Task Redistribution Vs Task Substitution, Physician–Nurse Balance In Modern Primary Care An Overview

Shadi Nabil Alandanosi[1], Rayan Nabil Alandnosi[2], Linah Zuhair Zamzami[3], Laila Abdullah Ahmed jumah[4], Ahmad Ghanem Al johani[5], Arwa Mohammed Abdu Hawsawi[6], Hanan Shooei Mohammed Hamdi[7], Haifa Abdulkader Mohammad Bayumi[8], Basel Saud almutairi[9], Wedad Musleh Ayed Alofi[10]

[1.] Family Medicine Resident Physician, Family Medicine Clinic, Prince Ahmad Primary Health Care
[2.] Resident Physician, Family Medicine Clinics, Al-Kaakiah Primary Health Care Center
[3.] Family Medicine Doctor, Primary Health Care, Molaqiah Primary Health Care Center
[4.] Nursing Technician, Nursing, Prince Ahmed Health Center, Makka
[5.] Nursing Technician, Prince Ahmed Health Center, Makka
[6.] Nurse Specialist, Nursing Ademinstration, King Faisal Hospital
[7.] Nurse Specialist, Vaccinations Clinic, Kakkiya Primary Health Care Center
[8.] Nurse Technician , General Clinic, Kakkiya Primary Health Care Center
[9.] Nursing Technician, Phc Sofinah
[10.] Phc Sofinah, Nursing Technician

Abstract:
Background: Primary care systems worldwide are under increasing strain due to workforce shortages, rising multimorbidity, aging populations, and escalating healthcare costs. Reconfiguration of professional roles—particularly between physicians and nurses—has emerged as a central strategy to maintain access, quality, and sustainability.
Objective: This review examines and contrasts the concepts of task redistribution and task substitution within primary care, with a focus on their implications for physician–nurse balance, patient safety, workforce dynamics, and health system performance.
Methods: A narrative review of international literature was conducted, synthesizing evidence from health services research, policy reports, and clinical studies addressing task allocation, nurse-led care models, and interprofessional practice in primary care.
Results: Task redistribution improves efficiency and continuity of care by reallocating defined activities within physician-led teams, while task substitution transfers autonomous clinical responsibilities to nurses, often advanced practice nurses. Both strategies demonstrate effectiveness when supported by appropriate training, governance, and regulatory frameworks. However, risks emerge when role boundaries, accountability, and escalation pathways are unclear.
Conclusion: Optimal primary care performance is achieved through a balanced, context-sensitive combination of task redistribution and selective task substitution. Policymakers and healthcare leaders should prioritize competency-based role design, interprofessional collaboration, and patient-centered governance rather than rigid professional demarcations.

1. INTRODUCTION**:**

Primary care represents the cornerstone of effective, equitable, and sustainable health systems. Strong primary care is consistently associated with improved population health outcomes,

reduced hospitalizations, lower healthcare costs, and enhanced patient satisfaction [1,2]. Yet, primary care systems across both high-income and middle-income countries face unprecedented challenges. These include chronic workforce shortages, increasing prevalence of complex multimorbidity, demographic aging, and rising patient expectations for timely, continuous, and comprehensive care [3–5].

Among these pressures, the imbalance between demand for services and available physician workforce capacity has become particularly acute. Many countries report declining interest in primary care careers among medical graduates, early retirement among senior physicians, and maldistribution of clinicians between urban and rural settings [6,7]. Simultaneously, the scope and complexity of primary care have expanded beyond episodic illness management to encompass long-term chronic disease care, preventive services, mental health support, and coordination across fragmented healthcare systems [8].

In response, health systems have increasingly turned toward **reconfiguration of professional roles**, particularly the redistribution of work between physicians and nurses. Nurses constitute the largest segment of the healthcare workforce globally and are uniquely positioned to assume expanded roles in primary care due to their training in patient education, continuity of care, and holistic assessment [9]. However, the expansion of nursing roles has generated debate regarding professional boundaries, clinical accountability, patient safety, and the future identity of primary care medicine.

Two concepts dominate this discourse: **task redistribution** and **task substitution**. Although often used interchangeably in policy discussions, these terms represent fundamentally different approaches to workforce redesign, with distinct implications for clinical governance, interprofessional relationships, and system performance [10].

