An evaluation of health care policies in India: An interstate comparison

Navdeep Singh[1]*, Shiwani[2], Anshu[3]
[1]*Principal, Indus College of Nursing, Khanda Kheri, Hansi, Haryana, 125038
(Corresponding author)
[2,3]Nursing Tutor, Indus College of Nursing, Khanda Kheri, Hansi, Haryana, 125038

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.20625803

ABSTRACT

This study critically evaluates the evolution, implementation, and effectiveness of healthcare policies in India through an interstate comparative framework. The research investigates the historical trajectory of Indian health planning from the Bhore Committee recommendations to contemporary initiatives such as the National Rural Health Mission (NRHM). Particular emphasis is placed on understanding how policy formulation, public expenditure, infrastructural development, and administrative governance have shaped health outcomes across different Indian states. The study compares better-performing states such as Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, and Gujarat with low-performing states including Uttar Pradesh, Bihar, Rajasthan, and Madhya Pradesh to identify regional disparities in healthcare access, infrastructure, manpower distribution, and service delivery.

The analysis reveals that despite decades of planned interventions, India continues to face major structural weaknesses characterized by low public health expenditure, inequitable resource allocation, inadequate rural infrastructure, shortage of trained healthcare professionals, and excessive dependence on out-of-pocket expenditure. The proliferation of the private healthcare sector, though improving tertiary care access, has simultaneously widened inequalities due to weak regulatory mechanisms and commercialization of medical services. The findings also highlight the growing burden of communicable diseases, non-communicable diseases, and nutritional deficiencies, creating a complex "triple burden" for the Indian healthcare system.

The study further examines the role of public-private partnerships, external aid, and post-1991 economic reforms in transforming healthcare governance. It concludes that successful healthcare performance depends not only on infrastructure creation but also on effective governance, financial restructuring, manpower planning, accountability, and decentralized administration. The paper recommends increasing public health expenditure, strengthening primary healthcare, improving regulatory oversight of private providers, modernizing supply chain systems, and developing universal risk-pooling mechanisms to ensure equitable and affordable healthcare access. These reforms are essential for transforming India's fragmented healthcare structure into an integrated, inclusive, and sustainable universal health system.

Keywords: Healthcare Policies, Indian Healthcare System, Public Health Expenditure, Primary Healthcare, Health Infrastructure, Health Financing, Rural Healthcare, Private Healthcare, Universal Health Coverage, Health Sector Reforms, Maternal Mortality, Infant Mortality, Healthcare Governance, Public Health System, Interstate Health Comparison.

1. INTRODUCTION: Rationale of Study, Objectives, and Research Methodology

1.1 Structural Context and Global Standing

The fundamental mandate of any progressive state is to cultivate an ecosystem that minimizes disease burden while comprehensively accelerating human development. In India, the stated objective of successive governmental configurations has long centred on lowering the incidence of morbidity and mortality across diverse demographic cross-sections (Banerji, 1985; Government of India, 2005). High disease incidence acts as a direct impediment to economic growth, social equity, and human capital accumulation (Bennett et al., 2006; WDR, 2009). As a consequence, international frameworks like the United Nations Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) explicitly prioritized targeted reductions in infant, under-five, and maternal mortality, alongside the containment of communicable pandemics (Cahill et al., 2006; WHO, 2007).

When evaluated on a global comparative matrix, the developmental trajectories of health outcomes reveal a stark divergence between highly industrialized, high-income nations and emerging South Asian economies (Abel-Smith, 1963; Abel-Smith, 1967; WDR, 2009). For decades, developed countries have maintained highly consolidated health systems that yield optimal survival and longevity indicators, whereas developing

countries navigate structural bottlenecks that yield highly uneven outcomes (Bennett et al., 2006; WHO, 2007). To understand India's historical and contemporary standing, Table 1.1 delineates macro-level health outcomes across selected South Asian nations and global benchmarks over a forty-five-year period.

Table 1: Health Outcomes in Terms of Global Indicators

Indicators	Year	Bangladesh	China	India	Nepal	Pakistan	Sri Lanka	World
TFR	1960	7.1	3.4	6.6	5.8	6.9	5.3	4.9
	1970	7.0	5.8	5.8	6.3	7.0	4.3	5.1
	1988	6.2	2.5	5.0	6.4	7.0	3.5	3.7
	1995	3.5	1.9	3.2	5.3	5.3	2.3	2.9
	2005	2.8	1.7	2.7	3.0	3.9	1.9	2.5
IMR	1960	156	132	165	195	163	71	128
	1970	140	69	139	168	143	55	98
	1988	133	42	119	134	125	36	82
	1995	80	35	69	92	91	16	55
	2007	47	19	54	43	73	17	47
U5 MR	1995	115	43	95	131	127	19	81
	2007	61	22	72	55	90	21	68

Source: Compiled from WDR (2004) and WDR (2009) repositories.

Granular longitudinal analysis of these data reveals that India's Total Fertility Rate (TFR)—defined as the average number of children born per woman—stood at a high level of 6.6 in 1960 (WDR, 2009). Through decades of targeted family planning initiatives and socio-economic transitions, this indicator was systematically reduced to 2.7 by 2005 (Government of India, 2005; WDR, 2009). While this represents a significant decline, it remains substantially higher than the replacement-level fertility achieved by High-Income Countries (HICs), which averaged 1.8 children per woman during the same period (WDR, 2009). Simultaneously, India's neighbours demonstrated highly variable trajectories: by 2005, Nepal registered a TFR of 3.0, while Pakistan lagged at 3.9 (Arif, 2006; WDR, 2009).

The gaps become even more apparent when evaluating early childhood survival metrics. India's Infant Mortality Rate (IMR) in 1960 stood at 165 deaths per 1,000 live births (with some records indicating up to 195 within specific regional sub-strata) (WDR, 2009). By the year 2007, the national IMR had dropped to 54 per 1,000 live births (WDR, 2009). Despite this significant reduction, the absolute figure compares poorly with both developed nations and specific regional peers. For instance, Sri Lanka, an island nation with historically high investments in public social infrastructure, recorded an exceptional IMR of just 17 per 1,000 live births in 2007 (WDR, 2009). China similarly outpaced India, bringing its IMR down to 19 by 2007 (WDR, 2009).

A parallel trend is observed in the Under-5 Mortality Rate (U5MR). In 1995, India's under-five mortality stood at 95 per 1,000 live births, which was brought down to 72 per 1,000 live births by 2007 (WDR, 2009). Yet, China had already suppressed its U5MR to 22 by 2007, and the average for HICs hovered at an optimal 7 per 1,000 (WDR, 2009). This persistent survival gap underscores a profound systemic crisis within the subcontinental public policy discourse, prompting a rigorous investigation into why Indian health infrastructure has historically failed to translate macroeconomic growth into equitable, high-performance

survival indicators (Bennett et al., 2006; Ramani et al., 2006).

1.2 Conceptualizing Health vs. Healthcare

To construct an analytically rigorous evaluation of state intervention, a clear distinction must be maintained between the concepts of *health* and *healthcare* (Banerji, 1985; Bennett et al., 2006). In public discourse, the former is frequently conflated with the latter, leading to the assumption that health status is an exclusive, direct function of medical intervention (Banerji, 1985). However, conceptualizing health as merely the absence of clinical disease is reductionist. True health confers upon an individual or a collective body the structural freedom from avoidable illness and the capacity to realize their full physical, mental, and economic potential (WHO, 2007). It operates as the indispensable foundation defining a person's holistic sense of well-being (Bennett et al., 2006). Consequently, the health of populations is a distinct key issue in public policy discourse, one that determines how society deploys its resources across cultural understandings of illness, the mitigation of socio-economic disparities, and the distribution of medical care (Choudhary, 1993; Bennett et al., 2006).

Conversely, *healthcare* encompasses a broader operational spectrum, covering not only curative medical intervention but also the entirely separate domain of preventative and promotive care (Banerji, 1985; WHO, 2007). Healthcare cannot be conceptually restricted to care rendered by, or financed out of, public expenditure within state-run clinics alone; it must incorporate self-care incentives, environmental sanitation, nutrition, and private medical transactions (Choudhary, 1993; Duggal, 1996). In the Indian context, private out-of-pocket expenditure heavily dominates the financing of healthcare, introducing unique structural market distortions (Bhat et al., 2004a; Duggal, 1996).

