



ENGENDERED ACCESS OF ENGENDERED CARE: EVIDENCE FROM A MAJOR INDIAN HOSPITAL

Dr. Satyabrata Mishra

Associate Prof. and HOD, P.G. Department of Environmental Economics, M.P.C. (A) College, Takhatpur, Baripada, Mayurbhanj, Odisha.

Introduction

A central feature of many developing countries is the presence of significant gender differentials in health outcomes. Two potential factors that can account for this are that female's access treatment later than males and that they receive differential care at the medical facility. This paper explores both of these in the context of eye care. The paper studies diagnostic and surgical outcomes of 60,000 patients who sought treatment over a three-month period in 2012 at the Aravind Eye Hospital in Madurai, Tamil Nadu. The results show that at presentation, women have worse diagnoses than men for indicators of symptomatic illness.

To resolve gender-based health inequalities in developing countries, we need to know where these inequalities lie. This paper finds them in access but not care. The findings suggest that women seek treatment later than men for symptomatic illness. That no such gender differential exists for asymptomatic diseases suggests that women do not necessarily go for regular preventive check-ups at a lower frequency than men.

Many developing countries display significant gender differentials in health outcomes. The most dramatic evidence of this is excess female mortality, as seen in the low ratio of women to men, notably in India and in China (Coale 1991; Coale et al 1983). This excess mortality is not confined to newborns (or prenatal selection by gender) and infants. Recent research by Anderson and Ray (2010, 2012) as well as the 2011 World Development Report (World Bank 2011) argues that the bulk of excess female mortality in India and sub-Saharan Africa is at older ages, not just at birth, infancy and early childhood as previously emphasized (Das Gupta 2005; Deaton 1989; Garg and Morduch 1998; Jha et al 2006; Oster, 2009; Pande and Yazbeck 2003; Sudha and Rajan 2002). This suggests that gender bias in health outcomes is pervasive and spans several age groups.

Presumably, there are numerous underlying pathways for these discrepancies, ranging from differential care at home to differential medical care once treatment is sought, not to mention other intervening factors, such as diet, stress and occupational structure. The main objective of this paper is to study one possible factor, but a fundamental one; namely, that females seek treatment later than males. We contrast this pathway with the hypothesis that females receive differential care at the medical facility. We do so by studying eye care in a major Indian hospital.

Three factors motivate our focus on eye care. First, there is the intrinsic importance of vision: it directly affects productivity and well-being. But of course eye care is not alone in this regard. The second factor - and in this respect eye disease is truly distinct - is that different aspects of it, such as visual acuity, myopia, cataract onset or glaucoma, are measurable with relatively high precision. Using these objective measures of disease intensity, it is possible to evaluate the extent to which eye health has deteriorated at the time of seeking care. Third, some eye diseases are perceived as they evolve, while others are not. The most obvious example of a symptomatic disease is the deterioration of vision: loss of acuity is immediately and directly linked to the perception of that deterioration. On the other hand, conditions such as glaucoma are asymptomatic until the disease has reached an advanced stage.

This distinction allows us to separate two notions of gender based neglect in the seeking of care. One is that females do not go for regular, preventive check-ups at the same frequency as males. In this case we would expect to see across-the-board discrepancies in the severity of illness (conditional on presentation at a care facility) irrespective of the symptomatic nature of the disease. On the other hand, if there is gender-based delay only in responding to the perceived onset of illness, we should expect to observe gender differences in disease progression at the time of presentation for symptomatic diseases, but no such differences for asymptomatic diseases.¹ To a large extent, our data allows us to do just that.

Literature

Our paper contributes to an existing literature that documents gender differences in treatment at medical facilities. One approach in this literature presents healthcare professionals with hypothetical cases in which the gender of the patient is varied.⁴ Our study has more in common with research that uses real-world, clinical records to examine this question. Much of this previous research has occurred using data in the United States and other high income countries. This literature generally indicates that women receive worse care (Ayanian and Epstein (1991); Chang et al (2007); Daly et al (2006); Schulman et al



(1999); Steingart et al (1991)). However, as recognized by Chandra and Staiger (2012), differences in treatment may not reflect prejudice by providers but rather accurate knowledge that the benefits to treatment vary by gender and race. For instance, they find that women receive less heart attack treatment than males, but argue that this may not reflect prejudice as women receive lower benefits from such treatment.

