Primary health center unit closures following the Finnish administrative reform: A multilevel analysis of determinants

Authors: Visa VÄISÄNEN [1,2] (Corresponding author), visa.vaisanen@thl.fi

Liina-Kaisa Tynkkynen [1], liina-kaisa.tynkkynen@thl.fi

Konsta Lavaste [1], konsta.lavaste@thl.fi

Timo Sinervo [1], timo.sinervo@thl.fi

Affiliations:

[1] Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare, Welfare State Research unit, Health and Social Service System Research team, Mannerheimintie 166, 00330, Helsinki, Finland.

[2] University of Eastern Finland, Faculty of Social Sciences and Business Studies, Department of Health and Social Management, Yliopistonranta 8 E, 70210, Kuopio, Finland.

Abstract

Background: Accessible primary healthcare (PHC) is a cornerstone of health systems, but various factors, such as health system reforms, can influence service organization. Following the recent Finnish administrative reform, the new wellbeing services counties are currently adjusting their PHC service networks, resulting in closures of PHC service points. Our aim was to examine the determinants of PHC center unit closure decisions.

Methods: Health center unit closure decisions were extracted from policy documents. Publicly available municipality and county-level register data were utilized, encompassing population

characteristics, geographics, service network, and reform-related factors. Multilevel logistic regression was conducted to analyze the factors associated with closures in the area of a municipality.

Results: Out of 295 municipalities, 82 were facing health center unit closures, with 45 left without a unit (previously four). A higher number of current (public) health centers (OR: 15.17, CI: 5.51–41.80), better medical desert index value (OR: 1.90, CI: 1.27–2.83), and the county being a new actor with no previous joint administration (OR: 10.95, CI: 1.15–104.33) were associated with closure decisions. Higher number of private clinics (OR: 0.22, CI: 0.05–0.94) and greater population growth (OR: 0.21, CI: 0.08–0.53) were associated with lower odds of closure.

Conclusions: The planned health center unit closures appear reasonably well targeted. Counties with no previous collaboration between municipalities face accumulated service reform needs, leading to more significant changes in their PHC service networks. Similar future reforms should consider previous administrative structures and current service networks to facilitate the implementation process.

Keywords: Primary healthcare, health center, health facility closure, organizational decision making, healthcare reform, public healthcare

Word count: 3929

1. Introduction

Reforms and policy changes serve as important ways to develop and advance health systems. Reforms can be small or large in scale and slow or rapid in pace [1], and are guided by varying theoretical and strategic approaches [2]. Present health system reform needs in high-income countries are primarily driven by demographic changes, mainly ageing, which challenge both financial sustainability and the current ways to provide services [3–5]. Additionally, the growing burden of chronic diseases [6], external and internal crises [7], and advancements in medicine [8] pose challenges to health systems' resilience. In European countries with universal health systems, the aims of reform planning and implementation have focused on improving the efficiency and, more recently, the quality of care [9]. Reforms have especially concentrated on strengthening primary healthcare (PHC), changing governance structures, and centralizing hospital networks [10]. Previous discussions on re-centralization and decentralization of healthcare services [11] are accelerating, with countries attempting to balance local know-how and national governance aims emphasizing efficiency, equity, and sustainability (e.g., [12–14]).

Health system reforms can have implicit or explicit repercussions for PHC service networks. For instance, health system reforms after the 2008 financial crisis focused on re-centralization and cost containment [7], which had widespread negative effects on availability of care, mainly due to longer waiting times and higher out-of-pocket payments, but also due to changes in service networks [15,16]. In England, encouraged (mainly financially) by the National Health Service long term plan [17,18], general practitioner (GP) practices have formed into larger primary care networks [19], and simultaneously many practices are continuing to face closures [20]. These reforms highlight the pursuit of economies of scale by utilizing larger care units and multidisciplinary practices. The trend towards more centralized PHC provision is further accelerated by the growing private equity investment in the European health sector, which has the potential to increase market consolidation [21]. PHC service networks can also be affected by more incremental reforms, such as development

of provider incentives [22,23] and quota-based systems [24]. For example, while the Swedish patient choice reform initially concentrated PHC services towards more affluent urban areas, certain provider incentives have been successful in attracting clinics also to underserved rural areas [25,26]. In health systems with strong reliance on public provision of PHC, service networks can be steered and reformed through centralized decisions on the locations of service providers. However, this task concurrently grapples with the realities of cost-containment and efficiency aims, politics, and workforce availability.

The current reform trends, in tandem with the continuing urbanization [27] and peri-urbanization [28], are likely resulting in an increasing frequency of PHC center or GP clinic closures or mergers across Europe in the coming years. Recent literature examining practice closures in PHC has largely focused on outcomes such as service utilization and population health impacts. Research has found the remaining GP practices growing in size [20], a decline in patient satisfaction [20], and a potential shift towards emergency and acute services, especially among vulnerable groups [29]. Literature also suggests that most clients successfully transition to new services with no perceived differences in quality of care [30], and that the newly re-matched clients might begin treatments due to a reassessment of care needs, potentially leading to improved care and health outcomes [31].

