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[1,4], 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:

a. **Abstract:** 212 words
b. **Text (excluding the references, tables, and abstract):** 2375words
c. **Introduction + Discussion:** 782 words

No. of pages: 26

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 Commission on a Citizen-Centred Health System for India, and a member of the Drafting Committee for Maharashtra State's Mental Health Policy. Other authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding: None

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, PKK, and AA drafted the manuscript, and all authors contributed substantially to its revision. SZ takes responsibility for the paper as the guarantor.

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.

Declaration on use of AI: The authors haven't used any generative AI/AI assisted technologies in the writing process.

Patient Consent: Not applicable

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

ABSTRACT

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

Methods: This was a retrospective cross-sectional analysis of HMIS and GBD data for 2019. We extracted EMD registrations, hospital 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 per HMIS. 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 that EMCs accounted 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.

Conclusion: The study reveals gaps in EMD utilization compared to EMC disease burden estimates. Improved data integration and reporting can address regional disparities.

INTRODUCTION

Globally, 90% of deaths related to Emergency Medical Conditions (EMCs) could have been prevented with timely emergency care, highlighting the crucial role of Emergency Medicine Departments (EMDs).[1] India ranks 144th among 195 countries in terms of access to and capacity for immediate care during medical emergencies, as assessed by the Global Burden of Disease (GBD).[1,2] India's pre-hospital and hospital-level emergency department services are fragmented at the state and district levels, due to variations in patient volumes, emergency care protocols implementation, and availability of resources such as ambulances or blood banks.[3] While research can help strengthen emergency care delivery in India and other low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), studies have revealed challenges such as inadequate data collection, ethical research practices, and insufficient funding for research.[4,5] In India, there are no standard database records of population-level outcomes on EMC disease burden at the state and national levels. The Indian Health Management Information System (HMIS) datasets collect data from health facilities. The publicly available HMIS aggregate numbers provide total EMD registrations as well as those classifications for trauma, burns, snake bites, acute cardiac events, cerebrovascular events, and obstetric complications.[6]

The GBD 2019 was a large-scale research initiative led by the Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) that estimated epidemiological parameters for 300+ diseases, injuries, and risk factors for 204 countries and territories using advanced statistical modeling methods.[7] HMIS and GBD serve distinct roles within the health information framework. HMIS aims to record localized data from individual health facilities, while GBD provides a population-level perspective on disease burden by combining real-world data with statistical modeling to estimate health outcomes across diverse populations and regions. To understand the EMC disease burden and EMD service utilization, we conducted a retrospective cross-sectional analysis of the Indian emergency care system using both HMIS and GBD datasets. We had three objectives. First, we evaluated EMD registrations, deaths, and cause-specific registrations measured by HMIS for total admissions and population rates during 2019-2020. Secondly, we evaluated the incidences and deaths for 31 EMCs modeled by GBD 2019. We then analyzed specific outcome metrics in HMIS and GBD, including EMD service utilization and EMC disease burden, expressed as 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 source.

METHODS

Data sources and extraction

The Indian Health Monitoring Information System (HMIS) collects data from health facilities that report monthly on various primary, secondary, and tertiary indicators, including patient admissions, diagnoses, treatments, and outcomes, and consolidates them at the district, state, and national levels. 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. 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.[8]

The GBD uses data from various sources, including vital registration records, national health surveys, health information systems, hospital records, death certificates, and disease registries, to cover a range of health conditions and demographic groups. GBD studies use advanced statistical models to impute and correct missing data and to compensate for variations in reporting quality, thereby helping mitigate bias.[7]

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." This framework was designed to systematically quantify the global burden of emergency care by reviewing all GBD categories against this definition, identifying 31 EMCs. We extracted data on these 31 EMCs, which closely align 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 counts and rates (per 100,000 people) for cause-specific and all-cause incidence and deaths, and for the 29 EMCs from GBD 2019.

