District Level Variation in Hypertension Epidemiology in India and Influence of Social Determinants: National Family Health Survey-5

Shore title: Hypertension in India: NFHS-5

Rajeev Gupta[1]

Kiran Gaur[2]

Suresh Sharma[3]

Raghubir S Khedar[1]

Rajinder K Dhamija[4]

From: [1]Department of Preventive Cardiology & Medicine, Eternal Heart Care Centre & Research Institute, Jaipur, India; [2]Department of Statistics, Mathematics and Computer Science, Government SKN Agriculture University, Jobner, Jaipur, India. [3]Population Research Centre, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare, Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi University Enclave, New Delhi, India. [4]Department of Neurology, Institute of Human Behavior and Allied Sciences, New Delhi, India.

Correspondence: Dr Rajeev Gupta, Department of Preventive Cardiology & Medicine, Eternal Heart Care Centre and Research Institute, Jagatpura Road, Jawahar Circle, Jaipur 302017 India. Phones: +91-141-5174000; FAX: +91-141-5174001; Email: rajeevgg@gmail.com; drrajeev.gupta@eternalheart.org;

Article Statistics: Abstract 225 words; Text: 2818; References 36; Tables 4; Figures 4. Supplementary Tables 35; Supplementary Figures 3.

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND: Enumeration of state and district-level variation in hypertension prevalence in India and to evaluate the influence of social determinants.

METHODS: We used data from the Fifth National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5) from 707 districts and 825,954 participants (women 724,115, men 101,839 men) on prevalence of hypertension defined according to standard criteria. Data on multiple social determinants were also obtained from NFHS-5 report.

RESULTS: Age-standardized prevalence of hypertension was 22.4% (women 21.3%, men 24.0%) with the highest prevalence in women and men, respectively, in Sikkim (34.5 and 41.6%) and Punjab (31.2 and 37.7%) and lowest in Rajasthan (15.4 and 17.9%) and Ladakh (15.7 and 17.4%). Prevalence was more in western and southern Indian districts. High prevalence of hypertension in the young (<30y) was observed in northeastern and northern states. District-level hypertension prevalence correlated negatively with multi-dimensional poverty index (R^2 women 0.299, men 0.245) and positively with female literacy (women 0.165, men 0.134). Among women, districts with the highest availability of electricity, clean water, sanitation, clean cooking fuels, healthcare service delivery and better nutrition were associated with more hypertension on univariate and multivariate analyses ($p<0.05$).

CONCLUSIONS: The study shows significant geographical variation in hypertension prevalence in India. Hypertension is more in men with high prevalence of premature hypertension. Better district-level development (less poverty, more literacy) and healthcare services are associated with greater hypertension prevalence in women.

KEY WORDS: Hypertension; Raised blood pressure; Epidemiology; Non-communicable diseases; Social determinants.

SUMMARY TABLE

What is known about the topic:

- Significant state-level variation in hypertension prevalence in India has been reported but district-level variation is not known.
- Social determinants are important in hypertension but not well studied, especially in women.

What this study adds:

- The study shows a significant district-level variation with greater hypertension prevalence in southern and western India.
- Hypertension among the young, <30 years, is more in less developed districts.
- Social determinants of hypertension in women are less poverty, more literacy and availability of healthcare services.

INTRODUCTION

World Health Organization (WHO) and others have reported that high blood pressure (BP) is the most important risk factor for mortality and disease burden in both women and men, globally and in India.[1-4] Studies have reported significant inter-country variation in hypertension prevalence with the highest prevalence rates in Eastern European, Central Asian and Eastern Asian countries.[1,3,5,6] Within-country variation has also been reported from several large countries- China, USA, Brazil, Indonesia, Pakistan, UK- and Europe.[7-13] A county (district) level variation has been reported from the USA and UK.[14,15] Studies from USA, UK and China have reported greater hypertension prevalence in less developed regions and counties.[7,8,12] Risk factors for hypertension are social and biological.[16] Social determinants of hypertension include low-quality urban and rural infrastructure, low socioeconomic status, social disorganization, unemployment, adverse work environment, illiteracy, adverse early life events, subnormal maternal and child health, etc.[16,17] It has been reported that macrolevel and micro-level variations in social, lifestyle and biological factors are responsible for difference in hypertension prevalence.[16]

Previous national studies in India- District Level Health Survey/Adult Health Survey (DLHS-4/AHS-3)[18] and Fourth National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4)[19] have reported significant state-level variation in hypertension prevalence. It has been reported that macro-level social factors such as greater urbanization, better human development index, more literacy and raised body mass index (BMI) are associated with this variation.[19] This contrasts with developed countries where hypertension is more in lesser developed and deprived regions and communities.[12,15] India has undergone rapid socio-economic progress in recent years. To correlate variation in hypertension prevalence at the district (county) level with various social factors we performed the present study. We used district-level data from Fifth National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5)[20] on hypertension prevalence and performed correlation with multiple social determinants of health.

