

1 **Health care seeking behaviour and financial protection of patients with hypertension: a**  
2 **cross-sectional study in rural West Bengal, India**

3  
4 **Sandipta CHAKRABORTY, MBBS MPH**

5 *MPH Graduate*, Institute of Public Health Kalyani, Kalyani, Nadia, West Bengal 741251, India.

6 *MD Candidate*, Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, All India Institute of Hygiene  
7 and Public Health, West Bengal 700073, India.

8 Email: [dr.sandipta@gmail.com](mailto:dr.sandipta@gmail.com)

9  
10 **Rajesh Kumar RAI, MPhil MPH**

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

13 *Lown Scholar*, Department of Global Health and Population, Harvard T H Chan School of Public  
14 Health, Boston, Massachusetts 02115, United States of America.

15 *Doctoral Candidate*, Department of Economics, University of Göttingen, Göttingen 37073,  
16 Germany.

17 Email: [rajesh.iips28@gmail.com](mailto:rajesh.iips28@gmail.com)

18  
19 **Asit Kumar BISWAS, MBBS MAE**

20 *Dean*, Institute of Public Health Kalyani, Kalyani, Nadia, West Bengal 741251, India.

21 Email: [akbiswasprl@gmail.com](mailto:akbiswasprl@gmail.com)

22

23

24 **Anamitra BARIK**, MBBS DipPH

25 *Field Director*, Society for Health and Demographic Surveillance, Suri, West Bengal 731101,  
26 India.

27 *Senior Medical Officer*, Chest Clinic- Suri District Hospital, and Niramoy TB Sanatorium, Suri,  
28 West Bengal 731101, India.

29 Email: [anomitro2010@gmail.com](mailto:anomitro2010@gmail.com)

30

31 **Preeti GURUNG**, BSc MPH

32 *Epidemiology Activity Manager*, Medecins Sans Frontieres, Chiengkongpang, Churachandpur,  
33 Manipur 795158, India.

34 Email: [preetigr04@gmail.com](mailto:preetigr04@gmail.com)

35

36 **Devarsetty PRAVEEN**, MBBS MD PhD

37 *Program Head*, Primary Health Care Research, The George Institute for Global Health,  
38 Hyderabad, Telangana 500082, India.

39 *Senior Lecturer*, Faculty of Medicine, University of New South Wales, Kensington NSW 2052,  
40 Australia.

41 *Conjoint Professor*, Prasanna School of Public Health, Manipal Academy of Higher Education,  
42 India

43 Email: [dpraveen@georgeinstitute.org.in](mailto:dpraveen@georgeinstitute.org.in)

44

45

46 **Contributors:** SC and AKB conceived and designed the study. SC conceptualized the data  
47 collection framework, analysed the data, and prepared the first draft of the manuscript. RKR,  
48 AKB, AB, PG, PD critically reviewed the manuscript, and provided feedback. All authors  
49 approved content presented in the study.

50

## 51 **Abbreviations**

52 aOR: adjusted odds ratio

53 BIRPOP: Birbhum Population Project

54 CI: confidence interval

55 NCDs: non-communicable diseases

56 OOPs: out of pocket payments

57 OR: odds ratio

58 uOR: unadjusted odds ratio

59

60

## 61 **Address for correspondence**

62 Sandipta Chakraborty

63 Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, All India Institute of Hygiene and Public Health,  
64 West Bengal 700073, India.

65 Email: [dr.sandipta@gmail.com](mailto:dr.sandipta@gmail.com)

66

67

68

69 **Abstract**

70 **Background:** Elevated blood pressure or hypertension is responsible for around 10 million  
71 annual deaths globally, and people residing in low and middle-income countries are  
72 disproportionately affected by it. India is no exception, where low rate of treatment seeking for  
73 hypertension coupled with widespread out-of-pocket payments (OOPs) have been a challenge.  
74 This study assessed the pattern of health care seeking and financial protection along with the  
75 associated factors among hypertensive individuals in a rural district of West Bengal, India.

76

77 **Method and findings:** A cross-sectional study was conducted in Birbhum district of the state of  
78 West Bengal, India during 2017-2018, where 300 individuals with hypertension were recruited  
79 randomly from a pre-defined list of individuals with hypertension in the district. Healthcare  
80 seeking along with two instance of financial protection –OOPs and relative expense, were  
81 analysed. Findings indicated that, of all hypertensives, 47% were not on treatment, 80%  
82 preferred private healthcare, and 91% of them had wide-spread OOPs. Cost of medication being  
83 a major share of expenses followed by significant transport cost to access public health care  
84 facility. Multivariable logistic regression analysis indicated longer duration of disease and  
85 private health care seeking were associated with more incident of OOPs. Results from linear  
86 regression modelling (generalized linear model) demonstrated association of co-morbidities with  
87 higher relative expenditure. Individuals belonging to poor economic group suffered from a high  
88 relative expense, compared to the richest.

