

1 **Digital healthcare reform and reduction of duplicate examinations and tests: a**
2 **study of physicians' behavior on mutual recognition in response to clinical**
3 **specialized demands and information intervention form a national pilot**
4 **province in China**

5

6

7 **Chao Song**

8 ROLES: Conceptualization, Data curation, Formal analysis, Funding acquisition, Methodology,
9 Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing –
10 review & editing.

11 Email: songchao@hmc.edu.cn

12 AFFILIATION: Department of Medical Affairs and Zhejiang Center of Clinical Laboratories,
13 Zhejiang Provincial People's Hospital, People's Hospital of Hangzhou Medical College, Hangzhou,
14 China.

15

16 **Xinmian Huang**

17 ROLES: Formal analysis, Methodology, Software, Writin – review & editing

18 Email: 417563461@qq.com

19 AFFILIATION: Department of Urology and Medical Affairs, Zhejiang Provincial People's Hospital,
20 People's Hospital of Hangzhou Medical College, Hangzhou, China.

21

22 **Shasha Qian**

23 ROLES: Conceptualization, Resources, Supervision

24 Email: qssxiao@163.com

25 AFFILIATION: Department of Medical Affairs, Zhejiang Provincial People's Hospital, People's
26 Hospital of Hangzhou Medical College, Hangzhou, China.

27

28 **Chaoyun Yuan**

29 ROLES: Investigation, Project administration, Resources, Software, Supervision

30 Email: yuanchaoyun3@126.com

31 AFFILIATION: Department of Information Center, Zhejiang Provincial People's Hospital, People's
32 Hospital of Hangzhou Medical College, Hangzhou, China.

33

34 **Shuning Liu**

35 ROLES: Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Writing – review & editing

36 Email: liushuning27@163.com

37 AFFILIATION: Department of International and Domestic Cooperation, Zhejiang Provincial
38 People's Hospital, People's Hospital of Hangzhou Medical College, Hangzhou, China.

39

40 **Jun Zhou**

41 ROLES: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Supervision, Writin – original draft, Writing – review
42 & editing

43 **Corresponding author**, Email: zhoujun_zju@outlook.com

44 AFFILIATION: Department of Laboratory Medicine, Hangzhou Children's Hospital, Hangzhou.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

45 China.

46

47 **Competing Interests**

48 The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

49

50 **Funding**

51 1. Grant number 2024C35061, The Soft Science Research Project of Zhejiang Provincial

52 Department of Science and Technology.

53 2. Grant number 2023KY047, The Medical and Health Science and Technology Project of

54 Zhejiang Province.

55 The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish,
56 or preparation of the manuscript.

57

58 **Abstract**

59 **Background:** To reduce duplicate medical exams and tests for patients across different hospitals and
60 alleviate their financial burden, Zhejiang, with the capital Hangzhou, has launched a digital
61 healthcare reform named "Zhejiang Medical Mutual Recognition" from 2021 and become a pilot
62 province in China. This digital healthcare reform policy has begun to be gradually implemented
63 nationwide. This study aims to evaluate and analyze the differences in physicians' behavior during
64 the mutual recognition process across different types of hospitals, clinical specialties, and
65 information intervention strategies, in order to provide suggestions and assistance for the
66 optimization and improvement of nationwide mutual recognition policies.

67 **Methods:** This is a one-year multicenter study involving eight top-tier hospitals in Hangzhou, China,
68 covering various types of hospitals, including general hospitals, traditional chinese medicine
69 hospitals, integrated chinese and western medicine hospitals, and specialized hospitals. A set of
70 recognition indicators, such as recognition proportion, cross-hospital recognition rate, were designed
71 to evaluate physicians' behaviors, providing a multi-dimensional perspective. Hospitals were
72 grouped and compared based on their characteristics of their clinical specialties. The key recognition
73 indicators among different hospitals, different specialties, and the same specialties in different
74 hospitals were compared. The information intervention strategies were implemented in 3 hospitals to
75 reduce the overlooked access rate and improve recognition rates through the method of information
76 system restrictions. The remaining five hospitals, which did not implement these specific
77 information interventions, served as the control group.

78 **Results:** The traditional chinese medicine demonstrated a low cross-hospital precision delivery rate
79 but a high rate of recognizing reports from other hospitals, contrasting with pediatrics. There were
80 significant differences in recognition indicators among different clinical specialties. The total
81 recognition proportion for the traditional chinese medicine group and the pediatrics group were
82 51.18% and 9.95%, respectively. The differences were not significant among the same clinical
83 specialties in different hospitals, however, some recognition indicators were also noticeably affected
84 by the mutual recognition management strategies of the affiliated hospitals. Information intervention
85 in certain hospitals significantly reduced the overlooked access rate; information intervention had

86 increased the workload for physicians in accessing duplicate reports, mainly stemming from the
87 repetitive process of accessing reports from their own hospital both locally and on the platform,
88 without significant affect on the main recognition indicators across hospitals.

89 **Conclusion:** The recognition indicators designed in this study can effectively assess and provide
90 decision support for mutual recognitio management. Although the treatment characteristics of
91 clinical specialties are factors affecting mutual recognition, the management strategies implemented
92 by hospitals can also significantly change mutual recognition. Hospital management strategies, such
93 as information interventions, need to strike a balance between mutual recognition work and the
94 workload of physicians accessing duplicate reports.

