

Can integration reduce inequity in healthcare utilization?

Evidence and Hurdles in China

Miaomiao Zhao, Baohua Liu, Linghan Shan, Cui Li, Qunhong Wu, Yanhua Hao, Zhuo Chen, Lan Lan, Zheng Kang, Libo Liang, Ning Ning, Mingli Jiao



**University of
Nottingham**

UK | CHINA | MALAYSIA

University of Nottingham Ningbo China, 199 Taikang East Road, Ningbo, 315100, Zhejiang, China.

First published 2019

This work is made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License:

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

The work is licenced to the University of Nottingham Ningbo China under the Global University Publication Licence:

<https://www.nottingham.edu.cn/en/library/documents/research-support/global-university-publications-licence.pdf>



**University of
Nottingham**

UK | CHINA | MALAYSIA

1 **Title Page**

2 **Can integration reduce inequity in healthcare utilization? Evidence and Hurdles in**
3 **China.**

4 *Miaomiao Zhao*^{1,2¶}, *Baohua Liu*^{1¶}, *Linghan Shan*^{1¶}, *Cui Li*¹, *Qunhong Wu*^{1✉}, *Yanhua Hao*^{1✉},
5 *Zhuo Chen*^{3,4}, *Lan Lan*¹, *Zheng Kang*¹, *Libo Liang*¹, *Ning Ning*¹, *Mingli Jiao*¹

6

7 **¶These authors contributed equally to this work.**

8 **✉ Corresponding author:** Qunhong Wu: wuqunhong@163.com,86-0451-87502860

9 Yanhua Hao: hyhyjw@126.com,86-0451-87502851

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27 **Manuscript**28 **Can integration reduce inequity in healthcare utilization? Evidence and**
29 **Hurdles in China.**30 **Abstract**

31 **Background** Integration of medical insurance schemes has been prioritized as one of the key
32 strategies to address inequity in China's health system. The first pilot attempt to integrate started
33 in 2003 and later expanded nationwide. This study aims to assess its intended impact on inequity
34 in inpatient service utilization and identify the main determinants contributing to its
35 ineffectiveness.

36 **Methods** A total of 49,365 respondents in the pilot integrated area and 77,165 respondents in
37 the non-integration area were extracted from the Fifth National Health Services Survey. A
38 comparative analysis was conducted between two types of areas. We calculate a concentration
39 index (CI) and horizontal inequity index (HI) in inpatient service utilization and decompose the
40 two indices.

41 **Results** Insurance integration played a positive role in reducing inequality in inpatient service
42 utilization to some extent. A 13.23% lower in HI, a decrease in unmet inpatient care and financial
43 barriers to inpatient care in the pilot integrated area compared with the non-integration area;
44 decomposition analysis showed that the Urban-Rural Residents Basic Medical Insurance, a type
45 of integrated insurance, contributed 37.49% to reducing inequality in inpatient service utilization.
46 However, it still could not offset the strong negative effect of income and other insurance
47 schemes that have increased inequality.

48 **Conclusions** The earlier pilot attempt for integrating medical insurance was not enough to
49 counteract the influence of factors which increased the inequality in inpatient service utilization.
50 Further efforts to address the inequality should focus on widening access to financing, upgrading
51 the risk pool, reducing gaps within and between insurance schemes, and providing broader
52 chronic disease benefit packages. Social policies that target the needs of the poor with
53 coordinated efforts from various levels and agencies of the government are urgently needed.

54 **Keywords** medical insurance integration, inequity, inequality, inpatient service utilization

55

56 **Background**

57 Equity in healthcare is one of the most important priorities in any healthcare system [1].
58 The achievement of equal access to healthcare is regarded as a key element of health system
59 performance and universal health coverage (UHC) [2, 3]. Equity in healthcare utilization is
60 affected not only by an individual's socioeconomic status [4], but also by fragmentation in
61 healthcare system[5]. Health insurance is one of the most important factors to improve equity in
62 healthcare since it provides a safeguard against risks and barriers to healthcare especially for
63 those who are suffering financial difficulty [6, 7]. In many cases, developing countries are striving
64 to achieve UHC quickly by combining multiple health insurance schemes covering different
65 population groups into fewer or a unified insurance scheme [8]. Meanwhile, differences in
66 government subsidies of the premium and benefit packages offered by the fragmented insurance
67 scheme unexpectedly contribute to inequity in healthcare utilization across groups with different
68 levels of wealth [9, 10]. A study using data from nine developing countries shows the gap of
69 healthcare utilization between the richest and the poorest ranged from 1.7 times to a surprising
70 12 times [11].

71 China achieved the goal of universal coverage of medical insurance swiftly by establishing
72 multiple medical schemes. Since the introduction of social medical insurance in 1990s, insurance
73 coverage gradually expanded. By 2011, about 95% of the Chinese population was covered by a
74 Social Basic Medical Insurance (SBMI) programme including the Urban Employee Basic Medical
75 Insurance (UEBMI), the New Rural Cooperative Medical Scheme (NRCMS), and the Urban
76 Resident Basic Medical Insurance (URBMI) [12]. This achievement is considered to be the first
77 step toward UHC [13]. However, the SBMI system in China was highly segmented. The three
78 schemes were separately administered and operated locally based on different eligibility
79 requirements (employment status, urban and rural household registration) [14]. The UEBMI
80 covered urban employees with the funds contributed from the employers and employees going

81 into a collectively pooled account at the municipal level and an individual medical savings
82 account. The NRCMS was a voluntary medical insurance program for rural residents, which was
83 jointly funded by government subsidies and individual premiums at county-level. The URBMI was
84 for urban residents who were not covered by the UEBMI or NRCMS, and the funds were pooled
85 at the municipal-level with contributions from government subsidies and premiums. Therefore,
86 more than 3000 funds operated independently in the three SBMI schemes [10]. The benefits
87 package of services and medicines provided as well as reimbursement policy varied significantly
88 among different insurance types, resulting in a rapid increase of inequity in healthcare utilization.
89 Previous studies revealed a gap of 2.33 times in actual use of inpatient services between richest
90 and poorest [15].

91 In order to address the inequity problem caused by the fragmented medical insurance
92 system, the Chinese government selected several areas to launch pilot insurance integration
93 reform since 2003. Two kinds of models emerged in the pilot areas. The one which merged the
94 UEBMI, URBMI, and NRCMS into one uniform scheme called Uniform Social Basic Medical
95 Insurance (USBMI). This model was adopted by several high-income cities such as Zhongshan and
96 Dongguan [16, 17]. The other type of pilot only merged the URBMI and NRCMS and is called
97 Urban-Rural Residents Basic Medical Insurance (URRBMI). URRBMI was adopted by most pilots
98 because the financing source and level of contribution of the URBMI and NRCMS were roughly
99 similar. Aspects including unifying enrollees, premiums, pooling level of fund, benefits packages,
100 reimbursements arrangement, and fund management system were involved in reform [18]. With
101 the health reform deepening and fragmentation more recognizable nationwide, Chinese
102 government officially endorsed a nationwide policy for medical insurance integration in 2016 [19].
103 Currently, the national integration reform is still in its initial stage, facing many challenges
104 because of the absence of national guideline. Thus it is timely and fills a critical need to conduct
105 studies about the integration pilots.

