

1 **Association between physicians' maldistribution and core clinical competency in**
2 **resident physicians**

3

4 Kiyoshi Shikino, MD, PhD, MHPE, FACP^{1,2}, Yuji Nishizaki, MD, MPH, PhD³; Koshi
5 Kataoka, MMSc³; Masanori Nojima, MD, PhD,⁴ Taro Shimizu, MD, MPH, PhD⁵; Yu
6 Yamamoto, MD⁶; Sho Fukui, MD, MPH⁷; Kazuya Nagasaki, MD, PhD^{8,9}; Daiki
7 Yokokawa, MD, PhD²; Hiroyuki Kobayashi, MD, PhD^{8,9}; and Yasuharu Tokuda, MD,
8 MPH, PhD^{10,11}

9 ¹Department of Community-Oriented Medical Education, Chiba University Graduate
10 School of Medicine, Chiba, Japan

11 ²Department of General Medicine, Chiba University Hospital, Chiba, Japan

12 ³Division of Medical Education, Juntendo University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

13 ⁴Center for Translational Research, The Institute of Medical Science, The University of
14 Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

15 ⁵Department of Diagnostic and Generalist Medicine, Dokkyo Medical University
16 Hospital, Tochigi, Japan

17 ⁶Division of General Medicine, Center for Community Medicine, Jichi Medical
18 University, Tochigi, Japan

19 ⁷General Medicine, Kyorin University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

20 ⁸University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Ibaraki, Japan

21 ⁹Department of Internal Medicine, Mito Kyodo General Hospital, Tsukuba, Ibaraki,
22 Japan

23 ¹⁰Department of Medical Education, Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan

24 ¹¹Muribushi Okinawa Center for Teaching Hospitals, Okinawa, Japan

25 Tokyo Foundation for Policy Research, Tokyo, Japan

26 **Co-corresponding authors**

27 Kiyoshi Shikino, MD, PhD, MHPE, FACP

28 Department of Community-Oriented Medical Education, Chiba University Graduate

29 School of Medicine, Chiba, Japan

30 1-8-1 Inohana, Chuo-ku, Chiba City, Chiba Prefecture, Japan

31 Tel. +81-43-222-7171 (Ext. 5239)

32 E-mail: kshikino@gmail.com

33

34 Yuji Nishizaki, MD, MPH, PhD

35 Division of Medical Education, Juntendo University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

36 2-1-1, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan

37 Tel. +81-3-3813-3111

38 E-mail: ynishiza@juntendo.ac.jp

39

40 **Word count:** 2,690 words

41

42 **Keywords:** clinical core competency; general medicine in-training examination;

43 physician maldistribution; physician uneven distribution index; resident physician

44

45

KEY POINTS

46

47 **Question:** How does physician maldistribution, indicated by the physician uneven
48 distribution (PUD) index, impact resident physicians' clinical competence based on
49 performance in the General Medicine In-Training Examination (GM-ITE) in Japan?

50 **Findings:** In this nationwide cross-sectional study, resident physicians affiliated with
51 hospitals in regions with a lower PUD index (indicating insufficient medical
52 professional supply relative to healthcare demands) had significantly higher scores on
53 the GM-ITE than those in regions with a higher PUD index.

54 **Meaning:** Training resident physicians in areas short of physicians does not adversely
55 affect their education; rather, it can enhance medical education and address the
56 physician maldistribution issue.

57

58

ABSTRACT

59

60 **Importance:** This study highlights the association between physicians' maldistribution
61 and core clinical competency of resident physicians and emphasizes the global
62 significance of addressing healthcare access disparities.

63 **Objective:** To investigate the relationship between a prefectural program with and
64 without physician maldistribution and core clinical competency, measured using the
65 General Medicine In-Training Examination (GM-ITE).

66 **Design:** Cross-sectional study.

67 **Setting:** Data from the GM-ITE survey were collected in January 2023.

68 **Participants:** Resident physicians in their first and second postgraduate year (PYG-1
69 and PGY-2) who were employed at Japanese hospitals that required the GM-ITE or
70 resident physicians who voluntarily participated in the GM-ITE.

71 **Exposure:** Physician uneven distribution (PUD) index is a policy index developed and
72 adopted in Japan. It serves as an indicator of regional disparities among physicians
73 within the country. A low PUD index indicates that there is an insufficient medical
74 supply relative to the medical demand in that region.

75 **Main Outcomes and Measures:** The GM-ITE scores of resident physicians.

76 **Results:** The high PUD index group included 2,143 participants and the low PUD index
77 group included 1,580 participants. After adjusting for relevant confounders,
78 multivariable linear regression analyses revealed that the low PUD index group had a
79 significantly higher GM-ITE score compared to the high PUD index group (adjusted
80 coefficient: 1.14; 95% confidence interval: 0.62–1.65; $p < 0.001$).

81 **Conclusions and Relevance:** Resident physicians in regions with low PUD indices had
82 significantly higher GM-ITE scores. These findings underscore the significance of
83 addressing physician maldistribution to enhance the clinical competency of resident
84 physicians and emphasize the potential benefits of reducing regional healthcare
85 disparities, particularly in terms of medical education and training. These insights have
86 broader relevance for healthcare policies and medical training programs worldwide,
87 highlighting the need to consider physician distribution as a critical factor in improving
88 healthcare access and quality.

