

**Title:** Diabetes diagnosis, treatment, and control in India: results from a national survey of 1.65 million adults aged 18 years and older, 2019-2021

**Authors:** Jithin Sam Varghese<sup>1,2</sup>, Ranjit Mohan Anjana<sup>3</sup>, Pascal Geldsetzer<sup>4,5</sup>, Nikkil Sudharsanan<sup>6,7</sup>, Jennifer Manne-Goehler<sup>8</sup>, Harsha Thirumurthy<sup>9</sup>, Soura Bhattacharya<sup>10</sup>, K.M. Venkat Narayan<sup>1,2</sup>, Viswanathan Mohan<sup>3</sup>, Nikhil Tandon<sup>11\*</sup>, Mohammed K. Ali<sup>1,2, 12\*</sup>

**Affiliations:**

1 Emory Global Diabetes Research Center of Woodruff Health Sciences Center and Emory University, Atlanta, USA.

2 Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, USA

3 Madras Diabetes Research Foundation and Dr Mohan's Diabetes Specialities Centre, Chennai, India

4 Division of Primary Care and Population Health, Department of Medicine, Stanford University, Stanford, CA, USA

5 Chan Zuckerberg Biohub, San Francisco, CA, USA

6 Professorship of Behavioral Science for Disease Prevention and Health Care, Technical University of Munich, Munich, Germany

7 Heidelberg Institute of Global Health, Heidelberg University, Germany

8 Division of Infectious Diseases, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School, Boston, USA

9 Leonard Davis Institute of Health Economics and Perelman School of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, USA

10 Lattice Innovations, New Delhi, India

11 Department of Endocrinology and Metabolism, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India

12 Department of Family and Preventive Medicine, School of Medicine, Emory University, Atlanta, USA

**\* Co-senior authors**

**Corresponding Author:** Jithin Sam Varghese, Emory Global Diabetes Research Center and Hubert Department of Global Health, Rollins School of Public Health, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, 30322, USA; Phone: +1 (404) 502-0415, E-mail: [jvargh7@emory.edu](mailto:jvargh7@emory.edu)

**Sources of Support:** None

**Short running head:** Diabetes care cascade in India

**Abbreviations:** ICMR: Indian Council of Medical Research; LASI: Longitudinal Aging Study in India; NFHS: National Family Health Surveys; NNMS: National Noncommunicable Disease Monitoring Survey; UT: Union Territory; WHO: World Health Organization

**Word count:** 3351

**Tables/figures:** 5

**References:** 31

## **ABSTRACT**

### **Importance**

Diabetes mellitus (DM) is widespread and treatable. Little is known about the diabetes care continuum (diagnosis, treatment, and control) in India, and whether it varies by socio-demographic characteristics and vary at the national, state, and district levels.

### **Objective**

To estimate the diabetes care continuum among individuals aged 18-98 years old at national, state, and district-levels, and by socio-demographic group.

### **Design**

Cross-sectional, nationally representative survey

### **Setting**

28 states, 8 union territories, and 707 districts of India

### **Participants**

1,895,287 approached in the Fifth National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5), 2019-2021

### **Exposures**

District, state, urban vs rural residence, age (18-39, 40-64,  $\geq 65$  years), sex, household wealth quintile

### **Main Outcomes and Measures**

Diabetes was defined by self-report or high capillary blood glucose ( $\geq 126$ mg/dL [fasting] or  $\geq 220$ mg/dL [non-fasting]). Of those with diabetes, we estimated proportions that were diagnosed (self-reported). Among those diagnosed, we reported the proportions treated (self-reported medication use) and proportion controlled (blood glucose  $< 126$  [fasting] or  $\leq 180$  mg/dL [non-fasting; corresponding to HbA1c  $\leq 8\%$ ]). We benchmarked findings against the World Health Organization's Global Diabetes Compact Targets (80% diagnosis, 80% control among those diagnosed). We partitioned the variance in indicators between state and district levels using variance partition coefficients (VPC).

## Results

Among 1,651,176 adult respondents (52.6% female; mean age: 41.6 years) with blood glucose measures, the proportion with diabetes was 6.5% (95% CI: 6.4, 6.6). Among adults with diabetes, 74.2% [73.3, 75.0] were diagnosed. Among those diagnosed, 59.4% [58.1, 60.6] reported taking medication and 65.5% [64.5, 66.4] achieved control. Diagnosis and treatment were higher in urban areas, older age groups, and wealthier households. Of the 707 districts, 34.8% districts met diagnosis target, while 10.7% districts met the control target among those diagnosed. Most of the variability in diabetes diagnosis (VPC:69.9%), treatment (VPC:51.8%), and control (VPC:66.8%) were between districts in a state, and not between states.

## Conclusions and Relevance

Nationally, the diabetes care continuum masks considerable state- and district-level variation, as well as age- and rural-urban disparities. Surveillance at the district-level can guide state health administrators to prioritize interventions and monitor achievement of global targets.

## **KEY POINTS**

### **Question**

How does the diabetes care continuum (diagnosis, treatment, and control) vary by state, district, and sociodemographic groups in India?

### **Findings**

Nationally, among 1.65 million respondents in the National Family Health Survey of 2019-2021, 74.2% were diagnosed. Among those diagnosed, 59.4% reported taking medication and 65.5% achieved control. Most of the variability in care continuum was within-state, between districts (% variance explained: 51.8-69.9) and not between-states. Higher diagnosis and treatment, but lower control was observed in urban compared to rural areas and older compared to younger and middle age groups.

### **Meaning**

Considerable differences between states, between districts in a state, for rural adults, and by age imply the need for targeted, decentralized solutions to improve the diabetes care continuum in India.

**Keywords:** Health system performance, Diabetes management, Low- and middle-income country, Diagnosis, Awareness, Treatment, Control, India, Asian Indians

## 1 **Introduction**

2 India is now the most populous country in the world and diabetes affects 74 million  
3 residents, representing 14% of the global burden of disease.<sup>1</sup> Strong evidence for interventions to  
4 improve diagnosis, treatment, and control exist to mitigate the complications of diabetes.<sup>2,3</sup>  
5 Several high-income nations have implemented quality of care programs for diabetes, and  
6 achieved reductions in population level rates of diabetes complications.<sup>4,5</sup> However, the extent of  
7 implementation of these programs in low- and middle-income nations is not clear.

8 India launched the National Programme for Prevention and Control of Cancer, Diabetes,  
9 Cardiovascular Disease and Stroke (NPCDCS), under the National Health Mission in 2010, to  
10 prevent and control major non-communicable diseases.<sup>6</sup> Under the NPCDCS, the National  
11 Multi-sectoral Action Plan (NMAP) for Prevention and Control of Common NCDs (2017 to  
12 2022) outlines four priority areas: governance, prevention and promotion, health care and  
13 surveillance and monitoring.<sup>7</sup> In parallel, in May 2021, the World Health Organization (WHO)  
14 member states, including India, as part of the World Health Assembly and Global Diabetes  
15 Compact, resolved to meet five targets including at least 80% of persons with diabetes should be  
16 diagnosed (“diagnosed diabetes”), and 80% of those with diagnosed diabetes have HbA1c levels  
17 below 8.0% (“controlled diabetes”).<sup>8</sup>

18 Monitoring of diabetes quality of care nationally, at subnational levels, and by socio-  
19 demographic groups would allow national and state policymakers working under the umbrella of  
20 NMAP and NPCDCS to monitor progress and thereby identify priorities for implementing  
21 appropriate interventions. While previous studies have estimated the quality of diabetes care,  
22 estimates are reported at higher administrative levels (national and state) or among younger

23 adults, impeding decentralized prioritization.<sup>9–13</sup> Estimates at lower administrative levels and by  
24 socio-demographic groups allow targeted solutions to improve the diabetes care continuum.

25 Using recent nationally representative data, we characterized the diabetes care continuum  
26 (diagnosis, treatment, and control) for India, by state, by district, and for each level, by socio-  
27 demographic subgroups (sex, urban/rural, age, attained schooling, household wealth).<sup>14–16</sup> We  
28 developed a dashboard for easy visualization of these data at the district level. These data can  
29 serve as a basis for driving improvements in diabetes quality of care for India, and will be a  
30 valuable resource as the country implements programs and policies toward attaining targets for  
31 diagnosis and control recommended by the NMAP and WHO Diabetes Compact.

## 32 **Methods**

### 33 *Study Population*

34 We used data from the National Family Health Survey-5 (NFHS-5), a nationally  
35 representative survey conducted in two phases from June 2019 to March 2020, and from  
36 November 2020 to April 2021 in 707 districts from 28 states and 8 union territories of India.<sup>17</sup>  
37 NFHS-5 is powered to provide estimates at the district-level.

