Understanding the Non-medical Costs of Healthcare: Evidence from Inpatient Care for Older People in China

Wei Yang[*]

Abstract

Non-medical costs, including costs associated with carers, travel, food and accommodation for family members who care for older people during their medical visits, can constitute a substantial part of total healthcare costs, especially for older people. Using data from the 2015 China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Survey, this study examines the effects of such non-medical costs on catastrophic health payments and health payment-induced poverty among older people in China. Results indicate that non-medical costs account for approximately 18 per cent of total inpatient costs. The percentage is highest for those in the lowest economic brackets. Rural populations are more likely than urban populations to incur catastrophic health payments and suffer from health payment-induced poverty. Non-medical costs increase the chances of older people incurring catastrophic health payments and suffering from health payment-induced poverty. These findings suggest that policymakers should look to develop new policies that facilitate reimbursement of non-medical costs, particularly for the rural population.

Keywords: non-medical costs for healthcare; catastrophic health payments; healthcare cost-induced poverty; China; older people

Non-medical costs can constitute a substantial part of total healthcare costs, especially for older people. While these costs may be deemed irrelevant from a healthcare perspective, they may influence the healthcare provided to older people. Most older people will experience at least one health problem that counts as a disability; many will undergo multiple issues by the time they reach the age of 85.[1] The associated health effects can be profound. There may be high costs relating to carers, travel, food and accommodation for family members who accompany and care for older people during their medical visits.

Notable differences have been observed in socio-economic characteristics and health outcomes. These differences are likely to become more pronounced with

advanced age as it has been observed that disabilities are often more prevalent in older people belonging to lower socio-economic groups.[2] As the poor tend to incur higher opportunity costs than the rich, the impact of non-medical costs (which are often paid out-of-pocket by these individuals) can significantly influence the material living standards of their households.[3] Older people from poorer socio-economic groups often have difficulties in meeting these costs, thereby worsening existing health inequalities.

This situation may be more problematic for older people residing in rural China, where health facilities are either scarce or of poor quality.[4] Rural farmers are more likely to bypass local practitioners to seek care in urban hospitals, which may increase both medical and non-medical costs.[5] Since differences in wealth can also profoundly influence access to care and affordability, healthcare payment-related problems are particularly acute for rural older people with little wealth who are already struggling to maintain their livelihoods.[6]

This study seeks to examine the effects of non-medical costs on catastrophic health payments and health payment-induced poverty among older people from urban and rural areas in China, where few related empirical studies have been conducted. It first presents a literature review to identify meaningful and applicable ways of measuring non-medical costs for inpatient care. This is followed by another literature review on the non-medical costs of patient care for older people and any related implications on inequity. The data used in this study are derived from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Survey (CHARLS) 2015. The findings suggest that policymakers need to modify existing policies, or develop new ones, to facilitate the reimbursement of non-medical costs and improve healthcare systems in general and particularly for the rural population.

Conceptualizing Non-medical Healthcare Costs

There is widespread contention and debate over the definition of non-medical healthcare costs. As this study focuses on patient costs borne by the individual, all costs associated with receiving care were considered. Specifically, three main categories of non-medical costs were examined, as follows.

Category 1: costs of loss of productivity

The value of potentially lost productivity often stems from short or long-term absences from work as a consequence of mortality and morbidity.[7] Although many health and illness studies have tended to ignore or underestimate the

---

2 Brinda et al. 2015.
3 O'Donnell et al. 2008.
4 Yip et al. 2012; Yip, Wagstaff and Hsiao 2009.
5 Chen, Li and Wang 2018.
6 Yang, Wei, and Wu 2014.
7 Knapp 1997.

costs associated with productivity losses, some of the highest non-medical costs arise from working time lost as a result of illness. These costs are often significantly higher for older people when compared to the general population.[8] Methods of accounting for the costs related to productivity losses have traditionally either been derived from the potential value of foregone earnings as a result of illness or by considering the estimated elasticity for labour time versus labour productivity.[9] The latter method requires information on elasticity, which may vary substantially across occupations and sectors and is often difficult to obtain. This study therefore estimated productivity losses owing to lost earnings, which were evident through the data.

Category 2: carer costs

Carer support accounts for a significant part of the total healthcare provided to older people, especially in situations of chronic illness.[10] The care given to older people usually involves a mixed support network consisting of hospital assistance in addition to paid and unpaid carers. If care is provided at the expense of paid labour, then any analysis should account for the carer's labour costs. If care is voluntarily delivered by informal unpaid family carers, then such unpaid work imposes additional costs through individual household expenditures, travel and food expenses or lost earnings, but not out-of-pocket payments. Opportunity costs can also be incurred by informal carers. However, these are often difficult to accurately assess and therefore were not included in this analysis.[11]

Category 3: travel, accommodation and food costs

It can be complex and/or costly to travel to healthcare facilities in places where health services are geographically distant or there is poor access to public transportation. This means that there are additional costs associated with travel, accommodation and food for family members who accompany older patients while they visit these facilities. These expenses were also considered in this analysis.

