

## **The impact of occupational risk from COVID on GP supply in England: A cross-sectional study.**

Miqdad Asaria, Assistant Professorial Research Fellow, London School of Economics and Political Science, Houghton Street, London WC2A 2AE, [m.asaria@lse.ac.uk](mailto:m.asaria@lse.ac.uk)

Rebecca Fisher, Senior Policy Fellow, The Health Foundation, 8 Salisbury Square, London EC4Y 8AP

### **Abstract**

**Objectives** To identify the risk of general practitioner mortality from COVID and the impact of measures to mitigate this risk on the level and socioeconomic distribution of primary care provision in the English NHS

**Design** Cross sectional study

**Setting** All GP practices providing primary care under the NHS in England

**Participants** 45,858 GPs and 6,771 GP practices in the English NHS

**Main outcome measures** Numbers of high-risk GPs, high-risk single-handed GP practices, patients associated with these high-risk single-handed practices and the regional and socioeconomic distribution of each. Mortality rates from COVID by age, sex and ethnicity were used to attribute risk to GPs and the Index of Multiple Deprivation was used to determine socioeconomic distributions of the outcomes.

**Results** Of 45,858 GPs in our sample 3,632 (7.9%) were classified as high risk or very high risk. Of 6,771 GP practices in our sample 639 (9.4%) were identified as single-handed practices and of these 209 (32.7%) were run by a GP at high or very high risk. These 209 single-handed practices care for 710,043 patients. GPs at the highest levels of risk from COVID, and single-handed practices run by high-risk GPs were concentrated in the most deprived neighbourhoods in the country. London had the highest proportion of both GPs and single-handed GP practices at very high risk of COVID mortality with 1,160 patients per 100,000 population registered to these practices.

**Conclusions** A significant proportion of GPs working in England, particularly those serving patients in the most deprived neighbourhoods, are at high risk of dying from COVID. Many of these GPs run single-handed practices. These GPs are particularly concentrated in London. There is an opportunity to provide additional support to mitigate COVID risk for GPs, GP practices and their patients. Failure to do so will likely exacerbate existing health inequalities.

### **What is already known:**

- Known risk factors for morbidity and mortality from COVID-19 include age, sex, ethnicity and certain underlying health conditions.
- NHS England have suggested that NHS staff who may be at higher risk from COVID are risk assessed and have their activities adjusted accordingly, including ceasing face to face patient contact.

### **What this study adds:**

- This study applies risk scoring to calculate the number of GPs practicing in England who are likely to be at high or very high risk of death from COVID. We examine the potential effect of removing GPs at high or very high risk from COVID from face to face patient contacts, estimating the number of GPs and patients likely to be affected, and relating this to deprivation and geography.
- We estimate that of 45,858 GPs in our sample, 2,253 (4.9%) were classified as high risk, and 1,379 (3%) as very high risk from COVID. These are likely to be conservative estimates.
- GPs at high risk of COVID are more likely to work in areas of high socioeconomic deprivation.
- Almost one in three single-handed GP practices (32.7%, or 209 out of 639) is run by a GP we estimate to be at high or very high risk from COVID. If these GPs did not see patients face to face, 710,043 patients would be left without face to face GP appointments. Single-handed GP practices in areas of high socioeconomic deprivation are more likely to be run by GPs at higher risk of COVID.

### **Introduction**

As the NHS shifts to the 'second phase' of responding to the COVID-19 ('COVID') pandemic, learning how to live and work alongside COVID is necessary. In general practice this will be challenging. Strategies already in use are likely to be maintained, including using 'hot hubs', 'zoning' and using telephone and video consulting to reduce face to face contact where possible. But these can only go so far. The number of patients requiring face to face consultations is likely to creep up over time (as examinations and tests can no longer be deferred), and with it the exposure of general practitioners (GPs) to COVID.

The risk of catching COVID – and of dying from it – is not equally distributed amongst GPs. Relatively early in the pandemic, Public Health England issued guidance identifying three risk factors used to guide managers in conversations with staff about increased vulnerability to COVID: age >70 years, selected underlying health

conditions, and pregnancy.(1) Although ethnicity was not originally included as a risk factor this has since been recognised as an important omission. Morbidity and mortality from COVID is higher in Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic (BAME) people than in Caucasian people, and the vast majority of COVID deaths in healthcare workers have been BAME staff, despite BAME workers accounting for 21% of the NHS workforce.(2–4)

The NHS Risk Reduction Framework attempts to capture this differential risk, with suggestion made – since reiterated in a letter from NHS England - that NHS employees deemed to be at higher risk from COVID be re-deployed to roles without face to face contact.(5,6) Unlike in secondary care, where individuals often work as part of large teams, GPs tend to work in smaller teams, and sometimes as the sole medical practitioner in a surgery (so called ‘single handed’ practice). The impact of removing GPs from face to face patient duties may be harder to compensate for, and in some cases may leave an entire patient population without a GP with whom they can face to face consult in a manner that is safe for GP and patient.

This analysis seeks to understand the potential implications of applying COVID-related occupational risk assessment to GPs. We calculate how many GPs currently practicing in England are likely to fall within high risk groups, whether those GPs are concentrated in particular geographical areas, and the correlation of this with socioeconomic deprivation - a known predictor of GP workload. We also calculate the number of single-handed practices being run by GPs likely to be deemed at high risk from COVID, and the number of patients covered by these GPs.

## **Methods**

### *Workforce data*

We used Primary care workforce data from the most recent release of the General Practice Workforce series published by NHS Digital for the 31<sup>st</sup> March 2020.(7) This dataset includes details on all NHS GPs as well as all NHS GP Practices operating in England. Data on individuals in this data series was used to categorise GPs by age, sex, country of qualification, primary job role and clinical commissioning group. The data series on GP Practices was used to identify single-handed GP practices as those run by a single GP (excluding locums, registrars and retainers who may work at the practice). GPs and practices lacking data on GP age and sex were excluded as meaningful judgements on risk of COVID mortality could not be made without these key characteristics. This resulted in 1,615 (3.4%) of GPs and 4 (0.06%) of single-handed GP practices being excluded from our dataset.

