Emergency Care in India: A Retrospective Cross-sectional Analysis of Health Management and Information System and Global Burden of Disease

Authors: Gaurav Urs MBBS[1], Siddhesh Zadey BSMS MScGH[1,2,3,4], Padmavathy Krishna Kumar MBBS[1], Anoushka Arora[1], Tejali Gangane MSc-DA[1], Pushkar Nimkar BTech MS[1], Catherine Staton MD MS-GH[2,5,6], Joao Ricardo Nickenig Vissoci PhD MSc[2,5,6]

Affiliations:
1 Association for Socially Applicable Research (ASAR), Pune, Maharashtra, India
2 Global Emergency Medicine Innovation and Implementation (GEMINI) Research Center, Duke University, NC, USA
3 Dr. D. Y. Patil Dental College and Hospital, Dr. D. Y. Patil Vidyapeeth, Pune, Maharashtra, India
4 Department of Epidemiology, Mailman School of Public Health, NYC, NY, USA
5 Duke Global Health Institute, Durham, NC, USA
6 Department of Emergency Medicine, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA

Correspondence: Siddhesh Zadey, BSMS MSc-GH; ASAR Office Address: D2 Sai Heritage, New DP Road, Aundh, Pune, Maharashtra, India 411007; Email: sidzadey@asarforindia.org

Keywords: India; global burden of disease; health management information system; emergency care

Meetings: The preliminary study findings were presented at the Society of Academic Emergency Medicine (SAEM) in May 2022 and the World Conference of Injury Prevention (Safety 2024) in September 2024, with the associated abstract published in the supplement of BMJ Injury Prevention.

Article type: Original Research Article

Word count: 3395 words

No. of figures: 6

No. of supplementary tables: 2

Conflicts of Interest: Siddhesh Zadey is the co-founding director of the Association for Socially Applicable Research (ASAR). He represents ASAR at the Permanent Council of the G4 Alliance. Siddhesh Zadey is the Chair of the Asia Working Group of the G4 Alliance, a Fellow at the Lancet Citizens' Commission on Reimagining India's Health System, and a member of the Drafting Committee for Maharashtra State's Mental Health Policy. Other authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding: None

Patient Consent: Not applicable

Ethical Approval Statement: No ethics approval was considered necessary since we used publicly available aggregate-level data.

Data Sharing Statement: The dataset, data dictionaries, and data analysis for this paper are available upon request by contacting Siddhesh Zadey, BS-MS, MScGH, at sidzadey@asarforindia.org.

Author contributions: SZ and JRNV conceived the study. SZ supervised the study. GU, PKK, TG, PN, and SZ performed the data extraction and compilation. TG, PN, GU, and PKK completed the data analysis. SZ, GU, and PKK drafted the manuscript, and all authors contributed substantially to its revision. SZ takes responsibility for the paper as a whole.

ABSTRACT

Background: To understand the utilization and burden of emergency medical conditions (EMCs), we assessed Emergency Medicine Department (EMD) data from the Health Management and Information System (HMIS) of India and EMC from the Global Burden of Diseases (GBD).

Methods: This was a retrospective cross-sectional analysis of HMIS and GBD data for 2019. We extracted EMD registrations, admissions, and deaths from HMIS and incidence and deaths from GBD for 31 EMCs at the national and state levels. We analyzed HMIS and GBD data for proportions and rates of registrations, deaths, and incident cases relative to population counts and hospital admission numbers.

Results: In 2019, 119,103,358 patients (8935.66 per 100,000 people) were registered at EMDs. The national EMD registration rate was 6744.21 per 100,000 hospital admissions, and the EMD death rate was 36002.6 per 100,000 hospital deaths. Only 12.14% of all HMIS registrations had cause-specific data. GBD estimated 2,047,175,737 EMC incident cases nationally, accounting for 27.22% of all-cause incidence, 51.71% of all-cause mortality, and Trauma-related registrations were 9.27% in HMIS, while injuries in GBD accounted for 7% of EMCs. Overall, HMIS EMD registrations were lower than GBD EMC incidence numbers, with regional variations.

