Evaluating the Quality of Medical and Health Services by the Method of Topsis and Linear Interpolation in China

Jiping Zhang^{1,*}¹, Yuqing Mi²^b and Haixia Zhang³

¹Department of Hospital Infection-Control, Qingdao Jiaozhou Central Hospital, Qingdao, China ²School of Public Health, Weifang Medical University, Weifang, China ³Department of Scientific Research and Education, Qingdao Jiaozhou Central Hospital, Qingdao, China

Keywords: Medical Service, TOPSIS Method, Linear Interpolation Method.

Abstract: This study aims to use of TOPSIS method and linear interpolation method to evaluate the work of medical services in towns and townships, to understand our country in various provinces, cities and towns and townships, 2016 medical and health services status quo, analysis of regional differences. This study selected reflected in towns and townships to medical service quality of six indicators, using TOPSIS method and linear interpolation method in various provinces and cities in the country towns and townships is used to evaluate medical service quality. Using the SPSS 17.0 software to the ranking results of two methods to do Spearman correlation analysis and Kruskal Wallis H test. The Spearman correlation analysis and TOPSIS method, the correlation of evaluation results is higher (r = 0.915, P = 0.000). Two kinds of comprehensive evaluation results sorting, sichuan, henan, guangxi is located in the top three, shanxi, Inner Mongolia, jilin, after three. Thus this research conclusions: regional differences in towns and townships throughout the country medical service quality, two kinds of evaluation results is highly correlation.

1 INTRODUCTION

In towns and townships as an important part of the basic health service system construction, burdened with a large number of medical and health services, epidemic prevention, such as maternity care work, in the protection of peasants health plays an important role of (Gao 2018). Although grassroots health workers are accelerating in China, has a certain regional differences. In towns and townships of our country is used to evaluate medical service quality is of great significance to the evaluation result directly reflect the grassroots medical service level. At present, the TOPSIS method is limited in systems engineering solution of multi-objective decision analysis is a kind of commonly used method, often used for quality evaluation work of medical institutions, advantage is that can make full use of original data information, sorting results intuitive and reliable (Liu, Chai, Xu, Cai 2018); Linear interpolation method, according to the average index of minor sort method is simple, convenient application, the differences due to different evaluation method and evaluation results, in order to ensure objectivity of evaluation results, this study adopts the TOPSIS method, linear interpolation method is used to evaluate the national basic medical service quality, in order to understand our country in various provinces, cities and towns and townships, 2016 service present situation and analyzes the regional differences.

2 DATA AND METHODS

2.1 Source

This research uses the data of national health and family planning commission, "2017 China statistical yearbook of health and family planning (National health and family planning commission 2017).

Zhang, J., Mi, Y. and Zhang, H.

Evaluating the Quality of Medical and Health Services by the Method of Topsis and Linear Interpolation in China. DOI: 10.5220/0012070500003624

In Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Public Management and Big Data Analysis (PMBDA 2022), pages 91-96 ISBN: 978-989-758-658-3

Copyright © 2023 by SCITEPRESS – Science and Technology Publications, Lda. Under CC license (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0)

^a https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9712-7168

^b https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2923-5618

^c https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2903-2498

2.2 Index Selection

Refer to the China statistical yearbook of health and family planning of towns and townships health service category, select six representative indicators of 29 provinces in China in 2016 (the data does not include Beijing, Shanghai) is used to evaluate the towns and townships of medical service quality. Selected indicators are: X1 - sickbed utilization rate (%), X2 - average (day) of such confinement, X3 physicians daily for visits, X4 - physicians daily for hospital bed, X5 - visits (ten thousand people), X6 admissions (ten thousand people).Among them, the X2 - low average such confinement for optimal index, the rest for the yields and indicators.

2.3 Comprehensive Evaluation Method

2.3.1 TOPSIS Method

TOPSIS method is based on the normalized after the original data matrix, calculated to evaluate solutions and the optimal scheme and the worst, according to the size of the relative distance evaluation using a method (Wang, Song, An 2015). list the decision matrix, namely the original data set: 29 provinces, six indicators, form a comprehensive evaluation of the original data table, as shown in table 1.index with chemokines normalization processing: 100 / (x)by inverse method yields and index, low optimal index can be converted to realize with chemokines, further normalization processing eliminate the influence of discrete tendency and normalized matrix values(1):to determine the optimal worst plan: $Z^+ = (0.31, 0.28, 0.38, 0.42, 0.52, 0.44), Z^- =$ (0.05, 0.01, 0.05, 0.01, 0.01, 0.01); D+i, D-i and proximity Ci: each evaluation objects and the distance Z+, Z- toD+i, D-i, proximity to Ci, Ci is close to 1, medical services, the better the results(2).sorting: according to the Ci value from big to small order, get medical service level of provinces and cities, sort the results, as shown in table 2.

