

Article Type: Original Article

Cost of hospitalization for non-communicable diseases in India: are we pro-poor?

J. P. Tripathy¹, B. M. Prasad², H. D. Shewade¹, A. M. V. Kumar¹, R. Zachariah³, S. Chadha², J. Tonsing¹,
A. D. Harries^{4,5}

¹*International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, South-East Asia Regional Office, New Delhi, India*

²*Project Axshya, International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, South-East Asia Regional Office, New Delhi, India*

³*Médecins Sans Frontières, Brussels Operational centre, Luxembourg*

⁴*International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, Paris, France*

⁵*London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, United Kingdom*

Abstract

Objectives: To estimate out-of-pocket (OOP) expenditure due to hospitalization from NCDs and its impact on households in India.

Methods: The study analysed nationwide representative data collected by the National Sample Survey Organization in 2014 that reported health service utilization and health care related OOP expenditure by income quintiles and by type of health facility (public or private). The recall period for inpatient hospitalization expenditure was 365 days. Consumption expenditure was collected for a recall period of one month. OOP expenditure amounting to >10% of annual consumption expenditure was termed as catastrophic. Weighted analysis was performed.

Results: The median expenditure per episode of hospitalisation due to NCDs was USD 149 – this was ~3 times higher among the richest quintile compared to poorest quintile. There was a significantly higher prevalence of catastrophic expenditure among the poorest quintile, more so for cancers (85%), psychiatric and neurological disorders (63%) and injuries (63%). Mean private sector OOP hospitalization expenditure was nearly five times higher than in the public sector. Medicines accounted for 40% and 27% of public and private sector OOP hospitalization expenditure respectively.

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process, which may lead to differences between this version and the Version of Record. Please cite this article as doi: 10.1111/tmi.12732

This article is protected by copyright. All rights reserved.

Conclusion: Strengthening of public health facilities is required at community level for the prevention, control and management of NCDs. Promotion of generic medicines, better availability of essential drugs and possible subsidization for the poorest quintile will be measures to consider to reduce OOP expenditure in public sector facilities.

Keywords: non communicable diseases; injury; cancer; out of pocket expenditure; catastrophic expenditure

Introduction

Noncommunicable Diseases (NCDs) are a major threat to general health, productivity, development and economic growth and account for 63% of annual global deaths.(1) Most of these deaths are premature and preventable. The probability of dying during the most productive years (ages 30-70) from one of the four main NCDs [cancer, cardiovascular disease, diabetes mellitus and stroke] is 26%. If urgent action is not taken, NCDs could hurt economic growth and cause an estimated economic loss of \$47 trillion during the period 2010-30. (2)

In an ageing nation like India, an increase in the prevalence of NCDs is likely to put additional burdens on households and the resource-constrained healthcare delivery system. India runs the risk of losing about \$4.6 trillion by 2030 due to NCDs and mental health conditions. In 2010, NCDs accounted for more disability-adjusted life years (DALYs) in India than communicable diseases.(2)

With a rising burden of NCDs, delivering healthcare in developing countries has many challenges. Even when such care is available, individuals with NCDs will continue to face significant risks of hospitalization and the associated burden of high costs of financing care. A review of the literature shows that households spend a substantial share of their income on health care leading to catastrophic expenditure and impoverishment. (3) Each year, globally, approximately 150 million people in 44 million households face catastrophic expenditure and about 100 million people in 25 million households are pushed into poverty because they have to pay for health care.(3)

The extent of the financial burden due to NCDs in India is poorly researched.(4,5) A gap area is the household impact of out-of-pocket (OOP) hospitalization expenditure due to NCDs. This information would be helpful in formulating social protection strategies to increase financial risk protection for households affected with NCDs. With the rising burden of NCDs, we need to look for answers whether people have access to the services they need to prevent or control these diseases, and the extent to which they suffer financial catastrophe or impoverishment in accessing the services.

There have been a few studies in India analysing household expenditure on chronic illnesses either combined or separately for diabetes, CVD and injuries.(6–11) However, these studies were limited to a specific geographical area or a hospital with unrepresentative samples. Another study by Engelgau et al. explored OOP for NCD care and the risk of catastrophic payment in a nationally representative survey sample (12) more than a decade ago. Since then there has been an unprecedented rise in the burden of NCDs.(13) The public health infrastructure in India has seen massive growth after significant investments through the National Health Mission since 2005.(14) The private sector has also proliferated due to government apathy.(15) In the present scenario, we have limited estimates of household expenditure patterns on hospitalization due to NCDs, both in public and the private sector. Availability of National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) data, from a nationally representative survey conducted in 2014, provided us an opportunity to study this.