Because healthcare is widely recognized as a fundamental public good, its demand and supply cannot be left to be regulated solely by the "invisible hand" of the market, nor can it be structured around the utility-maximizing conduct of private commercial providers (Bhat, 1996; Duggal, 1996). The structural failures of a marketized healthcare model necessitate a normative framework to evaluate a just health system (Bennett et al., 2006; WHO, 2007). Four core criteria are essential:

1. **Universal Access:** Provision of care to all citizens at an adequate level of quality without imposing an excessive financial burden (Bennett et al., 2006).
2. **Equitable Distribution:** Fair distribution of financial costs for accessing care, alongside transparent, equitable mechanisms for rationing capacity and resources (Choudhary, 1993; Bennett et al., 2006).
3. **Provider Competence and Accountability:** Training health workers to maintain high levels of clinical competence, empathy, and administrative accountability, while integrating cost-effective, evidence-based research into practice (Bardan et al., 1989; Cahill et al., 2006).
4. **Vulnerable Group Prioritization:** Special institutional attention directed toward structurally marginalized segments, including children, women, the disabled, and the elderly (Bennett et al., 2006; Ramani et al., 2006).

1.3 The Rationale, Scope, and Objectives of the Study

The core rationale of this study stems from the slow pace of health outcomes growth experienced by India over the past several decades (Bennett et al., 2006; Government of India, 2005). Despite possessing highly articulated national health policies—including the National Health Policy of 1983 and 2002—the state has consistently failed to meet its targets within its designated timeframes (Government of India, 2005; Government of India, 2002). Crucially, the milestones achieved are characterized by deep state-level bias and regional polarization (Chaudhary, 2006; David H. Peters et al., 2002). Thus, it is a critical research necessity to identify the systemic vulnerabilities, operational gaps, and policy failures that define this uneven landscape (Bajpai et al., 2004; Dhas et al., 2008). This evaluation aims to provide a diagnostic resource for policy makers and planners tasked with redesigning India's sub-national health architecture (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Ramani et al., 2006).

The scope of this study encompasses a structural and macroeconomic evaluation of healthcare research across the institutional divides of Indian states (Choudhary, 1993; David H. Peters et al., 2002). It aims to enhance the available knowledge base by evaluating the tension between state policy formulation and field-level implementation (Bajpai et al., 2004; Ramani et al., 2006). The specific objectives guiding this study are:

- **Review of Existing Policies:** Conducting a systemic review of National and State-level healthcare policies enacted across different plan periods (Government of India, 2005; Government of India, 2002).
- **Situation Analysis:** Assessing the field reality of health status across selected states to understand regional variations (Bajpai et al., 2004; David H. Peters et al., 2002).

- **Index Identification:** Isolating critical health and infrastructural indices to establish a baseline for comparative analysis (D. Varatharajan, 1999; Dhas et al., 2008).
- **Policy Gap Analysis:** Pinpointing clear institutional gaps at the level of planning and formulation, as well as operational failures during implementation (Bajpai et al., 2004; Ramani et al., 2006).
- **Interstate Comparison:** Executing an interstate comparative analysis of policy-level gaps between better-performing and low-performing states (Ashok Kumar, 2007; David H. Peters et al., 2002).
- **Strategic Prescription:** Formulating alternative programmatic and policy packages to support health systems development (Bennett et al., 2006; WHO, 2007).

1.4 Research Methodology

This article is based on a structured review of secondary literature, utilizing multiple search techniques to compile cross-sectional and time-series data (Bajpai et al., 2004; Dhas et al., 2008). The primary empirical foundation relies on peer-reviewed academic journals, governmental planning reports, and corporate healthcare databases (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Bennett et al., 2006). Advanced scientific search engines, including Ovid, PubMed, and Google Scholar, were queried using individual and combined Boolean operators. The specific search terms utilized included: *"Health policies in India"*, *"health scenario in different Indian states"*, *"Health indicators"*, *"Health infrastructure"*, *"Health financing"*, *"Quality of health care services"*, *"challenges in health care"*, *"National health policies"*, *"Health policies in states"*, *"Health service coverage"*, and *"private sectors health spending"*.

To capture institutional and macroeconomic data, the websites and published repositories of several agencies were consulted:

- **Financial and Economic Repositories:** Reserve Bank of India (RBI) and the Planning Commission of India (Government of India, 1951; Government of India, 1997).
- **International Health and Development Bodies:** World Health Organization (WHO), the World Bank, the Population Council, and the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA) (WDR, 2009; WHO, 2007).
- **Central and Sub-national State Apparatuses:** Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW), Government of India, alongside the specific Departments of Health and Family Welfare of Gujarat, Tamil Nadu, Maharashtra, Uttar Pradesh, Rajasthan, and Bihar (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Government of India, 2005; Government of India, 2002).

Additionally, physical and digital library catalogues, including the collection at Lucknow University, were searched using phrases such as *"Health care review in India"*, *"Healthcare financing"*, *"Health Indicators in Indian states"*, and *"Health sector reforms"*. Longitudinal data on health outcomes, infrastructural density, and human resources were extracted from successive rounds of the National Family Health Survey (NFHS-1, NFHS-2, and NFHS-3), the Reproductive and Child Health (RCH) reports, and the Ministry of Finance's state expenditure data (David H. Peters et al., 2002; Dhas et al., 2008). The time-series data for state healthcare expenditures focus primarily on the pivotal structural adjustment and post-reform decade, tracking resource shifts and their direct impacts on health indicators (Bhat et al., 2004a; Reddy et al., 1994).

2. HISTORICAL TRAJECTORY OF HEALTH PLANNING AND COMMITTEE RECOMENDATIONS

2.1 Pre-Independence and the Bhore Committee (1946)

Structured health policymaking and health planning within the Indian subcontinent is not a modern, post-colonial phenomenon (Banerji, 1985; Government of India, 2005). The most institutionally comprehensive, radical, and structurally complete health policy blueprint ever prepared in India was finalized on the eve of independence in 1946 (Banerji, 1985). This landmark document, the Report of the Health Survey and Development Committee, is widely known as the Bhore Committee report (Banerji, 1985; Government of India, 2005). Tasked with reviewing the health conditions of British India and designing a future health architecture, the committee authored a plan that remains a model for universal socialized medicine (Banerji, 1985).

The Bhore Committee recognized that health status is intrinsically bound to social conditions, and it explicitly advocated for a National Health Service model (Banerji, 1985). This model was designed to provide universal coverage to the entire population, completely free of cost at the point of service, via a comprehensive, state-run network populated by salaried medical professionals (Banerji, 1985). The committee explicitly rejected a market-driven approach to clinical care (Duggal, 1996). The structural components of the Bhore Committee's recommendations relied on several foundational pillars:

1. **Preventative and Curative Integration:** Complete institutional integration of preventative and curative services across all administrative tiers, ensuring that public health and clinical medicine were not bifurcated (Banerji, 1985).

2. **Short-Term Local Infrastructure:** The immediate establishment of Primary Health Centers (PHCs) designed to serve a maximum population of 40,000 individuals each, providing localized medical access (Banerji, 1985).
3. **Long-Term Macro Infrastructure (The Three-Million Plan):** A long-term developmental strategy establishing highly equipped, 75-bed Primary Health Centers tailored to serve compact populations of 10,000 to 20,000 citizens, backed by secondary and tertiary referral hospital networks (Banerji, 1985).
4. **Community Ownership:** The formation of localized Village Health Committees to ensure direct public participation and accountability in health governance (Banerji, 1985).
5. **The Concept of the "Social Physician":** A radical reorientation of medical education to produce a cadre of professionals trained in preventative medicine, social epidemiology, and public health (Banerji, 1985). This was backed by a mandated three-month specialized training module in social medicine to prepare physicians to act as agents of social progress (Banerji, 1985).
6. **Inter-sectoral Alignment:** A formal recognition that health outcomes require coordinated improvements in environmental sanitation, potable water supply, nutrition, and housing (Banerji, 1985).

Despite the depth of this report, the post-colonial state failed to implement its core structural mandates (Banerji, 1985; Duggal, 1996). The recommendations were largely set aside due to fiscal constraints and a political unwillingness to challenge the emerging private medical fraternity (Duggal, 1996; Reddy et al., 1994).

2.2 The Five-Year Plans and Early Mass Vertical Campaigns

With the formal launch of the planning process in Independent India, the state substituted the comprehensive socialized model of the Bhore Committee with a highly fragmented series of target-driven programmatic schemes within the successive Five-Year Plans (Government of India, 2005; Government of India, 1951). The First Five-Year Plan (1951–1955) framed the central challenge of planning as remoulding the socio-economic framework to address fundamental human needs, including health and insurance against sickness, as directed by the Directive Principles of State Policy (Government of India, 1951). In 1952, the state launched the Community Development Programme (CDP) to drive the holistic transformation of rural areas, where over 80% of the population resided (Banerji, 1985).

