Chair in Family Medicine at the Department of Family Medicine, University of Ottawa.

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The funder had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Disclaimer: 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.

Additional Information: Parts of this material are based on data and/or information compiled and provided by CIHI and Cancer Care Ontario (CCO). The analyses, conclusions, opinions and statements expressed herein are solely those of the authors and do not reflect those of the data sources; no endorsement is intended or should be inferred.

REFERENCES

1. Starfield B, Shi L, Macinko J. Contribution of primary care to health systems and health. *Milbank Q* 2005;83(3):457-502. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0009.2005.00409.x
2. O'Malley AS, Rich EC, Maccarone A, et al. Disentangling the Linkage of Primary Care Features to Patient Outcomes: A Review of Current Literature, Data Sources, and Measurement Needs. *J Gen Intern Med* 2015;30(Suppl 3):S576-85. doi: 10.1007/s11606-015-3311-9
3. Basu S, Berkowitz SA, Phillips RL, et al. Association of Primary Care Physician Supply With Population Mortality in the United States, 2005-2015. *JAMA Intern Med* 2019;179(4):506-14. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2018.7624 [published Online First: 2019/02/19]
4. Bazemore A, Petterson S, Peterson LE, et al. Higher Primary Care Physician Continuity is Associated With Lower Costs and Hospitalizations. *Ann Fam Med* 2018;16(6):492-97. doi: 10.1370/afm.2308 [published Online First: 2018/11/14]
5. McAlister FA, Bakal JA, Green L, et al. The effect of provider affiliation with a primary care network on emergency department visits and hospital admissions. *CMAJ* 2018;190(10):E276-E84. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.170385 [published Online First: 2018/03/14]
6. Pereira Gray DJ, Sidaway-Lee K, White E, et al. Continuity of care with doctors-a matter of life and death? A systematic review of continuity of care and mortality. *BMJ Open* 2018;8(6):e021161. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-021161 [published Online First: 2018/07/01]
7. OECD. OECD Health Policy Studies: Realising the Potential of Primary Health Care: OECD Publishing, 2020.
8. National Health Service (NHS) England. Primary Care England, UK: NHS; 2017 [updated 2019; cited 2023 March 3]. Available from: https://www.england.nhs.uk/five-year-forward-view/next-steps-on-the-nhs-five-year-forward-view/primary-care/ accessed March 3 2023.
9. Vallejo-Torres L, Morris S. Primary care supply and quality of care in England. *Eur J Health Econ* 2018;19(4):499-519. doi: 10.1007/s10198-017-0898-2 [published Online First: 2017/06/01]
10. Statistics Canada. Primary Health Care Providers, 2019 2020 [cited 2023 March 3]. Available from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-625-x/2020001/article/00004-eng.pdf accessed March 3 2023.
11. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs Population Division. World Population Ageing 2019: Highlights New York, United States: United Nations; 2019 [cited 2023 March 9]. Available from: https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/sites/www.un.org.development.desa.pd/files/files/documents/2020/Jan/worldpopulationageing2019-highlights.pdf accessed March 9 2023.
12. Kudesia P, Salimarouny B, Stanley M, et al. The incidence of multimorbidity and patterns in accumulation of chronic conditions: A systematic review. *J Multimorb Comorb* 2021;11:26335565211032880. doi: 10.1177/26335565211032880 [published Online First: 2021/08/06]

