

1 **Full title**

2 Representation of the hierarchical and functional structure of an ambulatory network of medical
3 consultations through social network analysis, with an emphasis on the role of medical specialties

4

5 **Short title**

6 Social network analysis in an ambulatory network of medical consultations

7

8 **Authors**

9 Fernando Martín Biscione^{1*}, Juliano Domingues da Silva²

10 ¹Department of Data Science in Healthcare, Healthcare Superintendence, Unimed-Belo Horizonte
11 Healthcare Plan, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais State, Brazil.

12 ²Department of Administration, Center for Socioeconomic Studies, State University of Maringá,
13 Maringá, Paraná State, Brazil.

14

15

16 *Corresponding author: Fernando Martín Biscione

17 E-mail: fernando.biscione@unimedbh.com.br (FMB)

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 **NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

26 **Abstract**

27 **Background**

28 Ambulatory Health Care Networks (Amb-HCN) emerge when doctors establish circuits of patient
29 referral and counter-referral in their offices, explicitly or spontaneously. We aimed to characterize
30 the structural and functional topology of an Amb-HCN of a private health insurance provider (PHIP)
31 using objective metrics from graph theory.

32

33 **Methods**

34 A Social Network Analysis was conducted with administrative claim data of a Brazilian PHIP.
35 Included were beneficiaries of a healthcare plan not restricting the location or physician caring for
36 the patient. A directional and weighted network was constructed, where doctors were vertices and
37 patient referrals between doctors were edges. Vertex-level measures were calculated and grouped
38 into three theoretical constructs: patient follow-up; relationship with authorities; and centrality
39 profiles. To characterize physicians into these profiles, cluster analysis was conducted using the
40 non-hierarchical K-means technique.

41

42 **Findings**

43 Between 04/01/2021 and 05/15/2022, 666,263 individuals performed 3,863,222 office visits with
44 4,554 physicians. Non-primary-care medical specialties (e.g., cardiology, endocrinology etc.) were
45 associated with central profile in the graph, while surgical specialties predominated in the
46 periphery, along with pediatrics. Only pediatrics was associated with strong and prevalent patient
47 follow-up. Weak and shared patient follow-up was present for many doctors from internal
48 medicine and family medicine. All profiles exhibited pairwise relationships with each other, and
49 with clinical characteristics and outcomes of the patients they treated. For example, physicians
50 identified as authorities were frequently central and treated patients with more comorbidities.

51 Eleven medical communities were identified with clear territorial and medical specialty
52 segregation.

53

54 **Conclusions**

55 Viewing the Amb-HCN as a social network provided emerging insights into the most influential
56 actors and specialties, potential gaps in care, and the most prevalent diseases in our patient
57 portfolio. Identifying self-constituted Amb-HCN can form a rational basis for developing more
58 formal networks or monitoring patient care performance without assigning responsibility to single
59 physicians.

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

70

71

72

73

74

75

76

77 Introduction

78 Health Care Networks (HCN) can be defined as the way in which health systems organize their
79 health actions and services, in an integrated, functional, and hierarchical manner, according to the
80 different technological densities each one offers, in order to ensure care for the population being
81 served [1]. The operational structure of HCN is therefore constituted by the different actors of
82 health care and the connections that link them. HCN are characterized by the development of
83 horizontal and vertical relationships between the various multi-professional care points for the
84 patient, in a more or less regulated manner. This network organizational arrangement of health
85 systems is justified by fundamentals such as economies of scale, regionalization (or territorial
86 coverage) of care, and guaranteeing quality, sufficiency, and access to health for the population
87 being served [1]. Another basic principle of HCN is the structured levels of care according to
88 technological density and rational use of resources, ranging from the level of lowest density
89 (Primary Health Care) to intermediate density (Secondary Health Care), to the highest
90 technological density level (Tertiary Health Care). It is the responsibility of Primary Health Care to
91 be the first level of care, with a resolution function for the vast majority of the population's health
92 problems, from which specialized care is activated [1].

93 Regarding the ambulatory level of health care, this study will conceptualize the ambulatory care
94 network (Amb-HCN) as the circuits of referral and counter-referral established, explicitly or
95 spontaneously, between the doctors who attend to patients in their offices. It is in the context of
96 the doctor's office where the primary level of health care takes place, with low technological
97 density, and part of the secondary care (specialized consultations). Therefore, characterizing the
98 organic and hierarchical functioning of an HCN through objective metrics can be strategically
99 important for health managers, allowing them to: identify informal patterns or hierarchies among
100 health actors that reveal the forces governing the organic functioning of the network; compare the
101 observed structure of the HCN with the structure of other external networks, the same network
102 over time, or with that expected according to the health care model proposed by the manager for

103 the network under their responsibility; identify actors with positive or negative influence on the
104 HCN, according to the objectives defined by the manager; seek correlations between HCN
105 performance metrics and attributes of health outcomes, quality or value delivered to users;
106 propose changes to reimbursement models based on results, quality and value in health. The
107 ultimate goal will always be to provide health managers with information that enables corrective
108 or preventive decision-making towards continuous improvement of HCN performance.

109 Characterizing the properties of a Amb-HCN through objective metrics is a complex methodological
110 challenge. Recently, Social Network Analysis (SNA) has received strong interest from the scientific
111 community for the study of numerous health phenomena that are inherently relational, complex,
112 and dynamic, including, but not limited to, identifying relationships and personas, dissemination
113 of innovations, and studying patterns of information exchange or collaboration among actors in
114 diverse areas such as education, health promotion, infectious diseases spread, digital health,
115 management, regulation, etc. [2, 3]. SNA is a set of methods and concepts based on graph theory
116 that analyze systems whose properties stem from the relationship between entities. The value of
117 SNA in determining the properties of HCN has been tested in recent studies. Researchers have used
118 SNA on administrative data to identify hidden or informal referral and counter-referral networks
119 among doctors who treat common patients [4, 5]. By applying SNA on networks of professional
120 teams who care for diabetic patients, Ostovari et al. [6] identified key professionals and healthcare
121 providers in the network. The same researchers found that when primary care physicians had high
122 values in community-level centrality measures (i.e., closeness, betweenness, and degree), the
123 diabetic, hypertensive, or dyslipidemic patients they cared for had lower hospitalization and
124 emergency department visit rates [7]. Similar results were reported in another study, in which
125 patients with cardiovascular diseases who were cared for by healthcare teams with dense
126 interactions and low centralization had 38% fewer hospitalization days and lower healthcare costs
127 compared to patients cared for by teams with less dense interactions that revolved around a few
128 central professionals. Face-to-face dense interactions among team members were also associated
129 with more effective control of hypercholesterolemia and a 73% lower need for emergency

130 department visits [8]. Although these and other studies point to promising results in the use of SNA
131 for analyzing complex HCN, the most appropriate set of measures and evaluation metrics, as well
132 as their clinical and administrative/managerial significance, remains uncertain [2, 9, 10].
133 The purpose of this study is to characterize the structural and functional topology of the Amb-HCN
134 of a private health insurance provider (PHIP) through objective measures and metrics, based on
135 the referral and counter-referral circuits, whether explicit or spontaneous, established between
136 network physicians during patient care in their offices. Therefore, the study will focus on the role
137 of physicians as the main responsible for generating these circuits and will propose the creation of
138 metrics for the operational definition of Amb-HCN attributes considered important for PHIP
139 strategy. The measures and metrics will be analyzed according to the physician's specialty, seeking
140 to determine their contribution to the functioning of Amb-HCN, and their relationships with patient
141 clinical characteristics and outcomes will be analyzed.

142

143

144

145

146

147

148

149

150

151

152

153

154

155

156

157 **Materials and methods**

158 **Study design**

159 This is a cross-sectional exploratory and explanatory quantitative study, with a secondary data
160 analysis study design.

161

162 **Setting and period**

163 The study was conducted on the beneficiaries base of a PHIP located in Belo Horizonte, capital city
164 of Minas Gerais state, Southeastern Brazil. This company has a coverage area in Belo Horizonte
165 and 33 other municipalities in its metropolitan region. As of April 2023, it provided assistance to
166 more than 1.538 million beneficiaries and had over 5,300 accredited doctors.

167

168 The study considered a base of 1,042,654 beneficiaries who, between April 2021 and March 2022,
169 were beneficiaries of a healthcare plan that did not restrict the location or physician who cares for
170 the patient, remaining at his or her discretion and convenience. The study evaluated all office visits
171 made by patients between 04/01/2021 and 05/15/2022.

172

173 **Data and definitions**

174 The study's database was extracted from secondary databases maintained by the PHIP in its own
175 Data Warehouse, and included the following data: physician identification; physician age and
176 specialty; patient satisfaction ratings reported by the patient after the consultation, on a scale of
177 0 to 10; patient identification; office medical visits made by the patient, including location,
178 physician who performed the consultation, and date of consultation; number of chronic
179 comorbidities of the patient recorded in the PHIP, classified according to Elixhauser et al., Charlson-
180 Deyo et al., and Feudtner et al. [11, 12]; cost of ambulatory exams and therapies ordered by the
181 physician; number of emergency department visits, hospital admissions due to medical condition,

182 and total number of days of hospitalization due to medical condition of the patient in the same
183 period of the study. All these data represent administrative claim data or beneficiary registration
184 information routinely collected by the PHIP.

185 The data reported in this research was extracted in April 2023. However, programming codes and
186 methods were developed for business – rather than research – purposes on a subset of the same
187 dataset available to the lead researcher in October 2022, in accordance with the PHIP’s
188 institutional compliance and legal standards. The data was retrieved from data repositories at the
189 individual level in a pseudonymized form and handled anonymously thereafter.