Despite the growing trend of reforming PHC service networks, the determinants of PHC unit closures have been scarcely examined, and thus, the factors guiding and influencing local-level service planning remain unidentified. This is of special relevance in tax-funded health systems, where public stewardship and local or regional policymakers can directly decide on the service networks. The recent administrative health system reform in Finland and the subsequent service network reformation enable examining the decision-making processes related to PHC center unit closures.

The Finnish health and social care reform came into effect in the beginning of 2023. Previously PHC and social services were organized by the 309 municipalities (or joint authorities formed by

the municipalities) and specialized care by 20 hospital districts, both funded mainly by municipal tax and government subsidies. The 2023 reform transferred all the previously fragmented responsibilities to 21 new autonomous wellbeing services counties (WSC) governed by elected council members and funded almost entirely by the national government. The capital city of Helsinki (hereafter, referred to as a WSC) continues to organize its own services. In the capital region (Uusimaa), the specialized care for the five WSCs in the area is organized jointly by the HUS Group joint authority. The reform goals were to ensure equal services for all residents, improve the accessibility of services, and to curb the growth of the costs. However, the reform implementation has been challenging, with virtually all WSCs facing large budgetary deficits caused by multiple factors, including inflation, IT and pay harmonization, and a historic underreporting of costs by municipalities [32]. As the funding comes from the government, budget deficits must be covered through expenditure cuts. Simultaneously, the WSCs inherited the PHC service networks designed for the system run by the municipalities. Therefore, one of the first tasks of the WSCs was to adapt their service networks to accommodate the new administrative structure. These factors have led to most WSCs planning and implementing saving plans, which are also affecting PHC service networks, including closures of health center units.

Health centers are the main providers of comprehensive primary care services in Finland. They consist of larger centers and smaller units, in which salaried GPs and nurses provide a varying set of primary care services that all residents in Finland are entitled to [33]. The services provided differ significantly between larger healthcare and social welfare centers and smaller units, of which the latter might offer only limited ambulatory services. Pre-reform service provision centered around health center units, with virtually all municipalities having at least one. In the Finnish PHC, nurses play a major role in providing care, and they often act as gatekeepers for seeing a physician, who then act as gatekeepers to specialist care. Due to the occupational healthcare scheme and voluntary private health insurance, the population served by the health centers is biased towards those outside

employment, pensioners, and people with lower socioeconomic status. Despite this, the centers remain a central pillar of PHC services in Finland, which in addition to outpatient medical services, provide multidisciplinary care for chronic diseases and mental health and substance use [33].

The planned closures have sparked lively discussion among policymakers and the general public. As health center units are both historically and culturally rooted in the municipalities' identities, many residents fear that potential closures signal the withering of services in general [34]. The WSCs have justified and emphasized the necessity of reorganizing the PHC service networks with aims of modernizing services, ensuring sufficient workforce, and improving the provided care, while downplaying the fiscal pressures. Meanwhile, other WSCs have opted to maintain their existing service networks. The situation presents a unique opportunity to investigate decision-making in the newly established WSCs and gather evidence of the PHC center closures. In response to the gap identified in the research literature, we aimed to exploit the ongoing reform implementation to analyze policy and decision-making related to health center unit closures. Two research questions were formulated:

1. Which municipality- and WSC-level factors are associated with the decision to close a health center unit in the area of a municipality?
2. Which factors explain the variation in closure decisions between WSCs?

2. Materials and methods

2.1 Study design

This is an observational study utilizing a multilevel modeling strategy.

2.2 Data collection

Publicly available aggregated register data were retrieved from Statistics Finland, National Land Survey of Finland, and the Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare. WSC websites were accessed for various policy documents, including strategies, service network analyses, and official meeting records and decisions.

The resulting cross-sectional dataset included all Finnish municipalities (excluding those in the autonomous Åland islands) in 2025 (n = 292) as observation units. Additionally, to accommodate for the multilevel structure, the capital city of Helsinki (treated as a WSC) was divided into eight official subdivisions (treated as municipalities) with their own data points.

2.3 Outcome variable

The outcome measure was the planned closure of a health center unit in the area of a municipality, with 1 indicating that at least one health center unit has been or will be closed, and 0 meaning that no closures are planned. Closures were determined by systematically reviewing the WSCs' websites, strategies, service network analyses, as well as WSC councils' meeting notes and decisions, with the latest check conducted on June 10, 2025.

In many cases, the WSCs reduced service networks by downsizing the service portfolios of the health center units rather than closing them entirely. We chose to determine closure based on ambulatory outpatient care: the unit was not identified as closed if a physician was planned to be present at least once a week and a nurse multiple times a week. Additionally, we took the uncertainty of decision making into account by marking closures lacking a political decision or planned for later than 2027 (five years after the reform) as unclear and examining them in the sensitivity analysis.