The importance of prejudicial or unequal treatment by health care professionals may be even more important in developing countries, where salient gender differences in the ratio of surviving females to males are more pronounced, and where norms and laws may do less to protect women against discrimination. However, there is relatively little research using administrative hospital records to examine differences in health treatment in developing countries.⁵The evidence in developing countries on unequal treatment is complicated by the fact that women often arrive at healthcare facilities in worse health than men. In addition to controlling for initial health condition in our regression analysis, we address this issue by examining gender differences in outcomes for symptomatic versus asymptomatic eye diseases.

Data Sample

We use data from the Aravind Eye Hospital (Aravind, for short) - an extraordinary network of eye care facilities based in Madurai, Tamil Nadu. Aravind has four main channels of service provision in the region: rural field camps set up on an ad hoc basis (usually over weekends), vision centres in semirural areas, and two state-of-the-art hospitals located in Madurai, one heavily subsidized, and the other providing services at market rates. The volume is enormous: close to a million patients, on average, have been served every year for 36 years. The economic philosophy of Aravind uses high end facilities in medical care to subsidize more Spartan approaches, without stinting in any way on the medical care itself. This approach has been much studied in both developed and developing countries as a business model (several case studies of Aravind exist, including one developed at the Harvard Business School).

Our database of over 60,000 patients is drawn from the Madurai district catchment area between May and August of 2012. The data span the paid hospital and subsidised hospital in the district capital, Madurai, as well as numerous vision centres and eye camps that operated in the region over this period. Specifically, there is information on: (i) a population of 13,422 new outpatients arriving at vision centres between June-August, recording the initial diagnosis as well as vision corrections, if any; (ii) a random sample of 16,155 new outpatients arriving at field camps, the paid hospital and the subsidised hospital between May-July, recording the initial diagnosis as well as any vision corrections that were made; (iii) a population of 29,591 cataract patients, whose surgeries were performed in the paid and subsidised hospitals between June August, recording the details of the surgical procedure that was followed, as well as subsequent follow-up; and (iv) a subsample of 1,000 glaucoma patients, who first registered between 2007-10.

Measures of Illness

Using the first group of measures outlined below, we examine whether symptomatic visual impairments and eye disease are more severe for women than men at presentation. The second group of measures - corrective procedures - allows us to investigate gender differentials in medical treatment. The third group of measures, pertaining to asymptomatic ocular disease, permits us to explore gender differences in general (or preventive) eye care.

I. Symptomatic Ocular Disease

Visual acuity, which measures the ability to see, is tested for all outpatients using the Snellen Tumbling-E eye chart. We convert this measure into a continuous variable with range (0,1), where 1 is perfect (i.e., 6/6 or 20/20) vision and 0 corresponds to cases in which only hand movement, finger counts or light could be perceived at best. Rather than reporting outcomes for each eye separately, we follow the common convention of taking the maximum of right- and left-eye visual acuity. Our measure can be roughly interpreted as the relative distance at which the patient would have to be located in order to see as clearly as a person with perfect vision.

In addition to visual acuity, we examine cataract. A cataract is a clouding of the eye lens typically manifested at later ages (50+). As in more routine vision problems that need correction, cataract is symptomatic except perhaps in its earliest stage. Outpatients are routinely examined by ophthalmologists who diagnose cataract and advise surgery. Diagnosis and surgery advice are measured as binary variables. Pinhole visual acuity, which is an additional indicator of centrally located, advanced cataract, is also recorded; the measure parallels our index of visual acuity.

II. Medical Care

We record best-corrected vision, which is visual acuity after refractive correction, as well as pinhole visual acuity after cataract surgery. We use three measures for cataract surgery patients: time elapsed between admission and surgery (for



patients who were operated on the same day as admission), whether 'the patient spent the previous night at the hospital, surgery duration, and the surgeon's medical qualifications. Finally, we have two measures of cataract patient follow-up: whether or not there were post-operative complications and whether or not the patient came later than their instructed post-operative appointment, typically scheduled for one month following the operation.

III. Asymptomatic Ocular Disease:

Glaucoma, an eye condition resulting in damage of the optic nerve, is asymptomatic until quite an advanced stage,⁶ whereupon it leads to progressive and irreversible loss of vision. The early stages of glaucoma are highly correlated with the results of different tests, such as measurement of the cup-to-disc ratio, scores on a visual fields test, and so on. We record this information.