Conclusions: The study reveals gaps in the EMD utilization as per HMIS data compared to the EMC burden estimates from GBD. Improved data integration and reporting can address regional disparities.

KEY MESSAGES

What is already known on this topic:

Emergency medical conditions (EMCs) are among the top 15 causes of global morbidity and mortality. Previous literature has focused on training programs for emergency medicine as a specialty. Assessments of EMC burden that can improve health system preparedness have been limited.

What this study adds:

We retrospectively analyzed the Indian government's HMIS database documenting hospital-level Emergency Medicine Department (EMD) registrations and deaths, as well as the Global Burden of Disease Study's estimates for EMC incidence and deaths for 2019. We identified potential similarities and gaps across sources in reporting cause-specific differences in burdens at the state and national levels. We found that only 12.14% of HMIS EMD registrations had cause-specific data. These causes represented 8.1% of the EMC incidence per GBD. Additionally, HMIS data lags the GBD estimates at the state and national levels, which can be attributed to the underutilization of EM facilities nationwide or the underreporting of EMCs.

How this study might affect research, practice, or policy:

Our study provides a systematic subnational assessment highlighting the absence of a standardized data reporting system capturing the complete EMC burden in India. Our findings depict under-utilization of EM facilities across states, pointing to the need for better policies on monitoring and evaluating health system resources in the country.

INTRODUCTION

The estimated global burden of emergency medical conditions (EMCs) in 2015 was 14,035 disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) per 100,000 people, with the most significant burden occurring in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where trauma is an important cause of morbidity and mortality. [1,2]

Globally, 90% of deaths and 84% of DALYs related to EMCs could have been prevented with timely emergency care, highlighting the crucial role of Emergency Medicine Departments (EMDs).[3] There is an urgent need to enhance the capacity and utilization of services provided by EMDs.[4] However, accurately assessing the extent of the burden of EMCs and utilization of EMDs in LMICs is challenging due to data scarcity, variability across sources, and concerns about data quality. [5,6]

India ranks 144th among 195 countries with health system access and capacity to seek immediate care during medical emergencies, as assessed by the Global Burden of Disease (GBD).[1,2,3,7] Efforts to improve emergency care research in India and other LMICs have revealed challenges such as inadequate data collection, ethical research practices, and insufficient funding for research.[8,9] Inadequate data infrastructure, ethical concerns about data collection, and inconsistent standards have hampered efforts to improve emergency care research.[10]

High-quality routine data collection is critical for informing policies and improving the quality of emergency medical services through monitoring and evaluation practices.[10] While India has made progress in recognizing emergency medicine as a specialty and expanding formal training programs since 2009, challenges such as inadequate infrastructure, overcrowding, and low public awareness of emergency services still need to be addressed, particularly in rural areas. There has been limited emphasis on quality data collection and data-driven decision-making. [9]

In India, there are no standard database records of EMC burden at the state and national levels. The Indian Health Monitoring Information System (HMIS) collects data from health facilities and creates a centralized health service monitoring source. Health facilities report monthly data on various primary, secondary, and tertiary indicators, including patient admissions, diagnoses, treatments, and outcomes, consolidated at the district, state, and national levels. The publicly available HMIS provides EM-related case classification for trauma, burns, snake bites, acute cardiac events, cerebrovascular events, and obstetric complications. [11] The hospital-level data collected by the HMIS database is a good proxy for understanding the country's EMC incidence and death burden.

The GBD 2019 was a large-scale research initiative led by the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) that modeled epidemiological parameters for over 300 diseases, injuries, and risk factors for 204 countries and territories, providing a comprehensive picture of population health across and progress over time. [12] HMIS and GBD serve distinct roles within the health information framework. HMIS aims to collect localized health data from

individual health facilities, and GBD provides a global perspective on disease burden by combining real-world data with statistical modeling to estimate health outcomes across diverse populations and regions.