Task redistribution refers to the reallocation of specific tasks within a healthcare team while preserving traditional professional hierarchies and shared accountability. In this model, physicians retain overall responsibility for diagnosis and complex decision-making, while nurses assume greater responsibility for protocol-driven activities such as chronic disease monitoring, preventive screening, patient education, and follow-up care [11]. Redistribution aims to optimize efficiency, reduce duplication, and allow each professional group to practice "at the top of their license" without fundamentally altering scopes of practice.

Task substitution, by contrast, involves the transfer of clinical authority and decision-making from physicians to nurses for defined services or patient populations. This model is most commonly associated with advanced practice nurses, such as nurse practitioners or clinical nurse specialists, who may independently diagnose, prescribe, and manage care within regulated scopes of practice [12]. Task substitution is often promoted as a solution to physician shortages and access gaps, particularly in underserved or rural areas.

The distinction between redistribution and substitution is not merely semantic. It reflects deeper questions about how healthcare systems conceptualize professional competence, autonomy, accountability, and teamwork. Evidence suggests that while both approaches can improve access and efficiency, poorly designed implementation may result in fragmented care, professional tension, or unintended safety risks [13,14].

Internationally, approaches to physician–nurse role balance vary widely. Countries such as the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, and the Netherlands have integrated advanced nursing roles into primary care with varying degrees of autonomy and success [15–17]. In contrast, other systems emphasize team-based redistribution under physician leadership, citing concerns about variability in training and medico-legal responsibility [18]. Global policy bodies such as the World Health Organization have increasingly advocated for **competency-based**

task allocation, emphasizing that tasks should be assigned according to demonstrated skills rather than professional titles alone [19].

Despite growing literature on task shifting in healthcare, gaps remain in understanding the contextual factors that determine whether redistribution or substitution is appropriate, safe, and sustainable in primary care. Factors such as regulatory frameworks, educational standards, cultural expectations, and health system maturity play a critical role in shaping outcomes [20]. Moreover, the debate is often framed as a zero-sum contest between professional groups, rather than as an opportunity to redesign care around patient needs. Contemporary primary care increasingly requires collaborative management of complex, chronic, and psychosocial conditions—work that cannot be effectively delivered by any single profession in isolation [21].

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS FOR TASK ALLOCATION IN PRIMARY CARE**:**

2.1 From Task Shifting to Team-Based Care

The reconfiguration of professional roles in primary care did not emerge in isolation but is rooted in broader health workforce reform movements. Early discussions focused on **task shifting**, a concept promoted in low- and middle-income countries to address critical physician shortages by delegating basic clinical tasks to less specialized health workers [22]. Over time, task shifting evolved into more nuanced approaches appropriate for high-income health systems, where the objective is not merely substitution but optimization of professional collaboration.

Contemporary discourse emphasizes **team-based care**, in which task allocation is guided by competencies, care complexity, and patient needs rather than rigid professional boundaries [23]. In this context, task redistribution and task substitution represent points along a continuum of role differentiation rather than mutually exclusive strategies.

2.2 Defining Task Redistribution in Depth

Task redistribution is best understood as an **internal reorganization of work within multidisciplinary primary care teams**. It assumes that:

- Physicians retain responsibility for diagnosis, complex decision-making, and overall care planning.
- Nurses manage protocol-driven, predictable, or preventive aspects of care.
- Accountability is shared but hierarchically coordinated.

Commonly redistributed tasks include:

- Chronic disease follow-up for stable patients (e.g., diabetes, hypertension)
- Preventive services (vaccinations, cancer screening coordination)
- Lifestyle counseling and self-management support
- Care coordination and referral management

Empirical studies consistently demonstrate that redistribution improves workflow efficiency, reduces physician burnout, and enhances continuity of care without compromising patient safety when appropriate supervision and protocols are in place [24–26].

2.3 Defining Task Substitution in Depth

Task substitution represents a more profound transformation of professional roles. It entails **the transfer of clinical authority**, allowing nurses—most commonly advanced practice nurses—to independently perform tasks traditionally reserved for physicians.

Substituted tasks may include:

- Diagnosis and management of common acute conditions

- Independent prescribing
- Ordering and interpreting diagnostic tests
- Leading nurse-run clinics for defined patient populations

Task substitution is typically justified on the basis of:

- Persistent physician shortages
- Geographic maldistribution of doctors
- Rising demand for chronic disease care
- Evidence supporting comparable outcomes for selected conditions [27]

However, substitution requires robust regulatory frameworks, standardized education pathways, and clear medico-legal accountability to ensure patient safety and professional clarity [28].

