

1 **Title:** - Comprehensive assessment of Age-Specific Mortality Rate and its incremental changes  
2 using a composite measure: A sub-national analysis of rural Indian women

3 **Short title-** Age-Specific Mortality Rate of rural Indian women

4 **Authors-** Divya Sharma<sup>1</sup>, Tanvi Kiran<sup>1</sup>, KP Junaid<sup>1</sup>, Vineeth Rajagopal<sup>1</sup>, Saraswati Sharma<sup>1</sup>

5 <sup>1</sup>Department of Community Medicine and School of Public Health, Postgraduate Institute of  
6 Medical Education and Research (PGIMER), Chandigarh, India

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23 **Abstract**

24 **Background-** Diverse socio-economic and cultural issues contribute to adverse health outcomes  
25 and increased mortality rates among rural Indian women across different age categories. The  
26 present study aims to comprehensively assess age-specific mortality rates and their temporal trends  
27 using a composite measure at the sub-national level for rural Indian females to capture cross-state  
28 differences.

29 **Methods-** A total of 19 states were included in the study to construct a composite age-specific  
30 mortality index for 2011 (base year) and 2018 (reference year) and examine the incremental  
31 changes in the index values across these years at the sub-national level in India. Sub-index values  
32 were calculated for each component age group and were subsequently used to compute the  
33 composite ASMR index using the geometric mean method. Based on the incremental changes, the  
34 performance of states was categorized into four different typologies.

35 **Results-** Improvement in mortality index scores in the 0-4 years age group was documented for  
36 all states. The mortality rates for the 60+ age group were recorded to be high for all states. Kerala  
37 emerged as the overall top performer in terms of mortality index scores, while Bihar and Jharkhand  
38 were at the bottom of the mortality index table. The overall mortality composite score has shown  
39 minor improvement from base year to reference year at all India level.

40 **Conclusions-** An overall reduction in the mortality rates of rural Indian women has been observed  
41 over the years in India. The success of public health interventions to reduce the under-five  
42 mortality rate is evident as the female rural mortality rates have reduced sizably for all states.  
43 Nevertheless, there is still sizable scope for reducing mortality rates for other component age

44 groups. Additionally, there is a need to divert attention toward the female geriatric (60+ years)  
45 population as the mortality rates are still high.

## 46 **Introduction**

47 Nearly 65% of the Indians predominantly reside in rural areas [1], and half of them fall below the  
48 poverty line [2]. Several studies conducted in developing countries have indicated the presence of  
49 a strong association between low socio-economic status, poor health, and inaccessible health care  
50 facilities [3]. Due to the unfavorable socio-economic conditions, the rural population faces a  
51 recurring struggle for survival and succumbs to it most of the time [4]. Disparities in the life span  
52 of rural and urban inhabitants have also been documented by many studies globally [5–7]. It can  
53 be explained by the disproportionate distribution of public resources toward healthcare in urban  
54 and rural areas, thus increasing the gap in terms of healthcare facilities [8]. The low investment in  
55 the health infrastructure of rural areas leads to management issues, a shortage of dedicated cadre  
56 of the health workforce, and insufficient training of healthcare workers, which contribute to poor  
57 health services at large. The other factors accounting for poorer survival of rural residents include  
58 inefficient illness management, remote and inaccessible healthcare facilities, lack of preventive  
59 and screening measures, and low levels of knowledge and awareness [7].

60 Significant health inequalities and disparities in health status are also seen within India, leading to  
61 differences in the mortality rates of vulnerable populations like women and children. These  
62 inequalities affect populations at the national and sub-national levels [9]. The discrepancies in the  
63 health status resulting in high mortality are majorly reported in the Empowered Action Group  
64 (EAG) states of India, which are socioeconomically backward and lag in the demographic  
65 transition [10]. Bihar, Madhya Pradesh, Jharkhand, Chhattisgarh, and Uttar Pradesh are the few  
66 EAG states and are usually found at the bottom of the tables in most of the developmental

67 parameters [11]. The major reasons for the poor performances of these states, specifically in terms  
68 of health outcomes and high mortality rates, include poverty, overpopulation, low literacy levels,  
69 gender discrimination, and poor health infrastructure [12].

70 Though biological differences exist between the genders however [13]; the health outcome  
71 differences and inequalities are more evident in the case of rural Indian women. Women face  
72 diverse socio-economic and cultural issues attributed in terms of gender discrimination, such as  
73 female infanticide, child marriage, dowry, domestic violence, lack of education, and unavailability  
74 of proper sanitation and healthcare facilities [14–16]. These indicators contribute to adverse health  
75 outcomes and increased mortality rates among rural women across different age categories [10].  
76 Various targeted public health programmes have been implemented to reduce mortality rates,  
77 especially in the EAG states. Age-specific interventions have also been launched to improve  
78 nutrition among women [17] and reduce mortality, particularly among infants and under-five  
79 children [18]. The programmes have successfully reduced mortality to a great extent, but the  
80 progress has been uneven. There is still a striking difference between the age-specific mortality  
81 rates at the sub-national level in India, especially concerning women residing in rural areas [19,20].

82 There is a gap in the literature on assessing differences in the Age-Specific Mortality Rates  
83 (ASMR) pertaining to rural women across different Indian states. To the best of our knowledge,  
84 no published study in India has been conducted to quantify and transform the age-specific  
85 mortality values into a single composite value at the sub-national level, especially for rural  
86 females. The present study addresses the lacuna by constructing age-specific mortality index for  
87 four major component age groups and a composite 'Age-specific mortality index' for rural Indian  
88 women at the sub-national and national levels for base and reference years to examine the temporal  
89 changes, if any. The proposed composite measure includes mortality values of all component age

90 groups within its ambit to capture India's cross-state differences. In this backdrop, the specific  
91 objectives of the study can be defined as follows; a) to comprehensively quantify the mortality  
92 values at the sub-national level in India by constructing a composite age-specific mortality index  
93 for rural Indian women using a rigorous methodology involving historical benchmark values for  
94 mortality; b) to examine the incremental changes in mortality index scores from base year to  
95 reference year at the sub-national level.; c) to map and categorize Indian states into not improved,  
96 least, moderately and highly improved classification based on the incremental changes of the  
97 mortality index scores. Thus, examining the state-specific and age-specific determinants leading  
98 to sizable mortality rates among rural Indian women is essential to address the health inequalities.  
99 The identification of determinants necessitates the assessment of age-specific mortality rates and  
100 their temporal trends in quantifiable terms at the sub-national level for rural Indian females, which  
101 forms the very rationale and aim of the present study.

## 102 **Methods**

### 103 **A. Data source**

104 The secondary data on age-specific mortality rates of states was extracted from Sample  
105 Registration System (SRS) statistical reports available on the web portal of the office of  
106 the Registrar General and Census Commissioner under the Indian Ministry of Home  
107 Affairs. The Census of India generates data on population statistics, including vital  
108 statistics and census [21]. A total of 19 states have been included in the study to construct  
109 a composite age-specific mortality index for 2011 (base year) and 2018 (reference year)  
110 and examine the incremental changes in the index values across these years at the sub-  
111 national level in India.

112

## 113 **B. Components of Age-Specific Mortality Rate**

114 Age-Specific Mortality Rate (ASMR) is a mortality rate confined to a particular age group  
115 [22]. The SRS statistical reports publish ASMR by sex and residence for four-component  
116 age groups, i.e., 0-4 years, 5-14years, 15-59 years, and 60 years and above. Since the  
117 present study aimed to construct a composite ASMR index for rural females, the data  
118 pertaining to all the aforementioned component age groups of rural females were extracted  
119 for the years commencing from 1971 to 2018 for the identification of benchmark values  
120 required for data normalization.