95

96 **Keywords:**

97 Mutual Recognition; Hospital Management; Clinical Specialties; Indicator Management Method;
98 Information Intervention; Medical Insurance

99

100 **Introduction**

101 In the context of healthcare reform in China,^[1] the mutual recognition of medical examination
102 and test reports (MR) has emerged as a pivotal strategy to enhance the efficiency of the healthcare
103 system and reduce the burden on patients.^[2,3] The Diagnosis-Related Groups (DRG) payment
104 method controls medical expenses by setting predetermined cost standards, encouraging hospitals to
105 use resources efficiently.^[4-6] The MR reduces unnecessary duplicate examinations and tests, thereby
106 lowering costs. When integrated with the DRG payment method, it aids in managing medical
107 insurance expenditures and enhancing the efficiency of medical services.^[7] The MR had significantly
108 reduced the unnecessary repetitive examinations and tests when patients seek treatment across
109 different hospitals in the past three years, enhanced the efficiency of tiered diagnosis and treatment,
110 and also markedly saved on the expenditure of medical insurance funds.

111 Zhejiang Province, with its provincial capital Hangzhou, is situated in the eastern coastal
112 region of China within the Yangtze River Economic Belt and is acknowledged as a leading province
113 in MR, serving as a model for the advancement of Shanghai, Jiangsu Province, and Fujian
114 Province.^[8] Zhejiang Province has taken the lead in establishing the "Zhejiang Medical Mutual
115 Recognition" platform (MR platform) in 2021^[9], which is dedicated to breaking down barriers in
116 medical data and achieving seamless MR and efficient sharing of examination and test results across
117 diverse medical institutions. The MR platform has become a key focus for enhancing medical
118 efficiency, optimizing resource allocation, and alleviating the economic burden on patients.^[10] On
119 the government website of Zhejiang Province in China, as of 2022, the MR platform had
120 cumulatively recognized various items 16.81 million, directly saving medical expenses of 712
121 million RMB, with residents making over 70,000 self-service inquiries daily.^[11]

122 The MR platform is built upon a province-wide integrated intelligent public data architecture,
123 deeply integrating medical big data resources and seamlessly connecting with various departmental
124 medical information systems. It activates the potential of medical data elements and reshapes the
125 value ecosystem of medical and health services. Through digital empowerment, the platform
126 standardizes diagnostic and treatment processes in all aspects, strengthens mechanisms for rational
127 examinations, enhances supervision and management efficiency, and significantly improves the
128 patient's medical experience. Since the MR platform's launch three years ago, by the end of 2024, it

129 has been deeply integrated into clinical practice. Physicians have become proficient in using the
130 platform to access patients' previous examination and test reports, which has significantly reduced
131 diagnostic cycles, markedly improving the efficiency and quality of medical services, and effectively
132 reducing the burden on patients. It has also accumulated experience in MR management for medical
133 institutions and prepared for the reform of medical insurance fund payments.

134 However, it cannot be ignored that the diversity of hospital management and the complexity of
135 clinical specialty characteristics are intertwined, forming a multifaceted network of factors affecting
136 the effectiveness of MR. The underlying mechanisms of this network remain to be deeply explored.
137 This gap hampers the precise optimization and widespread promotion of MR policies, necessitating
138 systematic research to address it. In light of this, our study is based on the MR platform, deeply
139 analyzing the interactive logic of hospital management and clinical specialty characteristics. We aim
140 to customize strategies for the refined hospital management of recognition and provide a basis for
141 the construction of a national MR network and the assessment of physicians' behaviors.

142

143

144 **Methods**

145

146 **Participants and data collection**

147 This study was a multicenter analysis, including various types of hospitals across China, all of
148 which were large tertiary hospitals (grade A hospitals), and were concentrated in the provincial
149 capital city of Hangzhou. A total of eight hospitals were included in the focal study, representing a
150 diverse array of medical institutions. These hospitals were selected based on the scale of their
151 operations, with each exceeding an annual medical revenue of 1.6 billion RMB (approximately 225
152 million USD) in 2023.^[12] The participants were composed of four general hospitals (designated as
153 hospital A, hospital B, hospital C, and hospital D), a hospital specializing in traditional chinese
154 medicine(TCM) (designated as hospital E), an integrated hospital combining chinese and western
155 medical practices (designated as hospital F), and two specialized hospitals (designated as hospital G
156 and hospital H). The selection criteria ensured a comprehensive evaluation across various healthcare
157 delivery models.

158 The physician behaviors of eight hospital were recorded by the MR platform, which was
159 accessible to hospitals. A complete statistical period from October 1, 2023, to September 30, 2024,
160 was selected to ensure a comprehensive reflection of physician behaviors, mitigating the impact of
161 seasonal or short-term fluctuations and enhancing the representativeness and stability.

162 All the data were subjected to anonymization. This process involved the careful exclusion of
163 any sensitive information that could compromise individual privacy or reveal clinical symptoms,
164 thus aligning with regulatory compliance and prioritizing patient confidentiality. All the data did not
165 contain information that could identify individual participants during or after data collection.

166

167 **Mutual recognition workflow**

168 The recognition and the specific actions taken by physicians at each step are shown in the
169 workflow (Fig 1). The workflow begins with a physician's intention to issue exam or test items order.
170 The MR platform is then queried to search for the existence of recently completed reports for the
171 same items in the patient's medical records from other hospitals. If no report is found, the item order

172 can be directly sent and executed by the local hospital. However, if there is a recently conducted
173 report of the same item exists, the platform will deliver the reports to the local medical system and
174 remind the physician to access the delivered reports. Upon accessing the reports, the physician
175 should make a decision on recognition. If the decision is non-recognition, the item order issued by
176 physician will be executed by the local hospital. Conversely, a recognition decision will lead to the
177 cancellation of the issued item order, and the recognized reports will be downloaded to the local
178 medical system. If the physician consistently overlooks the delivered reports, the item order can also
179 be executed by the local hospital.

