

TITLE PAGE

Title: Feminization of the rheumatology workforce: A longitudinal evaluation of patient volumes, practice sizes and physician remuneration

Running header: *Feminization of rheumatology*

Authors:

Jessica Widdifield ¹ PhD	ORCID: 0000-0002-7464-0460
Jodi M. Gatley ² MPH	ORCID: 0000-0001-8366-8214
Janet E. Pope ³ MD, FRCPC, MPH	ORCID: 0000-0003-1479-5302
Claire E.H. Barber ⁴ MD, FRCPC, PhD	ORCID: 0000-0002-3062-5488
Bindee Kuriya ⁵ MD, FRCPC, SM	ORCID: 0000-0003-3370-0006
Lih Eder ⁶ MD, PhD	ORCID: 0000-0002-1473-1715
Carter Thorne ⁷ MD, FRCPC	ORCID: 0000-0002-1721-190X
Vicki Ling ⁸ MSc	ORCID: 0000-0001-5185-4709
J. Michael Paterson ⁹ MSc	ORCID: 0000-0001-5995-1714
Vandana Ahluwalia ¹⁰ MD, FRCPC	ORCID: 0000-0001-9381-553X
Courtney Marks ¹¹	ORCID: none
Sasha Bernatsky ¹² MD, FRCPC, PhD	ORCID: 0000-0002-9515-2802

Affiliations:

1. Scientist, ICES, Sunnybrook Research Institute, Holland Bone & Joint Program, Toronto; Assistant Professor, Institute of Health Policy, Management & Evaluation, University of Toronto, Canada
2. Epidemiologist, ICES, Toronto, Canada
3. Professor, Division of Rheumatology, Western University, Schulich School of Medicine & Dentistry; St Joseph's Health Care London, Canada
4. Assistant Professor, The Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada; Arthritis Research Canada
5. Assistant Professor, Division of Rheumatology, University of Toronto; Sinai Health System, Canada
6. Assistant Professor, Women's College Research Institute, Toronto; University of Toronto, Canada
7. Assistant Professor, Department of Medicine, University of Toronto; Southlake Regional Health Centre, Newmarket, Canada
8. Analyst, ICES, Toronto, Canada
9. Senior Scientist, ICES, Toronto; Assistant Professor, McMaster University, Department of Family Medicine, Hamilton; Institute of Health Policy, Management & Evaluation, University of Toronto, Canada
10. Rheumatologist, William Osler Health System, Brampton, Ontario, Canada
11. Trainee, Sunnybrook Research Institute, Holland Bone & Joint Program, Toronto
12. Professor, Department of Epidemiology, McGill University; Research Institute of the McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

Correspondence:

Jessica Widdifield
 Holland Bone & Joint Research Program, Sunnybrook Research Institute
 MG 352 - 2075 Bayview Avenue, Toronto ON, M4N 3M5
 T: (416) 480-6100 x 89436 E-mail: jessica.widdifield@utoronto.ca

Funding: This study was funded by an operating grant from the Canadian Initiative for Outcomes in Rheumatology Care (CIORA), who played no role in the design or conduct of the study, other than providing peer-review of the study proposal.

Competing Interests: None

Key indexing terms: rheumatology, workforce, health human resource planning, gender,

Manuscript Details:

Manuscript Type: Full-length Manuscript

Manuscript word count: 3496/3500

Abstract word count: 249/250

Number of references: 48/50

Number of tables: 4

Number of supplementary tables: 5

Accepted Article

ABSTRACT

Objective:

To compare differences in clinical activity and remuneration between male and female rheumatologists and to evaluate associations between physician gender and practice sizes and patient volume, accounting for rheumatologists' age, and calendar year effects.

Methods:

We conducted a population-based study in Ontario, Canada between 2000-2015 identifying all rheumatologists practicing as full-time equivalents (FTE) or above and assessed differences in practice sizes (number of unique patients), practice volumes (number of patient visits), and remuneration (total fee-for-service billings) between male and female rheumatologists. Multivariable linear regression was used to evaluate the effects of gender on practice size and volume separately, accounting for age and year.

Results:

The number of rheumatologists practicing at or above one FTE increased from 89 to 120 from 2000 to 2015, with the percentage of females increasing from 27.0% to 41.7%. Males had larger practice sizes and practice volumes. Remuneration was consistently higher for males (between \$46,000-\$102,000 annually). Our adjusted analyses estimated that in a given year, males saw a mean of 606 (95% CI 107-1105) more patients than females did, and had 1,059 (95% CI 345-1773) more patient visits. Among males and females combined, there was a small but statistically significant reduction in mean annual number of patient visits, and middle-aged rheumatologists had greater practice sizes and volumes than their younger/older counterparts.

Conclusions:

On average, female rheumatologists saw fewer patients and had fewer patient visits annually relative to males, resulting in lower earnings. Increasing feminization necessitates workforce planning to ensure that populations' needs are met.

N=249/250

Introduction

In industrialized countries, there has been a substantial shift in the gender distribution of the medical workforce with physician workforces become increasingly female, a concept termed as “feminization of medicine” (1-3). An increasing body of evidence has identified specific attributes of female physicians relative to their male counterparts, including stronger patient–physician partnerships and more effective communication styles (4, 5), spending more time with their patients (6, 7), focusing more on preventive health services (4, 8-10), providing more guideline-concordant care (9, 11, 12). Consequently, patients under the care of female physicians may potentially achieve better patient outcomes (13-15) (although these observations are subject to ongoing debate). Conversely, concerns have been raised that increasing workforce feminization may result in reduced patient access as some studies have found that, on average, female physicians work fewer hours than males (19-22), and/or work on a part-time basis (22, 23), and are more likely to take periods of leave (19).

