Culture or corruption: who gave red envelopes to the doctors in China?

[1]Taotao Liu

[2]Yaocong Duan, co-first author

[3]Xi Luo

[1]Beijing Hospital, National Center of Gerontology, Institute of Geriatric Medicine, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Beijing 100730, P.R. China

[2]School of Psychology and Neuroscience, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QQ, UK

[3]Chengdu Boostvision Tech. Co. Ltd, Chengdu, 610041, P.R. China,

Corresponding author：Taotao Liu, Email: taotao20022000@163.com

Abstract

Background: In China, an important reason why patients give doctors red envelopes (informal payments) is that, due to the long-term influence of cultural practices and prevailing social norms, patients are concerned that if they do not provide red envelopes while others do, doctors may not provide full care or attention. However, does giving red envelopes really lead to more effective treatment? This study aims to investigate the impact of giving red envelopes on treatment effectiveness.

Methods: Based on the survey data from China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS) in 2015 and 2018, this study included the respondents aged 45 and over who had been hospitalized at least once within the year prior to the survey. Respondents were divided into two groups based on whether they gave red envelopes to doctors during their most recent hospitalization. We compared demographic data (age, gender, education level, residential distribution), household income, hospital levels, and medical insurance between two groups of respondents. Variables with significant differences in univariate analysis were then included in a multivariate logistic regression analysis to determine factors associated with medical red envelopes. Furthermore, respondents were grouped based on whether they fully recovered, and a multivariate logistic regression analysis was performed to analyze the impact of medical red envelopes on treatment effectiveness.

Results: In 2015, there were 2,767 respondents who had been hospitalized within the year prior to the survey. Among them, 34 respondents (1.2%) reported paying for medical red envelopes. In 2018, there were 3,323 respondents who had been hospitalized within the year prior to the survey. Among them, 48 respondents (1.4%) reported paying for medical red envelopes. Multivariate logistic regression analysis showed that age and whether it involves surgical treatment were statistically significant factors (both $P<0.001$) associated with medical red envelopes. In 2015, 1022 respondents fully recovered at discharge. Multivariate logistic regression analysis showed that health change score ($P=0.007$), ability to jog for one kilometer ($P=0.009$) and whether it involves surgical treatment ($P=0.04$) are significant factors associated with the treatment effectiveness. There is no credible evidence that giving medical red envelopes affects patients' recovery at discharge. ($P=0.635$).

Conclusion: In China, the probability of middle-aged and elderly patients giving red envelopes to doctors during hospitalization was approximately 1% per person per time in 2015 and 2018. The behavior of giving medical red envelopes is associated with age and whether it involves surgical treatment. There is no credible evidence that giving red envelopes leads to more effective treatment.

Keywords: Middle aged and elderly; red envelopes; medical corruption; China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study;

In China, for centuries, the older generation likes to give ornate red envelopes filled with cash, also known as "hongbao", to the younger generation during special occasions like the Lunar New Year or weddings because they symbolize happiness and good luck in Chinese culture. On the other hand, red envelopes also refer to a form of bribery (informal payments [1]). Initially, patients would give red envelopes to doctors in exchange for more timely and extensive medical services or simply out of gratitude. Nowadays, the way of giving money is not necessarily limited to red envelopes and can be in any form of monetary gift, but the term "red envelope" has remained to refer to this type of bribery behavior.

The cause of medical red envelopes is complicated [2–5] due to the contradiction between the huge population and scarce medical resources in China [6]. An important reason why patients give doctors red envelopes, which is often overlooked, is a lack of trust between patients and doctors leading to insecurity [7]. Due to the long-term influence of cultural practices and prevailing social norms, patients are concerned that if they do not provide red envelopes while others do, doctors may not provide full care or attention. However, does giving red envelopes really lead to more effective treatment?

