

Refugee Healthcare Resilience and Burdens: A 10-year Mixed-Methods Analysis of System Shocks in Canada

Eric Norrie MSc¹; Linda Holdbrook¹; Rabina Grewal¹; Rachel Talavlikar, MD^{1,3}; Mohammad Yasir Essar, MSc¹; Tyler Williamson PhD¹; Annalee Coakley, MD, DTM&H^{1,3}; Kerry McBrien MD, MPH^{1,3}; Gabriel E. Fabreau MD, MPH^{1,2}

¹ Refugee Health YYC, O'Brien Institute for Public Health, Department of Community Health Sciences, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary

² Department of Medicine, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary

³ Department of Family Medicine, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary

Corresponding Author:

Eric Norrie, MSc.

3E38 CWPB Bldg,

3280 Hospital Dr. NW

Calgary AB,

eric.norrie2@ucalgary.ca

Title: Refugee Healthcare Resilience and Burdens: A 10-year Mixed-Methods Analysis of System Shocks in Canada

Abstract

Background: System shocks, including sudden policy changes, refugee surges and pandemics, strain healthcare systems. These shocks compound existing vulnerabilities in refugee healthcare, limiting ability to provide patient care, but can also catalyze resilient adaptations. Investigating how local refugee health systems respond to shocks is critical to understanding resilience.

Methods: We conducted a sequential explanatory mixed-methods study (2011–2020) at a specialized refugee health centre in Alberta, Canada, investigating four health system shocks: IFHP Funding Cuts (2012), Syrian Surge (2015), Yazidi Resettlement (2017), and COVID-19 (2020). We analyzed patient sociodemographic characteristics, health center utilization, and healthcare provider supply, conducting interrupted time series analysis of mean monthly appointments (total, family physicians, specialists and multidisciplinary team) and rates of change. We adapted a Health System Resilience framework to thematically analyze interviews with centre leaders and integrated these findings with quantitative findings to assess resilience and operational burdens.

Findings: From 2011 to 2020, 10,661 refugees from 106 countries attended 107,642 appointments. Mean monthly appointments rose from 455 to 2,208 (3.9-fold, $p < 0.01$). Monthly appointments increased between IFHP and Syrian periods (610.8 to 937.9, $p < 0.01$), but not between Syrian Surge and Yazidi Resettlement ($p = 0.29$). During COVID-19, mean appointments remained stable (1,412.4 to 1,414.0, $p = 0.11$), but additional monthly appointments rose from 6.3 to 110.4 (17.5-fold, $p < 0.01$). Over ten years, mean provider hours increased from 320 to 736

(2.3-fold), and from 59.5 to 871.4 (14.6-fold) for family physicians and multidisciplinary team members. Qualitative analysis revealed resilience capacities but highlighted costs such as burnout, vicarious trauma, and financial strain. Integration showed the centre developed resilience but experienced notable operational burden.

Interpretation: Over a decade, a specialized refugee health centre adapted to successive shocks, transforming into a beacon clinic. It demonstrated resilience through care expansion and innovation, but with notable costs, financially and to health worker wellbeing.

Funding: None

Introduction

Global forced displacement has reached historic levels, with 117 million people displaced as of 2023, the highest on record.¹ This increase, driven by conflicts, persecution, disasters, both natural and climate-related, marks the twelfth consecutive year of rising displacement.¹ Refugees face unique health vulnerabilities, including exposure to violence, poverty, and limited healthcare access that can strain health systems that receive large refugee influxes or face rapid policy shifts.¹⁻² The resilience capacity of health systems to address refugees' complex needs remains critically underexplored.

Blanchet et al. developed a health system resilience framework that defines resilience through four dimensions: (1) *Knowledge*, the system's ability to gather and apply diverse information; (2) *Uncertainties*, readiness to anticipate and manage unexpected events; (3) *Interdependence*, effective coordination within and beyond the health sector; and (4) *Legitimacy*, the ability to uphold norms and gain community trust.³ These dimensions shape a health system's absorptive, adaptive, and transformative resilience capacities enabling it to maintain performance levels—defined by quantity, quality, and equity—under similar or reduced resources, or to restructure and enhance performance.³ Health system shocks, such as sudden policy shifts, rapid refugee influxes, and pandemics expose vulnerabilities by generating sudden demands or straining resources.⁴ Systems lacking resilience and adequate resourcing risk disruption when exposed to shocks, with system performance levels falling, failing to recover afterwards, or collapsing entirely under such pressures.^{5,6}

Canada is a global leader in refugee resettlement, leading in annual formal resettlements from 2018 to 2022.¹ However, unlike countries with formalized national refugee health systems, Canada relies on a decentralized approach, with most care delivered by primary care providers.⁷ Across Canada, specialized refugee 'beacon clinics' developed organically and act as hubs of expertise, that provide culturally sensitive, interdisciplinary care tailored to refugees' unique needs.^{8,9} These centres often integrate primary and specialty care, mental health, public health, and social services to efficiently manage recently arrived refugees' healthcare needs within Canada's healthcare system.^{8,9} Over the past decade these centres have faced multiple health system shocks including, refugee health policy changes, rapid refugee influxes, and COVID-19 pandemics. Despite their critical role, their resilience capacities and adaptations to successive system shocks remains poorly understood.

Between 2011 and 2020, Canada's refugee health system faced four major shocks.¹⁰⁻¹⁴ In 2012, cuts to the Interim Federal Health Program (IFHP), a national insurance program for refugees and asylum claimants, left many without essential services, such as medications and primary healthcare, increasing healthcare access barriers and forcing provincial systems to absorb emergency care costs for untreated conditions.¹⁰ The IFHP was reinstated in time to support the *Syrian Resettlement Initiative*, when Canada rapidly resettled 40,000 refugees between November 2015 and January 2017, creating a surge that strained local systems.^{11,12} From February 2017 to February 2020 the *Survivors of Daesh* program resettled 1,300 Yazidi refugees, survivors of genocide and horrific violence to four major Canadian cities. They arrived with complex trauma and physical health conditions that further strained refugee health

services.^{13,15} In March 2020 the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted global health systems, adding strain and exacerbating health disparities between resettled refugees and host populations.¹⁴

Subsequent humanitarian crises in Afghanistan (August 2021)¹⁶, Ukraine (January 2022), Sudan (April 2023), Gaza (October 2023), and Lebanon (October 2024) illustrate the urgent need for resilient health systems responsive to sudden forced displacement and other shocks.¹⁷ Despite multiple shocks, the impact on beacon refugee health centres remains unexamined, particularly their resilience capacities, adaptive strategies and impacts on healthcare providers and staff. This study addresses this gap by investigating health centre utilization, provider supply, provider and staff experiences and adaptations at one of Canada's largest and longest-operating specialized refugee health centres to understand its response to consecutive health system shocks.¹⁸

Methods

Study Design and Setting

We conducted a sequential explanatory mixed methods study to investigate changes in utilization, provider supply, and perceived impacts associated with health system shocks at a specialized 'beacon' refugee health centre in Calgary, Canada between January 1, 2011, and December 31, 2020. Our study comprised three phases: quantitative, qualitative, and integration. In the quantitative phase, we analyzed patient sociodemographic characteristics, tracked changes in centre utilization, and measured provider work hours supply, using the latter two as proxies for system performance.