METHODS

Data from NFHS-5 are available at the National Family Health Survey website at http://rchiips.org/nfhs/factsheet_NFHS-5.shtml.[20] NFHS is a large-scale, multi-round survey conducted in a representative sample of households throughout India. Multiple rounds of the survey have been conducted since the first survey in 1992-93. The survey provides state and national information for India on fertility, infant and child mortality, the practice of family planning, maternal and child health, reproductive health, nutrition, anemia, utilization and quality of health and family planning services. Each successive round of the NFHS has had two specific goals: a) to provide essential data on health and family welfare needed by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare and other agencies for policy and program purposes, and b) to provide information on important emerging health and family welfare issues. Ethics clearance has been obtained by the Institutional Ethics Committee of Indian Institute of Population Sciences, Mumbai, India. Technical assistance for the NFHS has been provided by ICF International (Virginia, USA) and other organizations on specific issues. The funding for different rounds of NFHS has been provided by USAID, DFID, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, UNICEF, UNFPA, and Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India. In NFHS-5, similar to the previous iterations, the sample was designed to provide data of all key indicators at the national and state levels as well as estimates for most key indicators at the district level for almost all the districts of the country.[20]

The total sample size in NFHS-5 was 610,000 households in India. This was estimated to produce reliable data for each district of the country. The sample selection process was similar to the previous NFHS studies. The rural sample was selected through a 2-stage sampling with villages as the primary sampling unit (PSU) at the first stage selected with probability proportional to size, followed by a random selection of 22 households in each PSU at the second stage. In urban areas, there was also a 2-stage sampling design with Census Enumeration Blocks (CEB) selected at the first stage and a random selection of 22 households in each CEB at the second stage. In the second stage in both rural and urban areas, households were selected after conducting a complete mapping and household listing operation in the selected first-stage units. NFHS-5 fieldwork for India was

111 conducted in two phases, phase one from 17 June 2019 to 30 January 2020 and phase two from 2
112 January 2020 to 30 April 2021 by 17 Field Agencies and gathered information from 636,699
113 households, 724,115 women, and 101,839 men in 705 districts of the country.

114 The biomarker questionnaire included measurements of height, weight, waist and hip
115 circumference, hemoglobin levels and finger-stick blood for additional testing in a laboratory for
116 women aged 15-49 years and men aged 15-54 years. Blood pressure and random blood glucose
117 were measured in all women and men aged 15 years and more in contrast to NFHS-4.[19]
118 Questionnaire information and biomarkers were collected after informed consent from each
119 participant. In the NFHS-5 the BP of eligible respondents was measured using an OMRON Blood
120 Pressure Monitor to determine the prevalence of hypertension. BP measurements for each
121 respondent were taken on three separate occasions and the readings were recorded in the
122 Biomarker Questionnaire with an interval of 5 minutes between readings. Respondents whose
123 systolic BP was >130 mm Hg or diastolic BP > 85 mm Hg were considered to have elevated blood
124 pressure readings and were encouraged to see a doctor for a full evaluation. Hypertension was
125 diagnosed when systolic BP was ≥140 mmHg and/or diastolic BP ≥90 mmHg or when the participant
126 was taking medicine to control BP and reported in per cent (%).

127 ***Statistical analyses***:

128 Data sheets were downloaded from the NFHS-5 website. Additional data were obtained
129 from the Population Research Centre, Institute of Economic Growth, Delhi University, New Delhi,
130 India. Data were transferred to MS Excel sheets and descriptive analyses were performed using this
131 program. Hypertension prevalence rates are reported separately for women and men and have been
132 age-adjusted to the population of India. A χ^2 test was used to determine the significance of women-
133 men differences. Hypertension prevalence rates for various districts of the country (n=705) were
134 also obtained from the NFHS-5 website and reported separately for women and men. State-level
135 mean, medians and 25-75 interquartile intervals (IQR) for hypertension were calculated. Univariate

136 correlation of district hypertension prevalence with social determinants (Supplementary Table 1)
137 was performed using polynomial regression and graphs were computed in MS Excel. For multivariate
138 correlation, we used SPSS statistical package.

