18/11/2025

Evaluation Dimensions and Measurement Approaches for Evaluating the Impact of China's Family Doctor Contract Services: A Scoping Review Protocol

Authors

Yang Wang[1,2], Hua Jin[1,2], Dehua Yu[1,2]

1. Department of General Practice, Research Center for General Practice, Yangpu Hospital, School of Medicine, Tongji University, Shanghai, China

2. Shanghai General Practice and Community Health Development Research Center, Shanghai, China

Abstract

Abstract

Background

Family doctor contract services (FDCS) in mainland China are designed to foster long-term relationships between family doctors and residents, promoting primary care delivery through teamwork. By 2035, coverage is expected to exceed 75%. However, the evaluation domains and measurement approaches used to assess these services remain fragmented and lack a consensus-based standard. This scoping review aims to systematically map the full spectrum of evaluation domains and analyze the measurement approaches used to evaluate FDCS in mainland China.

Methods

Conducted in accordance with JBI methodology, we will search CNKI, Wanfang, PubMed, and Web of Science for literature published since 2006. Sources will include policy documents, quantitative studies, and qualitative studies. A two-tier data extraction strategy will be employed to balance breadth and depth. We will categorize all identified evaluation domains using the Donabedian (Structure, Process, Outcome) framework, with outcome-related domains further mapped to the Quintuple Aim to analyze value orientation. Results will be synthesized through a three-stage visualization strategy: assessing the macro-alignment of evaluation domains (Sankey Diagram 1),

analyzing the value orientation of outcomes against the Quintuple Aim (Sankey Diagram 2), and critically appraising the quality of measurement tools (Instrument Inventory Table).

Discussion

This review will provide the first comprehensive map of the FDCS evaluation ecosystem. It will objectively identify alignments and gaps between policy mandates (intended evaluation domains), research practices (actual measurement approaches), and stakeholder perspectives. By mapping this landscape, the review aims to provide a clear evidence base for future evaluations and the development of a consensus-based core outcome set.

Systematic review registration

Registered in OSF on September 20, 2024 (osf.io/z3eju)

Introduction

The "family doctor contract service (FDCS)" implemented in mainland China is built upon long-term doctor-patient and social relationships established between family doctors and contracted residents. It supports family doctors in providing primary care services to community and rural residents through teamwork and patient-doctor collaboration[1,2]. According to the goals set by the National Health Commission's Primary Healthcare Department, by 2035, the coverage rate of family doctor contract services in China is expected to exceed 75%[3]. This suggests that family doctor contract services are gradually becoming the main approach for primary care facilities to deliver primary care and essential public health services to community residents.

As summarized by Stange et al., the purpose of using metrics to assess health service quality is to guide actions and highlight important issues that may be overlooked in routine work[4]. In Donabedian's classic theoretical model, three key elements—"structure," "process," and "outcome"—are prioritized when assessing healthcare service quality. Among these, "outcome" is not only the ultimate standard for verifying the effectiveness and quality of health services but is also prone to measurement bias due to variations in "time," "environment," "structure," and "process"[5]. Therefore, measuring "outcome," as the most fundamental and critical aspect of healthcare quality evaluation, must involve the careful selection of dimensions and tools to ensure the results are accurate, relevant, and easy to use, thereby providing meaningful support for future quality improvements.

However, in China, there is still a lack of comprehensive understanding of the outcome dimensions and measurement approaches used to evaluate family doctor contract services. Key policy documents and government surveys related to the evaluation of family doctor contract services, released after 2016, highlight several outcome dimensions and indicators, including "health improvement", "control of health risk factors," "number of visits," "patients' choice of primary care institution," "patient satisfaction," "service quality," and "coverage rate," etc[6-9]. Overall, the dimensions and indicators presented in these documents are diverse, fragmented, and somewhat disorganized.

