

Title: Hypertension diagnosis, treatment, and control in India: nationally representative results from 1.69 million adults, 2019-2021

Authors: Jithin Sam Varghese PhD^{*1,2}, Nikhil Srinivasapura Venkateshmurthy MD^{*3}, Nikkil Sudharsanan PhD^{4,5}, Panniyammakal Jeemon PhD⁶, Shivani A Patel PhD^{1,2}, Harsha Thirumurthy PhD⁷, Ambuj Roy MD DM⁸, Nikhil Tandon MD, PhD⁹, KM Venkat Narayan MD^{1,2}, Dorairaj Prabhakaran MD DM^{#3,10}, Mohammed K. Ali MD^{#1,2,11}

* Joint first authors, # Joint senior authors

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 Public Health Foundation of India, New Delhi, India

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

5 Heidelberg Institute of Global Health, Heidelberg University, Germany

6 Achutha Menon Centre for Health Science Studies, Sree Chitra Tirunal Institute for Medical Sciences and Technology, Trivandrum, India

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

8 Department of Cardiology, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India

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

10 Center for Chronic Disease Control, New Delhi, India

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

Corresponding Author: Jithin Sam Varghese, Emory Global Diabetes Research Center, Woodruff Health Sciences Center, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, 30322, USA; Phone: +1 (404) 502-0415, E-mail: jvargh7@emory.edu

Short title: Hypertension care continuum 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

Total word count (Title Page, Abstract, Text, References, Tables, Figure Legends): 6240

Text word count: 2807

Tables/figures: 5

References: 38

ABSTRACT

Background

Hypertension is a major cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide. Previous efforts to characterize gaps in the hypertension care continuum in India –including diagnosis, treatment, and control– did not assess district level variation. Local data are critical for planning, implementation, and monitoring efforts to curb hypertension burdens. Our objective is to characterize the hypertension care continuum in India among individuals aged 18-98 years old at national, state, and district levels and by socio-demographic group.

Methods

Data were from 1,895,297 individuals in the nationally representative Fifth National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5), 2019-21. Hypertension was defined as self-reported diagnosis or newly measured blood pressure $\geq 140/90$ mmHg. Among those with hypertension, we calculated the proportion diagnosed (self-reported). Among those with diagnosed hypertension, we computed the proportion treated (self-reported medication use). Among those treated, we calculated the proportion controlled (BP $< 140/90$ mmHg [20-80 years] or $< 150/90$ mmHg [> 80 years]) based on national guidelines. Estimates were also provided among the total with hypertension. To assess differences in the care continuum between or within states (i.e. between districts), we partitioned the variance at both levels using linear mixed models.

Results

Among 1,691,109 adult respondents nationally (52.6% female; mean age: 41.6 years), 28.2% [95%CI: 28.0-28.4] had hypertension, of whom, 36.7% [36.3- 37.2] were diagnosed. Among those diagnosed, 44.7% [44.1-45.3] reported taking medication (17.7% [17.5-17.9] of total with hypertension). Among those treated, 52.3% [51.4-53.1] had blood pressure control (9.1% [8.9-9.2] of total with hypertension). There were substantial variations across districts in diagnosis [range: 6.3–77.5%], treatment [8.7–97.1%] and control [2.7–76.6%]. Notably, large proportions of the variation in hypertension diagnosis (53.7%), treatment (32.8%), and control (57.7%) were within states, not just between states.

Conclusions

In India, more than 1 in 4 people have hypertension, and of these, only 1 in 3 are diagnosed, less than 1 in 5 are treated, and only 1 in 11 controlled. National averages hide considerable state- and district-level variation in the care continuum, implying the need for targeted, decentralized solutions to improve the hypertension care continuum in India.

1 **Introduction**

2 Hypertension is associated with 12.8% of all deaths globally.¹ Many countries have
3 implemented large-scale programs to diagnose and manage hypertension and other chronic
4 diseases, with varying success.^{2,3} Of over 1.3 billion people with hypertension globally, 82%
5 live in low- and middle-income countries, and India alone is home to an estimated 220 million
6 adults with hypertension.⁴⁻⁶ To address the burden of noncommunicable diseases, India launched
7 the National Programme for Prevention and Control of Cancer, Diabetes, Cardiovascular Disease
8 and Stroke (NPCDCS) in 2010, under the National Health Mission for 100 districts across 21
9 states.⁷ However, few data are currently available to assess the success and opportunities for
10 improved control of high blood pressure at subnational levels.⁸

11 Previous efforts to characterize the hypertension care continuum were limited to national
12 and state levels, or exclusively among older or younger adults, but not by socio-demographic
13 groups within states or at district levels.⁹⁻¹² Newer regional data may therefore strengthen
14 ‘planning, implementation, and monitoring of investments’ at the district-level to improve health
15 infrastructure and outreach services for hypertension - key objectives of the Government of
16 India’s national programs.¹³⁻¹⁵

17 We describe the national, state, and district-level hypertension care continuum
18 (prevalence, diagnosis, treatment, control) in India, the world’s most populous country. We
19 visually represent these data through a publicly available dashboard for stakeholders to help
20 identify priorities for reducing hypertension burdens in India and tracking the progress of
21 national initiatives.

22 **Methods**

23 *Study Population*

24 The National Family Health Survey-5 (NFHS) is a nationally-representative survey
25 conducted in two phases from June 2019 to March 2020, and from November 2020 to April 2021
26 in 707 districts from 28 states and 8 union territories, and powered to provide estimates at the
27 district level.¹⁶ Using a multi-stage stratified approach, primary sampling units (PSUs) were
28 selected from urban (census enumeration blocks) and rural (villages) strata of each district at the
29 first stage. At the second stage, 636,699 households within PSUs were randomly sampled from a
30 list of households where eligible participants (women: 15-49 years, men: 15-54 years) resided.¹⁷
31 Household and individual characteristics were collected using standardized instruments. The
32 survey additionally collected data on blood pressure among all adults (18 years and older) who
33 were living in the same household as eligible participants. The overall sample approached
34 consisted of 1,895,297 adults aged 18-98 years.

