

Part VII Supplement - AI Scribe Market Analysis, Extended Data

Ayers Software in Practice Survey: Supplemental Analysis

Jonathan Ayers and Adam Wysocki | April 6, 2026

TL;DR

- **This supplement adds to the original Part VII with extended analysis.**
- **Practice counts understate large-practice vendors.** FTE-weighted analysis shows VetRec's clinical footprint is nearly triple its practice-weighted share (14.8% vs. 5.8%), driven by large specialty and corporate hospitals. CoVet also shifts meaningfully upward under FTE weighting.
- **Bundled scribes have not gained traction.** Even with cloud-based PIMS platforms with built-in scribes, offered at low incremental subscription cost, independent scribe vendors capture 3x to 7x more users with their own customers. The best-performing built-in scribe captures only 13% of its own platform's clinical staff, versus 38% adoption of independent vendor scribes.
- **No single PIMS-bundle scribe exceeds 1.9% share.** Disaggregating the 8.6% PIMS-embedded total reveals no individual built-in scribe above 1.9%. The 10:1 independent-to-PIMS ratio reported in Part VII holds at the individual product level.

Why a Supplement?

Part VII of this series, published April 1, 2026, presented the first statistically representative measurement of AI scribe adoption and market share across English-speaking North America. The paper generated significant industry attention and, more importantly, substantive feedback from independent scribe vendors and other industry participants that adds meaningful context to the original findings.

This supplement extends the Part VII analysis in four directions, each driven by specific feedback from industry participants or by analytical limitations in the original methodology. The original findings stand; these additional lenses add depth.

First, **the cloud PIMS built-in scribe test.** Both IDEXX (ezyVet) and CoVetrus (Pulse/eVetPractice) offer cloud-native PIMS with built-in AI scribe features. Their installed bases provide a natural experiment: when a PIMS vendor bundles an integrated scribe at low incremental cost and easy, integrated access, how much of its own customer base does it capture versus the independent scribe vendors? The answer is relevant to the strategic question at the center of this series.

Second, **alternative measures of market footprint.** The original paper weighted market share by practice count. Several industry participants raised a valid point: a simple practice-count weighting systematically understates vendors concentrated in large multi-vet hospitals. A scribe vendor with 50 practices averaging 7 veterinarians (350 veterinarians reached), for example, looks smaller than a vendor with 100 practices averaging 2 veterinarians (200 veterinarians reached).

This supplement introduces FTE-weighted share as an alternative lens.

Third, it also examines what the market would look like by **adding French-speaking Canada** (Quebec, approximately 1,080 practices), which was excluded from the survey because the survey was conducted only in English-speaking parts of Canada.

We make an adjustment of country weighting to include Quebec, with certain assumptions. This increases the Canadian weight in the North American analysis (US and Canada combined).

Fourth, **individual PIMS scribe market share**. Part VII grouped the six PIMS-embedded scribes together as a combined 8.6% share. This supplement disaggregates that figure to show each PIMS scribe individually, revealing adoption figures for each product individually.

1. The Cloud PIMS Built-In Scribe Test: ezyVet vs. Pulse

Both ezyVet (IDEXX) and Pulse/eVetPractice (CoVetrus) are large cloud-native PIMS platforms in North America. Collectively, they account for close to 7,000 US practice locations.¹ Both have introduced built-in AI scribe features. Their customer bases present a controlled comparison: do practices on a cloud PIMS with a bundled scribe option still choose independent scribe vendors?

The answer is overwhelmingly yes.

Platform Demographics

The two platforms serve different practice populations. ezyVet practices average 6.0 veterinarian FTEs with a median of 4.0, and 35% are corporate-owned. Pulse practices average 3.4 FTEs with a median of 3.0, and 28% are corporate. Both have a reasonable number of practices in the survey from which to draw conclusions: ezyVet has 188 practices (164 US, 24 Canada); Pulse has 83 (76 US, 7 Canada). ezyVet's clinical staff is 60% associates, reflecting its corporate tilt. Pulse's clinical staff is more evenly split between owners (48%) and associates (43%), consistent with its concentration in smaller independent practices.