106 Current studies on integration reform mainly focus on a theoretical policy analysis [14, 20],
107 and the observational summary of the pilots' experience [21-23]. Some empirical research

108 studied the willingness and satisfaction among enrollees towards integration [18, 24]. Equity in
109 healthcare utilization is advocated as the core goal of integrated reform. However, there is no
110 quantitative study so far that used national representative data to evaluate to what degree this
111 objective has been achieved. Using inequity in inpatient service utilization as the main variable of
112 interest, this study seeks to answer the following questions: how is the inequity in inpatient
113 service utilization in the integrated area comparing with that in the non-integrated area? What is
114 the impact of the insurance integration on inequity? What's the hurdle to implementing
115 insurance integration and how to improve it? Our findings will provide evidential support for
116 future policy development on insurance integration in China and offer lessons to countries that
117 are facing similar challenges.

118 **Method**

119 **Data source**

120 The data was drawn from the Fifth National Health Services Survey (NHSS) in 2013. A
121 multi-stage stratified cluster random sampling method was used and all the responses were
122 self-reported. The NHSS covered 31 provinces with 156 sample areas (including nearly 300,000
123 respondents from 93,600 households).

124 In NHSS, there were 10 provinces whose sample areas had both integration reform pilots
125 and non-integrated areas; 22 pilot areas in these 10 provinces were grouped as the integration
126 group (pilot integrated area) and the remaining 42 non-integrated areas were grouped as the
127 reference group (non-integrated area). In addition, the integration group also include 3 provinces
128 that underwent a total integration reform (therefore has no reference group), we chose 3 other
129 provinces whose sample areas were all without integration reform but with similar social
130 economic levels (per capita GDP) as their reference group. The features and differences of the
131 medical insurance schemes in pilot integration area and non-integrated area are shown in Table 1.
132 Finally, 49,365 respondents from the integrated area and 77,165 respondents from the
133 non-integrated area were sampled.

Table1 Comparison of the medical insurance schemes and its features and differences in integration area and non-integration area

| | integration pilot area | | Non-integration area |
|--------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | Model 1 | Model 2 | |
| Specific arrangement | Merged the three existing insurance schemes (UEBMI, URBMI and NRCMS) into a new scheme--USBMI | Only merged the URBMI and NRCMS into a new scheme—URRBMI, UEBMI was kept. | The three existing insurance schemes still run separately. |
| Population coverage | USBMI covered all population | URRBMI covered urban-rural residents except for urban employees. | UEBMI covered urban employees, URBMI covered urban residents, NRCMS covered rural residents. |
| Pooling level of fund | USBMI was pooled at municipal level. | URRBMI were pooled at municipal level. | UEBMI and URBMI were pooled at municipal level, while NRCMS was pooled at county level. |
| Contribution of premium | All urban employees kept the previous percentage of wage for premium contribution which was shared by employees and employers; the remaining urban and rural residents paid the flat rate, which was also shared by local government. | In URRBMI, urban-rural residents paid uniform flat rate and was shared by individual and government, which was adjusted yearly; the premium level of URRBMI were much higher than un-integrated insurance schemes. | In UEBMI, employees paid percentage of wage for premium contribution which were shared by employees and employers; In URBMI and NRCMS, residents paid the flat rate, which was also shared by local government; the premium level of URBMI was higher than NRCMS |
| Fund management | All the funds were eventually pooled together and were uniformly managed. | The fund of URRBMI were uniformly managed but were separated from UEBMI. | The fund of three schemes were separately managed |
| Benefit package | The benefit package was expanded compared to the previous schemes and was unified for all enrollees. | In URRBMI, the benefit package was expanded compared to the previous URBMI and NRCMS and was unified for urban and rural residents. | UEBMI> URBMI>NRCMS |
| Reimbursement rate | The reimbursement rare was higher than previous schemes and was unified for all enrollees. | In URRBMI, reimbursement rare was higher than previous URBMI and NRCMS and was unified for urban and rural residents. | UEBMI> URBMI>NRCMS |

1 **Variables definition**

2 **Inpatient service utilization** referred to the use of inpatient service in the previous year,
3 which is based on the question “have you been hospitalized in the past year?”

4 **Need factors** included sex, age, self-assessed health, chronic conditions and functional
5 limitation etc.

6 **Non-need factors** were other socio-economic variables which influenced use of healthcare
7 except need factors, which included socioeconomic status, education, occupation, household
8 income, region, and medical insurance etc.

9 **Analytic Approach**

10 In this study, we used a concentration index (CI) to measure the degree of income-related
11 inequality which was derived from the concentration curve that plots the cumulative health care
12 utilization against the cumulative distribution of population ranked by socioeconomic status such
13 as income. CI was further decomposed to assess the contribution of different factors (need
14 factors and non-need factors) in explaining inequality in inpatient service utilization. The
15 horizontal inequity (HI) index indicated the income-related inequity in health care utilization after
16 standardizing for differences in health need, such as sex, age and health conditions. HI was
17 calculated based on the CI decomposition results. These methods were proposed by Wagstaff [25,
18 26] and extensively used by many researchers [27-34]. The calculation steps were as follows:

19 **Step 1 Standardization of inpatient service utilization**

20 Three groups of utilizations including actual inpatient service utilization, need-predicted
21 inpatient service utilization, and need-standardized inpatient service utilization were calculated.
22 Actual inpatient service utilization was collected in NHSS. Need-predicted inpatient service
23 utilization was calculated through statistical modeling, aiming to capture variation in utilization
24 predicted only by needs for inpatient service. Need-standardized inpatient service utilization was
25 used to measure the gap between actual inpatient service utilization and need-predicted
26 inpatient service utilization [32]. An indirect standardization with probit regression model was
27 used to calculate the distribution of need-standardized inpatient service utilization as it was

1 binary [25].

2 **Step 2 Estimate of CI and its decomposition**

3 The CI index is calculated through equation following [25]:

$$4 \quad CI = \frac{2}{\mu} cov(h, r)$$

5 Where h is need-standardized inpatient service utilization, μ is the mean of
6 need-standardized inpatient service utilization, r is the fractional rank of the individual by
7 income.

8 The CI is decomposed into contributions of need factors and non-need factors based on
9 probit regression model [31].

$$10 \quad y_i = \alpha + \sum_j \beta_j^m x_{ji} + \sum_k \gamma_k^n z_{ki} + \varepsilon_i$$

11 Where y_i is the probability of inpatient service utilization; x_{ji} are the need factors; z_{ki}
12 are the non-need factors; β_j^m and γ_k^n are marginal effects of each variable; ε_i is the error term.