In response to the burden of EMCs, we conducted a retrospective cross-sectional analysis of the Indian emergency care system. First, we evaluated EMD registrations, deaths, and cause-specific registrations measured by HMIS for total admissions and population rates. Secondly, we evaluated the incidences and deaths, and DALYs of 31 EMCs modeled by GBD 2019. We then analyzed specific outcome metrics in HMIS and GBD, including EMD and EMC numbers, rates, and proportions for population and cause-specific metrics. Lastly, we explored data consistency and organization between HMIS and GBD data and analyzed the similarities and differences in the metrics derived from each system.

METHODS

Data sources and extraction

We extracted data on EM registrations, inpatient admissions in EMD, and deaths, as well as all-cause inpatient admissions, outpatient admissions, and hospital deaths for 2019-20. The publicly available HMIS provided EM case classification for trauma, burns, snake bites, acute cardiac events, cerebrovascular events, and obstetric complications. For rates, we used the state-wise mid-year projections for 2019, based on rural, urban, and total populations from the 2011 Census of India.[13]

The GBD uses data from various sources, including vital registration systems, national health surveys, health information systems, hospital records, death certificates, and disease registries, to cover various health conditions and demographic groups. GBD studies utilize advanced statistical models to impute and correct missing data, as well as compensate for variations in reporting quality, thereby helping to mitigate bias.[12]

We used the framework by Chang and colleagues that defined EMCs as “diseases or injuries that, if not promptly diagnosed and treated, typically within hours to days, can result in significant physical or mental disability or even death.” [3] We extracted data on 31 EMCs that align closely with conditions generally managed in EMDs. Since India reported no cases of yellow fever or Ebola in 2019, we were left with 29 EMCs. We extracted count and rate (per 100,000 people) numbers for cause-specific and all-cause incidence and deaths, and for the 29 EMCs from GBD 2019.

Outcomes and Analysis

We used HMIS data to create national and state-level aggregates of registrations and deaths recorded at the EMDs. Population-level registration case rates and death rates (per 100,000 people) were calculated using mid-year population projections from the census. To assess the EMC disease burden in India, we used GBD's estimated incidence and death rates at the state and national levels. **Supplementary Table 1** lists EMC outcomes calculated from the GBD and EMD outcomes from HMIS, along with their definitions and formulae.

Due to a lack of a population-level dedicated database in India for EMCs, we used the GBD database estimates for our analysis. GBD estimates are derived and published after collating multiple data sources and rigorous validation, making it a robust data source. [14] We first mapped overlapping conditions between GBD and HMIS **(Supplementary Table 2)**. We then analyzed the EMC case burdens based on the HMIS EMD registration proportions and the GBD EMC incidence proportions. Next, we assessed the mortality burden using the death rates provided by the HMIS EMD and GBD EMC databases. Finally, to evaluate the standard of case registrations at EMD, we obtained HMIS EMD Registration Numbers and GBD EMC incidence numbers.

RESULTS

HMIS Descriptive Analysis

From April 2019 to March 2020, 119,103,358 patients (8935.66 per 100,000 people) were registered at EMDs per the Indian HMIS. 114,180,292 (95.86%) of these registrations were recorded at public facilities.

HMIS EMD Registration Rate

The national HMIS EMD registration rate was 6,744.21 registrations per 100,000 hospital admissions, with Manipur having the highest rate at 30,124.86 and Rajasthan the lowest at 1,210.75. Manipur, Arunachal Pradesh, and Mizoram in the Northeast had higher registration rates than North and West Indian states such as Rajasthan and Gujarat, which had lower rates. Meghalaya and Nagaland had higher registration rates than their neighboring states. Kerala, Karnataka, Tamil Nadu, Telangana, and Andhra Pradesh had moderate to high registration rates, with Kerala leading the way. Goa stood out for its high registration rate despite its small size **(Figure 1A)**.