13. Ryan BL, Allen B, Zwarenstein M, et al. Multimorbidity and mortality in Ontario, Canada: A population-based retrospective cohort study. *J Comorb* 2020;10:2235042X20950598. doi: 10.1177/2235042X20950598 [published Online First: 2020/09/15]
14. Rosella L, Kornas K, Huang A, et al. Accumulation Of Chronic Conditions At The Time Of Death Increased In Ontario From 1994 To 2013. *Health Aff* 2018;37(3):464-72. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2017.1150 [published Online First: 2018/03/06]
15. Koné Pefoyo AJ, Bronskill SE, Gruneir A, et al. The increasing burden and complexity of multimorbidity. *BMC Public Health* 2015;15:415. doi: 10.1186/s12889-015-1733-2 [published Online First: 2015/04/24]
16. Statistics Canada. In the Midst of High Job Vacancies and Historically Low Unemployment, Canada Faces Record Retirements from an Aging Labour Force 2022 [cited 2023 March 9]. Available from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/daily-quotidien/220427/dq220427a-eng.pdf accessed March 9 2023.
17. Cristea M, Noja GG, Stefea P, et al. The Impact of Population Aging and Public Health Support on EU Labor Markets. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020;17(4) doi: 10.3390/ijerph17041439 [published Online First: 2020/02/28]
18. Willis J, Antono B, Bazemore A, et al. The State of Primary Care in the United States: A Chartbook of Facts and Statistics, 2020.
19. Canadian Resident Matching Service (CaRMS). CaRMS R-1 Data and Reports. R-1 Match Reports 2022 [cited 2022 August 24]. Available from: https://www.carms.ca/data-reports/r1-data-reports/ accessed August 24 2022.
20. The American Academy of Family Physicians. 2022 Match Results for Family Medicine 2022 [cited 2022 August 24]. Available from: https://www.aafp.org/content/dam/AAFP/documents/medical_education_residency/the_match/AAFP-2022-Match-Results-for-Family-Medicine.pdf accessed August 24 2022.
21. Alberti H, Banner K, Collingwood H, et al. 'Just a GP': a mixed method study of undermining of general practice as a career choice in the UK. *BMJ Open* 2017;7(11):e018520. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-018520
22. Lambert TW, Smith F, Goldacre MJ. Trends in attractiveness of general practice as a career: surveys of views of UK-trained doctors. *Br J Gen Pract* 2017;67(657):e238-e47. doi: 10.3399/bjgp17X689893 [published Online First: 2017/03/16]
23. Freeman TR, Boisvert L, Wong E, et al. Comprehensive practice: Normative definition across 3 generations of alumni from a single family practice program, 1985 to 2012. *Can Fam Physician* 2018;64(10):750-59. [published Online First: 2018/10/14]
24. Kabir M, Randall E, Mitra G, et al. Resident and early-career family physicians' focused practice choices in Canada: a qualitative study. *Br J Gen Pract* 2022;72(718):e334-e41. doi: 10.3399/BJGP.2021.0512 [published Online First: 2022/01/14]
25. Lavergne MR, Scott I. The "kids" are alright: Practice patterns among early career family physicians and implications for primary care policy and workforce planning. Department of Family Medicine Rounds. University of British Columbia, BC, Canada, 2022.
26. Reitz R, Horst K, Davenport M, et al. Factors Influencing Family Physician Scope of Practice: A Grounded Theory Study. *Fam Med* 2018;50(4):269-74. doi: 10.22454/FamMed.2018.602663 [published Online First: 2018/04/19]
27. Chan BTB. The declining comprehensiveness of primary care. *CMAJ* 2002;166(4):429-34.

28. Coutinho AJ, Cochrane A, Stelter K, et al. Comparison of intended scope of practice for family medicine residents with reported scope of practice among practicing family physicians. *JAMA* 2015;314(22):2364. doi: 10.1001/jama.2015.13734
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–E63. doi: 10.9778/cmajo.20170083
30. Ganguli I, Sheridan B, Gray J, et al. Physician Work Hours and the Gender Pay Gap - Evidence from Primary Care. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383(14):1349-57. doi: 10.1056/NEJMsa2013804 [published Online First: 2020/10/01]
31. Rittenberg E, Liebman JB, Rexrode KM. Primary Care Physician Gender and Electronic Health Record Workload. *J Gen Intern Med* 2022;37(13):3295-301. doi: 10.1007/s11606-021-07298-z [published Online First: 2022/01/08]
32. Pelley E, Carnes M. When a Specialty Becomes "Women's Work": Trends in and Implications of Specialty Gender Segregation in Medicine. *Academic Medicine* 2020;95(10):1499-506. doi: 10.1097/acm.0000000000003555
33. Glied S, Ma S. How Will the Affordable Care Act Affect the Use of Health Care Services? Issue Briefs: The Commonwealth Fund, 2015:1-15.
34. Petterson SM, Liaw WR, Phillips RL, Jr., et al. Projecting US primary care physician workforce needs: 2010-2025. *Ann Fam Med* 2012;10(6):503-9. doi: 10.1370/afm.1431 [published Online First: 2012/11/15]
35. Rao A, Shi Z, Ray KN, et al. National Trends in Primary Care Visit Use and Practice Capabilities, 2008-2015. *Ann Fam Med* 2019;17(6):538-44. doi: 10.1370/afm.2474 [published Online First: 2019/11/13]
36. Bourgeault IL, Chamberland-Rowe C, Simkin S. Co-developing an integrated primary care workforce planning approach at a regional level: overarching framework and guiding principles. *Hum Resour Health* 2021;19(1):87. doi: 10.1186/s12960-021-00578-z
37. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Int J Surg* 2014;12(12):1495-99. doi: 10.1016/j.ijsu.2014.07.013
38. Simkin S, Dahrouge S, Bourgeault IL. End-of-career practice patterns of primary care physicians in Ontario. *Can Fam Physician* 2019;65(5):e221-e30. [published Online First: 2019/05/16]
39. Working Group on Postgraduate Curriculum Review TCoFPoCC. Length of Training in the Core Family Medicine Residency. Mississauga, ON, Canada, 2012.
40. Jaakkimainen L, Bayoumi I, Glazier RH, et al. Development and validation of an algorithm using health administrative data to define patient attachment to primary care providers. *J Health Organ Manag* 2021;ahead-of-print(ahead-of-print):733-43. doi: 10.1108/JHOM-05-2020-0171 [published Online First: 2021/07/26]
41. Kiran T, Green ME, Wu CF, et al. Family Physicians Stopping Practice During the COVID-19 Pandemic in Ontario, Canada. *Ann Fam Med* 2022;20(5):460-63. doi: 10.1370/afm.2865 [published Online First: 2022/10/14]
42. Kiran T, Wang R, Handford C, et al. Keeping doors open: A cross-sectional survey of family physician practice patterns during COVID-19, needs, and intentions. *medRxiv* 2021:2021.12.20.21267918. doi: 10.1101/2021.12.20.21267918
43. Ontario Physician Reporting Centre. Physicians in Ontario 2022 [cited 2022 August 31]. Available from: https://physicianreporting.org/pio/ accessed August 31 2022.