89

INTRODUCTION

90 Japan is currently experiencing a severe crisis in local healthcare delivery due to the
91 uneven distribution of physicians, which is exacerbating the critical situation in
92 community hospitals in rural areas.^{1,2} The insufficient number of physicians in rural
93 areas due to urbanization remains a serious problem.³⁻⁵ The issue of physician
94 maldistribution is not unique to Japan; it is a global concern affecting China, India,
95 England, Canada, the United States, Australia, and European nations.⁶⁻¹¹

96 In 2019, the Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare (MHLW) initiated an
97 intervention policy aimed at rectifying geographical disparities in physician distribution
98 at the prefectural level.^{1,12-14} This policy introduced the physician uneven distribution
99 (PUD) index. The PUD index was designed to gauge the extent of physician
100 maldistribution by considering both medical supply and demand at the prefectural level
101 (Supplement 1). A lower PUD index indicates a higher level of uneven distribution of
102 physicians across prefectures.

103 In Japan, training physicians to produce proficient clinical practitioners
104 involves 6 years of medical school followed by 2 years of clinical training as resident
105 physicians.¹⁵⁻¹⁷ Resident physicians are required to undergo supervised training and
106 rotate through seven specialties (internal medicine, surgery, pediatrics, obstetrics and
107 gynecology, psychiatry, emergency medicine, and community-based medicine). During
108 this 2-year clinical training period, resident physicians are mandated to acquire core
109 clinical competency that enables them to effectively manage common medical
110 conditions in general practice, irrespective of their future specialization.¹⁸ This clinical
111 training system is currently undergoing a policy review, addressing concerns regarding

112 recruitment capacity and other aspects, with a view to mitigate physician
113 maldistribution in various regions and enhance the quality of clinical training.

114 The MHLW has conducted a questionnaire regarding clinical training in areas
115 characterized by an uneven distribution of physicians.¹⁹ According to the report,
116 resident physicians who received clinical training in areas with a relatively low number
117 of physicians reported a higher level of satisfaction.¹⁹ Of the 2,684 resident physicians
118 who received their clinical training in areas with a relatively high number of physicians,
119 74.2% expressed satisfaction, though 79.6% of the 1,703 resident physicians who
120 received their clinical training in areas with a relatively low number of physicians
121 reported satisfaction with their clinical training.¹⁹ A questionnaire assessing self-
122 perceived competencies related to clinical training revealed no significant differences
123 between prefectures with a relatively high number of physicians and those with a low
124 number of physicians in terms of professionalism (69.4% vs. 69.4%), medical
125 knowledge and problem-solving skills (69.9% vs. 67.2%), medical skills and patient
126 care (71.6% vs. 70.1%), or quality and safety of care (68.2% vs. 68.0%).¹⁹

127 However, to the best of our knowledge, no objective and quantitative
128 assessment of clinical training and proficiency in core clinical competencies within
129 regions affected by physician maldistribution has been conducted in Japan.^{19,20} The
130 primary objective of this study was therefore to evaluate the relationship between areas
131 with a relatively high number of physicians and areas with a relatively low number of
132 physicians in each prefectural program and the achievement of core clinical
133 competencies, measured using resident physicians' General Medicine In-Training
134 Examination (GM-ITE) scores.²¹

135

136

METHODS

137 **Study design, setting, and participants**

138 A nationwide cross-sectional survey was conducted on 9,011 postgraduate resident
139 physicians (approximately 50% of the total number of resident physicians in Japan)
140 from 662 hospitals who had taken the GM-ITE between January 17–30, 2023. The
141 participants in this study included resident physicians in their first and second
142 postgraduate years (PYG-1 and PGY-2, respectively) in Japanese hospitals in which the
143 GM-ITE was included in the residency program as well as those who voluntarily
144 participated in the GM-ITE. We included the participants of the GM-ITE 2022.
145 Participants who refused the use of their data for research were excluded.

146

147 **Main outcome**

148 The main outcome of this study was the total GM-ITE scores of resident physicians. In
149 2011, the nonprofit Japan Institute for Advancement of Medical Education Program
150 (JAMEP) developed the GM-ITE as an in-training examination of clinical knowledge
151 using a methodology similar to that of the US Residency Internal Medicine In-Training
152 Examination.²¹⁻²³ The GM-ITE provides resident physicians and program directors with
153 an objective, reliable, and valid assessment of core clinical competency, including
154 clinical knowledge.²¹⁻²⁴ Designed by a committee of experienced attending physicians
155 organized by the JAMEP, the 2-hour GM-ITE includes 80 multiple-choice questions in
156 several domains^{24,25} and is scored from 0 to 80, with higher scores indicating better
157 performance and knowledge of clinical medicine.

