

REPRODUCTIVE AND CHILD HEALTH STATUS IN INDIA: DISTRICT LEVEL ANALYSIS

**Suresh Sharma
Population Research Center
Institute of Economic Growth
University Enclave, Delhi-8
suresh@ieg.ernet.in**

INTRODUCTION

Paradigm shifts have taken place in India's population policies from the earlier methods-mix target approach to the target free approach (TFA) in April 1996, subsequently renamed as the community's need assessment (CNA) approach in late 1997. These shifts have duly emphasized the reproductive and child health (RCH) quality services package, which is geared towards an improvement in the quality of life having implicit implications for a reduction in infant and maternal mortality. The immediate objective of the National Population Policy 2000 is to address the unmet needs for contraception, health care infrastructure, and health personnel, and to provide an integrated service delivery for basic reproductive and child health care (MoHFW, 2000). Addressing the unmet need of contraception, of course the informed choice of contraception while avoiding past pitfalls, would bring about an easy availability and accessibility to affordable quality contraceptives and would thereby help in controlling unwanted fertility which was around 20% in 1992-93 and has come down to around 16% in 1998-99 (NFHS-2, 1998-99). Furthermore, the availability and accessibility to the reproductive and child health package of quality services would facilitate a reduction in infant and maternal mortality and would improve not only the quality of life but also lead to a faster reduction in the wanted fertility component of the total fertility. Meeting these immediate objectives is essential in order to attain the medium term objective of bringing down fertility to replacement level, which implies a total fertility level (TFR) of around 2.1, by 2010 and population stabilization by 2045. Added concerns about gender issues, infertility, reproductive tract infections, HIV/AIDs,

women, children and adolescent girl's health, etc. have been well articulated in the National Population Policy Document released in February 2000 (NPP-2000). The short, medium and long run objectives and associated activities and action plans have been well enunciated in the NPP-2000 document.

The NPP-2000 document had laid an added emphasis on the vigorous implementation of inter-sectoral operation strategies towards population control and stabilization. The National Commission on Population (NCP) commissioned a Conference of Social Sector Programmes concerned with improvement in the quality of life of the people which in turn has a direct bearing on the desire for smaller family sizes and thus fertility control and early population stabilization. Shri K.C.Pant, Vice Chairman, NCP and Deputy Chairman, Planning Commission in his inaugural address at the conference reiterated that the population stabilization programme is linked with various social sectoral programmes towards improvement in the quality of life of the people, which again has a direct relationship with the desire for a smaller family. This would give a better chance to the children in life, an education, while giving the couple a sense of confidence about the survival of the child (Parmer, 2001).

Utilization of RCH services and their linkages with basic demographic parameters and socioeconomic developmental factors have often been argued and highlighted in the theoretical and empirical literature. The NPP-2000 also affirms the provision of quality RCH services and an informed choice of contraception alongwith women empowerment characterized by improvements in women's educational standards, working conditions and autonomy. These improvements are expected to bring about changes in their quality of life, standards of living and to facilitate a faster control and an early stabilization of the population. Nevertheless, for proper implementation and monitoring of the population policy document's intents we need district level indicators on socioeconomic, demographic and RCH parameters. The generation of district level data on RCH indices in 1998-99 for monitoring and evaluation of the programme interventions by the Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, especially in the light of India being a signatory to the ICPD action plan in 1994, seemed to be a timely attempt in the right direction.

The Ministry of Health and Family Welfare (MoHFW) sponsored district level Rapid Household Surveys, which have facilitated the availability of crucial and basic RCH indicators for all the 504 districts as per the 1991 Census of India. The surveys were conducted all over India during 1998-99 to elicit basic district level RCH indicators for 504 districts as of 1991 census. Proper planning, implementation and monitoring of RCH interventions at the district and sub-district levels in a resource-constrained regime certainly needs prioritization of districts in terms of the assessed needs of RCH services duly emphasized in the NPP-2000 document. Nevertheless, as reproductive health status is multi-dimensional, it is difficult to arrive at by any catchall variable. Thus, a composite index based on crucial RCH indicators and demographic parameters, and associated socioeconomic factors would facilitate an identification of demographically sensitive districts to be focused upon for devolution of scarce-resources to achieve the short-run unmet needs goals, medium-run replacement level fertility goal by 2010, and the long run population stabilization target by 2045.

NCP's attempt to make a districtwise composite index based on twelve basic RCH, demographic and socioeconomic indicators towards the assessment of district level needs and their prioritization for district level planning purposes in the constrained resource regime in India seems to be a good beginning. However, the composite indices seem to have some limitations in terms of choice of indicators and indexing technique. Let us briefly examine the limitations before we attempt alternate composite indices for the purpose.

NCP'S DISTRICTWISE COMPOSITE INDICES

The National Commission on Population (NCP) document attempted to rank 569 districts on the elicited composite index based on the underlying 12 socioeconomic, demographic and RCH indicators. Though this was certainly an attempt in the right direction, it seems to have some serious limitations in terms of choice of indicators and methodology adopted for eliciting the composite index (Population Commission, 2001).

IRRELEVANCE OF SOME UNDERLYING INDICATORS IN THE NCP'S INDICES

The selection of twelve variables for eliciting the composite index for ranking of 569 districts seems to be arbitrary in the sense that some of the important dimensions of reproductive and child health which have a direct bearing on infant and maternal mortality have been altogether omitted from the list of available RCH indicators in the survey reports. The extent of utilization of Antenatal care has often been emphasized as having a direct bearing on maternal and infant health and mortality, especially the neonatal component of infant mortality. Furthermore, some of the indicators do not depict any relevance to the basic demographic parameters of fertility and mortality, which are of prime concern in the policy document. Still further, we find that some of the indicators included in the indexing exercise have either conceptual or measurement problems and had raised several controversies in the past. The methodology adopted for eliciting the composite index assigns equal weightage to all the inducted indicators whereas the weightage patterns should have been devised using some objective criterion for eliciting the district level composite indices.

The selection of some of the indicators which do not depict any linkage with the basic demographic and RCH parameters like fertility, mortality, marriage patterns, reproductive health care utilization, contraception, etc. and associated socioeconomic factors enabling women's empowerment, etc. should have been obviated in the composite index exercise for prioritization of districts to be focused upon for fertility and population stabilization objectives. Factorial investigations of the twelve indicators under the purview of the Planning Commission's indexing document would clearly reflect the irrelevance of some such selected variables in the document. Table 1 provides a rotated factor structure for the 12 variables depicting the extent of interconnectedness or interlinkages through an examination of the factor loadings.

TABLE 1: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR TWELVE UNDERLYING INDICATORS IN NCP'S DISTRICTWISE COMPOSITE INDEX DOCUMENT

| Variable | Factor | | Communality |
|---------------------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------|
| | F-I | F-II | |
| 1. Decadal Growth Rate (DGR) | -.231 | -.755 | .624 |
| 2. Percent Of Birth Order 3+ (PBO3+) | -.845 | -.312 | .811 |
| 3. Percent Current Users of FP (CUFP) | .776 | .204 | .643 |

| | | | |
|--|--------------|-------------|------|
| 4. Percent Girls Marrying <18 Yrs (PGMB18) | -.712 | -.114 | .519 |
| 5. Sex Ratio (Female Male Ratio) (SR) | .043 | .850 | .724 |
| 6. Percent Safe Delivery (PSD) | .880 | .139 | .793 |
| 7. Complete Immunization (PCCI) | .787 | .349 | .742 |
| 8. Female Literacy Rate (FLR) | .816 | .093 | .674 |
| 9. Percent Villages Connected Road (PVCPR) | -.631 | .284 | .479 |
| 10. Safe Drinking Water Coverage (PHCSDW) | -.098 | -.389 | .161 |
| 11. Percent Births Registered (PBR) | .721 | .287 | .602 |
| 12. Percent Deaths Registered (PDR) | .565 | .303 | .410 |
| Eigen Value | 5.185 | 2.000 | |

Perusal of Table 1 reveals that two factors have been retained based on Kaiser's criterion of eigen-value to be greater than unity (Harman, 1970). The two retained factors account for 60 percent of the inter-district variations in 569 districts over the 12 selected indicators. The measure of communality reflects the percentage of variance of each indicator being captured by the retained factors. A perusal of the table reveals that for nine variables, the value exceeds fifty percent and for only one variable it is less than even 17 percent, which is safe drinking water coverage. The other two variables with moderate a value of communality turn out to be connectivity of villages by pucca road and extent of registration of deaths in the districts.

Perusal of the rotated factor structure in Table 1 clearly reveals that the First Factor (Factor-I) is primarily constituted by seven underlying indicators comprising: (i) two RCH indicators viz. extent of safe delivery and extent of children's complete immunization, (ii) three basic demographic parameters viz. fertility characterized by percent children born recently of birth order 3 and above, extent of current usage of contraception, and marriage age patterns characterized by percent girls recently married below 18 years in age; and (iii) two basic socioeconomic variables viz. extent of female literacy and lack of road connectivity of villages by all weather roads at the district level. Interestingly, interlinkages amongst the primary constituents of the first factor (F-I) clearly depict that extent of safe deliveries (PSD), children's complete immunization (PCCI) with much higher factor loadings depict close linkages with the basic demographic indicators viz. fertility (PBO3+), current usage of contraceptives (CUAM), and marriage-age patterns (PGMB18). The factor also depicts those women's empowerment enabling factors like female literacy rate (FLR) that depicts stronger linkages with the crucial RCH and demographic parameters under the purview of the document. Furthermore,

connectivity of villages by all weather road (PVCPR) also depicts strong linkages with the basic demographic and RCH parameters. Thus, inclusion of the seven variables with much higher factor loadings on the first factor and depicting close and rightful interconnectedness would have been right for the district wise composite indices.

Perusal of the table reveals that the district's population growth rate and sex ratio are closely associated as their factor loadings on the Second Factor are relatively much higher. Furthermore, these two variables depict weaker linkages with the First Factor, which is primarily constituted by the interconnected RCH, demographic and selected socioeconomic indicators under the purview of the document. Thus inclusion of the district's growth rate in the composite index seems to be redundant as it depicts weak linkage with other crucial demographic and RCH indicators impacting fertility and mortality, which are basic to population control and stabilization in the medium and long run. However, the inclusion of the district's population growth rate in the index seems to be irrelevant as it is linked more closely with sex ratio rather than with the RCH and demographic indicators. Furthermore, the sex ratio gets largely affected by the district level migrational flows. Thus, district's population growth rate and sex ratio are found to depict stronger linkages with each other rather than with other crucial demographic and RCH indicators, which were found to primarily constitute the First Factor.

It may be of interest to mention that intra-national migrational flows largely responsible for inter-district population growth variations do not seem to have any impact on the natural component of national population growth. It may also be mentioned that many of the metro centers depict a much higher growth rate largely because of massive immigration and depict much lower sex ratios but generally have much lower levels of fertility and mortality. Thus, the district's population growth rate and sex ratio seems to be redundant for such exercises to reflect the extent of demographic backwardness and seem to be irrelevant from the point of view of fertility, mortality and contraception issues which may be of primary concern towards population control and stabilization.

Inclusion of the variable depicting the extent of coverage of habitations by safe drinking water has some serious conceptual problems, which have already been highlighted in the past in several empirical studies. Especially in some of the southern districts, which depict much lowered levels of mortality, including infant and child mortality, these do not fall in the category of districts with a higher percentage of population with safe drinking water facility. The logical linkage could have been that districts with a higher percent of population covered by safe drinking water facility should have depicted lowered levels of infant and child mortality as the incidence of diarrhoeal diseases amongst children should be lower in such districts. However, several empirical studies have shown that a categorization of safe drinking water by its source like tap water may not be valid especially in the southern districts where the source may be well and not tap and that is how the infant and child mortality levels are already low and still the source of source of drinking water is predominantly well and not tap, which latter is considered as providing safe drinking water as per the official census documents. Such controversial issues should have been accounted for while selecting safe drinking water coverage as an indicator. The weak linkage between the safe drinking water facility indicator and other selected indicators for the composite index gets clearly reflected in the factorial analysis of the 12 selected variables in the Commission's document.

Though the extent of registration of births and deaths depict a close association with the first factors because of their relatively much higher factor loadings, but certainly these do not seem to have any implication or reflection on the population control or stabilization programme interventions or on socioeconomic and demographic backwardness of the district. Possibly, it seems to be chance a factor that districts reflecting a higher literacy level and better utilization of RCH services also have a better recording system, However, the better actuarial coverage of births and deaths certainly should not be indicative of better performance on the demographic front or RCH utilization or on the socioeconomic development front. Thus, the two variables reflecting efficiency in terms of recording of the vital events like births and deaths should not have been included in the exercise eliciting the composite index depicting socioeconomic and demographic development of the districts.

Thus, the choice of 5 out of the 12 variables, namely, (i) district's decadal growth rate of population (DGR), (ii) sex ratio (SR), (iii) extent of coverage by safe drinking water (PHCSDW), (iv) registration of births (PBR), and (v) registration of deaths (PDR) seems to have some serious conceptual, measurement or methodological problems for their inclusion in the set of variables that reflect the socioeconomic and demographic backwardness of the districts. Thus, an inclusion of five irrelevant variables in the composite index seems to be unnecessary and may affect the ranking of the districts based on the composite index meant for reflecting the socioeconomic and demographic backwardness or development of the districts.

NCP's INDEXING TECHNIQUE'S LIMITATIONS

The technique of eliciting a composite index in the Commission's document has provided an equal weightage to each variable included in the indexing exercise. The weightage pattern should have been based on some objective criterion of combining the different variables like their interconnectedness and relative importance towards fertility, mortality, contraception and other RCH components which are intended to be focused upon in the NPP-2000 document towards provision of quality health care, population control and population stabilization goals in the coming years.

Furthermore, the relative dispersions are much higher in the case of some variables compared with others as can be clearly depicted with the coefficient of variation for the selected variables. The skewness of the dispersions also varies greatly over the selected variables. Though the true form of statistical distributions of the variables is unknown, but the transformation of the variables to a standardized form will reduce the complexities arising due to different units and scales of measurement of different indicators and make the distributions relatively more compact. However, the factor score coefficients and factor scores, whether based on factorial analysis or principal component analysis, are based on the standardized scores of the implicit indicators and thus obviate such limitations (Gulati, 1996).

FACTOR ANALYTIC TECHNIQUE FOR INDEXING

The method starts with the original correlation matrix and generates principal components to arrive at the estimates of communalities and the number of factors or components to be retained based on Kaiser's criterion of Eigen values greater than unity (Harman, 1970). Subsequently, the estimated values of communalities replace the ones in the principal diagonal and the original correlation matrix and the principal factor solution is evolved. The method elicits factors which account for the inter-district variations among the original set of variables in descending order of magnitude i.e. the First Factor accounts for the greatest possible proportion of the total variance, the Second Factor for the greatest proportion of the remaining variance, and so on. Subsequently, the elicited factor matrix can be subjected to either orthogonal or oblique rotation to arrive at the simpler factor structure.

Subsequently, factor scores are calculated utilizing these factor loadings and other parametric estimates in the rotated factor structure in the following formula:

$$[FS]_{m \times 1} = [F'F]_{m \times m}^{-1} * C'_{mon} * Z_{n \times 1}$$

$FS_{m \times 1}$: Factor Score Vector with m entities.

$F_{n \times m}$: Varimax-Rotated Factor Matrix with m retained factors.

$Z_{n \times 1}$: Observation Matrix of Variables in standardized form.

m : Number of Retained Factors

n : Number of Underlying Variables

The formula clearly suggests that the weighting pattern for eliciting factor scores from different variables depends on the factor loadings depicting the extent of inter-connectedness among the variables. The clear advantage of the factor analytic technique is that factor loadings are used as weights to weave together the basic indicators, thereby avoiding the arbitrariness in choosing weights or equal weightage assigned to all the variables involved for eliciting the factor scores as the composite indices. Each factor depicts the performance of a district on the structural aspect as depicted by the factor. Furthermore, if the retained factor turns out to be just one based on Kaiser's criterion then the solution or component matrix being just a vector does not require

any rotation and becomes a unique solution providing weights to the constituting variables of the component with inbuilt characteristics of factor scores with zero mean and unit variance.

DISTRICTWISE RCH COMPOSITE INDICES

The factor analytical approach has been utilized for constructing the RCH-status indices for all the 504 districts of India, which were covered under RHS-RCH project sponsored by the MoHFW. Seven district level RCH and demographic indicators have been selected for eliciting the composite indices or factor scores for all the districts of India. The variables selected are: (i) child-woman ratio (CWR), (ii) percent births in last 3 years of birth order 3+ (PBO3P), (iii) percent couples using any contraceptive method (CUAM), (iv) percent girls married below 18 years of age (PGMB18), (v) percent pregnant women in last three years who availed antenatal care (PPANC), (vi) percent deliveries in last three years in health institutions (PDHI), and vii) percent children born over last three years and currently over one year of age and have been fully immunized. Summary indices of the selected variables are provided in Annex Table A1.

A selection of seven variables characterizing fertility, contraception, marriage pattern, antenatal care, delivery care, and children's immunization indicators are intended to elicit a composite index reflecting the extent of utilization of MCH care and the demographic backwardness of each district. The seven indicators are supposed to be highly interlinked and fall within the purview of the MoHFW. The composite indices would facilitate the identification of districts, which are demographically backward or sensitive, and need special attention towards attainment of the national objectives of fertility control and early population stabilization.

FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE SEVEN SELECTED INDICATORS

The evolved factor structure of the seven interconnected variables based on the Kaiser criterion of Eigen value greater than unity is presented in Table 2. Interestingly, selection of seven RCH indicators and demographic variables was such that all of them seem to depict strong interconnectedness and the number of retained factors turns out to be just one. The eigen roots of the correlation matrix of the seven variables depict that only the first eigen value turned out to be

5.05 and all others were less than unity resulting into retention of just one factor which accounts for almost 72 percent of the inter-district variations in the selected indicators. The elicited factor structure or component matrix is presented in Table 2.

TABLE 2: FACTOR STRUCTURE OF SEVEN SELECTED VARIABLES

| Variable | Component | Communality |
|--|------------------|--------------------|
| 1. Child Women Ratio | -.906 | .821 |
| 2. Percent Births of Order 3+ (PBO3P) | -.925 | .856 |
| 3. Percent Couples Using Any Method (CUAM) | .838 | .702 |
| 4. Percent Girls Marrying Below 18 Yrs (PGMB18) | -.640 | .410 |
| 5. Percent Pregnancies Utilized Antenatal Care (PPANC) | .873 | .762 |
| 6. Percent Deliveries In Health Institutions (PDHI) | .852 | .726 |
| 7. Percent Children With Complete Immunization (PCWCI) | .870 | .757 |
| Eigen Value | 5.034 | |

The nature of linkages amongst the seven selected variables turn out to be consistent with the general expectations. Districts with a higher usage of contraception depict a lower fertility characterized by the child woman ratio as well as percent births of order 3+. Furthermore, the lower age at marriage depicted by the higher percentage of girls marrying below 18 years of age depicts the promotive impact on fertility and inhibitive impact on usage of contraception. Furthermore, districts depicting higher usage of antenatal and delivery care depict strong linkages with fertility, contraception, and age at marriage. It may be of interest to mention that factorial investigations do not presume any cause and effect relationship. It is possible that a higher utilization of antenatal and delivery care may lead to a lower infant and maternal mortality and which in turn motivates couples to go for higher usage of contraception to control fertility because of the sense of confidence about the survivability of children and mothers. Thus, the districts with higher factor scores based on the elicited factor structure or factor loadings depict a better performance on the RCH care utilization front and demographic advancement. Alternatively, districts with higher factor scores depict a better status compared with districts with a lower scores and thus lower RCH-status.