190

191 **Data analysis**

192 SNA was conducted to evaluate the properties of the Amb-HCN, conceptualizing the latter as the
193 set of referral and counter-referral circuits of patients established between physicians, either
194 explicitly or spontaneously, who treat patients in their offices. The SNA design followed general
195 principles recommended in Blanchet et al. [13] and De Brún et al. [14]. According to the
196 classification proposed by Benhiba et al. [15], it is a structural SNA analysis (i.e., describing, at
197 discrete intervals, the topology of the network, the roles of the vertices, describing communities
198 and subgroups, etc.) with an egocentric view (i.e., characterizing actors according to the
199 relationship they have with their immediate network). The constitutive elements of this network
200 were as follows:

201 a) vertices (V): represented by the physicians $v_i \dots v_j$ who performed the consultations in their
202 offices;

203 b) edges (E): represented by patients who, after a consultation with a particular physician v_i , had a
204 consultation with another distinct physician v_j within an interval of 7 to 45 days, thus linking
205 physician v_i to physician v_j . This interval was chosen to represent the most likely period in which
206 referrals between professionals occur and would reveal referrals motivated by the same health-
207 related problems;

208 c) vertex weight (V_w): since the contribution of each physician to the total number of consultations
209 in the network depends on their own characteristics and, at the same time, the specialty to which
210 they belong, the weight of the vertices was represented by the product below:

211

$$\text{Weight of vertex } v_i = \left(\frac{\text{Total number of consultations by physician } i}{\text{Total number of consultations by specialty } i} \right) \times$$
$$\left(\frac{\text{Total number of consultations by specialty } i}{\text{Total number of overall consultations}} \right)$$

214

215 Or,

216

$$\text{Weight of vertex } v_i = \frac{\text{Total number of consultations by physician } i}{\text{Total number of overall consultations}}$$

218

219 d) edge weight (E_w) between $v_i \rightarrow v_j$: represented by the ratio between the number of referrals
220 from doctor v_i to doctor v_j and the total number of patients attended by doctor v_i :

221

$$\text{Edge weight between } v_i \rightarrow v_j = \frac{\text{Number of referrals (7 - 45 days) from doctor } i \text{ to doctor } j}{\text{Total number of patients attended by doctor } i}$$

223

224 The network thus designed can be understood as a directed and weighted network. It is worth
225 mentioning that, within this health system, the Amb-HCN has a basically self-regulated design,
226 depending on patient characteristics (such as place of residence, personal preferences, etc.),
227 physician characteristics (such as specialty, location of practice, private network of collaboration
228 and trust with other professionals, etc.), and terrain (such as availability of transportation, etc.).

229 There are no referral flows between physicians explicitly promoted by the PHIP.

230

231 Several performance metrics were calculated at both the network and vertex levels. For the
232 network, density, diameter, radius, average path length, global efficiency, clustering coefficient,

233 and number of weak and strong components were calculated [16]. The calculation of the weighted
 234 versions of the metrics was prioritized, assigning the edges the weight E_w , as previously described.
 235 Unweighted versions were also calculated for some metrics for descriptive purposes or when the
 236 calculation of the weighted version was not applicable (Box 1).
 237

Box 1. Network-level performance metrics

Metric	Definition
Density	Ratio between the number of existing edges and the total number of possible edges in the graph.
Diameter	Longest eccentricity (see Box 2) in the graph.
Radius	Shortest eccentricity (see Box 2) in the graph.
Average path length	Average length (or distance) of the shortest paths between all pairs of vertices in the graph.
Global efficiency	Average of the inverse of the shortest distances between all pairs of vertices in the network.
Clustering coefficient	Closely related to the clustering coefficient of vertices (see Box 2), it is the ratio between the number of triangles (or closed triples of vertices) and the total number of triples (open and closed) in the graph.
Weak components	Given a directed graph, a weakly connected component is a subgraph of the original graph where all vertices are connected to each other by some path, ignoring the direction of the edges.
Strong components	Given a directed graph, a strongly connected component is a subgraph of the original graph where all vertices are connected to each other by some path, respecting the direction of the edges.

238
 239 For the vertices, the following measures were calculated: referrals made by the physician; referrals
 240 received by the physician; follow-up consultations performed by the physician; degree-in; degree-
 241 out; clustering coefficient; local efficiency; closeness-in; closeness-out; betweenness; eccentricity;
 242 PageRank (Google); subgraph centrality; Kleinberg's authority score; Kleinberg's HUB score;
 243 diversity [16]. The calculation of weighted versions of the metrics was prioritized, giving the edges
 244 the weight E_w , as previously described. Unweighted versions were also calculated for some metrics
 245 for descriptive purposes or when the calculation of the weighted version was not applicable (Box
 246 2).
 247
 248

Box 2. Network-level performance metrics

Metric	Definition
Referrals made by the physician	Number of referrals made by physician vi divided by the total number of patients seen by physician vi .
Referrals received by the physician	Number of referrals received by physician vi divided by the total number of patients seen by physician vi .
Follow-up consultations performed by the physician	Number of follow-up consultations (after the patient's first consultation with that physician) performed by physician vi divided by the total number of patients seen by physician vi .
Degree-in	Number of edges that are incident on (or terminate at) vertex vi .
Degree-out	Number of edges that leave (or originate from) vertex vi .
Clustering coefficient	Measures the proportion of vertices adjacent to vertex vi that are connected to each other.
Local efficiency	For a given vertex vi , it is the average of the inverse distances between its adjacent vertices by traversing the shortest paths through the rest of the network (excluding vertex vi).
Closeness-in	Average number of steps required to reach vertex vi from all other vertices in the network.
Closeness-out	Average number of steps required to reach all other vertices in the network starting from vertex vi .
Betweenness	Number of shortest paths between all pairs of vertices in the network that pass through vertex vi .
Eccentricity	Longest distance from (or to) vertex vi to (or from) the farthest vertex in the network, following the shortest paths.
PageRank (Google)	Measures the stationary probability that a given vertex vi will be visited, following a node-to-node weighted propagation scheme based on eigenvectors. Increases when several vertices point to vertex vi or when vertices with high rankings point to vertex vi .
Subgraph centrality	Measures the number of subgraphs in which vertex vi participates (or closed arcs that originate in vi) and where longer arcs are exponentially down-weighted.
Kleinberg's authority score	These are essentially related measures that identify collections of densely connected vertices. Authorities are defined by a significant overlap of vertices that are densely pointed to by other vertices, called hubs. In turn, hubs densely point to several vertices with high authority scores. Hubs and authorities exhibit a mutual reinforcement relationship: a "good hub" is a vertex that points to many "good authorities," and a "good authority" is a vertex that is pointed to by many "good hubs".
Kleinberg's HUB score	
Diversity	Concept related to Shannon entropy, where high scores imply that a vertex distributes its connections to other vertices more evenly and equitably.

249

250 To ease comparisons between metrics with different dimensionalities, the results were expressed

251 in terms of the number of standard deviations above or below the mean of the analyzed group.

252 Vertices that acted as articulation points (also called cut vertices) in the network were identified,
253 defined as the vertices v_i that, if removed, would increase the number of connected components
254 in the graph or make a connected graph disconnected. Articulation points represent vulnerabilities
255 for a connected network [16].

256 The vertex metrics (Box 2) were grouped into three dimensions (or constructs) according to the
257 theoretical attributes they presumably reflect for the network and that are strategically significant
258 from a managerial perspective. They are: a) "patient follow-up profile" dimension: aimed at
259 characterizing whether the doctor practices a pattern of longitudinal follow-up or a more "episodic
260 care" or "fragmented care" follow-up (i.e., where patients are seen on a sporadic or disconnected
261 basis rather than consistently over an extended period of time). Represented by the candidate
262 metrics degree-in, degree-out, referrals made, referrals received, and follow-up consultations; b)
263 "relationship with authorities" dimension: aimed at characterizing the degree to which each doctor
264 achieves high authority scores and/or contributes to raising the authority score of other doctors to
265 whom they refer patients. Represented by Kleinberg's authority and HUB scores; c) "centrality"
266 dimension: aimed at positioning the doctor relative to the network graph, assuming that the more
267 central the position of a doctor in the network, the greater their ability to access and disseminate
268 knowledge and information, or in other words, control the flow of information and influence the
269 patient's care trajectory. Represented by the candidate metrics closeness-in, closeness-out,
270 betweenness, eccentricity, PageRank, and subgraph centrality.

271 To characterize each physician according to the three profiles above, a cluster analysis was
272 conducted using the non-hierarchical K-means technique, choosing the optimal number of clusters
273 through visual inspection of graphs constructed by the methods of average silhouette width and
274 within-clusters sum of squares. The physician clusters resulting from the network metrics were
275 evaluated for their theoretical significance, and qualitative profiles (personas) were created for
276 each dimension. For the "centrality" dimension: central, intermediary, or peripheral. For the
277 "relationship with authorities" dimension: is authority, seeks authority, or balanced. For the
278 "patient follow-up" dimension: strong prevalent, strong shared, medium shared, and weak shared.

279 The statistical association was evaluated between the centrality, relationship with authorities, and
280 patient follow-up profiles, as well as the number of chronic comorbidities, emergency department
281 visits, cost of exams (ordered by the analyzed physician), hospital admissions due to a medical
282 condition, and total days of hospitalization due to a medical condition of the patients they
283 attended. The association between categorical variables in contingency tables with dimensions
284 greater than 2x2 was evaluated using the chi-square test and simple correspondence analysis with
285 adjusted standardized residuals. Numerical variables were compared using the Kruskal-Wallis test,
286 Mann-Whitney test, or t-test, as appropriate. Correlations between numerical variables were
287 evaluated using the Pearson correlation coefficient (r).

288 The significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$ (two-tailed). When necessary, the overall significance
289 level was adjusted by means of Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons.

290 Medical community detection was performed using the Infomap algorithm. This algorithm uses an
291 information theoretic approach that is suitable for revealing community structures in weighted
292 and directed networks. It uses the probability flow of random walks on a network as a proxy for
293 information flows in the system and decompose the network into modules by compressing the
294 probability flow. A group of nodes among which information flows quickly and easily (in our case,
295 more dense referrals and counter-referrals) can be aggregated and described as a single well-
296 connected module or community [16]. For this community detection procedure, edges and vertices
297 were assigned weights E_w and V_w , previously described.

298 Due to the strong imbalance in the number of consultations among physicians, a definition was
299 established for "low consultation productivity" when a physician had performed less than 20% of
300 the consultations expected for his or her specialty, according to the criterion below:

301

$$302 \quad \text{Total number of consultations of doctor } v_i < 0.2 \times \frac{\text{Total number of consultations of specialty } i}{\text{Total number of doctors in specialty } i}$$

303

304 Doctors with low consultation productivity were included in the network-level SNA analysis but
305 were excluded from the vertex-level performance analyses.