158 An assessment of the validity of the GM-ITE revealed a strong positive
159 correlation between GM-ITE scores and scores on the Professional and Linguistic

160 Assessments Board test, Part 1 (PLAB 1), which was designed to assess the depth of
161 medical knowledge and levels of medical and communication skills.²⁶ In validity testing,
162 the discrimination index indicates how well the item differentiates between students
163 with high and low aptitude (whether high-aptitude learners performed better, worse, or
164 the same as that of low-aptitude learners).²⁷ The GM-ITE exhibited equivalent or
165 superior discriminative power compared to the PLAB 1 examination.²⁶

166

167 **Exposure and covariates**

168 The exposure in this analysis was the PUD index (updated on August 9, 2023). This
169 index is a policy index developed and adopted in Japan. It serves as an indicator of
170 regional disparities among physicians within the country. A low PUD index indicates
171 that there is an insufficient medical supply relative to the medical demand in that region.
172 Resident physicians were categorized into three groups based on the score ranges of
173 their residency program, as follows: the high PUD index group (PUD index: 353.9-
174 266.9), moderate PUD index group (PUD index: 266.5-230.5), and low PUD index
175 group (PUD index: 228.0-182.5).¹⁹ The resident physicians were also categorized based
176 on their duty hours per week: <60 hours, 60–79 hours, and ≥80 hours. The duty hour
177 category was defined with a lower limit indicating no or minimal overtime and an upper
178 limit of 80 hours per week, in accordance with the new resident physician duty hour
179 limit set by the MHLW. The questionnaire administered in this study included questions
180 regarding the participants' demographic information, such as hospital type (community
181 hospital or university hospital), gender, postgraduate year (PGY-1 or PGY-2),
182 participation in the general medicine rotation, and the duration of the participant's
183 internal medicine rotation. The number of night shifts per month, average number of

184 assigned inpatients, and self-study time per day were also reported by the resident
185 physicians.

186

187 **Statistical analysis**

188 The participant demographics and characteristics, as well as the GM-ITE scores, were
189 compared among the three PUD index groups. Multivariate linear regression analysis
190 was used to evaluate the association between the PUD index grade and the GM-ITE
191 score. The results were adjusted for covariates, including hospital type, gender, PGY,
192 rotation in the general medicine department, internal medicine rotation duration,
193 number of night shift duties per month, average number of assigned inpatients, self-
194 study time, and duty hours per week. All statistical analyses were conducted using
195 Statistical Analysis System version 9.4 for Windows (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC,
196 USA), with the level of significance set at $p < 0.05$. All statistical tests were two-tailed.

197 This study was approved by the Ethical Review Committee of the Japan
198 Organization for Advancing Medical Education (approval no. 23–9). All participants
199 provided informed consent prior to their participation in the study in accordance with
200 the Declaration of Helsinki.

201

202 **RESULTS**

203 **Demographics**

204 A total of 5,762 resident physicians from 608 hospitals, including 3,922 (68.1%) men,
205 participated in this study (Table 1). The minority of resident physicians ($n=979$; 17.0%)
206 were from university hospitals. The high PUD index group included 2,143 participants,

207 the moderate PUD index group included 2,039 participants, and the low PUD index
208 group included 1,580 participants.

209 Overall, the mean GM-ITE score was 45.45 ± 8.23 points. The mean scores of
210 the high, moderate, and low PUD index groups were 44.70 ± 8.25 points, 45.69 ± 8.25
211 points, and 46.16 ± 8.09 points, respectively. The GM-ITE score distribution is shown
212 in terms of the PUD index in Figure 1.

213 Approximately half (54.4%) of the participants did not undergo a general
214 medicine rotation; 26.8% underwent an internal medicine rotation that lasted 0–5
215 months, while 61.6% underwent an internal medicine rotation that lasted 6–10 months.
216 The reported hours per week were <60 hours in 51.0% of participants, 60–79 hours in
217 35.5% of participants, and ≥ 80 hours in 13.5% of participants.

218

219 **Univariate linear regression analysis**

220 As shown in Table 2, in univariate linear regression analysis, a low PUD index was
221 associated with a higher GM-ITE score when compared to a high PUD index (adjusted
222 coefficient: 1.46; 95% confidence interval: 0.93–1.99; $p < .001$). A moderate PUD index
223 was also associated with a higher GM-ITE score (adjusted coefficient: 0.98; 95%
224 confidence interval: 0.49–1.48; $p < .001$) when compared to a high PUD index.

225

226 **Multivariate linear regression analysis**

227 In multivariate linear regression analysis, a low PUD index was identified as an
228 independent predictor of a higher GM-ITE score when compared to a high PUD index
229 (adjusted coefficient: 1.14; 95% confidence interval: 0.62–1.65; $p < .001$) (Table 3). A
230 moderate PUD index was also identified as an independent predictor of a higher GM-

231 ITE score (adjusted coefficient: 0.91; 95% confidence interval: 0.43-1.39; $p < .001$) when
232 compared to a high PUD index.