Metric	ezyVet (IDEXX)	Pulse (CoVetrus)
Total practices	188	83
US / Canada	164 / 24	76 / 7
Avg vet FTE	6.0	3.4
Independent / Corporate	64% / 35%	72% / 28%
Clinical staff	168	77

Source: ASIPS/Kynetec PRJ17655. All practices using ezyVet (QA1=6) or Pulse/eVetPractice (QA1=12).

Scribe Adoption: Near-Parity Despite Different Profiles

Despite different practice profiles, clinical staff personal scribe adoption rates are nearly identical: **51.2% on ezyVet versus 50.6% on Pulse**. Practice-level adoption (at least one scribe user) is 67.6% for ezyVet and 61.4% for Pulse. These are both higher than the overall market averages. This makes sense: practices that have adopted a cloud-based PIMS are typically more progressive and therefore stronger candidates to adopt a scribe application.

¹ Source, yet to be published research from the ASIPS/Kynetec study.

The convergence at the individual clinician level is striking: scribe adoption has reached effective parity across cloud PIMS regardless of practice size or ownership profile.

Adoption Metric	ezyVet	Pulse
Practice-level (QB7)	67.6%	61.4%
US	65.9%	57.9%
US Independent	55.6%	55.6%
US Corporate	84.1%	63.6%
Clinical staff personal	51.2%	50.6%
Owners/partners	47.4%	35.1%
Associates	59.0%	66.7%
Vet techs	30.0%	57.1%

Source: ASIPS/Kynetec. Clinical staff = vets (owners + associates) + vet techs.

Product Choice: Independents Dominate Both Platforms

Where the two platforms diverge is in *which* scribes they choose. On ezyVet, 84.9% of scribe users select one of the top four independent products (ScribbleVet, CoVet, ScribeNote, VetRec). On Pulse, only 56.4% do. The remaining Pulse scribe users are fragmented across Talkatoo, Otto, PetDesk Scribe (all also independent) and the Pulse built-in AI scribe.

Scribe Product	ezyVet (% clinical)	Pulse (% clinical)
ScribbleVet	19.0%	11.7%
CoVet	14.3%	11.7%
ScribeNote	6.0%	6.5%
VetRec	4.8%	1.3%
Top 4 Independent	43.5%	28.6%
All Independent	44.7%	37.6%
Built-in PIMS scribe (write-in)	6.5%	13.0%
Any scribe (personal use)	51.2%	50.6%

Source: ASIPS/Kynetec. % of all clinical staff on each platform, including non-scribe-users. Built-in scribe from QB8C6O write-in classification.

When all independent vendors are combined, including Talkatoo, Otto, and PetDesk Scribe beyond the top four, independent scribes account for **44.7%** of ezyVet clinical staff and **37.6%** of Pulse clinical staff. That compares to 6.5% and 13.0%, respectively, for each platform’s built-in scribe. On both platforms, independent vendors collectively capture roughly **3-7 times more** of the clinical audience than the bundled alternative.

The Built-In Scribe: Pulse Does Better Within Its Own Base

The Pulse built-in AI scribe captures 13.0% of its platform’s clinical staff, compared to 6.5% for ezyVet’s built-in scribe. On its face, Pulse’s built-in offering appears to be performing about twice

as well within its own ecosystem. However, this adoption rate pales in comparison to the adoption of independent, scribe-focused vendors on both Pulse and ezyVet platforms.

The most likely explanation is practice size, not product preference. Pulse practices average 3.4 veterinarian FTEs with zero practices above 10 FTEs using any top-4 scribe. Smaller practices are presumably less likely to evaluate, select, and subscribe to a standalone scribe product. The built-in option requires no new procurement decision and carries low incremental cost. This path-of-least-resistance dynamic appears to be strongest in the smallest independent practices.

The conclusion remains the same regardless: even where the built-in scribe performs at its relative best, it still captures only about 13.0% of clinical staff versus 37.6% for independent scribe offerings of all types. The independent scribe vendors collectively dominate on both cloud platforms.

