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#### Abstract

\section*{Background}

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


## Methods

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

## Results

Among 1,691,109 adult respondents nationally (52.6\% female; mean age: 41.6 years), 28.2\% [ $95 \% \mathrm{CI}: 28.0-28.4$ ] had hypertension, of whom, $36.7 \%$ [36.3-37.2] were diagnosed. Among those diagnosed, $44.7 \%$ [44.1-45.3] reported taking medication (17.7\% [17.5-17.9] of total with hypertension). Among those treated, $52.3 \%$ [51.4-53.1] had blood pressure control ( $9.1 \%$ [8.99.2] of total with hypertension). There were substantial variations across districts in diagnosis [range: 6.3-77.5\%], treatment [8.7-97.1\%] and control [2.7-76.6\%]. Notably, large proportions of the variation in hypertension diagnosis (53.7\%), treatment (32.8\%), and control (57.7\%) were within states, not just between states.

## Conclusions

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

## Introduction

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

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

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

Methods

## Study Population

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

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

## Data collection

## Hypertension

Systolic and diastolic blood pressure were measured three times at five-minute intervals using validated electronic OMRON BP monitors after a five-minute sedentary period when the
participant was asked to sit comfortably. ${ }^{17}$ The respondent was also asked to avoid eating, smoking, and exercising for 30 minutes before the measurement. Cuff size of BP monitor was based on circumference of the bare upper arm measured using Gulick tape. Blood pressure was measured on the left arm, positioned so that it was at heart level with the cuff placed over bare skin or over thin clothes. Consistent with 2016 ICMR guidelines, we took the lowest of the first two measurements if their difference in systolic BP was less than or equal to 5 mmHg , and lowest of the three measurements otherwise. ${ }^{18}$

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

Hypertension Care Continuum - Diagnosis, Treatment, and Control

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

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

## Statistical Analysis

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

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

To assess whether the differences in the care continuum were greater between or within states (i.e. between districts), we partitioned the variance in the care continuum at both levels using variance partition coefficients from linear mixed models with state-level intercepts. To illustrate the variability between- and within-states, we present examples of two states from
regions with moderate to high burdens of hypertension, namely Karnataka from South India and Meghalaya from North East India.

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

## Results

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

## National-level care continuum

The age-standardized prevalence [95\%CI] of hypertension (Table 2) nationally was $28.2 \%$ [ $95 \% \mathrm{CI}: 28.0,28.4]$ and was higher in urban areas (32.7\% [32.3-33.1]) relative to rural areas ( $25.9 \%$ [25.7-26.2]). The prevalence was higher among men ( $30.6 \%[30.4,30.9]$ ) relative to women ( $25.8 \%$ [25.6-26.0]), and was higher at older ages ( 65 and above: 54.3\% [53.8-54.8], 18-39: $15.0 \%$ [14.9-15.2]), and greater household wealth (highest: $31.2 \%$ [30.8-31.5], lowest: $25.5 \%$ [25.2-25.8]) compared to their respective counterparts. Higher hypertension prevalence in
men, older, and wealthier individuals was observed in both urban and rural areas. Prevalence of hypertension did not vary by education at the national level.

Among all adults with hypertension, $36.7 \%$ [36.3-37.2] reported being diagnosed, (Figure 1). Diagnosed hypertension was higher in urban (39.8\% [39.0-40.7]) compared to rural areas ( $35.2 \%$ [34.7-35.8]), higher among older age groups (65 and above: 51.3\% [50.7-51.9], 1839: $31.3 \%$ [30.6-32.0]), and those with greater household wealth (highest: 40.6\% [39.8-41.3], lowest: $31.9 \%$ [31.0-32.7]) but did not vary by schooling (post-secondary: $39.3 \%$ [38.4-40.2], none: 41.6\% [40.7-42.6]).

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

Among those diagnosed and treated with medication, 52.3\% [51.4-53.1] had controlled blood pressure corresponding to $9.1 \%$ [8.9-9.2] of all those with hypertension (Figure 1;

Supplementary Table 3). Among treated adults, the proportion with controlled hypertension was $50.2 \%$ [48.7-51.7] in urban areas and $53.7 \%$ [52.6-54.7] in rural areas. These estimates
correspond to $7.6 \%$ [7.4-7.8] and $12.0 \%$ [11.7-12.4] of those with hypertension. Controlled hypertension among those treated was higher among women (55.3\% [54.3-56.4]) than men (47.2\% [45.8-48.5]), and adults aged 18-39 years ( $60.8 \%$ [59.2-62.4]) compared to 40-64 years ( $43.7 \%$ [43.0-44.3]) and those older than 65 years (44.3\% [43.5-45.1]). Hypertension control was also higher with higher schooling (none: $47.4 \%$ [46.2-48.5], post-secondary: 59.4\% [56.9-62.0]), but did not differ by household wealth (lowest: 54.5\% [52.5-56.5], medium: 52.1\% [50.3-53.9], highest: 51.7\% [50.0-53.4]).