## 121 **C. Data cleaning**

122 The extracted data was randomly chosen and rechecked to assess errors in data entry.  
123 Followed by that, the data was checked for the missing values. Out of 28 Indian states, the  
124 data was completely missing for 7 states, bringing the tally down to 21 states.  
125 Subsequently, data for two Indian states, namely; Uttarakhand, was available after 2014  
126 and for Telangana for the year 2018 only. The historical values of these states were not  
127 available in the literature and thus, these states were excluded from the study.

## 128 **D. Computation of composite Age-specific Mortality Index**

### 129 **i. Data normalization**

130 The extracted ASMR data was normalized based on the standardized procedure by  
131 employing the 'Minimum-Maximum approach' used by international and national  
132 agencies and organizations to compute various composite indices [4-5]. Since the  
133 indicators in the study were negative in nature, where an actual lower value means  
134 better performance, therefore the values were normalized and scaled using the  
135 following formula [23]: -

136 **Normalized value** ( $N_i$ ) =  $\frac{\text{Maximum value} - \text{Actual value } (X_i) \times 100}{\text{Maximum value} - \text{Minimum value}}$

138 The minimum and maximum values refer to the benchmark values identified using  
139 the following procedure.

140 **ii. Identification of 'minimum and maximum' (benchmark values) using**  
141 **historical data**

142 The Census of India has been publishing annual SRS statistical reports since 2011,  
143 before which these reports were published intermittently commencing from 1971.

144 The benchmark values were identified using historical ASMR values published in  
145 SRS statistical reports from 1971 to 2018 for each component age group. The  
146 historical data, being a crucial tool in statistical procedures, is the data often  
147 disaggregated or in different measuring [25] units that have been preserved for a  
148 long period [26] as it reflects information having substantial significance. Historical  
149 data is mainly required to identify the thresholds, which are then used for data  
150 normalization. For negative indicators like mortality, the maximum thresholds  
151 should not be obtained from the data range for which the index has to be calculated  
152 (2011 to 2018 in the present study) using the geometric mean approach [27,28]. The  
153 rationale governing this principle is that despite having non-zero (positive) values  
154 for the component/domains of the composite index, the entire index is rendered to  
155 be zero in the event of a single domain registering a zero value (which is  
156 transformed through normalization process explained above). The minimum and  
157 maximum values (benchmarks) are given in the supplementary table (**S1 Table**).

158

159           **iii.       Construction of composite Age-specific Mortality Index**

160           The normalized value computed for the four component age groups reflects the sub-  
161           index values for these age groups, which were subsequently used to compute the  
162           composite ASMR index using the geometric mean method. The geometric mean  
163           method has the upper hand over other measures as it is less altered by extreme  
164           values, is robust and thus maintains an overall balance in data distribution. Further,  
165           it is a standardized technique for index construction adopted by reputed  
166           international agencies/organizations, including United Nations Development  
167           Programme (UNDP) [24,29]

168           The index scores range from 0-to 100 for each indicator. A higher index score  
169           (closer to 100) indicates a lower ASMR value, and a lower index score (closer to  
170           zero) indicates a higher ASMR value.

171           **E.       Incremental changes and classification of states into different typologies**

172           Incremental change measures the change in the index score from 2011 (base year) to 2018  
173           (reference year). The highest positive incremental change across all the component age  
174           groups was 13.9, reported in the 60+ category. Based on the incremental changes, the states  
175           are divided into four groups: 'Not improved' ( $\leq 0$  incremental change), 'Least improved'  
176           (0.01 to 3 points increase), 'Moderately improved' (3.01 to 6 points increase), and 'Highly  
177           improved' ( $> 6$  points increase). The categorization was done using the percentile method  
178           ( $P_{20}$  and  $P_{40}$  determining cut off points for least improved and moderately improved,  
179           respectively) and is based on the approach followed by the National Institution for  
180           Transforming India (NITI Aayog-the apex public policy 'think tank' of the Government of  
181           India) for categorizing health index scores.



182 **F. Data sharing and Ethical Considerations-** The study is purely based on secondary data,  
183 which is freely available to the general public. The study does not involve any interaction  
184 with the participants/human subjects. Hence, ethical approval was not required for this  
185 study. Further, the excel files depicting the normalized values and computed composite  
186 index score for age-specific mortality rates for rural Indian women across different Indian  
187 states have already been uploaded to the Mendeley data repository [30]  
188 (<https://data.mendeley.com/datasets/v5gskzj78x/1>) and can be easily accessed by the  
189 interested users/researchers/ academicians and alike.

## 190 **Results**

### 191 **Descriptive characteristics of component age groups of ASMR for rural Indian women**

192 The means of AMSR values of the four component age groups for each state were calculated for  
193 a span of 8 years (2011-2018) (**Table 1**). At the all-India level, the highest mean death rate  
194 ( $41.63 \pm 0.42$ ) for rural Indian females was observed for the 60+ age group, while the lowest was  
195 for the 5-14 years age group ( $0.15 \pm 0.08$ ). In three out of four component age groups, barring 60+  
196 years, Kerela recorded the lowest mean death rate values for rural Indian women.

197 In the age groups 0-4 years and 5-14 years, Madhya Pradesh reported the highest mean value  
198 ( $17.70 \pm 2.94$  and  $1.14 \pm 0.36$ ), while Kerela ( $2.79 \pm 0.47$  and  $0.15 \pm 0.08$ ) registered the lowest mean  
199 death rates for the rural Indian females. Chhattisgarh recorded the highest ( $3.76 \pm 0.47$ ) and Kerala  
200 the lowest mean death rates ( $1.56 \pm 0.34$ ) in 15-59 years of age. In the 60+ age group, Bihar  
201 documented the highest mean value ( $53.48 \pm 5.55$ ), while Jammu & Kashmir (J&K) reported the  
202 lowest mean death rate ( $27.64 \pm 5.1$ ). Furthermore, estimates of the coefficient of variation showed  
203 the highest variation in the 5-14 years age group and lowest variation in the 60+ years age group.

204

205 **Table 1: Descriptive characteristics of component age groups of Age-specific mortality rates**  
 206 **of rural Indian women at the sub-national and national levels from 2011-2018**

States	Mean± SD				Coefficient of variation (%)			
	Death rates (rural females)				Death rates (rural females)			
	0-4 years	5-14 years	15-59 years	60+ years	0-4 years	5-14 years	15-59 years	60+ years
Andhra Pradesh	10.51±0.87	0.49±0.22	3.34±0.18	39.04±1.43	8.25	44.45	5.53	3.66
Assam	16.18±2.17	0.90±0.38	3.30±0.49	46.76±4.51	13.43	42.00	14.93	9.63
Bihar	11.66±1.51	0.74±0.24	2.35±0.3	53.48±5.55	12.99	32.36	15.26	10.37
Chhattisgarh	13.10±1.65	0.83±0.39	3.76±0.47	49.33±5.94	12.56	47.50	12.46	12.04
Gujarat	11.63±1.64	0.65±0.15	2.51±0.17	32.70±2.66	14.08	23.26	6.87	8.12
Haryana	11.61±1.11	0.56±0.38	2.45±0.19	36.65±2.94	9.56	67.15	7.87	8.03
Himachal Pradesh	7.86±1.96	0.45±0.25	1.88±0.35	33.48±3.05	24.88	55.71	18.86	9.12
Jammu& Kashmir**	8.51±1.85	0.55±0.18	2.14±0.21	27.64±5.19	21.77	32.23	9.98	18.76
Jharkhand	11.33±1.86	0.98±0.63	3.05±0.42	50.88±5.08	16.45	64.34	13.69	9.98
Karnataka	8.49±0.94	0.45±0.18	3.11±0.32	44.44±2.18	11.08	39.40	10.37	4.91
Kerala	2.79±0.47	0.15±0.08	1.56±0.34	34.16±3.28	16.77	50.40	21.89	9.61
Madhya Pradesh	17.70±2.94	1.14±0.36	2.88±0.32	46.16±2.23	16.60	31.85	11.12	4.83
Maharashtra	5.75±0.41	0.38±0.10	2.66±0.50	38.04±3.65	7.14	27.60	18.72	9.59
Odisha	14.28±2.08	1.00±0.38	3.19±0.30	41.94±3.43	14.58	37.80	9.55	8.17
Punjab	7.78±1.94	0.35±0.19	2.73±0.34	36.34±2.99	24.90	52.90	12.37	8.23
Rajasthan	14.91±2.67	0.70±0.24	2.16±0.23	34.89±1.35	17.91	34.15	10.47	3.88
Tamil Nadu	5.13±0.61	0.48±0.16	2.93±0.26	39.10±2.13	11.97	33.29	8.91	5.45
Uttar Pradesh	16.76±2.46	1.01±0.20	3.46±0.41	45.05±3.85	14.68	19.35	11.85	8.54
West Bengal	7.05±1.05	0.50±0.21	2.31±0.19	41.59±2.51	14.95	42.76	8.15	6.04
<b>India</b>	<b>12.11±1.60</b>	<b>0.75±0.12</b>	<b>2.83±0.12</b>	<b>41.63±0.42</b>	<b>13.21</b>	<b>15.94</b>	<b>4.12</b>	<b>1.02</b>

