Appendix A: Principal component analysis results
Table S1 Factor loading matrix(outpatients)

| Items | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | Factor 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sex | $-0.009(-0.003)$ | $-0.047(-0.021)$ | $-0.057(-0.034)$ | $0.275(0.23)$ | $0.914(0.873)$ |
| Occupation | $0.05(0.015)$ | $0.166(0.074)$ | $0.73(0.433)$ | $0.222(0.186)$ | $0.12(0.114)$ |
| Age (years) | $0.035(0.01)$ | $0.845(0.378)$ | $-0.005(-0.003)$ | $-0.13(-0.109)$ | $-0.142(-0.136)$ |
| Monthly income (RMB ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| Marital status | $-0.084(-0.025)$ | $0.201(0.09)$ | $0.792(0.469)$ | $0.174(0.145)$ | $-0.108(-0.103)$ |
| Educational level | $0.045(0.014)$ | $0.719(0.321)$ | $0.314(0.186)$ | $-0.096(-0.08)$ | $0.125(0.119)$ |
| Self-rated health status <br> Burden of health expenditures <br> Whether community health institutions advocated dual <br> practice policy in your current community <br> Whether dual practice could reduce difficulty in consulting a <br> doctor <br> Whether dual practice could meet patient demand for health <br> convenience <br> Whether dual practice could meet patient demand for <br> treatment for minor illness <br> Whether dual practice could meet patient demand for <br> treatment for chronic disease <br> Whether community health services were your first choice for <br> treatment for minor illness if community health centers <br> engaged in dual practice <br> Whether community health services were your first choice for <br> treatment for chronic disease if community health centers <br> engaged in dual practice <br> Initial Eigenvalues | $0.0 .074(-0.022)$ | $-0.642(-0.287)$ | $0.348(0.206)$ | $0.149(0.125)$ | $-0.272(-0.259)$ |


| Percentage of variance (\%) | 22.210 | 14.928 | 11.257 | 7.965 | 6.985 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Cumulative percentage of variance (\%) | 22.210 | 37.137 | 48.395 | 56.359 | 63.344 |

Notes: Extraction method: principal component analysis. Data shown as Eigenvalues (coefficient). ${ }^{a}$ RMB, RenMinBi Yuan.

Table S2 Factor loading matrix(medical staff)

| Items | Factor 1 | Factor 2 | Factor 3 | Factor 4 | Factor 5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sex | $-0.016(-0.004)$ | $-0.004(-0.002)$ | $-0.047(-0.033)$ | $0.762(0.694)$ | $0.046(0.043)$ |
| Age (years) | $-0.051(-0.014)$ | $0.208(0.128)$ | $-0.053(-0.037)$ | $-0.498(-0.453)$ | $0.604(0.568)$ |
| Educational level | $0.346(0.094)$ | $-0.174(-0.107)$ | $0.45(0.316)$ | $-0.235(-0.214)$ | $-0.287(-0.27)$ |
| Title | $-0.28(-0.076)$ | $0.506(0.311)$ | $-0.471(-0.331)$ | $-0.173(-0.158)$ | $-0.313(-0.294)$ |
| Technical position | $0.325(0.088)$ | $-0.559(-0.343)$ | $0.47(0.33)$ | $0.063(0.058)$ | $0.227(0.213)$ |
| Department | $-0.076(-0.021)$ | $0.358(0.22)$ | $-0.065(-0.046)$ | $0.329(0.299)$ | $0.548(0.516)$ |
| The willingness to join in dual practice | $-0.631(-0.171)$ | $0.082(0.05)$ | $0.238(0.168)$ | $-0.049(-0.044)$ | $0.127(0.12)$ |
| Whether hospital administrators advocated dual practice | $-0.333(-0.09)$ | $0.249(0.153)$ | $0.552(0.388)$ | $0.087(0.08)$ | $0.052(0.049)$ |
| policy in your current workplace |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whether respondents possessed the knowledge of dual | $-0.311(-0.084)$ | $0.526(0.323)$ | $0.319(0.224)$ | $0.195(0.178)$ | $-0.236(-0.222)$ |
| practice policy | $-0.167(-0.045)$ | $0.392(0.241)$ | $0.512(0.36)$ | $-0.113(-0.103)$ | $-0.169(-0.159)$ |
| Whether dual practice increased work-related burden |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whether dual practice could reduce difficulty in | $-0.44(-0.119)$ | $0.219(0.135)$ | $0.177(0.125)$ | $-0.086(-0.078)$ | $0.225(0.211)$ |
| consulting a doctor | $0.812(0.22)$ | $0.24(0.147)$ | $0.079(0.056)$ | $-0.016(-0.015)$ | $0.084(0.079)$ |
| Support from the hospital | $0.835(0.226)$ | $0.263(0.162)$ | $0.062(0.044)$ | $-0.02(-0.018)$ | $0.04(0.038)$ |
| Whether hospitals' human resource management system | $0.768(0.208)$ | $0.326(0.2)$ | $0.044(0.031)$ | $0.052(0.048)$ | $-0.025(-0.023)$ |
| permit free flow of medical staff | $0.78(0.211)$ | $0.278(0.171)$ | $-0.003(-0.002)$ | $0.021(0.019)$ | $0.03(0.029)$ |