### *Age-specific COVID mortality rates*

Age and sex specific mortality data covering the period between the 1<sup>st</sup> March 2020 and 30<sup>th</sup> April 2020 from the Office of National Statistics (ONS) were used to capture deaths from COVID.(8) This mortality data was combined with age and sex specific population data from ONS mid-year population estimates for 2019 to calculate age-sex specific COVID mortality rates.(9)

### *Socioeconomic distribution of Clinical Commissioning Groups*

The Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) 2019 measures relative deprivation in small areas in England called lower-layer super output areas (LSOAs).(10) We attributed IMD scores from LSOAs to CCGs by calculating population weighted averages, and used these attributed scores to rank CCGs into population weighted deprivation quintile groups with each quintile group of CCGs covering approximately a fifth of the total population.(11–13) A table detailing the CCG deprivation quintiles we calculated for use in this analysis is provided in the supplementary appendix (Table A2).

### *COVID risk reduction framework*

We used the Risk Reduction Framework for NHS Staff at risk of COVID infection to guide our understanding of key characteristics that contribute to the level of risk from COVID faced by GPs.(5) The framework highlights age, sex, ethnicity, underlying health conditions and pregnancy as the five most important factors that influence risk from COVID among NHS staff. We also considered the Safety Assessment And Decision (SAAD) score designed to assess risks for BAME communities during a COVID pandemic infection in general practice which highlights similar factors as contributing to mortality risk using a more detailed treatment of ethnicity and underlying health conditions.(14) We used data on age, sex and ethnicity to characterise risk amongst GPs using the age-groups and ethnicity categories suggested in the framework. Data on underlying health conditions and pregnancy were not available in the workforce data so we were unable to include these in our analysis. Additionally, ethnicity data was not provided in the data so we used country of qualification as a proxy for ethnicity assuming that GPs listed as qualifying either in the United Kingdom (UK) or the European Economic Area (EEA) as being White whilst GPs listed as qualifying anywhere else were characterised as BAME. Our ethnicity variable therefore mis-categorises those BAME GPs that qualified in the UK or EEA as White and hence will under-estimate COVID risk associated with these GPs. We have requested bespoke datasets from NHS Digital and the General Medical Council that explicitly include ethnicity and will update the analysis in this manuscript with more accurate ethnicity data if we are able to obtain these data.

### *COVID risk categorisation of GPs*

We used the age-sex specific COVID mortality rates we calculated to translate the risk reduction framework into a risk scoring system. Risk scores were calculated by dividing all mortality rates by those for women aged 55-60 (the lowest risk group for whom COVID mortality risk is non-negligible). These scores were adjusted for ethnicity using a recent ONS study that found that age and sex adjusted COVID mortality rates for non-White ethnic groups are between 2 times and 4 times those of Whites depending on which non-White ethnic group is being compared.(15) Two alternative sets of risk scores were calculated for BAME GPs by using the upper and lower range of these ethnicity specific adjustments respectively to adjust the overall age-sex specific risk scores. We used the resulting risk scores to categorise both GPs and single-handed GP practices into 4 risk categories (Low, Medium, High and Very High) to reflect risk of mortality from COVID.

### *Outcome measures*

Our main outcome measures were (1) numbers of GPs, (2) number of single-handed GP practices and (3) numbers of patients registered to single-handed GP practices. Each outcome measure was disaggregated by COVID risk category to identify the numbers of GPs, single-handed practices and patients registered to single-handed practices at high and very high risk levels. The regional and socioeconomic distribution of high and very high COVID risk in primary care was examined for each outcome measure.(16)

### *Software*

All analysis was conducted using R version 4.0.0 statistical software.(17)

## **Results**

Age-sex specific COVID mortality rates show that risk increases rapidly with age, with risk of dying from COVID in those over 70 years of age being approximately a hundred times higher than risk for those under 55 years of age (see Table 1). Additionally we see that at any given age, risk for men is approximately double that for women.

The results of converting these mortality rates into risk scores and adding ethnicity specific adjustments to get Risk Scores A and B, in which BAME GPs have double or quadruple the risk of white GPs of the same age and sex respectively are shown in Table 2. Using either risk scoring system we find that GPs under 55 years of age regardless of sex or ethnicity are at the lowest risk whilst those over 70 years old are at the highest risk. We categorise GPs into four categories based on these risk scores: Low (0-1 points), Medium (1-4), High (4-9) and Very High (>9). Risk categories were defined to reflect discontinuities in the risk scores. Table 2 shows that the highest risk GPs in each of the risk categories is at approximately half the risk as the lowest risk GPs in the next risk category. The categorisation we have used works for both Risk Scores A and B and is robust to the choice of ethnicity adjustment.

Summary statistics describing the 45,858 GPs and 639 single hander GP practices used in our analysis are given in Table 3. The vast majority of GPs (86.2%) and just over half of single-handed GP practices are classed as low risk. 4.9% of GPs and 14.9% of single-handed GP practices are classed as high risk and 3.0% of GPs and 17.8% of single-handed GP practices are classed as very high risk. Increased risk is particularly concentrated in single-handed practices almost 1/3 of which are run by a GP at high or very high risk from COVID.

Breaking down the GP workforce into age, sex and ethnicity groups (see Figure 1) shows that almost all GPs over the age of 70 are also of BAME ethnicity. We also see that locums are substantially over-represented amongst very high risk GPs, making up 17% of very high risk GPs (see Figure 1) whilst constituting less than 10% of the overall GP workforce (see Table 3). Full breakdowns of GPs by age, sex, ethnicity, risk group and job role are given in the supplementary appendix Table A2.