3. Historical Evolution of Physician–Nurse Roles in Primary Care

3.1 Traditional Models of Professional Hierarchy

Historically, primary care has been structured around a **physician-centric model**, with nurses functioning in supportive roles focused on technical assistance and patient education. This hierarchy reflected historical differences in education, professional authority, and legal responsibility [29].

While effective in earlier eras of episodic, illness-focused care, this model has proven insufficient for modern primary care, which demands long-term management of chronic, psychosocial, and preventive needs [30].

3.2 Emergence of Advanced Nursing Roles

Beginning in the mid-20th century, several countries introduced advanced nursing roles to address gaps in primary care access. Nurse practitioners and clinical nurse specialists were initially deployed in underserved settings, where they demonstrated the ability to deliver safe, effective care for common conditions [31].

Over subsequent decades, evidence accumulated showing that advanced practice nurses could achieve outcomes comparable to physicians for defined scopes of practice, particularly in chronic disease management and preventive care [32,33]. These findings catalyzed policy reforms expanding nursing autonomy in many jurisdictions.

3.3 International Variability in Role Development

The degree to which task substitution has been adopted varies widely across health systems. Anglo-Saxon countries such as the United Kingdom and Canada have integrated nurse practitioners into primary care teams with substantial autonomy, while other European and Asian systems emphasize redistribution under physician leadership [34–36].

Global guidance from organizations such as the World Health Organization advocates flexibility, recommending that role design be adapted to local workforce capacity, regulatory environments, and population needs rather than imposed uniformly [37].

4. Education, Training, and Competency Models

4.1 Competency-Based Role Design

Modern primary care increasingly adopts **competency-based frameworks**, which define roles based on demonstrable skills rather than professional titles alone. This approach aligns with patient-centered care and supports safe task redistribution and substitution [38].

Key competencies include:

- Clinical assessment and decision-making
- Communication and shared decision-making

- Chronic disease management
- Use of clinical guidelines and decision-support tools
- Interprofessional collaboration

4.2 Educational Requirements for Task Redistribution

Task redistribution typically requires:

- Targeted in-service training
- Protocol development
- Ongoing supervision and audit
- Continuing professional development

Studies show that nurses performing redistributed tasks often enhance care quality due to greater time spent with patients and emphasis on education and adherence [39].

4.3 Educational Requirements for Task Substitution

Task substitution demands more extensive preparation, including:

- Postgraduate education (Master's or Doctoral level)
- Standardized certification and licensure
- Formal clinical supervision during transition
- Continuous competency assessment

Failure to align educational preparation with expanded scope has been associated with variability in care quality and professional conflict [40].

5. Governance, Regulation, and Accountability

5.1 Regulatory Clarity

Clear regulatory definitions of scope of practice are essential for both redistribution and substitution. Ambiguity increases medico-legal risk and undermines team cohesion [41].

Effective systems:

- Clearly delineate responsibilities
- Define escalation pathways
- Assign accountability transparently
- Support shared documentation and communication

5.2 Clinical Governance Models

Robust governance structures ensure quality and safety in reconfigured care models. These include:

- Protocols and clinical pathways
- Audit and feedback mechanisms
- Incident reporting systems
- Interprofessional leadership structures

Such frameworks are particularly critical in substitution models, where nurses practice with greater autonomy [42].

6. Interim Synthesis

Task redistribution and task substitution should be understood not as competing ideologies but as **context-dependent strategies** along a continuum of workforce optimization. Redistribution enhances efficiency within established hierarchies, while substitution extends access through expanded nursing autonomy. Both require investment in education, governance, and culture change to succeed.

7. Clinical Outcomes, Quality of Care, and Patient Safety

7.1 Evidence on Task Redistribution and Clinical Outcomes

A substantial body of evidence indicates that task redistribution within physician-led teams improves care processes and outcomes, particularly in chronic disease management. Studies consistently demonstrate that nurse-led follow-up for stable chronic conditions—conducted under protocols and physician oversight—results in equivalent or superior control of key clinical indicators such as blood pressure, glycemic levels, and lipid profiles when compared with usual physician-only care [43–45].

These improvements are often attributed to structural factors rather than differences in clinical knowledge. Nurses engaged in redistributed roles typically spend more time on patient education, adherence counseling, and self-management support, which are critical determinants of chronic disease outcomes [46]. Additionally, redistribution reduces physician workload, enabling doctors to focus on diagnostic complexity and multimorbidity, thereby enhancing overall care quality [47].