207 *\*\* J&K was an Indian state till 2019 and is now administered as a union territory by India*

208

209

210 **Age-specific Mortality Index scores of component age groups and its comparison between**  
211 **the base year and reference year for rural Indian women**

212 The study computed sub-indices for mortality with regard to each component age group and  
213 compared their index scores for the base year (2011) and reference year (2018) (**Table 2 & 3**).  
214 Compared to the base year, index scores of mortality of rural women for the age group of 0-4 years  
215 increased for all the Indian states. Kerala accounted for the highest index score for 0-4 years in the  
216 base year (98.8) and in the reference year (99.8), and Madhya Pradesh documented the lowest  
217 index scores (80.5 and 87.5) in both the years. In terms of the incremental change between the  
218 base year and reference year for the age group 0-4 years, the highly improved (HI) states with the  
219 highest incremental changes include Madhya Pradesh (7.0) and Rajasthan (7.0). In contrast, the  
220 least improved states with the lowest incremental changes were Maharashtra (0.5), Kerala (1.0),  
221 and Tamil Nadu (1.6) (**Fig. 1**).

222 **Fig. 1: Mapping of Indian states based on incremental changes in index scores for each**  
223 **component age group**

224 In the age group 5-14 years, the index scores of states were relatively higher than other component  
225 age groups. However, there was a decline in the mortality index score for states that registered  
226 high index values in the base year. Fourteen states reported an increase in the mortality score in  
227 the reference year for this particular age group. A remarkable improvement was seen in  
228 Chhattisgarh (13.8) and Odisha (10.8) (**Fig. 1**). Meanwhile, Himachal Pradesh (-3.1), Jammu &  
229 Kashmir (-3.1), Karnataka (-1.6), and Maharashtra (-1.6) recorded negative changes in the  
230 mortality scores.

231

232 **Table 2: Incremental changes in mortality Index scores of age groups 0-4 and 5-14 years**  
 233 **for rural Indian women from the base year to reference year**

State	0-4 years			5-14 years		
	Index score Base year (2011)	Index score Reference Year (2018)	Incremental change	Index score Base year (2011)	Index score Reference Year (2018)	Incremental change
Andhra Pradesh	90.9 (9)	92.7 (10)	1.8 (LI)	86.2 (7) *	93.8 (3) *	7.6 (HI)
Assam	83.5 (17)	89.1 (16)	5.6 (MI)	89.2 (5) *	96.9 (1)	7.7 (HI)
Bihar	88.9 (10)	93.1 (8)	4.2 (MI)	81.5 (9) *	87.6 (7)	6.1 (HI)
Chhattisgarh	87.2 (14)	91.3 (13)	4.1 (MI)	80.0 (10)	93.8 (3) *	13.8 (HI)
Gujarat	87.9 (12)	92.8 (9)	4.9 (MI)	87.7 (6) *	92.3 (4) *	4.6 (MI)
Haryana	88.8 (11)	92.1 (12)	3.3 (MI)	93.8 (3)	95.3 (2)	1.5 (LI)
Himachal Pradesh	92.5 (5)	97.0 (3)	4.5 (MI)	96.9 (1)	93.8 (3) *	-3.1 (NI)
Jammu & Kashmir**	91.0 (8)	95.8 (6)	4.8 (MI)	95.4 (2) *	92.3 (4) *	-3.1 (NI)
Jharkhand	87.4 (13)	92.3 (11)	4.9 (MI)	87.7 (6) *	92.3 (4) *	4.6 (MI)
Karnataka	92.2 (6)	94.4 (7)	2.2 (LI)	92.3 (4)	90.7 (5) *	-1.6 (NI)
Kerala	98.8 (1)	99.8 (1)	1.0 (LI)	96.9 (1)	96.9 (1)	0 (NI)
Madhya Pradesh	80.5 (19)	87.5 (18)	7.0 (HI)	86.2 (7) *	90.7 (5) *	4.5 (MI)
Maharashtra	96.0 (2)	96.5 (4) *	0.5 (LI)	95.4 (2) *	93.8 (3) *	-1.6 (NI)
Odisha	85.1 (15)	90.7 (15)	5.6 (MI)	81.5 (9) *	92.3 (4) *	10.8 (HI)
Punjab	91.5 (7)	96.5 (4) *	5.0 (MI)	89.2 (5) *	92.3 (4) *	3.1 (MI)
Rajasthan	83.8 (16)	90.8 (14)	7.0 (HI)	84.6 (8)	89.2 (6)	4.6 (MI)
Tamil Nadu	95.9 (3)	97.5 (2)	1.6 (LI)	89.2 (5) *	95.3 (2) *	6.1 (HI)
Uttar Pradesh	81.7 (18)	87.7 (17)	6.0 (MI)	81.5 (9) *	86.1 (8)	4.6 (MI)
West Bengal	93.3 (4)	96.3 (5)	3.0 (LI)	87.7 (6) *	95.3 (2) *	7.6 (HI)
<b>India</b>	<b>87.6</b>	<b>92.1</b>	<b>4.5 (MI)</b>	<b>86.2</b>	<b>90.7</b>	<b>4.5 (MI)</b>

234 'NI' = Not Improved (<=0); 'LI' = Least Improved (0-3); 'MI' = Moderately Improved (3.01-6); 'HI' = Highly Improved  
 235 (>6.01)

236 The ranks for each Indian state have been displayed in the parentheses of the table. \* Denotes tied ranks.

237 \*\* J&K was an Indian state till 2019 and is now administered as a union territory by India.

238 For the 15-59 age group (**Table 3**), the mortality score of rural Indian women ranged from 68.0 to  
239 95.1. Kerela reported the highest index scores in base (93.4) and reference years (95.1), while  
240 Chhattisgarh reported the lowest scores in both years (76.2 & 68.0). There was no change in  
241 Karnataka, Maharashtra, and Rajasthan index scores from base year to reference year. Based on  
242 the incremental changes, Bihar showed the highest improvement (8.2), while Odisha (5.0) and  
243 Madhya Pradesh (4.9) improved moderately in the age category 15-59 years (**Fig. 1**). The states  
244 with negative changes in the mortality scores included Chhattisgarh (-8.2), Punjab (-4.9), Jammu  
245 & Kashmir (-1.6), and Uttar Pradesh (-1.6)

246 A wide disparity of mortality scores for rural women was seen in the 60+ years age group ranging  
247 from 37.4 to 92.2 in the reference year. Kerela (81.5) registered the highest index score in the base  
248 year and Jammu & Kashmir (92.2) in the reference year. Jharkhand (50.2) and Bihar (37.4)  
249 recorded the lowest index scores in the base year and reference year in this particular age group.  
250 Ten states showed improvement in index scores from base year to reference year. Jammu &  
251 Kashmir recorded the highest improvement (13.9) in this age group. It was followed by Odisha  
252 (9.6) and Gujarat (9.0) (**Fig. 1**). In contrast, Bihar (-27.5), Chhattisgarh (-16.0), and Tamil Nadu  
253 (-6.1) documented notable negative changes in the mortality index values for this age group. At  
254 all India level, the mortality scores sizably increased for both 0-4 (4.5) and 5-14 years age groups  
255 (4.5), whereas it slightly improved and decreased for 15-59 (1.6) and 60+ (-0.8) age groups,  
256 respectively for rural women.

