medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Health care seeking and financial protection among hypertensive population: a cross-sectional study in rural West Bengal, India

Abstract

Introduction: Elevated blood pressure or hypertension is responsible for around 10 million annual deaths globally, and people residing in low and middle-income countries are disproportionately affected by it. India is no exception, where low rate of treatment seeking for hypertension coupled with wide spread out of pocket payments (OOPs) have been a challenge.

Objectives: This study aimed to explore the pattern and predictors of health care seeking among hypertensive individuals along with financial protection.

Study design and settings: This cross-sectional study was conducted in in Birbhum district of the state of West Bengal, India in 2017-2018.

Study Population: 300 individuals were recruited after random sampling from the list of identified hypertensive subjects in the Birbhum Population Project.

Outcome measure: Healthcare seeking along with two strings of financial protection, out of pocket expenditure, and relative expense were analyzed.

Results: Findings indicated poor health care seeking (47% of hypertensive individuals were not on treatment), preference of private healthcare (80%), and wide-spread OOPs (91%) among study participants. Cost of medication bears major share of expenses with significant transport cost to access public health care facility. Multivariable logistic regression analysis indicated longer duration of disease and private health care seeking was associated with more incident of OOPs. Results from linear regression modeling (generalized linear model) demonstrates presence of co-morbidities was associated with higher relative expenditure. Individual belonged

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

to poorer economic group suffered from high relative expenses for hypertension compared to the richest.

Conclusion: Study suggested poor health care seeking, preference of private health care, suboptimal financial protection of population for hypertension care. Economically poorer section bears more relative burden of health expenditure.

Strengths and Limitations of the study

- Population based cross-sectional study, nested in a well-defined population cohort
- Use of pretested and validated study tool with Computer Assisted Personal Interview
- Self-reported assessment of health care seeking for hypertension and related Out of pocket expenditure
- Statistical analysis with regression modelling to control confounding effects on outcome
- Recall and reporting bias could not be ruled out completely

Key words: Hypertension; Health-care seeking; Out-of-pocket payments

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Authors

Sandipta CHAKRABORTY, MBBS MPH

Fellow, Institute of Public Health Kalyani, Netaji Subhash Sanatorium Second Floor, Kalyani 741251, Nadia, West Bengal, India.

Email: dr.sandipta@gmail.com, Tel.: +91 9830186482

Rajesh Kumar RAI, MA MPhil MPH

Senior Research Scientist, Society for Health and Demographic Surveillance, Suri 731101, Birbhum, West Bengal, India.

Email: rajesh.iips28@gmail.com

Asit Kumar BISWAS, MBBS MAE

Dean, Administration & Student's Affairs, Institute of Public Health Kalyani, Netaji Subhash Sanatorium Second Floor, Kalyani 74125, Nadia, West Bengal, India.

Email: akbiswasprl@gmail.com

Anamitra BARIK, MBBS DipPH

Research Coordinator, Society for Health and Demographic Surveillance, Suri 731101, Birbhum, West Bengal, India.

Senior Medical Officer, Suri District Hospital, and Niramoy TB Sanatorium, Suri 731101, Birbhum, West Bengal, India.

Email: anomitro2010@gmail.com

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Preeti GURUNG, BSc MPH

Epidemiology Activity Manager, Medecins Sans Frontieres /Doctors Without Borders India

Phalam Road, Chiengkonpang, Churachandpur 795158, Manipur, India.

Email: preetigrg04@gmail.com

Word count (excluding title, abstract, keywords, references, tables, and figure): 2939

Number of tables: 3

Number of Table (Online supplement): 2

Number of figures: 0

Corresponding author: Sandipta CHAKRABORTY, MBBS MPH

Fellow, Institute of Public Health Kalyani, Netaji Subhash Sanatorium Second Floor, Kalyani

741251, Nadia, West Bengal, India.[1]

187 Jonepur Road, Kanchrapara, 743145, North 24 PGS, West Bengal India. [2]

Department of Microbiology, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, Rishikesh 249203,

Uttarakhand, India.[3]

Email: dr.sandipta@gmail.com, Tel.: +91 9830186482

[1] Primary address of the study
[2] Permanent address
[3] Present address

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1. Introduction

Globally, non-communicable diseases (NCDs) contribute to a major share of the disease burden, where countries with differential level of development and varied phases of epidemiological transition have witnessed a significant rise in overall morbidity and mortality from NCDs[1-3]. Of all NCDs, cardiovascular diseases bear the major burden, with hypertension (or high blood pressure) as the most significant risk factor contributing to the global burden of disease. Uncontrolled blood pressure attributing nearly 10 million of deaths globally[4,5]. Despite of this grim situation, health system failed to achieve the desire level of response to the emergence of hypertension, especially in low and middle-income countries (LMIC). Service delivery, disease control, financial protection all remain suboptimal[6-10]. Evidence suggested that people seeking health care for NCDs bearing significant and unjustified financial burden, where irregular and absence of treatment seeking also resulted from financial difficulties[10,11], characterized by a huge burden of out-of-pocket payments (OOPs) due to recurrent expenditure to buy required medicine. In addition, overall health care seeking for blood pressure control remain low and private facility predominated[12].