Interestingly, the factor solution entailing just one factor also depicts that the factor structure is not subjected to any orthogonal or oblique rotation and thus the elicited factor

solution turns out to be unique. Furthermore, the elicited factor scores are presented in Annex Table A1.3. The scores depicting RCH-status of the districts will have inbuilt characteristics of having zero mean and unit variance and thus we can classify districts into categories around zero mean and unit interval. Thus, districts with factor scores less than -1 have been categorized into low RCH status, ranging from -1 to zero into lower middle category, zero to 1 into higher middle, and more than 1 in high RCH Status category.

RCH-STATUS OF 504 DISTRICTS OF INDIA

Distribution of 504 districts in the four categories of RCH-status is presented in Table 3. A perusal of Table 3 reveals that 97 out of 504 districts, as of 1991 census, fall in the Low RCH-health status category. Furthermore, 81 of these 97 districts in the low status category fall in the popular Hindi Belt comprising Bihar, Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, and Rajasthan, whereas all the remaining 16 districts in the low RCH-status category fall in the states over the Northeastern region namely Assam, Meghalaya, Nagaland, and Arunachal Pradesh. Furthermore, within the four states we find that Bihar is lagging far behind in terms of RCH utilization and demographic backwardness, as 39 out of 43 districts of Bihar fall into the low RCH-status category. Still further, we find that Uttar Pradesh within the belt is next in terms of demographic backwardness as 29 out of 68 districts fall in the low RCH-status category.

It may be interest to mention that only one district in Bihar, namely Purbi Singhbhum; and five districts of Uttar Pradesh, namely Dehradun, Kanpur-Nagar, Pauri-Garhwal, Chamoli and Nainital; fall in the higher middle RCH-status category depicting a demographic situation better than the national average.

The high performance districts turn out to be 102 out of 504, which fall into the high RCH-status category. Interestingly, 54 out of these 102 districts are located in the Southern belt of four states, namely Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala and Tamil Nadu. As per expectations, we find that almost all districts of Kerala (13/14) and Tamil Nadu (21/ 22) get categorized into high RCH-status category.

TABLE 3: DISTRIBUTION OF 504 DISTRICTS IN RCH-STATUS CATEGORIES

| State/UT | RCH Status Category | | | | Total |
|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|---------------|------|-------|
| | Low | Lower-Middle | Higher-Middle | High | |
| 1. Arunachal Pradesh | 5 | 8 | | | 13 |
| 2. Assam | 3 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 22 |
| 3. Manipur | | 5 | 3 | | 8 |
| 4. Meghalaya | 5 | 2 | | | 7 |
| 5. Mizoram | | 1 | 2 | | 3 |
| 6. Nagaland | 3 | 3 | 1 | | 7 |
| 7. Sikkim | | 3 | 1 | | 4 |
| 8. Tripura | | | 3 | | 3 |
| 9. Andhra Pradesh | | | 13 | 10 | 23 |
| 10. Karnataka | | 5 | 5 | 10 | 20 |
| 11. Kerala | | | 1 | 13 | 14 |
| 12. Tamil Nadu | | | 1 | 21 | 22 |
| 13. Gujarat | | 3 | 14 | 2 | 19 |
| 14. Maharashtra | | | 18 | 12 | 30 |
| 15. Bihar | 39 | 3 | 1 | | 43 |
| 16. Uttar Pradesh | 29 | 34 | 5 | | 68 |
| 17. Madhya Pradesh | 8 | 29 | 8 | | 45 |
| 18. Rajasthan | 5 | 25 | | | 30 |
| 19. Orissa | | 15 | 15 | | 30 |
| 20. Jammu & Kashmir | | 6 | 7 | 1 | 14 |
| 21. Himachal Pradesh | | | 4 | 8 | 12 |
| 22. Haryana | | 3 | 13 | 1 | 17 |
| 23. Punjab | | | 10 | 7 | 17 |
| 24. West Bengal | | 5 | 10 | 4 | 19 |
| 25. Delhi | | | | 1 | 1 |
| 26. A. N. Islands | | | | 2 | 2 |
| 27. D & N Haveli | | 1 | | | 1 |
| 28. Goa | | | | 2 | 2 |
| 29. Daman & Diu | | | 1 | 1 | 2 |
| 30. Lakshadweep | | | 1 | | 1 |
| 31. Pondichery | | | | 4 | 4 |
| 32. Chandigarh | | | | 1 | 1 |
| Total | 97 | 164 | 141 | 102 | 504 |

Among smaller states we find that Himachal Pradesh also depicts a good performance as 8 out of 12 districts fall into the high RCH-status category. Interestingly, we find that 2 districts of Assam namely Jorhat and Nalbari also fall in the high performance districts group.

Surprisingly, Leh in J&K is also one of the best performing districts of India. However, prioritization of districts based on the RCH-status indices can facilitate an identification of districts which need to be focused upon under the resource constrained regime of India to bring about optimal results for the national objectives of providing a better quality of life, population control and early population stabilization.

SOCIOECONOMIC AND CULTURAL PREDICTORS OF RCH-STATUS

The parametric estimates of multiple linear structural relation between elicited district level RCH-status indices (RHIND) and selected socioeconomic and cultural factors namely, female literacy (FLR), female work participation rate (FWPR), number of auxiliary nursing midwives per lakh population (ANM), percent villages not connected by *pucca* road (PVNCPR), district's economic development index (DDIO)¹, percent Muslim population (PMUS), and extent of urbanization (PURB) are presented in the following Table 4.

TABLE 4: PARAMETRIC ESTIMATES OF PREDICTORS OF RCH INDICES (RCHIND) IN INDIA

| Predictor Variable | Regression Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t-Value | Significance |
|--------------------|-------------------------|------------|---------------------------|---------|--------------|
| | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| Constant | -2.133 | .125 | | -17.071 | .000 |
| FLR | 3.403E-02 | .002 | .506 | 15.614 | .000 |
| FWPR | 2.135E-02 | .002 | .268 | 10.371 | .000 |
| ANM | 3.965E-03 | .001 | .232 | 7.401 | .000 |
| PVNCPR | -8.070E-03 | .001 | -.234 | -8.435 | .000 |
| DDIO | 0.271 | .058 | .196 | 4.688 | .000 |
| PMUS | -4.701E-03 | .002 | -.048 | -1.993 | .047 |
| PURB | -5.726E-03 | .002 | -.093 | -2.826 | .005 |
| N=385 | | | | | |
| R-Square= 0.825 | | | | | |
| Significance: .000 | | | | | |

Table 4 reveals that women's empowerment enabling factors like female literacy (FLR) and female employment (FWPR) turn out to be important predictors of RCH-status.

¹ The district development index (DDIO) was worked out by the author for districts of India based on 14 underlying economic activity indicators characterizing agricultural, industrial and tertiary aspects of economic development. For details please look into Gulati, 1992 and Annex 2.

Alternatively, women's empowerment enabling factors like women's education and employment, which has been duly emphasized in the NPP-2000 document as an important factor for population control and early population stabilization, turns out to be an important determinant of RCH-status or RCH-care utilization and demographic development at the district level.

Infrastructure variables like the number of ANMs per lakh population (ANM) and road connectivity of villages (PVNCPR) also turn out to have a significant and positive impact on the RCH-status of the districts. Thus, meeting the unmet need of health care infrastructure enshrined in NPP-2000 document as also the enabling of economic development characterized by road connectivity would certainly help in achievement of fertility control and early population stabilization objectives. Furthermore, extent of urbanization (PURB), which characterizes the extent of non-agricultural development in districts, also depicts a significant and promotive impact on RCH-status.

Surprisingly, we find that districts with higher Muslim population proportions depict lower RCH-statuses implying lower utilization of RCH services, higher fertility, lower contraception, and lower age at marriage. Despite accounting for important predictors like women's literacy and work participation, the extent of urbanization, etc. we find that PMUS depict a significant and negative impact on the RCH-status. Either concentration of Muslims in districts which are lacking in terms of health and developmental infrastructure facilities or possibly the lower utilization of RCH services and demographic backwardness in terms of higher fertility and lower contraceptive usage could be the reasons for such a phenomenon. However, the results suggest that the Muslim dominated districts depict a lower RCH-status and thus need focused attention towards improvement of the same.

DISTRICTWISE COMPOSITE INDICES:

Districtwise composite indices based on ten underlying variables comprising 7 RCH indicators and three additional socioeconomic variables namely female literacy rate, percent villages not connected by *pucca* road, and number of auxiliary nurse midwives per lakh population (ANMs).

The selection of other significant predictors in the earlier section has been obviated because of non-availability of data for a large number of newly delineated districts. Thus, the three important predictors characterizing health infrastructure, road connectivity of villages, and extent of female literacy have been selected, as data for a large number of districts are available. The factor-structure matrix is provided in Table 5.

TABLE 5: FACTOR STRUCTURE OF TEN SELECTED VARIABLES

| Variable | Component | Communality |
|--|------------------|--------------------|
| 1.Child Women Ratio | -.894 | .800 |
| 2.Percent Births of Order 3+ (PBO3P) | -.906 | .821 |
| 3.Percent Couples Using Any Method (CUAM) | .805 | .648 |
| 4.Percent Girls Marrying Below 18 Yrs (PGMB18) | -.681 | .463 |
| 5.Percent Pregnancies Utilized Antenatal Care (PPANC) | .840 | .706 |
| 6.Percent Deliveries In Health Institutions (PDHI) | .869 | .755 |
| 7.Percent Children With Complete Immunization (PCWCI) | .846 | .716 |
| 8.Female Literacy Rate (FLR) | .827 | .683 |
| 9.Percent Villages Not Connected By <i>Pucca</i> Road (PVNCPR) | -.492 | .242 |
| 10. Number Of ANMs Per Lakh Population (ANM) | .569 | .324 |
| Eigen Value | 6.159 | |

A perusal of Table 5 reveals that once again in factor structure only one factor has been retained based on Kaiser's criterion of Eigen value greater than unity. Thus, factor structure is not subjected to any rotation and thus unique solution gets evolved. Factor scores are elicited as explained earlier and the factor scores depicting the overall performance of districts on reproductive health utilization, demographic parameters, and selected socioeconomic parameters gets depicted. The factor scores or composite indices (COMI) and rankings (COMR) of the 504 districts based on the indices in ascending order are provided in the Annex Table A1.3.

The following Table 5 provides a cross-tabulation of districts based on the RCH-status indices and Composite-Indices categories.

TABLE-6: CROSS CLASSIFICATION OF 504 DISTRICTS BASED ON RCH & COMPOSITE INDICES

| RCH-Index (RCHI) | Composite Index (COMI) | | | | Total No. of Districts |
|------------------------|------------------------|-------------|------------|------|------------------------|
| | < -1.0 | -1.0 to 0.0 | 0.0 to 1.0 | 1.0+ | |
| <-1.0 | 86 | 12 | | | 98 |
| -1.0 to 0.0 | 7 | 153 | 4 | | 164 |
| 0.0 to 1.0 | | 10 | 121 | 9 | 140 |
| 1.0 + | | | 13 | 89 | 102 |
| Total No. Of Districts | 93 | 175 | 138 | 98 | 504 |

Entries in Table 6 reveal that there are 4 districts, which are found to be better in term of Composite Indices categories but are not performing well on RCH-status. The four districts are located in the Northeastern states namely, East Khasi Hills from Meghalaya, North and South Sikkim from Sikkim, and Lakhimpur from Assam. On the other hand, there are 7 districts, which are not doing so well on the socioeconomic front but are still performing well on the RCH-utilization front. These 7 districts are located in the so-called demographically backward regions or popular Hindi Belt. The 7 districts located in the Northwestern parts of India are: Banswara, Nagaur, Sawai-Madhopur from Rajasthan, Fatehpur from Uttar Pradesh, Rajgarh from Madhya Pradesh, and Nawrangpur from Orissa.

The cross classification of districts according to RCH-status indices and Socioeconomic Status Indices can provide clues to idiosyncratic cases which may be doing very well on the utilization of RCH services front despite being low in terms of socioeconomic development and vice versa. Overall of course there is a strong linkage between socioeconomic development and demographic performance at the district level as the rank order correlation between the two indices turns out to be .98, which is highly significant.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

The short, medium and long-run objectives and associated activities and action plans have been well enunciated in the NPP-2000 document. Provision of quality health care services, health infrastructure, health personnel, and fulfillment of the unmet need of contraception, etc. in the short run to facilitate reduction in infant and maternal mortality and improvement in the quality of life are considered to be essential to bring about results for fertility control and population

stabilization in the medium and long run, respectively. However, in a resource constrained regime concentration on areas/districts, which are demographically backward, and lagging behind in terms of RCH care utilization is inevitable.

This study has elicited district level RCH-status composite indices for all the 504 districts of India, which were covered under RHS-RCH project sponsored by MoHFW. The factor analytical technique has been utilized for eliciting the indices as this facilitates in evolving weighting patterns for weaving together the underlying indicators based on elicited factor loadings, eigen values and factor score coefficients. Furthermore, the technique obviates arbitrariness in a selection of underlying indicators and weighting patterns for weaving together the underlying indicators. The oblique and orthogonal rotations of the underlying indicators, which have not been reported here, also facilitate the selection of relevant indicators for the purpose.

The multiple linear regression analysis in the study clearly highlighted that women's empowerment enabling factors like women's education and women's gainful employment play a significant and promotive role towards RCH-status improvement. Alternatively, women's education and employment helps towards fertility reduction, higher contraceptive usage, lowering age at marriage, higher utilization of reproductive health care viz. antenatal and delivery care; and children's immunization. Furthermore, health infrastructure development characterized by number of auxiliary nursing midwives (ANMs) and road connectivity of villages (PVNCPR) facilitates a higher utilization of RCH services and thus an improvement of RCH-status. Still further, the overall economic development characterized by the district's development index (DDIO) and extent of urbanization also depicts a significant and promotive impact on the RCH-status. The analysis provides insights into the relevant socioeconomic variables which ought to be inducted in the district level composite indices characterizing the socioeconomic and demographic backwardness

It may be of interest to mention that districts with higher Muslim population proportions depict lower RCH-status implying a lower utilization of RCH services, higher fertility, lower contraception, and lower age at marriage. Despite accounting for important predictors like women's literacy and employment, economic development, extent of urbanization, etc. we find that PMUS depict a significant and negative impact on the RCH-status. However, the results suggest that the Muslim dominated districts depict a lower utilization of RCH care, lower usage of contraception, etc. and thus need focused attention towards the improvement of the RCH-statuses in such districts is needed.

Furthermore, composite indices based on 10 RCH and socioeconomic indicators have also been elicited for all the 504 districts of India. The cross-tabulation of districts on both the indices reflect idiosyncratic cases, which may be performing well on the RCH-status front but not on the socioeconomic development front or vice versa. Of course, the overall strong linkage between socioeconomic and RCH-care utilization gets reflected because of the positive and significant rank order correlation between the two indices and also by the Chi-square test of association on cross tabulations of the two indices. Thus, socioeconomic and infrastructure development certainly promotes better RCH-care utilization and demographic developments in terms of higher usage of contraception, lower fertility and early population stabilization.

The study suggests that as and when district level information becomes available on key socioeconomic parameters namely, female employment, extent of urbanization, overall economic developmental indicators, percent Muslim population, etc.; the socioeconomic composite indices at district level can be improved upon and that this would facilitate the selection of backward districts to be focused upon for planning purposes.

The obvious policy imperatives are that to begin with districts falling in the lower categories of RCH-status must be focused upon to bring about optimal results in terms of stated objectives of improvements in quality of life through meeting the unmet need of quality health care, informed choice of contraception, of course without past pitfalls, fertility control and early population stabilization. Ranking of districts according to RCH-status provide clues to policy

implementers at the state, region or national level about areas to be focused upon in the initial phases to bring about quicker results towards population policy objectives in a resource constrained regime.

References

Census of India, 2001. Provisional Population Totals, Paper 1 of 2001 Supplement, District Totals, Registrar General & Census Commissioner, India; New Delhi.

Gopaldaswamy, R. 1983. ed. 'Regional Dimensions of Plan Development – Possible Approaches' in Planning Commission (GOI) and State Planning Institute (U.P.) Regional Dimensions of India's Economic Development.

Gulati, S.C. 1992. 'Developmental Determinants of Demographic Variables in India: A District Level Analysis', in Journal of Quantitative Economics, Vol. 8, No. 1, (January 1992), pp. 157-172, Delhi School Of Economics, Delhi.

-----, 1996. 'District Level Development Indices: A Factor Analytical Approach', in Indian Journal of Regional Science, Vol. XXVIII, No. 1.

Harman, Harry, 1970. Modern Factor Analysis, Chicago, Chicago University Press.

NFHS Survey 1998-99. India: National Family Health Survey (NFHS-2), International Institute for Population Sciences, Mumbai.

Parmer, R.K. 2001. Summary Record of Conference on Convergence of Social Sector Programmes for Population Stabilization, 6 December 2001, New Delhi.

Population Commission, 2001. District-wise Social Economic Demographic Indicators, National Commission on Population, Government of India, New Delhi.

Srinivasan, K., S. C. Gulati, (et al), 1998. World Bank Projects in Population and Health in India in the Eighties: A Study of Demographic Impact at the District Level, Population Foundation of India, New Delhi.