HMIS EMD Death Rate

The national HMIS EMD death rate was 36002.6 deaths per 100,000 hospital deaths, with Haryana having the highest rate at 74746.04 and West Bengal having the lowest at 6466.57. Mizoram, Arunachal Pradesh, and Nagaland in the Northeast had lower death rates than Haryana and Punjab in North India, as well as Kerala and Karnataka in the South. Himachal Pradesh and Uttarakhand had higher death rates than their neighbors. Goa, like before, stood out for its relatively high death rate despite its small size **(Figure 1B)**.

HMIS Number of Registration Cause-Wise and Cause-Specific Registration Proportion

Among the HMIS EMD registrations, nationally, only 12.14% had category-specific data. Trauma accounted for 9,789,272 (8.22%) EMD registrations, followed by obstetric complications (2,221,216 or 1.86%), acute cardiac events (968,374 or 0.81%), cardiovascular events (670,878 or 0.56%), snake bites (518,674 or 0.43%), and burns (287,088 or 0.24%) **(Figure 2A).**

Among trauma-related deaths in the registered causes, Arunachal Pradesh led with 90%, followed by Sikkim (89%), Puducherry (89%), and Mizoram (87%). Lakshadweep had the

highest percentage of obstetric cases at 46%, followed by Chandigarh (53%), Andaman and Nicobar Islands (33%), and Maharashtra (25%). West Bengal had the highest number of burn cases registered at 13%, followed by Uttar Pradesh (11.6%) and Karnataka (8.7%). For snake bites, Maharashtra (15.47%), West Bengal (11.18%), and Tamil Nadu (8%) had the highest numbers, while Sikkim and Lakshadweep had the least. West Bengal (16.1%), Delhi (11.88%), and Karnataka (11.75%) had the highest rates of acute cardiac events in the country **(Figure 2B)**.

HMIS EM Population-Level Registration Rate

The national HMIS EM Population-Level Registration Rate was 8539.51 registrations per 100,000 population, with Delhi having the highest rate of 48749.42 and Bihar having the lowest at 2058.91. North India had a wide range of EMD Population-Level Registration Rates, with Delhi having the highest relative to the rest. Goa was an exception in West India, with a higher rate than Gujarat and Maharashtra, which had lower rates. Kerala in the south had a significantly higher rate than Telangana, which had a lower rate when compared to its neighbors. The East and Northeast regions showed the most variation, with Arunachal Pradesh having the highest rate and Bihar having the lowest **(Figure 3A)**.

HMIS EM Population-Level Death Rate

The national HMIS EM population-level death rate was 68.93 deaths per 100,000 population, with Delhi having the highest rate (68.93) and Uttarakhand having the lowest (7.41). Delhi had previously had the highest rate compared to the rest of North India. Goa and Gujarat in the west had higher rates, while Maharashtra had lower rates. Karnataka had the highest rate in the south, while its immediate neighbor, Kerala, had much lower rates. The East and Northeast regions had the most significant variation, with Sikkim having the highest rate and West Bengal having the lowest **(Figure 3B)**.

GBD Descriptive Analysis

The GBD data reported 2,047,175,737 EMC incident cases in 2019, with 4,846,724 deaths. At the national level, EMCs accounted for 27.22% of all-cause disease incidence and 51.71% of all-cause mortality.

GBD EMC Incidence Rates

At the national level, diarrheal diseases had the highest incidence rates among EMC at 120,789.43 cases per 100,000, while rabies had the lowest incidence rate at 0.40 per 100,000 **(Figure 4)**. Regionally, Odisha reported the highest EMC incidence rate, at 173,414.91 cases per 100,000, while Nagaland reported the lowest incidence rate, at 104,407.17 cases per 100,000 **(Figure 5A)**. Fourteen states, particularly those in central and northern India, had EMC incident rates higher than the national value of 147,203.96 cases per 100,000. Sixteen states, predominantly in southern and some parts of Northeast India, had lower EMC incident rates compared to the national level.

