

## Characteristics of Walk-In Clinic Physicians and Patients in Ontario, Canada:

### A Cross-Sectional Study

Lauren Lapointe-Shaw MD PhD<sup>1-6</sup>, Christine Salahub MA PhD<sup>1</sup>, Peter C. Austin PhD<sup>2,3,7</sup>, Li Bai PhD<sup>2</sup>, Sundeep Banwatt MD<sup>8</sup>, Simon Berthelot MD MSc<sup>9</sup>, R. Sacha Bhatia MD MBA<sup>4,10</sup>, Cheryl Bird HBA<sup>11</sup>, Laura Desveaux PhD MScPT<sup>3,5,12</sup>, Tara Kiran MD MSc<sup>2,3,13-15</sup>, Aisha Lofters MD PhD<sup>13,16</sup>, Malcolm Maclure ScD<sup>17</sup>, Danielle Martin MD MPP<sup>3,13,18</sup>, Kerry A. McBrien MD MPH<sup>19</sup>, Rita K. McCracken MD PhD<sup>20</sup>, J. Michael Paterson MSc<sup>2,3,21</sup>, Bahram Rahman MD MPP<sup>22,23</sup>, Jennifer Shuldiner MPH PhD<sup>5</sup>, Mina Tadrous PharmD PhD<sup>2,5,24</sup>, Braeden A. Terpou PhD<sup>12</sup>, Niels Thakkar MSc<sup>25</sup>, Ruoxi Wang PhD<sup>12</sup>, Noah M. Ivers MD PhD<sup>2,3,5,13,18</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>2</sup> ICES, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>4</sup> Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>5</sup> Women's College Institute for Health System Solutions and Virtual Care, Women's College Hospital, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>6</sup> Division of General Internal Medicine and Geriatrics, University Health Network and Sinai Health System, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>7</sup> Sunnybrook Research Institute, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>8</sup> CarePoint Health, Mississauga, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>9</sup> Département de médecine de famille et de médecine d'urgence, Faculté de médecine, Université Laval, Québec City, Québec, Canada.

<sup>10</sup> Department of Cardiology, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>11</sup> Patient partner, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>12</sup> Institute for Better Health, Trillium Health Partners, Mississauga, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>13</sup> Department of Family and Community Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>14</sup> MAP Centre for Urban Health Solutions, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>15</sup> Department of Family and Community Medicine, St. Michael's Hospital, Unity Health Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>16</sup> Peter Gilgan Centre for Women's Cancers, Women's College Hospital, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>17</sup> Department of Anesthesiology, Pharmacology and Therapeutics, Faculty of Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

<sup>18</sup> Department of Family Medicine, Women's College Hospital, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>19</sup> Departments of Family Medicine and Community Health Sciences, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

<sup>20</sup> Department of Family Practice, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.

<sup>21</sup> Department of Family Medicine, McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>22</sup> Primary Health Care Branch, Ministry of Health, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>23</sup> Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>24</sup> Leslie Dan Faculty of Pharmacy, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

<sup>25</sup> College of Nurses of Ontario, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

**Word Count:** 2,786

**Tables:** 4

**Figures:** 2

**Appendices:** 1

**Corresponding Author:** Dr. Lauren Lapointe-Shaw, [lauren.lapointe.shaw@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:lauren.lapointe.shaw@mail.utoronto.ca), Toronto General Hospital, University Health Network, 13EN-226, 200 Elizabeth Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5G 2C4, Tel 416 340 4800 ext. 7136

**Support:** This study was supported by ICES, which is funded by an annual grant from the Ontario Ministry of Health (MOH) and the Ministry of Long-Term Care. This study also received funding from a Canadian Institutes of Health Research project grant awarded to LLS and NMI (grant #175285).

## ABSTRACT

**Objective:** We aimed to describe family physicians who primarily practice in a walk-in clinic setting and compare them to family physicians who provide longitudinal care.

**Design:** A cross-sectional study that linked results from an annual physician survey (2019) to administrative healthcare data from Ontario, Canada. We compared the characteristics, practice patterns, and patients of physicians primarily working in a walk-in clinic setting, with family physicians providing longitudinal care.

**Setting:** Ontario, Canada.

**Participants:** Physicians who primarily worked in a walk-in clinic setting in 2019, as indicated by an annual physician survey.

**Exposure:** Whether the physician was a walk-in clinic physician or a family physician who provided longitudinal care.

**Main Measures:** Physician demographic and practice characteristics, as well as their patients' demographic and healthcare utilization characteristics.

**Results:** Compared to the 9,137 family physicians practicing longitudinal care, the 597 physicians who self-identified as practicing primarily in walk-in clinics were more frequently male (67% vs. 49%) and could speak a language other than English or French (43% vs. 32%). Walk-in clinic physicians had more encounters with patients who were younger ( $M$  37 vs. 47 years), had lower levels of prior healthcare utilization (15% vs. 19% in highest band), who resided in large urban areas (87% vs. 77%), and in highly ethnically diverse neighborhoods (45%

vs. 35%). Walk-in clinic physicians had more encounters with unattached patients (32% vs. 17%) and with patients attached to another physician outside their group (54% vs. 18%).

**Conclusion:** Physicians who primarily work in walk-in clinics saw many patients from historically underserved groups, and many patients who were attached to another family physician.

## KEY POINTS

- This is the first study to compare walk-in clinic physicians to longitudinal practice physicians using a population-based survey.
- Walk-in physicians saw younger, healthier patients, who lived in large urban and ethnically diverse areas.
- Overall, 33% of walk-in physicians' encounters were to patients who did not have a regular family physician, and another 54% were already attached to another family physician.
- We estimated that the time walk-in clinic physicians spent working in walk-in clinics is similar to that which would be needed to attach a quarter of all unattached patients in Ontario.