Alike global morbidity and mortality burden, with around 30% prevalence, hypertension remain a major threat to Indian health system[13-15]. As a part of broader programme to mitigate hypertension, in 2000, the federal Indian government introduced the National Programme for Prevention and Control of Cancer, Diabetes, Cardiovascular Disease and Stroke (NPCDCS), and the 2017 National Health Policy targets one-fourth reduction in premature mortality occurring from cardiovascular diseases, cancer, diabetes or chronic respiratory diseases by 2025[16,17]. Studies conducted in India have reported poor hypertension control along with extensive OOP, and most patients opt for private healthcare providers[12,18-20]. Existing studies on

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

hypertension in India focuses primarily on the risk factors of hypertension, and poorly explore the health care utilization, service expenses among the hypertensive individuals, as evidenced from the PubMed/MEDLINE database search. With a necessity of better health system response towards hypertension understanding of the local system capacity is essential. Against this knowledge gap, the present study was performed to understand the pattern of health care seeking, financial protection and its determinants among the hypertensive population in rural West Bengal as a part of a comprehensive study assessing the Capacity of Health Systems to combat the Emergence of Hypertension (COHESION Study).

2. Materials and Methods

2.1.Study setting and sampling

COHESION was a population based and cross-sectional study, conducted in a population cohort of Birbhum Population Project (BIRPOP), a health and demographic surveillance system (HDSS) located in the Birbhum district of the state of West Bengal, India, between November 2017 and February 2018. BIRPOP spreads over four administrative blocks of Birbhum namely Suri I, Sainthia, Mohammad Bazar and Rajnagar. At its inception in 2008, BIRPOP included sample of over 12000 households applying multistage stratified sampling method and has been collecting information on public health and demographic indicators. Till date, BIRPOP had completed three rounds of follow-up surveys (in 2008-09, 2012-13, and 2016-17). COHESION study was based on BIRPOP's 2016-17 survey where blood pressure measurement was taken for 12, 255 individuals aged ≥ 18 years. Those recorded with high blood pressure (Systolic Blood pressure (SBP) ≥140 mm of Hg and/or Diastolic blood pressure (DBP) ≥90 mm of Hg) or reported taking anti-hypertensive medication of any form were included in the hypertensive

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

population[21,22]. More about blood pressure measurement survey at BIRPOP could be retrieved from elsewhere[23]. Of total hypertensive population, 310 individuals were sampled applying simple random sampling. To be specific, with assumed 50% prevalence of hypertension control, 7.5% of error and 99% confidence level, a sample size of 295 was calculated using the software CDC Epi-info^{TM} version 7.2. Considering 5% of non-response final sample size counted to 310 individuals of which 300 interviews were conducted. If prescribed by the physician, terminally ill individuals and mentally challenged person were excluded from the analysis. Data were collected by trained surveyors using Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) technique. A rigorous protocol for survey monitoring was followed to assure the data quality.

2.2.Outcome measurement

To understand the healthcare seeking, participants were asked if they were taking any medication for blood pressure control and have been visiting to any healthcare provider. Intake of medication for hypertension preceding four weeks of survey was considered as patients on regular medication. Visit to any health care provider at least once in three months for treatment of hypertension, noted as regular healthcare seeking for hypertension. Hypertensive patients with regular visit to healthcare provider coupled with intake of regular medication labelled as patients receiving regular healthcare for hypertension.

Two outcomes were analysed – i) Out of Pocket payment (OOP), and ii) relative expenses for hypertension. Considering the varied practice of health care seeking absolute OOP were calculated in terms of expected value considering expenses for consultation, transport and other

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

purposes in the last effort of health care seeking, and cost of medication for a month in case of regular medicinal intake. Individuals were enquired about their approximate family consumption expenditure in a month on different regular components. Upon addition of all component monthly family expenditure and with adjustment for number of family member, per capita expenditure (PCE) was calculated. Expenditure used as the proxy measure of the economic status[24]. Logarithmic transformation of PCE employed, quartile distribution checked followed by categorization into relative economic groups: poor, lower-middle, upper-middle and highest economic class. Relative cost was defined as percentage of PCE incurred for Out of Pocket Payments (OOPs)[18]. That is if an individual seeks hypertensive care in a month, then the relative burden of treatment expenses on family expenditure capacity (expressed as PCE) reflected in relative cost estimate.