To date, most attention has been focused on the increasing representation of female physicians in primary care workforces (16). However, some specialty-based workforces are increasingly seeing more female representation including urology (17), immunology (18), dermatology (19), geriatric medicine(20), endocrinology (21), pediatrics (22) and obstetrics (23). The subspecialty of rheumatology has also seen a restructuring of the gender composition of its workforce. In Canada, females accounted for less than one third of rheumatologists in 1995, but reached parity in 2015, with an upward trajectory since (24). In particular, many younger Canadian rheumatologists are female, accounting for 72% of rheumatologists under 45 years of age as of 2018 (25). Limited research in this field suggests that female rheumatologists may also have different practice patterns than males (26-28). While less is known about gender differences in practice patterns

specific to the rheumatology setting, the increasing proportion of females in the rheumatology workforce may have implications for future physician supply and patient access.

In light of the rapidly changing demographics of the rheumatology workforce, it is crucial to understand how feminization is influencing clinical capacity. Thus, we sought to compare differences in clinical activity and remuneration between male and female rheumatologists in a government-funded healthcare setting, and to evaluate the effects of physician gender on clinical activity, accounting for rheumatologists' age, and calendar year effects.

Materials and Methods

Study Design and Setting

We conducted a population-based retrospective observational study in Ontario, Canada. We analyzed the administrative databases held at ICES from the province of Ontario, comprising data of approximately 14 million residents (as of 2015) who are covered under a publicly funded healthcare system. As of 2015, approximately 40% of the Canadian rheumatology workforce resided in Ontario (27).

Data Sources

We identified rheumatologists and patient visits with rheumatologists between April 1, 2000 and March 31, 2015. Rheumatologists were identified using the ICES Physician Database, a physician registry that is constructed and regularly validated using the Ontario Health Insurance Plan (OHIP) Corporate Provider Database, the Ontario Physician Human Resources Data Centre Database, and physicians' OHIP fee-for-service billing claims. It provides information on physician demographics, types of certified specialities, and is linkable to OHIP Claims History Database to quantify the health services provided by each physician (detailed below) .

Rheumatologists were excluded from years where they had no claims, with the date of the last claim used to identify the year first excluded. They could re-enter the workforce upon resuming activity.

The OHIP Claims History Database was used to identify patients aged 18 years and older seen by rheumatologists. The services rendered are identified using specific fee codes in the OHIP Schedule of Benefits. These billing claims also indicate the location of service (e.g., hospital-versus office-based) (29). We obtained patient demographic information and vital status from the OHIP Registered Persons Database.

These datasets were linked using unique encoded identifiers and analyzed at ICES (www.ices.on.ca). The use of the data in this project was authorized under section 45 of Ontario's Personal Health Information Protection Act, which does not require review by a Research Ethics Board.

Analysis

All outcomes were reported at the provider level and were stratified by physician gender and aggregated on an annual basis. In order to quantify clinical activity, we calculated clinical full-time equivalents (FTEs) using annual fee-for-service billing claims, which are submitted by all rheumatologists in Ontario including those working in hospitals. Rheumatologists practicing at least one clinical FTE were defined as those who were at or above the 40th percentile of total billings each year (30). We identified the total number of rheumatologists and the number working at least one clinical FTE. Rheumatologists practicing less than one FTE (about one third of the Ontario rheumatology workforce during this period (26)) were not included in the remaining analyses of practice sizes, volumes, and remuneration as their primary roles are more likely to be

in research, administration, and/or teaching, rather than clinical care and also receive institutional salary support outside of fee-for-service billing claims.

We also identified rheumatologists who worked at least 209 days in a given year (an alternative FTE benchmark) (26) with at least three patient visits on those days, as a secondary measure of clinical activity in order to account for number of days spent providing clinical care. Patient contacts were defined as any in-person clinical service (i.e., patient claim) with any outpatient or inpatient fee code.

Annual median practice volume (i.e., the number of patient visits in an outpatient setting) and median practice size (i.e., the number of unique patients seen) were reported. We also described the number of rheumatologists according to practice size and practice volume categories in 2000, 2007, and 2015. Practice size categories were based on the number of unique patients seen (i.e., <1500, 1500 to 1999, or \geq 2000 patients), while practice volume categories were based on the number of patient visits (i.e., <3500, 3500 to 4999, or \geq 5000 patient visits). We estimated median payments to rheumatologists in Canadian dollars, defined as the sum of paid fee-for-service billings and alternative payments (e.g., from additional hospital service). Median was chosen for outcomes with non-normal distributions. For all outcomes, effect sizes were reported as either mean or median differences. We compared annual values by gender each year using either the Mann-Whitney U test or Chi-squared test, as appropriate.

Multivariable linear regression was used to evaluate the effect of physician gender on practice volume and practice size separately, controlling for physician age (categorical) and year (continuous). We tested an interaction between gender and year by running models separately by gender for the effect of individual years on practice size and practice volume, controlling for physician age. In a sensitivity analysis, rheumatologists who fell within the highest and lowest

five percent of practice volume or practice size were excluded, and all models were run again with the truncated sample. This was intended to evaluate whether ‘outlier’ physicians influenced the results.

All analyses were performed at ICES using SAS version 7.15 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC, USA).

Results

Annual total number of all rheumatologists and clinical FTEs by physician gender (Table 1)

The total number of rheumatologists increased from 146 in 2000 to 194 in 2015, Table 1. Overall, there was an increasing percentage of females in the workforce over time, reaching 49.0% of the workforce in 2015.

Across all years, the percentage of rheumatologists working at least one clinical FTE ranged from 25.3% - 43.0% for females, whereas 57.0% to 74.7% of the clinical FTE workforce were males. Over the period under study, fewer than half of all female rheumatologists worked in a clinical FTE capacity whereas the majority (64.7% to 72.0%) of males did (Table 1).

As an alternative clinical FTE measure, the total number of rheumatologists who saw at least three patients in any setting on at least 209 days out of the year identified only 20 females (40-72%) and 50 males (67-85%) annually (Supplementary Table 1). A significantly lower percentage of females met this secondary benchmark of clinical activity, as compared to males, across over two thirds of the study years.