139 **Role of funding sources**:

140 No direct funding was obtained for writing this report. National Family Health Surveys are
141 funded by various grants from the Government of India.

142 **RESULTS**

143 NFHS-5 enrolled 724,115 women and 101,839 men >15 years of age (total of 825,954) with
144 response rates more than 90%.[20] Data for multiple socioeconomic, lifestyle and clinical variables
145 were obtained and recorded. National age-adjusted prevalence (%) of hypertension among women
146 was 21.3% and men 24.0% (overall 22.4%). Age-adjusted prevalence (%) of hypertension among
147 women and men in different states of India is in Table 1. There is significant state-level variation in
148 hypertension prevalence. In women the highest prevalence is in Sikkim (34.5%), Punjab (31.2%) and
149 Goa (27.5%) and the lowest in Rajasthan (15.4%), Ladakh (15.7%) and Bihar (15.9%). In men the
150 highest prevalence is in Sikkim (41.6%), Punjab (37.7%) and Manipur (33.2%) while the lowest is in
151 Ladakh (17.4%), Rajasthan (17.9%) and Bihar (18.4%) (Figure 1). Hypertension prevalence in various
152 states and districts of India in women and men is shown as a heat map (Figure 2). High prevalence is
153 observed in southern and eastern Indian states. There is a significant district-level variation with
154 greater prevalence in most western and southern districts in women and western, southern and
155 eastern districts in men. Absolute prevalence rates for each district among women and men are in
156 Supplementary Tables 2-34. We also calculated median (IQR) hypertension prevalence in each state
157 according to the district-level prevalence and prevalence rates for women and men shown in
158 Supplementary Figure 1.

159 Age-group stratified hypertension prevalence among women and men for the whole country
160 and all the states are in Table 2. There is a significant age-associated escalation in its prevalence in all

161 the states of the country (Mantel-Haenszel χ^2 for trend, $p < 0.001$). Higher prevalence of
162 hypertension in the young (<30 years) is observed among men and women in most North-Eastern
163 Indian states (Arunachal Pradesh, Assam, Meghalaya, Nagaland, Sikkim and West Bengal), Jammu &
164 Kashmir, Ladakh and Goa (Supplementary Figure 2). On the other hand, high prevalence of
165 hypertension among the elderly ($\geq$60yr) is observed in Delhi, Goa, Karnataka, Kerala, Punjab, Sikkim
166 and Telangana.

167 Data on multiple social determinants were obtained from various government databases,
168 NFHS-5 and others.[19,20] District-level multidimensional poverty index is negatively associated with
169 the prevalence of hypertension in both women and men with polynomial R^2 of 0.299 and 0.245,
170 respectively (Figure 3a). Hypertension prevalence is positively associated with district-level female
171 literacy levels in both women and men with polynomial R^2 of 0.165 and 0.134, respectively (Figure
172 3b). Data on social determinants in NFHS-5 have been primarily obtained for women, therefore, we
173 determined variation of hypertension prevalence in women according to them. Correlation of
174 district-level hypertension prevalence among women with various social, healthcare delivery and
175 clinical determinants are in Figure 4. Increasing hypertension prevalence among women correlates
176 significantly with declining poverty, better literacy, sanitation, and electricity, and availability of
177 clean fuel for cooking (Figure 4a). Greater hypertension prevalence is also observed in district with
178 lower childhood marriages and teenage pregnancies and greater vaccination coverage, modern
179 contraceptive usage and availability of skilled delivery services (Figure 4b). Presence of childhood
180 overweight, adult overweight (BMI $\geq$25) and adult hyperglycemia is also associated with greater
181 hypertension prevalence (Figure 4c).

182 To identify important social determinants among women we classified various
183 socioeconomic-, environmental-, healthcare service-, womankind specific-, and nutritional variables
184 into tertiles and determined hypertension prevalence in each of them (Table 3). Analyses of social
185 determinants show that in districts with lower poverty and illiteracy and the highest prevalence of
186 availability of electricity, clean water, sanitation and clean cooking fuels, the prevalence of

187 hypertension is the highest. Availability of better healthcare service delivery (higher availability of
188 skilled childbirth, use of modern contraception and full vaccination) and better nutrition (lower
189 anemia, childhood stunting or wasting, overweight in children and adults) is also associated with
190 greater prevalence of hypertension. We also calculated univariate and multivariate regression
191 coefficients to identify important variables (Table 4). On univariate analysis. There are multiple
192 factors associated with district level hypertension prevalence including socioeconomic and
193 environmental variables (multidimensional poverty index, illiteracy, access to electricity, clean
194 drinking water and sanitation, tobacco use), healthcare service delivery parameters and nutritional
195 factors. However, on multivariate analyses risk factors that continue to be significant are low female
196 illiteracy (standardized b -0.12), improved drinking water (0.11), sanitation (0.19), modern
197 contraceptive use (0.20) and overweight or obesity in women (0.44) ($p<0.05$).