2.4 Explanatory variables

In accordance with the research literature and the reform implementation, we identified several potential municipality and WSC-level elements which could influence decision-making, presented

in our conceptual framework (Figure 1). As the decision-making occurs in the WSCs, their characteristics and conditions (e.g., fiscal situation) are central. Although municipalities no longer play a role in the health system, the pre-reform service networks were inherited from them, and consequently their role, especially population and geographical characteristics, is still of interest. These municipality and WSC-level factors were supplemented by the overall context, including pre- and post-reform conditions, in addition to previous PHC closures.



Figure 1: Conceptual framework of the study illustrating the factors potentially influencing health center unit closures.

The municipality-level variables consisted of population and geographical characteristics, current service network, and political representation. Population in year 2023, population density (1000 per km²), population growth (%) from 2013 to 2023, and the proportion of residents aged 65 or older were included for population characteristics. Geographical characteristics (in addition to population density) included the previously constructed Finnish medical desert index [35], which comprises needs adjusted care supply data and average travel times to the nearest health center unit. The current service network was characterized by the number of health center units (mostly WSC-owned, but some provision purchased from private providers) and private clinics (purely private services), as well as the number of health center unit closures in the last 10 years. Lastly, to measure for the municipalities' political representation in the regional decision-making, the percentage of

WSC councilmembers from the municipality was used. Weaker spatial political representation has previously been linked to the closure of public services [36].

The WSC-level variables consisted of population and WSC characteristics, economic situation, and political configuration. Additionally, pre- and post-reform conditions, including reform specifications, were included. WSC characteristics included population density (1000 per km²) and the number of municipalities within the WSC. Some municipalities had organized PHC services jointly pre-reform and might consequently have already optimized their networks and retained collaboration structures. Therefore, a patchwork county indicator was included (1 = most municipalities in the WSC previously organized their care jointly, 0 = no previous cooperative service provision). Additionally, the presence of a university hospital (1 = yes) and the capital region (1 = yes), where specialized care is organized jointly (by the HUS Group) rather than WSC-wise, were included as cooperative specialized care provision may influence decision-making regarding the PHC service networks. The overall budgetary deficit or surplus at the end of year 2024 (€ per person) was used to measure the level of austerity, which could drive closure decisions [15,16]. Lastly, to measure the political configuration and power, the seat share of the largest political party was included, with a hypothesis that stronger political blocks could be linked to better decisiveness and governability of decision-making [37,38].

Statistical analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to compare municipalities by health center unit closure status. To examine the determinants of closures, multilevel logistic regression was performed, with a municipality facing health center unit closure or closures as the dependent binary variable. The municipalities (first level) were nested within the WSCs (second level). All continuous independent variables were standardized (Z-score). There was no missing data. Satterthwaite's degrees of freedom method was used to calculate p-values [39] and Akaike information criterion were used to assess model performance. Data management and statistical analyses were performed using R

Statistical Software version 4.2.3 for Windows 11 [40] and packages lme4 [41] and lmerTest [42]. Sensitivity analysis was conducted by including the unconfirmed closure of health center units in addition to a linear modeling strategy (see Supplementary file).

To determine how different factors explain the variation in the local and the WSC-level, a stepwise approach was utilized. First, a null model (0) was constructed. Next, municipality-level variables measuring population characteristics (1) and current service network (2) were added sequentially. In models 3-4, WSC-level reform conditions (3) and the characteristics (4) were incorporated. In the final model, political factors (5) were included.

3. Results

The population, geographics, service network, and reform-related characteristics of the municipalities and WSCs are presented in the Supplementary file. Both the municipalities and WSCs had significant variation in population characteristics and the current PHC service networks. The number of health center units in the area of municipalities ranged from 1 to 12, with a mean of 1.7. Over half of the WSCs were patchwork counties (no pre-reform collaboration in PHC), while one fifth had a university hospital or were part of the HUS Group (the capital region).

The current Finnish PHC service network and the planned closures are illustrated in Figure 2. The closures appear to concentrate in western Finland, particularly in patchwork counties. In the areas with the lowest population densities, especially northern Finland, very few closures were planned.



Figure 2: Map of Finnish primary health center unit closures (n = 108 in 82 municipalities). Patchwork county refers to wellbeing services counties (WSC) without pre-reform collaboration (such as joint administration of municipalities). Private clinics are not shown.

Next, municipalities with and without planned PHC center unit closures were compared (Table 1). Municipalities with planned closures had on average higher population sizes (28,562 vs. 15,049) but lower population densities (54.6 vs. 178.0). Their current service networks were denser, with better medical desert index values (0.36 vs. -0.12) and more public and private clinics (2.6 vs. 1.3 and 1.5 vs. 0.9, respectively). A significant proportion of closures were in municipalities located in patchwork counties (86.6%). The number of municipalities without a health center unit was 4 prior

to the reform, rising to 45 after the confirmed PHC center unit closures and to 61 when including unconfirmed closures.

Table 1: Comparison of characteristics between municipalities with and without planned health center unit closures in their area (n = 295).