13 **Step 3 Calculation of the HI**

14 HI is computed by subtracting the contribution of need factors from the CI, reflecting the
15 degree to which inpatient care service is distributed by income after standardizing for differences
16 in health need [26].

$$17 \quad HI = CI_m - CI_n$$

18 Where CI_m refers to the CI of actual inpatient service utilization, CI_n refers to the CI of
19 the need-expected inpatient service utilization.

20 All analyses were performed in Stata 12.1.

21 **Results**

22 ***Description of the survey population***

23 Both in the pilot integrated area and non-integrated area, the survey population was
24 predominantly 45 years old and above, married and employed. In the pilot integrated area, 27.48%
25 of respondents were covered by UEBMI, 5.47% by USBMI, 57.63% by URRBMI, and 5.86%
26 covered by mixed-insurance (enrolled in both social medical insurance and commercial medical

1 insurance). While in the non-integrated area, 23.71 % covered by UEBMI, 10.43% by URBMI,
2 56.63% by NRCMS, and 5.88% covered by mixed-insurance (see Additional file 1).

3 ***Distribution of inpatient service utilization across household income quintiles***

4 Figure 1 showed the inpatient service utilization by household income quintiles. The actual
5 inpatient service utilization reported by the richest group was 1.6 times of the poorest in the pilot
6 integrated area, and 1.7 times in the non-integrated area. It demonstrated a narrower gap of
7 actual inpatient service utilization between the rich and the poor in the pilot integrated area.

8 The quintile distribution also shows the difference between the actual and need-expected
9 inpatient service utilization. The actual inpatient service utilization by the richest and the second
10 richest group was about 1.31 times and 1.17 times of their need-expected inpatient service
11 utilization in the pilot integrated area, the figure in non-integrated area was 1.32 times and 1.13
12 times. While the actual inpatient service utilization by the poorest and second poorest group
13 accounted for 63.97% and 93.27% of their need-expected inpatient service utilization in the pilot
14 integrated area respectively, accounting for 66.91% and 87.69% in the non-integrated area. It
15 demonstrated that the overall level of overuse inpatient service among the rich in the pilot
16 integrated area was nearly the same as that in non-integrated area, and the underuse was much
17 lower in second poorest group in the pilot integrated area than non-integrated area although the
18 underuse among the poorest group was slightly higher.

19
20 **Figure 1 Distribution of inpatient service utilization across household income quintiles**
21

22 ***Distribution of the non-admission across household income quintiles***

23 Both in the pilot integrated area and non-integrated area, the no-admission rate (defined
24 as the percentage of patients needing hospitalization but unable to obtain it for various reasons)
25 and the no-admission rate caused by financial difficulty all decreased with rising income quintiles,
26 indicating that the poor group were more likely to forgo needed hospitalization. Nevertheless,
27 the overall no-admission rate and the no-admission rate caused by financial difficulty in the pilot
28 integrated area were all lower than in the non-integrated area among each quintile (average
29 difference was -4.50% and -1.10% respectively). More substantial reductions were observed in

1 the poorest and second poorest group (the differences for no-admission rate were -6.52% and
 2 -6.47%, for the no-admission rate caused by financial difficulty were -1.97% and -2.51%). Which
 3 shown that the pilot integrated area enjoy much reduced no-admission rate and financial barrier.

4
 5 **Figure 2 Non-admission rates across household income quintiles**

6
 7 ***Inequality and inequity in inpatient service utilization***

8 Table 2 shows the results of the CI and HI indexes. The actual distribution of inpatient
 9 service utilization was pro-rich in the two areas, while the CI was 15.67% lower in the pilot
 10 integrated area ($CI_M=0.0877$) than the non-integrated area ($CI_M=0.1040$). After need was taken
 11 into account, the HI showed even more pro-rich inequity in two areas, however the inequity
 12 degree in the pilot integrated area ($HI=0.0984$) was 13.23% lower than non-integrated area
 13 ($HI=0.1134$). This indicated the inequity degree of inpatient service utilization was reduced in the
 14 pilot integrated area.

15 **Table 2 CI and HI index of inpatient utilization**

| | CI_M (Actual) | CI_N (Need-Expected) | HI (Need-Standardized) |
|-----------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
| Pilot integrated area | 0.0877* | -0.0107* | 0.0984* |
| Non-integrated area | 0.1040* | -0.0094* | 0.1134* |

16 *p<0.05
 17

18 ***Decomposition of inequality in inpatient service utilization***

19 Table 3 shows the results of the decomposition analysis, including each determinant's
 20 marginal effect and CI_k and contribution to CI.

21 The marginal effect denotes the association between the determinants and the inpatient
 22 service utilization. A positive marginal effect means that that factor promoted utilization, and vice
 23 versa. Both in the pilot integrated area and non-integrated area, medical insurance (regardless of
 24 type) can significantly increase the inpatient service utilization compared to the uninsured group.
 25 The UEBMI and mixed-insurance are two of most important factors that significantly increased
 26 the inpatient service utilization in the two areas. In addition, the role in increasing inpatient

1 service utilization played by USBMI and URRBMI in the pilot integrated area was higher than
2 URBMI and NRCMS in the non-integrated area.

3 The CI_k was employed to describe how each determinant was distributed (range from $-1\sim+1$)
4 over the factor of wealth. With regard to the medical insurance type, the URRBMI ($CI_k = -0.175$)
5 and NRCMS ($CI_k = -0.184$) were more concentrated among the poor, while the USBMI, UEBMI,
6 URBMI, and mixed-insurance were more concentrated among the rich.

7 The contribution to CI describes each determinant's role in inequality. A positive value
8 implies the determinant increased inequality, and vice versa. In both areas, household income
9 accounted for most of the inequalities (162.78% and 128.84% for the highest quintile in the pilot
10 integrated area and non-integrated area respectively, it is also true for the second highest quintile
11 groups). While in the pilot integrated area, URRBMI has a pro-poor contribution (-37.49%),
12 meaning it played a positive role in reducing inequity by enhancing more inpatient service
13 utilization among poor population. But the other insurance including USBMI and mixed-insurance
14 all contributed from 6.08% to 37.51%, especially UEBMI contribute 37.51% to the pro-rich
15 inequity. Moreover, chronic disease made a pro-rich contribution in the pilot integrated area
16 (4.67%) and non-integrated area (7.76%), while remaining need factors made pro-poor
17 contributions. In addition, rural area (-6.52% and -12.69%) and eastern region (-13.05% and
18 -10.12%) had pro-poor contributions that achieving better performance in reducing inequality.