198 **DISCUSSION**

199 Fifth National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5) is the most representative and comprehensive
200 hypertension epidemiology study in India. The study shows that there is substantial variation in
201 hypertension prevalence across states and districts of the country. The prevalence of hypertension is
202 more in better-developed states and districts. Hypertension in the young (<30 y) is more in the
203 northeastern and northern states of the country. Greater hypertension prevalence in more
204 developed districts (lower multidimensional poverty, and better literacy, healthcare services and
205 nutritional status) in India, contrasts with developed countries where hypertension is more in lesser
206 developed locations and states. These findings suggest that macrolevel cardiovascular disease risk
207 factor transition associated with demographic and epidemiological shifts is still evolving in India.

208 Geographic variation in hypertension prevalence has been reported from all the large
209 countries of the world. [7-15] There are significant difference in prevalence rates at state and district-
210 levels. In China, greater hypertension prevalence has been reported from less developed western
211 and south-eastern regions;[7] in USA, hypertension prevalence is greater in southern and south-

212 eastern states and less developed counties;[8] and in the UK hypertension is more in deprived
213 counties of northern region.[12] Global Burden of Disease (GBD) Study sub-national collaborators have
214 reported greater hypertension related mortality in deprived regions of Brazil.[9] On the other hand, in
215 lower middle income countries such as India, Indonesia and Pakistan, greater hypertension
216 prevalence and hypertension related cardiovascular mortality have been reported from better
217 developed states and locations.[10,11,19] Country-level differences also exist in hypertension In Europe
218 and Asia. In Europe hypertension prevalence is significantly greater in less developed countries of
219 Central and Eastern Europe,[13] while in Asia the prevalence of hypertension is significantly lower in
220 high income countries of Eastern Asia and high in Central and Southern Asian countries.[21] Positive
221 association of hypertension in India with better development suggests that the risk factor transition
222 that happens with social development has not yet occurred in India.[23] There is, on the other hand,
223 evidence that at an individual level, hypertension may be more among illiterate rural and slum-
224 dwelling populations,[23,24] and there is a significant association of low socioeconomic and educational
225 status with greater cardiovascular mortality.[25,26] In the present study we have shown a positive
226 association of human development with hypertension in India and more studies are needed to
227 identify the importance of individual and macrolevel social determinants.

228 An important finding in the present study is a high prevalence of premature hypertension,
229 especially in lesser developed states of northeastern and northern India. Higher prevalence of
230 hypertension at young age in India, compared to countries of North and South America and Europe
231 has been previously reported in the DLHS-4/AHS study.[18] Northeastern Indian states have a very
232 proportion of tribal population and a high prevalence of hypertension among these populations has
233 also been reported.[27] Hypertension in the young is an important problem among less developed
234 societies in Africa and among African Americans in USA.[28] There is a significant association of
235 premature hypertension with stroke in these communities. Million Death Study in India reported a
236 significantly greater stroke burden and mortality in the eastern and north-eastern states of the
237 country.[29] This corresponds to the presence of premature hypertension in these regions. More

238 studies are required to elucidate reasons for greater hypertension and stroke burden among the
239 Sub-Himalayan regions of India.