306

307 SNA and clustering analyses were conducted using the igraph and factoextra packages of R 4.2.0
308 language (R Core Team (2022). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R
309 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL <https://www.R-project.org/>) in the
310 RStudio environment (Posit team (2022). RStudio: Integrated Development Environment for R.
311 Posit Software, PBC, Boston, MA. URL <http://www.posit.co/>). Other analyses, including data
312 handling and pre-processing, were performed using Stata/SE 11.2 software (StataCorp LP, College
313 Station, TX, USA).

314

315 The research was conducted following the principles of Brazilian ethical resolutions, particularly
316 Resolution No. 466/12 of the National Health Council and its complementary resolutions. The
317 project received approval from a research ethics committee endorsed by the National Commission
318 for Ethics in Research (CONEP) (submission identifier No. 68241023.8.0000.5128. Collegiate
319 decision No. 6.019.051).

320

321 **Results**

322 **Network-level measures**

323 During the study period, 666,263 individuals had at least one office visit, totaling 3,863,222 visits
324 with one or more of the 4,554 physicians accredited by the PHIP. Only 15 physicians did not receive
325 referrals or referred patients to other colleagues during the period and were excluded from SNA
326 analyses. The results of the network-level measures are shown in Table 1.

327

328

329

Table 1. Results of the network-level measures

Number of vertices	4,539
Number of edges	1,160,346
Weak components	1
Strong components	38
Clustering coefficient	0.255
Density	5.63%
Diameter	5 (unweighed); 34.417 (weighed)
Radius	3 (ignoring vertices with degree-out equal to zero)
Average path length	2.048 (unweighed); 3.346 (weighed)
Global efficiency	0.507 (unweighed); 0.339 (weighed)
Number of articulation point	27
Number of medical communities	15 (modularity = 0.149)

330

331 **Physicians with low consultation productivity**

332 A total of 577 physicians (12.67%) were classified as having low consultation productivity (see
333 Method). These physicians were responsible for only 18,058 referrals made (1.08%) and 17,961
334 referrals received (1.07%). The mean age of this group was 54.76 years-old (95% CI = 53.74 - 55.79),
335 not statistically different from that of physicians above this consultation threshold (55.51 years-
336 old, 95% CI = 55.18 - 55.84; t-test = 1.545, p = 0.123). Physicians with low consultation productivity
337 had lower mean satisfaction scores than the rest [9.57 (95% CI = 9.51 - 9.64) vs. 9.65 (95% CI = 9.64
338 - 9.67), t-test = 3.92, p = 0.001].

339 The distribution of physicians according to consultation productivity and medical specialty is shown
340 in S1 Table. The specialties most strongly associated with low consultation productivity were
341 anesthesiology, general surgery, internal medicine, endoscopy, and family and community
342 medicine.

343

344 **Vertex-level measures**

345 All subsequent analysis of vertex-level metrics was conducted by excluding these 577 physicians
346 with low consultation productivity, leaving 3,977 professionals. Distribution of vertex metric
347 results showed strong variations among physicians, suggesting that those metrics may in fact be
348 capturing different roles for each doctor in the network (Table 2).

Table 2. Results of vertex-level measures

Measure	Number of standard deviations above or below the mean				
	Minimum	25 th percentile	Median	75 th percentile	Maximum
Referrals made by the physician	-2.04	-0.56	-0.15	0.35	17.23
Referrals received by the physician	-2.65	-0.60	-0.10	0.42	16.08
Follow-up consultations performed by the physician	-1.37	-0.61	-0.23	0.29	10.45
Degree-in (unweighted)	-1.35	-0.76	-0.27	0.53	5.35
Degree-in (weighted)	-1.23	-0.70	-0.29	0.44	8.14
Degree-out (unweighted)	-1.32	-0.76	-0.27	0.53	5.40
Degree-out (weighted)	-2.04	-0.56	-0.15	0.35	17.23
Clustering coefficient (unweighted)	-3.03	-0.58	-0.08	0.49	7.79
Clustering coefficient (weighted)	-2.82	-0.61	-0.12	0.44	7.17
Local efficiency (unweighted)	-2.98	-0.53	-0.15	0.33	11.79
Local efficiency (weighted)	-1.08	-0.50	-0.37	-0.09	9.33
Closeness-in (unweighted)	-6.88	-0.53	0.03	0.62	3.70
Closeness-in (weighted)	-5.30	-0.69	-0.02	0.66	3.78
Closeness-out (unweighted)	-4.89	-0.57	0.02	0.63	3.82
Closeness-out (weighted)	-2.79	-0.69	-0.01	0.65	4.30
Betweenness (unweighted)	-0.62	-0.54	-0.36	0.13	13.12
Betweenness (weighted)	-0.41	-0.38	-0.28	-0.03	22.56
Eccentricity	-0.69	-0.69	-0.69	1.45	1.45
PageRank (Google)	-1.20	-0.70	-0.30	0.41	7.31
Subgraph centrality	-0.75	-0.65	-0.40	0.30	7.32
Kleinberg's authority score	-0.09	-0.07	-0.05	-0.02	45.47
Kleinberg's HUB score	-1.13	-0.50	-0.24	0.16	16.49
Diversity	-10.14	-0.28	0.26	0.61	1.28

349

350 Centrality dimension measures

351 There was a strong linear correlation among several candidate metrics of the centrality dimension.

352 This led to considering weighted closeness-out, weighted closeness-in, eccentricity, and PageRank

353 (Google) metrics in the clustering analysis (S2 Table). Subgraph centrality, weighted betweenness,

354 and unweighted betweenness did not participate in the clustering but their distribution in the

355 emerging clusters will also be shown, endorsing the stated correlation. The cluster analysis

356 suggested the existence of three clusters, which were named as "central", "intermediate", and

357 "peripheral" summary profiles (Table 3).

358

359

Table 3. Cluster analysis results for centrality dimension metrics, in number of standard deviations above or below the mean

Cluster	N	Weighted closeness-out*	Weighted closeness-in*	Eccentricity*	PageRank (Google)*	Subgraph centrality**	Unweighted betweenness**	Weighted betweenness**	Summary profile
1	1,768	-0.1	-0.2	-0.7	-0.3	-0.3	-0.3	-0.1	Intermediate
2	1,258	+0.6	-0.6	+1.5	-0.7	-0.6	-0.5	0.0	Peripheral
3	951	-0.7	+1.1	-0.6	+1.4	+1.3	+1.2	+0.1	Central

*Included in clustering analysis.

**Not included in clustering analysis.

360

361 The distribution of physicians according to their centrality profile and specialty is shown in Table
 362 4. Cardiology, dermatology, endocrinology, ophthalmology, orthopedics, otolaryngology,
 363 pulmonology, psychiatry, and urology were strongly associated with the central profile. Surgical
 364 specialties predominated in the peripheral position, as well as clinical specialties such as
 365 nephrology, infectious diseases, internal medicine, and pediatrics.

366

367

368

369

370

371

372

373

374

375

376

377

378

379

380

381

Table 4. Distribution of physicians according to their centrality profile and specialty

Medical specialty ^a	Centrality summary profile		
	Central	Intermediate	Peripheral
Acupuncture	3 (6.3%)↓**	27 (56.3%)↑****	18 (37.5%)
Allergy and immunology	10 (32.3%)	18 (58.1%)	3 (9.7%)↓**
Anesthesiology	20 (13.8%)↓**	45 (31%)↓**	80 (55.2%)↑*
Angiology and vascular surgery	7 (8%)↓*	43 (49.4%)	37 (42.5%)↑****
Cardiology	117 (44.3%)↑*	93 (35.2%)↓**	54 (20.5%)↓*
Cardiovascular surgery	1 (3.4%)↓***	4 (13.8%)↓**	24 (82.8%)↑*
Hand surgery	3 (20%)	7 (46.7%)	5 (33.3%)
Head and neck surgery	2 (12.5%)	7 (43.8%)	7 (43.8%)
General surgery	18 (13.4%)↓**	40 (29.9%)↓**	76 (56.7%)↑*
Pediatric surgery	1 (4%)↓***	4 (16%)↓**	20 (80%)↑*
Plastic surgery	3 (2.6%)↓*	48 (42.1%)	63 (55.3%)↑*
Thoracic surgery	0 (0%)↓***	3 (23.1%)	10 (76.9%)↑*
Internal medicine	63 (18.7%)↓***	139 (41.2%)	135 (40.1%)↑**
Coloproctology	19 (33.9%)↑****	20 (35.7%)	17 (30.4%)
Dermatology	71 (38.8%)↑*	93 (50.8%)↑****	19 (10.4%)↓*
Endocrinology and metabolism	68 (48.6%)↑*	56 (40%)	16 (11.4%)↓*
Endoscopy	7 (22.6%)	9 (29%)↓****	15 (48.4%)↑****
Gastroenterology	19 (28.4%)	31 (46.3%)	17 (25.4%)
Geriatrics	4 (11.1%)↓****	18 (50%)	14 (38.9%)
Gynecology and obstetrics	84 (17.1%)↓*	269 (54.7%)↑*	139 (28.3%)↓****
Hematology	3 (8.8%)↓***	16 (47.1%)	15 (44.1%)
Homeopathy	7 (18.9%)	22 (59.5%)↑****	8 (21.6%)
Infectious diseases	1 (5%)↓***	8 (40%)	11 (55%)↑***
Mastology	17 (32.1%)	23 (43.4%)	13 (24.5%)
Family and community medicine	2 (9.5%)	10 (47.6%)	9 (42.9%)
Nephrology	8 (16.3%)	17 (34.7%)	24 (49%)↑**
Neurosurgery	9 (16.7%)	25 (46.3%)	20 (37%)
Neurology	11 (19.3%)	25 (43.9%)	21 (36.8%)
Nutrology	0 (0%)↓****	6 (60%)	4 (40%)
Ophthalmology	108 (37%)↑*	137 (46.9%)	47 (16.1%)↓*
Orthopedics and traumatology	81 (34.8%)↑*	117 (50.2%)↑****	35 (15%)↓*
Otorhinolaryngology	52 (37.1%)↑*	74 (52.9%)↑***	14 (10%)↓*
Pediatrics	30 (7.4%)↓*	176 (43.2%)	201 (49.4%)↑*
Pulmonology	17 (36.2%)↑***	18 (38.3%)	12 (25.5%)
Psychiatry	38 (37.3%)↑**	46 (45.1%)	18 (17.6%)↓**
Rheumatology	9 (24.3%)	21 (56.8%)	7 (18.9%)↓****
Urology	34 (34.3%)↑***	45 (45.5%)	20 (20.2%)↓***
Total	951 (23.9%)	1,768 (44.5%)	1,258 (31.6%)

Shaded values are significantly ($p < 0.05$) above (yellow) or below (dark-pink) the expected.