Research in this field also shows similar characteristics. According to the literature, the dimensions and indicators used to measure the effectiveness of family doctor contract services have included at

least ten different outcome domains, such as “health”[10-12] , “functional features”[13], “chronic disease control”[14], “patient loyalty”[15] , “doctor-patient trust”[16-18], “resident contract rate”[19], “service utilization” [20,21] , “patient satisfaction”[22], “residents’ medical costs”[23] , and “receipt of chronic disease and preventive medicine screenings”[24,25]. Moreover, different studies employ various tools to assess the same outcome dimension, which complicates the comparison and aggregation of findings, further contributing to the fragmented nature of research in this area. For example, tools for measuring “health” include a 5-point Likert scale[10], the EQ-5D-5L scale[11], and the SF-36 scale[12], each reflecting different core constructs.

This documented fragmentation in both policy and research highlights an urgent need for a comprehensive map of the existing evaluation landscape. Without a clear synthesis of what is being measured and how, it is impossible to identify gaps, standardize approaches, or develop a consensus-based core outcome set.

The aim of this scoping review is to comprehensively summarize the outcome dimensions and measurement approaches previously used to evaluate the effectiveness of family doctor contract services in mainland China.

Following a search of databases including CNKI, Wanfang, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, JBI Evidence Synthesis, PubMed, PROSPERO, and Google Scholar, we identified a mixed-methods systematic review on the effectiveness of family doctor contract services, registered in PROSPERO on September 16, 2024[26]. However, we observed that this review focuses on "the outcome of chronic disease management" and "the facilitators and barriers that affect the effectiveness of family doctor contract services". As our scoping review aims to map the entire spectrum of evaluation metrics (spanning Structure, Process, and Outcome, and triangulating policy, quantitative, and qualitative sources), our overlap is minimal. As a result, we believe the innovation of our scoping review remains intact and is not constrained by the scope of the aforementioned review.

Review question

What evaluation domains and measurement approaches have been used to evaluate the impact of family doctor contract services on contracted residents in China?

In this review, "Evaluation Domains" refer to the specific content areas being assessed (e.g., blood pressure control, patient satisfaction, service accessibility), which will be analyzed through the theoretical lenses of the Donabedian model (Structure-Process-Outcome) and the Quintuple Aim.

"Measurement Approaches" are defined as the specific methodologies used to capture data, encompassing specific indicators, measurement tools (e.g., scales, questionnaires), and data sources/respondents (e.g., patient-reported, provider-reported, administrative records).

Inclusion criteria

Participants

Contracted residents under China's family doctor contract services.

Concept

Concept Evaluation dimensions (structure, process, and outcome) and measurement tools.

Context

China's primary care context.

Types of sources

The included literature must fall into one of the following three categories: government-issued policy documents, quantitative studies, and qualitative studies.

Methods

The proposed scoping review will be conducted in accordance with the JBI methodology for scoping reviews[27]. This review is based on the present protocol. Any deviations from the protocol will be reported in the relevant section of the methods, along with a justification.

Inclusion Criteria:

1. The included literature must fall into one of the following three categories: government-issued policy documents, quantitative studies, and qualitative studies.

2.Each type of literature must meet the following criteria:

(1) Policy documents: The document must focus on family doctor contract services and explicitly mention the assessment and evaluation of the quality or outcomes of these services.

(2) Quantitative studies: The study population must consist of residents contracted with family doctors, meaning individuals who have signed a service agreement with family doctors in China. The exposure or intervention must involve family doctor contract services or specific components of these services, and the study must report measurable indicators related to the performance, quality, structure, process, or outcomes resulting from the exposure/intervention.

(3) Qualitative studies: The phenomenon of interest must be the stakeholder perceptions, experiences, or valued aspects related to the structure, process (e.g., quality), or outcomes of family doctor contract services.

2. Only studies published from 2006 onwards (the year when China began implementing family doctor contract services) will be included[28].