| Initial Eigenvalues | 3.695 | 1.627 | 1.422 | 1.098 | 1.063 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Percentage of variance (\%) | 24.632 | 10.846 | 9.48 | 7.321 | 7.086 |
| Cumulative percentage of variance (\%) | 24.632 | 35.478 | 44.958 | 52.279 | 59.364 |

Notes: Extraction method: principal component analysis. Data shown as Eigenvalues (coefficient).

## Appendix B: Questionnaires

Questionnaire 1: Perception of outpatients of dual practice
Dear Sir / Madam:
Dual practice is defined as a physician's performance of medical activities in different health institutions (two or more) simultaneously. The aim of this survey was to examine the perception of outpatients of dual practice. The questionnaire information was only for academic research, without involving any commercial interests. All personal information was anonymized prior to analysis. Place a tick in the appropriate box, every question has a single answer. Thank you very much for your support and cooperation!

Q1. Your sex: $\quad$ Male $\quad$ Female
Q2. Your occupation:
$\square$ Student $\quad$ Factory worker $\quad$ Farmer $\quad \square$ Retiree $\quad \square$ Civil servant
$\square$ Medical personnel $\quad \square$ Military personnel $\quad \square$ Others
Q 3. Your age (years) :
$\square 18-20 \quad \square 20-30 \quad \square 30-40 \quad \square 40-50 \quad \square 50-60 \quad \square \geq 60$
Q4. Your monthly income (RenMinBi Yuan):

```
\square0 \square1-2000 \square2001-3000 ם3001-5000 ם5001-8000
\square8001-15,000 ם15,001-50,000 ם>50,000
```

Q5. Your marital status:
$\square$ Single $\quad$ Married $\quad \square$ Widowed $\quad$ Others
Q 6. Your educational level:
$\square$ Primary school $\quad \square$ Junior high school $\quad \square$ Senior high school
$\square$ Junior college $\quad \square$ Bachelor $\square$ Master $\quad$ Doctor
Q 7. Your self-rated health status:
$\square$ Very poor $\quad$ Poor $\quad$ Ordinary $\quad$ Healthy $\quad \square$ Very healthy
Q 8. Whether the burden of health expenditures is affordable?
$\square$ Completely affordable $\quad$ Affordable $\quad \square$ Can not affordable
Q 9. Whether community health institutions advocated dual practice policy in your current community?
$\square$ Yes $\quad$ No $\quad$ Not certain
Q 10. Whether dual practice could reduce difficulty in consulting a doctor ?
$\square$ Yes $\quad$ No $\quad$ Not certain
Q 11. Whether dual practice could meet patient demand for health convenience ?
$\square$ Yes $\quad$ No $\quad$ Not certain
Q 12. Whether dual practice could meet patient demand for treatment for minor illness ?Y
$\square$ No
$\square$ Not certain

Q 13. Whether dual practice could meet patient demand for treatment for chronic disease?
$\square$ Yes $\quad$ No $\quad$ Not certain
Q 14. Whether community health services were your first choice for treatment for minor illness if community health centers engaged in dual practice?
$\square$ Yes $\quad$ No $\quad$ Not certain

Q 15. Whether community health services were your first choice for treatment for chronic disease if community health centers engaged in dual practice ?
$\square$ Yes $\quad$ No $\quad$ Not certain

Questionnaire 2: Perception of medical staff of dual practice
Dear Sir / Madam:
Dual practice is defined as a physician's performance of medical activities in different health institutions (two or more) simultaneously. The aim of this survey was to examine the perception of medical staff of dual practice. The questionnaire information was only for academic research, without involving any commercial interests. All personal information was anonymized prior to analysis. Place a tick in the appropriate box, every question has a single answer. Thank you very much for your support and cooperation!