## INTRODUCTION

One in 10 Canadians report that they do not have a regular family or other primary care physician,<sup>1</sup> and many who do still struggle to get timely access.<sup>2,3</sup> Walk-in clinics provide care to patients with and without a regular physician, and do not require a scheduled appointment or an ongoing relationship between patient and provider.<sup>4-6</sup> An estimated one-third of the population visited a walk-in clinic annually prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.<sup>7</sup> Yet, walk-in clinics have been criticized for poor continuity of both relationships and information, which is associated with worse patient outcomes.<sup>8,9</sup>

Fewer family physicians are choosing to provide longitudinal primary care.<sup>10-13</sup> In 2021, 1 in 5 family physicians in Toronto were considering closing their practices in the next 5 years, and only 5% indicated they were actively seeking to grow their practices.<sup>14</sup> Reasons for leaving practice included health concerns, financial pressures, burnout, retirement, and other work options in or outside of medicine.<sup>15-17</sup> As a result, access to longitudinal primary care is likely to worsen in the coming decade.<sup>18</sup>

For family physicians, walk-in clinics may offer a practice alternative. Yet, little is known about the characteristics of physicians who work primarily in a walk-in setting. Our primary study objective was to describe their characteristics, practice patterns and patient populations, and compare these to longitudinal family physicians. Given current crises in primary care access and health human resources, an additional objective was to translate walk-in clinic days worked to the number of patients that could become attached if this time were re-allocated to supporting longitudinal primary care.

## METHODS

### Study Design & Setting

This was a cross-sectional study of Ontario family physicians. Ontario is Canada's most populous province, and in 2019 had 14.5 million residents and approximately 14,000 practicing family physicians.<sup>19</sup> About 13% of the population (2 million people) does not have a regular family doctor.<sup>20,21</sup>

Primary care reforms over the past 15 years attached 81% of Ontarians to a family physician through a patient enrolment model.<sup>22</sup> These models include an access-related bonus that is reduced by the total amount of fee-for-service charges made by enrolled patients attending outside clinics (e.g. walk-in clinics).<sup>23–25</sup>

### Data Sources

Health administrative datasets were linked using unique encoded identifiers and analyzed at ICES (**Appendix Table 1** lists databases used). ICES is an independent, non-profit research institute whose legal status under Ontario's health information privacy law allows it to collect and analyze healthcare and demographic data, without consent, for health system evaluation and improvement.

Administrative healthcare data were linked (through a data sharing agreement) to the results of the 2019 College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario (CPSO) annual license renewal survey, which is a mandatory component of physician license renewal in Ontario.<sup>26</sup> A mandatory question asks physicians to list all their practice settings and the hours worked in each setting,

per week. The CPSO then derived the following variables: whether a “walk-in clinic or episodic care clinic outside of a hospital” was a setting where a physician worked: i) more than 0 hours per week, ii) the greatest number of hours per week (of all listed settings) and iii) the majority of their working time (50% or more of the member’s practice hours).

### **Physician Population**

We included all 2019 CPSO survey respondents with a specialty of family medicine or with no specialty reported, excluding those who could not be linked, not actively practicing in 2019, or with a practice pattern consistent with a focused or specialist practice, or who worked fewer than 44 days per year.<sup>27</sup>

### **Physician Comparison Groups**

We defined “walk-in clinic physicians” as those who spent the greatest number of hours worked and the majority of their time in this setting, and who had at least one day with 10 or more office encounters with patients who were not enrolled to them personally.

The comparison group was longitudinal family physicians who were not included in the above definition and who practiced comprehensive primary care, as defined by a standard ICES algorithm (**Appendix Table 2**).<sup>27</sup>

### **Physician Characteristics**

Physician and practice characteristics including years in practice, gender, and patient enrolment model type were included (all variables listed in **Appendix Table 2**). Physician-level continuity was defined as the proportion of all their enrolled or virtually rostered patients with whom they



had encounters in 2019. Virtual rostering assigns patients who are not formally enrolled to the family physician with the most claims for primary care services in the previous year (**Appendix Table 2**).<sup>22</sup>

### **Patient Characteristics at Encounters**

We examined patient characteristics at each office encounter, from January to December 2019, excluding walk-in clinic physician encounters with their own enrolled patients. This included (all variables in **Appendix Table 2**) whether they were new insurance registrants in the past 10 years (a proxy for recent immigration to the province), level of material deprivation, dependency, instability, and ethnic concentration in patients' residential neighbourhoods, divided into quintiles<sup>28,29</sup>, as well as count of comorbidities and previous healthcare utilization based on Aggregated Diagnosis Groups (ADGs) and Resource Utilization Bands (RUBs), both derived from The John Hopkins ACG® System Version 10.<sup>30</sup> We also described the physician-patient relationship at each encounter, and the most frequent diagnoses.

### **Analysis**

We first described physicians and their encounters and plotted their main practice locations on a map of Ontario. As suggested by our patient partners, we overlaid a map of the density of unenrolled patients in 2019.

We compared the characteristics of walk-in and longitudinal FPs, and their encounters, using standardized mean differences (SMDs), with differences greater than 10% (0.1) considered meaningful.<sup>31</sup>

We estimated how many more Ontarians could be enrolled to a family physician if each walk-in clinic work day were reallocated to support a primary care enrolment model (methods in **Appendix Table 3**). The purpose of this was neither to simulate nor inform any particular intervention, but rather to appreciate the size of the walk-in clinic physician workforce, in the context of an Ontario population with over 2 million unattached patients.<sup>20</sup> Analysis was executed using SAS software, version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC). Figures were generated using Tableau version 2022.3.7. We followed the STROBE reporting guidelines.<sup>32</sup>

### **Ethics Approval**

This study was approved by the Women’s College Hospital Research Ethics Board (REB 2020-0095-E) with a waiver of patient consent.

### **Patient Partner Participation**

Three patient partners who have been longitudinally involved in the project team’s work on walk-in clinics<sup>33</sup> contributed to the analytic plan and results interpretation.

## RESULTS

In 2019, 16,337 family physicians completed the survey. After exclusions (**Figure 1**), 597 (5.7%) of the 10,443 included family physicians were classified as walk-in clinic physicians. Another 9,137 (87.5%) were longitudinal FPs, of whom 1,085 (11.9%) reported spending some time in a walk-in setting. Physicians who primarily worked in walk-in clinics had lower physician-level continuity than longitudinal FPs (0.1 vs. 0.6, SMD 1.98).

### Physician Characteristics

Compared to longitudinal FPs, more walk-in clinic physicians were male (**Table 1**), offered services in a language other than English or French, and were more likely to practice in large urban areas. Walk-in physicians' primary practice addresses were clustered in major urban areas, only covering some of the areas with the highest proportion of unattached patients (**Figure 2**).