3. Both quantitative and qualitative studies can include published literature or gray literature, such as graduate theses.

4. Literature published in English and Chinese languages will be included.

Exclusion Criteria:

1. Government-issued policy documents that mention family doctor contract services but do not include specific details regarding the evaluation or measurement of their impact will be excluded.

2. Quantitative and qualitative studies that explore factors influencing residents' decisions to contract with family doctors, rather than evaluating the outcomes or performance of the services themselves, will be excluded.

3. Policy documents and studies that focus broadly on "primary health care," "primary care," or the broader "healthcare system" without specifically examining family doctor contract services will be excluded.

4. We will exclude studies that evaluate the effects of specific clinical technologies or pharmaceutical interventions (e.g., drug efficacy trials, specific surgical techniques) that operate independently of the family doctor contract service management model. To define the "routine scope of services," we adhere to the Guiding Opinions on Standardizing the Management of Family Doctor Contract Services[8]. Interventions failing to align with the service categories defined in this policy (e.g., basic medical care, public health services, health management, long prescriptions, home-based care, and TCM preventive services) will be excluded.

5. We will exclude studies or documents focused on contexts outside of mainland China (e.g., Hong Kong, Macau, or Taiwan).

6. We will exclude non-primary (secondary) sources, including systematic reviews, other scoping reviews, narrative reviews, editorials, commentaries, and letters to the editor.

7. We will exclude incomplete sources published as 'abstracts only' (e.g., conference abstracts) that do not provide sufficient methodological or results data for our full data extraction.

Search strategy

The search strategy for this study will be divided into two parts based on the type of literature:

1. Government-issued policy documents: We will search the official websites of the National Health Commission of China and provincial/municipal Health Commissions. The search will use key terms and their policy-related synonyms (e.g., "family doctor contract service", "family doctor service team ", "signing service package"). The search will focus on documents published since 2006, when family doctor contract services were first introduced in China[28].

2.Quantitative and qualitative studies: We will develop two search strategies (one in English and one in Chinese) based on the JBI scoping review methodology[27].

For the English-language literature, an initial search was conducted in PubMed and Embase. Following frequency analysis using VOSviewer (developed by the Centre for Science and Technology Studies, CWTS, at Leiden University, Netherlands), a comprehensive search strategy was developed (see Appendix 1). This strategy is designed to be highly sensitive, combining key concepts related to both "family doctor" and "general practitioner" with terms related to "contract" or "signing" to identify all relevant studies . This strategy will be applied in a second round of searches in PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and Google Scholar. Finally, the reference lists of all relevant articles will be reviewed to identify additional sources.

For the Chinese-language literature, an initial search was conducted in the CNKI and Wanfang databases. Based on the JBI methodology for triangulating diverse sources, the final search strategy (see Appendix 1) was designed to be highly inclusive. It combines the core concept “family doctor contract service” with its key policy-related synonyms. This ensures the comprehensive capture of all three relevant literature types (policy documents, quantitative studies, and qualitative studies), as policy and qualitative sources often do not use such keywords. A second round of searches will be conducted in CNKI and Wanfang, followed by a review of reference lists to locate additional relevant studies.

Given that most gray literature on this topic in mainland China—aside from government reports—is typically published in CNKI or Wanfang, we determined that further searches for gray literature would not be necessary.

The search for both English and Chinese literature will focus on studies published from 2006 onwards, as this is the year when family doctor contract services were implemented in China. We may contact the authors of key studies for further information if needed.

Study selection

After the search, all information regarding the included articles will be imported into EndNote X9.2 software (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, USA, 2019), where duplicates will be removed using the software’s functions. The revision and study selection will then be performed by importing the literature information into Rayyan, a web and mobile app designed for conducting systematic reviews.