35 We restricted our analysis to non-pregnant women and men who had a valid
36 measurement of blood pressure (**Supplementary Figure 1**). The analytic sample consisted of
37 1,691,109 adults aged 18-98 (47.4% men and 52.6% non-pregnant women), representing a
38 response rate of 89.2%. The analytic sample was similar to the excluded sample
39 (**Supplementary Table 1**). Additional information on sampling and data collected are provided
40 in **Supplementary Methods**.

41 *Data collection*

42 *Hypertension*

43 Systolic and diastolic blood pressure were measured three times at five-minute intervals
44 using validated electronic OMRON BP monitors after a five-minute sedentary period when the

45 participant was asked to sit comfortably.¹⁷ The respondent was also asked to avoid eating,
46 smoking, and exercising for 30 minutes before the measurement. Cuff size of BP monitor was
47 based on circumference of the bare upper arm measured using Gulick tape. Blood pressure was
48 measured on the left arm, positioned so that it was at heart level with the cuff placed over bare
49 skin or over thin clothes. Consistent with 2016 ICMR guidelines, we took the lowest of the first
50 two measurements if their difference in systolic BP was less than or equal to 5 mmHg, and
51 lowest of the three measurements otherwise.¹⁸

52 Participants were also asked the question: “Before this survey, were you ever told you
53 had high blood pressure by a doctor, nurse, or health practitioner on two or more occasions?”.
54 Medication status was asked only to those who self-reported a diagnosis of hypertension.

55 *Hypertension Care Continuum – Diagnosis, Treatment, and Control*

56 We defined hypertension as self-reported or, among those without a prior diagnosis,
57 measured blood pressure $\geq 140/90$ mmHg.¹⁸ We defined the hypertension care continuum using
58 the following metrics: proportion diagnosed (self-reported diagnosed hypertension prior to the
59 survey among total with hypertension), and among those diagnosed, the proportion treated (those
60 self-reporting medication use). We defined the proportion controlled among those treated
61 ($<140/90$ mmHg for those below than 80 years, and $<150/90$ mmHg for those 80 years and
62 older) based on ICMR guidelines for management of hypertension.¹⁸ We also provided age-
63 standardized estimates of treatment and control among all of those with hypertension. The
64 definitions are summarized in **Supplementary Table 2**.

65 *Socio-demographic variables*

66 We estimated care continuum metrics by 3 individual-level socio-demographic factors:
67 sex (male or female), age (18-39, 40-64, ≥ 65 years), and schooling (none or missing, primary [up
68 to 4th class], secondary [up to 10th class], post-secondary). We also stratified by two household
69 socio-demographic factors: rural residence (versus urban) and regional wealth quintile (urban
70 and rural) from the household wealth index as provided by NFHS.¹⁹

71 *Statistical Analysis*

72 We report survey-weighted estimates accounting for the complex survey design and 95%
73 cluster-robust confidence intervals.¹⁶ Individual and household characteristics of the analytic
74 sample were assessed by strata of residence (urban or rural) and sex.

75 Continuum performance indicators were estimated for the national sample, for states
76 stratified by socio-demographic factors (residence, sex, age category, schooling, and regional
77 wealth quintile) and for districts. Age-standardized estimates of the continuum indicators were
78 computed for different strata at the national-level, based on distribution of the total sample since
79 different strata of schooling and wealth have different age distributions. We also calculated
80 weighted estimates at state-level and district-level that were not age-standardized, but would be
81 relevant for local decision making. We compared the estimates to those obtained when taking the
82 average of the last 2 blood pressure measurements as a sensitivity analysis.

83 To assess whether the differences in the care continuum were greater between or within
84 states (i.e. between districts), we partitioned the variance in the care continuum at both levels
85 using variance partition coefficients from linear mixed models with state-level intercepts. To
86 illustrate the variability between- and within-states, we present examples of two states from

87 regions with moderate to high burdens of hypertension, namely Karnataka from South India and
88 Meghalaya from North East India.

89 To further aid policy and priority decision-making, we developed a dashboard to visually
90 depict the disparities in the hypertension care continuum using Shiny by RStudio (link provided
91 in the Results). We displayed disparities, both crude and age-standardized, by sex and region
92 (Total/Urban/Rural) at the state-level on the “Overview” tab. We compared districts within each
93 state on the “District Disparities” tab. We displayed disparities across socio-demographic
94 characteristics at the state-level on the “Socio-demographic Disparities” tab. All analyses were
95 carried out using R 4.2.0 using srvyr 1.1.1.

96 **Results**

97 Nationally, over three-fourths of the population lived in rural areas in 2019-2021. More
98 than half were under 40 years of age and almost 90% were aged 18-64 years (**Table 1**). Average
99 systolic and diastolic BP were 120.3 [95%CI: 120.2-120.4] mmHg and 79.7 [79.7-79.8] mm Hg,
100 respectively, for women, and 124.6 [95%CI: 124.5-124.7] mmHg and 81.7 [81.6-81.7] mm Hg,
101 respectively, for men. (**Table 1**)

102 *National-level care continuum*

103 The age-standardized prevalence [95%CI] of hypertension (**Table 2**) nationally was
104 28.2% [95%CI: 28.0, 28.4] and was higher in urban areas (32.7% [32.3-33.1]) relative to rural
105 areas (25.9% [25.7-26.2]). The prevalence was higher among men (30.6% [30.4, 30.9]) relative
106 to women (25.8% [25.6-26.0]), and was higher at older ages (65 and above: 54.3% [53.8-54.8],
107 18-39: 15.0% [14.9-15.2]), and greater household wealth (highest: 31.2% [30.8-31.5], lowest:
108 25.5% [25.2-25.8]) compared to their respective counterparts. Higher hypertension prevalence in

109 men, older, and wealthier individuals was observed in both urban and rural areas. Prevalence of
110 hypertension did not vary by education at the national level.