The bundled advantage of zero friction and integration with the PIMS is not sufficient to overcome the product quality differences documented in the Part VII satisfaction analysis.

2. Alternative Measures of Scribe Market Footprint

The Part VII market share analysis weighted by practice count and excluded Quebec by design (English-only survey).

We add a look at when we shift from practice-weighted to FTE-weighted measurement.

The Quebec exclusion was methodologically necessary but leaves a significant veterinary population uncaptured. CoVet claims to have an exceptionally strong position in Quebec. This section examines what happens when we account for Quebec, given this claim.

2A. FTE-Weighted Market Share: A Different Lens on Leadership

Most AI scribes charge per veterinarian, not per practice. As one knowledgeable source observed after publication: "Most of the AI scribes out there charge per veterinarian, in general, as that is the core unit of billing and execution when it comes to this product. Naturally, you would calculate adoption (and even revenue) by how many DVMs are using your product." Another participant made the point that the original report "is focused on practices mainly rather than veterinarians," and suggested adding a different lens. This is a legitimate point.

A vendor serving 33 practices that average 12.9 veterinarian FTEs each is reaching a different scale of clinicians than one serving 155 practices averaging 5.9 FTEs. Both are meaningful, but they tell different stories about market position.

The FTE-weighted analysis sums veterinarian FTEs (full-time equivalents, computed as full-time vets plus half of part-time vets) across all US practices mentioning each scribe product. The results shift the rankings meaningfully.

Scribe	Practices	Total Vet FTEs	Avg FTE/ Practice	Median FTE	% of Scribe Vet FTEs
ScribbleVet	155	915.5	5.9	4.5	31.8%
ScribeNote	111	634.5	5.7	4.0	22.0%
CoVet	71	511.0	7.2	4.0	17.7%
VetRec	33	426.0	12.9	5.0	14.8%
Top 4 Combined	370	2,487			86.4%
All scribe users	503	2,879.5	5.7	4.0	

Source: ASIPS/Kynetec PRJ17655, US only. Vet FTEs summed across all US practices mentioning each product. Multiple scribes per practice permitted; FTEs may count under more than one product.

The most significant shift is VetRec. Under practice-count weighting, VetRec held **5.8%** of North American share, fourth among the independents. Under FTE weighting, VetRec rises to **14.8%** of scribe-using vet FTEs, reflecting its 12.9 average FTE per practice, more than double any other top-4 product. This concentration is driven by large corporate specialty/referral hospitals (5 corporate practices in the 10+ FTE band alone contribute 225 FTEs, 53% of VetRec's total) and several very large independent specialty practices, consistent with VetRec's strategic focus.

CoVet's US position also shifts upward under FTE weighting. Its 7.2 average FTE per practice (versus ScribbleVet's 5.9 and ScribeNote's 5.7) reflects a concentration in larger multi-vet hospitals, particularly 11 corporate specialty/referral practices that alone account for 43% of CoVet's US FTE reach. CoVet's FTE-weighted share in the US (**17.7%**) is notably higher than its practice-weighted US share (**14.5%**), confirming the observation that practice-count weighting can compress or expand a scribe vendor's footprint.

ScribbleVet maintains its leading position under both weighting methods. ScribeNote's FTE share (22.0%) is bolstered by its deployment at Mission Pet Health, where 67 corporate practices contribute 472.5 FTEs (75% of ScribeNote's total US FTE reach). Note that this corporate group has chosen an independent scribe over any of its PIMS-embedded offerings, a telling signal from a sophisticated customer.

2B. The Quebec Adjustment

The ASIPS survey was conducted in English only and excluded Quebec. The Canadian Veterinary Medical Association reports 4,694 total veterinary practices nationally. Quebec's 23% share (Statistics Canada Census, 2021) implies approximately 1,080 Quebec practices excluded from the survey's English-speaking Canada weighting base of 3,614.

CoVet commands 70.9% of weighted Canadian scribe share in the survey, reflecting dominant market position in English-speaking Canada. CoVet's claimed position in francophone Quebec is plausibly as strong or stronger, given its Canadian origins and French-language product capabilities, though we have not independently verified this.