44. Canadian Resident Matching Service (CaRMS). R-1 data and reports: Discipline choice of Canadian applicants 2022 [cited 2022 September 1]. Available from: https://www.carms.ca/data-reports/r1-data-reports/ accessed September 1 2022.
45. Kost A, Bentley A, Phillips J, et al. Graduating Medical Student Perspectives on Factors Influencing Specialty Choice: An AAFP National Survey. *Fam Med* 2019;51(2):129-36. doi: 10.22454/FamMed.2019.136973 [published Online First: 2019/02/12]
46. Mahood SC. Medical education: Beware the hidden curriculum. *Can Fam Physician* 2011;57(9):983-5. [published Online First: 2011/09/16]
47. Porter J, Boyd C, Skandari MR, et al. Revisiting the Time Needed to Provide Adult Primary Care. *J Gen Intern Med* 2023;38(1):147-55. doi: 10.1007/s11606-022-07707-x [published Online First: 2022/07/02]
48. Preparing Our Future Family Physicians: An educational prescription for strengthening health care in changing times. In: Fowler N, Oandasan I, Wyman R, eds. Mississauga, ON, Canada: The College of Family Physicians of Canada (CFPC), 2022.
49. Bazemore A, Grunert T. Sailing the 7C's: Starfield Revisited as a Foundation of Family Medicine Residency Redesign.
50. Kiran T, Kopp A, Moineddin R, et al. Longitudinal evaluation of physician payment reform and team-based care for chronic disease management and prevention. *CMAJ* 2015;187(17):E494-E502. doi: 10.1503/cmaj.150579 [published Online First: 2015/09/24]
51. Chen PG, Mehrotra A, Auerbach DI. Do we really need more physicians? Responses to predicted primary care physician shortages. *Med Care* 2014;52(2):95-6. doi: 10.1097/mlr.0000000000000046 [published Online First: 2013/12/07]
52. McMurchy D, Astles R. Final Report: An External Evaluation of the Family Health Team (FHT) Initiative Ottawa, ON, Canada: The Conference Board of Canada; 2014 [cited 2023 March 9]. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/273866011 accessed March 9 2023.
53. Canadian Medical Association (CMA). CMA 2021 National Physician Health Survey 2022 [cited 2023 March 9]. Available from: https://www.cma.ca/sites/default/files/2022-08/NPHS_final_report_EN.pdf accessed March 9 2023.
54. Chan B, Schultz S. Supply and Utilization of General Practitioner and Family Physician Services in Ontario: ICES, 2005.
55. Stukel TA, Glazier RH, Schultz SE, et al. Multispecialty physician networks in Ontario. *Open Med* 2013;7(2):e40-55. [published Online First: 2013/12/19]
56. Nurse Practitioner Assocation of Ontario. Nurse Practitioners' Association of Ontario and Nurse Practitioner-led Clinic Association supports "Vision for Tomorrow" report 2022 [cited 2022 September 12]. Available from: https://npao.org/nurse-practitioners-association-of-ontario-and-nurse-practitioner-led-clinic-association-supports-vision-for-tomorrow-report/ accessed September 12 2022.
57. Bavafa H, Hitt LM, Terwiesch C. The Impact of E-Visits on Visit Frequencies and Patient Health: Evidence from Primary Care. *Manage Sci* 2018;64(12):5461-80. doi: 10.1287/mnsc.2017.2900 [published Online First: 2018/12/01]
58. Ashwood JS, Mehrotra A, Cowling D, et al. Direct-To-Consumer Telehealth May Increase Access To Care But Does Not Decrease Spending. *Health Aff* 2017;36(3):485-91. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.2016.1130 [published Online First: 2017/03/08]