111 Among all adults with hypertension, 36.7% [36.3-37.2] reported being diagnosed,
112 **(Figure 1)**. Diagnosed hypertension was higher in urban (39.8% [39.0-40.7]) compared to rural
113 areas (35.2% [34.7-35.8]), higher among older age groups (65 and above: 51.3% [50.7-51.9], 18-
114 39: 31.3% [30.6-32.0]), and those with greater household wealth (highest: 40.6% [39.8-41.3],
115 lowest: 31.9% [31.0-32.7]) but did not vary by schooling (post-secondary: 39.3% [38.4-40.2],
116 none: 41.6% [40.7-42.6]).

117 Of adults with diagnosed hypertension, 44.7% [44.1-45.3] reported taking medication
118 corresponding to 17.7% [17.5-17.9] of those with hypertension **(Figure 1; Supplementary**
119 **Table 3)**. Among those diagnosed, medication use was 56.3% [54.9-57.6] in urban areas and
120 38.8% [38.0-39.6] in rural areas. These estimates correspond to 23.9% [23.4, 24.4] and 14.6%
121 [14.4, 14.9] of those with hypertension. Proportions of those diagnosed that were treated was
122 higher among men (men: 49.3% [48.5-50.1], women: 42.2% [41.5-42.9]), with higher age (65
123 and above: 77.1% [76.5-77.8], 18-39: 23.8% [22.9-24.7]) and household wealth (lowest: 37.2%
124 [36.0-38.4], highest: 48.1% [47.0-49.2]), but did not vary by education. The distributions of
125 those treated and controlled, treated and uncontrolled, or untreated, among those diagnosed, are
126 presented in **Supplementary Figure 2**. Estimates of treated and controlled hypertension among
127 those with hypertension by socio-demographic group are provided in **Supplementary Table 3**.

128 Among those diagnosed and treated with medication, 52.3% [51.4-53.1] had controlled
129 blood pressure corresponding to 9.1% [8.9-9.2] of all those with hypertension **(Figure 1;**
130 **Supplementary Table 3)**. Among treated adults, the proportion with controlled hypertension
131 was 50.2% [48.7-51.7] in urban areas and 53.7% [52.6-54.7] in rural areas. These estimates

132 correspond to 7.6% [7.4-7.8] and 12.0% [11.7-12.4] of those with hypertension. Controlled
133 hypertension among those treated was higher among women (55.3% [54.3-56.4]) than men
134 (47.2% [45.8-48.5]), and adults aged 18-39 years (60.8% [59.2-62.4]) compared to 40-64 years
135 (43.7% [43.0-44.3]) and those older than 65 years (44.3% [43.5-45.1]). Hypertension control was
136 also higher with higher schooling (none: 47.4% [46.2-48.5], post-secondary: 59.4% [56.9-62.0]),
137 but did not differ by household wealth (lowest: 54.5% [52.5-56.5], medium: 52.1% [50.3-53.9],
138 highest: 51.7% [50.0-53.4]).

139 Our results were similar when using the average of the second and third measurements of
140 blood pressure (**Supplementary Table 4**), instead of the lowest measurements (**Supplementary**
141 **Table 5, Supplementary Figure 3**).

142 *State-level care continuum*

143 Hypertension prevalence was similar among the southern states (Kerala, Tamil Nadu,
144 Karnataka, Telangana, Andhra Pradesh), union territories (Andaman & Nicobar Islands,
145 Lakshadweep, Puducherry), and Goa compared to other parts of the country (**Figure 2**; median
146 of states: 30% [southern] vs 26.9% [rest of India]). Higher hypertension prevalence was
147 observed in urban versus rural areas for all states (**Supplementary Figure 4**).

148 The proportions with diagnosed hypertension were similar between southern states and
149 rest of India (**Supplementary Figure 5**). However, proportions treated and controlled were
150 higher among the southern states. Disparities in diagnosis, treatment, and control between socio-
151 demographic groups within each state beyond the state-level heterogeneity observed in **Figure 2**
152 are published on the interactive ‘Hypertension Care Continuum’ dashboard (accessed at:
153 https://egdrc-precision-medicine.shinyapps.io/hypertension_cascade/).

154 *District-level care continuum*

155 There was considerable within-state (between-district) variation in the hypertension care
156 continuum (**Figure 3**) such that 53.7% of variance in proportion diagnosed, 32.8% of variance in
157 proportion treated among diagnosed, and 57.7% of variance in proportions controlled among
158 treated were at the district-level, with the remaining at the state-level (between-state). We
159 visualized this variability between- and within-states from all regions in **Supplementary Figure**
160 **6**.

161 We illustrated this variability in Meghalaya and Karnataka. In Meghalaya, the five
162 districts of Garo Hills (median: 21.9%) had similar prevalence as the two districts of Jaintia Hills
163 (median: 18.8%) and three districts of Khasi Hills (median: 23.2%) although the proportions of
164 those diagnosed, were much lower in Garo Hills (18.5%) than Jaintia Hills (40.8%) and Khasi
165 Hills (29.4%)(**Supplementary Figure 7A**).

166 In Karnataka, there was substantial between-district heterogeneity in treatment among
167 those diagnosed but less heterogeneity in control between districts with similar prevalence.
168 Chikmagalur (31.6% [28.8-34.4]), Udupi (34.0% [31.5-36.6]), Chitradurga (34.8% [32.1-37.5]),
169 and Shimoga (34.0% [29.0-39.0]) had similar prevalence of hypertension. The proportions
170 treated were higher in Chikmagalur (81.3% [84.5-88.0]) and Udupi (91.3% [87.6-95.1]),
171 compared to Chitradurga (61.6% [45.9-77.2]) and Shimoga (55.7% [38.1-73.3])
172 (**Supplementary Figure 7B**). Similarly, the proportion of those with controlled hypertension
173 (**Supplementary Figure 7C**) was higher in Chikmagalur (42.5% [33.6-51.4]) and Udupi (44.1%
174 [39.8-48.4]) compared to Chitradurga (39.6% [30.8-48.4]) and Shimoga (35.0% [28.6-41.5]).