↑ = observed above expected; ↓ = observed below expected.

* $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.05$, **** $p < 0.1$ [Significance level by adjusted standardized residual analysis (simple correspondence analysis)].

^a Some specialties were excluded due to low numbers (Genetics = 4; Physical medicine and rehabilitation = 9; Nuclear medicine = 2; Clinical neurophysiology = 2; Radiology and diagnostic imaging = 2; Radiation therapy = 7).

382 Relationship with authorities dimension measures

383 The variables included in the clustering were Kleinberg's authority and HUB scores. The cluster
384 analysis suggested the existence of four clusters which were summarized into three, named as "is
385 authority", "seeks authorities", and "balanced" profiles (Table 5).

386

Table 5. Cluster analysis results for the authority dimension metrics, in number of standard deviations above or below the mean

Cluster	N	Kleinberg's authority score	Kleinberg's HUB score	Summary profile
1	233	-0.04	+2.1	Seeks authorities
2	883	+0.15	+0.5	Is authority
3	2,828	-0.04	-0.4	Balanced
4	33	+0.10	+6.9	Seeks authorities

387

388 The distribution of physicians according to their authority profile and specialty is shown in Table 6.

389 There was a higher presence of physicians with an "is authority" profile in specialties such as
390 cardiology, endocrinology, gastroenterology, geriatrics, homeopathy, nephrology, neurology,
391 nutrology, pulmonology, psychiatry, and rheumatology.

392

393

394

395

396

397

398

399

400

401

402

403

Table 6. Distribution of physicians according to their authority profile and specialty

Medical specialty ^a	Summary authority profile		
	Balanced	Is authority	Seeks authorities
Acupuncture	17 (35.4%) ^{↓*}	12 (25%)	19 (39.6%) ^{↑*}
Allergy and immunology	22 (71%)	9 (29%)	0 (0%)
Anesthesiology	96 (66.2%)	24 (16.6%) ^{↓****}	25 (17.2%) ^{↑*}
Angiology and vascular surgery	63 (72.4%)	20 (23%)	4 (4.6%)
Cardiology	154 (58.3%) ^{↓*}	88 (33.3%) ^{↑*}	22 (8.3%)
Cardiovascular surgery	22 (75.9%)	5 (17.2%)	2 (6.9%)
Hand surgery	12 (80%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)
Head and neck surgery	12 (75%)	4 (25%)	0 (0%)
General surgery	93 (69.4%)	35 (26.1%)	6 (4.5%)
Pediatric surgery	25 (100%) ^{↑**}	0 (0%) ^{↓**}	0 (0%)
Plastic surgery	91 (79.8%) ^{↑***}	15 (13.2%) ^{↓***}	8 (7%)
Thoracic surgery	10 (76.9%)	1 (7.7%)	2 (15.4%)
Internal medicine	237 (70.3%)	82 (24.3%)	18 (5.3%)
Coloproctology	38 (67.9%)	15 (26.8%)	3 (5.4%)
Dermatology	139 (76%)	41 (22.4%)	3 (1.6%) ^{↓**}
Endocrinology and metabolism	67 (47.9%) ^{↓*}	56 (40%) ^{↑*}	17 (12.1%) ^{↑**}
Endoscopy	24 (77.4%)	6 (19.4%)	1 (3.2%)
Gastroenterology	42 (62.7%)	23 (34.3%) ^{↑***}	2 (3%)
Geriatrics	13 (36.1%) ^{↓*}	21 (58.3%) ^{↑*}	2 (5.6%)
Gynecology and obstetrics	385 (78.3%) ^{↑*}	80 (16.3%) ^{↓**}	27 (5.5%)
Hematology	20 (58.8%)	12 (35.3%) ^{↑****}	2 (5.9%)
Homeopathy	16 (43.2%) ^{↓*}	17 (45.9%) ^{↑*}	4 (10.8%)
Infectious diseases	12 (60%)	8 (40%) ^{↑****}	0 (0%)
Mastology	38 (71.7%)	12 (22.6%)	3 (5.7%)
Family and community medicine	18 (85.7%)	0 (0%) ^{↓***}	3 (14.3%)
Nephrology	18 (36.7%) ^{↓*}	25 (51%) ^{↑*}	6 (12.2%)
Neurosurgery	38 (70.4%)	12 (22.2%)	4 (7.4%)
Neurology	28 (49.1%) ^{↓*}	22 (38.6%) ^{↑**}	7 (12.3%)
Nutrology	4 (40%) ^{↓***}	6 (60%) ^{↑**}	0 (0%)
Ophthalmology	264 (90.4%) ^{↑*}	28 (9.6%) ^{↓*}	0 (0%) ^{↓*}
Orthopedics and traumatology	154 (66.1%) ^{↓****}	59 (25.3%)	20 (8.6%)
Otorhinolaryngology	118 (84.3%) ^{↑*}	18 (12.9%) ^{↓**}	4 (2.9%) ^{↓****}
Pediatrics	390 (95.8%) ^{↑*}	8 (2%) ^{↓*}	9 (2.2%) ^{↓*}
Pulmonology	26 (55.3%) ^{↓***}	19 (40.4%) ^{↑**}	2 (4.3%)
Psychiatry	19 (18.6%) ^{↓*}	55 (53.9%) ^{↑*}	28 (27.5%) ^{↑*}
Rheumatology	9 (24.3%) ^{↓*}	19 (51.4%) ^{↑*}	9 (24.3%) ^{↑*}
Urology	79 (79.8%) ^{↑****}	19 (19.2%)	1 (1%) ^{↓***}
Total	2,828 (71.1%)	883 (22.2%)	266 (6.7%)

Shaded values are significantly ($p < 0.05$) above (yellow) or below (dark-pink) the expected.

↑ = observed above expected; ↓ = observed below expected.

* $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.05$, **** $p < 0.1$ [Significance level by adjusted standardized residual analysis (simple correspondence analysis)].

^a Some specialties were excluded due to low numbers (Genetics = 4; Physical medicine and rehabilitation = 9; Nuclear medicine = 2; Clinical neurophysiology = 2; Radiology and diagnostic imaging = 2; Radiation therapy = 7).

404 Patient follow-up dimension measures

405 There was a strong linear correlation among several candidate metrics in the patient follow-up
 406 dimension. This led to including number of referrals made (per patient seen), number of referrals
 407 received (per patient seen), and number of follow-up appointments (per patient seen) in the
 408 clustering (S2 Table). Degree-in and degree-out, both weighted and unweighted, did not
 409 participate in the clustering, but their distribution in the clusters found will also be reported,
 410 corroborating the quoted correlation. The cluster analysis suggested the existence of five clusters,
 411 which were summarized into four, named as "strong, shared", "medium, shared", "weak, shared",
 412 and "strong, prevalent" profiles (Table 7).

413

Table 7. Cluster analysis results for patient follow-up dimension metrics, in number of standard deviations above or below the mean

Cluster	N	Referrals made*	Referrals received*	Follow-up appointments*	Unweighted degree-in**	Weighted degree-in**	Unweighted degree-out**	Weighted degree-out**	Summary profile
1	64	+4.7	+4.5	+4.4	+0.1	+0.2	+0.1	+4.7	Strong, shared
2	1,502	-0.6	-0.6	-0.6	-0.0	-0.1	-0.0	-0.6	Weak, shared
3	293	-0.9	-1.0	+1.2	-0.8	-0.5	-0.8	-0.9	Strong, prevalent
4	455	+1.3	+1.3	+1.1	+0.2	+0.3	+0.2	+1.3	Strong, shared
5	1,663	+0.2	+0.2	-0.1	+0.1	+0.1	+0.1	+0.2	Medium, shared

*Included in clustering analysis.

**Not included in clustering analysis.

414

415 The distribution of physicians according to their patient follow-up profile and specialty is shown in
 416 Table 8. The specialties significantly associated with strong and shared patient follow-up were
 417 acupuncture, internal medicine, endocrinology, geriatrics, hematology, homeopathy, nephrology,
 418 neurology, nutrology, psychiatry, and rheumatology. Only pediatrics was significantly associated
 419 with strong and prevalent patient follow-up. There was a significant association between weak and
 420 shared follow-up for internal medicine and family medicine, among other specialties.

421

Table 8. Distribution of physicians according to their patient follow-up profile and specialty