Examining the distribution of GPs according to the deprivation quintile of the CCG in which they practice (see Figure 2) we find that there is a steep socioeconomic gradient in the distribution of very high risk GPs. Very high risk GPs are more than 3 times as likely to be working in the most deprived CCGs in the country as they are to be working in the most affluent CCGs.

The socioeconomic distribution of single-handed GP practices displays an even steeper deprivation gradient (see Figure 3). Single-handed practices run by GPs classed as being at very high risk are more than 4 times as likely to be located in the most deprived CCGs in the country as compared to in the most affluent CCGs. We can also examine this through the numbers of patients registered to these single-handed practices (see Figure 4). There are 126,412 patients registered to single-handed GP practices classed as being at very high risk located in the most deprived CCGs in the country as compared to 33,745 patients registered to single-handed GP practices classed as very high risk located in the most affluent CCGs.

Examining the regional distribution of our three outcome measures (see Figure 5) we see that London has the highest proportions of very high risk GPs (5.2 very high risk GPs per 100,000 population), very high risk single-handed GP practices (0.37 very high risk single-handed GP practices per 100,000 population) and patients registered to very high risk single-handed GP practices (1,160 patients registered to very high risk single-handed GP practices per 100,000 population). Full breakdowns of our main outcomes by region are detailed in the supplementary appendix Table A6.

## **Discussion**

### *Statement of principle findings*

Although the majority of GPs practicing in England are at low risk of death from COVID, a significant proportion of GPs, 7.9% (3,632 GPs) are at high or very high risk. These GPs are more likely to work in areas of high socioeconomic deprivation. Almost one in three single handed GP practices (32.7%) is run by a GP at high or very high risk from COVID. These single-handed GP practices are even more heavily concentrated in areas of high deprivation, particularly in London.

### *Strengths and weaknesses:*

Our study is the first that we are aware of that explores the potential impact of COVID across the GP workforce in the NHS. We use a comprehensive national dataset to quantify the degree of fragility of primary care in the face of the COVID pandemic and highlight the particularly vulnerable position of single-handed GP practices in the delivery of primary care in these times. We also explore the implications of these risks on the regional and socioeconomic distributions of primary care provision and find that risks are patterned by both geography and deprivation. If left un-mitigated, existing health inequalities amongst the patient population are likely to be exacerbated along these dimensions.

Our study builds on emerging frameworks that identify COVID risk amongst healthcare staff in the NHS.(5,14) These frameworks were written to identify risk at the individual level, requiring detailed information about underlying health conditions and biomarkers of those being assessed. Our attempt to operationalise these frameworks at a health system level is challenging and has a number of limitations. First, detailed data on underlying health conditions, pregnancy, and biomarkers such as BMI and Vitamin D levels that are found in these frameworks are not recorded in the comprehensive national data sets that cover the NHS workforce underpinning our analysis. We were therefore unable to use these factors in our implementations of the COVID risk scores. Consideration of these additional factors if they were available would re-classify some GPs as being at higher risk than the risk level attributed to them in our analysis. Hence, the numbers of GPs we report to be at high COVID risk should be seen as conservative. Second, we were unable to obtain explicit data on ethnicity from the datasets used in our analysis. We instead had to use country of qualification as a proxy for ethnicity. This under-estimates the number of BAME people in our dataset assuming all GPs trained in the UK and EEA are White. The effect of this is likely to be a further under-estimation of the number of GPs at high risk from COVID. To get a sense of the magnitude of this bias we note that 23.9% of GPs in our dataset are classified as being of BAME ethnicity as compared to 44% of all doctors in the NHS.(18) We have requested bespoke data from NHS Digital and the GMC to explicitly capture ethnicity in our analysis and will update our results should this data become available to us.

Finally, we examined the socioeconomic distribution of high COVID risk GPs and single-handed GP practices using CCG level deprivation scores. CCGs cover large and heterogeneous populations and much of the granularity of the impacts of deprivation are masked when used at this coarse level of geography. Unfortunately, the datasets underpinning our analysis were unable to provide finer grained information on the geographical distribution of GPs and so we were limited by the data to perform our socioeconomic analysis at CCG level. We therefore expect that the socioeconomic gradients highlighted by our analysis will be much steeper in reality and could be better estimated if more granular geographic data on the distribution of GPs was available.

#### *Implications for policymakers*

COVID creates numerous challenges for policy makers and commissioners, and amidst the inevitable focus on 're-opening' secondary care, the implications of co-existing with COVID in general practice must not be overlooked. Maintaining general practice as a 'front door' to the NHS that is safe for both GPs and patients is vital but not easy. Options to quarantine and pre-test patients intended to help protect secondary care cannot be deployed in primary care. Precautions will be taken, but patient-facing members of the primary care team will be exposed to risk from COVID. Measures intended to protect higher risk GPs from COVID are likely to be necessary for some time, and may vary over time depending on COVID incidence and prevalence.

Withdrawing ‘high risk’ GPs from face to face consulting does not necessarily mean removing them from the clinical workforce. Doctors who are unable to see patients face to face may continue to consult via other means, including telephone and video consulting. Some ‘high risk’ GPs may decide to continue to see patients ‘as usual’. But surgeries need to plan for how to cover gaps in the provision of face to face appointments, acknowledging that the duration of GPs absence from face to face work is unknown. The scale of this challenge will vary depending on factors including the number of other GPs working at the same practice, and the COVID risk status of those GPs. Where a ‘single handed’ GP falls into a high risk group, practices may have no face to face provision at all. If GPs at higher risk do continue to practice face to face there is a greater than average risk that their ability to do so may be restricted by illness or death from COVID.

The impact of a reduction in GPs able to consult face to face is not evenly distributed geographically or by socioeconomic deprivation. This is likely to exacerbate inequalities in GP workload and funding which existed prior to COVID, and which result in GPs in areas of higher deprivation having a proportionately higher workload, with relative under-funding.(19–22) Our analysis shows a steep deprivation gradient. If GPs at higher risk of COVID stop seeing patients face to face, the reduction in provision will be greatest in the most deprived areas. These are the areas where overall health need is greatest, and where morbidity and mortality from COVID is likely to be greater too.(23,24) There are also concerns that alternatives to face to face consulting such as video consultations may be harder to access for deprived populations, and those with additional barriers to care such as English as a second language.