Q1. Your sex: $\quad$ Male $\quad$ Female
Q2. Your age (years) :
$\square 18-20 \quad \square 20-30 \quad \square 30-40 \quad \square 40-50 \quad \square 50-60 \quad \square \geq 60$
Q 3. Your Educational level:
$\square$ Junior college $\quad$ Bachelor $\square$ Master $\square$ Doctor $\square$ Post-doctorate $\quad \square$ Others
Q 4. Your title:
$\square$ Hospital leader $\quad$ Department leader $\quad$ Clinical department director
$\square$ Medical-technical department director $\square$ Pharmacy director $\square$ Doctor
$\square$ Researcher $\square$ Others

Q 5. Your technical position:
$\square$ Junior $\quad$ Intermediate $\quad$ Vice senior $\quad$ Senior
Q 6. Your department:
$\square$ Surgical department $\square$ Internal medical department $\square$ Medical-technical department -Others

Q 7. Whether hospital administrators advocated dual practice policy in your current workplace ?
$\square$ Yes $\quad$ No $\quad$ Not certain
Q 8. Do you want to join in dual practice?
$\square$ Yes
$\square$ No
$\square$ Not certain

Q 9. Do you possessed the knowledge regarding dual practice policy?
$\square$ Yes $\square$ No
Q 10. Whether dual practice would increase your work-related burden ?
$\square$ Yes $\quad$ No $\quad \square$ Not certain
Q 11. Whether dual practice could reduce difficulty in consulting a doctor ?
$\square$ Yes $\quad$ No $\quad$ Not certain
Q 12. The important levels regarding the influencing factors of dual practice
Q 12.1 Support from the hospital
םvery unimportant aunimportant $\square$ general aimportant avery important
Q 12.2 Whether hospitals' human resource management system permit free flow of medical staff

םvery unimportant aunimportant ageneral aimportant avery important
Q 12.3 The willingness of medical staff
םvery unimportant $\quad$ unimportant $\square$ general aimportant avery important
Q 12.4 Existence of a professional dual-practice team
םvery unimportant $\quad$ unimportant $\quad$ general $\quad$ aimportant $\quad$ very important

## Appendix C: Multinomial logistic regression analysis results of medical staff

Table S3 Comparison of medical staff who was uncertain about the willingness to join in dual practice with medical staff who wanted to join in

| Variables | Parameter | Estimate | SE | Wald $\chi^{2}$ | P-value | OR | 95\% CI |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lower | Upper |
| Age (years) | Intercept | 16.790 | 1837.988 | 0.000 | 0.993 |  |  |  |
|  | 18-20 | -0.106 | 4819.495 | 0.000 | 1.000 | 0.900 |  |  |
|  | 20-30 | -18.160 | 1837.987 | 0.000 | 0.992 | 0.000 |  |  |
|  | 30-40 | -18.365 | 1837.987 | 0.000 | 0.992 | 0.000 |  |  |
|  | 40-50 | -18.764 | 1837.987 | 0.000 | 0.992 | 0.000 |  |  |
|  | 50-60 | -17.546 | 1837.987 | 0.000 | 0.992 | 0.000 |  |  |
|  | $\geq 60$ | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Educational level | Others | 0.197 | 0.981 | 0.040 | 0.841 | 1.218 | 0.178 | 8.333 |
|  | Junior college | -0.557 | 1.197 | 0.216 | 0.642 | 0.573 | 0.055 | 5.982 |
|  | Bachelor | -0.077 | 0.339 | 0.051 | 0.821 | 0.926 | 0.477 | 1.800 |
|  | Master | -0.816 | 0.328 | 6.177 | 0.013* | 0.442 | 0.233 | 0.842 |
|  | Doctor | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Title | Others | -3.165 | 2.079 | 2.317 | 0.128 | 0.042 | 0.001 | 2.484 |
|  | Doctor | -3.566 | 1.986 | 3.226 | 0.072 | 0.028 | 0.001 | 1.384 |
|  | Medical-technical department director | -3.054 | 2.646 | 1.332 | 0.248 | 0.047 | 0.000 | 8.429 |
|  | Clinical department director Hospital leader | $-2.830$ <br> Reference | 2.073 | 1.864 | 0.172 | 0.059 | 0.001 | 3.431 |
| Technical position | Junior | 1.334 | 0.722 | 3.410 | 0.065 | 3.795 | 0.921 | 15.631 |
|  | Intermediate | 1.040 | 0.707 | 2.163 | 0.141 | 2.829 | 0.708 | 11.311 |
|  | Vice senior | 0.674 | 0.692 | 0.949 | 0.330 | 1.961 | 0.506 | 7.606 |
|  | Senior | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Department | Others | 0.055 | 0.408 | 0.018 | 0.893 | 1.056 | 0.475 | 2.351 |
|  | Medical-technical department | 0.142 | 0.514 | 0.077 | 0.782 | 1.153 | 0.421 | 3.156 |
|  | Internal medical department | 0.469 | 0.280 | 2.808 | 0.094 | 1.598 | 0.924 | 2.766 |
|  | Surgical department | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whether hospital administrators | Not certain | 1.461 | 0.375 | 15.177 | 0.000* | 4.308 | 2.066 | 8.983 |