59. Asch DA. The hidden economics of telemedicine. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;163(10):801-2. doi: 10.7326/M15-1416 [published Online First: 2015/09/08]

Figure 1a. Cohort creation: Patients



LTC: Long-term care home
FP: Family physician
CHC: Community Health Centre
VR: Virtually Rostered. Patient is considered VR to the physician with whom the majority of their primary care core visits were made over the preceding two-year period (Jaakkimainen et al 2021)
CoC: Physician-level Continuity of Care. Numerator = the number of patients virtually rostered to a physician. Denominator = all unique patients the same physician had seen over two years. Physician CoC ≤ 10% corresponds to low CoC. (Jaakkimainen et al 2021)
Comprehensive FP: Comprehensive scope of primary care practice. At least 50% of prior year's billings are for core primary care services in at least 7 different primary care activity areas (Schultz & Glazier 2017)
Focused FP: Narrowed scope of practice, such as sports medicine, palliative care, hospitalist.
Other: Not comprehensive and not focused practice
<44 days: Worked less than 44 days/year

Figure 1b. Cohort creation: Physicians



LTC: Long-term care
FP: Family physician
CHC: Community Health Centre
CoC: Physician-level Continuity of Care. Numerator = the number of patients virtually rostered to a physician. Denominator = all unique patients the same physician had seen over two years. Physician CoC ≤ 10% corresponds to low CoC. (Jaakkimainen et al 2021)
Comprehensive FP: Comprehensive scope of primary care practice. At least 50% of prior year's billings are for core primary care services in at least 7 different primary care activity areas (Schultz & Glazier 2017)
Focused FP: Narrowed scope of practice, such as sports medicine, palliative care, hospitalist.
Other: Not comprehensive and not focused practice
<44 days: Worked less than 44 days/year



Total Ns (all comprehensive family physicians):