	Municipalities with planned PHC center unit closures (n = 82)			Municipalities with no PHC center unit closures* (n = 213)		
	Mean / %	**SD**	**Range**	**Mean / %**	**SD**	**Range**
Population characteristics						
Population	28,562	57,129	682–314,024	15,049	26,908	912–247,443
Population density (per km^2)	54.6	151.8	1.4–1,005.3	178.0	786.6	0.2–6,827.0
Population aged 65 or more (%)	29.5	6.7	15.1–43.6	31.0	7.9	11.4–47.2
Population growth 2013–2023 (%)	-8.5	10.8	-27.2–17.0	-8.3	10.1	-29.7–16.7
Service network						
Medical desert index, physical	0.36	1.21	-1.96–5.99	-0.12	0.86	-1.96–2.30
Number of public health center units	2.6	2.5	1–12	1.3	1.0	1–8
Number of private clinics	1.5	3.1	0–18	0.9	1.8	0–16
WSC, reform and administration						
Councilmembers from the municipality (%)	9.6	16.1	0–69.5	6.6	11.0	0–87.0
Previous closures of health center units in municipality	0.22	0.65	0–4	0.19	0.53	0–3
In patchwork counties (%)	86.6			62.9		
County has a university hospital (%)	32.9			36.6		
In HUS Group area (%)	9.8			11.3		

* Excluding the municipalities of Kaustinen, Korsnäs, Nousiainen, and the Östersundom major district of Helsinki, which had no health center units.

Results of multilevel modeling, conducted in six steps, are presented in Table 2. A large proportion of the variance in PHC center unit closures in the areas of municipalities was explained by differences at the WSC level (ICC: 0.36). Models 1 and 2, adding municipality characteristics and service network factors, did not significantly change the variance explained by the group level. Model 3 (ICC: 0.27), which included WSC-level reform conditions, however, explained nearly a third of the variation in the regional level, with the WSC being a patchwork county especially

emerging as a predictive factor. Policy and political factors (model 5) had marginal effect on the proportion of variation explained by the fixed effects. Strong unexplained group-level variance remained in the final model (ICC: 0.25).

At the municipality-level, the number of health center units (OR: 15.17, CI: 5.51–41.80) and a better medical desert index value (OR: 1.90, CI: 1.27–2.83) were positively associated with closure decisions. Higher population growth (OR: 0.21, CI: 0.08–0.53), the number of private clinics (OR 0.22, CI: 0.05–0.94), and a higher proportion of population aged 65 or older (OR: 0.41, CI: 0.17–0.96) were associated with lower odds of PHC center unit closure decisions. On the WSC-level, the municipality being in a patchwork county (OR: 10.95, CI: 1.15–104.33) was a strong predictor of closures.

WSC characteristics and political factors, such as the number of municipalities, budget deficit, or councilmembers being from the municipality, were not associated with closures. We also examined the effects of different political parties but found no evidence of association with closures. Inclusion of political party seat proportions significantly reduced model performance and were therefore omitted.

Table 2: Results of the multilevel logistic regression analysis, with municipalities (level 1) clustered within the wellbeing services counties (level 2). The outcome variable was the decision to close a health center unit (minimum one) in the area of a municipality (0/1).

	Null model	Model 1: Municipality characteristics	Model 2: Municipality service network	Model 3: WSC reform conditions	Model 4: WSC characteristics	Model 5: Policy and political factors
		OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)	OR (95% CI)
Population		**4.98 (2.07–12.00)*** **	2.59 (0.45–14.99)	2.20 (0.37–13.05)	1.79 (0.29–10.96)	2.81 (0.28–27.85)
Population density (per km^2)		**0.01 (0.00–0.49)***	0.11 (0.01–1.18)	0.15 (0.01–2.14)	1.28 (0.04–41.49)	0.90 (0.01–74.74)
Proportion of population aged 65 or older (%)		**0.48 (0.23–0.99)***	**0.39 (0.17–0.92)***	**0.41 (0.18–0.95)***	**0.41 (0.18–0.95)***	**0.41 (0.17–0.96)***
Population growth (2013–2023)		**0.33 (0.15–0.71)****	**0.19 (0.08–0.48)*****	**0.20 (0.08–0.50)*****	**0.20 (0.08–0.49)*****	**0.21 (0.08–0.53)****
Number of public health center units			**12.50 (4.95–31.59)*****	**12.94 (5.16–32.47)*****	**14.26 (5.45–37.29)*****	**15.17 (5.51–41.80)*****
Number of private clinics			**0.17 (0.04–0.70)***	**0.18 (0.04–0.71)***	**0.17 (0.04–0.68)***	**0.22 (0.05–0.94)***
Medical desert index			**1.97 (1.32–2.92)*****	**1.95 (0.31–2.90)*****	**1.92 (1.29–2.85)****	**1.90 (1.27–2.83)****
Previous health center unit closures in the municipality (10 years) (1)			0.67 (0.19–2.38)	0.73 (0.20–2.63)	0.72 (0.20–2.63)	0.69 (0.18–2.69)
WSC: Patchwork county (1)				**5.62 (1.15–27.43)***	**10.60 (1.41–79.81)***	**10.95 (1.15–104.33)***
WSC: University hospital (1)				0.49 (0.09–2.68)	1.02 (0.11–9.15)	0.60 (0.05–7.59)
WSC: HUS-area (1)				1.72 (0.22–13.37)	1.39 (0.10–19.46)	1.05 (0.07–15.69)
WSC: Population density					0.08 (0.00–7.45)	0.05 (0.00–17.53)
WSC: Number of municipalities					0.50 (0.13–1.97)	0.48 (0.11–2.04)
WSC: Budget surplus or deficit per person						1.36 (0.59–3.13)
Councilmembers from the municipality (%)						0.53 (0.19–1.44)
Largest party seat share (%)						0.91 (0.44–1.88)
Variance of the random intercept	1.86	2.05	1.94	1.24	1.14	1.09
ICC	0.36	0.38	0.37	0.27	0.26	0.25
Δ ICC		0.02	-0.01	-0.10	-0.01	-0.01
AIC	322.4	297.5	249.5	250.2	251.6	255.1