Therefore, the present study was thus undertaken to estimate the proportion of all hospitalizations in public sector facilities due to non-communicable diseases by income quintiles, and the median out-of-pocket expenditure and prevalence of catastrophic expenditure due to hospitalization from non-communicable disease by type of health facility and income quintiles.

Methods

This is a secondary data analysis of a nationwide survey data collected by the NSSO, India. The data source is the representative nationwide survey collected by the National Sample Survey Organization (NSSO) in its 71st round (2014) on 'Health' and 'Education'. NSSO is a national organisation under the Ministry of Statistics, established in 1950 to regularly conduct surveys and provide useful statistics on socio-economic status of households, demography, health, industries, agriculture, consumer expenditure etc. Results of NSSO surveys are published in the form of NSS reports available at the website of the Ministry (www.mospi.nic.in). So far there have been 71 rounds of surveys, the last (71st round) was carried out for six months from January to June 2014. A stratified multi-stage sampling design was adopted. The first stage units were the census villages in the rural sector and Urban Frame Survey (UFS) blocks in the urban sector. The ultimate stage units were households in both sectors. 4577 villages and 3,720 urban blocks were surveyed, from which 36,480 and 29,452 households were sampled in rural and urban areas respectively. 333,104 persons from 65,932 households were interviewed. Detailed methods can be found in the survey report.(16)

OOP expenditure for each episode of hospitalization was recorded. Detailed expenditure was available for drugs; diagnostic tests (including ECG, X-ray, pathological tests, etc.); professional fees for doctors; payments to hospital/institution; other medical expenses (physiotherapy, personal medical appliances, blood, oxygen, attendant charges etc.); and other indirect costs. Indirect costs

included transport for patients and other accompanying persons, food related expenses, lodging charges and others. Household consumption expenditure was recorded as well as other socio-demographic characteristics including caste, occupation, gender and education. Data were also collected on type of facility (public or private) accessed for medical care.

The recall period was 365 days for assessing inpatient hospitalization expenditure, and 1 month for household consumption expenditure. OOP expenditure per hospitalization episode amounting to more than 10% of annual consumption expenditure was termed as 'catastrophic'. (17,18)

Disease conditions in the household survey were self-reported. We matched the categories in the surveys to broad ICD-10 disease classifications to distinguish between major NCD categories and communicable diseases (Box 1).

Data analysis

Data were imported into SPSS version 17.0 for analysis. The unit of analysis was an episode of hospitalization. The study population was divided into quintile groups based on monthly per capita consumption expenditure (MPCE). The household monthly per capita consumption expenditure limits (in USD) for the five quintiles are as follows: first quintile (2-16), second quintile (17-22), third quintile (23-30), fourth quintile (31-46) and the fifth quintile (47-538). Median values/percentages for all indicators were compared across each of the five MPCE quintiles and type of health facility (public and private). Median hospitalization expenditure per episode was estimated for those who reported hospitalization due to NCD. The Kruskal-Wallis test was used to evaluate the statistical significance of differences in expenditures between the quintiles. Chi-square test for trend was used to test linear trends across quintiles. Since it was a multistage stratified random survey, estimates were derived by applying sampling weights given by the NSSO.

Ethical approval

The Ethics Advisory Group of International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, Paris, France, determined that ethics clearance was not required for this study.

Results

Of a total of 57,456 hospitalizations, 25% were due to NCDs, 22% to communicable diseases and 53% to other conditions. 11,843 subjects reported 14,609 episodes of hospitalizations due to non-communicable disease in the last 365 days, of which 1.6% of episodes were removed due to missing data. Among the cases of hospitalization due to NCDs 31% were due to injuries; 25% to CVD; 18% to psychiatric/neurological conditions; 9% to respiratory diseases; 8% to endocrine/metabolic disorders

and 8% to cancers. 85% of respondents reported one episode of hospitalization in the previous year; 11% reported two episodes and 4% reported more than 2 episodes. 26% were females. The mean age of the respondents was 49 years (sd=16). The mean duration of hospitalization was highest in cases of cancer (15 days), followed by injuries and psychiatric/neurological disorders (9 days), endocrine/metabolic diseases (8 days), CVD and respiratory diseases (7 days).

Hospitalisation-related expenditure due to NCDs

Median expenditure per episode of hospitalisation due to NCDs was 149 USD. The expenditure incurred was ~3 times higher among the richest quintile than in the poorest quintile. There was a significantly higher prevalence of catastrophic expenditure among the poorest quintile, more pronounced with cancers (85%), psychiatric and neurological disorders (63%) and injuries (63%) (Table 1). Public sector utilization by the poorest quintile was twice as common as by the richest quintile (Table 2).

