

Comparing Primary Care Interprofessional and Non-interprofessional Teams on Access to Care and Health Services Utilization in Ontario, Canada: A Retrospective Cohort Study

Wissam Haj-Ali (✉ wissam.haj.ali@mail.utoronto.ca)

University of Toronto <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1232-5702>

Brian Hutchison

McMaster University Faculty of Health Sciences

Rahim Moineddin

University of Toronto

Walter Wodchis

University of Toronto

Rick Glazier

ICES

Research article

Keywords: Primary Care, Inter-professional teams, patient experience, access, health services utilization

Posted Date: October 5th, 2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-66166/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. [Read Full License](#)

Version of Record: A version of this preprint was published at BMC Health Services Research on September 14th, 2021. See the published version at <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-021-06595-x>.

Abstract

Background: Many countries, including Canada, have introduced primary care reforms to improve health system functioning and value. The purpose of this study was to examine the association between receiving care from interprofessional primary care teams and access to care and health services utilization.

Methods: We conducted a retrospective cohort study linking population-based administrative databases to Ontario's Health Care Experience Survey (HCES) between 2012 and 2018. We adjusted for physician group characteristics as well as individual physician and patient characteristics while assessing the relationship between receiving care from interprofessional teams and the outcomes of interest.

Results: As of March 31st, 2015, there were 465 physician groups with HCES respondents of which 177 (38.0%) were interprofessional teams and 288 (62.0%) were non-interprofessional teams in the same blended capitation reimbursement model. In this period, there were 4,518 physicians with HCES respondents, of whom 2,131 (47.2%) were in interprofessional teams and 2,387 (52.8%) were in non-interprofessional teams. There were 10,102 HCES respondents included in this study, of whom 42.4% were in interprofessional teams and 42.3% were in non-interprofessional teams. After adjustment, we found that being in an interprofessional team was associated with an increase in the odds of patients reporting same/next day access to care by 12.0% (OR=1.12 CI=1.00 to 1.24 p-value 0.0436) and a decrease in the odds of patients reporting walk-in clinic use by 16% (OR=0.84 CI=0.75 to 0.94 p-value 0.0019). After adjustment, there were no significant differences in patient-reported after-hours access to care and emergency department use.

Conclusions: Ontario has invested heavily in interprofessional primary care teams. As compared to patients in non-interprofessional teams, patients in interprofessional teams self-reported more timely access to care and less walk-in clinic use but no significant difference in self-reported access to after-hours care or in emergency department use. For jurisdictions aiming to expand physician voluntary participation in interprofessional teams, our study results inform expectations around access to care and health services utilization.

Background

Improving health system performance and efficiency have been the focus of many jurisdictions internationally.^[i] The pursuit of providing value-based health care revolves around three aims: improving the experience of care, improving the health of populations, and reducing per capita costs.^[ii] A strong primary care system is recognized as the cornerstone of health systems and is associated with better outcomes, improved patient experience and lower cost.^[iii] Many countries around the world, including Canada, have introduced primary care reform to deliver on those goals.

During the economic recession in the 1990s, there has been limited investments in primary care innovation in Canada.^[iv] A decade later, primary care reform initiatives started to emerge in Canada in response to various federal and provincial committees recommendations.^{[v],[vi]} In line with the Canadian healthcare reform movement, Ontario has undergone three major primary care policy initiatives: new physician reimbursement and organizational models, patient enrolment with a primary care provider and support to interprofessional team-based care.^[vii]

During the last two decades, more than one third of primary care physicians have voluntarily transitioned from traditional fee-for-service practice to blended capitation payment and some of them have received additional funding to deliver interprofessional care. Currently, the dominant blended capitation model in Ontario is called Family Health Organization (FHO). FHOs have formal patient enrollment, electronic medical records, physician-led governance and a minimum of three physicians practicing together. They offer comprehensive care, including preventive health care services, chronic disease management and health promotion, through a combination of regular physician office hours and after-hours services. FHOs were eligible to apply for additional funding for allied health professionals to join their practice and become

interprofessional primary care teams called Family Health Teams. Interprofessional teams are “groups of professionals from different disciplines who communicate and work together in a formal arrangement to care for a patient population in a primary care setting.”^[viii] They typically include primary care physicians, nurses or nurse practitioners, and at least one other health care professional (e.g. pharmacist, social worker, dietitian or physiotherapist). Interprofessional teams are also eligible for funding an administrator or executive director. There are many similarities between Ontario interprofessional family health teams, Quebec Family Medicine Groups, Alberta Primary Care Networks and the Patient-Centered Medical Home in the United States.^{[ix][x][xi]}

The government’s priorities in establishing interprofessional teams were to increase access to primary care and appropriate healthcare services utilization.^[xii] Physicians in FHO models in Ontario are required to provide after-hours access to care and receive a bonus when their patients do not seek services from physicians outside of their group, such as in walk-in clinics. The bonus is not affected if their patients visit the emergency department. Interprofessional team-based care is thought to free up some of the physicians’ time by delegating tasks to other health care professionals within their scope of practice.^[xiii] Access to quality primary care can reduce the need for unnecessary and more expensive services.^[xiv] Treating less-urgent conditions in primary care could improve continuity of care and patient experience.^{[xv][xvi]}

Several studies conducted in Ontario have compared capitation-based interprofessional teams to other funding and delivery models of care on specific measures of quality.^{[xvii][xviii][xix][xx][xxi][xxii][xxiii]} However, little research to date has evaluated the association between the interprofessional aspect of primary care teams and access to care and health services utilization. Our study examined the association between receiving care from interprofessional versus non-interprofessional primary care teams and patient-reported timely and after-hours access to care, patient-reported walk-in clinic visits and emergency department use. We hypothesised that interprofessional teams would be better performers on these measures given their enhanced capacity and structure. Evidence from our setting that underwent large-scale primary care reform will be relevant to other jurisdictions contemplating innovations in primary care delivery and, specifically, the adoption of interprofessional team-based primary care.

Methods

Setting

The study setting is Ontario, Canada. Ontario had a population on 14.4 million people in 2019.^[i] Permanent residents of Ontario are fully insured for physician primary care services through the Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP) with no co-payment or deductible. Primary care organization and payment models have evolved over the course of the last 18 years. Three dominant practice models exist in Ontario—enhanced fee-for-service, non-team blended capitation and team-based blended capitation. These models are described in detail elsewhere.^{[ii][iii][iv]}

The focus of this study was on the dominant blended capitation model—FHO—within which physicians practice in either interprofessional or non-interprofessional teams. When patients seek primary care services outside the practice in which they are enrolled, for example in walk-in clinics, the FHO loses a bonus payment equal to the fee-for-service payments to the physician who treated the patient, to a maximum bonus of 18.59% of the practice’s total capitation.^[v] There is no deduction if an enrolled patient visits an emergency department for non-emergency care. FHOs are required to provide at least one three-hour block of after-hours services per week for each physician in the group, to a maximum of five three-hour blocks per week for practices with five or more physicians. Contracts define “after-hours” as Monday to Thursday after 5 p.m. or any time on the weekend—that is, any time from Friday after 5pm through Sunday.^[vi]

Design and Population

We conducted a retrospective cohort study where we linked several population-based administrative databases to the Health Care Experience Survey (HCES) using encoded identifiers at ICES (formerly known as the Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences) to form data extractions and identify the population of interest (Figure 1).

