

1 **Are changes in Australian national primary health care policy likely to promote or**
2 **impede equity of access? A narrative review.**

3

4 **Abstract**

5 Significant changes have occurred in Australia's national primary health care (PHC) policy
6 over the last decade, but little assessment has been made of implications for equity. This
7 research aimed to identify key, recent changes in national PHC policy and assess
8 implications for equity of access to PHC. We reviewed academic literature to identify
9 issues affecting equity of access in national PHC policy, and grey literature to identify
10 significant policy changes during 2005-2016 with implications for equitable access. We
11 assessed equity implications of four areas of policy change, set against the existing
12 Medicare system.

13 We found that Medicare supports equitable access to general practice, but there is a risk of
14 reduced equity under current policy settings. We selected four changes in PHC policy as
15 having particular implications for equity of access and assessed these as follows: increased
16 involvement of private health insurance presents risks for equity; equity implications of
17 new models of coordinated care are unclear; and regional primary health organisations and
18 current policy on Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander health have potential equity
19 benefits, but these will depend on further implementation.

20

21 **Key words:** Primary health care, healthcare disparities, health care: reform

22

23 **Introduction**

24 Primary health care (PHC) has undergone significant national policy change in the last
25 decade in Australia. These changes have implications for social and health inequities yet

1 little assessment has been made through an equity lens. This article aims to contribute to
2 current national debate on equity in Australian health policy, with a specific focus on the
3 role of PHC and recent changes in national PHC policy. PHC can be defined as the first
4 level of access to the healthcare system, mainly provided by General Practice (GP),
5 nursing or allied health services (McDonald 2007). Those who argue for comprehensive
6 PHC (CPHC) assert that PHC should include but extend beyond first-level medical care to
7 include primary prevention, health promotion, community engagement and action to
8 address social determinants of health (SDH) and health equity (Hurley *et al.* 2010). The
9 Australian government has defined PHC as ‘socially appropriate, universally accessible,
10 scientifically sound first-level care [...that] gives priority to those most in need and
11 addresses health inequalities [...] and involves collaboration and partnership with other
12 sectors to promote public health’ (Department of Health and Ageing 2009). Affordable,
13 universal PHC is recognised internationally as a key means to promote population health
14 and prevent disease equitably (WHO 2008).

15 Harris *et al.* (2004) define equity of access to PHC services as when individuals or
16 communities are easily able to use the appropriate PHC services in proportion to their need
17 rather than their private ability to pay. Inequities of access are preventable and unfair
18 differences in access to PHC services, which may arise from variations in service use,
19 quality of care, or the extent to which individuals are able to benefit from care (Harris *et*
20 *al.* 2004). Equity of access to PHC is mediated by availability, affordability and
21 acceptability of services (Thiede *et al.* 2007). Equitable access encompasses horizontal
22 equity – equal access for all those at a particular level of need – and vertical equity –
23 distribution of resources in a manner proportionate to differences in need (Ward 2009).

24 Here we present perspectives on four areas of recent policy change positioned in the
25 context of the Medicare system, and consider their potential impact on equity of access.

1 We adopt a normative view that: PHC covers first-level services including medical,
2 nursing, pharmaceutical, diagnostic, allied health, mental health, child and family health,
3 community health and dental health services; PHC policy should be committed to equity
4 (Kidd *et al.* 2008); and PHC should be central to health system responses to long-term
5 change in patterns of disease and rise in chronic conditions (Swerissen *et al.* 2016).

6

7 **Methods**

8 We conducted two literature reviews concurrently; a narrative review of academic
9 literature using a structured search method, and a rapid narrative review of grey literature
10 addressing contemporary issues in national Australian PHC policy. Our theoretical
11 conceptions of in/equity of access to PHC applied in designing and conducting these
12 reviews were based on Harris *et al.* (2004), and drew on Thiede *et al.* (2007) and Ward
13 (2009).