Our qualitative phase comprised of semi-structured interviews with centre leadership, supported by quantitative data visualizations, to understand experiences during each shock period. We conducted deductive thematic analysis of qualitative data, adapting Blanchet et al.'s health system resilience framework to interpret low resilience themes as *vulnerabilities*.³

Finally, we used an integration matrix to integrate quantitative and qualitative findings, assessing convergence and divergence to enable a comprehensive interpretation of system performance outcomes and operational burdens. We defined system performance outcomes using quantitative metrics for utilization and supply, categorizing it into five levels after a shock period:

1. *Collapse*: Performance falls until system failure.
2. *Disruption*: Performance declines below baseline to new lower level without recovery.
3. *Absorptive*: Despite shock, performance is maintained at pre-shock levels after shock period ends.
4. *Adaptive*: Performance is maintained or temporarily improves using fewer or different resources.
5. *Transformative*: Performance is sustainably improved at higher level compared to pre-shock baseline.^{3,9}

We assessed operational burdens by examining integrated findings for financial strain, material shortages, provider well-being, quality of care, and infrastructure limitations.

Health System Shocks

Our primary exposures of interest compared a baseline period to four distinct shock periods: 1) baseline period (January 2011–June 2012); 2) the IFHP Cuts (July 2012–October 2015); 3) the

Syrian Surge (November 2015 to January 2017); 4) Yazidi Resettlement (February 2017–February 2020); and 5) COVID-19 (March 2020–December 2020).

Quantitative Phase

We extracted electronic medical record (EMR) data from all patients who attended one or more centre appointments including sociodemographic, utilization, biometric, diagnostic testing, treatment, and clinical data. Sociodemographic information included age, sex, and country of origin, aggregated into World Health Organization (WHO) regions (i.e., African, Eastern Mediterranean, Americas, European, South-East Asia, Western Pacific) to ensure confidentiality.¹⁹ We analyzed patient appointments by provider type—family physicians, specialist physicians, and multidisciplinary team (MDT) members—using EMR scheduling software. We defined specialist physicians as non-primary care providers (e.g., internal medicine, pediatrics, obstetrics, psychiatry, infectious diseases, and hepatology) and MDT members as nurses, pharmacists, dietitians, and psychologists.

Statistical Model

We used interrupted time series analysis to examine associations between shocks and monthly appointment volumes. We assembled linear regression models for four provider types: all providers, family physicians, MDT members, and specialist physicians. Quantitative analyses were conducted using Stata (version 18.0).²⁰

For each study period, we modeled the monthly number of appointments (Y_i) as a function of the intercept (β_{0j}) and slope (β_{1j}) for the j -th period. The general model for time point i in period j is:

$$Y_i = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j} \times Time_i + \epsilon_i$$

We used a linear combination of the intercept (β_{0j}) and slope (β_{1j}) coefficients to test for differences in the mean monthly appointments (level) and rate of change in appointments per month (slope) between adjacent periods, and overall change from baseline to COVID-19 period using a two-tailed alpha of <0.05 . We generated data visualizations to facilitate qualitative interviews.

Supply Analysis

We collected work hours for each family physician, specialist physician, and MDT member and categorized them by provider type. We calculated mean monthly averages and standard deviations for supply metrics for the baseline, each shock and over the entire study period.

Qualitative Phase

We conducted semi-structured interviews with current and former centre leaders including medical directors, executive directors and managers to explore changes in utilization, adaptations and operational costs across shock periods. Interviews were conducted in person or online via Zoom between May and August 2022, based on participant preference.²¹ Participants were presented graphs summarizing quantitative data and prompted to reflect on utilization patterns, staff experiences, adaptive strategies and costs during each shock. Two researchers independently coded interview transcripts using deductive thematic analysis. We adapted Blanchet et al.'s framework to examine resilience dimensions—**knowledge** (the system's ability to generate, integrate, and apply information effectively), **uncertainties** (the challenges related to unpredictable events), **interdependence** (the collaborative relationships that support system functionality), and **legitimacy** (the recognition and acceptance of the health center's role in the

community).³ We also examined **vulnerabilities** to investigate where resilience may have been lacking before the shock. Emerging themes were verified through iterative discussions and cross-checking to ensure consistency.

Integration

We used an integration matrix to systematically combine and assess our data. Quantitative data provided system performance metrics, while qualitative insights captured resilience dimensions, including interdependencies, uncertainties, legitimacy, and knowledge, and pre-existing vulnerabilities. By analyzing convergence, divergence, and expansion across data types, we assessed each shock period for resilience, categorized as collapse, disruption, absorption, adaptation, or transformation. We also examined operational burdens incurred during each shock across five domains: financial strain, material shortages, provider wellbeing, quality of care, and infrastructure limitations.²²

Ethical Considerations

The University of Calgary's Conjoined Health Research Ethics Board (CHREB – REB19-1029) approved the study and granted a waiver of consent for quantitative data. Informed verbal consent was obtained from all qualitative participants.

Results

Cohort Characteristics

We analyzed data from 10,661 patients representing 106 countries of origin (from all six WHO Regions²⁰), who attended 107,642 appointments in total. The mean age was 24.5 years (SD 17.1), and 47.8% (5,094/10,661) were female. Table 1 summarizes sociodemographic characteristics by shock period and over 10 years.

Interrupted Time Series Analyses

All Providers

Data from January–February 2011 were incomplete and excluded, leaving 118 months for analysis (Figure 2). Overall, mean monthly appointments increased 4.9-fold, from 455 at baseline to 2,208 during the COVID-19 period ($p<0.01$). The rate of change for monthly appointment rose 69-fold, from 1.6 to 110.4 additional appointments per month ($p<0.01$) (Figure 1). Between the baseline to the IFHP Cuts period, neither mean monthly appointments, nor the rate of change of additional monthly appointments, changed significantly ($p=0.16$ and $p=0.45$ respectively). However, between the IFHP Cuts and Syrian Surge periods, mean monthly appointments increased from 610.8 to 937.9 ($p<0.01$), though the rate of change did not differ, (4.5 to 9.1 additional appointments per month; $p=0.48$). Neither the mean appointments (1073.9 to 1179.9; $p=0.29$) nor the rate of change (9.1 to 6.3 additional appointments per month; $p=0.78$) differed between the Syrian Surge and Yazidi Resettlement periods. Between the Yazidi and COVID-19 periods, mean monthly appointments did not change (1413.9 to 1414.4, $p=0.11$), but the rate of appointments increases rose dramatically 17.5-fold, from 6.3 to 110.4 additional appointments per month ($p<0.01$).