The CDP was designed as a multipurpose framework covering agricultural development, basic transport, and rural literacy, alongside health and sanitation (Banerji, 1985). This health mandate was pursued through the creation of a basic network of primary health centres and sub-centres (Banerji, 1985; Dhas et al., 2008). Under this framework, each Community Development Block (CDB) comprised approximately 100 villages, encapsulating a total population of roughly one lakh, and was allotted a single Primary Health Centre (Banerji, 1985). However, the health component of the CDP was structurally underfunded and logistically isolated (Duggal, 1996; Reddy et al., 1994). The state's own internal evaluations admitted that the CDP was failing to establish a sustainable public health presence before the end of the second plan period (Banerji, 1985; Government of India, 1951).

Concurrently, during the 1950s and 1960s, India’s health policy abandoned comprehensive horizontal integration in Favor of specialized, vertical mass campaigns designed to manage rampant communicable epidemics (Banerji, 1985; Government of India, 2005). Separate countrywide campaigns with a rigid techno-centric focus were launched against malaria, smallpox, tuberculosis, leprosy, filaria, trachoma, and cholera (Banerji, 1985). Large cadres of single-purpose workers were trained exclusively to execute these vertical interventions (Banerji, 1985). For instance, the National Malaria Eradication Programme (NMEP), launched in 1953, required the deployment and training of over 150,000 vertical workers spread across 400 specialized units (Banerji, 1985).

This policy shift relied on the biomedical premise that population health could be secured by isolating and eradicating specific pathogens (Banerji, 1985; Frenk et al., 1989). This model largely ignored the social determinants of health, such as malnutrition, poor housing, and environmental degradation (Banerji, 1985). These early vertical programs were heavily dependent on international donor agencies—including the Technical Cooperation Mission of the United States, the World Health Organization (WHO), UNICEF, and the Rockefeller Foundation—for financial backing, technical experts, and imports of DDT and vaccines (Banerji, 1985; RCH Reports, 1997). This reliance allowed international experts to shape the programmatic designs and fiscal commitments of the domestic health sector, creating a precedent of supply-pushed public health interventions (RCH Reports, 1997).

2.3 The Evolution of Mid-Century Committees (1959–1977)

As the failures of the early planning periods became apparent, the Government of India appointed a series of specialized expert committees to re-evaluate the public health delivery apparatus (Banerji, 1985;

Government of India, 2005):

The Mudaliar Committee (1959)

Formally known as the Health Survey and Planning Committee, it was appointed to review the progress made since the Bhore Committee report (Banerji, 1985). It recognized that while vertical initiatives like the NMEP had secured short-term reductions in epidemic mortality, the broader health infrastructure remained weak (Banerji, 1985). The committee recommended limiting the population served by a single PHC to 40,000, while prioritizing structural upgrades to the quality of clinical care (Banerji, 1985). It also recommended deploying one basic health worker per 10,000 population to stabilize rural surveillance (Banerji, 1985).

The Jungalwalla Committee (1967)

This committee addressed the operational inefficiencies generated by the proliferation of single-purpose vertical health programs (Banerji, 1985). It advocated for the systematic integration of health services, defining it as a unified approach to all health problems rather than a segmented model (Banerji, 1985). The committee recommended complete integration of personnel and administration from the ministry level down to field staff, alongside the elimination of private practice among government doctors to curb institutional corruption (Banerji, 1985).

The Kartar Singh Committee (1973)

This committee established the modern blueprint for the Multipurpose Health Worker (MPW) model (Banerji, 1985). To ensure adequate rural coverage, the committee recommended that each PHC serve a maximum population of 50,000 and be sub-divided into 16 distinct Sub-Centers (Banerji, 1985). Each Sub-Center was designed to cater to a population of 3,000 to 3,500 and be staffed by a gender-balanced team of one male and one female health worker (Banerji, 1985). The supervisor-to-worker ratio was set at one health assistant per 3-4 frontline workers (Banerji, 1985).

The Shrivastav Committee (1975)

Officially titled the Committee on Medical Education and Support Manpower, it suggested creating community-embedded bands of para-professional and semi-professional health workers drawn directly from village populations, such as primary school teachers and postmasters (Banerji, 1985). Crucially, it recommended the development of a structured "Referral Service Complex" (Banerji, 1985). This aimed to create formal, operational linkages connecting rural Sub-Centers and PHCs to secondary Taluka/Tehsil hospitals, District hospitals, and tertiary Medical Colleges (Banerji, 1985).

Following these recommendations, the state launched the Rural Health Scheme in 1977, introducing the Village Health Guide (VHG) scheme (Banerji, 1985). This program selected and trained local volunteers, primarily women, to provide basic first aid and contraceptive distribution in exchange for a small financial incentive (Banerji, 1985).

2.4 The Alma Ata Declaration (1978) and India's First National Health Policy (1983)

The year 1978 marked a conceptual transformation in global public health with the signing of the International Conference on Primary Health Care at Alma Ata (WHO, 2000). Signed by 134 state signatories, including India, the declaration launched the global mandate of "Health for All by the Year 2000" (WHO, 2000). It established primary health care as an essential, scientifically sound, and socially acceptable methodology, made universally accessible through full community participation at an affordable cost (WHO, 2000).

In the immediate wake of Alma Ata, domestic bodies pushed the state to formalize its policy commitments (Banerji, 1985; Government of India, 2005). A joint study group commissioned by the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR) and the Indian Medical Research Council (ICMR) in 1980 authored *Health for All: An Alternative Strategy* (Banerji, 1985). This report argued that the majority of India's morbidity burden could be resolved at the primary healthcare tier through community ownership and an inter-sectoral approach linking health to environmental engineering, nutrition, and literacy (Banerji, 1985). Concurrently, the state's Working Group on Health for All by 2000 AD established specific, long-term health infrastructure and manpower targets (Government of India, 2005).

These efforts culminated in the formulation and adoption of India's first formal National Health Policy (NHP) in 1983 (Government of India, 2005; Government of India, 2002). The core goal of NHP-1983 was the institutional provision of universal, comprehensive primary health services through an integrated network (Government of India, 2002). It also emphasized the integration of private and voluntary organizations to support public health delivery (Government of India, 2002).

However, this commitment was quickly compromised (Banerji, 1985; Duggal, 1996). Influential health economists argued that macro-level resource constraints made comprehensive primary care unachievable within the designated timeframe (Warren, 1988). They advocated for a "Selective Primary Health Care"

model (Warren, 1988). This shifted the focus away from comprehensive systems development toward vertical, cost-effective interventions (Banerji, 1985; Warren, 1988). This trend was reinforced by international promotion of frameworks that prioritized growth monitoring, oral rehydration, breastfeeding, and immunization over broader systemic investments (RCH Reports, 1997). By the turn of the millennium, despite expanding its three-tier physical network, India had failed to realize the core goals of NHP-1983 (Bennett et al., 2006; Government of India, 2005). The public health infrastructure remained chronically underfunded, and the operational focus had shifted toward family planning targets and selected disease control initiatives (Duggal, 1996; Reddy et al., 1994).

3. SUB-NATIONAL ANALYSIS: Better-Performing vs. Low-Performing States

3.1 Methodological Framework of Comparison

To analyse how national health policies translate into sub-national health outcomes, this article compares two groups of states (Ashok Kumar, 2007; David H. Peters et al., 2002):

- **Better-Performing States:** Maharashtra, Tamil Nadu, and Gujarat (Ashok Kumar, 2007; D. Varatharajan, 1999; Dhas et al., 2008).
- **Low-Performing States:** Uttar Pradesh (UP), Bihar, Rajasthan, and Madhya Pradesh (MP) (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Chaudhary, 2006; David H. Peters et al., 2002).

This classification is based on a socio-economic matrix that links state-level domestic product growth to physical infrastructure density, demographic containment indicators, and childhood survival rates (Choudhary, 1993; David H. Peters et al., 2002). Better-performing states are characterized by higher institutional capacity, superior public financial allocations, and effective execution of health programs (Ashok Kumar, 2007; D. Varatharajan, 1999). In contrast, low-performing states exhibit high infant and maternal mortality, severe human resource deficits, and a high reliance on unregulated private healthcare providers (Chaudhary, 2006; Dhas et al., 2008).

3.2 Health Profiles of Better-Performing States

Maharashtra

Maharashtra represents an industrialized state with a deeply marketized, pluralistic healthcare ecosystem (Bhat et al., 2004a; Duggal, 1996). Longitudinal data indicate that Maharashtra successfully compressed its Total Fertility Rate (TFR) down to 2.1, achieving demographic replacement levels ahead of the national average (Dhas et al., 2008). This progress is supported by an expanded primary health infrastructure across its rural districts and a dense concentration of secondary and tertiary corporate medical centres in its urban industrial hubs like Mumbai, Pune, and Nagpur (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Ramani et al., 2004). However, the state exhibits significant intra-state polarization, with rural tribal pockets suffering from high infant malnutrition, contrasting with the advanced medical systems available in its urban centres (Bajpai et al., 2004; Dhas et al., 2008).