175 **Discussion**

176 Of the estimated 28% adults older than 18 years with high blood pressure in India, nearly
177 2 in 3 remain undiagnosed across all states and in both urban and rural areas.²⁰ Among those
178 diagnosed, only half were treated; treatment was higher in southern and western India, and lower
179 in other parts of the country. Among those treated, nearly half did not have their blood pressure
180 under control. Cumulatively, over 90% of adults with hypertension in India were either
181 undiagnosed, untreated, or treated and uncontrolled.

182 There was substantial variability across socio-demographic groups in prevalence,
183 diagnosis, treatment, and control of hypertension. Although the prevalence of hypertension was
184 higher among men, the proportion of those diagnosed was higher among women.^{11,21} Women
185 were less likely to be taking medication, but again, treated women were more likely than treated
186 men to have controlled hypertension.^{10,11} Proportion diagnosed did not vary with schooling,¹¹ but
187 proportion of treated and controlled were higher among those with higher schooling. Proportion
188 diagnosed and treated were higher among older adults and wealthier households.^{10,11}

189 The reasons for greater differences in hypertension diagnosis, treatment, and control
190 being between districts in a state, and not between states are likely multifactorial. Prior and
191 recent data show that there are between-district differences in health-seeking behaviors across
192 India.¹⁶ Furthermore, clinician (e.g. type of provider and practice variation) and system (e.g.
193 physical and financial access to clinics) factors also differ between states and districts.^{22,23}

194 The high unmet need in hypertension diagnoses in India has been identified previously,
195 though none of these provide comprehensive estimates for all age groups and district-level
196 precision in estimates.^{12,24} In 2017-18, the National Non-communicable Diseases Monitoring
197 Survey (NNMS) surveyed 10,659 adults aged 18-69y (n=10,659) from 26 states and estimated a
198 hypertension prevalence of 28.5%.¹¹ Among those with hypertension, 27.9% were diagnosed,

199 14.5% were treated (52.0% among diagnosed), and 12.6% were controlled (86.9% among those
200 treated). Although NNMS provided estimates for socio-demographic groups at the national level,
201 they did not provide state-level estimates. The NFHS-4 and Longitudinal Aging Study in India
202 (LASI), both of which were conducted over 2017-19, provided estimates for those aged 15-49
203 years (n=731,864; prevalence: 18.1%, diagnosed: 44.7%, treated among diagnosed: 29.8%,
204 controlled among treated: 59.4%) and those older than 45 years (n=72,262; prevalence: 45.9%,
205 diagnosed: 55.7%, treated among diagnosed: 69.8%, controlled among diagnosed: 56.9%),
206 respectively.^{9,10,25} NFHS-4 and LASI provided estimates by socio-demographic group and
207 state.^{14,15}

208 To improve the care continuum for hypertension in India, our data suggest that diagnosis
209 is a critical step in realizing the downstream indicators such as treatment and control. Screening
210 and linkage to care are therefore critical, as evidenced by previous data.²⁶⁻²⁸ Studies within India
211 also offer promising opportunities to improve hypertension diagnosis by linking frontline health
212 workers who carry out hypertension screening at the community level with doctors at the facility
213 level through an IT-enabled platform.²⁹ In addition, under the Ayushman Bharat Comprehensive
214 Primary Healthcare (CPHC) program for screening and referral for non-communicable diseases,
215 digitization of screening records by frontline workers can enable surveillance of hypertension
216 burdens.³⁰ Concerted strategies for hypertension treatment and control may offer models for
217 India to emulate.³¹⁻³³ Hypertension control can also be facilitated by providing doctors latest
218 evidence-based guidelines on treating hypertension through decision support systems embedded
219 within the NPCDCS portal.²⁹ Furthermore, population-based strategies such as policy mandated
220 reductions in salt content of packaged foods, food labeling, low sodium or salt substitutes,³⁴

221 reducing particulate exposure, and improved built environments can complement the above-
222 mentioned clinical efforts.

223 Our study has key strengths. This study is among the largest of its kind, consisting of
224 over 1.6 million respondents, providing data at district level, and for sociodemographic groups.
225 The response rate was high, and there were few missing data, indicating high quality of data
226 collection and completion. The study used validated protocols for blood pressure measurement
227 including cuff size selection, and our presentation offers easy-to-use visualization of results.

228 Our study had some limitations. First, while the hypertension care continuum is an
229 invaluable tool to visualize gaps at one time-point, these data hide the dynamic nature of
230 hypertension treatment and control, and argues for systems of ongoing surveillance.^{35,36} Second,
231 hypertension, among those who did not self-report a physician diagnosis, was based on blood
232 pressure measurements at a single time point.³⁷ The ICMR guidelines for diagnosis of
233 hypertension requires a minimum of 2 sets of readings on 2 different occasions, which are at
234 least 1-4 weeks apart.¹⁸ Third, diagnosis and treatment were based on self-report, and not
235 validated through medical records.^{35,38} Finally, we did not have data on older adults living by
236 themselves or institutionalized and non-civilian adults.¹⁶

237 In India, nationally, more than 1 in 4 people have hypertension, and cumulatively, over
238 90% of adults with hypertension were either undiagnosed, untreated, or treated and uncontrolled.
239 These summary data, however, hide district-level and sociodemographic differences. Thus, as
240 our data indicate, the characterization and visualization of India's hypertension care continuum
241 nationally, at the state and district levels, and across socio-demographic groups present
242 opportunities to tailor implementation of programs to prevent and control the burdens of high
243 blood pressure.