The special stage of development and reform in China offers a unique opportunity for studying medical bribery behavior and associated patient–doctor trust issues [8]. China is already in the process of large-scale health reforms [9], with specific laws and industry regulations prohibiting and punishing the practice of medical red envelopes but the problem persists [10,11]. Solving the issue of red envelopes requires not only laws and regulations, but also tackling it from multiple aspects, including the public education and dissemination of medical knowledge, as well as reforms in ethics and the healthcare system [8]. However, due to the illegal and clandestine nature of medical bribery behavior [7], the patients' factors associated with medical red envelops and their impacts on treatment effectiveness remain largely unexplored [12].

To inform the education and dissemination of medical knowledge, as well as reforms in law, ethics, and the healthcare system, this study analyzed the factors about middle-aged and elderly patients who give red envelopes to doctors during hospitalization and the impact of giving red envelopes on treatment effectiveness, based on the survey data from China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS) in 2015 and 2018 [13]. CHARLS is a large interdisciplinary survey project led by the National School of Development at Peking University and executed by the Institute of Social Science Survey. The CHARLS National Baseline Survey was launched in 2011 and covers 150 county-level units, 450 village-level units in 28 provinces of China.

Methods

Subjects

Based on the cross-sectional survey data from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS) in 2015 and 2018, this study included middle-aged and elderly respondents aged 45 and over who had been hospitalized at least once within the year prior to the survey. CHARLS is a large interdisciplinary survey project led by the National School of Development at

Peking University and executed by the Institute of Social Science Survey. The CHARLS National Baseline Survey was launched in 2011 and covers 150 county-level units, 450 village-level units in 28 provinces of China. Follow-up surveys were conducted in 2015 and 2018, with 21,095 and 19,752 respondents respectively from approximately 12,400 households. The database has obtained ethical approval from the Institutional Review Board of Peking University (IRB 00001052-11014), and informed consent was obtained from the respondents. This study has been granted access to the data.

Inclusion criteria: Age over 45 years; At least one hospitalization in the year prior to the interview.

Exclusion criteria: Missing data.

Study design

We retrieved data from the CHARLS database for respondents in 2015 and 2018, including demographic information (age, gender, marital status, province of residence, urban/rural residence, and educational level), health self-assessment score, health changes in the past 3 years, lower limb mobility, access to family care, household income, type of medical insurance, total hospitalization expenses, number of hospitalizations in the past year, public hospital or not, hospital level, local hospital or not, and recovery status. Among them, educational level, health self-assessment score, and health changes in the past 3 years were assigned ordinal categorical values based on the questionnaire in the database. The assignment criteria can be found in the table notes.

The respondents were divided into two groups, the red-envelope group and the no-red-envelope group, based on whether they gave red packets to doctors during their most recent hospitalization. We calculated the proportion of patients in the red envelope group for each province and created a map to illustrate their residential distribution. Baseline variables of two groups of patients were compared for the years 2015 and 2018 respectively. For variables with statistically significant differences from univariate analysis, we created a radar chart and conducted a multivariate logistic regression analysis to calculate the odds ratio (OR) of giving red envelopes and created a forest plot.

Dividing the patients into the fully-recovered group and the not-fully-recovered group, we included factors with statistically significant differences from the univariate analysis and performed a multivariate logistic regression analysis to calculate the odds ratio (OR) of recovery at discharge and create a forest plot. See Figure 1 for the study flowchart.

Statistical Analysis

The minimum sample size was estimated to be 120, based on 10 times the sample size of the logistic regression model with the 12 independent variables. This retrospective study included over 2000 respondents.

Normally distributed continuous data was described with the mean ± standard deviation, while non-normally distributed data was described with the median (interquartile range). T-tests and Mann-Whitney U tests were used for the intergroup comparisons of normally distributed and non-normally distributed data, respectively. Chi-square test or Fisher's exact test were used for rate

comparisons, and the approximate normal method was used for the 95% CI of rate comparisons. Multivariate logistic regression was used to calculate the odds ratio. SPSS 25.0 was used for statistical analysis, and Excel 2019 and Prism 9.3 were used for data visualization. $P < 0.05$ indicates a statistically significant difference [14].