Of the walk-in clinic physicians who had enrolled patients (38.5%), most worked in enhanced fee-for-service models (87.8%). Walk-in clinic physicians received a mean of 89.2% of their income from fee-for-service billings, compared to 44.1% for longitudinal FPs (SMD 1.55).

Compared to longitudinal FPs, walk-in clinic physicians worked a similar number of days in an office setting, but had 1.7 times as many office encounters, and saw almost three times as many patients.

### Encounter-level Characteristics

Walk-in clinic physicians provided 13% of all their office encounters to patients enrolled to them or their group (longitudinal = 64.7%, SMD 1.25), 33.0% of encounters to patients who were not formally enrolled to any family physician (longitudinal 17.0%, SMD 0.38), and 54.0% of encounters to patients who were enrolled to another physician outside their group (longitudinal 18.3%, SMD 0.80; **Table 2**).

Acute conditions such as the common cold, acute bronchitis, and acute sinusitis were more commonly diagnosed at encounters with walk-in clinic physicians; chronic conditions such as hypertension and diabetes were more commonly listed diagnoses for encounters with longitudinal FPs (**Table 3**).

Walk-in encounter patients were, on average, 10 years younger than those of longitudinal FPs (**Table 4**). Walk-in clinic physicians had more encounters with patients who were recent registrants, from large urban areas, and from neighbourhoods with high ethnic diversity. Walk-in clinic physicians had fewer encounters with patients who had high previous healthcare utilization or who resided in neighbourhoods with high dependency scores.

### **Walk-In Clinic Physician Workforce**

We estimated that the walk-in clinic work hours provided by the 597 walk-in physicians included in our sample (median 3 days of walk-in work per physician-week, IQR 2-4, mean 3.1, SD 1.5), were equivalent to the physician-time needed to support the enrolment of a median 468,456 (IQR 314,247-712,308) additional patients to longitudinal primary care.

## INTERPRETATION

We found that 6% of family physicians licensed in Ontario in 2019 worked mainly in walk-in clinics. These physicians saw more patients daily and frequently treated unattached patients and those attached to an outside family physician. They were also more often male, multilingual, and practiced in multiple locations. Compared to longitudinal FPs, their patients were typically younger, less frequent healthcare users, from urban, ethnically diverse areas, or recent immigrants. This subset of family doctors worked an average of 3 days weekly in walk-in clinics, equivalent to the physician-time needed to enrol about 470,000 patients to a longitudinal FP.

Past studies of walk-in clinic physicians in Canada are more than a decade old. Previously, physicians working in walk-in clinics in Ontario and British Columbia were more often female.<sup>6,34</sup> However, a study of 2015-2017 family medicine graduates found that more women preferred longitudinal primary care; this is potentially consistent with the finding of more men working in walk-in clinics in 2019.<sup>35</sup>

We found that, compared to longitudinal FPs, walk-in clinic physicians served more ethnically diverse populations. Recent immigrants have lower rates of attachment,<sup>23</sup> cancer screening,<sup>36-38</sup> and care for chronic diseases.<sup>39-43</sup> Whereas U.S. retail clinics typically serve higher income areas with lower levels of minority populations,<sup>44-48</sup> walk-in clinics have acted as healthcare hubs for immigrant communities in Scandinavia.<sup>49,50</sup> We found that a higher proportion of walk-in physicians offer services in a language other than English or French. They may be the children of immigrants, or immigrants themselves, in which case they could be in a better position to

communicate with and understand the needs of newcomer patients.<sup>51,52</sup> Nonetheless, newcomers should be offered the opportunity to also engage in longitudinal primary care to better meet their preventive and chronic care needs.

Timely access to episodic care remains foundational to a high-performing healthcare system. Ideally, this would be achieved in a setting that ensures continuity with longitudinal care. More than half of walk-in clinic physician encounters were with patients who were attached to an outside physician. In a survey study, 50% of patients indicated poor access to their regular family physician as the reason for visiting a walk-in clinic, although geographic proximity and general convenience were also commonly cited reasons.<sup>53</sup> Although access challenges<sup>2</sup> continue to drive demand for walk-in clinics in Canada, other countries such as Norway, the Netherlands, Sweden and Finland have few to no walk-in clinics.<sup>54-57</sup> In these countries, there is greater accountability for same-day and after-hours access for urgent primary care issues, obviating the need for separate walk-in clinics.<sup>58-63</sup>

In translating total walk-in clinic workdays to the number of additional patients who could be enrolled, our aim was to contextualize the size of the walk-in physician workforce. The combined walk-in clinic work days reflect a workforce similar to that which would be needed to enrol a quarter of all unattached patients in Ontario. However, any potential intervention could more realistically aim for 10% or less of walk-in days reallocated, and should account for what is presently a mismatch between the geographic locations of walk-in physicians' practices and many unattached patients.

In qualitative research from 20 years ago, family physicians reported walk-in clinics as necessary to fill the gap between primary care and emergency services.<sup>64</sup> Several recent physician workforce trends have the potential to increase that gap, by decreasing access to longitudinal primary care. Fewer new family medicine graduates are choosing to pursue longitudinal family practice,<sup>10,11</sup> and more are leaving practice.<sup>14</sup> In an upcoming study of walk-in clinic physicians' perspectives, scheduling flexibility, a desire to practice episodic care, the demand for walk-in care, and the fee-for-service payment model motivated the choice to practice in a walk-in setting.<sup>65</sup> Paradoxically, physician workforce diversion to walk-in clinics and other alternatives may further reduce access to longitudinal primary care, ensuring that demand for walk-in clinics remains high.

Our study has several limitations. First, we relied on self-report to identify walk-in clinic physicians in Ontario. Physicians may underreport full-time walk-in clinic status, and as a result, our sample of walk-in clinic physicians is likely to be more specific than sensitive. Second, longitudinal physicians included some who reported working in a walk-in clinic setting part-time. We focused on those who primarily practiced in walk-in clinic settings to increase confidence that encounters with unenrolled patients were indeed walk-in clinic encounters. Walk-in style practice exists on a spectrum, and any misclassification of physicians in either direction would have biased our findings toward the null. Third, the physician primary practice address may not always correspond to a walk-in clinic location. Fourth, some communities and care teams were not included in our study as they do not appear in claims-based data. This includes Indigenous communities,<sup>66</sup> as well as Community Health Centres, which care for under 2% of the population.<sup>14</sup> Finally, changes in walk-in clinic physician services since 2019 could not

be determined, but access to longitudinal, comprehensive primary care has worsened since the pandemic.<sup>67,68</sup>

## **Conclusion**

Physicians who primarily work in walk-in clinics fill gaps in the system by seeing unattached and underserved patients, albeit in an episodic model that is not designed to support preventive care, or the ongoing management of chronic disease. Over half of walk-in clinic physicians' encounters are with patients who were enrolled to another practice, suggesting that access barriers could explain some of this walk-in clinic use.