Comparison of practice sizes and volumes between female and male rheumatologists (Table 2)

Among both male and female clinical FTE rheumatologists, there were trends toward decreasing

Accepted Article

median practice sizes (number of unique patients seen annually) over the study period [females: 1605.5 patients (IQR 1276, 2228) in 2000 vs. 1468.5 patients (IQR 1212, 1984) in 2015; males: 2242 patients (IQR 1606, 2936) in 2000 vs. 1948.5 patients (IQR 1433, 2562)]. Males had significantly larger median practice sizes as compared to females in all but one year (2001). The gap in median practice sizes between males and females fluctuated over the study span, with a non-significant gap of 356 (95% CI -92, 805; $p=0.1121$) in 2001, up to a high of 677 more patients for males (95% CI 389, 979; $p<0.001$) in 2012.

While practice sizes declined over time for both genders, median practice volumes (total patient visits annually) were relatively stable for males, but trended to decline for females over the study span, with the gap widening over time. Males had significantly larger median practice volumes in most years. Gaps in median practice volume between males and females varied over the study period, ranging from a minimum non-significant gap of 668 visits in 2001 (95% CI -73, 1490) to a peak of 1486 more patient visits (95% CI 628, 2517) for male rheumatologists in 2008, Table 2.

When median practice size was examined categorically over three years (2000, 2007, and 2015), there was consistently a smaller percentage of female rheumatologists in the 'large' practice category (i.e., ≥ 2000 unique patients) and in the highest practice volume category (i.e. ≥ 5000 patient visits) relative to male rheumatologists (Supplementary Table 2).

Comparison of annual remuneration between female and male rheumatologists (Table 3)

The annual median payments to individual rheumatologists increased for both males and females during the study period (Table 3). Median female remuneration spanned \$199,730 (IQR \$180,696, \$262,409) in 2000 to \$362,522 (IQR \$309,503, \$437,127) by 2015, while male remuneration went from \$285,93 (IQR \$211,796, \$354,507) in 2000 to \$403,903 (IQR \$313,297, \$544,703) in

2015. Across years, male remuneration was significantly higher than female remuneration, with the median difference (gross earnings gap) ranging from \$45,556 to \$102,176.

Association of rheumatologist gender with practice volume and sizes (Table 4)

In the multivariable regression model for practice volume (adjusted for age and year), we found that female gender was associated with lower practice volume (-1058.9 patient visits, 95% CI -1773.3, -344.5) (Table 4). In the model for gender and practice size (adjusted for age and year), there was also an association with female gender and lower practice size (-605.8 unique patients, 95% CI -1104.5, -107.1). Rheumatologists in the middle age group (45-64 years) tended to have larger practice sizes and service volumes, whereas older providers (aged 65 years and over) tended to have lower service volumes, as compared to the younger rheumatologists (aged <45 years), adjusting for gender and year.

In the multivariable regression models stratified by gender, there was an increase in practice volume among male rheumatologists in 2008 of 1458.7 visits (95% CI 2.3, 2835), relative to 2000, and adjusted for age (Supplementary Table 3). Practice volume declined among males aged 65 and older (by -1254.31 visits annually, 95% CI -2145, -363.6), while practice size increased among middle aged males 45 to 64 years old (by 1028.6 patients annually, 95% CI 639.4, 1417.9), both relative to the youngest age group (under 45 years). Among females, practice volume increased for middle-aged women by 498.6 visits annually (95% CI 267, 730.3).

In the sensitivity analyses involving the truncated sample, our multivariable regression model confirmed that female gender was still negatively associated with both practice size and practice volume after adjusting for age and year (Supplementary Table 4). However, increasing year was negatively associated with practice size (fewer unique patients being seen annually), with no effect for practice volume. Relationships with physician age were similar to those in the main

analysis, except that there was no effect of belonging to the middle age group on practice volume. In the models for year stratified by gender and adjusted for age, there were no clear effects within genders on practice volume, but practice sizes fluctuated over time (Supplementary Table 5). Similar results to those observed in the main analyses were seen for age group in the gender-stratified models, controlling for year.

Discussion

We examined longitudinal changes in clinical activity and remuneration between male and female rheumatologists over a 15-year-period in the setting of a provincial-payer healthcare system for all rheumatology services. We observed growth in the number of rheumatologists and those working at least one clinical FTE. The percentage of rheumatologists who worked at least one clinical FTE was consistently higher for males (65%-72%) than females (50%). By calendar year, median practice sizes tended to decline for both genders, whereas practice volumes were relatively stable for males but declining among females. Female rheumatologists nearly always had lower practice sizes, patient volumes, and remuneration than males. After controlling for age and year, female gender was still associated with lower practice sizes and practice volumes. These findings highlight key differences in practice patterns between males and females that are essential to account for in rheumatology workforce planning.

Our findings of decreasing practice size and practice volume for both female and male rheumatologists in Ontario are in line with prior findings within rheumatology, for other clinical specialties, and among physicians more generally in Canada (26, 31-34). Previously, we found that the median number of days with any patient visit fell from 231 days to 205.5 days between

2000 and 2015 among all rheumatologists in Ontario (26). A separate study of all physicians in Ontario found a 14% decrease in yearly patient visits from 1992 to 2013, although number of distinct patients seen was stable(33). In Canada, decreases in weekly work hours devoted to patient care have been observed among all physicians since the early 1990s (31-34). These reductions may reflect the trend among younger cohorts of physicians to have decreasing numbers of visits each year than did physicians from older generations. Indeed, younger physicians (under 35 years old) in the US and Canada report working fewer hours than older doctors (35, 36), which may partly reflect the high importance placed on work-life balance among this generational group . Additional contributing factors could be the increasing complexity of care, structural changes in care delivery (e.g. electronic medical records (EMR), more non-patient work such as form completion), or more external consulting activities. For example, an observational study of American physicians across various specialities found nearly two hours were spent on administrative work and EMR completion for each hour of face-to-face time with patients (37).