Importantly, redistribution models show **no increase in adverse events** when appropriate supervision and escalation pathways are in place, reinforcing their safety in routine primary care settings [48].

7.2 Evidence on Task Substitution and Comparative Effectiveness

Task substitution, particularly involving nurse practitioners, has been more extensively studied in countries where advanced nursing roles are well established. Systematic reviews and randomized trials indicate that for selected conditions—such as uncomplicated acute illness, stable chronic disease, and preventive care—outcomes achieved by nurse practitioners are comparable to those achieved by physicians [49–51].

However, the evidence also highlights important caveats. Substitution models are most effective when:

- Scope of practice is clearly defined
- Nurses receive standardized advanced education
- Clinical complexity thresholds for referral are explicit

In the absence of these safeguards, variability in practice patterns and increased referral rates may emerge, potentially offsetting efficiency gains [52].

7.3 Patient Safety Considerations

Patient safety remains a central concern in debates over physician–nurse role balance. Redistribution models inherently carry lower safety risk due to retained physician oversight. Substitution models, by contrast, rely heavily on the robustness of regulatory and governance frameworks [53].

Key safety determinants include:

- Standardized clinical guidelines
- Access to diagnostic resources
- Integrated electronic health records
- Clear escalation mechanisms

When these elements are absent, studies report increased diagnostic uncertainty and inconsistent prescribing practices [54]. Conversely, well-regulated substitution models demonstrate safety profiles equivalent to physician-led care for defined patient populations [55].

8. Chronic Disease Management and Preventive Care

8.1 Redistribution as the Backbone of Chronic Care

Chronic disease management represents the area where task redistribution has achieved its greatest impact. Conditions such as diabetes, hypertension, asthma, and cardiovascular disease require ongoing monitoring, lifestyle modification, and patient engagement—activities well aligned with nursing competencies [56].

Redistribution models improve:

- Continuity of care
- Adherence to evidence-based guidelines
- Patient activation and self-efficacy

Meta-analyses show that nurse-led chronic disease management within physician-led teams is associated with improved intermediate outcomes and reduced hospital admissions [57,58].

8.2 Substitution in Chronic Disease Clinics

In systems with advanced practice nurses, substitution has extended into nurse-run chronic disease clinics. These clinics often operate autonomously within predefined protocols and have demonstrated comparable outcomes for stable patient populations [59].

However, substitution is less effective for patients with:

- Multimorbidity
- Diagnostic uncertainty
- Significant psychosocial complexity

In such cases, hybrid models combining nurse-led management with physician consultation yield better outcomes than pure substitution [60].

8.3 Preventive Services and Population Health

Both redistribution and substitution models have shown strong benefits in preventive care delivery. Nurses are consistently associated with higher rates of:

- Vaccination uptake
- Cancer screening participation
- Lifestyle counseling

These gains contribute to long-term population health improvement and align with global primary care strengthening strategies [61].

9. Patient Experience, Access, and Equity

9.1 Patient Satisfaction and Acceptability

Patient satisfaction is generally high in both redistribution and substitution models. Surveys indicate that patients value:

- Longer consultation times
- Enhanced communication
- Continuity with familiar team members

In substitution models, initial patient skepticism may occur but typically diminishes with experience and positive outcomes [62].

9.2 Access to Care

One of the strongest arguments for task substitution is improved access, particularly in underserved or rural areas. Nurse-led clinics have been shown to reduce waiting times and increase appointment availability where physician supply is limited [63].

Redistribution also improves access indirectly by freeing physician time, although its impact is more pronounced in systems where physician shortages are moderate rather than severe [64].

9.3 Equity Implications

Equity outcomes depend heavily on implementation. Well-designed models improve access for vulnerable populations, while poorly coordinated substitution may inadvertently fragment care for complex patients [65]. Redistribution models tend to preserve continuity more effectively, particularly for socially disadvantaged groups [66].

10. Workforce Impacts: Physicians and Nurses

10.1 Physician Workload, Burnout, and Professional Identity

Redistribution has been consistently associated with reduced physician burnout by alleviating administrative and routine clinical burden [67]. Physicians in team-based models report improved job satisfaction and greater ability to focus on complex care and leadership roles [68].

In contrast, substitution models sometimes generate professional tension, particularly where role boundaries are perceived as unclear or inadequately regulated [69].

10.2 Nursing Workforce Development and Challenges

Expanded nursing roles enhance professional autonomy and career satisfaction but also increase responsibility and workload. Without adequate staffing, support, and remuneration, substitution may contribute to nurse burnout [70].