180
181

182 **Recognition indicators**

183 A set of recognition indicators were designed to analyze the activities of hospitals, clinical
184 specialties, and physicians on the MR platform. The main recognition indicators were designed
185 based on the frequency of platform delivery, access reports, recognition decision, providing a
186 quantitative assessment of recognition. The definitions and connotations of each recognition
187 indicator were detailed as follows.

188 **Total Recognition Proportion(TRP):** This indicator showed the percentage of recognized
189 items to the overall accessed items.

190 **Total Recognition Rate(TRR):**This indicator showed the percentage of recognized items to
191 the delivered items.

192 **Precision Delivery Rate(PDR):** This indicator showed the percentage of the precision
193 delivered reports to the total number of delivered reports within a standard period, reflecting how
194 well a patient's previous medical reports align with their current medical needs.

195 **Access Rate(AR):** This indicator showed the percentage of the accessed items to the total
196 number of precision delivered items, indicating the effectiveness of physicians' engagement with the
197 delivered items.

198 **Overlooked Access Rate(OAR):** This indicator showed the percentage of the overlooked items
199 to the delivered items, highlighting instances where physicians might overlook or choose not to
200 engage with exams and tests. The Access Rate and the Overlooked Access Rate sum up to 100%.

201 **Cross-Hospital Access Rate(CHAR):** This indicator showed the percentage of the accessed
202 items to the precision delivered items from other hospital, indicating the effectiveness of physicians'
203 engagement with the other hospitals' delivered items.

204 **Cross-Hospital Recognition Proportion(CHRP):**This indicator showed the percentage of
205 recognized items to the accessed items from other hospitals.

206 **Cross-Hospital Recognition Rate(CHRR):** This indicator showed the percentage of the
207 recognized items in total delivered items from other hospitals, measuring the effectiveness of
208 cross-hospital recognition.

209 **Intra-Hospital Recognition Proportion(IHRP):**This indicator showed the percentage of
210 recognized items to the accessed items from the hospital where the physician was based.

211 **Radiological Exam Fees Proportion(REFP):** This represented the share of cost savings that
212 came from recognizing radiological exam items in the total cost of all recognized items, revealing
213 the efficiency of radiological exam resources used in the recognition.

214
215

216 **Groups and Comparisons**

217 This analysis involved a comparison of various recognition indicators across 8 hospitals. The
218 comparisons at the clinical specialty level began by categorizing data into four major groups:
219 internal medicine, surgery, TCM, and pediatrics. Data from outpatient departments or units named
220 under internal medicine were allocated to the internal medicine group, and similarly, data named
221 under surgery were allocated to the surgery group, traditional chinese medicine to the traditional
222 chinese medicine group, and pediatrics to the pediatrics group. To further delineated the behavioral
223 differences among clinical specialties, the surgery and internal medicine groups were subdivided
224 into more specific groups. Within the Surgery group, five clinical specialty groups were selected,
225 which included hepatobiliary surgery, thoracic surgery, orthopedics, urology, and neurosurgery. In
226 the internal medicine group, five clinical specialty groups were identified, namely endocrinology,
227 respiratory medicine, gastroenterology, nephrology, and neurology. This resulted in a total of 12
228 clinical specialty groups. The comparisons of recognition indicators were conducted across these
229 clinical specialty groups.

230

231 **Correlation between recognition indicators**

232 The analysis included data from an overall group, as well as segmented data from 8 hospitals
233 and 12 clinical specialty groups. The correlation analysis delved into the interrelationships among
234 main recognition indicators, focusing on four critical aspects: the link between TRP and OAR to
235 assess if there's a relationship between the extent of recognition and the frequency of overlooked
236 access incidents; the potential linear relationship between TRP and the CHRP; and the correlation
237 between OAR and CHRP. These analyses collectively aimed to provide a comprehensive
238 understanding of how recognition practices, cost implications, and overlooked access interacted
239 within and across hospitals.

240

241 **Comparison between specialized and general hospitals**

242 This analysis involved a comparative analysis of recognition indicators on the MR platform
243 between specialized hospitals and their corresponding specialties within general hospitals.
244 Specifically, the study collected and compared data from two distinct groups:

245 Data from the children's specialized hospital (Hospital H) was gathered and contrasted with
246 data from pediatric departments in general hospitals (excluding Hospital H). The comparison
247 included a range of indicators on the MR platform to assess differences in recognition practices and
248 outcomes between the specialized hospital and general hospital focused on pediatric care.

249 Similarly, data from the traditional Chinese medicine hospital (Hospital E) was compared with
250 data from TCM departments within general hospitals (excluding Hospital E). This comparison
251 aimed to identify any significant disparities in recognition behavior and to evaluate the effectiveness
252 of recognition within the context of TCM practices across different types of hospitals.

253

254 **Comparison between clinical specialties in different hospitals**

255 Hospital management strategies on recognition had an affect on physicians' behaviors, for
256 example, physician training, performance incentives, and MR promotion, etc. Two large general
257 hospitals with similar scales, Hospitals C and D, both with complete departments of urology,
258 thoracic surgery, orthopedics, nephrology, gastroenterology, and respiratory medicine, were selected
259 as representative cases. The recognition indicators of the aforementioned clinical specialties in the

260 two hospitals were compared to analyze the physicians' behaviors of the same clinical specialties in
261 different hospital management.