89 **Conclusion:** This study suggested that individuals with hypertension had poor health care  
90 seeking, preferred private health care and had suboptimal financial protection. Hypertensives

91 from economically poorer section had higher burden of health expenditure for treatment of  
92 hypertension, which indicated gaps in equitable health care for the control of hypertension.

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

114 **Introduction**

115 Globally, non-communicable diseases (NCDs) contribute to a major share of the disease burden,  
116 where countries with differential level of development and varied phases of epidemiological  
117 transition have witnessed a significant rise in overall morbidity and mortality from NCDs [1-3].  
118 Among all NCDs, cardiovascular diseases (ischaemic heart disease and stroke) are listed as the  
119 major cause of death worldwide, with hypertension (commonly defined as a systolic blood  
120 pressure  $\geq 140$  or diastolic blood pressure  $\geq 90$ ) being the most significant risk factor  
121 causing significant amount of premature deaths globally [4, 5]. Despite the high burden of  
122 hypertension, health system responses like health service delivery, health information and health  
123 financing for hypertension is suboptimal, especially in low and middle-income countries  
124 (LMICs) [6-10]. Evidence suggests that people seeking health care for NCDs bear significant  
125 and unjustified financial burden characterised by huge out-of-pocket payments (OOPs), often  
126 leading to irregular and absence of treatment seeking due to financial difficulties [10, 11]. In  
127 addition, studies show that overall health care seeking for blood pressure management is low and  
128 shared among public and private facilities [12, 13].

129 In India, between one-quarter to one-third of adults, aged 18 years or more, have hypertension.  
130 This remains a major threat to Indian healthcare system [14-16]. In the year 2010 the federal  
131 Indian government introduced the National Programme for Prevention and Control of Cancer,  
132 Diabetes, Cardiovascular Diseases and Stroke (NPCDCS) with hypertension and diabetes as the  
133 main focus areas. In addition, in 2017, the government launched the National Health Policy  
134 targeting 25% reduction in premature mortality occurring from cardiovascular diseases, cancer,  
135 diabetes or chronic respiratory diseases by 2025 [17, 18]. The main focus for research on  
136 hypertension in India is primarily on the risk factors of hypertension while few actually explored

137 the health care utilization and service expenses among hypertensive individuals, as evidenced  
138 from the PubMed/MEDLINE database search [19-22]. From the perspective of health system  
139 strengthening and population health management, understanding the local preferences and health  
140 system capacity is essential. In this paper, we present the pattern of health care seeking, financial  
141 protection and its predictors among patients with hypertension in rural West Bengal. This study  
142 was conducted as a part of a broad study assessing the Capacity of Health Systems to combat the  
143 Emergence of Hypertension (COHESION study). In a comprehensive way COHESION study  
144 analysed blood pressure control, health care seeking, financial protection and health system  
145 responsiveness among adult hypertensive population (Unpublished data) .

146

## 147 **Materials and Methods**

### 148 **Study setting, design and sampling**

149 COHESION study is a population-based cross-sectional study, conducted in a population cohort  
150 of Birbhum Population Project (BIRPOP), a health and demographic surveillance system  
151 (HDSS) functioning under the ambit of Society for Health and Demographic Surveillance  
152 ([www.shds.co.in](http://www.shds.co.in)), located in the Birbhum district of the state of West Bengal, India, between  
153 November 2017 and February 2018. BIRPOP spreads over four administrative blocks (namely  
154 Suri I, Sainthia, Mohammad Bazar and Rajnagar) out of a total of 19 blocks in district Birbhum.  
155 At its inception in 2008, BIRPOP included a sample of over 12,000 households selected by  
156 multistage stratified sampling method and has been periodically collecting information on  
157 indicators related to public health and demography. Till date, BIRPOP had completed three  
158 rounds of follow-up surveys, in 2008-09, 2012-13, and 2016-17 [23]. COHESION study was  
159 based on BIRPOP's 2016-17 survey where blood pressure was measured for 12,255 individuals

160 aged  $\geq 18$  years. Those recorded with high blood pressure (systolic blood pressure (SBP)  $\geq 140$   
161 mm of Hg and/or diastolic blood pressure (DBP)  $\geq 90$  mm of Hg) or reported taking anti-  
162 hypertensive medication of any form were included in the hypertensive cohort [23, 24]. Details  
163 about the blood pressure measurement survey at BIRPOP has previously been published  
164 elsewhere [25]. Of the hypertensive cohort, 310 individuals were randomly selected for this  
165 study. Sample size was calculated using CDC Epi-info<sup>TM</sup> version 7.2, assuming 50% prevalence  
166 for hypertension control in all hypertensives, 7.5% of error and confidence interval of 99%. With  
167 the addition of 5% non-response rate, final sample size was 310 individuals of which 300  
168 interviews were conducted. Terminally ill and mentally challenged individuals, diagnosed by a  
169 physician, were not considered for participation in the study. Data were collected by trained  
170 surveyors using Computer Assisted Personal Interview (CAPI) technique [26]. A rigorous  
171 protocol for survey monitoring was followed to assure the quality of the data being collected.