Non-medical Healthcare Costs for Older People and Associated Implications for Equity

Most empirical studies on the costs of health and illness have focused on a narrow range of healthcare services costs. However, a few studies that have focused on older people have recognized the importance of including non-medical or societal costs in their analyses. For instance, Sven Heinrich and colleagues examined

---

8 Costa-Font and Courbage 2012.
9 Koopmanschap and Rutten 1996.
10 de Meijer et al. 2010.
11 Ibid.; Dixon, Walker and Salek 2006.

primary care service utilization and costs among older people aged 75 and above in Germany and identified that costs associated with carers, assisted living and transportation accounted for approximately 18 per cent of the total patient care costs.[12] Research has also indicated that the costs associated with nursing, community care and domiciliary care, which involve personal care, significantly contribute to the overall patient costs for older people with cognitive impairments.[13] For example, informal and social care costs can contribute up to 40 per cent of the total costs for dementia patients in high-income countries, while the direct health costs tend to be much lower. Informal care also accounts for the majority of the total costs in low- and middle-income countries.[14]

Few studies have explicitly measured the extent to which non-medical costs vary according to socio-economic status. A Danish study compared the costs incurred by patients suffering from psoriatic arthritis (PsA) (a common chronic inflammatory skin disorder among older people) with those incurred by the healthy population and found that patients with PsA had higher total health care costs and spent an average of €10,641 per patient on non-medical costs. These patients were also more likely to be unemployed, disabled and experience co-morbidities.[15] Scholars have also argued that poor older people are exposed to increased cardiovascular risk factors and may incur higher costs compared to those with greater financial means; this situation is worse for those in developing countries.[16]

There has been scant research on patient care costs among older people in China, despite the increasing importance of this topic for policymakers. In China, large geographical variations exist in terms of healthcare provider availability. In the vast rural areas, where the number and quality of healthcare facilities are lower than those in urban areas, many older people may need to travel to a city to see a specialist, which often involves high non-medical costs. While these expenses may be affordable for some, they can be a significant deterrent for those belonging to lower socio-economic groups.[17] For instance, Zeng Yi, Chen Huashuang and Wang Zhenlian together investigated the utilization and cost of healthcare based on the demographic characteristics of older people in 22 provinces in China.[18] Results indicated that females who were disabled and without children were more likely to incur high health and social care costs. Scholars have also argued that patient costs usually account for a significant proportion of household expenditures and tend to be higher for older people with chronic illnesses.[19]

---

12 Heinrich et al 2008.
13 Herrmann et al. 2006; Yang, Zhou, Lin and Levey 2013.
14 Wimo et al. 2017.
15 Kristensen et al. 2017.
16 Prince et al. 2015.
17 Peng 2017.
18 Zeng, Chen and Wang. 2012.
19 Chen, Li and Wang 2018; Wu et al. 2012.

Methods

Data source and study sample

The data used in this study were drawn from the 2015 China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Survey (CHARLS). Using a multi-stage sampling process, the CHARLS interviewed households comprising persons aged 45 and above from 28 provinces/autonomous regions. The CHARLS was designed to investigate issues relating to demographic characteristics, socio-economic status and health-related factors. It also contained questions on health service utilization, insurance coverage, health providers and health facilities, in addition to items concerning the service accessibility, travel costs and perceived quality of care.

This study primarily focuses on the impact of non-medical costs for older people. Both urban and rural samples for individuals aged 60 years and above were included for analysis. In comparing the level of catastrophe and health payment-induced poverty for rural and urban populations, all empirical analyses were conducted among the whole (N = 5,329), rural (N = 4,038) and urban (N = 1,291) populations. Cross-sectional individual weights were adjusted according to the individual, and household non-responses were applied to all descriptive analyses.

Variable specifications

Table 1 provides a statistical summary and variable specifications. Two categories of inpatient cost variables were distinguished in this analysis. The first category was inpatient out-of-pocket (OOP) health costs, which were defined as the inpatient costs paid to hospitals after insurance reimbursement. Interviewees were first asked if they had received inpatient care in the 12 months prior to the survey. If answering yes, respondents were then asked to recall their most recent inpatient visit, as follows: "How much did you or will you eventually pay, out of pocket, to the hospital for your hospitalization?" The second cost category included inpatient OOP health costs plus non-medical costs. Respondents were also asked to report on the two following items: "the total costs of hired carers" and "the total costs for transportation, food, and accommodation for yourself and relatives." After adding the costs associated with productivity losses, which were calculated based on the number of days respondents were absent from work because of inpatient visits multiplied by the individual's daily income, the resulting number constituted non-medical costs. All outliers in the inpatient OOP health costs measurement (i.e. the top and bottom 0.5 per cent of all cases) were mitigated through Winsorization.[20] Per capita household expenditures were used as a measurement of living standards and were adjusted according to household size using the equivalence scale method.[21] The statistical summary also indicated

20 Wagstaff and Lindelow 2008.
21 Yang, Wei, and Wu 2014.

Table 1: **Summary Statistics**

Variable	Whole population (N = 5,329)		Rural population (N = 4,038)		Urban population (N = 1,291)	
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Age	68.994	6.984	68.766	6.970	69.463	6.993
Sex	0.558	0.497	0.548	0.498	0.579	0.494
Self-assessed health						
Excellent health	0.095	0.294	0.091	0.287	0.105	0.307
Good health	0.114	0.318	0.098	0.297	0.148	0.355
Average health	0.491	0.500	0.455	0.498	0.565	0.496
Poor health	0.228	0.420	0.273	0.446	0.136	0.343
Very poor health	0.071	0.257	0.083	0.277	0.046	0.211
Has chronic disease(s)	0.996	0.059	0.997	0.055	0.994	0.077
Productivity losses (number of days)	11.952	11.797	11.172	12.169	13.246	12.271
Household expenditures per capita	32,281.680	47,299.130	24,531.700	39,528.180	48,501.130	56,278.700
Urban residents	0.321	0.467	0.000	0.000	1.000	0.000
Lives alone	0.182	0.386	0.202	0.402	0.140	0.348
Education level						
No education	0.277	0.447	0.359	0.480	0.100	0.301
Elementary school education	0.449	0.497	0.506	0.500	0.327	0.469
Middle school education	0.156	0.363	0.110	0.313	0.254	0.435
High school education and above	0.119	0.324	0.025	0.156	0.319	0.466

that rural respondents were considerably poorer, less educated and less healthy when compared to urban respondents. Table 1 shows variable specifications and descriptive statistics for a set of health needs and socio-economic variables.