A central concern of these findings is that given that female rheumatologists see fewer patients, increased feminization of the rheumatology workforce may lead to longer patient wait-times and reduced clinical capacity. Many barriers may be preventing females from working at the same clinical capacity as their male peers. Prior research suggests that gender differences in work patterns among physicians are strongly tied to family characteristics including relationship status and children, and may be influenced by societal expectations in domestic and caregiving responsibilities (31, 32, 38). Female physicians are also more likely to take periods of leave for parental leave, illness/injury, or other reasons (38), yet service capacity appears to rebound to a higher level following child-bearing years, before declining with older age similar to males (32). The prevalence of burnout among female physicians is 20%-60% higher than among males, and

there is evidence that this is influenced by societal expectations placing a disproportionate burden on female physicians (39). Workforce disparities for women in rheumatology almost certainly play some role in physician burnout. Many female physicians also report encountering sex or gender-based discrimination in the workplace, and fewer females are represented in leadership and mentor positions (40-43). On the other hand, the higher clinical activity of male rheumatologists may indicate that men are more likely to be the primary income earner in their household (44), placing higher demands on them to see more patients. Additionally, males are more likely to be older physicians, with established practices and may receive more referrals than their female peers.

Our finding of year-over-year increases in remuneration is also in line with increases in reimbursement fees for services to Ontario physicians implemented over the study period (45). As both male and female Ontario rheumatologists are paid the same flat rates for services regardless of age, gender, or other physician characteristics (which in theory ensures that males and females receive the same remuneration for the same service), gender differences in remuneration can be assumed to reflect differences in practice patterns. However, it should be noted that payments to rheumatologists in our study do not directly reflect the net incomes rheumatologists receive as they are not adjusted for overhead and other expenses incurred by rheumatologists in running their practices. In Ontario, there is no specific funding allocated for administrative overhead, nursing, physiotherapists, occupational therapists, nurse practitioners, and physician assistants, essential to supporting rheumatology practices. Overhead is likely to vary substantially by practice, and it is difficult to construct a complete account of rheumatologists' income.(46)

Accepted Article

It is important to consider that differing practice patterns in male versus female specialists may have complex implications for health system sustainability, costs and quality of care, in a time when the burden of rheumatic and musculoskeletal diseases is increasing with population aging and expansion (i.e. immigration) (47). Health human resources planning needs to consider workforce feminization to offset potential negative consequences of lower supply. For instance, it may require more than one rheumatologist to take the place of an established male rheumatologist exiting the workforce. To inform policies and strategies related to improving supply of rheumatologists, future research is needed to predict the future rheumatology supply requirements, and demand for rheumatology care taking into account population needs as well as changing workforce clinical capacity. While the true deficit in rheumatology supply has not fully been quantified, immediate efforts to expand recruitment of clinical FTEs are needed considering the lag time required to train new rheumatologists. Moreover, more research is needed to better understand how the care of patients is distributed, potential differences in practice patterns and clinical case mix, and quality of care between male and female rheumatologists.

A key strength of this study was that we used population-based data from a large publicly-funded healthcare system, which captured virtually all rheumatology billing claims and physician demographics in a province of 14 million residents (as of 2015). To our knowledge, this is the first Canadian study to directly compare differences in clinical activity and remuneration between male and female rheumatologists. Ontario, being the most populous Canadian province, contains the largest Canadian rheumatology workforce, and while rheumatology supply differs across Canada, changing workforce characteristics in Ontario are likely to be generalizable to the broader Canadian and international rheumatology workforces as a whole. However, the effects of

increasing workforce feminization may have larger implications in settings with smaller rheumatology workforces where access to rheumatology care is already strained.

Despite these strengths, we acknowledge potential limitations. There is no standard definition of a clinical FTE rheumatologist and there are no records available of exact hours worked by physicians in Ontario. We chose to define FTEs by setting a percentile cut-off of fee-for-service billings as a proxy measure, as has been used previously, and which is not impacted by changes in fee levels over time(30) (48). In this study the 40th percentile of billings was used to define one FTE; simulations demonstrate that FTE counts are generally insensitive across benchmark ranges e.g. 60th vs 70th percentile to define high volume providers. In light of the lack of consensus on defining FTE, we also presented an alternative measure based on the annual number of days providing clinical care (26). We also do not have reasons as to why certain rheumatologists were practicing less than a clinical FTE. We assumed their primary responsibilities were outside of providing clinical care (e.g. research, administrative, teaching), however they may have also opted to work part time.

Another limitation is that we could only focus on gender, and did not have access to information about gender-related factors (e.g. marital status, family size and childcare roles) that could contribute to the relationship between physician gender and practice-level activity. Additionally, we lacked information on whether or not rheumatologists were practicing in multidisciplinary care teams and we were unable to assess differences between academic and community-based practices.

In summary, the current study provides crucial information about gender differences in clinical activity and practice characteristics of rheumatologists. In order for future health workforce policy

and planning to be effective and equitable, it is essential to consider policies and other solutions to support the sustainability of rheumatology workforces in light of increasing feminization, particularly in an era of increasing demand for rheumatology services and an already strained rheumatology supply. Future research should aim to further delineate possible gender differences in practice patterns and quality of care.

Acknowledgements

This study was funded by an operating grant from the Canadian Initiative for Outcomes in Rheumatology Care (CIORA), who played no role in the design or conduct of the study, other than providing peer-review of the study proposal. This study was supported by ICES which is funded by an annual grant from the Ontario Ministry of Health and Long-Term Care (MOHLTC). Parts of this material are based on data and information compiled and provided by the MOHLTC. 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. Widdifield receives support from the Arthritis Society Stars Career Development Award (STAR-19-0610). Barber receives support from the Arthritis Society Stars Career Development Award funded by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research-Institute of Musculoskeletal Health and Arthritis STAR-19-0611/CIHR SI2-169745. Bernatsky holds a career award from the Fonds de la recherche en santé du Québec.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Widdifield takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis. Widdifield/Gatley drafted the manuscript and all authors were involved in revising and finalizing it for important intellectual content.

Study design. Widdifield, Bernatsky, Pope, Ahluwalia, Barber, Eder, Kuriya, Ling, Paterson, Thorne, Gatley, Marks

Acquisition of data. Widdifield, Ling

Statistical analysis. Ling

Analysis and interpretation of data. Widdifield, Bernatsky, Gatley, Marks, Pope, Ahluwalia, Barber, Eder, Kuriya, Ling, Paterson, Thorne

Manuscript preparation. Widdifield, Bernatsky, Pope, Ahluwalia, Barber, Eder, Kuriya, Ling, Gatley, Marks, Paterson, Thorne

DISCLOSURES

None of the authors have conflicts of interests related to this study.