19 **Table 3 Decomposition of inequality in inpatient service utilization**

| | Pilot integrated area | | | Non-integrated area | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------|--------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|--------|------------------------------|
| | Marginal effect (β_k) | CI_k | Contribution to CI (%) | Marginal effect (β_k) | CI_k | Contribution to CI (%) |
| Sex and Age | | | | | | |
| Male | | | | | | |
| 15-24 (reference) | | | | | | |
| 25-34 | -0.033** | 0.063 | -2.00% | -0.026** | -0.010 | 0.16% |
| 35-44 | -0.026** | 0.073 | -2.20% | -0.009 | 0.076 | -0.56% |
| 45-54 | -0.017* | 0.043 | -0.93% | -0.003 | 0.053 | -0.02% |
| 55-64 | -0.006 | -0.071 | 0.62% | 0.028** | -0.065 | -1.78% |
| 65- | 0.019* | -0.106 | -2.49% | 0.058** | -0.065 | -3.43% |
| Female | | | | | | |
| 15-24 | 0.109** | 0.008 | 0.64% | 0.160** | -0.010 | -0.78% |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------|---------|-----------------|--------|---------|
| 25-34 | 0.082** | 0.101 | 8.57% | 0.119** | 0.028 | 2.28% |
| 35-44 | -0.011 | 0.078 | -1.05% | 0.012 | 0.096 | 1.07% |
| 45-54 | -0.013 | 0.022 | -0.38% | 0.009 | 0.042 | 0.41% |
| 55-64 | -0.008 | -0.046 | 0.51% | 0.026** | -0.060 | -1.61% |
| 65- | 0.015 | -0.124 | -2.35% | 0.053** | -0.064 | -3.08% |
| Chronic disease | | | | | | |
| Yes | 0.066** | 0.021 | 4.67% | 0.095** | 0.035 | 7.76% |
| No (reference) | | | | | | |
| Limitation of daily activities | | | | | | |
| Yes | 0.060** | -0.126 | -4.95% | 0.041** | -0.124 | -2.64% |
| No (reference) | | | | | | |
| Self-assessment health | | | | | | |
| Very poor | 0.155** | -0.115 | -0.65% | 0.113** | -0.038 | -0.15% |
| Poor | 0.099** | -0.116 | -2.35% | 0.124** | -0.079 | -1.59% |
| Medium | 0.078** | -0.067 | -6.55% | 0.074** | -0.064 | -5.31% |
| Good | 0.027** | -0.010 | -1.35% | 0.023** | 0.003 | 0.25% |
| Very good (reference) | | | | | | |
| Education | | | | | | |
| Illiterate (reference) | | | | | | |
| Primary school | 0.004 | -0.083 | -2.74% | 0.006 | -0.086 | -2.77% |
| Secondary school | -0.06 | 0.138 | -2.17% | -0.002 | 0.179 | -0.69% |
| College and above | -0.015** | 0.389 | -10.81% | -0.008 | 0.442 | -4.02% |
| Occupation status | | | | | | |
| Unemployment (reference) | | | | | | |
| Student | -0.055** | 0.059 | -2.09% | -0.066** | 0.150 | -4.13% |
| Peasant | -0.004 | -0.296 | 4.21% | 0.004 | -0.201 | -3.13% |
| Worker | -0.026** | 0.100 | -3.44% | -0.015** | 0.189 | -1.70% |
| Business | -0.031** | 0.181 | -9.75% | -0.023** | 0.200 | -4.54% |
| Manager | -0.027** | 0.293 | -22.35% | -0.016** | 0.351 | -9.71% |
| Other | -0.017** | 0.052 | -1.16% | -0.017** | 0.062 | -0.93% |
| Marital status | | | | | | |
| Other (reference) | | | | | | |
| Married | 0.021** | 0.015 | 3.32% | 0.022** | 0.014 | 2.39% |
| Household income | | | | | | |
| Quintile I (reference) | | | | | | |
| Quintile II | 0.033** | -0.400 | -36.32% | 0.028** | -0.400 | -22.00% |
| Quintile III | 0.046** | 0.000 | 0.04% | 0.048** | 0.000 | 0.02% |
| Quintile IV | 0.059** | 0.401 | 65.21% | 0.059** | 0.400 | 47.01% |
| Quintile V | 0.075** | 0.801 | 162.78% | 0.081** | 0.800 | 128.84% |
| Medical insurance | | | | | | |
| UEBMI | 0.040** | 0.248 | 37.50% | 0.030** | 0.355 | 25.39% |
| URBMI | | | | 0.017* | 0.043 | 0.74% |
| NRCMS | | | | 0.014* | -0.184 | -14.17% |
| USBMI | 0.029** | 0.277 | 6.07% | | | |
| URRBMI | 0.027** | -0.175 | -37.49% | | | |
| Mixed-insurance | 0.046** | 0.269 | 9.90% | 0.025** | 0.245 | 3.54% |
| Uninsured and other (reference) | | | | | | |
| Distance to the nearest health | | | | | | |

facilities

<1km (reference)

1–4km **0.008**** -0.061 -2.56% **0.008**** -0.101 -2.77%≥5km **0.019**** -0.122 -0.82% **0.046**** -0.228 -2.57%**Time to the nearest health****facilities**

<15 min (reference)

15–29min -0.003 -0.063 0.47% -0.004 -0.067 0.54%

≥30min -0.005 -0.265 0.90% -0.004 -0.288 0.77%

Preferred health facilities

Primary facilities (reference)

Non-primary facilities 0.004 0.223 3.00% **0.006*** 0.321 3.63%**Residence**

Urban (reference)

Rural **0.005*** -0.196 -6.52% **0.013**** -0.192 -12.69%**Region**Eastern **-0.029**** 0.059 -13.05% **-0.038**** 0.087 -10.12%Middle **-0.014**** -0.135 3.13% **-0.013**** -0.002 0.09%

Western (reference)

1 Note: *p<0.05; **p<0.01

2 Quintile I was the poorest 20%, and the Quintile V was the richest 20%

3

4 **Discussion**

5 Medical insurance integration reform is one of the key strategies addressing inequity issues
6 caused by a fragmented health system in China. This study compares the pilot integrated area
7 and non-integrated area by employing nationally representative data, and provides powerful
8 evidence of the effectiveness of integration reform in achieving the primary goal of reducing
9 inequity. It also provides a comprehensive view of the combined role of medical insurance with
10 other demographic and socioeconomic factors through a decomposition analysis.

11 The study reveals a mixed picture in terms of the distribution of inpatient service utilization
12 and how insurance integration influences the degree of inequality. Through comparisons, we
13 found the gap of inpatient service utilization between the rich and the poor was narrower in the
14 pilot integrated area than in the non-integrated area (1.61 times vs 1.69 times). Whilst the
15 non-admission rate and the non-admission rate caused by financial difficulty were all lower in the
16 pilot integrated area than in the non-integrated area across each household income quintile
17 (average differences were -4.50% and -1.10% respectively), the reduced gaps were even larger in
18 the poorest and second poorest group (the differences for no-admission rate were -6.52% and

1 -6.47%, for the no-admission rate caused by financial difficulty were -1.97% and -2.51%), which
2 indicates that the pilot integrated area enjoyed much reduced no-admission and financial barriers.
3 In addition, the pro-rich equity of inpatient service utilization in the pilot integrated area was
4 13.23% lower than in the non-integrated area. Further, decomposition results show that the
5 URRBMI made the greatest contribution in reducing the inequality (-37.49%) in the pilot
6 integrated area although other insurance schemes increased the inequality. These findings to
7 some extent revealed the positive impact of integration reform on reducing inequity in inpatient
8 service utilization.