172

### 173 **Outcome measurement**

174 To understand the health care seeking behaviour, patients were asked if they were taking any  
175 medication for blood pressure control and have been visiting to any healthcare provider. Patients  
176 with a history of intake of daily medication for hypertension in the preceding four weeks were  
177 considered to be on ‘regular medication’. Those with a history of visit to any health care provider  
178 at least once in the last six months for treatment or follow-up care of hypertension, were noted to  
179 have ‘regular medical consultation’. Patients who had both of the above (regular medication and  
180 regular visit to physician) were labelled as “having regular treatment for hypertension”. Those  
181 reported only regular medication, identified as having “regular medication only”. Patients,  
182 currently not on any medication or consultation for last one year or never sought any treatment

183 for hypertension, were labelled as “not on treatment”. The rest were categorised as ‘patients on  
184 irregular treatment”

185 Two outcomes in relation to cost of treatment, were analysed in this study – i) Out-of-pocket  
186 payments (OOPs), and ii) relative cost for hypertension care. Considering the varied practice of  
187 health care seeking behaviour, total expected OOPs were calculated considering multiple  
188 expenses. Expenses paid for medical consultation, transport and others like food, lodging etc.  
189 during the consultation in the last medical visit, and cost of blood pressure lowering medication  
190 if taken for a month, all together added to obtain total expected cost. Monthly per capita  
191 expenditure (MPCE) was calculated as monthly total consumer expenditure in a household over  
192 all items of consumption divided by the household size (total number of persons in the  
193 household) and was used as the proxy measure of the economic status [27]. Based on the MPCE,  
194 the participants were divided into four quartile classes and categorised into relative economic  
195 groups: poorest, lower-middle, upper-middle and richest class. Relative cost of seeking  
196 healthcare for hypertension for an individual was defined as percentage of MPCE incurred for  
197 OOPs [19].

198

### 199 **Covariates**

200 Based on existing literature from developing countries, a range of potential covariates were  
201 considered.

202 Social demographic characteristics: This included age in completed years (<50, 50-63, >63),  
203 gender (female and male), educational attainment (secondary and above, upper primary, primary,  
204 and illiterate/below primary), social group (other backward classes, scheduled caste/ scheduled  
205 tribes and others), religion (Hinduism and Islam), civil status (living with partner, and not living

206 with partner), employment status (service/business, labourer, homemaker/retired/student, and  
207 unemployed), and economic status based on MPCE quartile distribution (high, upper-middle,  
208 lower-middle, and poor)

209 Hypertension related variables: This included duration of hypertension (<5 years,  $\geq 5$  years, and  
210 not sure/don't know), co-morbidity (no and yes), regularity of treatment of hypertension (as  
211 elaborated before), type of health facility accessed (public and non-public), and healthcare  
212 provider like, public physician, private physician, AYUSH (*Ayurveda*, Yoga and Naturopathy,  
213 *Unani*, *Siddha* and Homoeopathy) doctor, and informal health care practitioner (Quack) [28].  
214 Comorbidity refers to self-report about any of the diseases like diabetes, dyslipidaemia, chronic  
215 kidney disease or cardiovascular disease in addition to hypertension.

216

## 217 **Statistical analysis**

218 Bivariate and multivariable analyses were performed to attain the study objectives. Means and  
219 proportions were presented with 95% confidence intervals. For the purpose of regression  
220 modelling, a directed acyclic graph (DAG) was developed, based on causal diagram theory [29]  
221 and review of existing literature. Binary logistic regression was deployed to understand the  
222 predictors of OOPs, whereas linear regression by generalized linear models (GLM) was used to  
223 assess the relative costs. Measures of association were presented as odds ratio (OR) with 95%  
224 confidence intervals (CIs) with value "1" as the null point. GLM is preferred because of  
225 abundance of zero values in relative cost data and a possible non-parametric distribution [30].  
226 With the linear modelling, the association is expressed with the estimated coefficient (Coeff) and  
227 associated 95% CIs, indicating direction of association with value "zero" as the null point. Data  
228 analysis were carried out using a statistical package - Stata, version 12.0 and *p* value was

229 considered to interpret the significance of observed association. Qualitative interpretation based  
230 on *p* value (significant/non-significant based on conventional cut off) was judged cautiously,  
231 keeping with the study design and limitations.

232

### 233 **Ethics statement**

234 Ethical approval was granted by institutional review board of Society for health and  
235 Demographic Surveillance. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants prior to  
236 enrolment in the study. Irrespective of their participation status, all, who were approached to  
237 participate in the study were provided with a leaflet on healthy lifestyle, health education related  
238 to hypertension and other NCDs written in local language.

