

thetically that between 1970 and 2000 the requirements for physicians in Canada increased by 72%, whereas supply increased by 116%. However, the overwhelming experience of those of us working in the profession is that large segments of the population can no longer find a family doctor; furthermore, getting patients to specialists in a timely manner is often so difficult as to approach futility. This jarring discoordination renders the article's future projections difficult to evaluate and merits an explanation. Could the reason be increasing medical capabilities, technology or demand, or might the cause be less inhuman physician lifestyles?

Second, Denton and associates¹ report that although use of physicians' services generally increases with patient age, it declines as elderly patients become very old, except in general practice, where use continues to increase even to the oldest age group. Perhaps the explanation is that GPs caring for very elderly patients do so in relative isolation, with these patients receiving less aggressive management. If so, is this appropriate? Or does it represent an adaptation to scarce resources, not only of human resources but also things such as diagnostic equipment, operating room time, even ground transportation?

There's a thesis topic here for somebody!

Charles T. Low

Anesthesia
Brockville General Hospital
Brockville, Ont.

Reference

1. Denton FT, Gafni A, Spencer BG. Requirements for physicians in 2030: Why population aging matters less than you may think [editorial]. *CMAJ* 2003;168(12):1545-7.

The provision of and need for services for elderly patients are underestimated by Frank Denton and associates¹ in their analysis of the effect of population aging on future physician requirements. In their Fig. 1, pediatrics is identified as a separate physician category, but geriatrics is not, even though the roles of geriatricians and the Regional Geriatric Programs (RGPs) of Ontario were recognized by the province's ministry of health in 1988.²

In addition, many of the medical services provided to frail elderly patients are not captured by OHIP. Comprehensive geriatric assessments performed by geriatricians (or by team members with case conferences involving geriatricians) in the 5 RGPs are funded by alternative payment plans, not OHIP.

Of patients 75 years of age or older, 14% to 27% are frail and could benefit from a comprehensive geriatric assessment.³ However, the RGPs of Ontario saw only about 1% of this group in 2001/02. By 2030, the proportion of the population in this age group will have grown by more than 94%.^{4,5}

Unfortunately, the supply of physicians with geriatric training is not keeping up with this projected demand. For example, in Canada in 2000/01, only 7 people entered a training program in geriatric medicine,⁶ and only rarely do family physicians train in care of the elderly.

Planning by medical schools alone will not address the low numbers of physicians with geriatric training. Governments need to establish and implement policies to correct the existing and increasing shortfall of health care professionals able to assess and treat frail elderly patients.

Michael J. Borrie

William Dalziel

Rory Fisher

William Molloy

John Puxty

Program Directors

Regional Geriatric Programs of Ontario

References

1. Denton FT, Gafni A, Spencer BG. Requirements for physicians in 2030: Why population aging matters less than you may think [editorial]. *CMAJ* 2003;168(12):1545-7.
2. *Guidelines for the establishment of regional geriatric programs in teaching hospitals*. Toronto: Ontario Ministry of Health; 1988.
3. Rockwood K, Fox RA, Stolee P, Robertson D, Beattie BL. Frailty in elderly people: an evolving concept. *CMAJ* 1994;150(4):489-95.
4. *Age groups (12) and sex (3) for population, for Canada, provinces and territories, 1921 to 2001 censuses — 100% data*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada; modified 2003 Jul 3. Available: www12.statcan.ca/english/census01/products/standard/themes/ListProducts.cfm?Temporal=2001&APATH=3&THEME=37&FREE=05.

5. Population projections for 2001, 2006, 2011, 2016, 2021 and 2026, July 1 [CANSIM table 052-001 online]. Ottawa: Statistics Canada; modified 2003 Jul 9. Available: www.statcan.ca/english/Pgdb/demo23c.htm (accessed 2003 Aug 30).
6. Hogan D, Beattie B, Bergman H, Dalziel WB, Goldlist B, MacKnight C, et al. Submission of the Canadian Geriatrics Society to the Commission on the Future of Health Care in Canada. *Geriatr Today* 2002;5(1):7-12.

[The authors respond:]

There is a misunderstanding common to all 4 sets of comments. The issue we addressed is how population change will affect future requirements for physician services — that issue, and that issue alone. To that end, we abstracted from (held constant) all other factors that might affect requirements.

One of our principal findings was that “overall requirements for physicians *in consequence of population change alone* are almost certain to increase by less in the future than in the past”¹ (italics in original). We also noted that a variety of factors would affect future requirements, but to investigate the effects of population change with any precision, it is necessary to abstract from these other factors, important as they may be.

Raymond Dawes says we “postulate that because population increases are now lessening, the future need for physicians will increase to a lesser extent than in the past.” However, we did not and would not draw such a conclusion. It would be unwarranted on the sole basis of our analysis of population effects, with utilization rates held constant.

We agree with Chris MacKnight and David Hogan that fee-for-service may not be “the most appropriate way to fund physician services for aging patients with multiple problems.” However, as we noted,¹ fee-for-service practices accounted for almost all physician services in Ontario,² and the data available to us (for 1995/96) on what services were provided to patients of different ages and sexes related to such practices. MacKnight and Hogan also feel that “using historical