257

258

259

260 **Table 3: Incremental changes in mortality Index scores of age groups 15-59 and 60+ years**  
 261 **for rural Indian women from the base year to reference year**

State	15-59 years			60+ years		
	Index score Base year (2011)	Index score Reference Year (2018)	Incremental change	Index score Base year (2011)	Index score Reference Year (2018)	Incremental change
Andhra Pradesh	77.0 (11)	77.9 (13)	0.9 (LI)	73.7 (8) *	77.7 (6)	4.0 (MI)
Assam	73.8 (13)	76.2 (14)	2.4 (LI)	59.2 (15)	67.2 (13)	8.0 (HI)
Bihar	81.1 (9)	89.3 (3)	8.2 (HI)	64.9 (12)	37.4 (19)	-27.5 (NI)
Chhattisgarh	76.2 (12) *	68.0 (15)	-8.2 (NI)	64.4 (13)	48.4 (18)	-16.0 (NI)
Gujarat	82.0 (8)	86.1 (6) *	4.1 (MI)	79.4 (2)	88.4 (2)	9.0 (HI)
Haryana	84.4 (6)	86.1 (6) *	1.7 (LI)	75.7 (5)	76.3 (8)	0.6 (LI)
Himachal Pradesh	89.3 (2)	90.2 (2)	0.9 (LI)	76.2 (4)	79.7 (5)	3.5 (MI)
Jammu & Kashmir**	88.5 (3) *	86.9 (5)	-1.6 (NI)	78.3 (3)	92.2 (1)	13.9 (HI)
Jharkhand	80.3 (10) *	82.0 (10)	1.7 (LI)	50.2 (17)	49.6 (17)	-0.6 (NI)
Karnataka	82.8 (7)	82.8 (9)	0 (NI)	71.5 (9)	66.1 (15)	-5.4 (NI)
Kerala	93.4 (1)	95.1 (1)	1.7 (LI)	81.5 (1) *	77.6 (7)	-3.9 (NI)
Madhya Pradesh	80.3 (10) *	85.2 (7)	4.9 (MI)	58.9 (16)	66.4 (14)	7.5 (HI)
Maharashtra	86.1 (4) *	86.1 (6) *	0 (NI)	73.7 (8) *	82.3 (3)	8.6 (HI)
Odisha	76.2 (12) *	81.2 (11)	5.0 (MI)	62.0 (14)	71.6 (11)	9.6 (HI)
Punjab	88.5 (3) *	83.6 (8) *	-4.9 (NI)	74.0 (7)	73.6 (10)	-0.4 (NI)
Rajasthan	86.1 (4) *	86.1 (6) *	0 (NI)	81.5 (1) *	81.4 (4)	-0.1 (NI)
Tamil Nadu	80.3 (10) *	83.6 (8) *	3.3 (MI)	75.4 (6)	69.3 (12)	-6.1 (NI)
Uttar Pradesh	80.3 (10) *	78.7 (12)	-1.6 (NI)	69.0 (10)	64.1 (16)	-4.9 (NI)
West Bengal	85.2 (5)	88.5 (4)	3.3 (MI)	68.5 (11)	74.4 (9)	5.9 (MI)
<b>India</b>	<b>82.0</b>	<b>83.6</b>	<b>1.6 (LI)</b>	<b>70.7</b>	<b>69.9</b>	<b>-0.8 (NI)</b>

262 'NI' = Not Improved ( $\leq 0$ ); 'LI' = Least Improved (0-3); 'MI' = Moderately Improved (3.01-6); 'HI' = Highly  
 263 Improved ( $> 6.01$ )

264 The ranks for each Indian state have been displayed in the parentheses of the table. \* Denotes tied ranks.

265 \*\* J&K was an Indian state till 2019 and is now administered as a union territory by India.

266

267 **Composite Age-specific Mortality Index (ASMI) scores of component age groups and its**  
 268 **comparison between the base year and reference year for rural Indian women**

269 A composite age-specific mortality index for rural Indian women was developed by aggregating  
 270 sub-indices for all component age groups using the geometric mean method (**Table 4**). The highest  
 271 mortality index score in the base year was 92.4, while the lowest was 74.6. In the reference year,  
 272 the index score range was 72.3 to 91.9. Kerala reported the highest composite index scores in the  
 273 base year (92.4) and reference (91.9). Jharkhand (74.6) and Bihar (72.3) documented the lowest  
 274 composite index scores in base and reference years, respectively. Fifteen states recorded an  
 275 increase in the index scores, out of which three states improved highly, four reported moderate  
 276 improvement, and eight made least improvements in the mortality scores (**Fig. 2**).

277 **Fig. 2: Mapping of Indian states into typologies based on incremental changes of composite**  
 278 **Age-Specific Mortality Index scores**

279 **Table 4: Composite Age-specific Mortality Index scores for rural Indian women and its**  
 280 **Incremental changes from the base year to reference year**

State	Composite Age-specific Mortality Index		
	Index score (2011)	Index score (2018)	Incremental change
Andhra Pradesh	81.7 (11)	85.2 (10)	3.5 (Moderately Improved)
Assam	75.5 (16)	81.6 (14)	6.1 (Highly Improved)
Bihar	78.6 (12)	72.3 (18)	-6.3 (Not Improved)
Chhattisgarh	76.5 (14)	72.9 (17)	-3.6 (Not Improved)
Gujarat	84.2 (8) *	89.9 (3) *	5.4 (Moderately Improved)
Haryana	85.4 (6)	87.2 (6)	1.8 (Least Improved)
Himachal Pradesh	88.4 (2)	89.9 (3) *	1.5 (Least Improved)
Jammu & Kashmir**	88.1 (3)	91.7 (2)	3.6 (Moderately Improved)
Jharkhand	74.6 (17)	76.7 (16)	2.1 (Least Improved)

Karnataka	84.2 (8) *	82.8 (12)	-1.4 (Not Improved)
Kerala	92.4 (1)	91.9 (1)	-0.5 (Not Improved)
Madhya Pradesh	75.7 (15) *	81.9 (13)	6.2 (Highly Improved)
Maharashtra	87.3 (4)	89.5 (4)	2.2 (Least Improved)
Odisha	75.7 (15) *	83.5 (11)	7.8 (Highly Improved)
Punjab	85.5 (5)	86.0 (8)	0.5 (Least Improved)
Rajasthan	84.0 (9)	86.8 (7)	2.8 (Least Improved)
Tamil Nadu	84.8 (7)	85.7 (9)	0.9 (Least Improved)
Uttar Pradesh	77.9 (13)	78.6 (15)	0.7 (Least Improved)
West Bengal	83.2 (10)	88.2 (5)	5.0 (Moderately Improved)
<b>India</b>	<b>81.3</b>	<b>83.6</b>	<b>2.3 (Least Improved)</b>

281 *The ranks for each Indian state have been displayed in the parentheses of the table. \* Denotes tied ranks.*

282 *\*\* J&K was an Indian state till 2019 and is now administered as a union territory by India.*

283

284 **Top and bottom performing Indian states based on Incremental changes in composite Age-**  
 285 **Specific Mortality Index scores for rural Indian women**

286 Odisha reported the highest incremental change (7.8) from base year to reference year. Substantial  
 287 improvements were also observed in Madhya Pradesh (6.2) and Assam (6.1). On the contrary,  
 288 composite ASMI scores of Bihar (-6.3), Chhattisgarh (-3.6), Karnataka (-1.4), and Kerala (-0.5)  
 289 reported a decline. At all India level, the incremental change in the composite mortality index score  
 290 for rural women has witnessed a slight improvement (2.3). The incremental changes in the  
 291 composite index are depicted in **Fig. 3**. The top five performing states (**Fig. 3**) with regard to  
 292 composite mortality scores for rural Indian women have more or less remained the same, except  
 293 that West Bengal has replaced the state of Punjab in the reference year (**S2 and S3 map**). The  
 294 bottom five performing states included Chhattisgarh, Assam, and Jharkhand in base and reference  
 295 years. Madhya Pradesh and Odisha in the base year were replaced by Uttar Pradesh and Bihar in  
 296 the reference year (**Fig. 3**) (**S2 and S3 map**).