ANNEX I

Table A1.1: List of Selected Variables

| Abbreviated Name | Description and Source |
|------------------|--|
| 1. RCHI | Reproductive and Child Health Status Index, Present Study |
| 2. PBO3P | Percent of Births of Order 3+ During 3 Years Prior to Survey, RHS-RCH |
| 3. CWR | Children 0-6 years to Women 6 and Above, Census 2001 |
| 4. CUAM | Percent Couples Using Any Contraceptive Method, RHS-RCH Reports |
| 5. PGMB18 | Percent Girls Married Below Age 18 Years, RHS-RCH Reports |
| 6. PPANC | Percent Pregnancies During Last 3 Years Availing Antenatal Care, RHS-RCH |
| 7. PDHI | Percent Deliveries in Health Institutions During Last 3 Years, RHS-RCH |
| 8. PCWCI | Percent Children Completely Immunized, Aged 1+ & Born During Last 3 Yrs. |
| 9. COMI | Composite Index, Present Study |
| 10. FLR | Female Literacy Rate, Census 2001 |
| 11. PVNCPR | Percent Villages Not Connected By Pucca Road, Population Commission-2001 |
| 12. ANM | ANMs Per Lakh Population, Srinivasan-1998 |
| 13. FWPR | Female Work Participation Rate, Srinivasan-1998 |
| 14. PURB | Percent Population in Urban Areas, Gulalti-1996 |
| 15. PMUS | Percent Muslim Population, Srinivasan-1998 |
| 16. DDIO | District's Development Indices, Gulati-1996 |
| 17. RCHR | District's rank as per RCH-status Indices (RCHI) in Ascending Order |
| 18. COMR | District's rank as per composite indices (COMI) in Ascending Order |

Table A1.2: Descriptive Statistics Of Selected Variables For 504 Districts of India

| No. | Abbreviated Name | N | Minimum | Maximum | Mean | Std. Deviation |
|-----|------------------|-----|---------|---------|-----------|----------------|
| 1 | RCHI | 504 | -1.83 | 2.28 | 1.984E-04 | 1.000 |
| 2 | CWR | 504 | 147.83 | 637.58 | 386.300 | 95.001 |
| 3 | PBO3P | 504 | 1.90 | 73.70 | 43.933 | 14.043 |
| 4 | CUAM | 504 | 1.70 | 83.70 | 45.666 | 17.458 |
| 5 | GM18 | 504 | .00 | 83.80 | 34.799 | 21.665 |
| 6 | PPANC | 504 | .00 | 100.00 | 66.663 | 25.177 |
| 7 | PDHI | 504 | .00 | 100.00 | 33.947 | 24.170 |
| 8 | PCWCI | 504 | 1.60 | 99.50 | 56.391 | 24.509 |
| 9 | COMI | 504 | -1.91 | 2.54 | 9.921E-05 | 1.000 |
| 10 | FLR | 490 | 2.14 | 96.60 | 53.840 | 15.401 |
| 11 | PVNCPR | 488 | .00 | 89.62 | 36.644 | 28.006 |
| 12 | ANM | 451 | 3.38 | 456.54 | 101.728 | 72.351 |
| 13 | FWPR | 451 | 1.75 | 60.07 | 24.915 | 13.321 |
| 14 | PURB | 451 | .00 | 100.00 | 21.726 | 17.508 |
| 15 | PMUS | 451 | .04 | 94.31 | 10.550 | 11.973 |
| 16 | DDIO | 354 | -1.11 | 3.98 | 2.062E-02 | 1.000 |