239

### 240 **Results**

241 In total, 310 were approached to participate in this study, and 300 finally participated. **Table 1**  
242 outlines the descriptive characteristics of all the participants. The mean age of the participants  
243 was  $55.99 \pm 12.46$  years. More than half of the participants were female and were illiterate or  
244 had not completed their primary education. Majority of the participants were Hindus and  
245 homemaker/retired/students by profession. Over 35% (n=106) of participants had hypertension  
246 for  $\geq 5$  years, and 20% (n= 60) had a co-morbid condition. Over 47% (n=141) of the participants  
247 were not on treatment, and among individuals receiving treatment, over 80% (n=128) sought  
248 healthcare from non-public healthcare provider. Over 90% (n=144) of those who sought care for  
249 blood pressure treatment incurred some OOPs. Expected cost for seeking complete care for  
250 hypertension per month was over ₹ 306 ( $> \$4.5$ ) and relative cost per month was 13.5% of the  
251 MPCE (**Table 1**). Further analysis (not shown separately) revealed that the median of relative

252 cost was higher for those seeking care in non-public healthcare facility (median: 10.7%)  
253 compared to the public healthcare provider (2.1%). The median of OOPs was the largest for  
254 purchase of medicines (47.7%) in those seeking private healthcare, while it was transport and  
255 other costs in those seeking care (51.3%) followed by purchase of medicines (37.5%) from a  
256 public healthcare facility. (**Figure 1**).

257 Fifteen individuals were reported incurring no OOPs for the usual treatment for hypertension.  
258 Majority (n=9) were female, aged between 50 to 63 years (n=9), Hindu (n=12), general caste  
259 (n=9) with below primary or no formal education (n=10), home maker/ retired (n=10) and  
260 belongs to upper-middle class (n=6) of the economic strata of the study population.

261

262 **Table 2** shows lower odds of having OOPs among participants aged 50-63 years and 63 years  
263 and above compared to participants below 50 years. Males when compared to females, and  
264 homemaker/retired /student, labourer and unemployed when compared to those in  
265 service/business had relatively lower odds of incurring any OOPs. Compared to the richest  
266 economic class the poorest had lower odds of having any OOPs, in unadjusted model (uOR<sub>poorest</sub>  
267 0.22 (CI: 0.04-1.21)). Having hypertension for five years or more (uOR 5.14 (CI: 1.39-19.01)  
268 and aOR 5.68 (CI: 1.24-25.99)) and seeking treatment from private establishments (uOR 26.32  
269 (CI: 6.80-101.93) and aOR 34.33 (CI: 4.82-244.68)) were positively associated with OOPs.

270

271 Linear regression (**Table 3**) demonstrated lower relative expenses among people with primary or  
272 below level of schooling, compared to highest educational group; (Adjusted Coefficient (aCoeff)  
273 completed primary -10.65 (CI: -19.78, -1.51) and aCoeff<sub>no formal education/below primary</sub> -11.60 (CI: -20.88, -  
274 2.32)). The unemployed individuals had more relative expenses compared to those engaged in

275 service/business (Unadjusted Coefficient ( $uCoeff$ )<sub>unemployed</sub> 8.71 (CI: 0.04,17.38) and  
276  $aCoeff$ <sub>unemployed</sub> 9.34 (CI: -1.74,20.43)). The poorest, lower-middle and upper-middle class had  
277 11, 8 and 7 units of more relative expenses respectively, compared to the richest economic class  
278 ( $aCoeff$ <sub>poorest</sub> 11.27 (CI: 3.82,18.71);  $aCoeff$ <sub>lower-middle</sub> 7.83 (CI: 0.65,15.00) and  $aCoeff$ <sub>upper-middle</sub>  
279 7.25 (CI: 0.80,13.70)) (**Figure 2**). Presence of co-morbidity and seeking treatment from private  
280 establishments were both associated with more relative expenses ( $aCoeff$ <sub>one or more co-morbidity</sub> 10.28  
281 (CI: 4.96,15.61); reference group: no co-morbidity and  $aCoeff$ <sub>private establishment</sub> 11.55 (CI:  
282 5.74,17.37); reference group: government institution). Similarly, seeking treatment from private  
283 doctors, informal practitioners and AYUSH doctors/others were associated with more relative  
284 expenses ( $aCoeff$ <sub>private Doctors</sub> 18.43 (CI: 12.13, 24.73),  $aCoeff$ <sub>informal healthcare provider</sub> 5.96 (CI: -0.36,  
285 12.28),  $aCoeff$ <sub>AYUSH/ Other</sub> 10.28 (CI: 2.56, 17.99)) when compared to those seeking treatment  
286 from government doctors.