9 Integration reform could reduce inpatient service utilization inequity for several reasons.
10 First, it connects different targeted populations regardless of their identity, occupation, and
11 district [14]. That was essential to narrow the insurance benefit gaps and reduce the inequity in
12 healthcare use. Second, for integrated insurance, the level of the benefit package and
13 reimbursement rate was standardized and all increased, which was crucial to provide equitable
14 financial protection to all beneficiaries. Third, risk pooling was increased after integration; for
15 instance, the pooling level of URRBMI which merged the URBMI and NRCMS (previously mainly
16 run at county level) was upgraded to the municipal level. The elevated funding pool will definitely
17 increase the ability of integrated insurance funds to protect against risks [35], which may lead to
18 more equitable access to inpatient health services.

19 Despite these encouraging results, inpatient service utilization was still pro-rich, and the
20 poorest group still had some inpatient health service needs that were not met. Furthermore, in
21 the decomposition analysis, we found the role played by URRBMI in reducing inequality could not
22 counteract the role played by income or the presence of other insurance types (especially UEBMI)
23 in increasing inequality. These results could be explained in two ways. One is in the imperfect
24 design of the integration reform itself. The financing of integrated URRBMI was similar to that of
25 NRCMS and URBMI (a flat rate contributed by individual and government), and despite increases
26 in premiums, the financing ability of URRBMI has not improved markedly. In fact, the financing
27 level of UEBMI was still nearly 10 times higher than URRBMI [36, 37]. The disparity in financing

1 eventually led to the disparity in reimbursement levels, we found the average actual
2 reimbursement rate of UEBMI was 66.8% while the URRBMI was 49.8% in 2013 (see Additional
3 file 2). Thus, URRBMI did equalize the financing and reimbursement level between urban and
4 rural residents and indeed provided more reimbursement for the poor than the rich (actual
5 reimbursement rate range from 57.6% for the poorest to 44.6% for the richest), but the gap
6 between it and UEBMI persists. The other reason why the URRBMI could not eliminate inequality
7 was due to its stepwise implementation process. Many pilots are still in the first step of
8 integrating the administration system, insurance agencies and funds, in order to reduce the
9 resistance to reform and to reach the policy aim more easily [10]. In some piloted areas, the
10 insurance fund still operates and is managed independently instead of being integrated into a
11 uniform risk pool; this hinders the attainment of equity [20, 38]. Furthermore, most pilots
12 provide two or three levels of premium – a higher level of premium means higher reimbursement
13 and more subsidies [39]. But problems emerge. On the one hand, the arrangement of differential
14 compensation based on the capacity to pay the premiums might transfer existing inequity from
15 different insurance schemes into inequity within the integrated scheme. On the other hand, in a
16 voluntary enrollment context, adverse selection may occur which goes against the financial
17 sustainability of the insurance scheme [40].

18 Obstacles also emerged due to the negative role played by UEBMI in increasing inequity.
19 Although the premium level of UEBMI was higher on average, the disparity of financing levels
20 was outstanding among different areas. It could partly explain the contradictory results in the
21 pilot integrated area: despite much reduced inequity level a pro-rich tendency persisted. The
22 UEBMI contributed 37.50% to increase the inpatient service utilization inequality in the pilot
23 integrated area. To overcome this issue more thoroughly, a better choice for China would be to
24 merge all existing medical insurance into one scheme—USBMI, that was regarded as the ultimate
25 goal of integration [39]. USBMI could achieve the equity goal through covering all enrollees by a
26 single medical insurance scheme, since the uniformed and expanded fund pooling could increase
27 the anti-risk ability of insurance funds [35]. Our results show the effect of USBMI on increasing

1 inequality (contribution=6.07%) was significantly lower than the existing UEBMI scheme no
2 matter whether we examined the pilot integrated area (contribution=37.50%) or non-integrated
3 area (contribution=25.39%). Nevertheless, due to the requirement for much higher level of
4 premiums, greater government subsidies, a better fund management capacity and information
5 system, USBMI currently is only piloted in a few highly developed areas, and not expanded
6 nationally. Despite rapid socio-economic development in China, the income gap between the rich
7 and the poor is widening; the income Gini coefficient is consistently higher than 0.47 since 2003
8 [41]. Although the benefits package in integrated insurance was provided equally to all enrollees,
9 medical cost affordability remains different due to different household income [42]. This actually
10 led to a gap in the ability to pay for health services between the rich and the poor and eventually
11 caused inequity in access to healthcare. In this study, household income itself contributed 191.71%
12 and 153.87% to the total inequalities in the pilot integrated area and the non-integrated area.
13 Meanwhile, more than 12% of the poorest respondents had forgone hospitalization due to
14 financial difficulty while the figure of the richest respondents was less than 5%. Due to
15 insufficient assistance for the low income group by the existing social insurance and welfare
16 policies, healthcare utilization equity cannot be achieved by integration reform itself, but requires
17 a concerted multi-sectoral action [43].

18 Owing to the combined effort of medical insurance and other socioeconomic factors,
19 urban-rural and regional disparities in healthcare have been reduced to some extent. This study
20 shows that residing in the eastern region of the country reduced the inequality by 13.05% in the
21 pilot integrated area, which was higher than it in the non-integrated area (10.12%). One possible
22 explanation is that most integrated pilots were concentrated in the eastern region with the
23 combined effect of developing both the economy and integration which have reinforced each
24 other, leading to a reduction in inequality in this region. But for residents of rural areas, their
25 inequality was reduced by 6.52% in the pilot integrated area which was much smaller than in the
26 non-integrated area (12.69%). This might be partly explained by the fact that the URRBMI
27 allowed rural residents to approach expensive urban health services, which thus reduced

1 inpatient services use in the pilot integrated area.

2 An interesting finding of our study is that, among all the need factors, only the presence of
3 chronic diseases drives inequality in inpatient service utilization. Such a phenomenon can be
4 explained by the fact that chronic diseases are more concentrated among the rich; therefore,
5 they used more inpatient services than the poor. The number of chronic disease patients in China
6 is around 300 million [44] and chronic diseases account for approximate 90% of total deaths [45],
7 posing a profound challenge for China's healthcare system. The current medical insurance system,
8 whether integrated or not, generally implements inpatient treatment-oriented benefits packages,
9 neglecting prevention and outpatient services. Such arrangements easily lead to delayed
10 treatment among the poor. Although many integrated pilots provide outpatient chronic disease
11 packages, the number of conditions covered is usually limited 8~15 [46]. A shift to primary health
12 care and a broader benefit package covering chronic disease management and treatment should
13 be incorporated into future integration reform.