Appointments by Provider Type

Figure 2b illustrates the increase in family physician appointments, with mean monthly appointments rising 2.9-fold, from 399 at baseline to 1,144.4 during COVID-19, and the rate of monthly changes increasing 87.3-fold, from 0.7 to 64.6 additional appointments per month (both $p < 0.01$). MDT appointments also rose dramatically, increasing 32.3-fold in mean monthly appointments, from 31.9 at baseline to 1,029.7 during COVID-19, with the rate rising 157.6-fold, from 0.29 to 45.7 additional appointments per month (both $p < 0.01$) (Figure 2c). Specialist appointments, by contrast, did not differ in the rate of change of monthly appointments (Figure 2d). Mean monthly specialist appointments rose modestly from 33.9 at baseline to 39.8 during the IFHP Cuts period ($p = 0.02$) but declined significantly during COVID-19, dropping from 66.3 to 32.9 ($p < 0.01$). Consequently, the mean monthly specialist appointments at baseline (33.9) did not differ from the final level during COVID-19 (29.2; $p = 0.46$).

Provider Supply

Provider work hours increased significantly for family physicians and MDT members, reflecting supply growth to accommodate rising centre utilization. Family physician hours rose from 320 hours per month at baseline to 736 hours per month during the COVID-19 period, (2.3-fold increase). MDT supply increased 14.9-fold, expanding from 58.3 hours to 871.4 hours per month. In contrast, specialist physician supply initially rose from 37.5 hours at baseline to 78.6 hours during the Yazidi Resettlement period, but declined nearly 50% during COVID-19, dropping to 41.9 hours per month (eTable 3).

Qualitative Results

We interviewed eight past and present refugee health centre leaders including executive officers, medical directors, and managers between May and August 2022. The interviews lasted between 30 to 60 minutes. Participants mostly identified as white women aged 35 to over 65 years. Table 5 presents themes and subthemes of resilience dimensions and vulnerabilities across all five study periods.

During the baseline and IFHP cuts periods integrating and applying different forms of knowledge was crucial, though finances emerged as a key vulnerability. During the Syrian surge period interdependence with health and resettlement partners was critical for handling the rapidly increased patient volume. In the Yazidi Resettlement period, staff and provider wellbeing emerged as a significant vulnerability due to vicarious trauma, while the centre developed legitimacy among the Yazidi community through advocacy for family reunification. During the COVID-19 pandemic, participants emphasized adaptability, building on lessons from previous shocks to navigate the uncertainties of COVID-19.

Integration

The health centre demonstrated absorptive, adaptive, and transformative capacities, but these came with operational burdens. Over the 10-year study period, the health centre demonstrated transformative resilience, as evidenced by a 4.9-fold increase in mean monthly appointments from 455 at baseline to 2,208 by the COVID-19 period ($p < 0.01$), and significant expansions in provider hours, with family physician hours more than doubling, and MDT hours increasing 14.6-fold (Figure 2). These dramatic expansions of system performance reflect the health center's capacity to adapt and transform in response to recurring shocks.

During the IFHP Cuts period, care levels were maintained despite policy-driven financial strain on patients and moral distress among providers who worked and personally donated funds to fill care gaps, demonstrating absorptive capacity. The Syrian Surge marked a period of transformative capacity, with mean monthly appointments rising rapidly from 610.8 to 937.9 ($p < 0.01$), supported by substantial increases in provider hours and collaborative adaptations among stakeholders. However, this surge also led to significant operational burdens, including increased provider burnout and infrastructure strain due to the high patient volume. During the Yazidi Resettlement, service levels were maintained despite high mental health needs that created additional burdens on staff, many of whom reported vicarious trauma. The centre adapted to these mental health needs through advocacy for family reunification which built community trust, and a vicarious trauma training program for staff and providers. The COVID-19 pandemic further illustrated the centre's adaptability, as it rapidly increased overall care levels and provider supply. Yet, this period also saw a collapse in specialist care, with appointments halving from 66.3 to 32.9 per month and provider hours dropping from 78.6 to 54.6. While these adaptations highlighted the centre's flexibility and resilience, they came with accumulated operational burden, including expanded infrastructure, increased human resources, financial costs, and challenges to provider wellbeing, such as burnout and change fatigue. Despite these challenges, the health center's ability to navigate these shocks reflects its role as a model for transformative resilience in refugee health systems.

Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the largest 10-year longitudinal cohort study of resettled refugees in a primary care setting in Canada, offering insights into how over a decade a specialized refugee health centre absorbed, adapted, and transformed in response to multiple health system shocks. Through a mixed-methods approach, we observed significant increases in utilization and provider supply, and identified resilience capacities—absorptive, adaptive, and transformative—alongside operational burdens during four shock periods. These findings reflect the centre’s operational resilience and the continuous demands imposed by external shocks.

Over the decade, both appointments and provider hours increased substantially, with family physician and multidisciplinary team appointments rising by 2.9-fold and 32.3-fold, respectively. This growth reflects the health centre’s transformation into a beacon clinic that expanded its services to meet patient needs through specialized programs while increasing overall capacity. This transformation enhanced refugee care and enabled the centre to contribute expertise within the province. During the COVID-19 pandemic the health centre demonstrated its strongest adaptation, as the rate of monthly appointments rose steeply (from 6.3 to 110.4 additional appointments per month). However, specialist care significantly declined, due to redeployment of hospital-based specialists to manage COVID-19 surges. This decline mirrored broader disruptions in Canadian healthcare, as surgeries and hospital admissions dropped significantly between March 2020 and June 2021, disproportionately affecting low-income individuals.²³ Nonetheless, despite the collapse in specialist care, the health center’s resilience grew over time but was not an assured outcome of each shock.

Study data integration assessed resilience capacities and operational burdens across each shock period. The IFHP Cuts demonstrated strong absorptive capacity, as family physician appointments were maintained despite funding cuts; however, financial strain on patients and moral distress among providers, who donated funds to address gaps in medication coverage, revealed substantial operational burdens. In contrast, the Syrian Surge, demonstrated transformative capacity, with sustained increases in appointments and provider supply that exceeded pre-shock levels. This period also fostered sustained transformative collaborations and partnerships with settlement and other sectors to coordinate services. During the Yazidi Resettlement, the health center exhibited adaptive capacity by maintaining service levels and advocating for family reunification, despite high mental health needs that contributed to vicarious trauma among staff and providers.²⁴ Finally, the initial months of COVID-19 revealed absorptive and adaptive capacities as the centre rapidly increased appointments and provider supply, leveraging virtual appointments, to address a sudden surge in their patients' outpatient health needs. If sustained post-pandemic, these adaptations may represent transformative capacity.