Medical specialty ^a	Patient follow-up summary profile			
	Weak, shared	Medium, shared	Strong, shared	Strong, prevalent
Acupuncture	7 (14.6%)↓**	14 (29.2%)↓****	27 (56.3%)↑*	0 (0%)↓****
Allergy and immunology	10 (32.3%)	18 (58.1%)↑****	3 (9.7%)	0 (0%)
Anesthesiology	80 (55.2%)↑*	62 (42.8%)	3 (2.1%)↓*	0 (0%)↓**
Angiology and vascular surgery	35 (40.2%)	50 (57.5%)↑**	2 (2.3%)↓**	0 (0%)↓**
Cardiology	63 (23.9%)↓*	163 (61.7%)↑*	37 (14%)	1 (0.4%)↓*
Cardiovascular surgery	6 (20.7%)↓****	22 (75.9%)↑*	1 (3.4%)	0 (0%)
Hand surgery	6 (40%)	8 (53.3%)	1 (6.7%)	0 (0%)
Head and neck surgery	1 (6.3%)↓**	13 (81.3%)↑**	2 (12.5%)	0 (0%)
General surgery	26 (19.4%)↓*	87 (64.9%)↑*	21 (15.7%)	0 (0%)↓**
Pediatric surgery	6 (24%)	14 (56%)	4 (16%)	1 (4%)
Plastic surgery	41 (36%)	64 (56.1%)↑**	9 (7.9%)↓****	0 (0%)↓**
Thoracic surgery	5 (38.5%)	7 (53.8%)	1 (7.7%)	0 (0%)
Internal medicine	155 (46%)↑**	121 (35.9%)↓****	60 (17.8%)↑**	1 (0.3%)↓*
Coloproctology	11 (19.6%)↓**	43 (76.8%)↑*	2 (3.6%)↓****	0 (0%)↓****
Dermatology	120 (65.6%)↑*	62 (33.9%)↓****	1 (0.5%)↓*	0 (0%)↓*
Endocrinology and metabolism	10 (7.1%)↓*	79 (56.4%)↑*	51 (36.4%)↑*	0 (0%)↓**
Endoscopy	13 (41.9%)	17 (54.8%)	1 (3.2%)	0 (0%)
Gastroenterology	14 (20.9%)↓**	47 (70.1%)↑*	6 (9%)	0 (0%)↓****
Geriatrics	1 (2.8%)↓*	17 (47.2%)	18 (50%)↑*	0 (0%)↓****
Gynecology and obstetrics	183 (37.2%)	244 (49.6%)↑*	36 (7.3%)↓*	29 (5.9%)
Hematology	0 (0%)↓*	22 (64.7%)↑**	12 (35.3%)↑*	0 (0%)↓****
Homeopathy	6 (16.2%)↓**	12 (32.4%)	19 (51.4%)↑*	0 (0%)↓****
Infectious diseases	4 (20%)	13 (65%)↑****	3 (15%)	0 (0%)
Mastology	15 (28.3%)	36 (67.9%)↑*	2 (3.8%)↓****	0 (0%)↓****
Family and community medicine	18 (85.7%)↑*	1 (4.8%)↓**	0 (0%)↓****	2 (9.5%)
Nephrology	3 (6.1%)↓*	26 (53.1%)	20 (40.8%)↑*	0 (0%)↓****
Neurosurgery	3 (5.6%)↓*	42 (77.8%)↑*	9 (16.7%)	0 (0%)↓****
Neurology	10 (17.5%)↓**	29 (50.9%)	18 (31.6%)↑*	0 (0%)↓****
Nutrology	0 (0%)↓****	5 (50%)	5 (50%)↑**	0 (0%)
Ophthalmology	255 (87.3%)↑*	36 (12.3%)↓*	1 (0.3%)↓*	0 (0%)↓*
Orthopedics and traumatology	117 (50.2%)↑*	105 (45.1%)	11 (4.7%)↓*	0 (0%)↓*
Otorhinolaryngology	93 (66.4%)↑*	47 (33.6%)↓****	0 (0%)↓*	0 (0%)↓**
Pediatrics	100 (24.6%)↓*	35 (8.6%)↓*	13 (3.2%)↓*	259 (63.6%)↑*
Pulmonology	6 (12.8%)↓*	36 (76.6%)↑*	5 (10.6%)	0 (0%)↓****
Psychiatry	1 (1%)↓*	14 (13.7%)↓*	87 (85.3%)↑*	0 (0%)↓**
Rheumatology	0 (0%)↓*	12 (32.4%)	25 (67.6%)↑*	0 (0%)↓****
Urology	73 (73.7%)↑*	26 (26.3%)↓**	0 (0%)↓*	0 (0%)↓**
Total	1,502 (37.8%)	1,663 (41.8%)	519 (13.1%)	293 (7.4%)

Shaded values are significantly ($p < 0.05$) above (yellow) or below (dark-pink) the expected.

↑ = observed above expected; ↓ = observed below expected.

* $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.05$, **** $p < 0.1$ [Significance level by adjusted standardized residual analysis (simple correspondence analysis)].

^a Some specialties were excluded due to low numbers (Genetics = 4; Physical medicine and rehabilitation = 9; Nuclear medicine = 2; Clinical neurophysiology = 2; Radiology and diagnostic imaging = 2; Radiation therapy = 7).

422 Associations between physician summary profiles

423 Each of the created profiles (i.e., centrality, patient follow-up, and relationship with authorities)
424 exhibited a strong and statistically significant pairwise relationship with the other profiles (chi-
425 square test, $p < 0.001$ for all pairwise comparisons).

426 Physicians in a central position were more likely to have a strong and shared patient follow-up
427 profile, while physicians in a peripheral position were associated with a strong and prevalent
428 follow-up profile. Physicians in an intermediate position exhibited a non-statistically significant
429 tendency to weak and shared patient follow-up (Table 9).

430

Table 9. Association between patient follow-up and centrality profiles of doctors

Centrality summary profile	Patient follow-up summary profile				Total
	Weak, shared	Medium, shared	Strong, shared	Strong, prevalent	
Central	346	420	162	23	951 (23.9%)
% of the line	36.4%	44.2% ^{↑****}	17.0% ^{↑*}	2.4% ^{↓*}	
% of the column	23.0%	25.3% ^{↑****}	31.2% ^{↑*}	7.8% ^{↓*}	
Intermediate	695	723	215	135	1,768 (44.5%)
% of the line	39.3% ^{↑****}	40.9%	12.2%	7.6%	
% of the column	46.3% ^{↑****}	43.5%	41.4%	46.1%	
Peripheral	461	520	142	135	1,258 (31.6%)
% of the line	36.6%	41.3%	11.3% ^{↓***}	10.7% ^{↑*}	
% of the column	30.7%	31.3%	27.4% ^{↓***}	46.1% ^{↑*}	
Total	1,502 (37.8%)	1,663 (41.8%)	519 (13.1%)	293 (7.4%)	3,977

Shaded values are significantly ($p < 0.05$) above (yellow) or below (dark-pink) the expected.

↑ = observed above expected; ↓ = observed below expected.

* $p < 0.001$, *** $p < 0.05$, **** $p < 0.1$ [Significance level by adjusted standardized residual analysis (simple correspondence analysis)].

431

432 Authorities were more likely to be in central positions within the network, while physicians seeking
433 authorities were more often located in intermediate positions in the network, next to them.

434 Physicians located in the periphery more frequently had a balanced relationship with authorities
435 (Table 10).

436

437

438

Table 10. Association between authority and centrality profiles of doctors

Centrality summary profile	Relationship with authorities summary profile			Total
	Balanced	Is authority	Seeks authorities	
Central	572	345	34	951 (23.9%)
% of the line	60.1%↓*	36.3%↑*	3.6%↓*	
% of the column	20.2%↓*	39.1%↑*	12.8%↓*	
Intermediate	1,283	351	134	1,768 (44.5%)
% of the line	72.6%↑****	19.9%↓**	7.6%↑***	
% of the column	45.4%↑****	39.8%↓**	50.4%↑***	
Peripheral	973	187	98	1,258 (31.6%)
% of the line	77.3%↑*	14.9%↓*	7.8%↑****	
% of the column	34.4%↑*	21.2%↓*	36.8%↑****	
Total	2,828 (71.1%)	883 (22.2%)	266 (6.7%)	3,977

Shaded values are significantly ($p < 0.05$) above (yellow) or below (dark-pink) the expected.

↑ = observed above expected; ↓ = observed below expected.

* $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < 0.05$, **** $p < 0.1$ [Significance level by adjusted standardized residual analysis (simple correspondence analysis)].

439

440 Authorities more frequently exhibited strong and medium shared patient follow-up profiles.

441 Physicians with a tendency to seek authorities were more likely to have a strong and shared patient

442 follow-up profile. Lastly, a weak follow-up profile was characteristic of physicians not classified as

443 authorities or seeking authorities (Table 11).

444

445

446

447

448

449

450

451

452

453

454

455

Table 11. Association between authority and patient follow-up profiles of doctors

Patient follow-up summary profile	Relationship with authorities summary profile			Total
	Balanced	Is authority	Seeks authorities	
Weak, shared	1.310	153	39	1,502 (37.8%)
% of the line	87.2% ^{↑*}	10.2% ^{↓*}	2.6% ^{↓*}	
% of the column	46.3% ^{↑*}	17.3% ^{↓*}	14.7% ^{↓*}	
Medium, shared	1.109	428	126	1,663 (41.8%)
% of the line	66.7% ^{↓*}	25.7% ^{↑*}	7.6% ^{↑****}	
% of the column	39.2% ^{↓*}	48.5% ^{↑*}	47.4% ^{↑****}	
Strong, shared	130	295	94	519 (13.1%)
% of the line	25.0% ^{↓*}	56.8% ^{↑*}	18.1% ^{↑*}	
% of the column	4.6% ^{↓*}	33.4% ^{↑*}	35.3% ^{↑*}	
Strong, prevalent	279	7	7	293 (7.4%)
% of the line	95.2% ^{↑*}	2.4% ^{↓*}	2.4% ^{↓**}	
% of the column	9.9% ^{↑*}	0.8% ^{↓*}	2.6% ^{↓**}	
Total	2,828 (71.1%)	883 (22.2%)	266 (6.7%)	3,977

Shaded values are significantly ($p < 0.05$) above (yellow) or below (dark-pink) the expected.

↑ = observed above expected; ↓ = observed below expected.

* $p < 0.001$, ** $p < 0.01$, **** $p < 0.1$ [Significance level by adjusted standardized residual analysis (simple correspondence analysis)].

456

457 **Association of physician profiles with patient clinical**
 458 **characteristics and outcomes**

459 Patients with a higher number of chronic comorbidities showed a progressive increase in the risk
 460 of hospitalization due to a medical condition ($r = 0.545$, $p < 0.001$), hospitalization for primary care-
 461 sensitive conditions ($r = 0.402$, $p < 0.001$), and days of hospitalization due to a medical condition (r
 462 = 0.547 , $p < 0.001$), but not emergency department visits ($r = 0.012$, $p = 0.464$). The correlation
 463 between the number of comorbidities and the cost of exams was weak but statistically significant
 464 ($r = 0.221$, $p < 0.001$).

465 The three physician profiles also showed statistically significant associations with the clinical
 466 characteristics and outcomes of the patients they treated (Table 12).