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

Funding: None

Disclosures: None declared

References

1. The Global Health Observatory. *Blood Pressure/Hypertension*. World Health Organization <https://www.who.int/data/gho/indicator-metadata-registry/imr-details/3155>
2. Department of Economic and Social Affairs. The 17 Goals. United Nations Sustainable Development Goals. Accessed February 2, 2023. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>
3. Geldsetzer P, Manne-Goehler J, Marcus ME, et al. The state of hypertension care in 44 low-income and middle-income countries: a cross-sectional study of nationally representative individual-level data from 1·1 million adults. *The Lancet*. 2019;394(10199):652-662. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(19)30955-9
4. Beaney T, Schutte AE, Stergiou GS, et al. May Measurement Month 2019: The Global Blood Pressure Screening Campaign of the International Society of Hypertension. *Hypertension*. 2020;76(2):333-341. doi:10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.120.14874
5. World Health Organization. Hypertension. Published August 25, 2021. Accessed January 30, 2023. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/hypertension>
6. Zhou B, Carrillo-Larco RM, Danaei G, et al. Worldwide trends in hypertension prevalence and progress in treatment and control from 1990 to 2019: a pooled analysis of 1201 population-representative studies with 104 million participants. *The Lancet*. 2021;398(10304):957-980. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)01330-1
7. 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. <https://nhm.gov.in/index1.php?lang=1&level=2&sublinkid=1048&lid=604>
8. Press Information Bureau. More than 27.31 lakh people participated in Ayushman Bharat block level Health Melas in 3204 blocks organized across 33 States/UTs in a week. <https://pib.gov.in/PressReleaseDetail.aspx?PRID=1820229>. Published April 26, 2022.
9. Prenissl J, Manne-Goehler J, Jaacks LM, et al. Hypertension screening, awareness, treatment, and control in India: A nationally representative cross-sectional study among individuals aged 15 to 49 years. Kruk ME, ed. *PLoS Med*. 2019;16(5):e1002801. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002801
10. Lee J, Wilkens J, Meijer E, Sekher TV, Bloom DE, Hu P. Hypertension awareness, treatment, and control and their association with healthcare access in the middle-aged and older Indian population: A nationwide cohort study. Basu S, ed. *PLoS Med*. 2022;19(1):e1003855. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1003855
11. Amarchand R, Kulothungan V, Krishnan A, Mathur P. Hypertension treatment cascade in India: results from National Noncommunicable Disease Monitoring Survey. *J Hum Hypertens*. Published online May 5, 2022. doi:10.1038/s41371-022-00692-y

12. Anchala R, Kannuri NK, Pant H, et al. Hypertension in India: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prevalence, awareness, and control of hypertension. *Journal of Hypertension*. 2014;32(6):1170-1177. doi:10.1097/HJH.000000000000146
13. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. *Training Manual for NCD Programme Managers at State and District Level: National Programme for Prevention and Control of Cancer, Diabetes, Cardiovascular Diseases and Stroke (NPCDCS)*. Government of India; 2017.
https://main.mohfw.gov.in/sites/default/files/Training%20Manual%20for%20NCD%20Programme%20Managers%20at%20State%20and%20District%20Level_0.pdf
14. 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*. Government of India; 2017.
15. Kaur P, Kunwar A, Sharma M, et al. The India Hypertension Control Initiative—early outcomes in 26 districts across five states of India, 2018–2020. *J Hum Hypertens*. Published online August 9, 2022. doi:10.1038/s41371-022-00742-5
16. 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>
17. International Institute for Population Sciences, ICF. *Clinical Anthropometric Biochemical (CAB) Manual: National Family Health Survey 2019-20, India*. International Institute for Population Sciences; 2019.
18. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. Standard Treatment Guidelines for Hypertension: Screening, Diagnosis, Assessment and Management of Primary Hypertension in Adults in India. Published online February 2016.
19. Shea O, Rutstein. *The DHS Wealth Index: Approaches for Rural and Urban Areas*. Macro International; 2008.
20. World Bank. World Development Indicators. Accessed September 7, 2022.
<https://databank.worldbank.org/source/world-development-indicators>
21. Geldsetzer P, Manne-Goehler J, Theilmann M, et al. Diabetes and Hypertension in India: A Nationally Representative Study of 1.3 Million Adults. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2018;178(3):363. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2017.8094
22. Acharya R, Porwal A. A vulnerability index for the management of and response to the COVID-19 epidemic in India: an ecological study. *The Lancet Global Health*. 2020;8(9):e1142-e1151. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(20)30300-4
23. International Institute of Population Studies. District Level Household & Facility Survey -4: 2012-14. Published 2014. <http://rchiips.org/DLHS-4.html>

24. Jeemon P, Séverin T, Amodeo C, et al. World Heart Federation Roadmap for Hypertension – A 2021 Update. *Global Heart*. 2021;16(1):63. doi:10.5334/gh.1066
25. Kothavale A, Puri P, Sangani PG. Quantifying population level hypertension care cascades in India: a cross-sectional analysis of risk factors and disease linkages. *BMC Geriatr*. 2022;22(1):98. doi:10.1186/s12877-022-02760-x
26. National Quality Assurance Standards. Quality Assurance Scores and Key Performance Indicators. National Health Systems Resource Center. Accessed February 28, 2023. <http://qi.nhsreindia.org/quality-assurance-scores-and-key-performance-indicators>
27. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare,. *Operational Guidelines. Prevention, Screening and Control of Common Non-Communicable Diseases: Hypertension, Diabetes and Common Cancers (Oral, Breast, Cervix)*. Government of India; 2018.
28. Peters MA, Noonan CM, Rao KD, Edward A, Alonge OO. Evidence for an expanded hypertension care cascade in low- and middle-income countries: a scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2022;22(1):827. doi:10.1186/s12913-022-08190-0
29. Jindal D, Sharma H, Gupta Y, et al. Improving care for hypertension and diabetes in india by addition of clinical decision support system and task shifting in the national NCD program: I-TREC model of care. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2022;22(1):688. doi:10.1186/s12913-022-08025-y
30. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare,. *Ayushman Bharat Comprehensive Primary Healthcare: Population-Based NCD Screening Program*. Government of India; 2019. https://nhm.gov.in/New_Updates_2018/Presentation/Goa_19th_20th_August_2019/CPHC_NCD_Aug_19.pdf
31. Sahoo SK, Pathni AK, Krishna A, et al. Financial implications of protocol-based hypertension treatment: an insight into medication costs in public and private health sectors in India. *J Hum Hypertens*. Published online October 21, 2022. doi:10.1038/s41371-022-00766-x
32. Ojji DB, Mayosi B, Francis V, et al. Comparison of Dual Therapies for Lowering Blood Pressure in Black Africans. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;380(25):2429-2439. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1901113
33. Jaffe MG, Lee GA, Young JD, Sidney S, Go AS. Improved Blood Pressure Control Associated With a Large-Scale Hypertension Program. *JAMA*. 2013;310(7):699. doi:10.1001/jama.2013.108769
34. Neal B, Wu Y, Feng X, et al. Effect of Salt Substitution on Cardiovascular Events and Death. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;385(12):1067-1077. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa2105675
35. 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. *Science Translational Medicine*. Published online 2022:13.