Two researchers familiar with the topic (YW, HJ) will screen the titles, keywords, and abstracts of the first 50 references as part of a pilot test to improve the eligibility criteria and ensure consistent understanding. Weekly comparisons and group discussions will be conducted during this phase. Full screening will begin once the consistency between the two reviewers reaches over 90%. If the two reviewers fail to reach a consensus, the third researcher (DY) will moderate group discussions to resolve discrepancies.

The study selection process will be illustrated using a PRISMA-Scr flow diagram, detailing the stages from the initial search, duplicates removed, title and abstract screening, full-text retrieval, and any additional sources identified through reference lists. Details of excluded studies and the reasons for their exclusion at the full-text stage will be recorded and securely stored. Government policy documents were selected separately based on relevance to FDCS evaluation standards. These

documents are not subject to the PRISMA flow but are listed as a supplementary data source for the triangulation analysis.

Data extraction

The data extraction for this review will be conducted using three distinct extraction forms, tailored to the specific nature of each evidence type (policy, qualitative, and quantitative) to facilitate our triangulation analysis.

1. For government-issued policy documents, the data extraction will include: issuing agency, year of publication, region/jurisdiction (e.g., national level, or specific province/city) ,and the specific evaluation dimensions or indicators mandated (e.g., 'contract rate', 'team configuration'). Each extracted indicator will be classified by the review team according to the Donabedian (Structure, Process, Outcome) framework. Additionally, indicators classified as 'Outcome' will be further mapped to the Quintuple Aim domains [29] to allow for value-based alignment analysis.
2. For qualitative studies: The data extraction will focus on: author, year, participant type, participant location/setting (e.g., Urban Shanghai, Rural Guizhou), data collection method, themes and sub-themes related to the impact or effectiveness of FDCS, conceptual Interpretation (narrative definition or Illustrative quotations from the original text), and classification according to the Donabedian framework. Similarly, Outcome-related themes will be sub-categorized into the Quintuple Aim domains [29].
3. For quantitative studies: Data extraction will be stratified into two levels to balance breadth and depth. First, for all included studies, we will extract study characteristics (author, year, province, population, data source/respondent, study design) and general evaluation domains from the abstract. Each dimension will be classified using the Donabedian framework; dimensions identified as 'Outcomes' will be further mapped to the Quintuple Aim domains (Population Health, Patient Experience, Per Capita Cost, Provider Well-being, Health Equity), while Structure and Process metrics will not undergo this secondary classification. Second, for studies published in English, core Chinese journals, or those explicitly reporting a named instrument in the abstract, we will conduct a full-text review to extract detailed measurement approaches, including specific metric definitions and technical specifications of the measurement tools used (e.g., scale name, validity, reliability).

To ensure inter-rater reliability, the three extraction forms will be piloted by two reviewers (YW and HJ) on a purposive sample of 15–20 sources, distributed evenly across the three evidence types. This pilot phase will specifically focus on calibrating the complex quantitative classification criteria (S-P-O framework and Quintuple Aim domains) and the 'Data Source' definitions through consensus meetings involving the third reviewer (DY). Any discrepancies will be resolved through discussion, and the extraction forms will be refined iteratively to maximize clarity. All extracted data will be securely stored with clear audit trails for tracking and reference.

Data analysis and presentation

In this scoping review, data will undergo a multi-stage triangulation analysis. The analysis is designed to systematically map the findings and identify logic gaps within the evaluation ecosystem.

Step 1: The Macro Landscape Mapping (Source-SPO-Dimension Sankey)

We will synthesize the "Evaluation Dimensions" from all three tracks. This will be visually presented using a Sankey Diagram. The diagram will map the flow from the 'Source Type' (Pillar 1) to their 'S-P-O Category' (Pillar 2), and subsequently to the specific 'Dimension Domains' (Pillar 3). Pillar 3 will categorize broad dimension clusters found in the literature, such as 'Service Quality' or 'Signed Resident Satisfaction' (often mandated by policy), alongside specific clinical domains (e.g., 'Blood Pressure Control') found in quantitative research.