38 NFHS-5 used a multi-stage stratified sample where primary sampling units (PSUs) from  
39 urban (census enumeration blocks) and rural (villages) strata of each district were sampled at the  
40 first stage and households within PSUs were randomly sampled from a list of eligible households  
41 at the second stage. NFHS-5 collected data on diabetes status from 612,910 households where  
42 eligible participants resided (women: 15-49 years, men: 15-54 years) and were approached.<sup>18</sup>  
43 Household and individual characteristics were collected using standardized instruments.

44 The survey additionally collected data on blood glucose among all adults (18 years and  
45 older) who were living in the same household as eligible participants (pregnant or non-pregnant  
46 women 15-49 years and men 15-54 years). However, information such as body mass index or  
47 waist circumference were not available for these participants. The overall sample consisted of  
48 1,895,287 adults aged 18-98 years.

49 We restricted our analytic sample to those who either self-reported having diabetes or  
50 who had a valid measurement of blood glucose (**Supplementary Figure 1**). We used district-  
51 level boundaries from the NFHS-5 district sampling frame (n = 707).

## 52 *Data collection and definitions*

### 53 *Diabetes Mellitus*

54 NFHS-5 measured random blood glucose using Accu-Chek Performa glucometers to  
55 quantify whole blood glucose from capillary blood.<sup>18,19</sup> As reported previously,<sup>20-22</sup> a conversion  
56 factor is used to reliably estimate plasma glucose concentrations (mg/dL).<sup>23</sup>

57 Diabetes was defined as either self-reported (in response to the question: “Before this  
58 survey, were you ever told you had high blood glucose by a doctor, nurse or health practitioner  
59 on two or more occasions?”) or based on high blood glucose measurement ( $\geq 126$  mg/dL if  
60 fasting [not eating or drinking anything except water for more than 8 hours] or  $\geq 220$  mg/dL if  
61 non-fasted).<sup>22,24</sup>

### 62 *Diabetes Care Continuum – Diagnosis, Treatment, and Control*

63 We used the following metrics to map the diabetes care continuum: prevalence of  
64 diabetes, proportion diagnosed, and among those diagnosed, the proportion treated, and



65 proportion controlled. We defined diagnosed diabetes as proportions of adults with diabetes who  
66 reported being diagnosed prior to the survey. Further, among those with diagnosed diabetes, we  
67 identified the proportion treated (those self-reporting medication use) and controlled diabetes  
68 (those achieving  $<126\text{mg/dL}$  [fasting] or  $\leq 180\text{mg/dL}$  [not fasting; corresponding to  
69  $\text{HbA1c} \leq 8\%$ ]) per national guidelines for management of Type 2 Diabetes.<sup>24</sup> We present state-  
70 level estimates and the district-level estimates in an interactive online dashboard that  
71 accompanies this work. We summarize the definitions in **Supplementary Table 1**.

### 72 *Socio-demographic variables*

73 We used the household wealth index computed as the first principal component from  
74 survey responses regarding possession of assets and quality of housing, separately for urban and  
75 rural areas, as provided by Demographic and Health Surveys.<sup>25</sup> We used the following household  
76 covariates: rural residence (versus urban) and regional wealth quintile (urban and rural) from the  
77 household wealth index as provided by NFHS. We used the following individual strata in our  
78 analysis: sex (male or female), age (18-39, 40-64,  $\geq 65$  years), and schooling (none or missing,  
79 primary [up to 4<sup>th</sup> class], secondary [up to 10<sup>th</sup> class], post-secondary).

### 80 *Statistical Analysis*

81 We report survey-weighted estimates accounting for the complex survey design and 95%  
82 cluster-robust confidence intervals.<sup>17</sup> We describe the individual and household characteristics  
83 of the analytic sample after stratifying by residence (urban or rural) and by sex. We also  
84 compared the analytic sample with the excluded (those without data on diabetes status).

85 Care continuum performance indicators were reported for the total sample for urban and  
86 rural areas, as well as stratified by sex, age category, schooling and regional wealth quintile. We

87 reported age-standardized estimates of the performance indicators for different strata at the  
88 national-level. We performed age-standardization to the distribution of the total sample since  
89 different strata of schooling and wealth have different age distributions. We also report weighted  
90 estimates at state-level and district-level that were not age-standardized and relevant for local  
91 decision making in this manuscript.

92 To illustrate the variability between- and within-states (between districts), we present  
93 examples from high burden states, namely Kerala and Karnataka. To quantify this variability, we  
94 partitioned the variance in prevalence attributable at the district-level using variance partition  
95 coefficients from linear mixed models with state-level intercepts.

96 To further aid policy and priority decision-making, we developed a dashboard to visually  
97 depict the disparities in care continuum using Shiny by RStudio. The interactive dashboard can  
98 be accessed at: [https://egdrc-precision-medicine.shinyapps.io/diabetes\\_cascade/](https://egdrc-precision-medicine.shinyapps.io/diabetes_cascade/). We displayed  
99 disparities, both crude and age-standardized, by sex and region (Total/Urban/Rural) at the state-  
100 level on the “Overview” tab. We compared districts within each state on the “District  
101 Disparities” tab. We displayed disparities across socio-demographic characteristics at the state-  
102 level on the “Socio-demographic Disparities” tab. All analyses were carried out using R 4.2.0  
103 using srvyr 1.1.1.

## 104 **Results**

105 The analytic sample consisted of 1,651,176 adults (men: 783,280; 47.4%, and non-  
106 pregnant women: 867,896; 52.6%), representing a response rate of 87.1%. Compared to those  
107 who were part of the analytic sample in urban areas ( $n = 406,463$ ), those in the excluded sample  
108 ( $n=77,941$ ) without data on diabetes were more likely to belong to higher wealth quintiles, and

109 received post-secondary education (**Supplementary Table 2**). In rural areas, the analytic sample  
110 (n = 1,244,713) was similar to the excluded sample (n = 166,180). More than half of the analytic  
111 sample were under 40 years of age (mean age: 41.6 [41.5, 41.6]), and almost 90% were aged 18-  
112 64 years (**Table 1**). Almost two-thirds of the analytic sample lived in rural areas. Less than 1.5%  
113 of the analytic sample (women: 1.2% [1.2, 1.3], men: 1.4% [1.3, 1.4]) reported fasting for at least  
114 8 hours before blood glucose measurement.

### 115 *National-level care continuum*

116 The age-standardized proportion [95%CI] with diabetes nationally was 6.5% [95%CI:  
117 6.4, 6.6], and was higher in urban areas (9.7% [9.4, 9.9]) relative to rural areas (4.9% [4.8, 5.0]).  
118 The proportion was higher among men (7.2% [7.1, 7.3]) relative to women (5.8% [5.7, 5.9]), and  
119 was greater with older age, attained schooling, and household wealth. Similar trends were  
120 observed in both urban and rural areas.

121 Among those with diabetes, 74.2% [73.3, 75.0] reported being diagnosed (**Table 2**). Of  
122 those with diagnosed diabetes, 59.4% [58.1, 60.6], and 65.5% [64.5, 66.4], respectively, reported  
123 taking medication and had controlled blood glucose. The proportion of those with diagnosed  
124 diabetes was higher in urban areas (77.2% [76.0, 78.4]), compared to rural areas (72.2% [71.1,  
125 73.3]). Nationally, and in both urban and rural areas, compared to their respective counterparts,  
126 diagnosis was higher among women (**Figure 1**), older age groups, those that attained higher  
127 schooling, and those with greater household wealth (**Table 2**).

128 Among those with diagnosed diabetes, the proportion currently taking medication was  
129 higher in urban areas (69.4% [67.4, 71.5]) compared to rural areas (52.7%, [51.0, 54.3]). Women  
130 were less likely to be receiving treatment than men. The proportion treated was greater with

131 higher age and household wealth, with no consistent differences by attained schooling in both  
132 urban and rural areas (**Table 2**).

133 Among those with diagnosed diabetes, the proportion with controlled diabetes was higher  
134 in rural areas (69.4% [68.1, 70.6]) compared to urban areas (59.6% [58.1, 61.0]). Controlled  
135 diabetes was higher among women (67.6% [66.4, 68.8]) than men (62.6% [61.4, 63.8]), and  
136 adults aged 18-39 years (75.2% [73.6, 76.8]) compared to 45-64 years (60.0% [58.9, 61.1]), but  
137 was not greater with higher schooling or household wealth. These socio-demographic disparities  
138 were observed in both urban and rural areas (**Supplementary Table 3**). Among those with  
139 controlled diabetes, only 47.1% (45.7, 48.4) nationally, 40.5% (38.9, 42.0) in rural areas and  
140 56.8% (54.2, 59.5) in urban areas were taking medication (**Supplementary Table 4**).