GBD EMC Death Rates

Nationally, ischemic heart disease had the highest EMC death rate at 109.23 deaths per 100,000, while Acute Glomerulonephritis had the lowest rate at 0.01 deaths per 100,000 **(Figure 4)**. Regionally, Punjab reported the highest EMC death rate at 416.76 deaths per 100,000, and Mizoram recorded the lowest rate at 181.22 per 100,000 **(Figure 5C)**. In total, 17 states reported EMC death rates higher than the national value of 348.51 per 100,000. Southern and Northeastern India, which had lower EMC incident rates, showed higher death rates. However, Telangana in South India had lower incident and death rates. Manipur and Arunachal Pradesh in Northeast India had high EMC incident rates and lower death rates. Central and certain parts of North India showed higher EMC incident and death rates compared to their respective national values.

GBD EMC Incidence Proportions

The national GBD incidence proportion of EMCs was 27.22%. Odisha recorded the highest incidence proportion at 30.41%. Ten states had an incidence proportion higher than the national value. The incidence proportion for the state of Arunachal Pradesh (24.48%) was the lowest in the country **(Figure 5D)**.

GBD EMC Death Proportions

The national GBD death proportion of EMCs was 51.71%. Punjab (57.54%) and Tamil Nadu (55.96%) had the highest death proportion due to EMCs. Thirteen states surpassed the national death proportion. Sikkim (42.22%) reported the lowest death proportions in the country **(Figure 5E)**.

Mapping of GBD EMC with HMIS EMD Registrations

In HMIS, trauma-related registrations comprised 9.27% of total EMD registrations, whereas injuries in GBD made up 7% of the total incidents. Obstetric registrations accounted for 1.8% of HMIS and 0.85% of GBD. Emergency acute cardiac events represented 0.81% of HMIS EMD and 0.23% of GBD. Similarly, cardiovascular events constituted 0.56% of HMIS and 0.09% of GBD.

Analyzing GBD EMC Incidence Proportion with HMIS EMD Registration Proportion

Madhya Pradesh, Kerala, Sikkim, and Tripura had the highest difference between the HMIS EMD Registration Proportion and the GBD EMC incidence Proportion. Assam, Gujarat, Nagaland, and Punjab had the least. Madhya Pradesh and Meghalaya reported higher HMIS EMD Registration Proportions than GBD EMC incidence proportions **(Figure 6A)**.

Analyzing GBD EMC Death Proportion with HMIS EMD Death Proportion

Odisha, Madhya Pradesh, Uttar Pradesh, and Assam had the highest difference between HMIS EMD Death Proportion and GBD Death Proportion. Mizoram, Meghalaya, and Sikkim had the least. Haryana, Tamil Nadu, Uttarakhand, Meghalaya, and Rajasthan had higher HMIS EMD Death Proportions than GBD EMC death proportions **(Figure 6B)**.

DISCUSSION

The primary aim of this study was to evaluate the national EMD systemic capacity in addressing the burden of EMCs, using two different data sources: GBD and HMIS. Our analysis reveals only 119,103,358 HMIS EMD registrations were recorded, compared to 2,047,175,737 GBD EMC incident cases. However, certain variations were observed between the two data courses, possibly due to several reasons.

Firstly, differences in numbers across sources could suggest a lack of consistency in data collection and reporting practices as well as on-ground healthcare access and utilization differences. While the HMIS database is one of the few databases providing information on health system functioning across national and sub-national levels, there are concerns being raised over how data is captured in HMIS. A 2013 policy brief published highlighted key issues influencing data collection in HMIS, including limited data from private hospitals and the poor quality of data submitted due to improper documentation and verification. [14] The poor quality of data was partly attributed to inadequate training of ground-level hospital staff. Hence, actual reporting errors in HMIS can result in different numbers between HMIS and other sources such as the GBD.