467

468

469

Table 12. Associations between physician profiles and the clinical characteristics and outcomes of the patients they treated

Physician summary profiles	Number of chronic comorbidities (per patient)*	Emergency department visits (per patient)*	Number of hospital admissions (per 100 patients)*	Total days of hospitalization (per 100 patients)*	Total cost with ordered exams (U\$S)* ^a
Centrality^b					
Central	1.92 (1.41 - 2.47)	1.55 (1.35 - 1.80)	4.89 (3.32 - 7.55)	40.50 (26.89 - 66.76)	35.7 (16.5 - 56.5)
Intermediate	1.77 (1.25 - 2.37)	1.64 (1.39 - 1.95)	4.93 (3.00 - 8.00)	38.17 (20.92 - 68.72)	37.0 (15.5 - 64.8)
Peripheral	1.89 (1.17 - 2.67)	1.67 (1.38 - 2.08)	5.88 (3.36 - 10.83)	44.61 (21.98 - 90.91)	34.5 (14.8 - 65.6)
p-value (Kruskal-Wallis)	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	0.142
Relationship with authorities^b					
Balanced	1.69 (1.15 - 2.29)	1.64 (1.38 - 2.00)	4.88 (3.62 - 8.14)	37.40 (21.50 - 66.59)	32.8 (15.0 - 59.5)
Is authority	2.24 (1.71 - 2.91)	1.57 (1.35 - 1.80)	6.00 (3.60 - 10.22)	51.34 (27.60 - 91.45)	44.4 (20.8 - 69.6)
Seeks authorities	2.25 (1.67 - 2.91)	1.62 (1.41 - 1.94)	6.13 (3.81 - 9.38)	46.75 (25.33 - 84.14)	42.1 (8.4 - 71.8)
p-value (Kruskal-Wallis)	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001
Patient follow-up^c					
Weak, shared	1.60 (1.23 - 2.02)	1.59 (1.36 - 1.89)	4.13 (2.83 - 6.15)	33.62 (20.09 - 52.32)	26.4 (11.3 - 49.4)
Medium, shared	2.17 (1.61 - 2.81)	1.61 (1.37 - 1.91)	5.76 (3.45 - 9.92)	46.57 (25.24 - 87.43)	46.2 (27.0 - 71.3)
Strong, shared	2.49 (1.84 - 3.30)	1.60 (1.36 - 1.93)	7.19 (4.25 - 12.83)	62.07 (31.30 - 116.41)	48.4 (12.6 - 90.7)
Strong, prevalent	0.38 (0.28 - 0.57)	1.98 (1.64 - 2.37)	6.26 (4.17 - 9.01)	34.19 (18.93 - 56.47)	14.5 (10.0 - 25.7)
p-value (Kruskal-Wallis)	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001	< 0.001

* Values are medians (25th - 75th percentiles).

^a The values were calculated in Brazilian local currency and converted into US dollars, based on the exchange rate in April 2023.

^b Values shaded in yellow are statistically different (significance level < 0.05/2 = 0.025) from dark-pink-shaded values, and vice-versa.

^c Values shaded in orange are statistically different (significance level < 0.05/3 = 0.017) from all other three categories. Values shaded in blue are statistically different (significance level < 0.05/3 = 0.017) only from orange-shaded values. All pairwise comparisons by Mann-Whitney test.

470

471 As to the centrality profile, physicians in central positions attended patients with the highest

472 number of chronic comorbidities, but these patients were less likely to visit emergency services.

473 Physicians in intermediate positions attended patients with fewer chronic comorbidities and who

474 spent less days at hospital. Patients attended by physicians in peripheral positions had the highest

475 incidence of hospitalization and hospital stay (Table 12). There were no statistically significant

476 differences in the cost of ambulatory exams per patient ordered by the doctor.

477 Physicians with a tendency to seek authorities and physicians who are authorities attended
478 patients with the highest number of comorbidities, but patients assisted by authorities visited
479 emergency services the least. Physicians with a balanced relationship with authorities attended
480 patients with significantly fewer comorbidities, less hospitalizations and hospital stay, and had the
481 lowest costs of exams per patient (Table 12).

482 Amongst physicians with shared follow-up standards, the presence of chronic comorbidities,
483 incidence of hospitalization and total days of hospital stay increased as the intensity of patient
484 follow-up increased, but there was no relationship with emergency service visits. Physicians with
485 weak follow-up standards generated lower costs with tests and therapies per patient. Patients
486 cared for by physicians with strong and prevalent follow-up profile showed the lowest number of
487 comorbidities and costs with tests and therapies, but the highest utilization of emergency services
488 (Table 12).

489

490 **Articulation points**

491 Twenty-seven physicians were identified as behaving as articulation points in the network, with
492 the following characteristics: four cardiologists, three each of endocrinologists, ophthalmologists,
493 and pediatricians, with the remaining 14 being in smaller numbers from other specialties. Ten
494 doctors were in a central position in the network and 10 were in an intermediate position, 13 were
495 authorities, and 14 had a medium and shared patient follow-up profile.

496

497 **Medical communities**

498 Overall, 15 medical communities were identified when considering the 4,539 physicians who
499 received or referred at least one patient to another colleague during the period (Table 1). Four of
500 these communities were small clusters of physicians classified as having low consultation
501 productivity (S1 Table). After excluding these, 11 communities were detected (Table 13).

502

Table 13. Number of physicians per identified community, according to their medical specialty

Medical specialty ^a	Medical community										Total
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	
Acupuncture	43	3	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	48
Allergy and immunology	25	1	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	31
Anesthesiology	141	2	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	145
Angiology and vascular surgery	82	3	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	87
Cardiology	245	11	2	4	1	-	1	-	-	-	264
Cardiovascular surgery	28	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29
Hand surgery	15	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15
Head and neck surgery	16	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	16
General surgery	126	6	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	134
Pediatric surgery	-	-	22	1	-	2	-	-	-	-	25
Plastic surgery	110	3	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	114
Thoracic surgery	12	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13
Internal medicine	299	29	-	3	6	-	-	-	-	-	337
Coloproctology	55	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	56
Dermatology	174	6	1	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	183
Endocrinology and metabolism	131	5	1	2	1	-	-	-	-	-	140
Endoscopy	25	3	1	-	1	-	1	-	-	-	31
Gastroenterology	64	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	67
Medical genetics	1	-	3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4
Geriatrics	34	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36
Gynecology and obstetrics	451	24	-	7	7	-	3	-	-	-	492
Hematology	33	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	34
Homeopathy	32	2	2	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	37
Infectious diseases	20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	20
Mastology	52	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	53
Family and community medicine	18	2	-	-	-	-	1	-	-	-	21
Physical medicine and rehab	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
Nephrology	46	1	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	49
Neurosurgery	49	1	4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	54
Neurology	52	3	-	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	57
Nutrology	10	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10
Ophthalmology	267	9	9	4	1	-	1	-	-	1	292
Orthopedics and traumatology	211	11	6	1	3	-	1	-	-	-	233
Otorhinolaryngology	124	6	5	2	1	-	2	-	-	-	140
Pediatrics	10	1	347	3	6	29	2	6	2	1	407
Pulmonology	42	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	47
Psychiatry	100	1	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	102
Radiation therapy	7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7
Rheumatology	37	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37
Urology	90	8	-	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	99
Total	3,288	153	413	36	34	31	12	6	2	2	3,977

^a Some specialties were excluded due to low numbers (Nuclear medicine = 2; Clinical neurophysiology = 2; Radiology and diagnostic imaging = 2).

504 Box 3 shows a clear territorial and medical specialty segregation within the emerging communities.
505 It is noteworthy that no community was detected with a primary seat in Contagem, the second
506 most populous municipality in the area covered by our PHIP.
507

Box 3. Characteristics of identified communities of physicians

Medical community	Main specialties	% of total consultations	Territory*
A	Medical-surgical network without a strong bias towards specialties, but with a predominance of adult specialties	82.9%	89% Belo Horizonte; 6.2% Contagem; 3% Nova Lima; 1.8% other municipalities
B	Medical-surgical network without a strong bias towards specialties, but with a predominance of adult specialties	5%	82.2% Betim; 12.3% several neighborhoods in Belo Horizonte; 5,5% other municipalities
C	Medical-surgical network with a strong bias towards pediatric specialties	8.6%	87.3% Belo Horizonte (mainly Barreiro, Barro Preto, Estoril, Funcionários, Horto, Planalto, Santo Agostinho, Santa Efigênia and São José); 7,2% Contagem; 4.8% Nova Lima; <1% other municipalities
D	Medical-surgical network, with a predominance of medium and low complexity clinical specialties	1.1%	78.2% Pedro Leopoldo; 12.4% Matozinhos; 7% Belo Horizonte (mainly Santa Efigênia and Funcionários); 1.1% Ribeirão das Neves; 1.3% other municipalities
E	Medical-surgical network, with a predominance of medium and low complexity medical specialties	1.1%	50.2% Lagoa Santa; 45.8% Vespasiano; 2.2% Belo Horizonte; 1.1% Matozinhos; 0.8% Pedro Leopoldo
F	Medical-surgical network with a strong bias towards pediatric specialties	0.8%	86.6% Betim; 5.3% Belo Horizonte; 1.7% Contagem; 4% Igarapé; 2.4% Esmeraldas
G	Medical-surgical network, with a predominance of medium and low complexity medical specialties	0.2%	56% Santa Bárbara; 33.5% Barão de Cocais; 10.6% Belo Horizonte (mainly Cidade Jardim and Funcionários)
H	Small network of clinical pediatrics	0.1%	100% Santa Luzia
I	Small network of 2 pediatricians	< 0.1%	100% Belo Horizonte (São Paulo)
J	Small network of 2 doctors	< 0.1%	80% Nova Lima (Alphaville); 20% Belo Horizonte (Centro)

* The locations are municipalities in the metropolitan region of Belo Horizonte. Locations within parentheses are neighborhoods (or districts) within municipalities.

508

509

510 Discussion

511 This study aimed to characterize the structure of the Amb-HCN of a PHIP located in Belo Horizonte,
512 Southern Brazil, by applying objective measures from graph theory to the patient referral and
513 counter-referral flows among the attending physicians. Specifically, it was possible to identify
514 medical specialties with different standards of centrality in the network, their relationship with
515 authorities, and patient follow-up. The study demonstrated the relationship between these
516 different profiles and their association with patient clinical characteristics and outcomes.
517 Importantly, it characterized the most frequent profiles for each medical specialty and the
518 significant dispersion of physician behaviors within each specialty.