2008: 7,673

2013: 8,050

2019: 9,377

Table 1. Practice characteristics of comprehensive family physicians

		<35 Years			35-44 Years			45-54 Years			55-64 Years			65-69 Years			70+ Years			Total Comprehensive FPs		
		Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F		M	F	Total	M	F
Comp. FPs N (%)	2008	592 (7.7)	211 (35.6)	381 (64.4)	1877 (24.5)	922 (49.1)	955 (50.9)	2467 (32.2)	1422 (57.6)	1045 (42.4)	1972 (25.7)	1522 (77.2)	450 (22.8)	409 (5.3)	347 (84.8)	62 (15.2)	356 (4.6)	319 (89.6)	37 (10.4)	7673 (100.0)	4743 (61.8)	2930 (38.2)
	2013	741 (9.2)	245 (33.1)	496 (66.9)	1666 (20.7)	674 (40.5)	992 (59.5)	2312 (28.7)	1227 (53.1)	1085 (46.9)	2170 (27.0)	1415 (65.2)	755 (34.8)	707 (8.8)	576 (81.5)	131 (18.5)	454 (5.6)	392 (86.3)	62 (13.7)	8050 (100.0)	4529 (56.3)	3521 (43.7)
	2019	1414 (15.1)	528 (37.3)	886 (62.7)	2135 (22.8)	806 (37.8)	1329 (62.2)	2242 (23.9)	1048 (46.7)	1194 (53.3)	2279 (24.3)	1290 (56.6)	989 (43.4)	708 (7.6)	519 (73.3)	189 (26.7)	599 (6.4)	505 (84.3)	94 (15.7)	9377 (100.0)	4696 (50.1)	4681 (49.9)
Years in pract. (mean (SD))	2008	6.0 (±2.3)	6.3 (±2.3)	5.9 (±2.2)	14.4 (±3.9)	14.7 (±3.8)	14.1 (±3.9)	23.7 (±4.2)	23.8 (±4.2)	23.5 (±4.2)	33.4 (±4.4)	33.6 (±4.2)	32.8 (±4.8)	41.3 (±3.0)	41.2 (±3.0)	42.0 (±3.2)	48.0 (±5.1)	48.0 (±4.9)	47.8 (±6.4)	24.6 (±11.4)	27.3 (±11.2)	20.2 (±10.1)
	2013	5.7 (±2.1)	5.4 (±2.1)	5.9 (±2.1)	13.8 (±4.2)	14.0 (±4.2)	13.7 (±4.1)	23.9 (±4.2)	23.9 (±4.0)	23.8 (±4.4)	33.2 (±4.4)	33.6 (±4.4)	32.5 (±4.5)	41.2 (±3.5)	41.1 (±3.4)	41.6 (±4.0)	48.7 (±4.9)	48.7 (±4.9)	49.0 (±4.9)	25.6 (±12.3)	28.8 (±12.1)	21.4 (±11.1)
	2019	5.8 (±2.0)	5.7 (±2.0)	5.8 (±1.9)	12.5 (±4.2)	12.5 (±4.4)	12.5 (±4.0)	23.7 (±4.7)	23.9 (±4.7)	23.5 (±4.6)	33.3 (±4.7)	33.4 (±4.5)	33.2 (±4.9)	40.8 (±3.6)	41.0 (±3.4)	40.3 (±4.0)	48.5 (±5.1)	48.4 (±5.3)	48.7 (±4.1)	23.7 (±13.4)	27.0 (±13.8)	20.3 (±12.0)
Roster size (mean (SD))	2008	638.3 (±622.5)	790.7 (±722.0)	553.9 (±542.7)	1131.8 (±873.2)	1323.5 (±981.3)	946.7 (±707.0)	1345.1 (±920.7)	1470.3 (±996.7)	1174.6 (±774.4)	1432.1 (±945.2)	1494.0 (±961.5)	1222.7 (±856.4)	1123.1 (±955.5)	1186.1 (±981.7)	770.7 (±701.1)	566.3 (±770.9)	584.9 (±785.4)	406.5 (±618.7)	1212.8 (±927.0)	1338.8 (±991.1)	1008.8 (±770.0)
	2013	620.0 (±605.9)	725.2 (±690.9)	568.0 (±552.6)	1152.8 (±836.0)	1348.6 (±935.1)	1019.7 (±732.6)	1407.1 (±927.1)	1567.8 (±1013.4)	1225.4 (±780.2)	1490.2 (±894.6)	1593.1 (±937.6)	1297.2 (±772.4)	1366.1 (±905.8)	1420.3 (±921.3)	1128.0 (±794.3)	898.1 (±895.7)	946.7 (±922.9)	591.1 (±622.7)	1272.1 (±909.2)	1425.0 (±975.2)	1075.4 (±773.4)
	2019	734.0 (±644.2)	834.7 (±712.0)	674.0 (±592.4)	1074.5 (±720.3)	1217.2 (±841.6)	987.9 (±620.1)	1394.8 (±876.2)	1529.3 (±946.5)	1276.7 (±791.2)	1405.6 (±847.2)	1531.6 (±902.2)	1241.1 (±738.3)	1434.4 (±900.5)	1502.5 (±932.8)	1247.6 (±777.3)	1098.0 (±804.3)	1125.7 (±815.1)	949.2 (±729.6)	1208.9 (±837.4)	1351.9 (±908.8)	1065.4 (±731.6)
Core PC visits (mean (SD))	2008	6.2 (±2.7)	6.2 (±2.8)	6.2 (±2.7)	7.3 (±4.2)	7.5 (±5.6)	7.2 (±2.3)	7.3 (±2.3)	7.4 (±2.5)	7.3 (±2.1)	7.7 (±2.6)	7.7 (±2.6)	7.7 (±2.4)	7.5 (±3.1)	7.6 (±3.2)	6.9 (±2.7)	6.8 (±3.5)	6.9 (±3.5)	6.2 (±2.9)	7.3 (±3.1)	7.4 (±3.5)	7.1 (±2.4)