The study population comprised respondents to the HCES over six fiscal years (April 1 – March 31) from 2012/13 to 2017/18. The study included respondents from 20 quarterly waves of the HCES that were conducted between October 2012 and October 2017. Once households were sampled in the HCES, they were removed from the sampling frame for 2 years. Respondents who responded to the survey more than once throughout the study period were excluded.

For each of the data extractions, we identified respondent to the HCES at the end of the fiscal year. To be included in the study, respondents had to be consistently in an FHO blended capitation model throughout the observation period for the fiscal year they responded to the HCES. We captured patients' characteristics at the beginning of the fiscal year they responded to the HCES. Self-reported timely access to care, after-hours access to care and walk-in clinic visits were captured during the fiscal year the patient responded to the HCES and ED visits were captured at the end of that fiscal year from health administrative data. Physician group and physicians' characteristics were captured at the mid-point of the study timeframe, March 31st, 2015 (Figure 2).

Measures and data sources

Exposure

Enrolment in a FHO blended capitation model, with an interprofessional team was the exposure. The exposure variable was retrieved from a population and demographics database—the Client Agency Program Enrolment tables that identify the patient enrolment model and the physician with whom patients are enrolled. A separate file provided by the Ontario Ministry of Health (MOH) to ICES identified physicians who are part of an interprofessional team versus a non-interprofessional team.

Outcomes

The outcomes included patient-reported timely access to care, patient-reported after-hours access to care, patient-reported walk-in clinic use and emergency department use. Patient-reported timely access to care, after-hours access to care and walk-in clinic use were derived from the HCES (How many days did it take from when you first tried to see your provider to when you actually saw them or someone else in their office? (sick_3); The last time when you needed medical care in the evening, on a weekend, or on a public holiday, how easy or difficult was it to get care without going to the emergency department? (access_5); Have you been to a walk-in clinic because you were sick or for a health-related problem in the 12 months? (wi_1)). The HCES is a quarterly survey of a random sample of the Ontario population, 16 years and older, conducted on behalf of the MOH by the Institute for Social Research at York University. The survey focuses on Ontarians' primary care experience, including access to care, to generate regional and province-level data. The HCES questionnaire is shown in Appendix A. The National Ambulatory Care Reporting System (NACRS) was used to derive emergency department visits.

Physicians Characteristics and Physicians Groups

Physicians' characteristics included age, sex, years since graduation, Canadian graduate status and number of years in practice. Physician group characteristics included the number of physicians per group and number of years under the capitation model. Those variables were derived from a health care providers data registry available at ICES.

Patient Characteristics

Patients age, sex and OHIP registration (as proxy for immigration) were identified from a population and demographics registry. Neighborhood income quintiles (1 lowest and 5 highest) were identified by linking postal codes to census data. Rurality was identified through the Ontario Medical Association Rurality Index of Ontario (RIO).^[vii] Resource Utilization Bands were derived from the Johns Hopkins Adjusted Clinical Groups (ACGs) case-mix system software.^[viii]

Analysis

For the descriptive results, we generated counts and percentages for categorical variables and means and standard deviations for continuous variables to describe the characteristics of physician groups and physicians who were either in interprofessional or non-interprofessional teams in relation to the outcomes of interest. For the patient variables, we generated sample weighted descriptive statistics. The probability weights assigned to respondents in the HCES were dependent on the probability of being selected, which was determined from the sampling design.

For the outcomes, we ran sample weighted survey logistic regressions to model each of the outcomes while adjusting for the respective physician group, physician and patient characteristics.

All study analyses were conducted using SAS v.9.3 and statistical significance was assessed at a p-value <0.05.

Results

Baseline Group, physician and patient characteristics comparing HCES respondents in interprofessional teams versus non-interprofessional teams

As of March 31st, 2015, there were 465 FHO physician groups with HCES respondents of which 177 (38%) were interprofessional teams and 288 (62%) were non-interprofessional teams. Interprofessional teams with HCES respondents had more physicians per group as compared to non-interprofessional teams (means= 13.1 versus 8.84, respectively) and more years under the capitation model (means= 6.0 versus 4.3 respectively).

In this period, there were 4,518 FHO physicians with HCES respondents of whom 2,131 (47.2%) were practicing in interprofessional teams and 2,387 (52.8%) were practicing in non-interprofessional teams. Interprofessional teams compared to non-interprofessional team physicians had: fewer patients per physician (mean=1,366 versus 1,555, respectively); more female physicians (46.3% versus 43.8%, respectively); more physicians in the younger age group under 40 years old (15.4% versus 9.3%, respectively); more physicians who were Canadian graduates (80.9% versus 74.4%, respectively); fewer years in practice (29.1% versus 17.6%, respectively in the 5 to 15 years category) (Table 1A).

There were 10,102 HCES respondents included in this study of whom 42.4% were in interprofessional teams and 42.3% were in non-interprofessional teams. Interprofessional as compared to non-interprofessional teams had fewer HCES respondents who were immigrants (3.1% versus 5.1 %, respectively); fewer HCES respondents in the highest income quintile (23.3% versus 26.4%, respectively); more HCES respondents residing in rural areas (14.2% versus 5.8%, respectively) and fewer patients with two or more comorbidities (42.6% versus 44.3%, respectively) (Table 1B).

Patient-reported timely access to care and after-hours access to care comparing HCES respondents in interprofessional teams versus non-interprofessional teams

HCES respondents in interprofessional teams were slightly more likely to report timely access to care (same/next day) when compared to patients in non-interprofessional teams (39.9% versus 39.1%). HCES respondents in interprofessional teams were less likely to report easy or somewhat easy access to after-hours care compared to patients in non-interprofessional teams (30.8% versus 35.2%).

Patient-reported walk-in clinic visits and emergency department use comparing HCES respondents in interprofessional teams versus non-interprofessional teams

HCES respondents in interprofessional teams reported a lower percent of walk-in clinic visits compared to patients in non-interprofessional teams (19.7% versus 28.2%, respectively) (Table 4 B). A higher percent of HCES respondents in interprofessional teams had emergency department visits as compared to patients in non-interprofessional teams (26.7% versus 23.5%, respectively) (Table 5B).