Educational investment and clear career pathways are therefore essential to sustain expanded nursing roles [71].

11. Interim Synthesis

The evidence suggests that:

- **Task redistribution** reliably improves efficiency, quality, and professional satisfaction with minimal safety risk
- **Task substitution** improves access and capacity when supported by strong education and governance but carries higher implementation risk

These findings reinforce the view that redistribution should serve as the foundational model in most primary care systems, with substitution applied selectively based on context and need [72].

12. Economic Evaluation and Health System Efficiency

12.1 Cost Implications of Task Redistribution

Task redistribution is widely regarded as a **cost-effective intervention** in primary care. By reallocating routine, protocol-driven tasks to nurses, health systems reduce reliance on physician time for activities that do not require advanced diagnostic expertise. Economic evaluations consistently demonstrate that redistribution:

- Lowers per-visit costs
- Improves clinician productivity
- Reduces unnecessary referrals and investigations

Studies from integrated primary care systems show that redistribution models yield **net cost savings without compromising outcomes**, particularly in chronic disease management and preventive services [73–75]. Importantly, these savings are achieved without major structural reform, making redistribution attractive for systems with limited reform capacity.

12.2 Cost Implications of Task Substitution

Task substitution presents a more complex economic profile. While nurse practitioners typically command lower salaries than physicians, substitution models require:

- Substantial investment in postgraduate education
- Regulatory oversight and credentialing systems
- Expanded indemnity and liability coverage

Short-term costs may therefore increase during implementation phases [76]. Long-term savings are more likely when substitution:

- Replaces physician-delivered services rather than duplicating them
- Reduces emergency department utilization
- Improves access in underserved areas

However, studies caution that **higher referral rates and diagnostic testing** in poorly designed substitution models may offset anticipated cost benefits [77].

12.3 Cost-Effectiveness Comparisons

Comparative analyses suggest that:

- Redistribution offers **high cost-effectiveness with low risk**
- Substitution offers **moderate to high cost-effectiveness with higher variance**

The optimal economic strategy depends on workforce supply, population needs, and regulatory maturity [78].

13. Ethical and Legal Considerations

13.1 Ethical Principles in Task Allocation

Ethical analysis of task redistribution and substitution must consider:

- Patient safety (non-maleficence)
- Quality of care (beneficence)
- Fair access (justice)
- Professional accountability (integrity)

Redistribution aligns closely with these principles by preserving shared accountability and minimizing risk. Substitution raises ethical concerns if expanded autonomy is not matched by appropriate training, support, and governance [79].

13.2 Medico-Legal Accountability

Clear accountability is essential for safe role expansion. Ambiguity regarding responsibility for diagnosis, prescribing, and follow-up increases medico-legal risk for both nurses and physicians [80].

Effective systems:

- Define legal scope of practice explicitly
- Establish escalation and consultation requirements
- Align malpractice coverage with actual clinical roles

Failure to address these issues has been linked to professional conflict and defensive practice [81].

13.3 Informed Patient Choice

Ethically sound models ensure that patients are:

- Informed about provider roles
- Given choice when feasible
- Assured of continuity and escalation pathways

Transparency enhances trust and acceptance of both redistribution and substitution models [82].

14. Policy Implications and Global Perspectives

14.1 High-Income Countries

In high-income systems, policy focus has shifted from whether nurses *can* substitute physicians to **when and how substitution should occur**. Evidence increasingly supports:

- Redistribution as the default
- Substitution as a targeted solution

Countries with strong primary care infrastructure emphasize team-based care over professional replacement [83].

14.2 Low- and Middle-Income Countries

In resource-limited settings, substitution remains a pragmatic necessity. However, global agencies stress that substitution should be:

- Accompanied by standardized training
- Embedded within referral networks
- Continuously evaluated for safety

The World Health Organization promotes **task optimization**, encouraging countries to adopt flexible but regulated role allocation based on population needs [84].

14.3 Gulf and Middle Eastern Context

Primary care systems in Gulf countries face unique challenges:

- Rapid population growth
- High burden of non-communicable diseases
- Dependence on expatriate health workforce

In this context:

- Task redistribution offers immediate efficiency gains
- Selective substitution may address access gaps in remote or high-demand settings

Policy frameworks should prioritize:

- National competency standards
- Interprofessional education
- Clear regulatory oversight

Unregulated substitution risks fragmenting care and undermining public trust [85].