*** = p < 0.001, ** = p < 0.01, * = p < 0.05

OR = Odds ratio, WSC = Wellbeing services county, ICC = Intraclass correlation coefficient, AIC = Akaike information criterion

Note: Municipalities Kaustinen, Korsnäs, Nousiainen, and the Östersundom major district of Helsinki had no health centers and were thus excluded from the analyses.

4. Discussion

We investigated the planned PHC center unit closures following the administrative health system reform in Finland. Our results indicate that the closures have been reasonably well targeted, focusing on areas with shrinking populations but denser existing service networks. Regardless, 45 municipalities (out of 295) will be left without a health center unit (previously four). As the closures mostly concentrated on urban or peri-urban areas, the situation in previously identified medical deserts appears largely unchanged. At the WSC-level, patchwork counties had significantly higher odds of closures. Significant variation in closure decisions remained between the WSCs in the final full model, indicating the presence of unexplored determinants.

Our study presents evidence of three main determinants driving PHC center unit closure decisions in the WSCs. First, municipal demographics, particularly population growth and age structure, were associated with closure decisions. This suggests that anticipated future care needs has been a factor in decision-making, which is important in the continuously urbanizing and ageing Europe [3,27]. Second, the current service networks appear central in decision-making, with both the number of health center units and private clinics, in addition to medical desertification, being associated with closure decisions. While this result was expected, the fact that underserved rural areas were considered is a positive indication that the closures may not exacerbate existing inequalities in care access. Third, the WSC being a patchwork county was strongly associated with increased closure decisions, suggesting that counties which previously functioned as joint authorities have already optimized their service networks, resulting in both a lower need to restructure their service networks and a fewer number of units to potentially close. This result highlights the accumulated service reform needs in patchwork counties. In a study by Fränti and colleagues, algorithmically optimized health care unit locations sometimes ignored municipality borders [43], highlighting the potential benefits of larger administrative actors for service network planning.

Previous qualitative assessments of the Finnish reform implementation have included stakeholders voicing concerns about the limited (political) decision-making capability of the WSCs and rigid, yet disjointed and fragmented, central steering by multiple ministries [44,45]. Our results support these views, as the service network planning in the WSCs has been mainly driven by geographical, population, and service network factors. The political factors analyzed were not associated with closures, contrary to expectations for a political process. Policy innovation and diffusion, which promote both the quality and efficiency of care, are often seen as the benefits of local-level decision-making [46,47]. However, the Finnish reform, these positive effects might not arise if diverse policy innovation is not encouraged, for instance due to the inability of the WSCs to collect extra revenue. While our findings might be explained by the rapid process required by the challenging operating environment [32] or the exclusion of politics in the PHC service network planning, the credibility and the functioning of the WSCs as self-governed entities would be promoted if the varying preferences of the county populations were better reflected in policy decisions. Lastly, a significant amount of variation between the WSCs remained unexplained, suggesting that some uncaptured dimensions, such as the workforce situation, could further explain the differences between WSCs.

Internationally, our findings are unique, as no comparable administrative health system reforms have been implemented in recent history, and evidence on previous PHC center unit closures remains scarce. As many countries are contemplating health system reforms, including centralization and consolidation of service networks [9,10], our results are beneficial for future reform planning and implementation. For instance, both Ireland and Denmark are introducing new regional actors [12,14]. Structural reforms can facilitate the restructuring of PHC services, which can promote policy innovation [48], eventually leading to better services. If the reforms result in service consolidation, aspects such as the current service network and underserved areas should be considered to ensure that closures are targeted as appropriately as possible. Health systems relying

on private GP practices may need to integrate provider incentives to guide the service network [24] to guarantee adequate services in rural or underserved areas. Additionally, national and local health policy should prepare to address the potential effects of increasing private equity investments in healthcare, which might lead to unit closures [49]. In this regard, the Finnish health system, alongside others relying on public providers, offers more direct governance tools to design service networks according to the population needs and characteristics.