**Table 1.** Characteristics of Walk-In Clinic vs. Longitudinal Family Physicians in 2019.

Physician Characteristics	Walk-In Clinic Physicians N = 597	Longitudinal Family Physicians N = 9,137	Standardized Mean Difference
<b>Walk-in clinic setting is a practice setting, n (%)</b>	597 (100)	1,085 (11.9)	-
<b>Years in practice, n (%)</b>			
Mean ± SD	25.5 ± 14.8	23.8 ± 13.4	0.12
Median (IQR)	25 (13-37)	24 (11-34)	NA
0 to 5	51 (8.5)	743 (8.1)	0.02
6 to 10	76 (12.7)	1,399 (15.3)	0.07
11 to 20	118 (19.8)	1,740 (19.0)	0.02
21 to 30	131 (21.9)	2,143 (23.5)	0.04
31 plus	221 (37.0)	3,112 (34.1)	0.06
<b>Male, n (%)</b>	399 (66.8)	4,487 (49.1)	0.37
<b>Language Spoken, n (%)</b>			
English and French	47 (7.9)	1,015 (11.1)	0.11
English and another language (not French)	255 (42.7)	2,888 (31.6)	0.23
English only	295 (49.4)	5,234 (57.3)	0.16
<b>Number of practice addresses, n (%)</b>			
Mean ± SD	1.8 ± 1.6	1.3 ± 0.7	0.36
Median (IQR)	1 (1-2)	1 (1-1)	NA
1	334 (55.9)	7,115 (77.9)	0.48
2	164 (27.5)	1,474 (16.1)	0.28
3	61 (10.2)	382 (4.2)	0.24
4+	38 (6.4)	166 (1.8)	0.23
<b>Primary practice location, n (%)</b>			
Large Urban	543 (91.0)	7,068 (77.4)	0.38
Small Urban	16 (2.7)	425 (4.7)	0.11
Rural	34 (5.7)	1,573 (17.2)	0.37
Missing	4 (0.7)	71 (0.8)	0.01
<b>Patient enrolment model type, n (%)</b>			
Enhanced fee-for-service	201 (33.7)	2,538 (27.8)	0.13
Non-team capitation	16 (2.7)	2,742 (30.0)	0.80
Team capitation	12 (2.0)	2,479 (27.1)	0.76
Other Group	0	85 (0.9)	0.14
No Group	366 (61.3)	1,250 (13.7)	1.13
Missing	2 (0.3)	43 (0.5)	0.02
<b>Percent of income from fee-for-service, n (%)</b>			
Mean ± SD	89.2 ± 20.5	44.1 ± 35.7	1.55
Median (IQR)	98 (89-100)	26 (12-82)	NA
0 to 25%	22 (3.7)	4,501 (49.3)	1.21

>25% to 50%	21 (3.5)	891 (9.8)	0.25
>50% to 75%	31 (5.2)	604 (6.6)	0.06
>75% to 100%	521 (87.3)	3,103 (34.0)	1.30
Missing	2 (0.3)	38 (0.4)	0.01
<b>Days worked in all locations, n (%)</b>			
Mean ± SD	201.9 ± 74.4	230.9 ± 58.0	0.44
Median (IQR)	210 (144-260)	240 (200-271)	NA
Less than or equal to 60 days	15 (2.5)	88 (1.0)	0.12
61 to 120 days	90 (15.1)	487 (5.3)	0.33
121 to 180 days	120 (20.1)	1,039 (11.4)	0.24
181 to 240 days	166 (27.8)	2,981 (32.6)	0.11
241 to 300 days	159 (26.6)	3,843 (42.1)	0.33
301 plus days	47 (7.9)	699 (7.7)	0.01
<b>Days worked in an office setting, n (%)</b>			
Mean ± SD	188.2 ± 75.6	184.8 ± 56.3	0.05
Median (IQR)	196 (125-250)	190 (152-223)	NA
Less than or equal to 60 days	33 (5.5)	291 (3.2)	0.12
61 to 120 days	108 (18.1)	979 (10.7)	0.21
121 to 180 days	123 (20.6)	2,674 (29.3)	0.20
181 to 240 days	160 (26.8)	3,978 (43.5)	0.36
241 to 300 days	141 (23.6)	1,123 (12.3)	0.30
301 plus days	32 (5.4)	92 (1.0)	0.25
<b>Number of patients seen in office in 2019</b>			
Mean ± SD	4,112 ± 3,091	1,521 ± 1,152	1.11
Median (IQR)	3,475 (1,839-5,537)	1,218 (855-1,750)	NA
<b>Number of office encounters in 2019</b>			
Mean ± SD	6,514 ± 5,130	3,788 ± 2,839	0.66
Median (IQR)	5,379 (2,780-8,884)	3,024 (1,985-4,687)	NA
<b>Median number of patients seen in a day of office encounters</b>			
Mean ± SD	31.6 ± 17.1	19.2 ± 10.6	0.88
Median (IQR)	29 (20-40)	17 (12-23)	NA
0 to 15, n (%)	78 (13.1)	3,977 (43.5)	0.72
16 to 30, n (%)	249 (41.7)	4,014 (43.9)	0.05
31 to 45, n (%)	169 (28.3)	832 (9.1)	0.51
46 to 60, n (%)	65 (10.9)	205 (2.2)	0.35
61 plus, n (%)	33 (5.5)	69 (0.8)	0.28
Missing, n (%)	3 (0.5)	40 (0.4)	0.01
<b>Physician-level continuity, n (%)</b>			
Mean ± SD	0.1 ± 0.2	0.6 ± 0.3	1.98
Median (IQR)	0 (0-0)	1 (0-1)	NA
0 to 0.1 (Lowest)	455 (76.2)	1,455 (15.9)	1.52
>0.1 to 0.3	94 (15.7)	625 (6.8)	0.28