Results

Results of univariate analysis and geographical distribution

This study retrospectively reviewed the survey data from the CHARLS database for 21,095 and 19,752 respondents in 2015 and 2018 respectively. In 2015, there were 2,767 respondents who had been hospitalized within the year prior to the survey. Among them, 34 respondents (1.2%) reported paying for medical red envelopes. In 2018, there were 3,323 respondents who had been hospitalized within the year prior to the survey. Among them, 48 respondents (1.4%) reported paying for medical red envelopes.

Logistic regression results for factors related to red envelopes

Age, gender, urbanization score, education level, access to family care, household income, surgical treatment, and hospital level were included in a multivariate logistic regression analysis to examine the factors associated with medical red envelopes. The results showed that age and surgical treatment were statistically significant factors associated with red envelopes (both $P<0.001$). Younger inpatients are more likely to pay medical red envelopes. (Figure 3)

Logistic regression results for factors related to treatment effectiveness

The multivariate logistic regression analysis showed that health change score ($P=0.007$), ability to jog for one kilometer ($P=0.009$) and surgical treatment ($P=0.04$) are significant factors associated with the treatment effectiveness (Table 3, Figure 4). There is no credible evidence that giving medical red envelopes affects patients' recovery at discharge from the hospital ($P=0.635$).

Discussion

This study analyzed CHARLS survey data about elderly patients aged 45 and over gave red envelopes to doctors during hospitalization in both urban and rural communities in China. The CHARLS survey data is highly representative because it was collected through a stratified sampling approach across 28 provinces of China, covering 150 county-level units, 450 village-level units. The survey data comes from Chinese elderly patients who offered medical bribery in the form of red envelopes. In judicial practice in China, such patients are treated as non-criminal and no patients will bear legal responsibility or moral condemnation. Therefore, we have reason to trust the accuracy of the survey results.

Comparing the data in 2015 and 2018, the probability of elderly inpatients giving a red envelope was approximately 1% per person per time, which was consistent across two cross-sectional surveys. The proportion of respondents who were hospitalized is approximately 15%, with an average number of hospitalizations of 1.6 times per year. The database also provides the probability of outpatient patients giving red envelopes in the year prior to the survey, which was 0.32% (13/4079) in 2015 and 0.37% (12/3255) in 2018.

The results of univariate analysis show that there are differences in factors such as age, surgical treatment, provincial-level hospitals, total hospitalization costs, and out-of-pocket expenses between patients in the red-envelope group and the no-red-envelope group. Younger patients may have a stronger willingness and ability to give medical red envelopes. Patients with higher medical expenses are also more likely to give medical red envelopes, which may be because their disease is more complex and severe, and they also have stronger ability to pay. Interestingly, surgical patients are more willing to give red envelopes to surgeons rather than internists. This could be because patients believe that surgeons, compared to internists, offer more technical services and are more likely to "legitimately" harm patients during surgery. These results are consistent with our expectations.

Data of treatment effectiveness and whether surgery was performed were missing from the 2018 database. Based on the data from 2015, the results of logistic regression with possible related factors revealed that only age and surgical treatment had statistically significant differences between patients in the red-envelope group and the no-red-envelope group. Surgeries are more likely to be performed in higher-level hospitals and involve higher costs. This suggests that variables such as provincial-level hospitals and medical expenses may be confounding factors with multicollinearity.

A finding that surprises most non-professionals but is expected by doctors is that medical red envelopes do not affect patients' recovery at discharge from the hospital. Instead, it is affected only by indicators reflecting their own health level, such as the assessment of health changes and the ability to jog 1 kilometer. These findings can be reassuring because: overall, doctors will not lower the quality of medical care because patients do not give red envelopes. Patients should have the freedom to be free from fear, including not worrying about being harmed during the medical process because they did not give red envelopes to the doctor. Education and medical knowledge dissemination should include these aspects.