Following the closure of PHC center units, it is essential to monitor the newly configured service networks, especially the costs, quality, accessibility, and availability of care. This includes analysis of services adjacent to PHC (e.g., long-term care), which have also been undergoing changes in their service networks. While the planned closures appear to mainly target areas with higher density service networks, currently underserved communities still continue to suffer from a significantly worse accessibility to care [35]. Access to rural PHC could be improved for instance by increased use of mobile clinics, telehealth services, and greater integration of non-profit service provision [50]. The current WSCs have already launched and accelerated efforts to strengthen digital services, with 49 % of all public PHC visits being done remotely for nurses and 17 % for physicians (excluding consultations between professionals) in 2024 [51]. However, poor digital competence, common especially among older people, can hinder care utilization and lead to digital exclusion [52,53], suggesting that substitutive digital care pathways may not be appropriate or sufficient for all populations. Additionally, the use of mobile clinics and service points with limited services has increased. Importantly, many of the units were not fully closed, but the range of services offered was significantly reduced (e.g., no walk-in services). While this may help maintain some level of service provision, especially for chronic care clients, it remains critical to ensure that the remaining health center units can adequately meet population needs.

Limitations

The study focuses on the early phases of the administrative reform and the initial changes made thereafter, and therefore, long-term effects of the reform are beyond the scope of our investigation. Next, as the Finnish PHC provision is based on administratively determined health center units, the generalizability of our findings to systems based on small independently established GP practices might be limited. Furthermore, although multiple dimensions potentially affecting decision-making were included, it is likely that additional factors explain the variation between WSCs, which remained high (ICC: 0.25 in the full model). For instance, we could not include information on the workforce availability, as no comprehensive data were available. Moreover, the administrative reform of Finland is unique in its breadth, and consequently more incremental reforms may involve different determinants in service network decisions. Nonetheless, the present study provides novel insights into PHC center closures and the related decision-making following a major administrative health system reform.

Conclusions

The large-scale administrative health system reform in Finland is resulting in significant changes to PHC service networks, with the newly established WSCs planning numerous health center unit closures. Consequently, the number of municipalities without a health center unit is increasing tenfold. Our findings indicate that the planned closures are reasonably well targeted, as areas with shrinking populations but denser existing service networks had higher odds of closure. Additionally, medical desertification was likely considered, as closures did not concentrate in underserved areas. Patchwork counties (i.e., no pre-reform municipal joint authority) had significantly more planned closures, suggesting higher accumulated service reform needs, with other counties having already optimized their networks prior to the reform. Similar international

reforms should account for previous administrative structures to facilitate the implementation process.

List of abbreviations:

GP: General practitioner

PHC: Primary healthcare

WSC: Wellbeing services county

Declarations

Acknowledgements: None.

Funding: This research was co-funded by the Research Council of Finland (grant number 354745).

Conflict of Interest statement: The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

Authors' contributions: VV: Conceptualization, writing – original draft, methodology, formal analysis. L-KT: Writing – review and editing. KL: Writing – review and editing. TS: Writing – review and editing, supervision. All authors made substantial intellectual contributions as well as read and accepted the final manuscript.

Ethics approval and consent to participate: The study utilized publicly available routinely collected aggregated, and thus anonymous, municipality and WSC level data, and as such, ethical approval by an ethics committee was not needed.

Consent for publication: Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials: The datasets used and/or analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

References

[1] Tuohy CH. Remaking policy: Scale, pace, and political strategy in health care reform. vol. 54. University of Toronto Press; 2018.

[2] Oliver A, Mossialos E. European Health Systems Reforms: Looking Backward to See Forward? J Health Polit Policy Law 2005;30:7–28. https://doi.org/10.1215/03616878-30-1-2-7.

[3] Bloom DE, Chatterji S, Kowal P, Lloyd-Sherlock P, McKee M, Rechel B, et al. Macroeconomic implications of population ageing and selected policy responses. The Lancet 2015;385:649–57. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61464-1.

[4] Rechel B, Doyle Y, Grundy E, McKee M. How can health systems respond to population ageing? World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe; 2009.

[5] De Biase P, Dougherty S, Lorenzoni L. Ageing and the long-run fiscal sustainability of health care across levels of government. OECD Work Pap Fisc Fed 2022:0_1-36.

[6] Hacker K. The Burden of Chronic Disease. Mayo Clin Proc Innov Qual Outcomes 2024;8:112–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mayocpiqo.2023.08.005.

[7] Berardi C, Schut F, Paolucci F. The dynamics of international health system reforms: Evidence of a new wave in response to the 2008 economic crisis and the COVID-19 pandemic? Health Policy 2024;143:105052. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2024.105052.

[8] Bodenheimer T. High and Rising Health Care Costs. Part 2: Technologic Innovation. Ann Intern Med 2005;142:932–7. https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-142-11-200506070-00012.

[9] Hernández-Quevedo C, Maresso A, Merkur S, Quentin W, Richardson E, Spranger A, et al. 20 years of health system reforms in Europe: what's new? Eurohealth 2018;24:23–8.

[10] Polin K, Hjortland M, Maresso A, Van Ginneken E, Busse R, Quentin W. "Top-Three" health reforms in 31 high-income countries in 2018 and 2019: an expert informed overview. Health Policy 2021;125:815–32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2021.04.005.

[11] Saltman RB. Decentralization, re-centralization and future European health policy. Eur J Public Health 2007;18:104–6. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckn013.