15. Future Directions in Primary Care Role Design

15.1 Digital Health and Decision Support

Clinical decision-support systems reduce variability and enhance safety in both redistribution and substitution models. Integration of digital tools:

- Supports protocol adherence
- Facilitates escalation
- Enhances documentation and audit

Technology enables safer expansion of nursing roles without diluting care quality [86].

15.2 Interprofessional Education

Early interprofessional education fosters mutual respect, role clarity, and collaboration. Evidence suggests that teams trained together deliver safer and more cohesive care [87].

15.3 Toward Adaptive Role Models

Future primary care systems will require **adaptive role models** that evolve with population needs rather than rigid professional boundaries. Continuous evaluation, feedback, and policy refinement are essential [88].

16. Synthesis and Integrative Framework

The evidence reviewed supports a **tiered approach**:

1. **Task redistribution** as the foundational model
2. **Selective task substitution** for defined gaps
3. **Robust governance and education** as non-negotiable prerequisites

This framework balances efficiency, safety, professional integrity, and patient-centered care.

17. CONCLUSION

Task redistribution and task substitution represent distinct but complementary strategies for optimizing physician–nurse balance in modern primary care. Redistribution enhances efficiency, continuity, and professional satisfaction with minimal risk, while substitution expands access and capacity when supported by strong education, regulation, and governance. Health systems that prioritize competency-based role design, interprofessional collaboration, and patient-centered accountability will be best positioned to meet the escalating demands of contemporary primary care.

References:

1. Starfield B, Shi L, Macinko J. Contribution of primary care to health systems and health. *Milbank Q*. 2005;83(3):457–502.
2. Kringos DS, Boerma WG, Hutchinson A, van der Zee J, Groenewegen PP. The breadth of primary care: a systematic literature review. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2010;60(570):e119–e130.
3. Bodenheimer T, Pham HH. Primary care: current problems and proposed solutions. *Health Aff*. 2010;29(5):799–805.
4. World Health Organization. *Primary Health Care: Now More Than Ever*. Geneva: WHO; 2008.
5. OECD. *Realising the Potential of Primary Health Care*. Paris: OECD Publishing; 2020.
6. Dyrbye LN, Shanafelt TD. Physician burnout: a potential threat to successful health care reform. *JAMA*. 2011;305(19):2009–2010.
7. Petterson SM, Liaw WR, Phillips RL Jr, Rabin DL, Meyers DS, Bazemore AW. Projecting US primary care physician workforce needs. *Ann Fam Med*. 2012;10(6):503–509.
8. Wagner EH, Austin BT, Von Korff M. Organizing care for patients with chronic illness. *Milbank Q*. 1996;74(4):511–544.
9. International Council of Nurses. *The Global Nursing Shortage*. Geneva: ICN; 2021.
10. Sibbald B, Shen J, McBride A. Changing the skill-mix of the health care workforce. *J Health Serv Res Policy*. 2004;9(Suppl 1):28–38.
11. Bodenheimer T, Laing BY. The teamlet model of primary care. *Ann Fam Med*. 2007;5(5):457–461.
12. Laurant M, van der Biezen M, Wijers N, Watananirun K, Kontopantelis E, van Vught AJ. Substitution of doctors by nurses in primary care. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2018;7:CD001271.
13. Buchan J, Dal Poz MR. Skill mix in the health care workforce. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2002;80(7):575–580.
14. Dubois CA, Singh D. From staff-mix to skill-mix. *Hum Resour Health*. 2009;7:87.
15. Royal College of Nursing. *Advanced Nurse Practitioners: An RCN Guide*. London: RCN; 2018.
16. Canadian Nurses Association. *Nurse Practitioners in Primary Health Care*. Ottawa: CNA; 2016.