#### 141 *State-level care continuum*

142 Higher diabetes prevalence was observed in urban versus rural areas across all states  
143 (**Supplementary Figure 2** and **Supplementary Figure 3**). Diabetes prevalence was higher  
144 among the southern states (Kerala, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Telangana, Andhra Pradesh), union  
145 territories (Andaman & Nicobar Islands, Lakshadweep, Puducherry), and Goa compared to other  
146 parts of the country (**Figure 2**; median in rural: 8.8% vs 4.2%; median in urban: 11.4% vs 7.1%).  
147 Beyond the regional and state-level heterogeneity observed in **Figure 2**, there were disparities in  
148 diagnosis, treatment, and control between socio-demographic groups within each state  
149 (interactive dashboard).

150 Benchmarking state-level diabetes care continuum indicators to the WHO Diabetes  
151 Compact targets, the diagnosed diabetes target was met in rural areas of 11 states/UTs, and in  
152 urban areas of 23 states/UTs. However, across all states and UTs except Arunachal Pradesh,

153 Ladakh, and Jammu & Kashmir, controlled diabetes was below the 80% target in both urban and  
154 rural areas (**Figure 2**).

### 155 *District-level care continuum*

156 Between-district variation in the diabetes care continuum were observed in many states.  
157 For example, at the district-level, central Kerala (e.g. Kottayam: 22.0 [19.5, 24.6], Ernakulam:  
158 17.8 [15.8, 19.8]) had higher prevalence than north Kerala (e.g. Wayanad: 10.8 [9.4, 12.2],  
159 Kasaragod: 11.0 [9.5, 12.5]) although the proportions of those diagnosed (Kottayam: 90.7 [87.5,  
160 93.8], Ernakulam: 94.2 [91.9, 96.5], Wayanad: 90.0 [85.2, 94.7], Kasaragod: 91.0 [87.3, 94.7])  
161 were similar (**Supplementary Figure 4A**). In Karnataka, among those who were diagnosed,  
162 there was substantial between-district heterogeneity in treatment and control. Gulbarga (6.2 [4.3,  
163 8.1]) and Raichur: 4.7 [3.2, 6.2]) had lower prevalence compared to Davanagere (9.2 [7.1, 11.3]),  
164 similar levels of low treatment (**Supplementary Figure 4B-C**; Gulbarga: 66.8 [50.4, 83.2],  
165 Raichur: 61.9 [45.6, 78.2], Davanagere: 71.2 [56.8, 85.5]) and higher controlled diabetes  
166 (Gulbarga: 72.3 [61.8, 82.8], Raichur: 72.7 [61.2, 84.2], Davanagere: 57.9 [44.5, 71.4]).  
167 Compared to these districts, Mysuru and Bengaluru had similar prevalence of diabetes (Mysuru:  
168 6.9 [5.7, 8.1], Bengaluru: 9.6 [7.2, 11.9]), higher proportions of treated diabetes (Mysuru: 94.9  
169 [90.8, 99.0], Bengaluru: 90.1 [84.7, 95.5]), and lower proportions of controlled diabetes  
170 (Mysuru: 43.2 [29.5, 56.9], Bengaluru: 39.9 [31.0, 48.7]).

171 There was considerable between-district variation in the diabetes care continuum (**Figure**  
172 **3**) such that 69.9% of variance in diagnosis, 51.8% of variance in treatment among diagnosed,  
173 and 66.8% of variance in control among diagnosed were at the district-level, with the remaining  
174 at the state-level.

175 At the district level (n = 707), 246 districts (34.8%) met the 80% diagnosis target while  
176 76 districts (10.7%) met the 80% control target among those diagnosed. Restricting our analysis  
177 to districts with at least 50 observations (**Supplementary Figure 5**), consistent with the  
178 reporting criteria used in NFHS-5 factsheets, did not change our results (diagnosis target: 36.3%,  
179 control target: 10.8%).

## 180 **Discussion**

181 Our estimates of the diabetes care continuum in India suggest opportunities for  
182 improvement in diagnosis, treatment, and control across all states and districts, and in both rural  
183 and urban areas, and across socio-demographic groups. Our analysis suggested three key policy-  
184 relevant findings. First, among those with diabetes, nearly 25% were undiagnosed, with lower  
185 diagnosis rates in rural areas compared to urban areas. Second, nearly 40% of those with self-  
186 reported diabetes were not taking medication, especially in Central, East, North East, and North  
187 India – regions where the prevalence is high. Third, 35% of those with diagnosed diabetes did  
188 not achieve glycemic control – a finding consistently observed in most states of India. We also  
189 observed that the greatest differences in diabetes diagnosis, treatment, and control were between  
190 districts in a state, and not between states. The interactive dashboard that accompanies this  
191 manuscript highlights these disparities between geographic and socio-demographic subgroups,  
192 furthering an agenda of precision public health and identifying district-level priorities for the  
193 NMAP for diabetes management.<sup>7</sup>

194 The higher proportion of diagnosed and controlled diabetes but lower treated diabetes  
195 among women in urban and rural areas suggests greater awareness in urban areas, or potentially  
196 better non-pharmaceutical management and maybe lower diabetes severity in rural areas. This  
197 may also explain the lower proportions of controlled diabetes among households with higher

198 wealth. The findings on urban-rural differences in diagnosis and control were also consistent  
199 with those from the Indian Council of Medical Research – India Diabetes (ICMR-INDIAB)  
200 study.<sup>10</sup> Higher proportions of diagnosed and treated diabetes with higher age, urbanicity, and  
201 household wealth were consistent across states and likely associated with greater awareness and  
202 access to medical care.

203 Global studies on diabetes care continuum suggest substantial disparities between- and  
204 within-countries. Glycemic control decreased over time from 2005-08 to 2013-16 in USA, with  
205 older adults and women more likely to achieve it, compared to younger and middle-aged adults,  
206 and men.<sup>14,26</sup> An analysis of 28 low and middle income countries reported that 77% of adults  
207 experienced an unmet need for diabetes care (undiagnosed, untreated, uncontrolled, and never  
208 tested) at some stage of the continuum, with better performance among upper middle income  
209 countries.<sup>27</sup> Nearly half of the outpatients in a retrospective analysis of medical records reported  
210 uncontrolled diabetes in eight high income European countries, with considerable between-  
211 country variation.<sup>4</sup>

212 Estimates from this analysis of recent NFHS data show higher proportions of diagnosed  
213 diabetes than previous estimates – e.g., among participants aged 18 to 69 years in National  
214 Noncommunicable Disease Monitoring Survey (NNMS) 2017-18, 45.8% self-reported being  
215 diagnosed. Among those 45 and older in the Longitudinal Aging Study in India (LASI) 2017-18,  
216 60.4% reported being diagnosed.<sup>12,13</sup> This may be related to differential classification of diabetes  
217 status based on the biomarkers used in these different surveys, greater awareness of diabetes over  
218 time, or differential response rates due to the COVID-19 pandemic and sampling strategies – all  
219 of these possibilities warrant further analysis that are beyond the scope of this manuscript.<sup>28</sup> For  
220 example, our non-fasted blood glucose cut-off of 220 mg/dL may have high specificity and low

221 sensitivity, identifies only severe diabetes making it more likely to be diagnosed, and therefore,  
222 underestimates the true burdens of diabetes and unmet need in diagnosis.

223 Our estimates for proportions of adults who attained blood glucose control are higher  
224 (65.5%) than the ICMR-INDIAB and LASI findings where 36.3% adults older than 20 years and  
225 46.1% adults older than 45 years with self-reported diabetes attained glycemic control (HbA1c  
226 <7.0%).<sup>10</sup> Results from NFHS-4 (2015-16; 15-49 years) and NNMS (2017-18; 18-69 years) also  
227 report poor glucose control (NFHS-4: 24.8%, NNMS: 15.7%) among those with diagnosed  
228 diabetes.<sup>11,12</sup> Beyond possible reasons identified for higher diagnosis, NFHS-5 used random  
229 blood glucose to define glycemic control and did not collect HbA1c that is more appropriate for  
230 this purpose.