233 Participation in a residency program at a university hospital was identified as an
234 independent predictor of a lower GM-ITE score when compared to participation at a
235 community hospital (adjusted coefficient: -4.05; 95% confidence interval: -4.63--3.48;
236 $p < .001$). A PGY-2 status was an independent predictor of a higher GM-ITE score
237 (adjusted coefficient: 0.74; 95% confidence interval: 0.27-1.20; $p = .002$). Having 31–60
238 (adjusted coefficient: 2.70; 95% confidence interval: 1.15-4.26; $p < .001$), 61–90
239 (adjusted coefficient: 3.27; 95% confidence interval: 1.64-4.91; $p < .001$), or ≥ 91
240 (adjusted coefficient: 4.28; 95% confidence interval: 2.38-6.17; $p < .001$) minutes of
241 study time per week was also indicative of higher GM-ITE scores compared to 0 self-
242 study time. Working 60–79 hours per week was predictive of a higher GM-ITE score
243 (adjusted coefficient: 1.27; 95% confidence interval: 0.81-1.72; $p < .001$) compared to
244 shorter working hours (< 60 hours). The other factors significantly associated with GM-
245 ITE scores were gender (women) , participation in a general medicine rotation, internal
246 medicine rotation duration, number of night shifts, and number of assigned patients.

247

248

DISCUSSION

249 Resident physicians from training programs in regions with a low and moderate PUD
250 index (areas facing physician shortages due to regional maldistribution) achieved
251 significantly higher GM-ITE scores than those in programs with a high PUD index. To
252 the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to quantitatively evaluate the
253 relationship between the distribution of physicians and the core clinical competency of
254 the resident physicians using nationwide data.

255 Physician maldistribution is a global problem that hinders patients' ability to
256 access healthcare services.²⁸ Physicians are geographically maldistributed, with too few
257 physicians in rural areas.^{29,30} In Japan, there is a well-documented issue of physician
258 shortages and regional maldistribution, where approximately 90% of physicians are
259 clustered in urban areas.³¹ As an example of countermeasures, changing the medical
260 education system so that it selects, trains, and retains physicians who are more likely to
261 practice in rural areas can remedy problems of rural geographic maldistribution.²⁹

262 Resident physicians who train in areas with a high PUD index may have a
263 more passive attitude towards clinical training than resident physicians who train in low
264 PUD index areas. This could be attributed to the possibility that clinical experiences in
265 areas with a high PUD index might not offer as diverse or challenging opportunities as
266 those in areas with a lower PUD index. In high PUD index areas, opportunities for the
267 supervising physician to allow resident physicians to make independent judgments may
268 be limited, leading to an observational training style. Furthermore, the higher patient
269 load or complexity in these high PUD index areas could potentially overshadow the
270 emphasis on hands-on experience, prioritizing efficiency over educational value.³²

271 Areas with high numbers of supervising physicians and nurses involved with
272 resident physicians have disadvantages. When resident physicians interact with several
273 different senior physicians and nurses, it takes time to establish relationships and build
274 trust, which may lead to inefficient learning and reduced effectiveness. A lower number
275 of supervising physicians in low PUD areas, including medical resident physicians, is
276 associated with higher GM-ITE scores.³³

277 Resident physicians in Japan require at least 60–65 □ duty hours per week
278 during their clinical training to acquire a certain level of clinical knowledge.²¹ However,

279 clinical knowledge does not proportionately increase with increases in duty hours. The
280 optimal number of duty hours that maximizes the development of resident physicians'
281 competencies must be determined. In Japanese areas with a low PUD index, resident
282 physicians face moderately longer working hours than resident physicians in areas with
283 a high PUD index, which may contribute to skill development.

284 Resident physicians from areas with a low PUD index dedicated more time to
285 self-study than those in areas with a high PUD index. Self-study time was strongly
286 correlated with GM-ITE scores, suggesting that self-directed learning is crucial for
287 enhancing competency, irrespective of the region (rural or urban). The positive
288 relationship between longer self-study time and higher GM-ITE scores in this study is
289 consistent with the results of a previous report.³⁴ William Osler noted that, “To study the
290 phenomena of disease without books is to sail an uncharted sea, while to study books
291 without patients is not to go to sea at all.”³⁵ Hence, it becomes imperative to ensure the
292 optimal equilibrium between the two elements within the constraints of limited time. In
293 Japan, physicians’ work-style reforms, including the establishment of working hour
294 limits for physicians and resident physicians, are scheduled to be implemented in April
295 2024.³⁶ Resident physicians working <60 hours per week reported less self-study time
296 than those working 60–65 hours per week.²¹ Therefore, innovative self-study tools that
297 efficiently demonstrate educational concepts in a limited time are needed.

298 Physician maldistribution remains a significant challenge in the global
299 healthcare context. The findings of the current study underscore the importance of
300 policy-driven interventions in addressing these disparities. The correlation between the
301 PUD index and resident physicians' clinical competence suggests that the quality of
302 medical training and patient care is intricately linked to the equitable distribution of

303 healthcare resources. The impact of physician distribution on clinical competence may
304 have implications beyond Japan, suggesting a need for international collaborative
305 efforts to address this issue.