Association between enrollment in an interprofessional team and the outcomes

When we examined timely access to care while adjusting for physician group, physician and patient characteristics, we found that being in an interprofessional team was associated with an increased odds of patient-reported timely (same/next day) access to care of 12% (OR=1.12 CI=1.00 to 1.24 p-value 0.0436) and decreased odds of self-reporting walk-in clinic use of 16% (OR=0.84 CI=0.75 to 0.94 p-value 0.0019). We did not find significant differences after adjustment between interprofessional and non-interprofessional teams in patient-reported after-hours access to care or in emergency department use (Tables 6).

When we stratified the analyses by sex and by rurality, we did not find a consistent pattern across the outcomes when comparing interprofessional teams with non-interprofessional teams (results not included but can be made available upon request).

Discussion

We linked the HCES to administrative databases to examine the association between receiving care from interprofessional primary care teams and patient-reported timely access and after-hours access to care, patient-reported use of walk-in clinics and emergency department use. We found that HCES respondents receiving care from interprofessional teams self-reported more timely access to care and less walk-in clinic use. We did not find a significant difference in patient-reported after-hours access to care or in emergency department visits.

The professional management and clinical structure available through interprofessional teams, such as having an Executive Director and allied health professionals can theoretically support access to care.

Although more timely access to care among patients in interprofessional teams is not an expectation in the contractual agreement between teams and the Ministry of Health, previous evidence indicates that enhanced interprofessional team structure can support the availability of the primary care provider by shifting some of their duties to other team members.^[i]^[ii]^[iii]^[iv]^[v]^[vi] The evaluations of Patient-Centered Medical Homes in the United States related to timely access to care suggest that greater availability of providers can free more of their time for patient encounters.^[vii] Our findings of generally low timely access to care are comparable to other reports that found only 43% of Canadians report that they were able to have same- or next-day appointment at their regular place of care and identified that Canada continues to perform below the average on timely access to care when compared to other countries included in the Commonwealth Fund International Health Surveys.^[viii]

Our findings showed a non-significant difference in patient-reported after-hours access to care between interprofessional and non-interprofessional teams. The provision of after-hours care is an expectation that all FHOs need to meet as part of their contractual agreement with the Ministry of Health.^[ix] Although some interprofessional teams operate out of multiple locations, the after-hours services only need to be offered at one location, which may not be convenient for many of the enrolled patients. Also, only one physician is required to be available during each after-hours block which might not be sufficient evening and weekend availability to meet patients' needs. Previous evidence that compared a slightly different after-hours access to care measure (asking if respondents providers have an after-hours clinic as opposed how easy or difficult was it to get care without going to the emergency department) found that respondents in interprofessional teams self-reported more after-hours access to care.^[x]

Although both interprofessional and non-interprofessional teams get penalised equally if their patients visit a walk-in clinic, our finding of significantly lower patient-reported walk-in clinic visits by HCES respondent among interprofessional teams may be explained by the higher patient-reported timely access to care in interprofessional teams, which can contribute to the lower walk-in clinic use. Patients may be less likely to seek care elsewhere if their provider is accessible to them in a timely manner. Additionally, the enhanced administrative structure of interprofessional teams can support reinforcing to patients the need to refrain from walk-in visits as part of being on the group roster. Our findings of a non-significant difference in emergency department use between interprofessional and non-interprofessional teams is consistent with evidence from Canada that looked at utilization in relation to interprofessional team-based care and found differences in quality but not in healthcare utilization.^{[xi],[xii],[xiii],[xiv]}

Some of our findings are not fully consistent with an Ontario provincial analysis where throughout the investigated years (2014 to 2017) timely access to care ranged between 44.3% and 39.9% (compared to 39.5% in our study population), easy or somewhat easy after-hours access to care ranged between 48.0% and 46.0% (vs. 33% in our sample) and walk-in clinic use ranged between 29.6% and 30.5% (vs. 24% in our study).^[xv] Those differences can be explained by the slightly different timeframe, inclusion of respondents from all primary care models and slightly larger sample that includes people who declined to have their data linked (6%) for the provincial analysis. Additionally, for the timely access to care question, the provincial analysis included respondents with and without a family doctor whereas our study includes only respondents with a family doctor. Through a personal communication with the Ministry of Health representative who is responsible for the survey, we have confirmed that our study results can be mainly explained by those differences.

Interprofessional teams in Ontario had access to several quality improvement initiatives that hypothetically can contribute to improved outcomes over non-interprofessional teams. The Association of Family Health Teams of Ontario through an initiative called Data to Decisions (D2D) supported interprofessional teams in informing quality improvement through performance measurement. D2D was made possible through the investment in more than 30 Quality Improvement Decision Support Specialists (QIDS Specialists) across Ontario to help interprofessional teams to access and use better data to improve care.^[xvi] Timely access to care and emergency department use were among the measurement areas monitored through this initiative.^[xvii] The Quality Improvement and Innovation Partnership (QIIP) was another province wide quality-improvement program implemented between 2008 and 2010 to support interprofessional teams to improve the care they provide.^[xviii] The learning collaboratives used the Institute for Healthcare Improvement's Breakthrough Series learning model and interprofessional teams were provided with a quality improvement coach who supported and mentored participants throughout the program.^[xix] Improved access to care was one of the supported quality improvement areas through QIIP.^[xx] Those investments should theoretically be reflected in better outcomes among interprofessional teams. The government's first priority in establishing interprofessional teams was to increase access to primary care and health services utilization.^[xxi] Our results show that interprofessional teams perform better than non-teams in some but not all aspects related to access to care and health services utilization.

Our study has limitations. First, this is an observational study that cannot address causation. It is also cross-sectional so it is not possible to distinguish whether the outcomes examined were pre-existing or were the result of joining or not joining

an interprofessional team. Self-reported timely and after-hours access to care are subject to limitations as measures of performance, respondent recall bias being one of them. People living in institutions, people with non-residential phone numbers, and people with invalid/missing household addresses in the Registered Persons Database (RPDB) are not captured in the HCES. Respondents who were unable to speak English or French or were not healthy enough (physically or mentally) to complete the interview were not surveyed. Second, there are other unmeasured factors that might contribute to the decision of having a walk-in clinic visit or using the emergency department that this study cannot capture. These could include personal preference or judgment during the time the service was needed. Third, access to care can be measured in many different ways. The access questions we investigated in this study provide a specific perspective restricted to timely and after-hours access to care. Previous evidence suggests that different measures of timely access are needed to understand health care system performance.^[xxii] Fourth, joining interprofessional team-based care was voluntary and our findings could be influenced by some unmeasured factors for physicians who chose to join this model of primary care delivery. Nonetheless, we aimed to capture all measured factors that can be traced through administrative databases. Finally, administrative databases have not been originally collected for research purposes, which presents a limitation in generating and interpreting the information. However, all the databases used for deriving the emergency department measure used in this study have been validated in the Ontario context.