$$Z_{ij}^{+} = \frac{f_{ij}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_{ij}^{2}}}$$
(1)
$$D_{i}^{+} = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} (Z_{ij} - Z_{j}^{+})^{2}}, D_{i}^{-} = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^{m} (Z_{ij} - Z_{j}^{-})^{2}},$$

$$i = 1, ..., n, C_{i} = \frac{D_{i}^{-}}{D_{i}^{+} - D_{i}^{+}},$$

$$0 \le C_{i} \le 1, i = 1, ..., n$$
(2)

2.3.2 Linear Interpolation Method

Linear interpolation method is essentially actual value evaluation of each index in the index is the ratio of the location in the whole distance, finally according to the evaluated object average minor sort, (0,1), the bigger value shows that comprehensive evaluation result more optimal (Li, Wang, Xia, Zhang, Bai 2015).

Rank: the minimum and maximum parameter values will be integers, the rest are basically as a integer. The yields and indicators:(3). For low optimal indicators: (4).

Calculated the comprehensive rank (5).

The sorting: by RSR values from big to small order, comprehensive evaluation results by linear interpolation method, shown in table 4.

$$R = 1 + (n-1)\frac{X - X_{\min}}{X_{\max} - X_{\min}}$$
(3)

$$R = 1 + (n-1) \frac{X_{max} - X}{X_{max} - X_{max}}$$
(4)

$$RSR_{i} = \sum_{j=1}^{m} \frac{R_{ij}}{m \times n}$$
(5)

2.4 Statistical Analysis Methods

SPSS 17.0 software was used to deal with the data analysis.a = 0.01.

3 RESULTS

3.1 Primary Care Services

Regional differences in towns and townships health service indicators. Hubei province in towns and townships sickbed utilization rate is as high as 76.70%, followed by chongqing, xinjiang, Tibet autonomous region sickbed utilization rate, the lowest is 28.30%; The highest average such confinement was in towns and townships, zhejiang province, is 9.1 days, followed by Shanxi Province and jiangsu province. Physician burden of daily visits are highest in Shanghai, followed by the zhejiang province, tianjin, the lowest is Tibet; Physicians daily for visits are highest in zhejiang province, the second is in yunnan province and hainan province. Physicians, xinjiang province, the highest average daily take such confinement was followed by chongqing municipality, sichuan province. In towns and townships, 2016 visits the most were in henan province, was hospitalized people most is sichuan province, as shown in the table 1.

Area	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6
Tianjin	44.00	7.50	11.70	0.80	645.94	7.22
Hebei	58.50	7.20	7.40	1.40	4777.19	168.67
Shanxi	35.10	8.50	6.70	1.10	1603.68	42.65
Inner Mongolia	42.20	6.50	5.50	0.90	1217.01	36.28
Liaoning	44.30	7.60	8.00	1.50	1718.16	55.25
Jilin	28.80	7.50	4.70	0.60	967.24	1.76
Heilongjiang	56.60	6.30	4.80	1.45	983.28	66.56
Jiangsu	63.60	7.60	10.90	1.10	8288.55	163.38
Zhejiang	49.70	9.10	18.00	0.40	9351.85	30.69
Anhui	60.60	6.60	8.80	1.40	4576.62	157.95
Fujian	49.50	6.10	11.00	1.40	2702.97	82.14
Jiangxi	68.70	5.40	8.90	2.20	3228.70	201.88
Shandong	60.70	7.30	7.50	1.50	7331.87	273.53
Henan	62.20	7.20	12.50	1.70	11218.47	287.33
Hubei	76.70	7.00	8.10	1.80	5755.85	258.67
Hunan	70.50	6.00	4.60	1.80	4046.01	373.03
Guangdong	55.20	5.30	8.70	1.00	6690.25	194.48
Guangxi	63.30	5.20	12.00	2.20	5132.05	252.32
Hainan	33.30	6.50	16.50	0.60	1149.72	7.72
Chongqing	74.10	6.70	7.60	2.80	2002.69	153.74
Sichuan	70.70	6.30	11.50	2.50	9372.06	443.28
Guizhou	44.90	4.90	8.70	1.40	2661.97	119.63
Yunnan	53.40	5.80	17.80	2.10	5087.92	140.96
Xizang	28.30	5.00	13.40	0.60	413.63	3.70
Shaanxi	46.60	7.30	9.00	1.60	2202.58	75.43
Gansu	60.00	6.40	8.90	1.50	2006.48	67.76
Qinghai	55.10	5.50	6.10	1.20	258.76	11.49
Ningxia	49.10	6.60	13.70	0.60	670.59	4.88
Xinjiang	74.00	6.10	12.90	2.80	2170.96	101.67