231 The interactive dashboard permits exploratory analysis to identify those with higher  
232 unmet needs among geographic and socio-demographic subgroups. The dashboard also presents  
233 a tool for policymakers to prioritize resources across steps in the care cascade for their  
234 administrative regions. Similar interfaces ought to be available for monitoring national quality of  
235 diabetes care targets set by NMAP and the Global Diabetes Compact.<sup>7,8</sup> For example, a state or  
236 district health official can navigate to the ‘Socio-demographic Disparities’ and ‘District  
237 Disparities’ tabs and compare priorities across different districts within a state, and explore  
238 socio-demographic disparities in the care continuum by sex, age, education, and wealth quintile.  
239 Additionally, the visualization could help in prioritizing regions for more frequent and  
240 widespread screening to improve rates of diagnosis. Investments towards meeting Indian Council  
241 of Medical Research’s routine screening guidelines (annual for pre-diabetes, once in 3 years for  
242 adults > 30 years) could prove cost effective if it is coupled with higher usage of nearby public  
243 healthcare facilities for diabetes management.<sup>29</sup>



244 This is the most comprehensive report of the diabetes care continuum among adults in a  
245 low- and middle-income country at the sub-national level and across socio-demographic  
246 subgroups. The most recent data from India (ICMR-INDIAB) reported estimates of glyce-  
247 mic control over 12 years (2008-2020) among adults with self-reported diabetes (n = 5,789 out of  
248 113,043) aged 20 years and older in 30 states and union territories.<sup>9,10</sup> Data from the India NNMS  
249 2017-18 also showed national-level care cascades stratified by sex, urbanicity, and age category  
250 among adults (18-69 years; n = 9,721).<sup>12</sup> However, due to its limited sample size, NNMS was  
251 not able to present sub-national estimates for socio-demographic groups to appropriately target  
252 interventions that could address care gaps. Previous data from the NFHS and LASI were limited  
253 to specific age groups and utilized different biochemical markers for glycemia.<sup>11 13</sup> Of note, the  
254 HbA1c cutoff used ( $\geq 6.5\%$ ) in LASI may overestimate diabetes prevalence among ethnicities  
255 other than Non-Hispanic Whites.<sup>28,30</sup>

256 Despite its large sample size and representativeness across geographic levels, our  
257 analysis has several limitations. First, our analysis is subject to information bias from self-report  
258 of high blood glucose and not medical records. However, the prevalence of self-reported  
259 diagnosed diabetes in the total population was comparable across different surveys (NFHS-5 vs  
260 LASI, INDIAB, and NNMS).<sup>12,13</sup> Second, we used a combination of fasting (about 1%) and  
261 random blood glucose values to determine diabetes status. Though a single capillary glucose  
262 doesn't meet the confirmatory standards of diagnosis for diabetes (i.e. consecutive elevated  
263 glucose levels or elevated glucose and HbA1c levels at the same visit), this approach provides  
264 internal consistency and has been used in similar population-based studies.<sup>11,22</sup> NFHS-5 also did  
265 not collect HbA1c to appropriately define long-term control. Third, the survey was limited in the  
266 nature of data it collected for the analytic sample used in this manuscript. For example, BMI and

267 waist circumference data for those older than 49 years in women and 54 years in men prevented  
268 us from assessing heterogeneity in care continuum by levels of weight status and whether  
269 screening guidelines were met across all ages. We did not have information on duration and  
270 family history of diabetes. The survey did not collect data on type of usual care provider and  
271 number of visits among those with self-reported diabetes. We were unable to differentiate  
272 between types of diabetes. Moreover, we did not have data on older adults living by themselves  
273 or institutionalized and non-civilian adults.<sup>18,20</sup>

274 India's rising diabetes burden across all socio-demographic groups present a challenge  
275 for public health and healthcare. Initiatives such as NMAP and the NPCDCS offer opportunities  
276 for ameliorating this rise through decentralized, targeted interventions. Near real-time monitoring  
277 of quality, coverage, and success of these initiatives through performance indicators such as the  
278 WHO Diabetes Compact, using interactive dashboards, may be a crucial step in this defeating  
279 diabetes.

280 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:** All participants gave written informed consent  
281 before participation. We were exempted from ethical approval for the secondary data analysis  
282 from the Institutional Review Board of Emory University.

283 **Data Availability Statement:** All datasets used in this analysis are available for download at  
284 [www.dhsprogram.com](http://www.dhsprogram.com). The code for the analysis is available on  
285 [https://github.com/jvargh7/nfhs\\_cascade](https://github.com/jvargh7/nfhs_cascade).

286 **Consent for publication:** Not applicable

287 **Competing interests:** None declared

288 **Funding:** None

289 **Author contributions:** JSV, PG, NS and MKA developed the study and the analysis plan with  
290 inputs from all authors. JSV performed the statistical analysis, prototyped the dashboard and  
291 wrote the first draft with inputs from MKA. All authors edited and approved the manuscript

292 **Acknowledgements:** We thank the participants and survey enumerators of National Family  
293 Health Survey 2019-21.

294

295

296 **References**

- 297 1. International Diabetes Federation. *IDF Diabetes Atlas*. International Diabetes Federation  
298 Accessed October 6, 2022. <https://diabetesatlas.org/>
- 299 2. IDF Working Group, Amanda Adler, Cliff Bailey, Pablo Ascher. *IDF Clinical Practice*  
300 *Recommendations for Managing Type 2 Diabetes in Primary Care.*; 2017.
- 301 3. ElSayed NA, Aleppo G, Aroda VR, et al. 1. Improving Care and Promoting Health in  
302 Populations: *Standards of Care in Diabetes—2023*. *Diabetes Care*.  
303 2023;46(Supplement\_1):S10-S18. doi:10.2337/dc23-S001
- 304 4. Stone MA, Charpentier G, Doggen K, et al. Quality of Care of People With Type 2 Diabetes  
305 in Eight European Countries. *Diabetes Care*. 2013;36(9):2628-2638. doi:10.2337/dc12-1759
- 306 5. Siegel KR, Ali MK, Zhou X, et al. Cost-effectiveness of Interventions to Manage Diabetes:  
307 Has the Evidence Changed Since 2008? *Diabetes Care*. 2020;43(7):1557-1592.  
308 doi:10.2337/dci20-0017
- 309 6. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. National Program for  
310 Prevention and Control of Cancer, Diabetes, CVD and Stroke (NPCDCS). National Health  
311 Mission. Accessed October 14, 2022.  
312 <https://nhm.gov.in/index1.php?lang=1&level=2&sublinkid=1048&lid=604>
- 313 7. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, World Health Organization -  
314 India Office. *National Multisectoral Action Plan for Prevention and Control of Common*  
315 *Noncommunicable Diseases 2017-2022*. Government of India; 2017.
- 316 8. First-ever global coverage targets for diabetes adopted at the 75th World Health Assembly.  
317 World Health Organization. Published May 28, 2022. Accessed August 28, 2022.  
318 [https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/first-ever-global-coverage-targets-for-](https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/first-ever-global-coverage-targets-for-diabetes-adopted-at-the-75-th-world-health-assembly)  
319 [diabetes-adopted-at-the-75-th-world-health-assembly](https://www.who.int/news-room/feature-stories/detail/first-ever-global-coverage-targets-for-diabetes-adopted-at-the-75-th-world-health-assembly)
- 320 9. Unnikrishnan R, Anjana RM, Deepa M, et al. Glycemic Control Among Individuals with Self-  
321 Reported Diabetes in India—The ICMR–INDIAB Study. *Diabetes Technology &*  
322 *Therapeutics*. 2014;16(9):596-603. doi:10.1089/dia.2014.0018
- 323 10. Anjana RM, Unnikrishnan R, Deepa M, et al. Achievement of guideline recommended  
324 diabetes treatment targets and health habits in people with self-reported diabetes in India  
325 (ICMR-INDIAB-13): a national cross-sectional study. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*.  
326 2022;10(6):430-441. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(22)00072-9
- 327 11. Prenissl J, Jaacks LM, Mohan V, et al. Variation in health system performance for  
328 managing diabetes among states in India: a cross-sectional study of individuals aged 15 to 49  
329 years. *BMC Med*. 2019;17(1):92. doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1325-6