Tamil Nadu

Tamil Nadu stands out as a high-performance model for public health infrastructure delivery in India (D. Varatharajan, 1999; Dhas et al., 2008). The state has consistently recorded advanced health indicators, including a TFR of 1.7 and an IMR far below the national average (D. Varatharajan, 1999; WDR, 2009). This success is tied to long-term public financing, strong administrative capacity, and an independent medical supplies corporation (TNMSC) that institutionalized the universal procurement and distribution of free essential drugs (D. Varatharajan, 1999). Tamil Nadu successfully countered the trend of public sector decline seen elsewhere by maintaining high utilization rates for both outpatient and inpatient care within its public PHC and government hospital networks (D. Varatharajan, 1999; Ramani et al., 2006).

Gujarat

Gujarat's health strategy highlights a market-oriented growth model supported by targeted public-private partnerships (PPPs) (Ashok Kumar, 2007). The state has maintained stable, mid-to-high level health status indicators (Dhas et al., 2008). It pioneered maternal survival initiatives like the *Chiranjeevi Yojana*, which compensated private obstetricians for delivering low-income and below-poverty-line (BPL) women in private clinics (Ashok Kumar, 2007). While this model accelerated institutional delivery rates, it also reflects a policy approach that relies on subsidizing private infrastructure rather than expanding the direct reach of public primary clinics (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Duggal, 1996).

3.3 Health Profiles of Low-Performing States

Uttar Pradesh

Uttar Pradesh presents a critical public health challenge due to its massive population and weak infrastructure (Chaudhary, 2006; David H. Peters et al., 2002). Health indicators in UP are poor, with the IMR historically hovering above 70 per 1,000 live births and the Maternal Mortality Ratio (MMR) exceeding 400 deaths per 100,000 live births in certain survey rounds (Dhas et al., 2008; WDR, 2009). Socio-economic

disparities are stark: the incidence of infant mortality is two and a half times higher among the poorest wealth quintiles than the wealthiest (Ramani et al., 2006).

Furthermore, public resource allocations are regressive, with less public funding spent on the bottom 20% of the population than the top 20% (Chaudhary, 2006; Ramani et al., 2006). While public health campaigns have achieved isolated successes in routine immunization and tuberculosis containment, the state's primary care delivery—represented by rural PHCs and Sub-Centers—remains underfunded and understaffed, leading to a high reliance on unregulated informal private providers (David H. Peters et al., 2002; Duggal, 1996).

Bihar

Bihar faces severe challenges across all major health indices, with a high TFR (exceeding 4.0 in older survey cohorts) and an elevated IMR (Dhas et al., 2008; WDR, 2009). The state's public sector suffers from deep structural deficits: the physical deficit for PHCs and CHCs routinely exceeds 50%, and the shortage of trained medical officers and female health workers (ANMs) is acute (Dhas et al., 2008). Consequently, public health infrastructure utilization is low (Bardan et al., 1989). The majority of households are forced to rely on out-of-pocket spending in an unregulated private market, which often drives low-income families into health-induced indebtedness (Duggal, 1996; Ramani et al., 2006).

Rajasthan

Rajasthan's vast geographic sprawl and arid terrain create unique structural barriers to healthcare access (Dhas et al., 2008). The state records a high infant mortality rate (81 per 1,000 live births in older series) and a high maternal mortality burden (Dhas et al., 2008; WDR, 2009). The primary policy failure in Rajasthan centres on the difficulty of maintaining physical infrastructure and retaining medical staff within remote, sparsely populated regions (Dhas et al., 2008). The state's per capita spending on health has historically been low, and efforts to reform the system are hindered by a mismatch between infrastructure and personnel (Bhat et al., 2004a; David H. Peters et al., 2002).

Table 2: State-Level Comparison of Health Status and Outcomes

State	TFR (2005)	IMR (per 1000)	MMR (per 100,000)	Per Capita Public Exp on Health ($)	Physical Infrastructure Deficit (%)
Maharashtra	2.1	42.6	132	High	Low (Dhas et al., 2008)
Tamil Nadu	1.7	31.2	99	High	Very Low (D. Varatharajan, 1999)
Gujarat	2.4	45.1	110	Mid-High	Low-Mid (Ashok Kumar, 2007)
Uttar Pradesh	3.8	84.0	707	Very Low	High (Chaudhary, 2006)
Bihar	4.3	63.0	707	Very Low	Very High (Dhas et al., 2008)
Rajasthan	3.5	81.0	607	Low	High (Dhas et al., 2008)
Madhya Pradesh	3.7	90.0	498	Low	High (Ashok Kumar, 2007)

Source: Compiled from Ministry of Finance & Planning Reports, and National Family Health Surveys (NFHS) data repositories (David H. Peters et al., 2002; Dhas et al., 2008; Government of India, 1997).

4. PUBLIC HEALTHCARE SYSTEM AND THE INFRASTRUCTURE-MANPOWER MISMATCH

4.1 The Three-Tier Structural Network

The operational delivery of public healthcare in Indian states relies on a hierarchically organized, three-tier physical network designed to provide a continuum of care from the village level to urban centres (Banerji,

1985; Ramani et al., 2006):

1. Primary Tier (Sub-Centers and PHCs)

The Sub-Center represents the initial peripheral contact point between the community and the public health apparatus (Banerji, 1985). It is designed to serve a population of 3,000 to 5,000 and is staffed by at least one female Multi-Purpose Worker / Auxiliary Nurse Midwife (ANM) and one male health worker (Banerji, 1985). The Sub-Center focuses on preventative, promotive, and maternal-child health interventions (Banerji, 1985; Dhas et al., 2008). The Primary Health Center (PHC) forms the institutional hub of primary clinical care, structured to serve a population of 20,000 to 30,000 (Banerji, 1985). A standard PHC is designed to be managed by a medical officer and supported by 14 paramedical staff, supervising a cluster of 4 to 6 Sub-Centers (Banerji, 1985).

2. Secondary Tier (Community Health Centers)

The Community Health Center (CHC) is designed as a 30-bed hospital serving a population of 80,000 to 120,000 (Banerji, 1985). It functions as a referral unit for 4 to 6 PHCs and is mandated to provide specialized clinical services across four key specialties: General Medicine, Surgery, Paediatrics, and Obstetrics/Gynaecology (Banerji, 1985).

3. Tertiary Tier (Medical Colleges and Apex Institutions)

Apex institutions, regional hospitals, and state medical colleges focus on providing specialized, high-technology medical interventions, alongside conducting clinical research and training advanced medical professionals (Banerji, 1985; Ramani et al., 2004).

4.2 The Reality of Physical Infrastructure Decoupling

While this three-tier architecture is conceptually robust, its implementation reveals significant decoupling between planned targets and ground realities (Bajpai et al., 2004; Dhas et al., 2008). Over successive decades, states have built thousands of rural facilities, but the physical quality of this infrastructure has deteriorated (Dhas et al., 2008).

A substantial percentage of rural Sub-Centers and PHCs operate out of temporary, rented spaces that lack basic amenities like running water, electricity, and functional diagnostic tools (Bajpai et al., 2004). In low-performing states like Bihar and Uttar Pradesh, the shortfall in physical facilities relative to population density often exceeds 40%, leaving large geographic areas without access to primary public care (Chaudhary, 2006; Dhas et al., 2008).

Furthermore, the public health sector exhibits strong structural path dependency: rural clinics are largely restricted to providing basic, low-technology preventative services like routine immunizations, antenatal checkups, and single-disease surveillance (Banerji, 1985; Duggal, 1996). Conversely, the state continues to concentrate its curative funding within urban secondary and tertiary hospitals, leaving the rural periphery without reliable curative clinical options (Duggal, 1996; Ramani et al., 2006).

4.3 Chronic Shortages and Mismatches in Human Resources

The primary factor undermining the functional status of this three-tier system is a severe mismatch between physical infrastructure and trained human resources (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Ramani et al., 2006). India produces over 17,000 graduates in modern systems of medicine annually, alongside a comparable number of Indian Systems of Medicine and Homeopathy (ISM&H) practitioners and nursing professionals (Ashok Kumar, 2007). However, these professionals are highly concentrated in urban areas, leaving critical vacancies within the primary public network (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Ramani et al., 2006).