Table A1.3: Indices and Selected Variables for 504 Districts of India

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GM18 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|------------|-------------------|-------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| 1 | 9 | Ar.Pradesh | East Kameng | -1.83 | 521.50 | 67.9 | 11.6 | 44 | 13.0 | 8.6 | 8.9 | -1.70 | 28.86 | 75.91 | 172.64 |
| 2 | 1 | Bihar | Kishanganj | -1.83 | 571.10 | 64.8 | 16.1 | 48 | 17.7 | 6.7 | 11.4 | -1.91 | 18.49 | 39.05 | 11.99 |
| 3 | 4 | UP | Budaun | -1.78 | 565.74 | 64.0 | 16.7 | 51 | 14.4 | 5.9 | 20.6 | -1.80 | 25.53 | 53.71 | 50.28 |
| 4 | 5 | Bihar | Paschim Champaran | -1.78 | 555.83 | 60.3 | 21.8 | 79 | 22.7 | 12.3 | 14.3 | -1.79 | 25.85 | 32.58 | 15.64 |
| 5 | 2 | Bihar | Sahibganj | -1.71 | 529.54 | 57.9 | 14.4 | 63 | 28.4 | 7.2 | 7.2 | -1.81 | 26.78 | 65.63 | 21.29 |
| 6 | 15 | Rajasthan | Barmer | -1.71 | 599.27 | 56.3 | 20.4 | 58 | 28.2 | 7.9 | 11.5 | -1.62 | 43.91 | 58.14 | 30.17 |
| 7 | 10 | Bihar | Sitamarhi | -1.69 | 536.70 | 56.8 | 16.8 | 65 | 16.4 | 8.2 | 19.3 | -1.69 | 26.35 | 24.34 | 13.30 |
| 8 | 19 | Bihar | Samastipur | -1.68 | 533.72 | 58.6 | 22.7 | 64 | 13.1 | 6.5 | 20.0 | -1.58 | 32.69 | 10.56 | 20.24 |
| 9 | 7 | Bihar | Katihar | -1.67 | 576.67 | 62.5 | 18.8 | 48 | 19.8 | 6.1 | 25.6 | -1.73 | 24.03 | 45.29 | 23.83 |
| 10 | 12 | Bihar | Madhepura | -1.66 | 557.15 | 57.0 | 25.0 | 66 | 19.9 | 9.0 | 15.7 | -1.66 | 22.31 | 4.39 | 4.67 |
| 11 | 6 | UP | Bahraich | -1.64 | 538.67 | 62.5 | 16.2 | 79 | 47.3 | 6.1 | 22.1 | -1.75 | 23.27 | 56.49 | 34.48 |
| 12 | 11 | Bihar | Palamu | -1.63 | 512.22 | 59.0 | 23.0 | 66 | 23.8 | 7.1 | 11.9 | -1.67 | 30.50 | 50.13 | 23.42 |
| 13 | 8 | Bihar | Purnia | -1.60 | 564.58 | 58.1 | 23.7 | 49 | 22.2 | 5.2 | 17.2 | -1.72 | 23.72 | 58.01 | 20.54 |
| 14 | 13 | Bihar | Purba Champaran | -1.59 | 546.92 | 56.9 | 22.5 | 63 | 27.0 | 9.6 | 15.4 | -1.64 | 24.65 | 31.11 | 18.86 |
| 15 | 21 | Bihar | Madhubani | -1.58 | 501.92 | 56.2 | 22.8 | 64 | 15.9 | 7.4 | 18.1 | -1.54 | 26.56 | 6.91 | 17.94 |
| 16 | 28 | UP | Etah | -1.57 | 518.91 | 66.2 | 14.3 | 58 | 23.9 | 11.1 | 36.0 | -1.45 | 40.65 | 22.90 | 22.84 |
| 17 | 18 | Rajasthan | Jaisalmer | -1.56 | 622.56 | 58.6 | 21.5 | 51 | 37.7 | 8.8 | 24.3 | -1.58 | 32.25 | 59.10 | 51.96 |
| 18 | 35 | Meghalaya | South Garo Hills | -1.54 | 551.36 | 68.2 | 6.9 | 0 | 28.1 | 4.0 | 18.3 | -1.40 | 42.19 | 64.77 | |
| 19 | 3 | Bihar | Araria | -1.54 | 565.18 | 58.1 | 28.1 | 52 | 22.9 | 6.7 | 20.4 | -1.81 | 2.14 | 36.05 | 13.03 |
| 20 | 24 | Bihar | Khagaria | -1.53 | 573.07 | 58.3 | 28.8 | 64 | 24.4 | 10.4 | 27.9 | -1.48 | 29.62 | 9.59 | 25.22 |
| 21 | 20 | MP | Jhabua | -1.51 | 582.44 | 63.0 | 26.8 | 58 | 40.2 | 18.0 | 17.4 | -1.55 | 25.50 | 55.78 | 83.94 |
| 22 | 14 | Bihar | Giridih | -1.50 | 532.17 | 57.1 | 20.5 | 60 | 40.8 | 13.3 | 8.0 | -1.62 | 27.05 | 65.29 | 32.34 |
| 23 | 41 | Ar.Pradesh | Upper Siang | -1.50 | 511.63 | 56.0 | 12.3 | 15 | 13.8 | 9.2 | 5.3 | -1.36 | 39.09 | 52.64 | |
| 24 | 30 | Bihar | Rohtas | -1.49 | 492.14 | 58.7 | 21.0 | 70 | 33.4 | 21.0 | 8.4 | -1.44 | 46.62 | 57.12 | 20.17 |
| 25 | 17 | Bihar | Godda | -1.49 | 490.66 | 57.0 | 20.2 | 66 | 17.8 | 7.0 | 32.6 | -1.61 | 27.98 | 61.39 | 22.76 |
| 26 | 26 | MP | Sidhi | -1.47 | 533.28 | 59.2 | 29.5 | 69 | 17.0 | 7.3 | 40.8 | -1.47 | 36.43 | 56.86 | 52.79 |
| 27 | 22 | Bihar | Saharsa | -1.45 | 534.69 | 53.2 | 28.4 | 57 | 17.9 | 9.4 | 20.7 | -1.53 | 25.31 | 32.26 | 13.94 |
| 28 | 16 | UP | Siddharthnagar | -1.45 | 531.46 | 65.0 | 19.0 | 73 | 52.4 | 6.1 | 37.7 | -1.61 | 28.35 | 68.85 | 18.09 |
| 29 | 23 | UP | Sonbhadra | -1.45 | 540.47 | 60.5 | 30.5 | 67 | 37.0 | 14.9 | 18.8 | -1.49 | 34.26 | 67.29 | 54.79 |
| 30 | 32 | Bihar | Gaya | -1.44 | 493.62 | 55.8 | 22.0 | 62 | 20.6 | 12.0 | 24.5 | -1.41 | 37.40 | 39.87 | 31.11 |
| 31 | 34 | Bihar | Aurangabad | -1.43 | 481.58 | 57.0 | 21.8 | 64 | 22.3 | 18.7 | 18.3 | -1.40 | 42.04 | 54.55 | 30.78 |
| 32 | 150 | Nagaland | Phek | -1.43 | 450.00 | 64.3 | 11.6 | 37 | 29.3 | 4.8 | 21.9 | -0.71 | 63.08 | .00 | 282.04 |
| 33 | 25 | UP | Shahjahanpur | -1.41 | 506.58 | 62.7 | 25.2 | 65 | 20.4 | 6.2 | 48.1 | -1.47 | 34.68 | 61.90 | 39.00 |
| 34 | 70 | Assam | Karbi Anglong | -1.40 | 455.65 | 61.9 | 1.7 | 8 | 26.4 | 14.8 | 4.3 | -1.12 | 48.65 | 15.68 | 81.87 |
| 35 | 74 | Ar.Pradesh | Upper Subansiri | -1.40 | 481.72 | 64.4 | 17.9 | 43 | 30.1 | 21.2 | 14.3 | -1.10 | 42.74 | 69.34 | 254.32 |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GM18 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|------------|-------------------------|-------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| 36 | 50 | Bihar | Begusarai | -1.40 | 520.38 | 56.7 | 23.1 | 59 | 36.2 | 15.7 | 16.4 | -1.27 | 36.20 | .00 | 28.54 |
| 37 | 44 | UP | Pilibhit | -1.39 | 516.09 | 60.5 | 21.3 | 56 | 24.8 | 12.6 | 37.2 | -1.34 | 35.84 | 28.27 | 41.54 |
| 38 | 31 | Bihar | Nawada | -1.39 | 488.28 | 56.4 | 20.4 | 73 | 28.6 | 17.8 | 29.6 | -1.42 | 32.64 | 35.78 | 19.20 |
| 39 | 59 | Bihar | Buxar | -1.38 | 493.41 | 61.1 | 20.3 | 65 | 27.4 | 28.2 | 24.5 | -1.23 | 40.36 | 36.28 | |
| 40 | 52 | Bihar | Munger | -1.38 | 451.52 | 59.6 | 23.1 | 61 | 29.6 | 17.9 | 10.9 | -1.27 | 47.97 | 37.82 | 29.93 |
| 41 | 61 | UP | Firozabad | -1.37 | 520.60 | 63.9 | 28.2 | 51 | 24.9 | 14.3 | 32.6 | -1.23 | 53.02 | 50.71 | 45.33 |
| 42 | 40 | UP | Hardoi | -1.36 | 509.75 | 62.9 | 25.0 | 44 | 25.7 | 5.3 | 35.6 | -1.36 | 37.62 | 54.27 | 46.92 |
| 43 | 46 | Bihar | Muzaffarpur | -1.36 | 492.90 | 59.6 | 25.3 | 53 | 21.7 | 10.5 | 31.1 | -1.31 | 35.20 | 15.94 | 20.62 |
| 44 | 43 | UP | Rampur | -1.36 | 542.86 | 62.8 | 28.9 | 50 | 24.2 | 9.8 | 41.2 | -1.36 | 27.87 | 14.16 | 31.75 |
| 45 | 36 | Bihar | Saran | -1.36 | 477.92 | 59.4 | 18.2 | 51 | 31.7 | 14.8 | 20.9 | -1.39 | 35.74 | 43.25 | 12.36 |
| 46 | 33 | Bihar | Vaishali | -1.36 | 498.86 | 53.2 | 24.3 | 63 | 26.8 | 13.9 | 22.6 | -1.41 | 38.14 | 55.30 | 15.24 |
| 47 | 29 | UP | Gonda | -1.36 | 490.28 | 62.3 | 19.8 | 71 | 51.9 | 7.6 | 31.7 | -1.45 | 27.29 | 38.05 | 24.32 |
| 48 | 37 | Bihar | Gopalganj | -1.35 | 477.86 | 56.6 | 15.9 | 58 | 33.9 | 16.9 | 21.2 | -1.38 | 32.81 | 31.58 | 10.85 |
| 49 | 47 | Bihar | Darbhanga | -1.35 | 492.86 | 59.7 | 27.1 | 51 | 26.7 | 11.9 | 22.2 | -1.30 | 30.35 | .48 | 23.10 |
| 50 | 49 | Rajasthan | Dholpur | -1.35 | 623.04 | 62.2 | 21.5 | 56 | 54.8 | 25.7 | 33.4 | -1.28 | 42.36 | 41.61 | 44.70 |
| 51 | 39 | UP | Banda | -1.34 | 518.30 | 61.9 | 30.7 | 72 | 37.9 | 13.1 | 35.4 | -1.36 | 37.10 | 49.23 | 31.25 |
| 52 | 106 | UP | Mahrajganj | -1.33 | 532.15 | 62.0 | 35.6 | 82 | 51.4 | 8.8 | 32.9 | -.93 | 88.64 | 58.83 | 37.76 |
| 53 | 57 | MP | Panna | -1.32 | 514.25 | 49.2 | 26.8 | 58 | 36.8 | 10.1 | 10.7 | -1.24 | 47.84 | 65.04 | 72.39 |
| 54 | 42 | UP | Sitapur | -1.31 | 508.08 | 61.0 | 13.8 | 64 | 41.9 | 15.4 | 45.8 | -1.36 | 35.08 | 59.98 | 47.60 |
| 55 | 53 | UP | Bareilly | -1.30 | 524.03 | 67.4 | 28.1 | 30 | 24.8 | 10.1 | 36.4 | -1.26 | 35.13 | 30.89 | 47.17 |
| 56 | 83 | Ar.Pradesh | Tirap | -1.30 | 522.61 | 61.7 | 10.6 | 50 | 38.2 | 26.4 | 36.9 | -1.03 | 29.00 | 31.00 | 260.05 |
| 57 | 27 | Bihar | Deochar | -1.29 | 493.09 | 55.0 | 30.5 | 66 | 39.2 | 12.5 | 17.4 | -1.45 | 32.33 | 76.98 | 30.22 |
| 58 | 112 | Nagaland | Tuensang | -1.29 | 336.14 | 73.2 | 19.5 | 9 | 21.5 | 4.8 | 1.6 | -.91 | 46.12 | 73.59 | 311.92 |
| 59 | 73 | UP | Mainpuri | -1.28 | 489.38 | 62.8 | 28.9 | 50 | 23.5 | 7.6 | 41.2 | -1.11 | 52.67 | 29.33 | 35.69 |
| 60 | 45 | UP | Moradabad | -1.26 | 536.05 | 60.6 | 27.4 | 30 | 23.6 | 12.5 | 32.8 | -1.31 | 33.32 | 39.67 | 12.67 |
| 61 | 48 | Bihar | Bhagalpur | -1.26 | 501.28 | 53.7 | 27.5 | 59 | 31.9 | 14.1 | 25.6 | -1.28 | 38.83 | 47.40 | 23.14 |
| 62 | 93 | Meghalaya | East Garo Hills | -1.23 | 507.64 | 58.7 | 9.2 | 4 | 33.6 | 9.2 | 21.5 | -1.00 | 56.16 | 62.65 | 123.82 |
| 63 | 38 | Bihar | Dumka | -1.23 | 432.43 | 54.3 | 26.4 | 50 | 25.0 | 7.7 | 18.5 | -1.38 | 32.68 | 72.78 | 30.02 |
| 64 | 56 | Bihar | Jahanabad | -1.23 | 476.99 | 53.5 | 21.2 | 55 | 19.8 | 25.9 | 27.2 | -1.25 | 40.08 | 49.70 | 23.58 |
| 65 | 51 | UP | Kheri | -1.23 | 507.09 | 62.6 | 24.4 | 54 | 47.7 | 7.6 | 38.6 | -1.27 | 35.89 | 40.84 | 22.61 |
| 66 | 104 | Meghalaya | West Khasi Hills | -1.23 | 603.02 | 65.0 | 13.0 | 9 | 56.1 | 36.9 | 9.5 | -.94 | 64.57 | 65.39 | 114.98 |
| 67 | 54 | Bihar | Hazaribagh | -1.21 | 455.74 | 55.0 | 24.7 | 67 | 37.1 | 14.9 | 26.4 | -1.26 | 43.15 | 65.02 | 25.60 |
| 68 | 71 | Bihar | Nalanda | -1.21 | 485.42 | 53.8 | 25.6 | 59 | 41.5 | 23.1 | 13.1 | -1.12 | 39.03 | 10.02 | 34.13 |
| 69 | 58 | UP | Barabanki | -1.20 | 509.97 | 63.6 | 27.0 | 56 | 48.7 | 11.3 | 39.3 | -1.24 | 35.64 | 38.20 | 25.05 |
| 70 | 63 | Bihar | Siwan | -1.18 | 475.21 | 57.7 | 21.8 | 44 | 32.3 | 14.4 | 30.7 | -1.17 | 37.26 | 21.69 | 10.00 |
| 71 | 76 | Rajasthan | Churu | -1.18 | 497.91 | 51.0 | 39.6 | 68 | 35.8 | 7.0 | 25.2 | -1.09 | 53.87 | 51.15 | 36.03 |
| 72 | 64 | Bihar | Bhojpur | -1.18 | 471.73 | 55.6 | 23.4 | 57 | 38.6 | 31.8 | 12.0 | -1.15 | 42.81 | 36.28 | 17.84 |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GM18 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|------------|---------------------|-------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| 73 | 113 | Ar.Pradesh | Tawang | -1.17 | 472.39 | 58.3 | 13.6 | 11 | 8.8 | 7.9 | 45.3 | -91 | 30.87 | 74.61 | 349.25 |
| 74 | 147 | Assam | Nagaon | -1.17 | 452.04 | 64.3 | 30.4 | 41 | 34.6 | 5.6 | 31.0 | -72 | 55.57 | .00 | 171.61 |
| 75 | 97 | UP | Hathras | -1.17 | 489.96 | 64.8 | 33.0 | 47 | 30.7 | 14.0 | 39.6 | -96 | 47.16 | 24.11 | |
| 76 | 92 | Assam | North Cachar Hills | -1.16 | 411.91 | 73.7 | 35.4 | 12 | 32.4 | 7.7 | 7.5 | -1.00 | 59.40 | 64.66 | 69.41 |
| 77 | 60 | Bihar | Lohardaga | -1.16 | 478.88 | 66.2 | 20.3 | 43 | 41.7 | 9.1 | 48.4 | -1.23 | 39.88 | 60.77 | 24.92 |
| 78 | 82 | UP | Aligarh | -1.16 | 477.44 | 64.4 | 23.5 | 43 | 32.6 | 15.5 | 43.1 | -1.03 | 43.88 | 14.21 | 39.05 |
| 79 | 86 | UP | Mathura | -1.14 | 514.55 | 58.9 | 22.1 | 42 | 34.0 | 21.1 | 40.2 | -1.02 | 43.77 | 24.11 | 56.49 |
| 80 | 55 | UP | Lalitpur | -1.13 | 545.89 | 58.6 | 38.3 | 84 | 54.8 | 15.8 | 46.0 | -1.26 | 33.25 | 55.54 | 33.24 |
| 81 | 67 | MP | Tikamgarh | -1.13 | 486.32 | 49.6 | 45.5 | 69 | 23.0 | 21.5 | 17.3 | -1.14 | 40.98 | 59.14 | 68.77 |
| 82 | 80 | UP | Bhadohi | -1.12 | 502.09 | 64.5 | 31.0 | 68 | 57.5 | 15.2 | 41.7 | -1.05 | 38.72 | 38.01 | |
| 83 | 78 | Rajasthan | Bharatpur | -1.09 | 542.95 | 54.0 | 33.1 | 57 | 52.0 | 22.7 | 23.2 | -1.07 | 44.12 | 48.73 | 54.92 |
| 84 | 62 | UP | Basti | -1.09 | 491.00 | 62.5 | 19.1 | 77 | 58.2 | 14.1 | 63.7 | -1.19 | 39.00 | 62.71 | 32.24 |
| 85 | 110 | Meghalaya | Ri Bhoi | -1.08 | 637.58 | 61.2 | 12.9 | 5 | 59.9 | 18.8 | 42.9 | -91 | 56.16 | 62.65 | |
| 86 | 89 | UP | Varanasi | -1.08 | 463.22 | 62.6 | 30.7 | 72 | 47.0 | 25.9 | 36.6 | -1.01 | 48.59 | 38.01 | 40.08 |
| 87 | 88 | MP | Rewa | -1.08 | 472.73 | 56.1 | 38.8 | 60 | 28.2 | 12.9 | 37.7 | -1.02 | 47.83 | 55.40 | 77.69 |
| 88 | 72 | MP | Chhatarpur | -1.08 | 518.10 | 51.8 | 32.8 | 73 | 53.8 | 19.1 | 29.5 | -1.11 | 39.38 | 61.57 | 78.06 |
| 89 | 84 | Meghalaya | West Garo Hills | -1.08 | 461.27 | 61.1 | 10.7 | 13 | 47.6 | 12.1 | 24.4 | -1.02 | 42.19 | 64.77 | 111.74 |
| 90 | 95 | MP | Satna | -1.06 | 460.31 | 52.2 | 36.0 | 60 | 22.6 | 14.4 | 37.7 | -98 | 51.40 | 55.01 | 69.06 |
| 91 | 115 | UP | Allahabad | -1.05 | 446.81 | 63.5 | 20.1 | 52 | 49.0 | 17.7 | 42.1 | -89 | 46.61 | 11.72 | 67.75 |
| 92 | 69 | Bihar | Gumla | -1.05 | 436.92 | 59.3 | 18.1 | 27 | 40.5 | 4.9 | 35.6 | -1.13 | 40.56 | 66.43 | 33.62 |
| 93 | 102 | UP | Farrukhabad | -1.04 | 457.44 | 64.0 | 33.6 | 37 | 25.9 | 9.8 | 46.9 | -95 | 50.35 | 36.53 | 43.89 |
| 94 | 133 | Nagaland | Zunheboto | -1.04 | 388.47 | 66.7 | 27.7 | 25 | 21.3 | 9.9 | 36.3 | -83 | 65.80 | 44.53 | 38.08 |
| 95 | 75 | MP | Shivpuri | -1.02 | 518.28 | 52.8 | 34.1 | 68 | 44.7 | 23.1 | 38.8 | -1.09 | 41.54 | 69.51 | 62.14 |
| 96 | 87 | UP | Mirzapur | -1.02 | 508.89 | 55.7 | 32.9 | 59 | 59.7 | 14.9 | 29.3 | -1.02 | 39.89 | 43.42 | 64.21 |
| 97 | 68 | Bihar | Paschim Singhbhum | -1.02 | 425.85 | 54.3 | 20.0 | 29 | 37.4 | 9.9 | 23.6 | -1.14 | 34.81 | 74.37 | 67.90 |
| 98 | 90 | UP | Hamirpur | -1.00 | 468.13 | 60.0 | 24.6 | 50 | 67.6 | 12.4 | 28.0 | -1.01 | 40.65 | 37.71 | 37.10 |
| 99 | 65 | Rajasthan | Jalore | -99 | 542.84 | 57.7 | 33.9 | 48 | 57.9 | 11.0 | 41.9 | -1.15 | 27.53 | 44.19 | 32.21 |
| 100 | 117 | UP | Bijnor | -98 | 499.79 | 59.9 | 23.0 | 16 | 39.3 | 19.9 | 32.9 | -88 | 47.28 | 23.95 | 39.76 |
| 101 | 123 | UP | Etawah | -98 | 452.93 | 58.6 | 42.6 | 45 | 23.4 | 8.8 | 42.6 | -86 | 58.49 | 44.08 | 36.90 |
| 102 | 235 | Mizoram | Chhimituipui | -97 | 415.41 | 57.1 | 18.9 | 30 | 36.8 | 16.3 | 30.1 | -19 | 89.64 | .00 | 220.27 |
| 103 | 94 | Rajasthan | Jodhpur | -96 | 491.33 | 55.8 | 35.7 | 57 | 43.0 | 24.8 | 34.5 | -99 | 39.18 | 26.84 | 17.37 |
| 104 | 77 | Rajasthan | Banswara | -96 | 530.75 | 55.4 | 34.3 | 66 | 66.2 | 32.9 | 23.1 | -1.07 | 27.86 | 51.80 | 86.45 |
| 105 | 114 | UP | Mahoba | -95 | 498.55 | 58.7 | 37.1 | 65 | 52.0 | 20.9 | 43.2 | -90 | 39.57 | 37.71 | |
| 106 | 91 | UP | Fatehpur | -94 | 478.60 | 58.5 | 24.2 | 47 | 53.9 | 16.0 | 43.7 | -1.00 | 44.62 | 62.64 | 35.91 |
| 107 | 98 | MP | Shahdol | -94 | 414.79 | 47.6 | 39.7 | 69 | 37.6 | 11.7 | 24.8 | -96 | 45.40 | 65.10 | 72.20 |
| 108 | 166 | Ar.Pradesh | West Kameng | -94 | 468.55 | 52.7 | 20.1 | 38 | 46.9 | 20.4 | 31.9 | -61 | 48.56 | 25.31 | 213.55 |
| 109 | 85 | Rajasthan | Nagaur | -92 | 472.08 | 53.0 | 35.3 | 67 | 46.9 | 16.3 | 43.3 | -1.02 | 40.45 | 57.22 | 32.82 |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GM18 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|------------|--------------------|-------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| 110 | 109 | Rajasthan | Sirohi | -0.92 | 500.21 | 54.1 | 30.1 | 48 | 48.8 | 23.5 | 35.1 | -0.91 | 37.37 | 28.58 | 63.61 |
| 111 | 128 | UP | Buland Shahar | -0.92 | 464.11 | 60.2 | 26.4 | 27 | 28.1 | 13.7 | 54.8 | -0.84 | 42.82 | 10.34 | 38.25 |
| 112 | 79 | Rajasthan | Sawai Madhopur | -0.92 | 474.18 | 45.3 | 26.0 | 57 | 46.9 | 26.5 | 24.2 | -1.05 | 35.44 | 59.14 | 40.34 |
| 113 | 185 | Manipur | Ukhrul | -0.91 | 350.37 | 64.6 | 17.3 | 18 | 37.6 | 8.4 | 33.7 | -0.46 | 64.68 | 50.03 | 250.74 |
| 114 | 143 | UP | Muzaffar Nagar | -0.91 | 486.57 | 58.1 | 33.7 | 21 | 30.1 | 19.1 | 36.1 | -0.74 | 48.63 | .00 | 42.36 |
| 115 | 152 | UP | Saharan Pur | -0.90 | 461.90 | 59.8 | 29.4 | 19 | 35.6 | 14.2 | 36.4 | -0.70 | 51.42 | 7.46 | 63.79 |
| 116 | 131 | Manipur | Tamenglong | -0.90 | 330.67 | 63.9 | 14.6 | 22 | 39.4 | 7.2 | 35.3 | -0.83 | 49.76 | 54.49 | 79.66 |
| 117 | 118 | Assam | Dhubri | -0.89 | 525.94 | 52.7 | 50.1 | 59 | 37.9 | 11.5 | 48.0 | -0.87 | 42.64 | 52.85 | 102.81 |
| 118 | 119 | Rajasthan | Dausa | -0.89 | 520.54 | 53.4 | 34.6 | 72 | 70.1 | 24.7 | 35.2 | -0.87 | 43.15 | 51.58 | |
| 119 | 101 | MP | Sarguja | -0.88 | 468.97 | 45.4 | 34.8 | 57 | 50.8 | 11.8 | 26.8 | -0.95 | 42.17 | 72.11 | 81.77 |
| 120 | 105 | UP | Sultanpur | -0.88 | 456.76 | 58.7 | 19.0 | 66 | 64.1 | 19.3 | 56.5 | -0.93 | 41.81 | 36.40 | 20.56 |
| 121 | 81 | MP | Rajgarh | -0.87 | 464.98 | 53.1 | 33.3 | 69 | 69.6 | 18.9 | 28.0 | -1.05 | 37.37 | 87.03 | 68.70 |
| 122 | 148 | Ar.Pradesh | Papumpare | -0.87 | 422.97 | 59.5 | 30.7 | 24 | 44.5 | 20.1 | 18.7 | -0.72 | 61.72 | 73.95 | |
| 123 | 111 | UP | Pratapgarh | -0.86 | 446.01 | 61.7 | 30.0 | 55 | 68.3 | 14.7 | 39.0 | -0.91 | 42.63 | 45.52 | 39.22 |
| 124 | 66 | Orissa | Nawarangpur | -0.86 | 432.61 | 49.0 | 32.2 | 70 | 68.9 | 7.2 | 28.1 | -1.15 | 21.02 | 89.19 | |
| 125 | 103 | MP | Guna | -0.85 | 511.20 | 49.4 | 39.0 | 70 | 57.6 | 29.0 | 30.7 | -0.94 | 43.06 | 75.50 | 76.32 |
| 126 | 138 | UP | Ambedkar Nagar | -0.85 | 462.06 | 60.1 | 29.0 | 70 | 70.9 | 12.6 | 55.5 | -0.78 | 45.98 | 42.91 | |
| 127 | 120 | Rajasthan | Udaipur | -0.85 | 454.46 | 51.5 | 34.3 | 70 | 68.9 | 21.7 | 23.1 | -0.86 | 43.71 | 54.65 | 78.74 |
| 128 | 159 | Assam | Hailakandi | -0.84 | 448.57 | 50.1 | 17.8 | 9 | 43.2 | 16.9 | 20.8 | -0.65 | 50.65 | 21.16 | 100.20 |
| 129 | 125 | MP | Morena | -0.84 | 497.51 | 49.0 | 48.6 | 74 | 60.0 | 26.4 | 18.6 | -0.85 | 46.81 | 43.93 | 50.39 |
| 130 | 156 | J&K | Kargil | -0.84 | 387.60 | 67.4 | 10.4 | 28 | 34.2 | 4.3 | 84.5 | -0.67 | | | |
| 131 | 107 | UP | Ghazipur | -0.84 | 481.74 | 57.5 | 28.3 | 61 | 68.2 | 20.4 | 45.8 | -0.92 | 44.39 | 55.76 | 28.39 |
| 132 | 180 | Ar.Pradesh | Dibang Valley | -0.83 | 480.02 | 57.0 | 29.9 | 36 | 53.4 | 27.9 | 29.1 | -0.51 | 48.96 | 60.56 | 299.53 |
| 133 | 122 | UP | Rae Bareli | -0.83 | 446.96 | 62.6 | 28.7 | 46 | 60.0 | 15.4 | 47.1 | -0.86 | 40.44 | 39.78 | 56.91 |
| 134 | 129 | MP | Damoh | -0.82 | 456.39 | 45.9 | 41.6 | 55 | 49.0 | 8.5 | 27.2 | -0.84 | 47.51 | 62.91 | 74.27 |
| 135 | 157 | Ar.Pradesh | Lower Subansiri | -0.82 | 443.35 | 59.7 | 19.6 | 33 | 58.3 | 31.1 | 29.5 | -0.66 | 36.19 | 73.95 | 287.98 |
| 136 | 135 | Rajasthan | Bikaner | -0.81 | 503.20 | 50.6 | 41.9 | 64 | 50.3 | 25.0 | 39.2 | -0.81 | 42.55 | 42.32 | 74.72 |
| 137 | 127 | Rajasthan | Alwar | -0.81 | 499.78 | 56.1 | 45.9 | 53 | 61.2 | 15.9 | 33.2 | -0.84 | 43.95 | 48.03 | 54.73 |
| 138 | 158 | MP | Datia | -0.81 | 444.91 | 50.8 | 40.2 | 49 | 29.9 | 23.7 | 35.7 | -0.65 | 62.48 | 55.39 | 83.27 |
| 139 | 99 | Rajasthan | Jhalawar | -0.80 | 445.27 | 52.6 | 43.0 | 74 | 61.5 | 21.0 | 29.1 | -0.96 | 40.39 | 71.84 | 43.47 |
| 140 | 124 | UP | Faizabad | -0.79 | 443.03 | 58.0 | 34.6 | 65 | 62.3 | 18.3 | 45.8 | -0.85 | 43.35 | 42.91 | 32.43 |
| 141 | 142 | Assam | Goalpara | -0.79 | 479.87 | 48.7 | 42.8 | 41 | 43.2 | 10.6 | 34.2 | -0.74 | 51.40 | 51.32 | 69.60 |
| 142 | 108 | MP | Dhar | -0.77 | 486.08 | 53.5 | 45.8 | 57 | 56.0 | 17.5 | 36.5 | -0.91 | 38.62 | 70.45 | 62.01 |
| 143 | 126 | MP | Vidisha | -0.77 | 503.14 | 54.1 | 40.9 | 60 | 61.9 | 19.6 | 44.0 | -0.84 | 47.45 | 71.04 | 58.43 |
| 144 | 121 | UP | Jaunpur | -0.77 | 462.19 | 53.6 | 31.2 | 56 | 47.3 | 22.2 | 54.3 | -0.86 | 43.53 | 50.90 | 25.01 |
| 145 | 146 | UP | Mau | -0.76 | 502.71 | 57.1 | 26.3 | 39 | 74.0 | 19.7 | 40.6 | -0.73 | 50.86 | 44.33 | 52.71 |
| 146 | 179 | Ar.Pradesh | Lohit | -0.75 | 523.58 | 48.9 | 22.3 | 14 | 45.9 | 39.8 | 24.9 | -0.51 | 44.59 | 52.39 | 249.57 |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GMI8 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|------------|----------------|-------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|--------|--------|
| 147 | 100 | Rajasthan | Tonk | - .74 | 456.10 | 54.1 | 37.2 | 78 | 70.5 | 13.4 | 53.3 | -.95 | 32.30 | 71.71 | 67.79 |
| 148 | 130 | UP | Azamgarh | - .73 | 468.41 | 58.0 | 17.8 | 64 | 78.1 | 25.0 | 61.5 | -.83 | 42.44 | 50.97 | 28.35 |
| 149 | 137 | WB | Uttar Dinajpur | - .72 | 541.93 | 53.2 | 55.0 | 59 | 73.2 | 19.5 | 28.5 | -.79 | 37.16 | 52.61 | |
| 150 | 116 | Rajasthan | Chittorgarh | - .71 | 412.16 | 41.4 | 33.1 | 60 | 49.6 | 13.3 | 33.0 | -.89 | 36.45 | 64.94 | 49.32 |
| 151 | 136 | UP | Gorakhpur | - .71 | 451.89 | 57.6 | 31.8 | 66 | 73.3 | 18.6 | 52.7 | -.81 | 44.48 | 62.96 | 49.22 |
| 152 | 139 | UP | Deoria | - .71 | 443.16 | 55.6 | 27.7 | 57 | 64.6 | 16.1 | 55.6 | -.77 | 43.56 | 39.20 | 30.68 |
| 153 | 162 | UP | Agra | - .70 | 438.25 | 60.6 | 39.1 | 38 | 42.0 | 30.0 | 42.0 | -.62 | 48.15 | 19.09 | 52.78 |
| 154 | 178 | Nagaland | Mon | - .70 | 363.36 | 55.7 | 19.0 | 18 | 59.0 | 10.3 | 25.8 | -.53 | 37.12 | 12.50 | 172.52 |
| 155 | 164 | MP | Bhind | - .69 | 463.76 | 50.6 | 43.7 | 61 | 48.3 | 14.1 | 53.8 | -.61 | 55.73 | 43.32 | 68.74 |
| 156 | 176 | Haryana | Gurgaon | - .68 | 531.59 | 53.5 | 39.8 | 37 | 51.9 | 16.7 | 57.5 | -.55 | 48.29 | 1.18 | 62.39 |
| 157 | 173 | Gujarat | The Dangs | - .68 | 466.67 | 50.2 | 45.0 | 47 | 34.5 | 7.4 | 62.4 | -.58 | 48.99 | 49.75 | 144.35 |
| 158 | 154 | MP | West Nimar | - .68 | 476.76 | 51.2 | 48.9 | 43 | 61.3 | 19.4 | 20.1 | -.68 | 50.89 | 58.29 | 69.57 |