14 **Limitations**

15 There were three limitations to the study. First, this was a cross-sectional study so the causal
16 relationship between integration reform and measured factors could not be established. Second,
17 the changes and effectiveness caused by insurance integration reform cannot be fully measured
18 and demonstrated because this study only investigates the earlier stage of the pilot areas while
19 the policy effect of integration reform usually takes longer to be fully revealed. Third, although
20 the selected pilot integrated area and non-integrated area are from the same province or other
21 provinces with similar socioeconomic levels to control the influence of socioeconomic factor,
22 there still might be other socioeconomic factors that confound our results. However, this study
23 provides rare and valuable policy evidence to evaluate the ongoing large scale medical insurance
24 integration reform in China, through comparative analyses and quantitatively measuring the
25 reduction in inequities resulting from integration reform and other influencing factors. It suggests
26 options for more targeted policy interventions to address persistent problems.

27 **Conclusion**

1 Integration reform played a positive role in reducing inequality in inpatient service utilization.
2 However, inequality still exists, particularly among the poorer population. Improvements can be
3 made. We offer some policy implications for China's integration reform. First, against the
4 backdrop of huge social, economic, geographical disparity in China, the implementation of
5 nationwide uniform medical insurance scheme like USBMI is not likely to be completed within the
6 short term. To reduce resistance to integration reform, URRBMI might be a more feasible and
7 appropriate policy choice for China's next stage of insurance reform. Second, to reduce the gap
8 between URRBMI and UEBMI, governments at different levels should widen financial support and
9 increase funding levels. Third, more attention should be directed to further improving the design
10 of URRBMI, which could include providing greater government subsidies and increasing its share
11 of the premiums, to gradually eliminate the existing two-level premium structure. Fourth, more
12 targeted policies for the poor are needed, including reducing out-of-pocket medical costs and
13 facilitating and expanding family physician contract programs to improve their access to
14 healthcare. Fifth, increasing the coverage of outpatient service and providing chronic
15 disease-related preventive services packages at the primary health care facilities could reduce the
16 overuse among the rich and underuse among the poor, so as to improve equitable access to
17 inpatient care. In addition, it should be clearly noted that the integration reform alone is unlikely
18 to eliminate inequity in inpatient service utilization, coordinated inter-government strategies
19 aimed to reduce socioeconomic inequity in income and social welfare are also needed.

20

21 **Abbreviations**

22 **CI:** concentration index;

23 **HI:** horizontal inequity index;

24 **UHC:** universal health coverage;

25 **SBMI:** Social Basic Medical Insurance;

26 **UEBMI:** Urban Employee Basic Medical Insurance;

27 **URBMI:** Urban Resident Basic Medical Insurance;

28 **NRCMS:** the New Rural Cooperative Medical Scheme;

29 **USBMI:** Uniform Social Basic Medical Insurance;

1 **URRBMI:** Urban-Rural Residents Basic Medical Insurance.

2

3 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

4 The NHSS was organized and administered by the National Health Commission of the People's
5 Republic of China. The institutional review board of the Chinese National Bureau of Statistics
6 provided review and ethics approval of the survey. All respondents were read a statement that
7 explained the purpose of the survey and provided verbal informed consent before interview.

8 **Consent to publish**

9 Not applicable.

10 **Availability of data and materials**

11 The data that support the findings of this study are available from Centre of Health Statistics and
12 Information, National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China, through its
13 confidential data center, which were used under license for the current study, and thus are not
14 available to the public. Requests for access to the data should be directed to Centre of Health
15 Statistics and Information, National Health Commission of the People's Republic of China.

16 **Competing interests**

17 None declared.

18 **Funding**

19 This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (71333003, 71573068).
20 The funders played no role in the design of the study and collection, analysis, and interpretation
21 of data and in writing the manuscript.

22 **Author's contribution**

23 MMZ, BHL, LHS, QHW and YHH designed the study; MMZ, BHL and LHS analyzed and interpreted
24 the data and drafted the original manuscript. CL ZK and LBL contributed to drafted introduction
25 and method. LL, NN and MLJ contributed to the contextualization of the study. QHW, YHH and ZC
26 revised the manuscript. MMZ, BHL and LHS contributed equally to this work. All authors have
27 read and approved the final manuscript for publication.

28 **Acknowledgments**

29 We acknowledge Centre of Health Statistics and Information, National Health Commission of the
30 People's Republic of China.

31 **Authors' details**

32 ¹ Department of Social Medicine, School of Health Management, Harbin Medical University, 157
33 Baojian Road, Nangang District, Harbin, Heilongjiang,150086, China.

34 ² Department of Health Management, School of Public Health, Nantong University,9 Seyuan Road,

1 Chongchuan District, Nantong, Jiangsu, 226019, China.

2 ³ Department of Health Policy and Management College of Public Health, University of Georgia,
3 GA 30602 Athens, America.

4 ⁴ School of Economics, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Nottingham
5 Ningbo, 199 Taikang East Road, Ningbo, Zhejiang, 315100, China.

6

7 **References**

- 8 1. Stronks K, Louise GJ. Should equity in health be target number 1? *Eur J Public Health*. 1993;
9 3(2):104-111.
- 10 2. Murray CJL, Frenk J. A framework for assessing performance of health system. *Bull World Health*
11 *Organ*. 2000; 78: 717-731.
- 12 3. Ottersen T, Norheim OF, Chitah BM, Cookson R, Daniels N, Defaye FB, Eyal N, Flores W,
13 Gosseries A, Hausman D et al. Making fair choices on the path to universal health coverage. *Bull*
14 *World Health Organ*. 2014;92:389. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.2471/BLT.14.139139>.
- 15 4. Michael DL, Lafortune G: Measuring Disparities in Health Status and in Access and Use of Health
16 Care in OECD Countries. OECD Health Working Papers; 2009.
- 17 5. McIntyre D, Ranson MK, Aulakh BK, Honda A. Promoting universal financial protection:
18 evidence from seven low- and middle-income countries on factors facilitating or hindering
19 progress. *Health Res Policy Syst*. 2013; 11: 36.
- 20 6. Dunlop S, Coyte PC, McIsaac W. Socio-economic status and the utilisation of physicians services:
21 results from the Canadian National Population Health Survey. *Soc Sci Med*. 2000; 5(11):123-133.
- 22 7. Devaux M: Income-related inequalities and inequities in health care services utilisation in 18
23 selected OECD countries. *The European Journal of Health Economics* 2015, 16(1):21-33.
- 24 8. Chomi EN, Mujinja PGM, Enemark U, Hansen KS, Kiwara A: Health care seeking behaviour and
25 utilisation in a multiple health insurance system: does insurance affiliation matter. *Int J Equity*
26 *Health* . 2014, 13(1):25.
- 27 9. McIntyre D, Garshong B, Mtei G, Meheus F, Thiede M, Akazili J, Ally M, Aikins M, Mulligan J,
28 Goudge J. Beyond fragmentation and towards universal coverage: insights from Ghana, South
29 Africa and the United Republic of Tanzania. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2008; 86(11):871-876.
- 30 10. Meng Q, Fang H, Liu X, Yuan B, Xu J. Consolidating the social health insurance schemes in
31 China: towards an equitable and efficient health system. *Lancet*. 2015; 386(10002):1484-1492.
- 32 11. Castroleal F, Dayton J, Demery L, Mehra K. Public spending on health care in Africa: Do the poor
33 benefit? *Bull World Health Organ*. 2000; 78(1):66-74.
- 34 12. Li Y, Malik V, Hu FB. Health Insurance In China: After Declining In The 1990s, Coverage Rates
35 Rebounded To Near-Universal Levels By 2011. *Health Aff (Millwood)* 2017; 36(8):1452-1460.
- 36 13. He AJ, Wu S. Towards universal health coverage via social health insurance in china: systemic
37 fragmentation, reform imperatives, and policy alternatives. *Appl Health Econ Health Policy*. 2017;
38 15(6):707-716.