This rural human resource deficit is driven by several systemic factors:

- **Absence of Mandatory Rural Service Enforcement:** States have largely failed to institutionalize or enforce mandatory rural service clauses for medical graduates (Ashok Kumar, 2007).
- **Poor Rural Working and Living Conditions:** Rural postings often lack clean housing, electricity, and educational facilities for families, discouraging personnel retention (Ashok Kumar, 2007).
- **Inadequate Continuing Medical Education (CME):** Public health professionals frequently lack access to structured CME programs for skill up-gradation and professional development (Bennett et al., 2006).
- **Irrational Workforce Deployment:** Paramedics and medical officers are often posted without matching equipment or infrastructure, leading to systemic underutilization (Ashok Kumar, 2007).

Consequently, low-performing states like Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, and Bihar report vacancy rates exceeding 50% for specialized clinical positions (such as paediatricians and surgeons) at rural CHCs (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Dhas et al., 2008). This human resource vacuum directly undermines the public referral system: because primary clinics lack staff, patients regularly bypass the lower tiers and crowd tertiary medical colleges for basic ailments, causing systemic inefficiencies (Banerji, 1985; Ramani et al., 2006).

5. HEALTH SECTOR SPENDING: Levels, Macro Trends, and Political Economy

5.1 Macro Analysis of Public Finance and GDP Metrics

The structural vulnerabilities of the Indian healthcare system are deeply rooted in decades of chronic public-sector underinvestment, which has constrained the system's capacity to deliver equitable, accessible, and high-quality healthcare services across the country (Bhat et al., 2004a; Reddy et al., 1994). Although India experienced substantial macroeconomic expansion and accelerated economic liberalization during the last half-century, the growth in public investment in healthcare failed to keep pace with population growth, epidemiological transitions, and increasing healthcare demands (Bhat et al., 2004a; WDR, 2009). This mismatch between economic growth and health-sector financing created persistent infrastructural deficits, shortages of trained healthcare professionals, inadequate rural health coverage, and fragmented service delivery systems that continue to affect healthcare outcomes nationwide.

During the post-economic reform period, the relative priority accorded to healthcare within national public expenditure steadily weakened. Public health expenditure declined from approximately 1.3% of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) in 1990 to nearly 0.9% of GDP by 2002, placing India among the lowest public health spenders globally when compared with both developed and several developing nations (Bhat et al., 2004a; Reddy et al., 1994). Such limited governmental investment restricted the expansion of public hospitals, primary healthcare centers, preventive health initiatives, and community-based health services. Consequently, the burden of healthcare financing increasingly shifted toward private out-of-pocket spending, which intensified inequalities in healthcare access, particularly among rural populations, economically disadvantaged groups, and socially marginalized communities.

The long-term effects of underfunding became visible in multiple dimensions of healthcare delivery, including overcrowded hospitals, insufficient nurse-to-patient ratios, inconsistent availability of essential medicines, inadequate emergency preparedness, and weak public health surveillance systems. These deficiencies were further amplified during periods of national health crises and pandemics, exposing systemic fragility within the healthcare infrastructure. In addition, low public investment limited the government's ability to establish robust preventive and promotive health programs, thereby contributing to persistent disparities in maternal health, child health, infectious disease control, and chronic disease management across different states and socioeconomic groups.

Furthermore, inadequate public financing encouraged rapid privatization and commercialization of healthcare services, resulting in an increasingly dualistic healthcare system characterized by advanced urban private facilities on one side and resource-constrained public institutions on the other. This imbalance widened regional and socioeconomic disparities in healthcare quality and accessibility. The insufficient allocation of resources also negatively affected workforce development, reducing opportunities for nursing education expansion, professional training, clinical specialization, and retention of skilled healthcare personnel within the public system. Collectively, these structural limitations demonstrate how prolonged underinvestment in public healthcare has contributed significantly to systemic inefficiencies, healthcare inequities, and the continuing vulnerability of the Indian healthcare system (Bhat et al., 2004a; WDR, 2009).

Table 3: Global Comparison of Economic Status and Health Financing

Country	Population (Mill.)	GDP Growth (%)	Public Exp on Health (% of GDP)	Private Exp on Health (% of GDP)	Total Per Capita Health Exp ($)	Child Mortality Rate (per 1000)	Maternal Mortality Rate (per 100,000)
Switzerland	7	-0.2	5.9	4.8	3,573	6	8 (WDR, 2009)
USA	288	2.3	5.8	7.2	4,887	7	12 (WDR, 2009)
China	1,280	8.0	2.0	3.5	45	31	55 (WDR, 2009)

Country	Population (Mill.)	GDP Growth (%)	Public Exp on Health (% of GDP)	Private Exp on Health (% of GDP)	Total Per Capita Health Exp ($)	Child Mortality Rate (per 1000)	Maternal Mortality Rate (per 100,000)
India	1,040	5.1	0.9	5.1	23	72	407 (WDR, 2009)
Sri Lanka	19	4.0	1.8	1.7	31	19	30 (WDR, 2009)

Source: Compiled from WDR (2009) and WHO (2000) repositories.

These data reveal that while developed countries like Switzerland and the United States commit between 5.5% and 6.0% of their GDP to public health infrastructure, India's public contribution has historically hovered around 1.0% (WDR, 2009). Consequently, out of India's total health spending (which averages around 6% of GDP), the public sector accounts for only about 17% (Bhat et al., 2004a; Duggal, 1996). The remaining 83% is financed through private, out-of-pocket expenditures by individual households at the point of service (Bhat et al., 2004a; Duggal, 1996).

This regressive financing model creates significant economic risks for low-income families (Ramani et al., 2006). While high-income individuals can access commercial insurance or pay out of pocket without jeopardizing their financial security, medical crises routinely push vulnerable households below the subsistence line (Bhat et al., 2004b; Ramani et al., 2006).

5.2 State-Level Spending Elasticity and Sub-National Priorities

Under India's constitutional framework, the primary responsibility for delivering health services rests with sub-national State Governments (Bhat et al., 2004a; Chaudhary, 2006). Central expenditures are largely confined to funding Centrally Sponsored Schemes (CSS) for family welfare and vertical disease control (Chaudhary, 2006; Banerji, 1985).

At the sub-national level, empirical analysis shows that state governments allocate an average of just 0.43% of their State Gross Domestic Product (SGDP) to health and medical care (Bhat et al., 2004a). This allocation is highly dependent on the state's fiscal position and political priorities (Bhat et al., 2004a; Chaudhary, 2006). Econometric evaluations of state data indicate that the income elasticity of public health expenditure with respect to changes in SGDP is 0.68 (Bhat et al., 2004a). This means that for every 1.0% increase in state per capita income, public healthcare spending increases by only 0.68% (Bhat et al., 2004a).

In contrast, the elasticity of private health expenditure relative to income stands at 1.95 (Bhat et al., 2004a). Because private spending is demand-driven and depends on household healthcare-seeking behaviour, consumers rapidly increase their out-of-pocket healthcare allocations as their incomes grow, filling the vacuum left by an underfunded public system (Bhat et al., 2004a; Duggal, 1996).

Furthermore, state spending patterns reveal internal misallocations:

- **Urban Bias:** Several states with large rural populations allocate a disproportionate share of their public medical budgets to urban hospitals and specialized tertiary clinics, leaving rural facilities under-resourced (Duggal, 1996; Ramani et al., 2006).
- **Neglect of Recurrent Costs:** Public health budgets frequently Favor capital investments—such as building new facility structures—while neglecting recurrent operational costs, leading to shortages of essential medicines and diagnostic reagents (Bhat et al., 2004a; D. Varatharajan, 1999).
- **Demographic Pressures:** High population growth rates in low-performing states dilute per capita public health allocations, reducing the net resources available per citizen (Chaudhary, 2006; David H. Peters et al., 2002).

5.3 The Structural Adjustment Program (SAP) and post-1991 Shifts

The year 1991 marked a major transition in India's political economy with the launch of macroeconomic stabilization and structural adjustment programs under the guidance of international financial institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) (Ahluwalia, 2000; Reddy et al., 1994). These

economic reforms prioritized fiscal consolidation, the deregulation of domestic markets, and the reduction of state spending on social infrastructure (Ahluwalia, 2000; Reddy et al., 1994).

The introduction of these policies impacted the public health sector in several ways:

1. **Stagnation of Public Allocations:** Public health expenditures stagnated or declined in real terms across many states during the 1990s, undermining the gains made during the previous decade (Bhat et al., 2004a; Reddy et al., 1994).
2. **Introduction of User Fees:** Under the guise of resource mobilization, several states introduced user fees for diagnostic and curative services within public hospitals, creating new barriers to access for low-income patients (Ramani et al., 2006; Reddy et al., 1994).
3. **Privatization of Secondary and Tertiary Care:** State policies actively subsidized the expansion of corporate healthcare providers through tax concessions, soft loans, and low-cost land allocations, positioning the private sector as the primary engine of curative care growth (Duggal, 1996; Reddy et al., 1994).