Empirical strategies

(a) Measuring catastrophic health payments. In this study, catastrophe is defined as the catastrophic health payments that occur when health costs exceed 40 per cent of the household per capita expenditures (net of food expenditures). This definition was introduced by the World Health Organization and has been used in many studies.[22] It is estimated using the following equation:

$$H_k = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{ik}}{N} \qquad (1)$$

Where H is catastrophic headcount (the proportion of older people who fall below the catastrophic thresholds), i denotes each observation in the sample (N), $x_i = 1$ if $\frac{Q_{ik}}{T_i} > z$ (the ratio of inpatient cost (Q_{ik}) as accounted for in the household per capita expenditure (T_i) exceeds the 40 per cent threshold (z)); it is 0 otherwise. Q denotes k different categories of inpatient costs (k = inpatient total health costs, inpatient total health costs plus indirect costs, inpatient OOP health costs, and inpatient OOP health costs plus indirect costs).

The intensity of the payment (overshoot) was measured by the average amount exceeding the catastrophic threshold, as follows:

$$O_k = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{N} x_{ik}(\frac{Q_{ik}}{T_i} - z)}{N} \qquad (2)$$

Mean Positive Overshoot (MPO) is defined as intensity divided by headcount, as follows:

$$MPO_k = \frac{O_k}{H_k} \qquad (3)$$

The measures of catastrophic headcount and overshoot required consideration of the distributions of these estimates across income groups. This is because the opportunity costs for the poor are usually greater than those for the rich.[23] Both measures can be adjusted using the Concentration Indices (CI) method. For catastrophic headcount measures, Guido Erreygers's concentration indices were used because the binary nature of the variable formally called for a non-linear measure.[24] Catastrophic overshoot was measured using the concentration indices introduced

22 O'Donnell et al. 2008; Xu et al. 2003.
23 O'Donnell et al. 2008.
24 Erreygers 2009.

by Owen O'Donnell et al.[25] These indices indicate the distribution of the catastrophic headcount (C^h) and gap (C^o) relative to household income, as follows:

$$H_k^w = H_k(1 - C_k^h) \qquad (4)$$

$$O_k^w = O_k(1 - C_k^o) \qquad (5)$$

Where H_k^w denotes the weighted headcount for inpatient cost category k, and C_k^h denotes Erregyers's CI for the catastrophic headcount, O_k^w represents the weighted overshoot and C_k^o represents the CI for weighted overshoot. This equation is equivalent to a weighted sum of a catastrophic headcount or an overshoot variable by multiplying weights declining linearly from 2 to 0 as the household ranks from poorest to richest. Here, poor households were likely to receive more weight (i.e. if those exceeding the catastrophic threshold tended to be poor).

(b) Health payment-induced poverty. The extent to which health costs impact household material living standards can also be estimated by examining health payment-induced poverty. This study followed the method introduced by O'Donnell and colleagues, wherein incidence and severity of health payment-induced poverty are compared as the two patient cost variables.[26] Incidence was measured according to the number of people who fall below the poverty line because of health payments (i.e. headcount), while intensity was measured according to the amount by which a household falls below the poverty line because of health payments (i.e. gap). This study used two poverty thresholds: the international poverty line of US$ 1.9 per person per day[27] and the Chinese National Poverty Line (NPL), which, as of 2016, was a net per capita income of 2,300 yuan per year (US$ 0.95 per day).[28]

This study also plotted a revised version of Jan Pen's Parade,[29] which is defined as "a succession of every person in the economy, with their height proportional to their income, and ordered from lowest to greatest."[30] In this case, a parade is plotted using household expenditures per capita gross of any health costs on the y-axis against the cumulative proportion of the population ranked by the expenditures on the x-axis. This study plotted two additional parades by using household expenditures per capita net of inpatient OOP costs and inpatient OOP costs plus indirect costs, respectively, against the cumulative proportion of the population ranked by each of these expenditure variables. The poverty lines were then plotted along the y-axis to show the proportion of households that had been pushed below the poverty line because of inpatient costs.[31]

25 O'Donnell et al. 2008.
26 Ibid.
27 https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/poverty/brief/global-poverty-line-faq.
28 NBS 2015.
29 Pen 1977.
30 Ibid., 484; 1972.
31 A detailed explanation of how Pen's Parade is used in health payment-induced poverty can be found in O'Donnell et al. 2008.

Robustness checks

Two sets of robustness checks were conducted to determine whether non-medical costs had any significant effects on catastrophic health payments and health payment-induced poverty. Separate analyses were run for the entire sample (i.e. rural and urban populations) in the first set of checks. An additional analysis for older people with chronic illnesses to determine whether non-medical costs resulted in a greater burden for that population was also performed. No significant differences were found when compared to the entire population. The second set of robustness checks can be found in the Appendix.