2.3.Covariates

Building upon the existing literature on determinants of OOPs, and relative cost from developing countries, a range of potential covariates were considered. The covariates are age (tertile distribution) in completed years (<50, 50-63, >63), education (secondary and above, upper primary, primary, and illiterate or below primary), sex (female, and male), social group (Others, Other Backward Classes, and Scheduled Caste/ Scheduled Tribes), religion (Hindu, and Muslim), civil status (living with partner, and not living with partner), employment status (service/business, laborer, homemaker/retired/student, and unemployed,), economic groups (highest, upper-middle, lower-middle, and poorest), duration of hypertension (<5 years, and ≥5 years, and not sure/don't know), co-morbidity (no, and yes), regularity of treatment of hypertension (on regular consultation and medication, on regular medication only, on regular treatment only, and not on treatment), place of treatment seeking for hypertension (public, and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

non-public), and healthcare provider (public physician, private physician, and AYUSH (*Ayurveda*, Yoga and Naturopathy, *Unani*, *Siddha* and Homoeopathy) doctor / other, and Informal health care practitioner (Quack)[25]. Comorbidity refers to self-reported information about diabetes, dyslipidemia, chronic kidney disease, heart disease, heart attack and stroke. Co-morbidity status was incorporated to explore any possible financial burden related to multiple disease occurrences.

2.4.Statistical approach

To attain the study objective, bivariate and multivariable analyses were deployed. All the numerical (continuous or discrete) variables were summarized for mean, maximum and minimum values. Categorical variables were tabulated for frequency of each category, and categories were clubbed as needed. Categorization for variables were based on percentile distribution upon suitable transformation of the respective values of the basic variable aiming at normalization[26], for example: economic group. List of all variables presented in codebook/ variable registry. A directed acyclic graph (DAG) was developed, based on causal diagram theory[27] and understanding of literature review, which helped building the regression models[28] used to fulfil the study objectives. Binary logistic regression was deployed to understand the predictors of OOPs, whereas linear regression by generalized linear models (GLM) used to assess the relative expenses. With logistic regression the strength of association expressed with odds ratio (OR) and associated 95% confidence interval (CI) value with value “1” as the null point. GLM is preferred for the abundance of zero values in relative expense data and possible non-parametric distribution[29]. With the linear modeling, the association expressed with the estimated coefficient (Coeff) and associated 95% CI value, indicating direction of association with value “zero” as the null point. Data analysis was executed with statistical

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

software, Stata version 12.0, and *p* value was considered to interpret the significance of observed association. Qualitative interpretation based on *p* value (significant/non-significant based on conventional cutoff) was judged cautiously, keeping with the study design and limitations.

2.5.Ethics statement

The ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review board of the teaching institution to which the author submitted the study protocol and got subsequent approval. Informed consent was obtained prior to enrolment of participants. Only consented individuals were interviewed. Selected individuals irrespective of participation were provided with a written guideline on healthy lifestyle, health education related to hypertension and other NCDs.

3. Results

Sample characteristics were presented in **Table 1**. With mean age of nearly 56 years, half of the participants (n=150, 50%) were illiterate or had education of below primary level. Majority were female (n=183, 61%), Hindu (n=225, 75%), and homemaker/retried person/student (n=160, 53%) by profession. Over 35% (n=106) of participants had hypertension for ≥5 years, and 20% (n= 60) had co-morbid condition. Over 47% (n=141) were not on treatment, and of individuals who were receiving treatment over 80% (n=128) sought healthcare from non-public healthcare provider. Over 90% (n=144) of those sought care for blood pressure control incurred some out-of-pocket payments (OOPs). Expected cost of seeking complete care for hypertension in a month was over 306 (> $4.5) and relative cost was 13.5% of the per-capita expenditure (PCE) (**Table 1**). Further analysis (not shown separately) revealed that the median of relative cost was higher for those seeking care in non-public healthcare facility (median: 10.68%) compared to the public healthcare provider (2.1%). The median of OOPs share was the largest for medicinal expenses

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

for seeking private healthcare (47.7%), as compared to transport and other expenses in public healthcare facility (51.3%). Medicinal purchases also carry a substantial amount of OOPs share (Median 37.5 %) in public healthcare facility.

Table 2 represents the adjusted and unadjusted odds ratio (OR) with 95% confidence interval (CI) of the incident of OOPs, estimated from the binary logistic regression. Logistic regression revealed lower odds of having OOP among aged 50-63 years (Unadjusted OR $(uOR)_{50\ to\ 63\ years}$ 0.14 (95% CI: 0.02-1.13) and Adjusted Odds ratio $(aOR)_{50\ to\ 63\ years}$ 0.14 (CI: 0.02-1.38); reference group: < 50 years). Male (aOR 0.08 (CI: 0.01-0.71) reference: female), homemaker/retired ($aOR_{homemaker/retired}$ 0.04 (CI: 0.00-0.79); reference group: service/business); had relatively lower odds of incurring any OOPs. Compared to the richest economic group the poorest had lower odds of having any OOPs, in unadjusted model ($uOR_{poorest}$ 0.22 (CI: 0.04-1.21). Having hypertension for five years or more (uOR 5.14 (CI: 1.39-19.01) and aOR 5.68 (CI: 1.24-25.99), seeking treatment from private establishments (uOR 26.32 (CI: 6.80-101.93) and aOR 34.33 (CI: 4.82-244.68) was positively associated with OOPs.