297 **Fig. 3: Positive and Negative Incremental changes in composite Age-Specific Mortality Index**  
298 **scores along with top and bottom performing states for rural Indian women**

299

300 **Discussion**

301 The study computed mortality index scores for four major component age groups and a composite  
302 Age-specific mortality index for rural Indian women at the sub-national and national levels. Rural  
303 Indian women face several difficulties due to gender disparity and discrimination. Issues  
304 concerning lack of educational opportunities, financial inclusion, proper medical care, hygiene,  
305 and sanitation are widespread in rural areas and are encountered more by women than men [14,15].  
306 Incremental changes in the index scores from the base to reference years have also been calculated.  
307 Based on the incremental changes, the performance of states was categorized into four levels for  
308 each component age group.

309 Out of the four age groups, the highest mean death rate was observed for the 60+ age group, while  
310 the lowest was for 5-14 years. The increase in mortality with age can be attributed to many factors.  
311 Irrespective of gender, the possibility of getting a chronic disease and disability increases with age,  
312 immunity, and strength also dwindle gradually, thus making the elderly more vulnerable to health  
313 problems and increasing the risk of mortality [31–33]. Further, studies on treatment-seeking  
314 behaviour in India revealed that the large majority of the elderly rural Indian population has unmet  
315 healthcare needs, thereby further substantiating the high mean death rates for elderly females as  
316 revealed by the present study [34]. Most deaths in the age group 5-14 years generally result from  
317 communicable diseases. However, a rapid decline in mortality due to infectious diseases in this  
318 age group has contributed to lower death rates [35]. Further, a study revealed that females have  
319 better survivorship in the under-five age group in India [36].

320 Looking at the sub-national level, the state of Madhya Pradesh documented the highest mean death  
321 rates among the states in the age groups 0-4 and 5-14 years, which can be attributed to women's  
322 low literacy and the common practice of child marriage, especially in the rural areas of this state.  
323 The state is among the backward states and trails behind the rest of India with regard to the  
324 demographic transition [10]. Low literacy leads to a lack of awareness and affects the utilization  
325 of Antenatal Care (ANC) services [37,38]. The prevalence of child marriage being interlinked with  
326 low literacy levels is significantly associated with abortions, premature deliveries, and low birth  
327 weight infants resulting in high child mortality [38].

328 Chhattisgarh topped mean death rates among rural females in the 15-59 years age group. It has  
329 been reported that 42% of deaths caused by malaria in India are from Chhattisgarh alone [39].  
330 Rural populations, particularly females, were relatively at higher risk than their male counterparts  
331 as far as malaria mortality figures are concerned in this state [40]. The maternal mortality rates are  
332 also comparatively high in the state, thus adding to death rates in the 15-59 age group [39].

333 In the 60+ age group, Bihar documented the highest mean death rate value. Bihar is one of India's  
334 most populous and poorest states. It is usually placed at the lower end of all major Indian states as  
335 far as most socio-economic development parameters are concerned [11]. The prevalence and  
336 incidence of anemia were considerably high among females [41], particularly in the geriatric  
337 population [42]. With a lack of proper infrastructure and health services, the elderly population in  
338 rural areas succumb to these illnesses due to the inaccessibility of good healthcare services [43].

339 Jammu & Kashmir (J&K) reported the lowest mean death rate in the 60+ years. An increase in life  
340 expectancy in J&K has been noted from 1990 to 2016 [44]. In comparison to males, the life  
341 expectancy for females increased considerably by 10.86 years during the said period [44]. The

342 determinants contributing to increased life expectancy include better healthcare delivery services,  
343 improved health infrastructure, development of supply chain mechanisms, and quality medical  
344 education in the state [45,46].

345 The study calculated the sub-indices for all component age groups. The index scores for 0-4 years  
346 of all states increased from base year to reference year. It indicates that the mortality rates for the  
347 age group 0-4 decreased from 2011 to 2018, which suggested better performance as far as death  
348 rates in this early age group are concerned. This trend can be attributed to the reduction in the  
349 under-5 mortality rate (U5MR), which has noticeably reduced from 66 deaths to 41 rural female  
350 deaths per 1000 live births [47] from 2011 to 2018 in India. Further, the neonatal mortality rate  
351 (NMR) has reportedly gone down by 38%, almost during a similar time period. The identifiable  
352 reason behind this is the strengthened immunization programme incorporating an umbrella of  
353 vaccines targeted to prevent fatal health outcomes[10,48,49].

354 Kerala was the top mortality index scorer for all component age groups in both years except for  
355 60+ years in the reference year. Similar outcomes were seen for mean death rates, where Kerala  
356 reported the lowest mean for all age groups barring 60+ years. According to the Health Index  
357 report (2019-2020) of the National Institution for Transforming India (NITI) Aayog, which is the  
358 Indian government's apex think tank, Kerala emerged as the top performer on multiple health-  
359 related indicators among the larger states [50]. The state's performance in recording lower rural  
360 female death rates can be associated with various economic and health-related factors. Kerala has  
361 registered enormous improvement in income level in the last decade [51], and it presently falls  
362 under the high per capita income and growth rate category [52]. The health infrastructure of Kerala  
363 has shown extensive expansion between 2005-2019, and the state has witnessed a considerable  
364 increase in the number of Community Health Centres (CHCs) in rural areas. The number of

365 allopathic doctors at the Primary Healthcare Centres (PHCs) has also increased significantly [12].  
366 To add to it, it is a front runner in female literacy rates [53] and maternal education in India [54].  
367 In context to the present study results, Kerela registered high mortality index scores, but the  
368 incremental change from base to reference year for each age group has been negligible [50]. The  
369 reason could be the low mortality rates have already reached the saturation level, and only marginal  
370 reduction is possible [55,56].

371 All Indian states recorded an improvement in the female mortality index scores for the 0-4 age  
372 group. Therefore, despite having a noticeable appreciation in the index score from the base to the  
373 reference year, Madhya Pradesh documented the lowest index score for both years. The health  
374 index report by NITI Aayog also reported deterioration in performance by the state for NMR and  
375 U5MR [50]. The states of Himachal Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Karnataka, and Maharashtra,  
376 with high index scores in the base year, showed a decline in the reference year for the 5-14 age  
377 group. A plausible explanation for this trend is that these states had recorded relatively high  
378 mortality index scores in the reference year and had considerably reduced mortality to a great  
379 extent for this age group. Subsequently, most public health interventions and programs were  
380 directed toward reducing female mortality in other age groups [57].

381 In the age group 15-59, Chhattisgarh reported the lowest index score for the base year, further  
382 decreasing in the reference year. A decline in three of four health outcomes has also been witnessed  
383 for Chhattisgarh in the NITI Aayog report [50]. Similarly, for the age group 60+ years, both  
384 Chhattisgarh and Bihar witnessed a worsening of their performance in the reference year, as  
385 revealed by their respective substantial decremental changes in female mortality index scores.  
386 These states are poverty-stricken states, with most poverty concentrated in their rural areas [51].  
387 Huge gender disparities in education levels have been recorded [58,59], wherein both these states

388 are plagued with low female literacy levels, resulting in mass poverty [58]. The states' health  
389 infrastructure is weak, with an acute shortage of doctors at PHCs [12]. Poverty makes the  
390 population more vulnerable to diseases, and the lack of healthcare services to address health  
391 problems results in high mortality rates.