- 330 12. Mathur P, Leburu S, Kulothungan V. Prevalence, Awareness, Treatment and Control of  
331 Diabetes in India From the Countrywide National NCD Monitoring Survey. *Front Public*  
332 *Health*. 2022;10:748157. doi:10.3389/fpubh.2022.748157
- 333 13. Flood D, Green H, Hu P, et al. Prevalence, Awareness, Treatment, and Control of  
334 Diabetes in India: A Nationally Representative Survey of Adults Aged 45 Years and Older.  
335 *SSRN Journal*. Published online 2022. doi:10.2139/ssrn.4066713
- 336 14. Ali MK, Bullard KM, Gregg EW, del Rio C. A Cascade of Care for Diabetes in the  
337 United States: Visualizing the Gaps. *Ann Intern Med*. 2014;161(10):681. doi:10.7326/M14-  
338 0019
- 339 15. Mauer N, Geldsetzer P, Manne-Goehler J, et al. Longitudinal evidence on treatment  
340 discontinuation, adherence, and loss of hypertension control in four middle-income countries.  
341 *Science Translational Medicine*. Published online 2022:13.
- 342 16. Flood D, Seiglie JA, Dunn M, et al. The state of diabetes treatment coverage in 55 low-  
343 income and middle-income countries: a cross-sectional study of nationally representative,  
344 individual-level data in 680 102 adults. *The Lancet Healthy Longevity*. 2021;2(6):e340-e351.  
345 doi:10.1016/S2666-7568(21)00089-1
- 346 17. International Institute for Population Sciences, ICF. *National Family Health Survey*  
347 *(NFHS-5), 2019-21: India.*; 2022. Accessed August 28, 2022.  
348 <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/FR375/FR375.pdf>
- 349 18. International Institute for Population Sciences, ICF. *Clinical Anthropometric Biochemical*  
350 *(CAB) Manual: National Family Health Survey 2019-20, India*. International Institute for  
351 Population Sciences; 2019.
- 352 19. Müller P, Hattemer A, Stephan P. Assessing System Accuracy of Blood Glucose  
353 Monitoring Systems Using Rectangle Target Plots. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 2016;10(2):350-  
354 365. doi:10.1177/1932296815612496
- 355 20. Risa M. *Accu-Chek Performa: Meter and Test Strips Designed for Glucose Self-*  
356 *Measurement and Measurements by Health Care Professionals*. SKUP; 2011.
- 357 21. Meex C, Poncin J, Chapelle JP, Cavalier E. Analytical validation of the new plasma  
358 calibrated Accu-Chek® Test Strips (Roche Diagnostics). *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory*  
359 *Medicine (CCLM)*. 2006;44(11). doi:10.1515/CCLM.2006.249
- 360 22. Taylor R, Zimmet P, Naseri T, et al. Erroneous inflation of diabetes prevalence: Are there  
361 global implications? *J Diabetes*. 2016;8(6):766-769. doi:10.1111/1753-0407.12447
- 362 23. Kubihal S, Goyal A, Gupta Y, Khadgawat R. Glucose measurement in body fluids: A  
363 ready reckoner for clinicians. *Diabetes & Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research & Reviews*.  
364 2021;15(1):45-53. doi:10.1016/j.dsx.2020.11.021

- 365 24. Indian Council of Medical Research. *ICMR Guidelines for Management of Type 2*  
366 *Diabetes, 2018*. Government of India; :7-8.
- 367 25. Shea O. Rutstein. *The DHS Wealth Index: Approaches for Rural and Urban Areas*.  
368 Macro International; 2008.
- 369 26. Kazemian P, Shebl FM, McCann N, Walensky RP, Wexler DJ. Evaluation of the Cascade  
370 of Diabetes Care in the United States, 2005-2016. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2019;179(10):1376.  
371 doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2019.2396
- 372 27. Manne-Goehler J, Geldsetzer P, Agoudavi K, et al. Health system performance for people  
373 with diabetes in 28 low- and middle-income countries: A cross-sectional study of nationally  
374 representative surveys. Wareham NJ, ed. *PLoS Med*. 2019;16(3):e1002751.  
375 doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002751
- 376 28. Kirk JK, D'Agostino RB, Bell RA, et al. Disparities in HbA1c Levels Between African-  
377 American and Non-Hispanic White Adults With Diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2006;29(9):2130-  
378 2136. doi:10.2337/dc05-1973
- 379 29. Kaur G, Chauhan AS, Prinja S, et al. Cost-effectiveness of population-based screening  
380 for diabetes and hypertension in India: an economic modelling study. *The Lancet Public*  
381 *Health*. 2022;7(1):e65-e73. doi:10.1016/S2468-2667(21)00199-7
- 382 30. Unnikrishnan R, Mohan V. Challenges in Estimation of Glycated Hemoglobin in India.  
383 *Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics*. 2013;15(10):897-899. doi:10.1089/dia.2013.0144
- 384 31. Perianayagam A, Bloom D, Lee J, et al. Cohort Profile: The Longitudinal Ageing Study  
385 in India (LASI). *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2022;51(4):e167-e176.  
386 doi:10.1093/ije/dyab266
- 387

**Table 1. Characteristics of participants in analytic sample for estimating care cascade of diabetes in India, n = 1,651,176**

	<b>Total</b>		<b>Urban</b>		<b>Rural</b>	
	<b>Women</b> (n = 867,896)	<b>Men</b> (n = 783,280)	<b>Women</b> (n = 212,770)	<b>Men</b> (n = 193,693)	<b>Women</b> (n = 655,126)	<b>Men</b> (n = 589,587)
<b>Age category</b>						
18-39	50.8 (50.6, 50.9)	49.7 (49.5, 49.9)	50.1 (49.7, 50.5)	50.2 (49.9, 50.6)	51.1 (50.9, 51.3)	49.4 (49.2, 49.7)
40-65	39.1 (39, 39.2)	38.4 (38.3, 38.6)	40 (39.7, 40.3)	38.9 (38.5, 39.2)	38.7 (38.5, 38.8)	38.2 (38, 38.4)
65 and above	10.1 (10, 10.2)	11.9 (11.8, 12)	9.9 (9.6, 10.1)	10.9 (10.6, 11.1)	10.3 (10.2, 10.4)	12.4 (12.2, 12.5)
<b>Schooling</b>						
None	36.7 (36.4, 37)	17.3 (17.1, 17.5)	22 (21.5, 22.5)	9.4 (9.1, 9.7)	43.5 (43.2, 43.8)	21.1 (20.8, 21.3)
Primary (up to 4 <sup>th</sup> class)	13.8 (13.7, 13.9)	15 (14.8, 15.2)	12.5 (12.2, 12.7)	11.3 (11, 11.6)	14.4 (14.3, 14.6)	16.8 (16.6, 17)
Secondary (5 <sup>th</sup> to 10 <sup>th</sup> class)	37 (36.8, 37.2)	49.6 (49.4, 49.9)	43.6 (43.2, 44)	50.8 (50.4, 51.3)	33.9 (33.7, 34.1)	49 (48.8, 49.3)
Post-secondary (11 <sup>th</sup> class and above)	12.5 (12.3, 12.7)	18 (17.7, 18.4)	22 (21.5, 22.5)	28.4 (27.8, 29.1)	8.1 (8, 8.3)	13.1 (12.8, 13.5)
<b>Caste of head of household</b>						
General or unspecified	27 (26.6, 27.4)	27.2 (26.8, 27.7)	35.1 (34.2, 36)	35 (34.1, 36)	23.3 (22.8, 23.7)	23.5 (23, 24)
Other Backward Castes	42.1 (41.7, 42.5)	41.7 (41.3, 42.1)	41.8 (40.9, 42.7)	41.9 (41, 42.8)	42.2 (41.7, 42.7)	41.6 (41.2, 42.1)
Scheduled Caste	21.6 (21.2, 21.9)	21.4 (21.1, 21.8)	19.1 (18.3, 19.8)	19 (18.2, 19.7)	22.7 (22.3, 23.1)	22.6 (22.2, 23)
Scheduled Tribe	9.3 (9.1, 9.6)	9.6 (9.4, 9.9)	4.1 (3.8, 4.4)	4.1 (3.8, 4.4)	11.8 (11.4, 12.1)	12.2 (11.9, 12.6)
<b>Religion</b>						
Hindu	82.4 (82, 82.8)	82.7 (82.3, 83.2)	78.4 (77.5, 79.3)	79 (78.1, 79.9)	84.3 (83.9, 84.7)	84.5 (84.1, 85)

Muslim	12.1 (11.7, 12.5)	11.9 (11.4, 12.3)	15.5 (14.6, 16.4)	15.2 (14.3, 16.1)	10.5 (10.1, 10.9)	10.2 (9.8, 10.7)
Other	5.5 (5.3, 5.7)	5.4 (5.2, 5.6)	6.1 (5.7, 6.5)	5.8 (5.4, 6.1)	5.2 (5, 5.4)	5.2 (5, 5.4)
<b>Household wealth quintile (by residence)</b>						
Lowest	18.6 (18.3, 18.9)	18 (17.7, 18.3)	19.4 (18.6, 20.1)	19.4 (18.7, 20.1)	18.2 (17.9, 18.5)	17.3 (17, 17.6)
Low	19.6 (19.3, 19.8)	19.4 (19.1, 19.6)	20.1 (19.6, 20.6)	20.2 (19.7, 20.7)	19.3 (19.1, 19.5)	18.9 (18.7, 19.2)
Medium	20.3 (20.1, 20.5)	20.4 (20.2, 20.6)	20.4 (19.9, 20.8)	20.4 (19.9, 20.8)	20.3 (20.1, 20.5)	20.5 (20.2, 20.7)
High	20.7 (20.4, 20.9)	21.2 (20.9, 21.4)	20.3 (19.8, 20.8)	20.3 (19.8, 20.8)	20.9 (20.6, 21.1)	21.6 (21.2, 21.9)
Highest	20.8 (20.5, 21.2)	21.1 (20.8, 21.4)	19.9 (19.2, 20.6)	19.7 (19, 20.4)	21.3 (20.9, 21.7)	21.7 (21.4, 22.1)
<b>Blood glucose measurement</b>						
Fasting for at least 8 hours	1.2 (1.2, 1.3)	1.4 (1.3, 1.4)	1.1 (1, 1.2)	1.4 (1.3, 1.5)	1.3 (1.3, 1.4)	1.3 (1.3, 1.4)
<b>Diabetes</b>						
Self-reported or high blood glucose	6.1 (6, 6.2)	6.2 (6.1, 6.3)	8.5 (8.3, 8.8)	8.3 (8, 8.6)	4.9 (4.8, 5)	5.2 (5.1, 5.3)
Self-reported	4.8 (4.7, 4.9)	4.7 (4.6, 4.8)	7 (6.8, 7.2)	6.6 (6.4, 6.9)	3.8 (3.6, 3.9)	3.8 (3.7, 4)

All values are percentages (95% confidence intervals) accounting for survey design. Estimates are not age-standardized.