5.4 External Aid, Soft Loans, and Policy Conditionalities

As state budgets faced constraints, India's public health sector became increasingly reliant on external aid and soft loans (RCH Reports, 1997). Prior to the 1980s, external assistance was modest, averaging around $85 million annually, and was delivered primarily as unrestricted grants from bilateral partners and foundations (RCH Reports, 1997). However, following the expansion of the World Bank's India Population Projects (IPP) and health sector development loans, annual external inflows rose to between $300 million and $600 million during the 1980s and 1990s (RCH Reports, 1997). By the close of the 1980s, the World Bank accounted for more than two-thirds of these external funds (RCH Reports, 1997).

This shift transformed the nature of public health governance: while earlier grants carried few policy demands, modern soft loans came tied to specific conditionalities (RCH Reports, 1997). International donor agencies began directly shaping domestic programmatic design, resource allocation, and structural choices (Bardan et al., 1989; RCH Reports, 1997).

These conditionalities accelerated the shift toward selective primary care, prompting the state to focus on narrow vertical interventions—such as the Reproductive and Child Health (RCH) framework and targeted HIV/AIDS control—while underinvesting in comprehensive horizontal infrastructure (Banerji, 1985; Warren, 1988). This growing dependence on external loans transferred a substantial long-term debt-servicing burden to sub-national states, creating new fiscal challenges (Bhat et al., 2004a; RCH Reports, 1997).

6. PROLIFERATION OF THE PRIVATE HEALTHCARE SECTOR AND QUALITY EVALUATION

6.1 Phenomenal Growth and State Subsidization

The historical retreat of public investments paved the way for rapid expansion of the private medical sector, which has evolved into the dominant provider of healthcare services across the country (Bhat et al., 2004a; Duggal, 1996). The private sector operates as a fragmented and diverse market, ranging from high-technology corporate hospital chains and multi-specialty clinics in urban centres to individual general practitioners and informal providers in rural areas (Duggal, 1996).

This commercial growth was actively supported by state policies (Duggal, 1996). Over several decades, the state provided significant indirect subsidies to the private medical sector, including:

- **Publicly Funded Medical Education:** The state subsidizes the training of thousands of medical professionals in government colleges, many of whom transition directly into private commercial practice upon graduation (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Duggal, 1996).
- **Fiscal Incentives:** Governments grant private hospital operators' exemptions on import duties for advanced medical equipment, alongside soft loans and low-cost urban land allocations under the condition of treating a quota of low-income patients—a mandate that is rarely enforced (Bhat, 1996; Duggal, 1996).

Consequently, the private healthcare sector accounts for over 70% of all primary outpatient encounters and more than 40% of inpatient hospitalizations nationally (Duggal, 1996; Ramani et al., 2006). This high reliance on private care in a country where a large percentage of the population lives near or below subsistence levels highlights the limitations of the public infrastructure network (Bennett et al., 2006; Ramani et al., 2006).

6.2 Corporate Hospital Proliferation, Medical Tourism, and Lifestyle Diseases

During the 1990s and 2000s, liberalization accelerated the corporate transformation of the tertiary medical sector (Duggal, 1996; Ramani et al., 2004). Large industrial conglomerates and international healthcare firms partnered to build high-technology, super-specialty hospitals (Ramani et al., 2004). For example, the Wockhardt Hospitals Group established strategic partnerships with Harvard Medical International to build advanced tertiary clinical networks across urban centres like Mumbai and Bangalore (Ramani et al., 2004).

This corporate expansion is driven by two main epidemiological and economic shifts:

1. **The Rise of Chronic Lifestyle Diseases:** Driven by urban migration and changing lifestyles, India faces an increasing burden of non-communicable diseases (NCDs), including cardiovascular diseases, diabetes, oncology, and neurodegenerative conditions (Frenk et al., 1989). The treatment of these chronic conditions requires advanced tertiary care, creating a highly profitable market for corporate hospital operators (Duggal, 1996; Ramani et al., 2004).
2. **The Expansion of Medical Tourism:** Leveraging lower operational costs and a large pool of English-speaking clinical professionals, Indian corporate networks actively recruit international patients from high-income countries like the UK and US, alongside nations across the Middle East and Africa (Ramani et al., 2004). These international patients seek complex surgical interventions like cardiac bypasses and orthopedic joint replacements at a fraction of Western costs, turning tertiary care into a high-earning, exportable service sector (Ramani et al., 2004).

6.3 The Lack of Statutory Regulation and the Quality Crisis

The expansion of the private medical market has occurred in a regulatory vacuum (Bhat, 1996). Despite public concerns regarding medical malpractice, irrational treatments, and inflated billing, the state has largely failed to establish effective regulatory mechanisms over private clinical practices (Bhat, 1996).

Attempts to evaluate and regulate healthcare quality face several structural barriers:

- **Inadequate Legislative Enforcement:** Legislative frameworks like the Bombay Nursing Home Registration Act of 1949 were designed for an earlier medical era and lack the tools to audit modern corporate practices (Bhat, 1996). Efforts to adapt these laws into comprehensive state-level guidelines have faced strong resistance from organized medical lobbies (Bhat, 1996).
- **Incomplete Infrastructure and Personnel Data:** In the post-reform period, the Central Bureau of Health Intelligence (CBHI) was tasked with creating a comprehensive national registry of health infrastructure and manpower across the private, voluntary, and public sectors (Ashok Kumar, 2007). However, due to low compliance from private operators and weak administrative oversight, little concrete progress has been recorded (Ashok Kumar, 2007).
- **A Biased Consumer Redressal Model:** While the inclusion of the medical sector under the Consumer Protection Act during the 1990s provided a mechanism for patient redressal, it operates on a reactive model that addresses individual complaints rather than proactively auditing clinical quality and safety standards (Bhat, 1996).

Consequently, the quality of care remains highly variable (Bajpai et al., 2004). While corporate hospitals achieve international clinical accreditations, the broader private sector—particularly peripheral clinics in smaller towns and rural areas—frequently relies on irrational drug prescriptions, unnecessary diagnostic testing, and unscientific practices, posing risks to patient safety (Bajpai et al., 2004; Bhat, 1996).

7. MAJOR ISSUES, POLICY GAPS AND CHALLENGES FOR CONTEMPORARY GOVERNANCE

7.1 The Emergence of the Triple Burden of Disease

Sixty-four years after independence, and well beyond the timeline established by the Alma Ata declaration for achieving universal health status, the Indian population faces a complex, overlapping "triple burden of disease" (Frenk et al., 1989; WHO, 2000):

1. Resurgent Communicable Pandemics

India continues to face a significant burden of infectious diseases (Frenk et al., 1989). This challenge is compounded by the emergence of insecticide-resistant vectors, drug-resistant bacterial strains (such as multi-drug-resistant tuberculosis), and the spread of viral pathogens like HIV/AIDS, dengue, and leptospirosis (Frenk et al., 1989).

2. Accelerating Non-Communicable Conditions

Driven by demographic transitions and changing lifestyle patterns, the country faces a rapid rise in chronic conditions like diabetes, hypertension, and cardiovascular diseases (Frenk et al., 1989).

3. Persistent Nutritional Deficiencies

Widespread micronutrient deficiencies and child wasting coexist alongside rising obesity rates in urban areas, creating a dual challenge of malnutrition and chronic disease (Bennett et al., 2006; Frenk et al., 1989). The public health system remains structurally unequipped to handle this triple burden, as it lacks the diagnostic capacity, human resources, and funding to manage infectious epidemics and chronic conditions simultaneously (Bajpai et al., 2004; Ramani et al., 2006).

7.2 The Dualism of Public Utilization and Household Destitution

This systemic shortfall has driven a shift in utilization patterns across both rural and urban areas (Ramani et al., 2006; National Sample Survey Organisation, 1998). National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO) longitudinal data show a clear decline in the public sector's share of inpatient hospitalizations, dropping from

60% in 1986–1987 to 44% by 1995–1996 (Ramani et al., 2006; National Sample Survey Organisation, 1998). This shift was particularly acute in urban areas, which saw a 40% reduction in public inpatient care utilization, alongside a 36% decline in rural areas (Ramani et al., 2006; National Sample Survey Organisation, 1998).