306

307 **Limitations**

308 This study is not without limitations. First, the potential for selection bias cannot be
309 ruled out. As the GM-ITE is voluntary for training hospitals, only half of the resident
310 physicians in Japan participated in this study. Second, a bias may exist between data
311 from community and university hospitals. Similar to previous studies regarding the
312 GM-ITE, resident physicians from university hospitals had lower GM-ITE scores in this
313 study.³⁷ The low PUD index group had a lower proportion of university hospitals, which
314 may be a confounding factor. Third, the resident physicians' baseline clinical skills were
315 not assessed. The participants had various medical school experiences, which may have
316 impacted the study results. Fourth, this investigation did not evaluate the actual number
317 of supervising physicians in each hospital or their years of clinical experience. These
318 factors may have affected the GM-ITE scores. Fifth, the current study relied heavily on
319 the GM-ITE scores as a primary measure of clinical competence. Although the GM-ITE
320 is a validated tool, it predominantly assesses theoretical knowledge rather than practical
321 skills. Sixth, although the regions were categorized based on the PUD index, intra-
322 regional disparities may exist. Different areas within a single region may have varying
323 physician densities, which may lead to heterogeneity in the clinical exposure and
324 training of residents within the same PUD category. Seventh, while the GM-ITE
325 assesses medical interviewing for communication skills, it does not sufficiently evaluate

326 crucial aspects such as interpersonal literacy and interprofessional communication

327 essential for effective leadership in contemporary medicine.

328

329

CONCLUSIONS

330 In prefectures with a shortage of physicians, resident physicians enrolled in training

331 programs can attain favorable core clinical competency scores. This highlights the close

332 relationship between efforts to address physician maldistribution and the enhancement

333 of clinical competency among resident physicians in Japan. Regions with a relatively

334 insufficient distribution of physicians, as indicated by a lower PUD index, have higher

335 clinical proficiency, measured as the GM-ITE scores. As the healthcare landscape

336 evolves, the assurance of equitable physician distribution has emerged as a central tenet

337 of robust healthcare systems. The findings of this study have global implications.

338

339 **Article Information**

340 **Co-corresponding authors**

341 1. Kiyoshi Shikino, MD, PhD, MHPE, FACP

342 Department of Community-oriented Medical Education, Chiba University Graduate

343 School of Medicine, Chiba, Japan

344 1-8-1, Inohana, Chuo-ku, Chiba-city, Chiba pref. Japan

345 Tel. +81-43-222-7171 (Ext. 5239)

346 E-mail: kshikino@gmail.com

347 2. Yuji Nishizaki, MD, MPH, PhD

348 Division of Medical Education, Juntendo University School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

349 2-1-1, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, Japan

350 Tel. +81-3-3813-3111

351 ynishiza@juntendo.ac.jp

352

353 **Authors' contributions:** Dr Kiyoshi Shikino and Dr Yuji Nishizaki had full access to

354 all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the

355 accuracy of the data analysis.

356 *Concept and design:* Kiyoshi Shikino, Yuji Nishizaki.

357 *Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data:* All authors.

358 *Drafting of the manuscript:* Kiyoshi Shikino.

359 *Critical review of the manuscript for important intellectual content:* All authors.

360 *Statistical analysis:* Koshi Kataoka, Masanori Nojima.

361 *Obtained funding:* Yuji Nishizaki.

362 *Administrative, technical, or material support:* Yuji Nishizaki, Yasuharu Tokuda.

363 Supervision: Yuji Nisizaki, Yasuharu Tokuda.

364

365 **Conflicts of Interest Disclosures:** KS received an honorarium from JAMEP as
366 speakers of the JAMEP lecture and exam preparers of GM-ITE. YN received an
367 honorarium from JAMEP as a GM-ITE project manager. YT is the JAMEP director, and
368 he received an honorarium from JAMEP as a speaker of the JAMEP lecture. HK
369 received an honorarium from JAMEP as speakers of the JAMEP lecture. TS and YY
370 received an honorarium from JAMEP as exam preparers of GM-ITE.

371

372 **Funding/Support:** This study was supported by the Health, Labor, and Welfare Policy
373 Grants of Research on Region Medical (21IA2004) from the Ministry of Health, Labour
374 and Welfare (MHLW).

375

376 **Role of the Funder/Sponsor:** The funder had no role in the design and conduct of the
377 study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation,
378 review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for
379 publication.

380

381 **Data Sharing Statement:** See the Supplement 2.

382

383 **Additional Contributions:** The authors express gratitude to JAMEP members and the
384 members of the question development committee as well as the peer-review committee
385 of the GM-ITE.