287

## 288 **Discussion**

289 India has witnessed an increasing burden of hypertension, which demands urgent attention from  
290 the public health researchers, program and policy makers. To add on to the existing body of  
291 literature on prevention of hypertension in India, this study aims to understand characteristics of  
292 healthcare seeking and financial protection among hypertensive population in West Bengal,  
293 India. The state of West Bengal recorded nearly 25% of total annual deaths and 13% of disability  
294 adjusted life years (DALYs) attributed to hypertension [15, 31]. This study revealed poor health  
295 care seeking behaviour, preference of private health facilities and high OOPs among patients  
296 who sought care for hypertension. Regression analysis adjusted for potential covariates indicate  
297 that OOPs are associated with age, sex, occupation, duration of hypertension, and place of

298 treatment seeking for hypertension, while relative expense is associated with education,  
299 occupation, economic class, comorbidity, place of treatment and healthcare provider.

300

301 The population under study were relatively older, female predominated, had low education level,  
302 and majority were retired/homemaker. This distribution was similar to other studies where  
303 hypertension prevalence was more among elderly, females, and in poor socio-economic strata  
304 [32, 33]. The findings of poor health care seeking for blood pressure control, attributed to low  
305 awareness, affordability and availability of health care services (unpublished data). Among the  
306 hypertensives seeking treatment, OOPs were extensively reported. This scenario corroborates  
307 with previous findings of sub-optimal health system response for blood pressure control care [10,  
308 11, 13, 14, 20, 34-37]. However better system response was associated with substantial  
309 improvement in indicators like awareness, treatment and control of hypertension in a few  
310 developed countries [38]. Similar to other studies, private establishments were major places for  
311 seeking treatment and Government institutions played a minor role for management of  
312 hypertension. Similarly, majority sought consultation from private physicians and informal  
313 healthcare providers [13, 20, 22]. The prevalence of OOPs and extent of relative cost varied  
314 between service utilization from government to non-government sources as well as with different  
315 service providers. The findings related to OOPs in this study are in line with previous reports  
316 including a report of the WHO Study on global AGEing and adult health (SAGE) but the  
317 significant variation observed in OOPs across government and private institutions in this study is  
318 found to be novel [19, 20]. Earlier studies found medicine purchase as the major share for OOPs  
319 [19-21] which corroborates with the findings from this study, however transport and other costs  
320 are also found to impose a substantial share of OOPs in Government set-up, possibly indicating

321 better accessibility for the private treatment sources in local level compared to Government  
322 sources. This could also justify the increased usage of private facilities for hypertension  
323 management. Contrasting with findings from other studies, the present study reported lower  
324 incident of OOPs among male and those belonging to 50 years or above age group[10, 20].  
325 Though relative cost (%) and high OOPs was proportional with level of education, the relative  
326 cost was found to be inversely related with disadvantageous economic class. These findings  
327 point towards potential issues of social justice and inequity which share a complex  
328 interrelationship [19, 20]. This might be related to poor treatment seeking behaviour among  
329 patients with low education and economic status (jointly the lower socio-economic class) owing  
330 to low awareness, financial constraint and limited access to healthcare, which may have led to  
331 lower possibility of having OOPs. But despite these barriers, patients who sought treatment  
332 experienced inequitable financial burden. Similar explanation may be applied for the  
333 unemployed group, having more extent of relative expenses while seeking care but less OOPs.  
334 Lower OOPs among homemaker/retired individuals may be due to more utilization of  
335 government health facilities, compared to the service holders/businessmen who generally have  
336 less opportunity to visit government outpatient services due to its fixed schedule. Longer  
337 duration of hypertension and existence of comorbid conditions require more intense therapy  
338 resulting in more possibility of OOPs and more relative cost (%) [10].

339

340 Limitation of the study should be interpreted in light of the results. Firstly, being a cross-  
341 sectional study, temporal ambiguity cannot be ruled out. Secondly, as most of variables under  
342 study are information based on recall, some chances for recall errors may be present. Thirdly,  
343 measurement of exact expenditure and assessing economic status could be debated. To counter

344 the variability of health care seeking, health care expenditure related to hypertension  
345 management was calculated as expected cost for having complete care. This may have over-  
346 represented the relative cost (%) for treatment to some extent. Effects of residual confounding  
347 also cannot be ruled out. Within purview of limitations, considering the geographic and  
348 demographic uniqueness of the Birbhum population, the findings of this study should be  
349 interpreted cautiously for other settings. Despite these limitations, the study contributes  
350 tremendously to the existing literature in terms of unique study setting and use of pre-tested and  
351 validated study tools. The findings from the study suggest suboptimal financial protection of  
352 population for hypertension care. The aspect of awareness generation and evaluation of existing  
353 programs on NCDs might be needed for a better financial protection mechanism to people with  
354 hypertension.