36. Datta BK, Ansa BE, Husain MJ. An analytical model of population level uncontrolled hypertension management: a care cascade approach. *J Hum Hypertens*. 2022;36(8):726-731. doi:10.1038/s41371-021-00572-x
37. Lamprea-Montealegre JA, Zelnick LR, Hall YN, Bansal N, de Boer IH. Prevalence of Hypertension and Cardiovascular Risk According to Blood Pressure Thresholds Used for Diagnosis. *Hypertension*. 2018;72(3):602-609. doi:10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.118.11609
38. Oksanen T, Kivimäki M, Pentti J, Virtanen M, Klaukka T, Vahtera J. Self-Report as an Indicator of Incident Disease. *Annals of Epidemiology*. 2010;20(7):547-554. doi:10.1016/j.annepidem.2010.03.017

Figure Legends

Figure 1. National-level care continuum in Indian adults by residence, n = 1,691,109

All columns are survey weighted percentages in total population. The values in *italics* are proportions of diagnosed hypertension among patients with hypertension, treated among diagnosed hypertension and controlled among treated hypertension (from **Table 2**). We performed age-standardization to the distribution of the within-sample total population separately for total population, population with hypertension, diagnosed population and treated population. This procedure harmonizes the age distribution within each category (total, hypertension, diagnosed, treated). The values should therefore not be sequentially multiplied to get prevalence within total population. Values in grey ovals are drops from all patients with hypertension (100 - %diagnosed among hypertension, 100 - %treated among hypertension, 100 - %controlled among hypertension).

Figure 2. State-level unmet need in hypertension care continuum, n = 1,691,109

All values are survey weighted percentages (not age standardized). Undiagnosed are among those with hypertension. Untreated and uncontrolled are among those diagnosed with hypertension and among those treated respectively. We report weighted estimates at state-level that were not age-standardized and relevant for local decision making in this manuscript. We present age standardized comparisons in the interactive dashboard.

Figure 3. Care continuum in analytic sample by urban and rural residence for 707 districts, n = 1,691,109

All values are survey weighted percentages (not age standardized). Undiagnosed are among those with hypertension. Untreated and uncontrolled are among those diagnosed with hypertension and among those treated respectively. We report weighted estimates at the district-level that were not age-standardized and relevant for local decision making in this manuscript. We present age standardized comparisons in the interactive dashboard.

Table 1. Characteristics of participants in analytic sample for estimating care cascade of hypertension in India, n = 1,691,109

	Total		Urban		Rural	
	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men
	(n = 889,507)	(n = 801,602)	(n = 218,595)	(n = 198,910)	(n = 670,912)	(n = 602,692)
Age category						
18-39	50.1 (49.9, 50.2)	49.1 (48.9, 49.3)	49.5 (49.1, 49.9)	49.6 (49.3, 50.0)	50.3 (50.2, 50.5)	48.8 (48.6, 49.1)
40-64	39.4 (39.2, 39.5)	38.7 (38.6, 38.9)	40.3 (40.0, 40.5)	39.2 (38.9, 39.5)	38.9 (38.8, 39.1)	38.5 (38.3, 38.7)
65 and above	10.6 (10.5, 10.7)	12.2 (12.1, 12.3)	10.2 (10.0, 10.5)	11.1 (10.9, 11.4)	10.7 (10.6, 10.9)	12.7 (12.5, 12.8)
Schooling						
None	37.1 (36.8, 37.4)	17.4 (17.2, 17.6)	22.3 (21.8, 22.8)	9.5 (9.2, 9.8)	44.0 (43.7, 44.3)	21.2 (21.0, 21.5)
Primary (up to 4 th class)	13.8 (13.7, 14.0)	15.1 (14.9, 15.2)	12.6 (12.3, 12.8)	11.4 (11.1, 11.7)	14.4 (14.3, 14.6)	16.9 (16.7, 17.0)
Secondary (5 th to 10 th class)	36.7 (36.5, 36.9)	49.5 (49.3, 49.7)	43.3 (42.9, 43.7)	50.8 (50.3, 51.3)	33.5 (33.3, 33.8)	48.9 (48.6, 49.2)
Post-secondary (11 th class and above)	12.4 (12.2, 12.6)	18.0 (17.7, 18.3)	21.8 (21.3, 22.3)	28.3 (27.7, 28.9)	8.0 (7.9, 8.2)	13.0 (12.7, 13.4)
Household wealth quintile (by residence)						
Lowest	18.6 (18.3, 18.9)	18.0 (17.6, 18.3)	19.4 (18.6, 20.1)	19.4 (18.6, 20.1)	18.2 (17.9, 18.6)	17.3 (17.0, 17.6)
Low	19.6 (19.4, 19.8)	19.3 (19.1, 19.6)	20.2 (19.7, 20.7)	20.2 (19.7, 20.7)	19.3 (19.1, 19.5)	18.9 (18.6, 19.2)
Medium	20.3 (20.1, 20.5)	20.4 (20.2, 20.6)	20.3 (19.9, 20.8)	20.3 (19.9, 20.8)	20.3 (20.1, 20.5)	20.4 (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 (21.3, 21.9)
Highest	20.8 (20.5, 21.2)	21.1 (20.8, 21.5)	19.9 (19.2, 20.6)	19.7 (19.0, 20.5)	21.3 (20.9, 21.7)	21.8 (21.5, 22.2)
Blood pressure measurement						
Average Systolic BP (mmHg)	120.3 (120.2, 120.4)	124.6 (124.5, 124.7)	120.6 (120.4, 120.8)	125.4 (125.2, 125.6)	120.2 (120.1, 120.3)	124.2 (124.1, 124.3)