Linear regression (**Table 3**) demonstrated less proportional expenditure among people with primary or below, level of schooling, compared to highest educational group; (Adjusted Coefficient $(aCoeff)_{completed\ primary}$ -10.65 (CI: -19.78, -1.51) and $aCoeff_{no\ formal\ education/below\ primary}$ -11.60 (CI: -20.88, -2.32).The unemployed individuals had more proportional expenditure compared to those engaged in service/business (Unadjusted Coefficient $(uCoeff)_{unemployed}$ 8.71 (CI: 0.04,17.38) and $aCoeff_{unemployed}$ 9.34 (CI: -1.74,20.43). The poorest, lower-middle and upper-middle class had 11, 8 and 7 units of more proportional expenditure respectively, compared to the highest economic class ($aCoeff_{poorest}$ 11.27 (CI: 3.82,18.71); $aCoeff_{lower\text{-}middle}$

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

7.83 (CI: 0.65,15.00) and $aCoeff_{upper\text{-}middle}$ 7.25 (CI: 0.80,13.70). Presence of co-morbidity, seeking treatment from private establishments, both were found associated with more expenses ($aCoeff_{one\ or\ more\ co\text{-}morbidity}$ 10.28 (CI: 4.96,15.61); reference group: no co-morbidity and $aCoeff_{private\ establishment}$ 11.55 (CI: 5.74,17.37); reference group: government institution). Seeking treatment from private doctors and AYUSH doctors/Others associated more proportional expenses ($aCoeff_{private\ Doctors}$ 18.43 (CI: 12.13, 24.73) and $aCoeff_{AYUSH/\ Other}$ 10.28 (CI: 2.56, 17.99) compared to government doctors. Seeking care from the informal practitioners also associated with more expenses ($aCoeff_{informal\ healthcare\ provider}$ 5.96 (CI: -0.36, 12.28).

4. Discussion

India has witnessed an increasing burden of hypertension, which demands urgent attention from the public health researchers, program and policy makers. To add on to the existing body of literature on prevention of hypertension in India, this study aims to understand characteristics of healthcare seeking and financial protection among hypertensive population in West Bengal, India. The state of West Bengal recorded nearly 25% of total annual deaths and 13% of disability adjusted life years (DALYs) attributed to hypertension[14,30]. Study revealed poor health care seeking, preference of private set-up and wide spread out of pocket payments (OOPs) among participants who sought care for hypertension. Findings form regression adjusted for potential covariates indicate that out of pocket payments (OOPs) is associated with age, sex, occupation, duration of hypertension, and place of treatment seeking for hypertension, whereas education, occupation, economic class, comorbidity, place of treatment and healthcare provider were associated with relative expense.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Population under study was relatively older, female predominated, retired/homemaker by majority. Also had low education level. Prior findings of more hypertension prevalence among elderly, among female specially at older age in low and middle income society, justify the sample characteristics[31,32]. The findings of poor health care seeking for blood pressure control, attributed to low awareness, affordability and availability of health care services (**Supplementary table 1 and 2**). Among those who sought treatment OOPs were extensively reported. This scenario corroborates with previous findings of sub-optimal health system response for blood pressure control care[10-13,33-37]. However better system response observed in some countries of west and far west[38]. Alike previous reportsprivate establishment was major place of treatment seeking. Government institutions played minor role, while sizable number sought treatment from quacks[12,20,37]. Evaluation of existing programs on prevention and control of NCD in public health system might enlighten further on this issue. Prevalence of OOPs, extent of relative cost varied between service utilization from government to non-government sources as well with different service providers. The findings were in line with previous report of the WHO Study on global AGEing and adult health (SAGE) and another study from urban India, although, the later one did not report any significant variation in OOPs across government and private institutions[12,18]. Earlier studies ported medicine purchase as the major share for OOPs[12,18,19], the present observation corroborate with those findings, however transport and other costs imposes a substantial share of OOPs in Government set-up, possibly indicating better accessibility for the Private treatment sources in local level. That could also justify the preference of private sector for health care seeking, instead of having more expenditure associated. Contrasting with previous findings the present study reported lower incident of OOPs among male and those belonging to 50-63 years age group[10,12]. Relative

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

cost (%), OOPs prevalence was proportional with level of education whereas relative cost was inversely related with disadvantageous economic class, these findings pointed towards significant issues of social justice and inequity with complex interrelationship[12,18]. Low education and economic status, jointly the lower socio-economic class; owing to low awareness, financial constraint and poor treatment seeking, which may lead to lower possibility of having OOPs, as treatment seeking was mostly associated with some OOPs. But despite those barriers, individual who sought treatment experienced inequitable financial burden. Same logic may have applied for the unemployed group, having more extent of relative expenses while seeking care but less OOPs incident. Lower OOPs among homemaker/retired individual might be due to more utilization of government health facilities, compared to the service holders/business man who generally had less opportunity to visit government outpatient services due to its fixed schedule. Longer duration of hypertension may cause better treatment adherence as well requires more intense therapy resulting in more possibility of OOPs, similar to those having one or more comorbidities and more relative cost (%)[10].