262

263 **Information intervention**

264 According to the design of the MR platform, every item that had been accessed must be subject
265 to a recognition decision. However, before reaching the decision-making phase, particularly during
266 the report access stage, the platform did not uniformly require all hospitals to implement information
267 intervention on the dotted arrow path that overlooked access in Fig 1, restricting physician from
268 using this path. When hospitals were connected to the MR platform, their internal information
269 intervention strategies were developed based on the clinical habits of physicians. Ultimately,
270 Hospitals A, C, and F carried out the information intervention on path of overlooked access while
271 other hospitals had not set up. We conducted a follow-up observation for over a year on the
272 recognition behavior of physicians in each hospitals and compared the recognition indicators
273 between hospitals with and without information intervention on path of overlooked access.

274 This study, which involves the analysis of existing, anonymized data, did not require direct
275 patient or public involvement in data collection. However, we acknowledge the importance of
276 patient and public perspectives and have consulted with relevant stakeholders to ensure our research
277 questions and outcomes are aligned with their interests and needs. Though not directly involved in
278 this observational study, their insights have informed the broader implications and potential
279 applications of our findings. We remain committed to engaging patients and the public in our
280 research endeavors moving forward.

281

282 **Results**

283 **Overall and Grouped Results**

284 During the study period, the 8 large hospitals received a total of 26,759,077 delivered items
285 through the MR platform, with 3,639,368 precision delivered items sent to meet physicians' orders.
286 There were 3,265,038 instances of physicians accessing reports, and 2,449,006 instances where
287 physicians explicitly made recognition decisions. There were 1,190,431 instances where reports
288 were overlooked and not accessed.

289 The recognition indicators for different clinical specialty groups were displayed in Table 1.
290 There were significant differences in the PDR among the four major clinical specialty groups. The
291 TCM group had the PDR of only 0.76%, which was closely related to the relatively low demand for
292 routine exams and tests and lower attention to past items by TCM physicians. In contrast, the
293 pediatric group had a rate as high as 5.79%, significantly higher than both the surgery group and the
294 internal medicine group. Without distinguishing between specialties and time periods, the TRP
295 within 30 days was 41.54%, with the surgery group and the internal medicine group being roughly
296 the same, while the TCM group had the highest TRP, reaching 51.18%, especially for reports from
297 other hospitals, reflecting a higher recognition of patients' past reports in TCM diagnostic and
298 treatment concepts. In comparison, the TRP of the pediatric group was significantly lower than other
299 groups, at only 9.95%, indicating that pediatric physicians, due to the rapid changes in children's
300 conditions, payed more attention to recent item results, and most past items of children had not been
301 recognized.

302 Distinct differences in recognition indicators among clinical specialty groups were shown in

303 Table 1. For instance, the nephrology group had a TRP as high as 69.03%, while the urology group
304 was relatively lower, at only 21.15%. The PDR in the Endocrinology group was 25.27%, while the
305 Neurosurgery group was only 2.85%. These differences reflected the varying degrees of demand and
306 reliance on exams and tests items in different clinical specialty groups during the diagnostic and
307 treatment process, thereby affecting their behavior on the MR platform.

308 Surgical specialty groups, such as orthopedics, hepatobiliary surgery, and neurosurgery
309 primarily focused on radiological exams, resulting in a relatively higher REFP. In contrast, The
310 internal medicine specialty groups majorly focused on laboratory test recognition, reflecting the
311 characteristic of internal medicine that emphasizes laboratory index analysis. However, the
312 respiratory medicine group paid more attention to radiological exams, leading to a slightly higher
313 REFP compared to other internal medicine specialties. The urology group, due to the high frequency
314 of routine urine tests, had a significantly lower REFP to other surgical specialties.

315

316 **Table 1. Recognition indicators across clinical specialty groups in the MR platform**

Groups	Clinical Specialty	TRP(%)	CHRP(%)	PDR (%)	REFP(%)	OAR(%)
Surgery Group	Hepatobiliary surgery	32.34	41.28	3.84	74.96	13.09
	Orthopedics	31.05	51.63	4.81	89.04	9.52
	Urology	21.15	24.98	9.78	28.16	16.68
	Thoracic surgery	50.67	44.44	17.77	70.23	55.65
	Neurosurgery	33.28	39.14	2.85	79.76	15.46
Internal Medicine Group	Endocrinology	35.84	39.23	25.27	1.74	29.55
	Neurology	40.45	49.75	8.84	34.15	18.5
	Nephrology	69.03	57.92	42.29	1.40	57.34
	Gastroenterology	44.66	52.21	6.64	16.44	14.42
	Respiratory Medicine	36.39	40.21	10.94	64.66	28.27
TCM Group	TCM	51.18	67.5	3.18	28.7	13.29
Pediatrics Group	Pediatrics	9.95	12.32	19.79	18.46	14.76
All Data		41.54	39.81	13.6	27.31	32.71

317

318 The TRP, CHRR, and AR were main recognition indicators of the recognition effectiveness
319 across the selected hospitals, which were shown in Table 2. The highest rates in both TRP(75.77%)
320 and CHRP(48.96%) were shown in Hospital D, indicating strong policy adherence and intra-hospital
321 collaboration. Conversely, Hospital H had the lowest rates, suggesting potential barriers to
322 implementation. The AR were generally high in Hospitals A, C, and F. However, The lower rate of
323 44.61% in Hospital B indicated a need for improvement. The OAR was notably high in Hospital B
324 (55.39%), suggesting possible resistance or lack of awareness, while Hospitals A, C, and F showed
325 low rates, below 2%, related to the information intervention in report access conducted by the three
326 hospitals.