Average Diastolic BP (mmHg)	79.7 (79.7, 79.8)	81.7 (81.6, 81.7)	79.9 (79.8, 80.0)	82.1 (82.0, 82.3)	79.6 (79.5, 79.7)	81.5 (81.4, 81.5)
Hypertension						
Self-reported or high blood pressure	27.2 (27.0, 27.4)	28.4 (28.2, 28.7)	29.1 (28.7, 29.5)	31.1 (30.6, 31.5)	26.3 (26.1, 26.5)	27.2 (26.9, 27.4)
Self-reported	12.6 (12.5, 12.8)	9.1 (9.0, 9.3)	15.0 (14.6, 15.3)	11.2 (10.9, 11.5)	11.6 (11.4, 11.8)	8.1 (8.0, 8.3)
Blood Pressure Category						
BP <120/80 mm Hg	40.1 (39.9, 40.3)	27.3 (27.1, 27.6)	38.3 (37.9, 38.7)	24.7 (24.3, 25.1)	41.0 (40.8, 41.2)	28.5 (28.3, 28.8)
120/80 ≤ BP < 140/90 mmHg	39.7 (39.5, 39.9)	48.7 (48.5, 48.9)	40.6 (40.2, 41.0)	49.5 (49.0, 49.9)	39.2 (39.0, 39.4)	48.3 (48.1, 48.5)
140/90 ≤ BP < 160/100 mm Hg	14.4 (14.3, 14.5)	17.7 (17.6, 17.9)	15.4 (15.1, 15.7)	19.2 (18.8, 19.5)	14.0 (13.8, 14.1)	17.0 (16.8, 17.2)
BP ≥ 160/110 mmHg	5.8 (5.7, 5.9)	6.3 (6.2, 6.4)	5.7 (5.6, 5.9)	6.6 (6.4, 6.8)	5.8 (5.7, 5.9)	6.1 (6.0, 6.2)

All values are percentages (95% confidence intervals) accounting for survey design. Estimates are not age-standardized. The household wealth index, as provided by the Demographic and Health Surveys, was computed as the first principal component from survey responses regarding possession of assets and quality of housing, separately for urban and rural areas.

Table 2. Socio-demographic variations in care continuum in India, n = 1,691,109

	Total				Urban				Rural			
	Hyperten sion (%)	Diagnose d ^a (%)	Treated ^b (%)	Controlle d ^c (%)	Hyperten sion (%)	Diagnose d ^a (%)	Treated ^b (%)	Controlle d ^c (%)	Hyperten sion (%)	Diagnose d ^a (%)	Treated ^b (%)	Controlle d ^c (%)
Total	28.2 (28, 28.4)	36.7 (36.3, 37.2)	44.7 (44.1, 45.3)	52.3 (51.4, 53.1)	32.7 (32.3, 33.1)	39.8 (39, 40.7)	56.3 (54.9, 57.6)	50.2 (48.7, 51.7)	25.9 (25.7, 26.2)	35.2 (34.7, 35.8)	38.8 (38, 39.6)	53.7 (52.6, 54.7)
Sex												
Women	25.8 (25.6, 26)	44.4 (43.8, 44.9)	42.2 (41.5, 42.9)	55.3 (54.3, 56.4)	30.1 (29.7, 30.6)	47.7 (46.7, 48.8)	54 (52.5, 55.5)	52.9 (51.1, 54.6)	23.8 (23.6, 24)	42.9 (42.2, 43.6)	36.9 (36, 37.8)	56.9 (55.6, 58.2)
Men	30.6 (30.4, 30.9)	28.3 (27.9, 28.8)	49.3 (48.5, 50.1)	47.2 (45.8, 48.5)	35.2 (34.7, 35.7)	32.1 (31.3, 33)	59.9 (58.3, 61.5)	46.3 (44, 48.6)	28.3 (28, 28.5)	26.2 (25.7, 26.8)	42.8 (41.8, 43.9)	47.8 (46.2, 49.5)
Age category												
18-39	15 (14.9, 15.2)	31.3 (30.6, 32)	23.8 (22.9, 24.7)	60.8 (59.2, 62.4)	15.7 (15.3, 16)	28.4 (27.1, 29.7)	27.2 (25.3, 29)	57.1 (54.1, 60)	14.8 (14.6, 15)	32.4 (31.6, 33.2)	22.7 (21.7, 23.7)	62.9 (61.1, 64.7)
40-64	37.2 (37, 37.5)	39.5 (39, 39.9)	61.8 (61.1, 62.4)	43.7 (43, 44.3)	40.2 (39.7, 40.7)	44.4 (43.6, 45.2)	70 (68.8, 71.2)	44.6 (43.5, 45.6)	35.5 (35.2, 35.7)	36.5 (36, 37)	56 (55.2, 56.8)	42.9 (42.2, 43.7)
65 and above	54.3 (53.8, 54.8)	51.3 (50.7, 51.9)	77.1 (76.5, 77.8)	44.3 (43.5, 45.1)	60.1 (59.1, 61.1)	59.8 (58.6, 60.9)	83.9 (82.8, 85)	45.8 (44.4, 47.2)	50.5 (50, 51)	45.6 (45, 46.3)	71.7 (70.8, 72.5)	43.2 (42.3, 44.1)
Schooling												
None	27.7 (27.5, 28)	36.2 (35.5, 36.9)	41.6 (40.7, 42.6)	47.4 (46.2, 48.5)	32.9 (32.2, 33.6)	38.8 (37.2, 40.5)	52.1 (49.4, 54.7)	44.5 (42, 46.9)	26.6 (26.3, 26.9)	35.5 (34.7, 36.3)	38.8 (37.7, 40)	48.4 (47, 49.8)
Primary (up to 4 th class)	28.8 (28.5, 29.1)	35.9 (35.2, 36.6)	46.8 (45.6, 48)	50.7 (49, 52.4)	34.8 (34, 35.5)	38.2 (36.8, 39.6)	58.9 (56.5, 61.3)	46.3 (43.6, 49)	26.8 (26.4, 27.1)	35 (34.1, 35.8)	42 (40.6, 43.5)	53 (50.9, 55.2)