Step 2: The Value Orientation Mapping (Outcome-Aim Sankey)

To visualize the value goals, we will perform a focused analysis on the subset of dimensions classified as "Outcome". A second Sankey Diagram (or an extension of the first) will be created to map the specific 'Outcome Dimensions' (e.g., Mortality, Satisfaction, Cost) to the 'Quintuple Aim Domains' (Population Health, Patient Experience, Per Capita Cost, Provider Well-being, Health Equity). This visualization will intuitively reveal which value goals are prioritized by different sources and which are neglected (e.g., if 'Health Equity' is missing from the Research track).

Step 3: Qualitative Connotation Analysis (Deductive Thematic Analysis)

For qualitative data, we will employ a Deductive Thematic Analysis based on the Donabedian framework. Key themes extracted from qualitative studies will be mapped to the Structure, Process, or Outcome categories. We will create a "Dimension-Connotation Table" that pairs evaluation dimensions with their qualitative meanings (e.g., explaining how 'Satisfaction' is conceptually defined by residents as 'Accessibility' and 'Respect').

Step 4: Measurement Approach Evaluation (Instrument Table)

Based on the full-text analysis of high-quality quantitative studies (Level 2), we will tabulate the detailed measurement approaches. A "Measurement Instrument Inventory" will summarize the specific tools used (e.g., SF-36), their psychometric validation, and the data sources.

Step 5: Narrative Synthesis and Gap Analysis

A final descriptive narrative will synthesize these findings. Beyond describing the alignment between policy and research, we will specifically analyze the internal logical consistency of the evaluation system using the Donabedian model.

Acknowledgements

Nil

Funding

This research was funded by and the 2024 Shanghai City Yangpu District Science and Technology and Economic Committee Deepening Medical Reform Innovation Research Project (Grant No: YPYG202403); Shanghai Municipal Health Commission Health Policy Research Project (Grant No. 2023HP28&2023HP71), Shanghai Leading Talents Program (Grant No. YDH-20170627), and Discipline Leader Advancement Program of Yangpu District Central Hospital (Ye2202103).

Declarations

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Author contributions

Conceptualization, Y.W.; Methodology, Y.W and H.J; Data curation, Y.W and H.J; Formal analysis, Y.W.; Funding acquisition, H.J and D.Y; Project administration, D.Y; Resources, Y.W and H.J; Supervision, D.Y; Validation, Y.W; Writing—original draft, Y.W.; Writing—review and editing, Y.W., H.J., D.Y.. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

References

1.National Health Commission. Interpretation of the policy on promoting high-quality development of family doctor contracted services [Internet]. 2022 Mar 15 [cited 2024 Apr 7]. Available from: https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2022-03/15/content_5679180.htm.

2.Xinhua News Agency. Basic medical and health promotion law of the People's Republic of China [Internet]. 2019 Dec 28 [cited 2024 Apr 7]. Available from: https://www.gov.cn/xinwen/2019-12/29/content_5464861.htm.

3.National Health Commission. Guiding opinions on promoting the high-quality development of family doctor contracted services [Internet]. 2022 Mar 3 [cited 2024 Apr 7]. Available from: https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/2022-03/15/content_5679177.htm.

4.Stange KC, Etz RS, Gullett H, et al. Metrics for assessing improvements in primary health care. Annu Rev Public Health. 2014;35(1):423-42.

5.Donabedian A. Evaluating the quality of medical care. Milbank Q. 2005;83(4):691-729.

6.Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, State Council. Outline of the "Healthy China 2030" Plan [Internet]. 2016 Oct 25 [cited 2024 Apr 7]. Available from: https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/2016-10/25/content_5124174.htm.

7.National Health Commission Information Center. Accessibility of medical and health services for urban and rural residents has improved—Release of the "Sixth National Health Service Survey Report" [Internet]. 2021 Jan 21 [cited 2024 Apr 7]. Available from: http://www.nhc.gov.cn/mohwsbwstjxxzx/s2908/202101/0838723e3f3a4adb835d970abd551665.shtml.