327

328 **Table 2: The recognition indicators for selected tertiary hospitals in the MR platform**

Hospital	TRP (%)	TRR (%)	AR(%)	CHRR (%)	OAR (%)
----------	---------	---------	-------	----------	---------

Hospital A	18.39	18.2	98.94	58.19	1.14
Hospital B	71.03	31.69	44.61	37.33	55.39
Hospital C	8.17	8.04	98.52	24.61	1.48
Hospital D	75.77	54.63	72.1	48.96	27.9
Hospital E	55.01	44.31	80.56	44.39	19.44
Hospital F	22.3	22.06	98.93	49.59	1.08
Hospital G	55.6	45.24	81.38	35.04	18.62
Hospital H	2.37	2.05	86.56	2.82	13.44

329

330

331 **Relationship between major recognition indicators**

332 The regression analysis of three key recognition indicators: OAR, TRP, and CHRP were shown
333 in Fig 2. The 21 data points in each chart are derived from an overall group, as well as segmented
334 data from 8 hospitals and 12 clinical specialty groups. Fig 2A shows the correlation between OAR
335 and TRP, presenting a positive correlation ($r=0.682$, $p<0.05$). The correlation indicates that as the
336 rate of overlooked access increased, the rate of total recognition proportion also increased. Fig 2B
337 shows the correlation between CHRP and TRP, presenting a positive correlation ($r=0.776$, $p<0.05$).
338 The correlation indicates that hospitals with a higher proportion of cross-hospital recognition also
339 tended to have a higher total recognition proportion. Fig 2C shows the correlation between OAR and
340 CHRP, presenting a non-significant correlation ($r=0.268$, $p>0.05$). The positive correlation observed
341 between the OAR and TRP implies that physicians with a higher rate of overlooking to access
342 reports also exhibit a higher TRP. This correlation may stem from the clinical practice where reports
343 overlooked by physicians were typically non-recognizable, thus when the OAR is high, the
344 denominator in the TRP calculation is reduced, which in turn boosts the TRP. The absence of a
345 correlation between OAR and CHRP suggests that the tendency of physicians to overlook delivered
346 reports does not influence their recognition of delivered reports from other hospitals, as the majority
347 of the overlooked reports are likely internal to their own hospital.

348

349

350 **Comparison between specialized and general Hospitals**

351 Hospital H represented data from a large pediatric specialty hospital, while the pediatric
352 department data excluded Hospital H and reflected the characteristics of pediatric departments in
353 general hospitals. The recognition indicators reflected physicians' behavior in terms of disease
354 diagnosis and treatment needs are shown in Fig 3. The figure presents a comparative bar chart of
355 seven recognition indicators for pediatrics in general hospitals (blue bars) and pediatric specialized
356 hospitals (red bars) in Fig 3A, and for TCM in general hospitals (green bars) and TCM specialized
357 hospitals (yellow bars) in Fig 3B. The x-axis represents the rate of each indicator as a percentage,
358 while the y-axis lists the seven indicators. The four indicators, including CHAR, AR, CHRP and
359 PDR, demonstrate no substantial differences between general and specialized hospitals in both
360 pediatrics(Fig 3A) and TCM(Fig 3B). However, the significant disparities are observed in CHRR,
361 TRR and TRP between the two hospitals in Fig 3A. The corresponding indicators for hospital H are
362 significantly lower than those for the pediatric departments in general hospitals, indicating that
363 pediatric specialized hospital physicians have a higher requirement for recent medical reports
364 compared to pediatricians in general hospitals. There are minimal differences in the recognition

365 indicators between general hospitals and TCM specialized hospitals. The CHRR, TRR, and TRP are
366 relatively consistent, indicating that the level of recognition practice is comparable. The differences
367 between TCM departments in general hospitals and hospital E are significantly less pronounced than
368 those between pediatric departments in general hospitals and hospital H. This suggests that TCM has
369 a relatively high recognition ratio for recent medical records, and despite being in different hospital
370 settings, the demand differences for recognition do not significantly across TCM specialties.

371

372

373 **Affect of information intervention**

374 It is shown that the implementation of information intervention strategies can significantly
375 reduce the OAR, ensuring that reports delivered by the MR platform are accessed by physicians(Fig
376 4). Hospitals A, C, and F have implemented information intervention strategies. Under the
377 information intervention strategies, the OAR among physicians have significantly decreased, with
378 rates as low as 1.14%, 1.48%, and 1.08%, respectively. However, the TRP in these three hospitals
379 are notably lower compared to other hospitals without the information intervention strategies,
380 standing at 18.39%, 8.17%, and 22.30%, respectively. Further analysis of the CHRP reveals no
381 significant difference between hospitals with information intervention and those without. This
382 suggests that while the information intervention could effectively reduce instances of overlooked
383 accession to delivered reports, it may also somewhat reduce the TRP of the hospital, although the
384 affect on the CHRP is not significant. It is reflected that there is no significant difference in the
385 recognition of reports to external hospitals due to the intervention, but primarily affects the
386 accession of reports originating from intra-hospital. It is noteworthy that hospital H, a pediatric
387 specialized hospital, despite not having implemented information intervention, has very low TRP
388 and CHRP, which may be related to the special diagnostic and treatment needs and patient
389 population characteristics of pediatric specialized hospitals. It is also reflected that beyond the
390 influence of information intervention, the characteristics of the clinical specialty and other
391 management strategies of the hospital also play an important roles. Consequently, even with an
392 increased OAR, the TRP and CHRP remained relatively low.

393

394 **Clinical specialties in different hospitals**

395 A visual representation of the recognition indicators for various clinical specialties in hospital
396 C and hospital D are shown in Fig 5. The indicators include TRR, CHRR, IHRP, CHRP and OAR.
397 The color gradient from light to dark blue signifies increasing values, with darker shades indicating
398 higher rates or proportions.