Conclusion

Ontario has made a major investment in interprofessional team-based care. As compared to patients in non-interprofessional teams, patients in interprofessional teams self-reported more timely access to care and less walk-in clinic use but there was no significant difference in self-reported access to after hours to care and in emergency department use. Our findings can inform other jurisdictions aiming to expand voluntary participation in interprofessional team-based primary care regarding expectations about the relationship between primary care policy, organization and delivery and patient experience and health services utilization. Careful consideration should be given to contractual and policy levers that can incentivise interprofessional team-based care in delivering on intended outcomes such as improving health services utilization.

Abbreviations

HCES	Health Care Experience Survey
FHO	Family Health Organization
OHIP	Ontario Health Insurance Plan
MOH	Ministry of Health
NACRS	National Ambulatory Care Reporting System
RIO	Rurality Index of Ontario
QIDS	Quality Improvement Decision Support Specialists
QIIP	Quality Improvement and Innovation Partnership
RPDB	Registered Persons Database

Declarations

- Ethics approval and consent to participate: ICES (formerly known as Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences) is a prescribed entity under section 45 of Ontario's Personal Health Information Protection Act. Section 45 authorizes ICES to collect personal health information, without consent, for the purpose of analysis or compiling statistical information

with respect to the management of, evaluation or monitoring of, the allocation of resources to or planning for all or part of the health system. Projects conducted under section 45, by definition, do not require review by a Research Ethics Board. This project was conducted under section 45 and approved by ICES' Privacy and Legal Office.

- Consent for publication: Not applicable
- Availability of data and materials: The dataset from this study is held securely in coded form at ICES. While data sharing agreements prohibit ICES from making the dataset publicly available, access may be granted to those who meet pre-specified criteria for confidential access, available at www.ices.on.ca/DAS. The full dataset creation plan and underlying analytic code are available from the authors upon request, understanding that the computer programs may rely upon coding templates or macros that are unique to ICES and are therefore either inaccessible or may require modification.
- Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests
- Funding: This study was supported by ICES, which is funded by an annual grant from the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (MOHLTC). ICES is an independent, non-profit research institute funded by an annual grant from the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (MOHLTC). As a prescribed entity under Ontario's privacy legislation, ICES is authorized to collect and use health care data for the purposes of health system analysis, evaluation and decision support. Secure access to these data is governed by policies and procedures that are approved by the Information and Privacy Commissioner of Ontario. Parts of this material are based on data and information compiled and provided by the Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI). The analyses, conclusions, opinions and statements expressed herein are solely those of the authors and do not reflect those of the funding or data sources; no endorsement is intended or should be inferred. Richard H. Glazier is supported as a Clinician Scientist in the Department of Family and Community Medicine at St. Michael's Hospital and at the University of Toronto.
- Authors' contributions: WHA: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing—Original Draft. RM: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Writing—Review & Editing. BH: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing—Review & Editing, Supervision. WPW: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing—Review & Editing, Supervision. RHG: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing—Review & Editing, Supervision. All authors have read and approved the manuscript.
- Acknowledgements: Not applicable

References

1. Chisholm D, Evans DB. Improving health system efficiency as a means of moving towards universal coverage. *World Health Report (2010)*, Background Paper, 28 [Internet]. 2010. Available: <http://www.who.int/healthsystems/topics/financing/healthreport/28UCefficiency.pdf>. Accessed 02 February 2016.
2. Berwick DM, Nolan TW, Whittington J. The Triple Aim: Care, Health, And Cost. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2008; 27(3):759–69. doi: 10.1377/hlthaff.27.3.759
3. Starfield B, Shi L, Macinko J. Contribution of primary care to health systems and health. *Milbank Q* 2005;83:457e502
4. Hutchison, B., LEVESQUE, J. F., Strumpf, E., & Coyle, N. (2011). Primary health care in Canada: systems in motion. *Milbank Quarterly*, 89(2), 256-288.
5. Commission on the Future of Health Care in Canada. Building on values: the future of health care in Canada — final report [Internet]. Saskatoon (SK): Government of Canada; 2002. Available from: <http://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/CP32-85-2002E.pdf>
6. Standing Senate Committee on Social Affairs, Science, and Technology. The health of Canadians —federal role—final report. Vol. 6, Recommendations for reform [Internet]. Ottawa (ON); Parliament of Canada; Available from: <http://www.parl.gc.ca/Content/SEN/Committee/372/soci/rep/repoct02vol6-e.htm>

7. Hutchison B, Glazier R. Ontario's primary care reforms have transformed the local care landscape, but a plan is needed for ongoing improvement. *Health affairs*. 2013 Apr 1;32(4):695-703. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2012.1087>
8. Conference Board of Canada. Improving primary health care through collaboration: briefing 1— Current knowledge about interprofessional teams in Canada. Ottawa (ON): The Board; 2012 Oct. p. 2.
9. Coyle N, Strumpf E, Fiset-Laniel J, Tousignant P, Roy Y. Characteristics of physicians and patients who join team-based primary care practices: Evidence from Quebec's Family Medicine Groups. *Health Policy*. 2014 Jun 1;116(2-3):264-72. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2014.02.010>
10. American Academy of Family Physicians. American college of physicians, American osteopathic association. Joint principles of the patient-centered medical home. 2007 Mar;3. Available at: DOI: https://www.aafp.org/dam/AAFP/documents/practice_management/pcmh/initiatives/PCMHJoint.pdf
11. Rosenthal TC. The medical home: growing evidence to support a new approach to primary care. *The Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*. 2008 Sep 1;21(5):427-40. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3122/jabfm.2008.05.070287>
12. Rosser, W. W., Colwill, J. M., Kasperski, J., & Wilson, L. (2011). Progress of Ontario's family health team model: a patient-centered medical home. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, 9(2), 165-171.
13. Goh TT, Eccles MP. Team climate and quality of care in primary health care: a review of studies using the Team Climate Inventory in the United Kingdom. *BMC Research Notes* 2009;2:222
14. Canadian Association of Emergency Physicians and National Emergency Nurses Affiliation. Canadian Association of Emergency Physicians and National Emergency Nurses Affiliation (CAEPNENA) Joint Position Statement on Emergency Department Overcrowding. *Canadian Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2001;3(2):82–4.
15. Moskop, J. C., Sklar, D. P., Geiderman, J. M., Schears, R. M., & Bookman, K. J. (2009). Emergency department crowding, part 1—concept, causes, and moral consequences. *Annals of emergency medicine*, 53(5), 605-611.
16. Durand, A. C., Palazzolo, S., Tanti-Hardouin, N., Gerbeaux, P., Sambuc, R., & Gentile, S. (2012). Nonurgent patients in emergency departments: rational or irresponsible consumers? Perceptions of professionals and patients. *BMC research notes*, 5(1), 525.
17. Jaakkimainen RL, Barnsley J, Klein-Geltink J, Kopp A, Glazier RH. Did changing primary care delivery models change performance? A population based study using health administrative data. *BMC family practice*. 2011 Dec;12(1):44. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2296-12-44>
18. Muldoon L, Dahrouge S, Hogg W, Geneau R, Russell G, Shortt M. Community orientation in primary care practices: Results from the Comparison of Models of Primary Health Care in Ontario Study. *Canadian Family Physician*. 2010 Jul 1;56(7):676-83. Available at: <http://www.cfp.ca/content/56/7/676.short>
19. Glazier RH, Klein-Geltink J, Kopp A, Sibley LM. Capitation and enhanced fee-for-service models for primary care reform: a population-based evaluation. *Cmaj*. 2009 May 26;180(11):E72-81. Available at: <http://www.cmaj.ca/content/180/11/E72.short>
20. Kiran T, Victor JC, Kopp A, Shah BR, Glazier RH. The relationship between financial incentives and quality of diabetes care in Ontario, Canada. *Diabetes care*. 2012 May 1;35(5):1038-46. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2337/dc11-1402>
21. 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 Nov 17;187(17):E494-502. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.150579>
22. Glazier RH, Hutchison B, Kopp A. Comparison of family health teams to other Ontario primary care models, 2004/05 to 2011/12. Toronto: Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences. 2015.
23. Glazier RH, Zagorski BM, Rayner J. Comparison of Primary Care Models in Ontario by Demographics, Case Mix and Emergency Department Use, 2008/09 to 2009/10. ICES Investigative Report. Toronto: Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences; 2012.