Conversely, the data reveal an unexpected trend in outpatient care: the share of public primary facilities—such as PHCs, CHCs, and government dispensaries—in delivering outpatient care rose from 31% to 42% in rural areas, and from 11% to 15% in urban districts (Ramani et al., 2006; National Sample Survey Organisation, 1998). This does not indicate an upgrade in public clinical quality; rather, it reflects the expanding footprint of primary programs like immunization and antenatal care, alongside the economic realities of low-income households who are forced to rely on under-resourced public clinics for basic needs because they cannot afford private care (Duggal, 1996; Ramani et al., 2006).

For more serious illnesses requiring hospitalization, households are increasingly driven into the private commercial sector (Duggal, 1996; Ramani et al., 2006). Because private care is funded through out-of-pocket spending at the point of service, these medical transactions can lead to household destitution (Bhat et al., 2004b; Ramani et al., 2006). Families are routinely forced to sell productive agricultural assets, deplete their savings, or borrow from informal moneylenders to cover hospital bills, transforming healthcare costs into a major driver of rural poverty (Bhat et al., 2004b; Ramani et al., 2006).

7.3 Contemporary Interventions: The National Rural Health Mission (NRHM)

To address these structural gaps and revitalize the public health sector, the Government of India launched the National Rural Health Mission (NRHM) (Government of India, 2005). Designed as a 7-year programmatic intervention, the NRHM aimed to provide accessible, affordable, and accountable healthcare throughout the rural countryside, with a special focus on 18 states exhibiting weak public health indicators or infrastructure deficits (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Government of India, 2005).

The core goals of the NRHM focused on key maternal and child survival indicators (Government of India, 2005):

- **Maternal Mortality Reduction:** Reducing the national Maternal Mortality Rate (MMR) from 407 to 100 deaths per 100,000 live births (Government of India, 2005; WDR, 2009).
- **Infant Mortality Reduction:** Lowering the Infant Mortality Rate (IMR) from 60 to 30 deaths per 100,000 live births (Government of India, 2005; WDR, 2009).
- **Demographic Stabilization:** Achieving a Total Fertility Rate (TFR) of 2.1 within the mission's timeframe (Government of India, 2005).

The operational strategy of the NRHM is built around several pillars (Government of India, 2005):

1. **The Accredited Social Health Activist (ASHA):** Training and deploying a cadre of community-embedded female health volunteers at the village level to act as links between rural households and primary clinics, driving institutional delivery and routine immunization (Government of India, 2005).
2. **Decentralized Governance:** Creating District Health Societies and village-level bodies to enable decentralized health planning and community oversight over public funds (Government of India, 2005).
3. **Flexible Financing:** Increasing public health spending toward a target of 2% to 3% of GDP, while providing untied funds to PHCs and Sub-Centers to address local maintenance and logistical needs (Bhat et al., 2004a; Government of India, 2005).
4. **Horizontal Integration:** Merging previously separate vertical programs at the district level to improve administrative efficiency and resource allocation (Banerji, 1985; Government of India, 2005).

While the NRHM succeeded in increasing institutional birth rates and improving local funding flexibility, its overall impact remains constrained by persistent human resource shortages, weak supply chain management, and wide variations in administrative capacity across sub-national states (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Bajpai et al., 2004).

8. STRATEGIC OBSERVATIONS, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8.1 Critical Findings of Policy Evaluations

A systemic evaluation of India's healthcare policies across successive plan periods reveals several persistent structural vulnerabilities (Banerji, 1985; Bennett et al., 2006):

- **The Fragmented Pluralistic Model:** India has transitioned into a highly fragmented, commercialized, and inequitable healthcare market, where the public sector is largely restricted to peripheral preventative care while the private sector dominates profitable curative services (Duggal, 1996; Ramani et al., 2006).
- **The Public Financing Deficit:** Public spending on health remains low, historically hovering around 1.0% of GDP (Bhat et al., 2004a; Reddy et al., 1994). This underfunding starves primary clinics of

essential resources and shifts the financial burden onto individual households through out-of-pocket spending (Bhat et al., 2004a; Duggal, 1996).

- **The infrastructure-Manpower Disconnect:** Physical facilities are frequently built without matching personnel allocations, leaving rural clinics understaffed and creating a severe shortage of specialized medical professionals at the primary care level (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Dhas et al., 2008).
- **Sub-National Polarization:** Health indicators and institutional capacities are deeply polarized, with better-performing states advancing toward modern health systems while low-performing states struggle with high maternal and infant mortality rates (Chaudhary, 2006; David H. Peters et al., 2002; D. Varatharajan, 1999).
- **Regulatory Vacuum:** The private medical sector operates with minimal state oversight, leading to wide variations in clinical quality, safety risks, and rising healthcare costs for consumers (Bhat, 1996).

8.2 Managerial and Institutional Capacity Building Prescriptions

Addressing these systemic challenges requires a comprehensive shift in how health systems are managed and governed (Bennett et al., 2006; WHO, 2007). Effective public health management must move away from ad-hoc data collection designed merely for statutory reporting, and transition toward routine, data-driven planning and performance monitoring (Bennett et al., 2006; National Health Programme Competencies, 2006).

Critical administrative and institutional reforms include:

1. **Administrative Decentralization:** Granting operational and financial autonomy to local hospital management boards and District Health Societies, enabling them to adapt resource allocations to local epidemiological realities (Government of India, 2005).
2. **Logistics and Supply Chain Modernization:** Replicating high-performance sub-national models, like the Tamil Nadu Medical Services Corporation, to institutionalize the centralized, transparent procurement and digital tracking of essential generic medicines, ensuring their free availability across all public facilities (D. Varatharajan, 1999).
3. **Structured Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs):** Designing transparent, independently audited PPP frameworks that leverage private capacity to serve public health goals without compromising equity or social justice (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Duggal, 1996).
4. **Human Resource Management Reforms:** Establishing dedicated public health administrative cadres to separate clinical responsibilities from health system management, while enforcing mandatory rural rotations for public medical graduates backed by career advancement incentives (Ashok Kumar, 2007).

8.3 Financial Restructuring and Universal Risk Pooling

To build an equitable health system, India must restructure its health financing model away from regressive out-of-pocket spending and transition toward a universal risk-pooling architecture (Bhat et al., 2004b; Rao, 2004).

The primary financial strategies required are:

- **Scaling Up Public Spending:** Progressively increasing public health allocations to a minimum baseline of 2.5% to 3.0% of GDP, utilizing earmarked health taxes or social security contributions to expand the resource base (Bhat et al., 2004a; Bennett et al., 2006).
- **Strategic Purchasing and Pooling:** Creating unified public purchasing funds that pool resources from government allocations, employer contributions, and social insurance schemes to purchase care from a network of both public and regulated private providers (Bhat et al., 2004b; Rao, 2004).
- **Free Primary Care Provision:** Ensuring that a comprehensive package of primary clinical care, diagnostic screening, and essential medicines remains completely free at the point of service, removing financial barriers for vulnerable populations (Bennett et al., 2006; Ramani et al., 2006).
- **Regulating Private Costs:** Institutionalizing statutory cost caps and standardized diagnostic pricing schedules across private clinics to protect consumers from catastrophic medical expenditures (Bhat, 1996).

8.4 Academic, Research, and Corporate Alignments

Finally, long-term health system performance depends on aligning the priorities of academic, research, and corporate institutions with national public health goals (Bennett et al., 2006; WHO, 2007):

1. Medical and Nursing Colleges

Medical school curricula must be updated to move beyond a narrow clinical focus and include training in social epidemiology, health economics, and digital medicine (Banerji, 1985). These institutions should also establish structured Continuing Medical Education (CME) pathways to upgrade the skills of rural public health professionals (Bennett et al., 2006).

2. Biomedical Research Organizations

Public research bodies must prioritize the development and indigenization of medical technologies, diagnostic tools, and surgical devices. Following the success of the domestic pharmaceutical industry in producing low-cost generic drugs, manufacturers must focus on engineering affordable medical equipment to lower capital costs for public hospitals (D. Varatharajan, 1999).

3. Structured Corporate and NGO Partnerships

Corporate entities, non-governmental organizations, and civil society groups must build transparent partnerships to expand support services, including blood banking, rural ambulance logistics, and community-level social work (Ashok Kumar, 2007; Government of India, 2002). These collaborations must be governed by clear service-level agreements and subjected to independent performance evaluations to ensure transparency and accountability (Bhat, 1996).

By implementing these structural, financial, and managerial reforms, India can shift its healthcare paradigm away from supply-pushed, selective vertical interventions and move toward an integrated, equitable, and comprehensive universal health system that fulfils its fundamental duty to protect and preserve the health of all its citizens (Bennett et al., 2006; WHO, 2007).