Outcomes and Analysis

To assess EMD service utilization, we used HMIS data to create national and state-level metrics, including case registration rates and death rates recorded at EMDs. We calculated population-level registration case rates and death rates (per 100,000 people) using mid-year population projections from the census. Due to the lack of a population-level, dedicated database for EMCs in India, we used GBD's estimated incidence and mortality rates at the

state and national levels to assess the EMC disease burden in India. **Supplementary Table 1** lists EMC outcomes calculated from the GBD and EMD outcomes from HMIS, along with their definitions and formulae.

We mapped overlapping conditions between GBD and HMIS to analyze cause-wise EMC incidence and EMD registration rates **(Supplementary Table 2)**. Next, we analyzed case burden using HMIS EMD registration proportions and GBD EMC incidence proportions. Finally, we assessed the mortality burden using death rates from the HMIS EMD and GBD EMC databases. No ethics approval was considered necessary for our data, as we used publicly available aggregate-level datasets such as HMIS and GBD.

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. Goa, a geographically and population-wise small West Indian state, however, stood out for its high registration rate. 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 **(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. **(Figure 1B)**.

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

Among HMIS EMD registrations nationwide, 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)**.

Within individual states, there were significant variations in EMD registrations by cause. States with the highest percentage of trauma-related registrations were Arunachal Pradesh

(90%), followed by Jharkhand (89%), Sikkim (89%), Puducherry (89%), and Mizoram (87%). Chandigarh had the highest percentage of obstetric cases at 53%, followed by Lakshadweep (46%), Andaman and Nicobar Islands (33%), and Manipur (26%). Himachal Pradesh had the highest number of burn cases registered at 3.6%, followed by Nagaland (3.5%) and Chhattisgarh (3.2%). For snake bites, Maharashtra and Telangana (each 9%), Andhra Pradesh (8%), and Chhattisgarh (7%) had the highest numbers. Delhi (30%), Lakshadweep (19%), and Andaman & Nicobar Islands (16%) 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 recording the highest rate at 48749.42 and Bihar 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 than its neighbors. The East and Northeast regions showed the greatest variation, with Arunachal Pradesh recording the highest rate and Bihar the lowest **(Figure 3A)**.

HMIS EM Population-Level Death Rate

The national HMIS EM population-level death rate was 21.29 deaths per 100,000 population, with Delhi having the highest rate (68.93) and Uttarakhand having the lowest (7.41). As before, Delhi had the highest rate among 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 showed the greatest variation, with Sikkim having the highest rate and West Bengal 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 rate among EMC at 120,789.43 cases per 100,000, while rabies had the lowest 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 at 104,407.17 cases per 100,000 **(Figure 5A)**. Thirteen 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. Seventeen states, predominantly in the South and in parts of the Northeast, had lower EMC incident rates than the national rate.

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, Chhattisgarh reported the highest EMC death rate at 453.23 deaths per 100,000, and Mizoram recorded the lowest rate at 181.22 per 100,000 **(Figure 5C)**. In total, 12 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 incidence 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 the 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%. Nine states had an incidence proportion higher than the national value. The incidence proportion in Nagaland (23.19%) 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. Mizoram (32.90%) reported the lowest death proportions in the country **(Figure 5E)**.

Mapping of GBD EMC with HMIS EMD Registrations

In HMIS, trauma-related registrations comprised 8.22% 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 0.03% of GBD.

Analyzing GBD EMC Incidence Proportion with HMIS EMD Registration Proportion

Kerala, Sikkim, Andhra Pradesh, 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 largest difference between the HMIS EMD Death Proportion and the 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 service utilization in addressing the EMC disease burden, using two different data sources: GBD and HMIS in the 2019-2020 period, to investigate the correspondence between population-level and health system-level indicators for emergency medicine and the underlying data patterns and gaps. Analyzing the 2019-2020 financial year provides a reliable pre-pandemic baseline to understand trends in both EMC disease burden and EMD service utilization. Our analysis reveals that 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 datasets, possibly due to several reasons.