386

387

REFERENCES

388

- 389 1. Takayama A, Poudyal H. Incorporating medical supply and demand into the index
390 of physician maldistribution improves the sensitivity to healthcare outcomes. *J Clin*
391 *Med.* 2021;11(1):155.
- 392 2. Hara K, Kunisawa S, Sasaki N, Imanaka Y. Examining changes in the equity of
393 physician distribution in Japan: A specialty-specific longitudinal study. *BMJ Open.*
394 2018;8(1):e018538.
- 395 3. Kobayashi Y, Takaki H. Geographic distribution of physicians in Japan. *Lancet.*
396 1992;340(8832):1391-1393.
- 397 4. Toyabe S. Trend in geographic distribution of physicians in Japan. *Int J Equity*
398 *Health.* 2009;8:5.
- 399 5. Tanihara S, Kobayashi Y, Une H, et al. Urbanization and physician maldistribution:
400 a longitudinal study in Japan. *BMC Health Serv Res.* 2011;11:260.
- 401 6. Wu J. Measuring inequalities in the demographical and geographical distribution of
402 physicians in China: Generalist versus specialist. *Int J Health Plan*
403 *Manag.* 2018;33(4):860-879.
- 404 7. Karan A, Negandhi H, Nair R, Sharma A, Tiwari R, Zodpey S. Size, composition
405 and distribution of human resource for health in India: New estimates using
406 National Sample Survey and Registry data. *BMJ Open.* 2019;9(4):e025979.
- 407 8. Morris S, Sutton M, Gravelle H. Inequity and inequality in the use of health care in
408 England: An empirical investigation. *Soc Sci Med.* 2005;60(6):1251-1266.

- 409 9. Guttman A, Shipman SA, Lam K, Goodman DC, Stukel TA. Primary care
410 physician supply and children's health care use, access, and outcomes: Findings
411 from Canada. *Pediatrics*. 2010;125(6):1119-1126.
- 412 10. Mick SS, Lee SY, Wodchis WP. Variations in geographical distribution of foreign
413 and domestically trained physicians in the United States: 'safety nets' or 'surplus
414 exacerbation'? *Soc Sci Med*. 2000;50(2):185-202.
- 415 11. Winkelmann J, Muench U, Maier CB. Time trends in the regional distribution of
416 physicians, nurses and midwives in Europe. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2020;20(1):937.
- 417 12. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). *Doctors*.
418 Paris: OECD Publishing. <https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/content/data/4355e1ec-en>
419 (2018, accessed 25 October 2023).
- 420 13. Sato H. Demand, supply and shortages of physicians: a critical analysis on the
421 current government's method. *J Health Welf Policy*. 2020;3:39-48. [Google
422 Scholar]
- 423 14. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare Study Group on Supply and Demand of
424 Medical Staff: Doctor Supply and Demand Subcommittee *4th Interim Report*.
425 [(accessed on 25 October 2023)];2019 Available online:
426 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/12601000/000504403.pdf>
- 427 15. Tago M, Shikino K, Hirata R, et al. General medicine departments of Japanese
428 universities contribute to medical education in clinical settings: a descriptive
429 questionnaire study. *Int J Gen Med*. 2022;15:5785-5793.
- 430 16. Teo A. The current state of medical education in Japan: a system under reform. *Med*
431 *Educ*. 2007;41(3):302-308.

- 432 17. Koze T. Medical education in Japan. *Acad Med J Assoc Am Med Coll.*
433 2006;81(12):1069-1075.
- 434 18. Ohde S, Deshpande GA, Takahashi O, Fukui T. Differences in residents' self-
435 reported confidence and case experience between two post-graduate rotation
436 curricula: results of a nationwide survey in Japan. *BMC Med Educ.* 2014;14:141.
- 437 19. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare, Medical Practice Council, Committee for
438 medical practitioner specialized training: Initiatives to enhance clinical training
439 opportunities in the region. [(accessed on 25 October 2023)];2023 Available online:
440 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10803000/001152774.pdf>
- 441 20. Fukui S, Shikino K, Nishizaki Y, et al. Association between regional quota program
442 in medical schools and practical clinical competency based on General Medicine
443 In-Training Examination score: a nationwide cross-sectional study of resident
444 physicians in Japan. *Postgrad Med J.* 2023;99(1177):1197-1204.
- 445 21. Nagasaki K, Nishizaki Y, Shinozaki T, et al. Impact of the resident duty hours on
446 in-training examination score: A nationwide study in Japan. *Med Teach.*
447 2022;44(4):433-440.
- 448 22. Nagasaki K, Nishizaki Y, Shinozaki T, Kobayashi H, Tokuda Y. Association
449 between resident duty hours and self-study time among postgraduate medical
450 residents in Japan. *JAMA Netw Open.* 2021;4(3):e210782.
- 451 23. Garibaldi RA, Subhiyah R, Moore ME, Waxman H. The in-training examination in
452 internal medicine: an analysis of resident performance over time. *Ann Intern Med.*
453 2002;137(6):505-510.