Median private sector OOP hospitalization expenditure was nearly 3-5 times higher than the public sector due to various NCDs. Private sector hospitalization expenditure was more than five times compared to public sector hospitalization expenses in case of cardiovascular diseases and injuries. Medicines accounted for 40% of public and 27% of private sector OOP hospitalization expenditure. In 26% of hospitalizations expenditures were sourced through borrowing or sale of assets – this was significantly higher among the poorest quintile (33%) than the richest (19%), more common when care was sought in the private sector (29%) than in the public sector (22%) and common in case of cancer. Indirect costs were more than two times higher in the public sector (24%) than in the private sector (10%) (Table 3). Nearly 4.4% of respondents were insured. Among the insured, median hospitalization expenditure was significantly higher (USD 519) compared to the non-insured (USD 160).

NCD related hospitalization leading to catastrophic household expenditure

Hospitalization due to an NCD had a 3 times higher odds of incurring catastrophic spending than hospitalization due to a communicable disease. For cancer, the impact was greatest with the odds of catastrophic expenditures being 12 times higher than for hospital stays due to a communicable disease (Table 4).

Discussion

The study shows that NCD-related expenditure per episode of hospitalisation in India is high and catastrophic in among the poorest quintile. Cancers, psychiatric and neurological disorders and injuries were the most expensive. Expenditure was higher when care was accessed in the private sector.

The utilization of public facilities showed a pro-poor distribution, which is corroborated by Shankar et al who also reported higher public sector utilization by the poor in three states of North India.(18) This is an encouraging sign considering the rising burden of NCDs. It lends support to the view that strengthening of the public health system is instrumental in providing care for the rising epidemic of NCDs.(19) However the results of the study also showed that private care is very costly, which might be the reason why poor people make greater use of public care facilities. The proportion of hospital stays due to NCDs in the public sector has remained stagnant at around 41% since 2004.(12) However, use of public services has decreased sharply with the increase in wealth quintile class. Thus people who are poor are heavily reliant on public health facilities and are therefore most affected by the unavailability of quality services in the public sector.

About half of the patients belonging to the lowest two quintiles approach the private sector for hospitalization due to NCDs. It is possible that patients with NCDs consider their illness as serious requiring better services. So despite their poor economic status, they might prefer costlier private care. Also, there is a general scepticism about quality of public health services.(20,21) The full survey report states the following reasons for not availing government services: poor quality of care, long waiting times, services not available or the facility too far. Thus, the public sector needs to be strengthened in terms of quality of care, infrastructure and availability of services, providers and drugs in order to increase its access and utilization. With higher health spending under the National Rural Health Mission we may be on track.

Medicines accounted for 40% of public sector OOP hospitalization expenditure which is significantly higher than in the private sector (27%). This supports a large body of evidence showing that medicines form a large component of the health care out-of-pocket expenditure.(6,22,23) This finding is to be interpreted with caution and does not mean that medicines are more expensive in the public than in the private sector. Rather, it means that as a percentage of total expenses, medicines contribute the most in public sector, while the absolute costs remain lower than in the private sector. The lower percentage of medicine costs in the private sector is due to higher costs of other services (like diagnostic tests, procedures and room rent) which are free or subsidised in the public sector. Poor availability of essential medicines for chronic diseases in public health facilities forces patients to purchase medicines from the private sector.(24) Thus, to increase access and affordability of health care, promotion of generic medicines and improved availability of medicines and subsidization of the poorest population quintiles in the public sector are required.(25) The Rajasthan model of a free drug scheme has increased access to health care for the underserved, reduced in OOP and resulted in savings to the government.(26) A drug pricing policy is needed to improve the availability of

affordable generics in the public sector, either by better targeting of existing public spending for medicines or by increasing the public budget on essential medicines.

Cardiovascular disease is the largest cause of mortality and accounted for more than one-fourth of all deaths in India in 2008.(27) Our study reveals prohibitive costs of care due to CVD in the private sector, with one-fifth of hospitalizations paid for by borrowings or sale of personal assets and medicines. The private sector is also typically driven by use of advanced medical technology, thus increasing the costs of diagnosis, care and treatment. We speculate that there may be unnecessary (irrational) overuse of such technology for increasing hospital activity and profit margins by the private health sector. This merits specific investigation. The issue of affordability is further magnified by the low penetration of health insurance in India. There is no coverage for preventive check-ups, diagnosis or any medical care. Along with poor awareness, this is a huge barrier towards lowering the burden of CVDs through preventive measures.