References

1. The Association of Faculties of Medicine of Canada. Canadian medical education statistics 2018 Ottawa: AFMC; 2019 Contract No.: Document Number|.
2. Young A CH, Pei X, Arnhart K, Dugan M, Snyder GB. A census of actively licensed physicians in the united states, 2016. *Journal of Medical Regulation* 2017;103:7-21.
3. General Medical Council. The state of medical education and practice in the uk 2017. London: General Medical Council; 2017 Contract No.: Document Number|.
4. Bertakis KD, Franks P, Azari R. Effects of physician gender on patient satisfaction. *J Am Med Womens Assoc* (1972) 2003;58:69-75.
5. Roter DL, Hall JA, Aoki Y. Physician gender effects in medical communication: A meta-analytic review. *JAMA* 2002;288:756-64.
6. French F, Andrew J, Awramenko M, Coutts H, Leighton-Beck L, Mollison J, et al. Why do work patterns differ between men and women gps? *J Health Organ Manag* 2006;20:163-72.
7. Franks P, Bertakis KD. Physician gender, patient gender, and primary care. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)* 2003;12:73-80.
8. Frank E, Harvey LK. Prevention advice rates of women and men physicians. *Arch Fam Med* 1996;5:215-9.
9. Henderson JT, Weisman CS. Physician gender effects on preventive screening and counseling: An analysis of male and female patients' health care experiences. *Med Care* 2001;39:1281-92.
10. Baig AA, Heisler M. The influence of patient race and socioeconomic status and resident physician gender and specialty on preventive screening. *Semin Med Pract* 2008;11:27-35.
11. Baumhake M, Muller U, Bohm M. Influence of gender of physicians and patients on guideline-recommended treatment of chronic heart failure in a cross-sectional study. *Eur J Heart Fail* 2009;11:299-303.
12. Berthold HK, Gouni-Berthold I, Besthorn KP, Bohm M, Krone W. Physician gender is associated with the quality of type 2 diabetes care. *J Intern Med* 2008;264:340-50.
13. Dahrouge S, Seale E, Hogg W, Russell G, Younger J, Muggah E, et al. A comprehensive assessment of family physician gender and quality of care: A cross-sectional analysis in ontario, canada. *Med Care* 2016;54:277-86.
14. Tsugawa Y, Jena AB, Figueroa JF, Orav EJ, Blumenthal DM, Jha AK. Comparison of hospital mortality and readmission rates for medicare patients treated by male vs female physicians. *JAMA Intern Med* 2017;177:206-13.
15. Wallis CJ, Ravi B, Coburn N, Nam RK, Detsky AS, Satkunasivam R. Comparison of postoperative outcomes among patients treated by male and female surgeons: A population based matched cohort study. *BMJ* 2017;359:j4366.
16. Jefferson L, Bloor K, Maynard A. Women in medicine: Historical perspectives and recent trends. *Br Med Bull* 2015;114:5-15.
17. Nam C, Daignault-Newton S, Herrel L, Kraft K. The future is female: Urology workforce projection from 2020 to 2060. *Urology* 2020;inpress.
18. Marshall GD, American Academy of Allergy A, Immunology Workforce C. The status of us allergy/immunology physicians in the 21st century: A report from the american

academy of allergy, asthma & immunology workforce committee. *J Allergy Clin Immunol* 2007;119:802-7.

19. Bae G, Qiu M, Reese E, Nambudiri V, Huang S. Changes in sex and ethnic diversity in dermatology residents over multiple decades. *JAMA Dermatol* 2016;152:92-4.

20. Fisher JM, Garside M, Hunt K, Lo N. Geriatric medicine workforce planning: A giant geriatric problem or has the tide turned? *Clin Med (Lond)* 2014;14:102-6.

21. Pelley E, Danoff A, Cooper DS, Becker C. Female physicians and the future of endocrinology. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2016;101:16-22.

22. Spector ND, Cull W, Daniels SR, Gilhooly J, Hall J, Horn I, et al. Gender and generational influences on the pediatric workforce and practice. *Pediatrics* 2014;133:1112-21.

23. Pearse WH, Haffner WH, Primack A. Effect of gender on the obstetric-gynecologic work force. *Obstet Gynecol* 2001;97:794-7.

24. CanadianMedicalAssociation. Rheumatology profile. Ottawa: CMA; 2018 Contract No.: Document Number|.

25. Association CM. Rheumatology profile. Ottawa: CMA; 2018 Contract No.: Document Number|.

26. Widdifield J BS, Pope JE, Ahluwalia V, Barber CEH, Eder L, Kuriya B, Ling V, Paterson JM, Thorne C. Encounters with rheumatologists in a publicly-funded canadian healthcare system: A population-based study. *J Rheumatol* 2019:1-23.

27. Barber CE JL, Badley EM, Lacaille D, Cividino A, Ahluwalia V, Averno H, Baillie C, Ellsworth J, Pope J, Levy D, Charnock C, McGowan C, Thorne JC, Barnabe C, Zimmer M, Lundon K, McDougall RS, Thomson JG, Yacyshyn EA, Mosher D, Brophy J, Ruban TN, Marshall DA. Stand up and be counted: Measuring and mapping the rheumatology workforce in canada. *J Rheumatol* 2017;44:248-57.

28. Barber CEH NM, Barnabe C, Badley EM, Lacaille D, Pope J, Cividino A, Yacyshyn E, Baillie C, Mosher D, Thomson JG, Charnock C, Thorne JC, Zimmer M, Brophy J, Ruban TN, Ahluwalia V, McDougall R, Marshall DA. Planning for the rheumatologist workforce: Factors associated with work hours and volumes. *J Clin Rheumatol* 2019;25:142-6.

29. MinistryofHealthandLongTermCare. Ontario health insurance plan. Ohip schedule of benefits and fees.: Government of Ontario; 2019 [updated 2019; cited 2019 August 14]; Available from: <http://health.gov.on.ca/en/pro/programs/ohip/sob/>.