Another potential reason for the differences between the sources could be the actual barriers to healthcare utilization for emergency care. Patients may be unable to avail themselves of timely EMD services due to reasons cited in the "three delays" model: delay in deciding to seek care, delay in reaching an adequately equipped health facility, and delay in receiving care while at the health facility. [15] In 2022, Ravindra et al. reported underutilization of pre-emergency and emergency services in India. [16] This was attributed to a lack of awareness of ambulance availability and distrust in the reliability and care provided during transfers. HMIS is only able to record data for those who are able to avail healthcare services. In settings such as India, where EM care utilization is suboptimal, the numbers from health information system would not match, and most often would undercount the population-level case incidence.

Another reason is likely due to differences in how EMCs are classified in India (HMIS) versus in global data sources such as the GBD. While we used the standard framework to select 31 EMCs from the GBD and HMIS databases for this analysis, it is not grounded on local Indian EMC epidemiology or policy prioritization data. [17] This can lead to classification differences, likely causing the exclusion of certain EMCs that may be of unique importance to India in our analysis. Additionally, reporting heterogeneity for EMCs can vary across hospitals and states due to local differences in clinical perception of what constitutes an "emergency". This could subsequently impact HMIS numbers. The resolution of data used in the current analysis precludes us from commenting on which of the above-mentioned issues (data reporting errors, limited healthcare utilization, and definition differences) are at play and the extent to which each of these contribute to the differences in HMIS and GBD for comparable outcomes.

Policy Implications

Our findings underscore the need to enhance EMD-level data collection to enhance EMC service delivery at both national and state levels. The differences between EMD registrations and EMC incidence depict utilization and/or reporting gaps. Implementing well-defined nomenclature and standardizing conditions can improve registration data quality by enhancing data infrastructure and training, ensuring that emergency protocols and treatment methodologies align with proposed national guidelines.[18]

High EMD death rates highlight the need for a focused strategy to improve EMD efficiency. The national and state governments could invest in developing frameworks for emergency medical services, outlining standardized protocols for identifying, registering, and treating EMCs. A novel example is the Emergency Care Data Set (ECDS) implemented in the National Health Service (NHS), England, a standard for Emergency Care.[19] A reliable data registration, capacity evaluation, and EMC reporting verification process must be established at the hospital EMDs, district, and state levels. [20]

States with large gaps between EMD registrations (from HMIS) and GBD EMC incidence (from GBD), including Manipur, Goa, Arunachal Pradesh, Rajasthan, Chhattisgarh, and Gujarat, require tailored training programs and capacity-building initiatives to improve data reporting accuracy and close these gaps. Furthermore, states with high EMD death rates, like Haryana, Punjab, and Sikkim, require targeted interventions to reduce mortality rates by improving emergency care quality. On the other hand, states such as Meghalaya, Mizoram, and West Bengal, which exhibit differences in death rates between HMIS and GBD data, require further assessment to verify data accuracy.

Strengths and limitations

In this novel nationwide assessment of emergency capacity and burden, we comprehensively analyze HMIS and GBD data, investigating their relationships with overlapping health indicators. The findings have direct policy implications, guiding strategic focus on regions that need to strengthen emergency departments and improve reporting mechanisms. This study also addresses the shortcomings in HMIS data and the need for standardization and improved reporting of emergency department conditions to streamline the allocation of emergency care resources.

While HMIS is based on health system data and relies on data reported from healthcare facilities, which are affected by differences in quality and completeness across facilities, GBD offers modeled estimates at the population level. Since India lacks widespread community-level reporting for EMCs, GBD data helps bridge this gap. Using data from both HMIS and GBD provides a more comprehensive understanding of EMCs in India while recognizing the strengths and limitations of each data source.