	2013	5.3 (±2.3)	5.4 (±2.3)	5.3 (±2.3)	6.3 (±2.1)	6.2 (±2.2)	6.3 (±2.0)	6.5 (±2.4)	6.6 (±2.7)	6.4 (±2.0)	6.7 (±2.8)	6.8 (±3.2)	6.4 (±1.9)	6.9 (±2.4)	6.9 (±2.4)	7.0 (±2.3)	7.3 (±4.0)	7.5 (±4.2)	6.5 (±2.4)	6.5 (±2.6)	6.6 (±2.9)	6.3 (±2.1)
	2019	5.6 (±2.5)	5.5 (±2.6)	5.6 (±2.4)	6.0 (±2.5)	5.9 (±2.8)	6.0 (±2.4)	6.1 (±2.1)	6.1 (±2.3)	6.1 (±1.9)	6.1 (±2.1)	6.2 (±2.3)	6.0 (±1.8)	6.4 (±2.2)	6.5 (±2.3)	6.2 (±2.0)	6.7 (±3.0)	6.5 (±2.9)	7.2 (±3.1)	6.0 (±2.3)	6.1 (±2.5)	6.0 (±2.2)
Pt age (mean (SD))	2008	27.9 (±13.8)	29.4 (±14.0)	27.1 (±13.6)	31.7 (±11.7)	32.8 (±12.6)	30.5 (±10.7)	34.3 (±11.9)	35.4 (±12.5)	32.7 (±10.8)	36.7 (±13.1)	37.6 (±13.2)	33.7 (±12.2)	35.1 (±16.2)	36.0 (±16.1)	30.5 (±15.9)	28.2 (±18.5)	28.5 (±18.5)	25.5 (±17.8)	33.5 (±13.2)	34.9 (±13.8)	31.3 (±11.8)
	2013	28.2 (±13.7)	30.0 (±13.7)	27.4 (±13.6)	34.0 (±10.8)	35.0 (±11.6)	33.4 (±10.1)	36.4 (±10.7)	37.8 (±11.2)	34.8 (±9.9)	39.4 (±10.7)	40.5 (±11.1)	37.3 (±9.8)	40.9 (±12.6)	42.0 (±12.4)	36.3 (±12.7)	39.1 (±17.0)	39.7 (±17.1)	35.0 (±16.0)	36.5 (±12.1)	38.5 (±12.5)	34.0 (±11.2)
	2019	31.8 (±14.5)	33.5 (±14.2)	30.7 (±14.5)	36.4 (±10.9)	37.1 (±11.8)	36.0 (±10.3)	38.4 (±9.8)	39.4 (±10.6)	37.5 (±9.0)	40.6 (±10.5)	42.0 (±10.8)	38.7 (±9.8)	43.0 (±11.5)	43.9 (±11.6)	40.8 (±10.9)	43.3 (±14.3)	43.6 (±14.5)	41.2 (±13.1)	38.1 (±12.0)	40.0 (±12.3)	36.2 (±11.3)
Prop. Fem. Pts (mean (SD))	2008	55.7 (±15.1)	46.9 (±10.7)	60.7 (±14.9)	55.2 (±13.2)	46.2 (±7.5)	63.8 (±11.6)	54.3 (±13.0)	46.3 (±7.4)	65.3 (±10.9)	51.0 (±11.0)	46.8 (±7.0)	65.0 (±10.7)	49.5 (±11.1)	47.3 (±8.5)	61.5 (±15.7)	47.8 (±13.2)	46.7 (±11.1)	57.6 (±22.6)	53.2 (±12.9)	46.6 (±7.8)	64.0 (±12.1)
	2013	55.3 (±15.6)	47.8 (±13.7)	59.0 (±15.1)	55.1 (±12.1)	46.1 (±8.3)	61.2 (±10.4)	53.7 (±12.3)	45.6 (±7.4)	62.9 (±9.9)	52.4 (±12.1)	45.9 (±7.5)	64.7 (±9.3)	48.9 (±10.1)	45.9 (±7.2)	62.2 (±10.5)	49.6 (±12.2)	47.2 (±10.4)	64.8 (±11.9)	53.1 (±12.5)	46.1 (±8.3)	62.3 (±11.0)
	2019	54.3 (±13.7)	47.7 (±11.2)	58.2 (±13.6)	54.3 (±11.8)	45.0 (±8.2)	59.9 (±10.0)	53.5 (±11.2)	45.4 (±7.6)	60.6 (±8.9)	52.4 (±11.8)	44.8 (±7.8)	62.2 (±8.5)	49.9 (±11.7)	45.1 (±7.9)	63.0 (±10.2)	48.2 (±9.9)	45.9 (±8.1)	60.7 (±9.6)	52.9 (±12.0)	45.5 (±8.4)	60.4 (±10.3)
FTE (N (%))	2008	290 (49.0)	146 (50.3)	144 (49.7)	1210 (64.5)	754 (62.3)	456 (37.7)	1802 (73.0)	1173 (65.1)	629 (34.9)	1481 (75.1)	1209 (81.6)	272 (18.4)	239 (58.4)	220 (92.1)	19 (8.0)	114 (32.0)	107 (93.9)	7 (6.1)	5136 (66.9)	3609 (70.3)	1527 (29.7)
	2013	335 (45.4)	152 (45.4)	183 (54.6)	1073 (64.4)	556 (51.8)	517 (48.2)	1694 (73.3)	1014 (59.9)	680 (40.1)	1634 (75.3)	1156 (70.8)	478 (29.3)	474 (67.0)	415 (87.6)	59 (12.5)	189 (41.6)	177 (93.7)	12 (6.4)	5399 (67.1)	3470 (64.3)	1929 (35.7)
	2019	734 (51.9)	351 (47.8)	383 (52.2)	1401 (65.6)	628 (44.8)	773 (55.2)	1722 (76.8)	881 (51.2)	841 (48.8)	1681 (73.8)	1052 (62.6)	629 (37.4)	514 (72.6)	402 (78.2)	112 (21.8)	327 (54.6)	288 (88.1)	39 (11.9)	6379 (68.0)	3602 (56.5)	2777 (43.5)