When the Canadian weighting base is expanded from 3,614 (English-speaking only) to 4,694 (all Canadian provinces, including Quebec, in the population denominator), the Canadian weight factor increases from 16.7 to 21.7 per respondent. This narrows the US-to-Canada practice ratio from 7.7:1 to 6.0:1, giving more weight to Canadian scribe patterns. The effect is meaningful: CoVet's NA share rises by approximately 2 percentage points, while ScribbleVet's declines by about 1

point. At the full-Canada weighting, ScribbleVet and CoVet are essentially tied for NA leadership at 25.1% and 25.0% respectively, compared to a clear ScribbleVet lead at the English-speaking-only weighting.

The Quebec exclusion means the survey data likely understates CoVet's true North American footprint. Without verified disclosure from CoVet of its actual customer metrics, the precise magnitude of this understatement remains unresolved.

3. Individual PIMS Scribe Market Share

Part VII reported that six PIMS-embedded scribes collectively held 8.6% of North American weighted share, versus 80.5% for the top six independents, a ratio of nearly 10 to 1. This section disaggregates the PIMS-embedded figure to the individual product level, using practice-level scribe mentions (QB8C) from the write-in responses.

Product	US Mentions	CA Mentions	NA Weighted	NA Share	Category	Parent
ScribbleVet	155	1	4,886	24.8%	Indep.	Instinct
CoVet	71	96	3,890	19.7%	Indep.	
ScribeNote	111	11	3,677	18.6%	Indep.	
VetRec	33	3	1,088	5.5%	Indep.	
Talkatoo	24	3	806	4.1%	Indep.	
HappyDoc	18	0	565	2.9%	Indep.	
Top 6 Independents	412	114	14,912	75.5%		
VetSoap (Vetcor proprietary)	16	1	520	2.6%	Corp.	VetCor
Vetspire AI (Thrive)	12	0	377	1.9%	Built-in	Thrive
ezyVet AI	11	1	363	1.8%	Built-in	IDEXX
Pulse/CoVetrus AI	9	1	300	1.5%	Built-in	CoVetrus
Otto (independent)	9	4	352	1.8%	Indep.	
Shepherd AI	7	1	237	1.2%	Built-in	
Digitail AI	2	4	132	0.7%	Built-in	
Neo AI	4	1	143	0.7%	Built-in	IDEXX
Other (ChatGPT, PetDesk - independent, etc.)	14	5	526	2.7%	Mixed	
All PIMS Built-in (6)	45	7	1,534	7.8%		

Source: ASIPS/Kynetec PRJ17655. Practice-level mentions (QB8C coded + QB8C6O write-in classification). NA weighted: US wt=31.41, CA wt=17.29. Talkatoo, Otto, VetSoap, and all PIMS scribes are from write-in responses; actual usage may be higher than captured.

The disaggregated view reveals how thin each individual PIMS scribe's adoption is. No single PIMS-embedded scribe exceeds **1.9%** of North American weighted share. Vetspire AI leads at 1.9%, but only because it likely has an enforced adoption by Thrive Pet Healthcare, Vetspire's parent. This is followed by ezyVet AI at **1.8%**, a better benchmark of market forces.

The two IDEXX scribes combined (ezyVet AI + Neo AI) hold 2.5%. The CoVetrus scribe (Pulse AI) holds 1.5%. VetSoap, the VetCor-proprietary product, holds 2.6%, though its enforced adoption is entirely within a single corporate group, VetCor.

These figures reinforce the central finding of Part VII: PIMS vendors have not been able to leverage the theoretical advantage of integration and ease of access to win meaningful scribe market share. Each PIMS scribe product individually commands less share than HappyDoc (2.9%), the sixth-ranked independent. The product quality gap, documented in the Part VII satisfaction analysis, appears to outweigh the bundling advantage.

4. What the Extended Data Confirms

The supplemental analyses in this paper reinforce the core findings of Part VII and add important additional dimension.

The cloud PIMS comparison shows that even when a PIMS vendor bundles a scribe at low incremental cost into a modern cloud platform with ease of access and integration, the independents still dominate. The built-in scribe captures at best 13% of its own platform's clinical staff. The independents collectively capture 3x to 7x more.