5. Conclusion:

Limitation of the study should be interpreted in light of the results. Firstly, being a cross-sectional study, temporal ambiguity cannot be ruled out. Secondly, as most of variables under study are information based on recall, some recall errors may be admitted. Thirdly, measurement of exact expenditure and assessing economic status could be debated. To counter the variability of health care seeking, health care expenditure related to hypertension management was calculated as expected cost for having complete care. This may have over represented the relative cost (%) for treatment to some extent. Effects of residual confounding also cannot be

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

ruled out. Within purview of limitations, considering the geographic and demographic uniqueness of the Birbhum population, the findings of this study should be interpreted cautiously for other settings. Despite these limitations, the study contributes tremendously to the existing literature in terms of unique study setting, use of pre-tested tools, and validated study tools. The findings from the study suggested suboptimal financial protection of population for hypertension care. The aspect of awareness generation and evaluation of existing programs on NCDs might be needed for a better financial protection mechanism.

Author statement: SC and AKB conceived and designed the study. SC conceptualized the data collection framework and software. SC conducted the analysis and prepared the first draft. RKR, AB, AKB and PG critically reviewed the manuscript. All authors approved the study.

Data statement: Data of COHESION study and associated codebook can be accessed through 10.5281/zenodo.3911116

Funding: SC received fellowship from the Department of Health and Family Welfare, Government of West Bengal, India during the study period. The fellowship provider had no role in the design/conduct of the study, collection/analysis/interpretation of the data, and preparation/review/approval of the manuscript.

Conflict of interest statement: None of the authors have any competing interest that could influence or bias the study design, settings, conduct, outcome and reporting.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgements: Authors are indebted to the members of Society for Health and Demographic Surveillance, West Bengal, India, for helping execute the study.

References

1 Abubakar I, Tillmann T, Banerjee A. Global, regional, and national age-sex specific all-cause and cause-specific mortality for 240 causes of death, 1990-2013: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2013. *Lancet* 2015;385(9963):117-71.

2 Habib SH, Saha S. Burden of non-communicable disease: global overview. *Diabetes & Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research & Reviews* 2010;4(1):41-47.

3 Murray CJ, Ezzati M, Flaxman AD, et al. GBD 2010: design, definitions, and metrics. *Lancet* 2012;380(9859):2063-6. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61899-6 [published Online First: 2012/12/19]

4 Lim SS, Vos T, Flaxman AD, et al. A comparative risk assessment of burden of disease and injury attributable to 67 risk factors and risk factor clusters in 21 regions, 1990–2010: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2010. *The lancet* 2012;380(9859):2224-60.

5 Hypertension: a silent contributor to the global cardiovascular epidemic. Regional Health Forum; 2013.

6 Alshamsan R, Lee JT, Rana S, et al. Comparative health system performance in six middle-income countries: cross-sectional analysis using World Health Organization study of global ageing and health. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine* 2017;110(9):365-75.

7 Feng XL, Pang M, Beard J. Health system strengthening and hypertension awareness, treatment and control: data from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 2014;92(1):29-41. doi: 10.2471/BLT.13.124495 [published Online First: 2014/01/07]

8 Ibrahim MM, Damasceno A. Hypertension in developing countries. *Lancet* 2012;380(9841):611-9. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60861-7 [published Online First: 2012/08/14]

9 Peck R, Mghamba J, Vanobberghen F, et al. Preparedness of Tanzanian health facilities for outpatient primary care of hypertension and diabetes: a cross-sectional survey. *Lancet Glob Health* 2014;2(5):e285-92. doi: 10.1016/S2214-109X(14)70033-6 [published Online First: 2014/05/13]

10 Wang Q, Fu AZ, Brenner S, et al. Out-of-pocket expenditure on chronic non-communicable diseases in sub-Saharan Africa: the case of rural Malawi. *PLoS One* 2015;10(1):e0116897. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0116897 [published Online First: 2015/01/15]

11 World Health Organization. Impact of out-of-pocket payments for treatment of non-communicable diseases in developing countries: a review of literature. 2011

12 Brinda EM, Kowal P, Attermann J, et al. Health service use, out-of-pocket payments and catastrophic health expenditure among older people in India: The WHO Study on global AGEing and adult health (SAGE). *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2015;69(5):489-94.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

13 Anchala R, Kannuri NK, Pant H, et al. Hypertension in India: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prevalence, awareness, and control of hypertension. *J Hypertens* 2014;32(6):1170-7. doi: 10.1097/HJH.0000000000000146 [published Online First: 2014/03/14]

14 Indian Council of Medical Research; Public Health Foundation of India and Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation. India: Health of Nation's States - The India State- level Disease Burden Initiative. New Delhi, India: ICMR, PHFI and IHME; 2017. 2017

15 Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME). GBD Compare Data Visualization (India), Seattle, WA: IHME, University of Washington 2016 [Available from: https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare/india accessed February 15 2018.

16 Directorate General of Health Services; Ministry of Health & Family Welfare Government of India. National Programme for Prevention and Control of Cancer, Diabetes, Cardiovascular Diseases and Stroke (NPCDCS) 2017 [Available from: http://dghs.gov.in/content/1363_3_NationalProgrammePreventionControl.aspx accessed February 15 2018.

17 Ministry of Health & Family Welfare GoI. National Health Policy, 2017 2017 [Available from: http://164.100.158.44/showfile.php?lid=4275.