Empirical Specification

We estimate the following regression model:

$$y_i = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Female}_i + \beta_2 \text{Age}_i + \beta_3 Z_i + \beta_4 Z_i * \text{Female}_i + \epsilon_i$$

where y_i is the outcome of interest for patient i , "Female" is a dummy variable equal to 1 if patient i is female, "Age" is the patient's age in years, and Z_i is a vector consisting of three dummy variables indicating whether the patient presented at a field camp, at the subsidised hospital or at a vision centre, taking the paid hospital as the baseline. We permit two-way interactions between location dummies and the gender variable. Our main coefficients of interest are β_1 and β_4 which indicate whether or not there exists a gender differential and whether this differential is exacerbated or ameliorated in camps, vision centres and subsidised hospitals, relative to the paid hospital. In the cataract surgery regressions, we include additional controls pertaining to the patient's general health status prior to surgery.⁷

We estimate all reported regression equations with ordinary least squares. In the case of binary dependent variables, this amounts to estimating a linear probability model, but probit and logit regressions produce qualitatively equivalent results. In each of our tables, robust standard errors are reported in parentheses under the coefficient estimates.

Symptomatic Ocular Disease

Table 1 examines correlates of symptomatic ocular disease. Columns 1-2 consider all new outpatients, columns 3-5 consider new outpatients aged 41 +, and column 6 considers all cataract surgery patients. In these and all succeeding tables, each column records the coefficient estimates of a separate regression, the dependent variable of which is mentioned in the column heading. Explanatory variables are mentioned in the row headings.

Table 1: Correlates of Symptomatic Ocular Disease

	Visual Acuity	Perfect	Sight	Surgery	Cataract	Pinhole
	w/o Glasses	Vision	Impaired	Advised	Diagnosed	Acuity
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Female	***-0.047 (0.010)	***-0.068 (0.014)	***0.050 (0.019)	0.018 (0.013)	***0.006 (0.002)	-0.010 (0.006)
Age	***-0.011 (0.000)	***-0.015 (0.000)	***0.015 (0.000)	***0.009 (0.000)	***0.005 (0.000)	***-0.005 (0.000)
Camp	***-0.049 (0.009)	0.003 (0.013)	***0.156 (0.017)	***0.167 (0.013)	***-0.022 (0.002)	***-0.166 (0.006)
Female* camp	***-0.048 (0.013)	**-.039 (0.017)	***0.082 (0.024)	***0.142 (0.019)	***0.006 (0.002)	-0.001 (0.008)
Subsidised hospital	***-0.085 (0.012)	***-0.071 (0.015)	***0.169 (0.023)	***0.310 (0.019)	***-0.021 (0.002)	***-0.102 (0.006)
Female* (subsidized)	0.012	0.007	-0.035	***0.068	***0.007	***-0.028



hospital)	(0.015)	(0.020)	(0.031)	(0.026)	(0.003)	(0.008)
Vision centre (VC)	***0.036	***0.075	***0.042	***-0.031	***0.260	
	(0.008)	(0.011)	(0.015)	(0.012)	(0.008)	
Female*(VC)	-0.002	0.005	0.029	-0.003	***0.045	
	(0.011)	(0.016)	(0.022)	(0.017)	(0.011)	
Constant	***1.114	***1.063	***-0.538	***-0.282	***-0.270	***1.033
	(0.008)	(0.012)	(0.024)	(0.020)	(0.012)	(0.012)
Observations	22,990	22,990	12,957	17,190	17,190	28,918
R-squared	0.393	0.366	0.128	0.154	0.233	0.090

In the regressions with outlet controls, "paid hospital- forms the baseline. Columns 1-2 pertain to the full sample of outpatients; the sample in columns 3-5 comprises outpatients aged 41+; the sample in column 6 comprises cataract surgery patients. Robust standard errors in parentheses, *p<0.10, **p<0.05, ***p<0.01.

Columns 1-3 consider three vision measures. Column 1 indicates that females come in with significantly lower visual acuity, the difference being around 8% of the mean, which is 0.61. Patients at the camps and subsidised hospital present with worse vision than at the paid hospital or the vision centres. Moreover, camps also exacerbate the gender differential. Because camps cater to the poorest patients, this suggests that both the average deficiency in vision and the gender differential are highest among the poor.