355

#### 356 **Data statement**

357 Data of COHESION study and associated codebook can be accessed through  
358 [10.5281/zenodo.3911116](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3911116).

359

#### 360 **Funding**

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

364

#### 365 **Conflict of interest statement**

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

368

### 369 **Acknowledgements**

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

372

### 373 **References**

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

377 2. Habib SH, Saha S. Burden of non-communicable disease: global overview. *Diabetes &*  
378 *Metabolic Syndrome: Clinical Research & Reviews*. 2010;4(1):41-7.

379 3. Murray CJ, Ezzati M, Flaxman AD, Lim S, Lozano R, Michaud C, et al. GBD 2010:  
380 design, definitions, and metrics. *Lancet*. 2012;380(9859):2063-6.

381 4. World Health Organization. The top 10 causes of death 2020 [updated 9 December 2020;  
382 cited 2020, 20th December]. [Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/the-top-10-causes-of-death)  
383 [sheets/detail/the-top-10-causes-of-death](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/the-top-10-causes-of-death)].

- 384 5. World Health Organization. Hypertension 2019 [updated 13 September 2019; cited 2020,  
385 20th December]. [Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/hypertension)  
386 [sheets/detail/hypertension](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/hypertension)].
- 387 6. Alshamsan R, Lee JT, Rana S, Areabi H, Millett C. Comparative health system  
388 performance in six middle-income countries: cross-sectional analysis using World Health  
389 Organization study of global ageing and health. *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*.  
390 2017;110(9):365-75.
- 391 7. Feng XL, Pang M, Beard J. Health system strengthening and hypertension awareness,  
392 treatment and control: data from the China Health and Retirement Longitudinal Study. *Bull*  
393 *World Health Organ*. 2014;92(1):29-41.
- 394 8. Ibrahim MM, Damasceno A. Hypertension in developing countries. *Lancet*.  
395 2012;380(9841):611-9.
- 396 9. Peck R, Mghamba J, Vanobberghen F, Kavishe B, Rugarabamu V, Smeeth L, et al.  
397 Preparedness of Tanzanian health facilities for outpatient primary care of hypertension and  
398 diabetes: a cross-sectional survey. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2014;2(5):e285-92.
- 399 10. Wang Q, Fu AZ, Brenner S, Kalmus O, Banda HT, De Allegri M. Out-of-pocket  
400 expenditure on chronic non-communicable diseases in sub-Saharan Africa: the case of rural  
401 Malawi. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(1):e0116897.

- 402 11. World Health Organization. Impact of out-of-pocket payments for treatment of non-  
403 communicable diseases in developing countries: a review of literature. 2011.
- 404 12. Bovet P, Gervasoni JP, Mkamba M, Balampama M, Lengeler C, Paccaud F. Low  
405 utilization of health care services following screening for hypertension in Dar es Salaam  
406 (Tanzania): a prospective population-based study. *BMC Public Health*. 2008;8(1):407.
- 407 13. Baliga SS, Gopakumaran PS, Katti SM, Mallapur MD. Treatment seeking behavior and  
408 health care expenditure incurred for hypertension among elderly in urban slums of Belgaum  
409 City. *Community Med*. 2013;4(2):227-30.
- 410 14. Anchala R, Kannuri NK, Pant H, Khan H, Franco OH, Di Angelantonio E, et al.  
411 Hypertension in India: a systematic review and meta-analysis of prevalence, awareness, and  
412 control of hypertension. *J Hypertens*. 2014;32(6):1170-7.
- 413 15. Indian Council of Medical Research; Public Health Foundation of India and Institute for  
414 Health Metrics and Evaluation. India: Health of Nation's States - The India State- level Disease  
415 Burden Initiative. New Delhi, India: ICMR, PHFI and IHME; 2017. 2017.
- 416 16. Gupta R, Gaur K, CV SR. Emerging trends in hypertension epidemiology in India. *J Hum*  
417 *Hypertens*. 2019;33(8):575-87.
- 418 17. Directorate General of Health Services; Ministry of Health & Family Welfare  
419 Government of India. National Programme for Prevention and Control of Cancer, Diabetes,