>0.3 to 0.5	32 (5.4)	1,031 (11.3)	0.22
>0.5 to 0.7	8 (1.3)	1,796 (19.7)	0.63
>0.7 to 0.9	8 (1.3)	3,132 (34.3)	0.95
>0.9 (Highest)	0	1,032 (11.3)	0.51
No visits	0	66 (0.7)	0.12
<b>Physician and group-level continuity, n (%)</b>			
Mean $\pm$ SD	0.1 $\pm$ 0.2	0.7 $\pm$ 7.6	0.12
Median (IQR)	0 (0-0)	1 (0-1)	NA
0 to 0.1 (Lowest)	454 (76.0)	1,440 (15.8)	1.52
>0.1 to 0.3	91 (15.2)	591 (6.5)	0.29
>0.3 to 0.5	33 (5.5)	906 (9.9)	0.17
>0.5 to 0.7	9 (1.5)	1,675 (18.3)	0.59
>0.7 to 0.9	*5-9	3,119 (34.1)	0.96
>0.9 (Highest)	*1-5	1,340 (14.7)	0.56
No visits	0	66 (0.7)	0.12

**Table 2.** Encounter-Level Patient Enrolment Characteristics of Walk-In Clinic vs. Longitudinal Family Physicians in 2019.

<b>Encounter-Level Patient Enrolment Characteristics</b>	<b>Walk-In Clinic Physician Encounters (All) N = 3,888,986</b>	<b>Longitudinal Family Physician Encounters N = 34,231,797</b>	<b>Standardized Mean Difference</b>
<b>Encounters with... n (%)</b>			
... patients formally enrolled to encounter physician	485,144 (12.5)	21,216,973 (62.0)	1.19
... patients formally enrolled to encounter physician or their group	505,834 (13.0)	22,151,085 (64.7)	1.25
... patients not formally enrolled to encounter physician or their group	3,383,152 (87.0)	12,080,712 (35.3)	1.25
... patients formally enrolled to another physician and group	2,098,330 (54.0)	6,254,392 (18.3)	0.80
... patients without a formally enrolling physician	1,284,822 (33.0)	5,826,320 (17.0)	0.38

**Table 3.** Top 10 OHIP Diagnoses Billed by Walk-In Clinic Physicians (walk-in encounters\*), versus Longitudinal Family Physicians (all office encounters) in 2019.

<b>Diagnoses from Walk-In Clinic Physician Encounters, n (%) N = 3,427,511</b>	<b>Diagnoses from Longitudinal Family Physician Encounters N = 34,231,797</b>
Acute nasopharyngitis, common cold 413,757 (12.1)	Essential, benign hypertension 2,175,602 (6.4)
Other ill-defined conditions 202,667 (5.9)	Mental health <sup>c</sup> 1,960,003 (5.7)
Acute bronchitis 114,844 (3.4)	Diabetes mellitus including complications 1,864,273 (5.5)
Musculoskeletal symptoms other than back pain <sup>a</sup> 101,327 (3.0)	Acute nasopharyngitis, common cold 1,757,705 (5.1)
Gastrointestinal symptoms <sup>b</sup> 98,834 (2.9)	Other ill-defined conditions 1,561,174 (4.6)
Mental health <sup>c</sup> 94,239 (2.8)	Musculoskeletal symptoms other than back pain <sup>a</sup> 1,183,028 (3.5)
Essential, benign hypertension 89,947 (2.6)	Gastrointestinal symptoms <sup>b</sup> 999,210 (2.9)
Acute sinusitis 88,064 (2.6)	Eczema, dermatitis 619,369 (1.8)
Eczema, dermatitis 78,698 (2.3)	Immunization – All types 589,202 (1.7)
Immunization – All types 76,312 (2.2)	Well baby care 587,608 (1.7)

\* Excludes encounters with their enrolled patients

<sup>a</sup> Musculoskeletal symptoms other than back pain = “Leg cramps, leg pain, muscle pain, joint pain, arthralgia, joint swelling, masses”

<sup>b</sup> Gastrointestinal symptoms = “Anorexia, nausea and vomiting, heartburn, dysphagia, hiccough, hematemesis, jaundice, ascites, abdominal pain, melena, masses”


<sup>c</sup> Mental health = “Anxiety, neurosis, hysteria, neurasthenia, obsessive compulsive neurosis, reactive depression”

**Table 4.** Encounter-Level Patient Characteristics of Walk-In Clinic Physicians (Non-Enrolled Patients Only) vs. Longitudinal Family Physicians (All Patients) in 2019.

<b>Encounter-Level Patient Characteristics</b>	<b>Walk-In Clinic Physician Encounters N = 3,427,511</b>	<b>Longitudinal Family Physician Encounters N = 34,231,797</b>	<b>Standardized Mean Difference</b>
<b>Patient age in years at encounter</b>			
Mean ± SD	37.1 ± 21.2	47.2 ± 23.4	0.45
Median (IQR)	35 (22-53)	50 (30-65)	NA
<b>Patient female sex, n (%)</b>	1,922,428 (56.1)	19,828,106 (57.9)	0.04
<b>Patient census-based neighbourhood income quintile, n (%)</b>			
1 (Lowest)	766,860 (22.4)	6,768,576 (19.8)	0.06
2	701,452 (20.5)	6,891,240 (20.1)	0.01
3	717,575 (20.9)	7,077,319 (20.7)	0.01
4	661,496 (19.3)	6,886,621 (20.1)	0.02
5 (Highest)	563,160 (16.4)	6,471,876 (18.9)	0.07
Missing	16,968 (0.5)	136,165 (0.4)	0.02
<b>Patient dependency quintile, n (%)</b>			
1 (Lowest)	1,238,611 (36.1)	9,929,547 (29.0)	0.15
2	754,396 (22.0)	7,017,074 (20.5)	0.04
3	547,554 (16.0)	5,762,803 (16.8)	0.02
4	464,452 (13.6)	5,473,911 (16.0)	0.07
5 (Highest)	398,464 (11.6)	5,807,265 (17.0)	0.15
Missing	24,034 (0.7)	241,197 (0.7)	0
<b>Patient neighbourhood material deprivation quintile, n (%)</b>			
1 (Lowest)	689,057 (20.1)	7,546,114 (22.0)	0.05
2	687,760 (20.1)	7,133,314 (20.8)	0.02
3	647,660 (18.9)	6,548,203 (19.1)	0.01
4	661,218 (19.3)	6,314,022 (18.4)	0.02
5 (Highest)	717,782 (20.9)	6,448,947 (18.8)	0.05
Missing	24,034 (0.7)	241,197 (0.7)	0
<b>Patient neighbourhood ethnic diversity quintile, n (%)</b>			
1 (Lowest)	205,441 (6.0)	4,066,247 (11.9)	0.21
2	334,319 (9.8)	4,821,205 (14.1)	0.13
3	514,920 (15.0)	5,739,671 (16.8)	0.05
4	818,525 (23.9)	7,345,046 (21.5)	0.06
5 (Highest)	1,530,272 (44.6)	12,018,431 (35.1)	0.20
Missing	24,034 (0.7)	241,197 (0.7)	0
<b>Patient neighbourhood residential instability quintile, n (%)</b>			
1 (Lowest)	903,757 (26.4)	8,224,984 (24.0)	0.05
2	546,543 (15.9)	6,191,466 (18.1)	0.06
3	504,954 (14.7)	5,907,334 (17.3)	0.07
4	526,707 (15.4)	5,813,679 (17.0)	0.04