8.National Health Commission. Guidelines on standardizing the management of family doctor contract services [Internet]. 2018 Sep 29 [cited 2024 Apr 7]. Available from: https://www.gov.cn/zhengce/zhengceku/2018-12/31/content_5435461.htm.

9.Shanghai Municipal Health Commission. Notice on further standardizing family doctor contract services in Shanghai [Internet]. 2023 Jul 31 [cited 2024 Apr 7]. Available from: https://www.shanghai.gov.cn/nw12344/20230803/46e6f1f456654bf0a6437c7887d1b72c.html.

10.Feng W, Geng P, Chen J, et al. Impact of family doctor contracting on the health status of the mobile population [Preprint]. Res Sq. 2024 Mar 27. Available from: https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-3987556/v1

11.Li Z, Li J, Fu P, et al. Family doctor contract services and health-related quality of life among patients with chronic diseases in rural China: what is the role of socioeconomic status?. Int J Equity Health. 2021;20(1):191.

12.Wang L, Liu W. Effects of family doctor contract services on the health-related quality of life among individuals with diabetes in China: evidence from the CHARLS. Front Public Health. 2022;10:865653.

13.Feng S, Cheng A, Luo Z, et al. Effect of family doctor contract services on patient perceived quality of primary care in southern China. BMC Fam Pract. 2020;21(1):1-11.

14.Xu C, Shen P, Lu F, et al. The impact of a family doctor contract service on outcomes for type 2 diabetes patients in Zhejiang Province. Asia Pac J Public Health. 2022;34(6-7):643-8.

15.Zhang L, Zhang Q, Li X, et al. The effect of patient perceived involvement on patient loyalty in primary care: the mediating role of patient satisfaction and the moderating role of the family doctor contract service. Int J Health Plann Manage. 2022;37(2):734-54.

16.Gu L, Deng J, Xu H, et al. The impact of contract service policy and doctor communication skills on rural patient-doctor trust relationship in the village clinics of three counties. BMC Health Serv Res. 2019;19(1):1-9.

17.Gu L, Wang X, Tian D. The association of family doctor contract service and patient trust in doctor: evidence from twenty-five village clinics of three counties in rural China. BMC Prim Care. 2024;25(1):58.

18.Li X, Li J, Shao W, et al. The relationship between family doctor contract services policy and perceived participation in primary health care among chronic disease patients in China: the mediating role of the patient trust. Health Soc Care Community. 2023;2023(1):6854131.

19.Zhou QR, Li JS, Hao C, et al. The impact of appointment services on the quality of family doctor contract services. Chin Gen Pract. 2023;26(10):1198-204. DOI: 10.12114/j.issn.1007-9572.2022.0438.

20.Cai LQ, Hou J. Study on the impact of the "1+1+1" combination contract on family doctor service outcomes. Chin Gen Pract. 2018;21(31):3814-7. DOI: 10.12114/j.issn.1007-9572.2018.31.007.

21.Wang S, Cheng F, Xu J. The impact of family doctor contract services on the utilization of and satisfaction with primary health care among Chinese residents: A cross-sectional study. J Fam Med Prim Care. 2024;13(5):1887-93.

22.Huang J, Lu W, Wang L, et al. A preliminary effect analysis of family doctor and medical insurance payment coordination reform in Changning District of Shanghai, China. BMC Fam Pract. 2019;20(1):1-10.

23.Li L, He X, Zhang C. The impact of public policy of family doctor contracting on medical expenses from the perspective of residents at community level in China. Front Psychol. 2023;13:972904.

24.Yan C, Yuan Y, Zhao D, et al. Family Doctor Contract services and awareness of blood pressure measurement among Hypertension patients: a cross-sectional study in rural Shandong, China. Front Public Health. 2022;10:757481.