The WHO Health System Building Blocks provide a foundational framework for understanding health system functions, but does not address how systems respond to shocks.²⁵ Blanchet et al.'s resilience framework was instrumental to understand the refugee health center's resilience capacities such as knowledge application, interdependence, uncertainty management, and legitimacy.³ Similarly, other studies have similarly applied this framework to examine the impacts of shocks like COVID-19 and the Syrian surge;^{26,27} however, while it effectively addresses shock responses, the framework does not integrate structural elements such as the WHO Building Blocks, or outcomes of resilience processes. Other published frameworks

integrate shock preparedness with elements of the Building Blocks, or include bottom-up perspectives on everyday resilience that highlight the critical role of frontline actors, but also fail to explicitly address resilience outcomes.^{28,29} Our study contributes to this evolving discussion by incorporating dimensions such as disruption, collapse, and operational burdens—including financial strain, material shortages, provider well-being, and infrastructure challenges.

By integrating qualitative and quantitative data, our findings demonstrated that resilience can be understood as both a process and an outcome.^{4,30} While other studies caution against framing resilience as an outcome, our mixed-methods approach indicate that resilience indeed can be interpreted both as system processes and an outcomes.^{4,30} Processes were captured through our qualitative analysis revealing how frontline actors adapted during shocks, while outcomes were captured through quantitative analysis that showed sustained system performance despite shocks. Critically, our study highlights that system-level resilience likely stems from both systemic capacities and the adaptability of individuals within systems—whose stress inoculation responding to previous shocks likely contribute to system resilience. By incorporating frontline perspectives, we avoid misattributing resilience solely to the system, and instead recognize how individuals interact with their environment to build resilience over time.

Our findings align with the Johns Hopkins Center for Humanitarian Health – Lancet Commission’s call for critical research into resilient health systems capable of adapting to ongoing crises.¹⁷ Our decade-long analysis of over 10,000 refugee patients from 106 countries, contextualized by refugee health leaders’ firsthand experiences, provide actionable insights. Consistent with studies of health systems in fragile and conflict-affected settings, our results emphasize the importance of interdependence between sectors and proactive preparation to

address unforeseen challenges.²⁶ Moreover, our results reflect the cumulative impact of consecutive shocks, such as rapid Syrian and Yazidi resettlement programs and COVID-19, interact to compound health system demands over time.²⁶ This compounding effect creates cascading burdens on health systems, demonstrating that such shocks cannot be effectively understood or managed in isolation.²⁷

This study has limitations. The qualitative phase focused exclusively on health centre leadership, limiting insights into the experiences of other frontline staff and physicians. Additionally, we did not include refugee voices, critical to fully understanding the impact of health system shocks on care delivery, patient care perceptions, and outcomes. Finally, our analysis of COVID-19 only included its first nine months, precluding an assessment of long-term impacts on resilience and operations.

Despite these limitations, this study provides valuable insights into the resilience of specialized refugee health centres in Canada and how they respond to consecutive health system shocks. These findings may be generalizable to other refugee health settings in Canada, and practices and systems worldwide that provide care in the context of mass displacements. Further, this study illustrates that while specialized refugee beacon clinics can absorb, adapt, and transform in response to external shocks, sustaining these capacities requires adequate resources and comes with operational burdens, particularly to the well-being of frontline providers. As global geopolitical instability continues to drive displacement, proactive strategies to mitigate operational burdens will be critical to sustaining resilient refugee healthcare systems.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the healthcare providers, staff and especially the patients at the Mosaic Refugee Health Clinic for their many contributions. Our sincere thanks for support from the Refugee Health YYC research team and the institutional support provided by the O'Brien Institute for Public Health, at the University of Calgary Cumming School of Medicine.

Declaration of Interests: None.

Funding: None.

Author Contributions: EN conducted data collection and analysis for both quantitative and qualitative phases, created visualizations, performed integration analysis, and led manuscript writing. LH double-coded qualitative data and contributed to integration and interpretation. GEF assisted in data analysis and contributed to interpretation of findings. RG improved the visual design of figures and diagrams. TW provided expertise in statistical methods and assisted in data analysis. LH, MYE, GEF, RG, KM, PR, RT, AC, and SM reviewed and edited the manuscript and approved the final version.

References

1. UNHCR. Global Trends: Forced displacement in 2023 [Internet]. Geneva: UNHCR; [cited 2024 Nov 17]. Available from: <https://www.unhcr.org/global-trends>
2. UNHCR. The 1951 Refugee Convention [Internet]. Geneva: UNHCR; [cited 2024 Mar 11]. Available from: <https://www.unhcr.org/about-unhcr/who-we-are/1951-refugee-convention>
3. Blanchet K, Nam SL, Ramalingam B, Pozo-Martin F. Governance and capacity to manage resilience of health systems: towards a new conceptual framework. *Int J Health Policy Manag.* 2017;6(8):431.
4. Ismail SA, Bell S, Chalabi Z, Fouad FM, Mechler R, Tomoaia-Cotisel A, et al. Conceptualising and assessing health system resilience to shocks: a cross-disciplinary view. *Wellcome Open Res.* 2022;7.
5. Alameddine M, Fouad FM, Diaconu K, Jamal Z, Lough G, Witter S, Ager A. Resilience capacities of health systems: accommodating the needs of Palestinian refugees from Syria. *Soc Sci Med.* 2019;220:22-30.
6. World Health Organization. WHO guidance for climate resilient and environmentally sustainable health care facilities [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2020 [cited 2024 Nov 17]. Available from: <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/335909>
7. Refugee Health YYC. Characterizing Canada's Refugee Healthcare System Amidst a Global Migration Crisis [Internet]. Calgary: Refugee Health YYC; [cited 2024 Sep 27]. Available from: <https://blog.rh2c.org/ccrhs>
8. Kay M, Jackson C, Nicholson C. Refugee health: a new model for delivering primary health care. *Aust J Prim Health.* 2010;16(1):98-103. doi:10.1071/PY09048.
9. Kohler G, Holland T, Sharpe A, Irwin M, Sampalli T, MacDonell K, et al. The Newcomer Health Clinic in Nova Scotia: a beacon clinic to support the health needs of the refugee population. *Int J Health Policy Manag.* 2018;7(12):1085-9. doi:10.15171/ijhpm.2018.54.
10. Antonipillai V, Baumann A, Hunter A, Wahoush O, O'Shea T. Health Inequity and "Restoring Fairness" Through the Canadian Refugee Health Policy Reforms: A Literature Review. *J Immigr Minor Health.* 2018;20(1):203-13. doi:10.1007/s10903-016-0486-z
11. Immigration, Refugees, and Citizenship Canada (IRCC). #WelcomeRefugees: Key figures [Internet]. Ottawa: IRCC; 2015 [cited 2024 Mar 11]. Available from: <https://www.canada.ca/en/immigration-refugees-citizenship/services/refugees/welcome-syrian-refugees/key-figures.html>
12. Janzen R, English Leis K, Ochocka J. The impact of Syrian refugee arrivals on local systems of support in Canada. *J Int Migr Integr.* 2021;22(4):1221-42. doi:10.1007/s12134-020-00792-z
13. Wilkinson L, Bhattacharyya P, Riziki A, Abdul-Karim AB. Yazidi Resettlement in Canada—Final Report 2018 [Internet]. Winnipeg: Manitoba Association of Newcomer Serving Organizations; 2019 [cited 2024 Mar 11]. Available from: <https://mansomanitoba.ca/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/YAZIDI-FINAL-FEB14.pdf>
14. Jenkins EK, McAuliffe C, Hirani S, et al. A portrait of the early and differential mental health impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic in Canada: Findings from the first wave of a nationally representative cross-sectional survey. *Prev Med.* 2021;145:106333. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2020.106333