[12] Sundhedsstruktur komissionen. Sundhedsstruktur kommissionens rapport: Beslutningsgrundlag for et mere lige, sammenhængende og bæredygtigt sundhedsvæsen. 2024.

[13] Dubas-Jakóbczyk K, Domagała A, Zabdyr-Jamróz M, Kowalska-Bobko I, Sowada C. The 2021 plan for hospital care centralization in Poland – When politics overwhelms the policy process. Health Policy 2023;129:104707. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2023.104707.

[14] Burke S, Barry S, Siersbaek R, Johnston B, Ní Fhallúin M, Thomas S. Sláintecare – A ten-year plan to achieve universal healthcare in Ireland. Health Policy 2018;122:1278–82. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2018.05.006.

[15] Doetsch JN, Schlösser C, Barros H, Shaw D, Krafft T, Pilot E. A scoping review on the impact of austerity on healthcare access in the European Union: rethinking austerity for the most vulnerable. Int J Equity Health 2023;22:3. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12939-022-01806-1.

[16] Stuckler D, Reeves A, Loopstra R, Karanikolos M, McKee M. Austerity and health: the impact in the UK and Europe. Eur J Public Health 2017;27:18–21. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckx167.

[17] Alderwick H, Dixon J. The NHS long term plan. BMJ 2019:l84. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l84.

[18] Parkinson S, Smith J, Sidhu M. Early development of primary care networks in the NHS in England: a qualitative mixed-methods evaluation. BMJ Open 2021;11:e055199. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2021-055199.

[19] Morciano M, Checkland K, Hammond J, Lau Y-S, Sutton M. Variability in size and characteristics of primary care networks in England: observational study. Br J Gen Pract 2020;70:e899–905. https://doi.org/10.3399/bjgp20x713441.

[20] Hutchinson J, Checkland K, Gibson J, Kontopantelis E, Sutton M. Consequences of the closure of general practices: a retrospective cross-sectional study. Br J Gen Pract 2023;73:e399–406. https://doi.org/10.3399/BJGP.2022.0501.

[21] Rechel B, Tille F, Groenewegen P, Timans R, Fattore G, Rohrer-Herold K, et al. Private equity investment in Europe's primary care sector—a call for research and policy action. Eur J Public Health 2023;33:354–5. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckad061.

[22] Holte JH, Kjaer T, Abelsen B, Olsen JA. The impact of pecuniary and non-pecuniary incentives for attracting young doctors to rural general practice. Soc Sci Med 2015;128:1–9. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2014.12.022.

[23] Flinterman LE, González-González AI, Seils L, Bes J, Ballester M, Bañeres J, et al. Characteristics of Medical Deserts and Approaches to Mitigate Their Health Workforce Issues: A Scoping Review of Empirical Studies in Western Countries. Int J Health Policy Manag 2023;12:7454. https://doi.org/10.34172/ijhpm.2023.7454.

[24] Ozegowski S. Effective policy mechanisms for an equitable geographical distribution of general practitioners: a qualitative comparative analysis of the accessibility of primary care in Europe. J Health Serv Res Policy 2013;18:151–9. https://doi.org/10.1177/1355819613482885.

[25] Fredriksson M, Isaksson D. Fifteen years with patient choice and free establishment in Swedish primary healthcare: what do we know? Scand J Public Health 2022;50:852–63. https://doi.org/10.1177/14034948221095365.

[26] Janlöv N, Blume S, Glenngård AH, Hanspers K, Anell A, Merkur S. Sweden: Health System Review. Health Syst Transit 2023;25:1–236.

[27] Urbanization in Europe 2000–2018: Amount, Density, and Form. Sustain. Urban Futur., Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2024, p. 15–52. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-62261-8_2.

[28] Shaw BJ, Van Vliet J, Verburg PH. The peri-urbanization of Europe: A systematic review of a multifaceted process. Landsc Urban Plan 2020;196:103733. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landurbplan.2019.103733.

[29] Palacios HV, Brant K, Rhubart D, Jackson J. Community responses and adaptations following the closure of a rural pharmacy and primary care facility. J Rural Health 2024:jrh.12896. https://doi.org/10.1111/jrh.12896.

[30] Trombetta M, Suchy N, Irwin AN. Patient perspectives of the impact of a rural health center closure: A cross□sectional survey. J Rural Health 2025;41:e70005. https://doi.org/10.1111/jrh.70005.

[31] Simonsen M, Skipper L, Skipper N, Thingholm PR. Discontinuity in care: Practice closures among primary care providers and patient health care utilization. J Health Econ 2021;80:102551. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2021.102551.

[32] Tynkkynen L-K, Keskimäki I, Karanikolos M. Finland: Health System Summary, 2024 2024.

[33] Keskimäki I, Tynkkynen L-K, Reissell E, Koivusalo M, Syrjä V, Vuorenkoski L, et al. Finland: health system review. Health Syst Transit 2019;21.