Firstly, differences in numbers across sources could suggest inconsistent data collection and reporting practices, as well as on-the-ground differences in healthcare access and utilization. While the HMIS database is one of the few sources of information on health system functioning at national and sub-national levels, concerns have been raised about how data is captured in HMIS. A 2013 policy brief highlighted key issues influencing data collection in HMIS, including limited and poor-quality data submitted due to improper documentation and verification.[9] The poor quality of data was partly attributed to inadequate training of ground-level hospital staff. In addition, data from private hospitals in India is often limited in HMIS reports, which can also affect the estimation of EMC disease burden and EMD service utilization at the national and sub-national levels. The Uttar Pradesh (UP) state government conducted a district-level survey to identify on-the-ground barriers affecting HMIS data reporting by hospitals across the state. It was discovered that during the 2013-14 period, no fixed deadlines were set for hospitals across the state to submit their monthly data. As a result, only 75 private hospitals regularly submitted monthly data reports to the government. However, UP's Technical Support Unit introduced data-collection training programs and established fixed deadlines for monthly report submissions, among several other measures, leading to nearly 2514 private hospitals in the state regularly submitting their data by 2018-19.[10] Therefore, missing data and actual reporting errors in HMIS can possibly contribute to discrepancies in 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 emergency care utilization. Patients may be unable to avail themselves of timely EMD services due to 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.[11] In 2022, Ravindra et al. reported underutilization of pre-emergency and emergency services in India.[12] This was attributed to a lack of awareness of ambulance availability and distrust in the reliability and care provided during transfers. HMIS can only record data for those who can access healthcare services. In settings such as India, where EMD service utilization is suboptimal, the numbers from the health information system would not match and, more often than not, would undercount 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.[13] 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 the 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 on the extent to which each contributes to the differences between HMIS and GBD for comparable outcomes.

Policy Implications

Our findings underscore the need to enhance EMD-level data collection to enhance emergency medicine 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 strengthening data infrastructure and training, and by ensuring that emergency protocols and treatment methodologies align with proposed national guidelines.[14]

High EMD death rates highlight the need for a focused strategy to improve EMD service utilization. The national and state governments could invest in developing frameworks for emergency medical services that outline 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) in England, which serves as a standard for Emergency Care.[15] A reliable data registration, capacity evaluation, and EMC reporting verification process must be established at the hospital EMDs, district, and state levels.[16]

State-wise variations in HMIS EMD registration and death rates reflect differences in health system capacity, accessibility, and population distribution. Higher EMD registration rates in Kerala, Goa, and Delhi reflect better EMD infrastructure and hospital availability per capita, while lower rates in Bihar, Rajasthan, and the Northeastern states reflect under-resourced facilities and limited geographic access. Total population, public versus private utilization, socioeconomic and cultural factors further influence service utilization.[17]

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 and investigate 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 by healthcare facilities, which are affected by differences in quality and completeness across facilities, GBD offers population-level estimates. 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 accurately capture and represent the true numbers. This could be partly attributed to the fact that GBD does not account for India-specific EMC classification. All these factors, taken together, further limit the comparability and reliability of the 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 across GBD and HMIS, indicating incomplete data completeness and coverage. Moreover, HMIS data are skewed towards public-sector hospitals, thereby failing to fully capture private hospitals. The absence of data from India's Union Territories in the GBD database is a significant limitation, hindering a comprehensive understanding of national-level health trends and burdens. Lastly, we cannot assess the proportion of the disparity attributable to underreporting of the condition or to underutilization of healthcare services.

CONCLUSION

EMCs account for 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.

Relevance to Preventive Medicine:

Our study highlights the necessity to introduce a dedicated emergency medicine database in India that collects and stores data from private and public hospital EMDs in India. Establishing standardized data collection and verification protocols ensures that high quality data is available to formulate policies and programs to direct resources to strengthen infrastructure and capacity building efforts that ensures equitable and timely access to emergency care services for patients across the country.

Implications for Clinical Practice:

Our study highlights the variations in EMC disease burden and EMD service utilization measures across states, pointing to the need for local benchmarks for clinical practice. Further, the gap between EMC disease burden and the EMD service utilization in any given state is the first step towards capturing the unmet clinical care need. Future studies with more localized data can further this line of work.

REFERENCES

1 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.

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

3 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.

4 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.

5 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.

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

7 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.

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

9 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.

10 Meghani A, Tripathi AB, Bilal H, Gupta S, Prakash R, Namasivayam V, et al. Optimizing the health management information system in uttar pradesh, india: implementation insights and key learnings. Glob Health Sci Pract 2022;10. https://doi.org/10.9745/GHSP-D-21-00632.