240 The study has several strengths- this is the one of the first studies that has evaluated
241 hypertension prevalence in each district of the country. The DLHS-4/AHS study also evaluated
242 hypertension in multiple districts but two important states were missing.[18] IN NFHS-4 the sample
243 size was restricted to the young and middle aged and did not provide data on elderly which have
244 greater hypertension.[30] The ICMR-INDIAB study also obtained data on hypertension in multiple
245 states but sampling was based on state-level data and not at the district level.[31] We have also
246 identified districts with greater hypertension prevalence. This is important for policy-making as these
247 districts should be the initial focus for hypertension control initiatives.[32] Identification of districts
248 with premature hypertension is also important as deployment of primary prevention strategies in
249 these regions (salt, alcohol and tobacco control, healthy foods). Limitations of the study include a
250 skewed female-male ratio in the recruitment of the sample (NFHS reports are focused on women's
251 health factors), single-day measurement of BP which is not recommended to confirm the diagnosis
252 of hypertension, use of older definition of hypertension (SBP $\geq$140 and/or DBP $\geq$90 mmHg) instead of
253 more recently suggested criteria (SBP $\geq$130 and/or DBP $\geq$80 mmHg). In the present study we do not
254 yet have data on hypertension awareness, awareness and control status and this is also a limitation.
255 Data on pre-hypertension, which is more prevalent than hypertension in India, and should be the
256 focus of prevention strategies, are not yet available. There is a need for more primary data on
257 hypertension determinants to explain regional variations including social and cultural determinants
258 of physical activity and diet. Data on district-level availability and access to healthcare and
259 availability of drug-therapies to individuals, especially women, with hypertension are not available.
260 Finally, all these data need replication for external validation using data from concurrent studies
261 including the ICMR-INDIAB and other national surveys.

262 **Conclusions:**

263 It has been argued that phase transition in the human progress has been brought about by
264 tectonic shifts in development with technological progress in every corner of the globe. This has
265 lifted most societies out of Malthusian trap but aspects of local geography, culture and institutions
266 are also important in this transition.[33] Our study shows that the escape from poverty and illiteracy
267 among women is associated with greater hypertension prevalence in India and forecasts a short-
268 term scenario with more hypertension with better social development. We hope that a
269 socioeconomic tipping point shall arrive soon where hypertension is more in lower socioeconomic
270 status individuals.[34] India and most low-middle income and low-income countries have significantly
271 higher adverse cardiovascular events and mortality from hypertension.[35] Reversal of this trend is
272 possible using well-tried evidence-based interventions at the level of population and individuals
273 cross the life course. The creation of an egalitarian society with a focus on various components of
274 inequality,[34] availability of non-communicable disease-focused healthcare,[36] and population
275 empowerment,[36] would lead to lower hypertension among the more developed communities and
276 regions of the country.
277

CONTRIBUTORS

RG and KG conceptualized the study. Data analyses and estimate generation were done by KG and SS. Maps were generated by KG. RG drafted the first iteration of the manuscript. RG, KG, SS and RKD made substantial contributions to critical review, editing and revision of the manuscript. All the authors approved the final version of the manuscript. RG, KG and SS accessed and verified the data underlying the study. All authors had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS:

All the authors declare no competing interests. KG is an employee of Government of Rajasthan and SS and RKD are employed by Government of India.

DATA SHARING:

All the data used for the manuscript are freely available at the National Family Health Survey website at http://rchiips.org/nfhs/.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

No specific funding was available for this article.

296 **LEGENDS TO TABLES**

297 **Table 1: Hypertension prevalence in Indian states in NFHS-5 in women and men >15 years. Criteria**
298 **for diagnosis of hypertension were systolic BP ≥140 mmHg and/or diastolic BP ≥90 mmHg or on**
299 **medical treatment.**

300 **Table 2: Age-group specific hypertension prevalence in Indian states in women and men.**

301 **Table 3: Hypertension prevalence (%, 95% CI) in women according to tertiles of various social**
302 **indicators.**

303 **Table 4: Univariate and multivariate regression analysis (standardized b) of district-level**
304 **hypertension prevalence (women) with various socioeconomic and other factors.**

305 **LEGENDS TO FIGURES**

306 **Figure 1: Hypertension prevalence among women and men in various states of India in NFHS-5.**

307 **Figure 2: Heat map showing state-level prevalence (Figure 2a) and district-level prevalence (Figure**
308 **2b) of hypertension among women and men in NFHS-5.**

309 **Figure 3: Inverse correlation of district-level hypertension prevalence in women and men with**
310 **increasing multidimensional poverty index (Figure 3a) and positive correlation of district-level**
311 **hypertension prevalence in women and men with increasing literacy (Figure 3b).**

312 **Figure 4 (a-c): Correlation of district-level hypertension prevalence in women with various (a)**
313 **social, (b) healthcare delivery, and (c) clinical determinants.**

314 **REFERENCES**

315 1. World Health Organization. Invisible numbers: the true extent of non-communicable diseases
316 and what to do about them. Geneva. World Health Organization. 2022.

317 2. Global Burden of Disease Study 2019 Risk Factor Collaborators. Global burden of 87 risk factors
318 in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of
319 Disease Study 2019. *Lancet*. 2020; 396:1223-1250.