Surgical patients are more likely to fully recover at discharge because surgical diseases are more likely to be curable, such as urinary tract stones, gallstones, appendicitis, orthopedic surgeries, and so on, whereas internal medicine diseases in elderly patients are typically chronic. Treatment at provincial-level hospitals does not result in higher discharge rates because the patients treated there could have more severe illnesses.

Limitations: 1. Due to the lack of more detailed data, we could only evaluate the treatment effectiveness based on patients’ recovery rate at discharge, which may be biased by factors such as length of hospital stay and other performance indicators. 2. There is a lack of follow-up data, but it would be possible to conduct a cohort study on the follow-up population after the update of the CHARLS database in 2024.

Conclusion

In China, the probability of middle-aged and elderly patients giving red envelopes to doctors during hospitalization was approximately 1% per person per time in 2015 and 2018. The behavior

of giving medical red envelopes is associated with age and whether it involves surgical treatment. There is no credible evidence that giving red envelopes leads to more effective treatment.

Table 1 Comparison of characteristics of respondents between the red-envelope group and the no-red-envelope group in China in 2015

	Total n=2767	Red-envelope group n=34	No-red-envelope group n=2733	*P*
Age	63.00±10.89	60.88±11.73	63.03±10.85	0.252
Male, n (%)	1293 (46.7%)	21 (61.8%)	1272 (46.5%)	0.077
Living in rural areas, n (%)	1836 (66.4%)	20 (58.8%)	1816 (66.4%)	0.350
Living with spouse, n (%)	2160 (78.1%)	30 (88.2%)	2130 (77.9%)	0.149
Access to family care, n (%)	1712 (61.9%)	20 (58.8%)	1692 (61.9%)	0.713
Educational level score	1.76±0.92	1.88±0.99	1.76±0.91	0.716
Health self-assessment score	3.72±0.95	3.52±0.77	3.73±0.96	0.220
Health changes in the past 3 years	2.54±0.65	2.68±0.59	2.54±0.65	0.239
Able to run 1 km, n (%)	1020 (36.9%)	17 (50.0%)	1003 (36.7%)	0.110
Public hospital, n (%)	2014 (72.8%)	23 (67.6%)	1991 (72.9)	0.498
Provincial-level hospital, n (%)	123 (4.4%)	5 (14.7%)	118 (4.3%)	0.016
City-level hospital	283 (10.2%)	5 (14.7%)	278 (10.2%)	0.387
Receive medical care within the province, n (%)	1961 (70.9%)	25 (73.5%)	1936 (70.8%)	0.731
Receive medical care within the city, n (%)	1851 (66.9%)	20 (58.8%)	1831 (67.0%)	0.314
Number of hospitalizations in the past year	1.50±1.06	1.32±0.53	1.50±1.06	0.332
Health insurance type				
Government-funded, n (%)	58 (2.1%)	1 (2.9%)	57 (2.1%)	0.729
Urban medical insurance, n (%)	534 (19.3%)	7 (20.6%)	527 (19.3%)	0.848
Rural medical insurance, n (%)	1560 (56.4%)	19 (55.9%)	1541 (56.4%)	0.953
Commercial medical insurance, n (%)	14 (0.5%)	0	14 (0.5%)	0.676
No medical insurance, n (%)	54 (2.0%)	1 (2.9%)	53 (1.9%)	0.675
Current hospitalization expenses, (RMB)	10470±21307	20885±20976	10334±21282	0.005
Out-of-pocket expenses, (RMB)	6543±14238	12405±12815	6468±14242	0.023
Family cash savings, (RMB)	11834±71877	16147±52441	11780±72091	0.725
Surgical treatment, n (%)	727 (26.3%)	27 (79.4%)	700 (25.6%)	<0.001
Medication treatment, n (%)	2387 (86.3%)	31 (91.2%)	2356 (86.2%)	0.614
Fully recovered at discharge, n (%)	1022 (36.9%)	20 (58.8%)	1002 (36.7%)	0.011

Annotation:

Health change score: 1 better 2 about the same 3 worse;

Health self-assessment score: 1 very good 2 good 3 fair 4 poor 5 very poor;

Urban medical insurance includes urban employee medical insurance and urban resident medical insurance;

Educational level score：1 Did not finish primary school 2 elementary school 3 middle or high school 4 college or above.