Results

Table 2 shows average per episode health costs as a share of household per capita expenditures by quintiles. Inpatient costs were measured in two different categories to show the differences that arose when including and excluding indirect costs in the measures. The first category was inpatient OOP costs, while the second was inpatient OOP costs plus non-medical costs (i.e. transportation costs, accommodation costs for family members and carer costs). Results showed that health costs, as a share of household per capita expenditures, were highest for the poorest households. In addition, the share for the poorest households was more than three times that of the richest households. For instance, inpatient OOP costs accounted for 10.82 per cent of household per capita expenditures for the poorest households, but only 3.02 per cent for the richest households. The share of inpatient OOP costs increased to 12.75 per cent for the poorest households and 3.56 per cent for the richest households when non-medical costs were considered. Looking at the rural and urban populations, it is evident that rural populations (especially those from the poorest and second-poorest groups) spend a significantly higher proportion of their total household incomes on inpatient care as compared to urban populations. The relative difference between the richest and poorest households in terms of the share of inpatient costs was approximately three times higher for the rural households, whereas it was less than two times higher for the urban ones.

Table 3 shows the inpatient costs and related non-medical costs for all samples and samples with inpatient visits. For all samples, the average inpatient OOP cost was 801.27 yuan, whereas non-medical costs for transportation, meals and accommodation for family members amounted to 146.6 yuan. That is, 18 per cent higher than the inpatient OOP costs. These findings also show that older people from urban areas tend to spend more on inpatient care as compared to those from rural areas.

Table 4 shows the incidence and intensity of catastrophic inpatient health payments according to different cost categories using the threshold level of 40 per cent of per capita household expenditures (net of food expenditures). The incidence and severity of catastrophes increased when non-medical costs were considered. For the whole population (before any non-medical costs were included),

Table 2: **Inpatient Costs as Shares of Household Income (net food expenditures)**

	Whole population (N = 5,329)		Rural population (N = 4,038)		Urban population (N = 1,291)	
	Inpatient OOP costs	Inpatient OOP costs + non-medical costs	Inpatient OOP costs	Inpatient OOP costs + non-medical costs	Inpatient OOP costs	Inpatient OOP costs + non-medical costs
Poorest(Q1)	10.82%	12.75%	10.69%	12.86%	5.80%	6.05%
2nd quintile	3.73%	4.26%	5.33%	6.05%	4.36%	4.95%
3rd quintile	3.38%	4.18%	3.46%	4.34%	1.69%	1.99%
4th quintile	3.06%	3.52%	2.98%	3.46%	2.16%	2.47%
Riches t (Q5)	3.02%	3.56%	3.23%	3.84%	2.92%	3.73%
Ratio(Q1/Q5)	3.58	3.58	3.31	3.35	1.99	1.62

Table 3: **Healthcare Cost Categories in Chinese Yuan Units**

	Whole population (N = 5,329)		Rural population (N = 4,038)		Urban population (N = 1,291)	
Medical costs	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Inpatient OOP costs (a)	801.27	6,105.60	708.65	6,147.69	1,090.97	5,965.08
Inpatient OOP costs + non-medical costs (b)	947.83	6,743.24	835.28	6,492.82	1,299.85	7,464.28
Difference	18.29%		17.87%		19.15%	
Non-medical costs	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.
Productivity loss	4.28	58.05	3.51	52.61	6.71	72.44
Transportation + food + accommodation	141.07	1,694.67	128.05	1,083.63	181.81	2,860.87
Carer	19.67	657.28	16.17	674.45	30.62	600.53

2.58 per cent (N = 150) of older people fell below the threshold level. This percentage increased to 3 per cent (N = 175) if only considering non-medical costs. The difference was 17 per cent and statistically significant at the 0.01 level. Similarly, catastrophic overshoot significantly increased (i.e. to 25.42 per cent ($p < 0.01$)) when comparing inpatient OOP costs with inpatient OOP costs plus non-medical costs. The same result held for the headcount measure.

Notably, older people from urban areas were significantly less likely to fall below the catastrophic thresholds (i.e. 3.28 per cent of rural populations fell below the catastrophic threshold, whereas the percentage was only 1.95 per cent for urban populations). Similar results were found for overshoot and MPO.

All CIs for headcount and overshoot were pro-poor, meaning that catastrophe was more likely to occur among poor households than rich ones. The CIs for overshoot were high, thus indicating the existence of pronounced pro-poor

Table 4: **Catastrophic Health Payments for Different Inpatient Cost Categories**

			Whole population (N = 5,329)			Rural population (N = 4,038)			Urban population (N = 1,291)		
			Inpatient OOP costs	Inpatient OOP costs + non-medical costs	Relative difference	Inpatient OOP costs	Inpatient OOP costs + non-medical costs	Relative difference	Inpatient OOP costs	Inpatient OOP costs + non-medical costs	Relative difference
			a	*b*	*(b-a)/a*	*a*	*b*	*(b-a)/a*	*a*	*b*	*(b-a)/a*
Head-count	Headcount (%)	Mean	2.58%	3.00%	16.67%***	2.81%	3.28%	16.81%***	1.72%	1.95%	13.64%*
		S.E.	0.002	0.002		0.003	0.003		0.004	0.004	
	CI	Mean	−0.020	−0.020	2.85%***	−0.014	−0.013	−7.82%***	−0.023	−0.024	6.31%***
		S.E.	0.005	0.005		0.008	0.008		0.008	0.008	
	Rank-weighted headcount		2.63%	3.07%	16.73%***	2.85%	3.32%	16.69%***	1.76%	2.00%	13.79%
Overshoot	Overshoot	Mean	1.98%	2.48%	25.42%***	2.24%	2.83%	26.42%***	1.02%	1.28%	25.59%***
		S.E.	0.004	0.004		0.005	0.006		0.364	0.321	
	CI	Mean	−0.035	−0.043	21.31%***	−0.058	−0.070	20.67%***	−0.022	−0.024	7.0%***
		S.E.	0.013	0.014		0.024	0.026		0.008	0.009	
	Rank-weighted overshoot		2.05%	2.59%	26.32%	2.37%	3.03%	27.86%	1.04%	1.31%	25.78%
MPO	MPO	Mean	76.78%	82.54%	7.50%***	79.83%	86.40%	8.23%***	59.50%	65.76%	10.52%***
		S.E.	0.141	0.133		0.175	0.165		0.274	0.250	
	MPO incidence	N	150	175	16.67%***	113	132	16.81%***	22	25	13.64%***