25.Lin W, Huang W, Mei C, et al. Associations between the signing status of family doctor contract services and cervical cancer screening behaviors: a cross-sectional study in Shenzhen, China. BMC Public Health. 2023;23(1):573.

26.Zhaochen Jiang, Mingsheng Chen, Dihan Tang, Lei Si. Effects of Family Doctor Contract Services in China: A Mixed Methods Systematic Review. PROSPERO 2024 CRD42024587272 Available from: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42024587272

27.Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Munn Z, Tricco AC, Khalil H. Scoping reviews. In: Aromataris E, Lockwood C, Porritt K, Pilla B, Jordan Z, editors. JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis. JBI; 2024 [cited 2024 Sep 19]. Available from: https://synthesismanual.jbi.global. https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-24-09

28.Li T, Zhu JW, Zhang Q. Analysis of contracted family doctor services in China: from the perspective of lateral contrast and dynamic development. Chin Gen Pract. 2018;21(33):4041-6.

29.Nundy S, Cooper LA, Mate KS. The quintuple aim for health care improvement: a new imperative to advance health equity. Jama. 2022 Feb 8;327(6):521-2.

Appendices

Appendix I: Search strategy

The search strategy is designed to be highly sensitive to capture all three evidence types (policy, quantitative, and qualitative) in accordance with JBI methodology.

Policy Documents:

We will search the official websites of the National Health Commission of China and the 31 provincial-level administrative units in mainland China. The search will use a combination of key terms and their policy-related synonyms, including:

“家庭医生签约” (family doctor contract)

“签约服务” (signing service)

“全科医生签约” (general practitioner contract)

“家庭医生服务团队” (family doctor service team)

“签约服务包” (contract service package)

Quantitative/Qualitative Studies (English):

The search strategy will be adapted for each database. The following strategy for PubMed will serve as the foundation:

PubMed

((((("family doctor*"[Title/Abstract] OR "general practitioner*"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("contract*"[Title/Abstract] OR "sign*"[Title/Abstract] OR "signing"[Title/Abstract] OR "agreement*"[Title/Abstract])) OR "family doctor contract service*"[Title/Abstract])) AND ("China"[MeSH Terms] OR "China"[Title/Abstract] OR "Chinese"[Title/Abstract])

(345)

Embase

(((('family doctor*' OR 'general practitioner*'):ti,ab,kw) AND (('contract*' OR 'sign*' OR 'signing' OR 'agreement*'):ti,ab,kw)) OR ('family doctor contract service*':ti,ab,kw)) AND (('China'/exp OR 'China':ti,ab,kw))

(643)

Web of Science (WOS)

(TI=((("family doctor*" OR "general practitioner*") AND (contract* OR sign* OR signing OR agreement*)) OR "family doctor contract service*") OR AB=((("family doctor*" OR "general practitioner*") AND (contract* OR sign* OR signing OR agreement*)) OR "family doctor contract service*")) AND (TI=(China OR Chinese) OR AB=(China OR Chinese))

(343)

Google Scholar

"Family doctor contract*" OR "GP contract*" OR "general practitioner signing" AND "China"

(500)

Quantitative/Qualitative Studies (Chinese):

China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI):

(TKA=("家庭医生签约") OR TKA=("全科医生签约") OR TKA=("家庭医生责任制") OR TKA=("签约服务包") OR TKA=("签约居民") OR TKA=("家庭医生服务团队")) AND (TKA=("研究") OR AB=("方法"))

限定类别为“研究论文”

（1857）

Wanfang Data:

题名或关键词:("家庭医生签约" OR "全科医生签约" OR "家庭医生责任制" OR "签约服务包" OR "签约居民" OR "家庭医生服务团队") AND (题名或关键词:("研究") OR 摘要:("方法"))

（2494）

Search conducted on: 18, November, 2025