Comp. FPs: Comprehensive family physicians; Pract.: Practice; PC: Primary care; Pt(s): Patient(s); Prop: Proportion; Fem: Female; FTE: Full-time equivalent

Table 2. Characteristics of patients attached to near-retirement comprehensive family physicians over time, by near-retirement group

		Age 55+ Comprehensive FPs		Age 65+ Comprehensive FPs		Age 70+ Comprehensive FPs	
Patient Characteristics		N	%	N	%	N	%
OVERALL (N, % of all patients attached to all comprehensive FPs)	2008	3,571,661	37.5	690,642	7.2	214,861	2.3
	2013	4,676,625	45.0	1,399,119	13.5	419,172	4.0
	2019	4,935,992	43.0	1,695,126	14.8	666,404	5.8
Aged 65+ (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	597,707	16.7	136,394	19.8	45,414	21.1
	2013	846,974	18.1	298,545	21.3	95,833	22.8
	2019	1,003,769	20.3	402,430	23.7	176,473	26.5
Female patients (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	1,804,585	50.5	338,656	49.0	103,386	48.1
	2013	2,371,923	50.7	678,971	48.5	201,104	48.0
	2019	2,498,453	50.6	823,090	48.6	317,967	47.7
Rural patients (RIO score 40+) (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	233,045	6.5	48,860	7.1	14,323	6.7
	2013	292,357	6.3	88,311	6.3	20,294	4.8
	2019	274,099	5.6	83,691	4.9	33,545	5.0
Highest (4+) RUB (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	677,436	19.0	137,995	20.0	44,067	20.5
	2013	878,340	18.8	283,013	20.2	88,182	21.0
	2019	983,818	19.9	350,439	20.7	146,298	22.0
Highest (5+) annual core primary care visits (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	2,109,950	59.1	403,026	58.4	127,050	59.1
	2013	2,462,236	52.7	753,388	53.9	227,090	54.2
	2019	2,480,395	50.3	876,487	51.7	346,668	52.0

COPD (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	233,498	6.5	51,856	7.5	16,411	7.6
	2013	326,748	7.0	115,669	8.3	37,477	8.9
	2019	337,202	6.8	132,395	7.8	59,350	8.9
CHF (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	69,573	2.0	15,645	2.3	4,952	2.3
	2013	80,026	1.7	28,187	2.0	9,214	2.2
	2019	90,436	1.8	35,567	2.1	15,832	2.4
Diabetes (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	327,127	9.2	68,392	9.9	21,389	10.0
	2013	506,014	10.8	170,115	12.2	52,815	12.5
	2019	555,358	11.3	215,696	12.7	92,395	13.9
Frailty (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	66,559	1.9	14,875	2.2	4,964	2.3
	2013	98,490	2.1	33,005	2.4	10,794	2.6
	2019	114,085	2.3	43,032	2.5	18,597	2.8
Any mental health illness in last 2 years (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	825,520	23.1	166,257	24.1	51,802	24.1
	2013	979,987	21.0	311,771	22.3	96,543	23.0
	2019	1,022,523	20.7	355,911	21.0	150,153	22.5
Lowest income quintile (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	706,504	19.8	150,381	21.8	48,403	22.5
	2013	876,982	18.8	282,922	20.2	91,236	21.8
	2019	944,888	19.1	348,869	20.6	142,881	21.4
Highest housing instability quintile (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	761,397	21.3	165,525	24.0	54,275	25.6
	2013	934,472	20.0	295,059	21.1	92,653	22.2
	2019	1,031,506	20.9	374,322	22.1	155,859	23.4
Highest material deprivation	2008	736,903	20.6	163,835	23.7	52,733	24.9

quintile (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2013	1,045,136	22.4	338,012	24.2	112,097	26.9
	2019	926,043	18.8	352,849	20.8	145,084	21.8
Highest racialized neighborhood quintile (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	962,252	26.9	177,586	25.7	63,167	29.8
	2013	1,335,124	28.6	397,430	28.4	124,062	29.8
	2019	1,521,975	30.8	584,512	34.5	213,182	32.0
Recent immigrant (N, % of patients attached to near-retirement physician group)	2008	269,131	7.5	52,717	7.6	21,202	10.9
	2013	289,772	6.2	83,484	6.0	27,024	7.0
	2019	277,755	5.6	82,560	4.9	28,449	4.3

Interpretation of Table 2 rows:

Interpretation of the "Overall" category: For example, in 2019, 1,695,126 patients were attached to a comprehensive FP aged 65+. This represents 14.8% of all patients who are attached to a comprehensive FP.