Nearly 40% of those insured were prevented from incurring catastrophic expenditure due to insurance payments. There is a need to mitigate this catastrophic expenditure through prepayment risk pooling mechanisms, such as social health insurance and tax-based financing of health care. In practice it has been found that the beneficiaries of such programmes are often not actually poor. Thus packages should be redesigned to target the poor and the disadvantaged. This study shows that even after six years of implementation of *Rashtriya Swasthya Bima Yojana*, a government social health insurance scheme, there is a high prevalence of catastrophic expenditure due to hospitalization for NCDs in public sector facilities among the poorest quintiles. Considering the long term chronic care and repeated hospitalizations for NCDs, separate customized insurance packages should be designed for patients with this group of morbidities. However, the median hospitalization expenditure among the insured was more than three times higher than among the non-insured, which reflects moral hazards of insurance requiring preventive mechanisms.

Hospitalizations due to injuries lead to a high prevalence of catastrophic OOP expenditure. There was also a higher prevalence of OOP hospitalization expenditures being paid for by borrowing/debt/sale of assets in both the public and private sectors. Other studies have also outlined the high burden of OOP health care expenditure associated with injuries in India.(28,29)

Apart from cancer, injury care leads to higher OOP and impoverishment of households. Similarly other studies have also reported higher OOP for injuries compared with other diseases and ailments. (30) This might be due to the fact that injuries requiring hospitalizations are usually severe and lead to more fatalities and disabilities.(30) Furthermore, the impact of injuries is sudden and rapid requiring immediate hospitalization, which demands sophisticated emergency trauma care services and prolonged duration of hospital stay. A review of economic evidence in LMICs suggests that the direct

Accepted Article

median medical cost of injury was US\$291 which increased 14-fold i.e. US\$4085 when studies included direct medical, direct non-medical and indirect costs.(31) This clearly shows the devastating financial impact of injury on households. There is therefore a need for advocacy for effective financial protection mechanisms in India against high OOP expenditure through insurance and universal health care. Various cost-effective injury prevention strategies are established which include strict legislative measures to regulate vehicle safety and road safety, installation of speed bumps, motorcycle helmet and seat belt legislation, breath testing campaigns and drowning prevention programmes. Thus, in view of the high burden of injuries, high cost of injury care and availability of cost effective preventive interventions there is significant potential for huge cost savings through implementation of established preventive strategies.(31)

There is high OOP hospitalization expenditure related to cancer care. The prevalence of catastrophic expenditure is highest in those with cancers in all the quintiles, but especially amongst the poorest. Cancer treatment in private hospitals is expensive in India as evident from other studies.(32) The high OOP expenditure due to cancer is sourced from borrowing/sale of assets in more than one third of patients.(32) The cost of cancer care is prohibitive due to costly medicines, sophisticated equipment and modern technology. Cancer also requires prolonged period of hospitalization as evident in this study. Providing cancer care free of cost at all public health facilities would put an enormous financial burden on the health system, but targeting the poorest quintile seems feasible and equitable. Some state level initiatives, such as the *Yashashwini* health insurance scheme in Karnataka and similar schemes in Andhra Pradesh and Tamil Nadu, cover cancer treatment for people living below the poverty line.(32)

Current programmes that address cancer prevention, care and treatment have not been effective due to limited scale of implementation. It is imperative to strengthen cancer control activities at the community with strong prevention messages, early screening and proper management as most of the common cancers are preventable.(33)

Our data confirm the important role that the private sector currently plays in the provision of health services for hospitalizations associated with NCDs. However the median OOP hospitalization expenditure in the private sector was 3-5 times higher than in the public sector. In the last decade there has been a significant increase in private sector expenditure on healthcare. During 2004-14, the out-of-pocket expenditure for inpatient care per episode in the public sector diminished, whereas it grew by 3.6% per year in private sector.(34) This is a reflection of the inability of the government to regulate the private sector. The government needs to regulate the private sector and at the same time use the private infrastructure to provide comprehensive preventive, promotive and curative care services for NCDs that are accessible and affordable.

Given that people living with NCDs face high risks of catastrophic health expenditure due to the long-term nature of their illness and OOP payments, the health system must provide universal access to quality health care, reduce health inequities and improve financial risk protection through universal health care (UHC). Many countries have already introduced NCD packages into UHC programs using frameworks developed by WHO.(35) Thus, NCD prevention and control should be prioritized in UHC design and implementation.