| advocated dual practice policy in the current workplace | $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { No } \\ & \text { Yes } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | -0.051 <br> Reference | 0.434 | 0.014 | 0.906 | 0.950 | 0.406 | 2.223 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Whether respondents possessed the knowledge of dual practice policy | No | 0.565 | 0.362 | 2.437 | 0.119 | 1.760 | 0.866 | 3.578 |
|  | Yes | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whether dual practice increased work-related burden | Not certain | 0.428 | 0.306 | 1.964 | 0.161 | 1.535 | 0.843 | 2.794 |
|  | No | 0.029 | 0.310 | 0.009 | 0.925 | 1.030 | 0.561 | 1.889 |
|  | Yes | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whether dual practice could reduce difficulty in consulting a doctor | Not certain | 1.340 | 0.284 | 22.255 | 0.000* | 3.820 | 2.189 | 6.667 |
|  | No | 0.566 | 0.324 | 3.053 | 0.081 | 1.761 | 0.933 | 3.324 |
|  | Yes | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Support from the hospital | Very unimportant | 2.912 | 1.172 | 6.171 | 0.013* | 18.396 | 1.849 | 183.042 |
|  | Unimportant | 2.062 | 1.113 | 3.433 | 0.064 | 7.861 | 0.888 | 69.629 |
|  | General | 1.145 | 0.459 | 6.217 | 0.013* | 3.142 | 1.278 | 7.728 |
|  | Important | 0.425 | 0.365 | 1.358 | 0.244 | 1.530 | 0.748 | 3.127 |
|  | Very important | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whether hospitals’ human resource management system permit free flow of medical staff | Very unimportant | -0.178 | 1.526 | 0.014 | 0.907 | 0.837 | 0.042 | 16.654 |
|  | Unimportant | 0.545 | 1.024 | 0.283 | 0.595 | 1.724 | 0.232 | 12.843 |
|  | General | 1.140 | 0.514 | 4.930 | 0.026* | 3.127 | 1.143 | 8.557 |
|  | Important | 1.003 | 0.384 | 6.822 | 0.009* | 2.726 | 1.284 | 5.786 |
|  | Very important | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The willingness of medical staff | Very unimportant | -0.300 | 1.674 | 0.032 | 0.858 | 0.741 | 0.028 | 19.720 |
|  | Unimportant | 2.295 | 1.144 | 4.024 | 0.045* | 9.926 | 1.054 | 93.456 |
|  | General | 0.498 | 0.503 | 0.982 | 0.322 | 1.646 | 0.615 | 4.408 |
|  | Important | 0.452 | 0.396 | 1.308 | 0.253 | 1.572 | 0.724 | 3.413 |
|  | Very important | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Existence of a professional dualpractice team | Very unimportant | 16.018 | 2092.200 | 0.000 | 0.994 | 904423 |  |  |
|  | Unimportant | 0.010 | 1.092 | 0.000 | 0.993 | 1.010 | 0.119 | 8.579 |
|  | General | -0.208 | 0.519 | 0.161 | 0.688 | 0.812 | 0.294 | 2.244 |
|  | Important | -0.402 | 0.399 | 1.016 | 0.313 | 0.669 | 0.306 | 1.462 |
|  | Very important | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes: *P,0.05 (two sided). ${ }^{\text {a Reference: }}$ medical staff who wanted to join in dual practice.
Abbreviations: OR, odds ratio; SE, standard error; CI, confidence interval.