Notes:
  *p < 0.1 , ** p < 0.05 , *** p < 0.01.

left
https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305574101900115 Published online by Cambridge University Press

right
Understanding the Non-medical Costs of Healthcare   497

inequities in the intensity of catastrophic inpatient costs. The MPO indicated the overshoot for those that had inpatient visits. Inpatient OOP health costs were 76.78 per cent higher than the threshold level and were 86.54 per cent more when non-medical costs were included for the entire population.

Table 5 shows the results for health payment-induced poverty using the NPL (2,300 yuan per year) and the World Bank's international poverty line (US $1.9). Using the World Bank poverty line, our results indicated that approximately 14.04 per cent of all older people fell below the poverty line before any inpatient costs were considered. However, the percentages increased to 15.02 per cent and 15.28 per cent when inpatient health costs and non-medical costs were considered, respectively. The poverty gap was 277.60 yuan below the poverty line before any health costs were considered. This gap increased to 400.20 yuan when inpatient health costs were added to the analysis. There was a further increase to 436.90 yuan when both health costs and non-medical costs were added. Similar results were found in the OOP patient costs category and when using the NPL. All differences were statistically significant.

Results unsurprisingly indicated that rural populations were more likely to fall below the poverty line than urban populations as a result of inpatient OOP costs. However, urban populations were more likely to fall below the poverty line owing to non-medical costs. In particular, 1.22 per cent of all rural populations fell below the World Bank poverty line as a result of non-medical costs (the percentage was 5.8 per cent for urban populations).

Figures 1 and 2 show Pen's Parade results for household expenditures per capita for the poorest 20 per cent using both the World Bank poverty line and the NPL for urban and rural populations, respectively. Figure 1 shows three lines indicating gross and net household expenditures per capita for different inpatient cost categories for rural populations. The X-axis indicates the cumulative percentage of the population ranked by household expenditures per capita gross and net of inpatient cost categories, while the Y-axis indicates household expenditures per capita. The dashed black line indicates household per capita expenditures gross of any health costs. The solid black line indicates household per capita expenditures net of inpatient OOP costs. The dotted line represents household per capita expenditure net of inpatient OOP costs and non-medical costs. As a result of inpatient costs, urban populations were less likely to fall below the poverty line than rural populations (Figures 1 and 2; Table 5). However, there was also a higher probability that urban populations would become poor after incurring non-medical costs.

Discussion and Conclusions

Although China has made remarkable achievements in strengthening its healthcare services, this study suggests that increased efforts are needed to reduce the financial burden of health costs for poor older people, many of whom are failing to seek medical treatment or are falling below the poverty line as a result of both

Table 5: **Healthcare Payment-induced Poverty Measures (gross and net of different inpatient cost categories)**

				Gross health payments	Net inpatient OOP costs	Net inpatient OOP costs + non-medical costs	Relative difference		
				a	*b*	*c*	*(d-a)/a*	*(e-a)/a*	*(c-b)/b*
Whole population (N = 5,329)	$1.90 per day poverty line	Poverty headcount	Mean	14.04%	15.02%	15.28%	6.97%***	8.80%***	1.71%***
			S.E.	0.0	0.0	0.0			
		Poverty gap (yuan)	Mean	277.6	400.2	436.9	44.15%***	57.35%***	9.16%***
			S.E.	10.8	38.2	42.4			
		Mean positive gap (yuan)	Mean	1,977.0	2,664.1	2,859.2	34.76%***	44.62%***	7.32%***
			S.E.	42.4	240.6	263.1			
	Chinese NPL	Poverty headcount	Mean	5.99%	6.70%	0.0691845	11.75%***	15.47%***	3.33%***
			S.E.	0.0	0.33%	0.0			
		Poverty gap (yuan)	Mean	65.9	169.7	200.675	157.44%***	204.40%***	18.24%***
			S.E.	4.0	35.9	40.1			
		Mean positive gap (yuan)	Mean	1,100.3	2,534.8	2,900.575	130.37%***	163.61%***	14.43%**
			S.E.	35.6	522.5	562.6			
Rural population (N = 4,038)	$1.90 per day poverty line	Poverty headcount	Mean	17.21%	18.36%	18.58%	6.64%***	7.94%***	1.22%***
			S.E.	0.0	0.0	0.0			
		Poverty gap (yuan)	Mean	343.4	478.6	505.4	39.39%***	47.21%***	5.61%***
			S.E.	14.3	50.0	52.9			
		Mean positive gap (yuan)	Mean	1,994.7	2,607.4	2,720.5	30.71%***	36.38%***	4.34%***
			S.E.	45.9	258.1	270.1			
	Chinese NPL	Poverty headcount	Mean	7.38%	8.22%	0.0842027	11.45%***	14.14%***	2.42%***
			S.E.	0.0	0.43%	0.0			
		Poverty gap (yuan)	Mean	81.9	194.8	215.7332	137.96%***	163.49%***	10.73%***
			S.E.	5.4	47.1	49.9			
		Mean positive gap (yuan)	Mean	1,109.9	2,369.7	2,562.07	113.52%***	130.85%***	8.12%*
			S.E.	38.6	559.3	578.4			