Interpretation of each patient category: For example, in 2019, of the 666,404 patients attached to comprehensive FPs over the age of 70 years, 28,449 (4.3%) were recent immigrants

FPs: Family physicians

RIO: Rurality Index of Ontario

RUB: Morbidity, based on Resource Utilization Band

COPD: Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease

CHF: Congestive heart failure

Table 3. Practice characteristics: Medical and social complexity of patients attached to comprehensive family physicians over time by physician age and sex

		<35 Years			35-44 Years			45-54 Years			55-64 Years			65-69 Years			70+ Years			TOTAL		
		Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F	Total	M	F
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Highest morbidity (RUB (4+))	2008	15.3	14.7	15.6	16.2	15.8	16.7	16.4	16.5	16.2	17.3	17.5	16.6	16.8	17.2	14.0	14.0	14.1	13.0	16.5	16.7	16.3
	2013	17.5	17.6	17.4	18.2	17.5	18.7	17.7	17.8	17.6	18.1	18.5	17.3	19.5	20.0	17.5	20.1	20.5	17.9	18.1	18.3	17.8
	2019	19.3	19.4	19.2	20.6	20.2	20.8	19.4	19.4	19.4	19.5	20.2	18.7	20.3	20.4	20.1	21.4	21.5	21.3	19.8	19.9	19.7
Lowest income quintile	2008	18.5	19.2	18.1	18.1	19.6	16.6	18.4	19.8	16.4	19.9	20.2	18.8	22.6	22.5	23.6	23.9	20.1	17.2	19.0	20.1	17.2
	2013	18.9	20.6	18.0	17.2	19.1	16.0	18.0	19.4	16.4	18.4	19.5	16.5	20.5	20.4	21.2	24.0	24.2	22.5	18.3	19.6	16.7
	2019	20.4	21.9	20.7	18.8	20.7	17.6	18.3	20.5	16.5	18.8	20.4	16.8	19.9	20.7	17.9	22.1	22.2	21.4	19.0	20.7	17.5
Highest housing instability quintile	2008	24.5	22.8	25.5	20.6	20.7	20.4	20.4	20.4	20.4	21.9	21.6	23.0	24.0	23.1	29.2	25.5	25.6	24.2	21.4	21.2	21.7
	2013	26.0	23.6	27.2	21.8	20.9	22.5	19.9	20.4	19.4	20.8	20.6	21.3	21.7	21.8	21.2	24.5	24.1	26.6	21.4	20.9	21.9
	2019	26.5	25.3	27.2	24.5	24.7	24.5	21.1	21.8	20.4	21.4	21.5	21.3	22.6	21.7	24.9	25.5	25.2	27.1	23.0	22.7	23.3
Highest material deprivation quintile	2008	18.6	19.8	17.9	17.4	19.3	15.5	18.2	20.1	15.6	20.5	21.3	18.1	23.7	23.9	22.4	25.7	26.2	21.3	19.0	20.6	16.4
	2013	22.9	24.6	22.0	20.5	22.1	19.4	21.2	22.9	19.3	21.4	22.6	19.2	23.7	23.2	25.7	29.2	29.4	27.8	21.5	22.8	19.9
	2019	18.2	19.7	17.3	17.3	19.9	15.8	17.0	19.3	15.0	18.1	19.8	15.9	19.7	20.9	16.7	21.8	22.1	19.9	17.8	19.8	15.9
Highest racialized neighborhood quintile	2008	27.4	30.8	25.5	27.5	28.4	26.5	26.0	26.1	25.9	27.2	26.3	30.4	28.0	26.4	37.2	32.6	32.8	30.7	26.9	26.9	27.0
	2013	29.9	31.1	29.2	28.6	29.2	28.2	27.9	29.2	26.6	27.2	27.2	27.3	27.7	25.5	37.3	33.0	32.0	39.4	28.0	28.1	28.0
	2019	26.0	26.6	25.7	25.8	27.2	25.0	28.5	29.2	27.8	27.0	26.8	27.3	33.2	33.7	31.9	32.1	30.9	38.5	27.4	28.3	26.7

Interpretation: For example, in 2008, within the group of comprehensive family physicians under the age of 35 years, 15.3% of patients in those practices had the highest level of morbidity (RUB 4+). When further stratified by physician sex, 14.7% of patients attached to male comprehensive family physicians belonged to the highest morbidity (RUB 4+) group.

RUB: Morbidity, based on Resource Utilization Band