Table 2 Comparison of characteristics of respondents between the red-envelope group and the no-red-envelope group in China in 2018

	Total n=3323	Red-envelope group n=48	No-red-envelope group n=3275	*P*
Age	65.41±10.36	61.13±9.49	65.47±10.36	0.004
Male, n (%)	1582 (47.6%)	25 (52.1%)	1557 (47.5%)	0.563
Living in rural areas, n (%)	2317 (69.7%)	34 (70.8%)	2283 (69.7%)	0.866
Living with spouse, n (%)	2549 (76.7%)	40 (83.3%)	2509 (76.6%)	0.307
Access to family care, n (%)	2399 (72.2%)	33 (68.8%)	2366 (72.2%)	0.627
Educational level score	1.85±0.90	2.08±0.87	1.84±0.89	0.241
Health self-assessment score	3.48±0.96	3.32±0.98	3.49±0.95	0.250
Health changes in the past 3 years	2.64±0.59	2.66±0.56	2.64±0.59	0.782
Able to run 1 km, n (%)	1235 (37.2%)	24 (50.0%)	1211 (37.0%)	0.071
Public hospital, n (%)	2583 (77.7%)	39 ()81.3%	2544 (77.7%)	0.726
Provincial-level hospital, n (%)	155 (4.7%)	6 (12.5%)	149 (4.5%)	0.023
City-level hospital, n (%)	450 (13.5%)	7 (14.6%)	443 (13.5%)	0.831
Receive medical care within the province, n (%)	data missing			
Receive medical care within the city, n (%)	1823 (54.9%)	19 (39.6%)	1804 (55.1%)	0.040
Number of hospitalizations in the past year	1.67±2.96	1.63±1.84	1.67±2.97	0.041
Health insurance type				
Government-funded, n (%)	72 (2.2%)	0	72 (2.2%)	0.626
Urban medical insurance, n (%)	676 (20.3%)	13 (27.1%)	663 (20.2%)	0.277
Rural medical insurance, n (%)	2207 (66.4%)	29 (60.4%)	2178 (66.5%)	0.441
Commercial medical insurance, n (%)	24 (0.7%)	2 (4.2%)	22 (0.7%)	0.046
No medical insurance, n (%)	58 (1.7%)	1 (2.1%)	57 (1.7%)	0.573
Current hospitalization expenses, (RMB)	12025±34218	31918±40352	11712±34028	<0.001
Out-of-pocket expenses, (RMB)	6431±22593	18769±28481	6244±22446	<0.001
Family cash savings, (RMB)	13420±51884	23093±49021	13277±51919	0.198
Surgical treatment, n (%)	data missing			
Medication treatment, n (%)	data missing			
Fully recovered at discharge, n (%)	data missing			

Table 3 Comparison of characteristics of respondents between the fully-recovered group and the not-fully-recovered group in China in 2015

