1

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^{1,2}, Ranjit Mohan Anjana³, Pascal Geldsetzer^{4,5}, Nikkil Sudharsanan^{6,7}, Jennifer Manne-Goehler⁸, Harsha Thirumurthy⁹, Soura Bhattacharya¹⁰, K.M. Venkat Narayan^{1,2}, Viswanathan Mohan³, Nikhil Tandon¹¹*, Mohammed K. Ali^{1,2, 12}*

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

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 sociodemographic 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 (≥ 126 mg/dL [fasting] or ≥ 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 ≤ 180 mg/dL [nonfasting; 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.

5

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

6

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. ¹ Strong evidence for interventions to
4	improve diagnosis, treatment, and control exist to mitigate the complications of diabetes. ^{2,3}
5	Several high-income nations have implemented quality of care programs for diabetes, and
6	achieved reductions in population level rates of diabetes complications. ^{4,5} 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. ⁶ 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. ⁷ 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"). ⁸
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. ^{9–13} 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). ^{14–16} 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. ¹⁷
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. ¹⁸
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. ^{18,19} As reported previously, ^{20–22} a conversion
56	factor is used to reliably estimate plasma glucose concentrations (mg/dL). ²³
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 ($\geq 126 \text{ mg/dL}$ if
60	fasting [not eating or drinking anything except water for more than 8 hours] or $\geq 220 \text{ mg/dL}$ if
61	non-fasted). ^{22,24}
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 <126mg/dL [fasting] or \leq 180mg/dL [not fasting; corresponding to
69	HbA1c≤8%]) per national guidelines for management of Type 2 Diabetes. ²⁴ 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. ²⁵ 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 th class], secondary [up to 10 th 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. ¹⁷ . 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

10

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/. 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

11

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

12

higher age and household wealth, with no consistent differences by attained schooling in bothurban 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]),
- 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,
- and 66.8% of variance in control among diagnosed were at the district-level, with the remaining
- 174 at the state-level.

14

At the district level (n = 707), 246 districts (34.8%) met the 80% diagnosis target while 76 districts (10.7%) met the 80% control target among those diagnosed. Restricting our analysis to districts with at least 50 observations (**Supplementary Figure 5**), consistent with the reporting criteria used in NFHS-5 factsheets, did not change our results (diagnosis target: 36.3%, 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 NMAP for diabetes management.⁷ 193

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

15

wealth. The findings on urban-rural differences in diagnosis and control were also consistent
with those from the Indian Council of Medical Research – India Diabetes (ICMR-INDIAB)
study.¹⁰ Higher proportions of diagnosed and treated diabetes with higher age, urbanicity, and
household wealth were consistent across states and likely associated with greater awareness and
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.^{14,26} 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 countries.²⁷ Nearly half of the outpatients in a retrospective analysis of medical records reported 209 210 uncontrolled diabetes in eight high income European countries, with considerable between-211 country variation.⁴

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, 60.4% reported being diagnosed.^{12,13} This may be related to differential classification of diabetes 216 217 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.²⁸ For 220 example, our non-fasted blood glucose cut-off of 220 mg/dL may have high specificity and low

16

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%). ¹⁰ 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. ^{11,12} 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 diabetes care targets set by NMAP and the Global Diabetes Compact.^{7,8} For example, a state or 235 236 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 healthcare facilities for diabetes management.²⁹ 243

17

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 glycemic
247	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. ^{9,10} 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; $n = 9,721$). ¹² 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. ^{11 13} Of note, the
254	HbA1c cutoff used ($\geq 6.5\%$) in LASI may overestimate diabetes prevalence among ethnicities
255	other than Non-Hispanic Whites. ^{28,30}

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 LASI, INDIAB, and NNMS).^{12,13} Second, we used a combination of fasting (about 1%) and 260 261 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 internal consistency and has been used in similar population-based studies.^{11,22} NFHS-5 also did 264 265 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