14 The narrative review of academic literature followed UK government guidelines for rapid
15 review of evidence (UK Government 2014). A structured search strategy was designed,
16 tested and agreed by the authors, and drew on similar work involving one of the authors
17 (*deleted for review*). We designed the search terms to find academic literature focused on
18 issues affecting equity of access in contemporary Australian PHC policy. To address our
19 interest in CPHC we incorporated terms on well-recognised SDH. Thus the search strategy
20 used linked groups of search terms related to: PHC (e.g. general practice); equity (e.g.
21 inequity, disparity, Aboriginal, refugee); Australian populations (e.g. Victoria); SDH (e.g.
22 employment, housing); and policy (e.g. policy, programme). In keeping with our focus on
23 policy in the last decade we limited the search to items published from 2005 onward. We
24 conducted on-line searches in June 2015 in *Medline*, *Proquest* (health and social sciences)
25 and *Informit* (health, indigenous and social sciences) academic data bases, producing an

1 initial data set of 1456 items. The authors discussed initial results and agreed on criteria for
2 excluding items not relevant to our interests. Author 1 scanned titles to eliminate: items not
3 focused on Australia; articles on research design or methodology; book reviews; calls for
4 papers or publication of abstracts; and incomplete records; leaving 1176 items. Author 1
5 then reviewed abstracts and eliminated items focused on: hospital or emergency care;
6 palliative care; assisted reproduction; alternative therapies; aged care; diagnostic or clinical
7 guidelines; simply reporting evidence of a health inequality; or otherwise judged as not
8 relevant to a relationship between PHC policy and equity of access; leaving 909 items. The
9 next stage involved reading abstracts in more detail, and categorising items according to
10 emerging themes related to equity and policy implementation, such as Aboriginal and
11 Torres Strait Islander (hereafter, 'Aboriginal') health, distribution of services, Medicare,
12 and CPHC. Themes were discussed and agreed by the research team as the review
13 proceeded. We then reviewed the contents of articles grouped under those themes we
14 judged as particularly relevant to understanding key areas of current policy and policy
15 change with implications for equity of access to PHC, as identified through our review of
16 grey literature.

17 To review grey literature we searched internet sources and material on PHC including:
18 expert commentary on policy; policy documents; Ministerial statements; government,
19 NGO or academic reports; and relevant materials from parliamentary committees,
20 government-appointed advisory committees, or Council of Australian Governments.

21 Author 1 selected and reviewed materials identified as: a) addressing major government
22 reforms or other significant changes in the national PHC policy environment since 2005;
23 and b) relevant to understanding implications of policy for equity of access. We reviewed
24 approximately 90 items and discussed findings as a team to identify significant changes in
25 national PHC policy during 2005-2016 with likely implications for equity.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Results

We identified four significant changes of direction in recent national PHC policy as having significant potential to affect equitable access to care. To place these changes in context we first summarise the current situation for Federal funding of PHC under Medicare in Australia and its implications for equity. Our summary assessment of risks and benefits for equity of access to PHC across these four areas, plus Medicare, is shown in table 1.

<Insert Table 1 here>

Federal structures and funding of PHC

Current Australian PHC policy is set within an environment where responsibilities for health policy are divided between national and state/territory governments, health costs are growing as a percentage of national income, and the national government is committed to cutting health expenditure (AHHA 2015). Since 1984 Medicare subsidies have enabled Australians to access PHC services, primarily GP services, with low or no out-of-pocket costs (Hetzl *et al.* 2015), with specific provisions for low-income service users (Korda *et al.* 2009). GP services funded through Medicare are a main part of the PHC system in Australia. State/territory governments also fund some PHC services including parent and child, youth, women’s and generic community health services (Baum 2014).

General Practice: Our review identified several studies showing that Medicare rebates and measures such as bulk billing, since their introduction (Hajizadeh *et al.* 2012) and currently (Korda *et al.* 2009; Golenko *et al.* 2015), support equity of access to GP services – the most highly utilised form of PHC – for people on low incomes. However, consistent with a review by Bywood *et al.* (2011), we also found studies showing inequities of access

1 to GP services affect specific population groups. For example, despite long-standing
2 government incentive schemes to improve access to GP services in under-served areas,
3 Roeger *et al.* (2010) found that such access is relatively poor for lower-income, outer
4 suburban areas within major cities. Harrison and Britt (2011) found inequalities in GP
5 service utilisation between major cities and country areas.