	Total n=2767	Fully recovered n=1022	Not fully recovered n=1745	*P*
Age	63.00±10.89	62.31±11.12	62.98±10.49	0.143
Male, n (%)	1293 (46.7%)	489 (47.8%)	804 (46.1%	0.367
Living in rural areas, n (%)	1836 (66.4%)	635 (62.1%)	1201 (68.8%)	<0.001
Living with spouse, n (%)	2160 (78.1%)	816 (79.8%)	1344 (77.0%)	0.083
Access to family care, n (%)	1712 (61.9%)	661 (64.7%)	1051 (60.2%)	0.020
Educational level score	1.76±0.92	1.81±0.93	1.82±0.93	0.857
Health self-assessment score	3.72±0.95	3.54±0.96	3.85±0.92	<0.001
Health changes in the past 3 years	2.54±0.65	2.47±0.66	2.61±0.62	<0.001
Able to run 1 km, n (%)	1020 (36.9%)	472 (46.2%)	548 (31.4%)	<0.001
Public hospital, n (%)	2014 (72.8%)	788 (77.1%)	1226 (70.3%)	<0.001
Provincial-level hospital, n (%)	123 (4.4%)	45 (4.4%)	78 (4.5%)	0.934
City-level hospital	283 (10.2%)	122 (11.9%)	161 (9.2%)	0.023
Receive medical care within the province, n (%)	1961 (70.9%)	770 (75.3%)	1191 (68.3%)	<0.001
Receive medical care within the city, n (%)	1851 (66.9%)	729 (71.3%)	1122 (64.3%)	<0.001
Number of hospitalizations in the past year	1.50±1.06	1.36±0.94	1.55±1.05	<0.001
Health insurance type				
Government-funded, n (%)	58 (2.1%)	19 (1.9%)	39 (2.2%)	0.505
Urban medical insurance, n (%)	534 (19.3%)	230 (22.5%)	304 (17.4%)	0.001
Rural medical insurance, n (%)	1560 (56.4%)	584 (57.1%)	976 (55.9%)	0.535
Commercial medical insurance, n (%)	14 (0.5%)	6 (0.6%)	8 (0.5%)	0.645
No medical insurance, n (%)	54 (2.0%)	18 (1.8%)	36 (2.1%)	0.580
Current hospitalization expenses, (RMB)	10470±21307	10923±19651	10356±17626	0.482
Out-of-pocket expenses, (RMB)	6543±14238	6637±11773	6497±12973	0.804
Family cash savings, (RMB)	11834±71877	14925±59611	11392±90896	0.285
Surgical treatment, n (%)	727 (26.3%)	356 (34.8%)	371 (21.3%)	<0.001
Medication treatment, n (%)	2387 (86.3%)	871 (85.2%)	1516 (86.9%)	0.223
Giving red envelopes, n (%)	34 (1.2%)	20 (2.0%)	14 (0.8%)	0.011



Fig 1 Flow chart of study





Fig 2 Radar chart of relevant characteristics for respondents in the red-envelope group and the no-red-envelope group

OR	95%CI		P value	
0.961	0.496	1.863	0.906	Fully recovered
1.000	1.000	1.000	0.474	Total medical cost
2.496	0.908	6.860	0.076	Provincial hospital
4.804	2.312	9.981	<0.001	Received surgery
0.918	0.908	0.929	<0.001	Age





Fig 3 Forest plots of variables in the regression model for giving red envelopes in 2015 and 2018



Fig 4 Forest plots of variables in the regression model for whether inpatients recovered

Supplemental table 1 Multivariate logistic regression results associated with red envelopes in 2015

	B	SE	Wald	P	Exp(B)	95% CI
Age	-0.085	0.006	200.705	<0.001	0.918	0.908-0.929
Total medical cost	<0.001	<0.001	0.513	0.474	1.000	1.000-1.000
Received surgery	1.569	0.373	17.692	<0.001	4.804	2.312-9.981
Provincial hospital	0.915	0.516	3.143	0.076	2.496	0.908-6.860
Fully recovered when discharged	-0.040	0.338	0.014	0.906	0.961	0.496-1.863

Supplemental table 2 Multivariate logistic regression results associated with red envelopes in 2018

	B	SE	Wald	P	Exp(B)	95% CI

Age	-0.052	0.007	56.766	<0.001	0.949	0.936-0.962
Total medical cost	<0.001	0.000	4.046	0.044	1.000	1.000-1.000
Provincial level hospital	0.593	0.500	1.411	0.235	1.810	0.680-4.818
Hospitalization in this city	-0.518	0.328	2.490	0.115	0.596	0.313-1.134
Number of hospitalizations	-0.495	0.290	2.911	0.088	0.610	0.345-1.076

Supplemental table 3 Multivariate logistic regression results associated with recovery in 2015