The study has several limitations. First, the data used in this study are from 2019-2020. Only nine out of 31 GBD conditions were mapped to seven available HMIS conditions, limiting the study's ability to capture and represent the true numbers accurately. This could be partly attributed to the fact that GBD does not account for India-specific EMC classification. All

these factors put together further limit the comparability and reliability of findings due to underrepresented or missing data, skewing the overall assessment. The study also has limitations due to discrepancies in the registration of certain conditions in both the GBD and the HMIS database, indicating a lack of data completeness and coverage. Moreover, HMIS data is collated with most data collected from public sector hospitals, thus not accounting for EMD registrations at private hospitals. The absence of data from India's Union Territories in the GBD database is a significant limitation, preventing a comprehensive understanding of health trends and burdens on a national level. Lastly, our paper cannot assess the proportion of the disparity that is due to underreporting of the condition or underutilization of healthcare services.

Conclusion

EMCs form a significant 27.22% of all-cause disease incidence and 51.71% of all-cause mortality at the national level in India. EMC-specific data revealed significant disparities across GBD and HMIS databases. Establishing robust data registration processes, incentivizing accurate reporting, and strategically allocating resources are critical steps toward improving emergency care delivery.

REFERENCES

1 WHO. World Health Organization The World Health Report 1999: Making a difference. Health Millions. *Health Millions* 1999; 25: 3–5.

2 NITI Aayog. Emergency and Injury Care at District Hospitals in India: A Report of Current Status on Country Level Assessment. Govt. of India, 2020.

3 Chang CY, Abujaber S, Reynolds TA, Camargo CA, Obermeyer Z. Burden of emergency conditions and emergency care usage: new estimates from 40 countries. *Emerg Med J* 2016; 33: 794–800.

4 Saving Lives: Emergency Medical Services in India. https://isbinsight.isb.edu/saving-lives-emergency-medical-services-in-india/ (accessed June 8, 2024).

5 Pines JM, Hilton JA, Weber EJ, *et al.* International perspectives on emergency department crowding. *Acad Emerg Med* 2011; 18: 1358–70.

6 Patiño AM, Chen J, DeVos EL, *et al.* Emergency medicine around the world: analysis of the 2019 american college of emergency physicians international ambassador country reports. *Journal of the American College of Emergency Physicians Open* 2022; 3: e12681.

7 Department of Emergency Medicine, JPNATC, AIIMS, NITI Aayog, Government of India. Emergency and Injury Care at District Hospitals in India: A Report of Current Status on Country Level Assessment. Department of Emergency Medicine, JPNATC, AIIMS, New Delhi, 2020.

8 Reynolds TA, Sawe H, Rubiano AM, Shin SD, Wallis L, Mock CN. Strengthening health systems to provide emergency care. In: Jamison DT, Gelband H, Horton S, *et al.*, eds. Disease control priorities: improving health and reducing poverty, 3rd edn.

Washington (DC): The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank, 2017. DOI:10.1596/978-1-4648-0527-1_ch13.

9 Millum J, Beecroft B, Hardcastle TC, *et al.* Emergency care research ethics in low-income and middle-income countries. *BMJ Glob Health* 2019; 4: e001260.

10 Kruk ME, Gage AD, Arsenault C, *et al.* High-quality health systems in the Sustainable Development Goals era: time for a revolution. *Lancet Glob Health* 2018; 6: e1196–252.

11 Government of India. HMIS-Health Management Information System. https://hmis.nhp.gov.in/ (accessed Feb 19, 2021).

12 GBD 2019 Diseases and Injuries Collaborators. Global burden of 369 diseases and injuries in 204 countries and territories, 1990-2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *Lancet* 2020; 396: 1204–22.

13 CENSUS OF INDIA 2011: POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR INDIA AND STATES (2011–2036). 2019; published online Nov.

14 Husain Z, Saikia N, Bora RS. CHALLENGES OF THE HMIS IN INDIA- A case study of Udham Singh Nagar, Uttarakhand. Institute of Economic Growth; 2013.

15 Kumar S, Dansereau EA, Murray CJL. Does distance matter for institutional delivery in rural India? Appl Econ 2014;46:4091–103. https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2014.950836.

