ELSEVIER



Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Public Health in Practice

journal homepage: www.sciencedirect.com/journal/public-health-in-practice

Association between child marriage and high blood glucose level in women: A birth cohort analysis

B.K. Datta^{a,b,*}, A. Tiwari^{a,c}, L. Glenn^d

^a Institute of Public and Preventive Health, Augusta University, Augusta, GA, USA

^b Department of Health Management, Economics and Policy, Augusta University, Augusta, GA, USA

^c Department of Community & Behavioral Health Sciences, Augusta University, Augusta, GA, USA

^d Department of Nursing Science, College of Nursing, Augusta University, Augusta, GA, USA

ARTICLE INFO	A B S T R A C T
<i>Keywords:</i> Marriage age Child marriage Blood glucose Hyperglycemia Women's health	Objectives: Child marriage prematurely forces girls (<18 years of age) to perform adult roles prior to physical and psychological maturity. Such precocious transitions to young adulthood can have consequences on their long-term health, however, limited work has examined such relationships to date. As such, this study examines whether child marriage is associated with the risk of having hyperglycemia, or high blood glucose, in adulthood. <i>Study design:</i> Observational study using repeated cross-sectional data. <i>Methods:</i> Using data from the 2015-16 and 2019-21 waves of the India National Family Health Survey, we matched 432,080 and 418,409 women, aged 20–49 years, by birth year and month to create birth cohorts. Fitting multivariable binomial and multinomial logistic models, we compared the odds of having hyperglycemia across groups by marriage age (i.e., before or after age 18 years) within respective birth cohorts. <i>Results:</i> We found that the adjusted odds of having high blood glucose among women married as children were 1.12 (95 % CI: 1.07–1.16) times that of their peers married as adults in the full-sample. The adjusted relative risks of having blood glucose levels higher than normal but lower than diabetic and diabetic ranges were 1.09 (95 % CI: 1.04–1.14) and 1.23 (95 % CI: 1.15–1.31), respectively, in comparison to blood glucose within normal range. These results were persistent across sub-groups of different birth cohorts. <i>Conclusion:</i> Our findings suggest that child marriage was associated with higher risk of having high blood glucose in women, later in life.

1. Introduction

Child marriage, defined as marriage before age 18 years, is a violation of human rights, with an estimated 650 million women currently alive to date married as children [1]. Extant literature documents that precocious transitions during developmental stages are associated with elevated risk of cardiometabolic disease and other health problems [2, 3]. Child marriage similarly represents a stressful transition from girlhood to womanhood [4], contributing to adverse health outcomes, along with dire implications for fertility, health and nutrition, economic opportunities, and decision making ability in adulthood [5].

The practice of child marriage is more prevalent in the developing world and is rooted in gender inequality, poverty, insecurity, and social norms [6,7]. As such, women in low-and-middle income countries (LMICs), from disadvantaged households and lower socioeconomic

status, are at greater risk of getting married at an early age [8]. Furthermore, onset of chronic conditions such as hypertension and diabetes, and the behavioral risk factors associated with these conditions have close links to the social determinants of health in both developed and developing countries [9,10]. As such, women married as children may have a relatively higher risk of noncommunicable diseases (NCDs), compared to their counterparts married as adults.

Beyond the scope of reproductive health outcomes, research on NCDs among women married as children, however, is limited [11]. Few recent studies have explored the relationship between child marriage and risk of hypertension among young adult women [12–15]. Another study assessed the risk of self-reported chronic conditions at midlife among women who were married as children [16]. Given the established association between psychosocial adversities in childhood and later life incidence of type 2 diabetes [17], it is plausible to extend this

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhip.2024.100556

Received 19 September 2023; Received in revised form 7 March 2024; Accepted 25 October 2024 Available online 28 October 2024

^{*} Corresponding author. Institute of Public and Preventive Health, Augusta University, 1120 15th St., CJ 2300, Augusta, GA, 30912, USA. *E-mail address:* bdatta@augusta.edu (B.K. Datta).

^{2666-5352/© 2024} The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd on behalf of The Royal Society for Public Health. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

relationship to contextual adversities, such as child marriage and its impact on the risk of hyperglycemia.

Two cross-sectional studies, have some evidence on the relationship between early marriage and the risk of having high blood glucose among women in India using data from the India National Family Health Survey (NFHS) [18,19]. One study found that child marriage was associated with high blood pressure and high blood glucose comorbidity among young adult women (aged 18-34 years) [18]. Another study reported that compared to women married during age 20-24 years, women married during early (age 10-14 years) and middle (age 15-17 years) adolescence had a higher risk of having high blood glucose [19]. These cross-sectional studies had a key limitation. Neither study accounted for the role of aging (i.e., growing older) in developing risk of hyperglycemia. Further, women of different age in the cross-sectional setting had differential likelihood of getting married in their childhood. The joint influence of these two aspects impeded obtaining a better estimate of the relationship between child marriage and hyperglycemia in the extant studies.