15. Hassan N, Coakley A, Al Masri I, Talavlikar R, Aucoin M, Grewal R, et al. Sociodemographic characteristics and mental and physical health diagnoses of Yazidi refugees who survived the Daesh genocide and resettled in Canada. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2023;6(7)
16. Smati H, Hassan N, Essar MY, Abdaly F, Noori S, Grewal R, et al. Health status and care utilization among Afghan refugees newly resettled in Calgary, Canada between 2011-2020 [Internet]. medRxiv; 2024 [cited 2024 Dec 2]. p. 2024.06.21.24309182. Available from: <https://www.medrxiv.org/content/10.1101/2024.06.21.24309182v1>
17. Spiegel PB, Karadag O, Blanchet K, Undie CC, Mateus A, Horton R. The CHH–Lancet Commission on Health, Conflict, and Forced Displacement: reimagining the humanitarian system. *Wellcome Open Res*. [Year unknown];[cited 2024 Nov 17].
18. Refugee Health YYC. About Refugee Health YYC [Internet]. Calgary: Refugee Health YYC; [cited 2024 Sep 27]. Available from: <https://blog.rh2c.org/about>
19. World Health Organization Regional Offices [Internet]. [cited 2024 Nov 25]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/about/who-we-are/regional-offices>
20. StataCorp. Stata Statistical Software: Release 18. College Station, TX: StataCorp LLC; 2023.
21. One platform to connect | Zoom [Internet]. [cited 2024 Nov 25]. Available from: <https://www.zoom.com/>
22. The concept of integration in mixed methods research: a step-by-step guide using an example study in physiotherapy [Internet]. [cited 2024 Nov 25]. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/09593985.2022.2120375>
23. COVID-19's impact on hospital services | CIHI [Internet]. [cited 2024 Nov 25]. Available from: <https://www.cihi.ca/en/covid-19-resources/impact-of-covid-19-on-canadas-health-care-systems/hospital-services>
24. Fabreau GE. Vicarious Trauma: The Hazard and Joy of Caring for Refugees. *Ann Intern Med*. 2020 Jun 16;172(12):830–1.
25. World Health Organization. Monitoring the building blocks of health systems: a handbook of indicators and their measurement strategies [Internet]. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2010 [cited 2024 Nov 25]. Available from: <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/258734>
26. Thu KM, Bernays S, Abimbola S. A literature review exploring how health systems respond to acute shocks in fragile and conflict-affected countries. *Confl Health*. 2022;16(1):60. doi:10.1186/s13031-022-00484-8.
27. Ismail SA, Tomoaia-Cotisel A, Noubani A, Fouad FM, Trogrlić RŠ, Bell S, et al. Identifying vulnerabilities in essential health services: Analysing the effects of system shocks on childhood vaccination delivery in Lebanon. *Soc Sci Med*. 2024;358:117260. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2024.117260.
28. Towards an understanding of resilience: responding to health systems shocks | Health Policy and Planning | Oxford Academic [Internet]. [cited 2024 Nov 25]. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/heapol/article/33/3/355/4794875?login=false>
29. Barasa EW, Cloete K, Gilson L. From bouncing back, to nurturing emergence: reframing the concept of resilience in health systems strengthening. *Health Policy Plan*. 2017;32(suppl_3). doi:10.1093/heapol/czx118.
30. Witter S, Thomas S, Topp SM, Barasa E, Chopra M, Cobos D, et al. Health system resilience: a critical review and reconceptualisation. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2023 Sep 1;11(9):e1454–8.

Exhibits

Table 1. Cohort Characteristics by Time Period

Characteristic	Patients during Baseline Period Jan 2011 to May 2012 n=1710 (%)	Patients during IFHP Cuts Jun 2012 to Oct 2015 n=3391 (%)	Patients during Syrian Surge Nov 2015 to Jan 2017 n=3191 (%)	Patients during Yazidi Period Feb 2017 to Feb 2020 n=5377 (%)	Patients during COVID-19 Period Mar 2020 to Dec 2020 n= 1608 (%)	Patients during All Time Periods Jan 2011 to Dec 2020 n=10661 (%)
Mean Years of Age at Intake (SD)*	26.5 (16.8)	25.5 (16.7)	25.0 (16.9)	24.9 (17.5)	24.3 (18.1)	24.5 (17.1)
Sex						
Female	886 (51.8)	1669 (49.2)	1481 (46.4)	2538 (47.2)	794 (49.4)	5094 (47.8)
Male	824 (48.2)	1722 (50.8)	1709 (53.6)	2832 (52.7)	814 (50.6)	5567 (52.2)
WHO Region of Origin						
African Region	684 (40.0)	1626 (48.0)	1321 (41.4)	2287 (42.5)	586 (36.4)	4408 (41.3)
Eastern Mediterranean	447 (26.14)	823 (24.3)	1253 (39.3)	1868 (34.7)	676 (42.0)	3550 (33.3)
European Region	55 (3.2)	86 (2.5)	30 (0.9)	196 (3.7)	12 (0.8)	312 (2.9)
Americas	163 (9.5)	315 (9.3)	262 (8.2)	673 (12.5)	227 (14.1)	1169 (11.0)
South-East Asia	168 (9.8)	333 (9.8)	180 (5.6)	129 (2.4)	25 (1.6)	532 (5.0)
Western Pacific	14 (0.8)	50 (1.5)	51 (1.6)	52 (1.0)	9 (0.6)	103 (1.0)
Missing	179 (10.5)	158 (4.7)	94 (3.0)	172 (3.2)	73 (4.5)	595 (5.6)
Refugee Category						
Government Assisted Refugee	248 (14.5)	1154 (34.0)	1416 (44.4)	2153 (40.0)	940 (58.5)	3991 (37.4)
Privately Sponsored Refugee	224 (13.1)	1173 (34.6)	1065 (33.4)	1456 (27.1)	211 (13.1)	2891 (27.1)
Asylum Claimant	99 (5.8)	311 (9.2)	426 (13.5)	1377 (25.6)	330 (20.5)	1815 (17.0)
Newborn Canadian	28 (1.6)	167 (5.0)	114 (3.6)	267 (5.0)	107 (6.7)	496 (4.7)
Missing	1111 (65.0)	586 (17.3)	170 (5.3)	124 (2.3)	20 (1.2)	1476 (13.8)

