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

In China, it is widely believed that the practice of patients giving red envelopes (informal payments) to doctors is prevalent. 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 economic development and institutional reform in China offers a unique opportunity for studying medical bribery behavior and associated patient–doctor trust issues. This study analyzed the demographic data and relevant factors about middle-aged and elderly inpatients who give red envelopes to doctors based on China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS) survey data in 2015 and 2018. Our results show geographical characteristics of medical bribery behavior. 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. 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.

It is widely believed that giving and taking red envelopes (informal payments) is a common phenomenon in medical practices due to the contradiction between the huge population and scarce medical resources in China [1]. The cause of medical red envelopes is complicated [2–5]. 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 [6]. 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 [7]. China is already in the process of large-scale health reforms [8], with specific laws and industry regulations prohibiting and punishing the practice of medical red envelopes but the problem persists [9,10]. Solving the issue of red envelopes requires not only laws and regulations, but also tackling it from multiple aspects, including education and the dissemination of medical knowledge, as well as reforms in ethics and the healthcare system [7]. However, due to the illegal and clandestine nature of medical bribery behavior [6], its occurrence rate, geographic distribution, demographic characteristics, and the impacts on treatment effectiveness remain unexplored [11].

To inform the education and dissemination of medical knowledge, as well as reforms in law, ethics, and the healthcare system, this study analyzed the demographic data and relevant factors about middle-aged and elderly patients who give red envelopes to doctors during hospitalization and the impact of red envelopes on treatment effectiveness, based on the survey data from China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS) in 2015 and 2018 [12]. 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.

Results

Univariate analysis results 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 and they were distributed across 20 provinces. 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, and they were also distributed across 20 provinces. Two cross-sectional data results show that medical red envelopes are concentrated in regions such as East China, North China, and Northeast China, with a probability of over 2% per person per time, while the probability in Southwest region is less than 1%. (Table 1-2, Figure 2-3)

Logistic regression results for factors associated with 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 for medical red envelopes. (Figure 4)

Logistic regression results for factors associated with 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 5). 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 almost no patients will bear legal responsibility or moral condemnation. Therefore, we have reason to believe in 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. Based on the results of the seventh national census in 2020, the population of people aged 60 and above in China is approximately 264 million. Therefore, it can be roughly estimated that this population would give about 600,000 red envelopes 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.

Data on patients below the age of 45 who give red envelopes in their outpatient and inpatient

services was not collected due to different population distributions and different disease incidence rates. However, it is important to note that, in China, pediatric medical resources are scarcer in the healthcare market, so parents are more willing to pay extra money to purchase medical services for their children. Therefore, the actual probability of giving red envelopes may be larger than what is indicated in this study. This widespread unfair medical bribery behavior undermines the healthcare market [1,2,13], and it is necessary to properly recognize it and address the issue through reforming the institutional construction [7].

Two cross-sectional data results show that medical red envelopes are concentrated in regions such as East China, North China, and Northeast China, with a probability of over 2% per person per time, while the probability in Southwest region is less than 1%. This typical regional distribution difference needs to be explained comprehensively by local culture, economic level, population density, medical scarcity and other factors. 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. Third-grade class-A hospitals, such as provincial-level hospitals, represent high-level medical services in the Chinese healthcare market, leading to more incidents of medical bribery. 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, indicating the presence of 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 bribe 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.

However, it should be noted that these data only come from community populations. More critically ill patients may not have been admitted to the hospital to receive timely treatment. They may have a stronger willingness to bribe doctors, and therefore the correlation between their treatment effectiveness and medical red envelope deserves further attention. In addition to the final treatment effectiveness, the patient experience during the treatment process may improve due to medical red envelopes. Medical bribery is essentially a premium paid for scarce medical resources [13], so price controls cannot eliminate this phenomenon [9].

Doctors who receive bribes from patients will be held legally responsible. Therefore, there is a lack of surveys on medical bribery among doctors because it is difficult to obtain reliable and valid data. In reality, most doctors who receive medical red envelopes are not reported, and even if they are reported, they may face lenient punishments. In Chinese society, there are two sets of moral evaluation systems: public and private. In the private moral evaluation system, many patients and doctors consider it acceptable to give medical red envelopes. Some doctors believe that they should receive better financial rewards for their medical skills. However, the profits from red envelopes may not necessarily be obtained by highly skilled doctors, but by doctors with low competence but profit-driven, or doctors in administrative positions who have the power to allocate medical resources, just like a Chinese antient poem says: "*those dressed in brocade are not necessarily silk producers*". Doctors who lack knowledge of economics may not agree with the above views. During China's reform and opening-up process, some people believed that "corruption is the lubricant for the development of the market economy." Similarly, one could argue that medical corruption improves the efficiency of medical work. However, all of this occurs within a distorted healthcare system. Doctors' professional titles and academic credentials do not fully reflect the actual value that patients can obtain when purchasing medical services. Widespread public disclosure and transparency of medical information, including costs, hospitalization duration, complications, and accurate assessments of treatment effectiveness and patient experiences, can benefit both patients and highly skilled doctors. Through market regulation and the reduction of intermediaries, it can improve fairness and efficiency in medical practices.