6 In 2014 the Abbott Coalition government sought to introduce a compulsory co-payment
7 for GP services, but reversed its position after public opposition. However, a government
8 freeze on indexation of Medicare rebates for GP services (extending to 2020), is likely to
9 increase pressure on services to charge patient fees and reduce bulk billing, with
10 implications for equity of access. While we did not identify any research showing such
11 effects, evidence shows the freeze is adversely affecting GP incomes (Harrison *et al.* 2015)
12 and a review article by Laba *et al.* (2014) concluded that introduction of co-payments or
13 increased fees would reduce equity of access to GP services.

14 *Other forms of PHC:* Some areas of PHC such as primary dental care and some allied
15 health services attract only limited and/or targeted public subsidies, or none, and are
16 otherwise funded privately by users out-of-pocket or via their private health insurance. We
17 found numbers of studies indicating that absence of universal Medicare coverage in these
18 other areas of PHC contributes to inequities of access. People on lower incomes are less
19 likely to use allied health services (Korda *et al.* 2009). In relation to dental care, research
20 shows inequalities in oral health (Mejia *et al.* 2014), inequities in dental insurance
21 associated with inequities in care (Alsharif *et al.* 2014), and cost as a barrier for lower-
22 income people to access care (Christopolous *et al.* 2013).

23 *Other points:* While Medicare appears broadly favourable to equity of access to GPs,
24 individual Medicare Benefits Schedule (MBS) rebates can be unfavourable to equity by
25 leading to greater uptake by the better off and/or by failing to overcome locational,

1 socioeconomic or cultural barriers to care (Meadows *et al.* 2015). The Medicare
2 Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS) does improve affordability of subsidised
3 medicines relative to their ‘market’ price (Doran and Henry 2008), however out-of-pocket
4 costs may still a significant impost for low-income people with chronic conditions (Laba *et*
5 *al.* 2015).

6

7 ***GP-led coordinated care for chronic illness***

8 Recent Australian government policy positions on PHC have emphasised an enhanced role
9 for GP services in coordinating multidisciplinary care for people with established chronic
10 illness; to manage illness more effectively and, in particular, to reduce avoidable
11 hospitalisations (Department of Health 2014). These services are planned to be funded
12 using a capitated payment model rather than fee-for-service (PHC Advisory Group 2015).
13 A two-year trial of this model, the ‘Health Care Homes’ (HCH) trial, commencing in mid-
14 2017, will be implemented through Primary Health Network organisations (PHNs) in ten
15 regions and involve up to 65,000 patients (Department of Health 2016). This policy change
16 raises the question of whether disadvantaged groups will gain access to the program in a
17 manner proportionate to their typically higher rates of ambulatory care sensitive conditions
18 (ACSCs) (Banham *et al.* 2010).

19 While it is too early for evidence on any aspect of the HCH trial, there is evidence that
20 models of coordinated care for chronic disease improve health outcomes (Davey *et al.*
21 2015). However, our review also identified a number of studies that raise questions about
22 the potential for enhanced PHC in this form to reduce avoidable hospitalisations, and to do
23 so equitably, within the current broader PHC policy environment. Plant *et al.* (2015) found
24 that a program of enhanced, coordinated PHC for people with chronic conditions did not
25 reduce avoidable hospitalisations, compared with standard care. Rates of ACSCs are

1 higher among low income groups (Banham *et al.* 2010). Avoidable hospitalisations are
2 higher among rural/regional/remote populations (Ansari *et al.* 2012), and Aboriginal
3 people (Australian Government 2014), who also tend to have poorer access to GP services.
4 A review article by Foster *et al.* (2008) concluded that costs to low income patients of
5 participating in multidisciplinary care may also act as a barrier and compromise equitable
6 access.