Table 1: Provinces of original index in towns and townships medical services.

3.2 TOPSIS Method to Comprehensive Evaluation Results

We Used TOPSIS comprehensive evaluation method of 29 provinces, cities and towns and townships of six measures of service. The results are shown in table 2, the medical service level in the top three, guangxi, henan, sichuan, after three, respectively, shanxi, jilin, Inner Mongolia.3.3. Status quo of incentive satisfaction of urban community nurses in Shandong Province. evaluation results.

Table 2: Based on TOPSIS method of job evaluation in towns and townships of medical services.

Area	D+	D-	Ci	The sorting
Sichuan	0.151	0.666	0.8151	1
Henan	0.249	0.573	0.6970	2
Guangxi	0.340	0.435	0.5618	3
Shandong	0.350	0.436	0.5549	4
Hunan	0.394	0.477	0.5480	5
Hubei	0.365	0.421	0.5357	6
Jiangsu	0.408	0.399	0.4940	7
Yunnan	0.418	0.403	0.4908	8
Guangdong	0.422	0.359	0.4598	9
Jiangxi	0.440	0.365	0.4530	10
Zhejiang	0.546	0.431	0.4410	11
Xinjiang	0.516	0.378	0.4232	12
Chongqing	0.511	0.370	0.4202	13
Hebei	0.469	0.298	0.3887	14

PMBDA 2022 - International Conference on Public Management and Big Data Analysis

Anhui	0.468	0.296	0.3876	15
Tianjin	0.686	0.381	0.3573	16
Guizhou	0.542	0.238	0.3053	17
Fujian	0.556	0.225	0.2878	18
Jiangsu	0.586	0.212	0.2654	19
Shaanxi	0.581	0.204	0.2603	20
Hainan	0.678	0.219	0.2445	21
Liaoning	0.616	0.172	0.2183	22
Heilongjiang	0.637	0.178	0.2183	23
Ningxia	0.686	0.181	0.2090	24
Xizang	0.703	0.185	0.2085	25
Qinghai	0.691	0.152	0.1799	26
Shanxi	0.656	0.115	0.1489	27
Jilin	0.730	0.041	0.0527	28
Inner Mongolia	0.673	0.037	0.0518	29

3.3 Linear Interpolation Method, Comprehensive Evaluation Results

According to the mean value of each evaluation index of provinces and cities, minor sort, the results

show that the sorting is located in the top three, respectively is sichuan, guangxi, henan, and after the three were in Inner Mongolia, shanxi, jilin, as shown in the table 3.

Table 3: Based on the linear interpolation method, the average size of minor sort of job evaluation in towns and townships medical services.