Column 2 shows that a significantly larger fraction of males present with perfect visual acuity scores.⁸ Once again, eye camp patients display an accentuated gender differential. Column 3 studies sight impairment, defined as a condition in which visual acuity is 2/6 or below. Females are approximately 5 percentage points more likely to be Sight-impaired. The difference is high, given that the average incidence of sight impairment is around 28%, and, yet again, gender differentials (as well as average impairment) are accentuated in the camps.

Columns 4-6 consider three other measures of symptomatic disease. The first is surgery advisement, which often (though not exclusively) has to do with cataract. Our second outcome is the diagnosis of cataract. Third, we record pinhole visual acuity in the full cataract surgery patient sample. The test is a measure of potential best vision,⁹ but if a cataract is advanced or centrally situated, the reduced light through the pinhole will lower patient score. Therefore, low acuity on the pinhole is correlated with advanced cataract, as well as real loss of potential vision, such as degeneration of the retina.

Column 4 indicates that females are significantly more likely to be recommended surgery than males. The insignificant "female effect" in the first row indicates that the baseline category of "paid hospital" does not exhibit any gender differential, but the positive and significant interaction terms for camps and the subsidised hospital indicate sizeable gender differentials in these locations. Column 5 studies the binary variable "cataract diagnosis". Once again we see that women are significantly more likely than men to be diagnosed with cataract, conditional on arrival at a clinic. The difference is present for all types of facilities, and is significantly higher at the vision centres. Finally, column 6 examines pinhole visual acuity among cataract surgery patients of all ages, prior to surgery. The location controls here refer to the place at which the patient initially presented as an out- and not paid hospital patients does not include vision centres. Again, the verdict is unambiguous: females have worse pinhole acuity than males and this gender gap is driven by subsidised hospital patient, which in our sample

It is remarkable that so many distinct indicators of care point to a unified conclusion: that females appear to seek medical care systematically later than males. We note that this conclusion stands irrespective of the incidence of such disease in the population at large. For instance, the results do not change in their interpretation even if women biologically tend to be afflicted by cataract to a far greater degree than men. All that matters is the stage of a symptomatic disease at which an individual seeks attention.

We note two qualifications. First, there may be sex-based differences in disease perception, in which case gender differentials would arise even without any discrimination. We are not aware of any study that examines this question, and see no reason to entertain such an assumption. Second, even in the absence of intrinsic differences, there may be differences in the



"technology of perception" induced by socioeconomic background. For instance, consider differential school attendance: lower female attendance might make for later detection. Similarly, differences in occupational structure could be related to differential rates in perception. These potentially important issues lie beyond the scope of the current paper.

Medical Care

It can be argued that gender health differentials are exacerbated by the discriminatory nature of the care itself. Table 2 explores this possibility. In column 1 of the table, there is no suggestion that best-corrected visual acuity after refractive correction in outpatients is worse for females than for males. Indeed, by this metric, females are actually better off than males in the paid and subsidised hospitals (the negative interaction terms offset the positive female effect for vision

Table 2: Correlates of Medical Care

	Best- corrected Vision (1)	Post -operative Vi,ual Acuity (2)	Stayed at Least One Night (3)	Surgery Wait If Same Day (4)	Surgery Duration (5)	Surgeon Is Medical Officer (6)	Post- operative Complications (7)	Late Follow- Up (8)
Female	**0.028 (0.012)	***-0.022 (0.007)	***-0.039 (0.012)	** -7.572 (3.407)	*-1.650 (0.977)	0.002 (0.005)	-0.003 (0.004)	0.003 (0.012)
Age	***-0.004 (0.000)	***-0.002 (0.000)	***-0.004 (0.001)	-0.256 (0.167)	-0.028 (0.057)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	***-0.001 (0.000)
High blood pressure		***-0.014 (0.004)	***-0.038 (0.013)	*5.905 (3.358)	0.632 (1.050)	0.005 (0.007)	0.002 (0.003)	-0.012 (0.009)
Cardiovascular condition		-0.007 (0.011)	**0.041 (0.021)	-5.848 (4.341)	** -2.681 (1.314)	0.008 (0.007)	-0.001 (0.007)	**0.041 (0.021)
Hypertension		0.012 (0.008)	0.015 (0.015)	***10.528 (3822)	0.878 (1.249)	0.004 (0.005)	**0.011 (0.005)	-0.021 (0.014)