7 *Models of PHC:* Although GP-centred models of coordinated care have similarities with
8 CPHC, such as an interest in multidisciplinary care, they lack the focus of CPHC on health
9 promotion, community engagement and addressing social determinants of health (Hurley
10 *et al.* 2010). According to our review, the HCH policy emphasis on secondary
11 management of existing disease may present barriers to adopting a CPHC approach
12 (Javanparast *et al.* 2015) and thus fail to gain the benefits of this approach for promoting
13 health, preventing disease, improving access, and improving management of chronic
14 conditions, especially within at-risk or disadvantaged groups including Aboriginal people
15 (e.g. Bath and Wakerman 2015; Kelaher *et al.* 2014). Panaretto *et al.* (2014) review
16 evidence and argue for the benefits of the CPHC approach among Aboriginal Community-
17 Controlled Health Services (ACCHSs).

18 State-funded PHC services have often led the way in implementing CPHC but more
19 recent, reduced policy support from several State governments for community-based PHC
20 have undermined this approach (Freeman *et al.* 2015; Baum *et al.* 2016). The present
21 national government focus on coordinated care also followed previous decisions to defund
22 health promotion programs and agencies; a move which is likely to have negative effects
23 on equity (Muhunthan *et al.* 2015).

24 A policy goal of reduced hospitalisations through GP-centred coordinated care may also be
25 undermined by other significant, inequitable drivers of hospitalisations such as: disparities

1 in dental insurance (Alsharif *et al.* 2014), inadequate policy support for public dental
2 programs (Lucas *et al.* 2011), and inadequate funding for PHC in remote areas (Bar-Zeev
3 *et al.* 2012).

4

5 ***Private health insurance (PHI) in PHC***

6 Since 2013, the Abbott /Turnbull Coalition governments have consistently expressed
7 policy support for an increased role for Private Health Funds (PHFs) in PHC (Dutton
8 2014; PHC Advisory Group 2015). PHFs have formed partnerships with several PHNs and
9 are intended to participate in the Health Care Homes trial (PHC Advisory Group 2015),
10 raising concerns about possible impacts on equity. While provisions in national health
11 insurance legislation prohibit PHFs from covering community-based GP services, PHFs
12 are exploring ways to work with GP services to offer enhanced services and access to their
13 members – relative to non-insured patients – without breaching these prohibitions, such as
14 Medibank Private’s (now ended) *GP Access* trial in Queensland (Senate Community
15 Affairs Committee 2014). Critics of these developments have argued they undermine
16 legislative intent, cause inequities in service access, and could (if extended) lead to a two-
17 tier system in General Practice as is already the case in the hospital and dental sectors
18 (Senate Community Affairs Committee 2014).

19 Menadue and McAuley (2012) argues that increased co-payments in PHC could lead to
20 PHFs offering insurance for these payment ‘gaps’; an allowance which has contributed to
21 rapid cost increases in specialist and hospital services.

22 Not surprisingly, given the emerging and evolving nature of the issues above, we did not
23 identify any studies examining impacts of PHI on equity of access to GP services.

24 However, evidence as discussed on allied health and dental care is indicative of the
25 inequities that tend to occur when timely access to good quality PHC service is dependent

1 on holding PHI and/or payment of out-of-pocket costs (Alsharif *et al.* 2014; Korda *et al.*
2 2009).

3

4 ***Regional Primary Health Organisations***

5 Australian governments have implemented several iterations of regional primary health
6 organisations (RPHOs) including Medicare Locals (MLs), and now Primary Health
7 Networks (PHNs). In early 2015 the Federal government funded 30 PHNs to replace 61
8 MLs established under the previous government. PHN funding stipulates regional need
9 assessment, support for GP-led coordinated care for chronic conditions, collaboration with
10 state Local Health Networks, and commissioning to fill service gaps. PHN funding may be
11 a positive for equity insofar as it is intended to take measures of population health, rurality
12 and socioeconomic status (by PHN region) into account (Department of Health 2014).
13 However, the introduction of MLs, and now PHNs, has also led to reduced support from
14 state governments for CPHC (McCann 2012).