As GPs are likely to feel the weight of responsibility for their patients, local systems must work together – at primary care network and CCG level - to ensure that GPs are able to make the right personal choices for themselves around COVID risk, safe in the knowledge that patient care will not suffer. Increasing collaboration between surgeries in primary care networks may be one avenue for this, and exploring a locum market significantly changed by COVID is another.(25)

#### *Unanswered questions and future research*

Analysis of occupational health risk from COVID should be expanded to include assessment of wider general practice teams, including allied health professionals and administrative support. Although the implications for face to face consulting may be different, risk assessment for the entire patient-facing practice staff must not be overlooked, particularly in light of evidence suggesting that COVID risk may be higher in less well paid roles.(26)

This study alerts us to a relatively large number of GPs at high risk of mortality from COVID, and to geographical and socioeconomic variation in the distribution of affected GPs. We do not know how many of these GPs will in practice choose to step away from direct patient contact, and how this may vary over time. Further work will be required to track what actually happens, and the effect on patient care of a



possible reduction in the number of GPs able to consult face to face. There is a timely opportunity to provide additional support to mitigate COVID-19 risk for high risk GPs, GP practices and their patients. Failure to do so will likely further exacerbate existing health inequalities.

**Acknowledgements:**

The authors would like to acknowledge helpful comments from Health Foundation colleagues.

**Data sharing statement:**

All data used in this study is publicly available administrative data. The data sources have been highlighted in the methods section of the manuscript. Code for all the analyses as well as the anonymised database will be made available on reasonable request.

## References:

1. Issar P. HR updates and guidance - Annex 2: Supporting our vulnerable staff [Internet]. NHS England and NHS Improvement; 2020 Mar. Available from: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/wp-content/uploads/sites/52/2020/03/annex-2-supporting-our-vulnerable-staff.pdf>
2. Marsh S, McIntyre N. Six in 10 UK health workers killed by Covid-19 are BAME. The Guardian [Internet]. 2020 May 25 [cited 2020 Jun 1]; Available from: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/may/25/six-in-10-uk-health-workers-killed-by-covid-19-are-bame>
3. Cook T, Kursumovic E, April 2020 SL. Exclusive: deaths of NHS staff from covid-19 analysed [Internet]. Health Service Journal. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://www.hsj.co.uk/exclusive-deaths-of-nhs-staff-from-covid-19-analysed/7027471.article>
4. Disparities in the risk and outcomes of COVID-19 [Internet]. Public Health England; 2020 Jun. Available from: [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/889195/disparities\\_review.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/889195/disparities_review.pdf)
5. Khunti K, de Bono A, Browne I, Greenhalgh T, Hanif W, Majeed A, et al. Risk Reduction Framework for NHS Staff at risk of COVID-19 infection [Internet]. Faculty of Medicine; 2020 May p. 44. Available from: <https://www.fom.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Risk-Reduction-Framework-for-NHS-staff-at-risk-of-COVID-19-infection-12-05-20.pdf>
6. Stevens S, Pritchard A. IMPORTANT - FOR ACTION - SECOND PHASE OF NHS RESPONSE TO COVID19 [Internet]. 2020. Available from: <https://www.england.nhs.uk/coronavirus/wp-content/uploads/sites/52/2020/04/second-phase-of-nhs-response-to-covid-19-letter-to-chief-execs-29-april-2020.pdf>
7. General Practice Workforce - 31 March 2020 [Internet]. NHS Digital. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://digital.nhs.uk/data-and-information/publications/statistical/general-and-personal-medical-services/final-31-march-2020>
8. Campbell A, Caul S. Deaths involving COVID-19, England and Wales [Internet]. Office for National Statistics. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/datasets/deathsinvolvingcovid19englandandwales>
9. Park N. Estimates of the population for the UK, England and Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland [Internet]. Office for National Statistics. [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/populationestimatesforukenglandandwalesscotlandandnorthernireland>

10. English indices of deprivation 2019 [Internet]. Ministry of Housing, Communities & Local Government. 2019 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/english-indices-of-deprivation-2019>
11. Park N. Lower layer Super Output Area population estimates mid-2018 [Internet]. Office for National Statistics. 2019 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/populationestimates/datasets/lowersuperoutputareamidyearpopulationestimates>
12. Lower Layer Super Output Area (2011) to Clinical Commissioning Group to Local Authority District (April 2019) Lookup in England [Internet]. Office for National Statistics. 2019 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/lower-layer-super-output-area-2011-to-clinical-commissioning-group-to-local-authority-district-april-2019-lookup-in-england>
13. Changes to Organisation Reference Data: sustainability and transformation partnerships reconfiguration [Internet]. NHS Digital. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://digital.nhs.uk/services/organisation-data-service/changes-to-ord-stp-reconfiguration>
14. Jiva M, Chauhan Z, Choudry B, Butt F, Omofuma OJ, Atcha Z, et al. Safety Assessment And Decision (SAAD) Score [Internet]. Available from: <https://abmacademy.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/SAAD-Score-2.pdf>
15. White C, Nafilyan V. Coronavirus (COVID-19) related deaths by ethnic group, England and Wales [Internet]. Office for National Statistics. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/articles/coronavirusrelateddeathsbyethnicgroupenglandandwales/2march2020to10april2020>
16. NHS England Regions (April 2020) Boundaries EN BUC [Internet]. Office for National Statistics. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://geoportal.statistics.gov.uk/datasets/nhs-england-regions-april-2020-boundaries-en-buc>
17. R Core Team. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing [Internet]. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2020. Available from: <https://www.R-project.org/>
18. NHS workforce [Internet]. Ethnicity facts and figures. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://www.ethnicity-facts-figures.service.gov.uk/workforce-and-business/workforce-diversity/nhs-workforce/latest#by-ethnicity-and-type-of-role>
19. Gershlick B, Fisher R. A worrying cycle of pressure for GPs in deprived areas [Internet]. The Health Foundation. 2019 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from:

<https://www.health.org.uk/news-and-comment/blogs/a-worrying-cycle-of-pressure-for-gps-in-deprived-areas>

20. Asaria M, Cookson R, Fleetcroft R, Ali S. Unequal socioeconomic distribution of the primary care workforce: whole-population small area longitudinal study. *BMJ Open*. 2016;6(1):e008783.
21. Boomla K, Hull S, Robson J. GP funding formula masks major inequalities for practices in deprived areas. *Bmj*. 2014;349.
22. Levene LS, Baker R, Bankart J, Walker N, Wilson A. Socioeconomic deprivation scores as predictors of variations in NHS practice payments: a longitudinal study of English general practices 2013–2017. *Br J Gen Pract*. 2019;69(685):e546–e554.
23. Stafford M, Steventon A, Thorlby R, Fisher R, Turton C, Deeny S. Understanding the health care needs of people with multiple health conditions [Internet]. London: The Health Foundation; 2018 Nov. Available from: <https://www.health.org.uk/publications/understanding-the-health-care-needs-of-people-with-multiple-health-conditions>
24. Caul S. Deaths involving COVID-19 by local area and socioeconomic deprivation [Internet]. Office for National Statistics. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/birthsdeathsandmarriages/deaths/bulletins/deathsinvolvingcovid19bylocalareasanddeprivation/deathsoccurringbetween1marchand17april>
25. May 2020 21. Locums out of work: ‘I never thought as a GP I would struggle to find work’ [Internet]. *Pulse Today*. 2020 [cited 2020 Jun 1]. Available from: <http://www.pulsetoday.co.uk/news/locums-out-of-work-i-never-thought-as-a-gp-i-would-struggle-to-find-work/20040850.article>
26. Windsor-Shellard B, Kaur J. Coronavirus (COVID-19) related deaths by occupation, England and Wales: deaths registered up to and including 20 April 2020 [Internet]. Office for National Statistics. 2020. Available from: <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/healthandsocialcare/causesofdeath/bulletins/coronaviruscovid19relateddeathsbyoccupationenglandandwales/deathsregistereduptoandincluding20april2020>

## Tables and figures:

Table 1: COVID-19 deaths by age and sex per 100,000 population

Age Group	Sex	Population	COVID-19 Deaths	COVID-19 deaths per 100,000 population
<55	Male	19,754,779	757	3.8
<55	Female	19,395,980	445	2.3
55-59	Male	1,809,613	650	35.9
55-59	Female	1,861,038	301	16.2
60-69	Male	2,880,038	2,143	74.4
60-69	Female	3,028,537	1,044	34.5
70+	Male	3,383,401	13,984	413.3
70+	Female	4,173,575	11,280	270.3

Note: population data from ONS 2019 mid-year populations, COVID-19 deaths from ONS deaths between 1<sup>st</sup> March 2020 and 30<sup>th</sup> April 2020

Table 2: COVID-19 risk categorisation based on mortality risk

Age group	Sex	Ethnicity	Risk Score A (BAME = 2*White)	Risk Score B (BAME = 4*White)	COVID-19 Risk
70+	Male	BAME	51.1	102.2	very high
70+	Female	BAME	33.4	66.8	very high
70+	Male	White	25.6	25.6	very high
60-69	Male	BAME	9.2	18.4	very high
70+	Female	White	16.7	16.7	very high
55-59	Male	BAME	4.4	8.9	high
60-69	Female	BAME	4.3	8.5	high
60-69	Male	White	4.6	4.6	high
55-59	Female	BAME	2	4	medium
55-59	Male	White	2.2	2.2	medium
60-69	Female	White	2.1	2.1	medium
55-59	Female	White	1	1	low
<55	Male	BAME	0.5	0.9	low
<55	Female	BAME	0.3	0.6	low
<55	Male	White	0.2	0.2	low
<55	Female	White	0.1	0.1	low


Notes: BAME = Black, Asian and Minority Ethnic, age-groups based on those used in the NHS risk reduction framework, GPs with missing data on age, sex or ethnicity classed with COVID-19 risk level Unknown

Table 3: Descriptive statistics for the 45,858 GPs and 639 single hander GP practices in England

Characteristic	Number of GPs	Proportion of GPs (%)	Number of single hander practices	Proportion of single hander practices (%)
<b>Age group</b>				
<55	38,141	83.2%	330	51.6%
55-59	3,853	8.4%	111	17.4%
60-69	3,238	7.1%	117	18.3%
70+	626	1.4%	81	12.7%
<b>Gender</b>				
Female	25,603	55.8%	194	30.4%
Male	20,255	44.2%	445	69.6%
<b>Country of Qualification</b>				
UK & EEA	34,877	76.1%	405	63.4%
Other	10,981	23.9%	234	36.6%
<b>Job Role</b>				
GP Partners	20,979	45.7%	639	100%
Salaried GPs	13,519	29.5%	-	-
GP Locums	4,484	9.8%	-	-
GP Registrars	6,339	13.8%	-	-
GP Retainers	537	1.2%	-	-
<b>COVID-19 Risk Group</b>				
Low	39,543	86.2%	348	54.5%
Medium	2,683	5.9%	82	12.8%
High	2,253	4.9%	95	14.9%
Very High	1,379	3.0%	114	17.8%
<b>Region</b>				
East of England	4,600	10.0%	67	10.5%
London	7,675	16.7%	131	20.5%
Midlands	8,445	18.4%	144	22.5%
North East and Yorkshire	6,815	14.9%	97	15.2%
North West	5,782	12.6%	136	21.3%
South East of England	6,851	14.9%	58	9.1%
South West of England	4,927	10.7%	6	0.9%
Unknown	763	1.7%	-	-
<b>IMD Quintile</b>				
Q1 most deprived	9,331	20.3%	239	37.4%
Q2	8,713	19.0%	146	22.8%
Q3	9,332	20.3%	111	17.4%
Q4	8,707	19.0%	84	13.1%
Q5 least deprived	9,012	19.7%	59	9.2%
Unknown	763	1.7%	-	-