| 159 | 145 | MP | Sehore | - .66 | 492.76 | 49.2 | 45.4 | 50 | 51.4 | 23.1 | 39.7 | -.73 | 47.95 | 71.44 | 73.69 |
| 160 | 163 | Assam | Bongaigaon | - .65 | 443.16 | 58.4 | 51.6 | 41 | 34.8 | 16.7 | 51.6 | -.62 | 51.16 | 43.76 | 65.95 |
| 161 | 187 | UP | Meerut | - .64 | 428.39 | 52.8 | 31.2 | 14 | 41.8 | 22.8 | 30.8 | -.46 | 54.12 | .00 | 54.53 |
| 162 | 96 | Orissa | Malkangiri | - .64 | 419.90 | 49.5 | 37.4 | 56 | 56.3 | 7.1 | 50.2 | -.97 | 21.28 | 89.19 | |
| 163 | 200 | Manipur | Churachandpur | - .64 | 294.43 | 53.4 | 8.1 | 11 | 55.2 | 21.6 | 12.6 | -.41 | 61.83 | 58.04 | 158.36 |
| 164 | 140 | Rajasthan | Pali | - .64 | 445.53 | 53.2 | 35.0 | 51 | 70.1 | 14.5 | 42.8 | -.75 | 36.70 | 45.03 | 60.21 |
| 165 | 223 | Ar.Pradesh | East Siang | - .63 | 437.56 | 53.3 | 37.4 | 34 | 46.0 | 24.5 | 38.4 | -.28 | 52.87 | 52.64 | 305.17 |
| 166 | 174 | UP | Jalaun | - .61 | 413.48 | 57.3 | 51.1 | 60 | 53.8 | 21.9 | 39.9 | -.56 | 50.66 | 21.04 | 49.45 |
| 167 | 190 | Bihar | Patna | - .61 | 440.30 | 52.7 | 36.6 | 41 | 37.7 | 43.6 | 37.0 | -.45 | 52.17 | 8.25 | 72.44 |
| 168 | 155 | Manipur | Chandel | - .60 | 296.52 | 50.8 | 6.9 | 21 | 50.3 | 15.3 | 34.5 | -.67 | 43.64 | 65.72 | 83.45 |
| 169 | 210 | Nagaland | Wokha | - .60 | 317.04 | 55.7 | 25.3 | 27 | 72.5 | 7.8 | 15.8 | -.36 | 76.46 | 82.23 | 138.68 |
| 170 | 204 | Ar.Pradesh | West Siang | - .59 | 422.45 | 56.7 | 39.8 | 41 | 47.7 | 28.6 | 42.8 | -.39 | 53.24 | 62.80 | 222.20 |
| 171 | 160 | MP | Bilaspur | - .59 | 410.59 | 49.5 | 35.1 | 41 | 36.0 | 13.4 | 58.9 | -.64 | 48.08 | 63.35 | 74.65 |
| 172 | 217 | Assam | Cachar | - .59 | 371.96 | 48.7 | 15.9 | 20 | 67.1 | 19.5 | 19.8 | -.34 | 59.85 | 2.52 | 82.10 |
| 173 | 149 | UP | Unnao | - .57 | 436.22 | 62.3 | 49.6 | 46 | 41.1 | 11.8 | 74.1 | -.72 | 42.40 | 60.96 | 39.40 |
| 174 | 165 | MP | Shajapur | - .57 | 455.57 | 47.8 | 45.4 | 84 | 50.7 | 29.2 | 63.2 | -.61 | 57.58 | 74.19 | 54.10 |
| 175 | 167 | MP | Sagar | - .56 | 472.19 | 44.9 | 44.1 | 60 | 68.4 | 24.4 | 32.4 | -.61 | 54.50 | 73.14 | 68.15 |
| 176 | 132 | Rajasthan | Bundi | - .56 | 457.44 | 54.5 | 39.4 | 81 | 77.2 | 34.0 | 52.1 | -.83 | 36.76 | 63.94 | 3.38 |
| 177 | 183 | Rajasthan | Ajmer | - .55 | 415.94 | 47.9 | 41.2 | 63 | 64.7 | 29.8 | 28.2 | -.47 | 49.10 | 34.84 | 113.98 |
| 178 | 205 | UP | Hardwar | - .54 | 458.80 | 56.5 | 39.0 | 13 | 40.5 | 23.6 | 48.2 | -.39 | 52.60 | .00 | 57.45 |
| 179 | 198 | Assam | Darrang | - .53 | 435.79 | 48.3 | 33.1 | 33 | 50.2 | 20.0 | 48.5 | -.44 | 46.95 | 10.16 | 79.47 |
| 180 | 193 | Assam | Karimganj | - .53 | 425.21 | 51.9 | 47.9 | 23 | 58.9 | 12.7 | 23.0 | -.44 | 60.09 | 58.03 | 90.81 |
| 181 | 144 | MP | Bastar | - .53 | 421.19 | 46.9 | 36.3 | 34 | 41.9 | 11.8 | 54.6 | -.73 | 33.97 | 80.36 | 96.38 |
| 182 | 153 | Rajasthan | Dungarpur | - .53 | 513.49 | 49.2 | 38.6 | 34 | 83.2 | 18.7 | 33.8 | -.69 | 31.22 | 42.39 | 69.98 |
| 183 | 199 | Karnataka | Gulbarga | - .52 | 395.65 | 53.7 | 39.2 | 48 | 70.1 | 27.9 | 25.3 | -.43 | 38.40 | .65 | 116.10 |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GM18 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|------------|-------------------|-------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| 184 | 195 | Meghalaya | Jaintia Hills | -0.51 | 580.56 | 43.8 | 16.5 | 1 | 59.9 | 30.1 | 57.4 | -0.44 | 48.91 | 22.96 | 69.94 |
| 185 | 241 | Nagaland | Kohima | -0.49 | 344.31 | 59.1 | 36.0 | 56 | 61.9 | 27.2 | 45.6 | -0.13 | 66.64 | 41.72 | 234.02 |
| 186 | 151 | Rajasthan | Bhilwara | -0.48 | 437.15 | 50.6 | 35.7 | 76 | 86.3 | 17.9 | 58.7 | -0.71 | 33.47 | 57.97 | 60.51 |
| 187 | 207 | Assam | Sonitpur | -0.48 | 387.38 | 52.1 | 30.4 | 31 | 52.2 | 16.9 | 52.1 | -0.39 | 52.43 | 26.26 | 81.98 |
| 188 | 134 | Orissa | Koraput | -0.48 | 392.77 | 50.1 | 40.4 | 65 | 68.1 | 11.1 | 55.5 | -0.82 | 24.81 | 89.19 | 93.08 |
| 189 | 181 | WB | Murshidabad | -0.47 | 436.44 | 47.4 | 64.8 | 79 | 55.2 | 25.8 | 39.4 | -0.48 | 48.33 | 43.52 | 94.09 |
| 190 | 211 | J&K | Baramulla | -0.47 | 379.44 | 64.9 | 36.4 | 9 | 36.7 | 39.6 | 41.8 | -0.36 | | | |
| 191 | 184 | MP | Raisen | -0.47 | 491.62 | 53.7 | 52.2 | 48 | 52.1 | 15.9 | 70.6 | -0.47 | 61.89 | 74.68 | 69.94 |
| 192 | 172 | UP | Ballia | -0.46 | 444.52 | 54.5 | 30.7 | 54 | 61.8 | 28.9 | 71.5 | -0.59 | 43.92 | 45.78 | 29.48 |
| 193 | 141 | Orissa | Kalahandi | -0.44 | 375.65 | 49.7 | 37.3 | 59 | 66.6 | 11.1 | 55.7 | -0.75 | 29.56 | 85.86 | 84.67 |
| 194 | 171 | Manipur | Senapati | -0.44 | 247.77 | 60.6 | 15.5 | 18 | 51.0 | 14.0 | 49.3 | -0.59 | 45.31 | 77.67 | 61.57 |
| 195 | 189 | MP | Ratlam | -0.44 | 435.23 | 43.1 | 53.1 | 48 | 65.3 | 30.0 | 12.0 | -0.46 | 54.66 | 72.96 | 102.28 |
| 196 | 177 | Rajasthan | Rajsamand | -0.43 | 433.21 | 53.2 | 32.4 | 49 | 81.6 | 17.0 | 57.4 | -0.55 | 37.89 | 54.65 | |
| 197 | 226 | Assam | Tinsukia | -0.42 | 389.60 | 43.9 | 39.6 | 24 | 43.1 | 21.7 | 31.9 | -0.25 | 53.40 | 8.69 | 108.01 |
| 198 | 188 | UP | Uttar Kashi | -0.42 | 408.44 | 54.8 | 48.5 | 17 | 41.0 | 12.7 | 50.2 | -0.46 | 47.48 | 58.27 | 99.70 |
| 199 | 191 | UP | Kanpur Dehat | -0.42 | 450.06 | 57.9 | 53.1 | 35 | 57.1 | 9.8 | 62.8 | -0.45 | 54.49 | 40.11 | 23.06 |
| 200 | 220 | UP | Udham Singh Nagar | -0.42 | 440.50 | 53.8 | 47.0 | 28 | 37.6 | 18.1 | 66.7 | -0.30 | 54.16 | 25.98 | |
| 201 | 228 | Ar.Pradesh | Changlang | -0.41 | 522.41 | 50.0 | 35.6 | 33 | 68.8 | 33.9 | 56.0 | -0.23 | 39.85 | 33.18 | 261.60 |
| 202 | 197 | Bihar | Ranchi | -0.41 | 391.51 | 56.1 | 34.4 | 39 | 58.4 | 18.5 | 64.1 | -0.44 | 52.77 | 75.17 | 112.78 |
| 203 | 170 | Gujarat | Banaskantha | -0.41 | 459.75 | 47.8 | 39.9 | 54 | 63.7 | 40.5 | 45.6 | -0.59 | 34.54 | 39.83 | 39.94 |
| 204 | 239 | Assam | Golaghat | -0.40 | 356.54 | 46.7 | 14.8 | 29 | 57.9 | 19.7 | 56.2 | -0.15 | 62.07 | 10.28 | 114.44 |
| 205 | 203 | Karnataka | Raichur | -0.39 | 390.55 | 52.8 | 45.4 | 57 | 78.7 | 22.7 | 37.2 | -0.40 | 36.84 | 12.32 | 107.14 |
| 206 | 218 | MP | Rajnandgaon | -0.39 | 391.84 | 46.7 | 45.0 | 51 | 47.5 | 10.5 | 64.3 | -0.31 | 67.92 | 68.64 | 89.03 |
| 207 | 208 | MP | Chhindwara | -0.37 | 385.94 | 52.6 | 51.7 | 31 | 48.1 | 18.9 | 41.4 | -0.38 | 54.82 | 68.76 | 106.33 |
| 208 | 230 | WB | West Dinajpur | -0.36 | 483.93 | 47.5 | 65.8 | 54 | 73.3 | 20.8 | 34.5 | -0.23 | 66.14 | | 75.97 |
| 209 | 202 | Gujarat | Panch Mahals | -0.35 | 399.78 | 47.5 | 40.3 | 27 | 67.0 | 29.4 | 20.9 | -0.40 | 45.43 | 34.49 | 65.31 |
| 210 | 168 | Orissa | Phulbani | -0.35 | 427.53 | 54.1 | 31.8 | 42 | 81.7 | 12.3 | 67.7 | -0.60 | 36.19 | 85.98 | 94.34 |
| 211 | 196 | WB | Maldah | -0.35 | 489.47 | 50.9 | 63.3 | 57 | 81.6 | 22.8 | 38.9 | -0.44 | 41.67 | 35.20 | 69.28 |
| 212 | 175 | Orissa | Boudh | -0.34 | 378.40 | 47.9 | 40.4 | 51 | 71.6 | 11.4 | 50.7 | -0.55 | 39.78 | 85.98 | |
| 213 | 237 | UP | Ghaziabad | -0.32 | 426.94 | 51.5 | 43.7 | 19 | 47.7 | 27.1 | 51.4 | -0.17 | 59.12 | .00 | 49.67 |
| 214 | 209 | MP | Mandsaur | -0.30 | 400.10 | 42.4 | 48.7 | 60 | 65.3 | 25.6 | 40.4 | -0.37 | 54.87 | 63.72 | 66.81 |
| 215 | 233 | Assam | Morigaon | -0.30 | 471.81 | 41.5 | 32.5 | 34 | 65.7 | 21.0 | 62.4 | -0.19 | 52.36 | 20.44 | 116.96 |
| 216 | 215 | MP | Raipur | -0.30 | 405.45 | 46.9 | 43.1 | 57 | 64.8 | 11.7 | 69.8 | -0.34 | 55.30 | 59.95 | 79.58 |
| 217 | 225 | Rajasthan | Hanumangarh | -0.30 | 416.61 | 42.1 | 61.9 | 52 | 59.7 | 13.4 | 38.2 | -0.27 | 52.71 | 38.45 | |
| 218 | 287 | Meghalaya | East Khasi Hills | -0.30 | 412.82 | 54.3 | 25.4 | 14 | 62.2 | 54.8 | 34.3 | .16 | 76.83 | 28.60 | 214.52 |
| 219 | 213 | MP | Raigarh | -0.29 | 368.32 | 46.8 | 34.8 | 9 | 37.8 | 8.3 | 63.1 | -0.35 | 57.90 | 79.72 | 74.44 |
| 220 | 214 | Rajasthan | Kota | -0.28 | 392.68 | 55.5 | 44.0 | 61 | 72.1 | 32.5 | 59.9 | -0.35 | 61.25 | 66.30 | 35.21 |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GM18 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|-----------|----------------------|-------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|
| 221 | 221 | Rajasthan | Sikar | -0.27 | 439.20 | 56.1 | 42.5 | 42 | 82.9 | 27.4 | 55.6 | -0.30 | 56.70 | 45.59 | 47.48 |
| 222 | 234 | Bihar | Dhanbad | -0.27 | 392.64 | 48.1 | 41.5 | 42 | 70.1 | 24.0 | 46.4 | -0.19 | 52.93 | 14.17 | 81.39 |
| 223 | 161 | Orissa | Rayagada | -0.26 | 403.81 | 47.2 | 40.1 | 39 | 66.4 | 19.1 | 55.2 | -0.63 | 24.31 | 89.19 | |
| 224 | 257 | Sikkim | West Sikkim | -0.25 | 398.67 | 51.7 | 35.7 | 17 | 44.9 | 22.4 | 70.0 | -0.04 | 50.75 | .00 | 156.89 |
| 225 | 192 | UP | Tehri Garhwal | -0.25 | 365.07 | 50.3 | 41.3 | 13 | 34.8 | 13.3 | 66.5 | -0.44 | 49.76 | 83.87 | 43.26 |
| 226 | 186 | WB | Puruliya | -0.25 | 383.07 | 48.5 | 52.6 | 74 | 93.8 | 21.5 | 38.0 | -0.46 | 37.15 | 70.94 | 106.99 |
| 227 | 169 | Orissa | Nawapada | -0.25 | 365.31 | 52.3 | 45.0 | 43 | 79.5 | 7.1 | 52.4 | -0.60 | 26.01 | 85.86 | |
| 228 | 206 | Orissa | Keonjhar | -0.24 | 361.99 | 50.9 | 44.6 | 30 | 61.2 | 19.1 | 46.8 | -0.39 | 46.71 | 86.29 | 106.28 |
| 229 | 238 | UP | Lucknow | -0.23 | 352.46 | 54.3 | 20.8 | 35 | 80.0 | 36.5 | 51.9 | -0.16 | 61.22 | 54.45 | 105.51 |
| 230 | 219 | UP | Jhansi | -0.22 | 393.15 | 41.0 | 27.0 | 42 | 67.7 | 29.2 | 56.7 | -0.30 | 51.21 | 57.33 | 70.01 |
| 231 | 216 | MP | Seoni | -0.22 | 400.90 | 48.3 | 50.8 | 37 | 48.9 | 13.9 | 69.0 | -0.34 | 54.06 | 74.97 | 65.95 |
| 232 | 243 | Karnataka | Bidar | -0.21 | 381.05 | 52.9 | 50.6 | 68 | 79.6 | 32.9 | 50.3 | -0.12 | 50.01 | 2.86 | 104.95 |
| 233 | 201 | MP | Dewas | -0.21 | 439.87 | 44.0 | 58.2 | 54 | 55.1 | 35.7 | 50.0 | -0.40 | 44.90 | 72.99 | 66.16 |
| 234 | 212 | Orissa | Ganjam | -0.20 | 348.94 | 49.9 | 51.5 | 51 | 74.7 | 22.8 | 37.5 | -0.35 | 47.70 | 78.49 | 98.01 |
| 235 | 277 | Sikkim | South Sikkim | -0.18 | 395.17 | 52.7 | 34.5 | 20 | 58.1 | 25.4 | 68.7 | .10 | 61.02 | .00 | 155.17 |
| 236 | 236 | Rajasthan | Jhunjhunu | -0.18 | 420.22 | 48.1 | 54.2 | 48 | 80.2 | 30.0 | 38.0 | -0.18 | 60.10 | 29.06 | 27.30 |
| 237 | 224 | MP | East Nimar | -0.18 | 445.40 | 45.3 | 51.5 | 43 | 69.9 | 21.9 | 56.7 | -0.27 | 48.46 | 50.96 | 78.51 |
| 238 | 232 | Rajasthan | Jaipur | -0.18 | 435.45 | 49.0 | 50.8 | 44 | 76.1 | 36.9 | 42.5 | -0.20 | 56.18 | 51.58 | 82.16 |
| 239 | 227 | Rajasthan | Ganganagar | -0.17 | 415.74 | 40.5 | 62.9 | 48 | 58.3 | 21.3 | 42.7 | -0.24 | 52.69 | 38.45 | 40.95 |
| 240 | 249 | Haryana | Faridabad | -0.16 | 452.29 | 55.6 | 47.6 | 30 | 77.6 | 28.7 | 60.9 | -0.07 | 56.80 | 4.45 | 61.74 |
| 241 | 244 | Karnataka | Bellary | -0.16 | 354.32 | 48.6 | 50.4 | 44 | 65.0 | 17.9 | 52.6 | -0.11 | 46.16 | .00 | 96.19 |
| 242 | 182 | Orissa | Gajapati | -0.16 | 409.57 | 47.9 | 52.0 | 42 | 70.0 | 13.2 | 62.0 | -0.48 | 28.91 | 78.49 | |
| 243 | 245 | J&K | Anantnag | -0.15 | 352.82 | 64.4 | 33.1 | 2 | 42.7 | 41.3 | 69.3 | -0.10 | | | |
| 244 | 194 | Orissa | Bolangir | -0.12 | 329.92 | 44.7 | 38.5 | 58 | 68.6 | 13.3 | 72.4 | -0.44 | 39.27 | 89.62 | 66.99 |
| 245 | 269 | Assam | Lakhimpur | -0.11 | 401.84 | 42.9 | 32.4 | 36 | 66.1 | 21.7 | 75.2 | .01 | 60.47 | | 128.90 |
| 246 | 262 | MP | Gwalior | -0.09 | 391.96 | 43.1 | 51.7 | 36 | 35.6 | 48.2 | 52.6 | -0.02 | 56.76 | 37.79 | 116.10 |
| 247 | 242 | D&NH | Dadra & Nagar Haveli | -0.08 | 493.34 | 44.9 | 41.4 | 51 | 90.6 | 25.9 | 79.0 | -0.12 | 42.99 | 5.56 | 72.94 |
| 248 | 248 | MP | Narasimhapur | -0.08 | 390.87 | 46.9 | 54.1 | 49 | 66.6 | 17.8 | 68.7 | -0.07 | 69.02 | 67.12 | 73.33 |
| 249 | 256 | J&K | Doda | -0.07 | 434.90 | 39.7 | 54.1 | 0 | 48.7 | 29.8 | 32.8 | -0.04 | | | |
| 250 | 337 | Sikkim | North Sikkim | -0.05 | 430.98 | 45.7 | 42.4 | 14 | 50.7 | 22.9 | 77.3 | .50 | 57.65 | 2.21 | 400.13 |
| 251 | 263 | Karnataka | Bijapur | -0.05 | 365.40 | 43.0 | 47.1 | 65 | 73.3 | 38.9 | 53.2 | -0.02 | 46.19 | .00 | 95.46 |
| 252 | 250 | Haryana | Kaithal | -0.04 | 381.34 | 43.1 | 57.1 | 33 | 63.5 | 19.9 | 47.4 | -0.06 | 47.60 | .00 | 50.20 |
| 253 | 255 | UP | Pithoragarh | -0.04 | 348.58 | 47.6 | 43.3 | 23 | 49.1 | 12.8 | 79.2 | -0.04 | 63.14 | 69.50 | 99.75 |
| 254 | 265 | J&K | Rajouri | -0.03 | 417.93 | 30.6 | 50.4 | 0 | .0 | .0 | 99.0 | -0.02 | | | |
| 255 | 231 | Orissa | Deogarh | -0.03 | 359.82 | 44.5 | 40.7 | 33 | 79.9 | 19.3 | 53.1 | -0.22 | 47.56 | 85.30 | |
| 256 | 247 | Assam | Barpeta | -0.03 | 464.25 | 26.2 | 71.0 | 23 | 44.2 | 19.9 | 32.1 | -0.09 | 48.16 | 38.97 | 95.76 |
| 257 | 229 | MP | Mandla | -0.03 | 382.09 | 46.5 | 58.2 | 39 | 55.3 | 10.7 | 77.1 | -0.23 | 45.39 | 71.85 | 86.35 |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GMI8 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|-------------|----------------------|------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|--------|--------|
| 258 | 246 | Orissa | Balasore (Baleshwar) | -.01 | 336.41 | 42.7 | 43.1 | 28 | 71.8 | 14.7 | 51.0 | -.10 | 59.57 | 74.23 | 79.50 |
| 259 | 260 | UP | Almora | -.01 | 329.89 | 46.4 | 41.7 | 14 | 40.5 | 11.9 | 79.4 | -.03 | 61.43 | 68.23 | 99.45 |
| 260 | 268 | J&K | Poonch | -.01 | 450.47 | 58.9 | 48.6 | 4 | 64.8 | 24.2 | 81.4 | .00 | | | |
| 261 | 264 | Orissa | Bhadrak | .00 | 324.65 | 46.4 | 46.8 | 18 | 53.4 | 21.0 | 54.0 | -.02 | 63.62 | 74.23 | |
| 262 | 222 | Orissa | Mayurbhanj | .00 | 383.53 | 45.1 | 52.0 | 33 | 78.5 | 14.9 | 55.1 | -.29 | 38.28 | 85.65 | 96.41 |
| 263 | 252 | MP | Jabalpur | .01 | 339.27 | 40.2 | 48.8 | 41 | 56.9 | 31.6 | 50.9 | -.05 | 59.47 | 68.22 | 94.68 |
| 264 | 253 | Gujarat | Bhavnagar | .01 | 381.60 | 43.7 | 60.2 | 29 | 72.3 | 27.3 | 32.1 | -.04 | 54.46 | 33.59 | 54.01 |
| 265 | 291 | UP | Nainital | .01 | 352.49 | 50.9 | 40.5 | 10 | 46.2 | 19.3 | 82.6 | .18 | 70.98 | 25.98 | 84.86 |
| 266 | 270 | UP | Chamoli | .04 | 342.19 | 50.6 | 51.5 | 8 | 42.4 | 11.8 | 78.0 | .02 | 63.00 | 76.25 | 111.24 |
| 267 | 281 | Manipur | Thoubal | .05 | 385.67 | 46.0 | 29.2 | 16 | 85.8 | 30.6 | 57.5 | .13 | 45.53 | 16.72 | 176.17 |
| 268 | 254 | MP | Hoshangabad | .06 | 400.47 | 41.3 | 51.8 | 48 | 64.3 | 32.6 | 71.0 | -.04 | 58.02 | 66.50 | 72.92 |
| 269 | 310 | Tripura | North Tripura | .07 | 336.91 | 44.4 | 51.3 | 15 | 54.5 | 37.3 | 38.5 | .30 | 66.28 | 8.03 | 129.21 |
| 270 | 267 | Assam | Dhemaji | .08 | 410.66 | 33.5 | 38.7 | 4 | 68.9 | 18.7 | 51.7 | .00 | 56.11 | 55.19 | 68.20 |
| 271 | 258 | Maharashtra | Nanded | .09 | 392.74 | 43.5 | 52.0 | 64 | 85.3 | 29.9 | 71.3 | -.04 | 55.12 | 72.03 | 98.44 |
| 272 | 289 | Haryana | Panipat | .09 | 410.98 | 45.3 | 57.2 | 26 | 69.7 | 28.1 | 58.4 | .18 | 58.48 | .00 | 67.55 |
| 273 | 240 | Orissa | Sonepur | .11 | 324.22 | 51.1 | 48.2 | 39 | 88.9 | 13.8 | 66.6 | -.14 | 47.28 | 89.62 | |
| 274 | 251 | Orissa | Anugul | .11 | 333.12 | 43.3 | 54.5 | 40 | 61.6 | 16.7 | 70.9 | -.05 | 56.01 | 87.50 | |
| 275 | 266 | Maharashtra | Parbhani | .11 | 389.82 | 47.0 | 55.7 | 47 | 76.8 | 32.3 | 67.2 | -.02 | 52.98 | 60.82 | 86.25 |
| 276 | 259 | WB | Birbhum | .12 | 389.14 | 36.2 | 67.6 | 59 | 78.2 | 38.6 | 34.9 | -.04 | 52.21 | 65.54 | 85.07 |
| 277 | 280 | J&K | Pulwama | .13 | 289.32 | 59.8 | 43.9 | 14 | 83.4 | 33.2 | 47.6 | .11 | | | |
| 278 | 261 | Maharashtra | Jalna | .13 | 377.40 | 44.0 | 51.7 | 56 | 77.0 | 27.9 | 78.3 | -.03 | 49.25 | 57.41 | 82.16 |
| 279 | 271 | MP | Ujjain | .15 | 397.80 | 40.5 | 58.6 | 42 | 65.3 | 41.1 | 57.6 | .04 | 57.87 | 76.20 | 99.56 |
| 280 | 284 | Haryana | Jind | .16 | 397.14 | 40.6 | 56.7 | 37 | 82.8 | 17.7 | 62.9 | .15 | 48.96 | .00 | 73.72 |
| 281 | 308 | Assam | Kamrup | .17 | 327.05 | 42.6 | 52.1 | 20 | 62.5 | 32.6 | 46.4 | .29 | 67.31 | 11.45 | 68.78 |
| 282 | 290 | Haryana | Hisar | .17 | 387.83 | 38.9 | 59.6 | 43 | 72.1 | 24.7 | 63.3 | .18 | 52.09 | .23 | 70.53 |
| 283 | 285 | J&K | Udhampur | .17 | 418.00 | 43.3 | 47.7 | 1 | 57.7 | 11.3 | 89.0 | .15 | | | |
| 284 | 279 | Maharashtra | Bid | .18 | 364.60 | 41.6 | 55.8 | 59 | 73.5 | 42.7 | 63.0 | .10 | 55.38 | 52.82 | 104.94 |
| 285 | 316 | Diu | Diu | .19 | 377.62 | 51.0 | 51.2 | 16 | 89.3 | 23.9 | 57.8 | .37 | 64.16 | .00 | 119.03 |
| 286 | 275 | Orissa | Nayagarh | .19 | 300.77 | 39.2 | 51.1 | 54 | 67.4 | 29.6 | 63.8 | .07 | 58.10 | 75.18 | |
| 287 | 278 | WB | Dakshin Dinajpur | .19 | 395.73 | 33.3 | 70.1 | 66 | 86.5 | 33.2 | 40.5 | .10 | 55.12 | 52.61 | |
| 288 | 276 | UP | Pauri Garhwal | .21 | 310.44 | 50.8 | 49.9 | 7 | 51.7 | 18.7 | 78.5 | .10 | 66.14 | 84.50 | 67.25 |
| 289 | 303 | Manipur | Bishnupur | .21 | 306.65 | 41.7 | 30.7 | 16 | 84.2 | 37.1 | 44.3 | .27 | 51.58 | .00 | 104.12 |
| 290 | 282 | WB | Kooch Bihar | .21 | 374.36 | 41.9 | 65.9 | 52 | 91.2 | 26.3 | 49.8 | .13 | 57.04 | 40.63 | 71.02 |
| 291 | 293 | WB | South 24 Parganas | .22 | 360.54 | 46.6 | 67.3 | 49 | 79.2 | 29.8 | 59.4 | .21 | 59.73 | 25.75 | 73.30 |
| 292 | 273 | MP | Betul | .22 | 402.75 | 48.9 | 61.8 | 28 | 69.9 | 25.2 | 78.9 | .07 | 56.05 | 72.87 | 86.84 |
| 293 | 298 | Haryana | Bhiwani | .22 | 390.13 | 39.6 | 61.9 | 49 | 86.9 | 16.8 | 68.3 | .24 | 53.50 | .00 | 79.14 |
| 294 | 286 | Orissa | Jajpur | .24 | 299.43 | 48.9 | 53.4 | 15 | 62.9 | 30.2 | 56.5 | .16 | 61.45 | 74.21 | |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GM18 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|-------------|--------------------|------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|--------|--------|
| 295 | 288 | MP | Balaghat | .25 | 350.91 | 45.3 | 54.5 | 34 | 70.3 | 12.3 | 90.4 | .16 | 57.02 | 46.22 | 77.53 |
| 296 | 302 | MP | Durg | .26 | 363.51 | 43.6 | 52.2 | 32 | 81.4 | 21.1 | 73.2 | .26 | 64.91 | 52.03 | 105.88 |
| 297 | 272 | AP | Adilabad | .26 | 339.51 | 38.5 | 49.1 | 48 | 79.9 | 38.9 | 59.6 | .04 | 41.38 | 44.58 | 81.11 |
| 298 | 313 | Maharashtra | Aurangabad | .26 | 359.03 | 42.2 | 50.9 | 51 | 81.6 | 49.6 | 59.2 | .31 | 61.28 | 33.20 | 121.20 |
| 299 | 299 | J&K | Srinagar | .28 | 242.93 | 61.3 | 37.2 | 9 | 86.3 | 78.9 | 15.5 | .25 | | | |
| 300 | 321 | Haryana | Rohtak | .29 | 362.66 | 37.4 | 56.7 | 29 | 70.5 | 22.8 | 65.9 | .39 | 63.19 | .00 | 85.20 |
| 301 | 306 | Haryana | Mahendragarh | .29 | 380.77 | 37.0 | 60.8 | 47 | 88.0 | 26.0 | 60.2 | .28 | 54.61 | .00 | 61.30 |
| 302 | 332 | UP | Kanpur Nagar | .30 | 315.92 | 44.5 | 43.3 | 6 | 77.0 | 42.4 | 41.9 | .46 | 72.50 | .00 | 51.81 |
| 303 | 274 | Orissa | Baragarh | .31 | 288.10 | 41.9 | 46.7 | 40 | 88.6 | 22.1 | 63.9 | .07 | 50.03 | 85.30 | |
| 304 | 304 | Orissa | Kendrapara | .32 | 296.52 | 42.0 | 53.4 | 16 | 73.5 | 20.9 | 53.8 | .27 | 67.29 | 74.21 | |
| 305 | 307 | Punjab | Firozpur | .33 | 358.97 | 43.2 | 61.5 | 25 | 80.0 | 34.0 | 51.8 | .28 | 52.33 | 13.22 | 74.20 |
| 306 | 371 | Nagaland | Mokokchung | .33 | 234.89 | 39.7 | 48.7 | 17 | 73.4 | 16.9 | 46.6 | .73 | 82.20 | .00 | 181.10 |
| 307 | 300 | Gujarat | Amreli | .34 | 317.43 | 41.4 | 64.8 | 20 | 72.9 | 25.5 | 46.3 | .25 | 57.77 | 30.93 | 46.78 |
| 308 | 315 | UP | Dehra Dun | .35 | 309.28 | 49.1 | 49.4 | 14 | 69.7 | 39.0 | 64.9 | .37 | 71.22 | 43.59 | 59.96 |
| 309 | 301 | Maharashtra | Dhule | .35 | 343.78 | 37.2 | 58.3 | 40 | 69.8 | 31.0 | 69.4 | .26 | 61.76 | 67.73 | 103.68 |
| 310 | 292 | Bihar | Purbi Singhbhum | .36 | 331.26 | 40.4 | 47.9 | 33 | 68.9 | 41.5 | 71.3 | .21 | 57.95 | 72.06 | 92.49 |
| 311 | 312 | J&K | Budgam | .36 | 374.34 | 56.5 | 54.9 | 3 | 71.0 | 57.2 | 61.2 | .30 | | | |
| 312 | 309 | HP | Sirmaur | .37 | 363.38 | 48.7 | 59.8 | 7 | 83.7 | 22.9 | 62.9 | .29 | 60.93 | 58.68 | 98.10 |
| 313 | 305 | Gujarat | Sabar Kantha | .37 | 358.06 | 38.5 | 52.1 | 32 | 81.7 | 40.6 | 58.9 | .28 | 52.85 | 26.94 | 71.54 |
| 314 | 311 | WB | Medinipur | .38 | 334.47 | 34.8 | 63.1 | 40 | 87.2 | 27.4 | 46.0 | .30 | 64.63 | 75.59 | 121.87 |
| 315 | 294 | Gujarat | Kachchh | .38 | 321.00 | 50.9 | 55.4 | 24 | 79.1 | 37.3 | 67.4 | .22 | 48.98 | 39.11 | 73.66 |
| 316 | 344 | Haryana | Sonapat | .40 | 387.99 | 36.9 | 58.5 | 31 | 78.5 | 23.1 | 79.0 | .54 | 61.65 | .00 | 143.20 |
| 317 | 324 | WB | Jalpaiguri | .40 | 366.67 | 38.7 | 61.8 | 36 | 87.1 | 29.4 | 62.0 | .43 | 52.90 | .00 | 112.01 |
| 318 | 283 | AP | Mahbubnagar | .41 | 359.50 | 39.3 | 52.1 | 42 | 89.2 | 41.9 | 65.7 | .14 | 32.83 | 18.88 | 65.97 |