Diabetes		-0.003 (0.008)	0.020 (0.014)	1.079 (3.752)	0.911 (1.212)	0.001 (0.005)	0.002 (0.005)	-0.010 (0.013)
Pinhole visual acuity		***0.353 (0.006)	***-0.192 (0.022)	***-21.077 (6666)	-1.002 (1.714)	**0.023 (0.010)	***-0.172 (0.007)	-0.019 (0.013)
Camp	***-0.149 (0.020)	***-0.220 (0.007)				***-0.467 (0.010)	***-0.027 (0.005)	***0.219 (0.013)
Female*camp	*-0.058 (0.031)	0.011 (0.008)				-0.019 (0.012)	-0.003 (0.005)	-0.018 (0.016)



Subsidised hospital	***-0.121	***-0.266				***-0.417	***-0.018	-0.023
	(0.030)	(0.007)				(0.009)	(0.004)	(0.014)
Female*(subsidised hospital)	0.033	0.008				** -0.026	-0.004	-0.026
	(0.043)	(0.009)				(0.012)	(0.005)	(0.017)
Vision centre	***0.125							
	(0.009)							
Female*(vision centre)	***-0.037							
	(0.012)							
Constant	***0.960	***0.529	***0.936	***165.472	***15.559	***0.954	***0.153	***0.345
	(0.010)	(0.013)	(0.039)	(12.968)	(3.952)	(0.020)	(0.011)	(0.027)
Observations	8,717	18,603	6,494	2,905	6,489	23,718	23,718	18,687
R-squared	0.257	0.427	0.019	0.010	0.001	0.187	0.082	0.059

The sample in column 1 contains all new outpatients. The sample in columns 2-9 contains cataract surgery patients. In the regressions without controls, "paid hospital" forms the baseline. Robust standard errors in parentheses, * p<0.10, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

centres and camps). Column 2 reports on visual acuity post-cataract surgery; the sample this time is the set of all cataract patients. Here, the results do indicate that women fare worse than men following surgery, holding constant their pre-surgery health characteristics.

Two factors might account for this difference relative to the results for best-corrected vision. First, while the disease in question may be reversible (e.g., cataract with no further complications), the medical staff have not done enough to reverse the gender differential that existed pre-surgery. Alternatively, the gap in post-operative acuity may reflect a deeper malaise with vision, such as retinal degeneration, which may have accompanied the cataract and caused irreversible damage.

While the data do not permit us to directly address the distinction, we can examine other aspects of the surgical process to see if there is any gender differential on those counts. The subsequent columns in Table 2 do this. Since hospital stay and medical treatment are likely to depend on the patient's prior medical condition, we control for pre-surgery health characteristics with the inclusion of pre-surgery visual acuity and four binary variables indicating whether (=1) or not (=0) a patient has high blood pressure, a cardiovascular condition, hypertension, or diabetes, prior to surgery.

Columns 3-5 capture the duration of patients' hospital stay and surgery (data available for the paid hospital). Column 3 suggests that females are less likely to spend an extra night as inpatients prior to surgery. Controlling for pre-surgical medical conditions and given that patients at this hospital are paying out of pocket, this possibly reflects the fact that women are less likely to register early at hospitals. By contrast, columns 4 and 5 explore decisions made by medical staff at the hospital. The results indicate that for patients whose surgery transpires on the same day as their hospital admission, females are moved faster to surgery, with a waiting time about seven minutes shorter than for men. Column 5 indicates that surgery times for women are slightly shorter than for men, but the difference is less than two minutes and is only significant at the 10% level.

Column 6 shows that females at the subsidised hospital are less likely to be operated upon by a full medical officer or senior medical officer than by less experienced fellows and "post graduate" residents who also perform surgery. This differential is absent in the paid hospital, and is insignificant for camps. Well over 50% of the sample is operated upon by a medical officer, so the gender differences at the subsidised hospital, while significant, are small. Still, one might be concerned that women face more post-operative complications as the result of being treated by less qualified surgeons. However, column 7 indicates that complications are practically non-existent, as are any gender differences in complications. This suggests that the



assignment of medical officers to patients corresponds to the complexity of the case rather than the gender of the patient. Finally, late follow-ups by patients are also a concern. The sample average is around 30% and significantly higher for the poorer patients who originally came in via the camps. But, as Column 8 indicates, there are no gender differentials to speak of.

We have already seen that gender differentials are high at the level of access. Following treatment, those differentials are non-existent or small. We must conclude that there is little evidence of differential treatment of males and females, though some differences in initial conditions appear to persist post-surgery.