18

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. ^{18,20}
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

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
- from the Institutional Review Board of Emory University.
- 283 Data Availability Statement: All datasets used in this analysis are available for download at
- 284 <u>www.dhsprogram.com</u>. The code for the analysis is available on
- 285 https://github.com/jvargh7/nfhs_cascade.
- 286 **Consent for publication:** Not applicable
- 287 **Competing interests:** None declared
- 288 **Funding:** None
- 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

20

296 **References**

- 1. International Diabetes Federation. *IDF Diabetes Atlas*. International Diabetes Federation
 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
- 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
- Siegel KR, Ali MK, Zhou X, et al. Cost-effectiveness of Interventions to Manage Diabetes:
 Has the Evidence Changed Since 2008? *Diabetes Care*. 2020;43(7):1557-1592.
 doi:10.2337/dci20-0017
- 6. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. National Program for
 Prevention and Control of Cancer, Diabetes, CVD and Stroke (NPCDCS). National Health
 Mission. Accessed October 14, 2022.
- 312 https://nhm.gov.in/index1.php?lang=1&level=2&sublinkid=1048&lid=604
- 7. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India, World Health Organization India Office. National Multisectoral Action Plan for Prevention and Control of Common
 Noncommunicable Diseases 2017 2022. Covernment of India: 2017
- 315 *Noncommunicable Diseases 2017-2022.* Government of India; 2017.
- 8. First-ever global coverage targets for diabetes adopted at the 75th World Health Assembly.
 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-
- 319 diabetes-adopted-at-the-75-th-world-health-assembly
- 9. Unnikrishnan R, Anjana RM, Deepa M, et al. Glycemic Control Among Individuals with Self-Reported Diabetes in India—The ICMR–INDIAB Study. *Diabetes Technology & Therapeutics*. 2014;16(9):596-603. doi:10.1089/dia.2014.0018
- Anjana RM, Unnikrishnan R, Deepa M, et al. Achievement of guideline recommended
 diabetes treatment targets and health habits in people with self-reported diabetes in India
 (ICMR-INDIAB-13): a national cross-sectional study. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*.
 2022;10(6):430-441. doi:10.1016/S2213-8587(22)00072-9
- Prenissl J, Jaacks LM, Mohan V, et al. Variation in health system performance for
 managing diabetes among states in India: a cross-sectional study of individuals aged 15 to 49
 years. *BMC Med.* 2019;17(1):92. doi:10.1186/s12916-019-1325-6

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

22

- 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
- Kirk JK, D'Agostino RB, Bell RA, et al. Disparities in HbA1c Levels Between AfricanAmerican and Non-Hispanic White Adults With Diabetes. *Diabetes Care*. 2006;29(9):21302136. doi:10.2337/dc05-1973
- Kaur G, Chauhan AS, Prinja S, et al. Cost-effectiveness of population-based screening
 for diabetes and hypertension in India: an economic modelling study. *The Lancet Public 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

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

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

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

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

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

	1.	• .• •	1 1 1 11	1 (21 18(
Table 7 Nocio-der	nooranhie vai	riations in care	e cascade in India	n – 1 651 ľ/6
	nographic va	manons m care	, cascauc m muna	, n - 1, 0, 0, 1, 1, 0