24. Ontario Ministry of Finance. Ontario Fact Sheet April 2016 Available from:
<https://www.fin.gov.on.ca/en/economy/ecupdates/factsheet.html> Accessed 31 Dec 2019.
25. Hutchison B, Glazier R. Ontario's primary care reforms have transformed the local care landscape, but a plan is needed for ongoing improvement. *Health affairs*. 2013 Apr 1;32(4):695-703.
26. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2012.1087>
27. Kiran T, Kopp A, Glazier RH. Those Left Behind From Voluntary Medical Home Reforms in Ontario, Canada. *The Annals of Family Medicine*. 2016;14(6):517-25.
28. Auditor General Report available at: <https://www.auditor.on.ca/en/content/annualreports/arreports/en11/306en11.pdf>
29. Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Primary Health Care Team Fact Sheet. Family Health Organization. May 2007. Available at:
[https://www.anl.com/MOHGUIDE/44%20Family%20Health%20Organization%20\(FHO\)%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf](https://www.anl.com/MOHGUIDE/44%20Family%20Health%20Organization%20(FHO)%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf) Accessed on July 6, 2020
30. Kralj B. (2008). *Measuring Rurality –RIO2008 BASIC: Methodology and Results*. Toronto: Ontario Medical Association
31. The Johns Hopkins University. The Johns Hopkins ACG System. Accessed March 25, 2015 at
<http://acg.jhsph.org/index.php>
32. McCarthy D, Mueller K, Tillmann I, Fund C. Group Health Cooperative: reinventing primary care by connecting patients with a medical home: Commonwealth Fund; 2009.
33. Sinsky CA, Willard-Grace R, Schutzbank AM, Sinsky TA, Margolius D, Bodenheimer T. In search of joy in practice: a report of 23 high-functioning primary care practices. *The Annals of Family Medicine*. 2013;11(3):272-8
34. Ghorob A, Bodenheimer T. Sharing the care to improve access to primary care. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2012;366(21):1955-7.
35. Bodenheimer T, Laing BY. The teamlet model of primary care. *Ann Fam Med*. 2007;5(5):457-461.
36. Sinsky CA, Sinsky TA, Althaus D, Tranel J, Thiltgen M. Practice profile. 'Core teams': nurse-physician partnerships provide patient-centered care at an Iowa practice. *Health Aff (Millwood)*. 2010;29(5):966-968.
37. Kiran, T., Green, M. E., DeWit, Y., Khan, S., Schultz, S., Kopp, A., ... & Glazier, R. H. (2020). Association of physician payment model and team-based care with timely access in primary care: a population-based cross-sectional study. *CMAJ open*, 8(2), E328-E337.
38. Nielsen M, Olayiwola JN, Grundy P, Grumbach K. The patient-centered medical home's impact on cost & quality: An annual update of the evidence, 2012-2013. Washington, DC: Patient-Centered Primary Care Collaborative. 2014:37.
39. Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Primary Health Care Team Fact Sheet. Family Health Organization. May 2007. Available at:
[https://www.anl.com/MOHGUIDE/44%20Family%20Health%20Organization%20\(FHO\)%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf](https://www.anl.com/MOHGUIDE/44%20Family%20Health%20Organization%20(FHO)%20Fact%20Sheet.pdf) Accessed on July 6, 2020
40. Canadian Institute for Health Information. *How Canada Compares: Results From The Commonwealth Fund's 2016 International Health Policy Survey of Adults in 11 Countries*. Ottawa, Ontario: CIHI; 2017
41. Kiran, T., Green, M. E., DeWit, Y., Khan, S., Schultz, S., Kopp, A., ... & Glazier, R. H. (2020). Association of physician payment model and team-based care with timely access in primary care: a population-based cross-sectional study. *CMAJ open*, 8(2), E328-E337.
42. 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 Nov 17;187(17):E494-502. DOI:
<https://doi.org/10.1503/cmaj.150579>
43. Strumpf E, Ammi M, Diop M, Fiset-Laniel J, Tousignant P. The impact of team-based primary care on health care services utilization and costs: Quebec's family medicine groups. *Journal of health economics*. 2017 Sep 1;55:76-94.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhealeco.2017.06.009>