| 319 | 327 | Haryana | Rewari | .41 | 367.05 | 38.0 | 60.4 | 45 | 91.6 | 23.7 | 72.9 | .44 | 61.25 | .08 | 63.04 |
| 320 | 394 | Mizoram | Lunglei | .43 | 411.49 | 45.2 | 52.9 | 11 | 68.3 | 50.7 | 78.1 | .87 | 80.74 | 36.45 | 310.54 |
| 321 | 295 | Gujarat | Surendranagar | .43 | 397.06 | 37.4 | 54.1 | 10 | 76.5 | 33.4 | 66.6 | .22 | 48.72 | 45.41 | 57.00 |
| 322 | 297 | Orissa | Dhenkal | .45 | 310.00 | 42.5 | 66.4 | 37 | 67.8 | 31.3 | 71.5 | .24 | 58.55 | 87.50 | 93.09 |
| 323 | 328 | Maharashtra | Nashik | .45 | 378.10 | 35.9 | 56.5 | 32 | 64.4 | 54.5 | 68.6 | .44 | 64.16 | 47.33 | 107.78 |
| 324 | 296 | Orissa | Sambalpur | .46 | 295.28 | 43.3 | 44.9 | 29 | 87.6 | 29.2 | 76.5 | .22 | 54.79 | 85.30 | 94.91 |
| 325 | 319 | J&K | Kupwara | .46 | 436.83 | 21.2 | 44.4 | 0 | 60.8 | 61.1 | 44.4 | .39 | | | |
| 326 | 317 | Maharashtra | Osmanabad | .47 | 364.18 | 35.6 | 58.2 | 47 | 79.8 | 36.4 | 79.3 | .37 | 57.55 | 47.42 | 104.44 |
| 327 | 323 | Haryana | Sirsa | .48 | 368.35 | 37.1 | 65.6 | 34 | 82.8 | 30.9 | 66.4 | .40 | 50.31 | 1.36 | 62.42 |
| 328 | 351 | MP | Bhopal | .49 | 385.78 | 47.3 | 63.5 | 35 | 77.6 | 52.5 | 78.5 | .58 | 66.67 | 50.02 | 184.91 |
| 329 | 331 | Punjab | Muktsar | .49 | 377.37 | 37.6 | 68.0 | 24 | 82.4 | 36.4 | 54.3 | .45 | 50.59 | 5.99 | |
| 330 | 325 | Maharashtra | Latur | .51 | 369.80 | 39.5 | 60.0 | 58 | 86.6 | 40.7 | 89.3 | .43 | 60.28 | 52.43 | 122.14 |
| 331 | 338 | Maharashtra | Buldana | .52 | 357.12 | 43.9 | 55.3 | 34 | 86.3 | 43.9 | 78.7 | .50 | 64.55 | 54.41 | 135.44 |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GM18 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|-------------|---------------|------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|--------|--------|
| 332 | 378 | Assam | Sibsagar | .53 | 326.01 | 34.6 | 27.2 | 13 | 83.0 | 39.6 | 83.0 | .79 | 68.00 | .00 | 192.97 |
| 333 | 329 | J&K | Jammu | .53 | 300.73 | 33.8 | 60.0 | 1 | 29.1 | 36.3 | 76.9 | .44 | | | |
| 334 | 336 | Tripura | South Tripura | .55 | 339.36 | 29.4 | 77.7 | 46 | 74.8 | 43.8 | 42.9 | .49 | 52.37 | 26.00 | 130.55 |
| 335 | 320 | Orissa | Sundergarh | .56 | 333.22 | 44.0 | 49.2 | 17 | 88.9 | 33.6 | 80.2 | .39 | 54.25 | 81.71 | 153.66 |
| 336 | 370 | Assam | Dibrugarh | .57 | 340.80 | 31.4 | 30.5 | 26 | 90.6 | 73.9 | 51.3 | .71 | 62.10 | .00 | 151.59 |
| 337 | 347 | Karnataka | Belgaun | .57 | 339.18 | 36.7 | 61.8 | 55 | 91.7 | 50.6 | 64.8 | .55 | 52.53 | .00 | 110.42 |
| 338 | 326 | AP | Kurnool | .57 | 352.35 | 37.5 | 55.1 | 38 | 92.0 | 38.8 | 76.9 | .43 | 41.07 | .00 | 93.17 |
| 339 | 318 | AP | Nalgonda | .57 | 319.13 | 30.6 | 55.1 | 42 | 93.5 | 44.7 | 51.4 | .39 | 45.05 | 18.33 | 68.65 |
| 340 | 390 | Sikkim | East Sikkim | .58 | 312.07 | 34.0 | 46.0 | 13 | 78.9 | 43.8 | 59.1 | .86 | 67.74 | 11.72 | 246.56 |
| 341 | 314 | Maharashtra | Gadchiroli | .58 | 374.58 | 35.9 | 58.2 | 27 | 95.5 | 16.4 | 85.7 | .36 | 50.64 | 81.32 | 147.39 |
| 342 | 341 | WB | Barddhaman | .58 | 303.48 | 32.6 | 70.7 | 55 | 82.1 | 44.7 | 51.8 | .51 | 61.93 | 45.10 | 113.33 |
| 343 | 349 | Gujarat | Vadodara | .58 | 310.25 | 33.2 | 58.8 | 34 | 78.2 | 39.0 | 63.8 | .57 | 61.24 | 33.25 | 119.63 |
| 344 | 322 | HP | Kinnaur | .59 | 339.04 | 38.0 | 66.8 | 16 | 88.4 | 28.1 | 56.2 | .39 | 54.77 | 58.61 | 85.65 |
| 345 | 352 | Gujarat | Kheda | .60 | 332.36 | 32.2 | 58.7 | 33 | 87.8 | 56.0 | 43.5 | .58 | 57.77 | 3.08 | 76.20 |
| 346 | 364 | Punjab | Amritsar | .62 | 325.41 | 44.5 | 65.0 | 11 | 84.2 | 33.3 | 66.2 | .66 | 61.41 | 9.18 | 112.36 |
| 347 | 339 | Punjab | Mansa | .62 | 337.50 | 37.3 | 63.8 | 21 | 89.1 | 32.9 | 61.6 | .51 | 45.07 | 5.52 | |
| 348 | 340 | Orissa | Puri | .63 | 279.59 | 37.3 | 53.2 | 14 | 78.4 | 38.6 | 60.5 | .51 | 67.80 | 75.18 | 95.60 |
| 349 | 342 | Maharashtra | Yavatmal | .64 | 352.71 | 37.9 | 59.3 | 27 | 91.2 | 37.1 | 74.3 | .54 | 63.01 | 56.41 | 107.98 |
| 350 | 354 | AP | Cuddapah | .64 | 290.13 | 31.3 | 44.6 | 33 | 93.5 | 47.4 | 58.1 | .59 | 50.76 | .00 | 98.69 |
| 351 | 345 | Maharashtra | Jalgaon | .65 | 332.57 | 35.7 | 62.4 | 46 | 83.7 | 44.1 | 78.5 | .55 | 64.95 | 54.27 | 92.29 |
| 352 | 362 | Gujarat | Bharuch | .65 | 325.67 | 32.7 | 58.2 | 18 | 78.4 | 34.6 | 69.1 | .65 | 65.42 | 21.33 | 82.98 |
| 353 | 343 | HP | Chamba | .66 | 358.07 | 36.5 | 55.7 | 2 | 81.7 | 22.5 | 84.8 | .54 | 68.08 | 72.90 | 90.88 |
| 354 | 330 | Orissa | Jharsuguda | .67 | 297.07 | 45.3 | 55.1 | 18 | 89.4 | 35.0 | 79.8 | .45 | 59.23 | 85.30 | |
| 355 | 353 | Orissa | Jagatsinghpur | .68 | 258.34 | 38.3 | 54.8 | 9 | 82.4 | 34.7 | 58.6 | .59 | 69.94 | 74.21 | |
| 356 | 374 | Maharashtra | Akola | .69 | 337.41 | 41.0 | 57.5 | 38 | 92.4 | 49.3 | 81.5 | .76 | 73.82 | 47.91 | 156.03 |
| 357 | 333 | WB | Bankura | .69 | 336.08 | 31.5 | 63.1 | 50 | 95.8 | 45.3 | 67.3 | .46 | 49.80 | 58.25 | 113.58 |
| 358 | 334 | AP | Srikakulam | .69 | 287.33 | 26.3 | 57.1 | 49 | 87.4 | 28.2 | 77.4 | .47 | 44.19 | 29.01 | 89.22 |
| 359 | 368 | MP | Indore | .70 | 346.58 | 37.4 | 67.4 | 43 | 79.1 | 62.4 | 68.9 | .70 | 63.96 | 49.34 | 169.40 |
| 360 | 335 | Gujarat | Jamnagar | .70 | 315.45 | 41.9 | 58.5 | 11 | 81.7 | 41.2 | 73.4 | .48 | 56.84 | 58.79 | 65.88 |
| 361 | 350 | Gujarat | Junagadh | .70 | 342.69 | 35.2 | 61.9 | 12 | 86.6 | 39.6 | 61.5 | .58 | 56.92 | 22.09 | 57.04 |
| 362 | 369 | Punjab | Moga | .71 | 300.82 | 41.0 | 63.9 | 13 | 84.2 | 42.2 | 60.2 | .71 | 58.96 | 5.99 | |
| 363 | 348 | HP | Lahul & Spiti | .72 | 278.34 | 33.5 | 56.9 | 0 | 70.7 | 25.8 | 70.0 | .56 | 60.94 | 62.46 | 92.91 |
| 364 | 366 | Haryana | Karnal | .72 | 367.00 | 36.4 | 67.7 | 16 | 90.8 | 25.9 | 78.7 | .69 | 58.42 | 3.11 | 83.43 |
| 365 | 365 | Maharashtra | Bhandara | .74 | 307.18 | 38.0 | 59.6 | 9 | 86.0 | 24.6 | 78.9 | .67 | 68.11 | 62.27 | 120.09 |
| 366 | 356 | Orissa | Cuttack | .74 | 273.55 | 41.4 | 63.7 | 11 | 71.4 | 40.6 | 70.8 | .61 | 66.19 | 74.21 | 107.63 |
| 367 | 383 | Haryana | Yamunanagar | .75 | 344.07 | 35.0 | 65.7 | 6 | 97.0 | 30.3 | 57.9 | .82 | 64.08 | 2.70 | 123.25 |
| 368 | 380 | Karnataka | Dharwad | .76 | 305.05 | 37.4 | 61.2 | 37 | 91.8 | 44.8 | 74.8 | .79 | 62.20 | .00 | 109.62 |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GM18 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|-------------|-------------------|------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|--------|--------|
| 369 | 361 | Maharashtra | Solapur | .76 | 340.98 | 38.8 | 63.1 | 42 | 84.9 | 57.0 | 84.1 | .64 | 60.07 | 55.74 | 124.26 |
| 370 | 359 | J&K | Kathua | .77 | 363.91 | 24.6 | 63.7 | 0 | 65.5 | 30.5 | 75.1 | .63 | | | |
| 371 | 385 | Gujarat | Gandhinagar | .77 | 316.59 | 30.2 | 59.6 | 33 | 81.1 | 60.0 | 61.7 | .84 | 64.85 | .00 | 111.49 |
| 372 | 422 | Karnataka | Bangalore | .77 | 265.21 | 26.1 | 60.1 | 12 | 1.2 | 82.5 | 77.7 | 1.10 | 78.98 | .00 | 197.22 |
| 373 | 358 | AP | Anantapur | .80 | 295.35 | 30.0 | 53.9 | 34 | 90.6 | 36.1 | 82.0 | .62 | 43.87 | .00 | 75.66 |
| 374 | 346 | AP | Medak | .80 | 342.93 | 36.3 | 56.8 | 36 | 95.1 | 50.8 | 85.4 | .55 | 40.68 | 13.29 | 69.65 |
| 375 | 367 | Orissa | Khurda | .80 | 284.09 | 34.7 | 61.8 | 23 | 76.0 | 56.6 | 62.8 | .69 | 71.06 | 75.18 | |
| 376 | 392 | Punjab | Gurdaspur | .81 | 311.96 | 40.6 | 67.8 | 7 | 87.8 | 24.7 | 80.5 | .87 | 67.31 | 8.41 | 112.88 |
| 377 | 355 | AP | Visakhapatnam | .82 | 275.24 | 22.9 | 54.7 | 54 | 93.2 | 58.0 | 58.4 | .59 | 49.99 | 54.74 | 119.17 |
| 378 | 379 | AP | Rangareddi | .83 | 316.74 | 30.9 | 56.1 | 37 | 92.1 | 55.3 | 73.7 | .79 | 57.03 | .00 | 95.30 |
| 379 | 412 | Kerala | Malappuram | .84 | 330.51 | 36.2 | 46.9 | 36 | 98.7 | 88.0 | 59.8 | 1.06 | 85.96 | .63 | 94.18 |
| 380 | 381 | Punjab | Faridkot | .84 | 294.61 | 33.6 | 67.3 | 13 | 81.6 | 39.6 | 64.2 | .80 | 57.09 | 5.99 | 101.68 |
| 381 | 363 | AP | Nizamabad | .87 | 316.17 | 27.7 | 54.1 | 44 | 97.2 | 53.0 | 78.6 | .66 | 40.57 | .00 | 84.12 |
| 382 | 373 | Punjab | Sangrur | .87 | 313.19 | 34.6 | 64.6 | 14 | 91.1 | 44.6 | 65.6 | .76 | 53.29 | 5.69 | 79.41 |
| 383 | 451 | Lakshadweep | Lakshadweep | .88 | 352.92 | 43.9 | 41.9 | 18 | 99.3 | 71.3 | 94.4 | 1.32 | 81.56 | .00 | 292.03 |
| 384 | 391 | Haryana | Kurukshetra | .88 | 339.58 | 35.7 | 65.8 | 15 | 86.8 | 39.1 | 85.2 | .87 | 60.76 | .00 | 92.38 |
| 385 | 375 | Punjab | Bathinda | .89 | 300.49 | 31.5 | 69.3 | 13 | 84.6 | 37.4 | 64.6 | .77 | 53.76 | 5.52 | 80.26 |
| 386 | 360 | AP | Warangal | .89 | 315.71 | 25.1 | 52.0 | 48 | 98.9 | 52.1 | 81.4 | .63 | 46.54 | 31.37 | 86.63 |
| 387 | 382 | Karnataka | Chitradurga | .89 | 292.98 | 34.4 | 59.9 | 31 | 91.0 | 39.1 | 88.4 | .82 | 54.62 | .00 | 99.15 |
| 388 | 388 | Gujarat | Surat | .89 | 339.93 | 28.8 | 62.6 | 19 | 75.0 | 52.0 | 80.3 | .85 | 66.71 | 28.08 | 90.56 |
| 389 | 372 | TN | South Arcot | .92 | 275.50 | 29.5 | 44.7 | 28 | 95.6 | 55.2 | 76.8 | .75 | 53.06 | 24.90 | 82.81 |
| 390 | 396 | Maharashtra | Amravati | .93 | 317.35 | 36.6 | 63.8 | 10 | 87.7 | 52.9 | 71.5 | .91 | 76.21 | 60.39 | 122.59 |
| 391 | 404 | WB | Haora | .93 | 275.65 | 36.7 | 79.1 | 38 | 94.5 | 53.0 | 56.1 | .99 | 70.93 | .00 | 98.32 |
| 392 | 414 | Manipur | Imphal | .93 | 287.51 | 31.4 | 42.4 | 5 | 88.7 | 58.4 | 71.9 | 1.06 | 73.15 | .00 | 121.10 |
| 393 | 471 | Mizoram | Aizawl | .96 | 333.36 | 36.2 | 52.8 | 13 | 91.7 | 69.3 | 76.3 | 1.53 | 96.60 | .00 | 302.01 |
| 394 | 389 | Maharashtra | Ahmadnagar | .97 | 331.81 | 33.9 | 64.6 | 41 | 91.2 | 60.0 | 89.7 | .86 | 64.88 | 36.25 | 94.61 |
| 395 | 400 | Punjab | Patiala | .97 | 299.51 | 30.9 | 59.8 | 10 | 84.6 | 51.0 | 72.0 | .96 | 62.94 | 7.60 | 106.47 |
| 396 | 377 | Karnataka | Kolar | .97 | 293.10 | 29.7 | 57.1 | 34 | 95.2 | 41.3 | 90.6 | .79 | 52.81 | 23.10 | 90.89 |
| 397 | 399 | Gujarat | Valsad | .98 | 337.52 | 27.6 | 58.5 | 12 | 88.1 | 61.8 | 66.8 | .94 | 59.92 | .00 | 94.08 |
| 398 | 357 | AP | Vizianagaram | .98 | 285.72 | 23.8 | 63.5 | 40 | 91.7 | 34.9 | 86.5 | .62 | 40.73 | 42.97 | 82.71 |
| 399 | 433 | Tripura | West Tripura | .99 | 289.17 | 27.9 | 76.7 | 35 | 74.2 | 59.5 | 66.6 | 1.16 | 72.66 | 9.85 | 188.43 |
| 400 | 418 | Gujarat | Ahmedabad | 1.00 | 299.36 | 32.7 | 63.4 | 28 | 83.1 | 65.8 | 76.0 | 1.09 | 71.12 | 1.15 | 126.85 |
| 401 | 419 | WB | Darjeeling | 1.00 | 282.01 | 30.9 | 69.2 | 25 | 88.7 | 57.6 | 60.8 | 1.09 | 63.92 | 36.86 | 250.94 |
| 402 | 413 | Haryana | Ambala | 1.00 | 312.12 | 29.6 | 60.9 | 13 | 86.7 | 40.2 | 86.9 | 1.06 | 68.45 | 3.38 | 123.38 |
| 403 | 387 | HP | Solan | 1.01 | 327.85 | 31.9 | 63.7 | 1 | 87.5 | 32.1 | 91.1 | .85 | 67.48 | 58.57 | 79.80 |
| 404 | 429 | Maharashtra | Thane | 1.02 | 346.87 | 34.9 | 56.3 | 20 | 92.9 | 71.1 | 84.8 | 1.14 | 75.00 | 42.38 | 205.56 |
| 405 | 425 | WB | North 24 Parganas | 1.03 | 269.17 | 32.2 | 81.6 | 48 | 94.9 | 52.8 | 65.6 | 1.13 | 72.13 | .00 | 132.19 |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GMI8 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|-------------|----------------|------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|--------|--------|
| 406 | 376 | TN | Dharmapuri | 1.04 | 305.05 | 30.1 | 47.0 | 34 | 97.7 | 62.5 | 94.4 | .79 | 49.10 | 25.34 | 74.20 |
| 407 | 384 | AP | Prakasam | 1.04 | 281.28 | 28.1 | 63.6 | 41 | 95.8 | 49.6 | 82.8 | .84 | 45.60 | .00 | 82.45 |
| 408 | 395 | Gujarat | Mahesana | 1.04 | 317.71 | 28.9 | 63.9 | 33 | 87.5 | 68.0 | 77.1 | .89 | 63.96 | 33.78 | 70.97 |
| 409 | 386 | J&K | Leh | 1.04 | 147.83 | 46.7 | 76.4 | 1 | 71.9 | 34.7 | 69.9 | .84 | | | |
| 410 | 403 | AP | Guntur | 1.07 | 262.86 | 25.5 | 63.6 | 35 | 96.5 | 56.3 | 65.4 | .98 | 54.17 | .00 | 110.57 |
| 411 | 397 | Maharashtra | Chandrapur | 1.07 | 306.37 | 31.1 | 65.8 | 26 | 96.3 | 41.0 | 92.7 | .93 | 62.56 | 55.02 | 134.26 |
| 412 | 420 | Haryana | Panchkula | 1.08 | 354.26 | 34.4 | 69.7 | 7 | 95.9 | 42.9 | 89.5 | 1.10 | 68.98 | 3.38 | |
| 413 | 416 | Punjab | Kapurthala | 1.09 | 288.92 | 31.0 | 62.9 | 3 | 86.3 | 38.4 | 87.2 | 1.07 | 67.90 | 18.94 | 114.44 |
| 414 | 405 | HP | Shimla | 1.09 | 274.80 | 40.4 | 68.2 | 2 | 83.0 | 53.3 | 82.0 | .99 | 70.68 | 72.82 | 146.91 |
| 415 | 459 | A&NI | Nicobar | 1.10 | 308.80 | 23.7 | 55.3 | 3 | 91.0 | 56.6 | 68.0 | 1.37 | 65.32 | 72.10 | 456.54 |
| 416 | 401 | HP | Kullu | 1.10 | 325.26 | 25.6 | 68.1 | 2 | 83.0 | 34.0 | 87.6 | .96 | 61.24 | 32.82 | 98.92 |
| 417 | 410 | Maharashtra | Raigarh | 1.11 | 323.23 | 28.7 | 56.9 | 16 | 95.3 | 55.9 | 87.3 | 1.06 | 68.06 | 43.35 | 143.03 |
| 418 | 406 | WB | Nadia | 1.11 | 304.62 | 26.7 | 74.3 | 42 | 89.5 | 70.0 | 68.9 | 1.00 | 60.06 | 30.45 | 130.37 |
| 419 | 439 | HP | Mandi | 1.12 | 298.90 | 24.3 | 67.6 | 4 | 82.0 | 31.8 | 87.0 | 1.21 | 65.36 | 70.74 | 325.94 |
| 420 | 436 | Punjab | Ludhiana | 1.12 | 299.37 | 30.3 | 64.8 | 8 | 85.5 | 52.8 | 81.5 | 1.20 | 72.11 | 7.04 | 131.70 |
| 421 | 409 | HP | Kangra | 1.12 | 265.65 | 26.4 | 63.9 | 3 | 93.7 | 29.8 | 77.2 | 1.04 | 73.57 | 39.19 | 78.52 |
| 422 | 393 | AP | Karimnagar | 1.12 | 290.92 | 22.4 | 58.3 | 43 | 99.6 | 54.7 | 86.4 | .87 | 44.19 | .00 | 69.04 |
| 423 | 448 | HP | Una | 1.14 | 300.27 | 30.2 | 62.8 | 1 | 96.4 | 27.7 | 95.5 | 1.29 | 73.85 | .00 | 165.57 |
| 424 | 398 | AP | Khammam | 1.15 | 306.74 | 21.6 | 64.2 | 33 | 97.6 | 52.7 | 80.4 | .94 | 48.16 | 9.60 | 98.56 |
| 425 | 431 | AP | Krishan | 1.15 | 265.27 | 24.3 | 65.0 | 26 | 97.3 | 60.4 | 61.3 | 1.15 | 65.05 | .00 | 112.20 |
| 426 | 468 | Chandigarh | Chandigarh | 1.15 | 318.98 | 20.1 | 60.9 | 0 | 79.8 | 68.0 | 61.6 | 1.50 | 76.65 | .00 | 284.11 |
| 427 | 440 | Punjab | Hoshiarpur | 1.16 | 283.66 | 34.3 | 64.1 | 3 | 98.0 | 33.9 | 93.7 | 1.22 | 75.56 | 8.92 | 109.00 |
| 428 | 435 | Punjab | Nawashar | 1.17 | 276.95 | 30.8 | 64.7 | 2 | 95.9 | 31.1 | 89.2 | 1.17 | 69.52 | 5.93 | |
| 429 | 438 | Maharashtra | Pune | 1.17 | 307.33 | 27.1 | 65.7 | 30 | 90.9 | 75.0 | 74.3 | 1.20 | 72.32 | 57.68 | 218.51 |
| 430 | 407 | Gujarat | Rajkot | 1.17 | 237.34 | 31.7 | 71.1 | 14 | 86.1 | 52.5 | 70.1 | 1.01 | 67.87 | 37.12 | 62.92 |
| 431 | 402 | Karnataka | Tumkur | 1.18 | 258.89 | 27.3 | 61.3 | 27 | 95.4 | 48.4 | 88.0 | .98 | 57.18 | 21.47 | 74.12 |
| 432 | 411 | Maharashtra | Ratnagiri | 1.18 | 291.31 | 32.3 | 58.3 | 13 | 96.4 | 51.7 | 94.1 | 1.06 | 65.98 | 48.85 | 127.52 |
| 433 | 428 | AP | East Godavari | 1.18 | 269.66 | 23.5 | 68.8 | 44 | 97.9 | 48.7 | 85.7 | 1.14 | 61.00 | .00 | 124.94 |
| 434 | 443 | Punjab | Jalandhar | 1.19 | 267.51 | 29.9 | 64.8 | 7 | 87.8 | 46.2 | 85.1 | 1.24 | 72.93 | 5.93 | 117.58 |
| 435 | 421 | WB | Hoogly | 1.19 | 270.50 | 22.9 | 73.9 | 34 | 93.9 | 55.1 | 67.8 | 1.10 | 67.72 | 36.32 | 122.54 |
| 436 | 415 | TN | Tiruvannamalai | 1.20 | 258.98 | 29.6 | 57.4 | 25 | 96.2 | 57.3 | 89.6 | 1.07 | 56.31 | .00 | 85.41 |
| 437 | 458 | Delhi | Delhi | 1.21 | 361.68 | 32.1 | 70.8 | 7 | 89.4 | 69.7 | 84.7 | 1.37 | 75.00 | .05 | 169.60 |
| 438 | 441 | AP | West Godavari | 1.22 | 260.96 | 24.1 | 69.1 | 30 | 95.2 | 49.4 | 79.5 | 1.22 | 69.45 | .00 | 102.80 |
| 439 | 424 | TN | Salem | 1.22 | 251.35 | 25.5 | 47.1 | 40 | 97.2 | 76.3 | 89.9 | 1.12 | 55.61 | .00 | 114.57 |
| 440 | 430 | HP | Bilaspur | 1.23 | 281.52 | 19.6 | 64.7 | 5 | 86.5 | 36.8 | 84.6 | 1.15 | 70.53 | 38.58 | 110.35 |
| 441 | 426 | AP | Nellore | 1.23 | 268.92 | 25.6 | 60.3 | 25 | 98.1 | 63.3 | 77.7 | 1.13 | 57.24 | 4.90 | 113.41 |
| 442 | 444 | TN | North Arcot | 1.23 | 265.43 | 28.9 | 50.6 | 21 | 99.3 | 65.5 | 90.0 | 1.26 | 63.53 | 6.78 | 166.40 |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GM18 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|-------------|-----------------------|------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|------|-------|------|-------|--------|--------|
| 443 | 408 | Karnataka | Mandya | 1.24 | 245.21 | 26.1 | 71.7 | 37 | 91.7 | 48.8 | 88.0 | 1.03 | 51.62 | .00 | 69.33 |
| 444 | 427 | HP | Hamirpur | 1.24 | 258.48 | 23.9 | 61.0 | 1 | 92.1 | 27.8 | 92.5 | 1.14 | 76.41 | 48.67 | 85.61 |
| 445 | 423 | Karnataka | Mysore | 1.24 | 268.05 | 23.9 | 65.4 | 48 | 96.4 | 59.5 | 92.7 | 1.11 | 55.81 | .00 | 105.21 |
| 446 | 450 | Maharashtra | Nagpur | 1.24 | 299.03 | 29.8 | 63.8 | 11 | 97.0 | 67.2 | 76.0 | 1.29 | 77.65 | 47.09 | 181.95 |
| 447 | 442 | Punjab | Fatehgarh Sahib | 1.25 | 297.54 | 31.3 | 67.4 | 7 | 96.8 | 57.7 | 80.2 | 1.22 | 68.60 | 7.60 | |
| 448 | 417 | Assam | Nalbari | 1.25 | 342.94 | 23.0 | 83.7 | 6 | 83.6 | 52.0 | 73.5 | 1.08 | 58.40 | 31.68 | 110.05 |
| 449 | 452 | Daman | Daman | 1.26 | 346.77 | 25.7 | 57.3 | 17 | 98.5 | 87.6 | 75.9 | 1.32 | 73.73 | .00 | 115.94 |
| 450 | 434 | AP | Chittoor | 1.28 | 283.36 | 22.4 | 63.2 | 23 | 98.3 | 50.8 | 88.4 | 1.17 | 56.48 | .00 | 109.59 |
| 451 | 432 | Maharashtra | Satara | 1.28 | 285.87 | 28.1 | 69.1 | 22 | 86.9 | 60.9 | 92.5 | 1.16 | 68.71 | 47.49 | 120.95 |
| 452 | 475 | A&NI | Andamans | 1.30 | 317.06 | 19.6 | 62.7 | 22 | 96.7 | 70.2 | 78.3 | 1.57 | 76.62 | 44.74 | 357.01 |
| 453 | 457 | Punjab | Rupnagar | 1.35 | 301.61 | 31.3 | 71.1 | 6 | 98.9 | 52.1 | 93.7 | 1.36 | 71.74 | 10.04 | 128.66 |
| 454 | 456 | TN | Tiruchirappalli | 1.35 | 237.47 | 20.4 | 42.8 | 24 | 98.1 | 77.2 | 85.6 | 1.35 | 71.19 | .00 | 97.56 |
| 455 | 449 | Maharashtra | Sangli | 1.37 | 291.10 | 20.7 | 63.4 | 26 | 95.7 | 68.7 | 87.3 | 1.29 | 66.88 | 45.96 | 178.05 |
| 456 | 437 | TN | Pudukkottai | 1.37 | 271.20 | 33.7 | 48.0 | 11 | 98.8 | 87.7 | 93.2 | 1.20 | 60.94 | 23.59 | 86.80 |
| 457 | 445 | Maharashtra | Kolhapur | 1.38 | 290.95 | 18.8 | 65.3 | 18 | 90.6 | 73.7 | 76.2 | 1.27 | 66.38 | 39.32 | 139.82 |
| 458 | 447 | TN | Ramanathapuram | 1.38 | 266.74 | 30.0 | 42.7 | 13 | 98.8 | 86.1 | 97.2 | 1.28 | 63.55 | 21.02 | 118.79 |
| 459 | 469 | AP | Hyderabad | 1.39 | 280.42 | 32.8 | 56.3 | 6 | 94.9 | 88.3 | 84.8 | 1.50 | 73.67 | .00 | 169.04 |
| 460 | 463 | TN | Chidambaranar | 1.40 | 242.11 | 31.2 | 46.0 | 7 | 99.5 | 86.2 | 85.8 | 1.40 | 75.64 | 21.88 | 119.79 |
| 461 | 455 | Karnataka | Chikmagalur | 1.41 | 261.83 | 26.1 | 71.8 | 14 | 91.7 | 62.4 | 83.5 | 1.34 | 64.47 | 4.97 | 116.59 |
| 462 | 446 | TN | Pasumpon M.T. | 1.41 | 245.06 | 22.8 | 53.9 | 29 | 98.8 | 69.0 | 96.7 | 1.27 | 61.41 | 14.84 | 109.91 |
| 463 | 465 | Karnataka | Bangalore Rural | 1.43 | 263.33 | 16.4 | 63.0 | 22 | 93.9 | 64.7 | 83.7 | 1.43 | 78.98 | .00 | 64.37 |
| 464 | 453 | TN | Kamarajar(Virdunagar) | 1.43 | 254.14 | 24.4 | 46.5 | 14 | 99.1 | 75.8 | 96.7 | 1.32 | 64.09 | 14.71 | 107.41 |
| 465 | 460 | TN | Dindigul | 1.44 | 240.49 | 19.1 | 51.5 | 28 | 97.8 | 74.8 | 90.9 | 1.37 | 59.30 | .00 | 142.11 |
| 466 | 462 | Maharashtra | Sindhudurg | 1.45 | 254.56 | 28.0 | 48.4 | 4 | 99.5 | 76.6 | 92.5 | 1.38 | 71.67 | 44.97 | 155.02 |
| 467 | 454 | Maharashtra | Wardha | 1.47 | 287.67 | 24.1 | 69.7 | 12 | 98.6 | 62.8 | 90.3 | 1.34 | 72.80 | 52.00 | 124.98 |
| 468 | 482 | Pondicherry | Yanam | 1.47 | 322.46 | 20.9 | 69.7 | 23 | 99.5 | 67.5 | 98.0 | 1.66 | 80.41 | .00 | 202.00 |
| 469 | 464 | Karnataka | Uttar Kannad | 1.48 | 290.26 | 27.2 | 66.0 | 15 | 98.4 | 78.2 | 89.9 | 1.41 | 68.48 | 18.55 | 128.50 |
| 470 | 461 | Karnataka | Shimoga | 1.48 | 278.79 | 22.8 | 69.3 | 17 | 97.6 | 62.1 | 92.9 | 1.38 | 67.24 | 4.67 | 80.43 |
| 471 | 481 | Karnataka | Dakshin Karnad | 1.49 | 249.50 | 32.0 | 63.7 | 5 | 98.5 | 76.6 | 86.0 | 1.65 | 77.39 | .00 | 193.74 |
| 472 | 476 | Kerala | Kasaragode | 1.52 | 279.07 | 28.2 | 59.6 | 18 | 98.3 | 96.7 | 87.4 | 1.57 | 79.80 | .00 | 108.45 |
| 473 | 480 | Goa | South Goa | 1.52 | 250.41 | 26.8 | 48.4 | 2 | 97.8 | 91.9 | 84.6 | 1.64 | 73.22 | 3.27 | 201.98 |
| 474 | 484 | Kerala | Kannur | 1.54 | 239.92 | 26.8 | 53.4 | 19 | 99.3 | 98.4 | 84.7 | 1.72 | 89.57 | .27 | 133.76 |
| 475 | 470 | TN | Madurai | 1.56 | 246.41 | 26.0 | 58.2 | 26 | 98.7 | 86.1 | 99.5 | 1.51 | 69.93 | 14.84 | 134.91 |
| 476 | 479 | Karnataka | Kodagu | 1.58 | 279.42 | 18.8 | 70.6 | 22 | 100.0 | 67.7 | 94.8 | 1.64 | 72.53 | .00 | 169.92 |
| 477 | 472 | TN | Tirunelveli | 1.58 | 242.82 | 24.5 | 51.4 | 7 | 99.6 | 82.0 | 95.5 | 1.54 | 68.50 | .00 | 115.44 |
| 478 | 487 | Pondicherry | Karaikal | 1.60 | 272.03 | 25.3 | 53.5 | 6 | 98.9 | 93.1 | 92.3 | 1.86 | 75.28 | 1.42 | 301.30 |