Secondary		75.8	60.5	64	10.1	78.1	70.7	58.3		74	52.5	
$(5^{\text{th}} \text{ to } 10^{\text{th}})$	7.2	(74.9,	(59.1,	(62.9,	(9.8,	(76.7,	(68.5,	(56.5,	5.5	(72.8,	(50.6,	68.5
class)	(7, 7.3)	76.7)	61.9)	65.2)	10.5)	79.5)	72.9)	60.2)	(5.3, 5.6)	75.3)	54.3)	(67, 69.9)
Post-												
secondary		79.7	58.1		10	80.9	67.1	65.8		78	44.5	
(11 th class	8.5	(78.4,	(56.1,	69.4	(9.5,	(79.1,	(64.3,	(63.6,	6.3	(75.9,	(41.5,	74.8
and above)	(8.2, 8.8)	81.1)	60.1)	(67.8, 71)	10.5)	82.6)	69.9)	68.1)	(6, 6.6)	80.2)	47.4)	(72.6, 76.9)
Household												
wealth												
quintile												
Lowest		67.7				69.7	57.5	66.5		65.8	41.4	
	4	(65.6,	49.2	73.2	6.3	(66.5,	(52.7,	(63.6,	2.8	(63.1,	(38,	79.6
	(3.8, 4.2)	69.7)	(46.5, 52)	(71.4, 75)	(5.9, 6.7)	72.9)	62.3)	69.5)	(2.6, 2.9)	68.4)	44.8)	(77.2, 82)
Low			55.9	67.7		72.2	67.4	58.6		69.4	45.7	
	5.3	70.8	(53.8,	(65.8,	8.9	(69.8,	(64.1,	(55.7,	3.5	(67.1,	(42.5,	75.8
	(5.1, 5.5)	(69, 72.5)	58.1)	69.5)	(8.5, 9.3)	74.7)	70.6)	61.5)	(3.3, 3.6)	71.8)	48.8)	(73.3, 78.3)
Medium		74.7	58.7	65.9	10.2	78.2	72.5	57.2			47.5	
	6.4	(73.2,	(56.6,	(64.1,	(9.7,	(76.2,	(69.6,	(54.3,	4.5	72	(44.8,	72.8
	(6.2, 6.6)	76.1)	60.7)	67.7)	10.7)	80.1)	75.4)	60.1)	(4.3, 4.6)	(70, 74.1)	50.3)	(70.6, 75.1)
High			61.6	65	11.1	80.1	70.8	59.8		71.4	55.6	
	7.5	74.6	(59.5,	(63.3,	(10.6,	(77.8,	(67.7,	(57.1,	5.8	(69.2,	(52.9,	68.2
	(7.4, 7.7)	(73, 76.3)	63.6)	66.7)	11.6)	82.4)	74)	62.5)	(5.7, 6)	73.6)	58.4)	(66.1, 70.4)
Highest			62.7		11.6		72.4	58.8		75.7	58.2	
	8.8	77.5	(60.7,	62.3	(11.1,	81.6	(69.2,	(56.1,	7.6	(73.8,	(55.6,	63.9
	(8.6, 9)	(76.1, 79)	64.7)	(60.5, 64)	12.1)	(79.2, 84)	75.6)	61.5)	(7.4, 7.8)	77.6)	60.8)	(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 (≥ 126 mg/dL [fasting for 12 hours] or ≥ 220 mg/dL [not fasting]).

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





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).





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**.

30

Term	Study Population	Definition	Comment
Individual-lev	vel indicators	•	•
Fasting	Analytic sample	(a) Time since last eaten ≥ 12 hours AND (b) Time since last drank, something other than water ≥ 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 (≥126 mg/dL if fasting or ≥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 ≤180 mg/dL if non-fasted)	We are defining control based on random blood glucose and not HbA1c (%)
Population-le	vel performance indic	ators	
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 1. Definitions of disease and care cascade of diabetes

	Urban		Rural	
	Analytic Sample	Excluded Sample	Analytic Sample	Excluded Sample
	(n = 406,463)	(n = 77,941)	(n = 1,244,713)	(n = 166,180)
Sex				
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)
Age category				
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)
Schooling				
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 th 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 th to 10 th 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 th 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)
Caste of head of household				
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)
Religion				
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)
Household wealth quintile				
(by residence)				
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)