44. Glazier RH, Hutchison B, Kopp A. Comparison of family health teams to other Ontario primary care models, 2004/05 to 2011/12. Toronto: Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences. 2015.
45. Glazier RH, Zagorski BM, Rayner J. Comparison of Primary Care Models in Ontario by Demographics, Case Mix and Emergency Department Use, 2008/09 to 2009/10. ICES Investigative Report. Toronto: Institute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences; 2012.
46. Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care. Health Care Experience Survey Results. January 2014 to December 2017.
47. Association of Family Health Teams of Ontario. What is a Quality Improvement Decision support Specialist? Available at: <https://www.afhto.ca/news-events/news/what-quality-improvement-decision-support-specialist-qidss> Accessed on February 2020
48. Association of Family Health Teams of Ontario. D2D Data Dictionary. Available at: <https://www.afhto.ca/wp-content/uploads/Data-Dictionary-D2D-3.0.pdf> Accessed on February 2020
49. Green, M. E., Harris, S. B., Webster-Bogaert, S., Han, H., Kotecha, J., Kopp, A., ... & Glazier, R. H. (2017). Impact of a provincial quality-improvement program on primary health care in Ontario: a population-based controlled before-and-after study. *CMAJ open*, 5(2), E281.
50. American Diabetes Association. (2004). The breakthrough series: IHI's collaborative model for achieving breakthrough improvement. *Diabetes Spectrum*, 17(2), 97-101.
51. <http://www.hqontario.ca/Portals/0/documents/qi/qi-report-learningcollaborative1-0909-en.pdf>
52. Rosser, W. W., Colwill, J. M., Kasperski, J., & Wilson, L. (2011). Progress of Ontario's family health team model: a patient-centered medical home. *The Annals of Family Medicine*, 9(2), 165-171.
53. Kiran, T., Green, M. E., DeWit, Y., Khan, S., Schultz, S., Kopp, A., ... & Glazier, R. H. (2020). Association of physician payment model and team-based care with timely access in primary care: a population-based cross-sectional study. *CMAJ open*, 8(2), E328-E337.

Tables

Table 1A: Physician Group and physicians characteristics (on March 31st, 2015) – comparing HCES respondents in interprofessional teams to respondents in non-interprofessional teams				
	Interprofessional Teams		Non-interprofessional teams	
Physician Group characteristics				
Physician Groups No. (%)	177	38.0	288	62.0
Number of physicians per group, Mean (SD)	13.1	10.7	8.8	7.6
Years under the capitation model, Mean (SD)	6.0	3.0	4.2	2.6
Physicians characteristics				
Physicians No. (%)	2,131	47.2	2,387	52.8
Number of patients per physician, Mean (SD)	1,366	615.1	1,555	665.2
Sex No. (%)				
Female	987	46.3	1,045	43.8
Age group in Yrs. No. (%)				
<40	329	15.4	222	9.3
40-64	1,417	66.5	1,607	67.3
> 64	358	16.8	534	22.4
Missing	27	1.3	24	1.0
Country of medical graduation Canada No. (%)				
Yes	1,724	80.9	1,775	74.4
Years in practice No. (%)				
<5	47	2.2	41	1.7
5_15	620	29.1	420	17.6
16-25	495	23.2	606	25.4
>25	969	45.5	1,320	55.3
Missing	0	0	0	0
Table 1B: Patients' characteristics comparing HCES respondents in interprofessional teams to respondents in non-interprofessional teams in the year they responded to the survey				
	Interprofessional Teams		Non-interprofessional Teams	
Patients total	12,988	52.7	11,648	47.3
Sex No. (%)				
Female	7,678	57.6	6,856	57.7
Age group, yr. No. (%)				
16-44	3,819	33.0	3,653	34.9
45-64	5,272	42.4	4,661	41.4
65-84	3,602	23.1	3,071	22.1

84+	295	1.5	263	1.6
Missing	0	0	0	0
New OHIP registrants (within 10 years) No. (%)	355	3.1	460	5.1
Income quintile, No. (%)				
1 (low)	2,089	13.8	1,764	13.9
2	2,468	18.6	2,228	17.9
3	2,697	21.2	2,295	19.6
4	2,822	22.8	2,550	22.0
5 (high)	2,888	23.3	2,784	26.4
Missing	24	0.3	27	0.2
Rurality Index of Ontario, No. (%)				
Largest Urban (0)	3,759	33.6	4,000	42.6
Large urban (1 to 9)	2,388	17.1	4,078	29.4
Small-urban (10 to 39)	4,823	34.2	2,737	21.7
Rural (≥ 40)	1,892	14.4	763	5.8
Missing	126	0.7	70	0.4
Resource utilization band (RUB), No. (%)				
1	629	5.4	471	4.3
2	2,128	17.7	1,802	16.5
3	6,746	51.0	6,417	54.6
4	2,031	15.0	1,869	15.4
5 (very high user)	823	5.4	674	5.1
Non-user and Missing	631	5.5	415	4.2
Patients with Chronic disease				
2 + Co-morbidity No. (%)	6,096	42.6	5,628	44.3
3+ comorbidities No. (%)	3,482	23.3	3,207	24.5
4+ comorbidities No. (%)	1,828	11.9	2,686	12.4
5+ comorbidities No. (%)	894	5.8	791	6.1

Table 2A: Patient-reported timely access to care (same/next day) in the year patients responded to the HCES by physicians' characteristics identified on March 31st, 2015

	Interprofessional Teams		Non-interprofessional Teams	
	Denominator	Percentage	Denominator	Percentage
Physicians characteristics				
Sex				
Female	2,621	39.5	2,256	35.5
Male	3,880	39.3	3,614	37.4
Missing	36	19.4	31	29.0
Age group				
<40	761	40.6	433	33.5
40-64	4,381	39.1	3,973	35.9
> 64	1,243	40.3	1,369	40.6
Missing	152	27.6	126	25.4
Country of medical graduation Canada				
No	1,176	36.6	1,318	35.9
Yes	5,209	40.2	4,457	37.2
Missing	152	27.6	126	25.4
Years in practice				
<5	151	35.1	110	30.0
5_15	1,553	40.5	892	33.0
16-25	1,469	35.5	1,483	34.1
>25	3,328	40.7	3,385	39.0
Missing	36	19.4	31	29.0

Table 2B: Patient-reported timely access to care (same/next day) by patients' characteristics identified at the year they have responded to the HCES

	Interprofessional Teams		Non-interprofessional Teams	
	Denominator	Weighted Percentage	Denominator	Weighted Percentage
Overall self-reported timely Access to care	6,537	39.9	5,901	39.1
Sex				
Female	4,159	40.5	3,681	39.6
Males	2,378	38.8	2,220	38.2
Missing	0	–	0	–
Age group, yr.				