30. CanadianInstituteforHealthInformation. National physician database data release, 2015–2016: Methodological notes. Ottawa; 2017 Contract No.: Document Number|.

31. Wang C SA. Gender, family status and physician labour supply. *Soc Sci Med* 2013;94:17-25.

32. Sarma S TA, Chu M. Do new cohorts of family physicians work less compared to their predecessors? The evidence from canada. *Soc Sci Med* 2011;72:2049-58.

33. Buys YM CM, Felfeli T, Jin Y. Influence of age, sex, and generation on physician payments and clinical activity in ontario, canada: An age-period-cohort analysis. *Am J Ophthalmol* 2019;197:23-35.

34. Watson DE SS, Buske L, Tepper J. Intergenerational differences in workloads among primary care physicians: A ten-year, population-based study. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2006;25:1620-8.

35. Deal CL HR, Harrington T, Birnbaum N, Hogan P, Bouchery E, Klein-Gitelman M, Barr W. The united states rheumatology workforce: Supply and demand, 2005-2025. *Arthritis Rheum* 2007;56:722-9.
36. The College of Family Physicians of Canada CMA, Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada. National physician survey: 2014 national results by sex and age group – all results. Ottawa; 2019 [updated 2019; cited 2019 July 31,]; Available from: <http://nationalphysiciansurvey.ca/result/2014-national-results/>.
37. Sinsky C CL, Li L, Prgomet M, Reynolds S, Goeders L, Westbrook J, Tutty M, Blike G. Allocation of physician time in ambulatory practice: A time and motion study in 4 specialties. *Ann Intern Med* 2016;165:753-60.
38. Weizblit N NJ, Baerlocher MO. The feminisation of canadian medicine and its impact upon doctor productivity. *Med Educ* 2009;43:442-8.
39. Templeton KC BC, Sukhera J, Nora LM, Newman C, Burstin H, Guille C, Lynn L, Schwarze ML, Sen S, Busis N. Gender-based differences in burnout: Issues faced by women physicians. Washington, DC: Discussion Paper, National Academy of Medicine; 2019.
40. Templeton KC BC, Sukhera J, Nora LM, Newman C, Burstin H, Guille C, Lynn L, Schwarze ML, Sen S, Busis N. Ender-based differences in burnout: Issues faced by women physicians. Washington, DC: Discussion Paper, National Academy of Medicine; 2019.
41. Butkus R, Serchen J, Moyer DV, Bornstein SS, Hingle ST, Health, et al. Achieving gender equity in physician compensation and career advancement: A position paper of the american college of physicians. *Ann Intern Med* 2018;168:721-3.
42. Mamtani M, Shofer F, Mudan A, Khatri U, Walker R, Perrone J, et al. Quantifying gender disparity in physician authorship among commentary articles in three high-impact medical journals: An observational study. *BMJ Open* 2020;10:e034056.
43. Lee D, Jalal S, Nasrullah M, Ding J, Sanelli P, Khosa F. Gender disparity in academic rank and productivity among public health physician faculty in north america. *Cureus* 2020;12:e8553.
44. Jolly S, Griffith KA, DeCastro R, Stewart A, Ubel P, Jagsi R. Gender differences in time spent on parenting and domestic responsibilities by high-achieving young physician-researchers. *Ann Intern Med* 2014;160:344-53.
45. Henry DA SS, Glazier RH, Bhatia RS, Dhalla IA, Laupacis A. Payments to ontario physicians from ministry of health and long-term care sources 1992/93 to 2009/10. Ices investigative report. Toronto: ICES; 2012 Contract No.: Document Number[.
46. Petch J, Dhalla IA, Henry DA, Schultz SE, Glazier RH, Bhatia S, et al. Public payments to physicians in ontario adjusted for overhead costs. *Healthc Policy* 2012;8:30-6.
47. Al Maini M AF, Al Saleh J, Al Weshahi Y, Burmester GR, Cutolo M, Flood J, March L, McDonald-Blumer H, Pile K, Pineda C, Thorne C, Kvien TK. The global challenges and opportunities in the practice of rheumatology: White paper by the world forum on rheumatic and musculoskeletal diseases. *Clin Rheumatol* 2015;34:819-29.
48. Information. Cifh. National physician database data release, 2015–2016: Methodological notes. Ottawa; 2017.

List of tables and figures

Table 1. Annual total number of all rheumatologists, and rheumatologists working at least one clinical FTE in Ontario between 2000 and 2015, by physician gender

Table 2. Comparison of annual median (IQR) practice volumes and practice sizes among female and male rheumatologists

Table 3. Comparison of annual physician remuneration among male and female rheumatologists

Table 4. Multivariable linear regression models testing the association of rheumatologist gender with mean practice volume and annual mean practice size among rheumatologists between 2000 and 2015

Supplementary Table 1. Annual number of Ontario rheumatologists working as at least one clinical FTE based on who had at least three patient contacts on at least 209 days of the year between 2000 and 2015 in by physician gender

Supplementary Table 2. Comparison of annual number of rheumatologists by practice size and by practice volume

Supplementary Table 3. Multivariable linear regression models testing the association of year with mean practice size and practice volume stratified by physician gender

Supplementary Table 4. Sensitivity analysis - Multivariable linear regression models testing the association between rheumatologist gender with mean practice size and mean practice volume, among the truncated sample of rheumatologists.