16 Ravindra P, Bhat R, Karanth N, Wilson W, Lavanya BN, Umra S, et al. Patterns and predictors of emergency medical services utilisation by patients attending the emergency medicine department of a tertiary care hospital in India. J Emerg Trauma Shock 2022;15:99–104. https://doi.org/10.4103/jets.jets_83_21.

17 Murray CJL. The Global Burden of Disease Study at 30 years. *Nat Med* 2022; 28: 2019–26.

18 Hughes RG. Tools and Strategies for Quality Improvement and Patient Safety. In: Hughes RG, ed. Patient Safety and Quality: An Evidence-Based Handbook for Nurses. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US), 2008.

19 Teresa B, Subhi M, Boyle A, Kark W. The value of emergency care data set (ECDS) presentation codes for predicting mortality and inpatient admission. *Cureus* 2024; 16: e56083.

20 Dash S, Shakyawar SK, Sharma M, Kaushik S. Big data in healthcare: management, analysis and future prospects. *J Big Data* 2019; 6: 54.

FIGURES



Figure 1: HMIS Emergency Medicine Department Rates for 35 States and Union Territories (2019-20) including A) Registration Rates and B) Death Rates.



Figure 2: HMIS Emergency Medicine Department Cause-Specific Registration Numbers (2019-20) at the A) National and B) State levels.



Figure 3: HMIS Emergency Medicine Department Population Level Rates for 35 States and Union Territories (2019-20) Including A) Registration Rates and B) Death Rates.

	Incidence Rate	Death Rate	DALYs Rate
Acute glomerulonephritis	13.17	0.01	0.34
Appendicitis	162.68	0.86	35.77
Atrial fibrillation and flutter	50.52	2.10	73.69
Dengue	2012.79	1.38	76.70
Diarrheal diseases	120789.43	45.47	1445.50
Ebola	0.00	0.00	0.00
Encephalitis	43.88	3.73	174.18
Endocarditis	6.60	0.49	15.44
Hemolytic disease and other neonatal jaundice	7.42	1.42	138.91
Idiopathic epilepsy	34.11	2.35	209.26
Injuries	10364.48	67.93	3851.56
Intracerebral hemorrhage	19.52	26.90	710.41
Ischemic heart disease	341.05	109.23	2677.33
Ischemic stroke	38.52	19.50	409.09
Lower respiratory infections	10667.04	31.18	1332.20
Malaria	711.44	2.40	159.57
Maternal abortion and miscarriage	508.22	0.10	6.22
Maternal hemorrhage	155.04	1.08	70.49
Maternal hypertensive disorders	195.65	0.25	17.06
Maternal obstructed labor and uterine rupture	130.61	0.18	21.62
Maternal sepsis and other maternal infections	270.58	0.14	9.60
Meningitis	39.70	2.50	157.62
Neonatal encephalopathy due to birth asphyxia and trauma	10.91	6.04	570.26
Neonatal preterm birth	223.18	11.91	1268.19
Neonatal sepsis and other neonatal infections	54.28	2.66	273.43
Paralytic ileus and intestinal obstruction	80.23	3.77	128.10
Paratyphoid fever	197.69	1.13	78.83
Rabies	0.40	0.37	18.42
Tetanus	1.19	0.53	37.24
Typhoid fever	345.14	3.65	262.98
Yellow fever	0.00	0.00	0.00

Figure 4: GBD Emergency Medical Conditions national rates (2019-20) Including Incidence, Death, and DALYs Rates.



Figure 5: GBD Emergency Medical Conditions for 35 States and Union Territories (2019-20) Including - A) Incidence Rates, B) DALY Rates, C) Death Rates, D) Incidence Proportion, and E) Death Proportion.



Figure 6: Comparison of data from HMIS emergency medicine departments and GBD emergency medical conditions for 35 states and UTs (2019-20) for A) Incidence Proportions vs Registration Proportions and B) Death Proportions



Figure 7: HMIS Emergency Department Registration Numbers vs. GBD Emergency Medical Conditions Incidence Numbers for 35 States and Union Territories (2019-20).