320 3. Global Burden of Diseases CVD Collaborators. Global burden of cardiovascular diseases and risk
321 factors, 1990-2019: Update from the Global Burden of Disease 2019 Study. *J Am Coll Cardiol*.
322 2020; 76:2982-3021.

323 4. Gupta R, Xavier D. Hypertension: the most important non-communicable disease risk factor in
324 India. *Indian Heart J*. 2018; 70:565-572.

325 5. NCD Risk Factor Collaboration (NCD-RiSC). Worldwide trends in blood pressure from 1975 to
326 2015: a pooled analysis of 1479 population-based measurement studies with 19.1 million
327 participants. *Lancet*. 2017; 389:37-55.

328 6. NCD Risk Factor Collaboration. Worldwide trends in hypertension prevalence and progress in
329 treatment and control from 1990 to 2019: A pooled analysis of 1173 population-representative
330 studies with 104 million participants. *Lancet*. 2021; 398:957-980.

331 7. Li Y, Wang L. Feng X, Zhang M, Huang Z, Deng Q, Zhou M, Astell-Burt T, Wang L. Geographical
332 variations in hypertension prevalence, awareness, treatment and control in China: Findings from
333 a nationwide and provincially representative survey. *J Hypertens*. 2018; 36:178-187.

334 8. Centres for Disease Control and Prevention. Hypertension maps and data sources: prevalence of
335 hypertension, 2017. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/bloodpressure/maps_data.htm. Accessed
336 7 March 2023.

337 9. Nascimento BR, Brant LCC, Yadgir S, Oliveira GMM, Roth G, Glenn SD, Mooney M, Naghavi M,
338 Passos VMA, Duncan BB, Silva DAS, Malta DC, Ribeiro ALP. Trends in prevalence, mortality and
339 morbidity associated with high systolic blood pressure in Brazil from 1990 to 2017: estimates
340 from the Global Burden of Disease 2017 (GBD 2017) study. *Pop Health Metrics*. 2020; 18:e17.

341 10. GBD 2019 Indonesia Subnational Collaborators. The state of health in Indonesia's provinces,
342 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet Glob*
343 *Health*. 2022; 10:e1632-1645.

344 11. GBD 2019 Pakistan Collaborators. The state of health in Pakistan and its provinces and
345 territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet*
346 *Glob Health*. 2023; 11:e229-243.

347 12. British Heart Foundation. Heart and circulatory disease statistics 2022. Available at:
348 https://www.bhf.org.uk/what-we-do/our-research/heart-statistics/heart-statistics-
349 publications/cardiovascular-disease-statistics-2022. Accessed 7 March 2023.

350 13. Timmis A, Townsend N, Gale CP, Torbica A, Lettino M, Petersen SE, Mossialo EA, Maggioni AP,
351 Kazakiewicz D, May HT, Smedt DD, Flather M, Zuhlke L, Beltrame JF, Huculeci R, Tavazzi L,
352 Hindricks G, Bax J, Casedei B, Achenbach S, Wright L, Vardas P. European Society of Cardiology:
353 cardiovascular disease statistics 2019. *Eur Heart J*. 2020; 40:12-85.

354 14. Vaughan AS, Coronado F, Casper M, Loustalot F, Wright JS. County level trends in hypertension
355 related cardiovascular mortality: United States, 2000 to 2019. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2022;
356 11:e024785.

357 15. Hughes A. Hypertension prevalence estimates in England, 2017: Estimated from the Health
358 Survey for England. London. Public Health England. 2020.

359 16. Hall ME, Hall JE, Whelton PK. Epidemiology, pathophysiology and treatment of hypertension. In:
360 Fuster V, Narula J, Vaishnava P, et al. Editors. Fuster & Hurst's: The Heart, 15th Ed. New York:
361 McGraw-Hill. 2022;189-232.

362 17. Marmot M, Wilkinson R. Social Determinants of Health, 2nd Ed. Oxford. Oxford University Press.
363 2006.

364 18. Geldsetzer P, Manne-Goehler J, Theilmann M, Davies JI, Awasthi A, Vollmer S, Jaacks LM,
365 Barnighausen T, Atun R. Diabetes and hypertension in India: a nationally representative study of
366 1.3 million adults. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2018; 178:363-372.

367 19. Gupta R, Gaur K, Ram CVS. Emerging trends in hypertension epidemiology in India. *J Hum*
368 *Hypertens*. 2019. 33:575-587.

369 20. National Family Health Survey of India. Available at: http://rchiips.org/nfhs/. Accessed 7
370 March19023.

