Appendix 5 (as supplied by the authors): Table 5.1 Description of inverse probability weights*

Estimated analytical weights	Mean (SE**; range)
Enrolment in a team-based PC at index admission	
Main analysis	$0.998 \ (0.0007; \ 0.187 - 22.0)$
Left censoring (follow-up visits provided on the day of	
lischarge)	
Follow-up with a primary care provider	$1.024 \ (0.0003; \ 0.638 - 1.74)$
Follow-up with a medical specialist	1.056 (0.0005; 0.606 - 3.34)
Follow-up with any physician	1.067 (0.0005; 0.406 - 2.67)
Censoring by death	
Main analysis	$1.001\ (0.0003;\ 0.973-192)$
Censoring by hospital readmission	
Main analysis	1.017 (0.0004; 0.759 - 42.9)
Combined weights (exposure weights multiplied by	
ensoring weights)	
Main analysis (PCP follow-up)	1.042 (0.0010; 0.099 –
	242.1)
Main analysis (SP follow-up)	1.081 (0.0011; 0.114 –
	240.0)
Main analysis (follow-up with any physician)	1.087 (0.0011; 0.083 –
	167.7)

Abbreviations: PCP, primary care provider; SP, medical specialist.

**Clustered standard errors.

Appendix to: Riverin BD, Li P, Naimi AI, et al. Team-based innovations in primary care delivery in Quebec and timely physician follow-up after hospital discharge: a population-based cohort study. *CMAJ Open* 2017. DOI: 10.9778/cmajo.20160059.

Copyright © 2017 The Author(s) or their employer(s).

^{*}We interpreted as evidence of positivity or propensity score model misspecification if the mean of the stabilized weight was far from zero or if there were extreme values. Truncating- the weights at various percentiles did not yield meaningful improvements in precision based on the standard errors; we chose to use untruncated weights to avoid introducing bias in our analyses.