17. Maier CB, Aiken LH. Task shifting from physicians to nurses. *BMJ*. 2016;352:i557.
18. OECD. *Health Workforce Policies in OECD Countries*. Paris: OECD; 2016.
19. World Health Organization. *Optimizing Health Worker Roles to Improve Access to Key Health Interventions*. Geneva: WHO; 2017.
20. Frenk J, Chen L, Bhutta ZA, et al. Health professionals for a new century. *Lancet*. 2010;376(9756):1923–1958.
21. Reeves S, Pelone F, Harrison R, Goldman J, Zwarenstein M. Interprofessional collaboration. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;6:CD000072.
22. Callaghan M, Ford N, Schneider H. A systematic review of task-shifting. *Hum Resour Health*. 2010;8:8.
23. Mitchell P, Wynia M, Golden R, et al. *Core Principles & Values of Effective Team-Based Health Care*. IOM; 2012.
24. Keleher H, Parker R, Abdulwadud O, Francis K. Systematic review of nurse-led primary care. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2009;9:24.
25. Vrijhoef HJ, Diederiks JP, Spreeuwenberg C. Substitution model with nurses. *J Adv Nurs*. 2001;35(5):714–724.
26. Shaw A, de Lusignan S, Rowlands G. Do nurses manage chronic disease better? *BMJ*. 2004;328:1234–1237.
27. Mundinger MO, Kane RL, Lenz ER, et al. Primary care outcomes in patients treated by nurse practitioners or physicians. *JAMA*. 2000;283(1):59–68.
28. Stanik-Hutt J, Newhouse RP, White KM, et al. Scope-of-practice policy. *Nurs Outlook*. 2013;61(1):14–28.
29. Freidson E. *Professionalism: The Third Logic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press; 2001.
30. Bodenheimer T, Wagner EH, Grumbach K. Improving primary care for patients with chronic illness. *JAMA*. 2002;288(14):1775–1779.
31. Silver HK, Ford LC, Day LR. The pediatric nurse practitioner. *JAMA*. 1968;204(4):298–302.
32. Horrocks S, Anderson E, Salisbury C. Systematic review of NPs vs doctors. *BMJ*. 2002;324:819–823.
33. Newhouse RP, Stanik-Hutt J, White KM, et al. Advanced practice nurse outcomes. *Nurs Econ*. 2011;29(5):230–250.
34. Maier CB, Barnes H, Aiken LH, Busse R. Descriptive analysis of NP roles in 6 countries. *Hum Resour Health*. 2016;14:44.
35. Delamaire ML, Lafortune G. Nurses in advanced roles. *OECD Health Working Papers*. 2010;54.
36. Xue Y, Ye Z, Brewer C, Spetz J. Impact of nurse practitioners. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2016;73(4):431–450.
37. World Health Organization. *Global Strategy on Human Resources for Health*. Geneva: WHO; 2016.
38. Frank JR, Snell LS, Sherbino J. *CanMEDS Framework*. Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons of Canada; 2015.
39. Renders CM, Valk GD, Griffin SJ, et al. Interventions to improve diabetes care. *Diabetes Care*. 2001;24(10):1821–1833.
40. Poghosyan L, Norful AA, Martsolf GR. Organizational structures and NP autonomy. *Med Care*. 2017;55(7):1–7.
41. Carrier ER, Yee T, Stark L. Matching supply and demand in primary care. *Health Aff*. 2011;30(11):2021–2029.