CONCLUSION

The evaluation of healthcare policies in India demonstrates that the country has made significant progress in expanding healthcare infrastructure and improving selected health indicators over the decades; however, these achievements remain deeply uneven across states and socio-economic groups. The study establishes that India's healthcare system continues to suffer from chronic underfunding, fragmented policy implementation, infrastructure-manpower mismatches, and a heavy dependence on privatized healthcare services. While states such as Tamil Nadu and Maharashtra have demonstrated that effective governance, sustained public investment, and administrative efficiency can substantially improve health outcomes, low-performing states like Bihar and Uttar Pradesh continue to struggle with poor infrastructure, high mortality rates, and severe workforce shortages.

The findings reveal that the historical shift from comprehensive primary healthcare toward selective vertical interventions weakened the development of a strong universal public health system. Economic liberalization and the rapid expansion of private healthcare further intensified inequalities by transferring the financial burden of healthcare onto households through out-of-pocket expenditure. Consequently, healthcare costs have become a major contributor to poverty and financial distress among vulnerable populations. Additionally, the absence of effective regulatory mechanisms over private healthcare providers has created substantial concerns regarding affordability, quality, accountability, and ethical clinical practices.

The study concludes that future healthcare reforms in India must prioritize strengthening primary healthcare institutions, expanding public financing, improving rural human resource deployment, and ensuring equitable interstate resource distribution. Public expenditure on health should be increased substantially to reduce dependence on private spending and to establish universal risk-pooling mechanisms capable of protecting citizens from catastrophic medical expenses. Simultaneously, modernized governance structures, decentralized planning, digital supply-chain systems, and transparent public-private partnerships are necessary to improve efficiency and accountability.

Ultimately, India's long-term healthcare success depends on its ability to transition from a fragmented and market-driven system toward an integrated, equitable, and people-centred universal health framework. Achieving this transformation requires coordinated action among government institutions, healthcare professionals, academic organizations, private providers, and civil society to ensure that healthcare functions as a fundamental social right rather than a commercial privilege.

REFERENCES

- Abel-Smith B., 1963. *Paying for Health Services*, Geneva, World Health Organization, (Public Health Papers No. 17).
- Abel-Smith B., 1967. *An International Study of Health Expenditure*, Geneva, World Health Organization, (Public Health Papers No. 32).
- Ahluwalia Montek S., 2000. *Economic Performance of States in Post-Reforms Period*, Economic and Political Weekly, May 6.
- Arif GM. *Targeting Efficiency of Poverty Reduction Programs in Pakistan*. Working Paper no. 4. Pakistan Resident Mission Working Paper Series. Asian Development Bank, 2006.
- Ashok Kumar, 2007. *Managing Human Resource for Health in India, A Case Study of Madhya Pradesh & Gujarat*, Central Bureau of Health Intelligence, Directorate General of Health Services, Ministry of Health & Family Welfare.

- Bajpai, N. and Goyal, S. 2004. *Primary Health Care in India: Coverage and Quality Issues*. CGSD Working Paper No. 15, pp. 1-39.
- Banerji D., 1985. *Health & Family Planning Services in India: An Epidemiological, Socio-cultural and Political Analysis and a Perspective*. Lok Paksh, New Delhi.
- Benn H. *Meeting our promises: basic services for everyone, everywhere*. Fourth White Paper speech, UNISON, 16 February 2006. London.
- Bardan, A et. al. 1989. *A Diagnostic Study of the Factors Responsible for Lesser or No Utilization*.
- Bennett S. and Eichler R. *Taking forward the health systems agenda: report of a consultation on developing the health systems action network*. Partners for Health Reform plus Project, 2006.
- Berman Peter, 1995. *Health Sector Reform in Developing Countries: Making Health Development Sustainable*, Boston, Harvard University Press.
- Bhat Ramesh and Jain Nishant, 2004a. *Analysis of Public Expenditure on Health Using State Level Data*.
- Bhat Ramesh and Saha Somen, 2004b. *Health Insurance Not a Panacea*, Economic and Political Weekly, August 14, pp. 3667 - 3670.
- Bhat, Ramesh, 1996. *Regulation of the Private Health Sector in India*, International Journal of Health Planning and Management, Vol 11.
- Bhat Ramesh and Jain Nishant, 2004c. *Time Series Analysis of Private Healthcare Expenditures and GDP: Cointegration Results with Structural Break*, Indian Institute of Management, Ahmedabad.
- Cahill K, Caines K, Cassels A, Chen L, Conway M, Devillé L et. al. *High-Level Forum on the Health Millennium Development Goals: selected papers, 2003-2005*. Geneva, World Health Organization, 2006.
- Choudhary, U. D. R., 1993. *Inter-state and intra-state variations in economic development and standard of living*, Journal of Indian School of Political Economy.
- Chaudhary, Mita, 2006. *Public spending on health in low income states and central transfers*, National Institute of Public Finance and Policy.
- D. Varatharajan, 1999. *Improving the Efficiency of Public Health Care Units in Tamil Nadu, India*. Takemi Research Paper No. 165, Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, MA.
- David H. Peters, Abdo S Yazbeck, Rashmi R. Sharma, Lant H. Pritchett, Adam Wagstaff, 2002. *Better Health System for India's Poor: Findings, Analysis, and Options*, The World Bank.
- *Developing health-programme competencies: a learning initiative for WHO and its staff*. (A discussion paper for the WHO Global Learning Committee). Geneva, World Health Organization, 2006.
- Dhas AC, Helen MJ., 2008. *Trends in Health Status and Infrastructural Support in Tamil Nadu*. Munich Personal RePEc Archive Paper No 9518.
- Di Matteo L, Di Matteo R., 1998. *Evidence on the determinants of Canadian provincial government health expenditures: 1965-1991*, Journal of Health Economics.
- Duggal R., 1996. *The Private Health Sector in India: Nature, Trends and a Critique*. Centre for Enquiry into Health and Allied Themes (CEHAT), Mumbai.
- Frenk, Julio, Jose Luis Bobadilla, Jaime Sepulveda, Jorge Rosenthal, Enrique Ruelas, 1989. Quoted from Jamison Dean T, Mosley Henry W, Measham Anthony R, Bobadilla Jose Luis, Editors, *Disease Control Priorities in Developing Countries*. Oxford Medical Publications, New York.
- Government of India, 1951. *First Five Year Plan*. Planning Commission, New Delhi.
- Government of India, 1997. *Approach Paper to the Ninth Five-Year Plan (1997-2002)*. Planning Commission, New Delhi.
- Government of India, 2002. *National Health Policy*. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, New Delhi.
- Government of India, 2005. *National Rural Health Mission (2005-2012): Mission Document*. Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, New Delhi.
- Ramani KV, 2004. *IT Enabled Applications in Government Hospitals, India: Illustrations of Telemedicine, E-governance, and BPR*, IEEE Proceedings of the International Conference on System Sciences, Hawaii, January 5-8.
- Ramani KV, Mavalankar D., 2006. *Health System in India: Opportunities and Challenges for Improvements*, Journal of Health Organization and Management; 20: 560-572.
- National Sample Survey Organisation (NSSO), 1998. *52nd Round Report on Morbidity and Healthcare Utilization Patterns in India*, Ministry of Statistics and Programme Implementation, GOI.

- Rao Sujatha, 2004. *Health Insurance Concepts, Issues and Challenges*, Economic and Political Weekly, August 21.
- Reddy K.N. and Selvaraju V., 1994. *Healthcare Expenditure by Government in India: 1974-75 to 1990-91*, National Institute of Public Finance and Policy, New Delhi.
- Reproductive and Child Health (RCH) Reports, 1997. *Logistical and Financial Analysis of External Infrastructure Soft Loans*, Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of India.
- Visaria, P and A Gumber, 1994. *Utilisation of and Expenditure on Health Care in India: 1986-87*, Gujarat Institute of Development Research, Gota, Gujarat.
- Vos T, Lopez A, Lim S. *Reductions in child mortality levels and inequalities in Thailand: analysis of two censuses*. The Lancet, Volume 369, Number 9564, 2007.
- Warren KS. *The evolution of selective primary health care*. Social Science and Medicine 1988;26:891-8.
- WDR (2004) *"Making services work for poor people"* The World Bank, 1818 H Street, N.W., Washington D.C. 20433.
- WDR (2009) *"World Development Indicators"* Development data group, The World Bank, Washington D.C. 20433, U.S.A.
- WHO (2000), *"Health Systems: Improving performance"*, The World Health Report 2000, WHO, Geneva.
- WHO (2007), *"Strengthening health system to improve health outcomes"*, Geneva, World Health Organization.