392 The composite Age-specific Mortality Index (ASMI) exhibited results consistent with the sub-  
393 indices. In terms of overall index scores, the top five performers included Kerela, Himachal  
394 Pradesh, Jammu & Kashmir, Maharashtra, and Punjab in the base year. Other studies pertaining  
395 primarily to the overall health index have reported results on similar lines [23,50]. West Bengal  
396 replaced Punjab in the reference year in the top five performers. The deterioration of performance  
397 by Punjab in the age group 15-59 might have caused the change in overall rank. It could be a  
398 consequence of high maternal mortality in the region [60]. Punjab is also among the high HIV  
399 incidence states leading to higher female deaths in the state [60]. Another study reported weakened  
400 performance of Punjab in terms of a downward shift in various health outcomes [23].

401 The bottom five performing states were Chhattisgarh, Assam, Jharkhand, Madhya Pradesh, and  
402 Odisha in the base year. Chhattisgarh performed poorly for age groups 15-59 and 60+years and  
403 thus showed a decline in overall score from base year to reference year. In contrast, Bihar and  
404 Uttar Pradesh documented a decline in the performances in the reference year and entered the  
405 bottom five performing states category, replacing the states of Odisha and Madhya Pradesh, which  
406 recorded highly improved incremental performance in terms of composite female rural mortality  
407 scores. There was a drastic decline in the index scores of Bihar in 60+ years, causing an impact on  
408 the overall performance. The NITI Aayog health index also reported a decline in Bihar's  
409 performance and a downward transition in all health outcomes, including institutional deliveries,  
410 Total Fertility Rates (TFR), Low Birthweight (LBW), success in treating tuberculosis, and

411 healthcare facilities and services [23]. Uttar Pradesh had also recorded decremental changes in  
412 index scores for both 15-59 and 60+years, resulting in its entry into the bottom five performing  
413 states in the reference year.

414 Kerela has remained at the top of its game, thereby emerging as the best-performing state in terms  
415 of overall rural female mortality scores in both the base and reference years. The probable reasons  
416 for this consistent performance have already been discussed earlier in this study. Additionally, the  
417 overall mortality composite score has shown minor improvement from base year to reference year  
418 at all India level. It indicates that there is still room for improvement as the composite score  
419 achieved by India (83.6.) in the reference year is still noticeable points away from the maximum  
420 potential (100) achievable.

421 The current study faces a few limitations. Due to the non-availability of data for all states, 19 out  
422 of 28 states were included in the study, leaving the scope for future studies to be conducted  
423 incorporating the left-over states as and when the data is made available by the Indian government.  
424 Since the data on age-specific mortality groups (0-4, 5-14, 15-59, 60+) from 1971 to 2001 was  
425 disaggregated into various small age groups (5-9, 10-14, 15-19, etc.), the average values of the  
426 death rates were taken to concise them into four major component age groups to identify the  
427 threshold values for data normalization. Therefore, these threshold values for specific component  
428 age groups need to be used with caution in similar future research work.

429 Nevertheless, the present study has some strengths to offer. The 'composite Age-specific Mortality  
430 Index' is a pioneer endeavor to comprehensively quantify the mortality levels pertaining to rural  
431 Indian women at the sub-national level. The scope of usage of this unique 'composite index' is vast  
432 as it provides concise information from the complex and extensive data, which is more convenient

433 to communicate and report for policy plans. The index summarizes the overall performances of  
434 the states and performances specific to component age groups, thus highlighting those age groups  
435 which need attention from the policymakers and the government. This will facilitate the reduction  
436 in mortality rates of rural Indian women at the national level as well. Further, the study has  
437 categorized the Indian states into different typologies (not improved, least/moderately/highly  
438 improved) based on their temporal performance from base to reference year. It will facilitate the  
439 laggard states to initiate customized policies/interventions to follow the performance trajectory of  
440 the frontrunner states in terms of lower rural female mortality scores. Furthermore, the threshold  
441 minimum and maximum values have also been identified for each component age group using the  
442 historical mortality data at the Indian sub-national level, which shall serve as benchmark values to  
443 be used and referred to in future academic and research endeavors.

#### 444 **Conclusions**

445 An overall reduction in the mortality rates of rural Indian women has been observed over the years  
446 in India. The success of public health interventions to reduce under five mortality rate is evident  
447 as the female rural mortality rates have reduced sizably for all states. However, there is still  
448 significant scope for improvement for all states in terms of reduction in mortality rates for other  
449 component age groups. Further, there is a need to divert attention toward the female geriatric (60+  
450 years) population as the mortality rates are still high. Based on the incremental performance, the  
451 gap between the top and bottom performing states in term of feinequalities mortality rates in the  
452 rural areas is mainly attributed to multiple factors emerging from literature like, immunization  
453 coverage, the proportion of registered Antenatal checkups (ANCs), institutional deliveries, total  
454 fertility rate, the number of healthcare providers, presence of dedicated health workforce and alike.  
455 Robust policies and interventions should be developed at the state level to identify and address the

456 state-specific determinants, which will help in lowering the rural female mortality rates at the  
457 national level.

458 **Acknowledgements-** Not applicable

459 **References: -**

- 460 1 The World Bank. Rural population (% of total population) | Data.  
461 <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/SP.RUR.TOTL.ZS> (accessed 18 Apr 2022).
- 462 2 Chandramouli DC. Rural Urban Distribution of population: Census 2011. *Census India*  
463 *2011* 2011;:1–40.[https://censusindia.gov.in/2011-prov-](https://censusindia.gov.in/2011-prov-results/paper2/data_files/india/Rural_Urban_2011.pdf)  
464 [results/paper2/data\\_files/india/Rural\\_Urban\\_2011.pdf](https://censusindia.gov.in/2011-prov-results/paper2/data_files/india/Rural_Urban_2011.pdf)
- 465 3 Saikia N., Bora J., Luy M. Socioeconomic disparity in adult mortality in India. *Genus*  
466 2019;**75**.
- 467 4 Patil AV, Somasundaram K V., Goyal RC. Current health scenario in rural India. *Aust J*  
468 *Rural Health* 2002;**10**:129–35. doi:10.1046/j.1440-1584.2002.00458.x
- 469 5 Hall SE, Holman CDAJ, Threlfall T, *et al*. Lung cancer: an exploration of patient and  
470 general practitioner perspectives on the realities of care in rural Western Australia. *Aust J*  
471 *Rural Health* 2008;**16**:355–62. doi:10.1111/J.1440-1584.2008.01016.X
- 472 6 Campbell NC, Elliott AM, Sharp L, *et al*. Rural factors and survival from cancer: analysis  
473 of Scottish cancer registrations. *Br J Cancer* 2000;**82**:1863–6.  
474 doi:10.1054/BJOC.1999.1079
- 475 7 Dobson A, McLaughlin D, Vagenas D, *et al*. Why are death rates higher in rural areas?  
476 Evidence from the Australian Longitudinal Study on Women’s Health. *Aust. N. Z. J.*  
477 *Public Health*. 2010;**34**:624–8. doi:10.1111/j.1753-6405.2010.00623.x
- 478 8 Saikia N, Singh A, Jasilionis D, *et al*. Explaining the rural-urban gap in infant mortality in