There are some limitations in this study. Firstly, consumption expenditure in the survey does not differentiate between food and non-food expenditure. WHO recommends a 40% cut-off level for non-food expenditure.(36) In this study we have used a threshold of 10% of annual consumption expenditure. However, this does not provide an accurate estimate of catastrophic expenditure since the expenditure on food as a proportion of total consumption expenditure is higher for poorer households. Hence the results of the present study for catastrophic expenditure may be an underestimate for the poorer income quintiles and overestimate for higher income quintiles. Secondly, consumption expenditure as an alternative to income also might overestimate the findings. Thirdly, indirect costs do not include wage losses due to the illness, which might underestimate the impact of health care expenditure on the household. Lastly, the data used for the analyses are self-reported and may be subject to recall and other biases.

Conclusion

The study shows that a household with a member suffering from any NCD is exposed to significant financial risks which lead to catastrophic household expenditure. This trend is likely to worsen over time due to the rising NCD epidemic and the ageing population. We strongly advocates for publicly funded risk protection mechanisms targeting the poor. The use of NCD health services from public facilities results in lower out of pocket household expenses than the use of private services, which warrants strengthening of public sector health facilities for better financial risk protection. Promotion of generic medicines and better availability and access to essential drugs will significantly reduce OOP expenditure in public sector facilities. NCD prevention and control should be prioritized in universal health care design and implementation.

References

1. Alwan A, Maclean DR, Riley LM, d'Espaignet ET, Mathers CD, Stevens GA, et al. Monitoring and surveillance of chronic non-communicable diseases: progress and capacity in high-burden countries. *Lancet* (London, England). 2010 Nov 27;376(9755):1861–8.
2. Bloom D, Cafiero-Fonseca E, Candeias V, Adashi E, Bloom L, Gurfein L, et al. Economics of Non

Communicable Diseases in India: Costs and Returns on Investment of Interventions to Promote Healthy Living and Prevent, Treat, and Manage NCDs [Internet]. 2014 [cited 2015 Nov 2].

Available from:

http://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_EconomicNonCommunicableDiseasesIndia_Report_2014.pdf

3. Xu K, Evans D, Carrin G, Aguilar-Rivera A. Designing health financing systems to reduce catastrophic health expenditure [Internet]. Geneva; 2005 [cited 2015 Nov 2]. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/70005/1/WHO_EIP_HSF_PB_05.02_eng.pdf?ua=1
4. Boutayeb A. The double burden of communicable and non-communicable diseases in developing countries. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.* 2006 Mar;100(3):191–9.
5. Daar AS, Singer PA, Persad DL, Pramming SK, Matthews DR, Beaglehole R, et al. Grand challenges in chronic non-communicable diseases. *Nature.* 2007 Nov 22;450(7169):494–6.
6. Dror DM, van Putten-Rademaker O, Koren R. Cost of illness: evidence from a study in five resource-poor locations in India. *Indian J Med Res.* 2008 Apr;127(4):347–61.
7. Binnendijk E, Koren R, Dror DM. Can the rural poor in India afford to treat non-communicable diseases. *Trop Med Int Health.* 2012 Nov;17(11):1376–85.
8. Ramachandran A, Ramachandran S, Snehalatha C, Augustine C, Murugesan N, Viswanathan V, et al. Increasing expenditure on health care incurred by diabetic subjects in a developing country: a study from India. *Diabetes Care.* 2007 Feb;30(2):252–6.
9. Shobhana R, Rama Rao P, Lavanya A, Williams R, Vijay V, Ramachandran A. Expenditure on health care incurred by diabetic subjects in a developing country--a study from southern India. *Diabetes Res Clin Pract.* 2000 Apr;48(1):37–42.
10. Rao KD, Bhatnagar A, Murphy A. Socio-economic inequalities in the financing of cardiovascular & diabetes inpatient treatment in India. *Indian J Med Res.* 2011 Jan;133:57–63.
11. Prinja S, Jagnoor J, Chauhan AS, Aggarwal S, Ivers R. Estimation of the economic burden of injury in north India: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet (London, England).* 2015 Apr 27;385 Suppl :S57.
12. Engalgau MM, Karan A, Mahal A. The Economic impact of Non-communicable Diseases on households in India. *Global Health.* 2012 Jan;8(1):9.
13. Shah B, Mathur P. Surveillance of cardiovascular disease risk factors in India: the need & scope. *Indian J Med Res.* 2010 Nov;132:634–42.
14. Report of the Working Group on National Rural Health Mission (NRHM) for the Twelfth Five Year Plan (2012-2017). Government of India, Planning Commission 2011 [Internet]. [cited 2016 May 16]. Available from:

- http://planningcommission.nic.in/aboutus/committee/wrkgrp12/health/WG_1NRHM.pdf
15. Sengupta A, Nundy S. The private health sector in India. *BMJ*. 2005 Nov 19;331(7526):1157–8.
 16. Key Indicators of Social Consumption in India Health NSS 71st round [Internet]. Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, Government of India. 2015 [cited 2016 Jan 12]. Available from: http://mospi.nic.in/Mospi_New/upload/nss_71st_ki_health_30june15.pdf
 17. Limwattananon S, Tangcharoensathien V, Prakongsai P. Catastrophic and poverty impacts of health payments: results from national household surveys in Thailand. *Bull World Health Organ*. 2007 Aug;85(8):600–6.
 18. Prinja S, Kanavos P, Kumar R. Health care inequities in north India: role of public sector in universalizing health care. *Indian J Med Res*. 2012 Oct;136(3):421–31.
 19. Engelgau M, Okamoto K, Navaratne K, Gopalan S. Prevention and Control of Selected Chronic NCDs in Sri Lanka: Policy Options and Action [Internet]. Washington; 2010 [cited 2015 Nov 2]. Available from: <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/13607/575630WP0Box351DS0SriLanka01PUBLIC1.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
 20. Berman PA. Rethinking health care systems: Private health care provision in India. *World Dev*. 1998 Aug;26(8):1463–79.
 21. Reddy KS, Patel V, Jha P, Paul VK, Kumar AKS, Dandona L. Towards achievement of universal health care in India by 2020: a call to action. *Lancet (London, England)*. 2011 Feb 26;377(9767):760–8.
 22. Financing and delivery of health care services in India [Internet]. New Delhi; 2005 [cited 2015 Nov 2]. Available from: [http://www.who.int/macrohealth/action/Background Papers report.pdf](http://www.who.int/macrohealth/action/Background%20Papers%20report.pdf)
 23. Engelgau MM, Karan A, Mahal A. The Economic impact of Non-communicable Diseases on households in India. *Global Health. BioMed Central*; 2012 Apr 25;8(1):9.
 24. Prinja S, Bahuguna P, Tripathy JP, Kumar R. Availability of medicines in public sector health facilities of two North Indian States. *BMC Pharmacol Toxicol*. 2015 Jan;16(1):43.
 25. Babar ZUD, Ibrahim MIM, Singh H, Bukahri NI, Creese A. Evaluating drug prices, availability, affordability, and price components: implications for access to drugs in Malaysia. *PLoS Med*. 2007 Mar 27;4(3):e82.
 26. Gurbani N. Access to Quality Medicines: Rajasthan Model Reaching the Unreached. *Pharma Times*. 2015;47(2):18–24.
 27. Non communicable diseases (NCD) Country Profiles [Internet]. Geneva; 2014 [cited 2015 Nov 2]. Available from: http://www.who.int/nmh/countries/ind_en.pdf?ua=1
 28. Kumar GA, Dilip TR, Dandona L, Dandona R. Burden of out-of-pocket expenditure for road traffic

- injuries in urban India. BMC Health Serv Res. 2012 Jan;12:285.
29. Reddy GMM, Singh A, Singh D. Community based estimation of extent and determinants of cost of injuries in a north Indian city. Indian J Med Sci. Jan;66(1-2):23–9.
30. Gumber A. Burden of Injury in India. Econ Pol Wkly. 1997;32(25):1478-87.
31. Wesson HKH, Boikhutso N, Bachani AM, Hofman KJ, Hyder AA. The cost of injury and trauma care in low- and middle-income countries: a review of economic evidence. Health Policy Plan. 2014 Oct;29(6):795–808.
32. Nair KS, Raj S, Tiwari VK, Piang LK. Cost of treatment for cancer: experiences of patients in public hospitals in India. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev. 2013 Jan;14(9):5049–54.
33. Pramesh CS, Badwe RA, Borthakur BB, Chandra M, Raj EH, Kannan T, et al. Delivery of affordable and equitable cancer care in India. Lancet Oncol. 2014 May;15(6):e223–33.
34. Patel V, Parikh R, Nandraj S, Balasubramaniam P, Narayan K, Paul VK, et al. Assuring health coverage for all in India. Lancet. 2015 Dec 12;386(10011):2422–35.
35. Jamison DT, Summers LH, Alleyne G, Arrow KJ, Berkley S, Binagwaho A, et al. Global health 2035: a world converging within a generation. Lancet. 2013 Dec 7;382(9908):1898–955.
36. The World Health Report. Health Systems: Improving Performance [Internet]. Geneva; 2000 [cited 2015 Nov 2]. Available from: http://www.who.int/whr/2000/en/whr00_en.pdf