18 Bhojani U, Thriveni B, Devadasan R, et al. Out-of-pocket healthcare payments on chronic conditions impoverish urban poor in Bangalore, India. *BMC Public Health* 2012;12(1):990. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-12-990 [published Online First: 2012/11/20]

19 Engelgau MM, Karan A, Mahal A. The Economic impact of Non-communicable Diseases on households in India. *Global Health* 2012;8(1):9. doi: 10.1186/1744-8603-8-9 [published Online First: 2012/04/27]

20 Kanungo S, Mahapatra T, Bhowmik K, et al. Patterns and predictors of undiagnosed and uncontrolled hypertension: observations from a poor-resource setting. *Journal of human hypertension* 2017;31(1):56-65. doi: 10.1038/jhh.2016.30 [published Online First: 2016/05/20]

21 Chobanian AV, Bakris GL, Black HR, et al. The Seventh Report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and Treatment of High Blood Pressure: the JNC 7 report. *JAMA* 2003;289(19):2560-72. doi: 10.1001/jama.289.19.2560 [published Online First: 2003/05/16]

22 Ghosh S, Barik A, Majumder S, et al. Health & Demographic Surveillance System Profile: The Birbhum population project (Birbhum HDSS). *Int J Epidemiol* 2015;44(1):98-107. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyu228 [published Online First: 2014/12/30]

23 Ghosh S, Mukhopadhyay S, Barik A. Sex differences in the risk profile of hypertension: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(7):e010085. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010085 [published Online First: 2016/07/29]

24 Howe LD, Galobardes B, Matijasevich A, et al. Measuring socio-economic position for epidemiological studies in low- and middle-income countries: a methods of measurement in epidemiology paper. *Int J Epidemiol* 2012;41(3):871-86. doi: 10.1093/ije/dys037 [published Online First: 2012/03/23]

25 Das J, Chowdhury A, Hussam R, et al. The impact of training informal health care providers in India: A randomized controlled trial. *Science (New York, NY)* 2016;354(6308) doi: 10.1126/science.aaf7384 [published Online First: 2016/11/16]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

26 Manikandan S. Data transformation. *J Pharmacol Pharmacother* 2010;1(2):126-7. doi: 10.4103/0976-500X.72373 [published Online First: 2011/02/26]

27 Rothman KJ, Greenland S, Lash TL. Modern epidemiology. 3rd ed: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins 2008.

28 Kleinbaum DG, Klein M. Logistic Regression. 3 ed: Springer-Verlag New York 2010.

29 Matsaganis M, Mitrakos T, Tsakloglou P. Modelling health expenditure at the household level in Greece. *The European Journal of Health Economics* 2009;10(3):329-36.

30 Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME). GBD India Compare | Viz Hub 2017 [Available from: https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare/india accessed February 15 2018.

31 Irazola VE, Gutierrez L, Bloomfield GS, et al. Hypertension Prevalence, Awareness, Treatment, and Control in Selected Communities of Nine Low-and Middle Income Countries: Results From the NHLBI/UHG Network of Centers of Excellence for Chronic Diseases. *Global heart* 2016;11(1):47.

32 Sarki AM, Nduka CU, Stranges S, et al. Prevalence of Hypertension in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2015;94(50):e1959. doi: 10.1097/MD.0000000000001959 [published Online First: 2015/12/20]

33 Chow CK, Teo KK, Rangarajan S, et al. Prevalence, awareness, treatment, and control of hypertension in rural and urban communities in high-, middle-, and low-income countries. *JAMA* 2013;310(9):959-68. doi: 10.1001/jama.2013.184182 [published Online First: 2013/09/05]

34 Kaur P, Rao SR, Radhakrishnan E, et al. Prevalence, awareness, treatment, control and risk factors for hypertension in a rural population in South India. *Int J Public Health* 2012;57(1):87-94. doi: 10.1007/s00038-011-0303-3 [published Online First: 2011/09/29]

35 Singh AK, Kalaivani M, Krishnan A, et al. Prevalence, awareness, treatment and control of hypertension among elderly persons in an urban slum of Delhi, India. *Indian Journal of Medical Specialities* 2014;5(1):7-10.

36 Tocci G, Ferrucci A, Pontremoli R, et al. Blood pressure levels and control in Italy: comprehensive analysis of clinical data from 2000–2005 and 2005–2011 hypertension surveys. *Journal of human hypertension* 2015;29(11):696.

37 Baliga SS, Gopakumaran PS, Katti SM, et al. Treatment seeking behavior and health care expenditure incurred for hypertension among elderly in urban slums of Belgaum City. *Community Med* 2013;4(2):227-30.

38 Joffres M, Falaschetti E, Gillespie C, et al. Hypertension prevalence, awareness, treatment and control in national surveys from England, the USA and Canada, and correlation with stroke and ischaemic heart disease mortality: a cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open* 2013;3(8):e003423. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003423 [published Online First: 2013/09/03]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Characteristics of sampled hypertensive population.