Supplementary Table 5. Sensitivity analysis - Multivariable linear regression models testing the association between year with practice size and practice volume stratified by physician gender among the truncated sample

Table 1. Annual total number of all rheumatologists, and rheumatologists working at least one clinical FTE in Ontario between 2000 and 2015, by physician gender

YEAR	Total Number of rheumatologists and breakdown by gender			Number (%) of rheumatologists working at least one FTE ¹			Percentage of rheumatologists working at least one FTE out of the total number rheumatologists within each gender category	
	Total, n	Female, n (%)	Male, n (%)	Total, n	Female, n (%)	Male, n (%)	Female, %	Male, %
2000	146	50 (34.2%)	96 (65.8%)	89	24 (27.0%)	65 (73.0%)	48.0%	67.7%
2001	152	51 (33.6%)	101 (66.4%)	92	25 (27.2%)	67 (72.8%)	49.0%	66.3%
2002	154	51 (33.1%)	103 (66.9%)	95	24 (25.3%)	71 (74.7%)	47.1%	68.9%
2003	148	53 (35.8%)	95 (64.2%)	91	26 (28.6%)	65 (71.4%)	49.1%	68.4%
2004	148	53 (35.9%)	95 (64.2%)	90	24 (26.7%)	66 (73.3%)	45.3%	69.5%
2005	151	54 (35.8%)	97 (64.2%)	91	26 (28.6%)	65 (71.4%)	48.2%	67.0%
2006	154	55 (35.7%)	99 (64.3%)	94	30 (31.9%)	64 (68.1%)	54.6%	64.7%
2007	155	59 (38.1%)	96 (61.9%)	94	29 (30.9%)	65 (69.2%)	49.2%	67.7%
2008	156	62 (39.7%)	94 (60.3%)	96	35 (36.5%)	61 (63.5%)	56.5%	64.9%
2009	160	68 (42.5%)	92 (57.5%)	97	31 (32.0%)	66 (68.0%)	45.6%	71.7%
2010	161	68 (42.2%)	93 (57.8%)	98	31 (31.6%)	67 (68.4%)	45.6%	72.0%
2011	176	79 (44.9%)	97 (55.1%)	107	39 (36.5%)	68 (63.6%)	49.4%	70.1%
2012	177	81 (45.8%)	96 (54.2%)	107	43 (40.2%)	64 (59.8%)	53.1%	66.7%
2013	186	89 (47.8%)	97 (52.2%)	114	49 (43.0%)	65 (57.0%)	55.1%	67.0%
2014	183	89 (48.6%)	94 (51.4%)	114	48 (42.1%)	66 (57.9%)	53.9%	70.2%
2015	194	95 (49.0%)	99 (51.0%)	120	50 (41.7%)	70 (58.3%)	52.6%	70.7%

¹Denominator for % is the total of FTE rheumatologists

Table 2. Comparison of annual median (IQR) practice volumes (total patient visits¹) and practice sizes (number of unique patients seen) among female and male rheumatologists

YEAR	PRACTICE VOLUME					PRACTICE SIZE				
	Total ² median (IQR)	Female median (IQR)	Male median (IQR)	Median difference (95% CI)	P value	Total ² median (IQR)	Female median (IQR)	Male median (IQR)	Median difference (95% CI)	P value
2000	4823 (3926, 6068)	4488.5 (3421.5, 5253.5)	5199 (4195, 6461)	868 (54, 1602)	0.032	2030 (1418, 2780)	1605.5 (1276, 2228)	2242 (1606, 2936)	508 (104, 975)	0.0156
2001	4946.5 (3882, 6207)	4640 (3805, 5608)	5180 (4253, 6622)	668 (-73, 1490)	0.082	2166 (1485, 2837)	1768 (1371, 2649)	2263 (1651, 2877)	356 (-92, 805)	0.1121
2002	4987 (3626, 6086)	4329.5 (3499, 5164)	5219 (3851, 6615)	834 (72, 1694)	0.0337	2064 (1544, 2653)	1762 (1330, 2428.5)	2153 (1590, 3079)	385 (14, 770)	0.0386
2003	4869 (3799, 6553)	4020 (3365, 5060)	5263 (4089, 6898)	1187.5 (400, 2070)	0.0038	1973 (1521, 2683)	1575 (1245, 1957)	2149 (1729, 3098)	574 (260, 939)	0.0009
2004	4947 (3948, 6729)	4587 (3924, 5348.5)	5127 (4018, 7501)	716.5 (-138, 1717)	0.0977	1962.5 (1515, 2747)	1620 (1462, 2276)	2066 (1584, 3123)	376.5 (25, 805)	0.0367
2005	5265 (3866, 7004)	4506 (3720, 5423)	5384 (4107, 7652)	1079 (75, 2122)	0.0287	1988 (1478, 2905)	1687.5 (1300, 2041)	2165 (1549, 3060)	507.5 (156, 944)	0.0052
2006	5153 (3915, 6854)	4242 (3493, 5299)	5603.5 (4094, 8234)	1328.5 (442, 2350)	0.0033	1963 (1475, 2975)	1540.5 (1254, 2042)	2257 (1582, 3345)	623 (285, 1064)	0.0004
2007	5080.5 (3668, 6740)	4438 (3539, 5175)	5396 (3986, 8282)	1183 (343, 2201)	0.006	1948 (1399, 2824)	1641 (1293, 2221)	2063 (1532, 3077)	463 (119, 899)	0.0091
2008	4954 (3770.5, 6696)	4173 (3273, 4997)	5659 (4034, 7879)	1486 (628, 2517)	0.0008	1891 (1396.5, 2778)	1655 (1211, 2170)	2011 (1556, 3121)	516 (169, 892)	0.0021
2009	4824 (3711, 6656)	4322 (3564, 5097)	5362.5 (3817, 7880)	1011 (147, 2008)	0.0203	1925 (1403, 2717)	1519 (1282, 2095)	2120 (1526, 3088)	545 (178, 958)	0.0032
2010	4748 (3820, 7137)	4370 (3516, 5048)	5029 (4035, 8205)	883 (99, 1976)	0.0275	1939.5 (1368, 2755)	1745 (1325, 2071)	2139 (1427, 3088)	407 (62, 835)	0.0213
2011	4595 (3773, 6582)	4074 (3485, 4964)	5210 (4092.5, 7653.5)	1180.5 (437, 2065)	0.0013	1829 (1351, 2625)	1510 (1119, 1989)	2143.5 (1554.5, 2931.5)	592 (283, 902)	<.0001
2012	4581 (3408, 5966)	3807 (3134, 4901)	5229.5 (4116, 7703.5)	1443.5 (776, 2252)	<.0001	1819 (1274, 2467)	1455 (1137, 1994)	2097.5 (1613.5, 2949.5)	677 (389, 979)	<.0001
2013	4500 (3485, 6043)	3832 (3269, 4594)	5090 (3825, 7582)	1191 (488, 1933)	0.0007	1720.5 (1259, 2303)	1311 (1102, 1836)	1983 (1500, 2690)	550 (304, 835)	<.0001
2014	4528 (3444, 6083)	3966.5 (3287, 4645)	5096 (3737, 7776)	1232 (504, 1961)	0.0004	1719 (1279, 2306)	1451.5 (1123.5, 1873.5)	1934.5 (1533, 2498)	501.5 (266, 756)	<.0001
2015	4595.5 (3458, 6325)	4252.5 (3318, 4851)	5014 (3672, 7269)	924.5 (193, 1717)	0.0109	1779 (1296, 2265)	1468.5 (1212, 1984)	1948.5 (1433, 2562)	404.5 (144, 682)	0.0017