- 1 14. Wang HQ, Liu ZH, Zhang YZ, Luo ZJ. Integration of current identity-based district-varied health
2 insurance schemes in China: implications and challenges. *Front Med.* 2012; 6(1):79-84.
- 3 15. Zhang X, Wu Q, Shao Y, Fu W, Liu G. Socioeconomic Inequities in Health Care Utilization in
4 China. *Asia-Pac J Public He.* 2015; 27(4):429-438.
- 5 16. Li Y. A Comparative Study of Urban and Rural Integration Medicare Typical Pattern-Take
6 Dongguan, Zhuhai, and Zhanjiang City as an Example. *Health Economics Research.* 2014;
7 06:17-22.
- 8 17. Chen H. Zhongshan medical insurance has already met the requirements. *Zhongshan Daily.* 2009.
- 9 18. Shan L, Zhao M, Ning N et al. Dissatisfaction with current integration reforms of health insurance
10 schemes in China: are they a success and what matters? *Health Policy Plan.* 2018; 33(3):345-354.
- 11 19. The Central Peoples Government, China. Opinions of the CPC Central Committee and the State
12 Council on deepening the reform of the medical and health system. 2009.
- 13 20. Zhang D. Analysis on the challenges and countermeasures faced by the integration of medical
14 insurance for urban and rural residents. *Assets and Finances in Administration and Institution* 2017;
15 09:35-36.
- 16 21. Yang X. The urban and rural residents' medical insurance integration pilot in Hubei province:
17 practice, effect and difficulty. *Hubei Social Sciences.* 2017; 07:59-63.
- 18 22. Wu C, Li Y, Shen C, Shen Y, Dai T. Research on the Integrating the Urban-rural Resident Medical
19 Insurance System: Taking Jiaxing of Zhejiang as an Example. *Chinese Health Economics.* 2016;
20 05:41-44.
- 21 23. Xue W, Zhou X, Zhang S. Integration Objectives and Strategies Based on Urban and Rural
22 Medical Insurance System. *Journal of Hunan Agricultural University (Social Sciences).* 2015;
23 03:98-102.
- 24 24. Wang X, Zheng A, He X, Jiang H. Integration of rural and urban healthcare insurance schemes in
25 China: an empirical research. *BMC Health Servi Res.* 2014; 14:142.
- 26 25. Wagstaff A, Paci P, van Doorslaer E. On the measurement of inequalities in health. *Soc Sci Med.*
27 1991; 33(5):545-557.
- 28 26. Wagstaff A, van Doorslaer E, Watanabe N. On decomposing the causes of health sector
29 inequalities with an application to malnutrition inequalities in Vietnam. *J Econometrics.* 2003;
30 112(1):207-223.
- 31 27. van Doorslaer E, Masseria C. Income-Related Inequality in the Use of Medical Care in 21 OECD
32 Countries. *OECD Health Working Papers 14, OECD Publishing.* 2004.
- 33 28. Sözmen K, Ünal B. Explaining inequalities in Health Care Utilization among Turkish adults:
34 Findings from Health Survey 2008. *Health Policy.* 2016; 120(1):100-110.
- 35 29. Zhou Z, Su Y, Gao J, Campbell B, Zhu Z, Xu L, Zhang Y. Assessing equity of healthcare
36 utilization in rural China: results from nationally representative surveys from 1993 to 2008. *Int J*
37 *Equity Health.* 2013; 12(1):34.
- 38 30. Lu JR, Leung GM, Kwon S, Tin KYK, Van Doorslaer E, O'Donnell O. Horizontal equity in health

- 1 care utilization evidence from three high-income Asian economies. *Soc Sci Med.* 2007;
2 64(1):199-212.
- 3 31. Van Doorslaer E, Koolman X, Jones AM. Explaining income-related inequalities in doctor
4 utilisation in Europe: a decomposition approach. *Health Econ.* 2004; 13(7):629-647.
- 5 32. Xie X, Wu Q, Hao Y et al: Identifying determinants of socioeconomic inequality in health service
6 utilization among patients with chronic non-communicable diseases in China. *Plos One.* 2014;
7 9(6):e100231.
- 8 33. Chen Z, Roy K. Calculating concentration index with repetitive values of indicators of economic
9 welfare. *J Health Econ.* 2009. 28(1):169-175.
- 10 34. Chen Z, Roy K, Gotway CC. Evaluation of variance estimators for the concentration and health
11 achievement indices: a Monte Carlo simulation. *Health Econ.*2012; 21(11):1375-1381.
- 12 35. Carrin G, James C. Reaching universal coverage via social health insurance: key design features in
13 the transition period. Geneva: World Health Organization. 2004.
14 https://www.who.int/health_financing/issues/en/reaching_universal_dp_04_2.pdf
- 15 36. Zhu K, Zhang L, Yuan S, Zhang X, Zhang Z. Health financing and integration of urban and rural
16 residents basic medical insurance systems in China. *I Int J Equity Health.* 2017; 16(1):p1-p12.
- 17 37. National Bureau of Statistics of China. Average wages for urban employee.
18 <http://data.stats.gov.cn/easyquery.htm?cn=C01&zb=A040F&sj=2016>
- 19 38. Qiu Y, Yuan T. Integrating Urban and Rural Residents Medical Insurance Systems: Observation
20 and Consideration. *China Health Insurance.* 2016; 04:15-17.
- 21 39. Zhang X, Hu H, Zhang W, Liu R. Analysis of the Integration of Urban and Rural Residents Health
22 Care System by the Implementation of Multiple Level in One Medical Insurance System. *China*
23 *Health Insurance.* 2014; 05:15-17.
- 24 40. Wang H, Zhang L, Yip W, Hsiao W. Adverse selection in a voluntary Rural Mutual Health Care
25 health insurance scheme in China. *Soc Sci Med.* 2006; 63(5):1236-1245.
- 26 41. Xiujuan Y, Zhang J. The influence and countermeasure of the gap between rich and poor on
27 Chinas social development. *Contemporary World and Socialism .* 2014; 03:184-188.
- 28 42. Lei X, Cui F. Integrating and improving the basic medical insurance system for urban and rural
29 residents. *Journal of Northwest A&F University (Social Science Edition).* 2016; 05:1-7.
- 30 43. Zere E, Oluwole D, Kirigia JM, Mwikisa CN, Mbeeli T. Inequities in skilled attendance at birth in
31 Namibia: a decomposition analysis. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2011; 11:34.
- 32 44. Souhu Net. The first "Blue Book of health management" have been published in China. 2018.
33 http://www.sohu.com/a/231598259_258430
- 34 45. National Health Commission of Peoples Republic of China. Illustration: report on nutrition
35 and chronic diseases of Chinese residents. 2015. [http://www.nhfpc.gov.cn/jkj/s5879/201506/4](http://www.nhfpc.gov.cn/jkj/s5879/201506/4505528e65f3460fb88685081ff158a2.shtml)
36 [505528e65f3460fb88685081ff158a2.shtml](http://www.nhfpc.gov.cn/jkj/s5879/201506/4505528e65f3460fb88685081ff158a2.shtml)
- 37 46. Ning Y. How to protect the chronic disease by medical insurance. *Chinese Health.* 2017; 8:50-55.
38 DOI:10.15973/j.cnki.cn11-3708/d.2017.08.019