*SD denotes standard deviation from the mean.

Table 2. Health System Capacities

Time Period	Capacity Dimension	Summary	Quote*
Baseline	Knowledge	The centre developed by establishing health programs tailored to specific needs, including treatment or screening for reproductive health, tuberculosis testing, hepatitis, and obstetrical medicine.	<i>[A pregnant patient] arrived [at an external obstetrician's office] without an interpreter, and [the obstetrician] wrote a handwritten note to me, because I had referred the patient, saying that if these babies died, it would be on my head for not arranging a translator... And that's when I went back to upgrade my obstetrical skills. –LISA2</i>
	Uncertainties	Foundational challenges such as health centre budgets to keep the operation sustainable created uncertainty.	<i>The other thing I had to do was balanced the budget. The more you get to know the refugees, the more you identify things that might benefit from a programmatic approach. We were over budget,...which meant cutting staff... We just couldn't afford everybody. –SUSAN4</i>
	Interdependence	Providers relied on each other and external providers to ensure patients' needs were met.	<i>Everything was just by pushing rocks uphill, and seeking out help. It wasn't just me, we worked as a team. We would refer our patients with hepatitis B to the hepatitis clinic... We drove down to Brooks [a different municipality] and provided a consult clinic. –LISA2</i>
	Legitimacy	The health centre established its institutional legitimacy through foundational governance documents and ensured sustainability through balancing the operational budget.	<i>I did get the budget balanced... I did get a Memorandum of Understanding signed, [those two things] are probably my two largest achievements as the medical director. –SUSAN4</i>
	Vulnerabilities	Roles and responsibilities were not clearly understood at first, and this created friction between stakeholders.	<i>The problem is when [the health centre] started, it started with a group of doctors forming an alternate reimbursement plan,... to get funded for their services, and the administrative services and the facility was provided by [resettlement organization]. There was not always agreement on how the clinic should be run by the administrative arm and the docs. So a memorandum of understanding was needed. –SUSAN4</i>
IFHP Cuts	Knowledge	Staff and providers understood the implications of the funding cuts and used this knowledge to advocate for their restoration.	<i>Everybody was so upset, like we were scared like what will happen like once those cuts are happening. Like there was those demonstrations in downtown, right, all the healthcare providers throughout the country, they were worried about...how we will be able to provide a better service for these new people, new Canadians...when they need lots of support...if they need immediate help, health issues of concern, how we could address this?...–SARAH8</i>
	Uncertainties	Participants claimed the IFHP cuts resulted in uncertainty in how they could continue to provide high quality care to patients.	<i>Canada was accepting all those people who has complex medical issues. So if we are bringing people who are complex, who are in need of like, essential things, and then all of a sudden, people are here, but resources are limited... So you will be thinking, 'how we can help? How we can provide them a better service?' This was like the fear that we had, and then [it] really happened. –SARAH8</i>

	Interdependence	Physicians created a donation account to cover patient medication costs, establishing interdependent relationships with pharmacies that invoiced the health centre directly.	<i>We developed relationships with a couple of pharmacies. So when we added the prescription donation account that they would send the clinic the bill, rather than bill a patient, and then we would directly compensate the pharmacy. –AMY5</i>
	Legitimacy	The centre demonstrated legitimacy by creating a donation account to cover medication costs for patients.	<i>Most of our most of our patients live in poverty and can't afford basic medications. So... we developed our donation account with the Calgary Health Trust. From the donation account, we were able to provide coverage for our patients. –AMY5</i>
	Vulnerabilities	While the health centre took measures to reduce the impact of the cuts, not all of the impact could be mitigated.	<i>The IFH cuts, I would say, are, were the most difficult of times, because a lot of our patients lost their coverage for health services. And so of course, that made our lives very difficult... In fact, one patient eventually died because of that lack of care. –AMY5</i>
	Knowledge	Lack of knowledge about the large volume increase necessitated adaptation.	<i>You know, we got big volume. So the information was not shared 100% with us... Sometimes one family was supposed to go to one clinic, then we ended up sending them to another because we didn't have all the information. –SARAH8</i>
Syrian Surge	Uncertainties	There was uncertainty about how the health centre would handle the unprecedented volume of new patients.	<i>[The Syrian period was] chaos, chaos. You know, we tried to prepare, we had a couple months to prepare, but nothing can prepare you. –MARY1</i>
	Interdependence	The health centre collaborated with external partners and internal staff to innovate solutions.	<i>Everyone pulled together to do what we could and to think outside the box, you know, innovate as we as we went... Nothing really prepares you, but it all helped us really get through it. –MARY1</i>
	Legitimacy	The health centre demonstrated its institutional legitimacy through rapid care assessment and provision.	<i>I do think just the amount of care we were able to provide... To have everyone assessed within 24 hours to seven days of arrival, and then start managing getting the care they needed, I think it was incredible. –CANDACE6</i>
	Vulnerabilities	The sudden increase in volume was considered an unnecessary vulnerability.	<i>There were too many new refugees that were coming at once. It didn't need to be that fast. It was just this political [expletive] thing... They just wanted to make the headlines. –CANDACE6</i>
	Knowledge	Health centre staff needed to develop knowledge on handling complex mental health cases.	<i>We had meetings focusing on youth mental health for the refugees. Our questions at the time were like how do you help a child who's been trained to be a child soldier? Or a child who was sold into sexual slavery to overcome that trauma?" –CANDACE6</i>
Yazidi	Uncertainties	Leadership was uncertain how to accommodate the severe trauma experienced by the Yazidi.	<i>To be honest it felt awful in a way. You know, I think that's the only way I can describe it... I get teary thinking about I think the trauma is still there for so many, right. And I don't know if we ever or could have ever been prepared to deal with it. –MARY1</i>
	Interdependence	The health centre collaborated with patients, advocates and media to push for family reunification.	<i>They were very desperate to have their family members who they were separated from join them here in Canada, and we wrote all those advocacy letters, we advocated very hard for some families. –AMY5</i>