[34] Kihlström L, Keskimäki I, Paananen H, Paatela S, Satokangas M, Tynkkynen L-K. How is a large-scale reform perceived by citizens in Finnish primary health care? Soc Sci Med 2025;387:118688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2025.118688.

[35] Väisänen V, Satokangas M, Huhtakangas M, Antikainen H, Sinervo T. Medical deserts in Finland: measuring the accessibility and availability of primary health care services. BMC Health Serv Res 2025;25:281. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-025-12409-1.

[36] Harjunen O, Saarimaa T, Tukiainen J. Love Thy (Elected) Neighbor? Residential Segregation, Political Representation, and Local Public Goods. J Polit 2023;85:860–75. https://doi.org/10.1086/723983.

[37] Boston J, Bullock D. Multi-party governance: Managing the unity-distinctiveness dilemma in executive coalitions. Party Polit 2012;18:349–68. https://doi.org/10.1177/1354068810382937.

[38] Tsebelis G. Decision Making in Political Systems: Veto Players in Presidentialism, Parliamentarism, Multicameralism and Multipartyism. Br J Polit Sci 1995;25:289–325. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123400007225.

[39] Satterthwaite FE. Synthesis of Variance. Psychometrika 1941;6:309–16. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02288586.

[40] R Core Team. A language and environment for statistical computing. R Found Stat Comput Vienna Austria 2020.

[41] Bates D, Maechler M, Bolker B, Walker S. lme4: Linear Mixed-Effects Models using "Eigen" and S4 2003:1.1-37. https://doi.org/10.32614/CRAN.package.lme4.

[42] Kuznetsova A, Bruun Brockhoff P, Haubo Bojesen Christensen R. lmerTest: Tests in Linear Mixed Effects Models 2013:3.1-3. https://doi.org/10.32614/CRAN.package.lmerTest.

[43] Fränti P, Sieranoja S, Laatikainen T. Designing a clustering algorithm for optimizing health station locations. Int J Health Geogr 2025;24. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12942-025-00390-1.

[44] Paananen H, Jäntti A, Haveri A, Sinervo L-M, Sinkkonen J. Havaintoja hyvinvointialueiden toiminnan käynnistymisestä ja suhteesta kuntiin: HALKO-hankkeen väliraportti [Observations on the initiation of wellbeing services counties' operations and their relationship with municipalities: Interim report of the HALKO project]. Publications of the Government´s analysis, assessment and research activities; 2024.

[45] Tynkkynen L-K, Paatela S, Aalto A-M, Keskimäki I, Nykänen E, Peltola M, et al. Tilannekuvia hyvinvointialueilta: muutokset palvelujärjestelmässä sote-uudistuksen alkuvuosina [Situational pictures from wellbeing services counties – changes in the service system from the early years of the health and social services reform]. THL Rep 2025;3. https://urn.fi/URN:ISBN:978-952-408-459-8.

[46] Costa-Font J, Ferrer-i-Carbonell A. Does devolution influence the choice and quality of public (vs private) health care? J Econ Behav Organ 2022;202:632–53. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jebo.2022.08.022.

[47] Costa-Font J, Turati G. Regional healthcare decentralization in unitary states: equal spending, equal satisfaction? Reg Stud 2018;52:974–85. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2017.1361527.

[48] Islam QM. Innovation in Primary Healthcare in the Twenty-first Century. J Health Manag 2021;23:129–42. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972063421994987.

[49] Tracey M, Schulmann K, Tille F, Rice T, Mercille J, Timans R, et al. What are the policy options for regulating private equity involvement in health care? A review of policies

implemented or considered in seven high-income countries. Health Policy 2025;156:105312. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2025.105312.

[50] Gizaw Z, Astale T, Kassie GM. What improves access to primary healthcare services in rural communities? A systematic review. BMC Prim Care 2022;23:313. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12875-022-01919-0.

[51] Finnish Institute for Health and Welfare. Avohilmo: Terveydenhuollon avohoidon käynnit hyvinvointialueittain ja kunnittain [Avohilmo: Outpatient healthcare visits by wellbeing services county and municipality] 2025.

[52] Heponiemi T, Kaihlanen A-M, Virtanen L, Kainiemi E, Saukkonen P, Koponen P, et al. The Mediating Role of Digital Competence in the Associations Between the Factors Affecting Healthcare Utilization and Access to Care. Int J Public Health 2024;68:1606184. https://doi.org/10.3389/ijph.2023.1606184.

[53] Heponiemi T, Kaihlanen A-M, Kouvonen A, Leemann L, Taipale S, Gluschkoff K. The role of age and digital competence on the use of online health and social care services: A cross-sectional population-based survey. Digit Health 2022;8:205520762210744. https://doi.org/10.1177/20552076221074485.


Context:
- Pre-reform conditions
- Reform specifications
- Post-reform conditions
- Previous closures
Municipality:
- Population characteristics
- Current service network
- Political representation
- Geographics
Influencing decision-making
Wellbeing services county:
- Population and county characteristics
- Budget pressure
- Political configuration
Decision to close a health center


Legend:
= Center under closure
= Remaining centers
= Population density
= Non-patchwork county
= Municipality border
= WSC border