Continued

Table 5: **Continued**

				Gross health payments	Net inpatient OOP costs	Net inpatient OOP costs + non-medical costs	Relative difference		
Urban population (N = 1,291)	$1.90 per day poverty line	Poverty headcount	Mean	4.76%	5.39%	5.70%	13.11%***	19.67%***	5.80%***
			S.E.	0.0	0.0	0.0			
		Poverty gap (yuan)	Mean	94.9	175.6	252.1	85.00%	165.56%*	43.55%
			S.E.	13.9	67.3	92.2			
		Mean positive gap (yuan)	Mean	1,993.5	3,260.4	4,423.8	63.55%	121.91%	35.68%
			S.E.	151.5	1,196.9	1,692.6			
	Chinese NPL	Poverty headcount	Mean	2.19%	2.42%	0.0273224	10.71%*	25.00%***	12.90%***
			S.E.	0.0	2.19%	0.0			
		Poverty gap (yuan)	Mean	21.1	92.9	164.6699	339.88%	679.54%	77.22%
			S.E.	4.8	64.2	88.7			
		Mean positive gap (yuan)	Mean	966.4	3,839.7	6,026.917	297.31%	523.63%	56.96%
			S.E.	125.4	2,604.4	3,129.5			

Notes:
NPL = national poverty line; *p < 0.1 , ** p < 0.05 , *** p < 0.01.

Figure 1: **Effect of Different Inpatient Costs on Pen's Parade of the Household Expenditure Distribution for Rural Populations**


Figure 2: **Effect of Different Inpatient Costs on Pen's Parade of the Household Expenditure Distribution for Urban Populations**

medical and non-medical costs. This study is among the first to investigate the effects of inpatient care costs on catastrophic health payments and health payment-induced poverty for older people by incorporating non-medical costs

into its analysis. Findings suggest that inpatient costs account for a significant portion of household expenditures among older people. Here, non-medical costs may account for approximately 18 per cent. The share is highest for those in the lowest wealth groups. Results also indicate that rural populations are more likely than urban populations to incur catastrophic health payments and suffer from health payment-induced poverty. Non-medical costs also increase the chances that older people will be affected by both of these problems. These effects are more concentrated among rural and poor populations.

This paper offers three related policy implications. First, the non-medical costs associated with receiving healthcare can present difficulties for many older patients; the government needs to recognize this. For instance, travel costs can be especially expensive when patients are required to complete complex and lengthy journeys from rural villages to tertiary hospitals in urban areas. Further, some older patients may require escorts or carers to accompany them in this context. These individuals should have the option to claim these costs. Some developed countries have already implemented healthcare travel-cost programmes to help vulnerable groups cover these expenses. For instance, the National Health Service in the UK reimburses travel and associated costs for low-income patients if they are referred to hospitals or other health facilities for specialist treatment or diagnostic testing.[32] Similar measures should be considered by the Chinese government. It is also worth pointing out that poor patients seeking care in urban areas may incur particularly high and burdensome costs related to non-medical items (for example, carers, productivity losses and others).

Second, the government needs to address the issue of high healthcare costs. Here, stress is particularly apparent throughout the nation's rural villages, in which 65 per cent of older people live below the poverty line.[33] Although the New Cooperative Medical Scheme reaches nearly all of China's rural population, the benefits package is rather basic and only covers a narrow range of conditions.[34] Thus, more comprehensive coverage with higher reimbursement rates for healthcare services should be introduced so that access to care can be improved for older people living in rural areas.[35]

Finally, there should be special emphasis on the need for long-term care while enhancing coordinated and more continuous care for older patients, who are suffering from chronic diseases at an increasing rate. International precedent indicates that services of this type also reduce unnecessary use of and spending on acute health services while helping families avoid catastrophic health payments.[36]

This study has some limitations. First, the costs associated with health deterioration subsequent to inpatient episodes were not evident through the dataset.

---

32 NHS 2017.
33 Hatton 2015.
34 Yang, Wei 2013.
35 Yip et al. 2012; Yang, Wei 2013; Yip and Hsiao 2009.
36 World Health Organization n.d.

These costs were therefore not reflected in the findings. Second, this study mainly relied on self-reported data, which may cause bias in the analysis because of inaccurate recall or misreporting.[37] However, most studies that use data from individual surveys operate with this limitation. Third, approximately 5.71 per cent of those observed in our sample stated that they had forgone treatments. A higher percentage of people having catastrophic health payments or falling below the poverty line can be anticipated if these respondents are included in the analysis. However, it is difficult to know how the results would have been affected in this scenario. Further studies are thus needed to address the methodological omissions of this analysis.