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

## State-level care continuum

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

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

## District-level care continuum

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

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

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

## Discussion

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

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

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

The high unmet need in hypertension diagnoses in India has been identified previously, though none of these provide comprehensive estimates for all age groups and district-level precision in estimates. ${ }^{12,24}$ In 2017-18, the National Non-communicable Diseases Monitoring Survey (NNMS) surveyed 10,659 adults aged 18-69y ( $\mathrm{n}=10,659$ ) from 26 states and estimated a hypertension prevalence of $28.5 \% .^{11}$ Among those with hypertension, $27.9 \%$ were diagnosed,
$14.5 \%$ were treated ( $52.0 \%$ among diagnosed), and $12.6 \%$ were controlled ( $86.9 \%$ among those treated). Although NNMS provided estimates for socio-demographic groups at the national level, they did not provide state-level estimates. The NFHS-4 and Longitudinal Aging Study in India (LASI), both of which were conducted over 2017-19, provided estimates for those aged 15-49 years ( $\mathrm{n}=731,864$; prevalence: $18.1 \%$, diagnosed: $44.7 \%$, treated among diagnosed: $29.8 \%$, controlled among treated: $59.4 \%$ ) and those older than 45 years ( $n=72,262$; prevalence: $45.9 \%$, diagnosed: $55.7 \%$, treated among diagnosed: $69.8 \%$, controlled among diagnosed: 56.9\%), respectively. ${ }^{9,10,25}$ NFHS-4 and LASI provided estimates by socio-demographic group and state. ${ }^{14,15}$

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

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

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

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

Figure 1. National-level care continuum in Indian adults by residence, $\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{1 , 6 9 1 , 1 0 9}$

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

Figure 2. State-level unmet need in hypertension care continuum, $\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{1 , 6 9 1}, 109$

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

Figure 3. Care continuum in analytic sample by urban and rural residence for 707 districts, $\mathrm{n}=\mathbf{1 , 6 9 1 , 1 0 9}$

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

Table 1. Characteristics of participants in analytic sample for estimating care cascade of hypertension in India, $\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{1 , 6 9 1 , 1 0 9}$