Corresponding author: Jaya Prasad Tripathy, International Union Against Tuberculosis and Lung Disease, The Union South-East Asia Regional Office, New Delhi, India. E-mail: jtripathy@theunion.org

Box 1. Classification of 2014 household survey response categories from National Sample Survey Data into disease categories

Communicable diseases

Fever with rash/ eruptive lesions, loss of consciousness
Fever due to malaria, typhoid, Diphtheria, Whooping Cough, fevers of unknown origin)
Tuberculosis, Filariasis
Tetanus
HIV/AIDS and other Sexually Transmitted Diseases
Jaundice
Diarrhoea/ dysentery/ increased frequency of stools with or without blood and mucus in stools
Worms infestation
Skin infection (boil, abscess, itching) and other skin diseases
Acute upper respiratory infections

Non-communicable diseases

Cancers

Psychiatric and Neurological disorders

Endocrine, nutritional and metabolic disorders

Cardiovascular disorders

Chronic respiratory conditions (Bronchial asthma)

Injuries

Other conditions

Blood disorders

Disorders of the gastrointestinal system

Disorders of the genitourinary system

Obstetric complications

Disorders of eye and ear

Table 1. Out-of-pocket hospitalization expenditure per episode of hospitalization due to Non-Communicable Diseases by income quintiles in India, 2014[^]

Income quintiles	Cancer	Endocrine /metabolic	Psychiatric /neurological	Cardiovascular	Chronic respiratory	Injuries	Total
Median hospitalization expenditure in USD for each episode (IQR)							
1 st MPCE quintile	400(96-957)	88(25-191)	108(37-226)	67(24-218)	79(31-138)	105(38-268)	93(34-231)
2 nd MPCE quintile	310(111-465)	142(55-235)	102(45-274)	122(37-314)	68(32-154)	111(45-317)	114(45-305)
3 rd MPCE quintile	277(140-826)	98(47-200)	148(57-295)	123(52-276)	83(33-185)	139(42-354)	137(47-309)
4 th MPCE quintile	383(117-769)	132(43-300)	205(75-527)	177(66-457)	114(48-240)	213(70-579)	185(67-499)
5 th MPCE quintile	608(282-1360)	215(78-400)	347(117-943)	291(86-1320)	197(102-431)	331(108-885)	298(102-873)
Overall	357(143-864)	130(53-272)	152(58-398)	148(54-412)	101(42-200)	156(50-447)	149(55-406)
Out-of-pocket hospitalization expenditure as a proportion of annual household consumption expenditure expressed in median percentage (%)							
1 st MPCE quintile	56	14	14	12	13	16	15
2 nd MPCE quintile	25	11	10	12	7	11	11
3 rd MPCE quintile	23	7	12	09	6	09	10
4 th MPCE quintile	26	7	9	08	7	13	09
5 th MPCE quintile	22	8	12	09	6	09	09
Overall	25	8	12	10	8	11	11
p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Proportion of hospitalization episodes leading to catastrophic expenditure (%)							
1 st MPCE quintile	85	63	63	55	55	63	61
2 nd MPCE quintile	73	50	49	55	45	52	52
3 rd MPCE quintile	75	39	57	48	33	45	48
4 th MPCE quintile	75	41	48	42	31	55	48

5 th MPCE quintile	74	30	56	49	28	47	48
Overall	76	44	55	49	40	53	52
p-value	0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Proportion of hospitalization episodes whose expenditure was sourced from borrowings/sale of physical assets (%)							
1 st MPCE quintile	38	27	39	28	22	37	33
2 nd MPCE quintile	48	27	31	30	25	33	32
3 rd MPCE quintile	36	23	29	20	18	26	25
4 th MPCE quintile	26	16	33	26	19	19	24
5 th MPCE quintile	28	21	19	19	10	19	19
Overall	36	22	30	24	19	27	26
p-value	<0.001	0.002	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

l

^ weighted analysis;

IQR=Interquartile Range; MPCE=monthly per capita expenditure; *>10% of annual household consumption expenditure; The household monthly per capita consumption expenditure limits (in USD) for the five quintiles are as follows: first quintile (2-16), second quintile (17-22), third quintile (23-30), fourth quintile (31-46) and the fifth quintile (47-538)

Table 2. Utilization of public sector facilities for hospitalization due to non-communicable diseases by income quintiles in India, 2014[^]