	Legitimacy	The health centre built legitimacy by successfully advocating for Yazidi family reunifications.	<i>We advocated for their family reunification. And those families were reunited. I think that built a tonne of trust, where they finally sort of recognized that we as a health team are on their side... I think that was the success with the Yazidi. –AMY5</i>
	Vulnerabilities	The primary vulnerability during the Yazidi period the vicarious trauma experienced by clinicians and staff.	<i>With Yazidi, the volume was not that high, but again, the complexity and the language barrier, and mental health was the biggest challenge ... it was like, like, really overwhelming, –SARAH8</i>
COVID-19	Knowledge	Health centre providers quickly gained knowledge adapted practices to address COVID-19 and implemented new protocols to manage the crisis.	<i>I just don't even think we knew what was coming. And I actually commend the physicians at the clinic because they're used to seeing infectious disease... They were early adopters, in trying to innovate in terms of the response. So specifically, to the refugee clinic, I think that was immensely helpful.–MARY1</i>
	Uncertainties	The clinic had learned to cope with uncertainties due to its stress inoculation through previous shocks.	<i>As a leader of an entire organization, we had no idea how to-- We're constantly learning and things were constantly changing, right? Every time we created a policy, something changed, right? ... We learned more about COVID. 'Okay, now we have to wear masks and goggles' ... It's constantly changing. And I think that is a constant challenge for everyone. [But], you look at the refugee clinic. And there, you have to be innovators, because you're constantly adapting, you know, to new challenges and new things coming. So in some ways that helped the refugee clinic. –MARY1</i>
	Interdependence	Clinic leadership and patients quickly identified interdependence challenges such as transportation during the pandemic.	<i>The other challenge was if somebody's positive or symptomatic... you don't want the client to go on the bus and expose so many people. But the taxis were not taking anybody. –SARAH8</i>
	Legitimacy	The physicians were able to care not only for patients at the health centre, but also lent their expertise to benefit the broader health system.	<i>We were really able to lend the expertise of our physician group, to some of those outbreaks that occurred within the province... So our physicians were able to lend their cultural competencies, their tropical medicine, all of those competencies over to those outbreaks and really help the system address and manage them. –JANET7</i>
	Vulnerabilities	The uncertainty of what would come next, coupled with the long hours and change fatigue created burnout.	<i>It's that change fatigue, right? People wanted stability, and people wanted clarity, and an under solid understanding of how to prepare and it just wasn't there... COVID is, like the last thing that made me, you know, leave completely and it wasn't anyone's fault. It was just unbelievably taxing. I don't think I've worked ever worked so many hours as in COVID, you know, and it just so it burns people out. I burnt out. –MARY1</i>

* All names used in this table are pseudonyms and do not correspond to actual participants to ensure confidentiality and compliance with ethical standards.

Table 3. Integration Matrix

Shock	Quantitative Findings	Qualitative Findings*	Integrated Findings	Outcomes
IFHP Cuts	<p>Monthly family physician appointments remained stable, from 399 to 376.5 (p = 0.21).</p> <p>Family physician supply remained similar, from 320 to 332 hours per month.</p>	<p><i>“The IFH cuts didn't really have an impact on our attended clinic appointments. It didn't really affect the number of patients that we saw, because we would see people whether or not they were covered by IFH or [provincial health coverage]. So we saw people, irrespective of their coverage... In fact, [we saw] new refugee claimants who had no coverage at all.” - AMY5</i></p> <p><i>“The IFHP cuts didn't actually impact us directly for the clinic operations. They impacted the refugees.” - SUSAN4</i></p>	<p>Convergence: Quantitative stability aligns with qualitative findings of no major impact on clinic operations despite policy changes.</p> <p>Expansion: Qualitative data indicates that although utilization and provider supply were not impacted, it was a difficult time due to the increased burden on patients.</p>	<p>Absorptive Capacity: Quantitative and qualitative findings indicate that care levels mostly remained stable despite the shock. This was the most convergent capacity between our quantitative and qualitative findings.</p> <p>Adaptive Capacity: Clinicians adapted to the reduced financial resources by creating a donation account for patients to receive similar levels of care. This adaptation was temporary, not long term-transformation.</p> <p>Operational Burden: The burden of this shock was primarily the financial (to patients directly, and to providers who donated to the trust account), and quality of care, as some patients were no longer able to get necessary medications, despite the providers' efforts.</p>

Syrian Surge	<p>Significant increase in total appointments per month, from 610.8 to 937.9 ($p < 0.01$).</p> <p>Family physician supply increased from 423.1 to 683.2 hours per month.</p> <p>MDT supply increased from 152.8 to 366 hours.</p>	<p><i>"I think what was beautiful was that the passion to serve was there. No matter how tired people were, they were still so invested in the work. You could just see it in the way people interact with the patients that would come into the clinic. I think that was really beautiful."</i> - CANDACE6</p> <p><i>"Everybody came together to discuss issues and meet the needs of the Syrians. It was a big community project, and everybody was enthusiastic and engaged... I think that those collaborations have served us well over the subsequent years."</i> - AMY5</p>	<p>Convergence: Quantitative increases in appointments and provider hours are supported by qualitative reflections on intense collaboration and engagement.</p> <p>Divergence: Qualitative accounts highlight the emotional investment and fatigue that quantitative data alone do not capture.</p>	<p>Transformative Capacity: Significant increases in all provider appointment change rate and doubling of MDT appointments.</p> <p>Operational Burden: Heavy burden on infrastructure due to the sudden increase in volume but not a proportional increase in supply. Leadership perceived this "chaos" as impacting provider wellbeing by creating uncertainty and stress.</p>
Yazidi Resettlement	<p>No significant change in mean monthly appointments in any provider category. (All providers $p=0.29$, family physicians $p=0.86$, MDT $p=11$, specialists $p=0.21$)</p> <p>No significant change in monthly appointment rate of change for any providers. (All providers $p=0.78$, family physicians $p=0.29$, MDT $p=0.10$, specialists $p=0.21$)</p>	<p><i>"I am surprised that the numbers did not go up when you got the Survivors of Daesh. Certainly, they created a great deal more work for us. But we may not have had the psych support, because we didn't increase our psych support exponentially."</i> - SUSAN4</p> <p><i>"I think the beauty of the clinic is that we are adaptable... What really cinched it was when we did the advocacy for [the Yazidi]. They were very desperate to have their family members who they were separated from join them here in Canada, and we wrote all those advocacy letters, we advocated very hard... I think we did well in being flexible, adaptable, and being allies of our patients and going outside the box in terms of allyship."</i> - AMY5</p>	<p>Divergence: Qualitative findings repeatedly emphasize the large perceived impact on staff and provider wellbeing which is not captured in the quantitative data.</p> <p>Expansion: In addition to emphasizing the vicarious trauma experienced by staff and providers, lack of sufficient mental health support could explain the absence of quantitative care level increases.</p>	<p>Adaptive Capacity: The health centre advocated for family reunification to improve quality of care for patients.</p> <p>Absorptive Capacity: No significant change in mean level or rate of change of overall monthly appointments, despite reported increased patient need.</p> <p>Operational Burden: Large perceived impact on provider wellbeing. No significant change in clinic utilization and qualitative findings indicate that there lacked a proportionate investment to meet the increased mental health needs of patients, shifting some operational to quality of care.</p>