15 Research we identified suggests that RPHOs can: undertake needs assessment and
16 population health planning (Javanparast *et al.* 2015); improve collaboration between GPs
17 and state-funded PHC services (Weise *et al.* 2011); and improve preventative PHC
18 (Alexander *et al.* 2014); all of which have potential benefits for equity. However,
19 Javanparast *et al.* (2015) also suggests that policy emphasis on intermediate and acute care
20 undermines attention of RPHOs on preventive care and health promotion. We did not
21 identify any evidence regarding effects of the implementation of PHNs on equity of access
22 to PHC.

23

24 ***PHC for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples***

1 In 2015 the Federal government release its *Implementation Plan (IP)* for the *National*
2 *Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Pan 2013-2023*. The IP recognises several
3 social determinants of Indigenous health including the centrality of culture and impacts of
4 racism in healthcare. It commits government to continued support for ACCHSs, which
5 adopt a CPHC approach (Freeman *et al.* 2015), and improved cultural safety in mainstream
6 services. However, while national health funding to ACCHSs has been maintained, \$534m
7 funding over five years was cut from Indigenous health and social programs in the national
8 2014 budget.

9 Our review found a number of studies showing that community-controlled CPHC services
10 deliver health and access benefits for Aboriginal people (e.g. Parker *et al.* 2012, Bath and
11 Wakerman 2015; Kelaher *et al.* 2014; Freeman *et al.* 2015). Collaborative models of care
12 between ACCHSs, PHC and acute care services also have been shown to improve service
13 access and health outcomes for Aboriginal people in a remote setting (Reeve, *et al.* 2015).

14

15 **Discussion**

16 This research reviewed Australian academic literature including empirical studies,
17 evidence reviews and position papers based on a search to identify literature focused on
18 issues affecting equity of access in contemporary Australian PHC policy. One limitation of
19 this approach was that we did not consider international research literature considering
20 impacts of similar policy approaches in other jurisdictions.

21 We also reviewed grey literature from Australian sources including policy documents,
22 reports and expert commentary to identify major changes in national PHC policy since
23 2005 and understand implications of these for equity of access. In seeking to meet the aims
24 of the research, findings from the two reviews informed each other.

1 The position papers and grey literature we reviewed provided information on the
2 contemporary PHC policy environment, key changes in PHC policy and government
3 rationale for these, and the policy instruments or strategies that policy changes would use
4 in implementation. This enabled us to select areas of significant policy change as the target
5 of the analysis and to make informed choices about which parts of the evidence reviewed
6 were relevant to assessing equity implications of the selected areas.

7 The research literature we reviewed included empirical evidence on (inter alia):

- 8 1. the impacts of established PHC funding structures, and some large scale funded
9 programs, on equity of access to PHC services across different SES groups;
- 10 2. Outcomes for access or health from various programs or services directed toward
11 vulnerable or disadvantaged groups
- 12 3. Inequities in measures of health status or service access associated with determinants
13 such as SES, location, PHI status, Aboriginal/non-Aboriginal status, and others
- 14 4. And qualitative evidence on health services, RPHO organisations, and other matters
15 related to PHC

16 As shown in Table 1, the first kind of evidence, in particular, enabled us to assess effects
17 of Medicare funding structures on equity of access, and to judge a clear risk to equity
18 associated with a policy adjustment to one key line of MBS funding instrumental (hitherto)
19 in maintaining equitable access to general practice. In the four areas of major policy
20 *change* we chose to examine we drew on all the forms of evidence noted – as related to
21 policy goals and instruments/strategies identified in the grey literature – in order to assess,
22 and weigh the balance between, potential positive gains (benefits) or negative impacts
23 (risks) of policy change. Here it was necessary to recognise that each of the areas of
24 policy change identified has not yet ‘unfolded’ very far and direct assessment of their
25 impacts for access or health will depend on actual implementation over time. In two of the

1 selected areas – the increased involvement of PHI in PHC and the general practice sector,
2 and the introduction of PHNs – we found little research investigating equity impacts,
3 indicating a need for more research. Here we made inferences drawing on strong evidence
4 on the role of PHI in other PHC sectors and some research on Medicare Locals.

