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 in mainland China are designed to foster long-term relationships between family doctors and contracted residents, promoting the delivery of primary care services through teamwork and collaboration. By 2035, it is expected that the coverage of these services will exceed 75%, making it a key model for primary care in China. However, the evaluation dimensions and measurement approaches used to assess these services remain fragmented and lack a comprehensive, consensus-based framework. This scoping review aims to systematically map and analyze the full spectrum of dimensions (spanning Structure, Process, and Outcome) and measurement approaches used to evaluate family doctor contract services in mainland China.

Methods

This scoping review will be conducted in accordance with the JBI methodology for scoping reviews. We will search electronic databases, including CNKI, Wanfang, PubMed, and Web of Science, for literature published since 2006. Eligible sources will include three tracks: policy documents, quantitative studies, and qualitative studies. A three-track data extraction will be performed . Data will be analyzed using a multi-stage triangulation analysis . We will map all metrics using two parallel lenses: the Donabedian (Structure, Process, Outcome) framework and the Quintuple Aim . Results

will be presented using a Sankey Diagram (to map the macro evidence flow) and a Heat Map (to matrix quantitative metrics) . Two independent reviewers will screen and extract data, with discrepancies resolved by a third reviewer.

Discussion

This scoping review will provide the first comprehensive triangulation map of the FDCS evaluation ecosystem. It will help to objectively identify alignments and gaps between stated policy goals (from policy documents), quantitative research findings, and qualitative stakeholder perspectives. By mapping the landscape, this 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 subtle mismeasurement 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 dimensions, 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 dimensions (spanning structure, process, and outcome) and measurement approaches have been used to evaluate the impact of family doctor contract services on contracted residents in China?

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 interventions delivered to contracted residents, if those interventions are not included in the routine scope of services defined by the family doctor contract services policy.

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" or "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/Source of evidence 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. These data will be made available upon request to ensure transparency in the selection process.

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, quantitative, and qualitative) to facilitate our triangulation analysis.

1. For government-issued policy documents: The data extraction will include the following fields: author (issuer) , year of publication (or release) , and the specific evaluation dimensions or indicators mentioned (e.g., 'contract rate', 'satisfaction'). Each extracted indicator will also be classified by the review team according to the Donabedian (Structure, Process, Outcome) framework.
2. For quantitative studies: The data extraction will be the most detailed. It will include: author , year of publication , province(s) involved in the study, study population, data source/respondent, data collection method, study design (method), and the specific metrics reported. For each metric, two reviewers will independently perform a parallel classification using two theoretical lenses:

   Lens 1 (S-P-O Classification): The metric will be categorized as Structure, Process, or Outcome.

   Lens 2 (Quintuple Aim Domain): The metric will be independently categorized as relating to Population Health, Patient Experience, Per Capita Cost, Provider Well-being, Health Equity, or 'Not Applicable' (N/A)[29] (e.g., for purely structural or process-based KPIs).

Furthermore, we will extract the Specific Metric Definition, the Measurement Tool/Scale used (e.g., 'SF-36' or 'self-developed scale'), and the Timepoint of Measurement.

3. For qualitative studies: The data extraction will focus on: author, year, participant type, data collection method and the phenomenon of interest.

   We will extract the key themes or constructs identified by the study that relate to stakeholder-valued aspects of the structure, process (e.g., quality), or outcomes of FDCS (e.g., 'trust', 'communication', 'coordination').

The three distinct extraction forms will be piloted by two reviewers (YW and HJ). This pilot will be purposefully structured to ensure the reliability and consistency of all three tracks. The reviewers will pilot an estimated 15-20 sources, purposively selected to include a sufficient sample of each evidence type (e.g., approximately 5-7 policy documents, 5-7 qualitative studies, and 5-7 quantitative studies).

Crucially, the piloting will focus intensively on calibrating the complex Quantitative form. The reviewers (YW, HJ, and DY) will hold specific calibration meetings to test the parallel classification (SPO x Quintuple Aim) and the "Data Source/Respondent" fields, ensuring all reviewers apply these complex criteria identically.

Any discrepancies or differences between the two reviewers (YW, HJ) will be discussed and resolved through consultation with the third reviewer (DY). After piloting, the extraction process and the forms themselves will be adjusted if necessary to ensure maximum clarity and consistency.

The study selection process will be illustrated using a PRISMA-Scr flow diagram, and the extracted data will be securely stored with clear records for tracking and reference. Any additional data identified during the extraction process will be included iteratively

Data analysis and presentation

In this scoping review, the extracted data will undergo a multi-stage triangulation analysis. This analysis is designed to systematically map the findings from the three distinct extraction tracks (Policy, Quantitative, and Qualitative).

Step 1: Triangulation (The Macro Map): We will first synthesize the findings from all three evidence tracks. This synthesis will be visually presented using a Sankey Diagram. This diagram will be used to illustrate the 'flow' of evidence—for example, mapping metrics from their 'source type' (e.g., Policy document, Quantitative study) to their 'S-P-O category', and subsequently to their 'Quintuple Aim domain' (or 'N/A'). This visualization will help to objectively map the relationships and distribution of evidence across the evaluation ecosystem.

Step 2: Quantitative Mapping (The Micro Matrix): Following the macro mapping, we will conduct a detailed micro-analysis of the data extracted from quantitative studies (Track 2). We will create a cross-tabulation matrix to map the S-P-O Classification (Lens 1) against the Quintuple Aim Domains (Lens 2). This matrix will be visually presented as a Heat Map or Balloon Plot to quantitatively illustrate the frequency and distribution of metrics across the intersections of these two frameworks.

Step 3: Narrative Synthesis: A descriptive narrative synthesis will accompany these visualizations. This summary will provide context to the results, objectively describing the alignment and potential gaps between the three evidence tracks (policy goals, quantitative reality, and qualitative needs). The summary will also highlight any notable concentrations or absences observed in the use of measurement tools for specific dimensions.

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] OR "GP"[Title/Abstract] OR "GPs"[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])

Google Scholar

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

Embase

(('family doctor*' OR 'general practitioner*' OR gp OR gps):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)

Web of Science (WOS)

TS=(("family doctor*" OR "general practitioner*" OR GP OR GPs) AND (contract* OR sign* OR signing OR agreement*)) OR TS=("family doctor contract service*") AND TS=(China OR Chinese)

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")

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")

Search conducted on: 18, November, 2025