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

Highest	19.8 (19.1, 20.5)	29.6 (27.9, 31.2)	21.5 (21.1, 21.8)	24.7 (24, 25.4)
WHO body mass index categories				
(18-49y in women, 18-54y in men)				
Underweight ($<18.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$)	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 ²)	22.7 (22.5, 23)	1.8 (1.6, 2)	25.4 (25.3, 25.6)	2.4 (2.2, 2.5)
Overweight $(25-29.9 \text{ kg/m}^2)$	10.2 (10, 10.4)	1.2 (1.1, 1.3)	6.9 (6.9, 7)	1.1 (1, 1.1)
Obese ($\geq 30 \text{ kg/m}^2$)	4.3 (4.2, 4.5)	0.6 (0.5, 0.7)	1.9 (1.9, 2)	0.4 (0.3, 0.4)
High waist circumference				
(18-49y in women, 18-54y in men)	49.1 (48.4, 49.8)	60.7 (58.3, 63.2)	35.5 (35.2, 35.8)	46 (44.4, 47.6)
Diabetes Care Cascade				
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/m2, overweight: \geq 25-29.9 kg/m², obesity: \geq 30kg/m²) (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: \geq 94 cm, women: \geq 80 cm) (Misra 2006 Int J Obes).

		Urb	an		Rural			
	Diabetes (%)	Diagnosed ^a (%)	Treated ^b (%)	Controlled ^c (%)	Diabetes (%)	Diagnosed ^a (%)	Treated ^b (%)	Controlled ^b (%)
Total	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)
Sex								
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)
Age category				· · ·				
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)
Schooling								
None	7.4	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 th 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 th to 10 th 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 th 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)
Household wealth quintile						/		
Lowest	6.3	69.7	57.5	54.2	2.8	65.8	41.4	65.7

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

	(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	72.2	67.4	48.6	3.5	69.4	45.7	59.4
	(8.5, 9.3)	(69.8, 74.7)	(64.1, 70.6)	(44.7, 52.6)	(3.3, 3.6)	(67.1, 71.8)	(42.5, 48.8)	(55.5, 63.3)
Medium	10.2	78.2	72.5	47.3	4.5	72	47.5	54.8
	(9.7, 10.7)	(76.2, 80.1)	(69.6, 75.4)	(43.3, 51.4)	(4.3, 4.6)	(70, 74.1)	(44.8, 50.3)	(51.5, 58.2)
High	11.1	80.1	70.8	51.6	5.8	71.4	55.6	52.4
	(10.6, 11.6)	(77.8, 82.4)	(67.7, 74)	(47.9, 55.3)	(5.7, 6)	(69.2, 73.6)	(52.9, 58.4)	(49.6, 55.1)
Highest	11.6	81.6	72.4	51.3	7.6	75.7	58.2	49
	(11.1, 12.1)	(79.2, 84)	(69.2, 75.6)	(47.1, 55.5)	(7.4, 7.8)	(73.8, 77.6)	(55.6, 60.8)	(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 (≥ 126 mg/dL [fasting for 12 hours] or ≥ 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 (<126mg/dL [fasting for 8 hours] or \leq 180mg/dL [not fasting])

	Total	Urban	Rural
	Treated (%)	Treated (%)	Treated (%)
Total	47.1 (45.7, 48.4)	56.8 (54.2, 59.5)	40.5 (38.9, 42)
Sex			
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)
Age category			
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)
Schooling			
None	51.9 (50.1, 53.6)	62.9 (59.4, 66.3)	47.8 (45.8, 49.9)
Primary (up to 4 th class)	53.7 (51.5, 55.8)	65.2 (61.2, 69.2)	47.2 (44.5, 49.9)
Secondary (5 th to 10 th class)	46.3 (44.6, 47.9)	57.4 (54.3, 60.5)	38.6 (36.6, 40.5)
Post-secondary (11 th class and above)	39.9 (37.2, 42.5)	49.5 (45.4, 53.6)	28.2 (25.1, 31.3)
Household wealth quintile	, · · · · ·	, . <i>,</i>	· · · · · ·
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 Table 4. Proportion of those diagnosed and treated among those with controlled blood glucose

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

40

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.