5 (Highest)	921,516 (26.9)	7,853,137 (22.9)	0.09
Missing	24,034 (0.7)	241,197 (0.7)	0
<b>Recent insurance registrant (&lt;10 years), n (%)</b>	430,960 (12.6)	3,063,742 (8.9)	0.12
<b>Patient residence location, n (%)</b>			
Large Urban	2,989,435 (87.2)	26,499,077 (77.4)	0.26
Small Urban	35,625 (1.0)	1,406,353 (4.1)	0.20
Rural	287,350 (8.4)	5,271,368 (15.4)	0.22
Missing	103,253 (3.0)	890,681 (2.6)	0.03
Unknown	11,848 (0.3)	164,318 (0.5)	0.02
<b>Patient resource utilization band, n (%)</b>			
High	495,295 (14.5)	6,427,893 (18.8)	0.12
Moderate	1,900,331 (55.4)	20,049,104 (58.6)	0.06
Low	1,031,885 (30.1)	7,754,800 (22.7)	0.17
<b>Patient ADG score, n (%)</b>			
High	192,677 (5.6)	1,973,973 (5.8%)	0.01
Moderate	947,119 (27.6)	9,837,567 (28.7%)	0.03
Low	2,287,715 (66.7)	22,420,257 (65.5%)	0.03

**Figure 1.** Flowchart of Family Physicians Included. **NB:** Physicians who met the definition for comprehensive practice and also practiced in a walk-in clinic setting some of the time, but did not meet the definition for “walk-in clinic physicians” listed above were included in the longitudinal family physician group.





**Figure 2.** Proportion of Patients Without a Family Physician (per 1,000 Patients) Overlaid with Walk-In Clinic Physician Primary Practice Locations in Ontario, Canada.



*Note.* Circle size reflects the number of walk-in clinic physicians with a primary practice location within a forward sortation area (FSA, first 3 digits of postal code). Colour of FSA reflects the proportion of patients without a family physician (non-enrolled) per 1,000 patients on a scale from 0 to 300.  $n = 11$  physicians were missing an FSA and  $n = 2$  physicians had a primary practice location outside of Ontario (not plotted). Total  $N = 584$  physicians.

## References

1. Government of Canada SC. Primary health care providers, 2019. Published October 22, 2020. Accessed January 13, 2023. <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/82-625-x/2020001/article/00004-eng.htm>
2. Canadian Institute for Health Information. *How Canada Compares: Results From The Commonwealth Fund's 2016 International Health Policy Survey of Adults in 11 Countries - Accessible Report*. Ottawa, ON: CIHI; 2017.
3. Kiran T, Green ME, DeWit Y, et al. Association of physician payment model and team-based care with timely access in primary care: a population-based cross-sectional study. *Can Med Assoc Open Access J*. 2020;8(2):E328-E337. doi:10.9778/cmajo.20190063
4. Jones M. Walk-in primary medical care centres: lessons from Canada. *BMJ*. 2000;321(7266):928-931. doi:10.1136/bmj.321.7266.928
5. Bell NR, Szafran O. Use of walk-in clinics by family practice patients: Who is using this health care service? *Can Fam Physician*. 1992;38:507-513.
6. Williams AP, Barnsley J, Vayda E, Kaczorowski J, Østbye T, Wenghofer E. Comparing the characteristics and attitudes of physicians in different primary care settings: The Ontario Walk-in Clinic Study. *Fam Pract*. 2002;19(6):647-657. doi:10.1093/fampra/19.6.647
7. Health Quality Ontario. Measuring Up 2018. Published online 2018. Accessed January 5, 2021. <http://www.hqontario.ca/Portals/0/Documents/pr/measuring-up-2018-en.pdf>
8. Lapointe-Shaw L, Kiran T, Salahub C, et al. Walk-in clinic patient characteristics and utilization patterns in Ontario, Canada: a cross-sectional study. *Can Med Assoc Open Access J*. 2023;11(2):E345-E356. doi:10.9778/cmajo.20220095
9. Haggerty JL, Reid RJ, Freeman GK, Starfield BH, Adair CE, McKendry R. Continuity of care: a multidisciplinary review. *BMJ*. 2003;327(7425):1219-1221. doi:10.1136/bmj.327.7425.1219
10. Hedden L, Banihosseini S, Strydom N, McCracken R. Modern work patterns of "classic" versus millennial family doctors and their effect on workforce planning for community-based primary care: a cross-sectional survey. *Hum Resour Health*. 2020;18(1):67. doi:10.1186/s12960-020-00508-5
11. Lavergne MR, Peterson S, McKendry R, Sivananthan S, McGrail K. Full-service family practice in British Columbia: policy interventions and trends in practice, 1991-2010. *Heal Policy*. 2014;9(4):32-47.
12. Rudoler D, Peterson S, Stock D, et al. Changes over time in patient visits and continuity of care among graduating cohorts of family physicians in 4 Canadian provinces. *CMAJ*. 2022;194(48):E1639-E1646. doi:10.1503/cmaj.220439
13. Lavergne MR, Rudoler D, Peterson S, et al. Declining Comprehensiveness of Services Delivered by Canadian Family Physicians Is Not Driven by Early-Career Physicians. *Ann Fam Med*. 2023;21(2):151-156. doi:10.1370/afm.2945
14. Kiran T, Wang R, Handford C, et al. Family physician practice patterns during COVID-19 and future intentions: Cross-sectional survey in Ontario, Canada. *Can Fam Physician*. 2022;68(11):836-846. doi:10.46747/cfp.6811836
15. Rubin R. COVID-19's Crushing Effects on Medical Practices, Some of Which Might Not Survive. *JAMA*. 2020;324(4):321-323. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.11254
16. Couto Zuber M. Nearly 75 per cent of Ontario doctors experienced burnout during pandemic, survey finds. Canadian Press. Published August 18, 2021. Accessed January 17, 2023. <https://toronto.ctvnews.ca/nearly-75-per-cent-of-ontario-doctors-experienced-burnout-during-pandemic-survey-finds-1.5552218>
17. Buerhaus PI, Auerbach DI, Staiger DO. Older Clinicians and the Surge in Novel Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *JAMA*. 2020;323(18):1777-1778. doi:10.1001/jama.2020.4978