- 454 24. Kinoshita K, Tsugawa Y, Shimizu T, et al. Impact of inpatient caseload, emergency
455 department duties, and online learning resource on general medicine in-training
456 examination scores in Japan. *Int J Gen Med*. 2015;8:355-360.
- 457 25. Shimizu T, Tsugawa Y, Tanoue Y, et al. The hospital educational environment and
458 performance of residents in the general medicine in-training examination: a
459 multicenter study in Japan. *Int J Gen Med*. 2013;6:637-640.
- 460 26. Nagasaki K, Nishizaki Y, Nojima M, et al. Validation of the general medicine in-
461 training examination using the professional and linguistic assessments board
462 examination among postgraduate residents in Japan. *Int J Gen Med*. 2021;14:6487-
463 6495.
- 464 27. Tiffin PA, Illing J, Kasim AS, McLachlan JC. Annual Review of Competence
465 Progression (ARCP) performance of doctors who passed Professional and
466 Linguistic Assessments Board (PLAB) tests compared with UK medical graduates:
467 national data linkage study. *BMJ*. 2014;348:g2622.
- 468 28. Elma A, Nasser M, Yang L, Chang I, Bakker D, Grierson L. Medical education
469 interventions influencing physician distribution into underserved communities: a
470 scoping review. *Hum Resour Health*. 2022;20(1):31.
- 471 29. Rosenthal MB, Zaslavsky A, Newhouse JP. The geographic distribution of
472 physicians revisited. *Health Serv Res*. 2005;40(6 Pt 1):1931-1952.
- 473 30. Rosenblatt RA, Hart LG. Physicians and rural America. *West J Med*.
474 2000;173(5):348-351.
- 475 31. Ishikawa T, Nakao Y, Fujiwara K, Suzuki T, Tsuji S, Ogasawara K. Forecasting
476 maldistribution of human resources for healthcare and patients in Japan: a
477 utilization-based approach. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2019;19(1):653.

- 478 32. Russell DJ, Wilkinson E, Petterson S, Chen C, Bazemore A. Family medicine
479 residencies: How rural training exposure in GME is associated with subsequent
480 rural practice. *J Grad Med Educ*. 2022;14(4):441-450
- 481 33. Mizuno A, Tsugawa Y, Shimizu T, et al. The impact of the hospital volume on the
482 performance of residents on the General Medicine In-Training Examination: A
483 multicenter study in Japan. *Intern Med*. 2016;55(12):1553-1558.
- 484 34. Nishizaki Y, Shimizu T, Shinozaki T, et al. Impact of general medicine rotation
485 training on the in-training examination scores of 11, 244 Japanese resident
486 physicians: a Nationwide multi-center cross-sectional study. *BMC Med Educ*.
487 2020;20(1):426.
- 488 35. Osler W. Address on the dedication of the new building. *Boston Med Surg J*.
489 1901;144:60-61.
- 490 36. Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. On the Revision of Overtime Regulations.
491 [(accessed on 25 October 2023)];2019 Available online:
492 <https://www.mhlw.go.jp/content/10800000/000481338.pdf>
- 493 37. Nishizaki Y, Nozawa K, Shinozaki T, et al. Difference in the general medicine in-
494 training examination score between community-based hospitals and university
495 hospitals: a cross-sectional study based on 15,188 Japanese resident physicians.
496 *BMC Med Educ*. 2021;21(1):214.
497

498 **Figure legend**

499

500 Figure 1. GM-ITE score distribution between low and high PUD index prefecture

501 resident physicians.

502 GM-ITE, General Medicine In-Training Examination

503

504 **Table**

505

506 Table 1. Baseline characteristics of resident physicians categorized according to PUD
507 index.

508 PUD, Physician uneven distribution index

509

510 Table 2. Factors associated with the GM-ITE score in univariate regression analysis.

511 GM-ITE, General Medicine In-Training Examination

512

513 Table 3. Factors associated with the GM-ITE score in multivariate linear regression
514 analysis.

515 GM-ITE, General Medicine In-Training Examination

516

517 **Supplement**


518

519 Supplement 1. Physician uneven distribution index (PUD index).

520

521 Supplement 2. Data sharing statement.

522



	Physician uneven distribution index							
	All		High		Moderate		Low	
	n = 5762		n = 2143		n = 2039		n = 1580	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
GM-ITE score	45.45	8.23	44.70	8.25	45.69	8.25	46.16	8.09
	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)
Hospital type								
Community Hospital	4783	(83.0)	1691	(78.9)	1703	(83.5)	1389	(87.9)
University Hospital	979	(17.0)	452	(21.1)	336	(16.5)	191	(12.1)
Gender								
Man	3922	(68.1)	1462	(68.2)	1401	(68.7)	1059	(67.0)
Woman	1840	(31.9)	681	(31.8)	638	(31.3)	521	(33.0)
PGY								
1	2989	(51.9)	1107	(51.7)	1055	(51.7)	827	(52.3)
2	2773	(48.1)	1036	(48.3)	984	(48.3)	753	(47.7)
General Medicine rotation								
No	3136	(54.4)	1099	(51.3)	1094	(53.7)	943	(59.7)
Yes	2626	(45.6)	1044	(48.7)	945	(46.3)	637	(40.3)
Internal Medicine rotation (month)								
0–5	1542	(26.8)	548	(25.6)	547	(26.8)	447	(28.3)
6–10	3550	(61.6)	1355	(63.2)	1225	(60.1)	970	(61.4)
11–15	588	(10.2)	206	(9.6)	231	(11.3)	151	(9.6)
16–20	60	(1.0)	27	(1.3)	26	(1.3)	7	(0.4)
≥21	22	(0.4)	7	(0.3)	10	(0.5)	5	(0.3)
Night shift per month								
0	157	(2.7)	83	(3.9)	43	(2.1)	31	(2.0)
1–2	969	(16.8)	415	(19.4)	299	(14.7)	255	(16.1)
3–5	4086	(70.9)	1443	(67.3)	1451	(71.1)	1192	(75.4)
≥6	531	(9.2)	199	(9.3)	238	(11.7)	94	(6.0)
Unknown	19	(0.4)	3	(0.1)	8	(0.4)	8	(0.5)
Average number of assigned inpatients								
	0.4	(28.7)	0.5	(23.8)	0.6	(42.0)	0.1	(28.0)