371 21. Gupta R, Gaur K. Hypertension epidemiology in India: Recent nationwide studies and comparison
372 with Asian countries. In: Ponde CK, Mohanan PP. Editors. *Cardiology 2022: Hypertension*.
373 Bengaluru. Microlabs Ltd. 2022. 235-244.

374 22. Subramanian S, Ambade M, Kumar A, Chi H, Joe W, Rajpal S, Kim R. Progress on Sustainable
375 Development Goal indicators in 707 districts of India: a quantitative mid-line assessment using
376 the National Family Health Surveys, 2016 and 2021. *Lancet Reg Health SE Asia*. 2023;100155.

377 23. Gupta R, Gupta VP, Ahluwalia NS. Educational status, coronary heart disease and coronary risk
378 factor prevalence in a rural population of India. *BMJ*. 1994; 309:1332-1336

379 24. Gupta R, Kaul V, Agrawal A, Guptha S, Gupta VP. Cardiovascular risk according to educational
380 status in India. *Prev Med*. 2010; 51:408-411.

381 25. Rosengren A, Smyth A, Rangarajan S, Ramasundarahettige C, Bangdiwala SI, AlHabib KF, Avezum
382 A, Bengtsson Boström K, Chifamba J, Gulec S, Gupta R, Igumbor EU, Iqbal R, Ismail N, Joseph P,

383 Kaur M, Khatib R, Kruger IM, Lamelas P, Lanas F, Lear SA, Li W, Wang C, Quiang D, Wang Y,
384 Lopez-Jaramillo P, Mohammadifard N, Mohan V, Mony PK, Poirier P, Srilatha S, Szuba A, Teo K,
385 Wielgosz A, Yeates KE, Yusoff K, Yusuf R, Yusufali AH, Attaei MW, McKee M, Yusuf S..
386 Socioeconomic status and risk of cardiovascular disease in 20 low-income, middle-income, and
387 high-income countries: the Prospective Urban Rural Epidemiology (PURE) study. *Lancet Glob*
388 *Health.* 2019; 7:e748-760.

389 26. Joseph P, Kutty VR, Mohan V, Kumar R, Mony P, Vijayakumar K, Islam S, Iqbal R, Kazmi K, Rahman
390 O, Yusuf R, Anjana RM, Mohan I, Rangarajan S, Gupta R, Yusuf S. Cardiovascular disease,
391 mortality and their associations with modifiable risk factors in a multinational South Asia cohort:
392 A PURE substudy. *European Heart J*. 2022; 43:2831-2840.

393 27. Hazarika C, Babu BV. Prevalence of hypertension in Indian tribal population: a systematic review
394 and meta-analysis. *J Racial Ethn Health Disparities*. 2023; EPub. doi: 10/1007/s40615-023-01532-
395 6.

396 28. Zhou B, Perel P, Mensah GA, Ezzati M. Global epidemiology, health burden and effective
397 interventions for elevated blood pressure and hypertension. *Nature Rev Cardiol*. 2021; 18:785-
398 802.

399 29. Ke C, Gupta R, Xavier D, Prabhakaran D, Mathur P, Kalkonde YV, Kolpak P, Suraweera W, Jha P;
400 Million Death Study Collaborators.. Divergent trends in ischemic heart disease and stroke
401 mortality in India from 2000 to 2015: A nationally representative mortality survey. *Lancet Global*
402 *Health*. 2018; 6:e914-923.

403 30. Prenissl J, Manne-Goehler J, Jaacks LM, Prabhakaran D, Awasthi A, Bischops AC, Atun R,
404 Bärnighausen T, Davies JI, Vollmer S, Geldsetzer P. Hypertension screening, awareness,
405 treatment and control in India: a nationally representative cross sectional study among
406 individuals aged 15-49 years. *PLoS Med*. 2019; 16:e1002801.

407 31. Anjana RM, Unnikrishnan R, Deepa M, Pradeepa R, Tandon N, Das AK, Joshi S, Bajaj S, Jabbar PK,
408 Das HK, Kumar A, Dhandhania VK, Bhansali A, Rao PV, Desai A, Kalra S, Gupta A, Lakshmy R,
409 Madhu SV, Elangovan N, Chowdhury S, Venkatesan U, Subashini R, Kaur T, Dhaliwal RS, Mohan
410 V; ICMR-INDIAB Collaborative Study Group. Metabolic non-communicable disease health report
411 of India: the ICMR-INDIAB national cross-sectional study (ICMR-INDIAB 17). *Lancet Diabetes*
412 *Endocrinol*. 2023; 11:474-489.