**Table 2. Socio-demographic variations in care cascade in India, n = 1,651,176**

	Total				Urban				Rural			
	Diabetes (%)	Diagnosed <sup>a</sup> (%)	Treated <sup>b</sup> (%)	Controlled <sup>b</sup> (%)	Diabetes (%)	Diagnosed <sup>a</sup> (%)	Treated <sup>b</sup> (%)	Controlled <sup>b</sup> (%)	Diabetes (%)	Diagnosed <sup>a</sup> (%)	Treated <sup>b</sup> (%)	Controlled <sup>b</sup> (%)
<b>Total</b>	6.5 (6.4, 6.6)	74.2 (73.3, 75)	59.4 (58.1, 60.6)	65.5 (64.5, 66.4)	9.7 (9.4, 9.9)	77.2 (76, 78.4)	69.4 (67.4, 71.5)	59.6 (58.1, 61)	4.9 (4.8, 5)	72.2 (71.1, 73.3)	52.7 (51, 54.3)	69.4 (68.1, 70.6)
<b>Sex</b>												
Women	5.8 (5.7, 5.9)	75.9 (74.8, 76.9)	57 (55.5, 58.6)	67.6 (66.4, 68.8)	9.1 (8.8, 9.4)	78.6 (77, 80.2)	68 (65.6, 70.5)	60.6 (58.7, 62.4)	4.3 (4.2, 4.4)	74.2 (72.7, 75.6)	50 (47.9, 52)	72.1 (70.5, 73.7)
Men	7.2 (7.1, 7.3)	72 (71, 73.1)	62.5 (61.1, 63.8)	62.6 (61.4, 63.8)	10.2 (9.9, 10.6)	75.6 (74.1, 77.1)	71.2 (69, 73.3)	58.3 (56.4, 60.2)	5.6 (5.5, 5.8)	69.7 (68.3, 71.2)	56.4 (54.6, 58.3)	65.6 (64, 67.2)
<b>Age category</b>												
18-39	1.9 (1.9, 2)	70 (68.5, 71.4)	43.5 (41.5, 45.4)	75.2 (73.6, 76.8)	2.4 (2.3, 2.6)	70.5 (67.9, 73)	51.2 (47.6, 54.8)	69.2 (66.3, 72.1)	1.8 (1.7, 1.8)	69.7 (67.9, 71.5)	39.9 (37.5, 42.2)	78 (76.1, 79.9)
40-65	9.6 (9.4, 9.8)	76.9 (76.3, 77.5)	74.2 (73.2, 75.1)	54.4 (53.6, 55.3)	12.6 (12.3, 13)	80.3 (79.4, 81.2)	80.3 (78.9, 81.7)	51.9 (50.6, 53.2)	7.8 (7.6, 7.9)	74.1 (73.3, 74.8)	68.6 (67.4, 69.9)	56.7 (55.7, 57.8)
65 and above	16.3 (15.9, 16.7)	83.8 (83.1, 84.5)	79.6 (78.6, 80.6)	60 (58.9, 61.1)	22.9 (22, 23.8)	87.4 (86.3, 88.5)	85.4 (84, 86.8)	57.6 (55.9, 59.3)	11.9 (11.6, 12.3)	80.3 (79.4, 81.3)	73.6 (72.2, 75)	62.4 (61.1, 63.7)
<b>Schooling</b>												
None	4.5 (4.4, 4.6)	69.9 (68.1, 71.7)	58.1 (55.8, 60.4)	66.5 (64.5, 68.4)	7.4 (7, 7.7)	72.8 (69.7, 76)	68.1 (63.7, 72.4)	57.8 (54.2, 61.4)	3.9 (3.8, 4)	68.9 (66.7, 71.1)	54.4 (51.6, 57.2)	69.7 (67.3, 72)
Primary (up to 4 <sup>th</sup> class)	6.2 (6.1, 6.4)	72.8 (70.9, 74.8)	59.5 (57.1, 62)	64.4 (62.2, 66.7)	9.8 (9.4, 10.3)	75.1 (71.6, 78.6)	70.1 (66.2, 74)	57 (53.4, 60.7)	5 (4.8, 5.2)	71.6 (69.3, 74)	54.1 (50.8, 57.4)	68.2 (65.4, 71.1)


Secondary (5 <sup>th</sup> to 10 <sup>th</sup> class)	7.2 (7, 7.3)	75.8 (74.9, 76.7)	60.5 (59.1, 61.9)	64 (62.9, 65.2)	10.1 (9.8, 10.5)	78.1 (76.7, 79.5)	70.7 (68.5, 72.9)	58.3 (56.5, 60.2)	5.5 (5.3, 5.6)	74 (72.8, 75.3)	52.5 (50.6, 54.3)	68.5 (67, 69.9)
Post- secondary (11 <sup>th</sup> class and above)	8.5 (8.2, 8.8)	79.7 (78.4, 81.1)	58.1 (56.1, 60.1)	69.4 (67.8, 71)	10 (9.5, 10.5)	80.9 (79.1, 82.6)	67.1 (64.3, 69.9)	65.8 (63.6, 68.1)	6.3 (6, 6.6)	78 (75.9, 80.2)	44.5 (41.5, 47.4)	74.8 (72.6, 76.9)
<b>Household wealth quintile</b>												
Lowest	4 (3.8, 4.2)	67.7 (65.6, 69.7)	49.2 (46.5, 52)	73.2 (71.4, 75)	6.3 (5.9, 6.7)	69.7 (66.5, 72.9)	57.5 (52.7, 62.3)	66.5 (63.6, 69.5)	2.8 (2.6, 2.9)	65.8 (63.1, 68.4)	41.4 (38, 44.8)	79.6 (77.2, 82)
Low	5.3 (5.1, 5.5)	70.8 (69, 72.5)	55.9 (53.8, 58.1)	67.7 (65.8, 69.5)	8.9 (8.5, 9.3)	72.2 (69.8, 74.7)	67.4 (64.1, 70.6)	58.6 (55.7, 61.5)	3.5 (3.3, 3.6)	69.4 (67.1, 71.8)	45.7 (42.5, 48.8)	75.8 (73.3, 78.3)
Medium	6.4 (6.2, 6.6)	74.7 (73.2, 76.1)	58.7 (56.6, 60.7)	65.9 (64.1, 67.7)	10.2 (9.7, 10.7)	78.2 (76.2, 80.1)	72.5 (69.6, 75.4)	57.2 (54.3, 60.1)	4.5 (4.3, 4.6)	72 (70, 74.1)	47.5 (44.8, 50.3)	72.8 (70.6, 75.1)
High	7.5 (7.4, 7.7)	74.6 (73, 76.3)	61.6 (59.5, 63.6)	65 (63.3, 66.7)	11.1 (10.6, 11.6)	80.1 (77.8, 82.4)	70.8 (67.7, 74)	59.8 (57.1, 62.5)	5.8 (5.7, 6)	71.4 (69.2, 73.6)	55.6 (52.9, 58.4)	68.2 (66.1, 70.4)
Highest	8.8 (8.6, 9)	77.5 (76.1, 79)	62.7 (60.7, 64.7)	62.3 (60.5, 64)	11.6 (11.1, 12.1)	81.6 (79.2, 84)	72.4 (69.2, 75.6)	58.8 (56.1, 61.5)	7.6 (7.4, 7.8)	75.7 (73.8, 77.6)	58.2 (55.6, 60.8)	63.9 (61.7, 66.1)

Estimates (95% confidence intervals) are standardized to age distribution in overall sample.

a Among those with self-reported diabetes or high blood glucose ( $\geq 126$ mg/dL [fasting for 12 hours] or  $\geq 220$ mg/dL [not fasting]).


b Among those with self-reported diabetes ('Diagnosed')

**Figure 1. National-level care cascade in analytic sample by urban and rural residence, n = 1,651,176**




All values are percentages (error bars: 95% confidence intervals) in total population. Proportions of populations in these categories is presented in **Table 1**. A: Age-standardized and sex-stratified estimates of care cascade; B: Age-stratified estimates of care cascade

**Figure 2. State-level priorities for unmet need in diabetes care cascade, n = 1,651,176**



A: Urban, B: Rural; All values are crude percentages. Undiagnosed are among those with diabetes (n = 93,263). Untreated and uncontrolled are among those diagnosed with diabetes (n = 67,209).