Income quintiles	Cancer	Endocrine /metabolic	Psychiatric /neurological	Cardiovascular	Chronic respiratory	Injuries	Total
1 st MPCE quintile	52	54	54	56	63	57	56
2 nd MPCE quintile	46	42	48	45	61	46	47
3 rd MPCE quintile	39	36	36	36	41	44	39
4 th MPCE quintile	41	35	36	34	39	28	33
5 th MPCE quintile	28	18	22	20	26	29	23
Overall	39	35	39	37	47	42	40
p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001

[^] weighted analysis; MPCE=monthly per capita expenditure; numbers given indicate percentage utilizing public sector facility for hospitalization due to non-communicable disease; The household monthly per capita consumption expenditure limits (in USD) for the five quintiles are as follows: first quintile (2-16), second quintile (17-22), third quintile (23-30), fourth quintile (31-46) and the fifth quintile (47-538)

Table 3. Out-of-pocket hospitalization expenditure characteristics for each episode of hospitalization due to non-communicable disease in public and private sector in India, 2014[^]

Level of care	Cancer	Endocrine /metabolic	Psychiatric /neurological	Cardiovascular	Chronic respiratory	Injuries	Total
Median hospitalization expenditure (IQR)							
Public sector	169(62-495)	46(20-95)	59(26-138)	45(17-113)	48(15-95)	55(21-137)	55(21-138)
Private sector	548(277-1161)	191(100-364)	245(122-537)	241(107-615)	163(85-343)	290(127-695)	254(116-600)
Overall	357(143-864)	130(53-272)	152(58-398)	148(54-412)	101(42-200)	156(50-447)	149(55-406)
Proportion of hospitalization episodes sourced from borrowings/sale of personal physical assets (%)							
Public sector	30	17	28	18	17	24	22
Private sector	40	25	31	27	20	30	29
Overall	36	22	30	24	19	28	26
p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Medicine cost as a percentage of total hospitalization expenditure ^a (%)							
Public sector	32	40	43	43	36	36	40
Private sector	24	28	30	27	29	26	27
Overall	27	31	33	29	31	28	30
p-value	0.01	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Indirect cost as a percentage of total hospitalization expenditure ^b (%)							
Public sector	17	25	18	21	24	25	24
Private sector	8	10	11	11	12	10	10
Overall	10	12	13	13	15	13	13
p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001
Diagnostic cost as a percentage of total hospitalization expenditure ^c (%)							
Public sector	17	16	18	17	11	12	15
Private sector	09	10	12	12	11	09	11
Overall	10	11	13	13	11	10	12
p-value	<0.001	<0.001	<0.001	0.001	0.2	0.003	0.001

^a weighted analysis; Cost estimates are given in terms of US Dollars; Indirect cost includes transport for patient and others, expenses on food, escort, lodging charges and others etc; IQR stands for Inter quartile range; ^a proportion of per episode hospital expenditure spent towards medicine expressed in median percentage; ^b proportion of per episode hospital expenditure spent towards indirect costs expressed in median percentage; ^c proportion of per episode hospital expenditure spent towards diagnostic tests expressed in median percentage

Table 4. Adjusted odds ratios for catastrophic spending for patients with specific Non-Communicable Diseases compared to those with Communicable Diseases, India, 2014[^]

Type of disease	Type of expenditure		Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR (95% CI)
	Catastrophic [¥] N (%)	Non catastro- phic N (%)		
Cancer	807(74)	286(26)	7.2** (6.2-8.2)	12.2** (12.0-12.4)
Endocrine/metabolic disorders	512(42)	700(58)	1.9** (1.6-2.1)	2.0** (1.9-2.1)
Psychiatric and neurological disorders	1410(54)	1212(46)	2.9** (2.7-3.2)	3.5** (3.2-3.8)
Cardiovascular diseases	1904(53)	1720(47)	2.8** (2.6-2.9)	2.8** (2.6-3.0)
Respiratory diseases	469(37)	795(63)	1.5** (1.3-1.7)	1.8** (1.6-2.0)
Injuries	2461(55)	2044(45)	3.0** (2.8-3.2)	3.2** (3.0-3.4)
Overall NCDs	7563(53)	6757(47)	2.8** (2.7-2.9)	3.0** (2.9-3.1)
Communicable disease	3459(28)	8781(72)	Reference ^a	Reference

Note: [^] weighted analysis; CI stands for Confidence Interval; OR stands for Odds Ratio; ** indicates p-value <0.001; Variables included in logit regression were age, sex, social group, education, income quintiles and type of health facility, [¥] >10% of annual household consumption expenditure; ^a reference category includes a list of communicable diseases as given in Box 1