399 Hospital D exhibits a generally higher recognition across most indicators compared to hospital
400 C. This is evident from the darker blue shades prevalent in columns of hospital D for TRR, IHRP
401 and OAR, suggesting a more effective implementation of recognition practices. This indicates that
402 while both hospitals may have comparable practices in acknowledging reports from other hospitals.

403 It is revealed that for hospital C, the TRR, IHRP and OAR for most clinical specialties are
404 generally lower than corresponding clinical specialties in hospital D, indicating that the physicians'
405 behaviors are significantly influenced by the management of its host hospital. Due to the
406 implementation of information intervention strategies in hospital C, physicians have accessed a
407 higher number of delivered reports that may not require attention, leading to a lower TRR in the
408 final count. However, it is noteworthy that the orthopedics department in hospital C has a higher

409 CHRP compared to hospital D. Orthopedics physicians has a higher recognition for recent radiology
410 reports, and the implement of information intervention in hospital C has promoted an increase in the
411 number of recognition in orthopedics.

412

413

414

415

416 **Discussion**

417 **The relationship of MR and DRG**

418 The implementation of DRG reform in China's healthcare system has significantly influenced
419 the necessity and affect of MR. As highlighted in the study, the DRG reform has led to a notable
420 decrease in the standard deviation (SD) of hospitalization expenditure for patients with chronic
421 obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), acute myocardial infarction (AMI), and cerebral infarction
422 (CI) in a Chinese city[13,14]. The MR has been catalyzed by the DRG payment reform in China,
423 positively influencing its implementation and leading to a more efficient and patient-centered
424 healthcare model. This integrated approach is crucial for the future of healthcare management and
425 policy-making in China, as it tackles the challenges of escalating healthcare costs and the demand
426 for high-quality, cost-effective medical services.

427 In the advancement of MR, the recognition needs and scales of clinical specialties are closely
428 related to the main diseases treated, which are main factors influencing recognition practices. By
429 conducting an in-depth analysis of recognition indicators from various large hospitals, this study
430 provides reliable evidence and strong guidance for precisely identifying differences in the
431 performance of MR across different clinical specialties^[15]. Since the promulgation of MR by the
432 National Health Commission in 2022^[16], a clear standard has been established, strictly following the
433 framework of mutual recognition at the same level. In China's medical reform, tiered diagnosis and
434 treatment have a significant affect on the use of medical insurance funds and medical services for
435 various diseases.^[17,18] Due to the complexity of medical technology, the challenging nature of patient
436 conditions, and the high demand for diagnostic accuracy, theoretically, the recognition rates of large
437 tertiary hospitals may be relatively lower compared to primary and some secondary hospitals. This
438 phenomenon does not imply that the MR work in large tertiary hospitals is lagging; rather, it reflects
439 the need for a more cautious balance between the feasibility and necessity of recognition when
440 facing complex conditions, to ensure medical quality and patient safety. On the other hand, the
441 equipment and quality control levels for exams and tests in lower-level hospitals usually do not meet
442 the standards required by tertiary hospitals. Large tertiary hospitals, with their extensive range of
443 diagnoses and treatments, involve a vast array of diseases, and the indicators related to the
444 recognition practices can comprehensively and meticulously reflect the needs of each clinical
445 specialty for various diseases^[19]. Therefore, these hospitals have the capability to set precise
446 reference baselines for recognition indicators within the provincial medical field, providing a clear
447 and definite direction for hospitals at all levels to carry out comparative management work. In this
448 study, the eight large tertiary general hospitals across the province, including general hospitals and
449 various types of specialized hospitals, have been selected, demonstrating good representation and
450 depth in terms of categories, which can accurately and effectively present the behavioral patterns
451 and intrinsic needs of clinical specialties in MR. This ensures that the research conclusions are

452 highly representative and universally applicable, providing crucial and solid support for the
453 optimization of medical resource allocation and the refinement of MR policies.

454 The recognition indicators constructed in this study offers significant analytical and evaluative
455 value for the recognition behaviors of physicians on the MR platform. Through these indicators, a
456 comprehensive and systematic reflection of the performance of hospitals, clinical specialties, and
457 physicians on the MR platform can be achieved. These indicators provide a quantitative basis for
458 in-depth research on the operational effectiveness of the MR platform, assisting hospital
459 management in accurately assessing the efficiency of MR work, identifying existing issues, and
460 taking timely targeted improvement measures. At the same time, they provide a unified standard for
461 horizontal comparisons between different hospitals, promoting the exchange of experiences and
462 mutual learning among hospitals.

463

464 **Optimization of the recognition management in clinical specialties**

465 The needs for medical exams and tests vary significantly among different clinical specialties,
466 which directly affects their behavior patterns on the MR platform. Most clinical specialties have a
467 higher recognition proportion for reports from other hospitals compared to their own hospital reports.
468 This phenomenon is due to various reasons. In the tiered diagnosis and treatment process^[20], patients
469 are referred from primary-level facilities to higher-level hospitals. They are usually at the initial
470 stage of consultation, and physicians tend to adopt existing exams and tests reports from other
471 hospitals to quickly establish a diagnosis and formulate treatment plans, saving time and costs for
472 patients, and starting treatment as soon as possible. During the follow-up process within the same
473 hospital, the patient's condition may be in a state of change, and physicians often need to assess the
474 effectiveness of the treatment at this stage, at which previous reports from the same hospital may not
475 meet the current medical needs, leading to a relatively lower recognition proportion for intra-hospita
476 reports. From the perspective of the recognition process, physicians usually access intra-hospital
477 items within the hospital's information system during routine medical treatment. It is understandable
478 that physicians do not access the reports delivered by MR platform in the absence of information
479 intervention or other hospital management strategies. This may be the main reason for the high
480 overlooked access rate in hospitals without information intervention. However, there may be other
481 reasons, possibly because some physicians are unwilling or afraid to trust the reports from other
482 hospitals. Therefore, strengthening training on recognition, establishing national or provincial
483 standards for the quality of exams and tests, and implementing them robustly are necessary to
484 alleviate physicians' concerns about reports from other hospitals.