- 479 India. *Demogr Res* 2013;**29**:473–506. doi:10.4054/DemRes.2013.29.18
- 480 9 Ahmad Malik M, Naaz Akhtar Affiliations S, Naaz Akhtar S. Inequalities and policy gaps  
481 in maternal health among Empowered Action Group (EAG) States in India: Evidence  
482 from Demographic Health Survey. *medRxiv* 2021;:2021.01.15.21249872.  
483 doi:10.1101/2021.01.15.21249872
- 484 10 Liu L, Chu Y, Oza S, *et al.* National, regional, and state-level all-cause and cause-specific  
485 under-5 mortality in India in 2000–15: a systematic analysis with implications for the  
486 Sustainable Development Goals. *Lancet Glob Heal* 2019;**7**:e721–34. doi:10.1016/S2214-  
487 109X(19)30080-4
- 488 11 Balaji M. Negotiating Poverty Line-Study on Density Effect around the Poverty Line for  
489 Indian States. *Singapore Econ Rev* 2020;**65**:139–60.  
490 doi:10.1142/S0217590819440041/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/S0217590819440041FIGF9  
491 .JPEG
- 492 12 Ministry of Health and Family Welfare; Government of India. Rural Health Mission  
493 Statistics 2018-19. 2019;:180–92.[https://nrhm-mis.nic.in/SitePages/HMIS-](https://nrhm-mis.nic.in/SitePages/HMIS-Publications.aspx)  
494 [Publications.aspx](https://nrhm-mis.nic.in/SitePages/HMIS-Publications.aspx)
- 495 13 Kushwaha S, Khanna P, Rajagopal V, *et al.* Biological attributes of age and gender  
496 variations in Indian COVID-19 cases: A retrospective data analysis. *Clin Epidemiol Glob*  
497 *Heal* 2021;**11**:100788. doi:10.1016/j.cegh.2021.100788
- 498 14 Bhattacharyya A. Rural Women In India : The invisible lifeline of rural community.  
499 2016;:1–  
500 10.<https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/HRBodies/CEDAW/RuralWomen>  
501 [/ArundhatiBhattacharyya.pdf](https://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/HRBodies/CEDAW/RuralWomen)

- 502 15 Endorsing Women Empowerment in Rural India | S M Sehgal Foundation.  
503 <https://www.smsfoundation.org/womens-empowerment-in-rural-india/> (accessed 12 Apr  
504 2022).
- 505 16 Radiowala AA, S. Molwane M. A Study on the Challenges Faced by Rural Women in  
506 Accessing Education. *J Sci Res* 2021;**65**:13–7. doi:10.37398/jsr.2021.650402
- 507 17 United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF). Delivering essential nutrition interventions to  
508 women in tribal pockets in India: A study from Odisha , Chhattisgarh and Jharkhand. *Nutr*  
509 *Reports* 2017.
- 510 18 Kumar S, Sahu D, Mehto A, *et al.* Health Inequalities in Under-Five Mortality: An  
511 Assessment of Empowered Action Group (EAG) States of India. *J Heal Econ Outcomes*  
512 *Res* 2020;**7**:189–96. doi:10.36469/JHEOR.2020.18224
- 513 19 Roy MP. Infant mortality in Empowered Action Group states in India: An analysis of  
514 sociodemographic factors. *J Dr NTR Univ Heal Sci* 2021;**10**:21.  
515 doi:10.4103/JDRNTRUHS.JDRNTRUHS\_8\_20
- 516 20 Mesceriakova-Veliuliene O, Kalediene R. Changes in mortality inequalities in urban and  
517 rural populations during 1990–2018: Lithuanian experience. *Med* 2021;**57**.  
518 doi:10.3390/medicina57080750
- 519 21 Foreign Ministry of Home Affairs. Census of India Website : Office of the Registrar  
520 General & Census Commissioner, India. *Lancet*. 2016;**388**:1659–  
521 724.<https://censusindia.gov.in/%0Ahttp://censusindia.gov.in/> (accessed 10 Jan 2022).
- 522 22 Center for Disease Control (CDC). Principles of Epidemiology | Lesson 3 - Section 3.  
523 CDC. 2012.<https://www.cdc.gov/csels/dsepd/ss1978/lesson3/section3.html> (accessed 8  
524 Feb 2022).

- 525 23 Niti Aayog. Healthy States Progressive India Report on the Ranks of States and Union  
526 Territories Health Index. 2019. <http://social.niti.gov.in/>
- 527 24 Alkire S, Friedman M, Robles Aguilar G, *et al.* UNDP Human Development Report  
528 Office Training Material for Producing National Human Development Reports. 2015.
- 529 25 Giuliano P, Matranga A. Historical Data: Where to find them, how to use them. *Natl Bur*  
530 *Econ Res* 2020;**21**:1–9.
- 531 26 Simonton DK. Qualitative and Quantitative Analyses of Historical Data. *Annu Rev*  
532 *Psychol* 2003;**54**:617–40. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.54.101601.145034
- 533 27 Mazziotta M, Pareto A. Methods for constructing composite indicators: One for all or all  
534 for one. *Ital J Econ Demogr Stat* 2013;**67**:67–  
535 80.[http://www.istat.it/en/files/2013/12/Rivista2013\\_Mazziotta\\_Pareto.pdf](http://www.istat.it/en/files/2013/12/Rivista2013_Mazziotta_Pareto.pdf)  
536 [http://www.istat.it/en/files/2013/12/Rivista2013\\_Mazziotta\\_Pareto.pdf](http://www.istat.it/en/files/2013/12/Rivista2013_Mazziotta_Pareto.pdf)
- 537 28 Gerstein HC, Ramasundarahettige C, Bangdiwala SI. Creating composite indices from  
538 continuous variables for research: The geometric mean. *Diabetes Care* 2021;**44**:e85–6.  
539 doi:10.2337/dc20-2446
- 540 29 United Nations Development Programme. 2020 Human Development Report Technical  
541 Notes. 2020;:1–19.[http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr2020\\_technical\\_notes.pdf](http://hdr.undp.org/sites/default/files/hdr2020_technical_notes.pdf)
- 542 30 Sharma D, Kiran T, Junaid K, *et al.* Composite measure of Age-Specific Mortality Rate of  
543 rural females at sub-national level in India - Mendeley Data.  
544 2022.<https://data.mendeley.com/drafts/v5gskzj78x> (accessed 21 Apr 2022).
- 545 31 Wolinsky FD, Johnson RL, Stump TE. The risk of mortality among older adults over an  
546 eight-year period. *Gerontologist* 1995;**35**:150–61. doi:10.1093/GERONT/35.2.150
- 547 32 Maia F de OM, Duarte YAO, Lebrão ML, *et al.* Risk factors for mortality among elderly

- 548 people. *Rev Saude Publica* 2006;**40**:1049–56. doi:10.1590/s0034-89102006005000009
- 549 33 Baker DW, Wolf MS, Feinglass J, *et al.* Health literacy, cognitive abilities, and mortality  
550 among elderly persons. *J Gen Intern Med* 2008;**23**:723–6. doi:10.1007/s11606-008-0566-  
551 4
- 552 34 Banerjee S. Determinants of rural-urban differential in healthcare utilization among the  
553 elderly population in India. *BMC Public Health* 2021;**21**:1–18. doi:10.1186/S12889-021-  
554 10773-1/TABLES/11
- 555 35 Fadel SA, Boschi-Pinto C, Yu S, *et al.* Trends in cause-specific mortality among children  
556 aged 5–14 years from 2005 to 2016 in India, China, Brazil, and Mexico: an analysis of  
557 nationally representative mortality studies. *Lancet* 2019;**393**:1119–27. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
558 6736(19)30220-X
- 559 36 Bora JK, Saikia N. Neonatal and under-five mortality rate in Indian districts with  
560 reference to Sustainable Development Goal 3: An analysis of the National Family Health  
561 Survey of India (NFHS), 2015–2016. *PLoS One* 2018;**13**:e0201125.  
562 doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0201125
- 563 37 Singh A, Pathak PK, Chauhan RK, *et al.* Infant and child mortality in India in the last two  
564 decades: A geospatial analysis. *PLoS One*. 2011;**6**:6(11).  
565 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0026856
- 566 38 Brahmapurkar KP. High Under-five Mortality Rate in Madhya Pradesh, Time to identify  
567 High-risk districts using National Family Health Survey-4 Data with Comparison to  
568 Loww Under-five Mortality Rate in Rural Tamil Nadu, India. 2019.
- 569 39 Raza F. Hidden failures and a malnourished south: Health and nutrition in Chhattisgarh |  
570 ORF. Obs. Res. Found. 2018.<https://www.orfonline.org/expert-speak/hidden-failures->