Notes: Data from the NHS Digital General Practice Workforce for 31 March 2020, COVID-19 risk scores: Low (0-1), Medium (1-4), High (4-9), Very High (>9), IMD = Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 population weighted ranks at CCG level

Figure 1: GP workforce breakdown by COVID-19 mortality risk



Notes: Data from the NHS Digital General Practice Workforce for 31 March 2020, COVID-19 risk scores: Low (0-1), Medium (1-4), High (4-9), Very High (>9), showing all GPs over 55 years of age


Figure 2: Socioeconomic distribution of GPs with high and very high risk of COVID-19 mortality



Notes: Data from the NHS Digital General Practice Workforce for 31 March 2020, COVID-19 risk scores: Low (0-1), Medium (1-4), High (4-9), Very High (>9), deprivation quintiles based on population weighted Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 rank at CCG level




Figure 3: Socioeconomic distribution of single-handed GP practices run by GPs with high and very high COVID-19 mortality risk




Notes: Data from the NHS Digital General Practice Workforce for 31 March 2020, COVID-19 risk scores: Low (0-1), Medium (1-4), High (4-9), Very High (>9), deprivation quintiles based on population weighted Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 rank at CCG level

Figure 4: Socioeconomic distribution of patients registered at single-handed GP practices run by GPs with high and very high COVID-19 mortality risk



Notes: Data from the NHS Digital General Practice Workforce for 31 March 2020, COVID-19 risk scores: Low (0-1), Medium (1-4), High (4-9), Very High (>9), deprivation quintiles based on population weighted Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019 rank at CCG level

Figure 5: Regional distribution of GPs, single-handed practices and patients registered to these practices by COVID-19 mortality risk



Notes: Population data from ONS 2019 mid-year populations, GP workforce data from the NHS Digital General Practice Workforce for 31 March 2020, COVID-19 risk scores: Low (0-1), Medium (1-4), High (4-9), Very High (>9), map boundaries from Office for National Statistics licensed under the Open Government Licence v.3.0, contains OS data © Crown copyright and database right 2019

## Supplementary appendix

Table A1: Population, IMD 2019 score and IMD 2019 quintile for Clinical Commissioning Groups as of April 2020

CCG Code	CCG Name (from April 2020)	Population (mid-2018)	IMD 2019 Score	IMD 2019 Quintile
00R	NHS Blackpool CCG	139,305	45.39	1
01J	NHS Knowsley CCG	149,571	43.14	1
99A	NHS Liverpool CCG	494,814	42.44	1
03F	NHS Hull CCG	260,645	40.58	1
14L	NHS Manchester CCG	547,627	39.87	1
05L	NHS Sandwell and West Birmingham CCG	504,641	37.78	1
00Q	NHS Blackburn with Darwen CCG	148,942	36.15	1
01D	NHS Heywood, Middleton and Rochdale CCG	220,001	34.67	1
01G	NHS Salford CCG	254,408	34.32	1
05W	NHS Stoke on Trent CCG	264,149	33.99	1
00Y	NHS Oldham CCG	235,623	33.69	1
15E	NHS Birmingham and Solihull CCG	1,179,020	33.62	1
36J	NHS Bradford District and Craven CCG	587,936	32.93	1
01T	NHS South Sefton CCG	159,237	32.79	1
07L	NHS Barking and Dagenham CCG	211,998	32.74	1
06A	NHS Wolverhampton CCG	262,008	32.41	1
01F	NHS Halton CCG	128,432	32.34	1
05Y	NHS Walsall CCG	283,378	32.07	1
07T	NHS City and Hackney CCG	288,371	32.03	1
01X	NHS St Helens CCG	180,049	31.69	1
00N	NHS South Tyneside CCG	150,265	31.68	1
03H	NHS North East Lincolnshire CCG	159,821	31.34	1
00T	NHS Bolton CCG	285,372	31.03	1

CCG Code	CCG Name (from April 2020)	Population (mid-2018)	IMD 2019 Score	IMD 2019 Quintile
16C	NHS Tees Valley CCG	674,284	30.96	1
04C	NHS Leicester City CCG	355,218	30.84	1
00P	NHS Sunderland CCG	277,417	30.70	1
02X	NHS Doncaster CCG	310,542	30.46	1
02P	NHS Barnsley CCG	245,199	29.99	1
01Y	NHS Tameside and Glossop CCG	258,613	29.75	1
12F	NHS Wirral CCG	323,235	29.73	1
01A	NHS East Lancashire CCG	380,013	29.63	1
03L	NHS Rotherham CCG	264,671	29.63	1
08M	NHS Newham CCG	352,005	29.49	1
13T	NHS Newcastle Gateshead CCG	502,704	29.28	1
03J	NHS North Kirklees CCG	192,750	28.88	1
08V	NHS Tower Hamlets CCG	317,705	27.63	2
15F	NHS Leeds CCG	789,194	27.58	2
03R	NHS Wakefield CCG	345,038	27.36	2
03N	NHS Sheffield CCG	582,506	27.25	2
10R	NHS Portsmouth CCG	215,133	27.20	2
10X	NHS Southampton CCG	252,796	26.88	2
84H	NHS County Durham CCG	526,980	26.61	2
02T	NHS Calderdale CCG	210,082	26.46	2
06P	NHS Luton CCG	214,109	26.05	2
02H	NHS Wigan Borough CCG	326,088	25.89	2
07P	NHS Brent CCG	330,795	25.66	2
08W	NHS Waltham Forest CCG	276,700	25.24	2
05X	NHS Telford and Wrekin CCG	177,799	24.99	2
05C	NHS Dudley CCG	320,626	24.31	2