18. 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. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-056868
19. *CPSO Annual Report 2019*. College of Physicians and Surgeons of Ontario Accessed June 7, 2023. <https://viewer.joomag.com/annual-report-2019/0540650001597960535>
20. *Primary Care Data Reports for Ontario Health Teams (OHTs) Inspire-PHC.*; 2023. Accessed March 2, 2023. <https://www.ontariohealthprofiles.ca/ontarioHealthTeam.php>
21. OurCare. OurCare. Accessed June 13, 2023. <https://www.ourcare.ca>
22. 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;35(6):733-743. doi:10.1108/JHOM-05-2020-0171
23. Kiran T, Kopp A, Glazier RH. Those left behind from voluntary medical home reforms in Ontario, Canada. *Ann Fam Med*. 2016;14(6):517. doi:10.1370/afm.2000
24. Glazier RH, Kopp A, Schultz SE, Henry TK and DA. All the Right Intentions but Few of the Desired Results: Lessons on Access to Primary Care from Ontario's Patient Enrolment Models. *Healthc Q*. 2012;15(3).
25. 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. doi:10.1503/cmaj.150579
26. CPSO - Annual Membership Renewal. Accessed September 8, 2023. <https://www.cpso.on.ca/Physicians/Your-Practice/Registration-Renewals-and-Incorporation/Annual-Membership-Renewal>
27. 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. doi:10.9778/cmajo.20170083
28. Matheson F, Moloney G, van Ingen T. *2021 Ontario Marginalization Index: User Guide*. St. Michael's Hospital (Unity Health Toronto); 2023:Joint publication with Public Health Ontario. Accessed September 8, 2023. [https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/Documents/O/2017/on-marg-userguide.pdf?rev=b238de7466c24dfcb96f032e6dca3ba3&sc\\_lang=en&hash=75302AF52A3642B88B34D4AE8C4C29FA](https://www.publichealthontario.ca/-/media/Documents/O/2017/on-marg-userguide.pdf?rev=b238de7466c24dfcb96f032e6dca3ba3&sc_lang=en&hash=75302AF52A3642B88B34D4AE8C4C29FA)
29. Ontario Marginalization Index (ON-Marg). Public Health Ontario. Accessed March 2, 2023. <https://www.publichealthontario.ca/en/Data-and-Analysis/Health-Equity/Ontario-Marginalization-Index>
30. Johns Hopkins ACG® System. Johns Hopkins ACG® System. Accessed October 26, 2021. <https://www.hopkinsacg.org/>
31. Austin PC. Using the Standardized Difference to Compare the Prevalence of a Binary Variable Between Two Groups in Observational Research. *Commun Stat - Simul Comput*. 2009;38(6):1228-1234. doi:10.1080/03610910902859574
32. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) Statement: Guidelines for Reporting Observational Studies. *Ann Intern Med*. 2007;147(8):573-577. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-147-8-200710160-00010
33. Lapointe-Shaw L, Salahub C, Bird C, et al. Characteristics and health care use of patients attending virtual walk-in clinics in Ontario, Canada: Cross-sectional analysis. *J Med Internet Res*. 2023;25(1):e40267. doi:10.2196/40267
34. McGrail K, Lavergne R, Lewis SJ, Peterson SL, Barer M, Garrison SR. Classifying physician practice style: a new approach using administrative data in British Columbia. *Med Care*. 2015;53(3):276-282. doi:10.1097/mlr.0000000000000310