**Figure 3. Care cascade in analytic sample by urban and rural residence for 707 districts, n = 1,651,176**



All values are crude percentages. Undiagnosed are among those with diabetes (n = 93,263). Untreated and uncontrolled are among those diagnosed with diabetes (n = 67,209). We excluded all districts with less than 50 observations in **Supplementary Figure 4**.

**Supplementary Table 1. Definitions of disease and care cascade of diabetes**

Term	Study Population	Definition	Comment
<b>Individual-level indicators</b>			
Fasting	Analytic sample	(a) Time since last eaten $\geq 12$ hours AND (b) Time since last drank, something other than water $\geq 8$ hours	In our analytic sample, less than 1% are fasted
Diabetes	Analytic sample	(a) Self-reported diabetes OR (b) Currently taking medication for diabetes OR (c) High blood glucose ( $\geq 126$ mg/dL if fasting or $\geq 220$ mg/dL if not fasting)	A single capillary glucose doesn't meet the confirmatory standards of diagnosis for diabetes (i.e. consecutive elevated glucose levels or elevated glucose and HbA1c levels at the same visit)
Screening			ICMR guidelines recommend annual screening for adults with pre-diabetes and every 3 years for those older than 30 years
Diagnosis	"Diabetes" as Yes	Told had high glucose on two or more occasions by a medical provider	Self-reported
Treatment	"Diagnosis" as Yes	Currently taking a prescribed medicine to lower glucose	Self-reported. We do not have information on dosage and type of medication used
Control	"Diagnosis" as Yes	Blood glucose in non-hyperglycemic range ( $< 126$ mg/dL if fasted and $\leq 180$ mg/dL if non-fasted)	We are defining control based on random blood glucose and not HbA1c (%)
<b>Population-level performance indicators</b>			
Diagnosis Gap	"Diabetes" as Yes	Percentage Undiagnosed (%)	Meeting WHO Global Diabetes Compact target requires 80% of patients with diabetes to be diagnosed
Treatment Gap	"Diagnosis" as Yes	Percentage Untreated (%)	
Control Gap	"Diagnosis" as Yes	Percentage Uncontrolled (%)	Meeting WHO Global Diabetes Compact target requires 80% of patients with diagnosed diabetes to have good control of blood glucose based on HbA1c (%) $< 8.0$

Supplementary Table 2. Characteristics of participants in analytic sample versus those excluded, n = 1,895,297

	<b>Urban</b>		<b>Rural</b>	
	<b>Analytic Sample (n = 406,463)</b>	<b>Excluded Sample (n = 77,941)</b>	<b>Analytic Sample (n = 1,244,713)</b>	<b>Excluded Sample (n = 166,180)</b>
<b>Sex</b>				
Women	52.6 (52.4, 52.8)	38.5 (37.9, 39)	53.1 (53, 53.2)	38.1 (37.8, 38.4)
Men	47.4 (47.2, 47.6)	61.5 (61, 62.1)	46.9 (46.8, 47)	61.9 (61.6, 62.2)
<b>Age category</b>				
18-39	50.2 (49.8, 50.5)	52.4 (51.7, 53)	50.3 (50.1, 50.5)	52.6 (52.3, 52.9)
40-65	39.5 (39.2, 39.7)	37.7 (37.1, 38.2)	38.5 (38.3, 38.6)	35.2 (34.9, 35.5)
65 and above	10.3 (10.2, 10.5)	10 (9.6, 10.4)	11.2 (11.1, 11.3)	12.2 (12, 12.4)
<b>Schooling</b>				
None	16 (15.6, 16.4)	14.2 (13.6, 14.8)	33 (32.7, 33.2)	31.1 (30.7, 31.5)
Primary (up to 4 <sup>th</sup> class)	11.9 (11.7, 12.2)	9.6 (9.2, 10)	15.5 (15.4, 15.7)	14 (13.7, 14.2)
Secondary (5 <sup>th</sup> to 10 <sup>th</sup> class)	47 (46.7, 47.4)	44.4 (43.6, 45.3)	41 (40.8, 41.2)	42.2 (41.8, 42.6)
Post-secondary (11 <sup>th</sup> class and above)	25 (24.5, 25.6)	31.8 (30.6, 32.9)	10.5 (10.2, 10.7)	12.7 (12.4, 13)
<b>Caste of head of household</b>				
General or unspecified	35.1 (34.2, 36)	41.5 (39.9, 43.2)	23.4 (22.9, 23.9)	24.4 (23.8, 25.1)
Other Backward Castes	41.8 (40.9, 42.7)	38.6 (37.2, 40)	41.9 (41.5, 42.4)	42.6 (41.9, 43.3)
Scheduled Caste	19 (18.3, 19.7)	16.9 (15.9, 17.9)	22.7 (22.3, 23.1)	22.5 (21.9, 23)
Scheduled Tribe	4.1 (3.8, 4.4)	2.9 (2.6, 3.3)	12 (11.6, 12.3)	10.5 (10, 11)
<b>Religion</b>				
Hindu	78.7 (77.8, 79.6)	73.5 (71.9, 75.1)	84.4 (84, 84.8)	81.4 (80.7, 82.1)
Muslim	15.4 (14.5, 16.3)	18.8 (17.2, 20.3)	10.4 (10, 10.8)	12.4 (11.8, 13)
Other	6 (5.6, 6.3)	7.7 (6.8, 8.6)	5.2 (5, 5.4)	6.2 (5.8, 6.6)
<b>Household wealth quintile (by residence)</b>				
Lowest	19.4 (18.7, 20.1)	13.8 (12.9, 14.8)	17.8 (17.5, 18.1)	17.8 (17.3, 18.3)
Low	20.2 (19.7, 20.7)	16.4 (15.6, 17.2)	19.1 (18.9, 19.4)	18.5 (18.1, 18.9)
Medium	20.4 (19.9, 20.8)	18.2 (17.4, 19)	20.4 (20.1, 20.6)	18.8 (18.4, 19.2)
High	20.3 (19.8, 20.8)	22 (21.1, 23)	21.2 (20.9, 21.5)	20.1 (19.7, 20.6)

Highest	19.8 (19.1, 20.5)	29.6 (27.9, 31.2)	21.5 (21.1, 21.8)	24.7 (24, 25.4)
<b>WHO body mass index categories (18-49y in women, 18-54y in men)</b>				
Underweight (<18.5 kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	4.4 (4.2, 4.5)	0.3 (0.3, 0.4)	7.4 (7.3, 7.5)	0.7 (0.6, 0.7)
Normal (18.5-24.9 kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	22.7 (22.5, 23)	1.8 (1.6, 2)	25.4 (25.3, 25.6)	2.4 (2.2, 2.5)
Overweight (25-29.9 kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	10.2 (10, 10.4)	1.2 (1.1, 1.3)	6.9 (6.9, 7)	1.1 (1, 1.1)
Obese (≥30 kg/m <sup>2</sup> )	4.3 (4.2, 4.5)	0.6 (0.5, 0.7)	1.9 (1.9, 2)	0.4 (0.3, 0.4)
<b>High waist circumference (18-49y in women, 18-54y in men)</b>	49.1 (48.4, 49.8)	60.7 (58.3, 63.2)	35.5 (35.2, 35.8)	46 (44.4, 47.6)
<b>Diabetes Care Cascade</b>				
Fasting (%)	1.2 (1.2, 1.3)		1.3 (1.3, 1.4)	
Diabetes in total population (%)	8.4 (8.2, 8.6)		5 (4.9, 5.1)	
Diagnosed in total population (%)	6.8 (6.6, 7)		3.8 (3.7, 3.9)	
Treated in total population (%)	5.3 (5.2, 5.5)		2.5 (2.4, 2.5)	
Controlled in total population (%)	3.8 (3.7, 4)		2.4 (2.3, 2.4)	

All values are percentages (95% confidence intervals). Height and weight were measured using SECA 213 Stadiometer and SECA 874U digital scale respectively for men 15-54 years eligible for the interview. Body mass index was categorized based on WHO cut-offs (underweight: <18.5 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, overweight: ≥ 25-29.9 kg/m<sup>2</sup>, obesity: ≥ 30kg/m<sup>2</sup>) (WHO Tech Rep Ser 1995). Gulick tape was used to measure waist circumference for men 15-54 years eligible for the interview. High waist circumference (yes or no) was categorized based on WHO sex-specific cut-offs (men: ≥94 cm, women: ≥80 cm) (Misra 2006 Int J Obes).