Area X1 X2 X3 X4 X5 X6 P The sorting Guangxi 21.25 27.00 16.46 22.00 13.81 16.89 0.67 2 Henan 20.61 13.67 17.51 16.17 29.00 19.11 0.67 3 Yunnan 15.52 23.00 28.58 20.83 13.34 9.83 0.64 4 Xinjiang 27.44 21.00 18.34 29.00 5.89 7.34 0.63 5 Jiangxi 24.37 25.67 9.99 22.00 8.59 13.60 0.60 6 Hubei 29.00 15.00 8.31 17.33 15.04 17.29 0.59 7 Hunan 25.41 21.67 1.00 17.43 13.22 0.52 10 Shandong 19.74 13.00 7.06 13.83 19.07 18.23 0.52 11 Jiangsu 21.42 11.00										
Sichuan 25.53 19.67 15.42 25.50 24.28 29.00 0.80 1 Guangxi 21.25 27.00 16.46 22.00 13.45 16.89 0.67 2 Henan 20.61 13.67 17.51 16.17 29.00 19.11 0.67 3 Yunnan 15.52 23.00 28.58 20.83 13.34 9.83 0.64 4 Xinjiang 27.44 21.00 18.34 29.00 5.89 7.34 0.63 5 Jiangxi 24.37 25.67 9.99 22.00 8.59 13.69 0.60 6 Hubei 29.00 15.00 8.31 17.33 10.64 0.58 7 Guangdong 16.56 26.33 9.57 8.00 17.43 13.22 0.52 10 Shandong 19.74 13.00 7.06 13.83 19.07 18.23 0.52 11 Jiangsu 21.42 <td< td=""><td>Area</td><td>X1</td><td>X2</td><td>X3</td><td>X4</td><td>X5</td><td>X6</td><td>Р</td><td></td><td>1</td></td<>	Area	X1	X2	X3	X4	X5	X6	Р		1
Guangxi 21.25 27.00 16.46 22.00 13.45 16.89 0.67 2 Henan 20.61 13.67 17.51 16.17 29.00 19.11 0.67 3 Yunnan 15.52 23.00 28.58 20.83 13.34 9.83 0.64 4 Xinjiang 27.44 21.00 18.34 29.00 5.89 7.34 0.66 5 Hubei 29.00 15.00 8.31 17.33 15.04 17.29 0.59 7 Hunan 25.41 21.67 1.00 17.33 15.04 10.64 0.58 8 Chongqing 27.50 17.00 7.27 29.00 5.46 10.64 0.56 9 Guangdong 16.56 26.33 9.57 8.00 17.43 13.22 0.52 11 Jiangsu 21.42 11.00 14.16 9.17 21.51 11.25 0.51 12 Anhui 19.	Siehuen	25.52	10.67	15.42	25.50	24.28	20.00	0.80	sorting	1
Henan 20.61 13.67 17.51 16.17 29.00 19.11 0.67 3 Yuman 15.52 23.00 28.58 20.83 13.34 9.83 0.64 4 Xinjiang 27.44 21.00 18.34 29.00 5.89 7.34 0.63 5 Jiangxi 24.37 25.67 9.99 22.00 8.59 13.69 0.60 6 Hubei 29.00 15.00 8.31 17.33 15.04 17.29 0.59 7 Hunan 25.41 21.67 1.00 17.33 10.68 24.54 0.58 8 Chongqing 27.50 17.00 7.27 29.00 5.46 10.64 0.56 9 Guangdong 16.56 26.33 9.57 8.00 17.43 13.22 0.52 10 Shandong 19.74 13.00 7.08 12.67 12.03 10.90 4.8 13 Guizhou 10.6									1	
Yunnan 15.52 23.00 28.58 20.83 13.34 9.83 0.64 4 Xinjiang 27.44 21.00 18.34 29.00 5.89 7.34 0.63 5 Jiangxi 24.37 25.67 9.99 22.00 8.59 13.69 0.60 6 Hubei 29.00 15.00 8.31 17.33 15.04 17.29 0.59 7 Hunan 25.41 21.67 1.00 17.33 10.68 24.54 0.58 8 Chongqing 27.50 17.00 7.27 29.00 5.46 10.64 0.56 9 Guangdong 16.56 26.33 9.57 8.00 17.43 13.22 0.52 10 Shandong 19.74 13.00 7.06 13.83 19.07 18.23 0.52 11 Jiangsu 21.42 11.00 14.16 9.17 12.67 12.03 10.90 0.48 13 Gu	0									
Xinjiang 27.44 21.00 18.34 29.00 5.89 7.34 0.63 5 Jiangxi 24.37 25.67 9.99 22.00 8.59 13.69 0.60 6 Hubei 29.00 15.00 8.31 17.33 15.04 17.29 0.59 7 Hunan 25.41 21.67 1.00 17.33 10.68 24.54 0.58 8 Chongqing 27.50 17.00 7.27 29.00 5.46 10.64 0.56 9 Guangdong 16.56 26.33 9.57 8.00 17.43 13.22 0.52 10 Shandong 19.74 13.00 7.06 13.83 19.07 18.23 0.52 11 Jiangsu 21.42 11.00 14.16 9.17 21.51 11.25 0.51 12 Anhui 19.69 17.67 9.78 12.67 12.43 10.48 14 Hebei 18.47 13.67 6.85 12.67 7.24 6.10 0.43 16 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>										