- 420 Cardiovascular Diseases and Stroke (NPCDCS) 2017 [updated 26 August 2020; cited 2021  
421 February 22]. [Available from:  
422 [http://dghs.gov.in/content/1363\\_3\\_NationalProgrammePreventionControl.aspx](http://dghs.gov.in/content/1363_3_NationalProgrammePreventionControl.aspx)].
- 423 18. Ministry of Health & Family Welfare GoI. National Health Policy 2017 [cited 2021  
424 February 22]. [Available from:  
425 [https://www.nhp.gov.in/nhpfiles/national\\_health\\_policy\\_2017.pdf](https://www.nhp.gov.in/nhpfiles/national_health_policy_2017.pdf)].
- 426 19. Bhojani U, Thriveni B, Devadasan R, Munegowda C, Devadasan N, Kolsteren P, et al.  
427 Out-of-pocket healthcare payments on chronic conditions impoverish urban poor in Bangalore,  
428 India. BMC Public Health. 2012;12(1):990.
- 429 20. Brinda EM, Kowal P, Attermann J, Enemark U. Health service use, out-of-pocket  
430 payments and catastrophic health expenditure among older people in India: The WHO Study on  
431 global AGEing and adult health (SAGE). J Epidemiol Community Health. 2015;69(5):489-94.
- 432 21. Engelgau MM, Karan A, Mahal A. The Economic impact of Non-communicable  
433 Diseases on households in India. Global Health. 2012;8(1):9.
- 434 22. Kanungo S, Mahapatra T, Bhowmik K, Saha J, Mahapatra S, Pal D, et al. Patterns and  
435 predictors of undiagnosed and uncontrolled hypertension: observations from a poor-resource  
436 setting. J Hum Hypertens. 2017;31(1):56-65.

- 437 23. Ghosh S, Barik A, Majumder S, Gorain A, Mukherjee S, Mazumdar S, et al. Health &  
438 Demographic Surveillance System Profile: The Birbhum population project (Birbhum HDSS).  
439 Int J Epidemiol. 2015;44(1):98-107.
- 440 24. Chobanian AV, Bakris GL, Black HR, Cushman WC, Green LA, Izzo JL, Jr., et al. The  
441 Seventh Report of the Joint National Committee on Prevention, Detection, Evaluation, and  
442 Treatment of High Blood Pressure: the JNC 7 report. JAMA. 2003;289(19):2560-72.
- 443 25. Ghosh S, Mukhopadhyay S, Barik A. Sex differences in the risk profile of hypertension:  
444 a cross-sectional study. BMJ Open. 2016;6(7):e010085.
- 445 26. Baker RPJSSCR. New technology in survey research: Computer-assisted personal  
446 interviewing (CAPI). 1992;10(2):145-57.
- 447 27. Howe LD, Galobardes B, Matijasevich A, Gordon D, Johnston D, Onwujekwe O, et al.  
448 Measuring socio-economic position for epidemiological studies in low- and middle-income  
449 countries: a methods of measurement in epidemiology paper. Int J Epidemiol. 2012;41(3):871-  
450 86.
- 451 28. Das J, Chowdhury A, Hussam R, Banerjee AV. The impact of training informal health  
452 care providers in India: A randomized controlled trial. Science (New York, NY).  
453 2016;354(6308).

- 454 29. Rothman KJ, Greenland S, Lash TL. Modern epidemiology. 3rd ed: Lippincott Williams  
455 & Wilkins; 2008. p. 183-209.
- 456 30. Matsaganis M, Mitrakos T, Tsakloglou P. Modelling health expenditure at the household  
457 level in Greece. *The European Journal of Health Economics*. 2009;10(3):329-36.
- 458 31. Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME). GBD India Compare | Viz Hub 2019  
459 [cited 2021 February 22]. [Available from: <https://vizhub.healthdata.org/gbd-compare/india>].
- 460 32. Irazola VE, Gutierrez L, Bloomfield GS, Carrillo-Larco RM, Dorairaj P, Gaziano T, et al.  
461 Hypertension Prevalence, Awareness, Treatment, and Control in Selected Communities of Nine  
462 Low-and Middle Income Countries: Results From the NHLBI/UHG Network of Centers of  
463 Excellence for Chronic Diseases. *Global heart*. 2016;11(1):47.
- 464 33. Sarki AM, Nduka CU, Stranges S, Kandala NB, Uthman OA. Prevalence of  
465 Hypertension in Low- and Middle-Income Countries: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.  
466 *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2015;94(50):e1959.
- 467 34. Chow CK, Teo KK, Rangarajan S, Islam S, Gupta R, Avezum A, et al. Prevalence,  
468 awareness, treatment, and control of hypertension in rural and urban communities in high-,  
469 middle-, and low-income countries. *JAMA*. 2013;310(9):959-68.

- 470 35. Kaur P, Rao SR, Radhakrishnan E, Rajasekar D, Gupte MD. Prevalence, awareness,  
471 treatment, control and risk factors for hypertension in a rural population in South India. *Int J*  
472 *Public Health*. 2012;57(1):87-94.
- 473 36. Singh AK, Kalaivani M, Krishnan A, Aggarwal P, Gupta SK. Prevalence, awareness,  
474 treatment and control of hypertension among elderly persons in an urban slum of Delhi, India.  
475 *Indian Journal of Medical Specialities*. 2014;5(1):7-10.
- 476 37. Tocci G, Ferrucci A, Pontremoli R, Ferri C, Rosei E, Morganti A, et al. Blood pressure  
477 levels and control in Italy: comprehensive analysis of clinical data from 2000–2005 and 2005–  
478 2011 hypertension surveys. *Journal of human hypertension*. 2015;29(11):696.
- 479 38. Joffres M, Falaschetti E, Gillespie C, Robitaille C, Loustalot F, Poulter N, et al.  
480 Hypertension prevalence, awareness, treatment and control in national surveys from England, the  
481 USA and Canada, and correlation with stroke and ischaemic heart disease mortality: a cross-  
482 sectional study. *BMJ Open*. 2013;3(8):e003423.
- 483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490