CCG Code	CCG Name (from April 2020)	Population (mid-2018)	IMD 2019 Score	IMD 2019 Quintile
01E	NHS Greater Preston CCG	202,562	24.07	2
00V	NHS Bury CCG	190,108	23.92	2
52R	NHS Nottingham and Nottinghamshire CCG	1,037,356	23.68	2
10L	NHS Isle of Wight CCG	141,538	23.33	2
05A	NHS Coventry and Rugby CCG	473,979	23.27	2
11N	NHS Kernow CCG	568,210	23.01	2
93C	NHS North Central London CCG	1,498,001	22.97	2
07W	NHS Ealing CCG	341,982	22.75	2
02Q	NHS Bassetlaw CCG	116,839	22.75	2
06T	NHS North East Essex CCG	338,326	22.68	2
03A	NHS Greater Huddersfield CCG	245,977	22.56	2
99G	NHS Southend CCG	182,463	22.55	2
08C	NHS Hammersmith and Fulham CCG	185,426	22.33	2
08Y	NHS West London CCG	226,099	22.28	2
72Q	NHS South East London CCG	1,811,249	22.25	3
03K	NHS North Lincolnshire CCG	172,005	22.22	3
99C	NHS North Tyneside CCG	205,985	22.22	3
00L	NHS Northumberland CCG	320,274	22.08	3
05H	NHS Warwickshire North CCG	193,752	21.80	3
01H	NHS North Cumbria CCG	318,631	21.79	3
01K	NHS Morecambe Bay CCG	330,572	21.72	3
26A	NHS Norfolk & Waveney CCG	1,021,991	21.72	3
07Y	NHS Hounslow CCG	270,782	21.57	3
07G	NHS Thurrock CCG	172,525	21.08	3
01W	NHS Stockport CCG	291,775	20.99	3
09D	NHS Brighton and Hove CCG	290,395	20.86	3

CCG Code	CCG Name (from April 2020)	Population (mid-2018)	IMD 2019 Score	IMD 2019 Quintile
15M	NHS Derby and Derbyshire CCG	1,019,900	20.51	3
91Q	NHS Kent and Medway CCG	1,846,478	20.36	3
71E	NHS Lincolnshire CCG	755,833	20.27	3
15N	NHS Devon CCG	1,194,166	20.17	3
97R	NHS East Sussex CCG	554,590	19.80	3
15C	NHS Bristol, North Somerset and South Gloucestershire CCG	959,968	19.72	3
01V	NHS Southport and Formby CCG	116,159	19.51	4
99E	NHS Basildon and Brentwood CCG	262,412	19.49	4
04Y	NHS Cannock Chase CCG	136,974	19.28	4
02E	NHS Warrington CCG	209,547	19.05	4
78H	NHS Northamptonshire CCG	730,650	18.78	4
02M	NHS Fylde and Wyre CCG	192,421	18.66	4
02G	NHS West Lancashire CCG	113,949	18.61	4
11X	NHS Somerset CCG	559,399	18.60	4
09A	NHS Central London (Westminster) CCG	185,422	18.55	4
08G	NHS Hillingdon CCG	304,824	18.36	4
18C	NHS Herefordshire and Worcestershire CCG	784,164	18.32	4
05D	NHS East Staffordshire CCG	128,418	18.25	4
04F	NHS Milton Keynes CCG	275,002	17.77	4
06L	NHS Ipswich and East Suffolk CCG	409,248	17.72	4
00X	NHS Chorley and South Ribble CCG	176,862	17.70	4
05G	NHS North Staffordshire CCG	219,571	17.62	4
08N	NHS Redbridge CCG	303,858	17.30	4
05N	NHS Shropshire CCG	320,274	17.13	4
11J	NHS Dorset CCG	772,268	17.05	4
08F	NHS Havering CCG	257,810	17.03	4

CCG Code	CCG Name (from April 2020)	Population (mid-2018)	IMD 2019 Score	IMD 2019 Quintile
10V	NHS South Eastern Hampshire CCG	216,379	16.94	4
06H	NHS Cambridgeshire and Peterborough CCG	889,112	16.85	4
27D	NHS Cheshire CCG	721,292	16.21	4
02A	NHS Trafford CCG	236,370	16.13	4
02Y	NHS East Riding of Yorkshire CCG	317,404	16.09	4
07K	NHS West Suffolk CCG	230,997	15.99	4
36L	NHS South West London CCG	1,494,905	15.99	4
42D	NHS North Yorkshire CCG	426,821	15.65	4
05Q	NHS South East Staffordshire and Seisdon Peninsula CCG	226,137	15.52	5
07H	NHS West Essex CCG	306,910	15.16	5
08E	NHS Harrow CCG	250,149	15.10	5
11M	NHS Gloucestershire CCG	633,558	14.94	5
06F	NHS Bedfordshire CCG	455,229	14.75	5
70F	NHS West Sussex CCG	858,852	14.44	5
92G	NHS Bath and North East Somerset, Swindon and Wiltshire CCG	918,428	14.28	5
15D	NHS East Berkshire CCG	434,463	13.99	5
10K	NHS Fareham and Gosport CCG	201,622	13.96	5
06K	NHS East and North Hertfordshire CCG	569,078	13.80	5
99F	NHS Castle Point and Rochford CCG	177,051	13.70	5
06Q	NHS Mid Essex CCG	393,065	13.56	5
05V	NHS Stafford and Surrounds CCG	155,803	13.55	5
04V	NHS West Leicestershire CCG	402,165	13.29	5
10J	NHS North Hampshire CCG	223,795	12.12	5
03Q	NHS Vale of York CCG	362,955	11.96	5
06N	NHS Herts Valleys CCG	595,670	11.94	5
05R	NHS South Warwickshire CCG	270,064	11.89	5