519 Understanding the structure and organic functioning of an Amb-HCN involves understanding the
520 roles and responsibilities of physicians during and after patient care in their offices. The presence
521 of shared patients between two or more physicians reveals relationships that are established
522 explicitly (i.e., established in contracts and formally monitored through performance indicators
523 and value delivery), informally (i.e., established naturally and spontaneously, due to physician's
524 and patient's preferences, sociodemographic characteristics, terrain, etc.), or even by chance, but
525 represent a valuable source of information for the study of care networks [4, 9]. Physicians
526 establish patient referral bonds more frequently with other physicians of the same sex and age
527 group when working in the same institution or geographically close, when completed their degree
528 or residency training at the same educational institution, and when treating patients with similar
529 clinical complexity, among other factors [17]. In any case, managing the functioning of an Amb-
530 HCN presupposes the identification and measurement of these roles and responsibilities of the
531 actors involved in direct patient care. Studies support the use of graph theory and SNA metrics to
532 express the structure of healthcare networks, explain their care outcomes, study their changes
533 over time, and observe how they react to dynamic influences of central governance policies [9, 18,
534 19].

535 Studies suggest that various structural properties of healthcare networks may be associated with
536 quality and safety of care [9, 20], although there remains a vast field of research to be explored.
537 The dimensions used in this study to characterize the Amb-HCN were defined based on attributes
538 considered strategically important for health policy makers [9, 20, 21]. The proposed analysis in
539 this study aimed to identify the professionals who occupy prominent positions in the network,
540 either due to their relationships with their peers, their connections with influential physicians, or
541 because the topology of the network would change substantially without them. Thus, the following
542 components were identified as key factors for identifying prominent professionals: patient
543 referrals received from peers, relative importance in the network, and patient return behavior.
544 Similar criteria were followed in other studies [22].

545 Regarding the centrality dimension, it is assumed that doctors occupying more central positions in
546 the graph have access to the most intense flow of information from colleagues who preceded them
547 in patient care, and their own conduct can significantly influence the conduct of colleagues who
548 will succeed them in patient care [7, 18, 20, 21]. Measures of centrality quantify the ability of a
549 vertex to send, receive, or interrupt the flow of information [9]. Therefore, these doctors have a
550 significant influence on the care trajectory of patients who seek them, even without conscious
551 awareness or formally assuming this role [20, 21]. Another possible interpretation for the central
552 role of some specialties is that they reflect the most prevalent nosology of the patient portfolio,
553 which requires critical analysis by the health manager in the face of the central position of
554 specialties such as cardiology, endocrinology, pulmonology, orthopedics, and psychiatry. Of
555 particular interest is the central position occupied by urology, which may reflect the prevalent
556 cultural practice in our setting of this professional assuming the health care of men in many
557 situations. It may be argued that having many specialist doctors occupying the center of the
558 network (as shown in Table 4) would not be the ideal structure for an Amb-HCN from the patient's
559 point of view, assuming that this position should be occupied by generalist and primary care
560 physicians with the ability to coordinate patient care [10, 23]. Indeed, authors have proposed
561 calculating the ratio between the centrality of primary care physicians and that of specialist

562 physicians in the network [4, 23]. However, some studies have failed to demonstrate that Amb-
563 HCN where primary care physicians were more central led to better health outcomes [23]. A study
564 conducted with data from a private healthcare organization in Brazil found very similar centrality
565 profiles to those of this study, with the most prevalent medical specialties being cardiology,
566 endocrinology, dermatology, hematology, nephrology, orthopedics, and otorhinolaryngology [24].
567 Another analysis conducted in Amb-HCN in the German public health system, where patients can
568 seek care directly from specialists without needing to go through a primary care physician, also
569 observed a notable dispersion of specialties involved in the care of patients with chronic diseases:
570 72% of the networks involved at least 10 distinct specialties, and the physicians with greater
571 centrality in the networks were more often specialists (e.g., otorhinolaryngology, ophthalmology,
572 etc.) [10]. On the other hand, peripheral positions in our Amb-HCN are predominantly occupied by
573 surgical specialties, which can be readily explained by the nature of these specialties. However, the
574 peripheral position of internal medicine, nephrology, and pediatrics is remarkable. In the case of
575 the latter two, it could be explained by their strong profile of longitudinal patient follow-up (Table
576 8), which would lead them to assume a large part of patient care and have few connections with
577 other colleagues. It is necessary to understand whether the unexpected strong peripheral presence
578 of internal medicine can be explained by the same fact or, conversely, by the low care coordination
579 role of a significant subgroup of these physicians, given the also prevalent weak longitudinal follow-
580 up profile found in a large proportion of these specialists (Table 8) [2].
581 Regarding the profile of relationship with authorities, the convergence of authorities in certain
582 medical specialties, in addition to reflecting the prevalent nosology of the patient portfolio, may
583 indicate the concentration of referrals in few professionals considered references or qualified by
584 their peers, and who keep their schedules more widely available for patient appointments [22].
585 Therefore, in our Amb-HCN, attention should be placed on evaluating access or qualification
586 problems in specialties such as cardiology, endocrinology, gastroenterology, geriatrics,
587 homeopathy, nephrology, neurology, nutrology, pulmonology, psychiatry, and rheumatology. It is
588 also important to note that the fact that some specialties concentrate physicians with a tendency

589 to seek authorities may reflect the intrinsic clinical complexity of their own patient portfolios, a
590 fact supported by the similarity in clinical characteristics and outcomes of patients treated by these
591 two categories (Table 12). In the SNA approach that analyzes networks as mechanisms of social
592 influence, studies suggest that physicians influence and are influenced by the behaviors and
593 practices of colleagues with whom they are in closer contact, leading them to share similar clinical
594 results [9, 21]. It may also be evidence of the tendency of clinical specialists who assume patient
595 care to be knowledgeable about the other specialists that their patients seek [4], giving them
596 greater authority to influence their choices. All of this justifies considering it possible that
597 physicians classified as authorities and those who seek authorities are a cohesive group, with
598 shared patient portfolios and clinical practices.

599 The third profile proposed in this study aimed to reveal the patterns of patient follow-up by
600 physicians, in light of the assumed responsibility of their specialty. Thus, just as the strong role of
601 patient follow-up by specialists such as pediatrics, internal medicine, geriatrics, psychiatry,
602 endocrinology, nephrology, and others was evident, the weak role of patient follow-up by
603 significant subgroups of physicians in internal medicine, family medicine, and, to a lesser extent,
604 pediatrics was also evident. In the Austrian Amb-HCN, where patient access to physicians was not
605 restricted to primary care physicians as the entry point to the system, Sauter et al. [25] also
606 demonstrated poor performance of family medicine and, to a lesser extent, internal medicine, as
607 coordinators of patient care, judging by the significant proportion of their patients who consulted
608 with other physicians. Efforts should be made to understand to what extent the discrepancy
609 between the practice of these physicians and the standards of their specialty is justified by specific
610 areas of practice [10] or, in turn, explained by the physician's lack of adherence to expected
611 standards of patient care quality and accessibility.

612 Another relevant finding of this study is the significant relationship between the centrality,
613 relationship with authorities, and patient follow-up profiles with patient clinical characteristics and
614 outcomes. This relationship may be bidirectional. On the one hand, it suggests that for each
615 patient's health needs, it is possible and desirable to find the best combination of physician or

616 Amb-HCN profiles that match best with those needs. On the other hand, it suggests that for each
617 physician or Amb-HNC profile, it is possible and desirable to find patients with health needs that
618 best fit those profiles [2, 9]. The objective metrics of Amb-HCN proposed herein can be a valuable
619 aid in identifying the compatibility (or incompatibility) between patients' health needs and the
620 profile of their physician, allowing healthcare managers to identify service gaps and steer solutions.
621 A study conducted in the Medicare population reported a significant positive association between
622 the number of connections of primary care physicians with other physicians (i.e., degree) and
623 healthcare costs, hospital admissions, days of hospitalization, admissions for primary care-sensitive
624 conditions, emergency department visits, and specialist visits for patients under their care [18].
625 Another study also found that patients treated by physicians who shared care more intensely with
626 other physicians had higher rates of hospitalization for primary care-sensitive conditions [23]. As
627 in the present study, this relationship can be interpreted as either arising from poor clinical
628 coordination by the primary care physician, or from a greater need for referral to specialists due
629 to the higher clinical complexity of their patients. Although the present study was not designed to
630 evaluate the clinical effectiveness of the network, it is worth mentioning that patients treated by
631 physicians in central positions were those with highest number of chronic comorbidities and yet
632 needed to visit the emergency department or be hospitalized for medical reasons the least (Table
633 12). Actors in central positions of social networks tend to be considered opinion leaders and highly
634 influential on the clinical decisions of colleagues [2, 9], a fact corroborated in this study, where
635 authorities were more frequently central. The possibility that the physician's position in the
636 network, their relationship with authorities, and their patient follow-up profile are causally related
637 to patients' clinical outcomes should be considered by decision-makers and investigated in a timely
638 manner.

639 The identification of different roles and responsibilities of physicians and specialties supports the
640 theory that the health outcomes of individuals should be attributed not only to individual
641 physicians but also to the functioning of the care network, collaboration, and information flow
642 between physicians and specialties [17, 23, 24]. The demonstration of the natural emergence of

643 self-organized communities of physicians (Table 13 and Box 3), with evident territorial and
644 specialty segregation, reinforces this concept. This finding is a powerful management tool. Landon
645 et al. [5] showed that naturally arranged communities of physicians around territories had
646 professionals with close working relationships and were able to keep most hospitalizations (73%),
647 emergency department visits (40%), primary care visits (88%), and specialists visits (60%) of
648 patients within those networks boundaries. Networks and communities of professionals thus
649 defined would be preferred targets of managers seeking physicians willing to become responsible
650 for the health care of a defined patient population in capitation-based payment contracts [5] . The
651 territorial separation of the communities identified in this study confirms the impression that
652 regionalization is an important attribute of self-constituted Amb-HCN. In this sense, the fact that
653 no medical community with a predominant seat in Contagem municipality - the second most
654 populous municipality in the PHIP coverage area - has emerged, forces us to formulate the
655 hypothesis that beneficiaries living in this municipality may need to seek care in nearby
656 municipalities, such as Belo Horizonte or Betim, probably due to the insufficient specialty network
657 in Contagem.

658 Several strengths of this study can be highlighted. By using administrative claim data routinely
659 collected by the PHIP and by considering all more than 1 million beneficiaries of a healthcare plan
660 which does not restrict the location or physician for consultations, the study has no missing data,
661 avoided selection and response bias, and can be considered representative of a large population.
662 By relying on the date of consultation, it was possible to model the network as directional, which
663 has been quite uncommon in published studies, in which the relationship between physicians has
664 generally been treated as non-directional.