5

6 **Conclusion**

7 The ‘risk/benefit profile’ for equity of access arising from four areas of change in
8 contemporary Australian PHC policy – set against the background of existing funding
9 structures and existing inequities – is mixed. We assessed a definite risk in relation to
10 Medicare funding for general practice and significant potential risk from increased
11 involvement of the PHI industry in PHC, in the current political environment. In relation to
12 the emerging policy direction of capitated funding for GP-led coordinated care for people
13 with chronic conditions, the potential of the proposed model to improve equity of access or
14 health must be weighed against the evidence on inequities in the health measures
15 (avoidable hospitalisations, ACSCs) the policy seeks to affect, and in the policy
16 mechanisms (access to GP and allied health services) it intends to use. Thus the outcome
17 for equity is unclear. In two areas, the introduction of PHNs and current national policy
18 directions on Aboriginal health, we assessed there is potential benefit for equity, but
19 realising this will depend on the adequacy and distribution of resources committed by
20 government to implement these policy directions.

21

22

23 **Acknowledgements**

24 *Deleted for review*

25

1 **Conflicts of interest:**

2 None.

3

4

5 **References**

6 Alexander K, Brijnath B, Mazza D (2014) Barriers and enablers to delivery of the Healthy

7 Kids Check. *Implementation Science* **9**, 60.

8 Alsharif A, Kruger E, Tennant M (2014) Disparities in dental insurance coverage among

9 hospitalised Western Australian children. *International Dental Journal* **64**, 252-259.

10 Ansari Z, Haider SI, Ansari H, De Gooyer T, Sindall C (2012) Patient characteristics

11 associated with hospitalisations for ambulatory care sensitive conditions in Victoria,

12 Australia. *BMC Health Services Research* **12**(1), 475. Australian Government (2014)

13 'Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Health Performance Framework 2014 Report.'

14 (Australian Government: Canberra.)

15 Australian Healthcare and Hospitals Association (2015) 'Pathways to reform: Health

16 funding and the reform of Federation.' (AHHA: Canberra.)

17 Banham D, Woollacott T, Gray J, Humphrys B, Mihnev A, McDermott R (2010)

18 Recognising potential for preventing hospitalisation. *Australian Health Review*

19 **34**(1), 116-122.

20 Bar-Zeev S, Kruske S, Barclay L, Bar-Zeev N, Carapetis J, Kildea S (2012) Use of health

21 services by remote dwelling Aboriginal infants in tropical northern Australia: a

22 retrospective cohort study. *BMC Pediatrics* **12**, 173-181.

23 Bath J, Wakerman J (2015) Impact of community participation in primary health care:

24 What is the evidence? *Australian Journal of Primary Health* **21**(1), 2-8.

1 Baum F (2014) Community health services in Australia. IN 'Second opinion: An
2 introduction to health sociology' 5th ed. (Ed J Germov) pp. 484-502. (Oxford
3 University Press: Melbourne)

4 Baum F, Freeman T, Sanders D, Labonté R, Lawless A, Javanparast S (2016)
5 Comprehensive Primary Health Care under neo-liberalism in Australia. *Social*
6 *Science and Medicine* **168**, 43-52.

7 Bywood P, Katterl R, Lunnay B (2011) 'Disparities in primary health care utilisation.'
8 (Primary Health Care Research & Information Service: Adelaide)

9 Chrisopoulos S, Luzzi L, Brennan DS (2013) Trends in dental visiting avoidance due to
10 cost in Australia, 1994 to 2010: an age-period-cohort analysis. *BMC Health Services*
11 *Research* **13**, 381.

12

13 Davy C, Bleasel J, Liu H, Tchan M, Ponniah S, Brown A (2015) Effectiveness of chronic
14 care models: Opportunities for improving healthcare practice and health outcomes -
15 a systematic review *BMC Health Services Research* **15**(1),194.