Background characteristics	n	mean or percentage (95% CI)
Age	300	55.99 (54.58-57.41)
Total expected cost of seeking complete care for hypertension (□)*	159	306.49 (257.65-355.33)
Relative cost (%) for treatment of hypertension*	159	13.52 (11.13-15.90)
Age group (years)		
< 50	101	33.67(28.29-39.04)
50 - 63	107	35.67(30.22-41.12)
>63	92	30.67(25.42-35.91)
Education		
Completed Secondary or above	48	16.00(11.83-20.17)
Completed Upper-primary	46	15.33(11.23-19.43)
Completed Primary	56	18.67(14.23-23.10)
Illiterate/ Below primary	150	50.00(44.31-55.69)
Sex		
Female	183	61.00(55.45-66.55)
Male	117	39.00(33.45-44.55)
Social group		
Others	140	46.67(40.99-52.34)
OBC	42	14.00(10.05-17.95)
SC/ST	118	39.33(33.77-44.89)
Religion		
Hindu	225	75.25(70.33-80.17)
Muslim	74	24.75(19.83-29.67)
Civil status		
Living with partner	195	65.00(59.57-70.43)
Not living with partner	105	35.00(29.57-40.43)
Occupation		
Service/Business	65	21.67(16.98-26.36)
Labourer	47	15.67(11.53-19.80)
Homemaker/Retired/ Student	160	53.33(47.66-59.01)
Unemployed	28	9.33(6.02-12.64)
Economic Class		

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Richest	75	25.00(20.07-29.93)
Upper Middle	79	26.33(21.32-31.35)
Lower-middle	70	23.33(18.52-28.15)
Poorest	76	25.33(20.38-30.28)
Duration of Hypertension (years)		
<5	141	47.00(41.32-52.68)
≥5	106	35.33(29.89-40.77)
Not sure/don't know	53	17.67(13.32-22.01)
Co-morbidity		
No	240	80.00(75.45-84.55)
Yes	60	20.00(15.45-24.55)
Regularity of treatment for hypertension		
On regular consultation & Medication	71	23.67(18.83-28.50)
On regular medication only	39	13.00(9.17-16.83)
On irregular treatment	49	16.33(12.13-20.54)
Not on treatment	141	47.00(41.32-52.68)
Place of treatment seeking for hypertension*		
Public	31	19.50(13.27-25.72)
Non-public	128	80.50(74.28-86.73)
Health care provider*		
Public physician	30	18.87(12.72-25.02)
Private physician	63	39.62(31.94-47.31)
AYUSH doctor/ Other	19	11.95(6.85-17.05)
Informal healthcare provider	47	29.56(22.39-36.73)
OPP*		
Absent	15	9.43(4.84-14.03)
Present	144	90.57(85.97-95.16)

□: Indian National Rupee; CI: Confidence Interval; OBC: Other backward classes; SC: Scheduled caste; ST: Scheduled tribe; AYUSH: *Ayurveda*, Yoga and Naturopathy, *Unani*, *Siddha* and Homoeopathy; OPP: Out of Pocket Payments

* Sample characteristics is based on 159 participants representing individual sought treatment for hypertension

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Odds of out of pocket payment.

	Unadjusted		**Adjusted**	
	OR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p
Age group (years)				
< 50	1.00		1.00	
50 - 63	0.14 (0.02-1.13)	0.06	0.14 (0.02-1.38)	0.09
>63	0.29 (0.03-2.60)	0.27	0.47 (0.04-5.88)	0.56
Education				
Completed Secondary or above	1.00		1.00	
Completed Upper-primary	0.89 (0.05-15.00)	0.93	0.39 (0.01-12.94)	0.60
Completed Primary	0.33 (0.03-3.41)	0.35	0.20 (0.01-4.22)	0.30
Illiterate/ Below primary	0.24 (0.03-2.00)	0.19	0.09 (0.00-2.49)	0.15
Sex				
Female	1.00		1.00	
Male	0.70 (0.24-2.10)	0.53	0.08 (0.01-0.71)	0.02
Social group				
Others	1.00		1.00	
OBC	2.19 (0.26-18.37)	0.47	3.13 (0.28-34.91)	0.35
SC/ST	1.09 (0.34-3.43)	0.89	3.36 (0.60-18.97)	0.17
Religion				
Hindu	1.00		1.00	
Muslim	1.40 (0.37-5.22)	0.62	2.30 (0.40-13.39)	0.35
Civil status				
Living with partner	1.00		1.00	
Not living with partner	0.82 (0.28-2.37)	0.71	0.95 (0.25-3.66)	0.94
Occupation				
Service/Business	1.00		1.00	
Labourer	0.16 (0.01-1.91)	0.15	0.08 (0.00-1.65)	0.10
Homemaker/Retired/ Student	0.27 (0.03-2.18)	0.22	0.04 (0.00-0.79)	0.03
Unemployed	0.25 (0.02-2.97)	0.27	0.17 (0.01-3.65)	0.26
Economic Class				
Richest	1.00		1.00	
Upper Middle	0.27 (0.05-1.42)	0.12	0.47 (0.07-3.04)	0.42
Lower-middle	0.57 (0.08-4.28)	0.59	1.14 (0.12-11.18)	0.91
Poorest	0.22 (0.04-1.21)	0.08	0.40 (0.06-2.91)	0.37
Co-morbidity				
No	1.00		1.00	
Yes	0.74 (0.24-2.31)	0.61	0.54 (0.13-2.24)	0.39