	B	SE	Wald	P	Exp(B)	95% CI
Living in village	-0.278	0.332	0.699	0.403	0.757	0.395-1.453
Home care available	0.123	0.272	0.204	0.651	1.131	0.663-1.929
Health change score in the past three years	-0.520	0.193	7.226	0.007	0.595	0.407-0.869
Health self-assessment score	-0.065	0.147	0.196	0.658	0.937	0.703-1.249
Able to jog for one kilometer	0.683	0.263	6.757	0.009	1.980	1.183-3.314
Hospitalization in public hospital	-0.168	0.466	0.130	0.719	0.845	0.339-2.109
Regional or city level hospital	0.356	0.311	1.309	0.253	1.427	0.776-2.626
Urban medical insurance	0.946	0.938	1.018	0.313	2.575	0.410-16.180
Hospitalization in this city	0.281	0.464	0.367	0.544	1.325	0.534-3.289
Received surgery	0.623	0.304	4.202	0.040	1.864	1.028-3.381
sent “red envelopes” to doctors	-0.508	1.072	0.225	0.635	0.602	0.074-4.915
Number of hospitalizations	-0.041	0.134	0.096	0.757	0.959	0.738-1.247

Annotation:

Health change score: 1 better 2 about the same 3 worse;

Health self-assessment score: 1 very good 2 good 3 fair 4 poor 5 very poor;

Urban medical insurance including urban employee medical insurance and urban resident medical insurance

Acknowledgments

Thanks to the Peking University China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS) research project for providing public data.

Authors' contributions

Taotao Liu conceived the idea and led this study. Taotao Liu and Yaocong Duan interpreted the results and drafted the manuscript. Xi Luo helped to interpret the results and drafted the manuscript. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The original CHARLS has obtained ethical approval from the Institutional Review Board of Peking University (IRB 00001052-11014), and informed consent was obtained from the respondents. This study has been granted access to the data.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Conflict of interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

Reference

1. Chereche̦ş, R.M. *et al.* (2013) Defining informal payments in healthcare: A systematic review. *Health Policy* 110, 105–114
2. Zhu, W. *et al.* (2018) Corruption or professional dignity: An ethical examination of the phenomenon of “red envelopes” (monetary gifts) in medical practice in China. *Developing World Bioeth* 18, 37–44
3. Guo, W. and Xu, B. (2022) Dignity in Red Envelopes: Disreputable Exchange and Cultural Reproduction of Inequality in Informal Medical Payment. *Soc Psychol Q* 85, 23–43
4. Cohen, N. (2012) Informal payments for health care – the phenomenon and its context. *HEPL* 7, 285–308
5. Habibov, N. and Cheung, A. (2017) Revisiting informal payments in 29 transitional countries: The scale and socio-economic correlates. *Social Science & Medicine* 178, 28–37
6. Yang, J. (2013) The impact of informal payments on quality and equality in the Chinese health care system: A study from the perspective of doctors. *Health Sociology Review* 22, 268–281
7. Li, M. *et al.* (2022) Informal payments and patients’ perceptions of the physician agency problem: Evidence from rural China. *Social Science & Medicine* 298, 114853
8. Tucker, J.D. *et al.* (2016) Rebuilding patient–physician trust in China. *The Lancet* 388, 755
9. Hu, K.-J. and Xu, W.-D. (2014) Towards the end of “red envelopes” in China? *The Lancet* 383, 2211
10. Liu, N. *et al.* (2020) Does health insurance coverage reduce informal payments? Evidence from the “red envelopes” in China. *BMC Health Serv Res* 20, 95
11. Xu, H. and Yuan, M. (2022) The red packet phenomenon from the perspective of young Chinese doctors: a questionnaire study. *BMC Med Ethics* 23, 56
12. Meskarpour Amiri, M. *et al.* (2019) Factors affecting informal patient payments: a systematic literature review. *IJHG* 24, 117–132
13. Zhao, Y. *et al.* (2014) Cohort Profile: The China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS). *International Journal of Epidemiology* 43, 61–68
14. (2023) Points of significance. *Nat Hum Behav* 7, 293–294