| RCHR | COMR | STATE | DISTRICT | RCHI | CWR | PBO3P | CUAM | GMI8 | PPANC | PDHI | PCWCI | COMI | FLR | PVNCPR | ANM |
|------|------|-------------|--------------------|------|--------|-------|------|------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|--------|--------|
| 479 | 466 | TN | Namakkal | 1.61 | 216.97 | 19.9 | 42.2 | 13 | 99.5 | 86.9 | 95.8 | 1.44 | 57.04 | .00 | |
| 480 | 477 | TN | Thanjavur | 1.61 | 247.29 | 25.4 | 56.8 | 13 | 98.0 | 88.4 | 94.8 | 1.61 | 76.07 | 2.96 | 106.61 |
| 481 | 483 | Kerala | Palakkad | 1.62 | 251.50 | 20.8 | 61.6 | 10 | 98.1 | 93.4 | 75.1 | 1.67 | 79.31 | .00 | 118.00 |
| 482 | 467 | Karnataka | Hassan | 1.62 | 250.61 | 19.7 | 75.1 | 15 | 97.2 | 60.4 | 92.8 | 1.46 | 59.32 | .00 | 100.72 |
| 483 | 493 | Maharashtra | Greater Bombay | 1.62 | 252.47 | 29.9 | 63.2 | 8 | 96.8 | 93.1 | 90.5 | 2.02 | 82.71 | .00 | 351.67 |
| 484 | 474 | TN | Chengalpattu | 1.64 | 252.25 | 19.6 | 53.4 | 10 | 99.3 | 83.2 | 95.7 | 1.56 | 68.23 | 16.77 | 138.26 |
| 485 | 473 | Assam | Jorhat | 1.67 | 295.89 | 20.6 | 72.0 | 8 | 97.9 | 75.6 | 94.9 | 1.55 | 72.54 | 9.08 | 70.59 |
| 486 | 491 | Goa | North Goa | 1.76 | 233.74 | 18.3 | 52.0 | 4 | 98.7 | 95.2 | 90.9 | 1.99 | 77.29 | .00 | 283.39 |
| 487 | 485 | TN | Coimbatore | 1.77 | 233.42 | 14.9 | 56.6 | 16 | 98.9 | 92.8 | 91.7 | 1.74 | 69.80 | .00 | 148.62 |
| 488 | 494 | Pondicherry | Pondicherry | 1.79 | 258.72 | 20.0 | 60.2 | 4 | 100.0 | 91.9 | 96.0 | 2.10 | 71.84 | .00 | 384.16 |
| 489 | 488 | TN | Kanniyakumari | 1.79 | 226.09 | 17.3 | 54.8 | 0 | 98.2 | 89.2 | 90.7 | 1.91 | 85.38 | .00 | 153.40 |
| 490 | 486 | Kerala | Wayanad | 1.79 | 291.11 | 16.7 | 71.5 | 8 | 99.5 | 97.7 | 82.3 | 1.86 | 80.80 | 1.08 | 149.08 |
| 491 | 490 | WB | Calcutta | 1.81 | 191.80 | 26.4 | 78.7 | 20 | 98.3 | 91.4 | 82.9 | 1.97 | 77.95 | .00 | 244.67 |
| 492 | 478 | TN | Periyar | 1.81 | 203.58 | 13.6 | 55.9 | 14 | 100.0 | 82.6 | 95.7 | 1.62 | 55.26 | .00 | 126.28 |
| 493 | 492 | Kerala | Kozhikode | 1.86 | 254.65 | 19.2 | 70.8 | 14 | 100.0 | 98.9 | 90.9 | 2.00 | 88.86 | .14 | 159.47 |
| 494 | 489 | TN | Nilgiri | 1.90 | 235.41 | 14.7 | 66.0 | 9 | 98.4 | 86.0 | 99.2 | 1.94 | 73.39 | .00 | 196.42 |
| 495 | 503 | Pondicherry | Mahe | 1.96 | 226.08 | 16.0 | 60.4 | 3 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 94.2 | 2.50 | 96.40 | .00 | 421.56 |
| 496 | 495 | Kerala | Thrissur | 2.04 | 230.55 | 13.4 | 69.5 | 2 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 90.5 | 2.17 | 89.94 | .00 | 173.09 |
| 497 | 497 | TN | Madras/Chennai | 2.06 | 199.98 | 13.8 | 62.6 | 6 | 99.2 | 99.2 | 98.9 | 2.22 | 75.32 | .00 | 286.64 |
| 498 | 496 | Kerala | Idukki | 2.06 | 259.52 | 12.6 | 81.8 | 2 | 98.0 | 93.3 | 90.8 | 2.20 | 85.04 | 2.09 | 211.68 |
| 499 | 498 | Kerala | Thiruvananthapuram | 2.10 | 238.85 | 8.5 | 78.1 | 3 | 99.5 | 99.5 | 81.6 | 2.23 | 86.26 | .00 | 199.11 |
| 500 | 502 | Kerala | Koyyayam | 2.10 | 233.01 | 9.7 | 78.9 | 0 | 99.4 | 99.4 | 79.1 | 2.44 | 94.45 | .00 | 304.33 |
| 501 | 499 | Kerala | Kollam | 2.18 | 236.47 | 5.5 | 75.1 | 2 | 100.0 | 99.0 | 90.6 | 2.27 | 88.60 | .00 | 169.13 |
| 502 | 501 | Kerala | Ernakulam | 2.20 | 233.06 | 5.9 | 73.3 | 0 | 100.0 | 99.4 | 93.4 | 2.40 | 90.96 | .00 | 235.66 |
| 503 | 500 | Kerala | Alappuzha | 2.24 | 220.49 | 8.0 | 74.2 | 0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 97.3 | 2.37 | 91.14 | 6.96 | 204.68 |
| 504 | 504 | Kerala | Pathanamthitta | 2.28 | 209.52 | 1.9 | 73.1 | 0 | 98.9 | 99.4 | 91.4 | 2.54 | 93.71 | .00 | 273.49 |