Acknowledgements

Biographical note

Wei YANG is an assistant professor in global health at King's College London. She is a health economist with an interest in health and long-term care (LTC) research. Her work focuses on measuring the impacts of health and LTC financing policies on inequities in access to care and fairness in financing, and identifying factors that drive inequities using longitudinal survey datasets. She is also interested in issues relating to efficiency in health and LTC financing in China.

摘要：老年人在看病时发生的非医疗支出往往占据总医疗费用的很大一部分。这些非医疗支出包含高昂的雇佣护工发生的费用，交通和食宿费用。本文利用中国健康养老追踪调查 2015 年的数据来分析接受住院医疗的老年人的非医疗支出对灾难性医疗支出和大病致贫的影响。本文发现非医疗支出占据 18% 的总医疗支出。而这个百分比在收入最低的老年人群中最高。农村老年人要比城市老年人更容易发生灾难性医疗支出和大病致贫。非医疗支出会增加发生灾难性医疗支出和大病致贫的概率。本文提议政府应考虑对非医疗支出进行一定补偿。

关键词：非医疗支出；灾难性医疗支出；大病致贫；中国；老年人

References

Brinda, Ethel Mary, Paul Kowal, Jorn Attermann and Ulrika Enemark. 2015. "Health service use, out-of-pocket payments and catastrophic health expenditure among older people in India: the

---

37 Wooldridge 2012.

WHO Study on global ageing and adult health (SAGE)." *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health* 69(5), 489–494.

Chen, Zaiyu, Wei Li and Haixu Wang. 2018. "Xinnong he dui nongcun laonianren yiliao fuwu liyong de yingxiang – ji yu gaoling, diling laoren de fenxi" (The effects of the New Cooperative Medical Insurance on access to healthcare among the elderly in rural China). *Zhongguo weisheng zhengce yanjiu* 11(07), 30–36.

Costa-Font, Joan, and Christophe Courbage. 2012. "Financing long-term care: new and unresolved questions." In Joan Costa-Font and Christophe Courbage (eds.), *Financing Long-term Care in Europe: Institutions, Markets, and Models*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 3–16.

de Meijer, Claudine, Werner Brouwer, Marc Koopmanschap, Bernard van den Berg and Job van Exel. 2010. "The value of informal care: a further investigation of the feasibility of contingent valuation in informal caregivers." *Health Economics* 19(7), 755–771.

Dixon, Simon, Mel Walker and Sam Salek. 2006. "Incorporating carer effects into economic evaluation." *PharmacoEconomics* 24(1), 43–53.

Erreygers, Guido. 2009. "Correcting the Concentration Index." *Journal of Health Economics* 28(2), 504–515.

Hatton, Celia. 2015. "Who will take care of China's elderly people?" *BBC*, 21 December, http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/magazine-35155548. Accessed 14 February 2018.

Heinrich, Sven, Melanie Luppa, Herbert Matschinger, Matthias C. Angermeyer, Steffi G. Riedel-Heller and Hans-Helmut Koenig. 2008. "Service utilization and health-care costs in the advanced elderly." *Value in Health* 11(4), 611–620.

Herrmann, Nathan, Krista L. Lanctot, Robert Sambrook, Nadia Lesnikova, Rejean Hebert, Peter McCracken, Alain Robillard et al. 2006. "The contribution of neuropsychiatric symptoms to the cost of dementia care." *International Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry* 21(10), 972–976.

Knapp, Martin. 1997. "Costs of schizophrenia." *British Journal of Psychiatry* 171, 509–518.

Koopmanschap, Marc A., and Frans F.H. Rutten. 1996. "A practical guide for calculating indirect costs of disease." *PharmacoEconomics* 10(5), 460–466.

Kristensen, Lars Erik, Tanja S. Jorgensen, Robin Christensen, Henrik Gudbergsen, Lene Dreyer, Christine Ballegaard, Lennart T.H. Jacobsson et al. 2017. "Societal costs and patients' experience of health inequities before and after diagnosis of psoriatic arthritis: a Danish cohort study." *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 76(9), 1495–1501.

NBS (National Bureau of Statistics, PRC). 2015. "Zhongguo nongcun pinkun biaozhun wenti yanjiu" (A study on the poverty issue in rural China), 24 August, http://www.stats.gov.cn/tjzs/tjsj/tjcb/dysj/201509/t20150902_1239121.html. Accessed 15 February 2018.

NHS (National Health Service, UK). 2017. "Healthcare Travel Costs Scheme (HTCS)," 1 April, https://www.nhs.uk/NHSEngland/Healthcosts/Pages/Travelcosts.aspx. Accessed 14 February 2018.

O'Donnell, Owen, Eddy van Doorslaer, Adam Wagstaff and Magnus Lindelow. 2008. *Analyzing Health Equity Using Household Survey Data: A Guide to Techniques and their Implementation*. Washington, DC: World Bank.

Pen, Jan. 1972. "*Distribution of Personal Income in United Kingdom, 1949–1963* – Stark, T" (book review). *Economist* 120(5), 484–486.

Pen, Jan. 1977. "*Personal Distribution of Incomes* – Atkinson, A.B" (book review). *Journal of Economic Literature* 15(1), 123–24.

Peng, Rong. 2017. "Yiliao he yanglao baoxian yu gaoling shi neng laoren changqi zhaohu zhichu – ji yu CLHLS shuju de shizheng fenxi" (Social health insurance, pension scheme, and the long-term care costs among the disabled elderly in China). *Zhongguo weisheng zhengce yanjiu* 10(1), 46–51.