Supplementary Table 3. Care cascade estimates conditional on previous step in India, 2019-21

	Urban				Rural			
	Diabetes (%)	Diagnosed <sup>a</sup> (%)	Treated <sup>b</sup> (%)	Controlled <sup>c</sup> (%)	Diabetes (%)	Diagnosed <sup>a</sup> (%)	Treated <sup>b</sup> (%)	Controlled <sup>b</sup> (%)
<b>Total</b>	9.7 (9.4, 9.9)	77.2 (76, 78.4)	69.4 (67.4, 71.5)	50.4 (48.4, 52.3)	4.9 (4.8, 5)	72.2 (71.1, 73.3)	52.7 (51, 54.3)	52.9 (51.4, 54.5)
<b>Sex</b>								
Women	9.1 (8.8, 9.4)	78.6 (77, 80.2)	68 (65.6, 70.5)	50.8 (48.1, 53.4)	4.3 (4.2, 4.4)	74.2 (72.7, 75.6)	50 (47.9, 52)	53 (51, 55)
Men	10.2 (9.9, 10.6)	75.6 (74.1, 77.1)	71.2 (69, 73.3)	49.9 (47.2, 52.6)	5.6 (5.5, 5.8)	69.7 (68.3, 71.2)	56.4 (54.6, 58.3)	52.9 (50.7, 55.1)
<b>Age category</b>								
18-39	2.4 (2.3, 2.6)	70.5 (67.9, 73)	51.2 (47.6, 54.8)	53.7 (49.9, 57.6)	1.8 (1.7, 1.8)	69.7 (67.9, 71.5)	39.9 (37.5, 42.2)	57.8 (55.1, 60.5)
40-65	12.6 (12.3, 13)	80.3 (79.4, 81.2)	80.3 (78.9, 81.7)	45.2 (43.8, 46.5)	7.8 (7.6, 7.9)	74.1 (73.3, 74.8)	68.6 (67.4, 69.9)	45.5 (44.4, 46.6)
65 and above	22.9 (22, 23.8)	87.4 (86.3, 88.5)	85.4 (84, 86.8)	54.7 (52.9, 56.6)	11.9 (11.6, 12.3)	80.3 (79.4, 81.3)	73.6 (72.2, 75)	54.8 (53.4, 56.3)
<b>Schooling</b>								
None	7.4 (7, 7.7)	72.8 (69.7, 76)	68.1 (63.7, 72.4)	47.3 (43.8, 50.8)	3.9 (3.8, 4)	68.9 (66.7, 71.1)	54.4 (51.6, 57.2)	52.7 (50.5, 54.9)
Primary (up to 4 <sup>th</sup> class)	9.8 (9.4, 10.3)	75.1 (71.6, 78.6)	70.1 (66.2, 74)	47.3 (43.6, 51.1)	5 (4.8, 5.2)	71.6 (69.3, 74)	54.1 (50.8, 57.4)	51.2 (47.9, 54.5)
Secondary (5 <sup>th</sup> to 10 <sup>th</sup> class)	10.1 (9.8, 10.5)	78.1 (76.7, 79.5)	70.7 (68.5, 72.9)	48.5 (45.8, 51.3)	5.5 (5.3, 5.6)	74 (72.8, 75.3)	52.5 (50.6, 54.3)	52.1 (49.8, 54.5)
Post-secondary (11 <sup>th</sup> class and above)	10 (9.5, 10.5)	80.9 (79.1, 82.6)	67.1 (64.3, 69.9)	56.8 (52.3, 61.3)	6.3 (6, 6.6)	78 (75.9, 80.2)	44.5 (41.5, 47.4)	58.3 (53.4, 63.2)
<b>Household wealth quintile</b>								
Lowest	6.3	69.7	57.5	54.2	2.8	65.8	41.4	65.7

	(5.9, 6.7)	(66.5, 72.9)	(52.7, 62.3)	(49.4, 59)	(2.6, 2.9)	(63.1, 68.4)	(38, 44.8)	(61.4, 70)
Low	8.9 (8.5, 9.3)	72.2 (69.8, 74.7)	67.4 (64.1, 70.6)	48.6 (44.7, 52.6)	3.5 (3.3, 3.6)	69.4 (67.1, 71.8)	45.7 (42.5, 48.8)	59.4 (55.5, 63.3)
Medium	10.2 (9.7, 10.7)	78.2 (76.2, 80.1)	72.5 (69.6, 75.4)	47.3 (43.3, 51.4)	4.5 (4.3, 4.6)	72 (70, 74.1)	47.5 (44.8, 50.3)	54.8 (51.5, 58.2)
High	11.1 (10.6, 11.6)	80.1 (77.8, 82.4)	70.8 (67.7, 74)	51.6 (47.9, 55.3)	5.8 (5.7, 6)	71.4 (69.2, 73.6)	55.6 (52.9, 58.4)	52.4 (49.6, 55.1)
Highest	11.6 (11.1, 12.1)	81.6 (79.2, 84)	72.4 (69.2, 75.6)	51.3 (47.1, 55.5)	7.6 (7.4, 7.8)	75.7 (73.8, 77.6)	58.2 (55.6, 60.8)	49 (46.3, 51.6)

Estimates (95% confidence intervals) are standardized to age distribution in overall sample.

a Among those with self-reported diabetes or high blood glucose ( $\geq 126$ mg/dL [fasting for 12 hours] or  $\geq 220$ mg/dL [not fasting]).


b Among those with self-reported diabetes

c Among those seeking treatment with self-reported diabetes (Urban: 19423, Rural: 25580) defined using blood glucose ( $< 126$ mg/dL [fasting for 8 hours] or  $\leq 180$ mg/dL [not fasting])


**Supplementary Table 4. Proportion of those diagnosed and treated among those with controlled blood glucose**

	<b>Total</b>	<b>Urban</b>	<b>Rural</b>
	<b>Treated (%)</b>	<b>Treated (%)</b>	<b>Treated (%)</b>
<b>Total</b>	47.1 (45.7, 48.4)	56.8 (54.2, 59.5)	40.5 (38.9, 42)
<b>Sex</b>			
Women	45.2 (43.6, 46.7)	55.9 (52.8, 58.9)	37.9 (36.1, 39.7)
Men	49.5 (47.9, 51)	58.1 (55.2, 61)	43.7 (41.8, 45.6)
<b>Age category</b>			
18-39	30.4 (28.5, 32.2)	37.7 (33.9, 41.6)	26.3 (24.4, 28.2)
40-65	61.8 (60.5, 63.2)	70.2 (68.1, 72.4)	55.1 (53.4, 56.8)
65 and above	71.2 (69.8, 72.6)	80 (78, 82)	63.9 (62, 65.8)
<b>Schooling</b>			
None	51.9 (50.1, 53.6)	62.9 (59.4, 66.3)	47.8 (45.8, 49.9)
Primary (up to 4 <sup>th</sup> class)	53.7 (51.5, 55.8)	65.2 (61.2, 69.2)	47.2 (44.5, 49.9)
Secondary (5 <sup>th</sup> to 10 <sup>th</sup> class)	46.3 (44.6, 47.9)	57.4 (54.3, 60.5)	38.6 (36.6, 40.5)
Post-secondary (11 <sup>th</sup> class and above)	39.9 (37.2, 42.5)	49.5 (45.4, 53.6)	28.2 (25.1, 31.3)
<b>Household wealth quintile</b>			
Lowest	39.4 (36.4, 42.4)	46 (40.7, 51.4)	33 (29.9, 36.2)
Low	43.5 (41.2, 45.8)	53 (48.8, 57.2)	35.4 (32.6, 38.1)
Medium	46.2 (44, 48.4)	58.5 (54.4, 62.6)	37.3 (34.7, 39.8)
High	49.4 (47.4, 51.5)	59.8 (56, 63.6)	42.6 (40.1, 45.1)
Highest	50.2 (48.2, 52.3)	61 (56.9, 65.2)	44.8 (42.4, 47.2)

### Supplementary Figure 1. Flowchart of analytic sample




## Supplementary Figure 2. State-level care cascade




Refer to dashboard for detailed presentation; Undiagnosed are among those with diabetes ( $n = 93,263$ ). Untreated and uncontrolled are among those diagnosed with diabetes ( $n = 67,209$ ). We excluded all strata with less than 50 participants.


Supplementary Figure 3. Column plot for care cascade



All values are crude percentages (95% confidence intervals). Undiagnosed are among those with diabetes ( $n = 93,263$ ). Untreated and uncontrolled are among those diagnosed with diabetes ( $n = 67,209$ ). We excluded all strata with less than 50 observations.

**Supplementary Figure 4. Disparities within states at the district level**

### Supplementary Figure 5. District-level care cascade in analytic sample by urban and rural residence for districts with at least 50 observations



All values are crude percentages.