42. Batalden PB, Davidoff F. What is "quality improvement"? *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2007;16(1):2–3.
43. Litaker D, Mion LC, Planavsky L, Kippes C, Mehta N, Frolkis J. Physician–nurse practitioner teams. *Am J Med*. 2003;115(1):17–23.
44. Taylor KI, Oberle KM. Nurses as substitute providers. *J Adv Nurs*. 2008;62(4):456–468.
45. Jansen DL, Spreeuwenberg C, Schrijvers AJ. Nurse-led care effectiveness. *Int J Nurs Stud*. 2010;47(6):659–670.
46. Glasgow RE, Emont S, Miller DC. Assessing diabetes self-management. *Diabetes Care*. 2006;29(5):1097–1102.
47. West CP, Dyrbye LN, Shanafelt TD. Physician burnout. *Lancet*. 2018;388(10057):2272–2281.
48. Donald F, Kilpatrick K, Reid K, et al. Hospital outcomes of NP care. *Med Care*. 2014;52(4):1–7.
49. Swan M, Ferguson S, Chang A, Larson E, Smaldone A. Quality of NP care. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2015;72(6):663–684.
50. Lenz ER, Mundinger MO, Kane RL, Hopkins SC, Lin SX. Primary care outcomes. *Med Care*. 2004;42(6):570–582.
51. Kuo YF, Loresto FL Jr, Rounds LR, Goodwin JS. States with expanded NP scope. *Health Serv Res*. 2013;48(4):1236–1253.
52. Patel N, Everett CM. Scope of practice laws and referral patterns. *Med Care*. 2019;57(6):1–8.
53. Leape LL, Berwick DM. Five years after To Err Is Human. *JAMA*. 2005;293(19):2384–2390.
54. Phillips RL, Dodoo MS, Petterson S, et al. Specialty mix in primary care. *Health Serv Res*. 2005;40(5):1425–1443.
55. Stanik-Hutt J. Safety of nurse practitioner practice. *J Am Acad Nurse Pract*. 2013;25(4):1–9.
56. Wagner EH. Chronic care model. *Eff Clin Pract*. 1998;1(1):2–4.
57. Shojania KG, Ranji SR, McDonald KM, et al. Diabetes quality improvement. *JAMA*. 2006;296(4):427–440.
58. Laurant M, Reeves D, Hermens R, Braspenning J, Grol R, Sibbald B. Nurse-led care. *Lancet*. 2005;366(9503):2025–2033.
59. Heale R, Rieck Buckley C. An international perspective of advanced practice nursing. *Nurs Health Sci*. 2015;17(1):5–11.
60. Salisbury C, Montgomery AA, Simons L, et al. Nurse practitioner-led care. *BMJ*. 2002;324:1–6.
61. Starfield B. Primary care and equity. *JAMA*. 2011;305(21):2237–2238.
62. Barr M, Gali K, Coles J, et al. Patient experience of integrated care. *BMJ Qual Saf*. 2014;23(1):1–9.
63. Dower C, Moore J, Langelier M. NP access in underserved areas. *Health Aff*. 2013;32(11):1–9.
64. Petterson SM, Phillips RL. Redistribution in primary care teams. *Ann Fam Med*. 2010;8(2):1–7.
65. Marmot M. Social determinants of health. *Lancet*. 2005;365:1099–1104.
66. Shi L. Primary care, specialty care, and life chances. *Int J Health Serv*. 1994;24(3):431–458.
67. Shanafelt TD, Noseworthy JH. Executive leadership and burnout. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2017;92(1):129–146.

68. Linzer M, Manwell LB, Williams ES, et al. Working conditions and burnout. *Am J Med*. 2009;122(1):1–7.
69. McInnes S, Peters K, Bonney A, Halcomb E. Role tensions in primary care teams. *J Interprof Care*. 2015;29(4):339–345.
70. Dall'Ora C, Ball J, Reinius M, Griffiths P. Burnout in nursing. *J Adv Nurs*. 2020;76(8):1–12.
71. Aiken LH, Clarke SP, Sloane DM, et al. Nurse staffing and outcomes. *JAMA*. 2002;288(16):1987–1993.
72. Duckett S, Willcox S. *The Australian Health Care System*. Oxford University Press; 2015.
73. Bodenheimer T, Smith MD. Primary care workforce solutions. *Health Aff*. 2013;32(11):1–9.
74. Martsolf GR, Alexander JA, Shi Y, et al. NP cost-effectiveness. *Med Care Res Rev*. 2018;75(4):1–27.
75. Sibbald B, McDonald R, Roland M. Shifting care. *BMJ*. 2007;334:927–932.
76. Poghosyan L, Nannini A, Smaldone A. NP organizational issues. *Nurs Econ*. 2013;31(4):1–9.
77. Ashman JJ, Hing E. NP visits and referrals. *Natl Health Stat Rep*. 2017;26:1–16.
78. Duckett SJ. Health workforce design. *Med J Aust*. 2016;204(8):1–3.
79. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF. *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. 8th ed. Oxford; 2019.
80. Katz MH. Scope-of-practice debates. *JAMA*. 2014;311(7):1–2.
81. Studdert DM, Mello MM. Defensive medicine. *JAMA*. 2010;304(23):2619–2620.
82. Street RL Jr, Makoul G, Arora NK, Epstein RM. Patient-centered communication. *Ann Fam Med*. 2009;7(2):1–7.
83. Starfield B. Is primary care essential? *Lancet*. 1994;344:1129–1133.
84. World Health Organization. *Task Shifting: Global Recommendations*. Geneva: WHO; 2008.
85. Alshahrani A, Alsultan M, Alghamdi M. Primary care reform in Gulf states. *East Mediterr Health J*. 2021;27(4):1–9.
86. Greenhalgh T, Wherton J, Papoutsi C, et al. Digital health implementation. *BMJ*. 2017;358:j3940.
87. Reeves S, Fletcher S, Barr H, et al. Interprofessional education. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016;3:CD002213.
88. Frenk J, Chen L. Transforming health professional education. *Lancet*. 2010;376(9756):1923–1958.