1

2 Figure legends

3 Figure 1 Distribution of inpatient service utilization across household income quintiles

4 Figure 2 Non-admission rates across household income quintiles

5

6 Additional files

7

8 Additional file 1: Description of the survey population. (DOCX 23kb)

9 Additional file 1: The actual reimbursement rate for inpatient service of different medical

10 insurance scheme (%). (DOCX 17kb)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33



34

35

36


1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Figure 1



1 **Figure 2**

2
3
4



5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

15

16 Note: Quintile I was the poorest 20%, and the Quintile V was the richest 20%

17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

1
2
3
4**Appendix Table 1** Description of the survey population

| | Pilot integrated area (N=49365) | | Non-integrated area (N=77165) | |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------|----------------------------------|--------|
| | N | % | N | % |
| Sex and Age | | | | |
| Male | | | | |
| 15-24 | 2759 | 5.59% | 4001 | 5.18% |
| 25-34 | 3458 | 7.00% | 4675 | 6.06% |
| 35-44 | 4119 | 8.34% | 6510 | 8.44% |
| 45-54 | 4508 | 9.13% | 7666 | 9.93% |
| 55-64 | 4978 | 10.08% | 7684 | 9.96% |
| 65- | 4334 | 8.78% | 7020 | 9.10% |
| Female | | | | |
| 15-24 | 2688 | 5.45% | 3882 | 5.03% |
| 25-34 | 3737 | 7.57% | 5239 | 6.79% |
| 35-44 | 4326 | 8.76% | 6979 | 9.04% |
| 45-54 | 4944 | 10.02% | 8267 | 10.71% |
| 55-64 | 5013 | 10.15% | 8197 | 10.62% |
| 65- | 4501 | 9.12% | 7045 | 9.13% |
| Chronic disease | | | | |
| Yes | 12035 | 24.38% | 18171 | 23.55% |
| No | 37330 | 75.62% | 58994 | 76.45% |
| Limitation of daily activities | | | | |
| Yes | 2839 | 5.75% | 4737 | 6.14% |
| No | 46526 | 94.25% | 72428 | 93.86% |
| Self-assessment health | | | | |
| Very poor | 2420 | 4.90% | 4394 | 5.69% |
| Poor | 3285 | 6.65% | 6082 | 7.88% |
| Medium | 6214 | 12.59% | 10512 | 13.62% |
| Good | 14835 | 30.05% | 22825 | 29.58% |
| Very good | 22611 | 45.80% | 33352 | 43.22% |
| Education | | | | |
| Illiterate | 5762 | 11.67% | 8793 | 11.40% |
| Primary school | 27328 | 55.36% | 45339 | 58.76% |
| Secondary school | 9535 | 19.32% | 14518 | 18.81% |
| University and above | 6740 | 13.65% | 8515 | 11.03% |
| Occupation status | | | | |
| Unemployment | 8207 | 16.63% | 10820 | 14.02% |
| Student | 2357 | 4.77% | 3236 | 4.19% |
| Peasant | 12506 | 25.33% | 30499 | 39.52% |
| Worker | 4839 | 9.80% | 4509 | 5.84% |
| Business | 6384 | 12.93% | 7757 | 10.05% |
| Manager | 10299 | 20.86% | 13484 | 17.47% |
| Other | 4773 | 9.67% | 6860 | 8.89% |
| Marital status | | | | |
| Other | 10866 | 22.01% | 15451 | 20.02% |

| | | | | |
|--|-------|--------|-------|--------|
| Married | 38499 | 77.99% | 61714 | 79.98% |
| Household income | | | | |
| Quintile I (Poorest) | 9887 | 20.03% | 15437 | 20.01% |
| Quintile II | 9860 | 19.97% | 15442 | 20.01% |
| Quintile III | 9886 | 20.03% | 15421 | 19.98% |
| Quintile IV | 9895 | 20.04% | 15433 | 20.00% |
| Quintile V (Richest) | 9837 | 19.93% | 15432 | 20.00% |
| Medical insurance | | | | |
| UEBMI | 13564 | 27.48% | 18294 | 23.71% |
| URBMI | ---- | ---- | 8046 | 10.43% |
| NRCMS | ---- | ---- | 43700 | 56.63% |
| USBMI | 2700 | 5.47% | ---- | ---- |
| URRBMI | 28447 | 57.63% | ---- | ---- |
| Mixed-insurance | 2893 | 5.86% | 4541 | 5.88% |
| Uninsured | 1761 | 3.57% | 2584 | 3.35% |
| Distance to the nearest health facilities | | | | |
| <1km | 29328 | 59.41% | 48979 | 63.47% |
| 1-4km | 18779 | 38.04% | 26259 | 34.03% |
| ≥5km | 1258 | 2.55% | 1927 | 2.50% |
| Time to the nearest health facilities | | | | |
| <15 min | 37860 | 76.69% | 57336 | 74.30% |
| 15-29min | 8885 | 18.00% | 13978 | 18.11% |
| ≥30 min | 2620 | 5.31% | 5851 | 7.58% |
| Preferred health facilities | | | | |
| Primary | 38237 | 77.46% | 62733 | 81.30% |
| Non-primary | 11128 | 22.54% | 14432 | 18.70% |
| Residence | | | | |
| Urban | 26648 | 53.98% | 37707 | 48.87% |
| Rural | 22717 | 46.02% | 39458 | 51.13% |
| Region | | | | |
| Eastern | 27828 | 56.37% | 23911 | 30.99% |
| Middle | 5996 | 12.15% | 28885 | 37.43% |
| Western | 15541 | 31.48% | 24369 | 31.58% |

Note: Quintile I was the poorest 20%,and the Quintile V was the richest 20%

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11