CCG Code	CCG Name (from April 2020)	Population (mid-2018)	IMD 2019 Score	IMD 2019 Quintile
15A	NHS Berkshire West CCG	489,709	11.80	5
10Q	NHS Oxfordshire CCG	672,414	11.72	5
11A	NHS West Hampshire CCG	566,879	11.37	5
03W	NHS East Leicestershire and Rutland CCG	335,800	10.78	5
99M	NHS North East Hampshire and Farnham CCG	211,590	10.40	5
92A	NHS Surrey Heartlands CCG	1,036,742	10.32	5
14Y	NHS Buckinghamshire CCG	542,512	10.15	5
10C	NHS Surrey Heath CCG	96,474	9.24	5

Table A2: Distribution of COVID-19 mortality risk by age, sex and ethnicity – data underpinning figure 1

Age Group	Sex	Ethnicity	COVID-19 mortality risk	All GPs	GP Partners	Salaried GPs	GP Locums	GP Registrars	GP Retainers
70+	Female	BAME	Very High	106 (0.23%)	79 (0.17%)	10 (0.02%)	17 (0.04%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
70+	Female	White	Very High	29 (0.06%)	14 (0.03%)	5 (0.01%)	10 (0.02%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
70+	Male	BAME	Very High	417 (0.91%)	307 (0.67%)	36 (0.08%)	73 (0.16%)	0 (0%)	1 (0%)
70+	Male	White	Very High	74 (0.16%)	33 (0.07%)	14 (0.03%)	24 (0.05%)	0 (0%)	3 (0.01%)
60-69	Male	BAME	Very High	753 (1.64%)	534 (1.16%)	101 (0.22%)	111 (0.24%)	3 (0.01%)	4 (0.01%)
60-69	Female	BAME	High	316 (0.69%)	184 (0.4%)	75 (0.16%)	55 (0.12%)	0 (0%)	2 (0%)
60-69	Male	White	High	1,515 (3.3%)	1,066 (2.32%)	216 (0.47%)	184 (0.4%)	1 (0%)	48 (0.1%)
55-59	Male	BAME	High	422 (0.92%)	301 (0.66%)	66 (0.14%)	49 (0.11%)	5 (0.01%)	1 (0%)
60-69	Female	White	Medium	654 (1.43%)	374 (0.82%)	180 (0.39%)	65 (0.14%)	0 (0%)	35 (0.08%)
55-59	Female	BAME	Medium	328 (0.72%)	198 (0.43%)	88 (0.19%)	35 (0.08%)	2 (0%)	5 (0.01%)
55-59	Male	White	Medium	1,701 (3.71%)	1,433 (3.12%)	163 (0.36%)	91 (0.2%)	0 (0%)	14 (0.03%)
55-59	Female	White	Low	1,402 (3.06%)	960 (2.09%)	335 (0.73%)	79 (0.17%)	0 (0%)	28 (0.06%)
<55	Female	BAME	Low	4,694 (10.24%)	1,407 (3.07%)	1,771 (3.86%)	622 (1.36%)	850 (1.85%)	44 (0.1%)
<55	Female	White	Low	18,074 (39.41%)	6,109 (13.32%)	7,316 (15.95%)	1,307 (2.85%)	3,012 (6.57%)	330 (0.72%)
<55	Male	BAME	Low	3,945 (8.6%)	1,797 (3.92%)	821 (1.79%)	590 (1.29%)	735 (1.6%)	2 (0%)
<55	Male	White	Low	11,428 (24.92%)	6,183 (13.48%)	2,322 (5.06%)	1,172 (2.56%)	1,731 (3.77%)	20 (0.04%)

Table A3: Distribution of COVID-19 mortality risk for GPs by CCG IMD quintile – data underpinning figure 2

IMD 2019 Quintile	All GPs	High Risk GPs	Very High Risk GPs
Q5 least deprived	9,012	414	143
Q4	8,707	488	209
Q3	9,332	464	290
Q2	8,713	437	312
Q1 most deprived	9,331	450	425
Unknown	763	0	0

Table A4: Distribution of COVID-19 mortality risk for single handed GP practices by IMD quintile – data underpinning figure 3

IMD 2019 Quintile	All	High Risk	Very High Risk
Q5 least deprived	59	15	9
Q4	84	13	8
Q3	111	15	23
Q2	146	22	32
Q1 most deprived	239	30	42

Table A5: Distribution of COVID-19 mortality risk for patients registered to single handed GP practices by IMD quintile – data underpinning figure 4

IMD 2019 Quintile	All	High Risk	Very High Risk
Q5 least deprived	277,496	79,170	33,743
Q4	310,119	50,535	19,802
Q3	492,097	49,451	78,395
Q2	546,183	80,014	92,506
Q1 most deprived	871,264	100,015	126,412

Table A6: Rates of GPs, single-handed GP practices, and patients registered to single-handed GP practices per 100,000 population

Region	All General Practitioners Overall	All General Practitioners High Risk	All General Practitioners Very High Risk	Single-handed practices Overall	Single-handed practices High Risk	Single-handed practices Very High Risk	Single-handed patients Overall	Single-handed patients High Risk	Single-handed patients Very High Risk
East of England	70.84	4.53	2.11	1.03	0.28	0.14	4,684	1,273	580
London	86.16	5.00	5.22	1.47	0.17	0.37	6,028	741	1,160
Midlands	80.14	3.90	2.47	1.37	0.19	0.20	4,950	505	634
North East and Yorkshire	79.55	3.08	1.95	1.13	0.14	0.21	4,092	489	475
North West	82.45	3.44	2.10	1.94	0.21	0.29	6,996	826	692
South East	77.39	4.08	2.03	0.66	0.15	0.15	3,023	581	605
South West	87.89	4.23	0.41	0.11	0.04	-	451	105	-