491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497

**Table 1.** Characteristics of sampled hypertensive population.

Background characteristics	n	mean or percentage (95% CI)
<b>Age</b>	300	55.99 (54.58-57.41)
<b>Total expected cost of seeking complete care for hypertension (₹) *</b>	159	306.49 (257.65-355.33)
<b>Relative cost (%) for treatment of hypertension*</b>	159	13.52 (11.13-15.90)
<b>Age group (years)</b>		
< 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)
<b>Education</b>		
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)
<b>Sex</b>		
Female	183	61.00(55.45-66.55)
Male	117	39.00(33.45-44.55)
<b>Social group</b>		
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)
<b>Religion<sup>+</sup></b>		
Hinduism	225	75.25(70.33-80.17)
Islam	74	24.75(19.83-29.67)
<b>Civil status</b>		
Living with partner	195	65.00(59.57-70.43)
Not living with partner	105	35.00(29.57-40.43)
<b>Occupation</b>		
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)

<b>Economic Class</b>		
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)
<b>Duration of Hypertension (years)</b>		
<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)
<b>Co-morbidity</b>		
No	240	80.00(75.45-84.55)
Yes	60	20.00(15.45-24.55)
<b>Regular treatment for hypertension</b>		
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)
<b>Place of treatment for hypertension*</b>		
Public	31	19.50(13.27-25.72)
Non-public	128	80.50(74.28-86.73)
<b>Health care provider*</b>		
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)
<b>OPP*</b>		
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 patients seeking treatment for hypertension

+ One person did not share information on religion.

498

499

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515

**Table 2.** Odds of out-of-pocket payment.

	<b>Unadjusted</b>		<b>Adjusted</b>	
	OR (95% CI)	p	OR (95% CI)	p
<b>Age group (years)</b>				
< 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
<b>Education</b>				
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
<b>Sex</b>				
Female	1.00		1.00	
Male	0.70 (0.24-2.10)	0.53	0.08 (0.01-0.71)	0.02
<b>Social group</b>				
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
<b>Religion</b>				
Hinduism	1.00		1.00	
Islam	1.40 (0.37-5.22)	0.62	2.30 (0.40-13.39)	0.35
<b>Civil status</b>				
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
<b>Occupation</b>				
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
<b>Economic Class</b>				
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
<b>Co-morbidity</b>				
No	1.00		1.00	
Yes	0.74 (0.24-2.31)	0.61	0.54 (0.13-2.24)	0.39
<b>Duration of Hypertension (years)</b>				
<5	1.00		1.00	
≥5	5.14 (1.39-19.01)	0.01	5.68 (1.24-25.99)	0.03
<b>Place of treatment seeking for hypertension</b>				
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

516

**Table 3.** Associates of relative expenses.

	<b>Unadjusted</b>		<b>Adjusted</b>	
	$\beta$ (95% CI)	p	$\beta$ (95% CI)	p
<b>Age group (years)</b>				
< 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
<b>Education</b>				
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
<b>Sex</b>				
Female	0.00		0.00	
Male	-0.94 (-5.99,4.10)	0.71	-3.39 (-10.90,4.13)	0.38
<b>Social group</b>				
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
<b>Religion</b>				
Hinduism	0.00		0.00	
Islam	-0.07 (-5.54,5.40)	0.98	3.23 (-3.37,9.82)	0.34
<b>Civil status</b>				
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
<b>Occupation</b>				
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
<b>Economic Class</b>				
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
<b>Co-morbidity</b>				
No	0.00		0.00	
Yes	7.74 (2.59,12.89)	0.00	10.28 (4.96,15.61)	<0.01
<b>Duration of Hypertension (years)</b>				
<5	0.00		0.00	
≥5	1.64 (-3.10,6.37)	0.50	2.17 (-2.62,6.97)	0.37
<b>Place of treatment seeking for hypertension</b>				
Public	0.00		0.00	
Non-public	9.35(3.56,15.14)	0.00	11.55 (5.74,17.37)	<0.01
<b>Health care provider</b>				
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;  $\beta$ : Coefficient

517

518

519

520

521

522

523

524

525

526

527


528

529

530


531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538

539 **Figure 1:** Median of OOPs share (%) and relative OOPs (%) across the place of treatment seeking



540  
541  
542

**Figure 2:** Relative expenses for care seeking across the economic strata with reference to high income group



543