Jiangxi 24.37 25.67 9.99 22.00 8.59 13.69 0.60 6 Hubei 29.00 15.00 8.31 17.33 15.04 17.29 0.59 7 Hunan 25.41 21.67 1.00 17.33 10.68 24.54 0.58 8 Chongging 27.50 17.00 7.27 29.00 5.46 10.64 0.56 9 Guangdong 16.56 26.33 9.57 8.00 17.43 13.22 0.52 10 Shandong 19.74 13.00 7.06 13.83 19.07 18.23 0.52 11 Jiangsu 21.42 11.00 14.16 9.17 21.51 11.25 0.51 12 Anhui 19.69 17.67 9.78 12.67 12.03 10.90 0.48 13 Guizhou 10.60 29.00 9.57 12.67 7.24 6.10 0.43 16 Gansu 19.										1
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$										
Hunan 25.41 21.67 1.00 17.33 10.68 24.54 0.58 8 Chongqing 27.50 17.00 7.27 29.00 5.46 10.64 0.56 9 Guangdong 16.56 26.33 9.57 8.00 17.43 13.22 0.52 10 Shandong 19.74 13.00 7.06 13.83 19.07 18.23 0.52 11 Jiangsu 21.42 11.00 14.16 9.17 21.51 11.25 0.51 12 Anhui 19.69 17.67 9.78 12.67 12.03 10.90 0.48 13 Guizhou 10.60 29.00 9.57 12.67 7.14 8.47 0.45 14 Hebei 18.47 13.67 6.85 12.67 7.24 6.10 0.43 16 Gansu 19.34 19.00 9.99 13.83 5.47 5.19 0.42 17 Jiangsu 13.38 1.00 29.00 1.00 24.23 2.83 0.41 18 Shaanxi 11.59 13.00 10.19 15.00 5.97 5.67 0.35 19 Heilongjiang 17.37 19.67 1.42 13.25 2.85 5.11 0.34 20 Qinghai 16.50 25.00 4.13 10.33 1.00 1.62 0.34 21 Ningxia 13.03 17.67 20.01 3.33 2.05 1.20 0.33										
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$,	1
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$										1
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	010									1
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	<u> </u>									1
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$										1
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	U									1
Hebei18.4713.676.8512.6712.5411.580.4415Fujian13.2621.0014.3712.677.246.100.4316Gansu19.3419.009.9913.835.475.190.4217Jiangsu13.381.0029.001.0024.232.830.4118Shaanxi11.5913.0010.1915.005.975.670.3519Heilongjiang17.3719.671.4213.252.855.110.3420Qinghai16.5025.004.1310.331.001.620.3421Ningxia13.0317.6720.013.332.051.200.3322Hainan3.8918.3325.873.333.281.380.3223Xizang1.0028.3319.393.331.401.120.3124Liaoning10.2611.008.1013.834.734.390.3025Tianjin10.0811.6715.845.671.991.350.2726Inner Mongolia9.0418.332.886.833.453.190.2527Shanxi4.935.005.399.174.443.590.1928										1
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$										1
Gansu19.3419.009.9913.835.475.190.4217Jiangsu13.381.0029.001.0024.232.830.4118Shaanxi11.5913.0010.1915.005.975.670.3519Heilongjiang17.3719.671.4213.252.855.110.3420Qinghai16.5025.004.1310.331.001.620.3421Ningxia13.0317.6720.013.332.051.200.3322Hainan3.8918.3325.873.333.281.380.3223Xizang1.0028.3319.393.331.401.120.3124Liaoning10.2611.008.1013.834.734.390.3025Tianjin10.0811.6715.845.671.991.350.2726Inner Mongolia9.0418.332.886.833.453.190.2527Shanxi4.935.005.399.174.443.590.1928						_		-		1