16-44	1,964	41.0	1,840	38.1
45-64	2,781	36.8	2,467	38.1
65+	1,680	44.5	1,479	42.5
Missing	112	40.0	115	43.1
New OHIP registrants (within 10 years)				
No	6,351	39.9	5,659	38.6
Yes	180	36.7	238	47.1
Income quintile				
1 (low)	1,030	37.6	862	35.8
2	1,239	39.7	1,132	40.3
3	1,340	41.1	1,193	37.1
4	1,419	38.9	1,254	37.9
5 (high)	1,500	41.2	1,445	42.2
Missing	9	29.3	15	32.9
Rurality Index of Ontario				
Largest Urban (0)	2,010	42.8	2,133	42.9
Large urban (1 to 9)	1,276	42.2	2,077	37.1
Small-urban (10 to 39)	2,375	39.1	1,312	36.1
Rural (≥ 40)	832	30.1	345	29.5
Missing	44	18.7	34	31.3
Resource utilization band (RUB)				
1	234	42.1	167	42.0
2	868	38.4	700	36.7
3	3,625	39.5	3,421	39.3
4	1,172	42.6	1,114	39.2
5 (very high user)	508	40.5	425	41.7
Non-user and Missing	130	44.4	74	24.1
Patients with Chronic disease				
2 + Co-morbidity				
No	3,221	38.2	2,817	37.8
Yes	3,316	41.8	3,084	40.4
3+ comorbidities				
No	4,602	40.0	4,087	37.8
Yes	1,935	39.4	1,814	42.6

4+ comorbidities				
No	5,505	39.7	4,931	38.6
Yes	1,032	41.1	970	41.9
5+ comorbidities				
No	6,022	39.8	5,444	38.8
Yes	515	40.8	457	43.1

Table 3A: Patient-reported after-hours access to care (very easy and somewhat easy) in the year patients responded to the HCES by physicians' characteristics identified on March 31st, 2015

	Interprofessional Teams		Non-interprofessional Teams	
	Denominator	Percentage	Denominator	Percentage
Physicians characteristics				
Sex				
Female	4,917	32.3	4,246	34.5
Male	7,769	29.9	7,145	34.0
Missing	83	27.7	65	29.2
Age group				
<40	1,385	31.2	829	36.4
40-64	8,542	31.3	7,605	33.9
> 64	2,523	29.4	2,791	34.6
Missing	319	26.6	231	29.0
Country of medical graduation Canada				
No	2,324	27.6	2,572	33.7
Yes	10,126	31.6	8,653	34.4
Missing	319	26.6	231	29.0
Years in practice				
<5	285	27.0	205	34.1
5-15	2,907	31.9	1,679	33.7
16-25	2,865	31.7	2,791	33.0
>25	6,629	30.1	6,716	34.8
Missing	83	27.7	65	29.2

Table 3B: Patient-reported after-hours access to care (very easy and somewhat easy) by patients' characteristics identified in the year they have responded to the HCES

	Interprofessional Teams		HCES Respondents in Non-interprofessional Teams	
	Denominator	Weighted Percentage	Denominator	Weighted Percentage
Overall patient-reported after-hours access to care	12,769	30.8	11,456	35.2
Patients characteristics				
Sex				
Female	7,584	33.4	6,765	37.0
Males	5,185	30.9	4,691	32.8

Missing				
Age group, yr.				
16-44	3,703	38.9	3,544	39.3
45-64	5,199	30.9	4,602	34.2
65+	3,575	26.0	3,051	31.1
Missing	292	28.5	259	33.9
New OHIP registrants (within 10 years)				
Yes	346	30.4	445	40.0
NO	12410	32.4	10997	35.0
Missing	13	42.8	14	47.9
Income quintile				
1 (low)	2,038	32.3	1,718	34.5
2	2,427	29.6	2,187	33.8
3	2,655	32.1	2,268	33.2
4	2,777	34.7	2,511	35.6
5 (high)	2,849	32.4	2,745	37.8
Missing	23	44.4	27	33.2
Rurality Index of Ontario				
Largest Urban (0)	3,700	38.3	3,931	37.8
Large urban (1 to 9)	2,344	41.5	4,010	39.0
Small-urban (10 to 39)	4,752	28.0	2,699	28.6
Rural (≥ 40)	1,852	18.4	746	23.2
Missing	121	23.4	70	24.6
Resource utilization band (RUB)				
1	609	33.4	457	38.4
2	2,073	35.8	1,771	37.9
3	6,671	30.9	6,334	35.1
4	2,013	32.0	1,845	34.4
5	816	30.8	671	33.7
Non-user and Missing	587	39.6	378	37.7
Patients with Chronic disease				
2 + Co-morbidity				
No	6,732	34.0	5,875	36.1
Yes	6,037	30.1	5,581	34.2

3+ comorbidities				
No	9,322	33.2	8,274	35.3
Yes	3,447	29.4	3,182	35.0
4+ comorbidities				
No	10,963	32.6	9,784	35.2
Yes	1,806	30.2	1,672	35.7
5+ comorbidities				
No	11,886	32.5	10,672	35.0
Yes	883	29.8	784	38.4

Table 4A: Patient-reported walk-in clinic use in the year patients responded to the HCES by physicians' characteristics identified on March 31st, 2015

	Interprofessional Teams		Non-interprofessional Teams	
	Denominator	Percentage	Denominator	Percentage
Physicians characteristics				
Sex				
Male	7,909	17.3	7,279	26.1
Female	4,994	20.3	4,302	28.8
Missing	85	17.6	67	23.9
Age group				
<40	1,418	19.3	842	27.8
40-64	8,670	18.7	7,717	26.8
> 64	2,573	17.4	2,852	28.1
Missing	327	16.5	237	20.7
Country of medical graduation				
Canada				
Yes	10,286	18.2	8,771	26.3
No	2,375	19.8	2,640	30.3
Missing	327	16.5	237	20.7
Years in practice				
<5	294	17.3	210	20.5
5_15	2,971	19.1	1,703	27.2
16-25	2,903	19.7	2,835	26.7
>25	6,735	17.7	6,833	27.4
Missing	85	17.6	67	23.9

Table 4B: Patient-reported walk-in clinic by patients' characteristics identified at the year they have responded to the HCES

	Interprofessional Teams		Non-Interprofessional Teams	
	Denominator	Weighted Percentage	Denominator	Weighted Percentage
Overall patient-reported walk-in clinic	12,988	19.7	11,648	28.2
Patients characteristics				
Sex				
Males	5,310	17.7	4,792	26.1
Female	7,678	21.2	6,856	29.7
Missing	0	--	0	--