35. Lavergne MR, Gonzalez A, Ahuja MA, Hedden L, McCracken R. The relationship between gender, parenthood and practice intentions among family medicine residents: cross-sectional analysis of national Canadian survey data. *Hum Resour Health*. 2019;17(1):67. doi:10.1186/s12960-019-0396-y
36. Lofters AK, Moineddin R, Hwang SW, Glazier RH. Low Rates of Cervical Cancer Screening Among Urban Immigrants: A Population-Based Study in Ontario, Canada. *Med Care*. 2010;48(7):611-618.
37. Vahabi M, Lofters A, Kumar M, Glazier RH. Breast cancer screening disparities among urban immigrants: a population-based study in Ontario, Canada. *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15(1):679. doi:10.1186/s12889-015-2050-5
38. Lofters AK, Kopp A, Vahabi M, Glazier RH. Understanding those overdue for cancer screening by five years or more: A retrospective cohort study in Ontario, Canada. *Prev Med*. 2019;129:105816. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2019.105816
39. Hyman I, Patychuk D, Zaidi Q, et al. Self-management, health service use and information seeking for diabetes care among recent immigrants in Toronto. *Chronic Dis Inj Can*. 2012;33(1):12-18.
40. Veenstra G, Patterson AC. South Asian-White health inequalities in Canada: Intersections with gender and immigrant status. *Ethn Health*. 2016;21(6):639-648. doi:10.1080/13557858.2016.1179725
41. Greenaway C, Azoulay L, Allard R, et al. A population-based study of chronic hepatitis C in immigrants and non-immigrants in Quebec, Canada. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2017;17(1):140. doi:10.1186/s12879-017-2242-y
42. Jin K, Ding D, Gullick J, Koo F, Neubeck L. A Chinese Immigrant Paradox? Low Coronary Heart Disease Incidence but Higher Short-Term Mortality in Western-Dwelling Chinese Immigrants: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2015;4(12):e002568. doi:10.1161/JAHA.115.002568
43. Newbold KB, Danforth J. Health status and Canada's immigrant population. *Soc Sci Med*. 2003;57(10):1981-1995. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(03)00064-9
44. Pollack CE, Armstrong K. The geographic accessibility of retail clinics for underserved populations. *Arch Intern Med*. 2009;169(10):945-949; discussion 950-953. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2009.69
45. Rudavsky R, Mehrotra A. Sociodemographic characteristics of communities served by retail clinics. *J Am Board Fam Med JABFM*. 2010;23(1):42-48. doi:10.3122/jabfm.2010.01.090033
46. Reid RO, Ashwood JS, Friedberg MW, Weber ES, Setodji CM, Mehrotra A. Retail Clinic Visits and Receipt of Primary Care. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2013;28(4):504-512. doi:10.1007/s11606-012-2243-x
47. Ashwood JS, Reid RO, Setodji CM, Weber E, Gaynor M, Mehrotra A. Trends in Retail Clinic Use Among The Commercially Insured. *Am J Manag Care*. 2011;17(11):e443-e448.
48. Mehrotra A, Wang MC, Lave JR, Adams JL, McGlynn EA. Retail Clinics, Primary Care Physicians, And Emergency Departments: A Comparison Of Patients' Visits. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2008;27(5):1272-1282. doi:10.1377/hlthaff.27.5.1272
49. Ruud SE, Hjortdahl P, Natvig B. Is it a matter of urgency? A survey of assessments by walk-in patients and doctors of the urgency level of their encounters at a general emergency outpatient clinic in Oslo, Norway. *BMC Emerg Med*. 2016;16(1):22. doi:10.1186/s12873-016-0086-1
50. Wärdig R, Hadziabdic E, Hjelm K. Evaluation of a healthcare walk-in centre in an immigrant-dense area from the perspective of Swedish-born patients. *Prim Health Care Res Dev*. 2021;22:e16. doi:10.1017/S1463423621000189
51. Ravichandiran N, Mathews M, Ryan BL. Utilization of healthcare by immigrants in Canada: a cross-sectional analysis of the Canadian Community Health Survey. *BMC Prim Care*. 2022;23:69. doi:10.1186/s12875-022-01682-2
52. Wang L, Rosenberg M, Lo L. Ethnicity and utilization of family physicians: A case study of Mainland Chinese immigrants in Toronto, Canada. *Soc Sci Med*. 2008;67(9):1410-1422. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.06.012

53. Rahman B, Costa A, Gayowsky A, et al. The association between patients' timely access to their usual primary care physician and use of walk-in clinics in Ontario, Canada: a cross-sectional study. *CMAJ Open*. 2023;In Press.
54. Dahlgren C, Dackehag M, Wändell P, Rehnberg C. Simply the best? The impact of quality on choice of primary healthcare provider in Sweden. *Health Policy*. 2021;125(11):1448-1454. doi:10.1016/j.healthpol.2021.09.009
55. Wammes J, Stadhouders N, Westert G. International Health Care System Profiles: Netherlands. Published June 5, 2020. Accessed July 4, 2023. <https://www.commonwealthfund.org/international-health-policy-center/countries/netherlands>
56. Hasvold T, Christensen B. Norway. In: *Building Primary Care in a Changing Europe: Case Studies [Internet]*. European Observatory on Health Systems and Policies; 2015. Accessed July 4, 2023. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK459031/>
57. World Health Organization. Regional Office for Europe, Policies EO on HS and, Keskimäki I, et al. *Finland: Health System Review*. World Health Organization. Regional Office for Europe; 2019. Accessed July 4, 2023. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/327538>
58. Ruud SE, Hjordahl P, Natvig B. Reasons for attending a general emergency outpatient clinic versus a regular general practitioner – a survey among immigrant and native walk-in patients in Oslo, Norway. *Scand J Prim Health Care*. 2017;35(1):35-45. doi:10.1080/02813432.2017.1288817
59. Sperre Saunes I. International Health Care System Profiles: Norway. Published June 5, 2020. Accessed July 4, 2023. <https://www.commonwealthfund.org/international-health-policy-center/countries/norway>
60. Smits M, Rutten M, Keizer E, Wensing M, Westert G, Giesen P. The Development and Performance of After-Hours Primary Care in the Netherlands: A Narrative Review. *Ann Intern Med*. 2017;166(10):737-742. doi:10.7326/M16-2776
61. Glenngård AH. International Health Care System Profiles: Sweden. Published June 5, 2020. Accessed July 4, 2023. <https://www.commonwealthfund.org/international-health-policy-center/countries/sweden>
62. Göransson M, Persson AC, Abellsson A. Triage in primary healthcare. *Nord J Nurs Res*. 2020;40(4):213-220. doi:10.1177/2057158520909451
63. Giesen P, Smits M, Huibers L, Grol R, Wensing M. Quality of After-Hours Primary Care in the Netherlands: A Narrative Review. *Ann Intern Med*. 2011;155(2):108-113. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-155-2-201107190-00006
64. Brown JB, Bouck LMS, Østbye T, Barnsley JM, Mathews M, Ogilvie G. Walk-in clinics in Ontario. An atmosphere of tension. *Can Fam Physician*. 2002;48(3):531-536.
65. Terpou BA, Lapointe-Shaw L, Wang R, et al. An environment of uncertainty: Understanding the experiences of walk-in physicians amid worsening primary care access in Ontario, Canada. Published online May 1, 2023.
66. Government of Canada. About the Non-Insured Health Benefits program. Published December 19, 2019. Accessed July 4, 2023. <https://www.sac-isc.gc.ca/eng/1576790320164/1576790364553>
67. 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. doi:10.1370/afm.2865
68. Ontario Medical Association. Ontario's doctors say primary care is in crisis, burnout at record levels. Ontario Medical Association (OMA). Published May 31, 2023. Accessed September 26, 2023. <https://www.oma.org/newsroom/news/2023/may/ontarios-doctors-say-primary-care-is-in-crisis-burnout-at-record-levels/>