665 Some limitations of this study should also be acknowledged. As with any quantitative and cross-
666 sectional representation of reality, the application of SNA certainly cannot capture all the
667 complexity involved in the emerging relationships between actors. Part of the structural and
668 functional topology observed in our Amb-HCN may originate from conjunctural, unstable, or
669 seasonal factors that were not considered in the analysis. In addition, SNA requires multiple

670 methodological choices appropriate for the study objectives but not necessarily relevant for all
671 other purposes [2, 10]. Therefore, the extent to which the findings are reproducible and stable
672 over time is unknown. Another limitation inherent to SNA is the influence of actors beyond the
673 boundaries of the analyzed network. If the analysis did not include all relevant actors, it is unlikely
674 that the results captured all the complexity of the Amb-HCN. Thirdly, as the analysis used
675 administrative data and may not necessarily represent explicit and deliberate referrals between
676 physicians, some of the relationships found may be spurious. An ideal approach to this problem,
677 although methodologically complex, would be to restrict physician relationships to episodes of
678 care or specific health problems of the patients, which would exclude circumstantial relationships
679 between physicians who treat patients for unrelated health problems. This was the reason why
680 this study considered consultations spaced by an interval between 7 and 45 days. Finally, although
681 the analysis focused on the role of physicians as the main actors, it would be interesting to know
682 to what extent the structure of the Amb-HCN depends on patient behaviors and preferences.

683

684 **Conclusions**

685 Viewing our Amb-HCN as a social network and applying measures based on graph theory and SNA
686 provided emerging insights into the most influential actors and specialties, potential gaps in care,
687 and the most prevalent diseases in our patient portfolio. The identification of self-constituted Amb-
688 HCN can form a rational basis for developing more formal networks or monitoring patient care
689 performance without assigning responsibility to a single physician. However, transferring research
690 knowledge into actionable plans and decision-making by health authorities requires reflection,
691 business expertise, and strategies based on continuous improvement cycles. The way network
692 metrics reflect attributes of quality, access, and care coordination in healthcare is an evolving field
693 [9]. Defining operational metrics for the roles and responsibilities of healthcare professionals,
694 understanding the functional structure of Amb-HCN, and evaluating their influence on patient
695 health outcomes remain challenges for researchers and health policy makers.

696 **References**

- 697 1. Brazilian Ministry of Health. [Ordinance nº 4.279, December 30, 2010. Establishes guidelines
698 for the organization of the health care network within the scope of the Unified Health System
699 (SUS). Diário Oficial da União. Brasília-DF: Brazilian Ministry of Health; 2010 Dec 31. Section 1:
700 p. 89-93]. Available from: [https://www.jusbrasil.com.br/diarios/24023258/pg-88-secao-1-](https://www.jusbrasil.com.br/diarios/24023258/pg-88-secao-1-diario-oficial-da-uniao-dou-de-31-12-2010)
701 [diario-oficial-da-uniao-dou-de-31-12-2010](https://www.jusbrasil.com.br/diarios/24023258/pg-88-secao-1-diario-oficial-da-uniao-dou-de-31-12-2010) (in Portuguese).
- 702
- 703 2. Hu H, Yang Y, Zhang C, Huang C, Guan X, Shi L. Review of social networks of professionals in
704 healthcare settings—where are we and what else is needed? *Global Health*. 2021; 17(1): 139.
705 doi: 10.1186/s12992-021-00772-7.
- 706
- 707 3. Saatchi AG, Pallotti F, Sullivan P. Network approaches and interventions in healthcare settings:
708 a systematic scoping review. *PLoS One*. 2023; 18(2): e0282050. doi:
709 10.1371/journal.pone.0282050.
- 710
- 711 4. Barnett ML, Landon BE, O'Malley AJ, Keating NL, Christakis NA. Mapping physician networks
712 with self-reported and administrative data. *Health Serv Res*. 2011; 46(5): 1592-1609. doi:
713 10.1111/j.1475-6773.2011.01262.x.
- 714
- 715 5. Landon BE, Onnela J-P, Keating NL, Barnett ML, Paul S, O'Malley AJ, et al. Using administrative
716 data to identify naturally occurring networks of physicians. *Med Care*. 2013; 51(8): 715-721.
717 doi: 10.1097/MLR.0b013e3182977991
- 718
- 719 6. Ostovari M, Yu D, Steele-Morris CJ. Identifying key players in the care process of patients with
720 diabetes using social network analysis and administrative data. *AMIA Annu Symp Proc*. 2018;
721 2018: 1435-1441. PMID: PMC6371373.

722

723 7. Ostovari M, Yu D. Impact of care provider network characteristics on patient outcomes: usage
724 of social network analysis and a multi-scale community detection. PLoS One. 2019; 14(9):
725 e0222016. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0222016.

726

727 8. Mundt MP, Gilchrist VJ, Fleming MF, Zakletskaia LI, Tuan WJ, Beasley JW. Effects of the social
728 networks of the primary care team on quality of care and costs for patients with cardiovascular
729 disease. Ann Fam Med. 2015; 13(2): 139-148. doi: 10.1370/afm.1754.

730

731 9. DuGoff EH, Fernandes-Taylor S, Weissman GE, Huntley JH, Pollack CE. A scoping review of
732 patient-sharing network studies using administrative data. Transl Behav Med. 2018; 8(4): 598-
733 625. doi: 10.1093/tbm/ibx015.

734

735 10. Flemming R, Schüttig W, Ng F, Leve V, Sundmacher L. Using social network analysis methods
736 to identify networks of physicians responsible for the care of specific patient populations. BMC
737 Health Serv Res. 2022; 22(1): 462. doi: 10.1186/s12913-022-07807-8.

738

739 11. Feudtner C, Feinstein JA, Zhong W, Hall M, Dai D. Pediatric complex chronic conditions
740 classification system version 2: updated for ICD-10 and complex medical technology
741 dependence and transplantation. BMC Pediatr. 2014; 14: 199. doi: 10.1186/1471-2431-14-
742 199.

743

744 12. Quan H, Sundararajan V, Halfon P, Fong A, Burnand B, Luthi JC, et al. Coding algorithms for
745 defining comorbidities in ICD-9-CM and ICD-10 administrative data. Med Care. 2005; 43(11):
746 1130-1139. doi: 10.1097/01.mlr.0000182534.19832.83.

747

- 748 13. Blanchet K, James P. How to do (or not to do)... a social network analysis in health systems
749 research. *Health Policy Plan.* 2012; 27(5): 438-446. doi: 10.1093/heapol/czr055.
750
- 751 14. De Brún A, McAuliffe E. Social network analysis as a methodological approach to explore health
752 systems: a case study exploring support among senior managers/executives in a hospital
753 network. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2018; 15(3): 511. doi: 10.3390/ijerph15030511.
754
- 755 15. Benhiba L, Loutfi A, Janati Idrissi MA. A classification of healthcare social network analysis
756 applications. In: van den Broek EL, Fred A, Gamboa H, Vaz M, editors. *Proceedings of the 10th*
757 *International Joint Conference on Biomedical Engineering Systems and Technologies; 2017 Feb*
758 *21-23; Porto, Portugal. Setubal: SCITEPRESS – Science and Technology Publications, Lda; 2017.*
759 *p. 147-158. ISBN: 978-989-758-213-4.*
760
- 761 16. Csardi G, Nepusz T. R igraph manual pages. Available from: <https://igraph.org/r/html/latest/>.
762
- 763 17. Landon BE, Keating NL, Barnett ML, Onnela J-P, Paul S, O'Malley AJ, et al. Variation in patient-
764 sharing networks of physicians across the United States. *JAMA.* 2012 25; 308(3): 265-273. doi:
765 10.1001/jama.2012.7615.
766
- 767 18. Landon BE, Keating NL, Onnela J-P, Zaslavsky AM, Christakis NA, O'Malley J. Patient-sharing
768 networks of physicians and health care utilization and spending among Medicare beneficiaries.
769 *JAMA Intern Med.* 2018; 178(1): 66-73. doi: 10.1001/jamainternmed.2017.5034.
770
- 771 19. Lewis JM, Baeza JI, Alexander D. Partnerships in primary care in Australia: network structure,
772 dynamics, and sustainability. *Soc Sci Med.* 2008; 67(2): 280-291. doi:
773 10.1016/j.socscimed.2008.03.046.
774

- 775 20. Cunningham FC, Ranmuthugala G, Plumb J, Georgiou A, Westbrook JI, Braithwaite J. Health
776 professional networks as a vector for improving healthcare quality and safety: a systematic
777 review. *BMJ Qual Saf.* 2012; 21(3): 239-249. doi: 10.1136/bmjqs-2011-000187.
778
- 779 21. Fattore G, Frosini F, Salvatore D, Tozzi V. Social network analysis in primary care: the impact of
780 interactions on prescribing behaviour. *Health Policy.* 2009; 92(2-3): 141-148. doi:
781 10.1016/j.healthpol.2009.03.005.
782
- 783 22. Figueredo de Santana V, Appel AP, Moyano LG, Ito M, Santos Pinharez C. Revealing physicians'
784 referrals from health insurance claims data. *Big Data Res* 2018; 13: 3-10. doi:
785 10.1016/j.bdr.2018.03.002.
786
- 787 23. Casalino LP, Pesko MF, Ryan AM, Nyweide DJ, Iwashyna TJ, Sun X, et al. Physician networks and
788 ambulatory care-sensitive admissions. *Med Care.* 2015; 53(6): 534-541. doi:
789 10.1097/MLR.0000000000000365.
790
- 791 24. Ito M, Appel AP, Figueredo de Santana V, Moyano LG. Analysis of the existence of patient care
792 team using social network methods in physician communities from healthcare insurance
793 companies. *Stud Health Technol Inform.* 2017; 245: 412-416. PMID: 29295127.
794
- 795 25. Sauter SK, Neuhofer LM, Endel G, Klimek P, Duftschmid G. Analyzing healthcare provider
796 centric networks through secondary use of health claims data. In: *Proceedings of the IEEE-
797 EMBS International Conference on Biomedical and Health Informatics; 2014 Jun 1-4; Valence,
798 Spain.* p. 522-525. doi: 10.1109/BHI.2014.6864417.
799
800
801

802 **Supporting information**

803 **S1 Table. Distribution of physicians according to consultation productivity and medical**
804 **specialty**

805 **S2 Table. Pearson correlation coefficients between vertex-level measures**