Age group, yr.				
16-44	3,819	29.5	3,653	37.6
45-64	5,272	17.1	4,661	27.4
65-84	3,602	11.3	3,071	15.9
85+	295	10.1	263	14.9
Missing	0	--	0	--
New OHIP registrants (within 10 years)				
Yes	355	23.6	460	34.2
No	12620	19.6	11174	27.8
Missing	13	21.0	14	40.8
Income quintile				
1 (low)	2,089	19.2	1,764	27.1
2	2,468	17.4	2,228	27.6
3	2,697	20.6	2,295	28.7
4	2,822	20.4	2,550	30.4
5 (high)	2,888	20.4	2,784	26.8
Missing	24	12.6	27	36.3
Rurality Index of Ontario				
Largest Urban (0)	3,759	21.8	4000	30.2
Large urban (1 to 9)	2,388	32.0	4078	34.8
Small-urban (10 to 39)	4,823	16.2	2737	19.8
Rural (≥ 40)	1,892	9.3	763	10.9
Missing	126	11.2	70	34.9
Resource utilization band (RUB)				
1	629	18.5	471	26.8
2	2,128	17.4	1,802	27.8
3	6,746	20.2	6,417	29.6
4	2,031	23.0	1,869	30.9
5	823	18.2	674	20.6
Non-user and Missing	631	18.5	415	25.7
Patients with Chronic disease				
2 + Co-morbidity				
Yes	6,096	17.5	5,628	25.9
No	6,892	21.4	6,020	30.0

3+ comorbidities				
Yes	3,482	16.8	3,207	24.7
No	9,506	20.6	8,441	29.3
4+ comorbidities				
Yes	1,828	17.0	1,686	22.7
No	11,160	20.1	9,962	28.9
5+ comorbidities				
Yes	894	17.3	791	20.1
No	12,094	19.9	10,857	28.7

Table 5A: All Emergency Department (ED) visits in the year patients responded to the HCES by physicians' characteristics identified on March 31st 2015

	Interprofessional Teams		Non-interprofessional Teams	
	≥1 ED visits		≥1 ED visits	
	Denominator	Percentage	Denominator	Percentage
Physicians characteristics				
Sex				
Male	7909	27.8	7279	24.4
Female	4994	24.8	4302	21.9
Missing	85	29.4	67	20.9
Age group				
<40	1418	26.0	842	27.4
40-64	8670	26.4	7717	22.7
> 64	2573	27.6	2852	24.7
Missing	327	30.9	237	19.8
Country of medical graduation				
Canada				
Yes	10286	26.1	8771	23.2
No	2375	28.6	2640	24.9
Missing	327	30.9	237	19.8
Years in practice				
<5	294	31.6	210	20.0
5_15	2971	26.4	1703	25.3
16-25	2903	25.5	2835	22.9
>25	6735	27.1	6833	23.4
Missing	85	29.4	67	20.9

Table 5B: All ED visits by patients' characteristics identified in the year they responded to the HCES

	HCES Respondents in Interprofessional Teams		HCES Respondents in Non-interprofessional Teams	
	≥1 ED visits		≥1 ED visits	
	Denominator	Weighted Percentage	Denominator	Weighted Percentage
Overall ED visits	12988	26.7	11648	23.5
Sex				
Males	5310	26.7	4792	22.9
Female	7678	26.7	6856	23.9
Missing	0	–	0	–

Age group, yr.				
16-44	3819	26.8	3653	22.3
45-64	5272	24.1	4661	21.8
65-84	3602	29.2	3071	26.1
85+	295	40.0	263	38.4
Missing	0	–	0	–
New OHIP registrants (within 10 years)				
Yes	355	20.3	460	22.0
No	12620	26.9	11174	23.6
Income quintile				
1 (low)	2089	33.3	1764	27.7
2	D/S	D/S	D/S	D/S
3	2697	26.4	2295	23.8
4	2822	24.8	2550	21.9
5 (high)	2888	22.6	2784	21.6
Missing	D/S	D/S	D/S	D/S
Rurality Index of Ontario				
Largest Urban (0)	3759	23.5	4000	20.9
Large urban (1 to 9)	2388	22.0	4078	20.3
Small-urban (10 to 39)	4823	27.8	2737	28.0
Rural (≥ 40)	1892	35.3	763	37.5
Missing	126	38.1	70	30.0
Resource utilization band (RUB)				
1	629	19.9	471	15.7
2	2128	19.2	1802	15.2
3	6746	25.7	6417	22.7
4	2031	34.6	1869	31.7
5 (very high user)	823	48.5	674	42.7
Non-user and Missing	631	15.5	415	13.5
Patients with Chronic disease				
2 + Co-morbidity				
Yes	6096	32.0	5628	23.5
No	6892	22.0	6020	23.5

3+ comorbidities				
Yes	3482	36.4	3207	32.6
No	9506	23.1	8441	20.0
4+ comorbidities				
Yes	1828	40.6	1686	37.9
No	11160	24.4	9962	21.0
5+ comorbidities				
Yes	894	47.0	791	41.6
No	12094	25.2	10857	22.2
D/S= Data suppressed where counts are between 1 and 5; additional suppression may be applied where counts are greater than 5 to prevent residual disclosure of suppressed values—in compliant with the Personal Health Information Protection Act (PHIPA) privacy legislation.				

Table 6: Association between enrolment in an interprofessional team-based model and timely access, after-hours access to care, walk-in clinic use and emergency department visits in the year responded to the survey

Timely access to care Reference: non-interprofessional teams				
	OR	95% CI		P-Value
Unadjusted (null model)	1.03	0.91	1.15	0.6764
†Adjusted for:				
Physician group characteristics	1.01	0.90	1.13	0.8397
Group and physicians' characteristics	1.02	0.92	1.14	0.7041
Physician group, physician and patients	1.12	1.00	1.24	0.0436*
After-hours care at the year responded to the survey				
Reference: non-interprofessional teams				
	OR	95% CI		P-Value
Unadjusted (null model)	0.87	0.79	0.96	0.0068*
†Adjusted for:				
Physician group characteristics	0.81	0.73	0.89	<0.0001*
Group and physicians' characteristics	0.81	0.73	0.90	<0.0001*
Physician group, physician and patients	1.01	0.91	1.12	0.8251
Walk-in clinic visits at the year responded to the survey				
Reference: non-interprofessional teams				
	OR	95% CI		P-Value
Unadjusted (null model)	0.63	0.57	0.69	<0.001*
†Adjusted for:				
Physician group characteristics	0.67	0.60	0.74	<0.001*
Group and physicians' characteristics	0.68	0.61	0.76	<0.001*
Physician group, physician and patients	0.84	0.75	0.94	0.0019*
Emergency department uses at the year responded to the survey				
Reference: non-interprofessional teams				
	OR	95% CI		P-Value
Unadjusted (null model)	1.17	1.08	1.28	<0.0002*
†Adjusted for:				
Physician group characteristics	1.20	1.10	1.31	<0.001*
Group and physicians' characteristics	1.20	1.10	1.30	<0.001*
Physician group, physician and patients	1.05	0.95	1.15	0.3234

*p-value significant <0.05

† Adjustment used physician groups and physicians' characteristics identified on March 31st, 2015 and patients' characteristics at the year they have responded to the HCES

Figures




Figure 1

Study Population Flow Diagram




Figure 2

Data Extractions and Cohort Generation

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [AppendixHCESquestionnaire.docx](#)