Asymptomatic Disease

We study two indicators of glaucoma, a disease that is largely asymptomatic at an advanced (and irreversible) stage. One is the cup-disc ratio, used to assess progression. This ratio compares the diameter of the "cup" of the optic disc with the overall diameter of the disc. There is population variation in the ratio, but glaucoma causes the ratio to grow. A second indicator is IOP, which measures fluid pressure within the eye. Ocular hypertension refers to elevated values of IOP, and it is an important correlate of glaucoma.

Table 3 reports on gender differentials in these indicators among the patients in our sample. Note that with asymptomatic disease, population incidence does matter in interpreting the findings. Fortunately for our purposes, studies on gender as a risk factor for glaucoma are inconclusive. Previous research - Varma et al (2004); Hoffmann et al (2007); Quigley (1996); Klein et al (1992) - finds no association between sex and the prevalence of glaucoma,¹⁰ particularly for primary open-angle variety, the most common form of glaucoma. There is also little or no connection between the correlates of glaucoma that we examine here, and gender; see, for instance Senol (2003) and Mitchell et al (1996) for IOP,¹¹ and Huynh et al (2006) for cup-disc ratios. With that in mind, Table 3 suggests that when the disease in question is asymptomatic, as glaucoma in its

Table 3: Correlates of Glaucoma-Asymptomatic, Age 41+

	Cup-Disc Ratio		IOP	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Female	*-0.013 (0.007)	-0.102 (0.079)	-0.086 (0.078)	-0.020 (0.137)
Age	***0.002 (0.000)	***0.013 (0.004)	**0.010 (0.005)	**0.010 (0.005)
Camp			***0.245 (0.091)	*0.238 (0.134)
Female*camp				0.010 (0.169)
Subsidised hospital			***-1.690 (0.131)	***-1.515 (0.224)
Female* (subsidised hospital)				-0.315 (0.265)
Vision centre			***-1.754 (0.112)	***-1.720 (0.156)
Female* (vision centre)				-0.069 (0.226)
Constant	***0.635 (0.020)	***14.982 (0.262)	***15.809 (0.268)	***15.778 (0.266)
Observations	849	10,743	10,743	10,743
R-squared	0.058	0.001	0.053	0.054



The Cup Disc ratio sample (column 1) pertains only to glaucoma patients treated at hospitals. The IOP sample (columns 2-4) comprises new outpatients. In the regressions with outlet controls, "paid hospital" forms the baseline. Robust standard errors in parentheses, * $p < 0.10$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

early stages tends to be, there is no significant difference between males and females. Females in our glaucoma patient sample have a slightly lower cup-disc ratio (column 1) and there is no difference at all in IOP for outpatients (columns 2-4). Either individuals of both genders in India go in for preventive health check-ups at similar intervals, or more likely, they do not go in for such check-ups at all. In any event there is no discernible gender differential. In our opinion, this contrast between symptomatic and asymptomatic disease is an important finding.

Summary and Discussion

We document gender differentials in the seeking of eye care. Such differentials are significant along many dimensions. Females present with lower uncorrected visual acuity than males. They have a lower incidence of perfect vision. They are more likely to be sight-impaired. They are more likely to be advised surgery. They are more likely to be diagnosed for cataract. They have lower pinhole visual acuity, which is a separate indicator for the existence of disease quite apart from the need for refractive correction.

All these differences are robust to the inclusion of age as a control, as well as to the use of controls for different eye care facilities, entered with or without interaction with gender. We also observe that these indicators (for males and females together) are generally at their nadir at the eye camps, where at the same time the gender differentials for many of these indicators are at their widest. This is true even relative to the paid hospital, where the proportion of seriously ill patients could reasonably have been expected to be higher. This suggests that the poorest individuals, who predominantly seek treatment at the camps, have the lowest average rate of access and also the largest differential in access between males and females.

Yet, following the refractive correction that takes place during the visit, males and females do not differ significantly in their "best-corrected" visual acuity. In this respect, the medical facility appears to fully compensate for the initial gender discrepancy. That is not entirely the case, however, for post-operative visual acuity, where differences remain. Without further investigation, it is hard to say what causes the discrepancy in visual acuity after surgery. It could be irreversible disease, or lack of full compensation in care. To further investigate this, we look at other indicators of surgical care received: time to surgery, surgery duration, post-operative complications, and the seniority of medical personnel during operations.