ANNEX 2

METHOD OF COMPUTING DISTRICT DEVELOPMENT INDICES

Development being a multi-dimensional phenomenon is difficult to capture by any single development indicator. Most often, per capita income is suggested as an overall measure of economic development. This measure of development has often been subjected to lot of criticism for its inherent limitations and accounting problems in the Indian context (Gopaldaswamy, 1983). Nevertheless, the non-availability of even such a limited measure of development at the district level constrains us in investigating the linkages between development and demographic patterns.

Furthermore, sectoral aspects of economic development may depict varied linkages with the demography parameters. Thus, a truer nature of linkages between different demographic parameters and varied composition of gross domestic product or labour force would also be worthwhile to investigate. For the purpose, this study has elicited district level economic developmental indicators highlighting sectoral aspects of economic development. The database on developmental indicators is primarily drawn from the Centre for Monitoring Indian Economy district level indicators. Data on 14 such developmental variables for all the districts of India have been drawn from the CMIE reports. Districts in Assam, Arunachal Pradesh, Manipur, Tripura, Sikkim, etc. in the Northeastern region, got excluded because of non-availability of the data.

A vector of fourteen developmental indicators, for each of the 354 districts is selected to highlight the aggregate and sectoral aspects of development. Basic indicators are selected to reflect the sectoral aspects of development, viz. agricultural, manufacturing and tertiary, at the district level.

Factor scores are elicited for all the districts depicting underlying sectoral dimensions of development and thereby the factor scores for overall economic development are also elicited by a weighted average of the sectoral aspects of development. A brief description of the varimax rotated factor structure of the 14 underlying development indicators is presented as follows:

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR STRUCTURE FOR DEVELOPMENTAL VARIABLES

The factorial approach starts with the correlation matrix of the original set of 14 development variables and elicits factors, which account for the inter-district variations among the variables in descending order of magnitude. The number of factors retained in the factor structure is subjected to the Kaiser's criterion of Eigen value greater than unity. It may be noted that the contribution of the rotated factor structure to be variance explained may not necessarily be in the descending order of magnitude as in the case of principal factor solution. The rotated factor structure is presented in Table A2.1.

A perusal of the varimax rotated factor solution reveals that the First Factor (F-1) represents extent of 'Agricultural Activity' as it is basically constituted by per hectare fertilizer consumption (PHFC), per capita food production (PCFP), percent gross irrigated area to gross cropped area (PGIAGCA) percent net sown area to geographical area (PNSAGA), etc. The factor loading of these variables are much higher on the factor compared to other industrial or tertiary sectoral developmental indicators.

The Second Factor (F-II) is identified as 'Industrial Development' because its predominant constituent variables are extent of employment in factories (ADEFPLA), employment in household industry per lakh population (EHHIPLP), extent of electrification (PVE), and extent of overall literacy (LITPTP).

The Third Factor (F-III) is identified as 'Tertiary Sector Development because of its relatively much higher factor loading on bank advances to the service sector (PCBASS), per capita bank deposits (PCBD), literacy (LITPTP), and extent of urbanization (URBTPT).

TABLE A2.I: VARIMAX ROTATED FACTOR STRUCTURE OF DISTRICT LEVEL DEVELOPMENT INDICATORS

| Var No | Abridged Name | Factor Loadings | | | Communality |
|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|
| | | I (AGR) | II (IND) | III (TER) | |
| 1 | PNASGA | .52(.19) | .36(.20) | -.26(.06) | .46 |
| 2 | PGIAGCA | .73(.27) | -.18(.09) | .02(.00) | .56 |
| 3 | PHFC | .85(.32) | .24(.13) | .10(.02) | .79 |
| 4 | ACFP | .83(.31) | -.00(.00) | -.09(.02) | .70 |
| 5 | ANR | -.54(.20) | .31(.18) | -.00(.00) | .39 |
| 6 | PVE | .40(.15) | .62(.35) | .34(.08) | .66 |
| 7 | EHHIPLP | -.05(.02) | .52(.29) | -.12(.03) | .28 |
| 8 | ADEFPLP | -.10(.04) | .60(.34) | .38(.09) | .51 |
| 9 | PCBCAI | -.01(.00) | .21(.12) | .72(.18) | .56 |
| 10 | BOPLP | .02(.01) | .07(.04) | .79(.20) | .63 |
| 11 | PCBD | .01(.00) | -.07(.04) | .94(.23) | .88 |
| 12 | PCBASS | -.04(.01) | -.18(.10) | .77(.19) | .63 |
| 13 | LITPTP | -.16(.06) | .56(.31) | .61(.15) | .71 |
| 14 | PURBP | -.00(.00) | .22(.12) | .81(.20) | .71 |
| Eigen-Value | | 2.71 | 1.77 | 4.00 | |

- Notes:* 1. Figures in brackets are the factor score coefficients
2. Factor I: Extent of Agricultural Development
3. Factor II: Extent of Industrial Development
4. Factor III: Extent of Tertiary Sector Development.

DISTRICT LEVEL DEVELOPMENT FACTOR SCORES

The three factor scores (m=3) for all the districts representing three sectoral aspects of economic development are estimated. It may be of interest to mention that the three factor scores can be combined to obtain a weighted aggregate index reflecting overall economic development.

The aggregate development index (DDIO) was calculated by assigning weights to the sectoral factor scores in proportion to the Eigen values of the three factors. The pattern of weights is in close correspondence with the conventional approach of assigning weights to different sectors in proportion to their percentage contribution towards the gross domestic product (GDP), namely, agricultural (.32), industrial (.21), and services (.47). Interestingly, the rank order correlation between the aggregate development index and per capita gross domestic product at state level turns out to be .96. Furthermore, the correlation coefficient between DDIO

and per capita income for 87 districts in 1991 turns out to be highly significant. Thus, a validation of DDIO the depicting overall economic development at district level seems well justified.