Jiangsu13.381.0029.001.0024.232.830.4118Shaanxi11.5913.0010.1915.005.975.670.3519Heilongjiang17.3719.671.4213.252.855.110.3420Qinghai16.5025.004.1310.331.001.620.3421Ningxia13.0317.6720.013.332.051.200.3322Hainan3.8918.3325.873.333.281.380.3223Xizang1.0028.3319.393.331.401.120.3124Liaoning10.2611.008.1013.834.734.390.3025Tianjin10.0811.6715.845.671.991.350.2726Inner Mongolia9.0418.332.886.833.453.190.2527Shanxi4.935.005.399.174.443.590.1928	e e									1
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$									-	1
Heilongjiang17.3719.671.4213.252.855.110.3420Qinghai16.5025.004.1310.331.001.620.3421Ningxia13.0317.6720.013.332.051.200.3322Hainan3.8918.3325.873.333.281.380.3223Xizang1.0028.3319.393.331.401.120.3124Liaoning10.2611.008.1013.834.734.390.3025Tianjin10.0811.6715.845.671.991.350.2726Inner Mongolia9.0418.332.886.833.453.190.2527Shanxi4.935.005.399.174.443.590.1928										1
Qinghai16.5025.004.1310.331.001.620.3421Ningxia13.0317.6720.013.332.051.200.3322Hainan3.8918.3325.873.333.281.380.3223Xizang1.0028.3319.393.331.401.120.3124Liaoning10.2611.008.1013.834.734.390.3025Tianjin10.0811.6715.845.671.991.350.2726Inner Mongolia9.0418.332.886.833.453.190.2527Shanxi4.935.005.399.174.443.590.1928										1
Ningxia13.0317.6720.013.332.051.200.3322Hainan3.8918.3325.873.333.281.380.3223Xizang1.0028.3319.393.331.401.120.3124Liaoning10.2611.008.1013.834.734.390.3025Tianjin10.0811.6715.845.671.991.350.2726Inner Mongolia9.0418.332.886.833.453.190.2527Shanxi4.935.005.399.174.443.590.1928										1
Hainan3.8918.3325.873.333.281.380.3223Xizang1.0028.3319.393.331.401.120.3124Liaoning10.2611.008.1013.834.734.390.3025Tianjin10.0811.6715.845.671.991.350.2726Inner Mongolia9.0418.332.886.833.453.190.2527Shanxi4.935.005.399.174.443.590.1928	Ningxia							0.33		1
Xizang1.0028.3319.393.331.401.120.3124Liaoning10.2611.008.1013.834.734.390.3025Tianjin10.0811.6715.845.671.991.350.2726Inner Mongolia9.0418.332.886.833.453.190.2527Shanxi4.935.005.399.174.443.590.1928		3.89	18.33		3.33		1.38	0.32	23	1
Liaoning10.2611.008.1013.834.734.390.3025Tianjin10.0811.6715.845.671.991.350.2726Inner Mongolia9.0418.332.886.833.453.190.2527Shanxi4.935.005.399.174.443.590.1928	Xizang				3.33				24	1
Inner Mongolia9.0418.332.886.833.453.190.2527Shanxi4.935.005.399.174.443.590.1928								0.30		1
Inner Mongolia9.0418.332.886.833.453.190.2527Shanxi4.935.005.399.174.443.590.1928	Tianjin	10.08	11.67	15.84	5.67	1.99	1.35	0.27	26	1
Shanxi 4.93 5.00 5.39 9.17 4.44 3.59 0.19 28	Inner	9.04	18.33	2.88	6.83	3.45	3.19	0.25	27	1
Jilin 1.29 11.67 1.21 3.33 2.81 1.00 0.12 29		4.93	5.00	5.39	9.17	4.44	3.59	0.19	28	1
	Jilin	1.29	11.67	1.21	3.33	2.81	1.00	0.12	29	1