413 32. Kaur P, Kunwar A, Sharma M, Durgad K, Gupta S; India Hypertension Control Initiative
414 collaboration; Bhargava B. The India Hypertension Control Initiative: early outcomes in 26
415 districts across 5 states of India, 2018-2020. *J Hum Hypertens*. 2023; 37:560-567.

416 33. Galor O. Metamorphosis. In: *The Journey of Humanity: The Origins of Wealth and Inequality*.
417 Dublin. Penguin Random House. 2022;85-100.

418 34. Piketty T. Toward a democratic, ecological and multicultural socialism. In: *A Brief History of*
419 *Equality*. Cambridge, MA. Harvard University Press. 2022; 226-244.

420 35. Walli-Attaei M, Rosengren A, Rangarajan S, Breet Y, Abdul-Razak S, Sharief WA, Alhabib KF,
421 Avezum A, Chifamba J, Diaz R, Gupta R, Hu B, Iqbal R, Ismail R, Kelishadi R, Khatib R, Lang X, Li S,
422 Lopez-Jaramillo P, Mohan V, Oguz A, Palileo-Villanueva LM, Poltyn-Zaradna K, R SP, Pinnaka LVM,
423 Serón P, Teo K, Verghese ST, Wielgosz A, Yeates K, Yusuf R, Anand SS, Yusuf S; PURE
424 investigators. Metabolic, behavioural, and psychosocial risk factors and cardiovascular disease in
425 women compared with men in 21 high-income, middle-income, and low-income countries: an
426 analysis of the PURE study. *Lancet* 2022; 400:811-821.

427 36. Gupta R, Wood DA. Primary prevention of ischemic heart disease: populations, individuals, and
428 healthcare professionals. *Lancet*. 2019; 394:685-696.


Women
Sikkim 35.8
Punjab 31.5
Kerala 31.4
Goa 27.5
Puducherry 27.5
Telangana 26.1
Karnataka 25.5
Arunachal Pradesh 25.3
Tamil Nadu 24.4
Delhi 24.1
Andhra Pradesh 24
Chhattisgarh 23.9
Nagaland 22.6
Uttarakhand 22.1
Manipur 21.9
Maharashtra 21.8
Odisha 21.8
Madhya Pradesh 21.1
Haryana 20.7
Himachal Pradesh 20.4
West Bengal 20.2
Jammu & Kashmir 20
Tripura 19.5
Gujarat 19.4
Uttar Pradesh 18.4
Assam 18.2
Jharkhand 17.6
Meghalaya 17.4
Bihar 16
Rajasthan 15.1
Mizoram 14.1


Men
Sikkim 46.4
Punjab 36.2
Delhi 33.8
Kerala 33.5
Puducherry 32.2
Uttarakhand 31.9
Arunachal Pradesh 31.6
Telangana 30.3
Tamil Nadu 30.2
Nagaland 30
Manipur 29.4
Andhra Pradesh 28.5
Karnataka 27.9
Chhattisgarh 27.7
Goa 26.7
Haryana 25.2
Odisha 25
Maharashtra 23.7
Madhya Pradesh 23.2
Himachal Pradesh 23
Assam 22
Jharkhand 22
Tripura 21.4
Uttar Pradesh 21.4
Mizoram 20.7
West Bengal 20.4
Meghalaya 20
Jammu & Kashmir 18.7
Gujarat 18.2
Rajasthan 17.3
Bihar 16.7

Hypertension Prevalence Women (%)



Hypertension Prevalence Men (%)



Value

- 33 - 42
- 28 - 32
- 23 - 27
- 19 - 22
- 15 - 18

Hypertension Prevalence Women (%)



Hypertension Prevalence Men (%)




WOMEN
MEN
y = 0.0069x² - 0.5078x + 26.576
R² = 0.2998
y = 0.0078x² - 0.5856x + 30.783
R² = 0.2450
Hypertension Prevalence %
Multi-dimensional Poverty Index
60.0
50.0
40.0
30.0
20.0
10.0
0.0
0
10
20
30
40
50


WOMEN
y = 0.1728x + 8.5435
R² = 0.1645
MEN
y = 0.2021x + 9.7285
R² = 0.1341
Hypertension Prevalence %
Female Literacy Rate %
60.0
50.0
40.0
30.0
20.0
10.0
0.0
30.0
40.0
50.0
60.0
70.0
80.0
90.0
100.0

Social Determinants of Health



Women Specific Healthcare Service Delivery Parameters













Women Specific Clinical Parameters