The FTE-weighted analysis shows that vendors concentrated in large multi-vet practices, particularly VetRec and CoVet, have a larger clinical footprint than practice-count weighting suggests. VetRec's FTE share (14.8%) is nearly triple its practice-weighted share (5.8%). CoVet's position is further understated by the exclusion of Quebec.

The individual PIMS scribe breakdown reveals that no single built-in scribe exceeds 1.8% of North American share, when market forces are considered. The 10:1 ratio between independents and PIMS scribes reported in Part VII is not an artifact of aggregation. It holds at the individual product level: each of the top four independents individually outperforms all six PIMS scribes combined.

The implication for PIMS strategy remains the same: the market has spoken. Veterinary clinicians have chosen independent scribe vendors by overwhelming margins, across every cloud platform, every ownership type, and every practice size.

PIMS vendors would serve their customers better by building seamless integration with the products clinicians have already chosen than by doubling down on competing offerings that have achieved single-digit aggregate and sub-2% individual market share. The data is clear on which path creates value for the PIMS and their customers, let alone pet owners and their pets.

Assumptions and Caveats

The supplemental analyses in this paper extend the Part VII findings using alternative methodologies and adjustments. Readers should be aware of the following assumptions and limitations.

FTE weighting is US-only. The FTE-weighted market share analysis (Section 2A) is limited to US practices because the Canadian sample (216 practices) is too small to produce reliable FTE-weighted estimates at the individual scribe product level. Canadian practices are included in all practice-weighted analyses.

Multi-scribe practices create overlap. Both practice-count and FTE-weighted analyses permit a single practice to appear under multiple scribe products. Shares therefore sum to more than 100% across products. This reflects the survey instrument, which allowed respondents to select multiple scribes in use at their practice.

Quebec adjustment assumes comparable adoption patterns. The Quebec adjustment (Section 2B) expands the Canadian population denominator from 3,614 to 4,694 practices. This assumes that scribe adoption patterns among Quebec veterinarians are at least comparable to those in English-speaking Canada. Given CoVet's Canadian origins and French-language capabilities, this is a conservative assumption for CoVet and may *overstate* the position of vendors without French-language support.

PIMS scribe classification involves judgment. Individual PIMS-embedded scribe figures (Section 3) are derived from write-in responses (QB8C6O) that required manual classification. Some respondents may have described their PIMS scribe in terms that were ambiguous or difficult to attribute to a specific product. These figures should be considered directional rather than precise.

Built-in scribe adoption may be underreported. The survey prompted the top four independent scribes by name but required respondents to write all others, including other independents and PIMS-embedded scribes. The survey design may understate the write-ins, including the built-in scribe adoption relative to prompted independent products. However, the magnitude of the independent-to-PIMS gap (roughly 10:1) is so large that prompting effects alone are unlikely to explain it.

The survey excludes practices that are part of Mars Veterinary Health, including VCA, BluePearl (specialty referral focus), and Banfield. By practice location count, the Mars network is estimated to be 2,200 practices, or 7.3% of the US market. These exclusions were methodologically necessary but mean the survey does not capture the full North American scribe market. Vendors with disproportionate presence in this excluded population may be understated in the reported shares.

Survey Methodology

All data in this supplement is drawn from the same ASIPS/Kynetec Veterinary Practice Software Usage Market Research Study (PRJ17655) described in Part VII. The survey comprised 1,273 validated practices (1,057 US, 216 English-speaking Canada), fielded January 13 to March 4, 2026. Quebec was excluded (English-only survey).

Market-size weighting in Part VII used 30,000 US practices and 3,614 English-speaking Canadian practices. Section 2B expands the Canadian weighting base to the full CVMA count of 4,694 practices. See that section for the rationale and impact on market share.

FTE-weighted analysis uses CLINIC_SIZE (full-time vets + 0.5 times part-time vets) and is limited to US practices only due to the smaller Canadian sample. PIMS scribe identification from write-in responses (QB8C6O) involves classification judgment; individual PIMS scribe figures should be considered directional.