16 Department of Health (2014) 'Primary Health Networks: Grant Programme Guidelines.'
17 (Australian Government: Canberra)

18 Department of Health (2016) 'Health Care Homes: Reform of the Primary Health Care
19 System.' (Australian Government: Canberra) Available at
20 [http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/health-care-](http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/health-care-homes#four)
21 [homes#four](http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/health-care-homes#four) [Verified 27 July 2016]

22 Department of Health and Ageing (2009) 'Primary Health Care reform in Australia.'
23 (Australian Government: Canberra)

24 Doran E, Henry D (2008) Australian Pharmaceutical Policy: Price control, equity, and
25 drug innovation in Australia. *Journal of Public Health Policy* **29**, 106-120.

1 Dutton P (2014) 'Speech. Health demand: policy and productivity reforms.' (Committee
2 for Economic Development of Australia: Brisbane, Queensland)

3 Foster M, Mitchell M, Haines T, Tweedy S, Cornwell P, Fleming J (2008) Does enhanced
4 primary care enhance primary care? Policy-induced dilemmas for allied health
5 professionals. *Medical Journal of Australia* **188**(1), 29-32.

6 Freeman T, Baum F, Lawless A, Javanparast S, Jolley G, Labonte R, Bentley M, Boffa J,
7 Sanders D (2015) Revisiting the ability of Australian primary health care services to
8 respond to health inequity. *Australian Journal of Primary Health* **22**, 332-338.

9 Golenko X, Shibl R, Scuffham P, Cameron C (2015) Relationship between socioeconomic
10 status and general practitioner visits for children in the first 12 months of life: An
11 Australian study. *Australian Health Review* **39**(2), 136-145.

12 Hajizadeh M, Connelly L, Butler J (2012) Health policy and horizontal inequities of
13 health-care utilization in Australia: 1983-2005. *Applied Economics Letters* **19**(18),
14 1765-1775.

15 Harris M, Harris E, Roland M (2004) Access to primary health care: three challenges to
16 equity. *Australian Journal of Primary Health* **10**(3), 21-29.

17

18 Harrison C, Bayram C, Miller G, Britt H (2015) The cost of freezing general practice.
19 *Medical Journal of Australia*. **202**(6), 313-316. Harrison C, Britt H (2011) General
20 practice: Workforce gaps now and in 2020. *Australian Family Physician* **40**, 12-15.

21 Hetzel D, Glover J, McDonald S (2015) 'Health systems of Australia and New Zealand.'
22 (Elsevier: Amsterdam, The Netherlands)

23 Hurley C, Baum F, Johns J, Labonte R (2010) Comprehensive Primary Health Care in
24 Australia: Findings from a narrative review of the literature. *Australasian Medical*
25 *Journal* **1**(2), 147-152.

- 1 Javanparast S, Baum F, Barton E, Freeman T, Lawless A, Fuller J, Reed R, Kidd M (2015)
2 Medicare local-local health network partnerships in South Australia: Lessons for
3 primary health networks. *Medical Journal of Australia* **203**(5), 219.e211-219.e216.
- 4 Kelaher M, Sabanovic H, La Brooy C, Lock M, Lusher D, Brown L (2014) Does more
5 equitable governance lead to more equitable health care? *Social Science & Medicine*
6 **123**: 278.
- 7 Kidd M, Watts I, Saltman D (2008) Primary health care reform: Equity is the key. *Medical*
8 *Journal of Australia* **189**(4), 221-222.
- 9 Korda, R, Banks E, Clements M, Young A (2009) Is inequity undermining Australia's
10 'universal' health care system? Socio-economic inequalities in the use of specialist
11 medical and non-medical ambulatory health care. *Australian and New Zealand*
12 *Journal of Public Health* **33**(5), 458-465.
- 13 Laba, T, Usherwood T, Leeder S, Yusuf F, Gillespie J, Perkovic V, Wilson A, Jan S,
14 Essue B (2015) Co-payments for health care: what is their real cost? *Australian*
15 *Health Review* **39**(1), 33-36.
- 16 Lucas N, Neumann A, Kilpatrick N, Nicholson J (2011) State-level differences in the oral
17 health of Australian preschool and early primary school-age children. *Australian*
18 *Dental Journal* **56**(1), 56-62.
- 19 McCann W (2012) 'Review of non-hospital based services.' (Government of South
20 Australia: Adelaide)
- 21 McDonald J (2007) Primary health care or primary medical care: In reality. *Australian*
22 *Journal of Primary Health* **13**(2), 18-23.
- 23 Meadows G, Enticott J, Inder B, Russell G, Gurr R (2015) Better access to mental health
24 care and the failure of the Medicare principle of universality. *Medical Journal of*
25 *Australia* **202**(4): 190-194.