31–60	2197	(38.1)	784	(36.6)	770	(37.8)	643	(40.7)
61–90	642	(11.1)	232	(10.8)	219	(10.7)	191	(12.1)
≥91	183	(3.2)	68	(3.2)	63	(3.1)	52	(3.3)

Duty-hour per week (hours)

Category 1 (<60)	2940	(51.0)	1083	(50.6)	1094	(53.7)	763	(48.3)
Category 2 (60–79)	2045	(35.5)	757	(35.3)	704	(34.5)	584	(37.0)
Category 3 (≥80)	777	(13.5)	303	(14.1)	241	(11.8)	233	(14.7)

		95% confidence interval			
		Adjusted coefficient	Lower	Upper	p-value
Physician uneven distribution index					
	High	(reference)			
	Moderate	0.98	0.49	1.48	<.001
	Low	1.46	0.93	1.99	<.001
Hospital type					
	Community Hospital	(reference)			
	University Hospital	-4.81	-5.36	-4.25	<.001
Gender					
	Man	(reference)			
	Woman	-1.03	-1.48	-0.57	<.001
PGY					
	1	(reference)			
	2	1.34	0.92	1.77	<.001
General Medicine rotation					
	No	(reference)			
	Yes	1.29	0.86	1.71	<.001
Internal Medicine rotation (month)					
	0-5	(reference)			
	6-10	1.02	0.53	1.51	<.001
	11-15	2.25	1.47	3.03	<.001
	16-20	1.96	-0.16	4.08	.070
	≥21	0.24	-3.21	3.70	.890
Night shift per month					
	0	(reference)			
	1-2	1.25	-0.12	2.62	.074
	3-5	3.98	2.68	5.28	<.001
	≥6	4.74	3.29	6.19	<.001
	Unknown	2.66	-1.22	6.53	.179
Average number of assigned inpatients					
	0-4	(reference)			

1–30	1.30	-0.31	2.90	.113
31–60	3.27	1.66	4.88	<.001
61–90	4.23	2.53	5.92	<.001
≥91	5.34	3.37	7.30	<.001

Duty-hour per week (hours)

Category 1 (<60)	(reference)			
Category 2 (60–79)	2.10	1.64	2.56	<.001
Category 3 (≥80)	2.06	1.41	2.70	<.001

		95% confidence interval			
		Adjusted coefficient	Lower	Upper	p-value
Physician uneven distribution index					
	High	(reference)			
	Moderate	0.91	0.43	1.39	<.001
	Low	1.14	0.62	1.65	<.001
Hospital type					
	Community Hospital	(reference)			
	University Hospital	-4.05	-4.63	-3.48	<.001
Gender					
	Man	(reference)			
	Woman	-0.63	-1.07	-0.20	.005
PGY					
	1	(reference)			
	2	0.74	0.27	1.20	.002
General Medicine rotation					
	No	(reference)			
	Yes	0.95	0.54	1.37	<.001
Internal Medicine rotation (month)					
	0–5	(reference)			
	6–10	0.46	-0.05	0.97	.074
	11–15	1.20	0.38	2.03	.004
	16–20	1.29	-0.76	3.35	.217
	≥21	0.17	-3.14	3.49	.918
Night shift per month					
	0	(reference)			
	1–2	-0.10	-1.43	1.23	.882
	3–5	1.01	-0.27	2.29	.122
	≥6	1.45	0.01	2.90	.049
	Unknown	1.64	-2.10	5.39	.390

Average number of assigned inpatients

31–60	2.70	1.15	4.26	<.001
61–90	3.27	1.64	4.91	<.001
≥91	4.28	2.38	6.17	<.001

Duty-hour per week (hours)

Category 1 (<60)	(reference)			
Category 2 (60–79)	1.27	0.81	1.72	<.001
Category 3 (≥80)	0.83	0.17	1.48	.014

Physician Uneven Distribution Index (PUD index)

$$\text{PUD index} = \frac{\text{Standardized number of physicians}^{\$}}{(\text{Population in the districts}) \div 100,000 \times (\text{Standardized consultation rate of the district}^{\#})}$$

$$^{\$} \text{ Standardized number of physicians} = \text{Total number of doctors stratified by gender and 10-year interval age group} \times \frac{\text{Working time for each sex and age group}}{\text{National mean of working time}}$$

$$^{\#} \text{ Standardized consultation rate of the district} = \frac{\text{Expected consultation rate for the district}}{\text{National mean of expected consultation rate}^{\$}}$$

$$^{\$} \text{ National mean of expected consultation rate} = \frac{\Sigma (\text{National mean of age and sex-adjusted consultation rate} \times \text{by gender and 10-year interval age group})}{\text{Population of the district}}$$