|  | Total |  | Urban |  | Rural |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Women } \\ (\mathrm{n}=889,507) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Men } \\ (\mathrm{n}=\mathbf{8 0 1 , 6 0 2 )} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Women } \\ (\mathrm{n}=218,595) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Men } \\ (\mathrm{n}=\mathbf{1 9 8 , 9 1 0 )} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Women } \\ (\mathrm{n}=670,912) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Men } \\ (\mathrm{n}=\mathbf{6 0 2 , 6 9 2}) \end{gathered}$ |
| Age category |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 18-39 | $\begin{gathered} 50.1(49.9, \\ 50.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49.1(48.9, \\ 49.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49.5(49.1, \\ 49.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49.6(49.3, \\ 50.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50.3(50.2, \\ 50.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48.8(48.6, \\ 49.1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 40-64 | $\begin{gathered} 39.4(39.2, \\ 39.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.7(38.6, \\ 38.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 40.3(40.0, \\ 40.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 39.2(38.9, \\ 39.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.9(38.8, \\ 39.1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 38.5(38.3, \\ 38.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 65 and above | $\begin{gathered} 10.6(10.5, \\ 10.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.2(12.1, \\ 12.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.2(10.0, \\ 10.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.1(10.9, \\ 11.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 10.7(10.6, \\ 10.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.7(12.5, \\ 12.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Schooling |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| None | $\begin{gathered} 37.1(36.8, \\ 37.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 17.4(17.2, \\ 17.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 22.3(21.8, \\ 22.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 9.5 (9.2, 9.8) | $\begin{gathered} 44.0(43.7, \\ 44.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.2(21.0, \\ 21.5) \end{gathered}$ |
| Primary (up to $4^{\text {th }}$ class) | $\begin{gathered} 13.8 \text { (13.7, } \\ 14.0) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 15.1(14.9, \\ 15.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 12.6(12.3, \\ 12.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 11.4(11.1, \\ 11.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 14.4(14.3, \\ 14.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 16.9 \text { (16.7, } \\ 17.0) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Secondary ( $5^{\text {th }}$ to $10^{\text {th }}$ class) | $\begin{gathered} 36.7(36.5, \\ 36.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 49.5(49.3, \\ 49.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 43.3(42.9, \\ 43.7) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 50.8(50.3, \\ 51.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 33.5(33.3, \\ 33.8) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 48.9 \text { (48.6, } \\ 49.2) \end{gathered}$ |
| Post-secondary ( $11^{\text {th }}$ class and above) | $\begin{gathered} 12.4(12.2, \\ 12.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.0(17.7, \\ 18.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.8(21.3, \\ 22.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28.3(27.7, \\ 28.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | 8.0 (7.9, 8.2) | $\begin{gathered} 13.0(12.7, \\ 13.4) \end{gathered}$ |
| Household wealth quintile (by residence) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lowest | $\begin{gathered} 18.6(18.3, \\ 18.9) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.0(17.6, \\ 18.3) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.4(18.6, \\ 20.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.4(18.6, \\ 20.1) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.2(17.9, \\ 18.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 17.3(17.0, \\ 17.6) \end{gathered}$ |
| Low | $\begin{gathered} 19.6(19.4, \\ 19.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.3(19.1, \\ 19.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.2(19.7, \\ 20.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.2(19.7, \\ 20.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.3 \text { (19.1, } \\ 19.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18.9(18.6, \\ 19.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Medium | $\begin{gathered} 20.3(20.1, \\ 20.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.4(20.2, \\ 20.6) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.3(19.9, \\ 20.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.3(19.9, \\ 20.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.3(20.1, \\ 20.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.4(20.2, \\ 20.7) \end{gathered}$ |
| High | $\begin{gathered} 20.7(20.4, \\ 20.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.2(20.9, \\ 21.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.3(19.8, \\ 20.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.3(19.8, \\ 20.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 20.9(20.6, \\ 21.1) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.6(21.3, \\ 21.9) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Highest | $\begin{gathered} 20.8(20.5, \\ 21.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.1(20.8, \\ 21.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 19.9(19.2, \\ 20.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 19.7(19.0, \\ 20.5) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.3(20.9, \\ 21.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 21.8(21.5, \\ 22.2) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| Blood pressure measurement |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Average Systolic BP (mmHg) | $\begin{gathered} \hline 120.3(120.2, \\ 120.4) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 124.6(124.5, \\ 124.7) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 120.6(120.4, \\ 120.8) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 125.4(125.2, \\ 125.6) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 120.2(120.1, \\ 120.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \hline 124.2(124.1, \\ 124.3) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |


| Average Diastolic BP (mmHg) | $79.7(79.7$, <br> $79.8)$ | $81.7(81.6$, <br> $81.7)$ | $79.9(79.8$, <br> $80.0)$ | $82.1(82.0$, <br> $82.3)$ | $79.6(79.5$, <br> $79.7)$ | $81.5(81.4$, <br> $81.5)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hypertension |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Self-reported or high blood | $27.2(27.0$, | $28.4(28.2$, | $29.1(28.7$, | $31.1(30.6$, | $26.3(26.1$, | $27.2(26.9$, |
| pressure | $27.4)$ | $28.7)$ | $29.5)$ | $31.5)$ | $26.5)$ | $27.4)$ |
| Self-reported | $12.6(12.5$, |  | $15.0(14.6$, | $11.2(10.9$, | $11.6(11.4$, | $11.8)$ |

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

Table 2. Socio-demographic variations in care continuum in India, $\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{1 , 6 9 1 , 1 0 9}$

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


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

Estimates ( $95 \%$ confidence intervals) are standardized to age distribution in overall sample.
a Among those with self-reported hypertension or high blood pressure ( $\geq 140 / 90 \mathrm{mmHg}$ ).
b Among those with self-reported hypertension ('Diagnosed')
c Among those taking medication for hypertension ('Treated')

Figure 1. National-level care continuum in Indian adults by residence, $\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{1 , 6 9 1}, 109$


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

Figure 2. State-level unmet need in hypertension care continuum, $\mathbf{n}=\mathbf{1 , 6 9 1}, 109$

$\begin{array}{lllll} & \\ \text { Estimate (\%) } & 0 & 25 & 50 & 75 \quad 100\end{array}$
All values are survey weighted percentages (not age standardized). Undiagnosed are among those with hypertension. Untreated and uncontrolled are among those diagnosed with hypertension and among those treated respectively. We report weighted estimates at state-level that were not age-standardized and relevant for local decision making in this manuscript. We present age standardized comparisons in the interactive dashboard.

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


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