¹Outpatient Visits Included Only Face-To-Face Patient Assessments; ² Both genders combined; CI = Confidence Interval; IQR = Interquartile Range;

Table 3. Comparison of annual physician remuneration among male and female rheumatologists**PAYMENTS TO INDIVIDUAL RHEUMATOLOGISTS IN UNADJUSTED CANADIAN DOLLARS**

YEAR	Total, median (IQR)	Female, median (IQR)	Male, median (IQR)	Median difference (95% CI)	P value
2000	\$251,595.8 (199366.9, 333163.6)	\$199,730.2 (180695.5, 262409.3)	\$285,930.3 (211795.8, 354506.9)	\$56,125.0 (18272.1, 101713.7)	0.0027
2001	\$258,463.9 (208455.9, 342156.7)	\$222,454.9 (188688.7, 269354.9)	\$270,351.9 (216318.4, 360675.9)	\$50,342.5 (13534.4, 91321.0)	0.0075
2002	\$252,449.9 (199647.5, 314882.6)	\$211,667.0 (182897.9, 250350.1)	\$279,656.9 (219073.0, 355171.2)	\$60,264.9 (29022.7, 98546.3)	0.0002
2003	\$263,003.8 (213712.8, 325656.3)	\$209,481.6 (183690.6, 253215.4)	\$295,498.4 (228063.6, 357545.5)	\$72,726.4 (40313.1, 109344.0)	<.0001
2004	\$272,357.0 (227868.9, 335432.3)	\$238,171.1 (198609.2, 277243.7)	\$291,854.7 (239215.5, 368793.4)	\$52,828.3 (21111.8, 91211.3)	0.0012
2005	\$292,459.3 (238290.7, 392425.5)	\$228,396.1 (193815.2, 292459.3)	\$317,353.2 (258667.3, 411608.4)	\$83,007.0 (46897.2, 131020.7)	<.0001
2006	\$291,249.5 (238516.8, 405151.7)	\$245,095.0 (205204.2, 283709.6)	\$329,291.0 (264320.4, 432141.3)	\$78,804.5 (39996.7, 128666.8)	<.0001
2007	\$299,931.7 (245636.1, 397507.1)	\$269,226.6 (215337.4, 301442.6)	\$326,978.2 (267005.7, 439878.2)	\$68,404.8 (29054.0, 114356.5)	0.0004
2008	\$334,931.1 (269413.0, 452917.6)	\$296,865.1 (231641.5, 333425.6)	\$379,693.3 (312623.9, 502307.5)	\$94,773.8 (46018.7, 143569.9)	<.0001
2009	\$334,562.6 (274796.2, 459641.6)	\$298,668.9 (239118.4, 328743.6)	\$380,515.0 (282318.7, 507681.6)	\$83,268.8 (36424.3, 143275.3)	0.0003
2010	\$346,341.2 (295856.7, 490270.7)	\$320,305.6 (275121.8, 346702.1)	\$386,585.0 (301676.3, 520005.1)	\$62,041.3 (19928.6, 118770.2)	0.0074
2011	\$382,894.4 (311205.3, 519672.0)	\$314,771.6 (290131.1, 386321.8)	\$430,162.4 (356362.4, 547826.9)	\$102,176.1 (58457.5, 152821.2)	<.0001
2012	\$382,047.5 (319793.6, 485662.4)	\$333,453.1 (279504.4, 391388.2)	\$425,484.3 (358047.7, 519733.4)	\$95,571.2 (54125.8, 136502.3)	<.0001
2013	\$367,886.4 (305830.9, 482377.7)	\$331,245.7 (293372.5, 386791.5)	\$429,770.2 (335206.9, 539754.2)	\$86,207.0 (39291.4, 139697.5)	0.0001
2014	\$389,029.8 (313773.9, 491499.1)	\$344,056.2 (285992.0, 393329.5)	\$427,442.6 (338463.2, 542642.0)	\$89,533.5 (42881.5, 138858.8)	0.0001
2015	\$388,732.8 (311924.0, 491598.9)	\$362,522.0 (309503.0, 437127.4)	\$403,903.4 (313296.8, 544703.1)	\$45,556.1 (951.6, 92470.4)	0.0436

Table 4. Multivariable linear regression models testing the association of rheumatologist gender with mean practice volume (total patient visits) and annual mean practice size (number of unique patients seen) among rheumatologists between 2000 and 2015

	<i>Model 1: Practice Volume</i>		<i>Model 2: Practice Size</i>	
	Estimate	95% CI	Estimate	95% CI
Intercept	5484.3	(5028.6, 5940)	2339.8	(2021.7, 2657.9)
Variables				
Gender				
Female (ref: male)	-1058.9	(-1773.3, -344.5)	-605.8	(-1104.5, -107.1)
Year (continuous)	88.6	(45.3, 132)	22.1	(-8.1, 52.4)
Age group (ref: <45 years)				
45-64 years	385.9	(26.3, 745.5)	620.1	(369.1, 871.2)
≥65 years	-1144.8	(-1841.8, -447.7)	-27.3	(-513.9, 459.3)
Interaction term - year and female gender	-114.9	(-189.7, -40.2)	-57.8	(-110, -5.6)

CI = confidence interval; FTE = full-time equivalent