COVID-19	<p>Significant increase in the slope of monthly appointments, from 6.3 to 110.4 additional appointments per month ($p < 0.01$).</p> <p>Specialist monthly supply hours were nearly halved, from 78.6 hours per month to 41.9 hours per month).</p>	<p><i>We were so busy with the other stuff, dealing with all these pandemic problems like COVID... We were busy, but we changed the workstyle. So like, from in-person, to virtual appointments, lots and lots of phone appointments. And then we were part of all these COVID vaccine clinics. -SARAH8</i></p> <p><i>It's our same panel, but more frequent follow up. And I think that's because of the whole issue with telephone appointments and working through language barriers and cultural barriers and health literacy barriers... Also, our patients are at higher risk of complications of COVID-19, it would have required more frequent follow up. So I think that's what's responsible for that uptick. -AMY5</i></p>	<p>Convergence: Quantitative data on rising appointments and provider hours aligns with qualitative accounts of constant adaptation and innovative responses to the pandemic.</p> <p>Expansion: The significant drop in specialist appointments is the only sustained decrease in a quantitative metric in our visualizations.</p>	<p>Adaptive/Transformative Capacity: Highly significant increases in appointment rate of change. Virtual appointments demonstrate an adaptation to the pandemic. If sustained this would indicate a transformation.</p> <p>Disruption of Specialist Provider Services: Monthly specialist provider hours per month fell from 78.6 to 41.9, close to the baseline level of 37.2 hours per month.</p> <p>Operational Burden: Qualitative participants described staff and provider burnout and reduced wellbeing. Perceived patient care was reduced due to technology and language barriers.</p>
Overall Resilience	<p>Overall increase from first to last study time point: from 455 to 2208 monthly appointments ($p < 0.01$).</p> <p>Family physician supply increased more than twofold; MDT supply increased over 14-fold.</p>	<p><i>"We started with two rooms, and [look] where it is today. It is astonishing to see what made the difference every step of the way." - LISA2</i></p> <p><i>"We are very flexible. The team would give you support material, respecting client's tradition, culture, [instructing] how to adapt, how to be open, how we could welcome them, by making things flexible." - SARAH8</i></p>	<p>Convergence: Qualitative findings corroborate the large increases in clinic utilization and provider supply.</p> <p>Expansion: Qualitative findings also indicate the health centre aimed to be flexible and meet patients' needs for cultural sensitivity.</p>	<p>Transformative Capacity: Large, sustained improvements across care utilization, provider monthly hours, and perceived quality of care.</p> <p>Operational Burden: To accomplish this transformation over ten years the health centre expanded its infrastructure, workforce, materials such as interpretation services and protective masks, and finances to pay for these improvements. Responses to shocks often came at the expense of clinician wellbeing.</p>

*All names used in this table are pseudonyms and do not correspond to actual participants to ensure confidentiality and compliance with ethical standards.








Figure 1. Resilience and Burden Framework, adapted from Blanchet et al. (2017)










Figure 2. Monthly Appointments Across Shock Periods by Provider Type



Figure 2a. All Providers: Monthly appointments for all providers are displayed from March 2011 to December 2020. A significant increase in appointment levels occurred between the IFHP Cuts and Syrian Surge periods (427.5 to 610.8, $p < 0.01$). During the COVID-19 period, the rate of monthly appointment changes increased dramatically (6.3 to 110.4 appointments/month, $p < 0.01$).



Figure 2b. Family Physicians: Monthly appointments with family physicians are shown between March 2011 and December 2020. Appointment levels increased significantly from the IFHP Cuts to Syrian Surge periods (376.5 to 683.2, $p < 0.01$). A substantial increase in the rate of monthly changes was observed during COVID-19 (64.6 appointments/month, $p < 0.01$).

Figure 2c. Multidisciplinary Team (MDT): Monthly MDT appointments are displayed from March 2011 to December 2020. Significant increases were observed in both levels and rates of change, including a level increase from the IFHP Cuts Final (26.2) to Syrian Surge Final (156.5, $p = 0.01$), and a rate increase from Yazidi (3.7) to COVID-19 (45.7, $p < 0.01$).

Figure 2d. Specialist Physicians: Monthly specialist physician appointments are shown between March 2011 and December 2020. A significant decrease in appointment levels was observed during COVID-19, dropping from Yazidi Resettlement Final (66.3) to COVID-19 Initial (32.9, $p < 0.01$). No significant changes in the rate of monthly appointments were observed across the shock periods.

Annotations: Start and end levels (appointments/month) and rates of change are labeled for each period. Bolded values denote statistical significance ($p < 0.05$) at a two-tailed alpha level of 0.05.









Figure 3. Provider Hours and Appointments Across Shock Periods

Figure 3a. Overall Provider Supply and Patient Utilization: Monthly provider hours (black line) are displayed alongside monthly appointments (black circles) for all providers between March 2011 and December 2020. Horizontal lines indicate the mean provider hours worked during each shock period: Baseline, IFHP Cuts, Syrian Surge, Yazidi Resettlement, and COVID-19.

Figure 3b. Family Physician Supply and Patient Utilization: Monthly family physician hours (black line, scaled 5:1) are overlaid on monthly family physician appointments (black circles) between March 2011 and December 2020. Horizontal lines show the mean hours worked by family physicians during each shock period.

Figure 3c. Multidisciplinary Team (MDT) Supply and Patient Utilization: Monthly MDT hours (black line) are displayed alongside monthly MDT appointments (black circles) from March 2011 to December 2020. Horizontal lines represent the mean hours worked by MDT members during each shock period.

Figure 3d. Specialist Physician Supply and Patient Utilization: Monthly specialist physician hours (black line) are overlaid on monthly specialist appointments (black circles) between March 2011 and December 2020. Horizontal lines illustrate the mean hours worked by specialist physicians for each shock period.