3.4 Correlation Analysis

The ranking results of two comprehensive evaluation methods are the same, On the results of regional sorting the raw data. Completely random design of Kruskal Wallis H - inspection, the result shows that the difference in the ranking results of two kinds of evaluation methods has no statistical significance. Further do Spearman correlation analysis, the result of the evaluation shows that the ranking results of two kinds of evaluation methods have high correlation (r=0.915, P<0.01) ,as shown in the table 4.

Table 4: Two kinds of Spearman correlation analysis of the evaluation results.

	TOPSIS method	linear interpolation method
TOPSIS method	1.000	0.915
linear interpolation method	0.915	1.000

3.5 Two Kinds of Evaluation Results of Correlation Analysis

Two kinds of evaluation results is not the same, to ensure the accuracy and objectivity of the evaluation results, the results of the two evaluation methods show comprehensive sequencing, the results showed that the country towns and townships of medical service quality of the top three provinces, guangxi, henan, sichuan, those in the bottom three of shanxi, Inner Mongolia, jilin, respectively. As shown in the table 5.

Table 5: Based on two methods of evaluation of comprehensive sorting table in towns and townships of medical services.

Area	TOPS IS metho d	linear interpol ation method	The averag e sort	The compreh ensive sequenci ng
Sichuan	1	1	1.00	1
Henan	2	3	2.50	2
Guangxi	3	2	2.50	2
Yunnan	8	4	6.00	3
Henan	5	8	6.50	4
Hubei	6	7	6.50	4
Shandong	4	11	7.50	5
Jiangxi	10	6	8.00	6
Xinjiang	12	5	8.50	7
Jiangsu	7	12	9.50	8
Guangdong	9	10	9.50	8
Chongqing	13	9	11.00	9

10 11 11 12 13
11 12 13
12 13
13
-
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
20
21
22
23
23
24
1

4 CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Comprehensive Evaluation Results

At present, the urban grassroots medical and health service system is steady and rapid development, but there are still areas development speed and scale imbalance problem. Comprehensive evaluation results from the above, our country towns and townships in the central region the low level medical service quality, this is consistent with the result of actor of (Liu 2013). Among them, the medical service quality comprehensive ranking top three, respectively is, guangxi, henan, sichuan, after three shanxi, Inner Mongolia, jilin, respectively.

Sichuan, henan, guangxi region in towns and townships of medical service quality is good, is located in the top level. Sichuan towns and townships comprehensive medical service quality is best, high on the first bit admissions index; The number of physician practice in henan and admission number is located in the country first and third respectively. In towns and townships of shanxi, Inner Mongolia, jilin region after comprehensive ranking in the national health service ability. Hospital in jilin people located in all but 1, sickbed utilization rate, average daily visits and professionals, average daily for hospital beds per second from bottom in the country. Grassroots health work in recent years, the rapid development in our country, but the regional conditions and policy environment to a certain extent, affect the operation of the medical and health work and development. Some less developed areas of fiscal investment is insufficient, compensation mechanism

is imperfect, the government health work value degree is low, lead to the low level of health manpower, equipment and funds, weak grassroots service capacity (Xue 2014). So, in order to improve the basic health service ability, improve the grassroots health development of the regional imbalance, local governments should improve attention to grassroots health work, increase policy support and financial support. Central policy tilt in less developed areas should be targeted to the economy, to strengthen the construction of infrastructure, the rational allocation of health resources, perfect the incentive mechanism, to provide economic underdeveloped regions in health manpower and material resources, and promote the equal basic health services.

4.2 The Application Value of the Two Kinds of Evaluation Method

The combination of two kinds of evaluation methods, can be more intuitive, accurately reflect the regional grassroots medical service level (Ying, Liu, Zhao, Wang, Sa, LI 2016). By Spearman correlation analysis, according to two kinds of results correlation is higher, the correlation coefficient were statistically significant. Although the two kinds of evaluation results, but the difference was not significant, examined the Kruskal Wallis H - and there was no statistically significant difference of the two kinds of evaluation result, and the results have good consistency. In this paper, research results are accurate, can reflect the regional differences of the basic medical service quality.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank all collaborators for their contribution in collecting data for current study.

REFERENCES

- Gao, Z. Y. To strengthen the construction of towns and townships in our province. Chinese people's political consultative conference (CPPCC) newspapers in guizhou. 2018-06-15(A02).
- Liu, H.Q., Chai, X. D., Xu, C. M. & Cai, L. (2018). TOPSIS method combined with RSR method of comprehensive evaluation the singularity of children immunization vaccine immunization coverage. *China for vaccines and immunization*, 05,589-592. doi: 10.19914/j.carol carroll jni 2018.05.018.

- Li, L. F., Wang, X. D., Xia, Y. G., Zhang, Y., Bai, Y., et al. (2015). A linear interpolation method in the application of the comprehensive evaluation on the work quality of child care. *China's maternal and child health care*,16,2491-2494.
- Liu, Q. (2013). The Chinese community health service efficiency analysis. The Chinese health service management,07,497-499 + 502.
- National health and family planning commission. China statistical yearbook of health and family planning, Beijing union medical university press, Beijing,2017.
- Wang, He., Song, P.G., An, L. (2015). Comprehensive evaluation of maternal health in China by TOPSIS and RSR, *China Health Statistics*,02,240-242.
- Xue, J. W. (2014). Exploration of jilin province community health reform and development. *China's community physicians*,24,183-186.
- Ying, R. J., Liu, W. L., Zhao, Z., Wang, C. D., Sa, L. F., & LI, X.L. (2016). Three kinds of comprehensive evaluation method for the quality evaluation of influenza surveillance network in xinjiang. *Modern* preventive medicine,16,2963-2967.