11 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.

12 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.

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

14 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.

15 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.

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

17 Li Y, Li J, Geng J, Liu T, Liu X, Fan H, et al. Urban-sub-urban-rural variation in the supply and demand of emergency medical services. Front Public Health 2022;10:1064385. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2022.1064385.

TABLES

Table 1: List of HMIS and GBD Outcomes.

Source	Outcome	Formula
HMIS	EMD Registration Rate	$\frac{\text{Number of Emergency Department Registrations}}{\text{Total Hospital Admissions}} \times 100{,}000$
	EMD Death Rate	$\frac{\text{Number of Deaths in the Emergency Department}}{\text{Total Hospital Deaths}} \times 100{,}000$
	EMD Death Proportion	$\frac{\text{Number of Deaths in the Emergency Department}}{\text{Total Hospital Deaths}} \times 100$
	HMIS EMD Registration Cause-wise	The number of registrations for specific medical conditions
	Cause-Specific Registration Proportion	$\frac{\text{Number of Registrations for a Specific Cause}}{\text{Total Emergency Department Admissions}} \times 100$
	EMD Population Level Registration Rate	$\frac{\text{Number of Emergency Department Registrations}}{\text{Population}} \times 100{,}000$
	EMD Population Level Death Rate	$\frac{\text{Number of Deaths in the Emergency Department}}{\text{Population}} \times 100{,}000$
GBD	EMC Death Rate	$\frac{\text{Deaths Due to Emergency Conditions}}{\text{Population}} \times 100{,}000$
	EMC Incidence Rate	$\frac{\text{Incidence of Emergency Conditions}}{\text{Population}} \times 100{,}000$
	EMC Death Proportion	$\frac{\text{Deaths Due to Emergency Conditions}}{\text{Deaths of all causes}} \times 100$

	EMC Incidence Proportion	$\frac{\text{Incidence of Emergency Conditions}}{\text{Incidence of all causes}} \times 100$

Table 2: Mapping of GBD emergency medical conditions against HMIS emergency medical department registrations.

HMIS Registered Causes	**Corresponding GBD EMCs**
Trauma	Injuries
Burns	
Snake Bite	
Obstetric Complications	Maternal abortion and miscarriage
	Maternal hemorrhage
	Maternal hypertensive disorders
	Maternal obstructed labor and uterine rupture
	Maternal sepsis and other maternal infections
Emergency Acute Cardiac Events	Ischemic heart disease
Cardiovascular Accidents	Hemorrhagic stroke
	Ischemic stroke

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
Acute glomerulonephritis	13.17	0.01
Appendicitis	162.68	0.86
Atrial fibrillation and flutter	50.52	2.10
Dengue	2012.79	1.38
Diarrheal diseases	120789.43	45.47
Ebola	0.00	0.00
Encephalitis	43.88	3.73
Endocarditis	6.60	0.49
Hemolytic disease and other neonatal jaundice	7.42	1.42
Idiopathic epilepsy	34.11	2.35
Injuries	10364.48	67.93
Intracerebral hemorrhage	19.52	26.90
Ischemic heart disease	341.05	109.23
Ischemic stroke	38.52	19.50
Lower respiratory infections	10667.04	31.18
Malaria	711.44	2.40
Maternal abortion and miscarriage	508.22	0.10
Maternal hemorrhage	155.04	1.08
Maternal hypertensive disorders	195.65	0.25
Maternal obstructed labor and uterine rupture	130.61	0.18
Maternal sepsis and other maternal infections	270.58	0.14
Meningitis	39.70	2.50
Neonatal encephalopathy due to birth asphyxia and trauma	10.91	6.04
Neonatal preterm birth	223.18	11.91
Neonatal sepsis and other neonatal infections	54.28	2.66
Paralytic ileus and intestinal obstruction	80.23	3.77
Paratyphoid fever	197.69	1.13
Rabies	0.40	0.37
Tetanus	1.19	0.53
Typhoid fever	345.14	3.65
Yellow fever	0.00	0.00

Created with Datawrapper

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



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