- 571 malnourished-south-health-nutrition-chhattisgarh-45474/ (accessed 24 Mar 2022).
- 572 40 Jana S, Fu SH, Gelband H, *et al.* Spatio-temporal modelling of malaria mortality in India  
573 from 2004 to 2013 from the Million Death Study. *Malar J* 2022;**21**:1–10.  
574 doi:10.1186/S12936-022-04112-X/FIGURES/5
- 575 41 Zakiuddin M, Ahmed M, Vadiraja N. A longitudinal study on incidence and  
576 morphological types of anaemia in inhabitants of Katihar, Bihar, India - Document - Gale  
577 OneFile: Health and Medicine. *J Evol Med Dent Sci*  
578 2016;**5**.<https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA470461639&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=22784748&p=HRCA&sw=w&userGroupName=anon~9ecf3a9c> (accessed 11 Apr 2022).
- 581 42 Kumar Barman S, Lata K, Ram R, *et al.* A study of morbidity profile of geriatric  
582 population in an urban community of Kishanganj, Bihar, India. *WwwGjmedphOrg*  
583 2014;**3**.[www.gjmedph.org](http://www.gjmedph.org)
- 584 43 Soni S, Kumar M, Shukla M. A Study on Morbidity Profile Among Elderly in A Rural  
585 Population of Katihar , Bihar. *Paripex-Indian J Res* 2016;:14–7.
- 586 44 Qazi N, Zhao H, Bashir R. Contemporary trends in life expectancy in the State of Jammu  
587 and Kashmir: Insight from the Global burden of disease 2017. *JK Pract* 2019;**24**:11–3.
- 588 45 Department of Health & Medical Education Government of UT of J&K. INSPIRING New  
589 Hope: Transforming Healthcare landscape in Jammu and Kashmir. 2020.
- 590 46 Shah SA. ‘At 74 years, life expectancy in J&K 3rd best in country’. Gt. Kashmir.  
591 2020.[https://www.greaterkashmir.com/editorial/at-74-years-life-expectancy-in-jk-3rd-](https://www.greaterkashmir.com/editorial/at-74-years-life-expectancy-in-jk-3rd-best-in-country)  
592 [best-in-country](https://www.greaterkashmir.com/editorial/at-74-years-life-expectancy-in-jk-3rd-best-in-country) (accessed 24 Mar 2022).
- 593 47 Ministry of Home Affairs; Government of India. Sample Registration System Statistical

- 594 Report 2018. 2018.
- 595 48 Malik A, Haldar P, Ray A, *et al.* Introducing rotavirus vaccine in the Universal  
596 Immunization Programme in India: From evidence to policy to implementation. *Vaccine*  
597 2019;**37**:5817–24. doi:10.1016/j.vaccine.2019.07.104
- 598 49 Dandona R, Kumar A, Henry N, *et al.* Subnational mapping of under-5 and neonatal  
599 mortality trends in India: the Global Burden of Disease Study 2000–17. *Lancet*  
600 2020;**395**:1640–58. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30471-2
- 601 50 NITI Aayog. Health States Progressive India: Health Index Round IV 2019-20. Published  
602 Online First: 2021.<http://indiabudget.nic.in/ub2013-14/eb/sbe47.pdf>
- 603 51 Nayak PK, Chattopadhyay SK, Kumar A, *et al.* Inclusive Growth and Its Regional  
604 Dimension. *Reserv Bank India Occas Pap* 2010;**31**:91–  
605 156.[http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eoh&AN=1725810&lang=fr](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eoh&AN=1725810&lang=fr&site=ehost-live)  
606 [&site=ehost-live](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=eoh&AN=1725810&lang=fr&site=ehost-live)
- 607 52 Hanagodimath S. Spatial Income Inequalities in India: An Inter-State and Intra-State  
608 Analysis. 2021;:1–55.[https://ieawc2021.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/48f3089cd46e-](https://ieawc2021.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/48f3089cd46e-Hanagodimath_Shiddalingaswami_Spatial_Income_Inequalities_in_India_An_Inter_State_and_Intra_State_Analysis.pdf)  
609 [Hanagodimath\\_Shiddalingaswami\\_Spatial\\_Income\\_Inequalities\\_in\\_India\\_An\\_Inter\\_State](https://ieawc2021.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/48f3089cd46e-Hanagodimath_Shiddalingaswami_Spatial_Income_Inequalities_in_India_An_Inter_State_and_Intra_State_Analysis.pdf)  
610 [\\_and\\_Intra\\_State\\_Analysis.pdf](https://ieawc2021.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/48f3089cd46e-Hanagodimath_Shiddalingaswami_Spatial_Income_Inequalities_in_India_An_Inter_State_and_Intra_State_Analysis.pdf)
- 611 53 Ministry of Home Affairs; Government of India. State of Literacy- Provisional Populatin  
612 Totals- Census India 2011.
- 613 54 Govindasamy P, Ramesh BM. Maternal education and the utilization of maternal and  
614 child health services in India. *Natl Fam Heal Surv Subj Reports* 1997;:1–28.
- 615 55 Dhirar N, Dudeja S, Khandekar J, *et al.* Childhood Morbidity and Mortality in India -  
616 Analysis of National Family Health Survey 4 (NFHS-4) Findings. *Indian Pediatr*

- 617 2018;**55**:335–8. doi:10.1007/s13312-018-1276-6
- 618 56 Bahl A, Sharma D, Aggarwal AK, *et al.* Temporal Analysis of Under 5 Mortality Rate at  
619 Sub- National Level in India. *Int J Heal Syst Implement Res* 2021;**5**:49–57.
- 620 57 Hill K, Zimmerman L, Jamison D. Mortality risks in children aged 5-14 years in low-  
621 income and middle-income countries: A systematic empirical analysis. *Lancet Glob Heal*  
622 2015;**3**:e609–16. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(15)00044-3
- 623 58 Singh R. Female literacy and economic development in India. *Rupkatha J Interdiscip Stud*  
624 *Humanit* 2016;**8**:64–70. doi:10.21659/rupkatha.v8n2.07
- 625 59 Pathania R. Literacy in India : Progress and Inequality. *Bangladesh e-Journal Sociol*  
626 2020;**17**:57–65.
- 627 60 NITI AYOOG. SDG India Index & Dashboard 2020-21 report: Partnerships in the Decade  
628 of Action. 2021.  
629 [https://niti.gov.in/writereaddata/files/SDG\\_3.0\\_Final\\_04.03.2021\\_Web\\_Spreads.pdf](https://niti.gov.in/writereaddata/files/SDG_3.0_Final_04.03.2021_Web_Spreads.pdf)

630 **Supporting information-**



631 **S1 Table: Minimum and maximum benchmark values of Age-Specific Mortality Rates**

632 **S2 Map: Mapping of top five and bottom five states based on composite Age-Specific**  
633 **Mortality index scores in base year (2011)**


634 **S3 Map: Mapping of top five and bottom five states based on composite Age-Specific**  
635 **Mortality index scores in reference year (2018)**

**Age Group: 0-4 years**

**Age Group: 5-14 years**





medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.04.25.22274281>; this version posted April 28, 2022. 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](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).



**Age Group: 15-59 years**

**Age Group: 60+ years**



**Fig. 1**








Fig. 3