Secondary (5 th to 10 th class)	28.2 (28, 28.4)	36.9 (36.4, 37.4)	45.8 (45.1, 46.5)	52.8 (51.4, 54.1)	33 (32.5, 33.5)	39.9 (39, 40.8)	57.9 (56.4, 59.4)	49.6 (47.6, 51.7)	25.4 (25.2, 25.7)	35 (34.4, 35.6)	37.9 (36.9, 38.8)	55.1 (53.4, 56.9)
Post- secondary (11 th class and above)	28.3 (27.8, 28.7)	39.3 (38.4, 40.2)	46.9 (45.7, 48.1)	59.4 (56.9, 62)	31.1 (30.4, 31.8)	42 (40.7, 43.2)	55.4 (53.5, 57.3)	57 (53.5, 60.4)	24.5 (23.9, 25.1)	35.6 (34.5, 36.7)	34.6 (33, 36.3)	63.3 (59.6, 66.9)
Household wealth quintile												
Lowest	25.5 (25.2, 25.8)	31.9 (31, 32.7)	37.2 (36, 38.4)	54.5 (52.5, 56.5)	29.1 (28.4, 29.8)	34.8 (33, 36.5)	45.1 (42.5, 47.7)	49.9 (46.7, 53)	23.6 (23.3, 24)	30.2 (29.2, 31.2)	32.2 (30.6, 33.7)	58.2 (55.5, 60.9)
Low	26.8 (26.5, 27.1)	35.7 (35, 36.4)	41.9 (40.9, 42.9)	51.4 (49.6, 53.2)	32 (31.4, 32.7)	38.1 (36.8, 39.4)	55.3 (53.2, 57.5)	47.3 (44.5, 50)	24 (23.7, 24.3)	34.4 (33.5, 35.3)	34 (32.7, 35.3)	55 (52.8, 57.3)
Medium	27.9 (27.6, 28.2)	36.7 (36, 37.4)	44.5 (43.4, 45.5)	52.1 (50.3, 53.9)	33.3 (32.7, 34)	39.6 (38.4, 40.8)	59.6 (57.6, 61.7)	50.3 (47.4, 53.2)	25.2 (24.9, 25.5)	35.2 (34.3, 36.1)	36.5 (35.2, 37.8)	53.5 (51.2, 55.9)
High	29.1 (28.8, 29.4)	37.1 (36.4, 37.9)	47.2 (46.2, 48.3)	52.7 (50.9, 54.4)	34 (33.3, 34.6)	41.6 (40.3, 42.9)	59.3 (57.2, 61.4)	51 (48, 54)	26.7 (26.4, 27.1)	35.1 (34.2, 36)	41.4 (40, 42.7)	53.7 (51.7, 55.8)
Highest	31.2 (30.8, 31.5)	40.6 (39.8, 41.3)	48.1 (47, 49.2)	51.7 (50, 53.4)	34.8 (34.1, 35.5)	44.2 (42.7, 45.7)	58.7 (56.3, 61)	51.6 (48.3, 54.9)	29.5 (29.1, 29.9)	39.1 (38.2, 39.9)	43.8 (42.4, 45.1)	51.7 (49.9, 53.6)


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

a Among those with self-reported hypertension or high blood pressure ($\geq 140/90$ mmHg).

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


c Among those taking medication for hypertension ('Treated')

Figure 1. National-level care continuum in Indian adults by residence, n = 1,691,109




All columns are survey weighted percentages in total population. The values in *italics* are proportions of diagnosed hypertension among patients with hypertension, treated among diagnosed hypertension and controlled among treated hypertension (from **Table 2**). We performed age-standardization to the distribution of the within-sample total population separately for total population, population with hypertension, diagnosed population and treated population. This procedure harmonizes the age distribution within each category (total, hypertension, diagnosed, treated). The values should therefore not be sequentially multiplied to get prevalence within total population. Values in grey ovals are drops from all patients with hypertension (100 - %diagnosed among hypertension, 100 - %treated among hypertension, 100 - %controlled among hypertension).

Figure 2. State-level unmet need in hypertension care continuum, n = 1,691,109



All values are survey weighted percentages (not age standardized). Undiagnosed are among those with hypertension. Untreated and uncontrolled are among those diagnosed with hypertension and among those treated respectively. We report weighted estimates at state-level that were not age-standardized and relevant for local decision making in this manuscript. We present age standardized comparisons in the interactive dashboard.

Figure 3. Care continuum in analytic sample by urban and rural residence for 707 districts, n = 1,691,109



All values are survey weighted percentages (not age standardized). Undiagnosed are among those with hypertension. Untreated and uncontrolled are among those diagnosed with hypertension and among those treated respectively. We report weighted estimates at the district-level that were not age-standardized and relevant for local decision making in this manuscript. We present age standardized comparisons in the interactive dashboard.