485 The recognition indicators of a clinical specialty is not only related to the clinical specialty's
486 own diagnostic and treatment characteristics but is also closely related to the management and
487 guidance provided by the hospital to the clinical specialty. Taking pediatrics and traditional chinese
488 medicine as examples, there is a significant difference in recognition indicators between pediatric
489 departments in general hospitals and pediatric specialized hospitals, indicating that hospitals can
490 guide clinical specialty physicians to better participate in MR work, improve recognition rates, by
491 developing targeted training programs, establishing effective communication mechanisms, and
492 improving incentive measures. At the same time, hospitals can also formulate personalized
493 recognition guidelines based on the characteristics of different clinical specialties, clarifying which
494 items can be mutually recognized under what circumstances, providing physicians with clear
495 operational standards and reducing inconsistencies in recognition caused by individual judgment

496 differences. In addition, strengthening collaboration and communication between different clinical
497 specialties is also crucial, as good specialty collaboration can promote information sharing and
498 improve recognition efficiency, ensuring that patients benefit from the MR throughout the entire
499 diagnostic and treatment process.

500

501 **The affect of hospital management and information intervention**

502 The implementation of appropriate information intervention can furnish physicians with a
503 broader range of patient-related information crucial for decision-making. This encompasses details
504 like the indications, contraindications, and the level of accuracy associated with various exams.
505 Consequently, it empowers physicians to make more judicious choices regarding exam items,
506 thereby enhancing the precision of diagnosis and averting the occurrence of both over-exam and
507 under-exam. Typically, information intervention serves as a principal means by which hospitals
508 conduct the management of medical paths and the enforcement of medical norms. Similarly,
509 information intervention is also regarded as a method for the MR management in some hospitals. On
510 one hand, it is necessary to ensure that the MR platform covers all diagnostic and treatment
511 workstations, enabling physicians to access reports from the MR platform smoothly. On the other
512 hand, effective interventions of the recognition process by physicians is of vital importance. If
513 physicians ignore to access the cross-hospital reports, it will waste the resources for data
514 transmission and increase the exam and test costs that could have been saved on medical insurance.
515 Some hospitals have addressed this issue through information intervention strategies, significantly
516 improving the precision access rate and reducing the overlooked access rate. However, the
517 information intervention strategies also bring some negative affects, such as increasing the workload
518 for physicians in accessing duplicate reports. Under strictly information intervention, physicians
519 must access all delivered reports and make recognition decisions, even if some reports are clearly
520 outdated or not subject to recognition by default, which leads to an increase in non-recognition
521 quantity and a decrease in recognition rate. Therefore, when implementing management strategies,
522 hospitals need to strike a balance between ensuring effective recognition of reports and reducing the
523 workload for physicians in accessing duplicate reports, choosing appropriate management methods
524 based on the actual situation, such as considering the overlooked access rate, total recognition rate,
525 and cross-hospital recognition rate in a comprehensive manner.

526

527 **Limitations**

528 Although this study had conducted an in-depth analysis of hospital management and clinical
529 specialty behavior on the MR platform, there were certain limitations. First, the data from the MR
530 platform might only represent a major part of the province-wide mutual recognition, but not the
531 entirety, and did not reflect the full picture in Zhejiang Province, as it did not include data from
532 other reporting platforms, such as the cloud image platform.^[21] Second, the information intervention
533 strategies were just one of the methods hospitals use to manage internal mutual recognition; there
534 were other management methods that could also affect the recognition indicators of clinical
535 specialties. These included improving the quality of various exams and tests, conducting
536 promotional training, and performance assessments, etc. In addition, the study did not adequately
537 take into account the demand for exams and tests that originates directly from the patients
538 themselves.

539

540 **Future Prospects**

541 In response to the limitations of this study, future research can be carried out in the following
542 areas: First, extend the data collection period and increase the participating hospitals to more
543 accurately grasp the long-term trends and patterns of change, providing more forward-looking basis
544 for policy formulation. Second, strengthen the research on the coordination between medical
545 insurance policies and MR practices, conduct in-depth analysis of the affect of medical insurance
546 payment method reforms, reimbursement ratio adjustments, etc., on the recognition behavior of
547 physicians and patients to provide references for the optimization of medical insurance policies.
548
549
550

551 **Acknowledgments :**

552 The authors would like to express their sincere gratitude to all the individuals and
553 organizations that contributed to the successful completion of this study.Special thanks go
554 to the participating hospitals for their cooperation and for the valuable insights they
555 provided into the practical aspects of mutual recognition practices.
556
557