Prince, Martin J., Fan Wu, Yanfei Guo, Luis M. Gutierrez Robledo, Martin O'Donnell, Richard Sullivan and Salim Yusuf. 2015. "The burden of disease in older people and implications for health policy and practice." *The Lancet* 385(9967), 549–562.

Wagstaff, Adam, and Magnus Lindelow. 2008. "Can insurance increase financial risk? The curious case of health insurance in China." *Journal of Health Economics* 27(4), 990–1005.

Wimo, Anders, Maelenn Guerchet, Gemma-Claire Ali, Yu-Tzu Wu, A. Matthew Prina, Bengt Winblad, Linus Jonsson et al. 2017. "The worldwide costs of dementia 2015 and comparisons with 2010." *Alzheimers & Dementia* 13(1), 1–7.

Wooldridge, Jeffrey M. 2012. *Introductory Econometrics: A Modern Approach. Vol. 5*. Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning.

World Health Organization. N.d. "Ageing and long-term care system," http://www.who.int/ageing/long-term-care/en/. Accessed 15 February 2018.

World Health Organization. 2015. "Ageing and health," http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs404/en/. Accessed 10 November 2017.

Wu, Zhuochun, Peng Lei, Elina Hemminki, Ling Xu, Shenglan Tang, Xiaoyan Li, Joanna Raven et al. 2012. "Changes and equity in use of maternal health care in China: from 1991 to 2003." *Maternal and Child Health Journal* 16(2), 501–09.

Xu, Ke, David B. Evans, Kei Kawabata, Riadh Zeramdini, Jan Klavus and Christopher J.L. Murray. 2003. "Household catastrophic health expenditure: a multicountry analysis." *The Lancet* 362 (9378), 111–17.

Yang, Wei. 2013. "China's New Cooperative Medical Scheme and equity in access to health care: evidence from a longitudinal household survey." *International Journal for Equity in Health* 12, 20–33.

Yang, Wei, and Xun Wu. 2014. "Paying for outpatient care in rural China: cost escalation under China's New Co-operative Medical Scheme." *Health Policy and Planning* 30(2), 187–196.

Yang, Zhou, Pei-Jung Lin and Allan Levey. 2013. "Monetary costs of dementia in the United States." *New England Journal of Medicine* 369(5), 489–490.

Yip, Winnie, and William Hsiao. 2009. "China's health care reform: a tentative assessment." *China Economic Review* 20(4), 613–19.

Yip, Winnie, Adam Wagstaff and William C. Hsiao. 2009. "Economic analysis of China's health care system: turning a new page." *Health Economics* 18, S3–S6.

Yip, Winnie Chi-Man, William C. Hsiao, Wen Chen, Shanlian Hu, Jin Ma and Alan Maynard. 2012. "Early appraisal of China's huge and complex health-care reforms." *The Lancet* 379(9818), 833–842.

Zeng, Yi, Huashuang Chen and Zhenlian Wang. 2012. "21 shiji shangban ye laonianren jiating zhaoliao xuqiu chengben biandong qushi fenxi" (Costs associated with caring for older people in the 21st century in China). *Jingji yanyiu* 10(1), 134–149.

Appendix 1: **Catastrophic Health Payments for Different Inpatient Cost Categories for Those with Chronic Diseases**

			Inpatient OOP costs	Inpatient OOP costs + non-medical costs	Relative difference
			a	*b*	*(b-a)/a*
Headcount	**Headcount (%)**	Mean	2.54%	2.96%	16.67%***
		S.E.	0.002	0.002	
	CI	Mean	−0.018	−0.018	2.85%***
		S.E.	0.005	0.005	
	Rank-weighted headcount		2.59%	3.01%	16.25%
Overshoot	**Overshoot**	Mean	1.95%	2.46%	25.42%***
		S.E.	0.004	0.005	
	CI	Mean	−0.037	−0.043	21.31%***
		S.E.	0.014	0.015	
	Rank-weighted overshoot		2.02%	2.57%	27.10%***
MPO	**MPO**	Mean	76.52%	83.11%	7.50%***
		S.E.	0.153	0.144	
	MPO incidence	N	135	157	16.67%***

Appendix 2: **Heath Payment-induced Poverty Measures, Gross and Net, of Different Inpatient Cost Categories**

			Gross of health payments	Net of inpatient OOP costs	Net of inpatient OOP costs + non-medical costs	Relative difference		
			a	*b*	*c*	*(d-a)/a*	*(e-a)/a*	*(c-b)/b*
US$1.90 per day poverty line	Poverty headcount	Mean	14.21%	15.23%	15.47%	7.16%***	8.89%***	1.61%***
		S.E.	0.0	0.0	0.0			
	Poverty gap (yuan)	Mean	283.4	405.5	444.3	43.08%***	56.78%***	9.57%***
		S.E.	11.4	41.3	45.9			
	Mean positive gap (yuan)	Mean	1,994.6	2,663.1	2,871.9	33.52%***	43.98%***	7.84%***
		S.E.	43.9	266.1	294.3	***	***	***
The Chinese National Poverty Line	Poverty headcount	Mean	6.12%	6.82%	0.070473	11.38%***	15.08%***	3.31%***
		S.E.	0.0	0.35%	0.0			
	Poverty gap (yuan)	Mean	67.2	170.2	203.4076	153.28%***	202.64%***	19.49%***
		S.E.	4.3	38.9	43.5			
	Mean positive gap (yuan)	Mean	1,097.5	2,495.6	2,886.321	127.39%***	162.99%***	15.66%**
		S.E.	24.2	557.0	600.9			