Women in the paid hospital are less likely to be admitted at least one night before cataract surgery. This is likely to reflect the reluctance of the individual or family (rather than the doctor) to admit women into hospitals early. There is no gender differential in follow-up after surgery. As for treatment by hospital staff, female surgery outpatients are kept waiting for a shorter time than male outpatients between admission and surgery. While females are less likely to be treated by a medical officer in subsidised hospitals, this does not seem to have any repercussions in terms of surgical procedure. Surgery duration for females is marginally shorter, and there are no gender differentials in post-operational complications.

Finally, when the disease in question is asymptomatic, as glaucoma in its early stages tends to be, there is no significant difference between males and females. Neither a high cupdisc ratio nor [OP is significantly different across gender. That supports our presumption that for diseases that are initially asymptomatic, there is no significant difference between males and females at presentation. (We use secondary information to argue that there is not a large difference in the population to begin with.) It is precisely when a disease is linked to the direct perception of it, as in the case of bad eyesight that requires simple correction that males and females seem to present differently. On the assumption that perception itself is not gender-specific, males (or the parents of males) appear more responsive to their perceptions of ill-health.

Improving health outcomes in developing countries is, first and foremost, of central intrinsic importance. Resolving gender-based health inequalities remains at the forefront of development policy. However, we need to know where the inequalities lie. In particular, we need to understand whether inequality exists at the level of access or at the level of treatment. This paper takes a first step in that direction. To be sure, there are many other issues that are inextricably tied up at the intersection of economics, sociology, culture and health, which influence these differences and warrant further study.

Conclusion

At the time of presentation to an eye care facility, women have worse diagnoses than men across all available indicators of symptomatic illness. They have lower visual acuity and pinhole visual acuity, they are more likely to be sight-impaired, and are more likely to be advised surgery or diagnosed for cataract.² In contrast, males and females do not differ significantly in



their "best-corrected" visual acuity and there are no gender differences in other indicators of surgical care, including time to surgery, surgery duration, the incidence of post-operative complications, and the seniority of attending medical personnel.³ Finally, for asymptomatic disease, there is no significant difference between males and females for two correlates of glaucoma: intra-ocular eye pressure (IOP) and a high cup-to-disc ratio. The bias appears to lie in the differential seeking of care following illness, not in treatment.

References

1. Abufal, Akram, YoriGidron and Yaakov Henkin (2005): "Physicians' Attitudes toward Preventive Therapy for Coronary Artery Disease: Is There a Gender Bias?", *Clinical Cardiology*, 28(8): 389-93.
2. Anderson, Siwan and Debraj Ray (2010): "Missing Women: Age and Disease", *The Review of Economic Studies*, 77(4): 1262-1300.
3. (2012): "The Age Distribution of Missing Women in India", *Economic & Political Weekly*, 47: 87-95.
4. Ayanian, John Z and Arnold M Epstein (1991): "Differences in the Use of Procedures between Women and Men Hospitalised for Coronary Heart Disease", *New England Journal of Medicine*, 325 (4): 221-25.
5. Borooah, Vani K (2004): "Gender Bias among Children in India in Their Diet and Immunisation against Disease", *Social Science & Medicine*, 58(9): 1719-31.
6. Chandra, Amitabh and Douglas O Staiger (2012): "Identifying Provider Prejudice in Healthcare", mimeo, Harvard University.
7. Chang, Anna Marie, Bryn Mumma, Keara L Sease, Jennifer L Robey, Frances S Shofer and Judd E Hollander (2007): "Gender Bias in Cardiovascular Testing Persists after Adjustment for Presenting Characteristics and Cardiac Risk", *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 14(7): 599-605.
8. Coale, Ansley J (1991): "Excess Female Mortality and the Balance of the Sexes in the Population: An Estimate of the Number of 'Missing Females'", *The Population and Development Review*, 517-23.
9. Coale, Ansley J, Paul Demeny and Barbara Vaughan (1983): *Regional Model Life Tables and Stable Populations*, Vol 41 (New York: Academic Press).
10. Daly, Caroline, Felicity Clemens, Jose L Lopez Sendon, Luigi Tavazzi, Eric Boersma, Nicholas Danchin, Francois Delahaye, Anselm Gitt, Desmond Julian, David, Mulcahyet al (2006): "Gender Differences in the Management and Clinical Outcome of Stable Angina", *Circulation*, 113(4): 490-98.
11. Das Gupta, Monica (2005): "Explaining Asia's Missing Women: A New Look at the Data", *Population and Development Review*, 31(3): 529-35.