Limitations: 1. Due to the lack of more detailed data, we could only evaluate the treatment effectiveness based on whether patients were discharged after recovery, 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. 3. The survey did not include information on monetary amounts of red envelopes provided by patients, the form of bribery, and the patients' healthcare demands. It is regrettable that more detailed analysis results could not be obtained due

to this limitation.

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].

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





Distribution according to patients' habitations and less than 9% inpatients crossing province. The seven major geographical regions of China are classified according to the geographic division standards released by the Chinese Ministry of Natural Resources in 2022.

Fig 2 Regional distribution of inpatients aged 45 and over who gave red envelopes to doctors in China in 2015 and 2018





Fig 3 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
1.000	1.000	1.000	0.474
2.496	0.908	6.860	0.076
4.804	2.312	9.981	<0.001
0.918	0.908	0.929	<0.001

OR	95%CI		P value
1.810	0.680	4.818	0.235
0.596	0.313	1.134	0.115
0.610	0.345	1.076	0.088
1.000	1.000	1.000	0.044
0.949	0.936	0.962	<0.001

Fig 4 Forest plots of variables in the regression model for giving red envelopes in 2015 and 2018



Fig 5 Forest plots of variables in the regression model for whether inpatients recovered

Supplemental table 1 Province distribution of inpatients aged 45 and over who gave red envelopes to doctors in China in 2015 and 2018

	In 2015			In 2018		
	Inpatients	Inpatients who gave red envelopes	Percentage	Inpatients	Inpatients who gave red envelopes	Percentage
Anhui	113	1	0.9%	168	4	2.4%
Beijing	3	0	0.0%	5	1	20.0%
Fujian	56	0	0.0%	49	1	2.0%
Gansu	82	2	2.4%	102	1	1.0%
Guangdong	129	3	2.3%	146	2	1.4%
Guangxi	80	0	0.0%	90	2	2.2%
Guangdong	28	0	0.0%	29	0	0.0%
Hebei	116	0	0.0%	140	4	2.9%
Henan	215	2	0.9%	272	4	1.5%
Heilongjiang	65	2	3.1%	69	1	1.4%
Hubei	85	0	0.0%	125	0	0.0%
Hunan	125	1	0.8%	170	3	1.8%
Jilin	62	1	1.6%	54	0	0.0%
Jiangsu	136	5	3.7%	146	5	3.4%
Jiangxi	157	1	0.6%	179	2	1.1%
Liaoning	75	4	5.3%	77	3	3.9%
Inner Mongolia	118	5	4.2%	184	6	3.3%
Qinghai	33	0	0.0%	36	0	0.0%
Shandong	195	0	0.0%	204	4	2.0%

Shanxi	62	1	1.6%	76	1	1.3%
Shaanxi	132	1	0.8%	155	1	0.6%
Shanghai	11	0	0.0%	5	0	0.0%
Sichuan	321	0	0.0%	381	2	0.5%
Tianjin	9	0	0.0%	17	0	0.0%
Xinjiang	33	1	3.0%	31	0	0.0%
Yunnan	185	3	1.6%	261	0	0.0%
Zhejiang	81	1	1.2%	94	1	1.1%
Chongqing	60	0	0.0%	58	0	0.0%

Supplemental table 2 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 3 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 4 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

Taotao Liu was supported by National High Level Hospital Clinical Research Funding [BJ-2023-173]. 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.

Conflict of interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

Reference

1. 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
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. Li, M. *et al.* (2022) Informal payments and patients' perceptions of the physician agency problem: Evidence from rural China. *Social Science & Medicine* 298, 114853
7. Tucker, J.D. *et al.* (2016) Rebuilding patient–physician trust in China. *The Lancet* 388, 755
8. Hu, K.-J. and Xu, W.-D. (2014) Towards the end of "red envelopes" in China? *The Lancet* 383, 2211
9. 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
10. 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
11. Meskarpour Amiri, M. *et al.* (2019) Factors affecting informal patient payments: a systematic literature review. *IJHG* 24, 117–132
12. Zhao, Y. *et al.* (2014) Cohort Profile: The China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study (CHARLS). *International Journal of Epidemiology* 43, 61–68
13. Souliotis, K. *et al.* (2016) Informal payments in the Greek health sector amid the financial crisis: old habits die last... *Eur J Health Econ* 17, 159–170
14. (2023) Points of significance. *Nat Hum Behav* 7, 293–294