Table S4 Comparison of medical staff who was opposed to joining in dual practice with medical staff who wanted to join in dual practice ${ }^{\text {a }}$
$\left.\begin{array}{llllllll}\hline \text { Variables } & \text { Parameter } & \text { Estimate } & \text { SE } & \text { Wald } \chi^{2} & \text { P-value } & \text { OR } \\ \text { Age (years) } & & & & \\ \text { Lower } \\ \text { Upper }\end{array}\right]$

|  | technical department <br> Internal medical department <br> Surgical department | $0.791$ <br> Reference | 0.390 | 4.116 | 0.042* | 2.206 | 1.027 | 4.736 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Whether hospital administrators advocated dual practice policy in the current workplace | Not certain | 0.085 | 0.511 | 0.027 | 0.868 | 1.088 | 0.400 | 2.963 |
|  | No | 1.315 | 0.489 | 7.231 | 0.007* | 3.724 | 1.428 | 9.710 |
|  | Yes | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whether respondents possessed the knowledge of dual practice policy | No | 0.508 | 0.442 | 1.319 | 0.251 | 1.662 | 0.698 | 3.954 |
|  | Yes | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whether dual practice increased work-related burden | Not certain | -0.311 | 0.416 | 0.561 | 0.454 | 0.732 | 0.324 | 1.654 |
|  | No | -0.688 | 0.391 | 3.096 | 0.079 | 0.503 | 0.233 | 1.082 |
|  | Yes | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whether dual practice could reduce difficulty in consulting a doctor | Not certain | 1.226 | 0.414 | 8.752 | 0.003* | 3.406 | 1.512 | 7.673 |
|  | No | 1.506 | 0.389 | 14.971 | 0.000* | 4.508 | 2.102 | 9.667 |
|  | Yes | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Support from the hospital | Very unimportant | 0.171 | 1.416 | 0.015 | 0.904 | 1.187 | 0.074 | 19.033 |
|  | Unimportant | -0.335 | 1.503 | 0.050 | 0.824 | 0.716 | 0.038 | 13.625 |
|  | General | 0.057 | 0.618 | 0.008 | 0.927 | 1.058 | 0.315 | 3.551 |
|  | Important | 0.410 | 0.468 | 0.769 | 0.381 | 1.507 | 0.603 | 3.768 |
|  | Very important | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Whether hospitals’ human resource management system permit free flow of medical staff | Very unimportant | 2.342 | 1.543 | 2.305 | 0.129 | 10.401 | 0.506 | 213.865 |
|  | Unimportant | 3.610 | 1.108 | 10.609 | 0.001* | 36.956 | 4.211 | 324.347 |
|  | General | 2.102 | 0.660 | 10.145 | 0.001* | 8.185 | 2.245 | 29.840 |
|  | Important | 1.246 | 0.507 | 6.032 | 0.014* | 3.475 | 1.286 | 9.388 |
|  | Very important | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The willingness of medical staff | Very unimportant | 0.608 | 1.554 | 0.153 | 0.696 | 1.837 | 0.087 | 38.599 |
|  | Unimportant | 1.984 | 1.177 | 2.839 | 0.092 | 7.270 | 0.723 | 73.057 |
|  | General | -0.397 | 0.612 | 0.422 | 0.516 | 0.672 | 0.202 | 2.231 |


|  | Important <br> Very important | $\begin{aligned} & -0.110 \\ & \text { Reference } \end{aligned}$ | 0.487 | 0.051 | 0.822 | 0.896 | 0.345 | 2.327 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Existence of a professional dualpractice team | Very unimportant | -2.196 | 5167.744 | 0.000 | 1.000 | 0.111 |  |  |
|  | Unimportant | -0.666 | 1.266 | 0.277 | 0.599 | 0.514 | 0.043 | 6.146 |
|  | General | -0.696 | 0.602 | 1.337 | 0.248 | 0.499 | 0.153 | 1.622 |
|  | Important | -0.766 | 0.472 | 2.639 | 0.104 | 0.465 | 0.184 | 1.171 |
|  | Very important | Reference |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Notes: *P,0.05 (two sided). ${ }^{\text {a Reference: }}$ medical staff who wanted to join in dual practice.
Abbreviations: OR, odds ratio; SE, standard error; CI, confidence interval.