1

2 Mejia G, Armfield J, Jamieson L (2014) Self-rated oral health and oral health-related
3 factors: the role of social inequality. *Australian Dental Journal* **59**(2), 226-233.

4 Menadue J, McAuley I (2012) 'Private health insurance: High in cost and low in equity.'
5 (Centre for Policy Development: Sydney, NSW)

6 Muhunthan J, Eades A, Jan S (2015) Neglecting preventive health threatens child rights in
7 Australia. *The Lancet* **385**(9966), 415.

8 *Deleted for review*

9 Panaretto K, Wenitong S, Button S, Ring I (2014) Aboriginal community controlled health
10 services: leading the way in primary care. *Medical Journal of Australia* **200**(11),
11 649-652.

12 Parker E, Misan J, Shearer M, Richards L, Russell A, Mills H, Jamieson L (2012)
13 Planning, implementing, and evaluating a program to address the oral health needs of
14 Aboriginal children in Port Augusta, Australia. *International Journal of Pediatrics*
15 **2012**: doi:10.1155/2012/496236

16 Plant N, Kelly P, Leeder S, D'Souza M, Mallitt K, Usherwood T, Jan S, Boyages S., Essue
17 B, McNab J, Gillespie J (2015) Coordinated care versus standard care in hospital
18 admissions of people with chronic illness: a randomised controlled trial. *Medical*
19 *Journal of Australia* **203**(1), 33-38.

20 Primary Health Care Advisory Group (2015) 'Better Outcomes for People with Chronic
21 and Complex Health Conditions through Primary Health Care.' (Australian
22 Government: Canberra)

23 Reeve C, Humphreys J, Wakerman J, Carter M, Carroll V, Reeve D (2015) Strengthening
24 primary health care: Achieving health gains in a remote region of Australia. *Medical*
25 *Journal of Australia* **202**(9), 483-8.

1 Roeger L, Reed R, Smith B (2010). Equity of access in the spatial distribution of GPs
2 within an Australian metropolitan city. *Australian Journal of Primary Health* **16**(4),
3 284-290.

4 Senate Community Affairs Committee (2014) 'Private Health Insurance Amendment (GP
5 Services) Bill 2014.' (Commonwealth of Australia: Canberra)

6 Swerissen H, Duckett S, Wright J (2016) 'Chronic failure in primary medical care.'
7 (Grattan Institute: Melbourne)

8 Thiede M, Akweongo P, McIntyre D (2007) Exploring the dimensions of access. In 'The
9 economics of health equity.' (Eds D McIntyre and G Mooney) pp. 103-123
10 (Cambridge University Press: Cambridge)

11 UK Government (2014) 'Rapid Evidence Assessment Guidelines.' (National Archives:
12 London UK) Available at
13 [http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140305122816/http://www.civilservice.](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140305122816/http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/networks/gsr/resources-and-guidance/rapid-evidence-assessment/what-is)
14 [gov.uk/networks/gsr/resources-and-guidance/rapid-evidence-assessment/what-is](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140305122816/http://www.civilservice.gov.uk/networks/gsr/resources-and-guidance/rapid-evidence-assessment/what-is)
15 [Verified 21 November 2016]

16 Ward P (2009) The relevance of equity in health care for primary care: Creating and
17 sustaining a 'fair go, for a fair innings'. *Quality in Primary Care* **17**(1), 49-54.

18 Weise M, Baum F, Freeman T, Kidd M (2011) Australia's systems of primary healthcare:
19 The need for improved coordination and implications for Medicare Locals.
20 *Australian Family Physician* **40**(12), 995-999.

21 World Health Organization (2008) 'The World Health Report 2008.' (WHO: Geneva)
22
23
24