558 **Reference**

- 559
- 560 [1] Qian J., Health reform in China: Developments and future prospects. *Health Care Sci*, 2022.
561 27;1(3):166-172. pmid: 38938559
 - 562 [2] Wang J.J., et al., Current situation and trend of medical laboratory results homogeneity
563 management. *Zhonghua Yu Fang Yi Xue Za Zhi*, 2023. 57(9):1504-1509. pmid: 37743315
 - 564 [3] Sun G., Gong J., Implementation and influencing factors of inter-hospital mutual recognition of
565 medical examination results under hierarchical diagnosis and treatment policy. *Chin J Public*
566 *Health* ,2019.35(11): 1528-1531.(Chinese Article)
 - 567 [4] Jung Y.W., Pak H., Lee I., Kim E.H., The Effect of Diagnosis-Related Group Payment System
568 on Quality of Care in the Field of Obstetrics and Gynecology among Korean Tertiary Hospitals.
569 *Yonsei Med J*, 2018. 59(4):539-545. pmid 29749137
 - 570 [5] Zhao C., Wang C., Shen C., Wang Q., Diagnosis-related group (DRG)-based case-mix funding
571 system, a promising alternative for fee for service payment in China. *Biosci Trends*, 2018.
572 12(2):109-115. pmid: 29657242
 - 573 [6] Kim S.J., Park E.C., Kim S.J., Han K.T., Jang S.I., How did market competition affect
574 outpatient utilization under the diagnosis-related group-based payment system? *Int J Qual Health*
575 *Care*. 2017. 29(3):399-405. pmid: 28398580.
 - 576 [7] Aragón M.J., Chalkley M., Kreif N., The long-run effects of diagnosis related group payment
577 on hospital lengths of stay in a publicly funded health care system: Evidence from 15 years of micro
578 data. *Health Econ*, 2022.31(6):956-972. pmid: 35238106
 - 579 [8] Medical Administration Department of the National Health Commission of the People's
580 Republic of China. Guidance on Further Promoting the Mutual Recognition of Medical Institution
581 Inspection and Testing Results. Available: <http://www.nhc.gov.cn/zyygj/s7657/>

- 582 202411/630b0c398fd848f0a 2ea68c9b030197d.shtml.
- 583 [9] Zhejiang Provincial Health Commission. The provincial health commission has launched the
584 "Zhejiang Medical Mutual Recognition" application to further regulate medical behaviors and
585 promote reasonable medical examinations. Available: [https://](https://wsjkw.zj.gov.cn/art/2022/4/8/art_1650497_59016743.html)
586 wsjkw.zj.gov.cn/art/2022/4/8/art_1650497_59016743.html
- 587 [10] Chan S.L., Lum E., Ong M.E.H., Graves N., Implementation science: A critical but
588 undervalued part of the healthcare innovation ecosystem. *Health Care Sci*,2022.1(3):160-165. pmid:
589 38938555
- 590 [11] Zhejiang Provincial Health Commission. "Zhejiang Medical Mutual Recognition", "Zhejiang
591 Quality Childcare" and "Zhejiang First Aid" were selected as the "Best Applications" in the digital
592 reform. Available: https://wsjkw.zj.gov.cn/art/2022/12/9/art_1650497_59019121.html
- 593 [12] Zhejiang Provincial Health Commission. Departmental Final Accounts of Zhejiang Provincial
594 Health Commission for the Year 2023. Available:
595 https://wsjkw.zj.gov.cn/art/2024/8/29/art_1229123443_5364799.html
- 596 [13] Li Q., Fan X., Jian W., Impact of Diagnosis-Related-Group (DRG) payment on variation in
597 hospitalization expenditure: evidence from China. *BMC Health Serv Res*, 2023. 23(1):688. pmid:
598 37355657
- 599 [14] Zhu T., Chen C., Zhang X., Yang Q., Hu Y., Liu R., Zhang X., Dong Y., Differences in
600 inpatient performance of public general hospitals following implementation of a points-counting
601 payment based on diagnosis-related group: a robust multiple interrupted time series study in
602 Wenzhou, China. *BMJ Open*, 2024.14(3):e073913. pmid: 38471900
- 603 [15] Xiao-hua, X., Hui, L., Heng-bin, L., Zhen-wei, P., & Ru-ru, S. Analysis of the Status Quo and
604 Influencing Factors of Mutual Recognition of Medical Examination Results in Tertiary Hospitals.
605 *Chinese Hospital Management*, 2019,39(5), 17-19. (Chinese Article)
- 606 [16] Medical Administration Department of the National Health Commission of the People's
607 Republic of China. Notice on Issuing the Administrative Measures for the Mutual Recognition of
608 Examination and Test Results of Medical Institutions.
609 Available:<http://www.nhc.gov.cn/yzygj/s7659/202202/b2ea61aed69746e195e79d4b505ee8b4.shtml>
- 610 [17] Liu X., Du C., Hu F., et al., Management of acute exacerbation of chronic obstructive
611 pulmonary disease under a tiered medical system in China. *Ther Adv Respir Dis*,
612 2022.16:17534666221075499. pmid: 35156477
- 613 [18] Chen J., Xu S., Gao J.. The Mixed Effect of China's New Health Care Reform on Health
614 Insurance Coverage and the Efficiency of Health Service Utilisation: A Longitudinal Approach. *Int J*
615 *Environ Res Public Health*, 2020.17(5):1782. pmid: 32182950
- 616 [19] Yip W., Fu H., Chen A.T., et al., 10 years of health-care reform in China: progress and gaps in
617 Universal Health Coverage. *Lancet*, 2019;394(10204):1192-1204. pmid: 31571602.
- 618 [20] Wu Y., Zhang Z., Zhao N., et al., Primary health care in China: A decade of development after
619 the 2009 health care reform. *Health Care Sci*, 2022. 1(3):146-159. pmid:38938556
- 620 [21] Chen M., Chen W., Li K., Application of Image Cloud Platform in Hierarchical Hospital Visit.
621 *Zhongguo Yi Liao Qi Xie Za Zhi*, 2017.41(3):228-230. pmid: 29862775




Fig 2. Correlatio analysis of OAR, TRP, and CHR




Fig 4. Recognition indicators across various hospitals with inform




Fig 3. Comparative analysis of seven recognition indicators betw




Fig 5. Comparative analysis of recognition indicators across clinical

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2025.01.26.25321151>; this version posted January 28, 2025. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.




Fig 1. The workflow of the recognition process in the MR platform