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Duration of Hypertension (years)				
<5	1.00		1.00	
≥5	5.14 (1.39-19.01)	0.01	5.68 (1.24-25.99)	0.03
Place of treatment seeking for hypertension				
Public	1.00		1.00	
Non-public	26.32 (6.80-101.93)	<0.01	34.33(4.82-244.68)	<0.01

CI: Confidence Interval; OBC: Other backward classes; SC: Scheduled caste; ST: Scheduled tribe; OR: Odds ratio

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Associates of relative expenses.

	Unadjusted		**Adjusted**	
	β (95% CI)	p	β (95% CI)	p
Age group (years)				
< 50	0.00		0.00	
50 - 63	-2.39 (-8.55,3.77)	0.45	-3.22 (-9.84,3.40)	0.34
>63	0.28 (-5.78,6.33)	0.93	-1.66 (-8.51,5.19)	0.64
Education				
Completed Secondary or above	0.00		0.00	
Completed Upper-primary	-2.58 (-10.82,5.67)	0.54	-5.17 (-14.14,3.80)	0.26
Completed Primary	-3.15 (-11.02,4.73)	0.43	-10.65 (-19.78,-1.51)	0.02
Illiterate/ Below primary	-1.06 (-7.69,5.56)	0.75	-11.60 (-20.88,-2.32)	0.01
Sex				
Female	0.00		0.00	
Male	-0.94 (-5.99,4.10)	0.71	-3.39 (-10.90,4.13)	0.38
Social group				
Others	0.00		0.00	
OBC	0.43 (-6.95,7.82)	0.91	-2.02 (-9.58,5.55)	0.60
SC/ST	3.44 (-1.78,8.66)	0.20	5.36 (-1.27,11.98)	0.11
Religion				
Hindu	0.00		0.00	
Muslim	-0.07 (-5.54,5.40)	0.98	3.23 (-3.37,9.82)	0.34
Civil status				
Living with partner	0.00		0.00	
Not living with partner	1.11(-3.68,5.90)	0.65	1.85 (-3.62,7.32)	0.51
Occupation				
Service/Business	0.00		0.00	
Labourer	5.57 (-4.40,15.54)	0.27	5.88 (-5.04,16.79)	0.29
Homemaker/Retired/ Student	1.59 (-4.38,7.56)	0.60	0.85 (-7.88,9.59)	0.85
Unemployed	8.71 (0.04,17.38)	0.05	9.34 (-1.74,20.43)	0.09
Economic Class				
Richest	0.00		0.00	
Upper Middle	5.54 (-0.38,11.46)	0.07	7.25 (0.80,13.70)	0.03
Lower-middle	5.73 (-0.97,12.43)	0.09	7.83 (0.65,15.00)	0.03
Poorest	10.39 (3.82,16.95)	0.00	11.27 (3.82,18.71)	0.00
Co-morbidity				
No	0.00		0.00	
Yes	7.74 (2.59,12.89)	0.00	10.28 (4.96,15.61)	<0.01
Duration of Hypertension (years)				
<5	0.00		0.00	
≥5	1.64 (-3.10,6.37)	0.50	2.17 (-2.62,6.97)	0.37
Place of treatment seeking for hypertension				

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Public	0.00		0.00	
Non-public	9.35(3.56,15.14)	0.00	11.55 (5.74,17.37)	<0.01
Health care provider				
Public physician	0.00		0.00	
Private physician	14.38 (8.24,20.51)	<0.01	18.43 (12.13,24.73)	<0.01
AYUSH doctor/ Other	5.39 (-2.72,13.50)	0.19	10.28 (2.56,17.99)	0.01
Informal healthcare provider	3.40 (-3.07,9.86)	0.30	5.96 (-0.36,12.28)	0.06

CI: Confidence Interval; OBC: Other backward classes; SC: Scheduled caste; ST: Scheduled tribe; AYUSH: *Ayurveda*, Yoga and Naturopathy, *Unani*, *Siddha* and Homoeopathy; OPP: Out of Pocket Payments; β: Coefficient

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.06.27.20141549; this version posted June 29, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Supplementary table 1: Causes of seeking irregular treatment for hypertension

Factor	Individual reported	Percentage (95% CI)
Affordability/ Economic factor	39	44.32(33.73-54.90)
Availability/ Health system factor	37	42.05(31.53-52.56)
Awareness factor	56	63.64(53.39-73.89)

Supplementary table 2: Causes of not seeking treatment for hypertension

Factor	Individual reported	Percentage (95% CI)
Affordability/ Economic factor	21	14.89(8.94-20.84)
Availability/ Health system factor	24	17.02(10.74-23.30)
Awareness factor	120	85.11(79.16-91.06)