Successive waves of the NFHS allow for the creation of birth cohorts to examine high blood glucose outcomes over time within a cohort. This essentially means that we were able to observe women who were of similar age at two points of time and thereby facilitates offering a more compelling estimate of the relationship between child marriage and hyperglycemia. Data from India are of relevance, with 223 million women in the country married before reaching adulthood [20], and approximately 107 million diabetic and 255 million prediabetic adults [21]. As such, investigating the association between child marriage and high blood glucose among women has important public health implications in the Indian context. The primary aim of this observational study was to assess whether child marriage was associated with differential risk of high blood glucose level in women within birth cohorts. The secondary aim was to examine whether the association within birth cohorts changed over time.

2. Methods

2.1. Data

This was an observational study using repeated cross-sectional data from the 2015-16 and 2019-21 waves of the India National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4 & 5). The Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) Program, funded by the USAID, provided technical assistance in implementation of the NFHS [22,23]. The DHS program uses standard model questionnaires that are generally comparable across countries and the DHS datasets have been widely used to conduct public health research in the developing countries [24]. The NFHS-4 & 5 are nationally representative surveys that entail a two-stage stratified sampling framework; and covers rural and urban regions of all 36 states and union territories of India. The survey reports on various sociodemographic and anthropometric characteristics as well as several measures on reproductive-aged (i.e., age 15-49 years) women's health including random blood glucose level [22,23]. Our sample comprised of 850,489 married adult women, who were aged 20-47 years and 22-49 years during the 2015-16 and 2019-21 waves of the survey, respectively. Respondents were excluded if information was not available on age at 1969–1974 (oldest cohort), ii) 1975–1979, iii) 1980–1984, iv) 1985–1989, and v) 1990–1996 (youngest cohort). Each birth cohort spanned over five years except for the oldest and youngest cohorts, which had one or two additional years to include women who were otherwise not part of any other cohort.

Of note, we used publicly available anonymized secondary data for analysis. The datasets for this study meet the definition of National Institutes of Health (NIH) Exempt Human Subjects Research under the following exemption criteria - "Exemption 4: involves the collection/ study of data or specimens if publicly available, or recorded such that subjects can not be identified" [25]. The original survey protocol was reviewed and approved by the International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS) and ICF institutional review boards [22,23]. During both waves of the survey, written informed consents were obtained prior interview in the following manner. The interviewer read the informed consent statement that explained the purpose of the survey to the respondent. Participation in the survey was completely voluntary. If the respondent agreed to participate, the interviewer signed in the designated space in the paper questionnaire affirming that the informed consent statement had been read out to the respondent and that the respondent provided her consent to participate in the survey [26,27].

2.2. Measures

Respondents' random blood glucose was measured using the Free-Style Optium H (in NFHS-4) and Accu-Chek Performa (in NFHS-5) glucometer. Blood samples were collected by trained health investigators, who were part of the survey team [26,27]. A respondent was determined to have high blood glucose if random blood glucose levels were \geq 141 mg/dl [22,23]. Our primary outcome variable thus, was a dichotomous variable, *HBG*_{*i*} indicating whether a respondent had high blood glucose. In addition, we analyzed a secondary categorical outcome indicating multiple ranges of blood glucose measures, denoted by a polychotomous variable *RBG*_{*j*,*i*} as follows: i) normal range (\leq 140 mg/dl), iii) higher than normal but lower than diabetic range (141–199 mg/dl), and iii) diabetic range (\geq 200 mg/dl) [22,23,28].

We identified women who were married as children (i.e., before 18 years) or as adults (\geq 18 years) based on respondents' reported age at first marriage. Our key explanatory variable thus, is a dichotomous variable, *CM*_{*i*}, indicating whether a respondent was married as a child or as an adult.

2.3. Statistical analysis

We first estimated a set of multivariable logistic regressions to assess the relationship between child marriage and the risk of having high blood glucose for the full-sample (i.e., all birth cohorts together) as follows:

$$logit(HBG_i) = \alpha_0 + \alpha_1 CM_i + X_i \alpha_2 + Cohort + TLA + TLD + State$$
(1)

$$logit(HBG_i) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 CM_i + X_i\beta_2 + \beta_3 Year_i + Cohort + TLA + TLD + State$$
(2)

 $logit(HBG_i) = \gamma_0 + \gamma_1 CM_i + X_i \gamma_2 + \gamma_3 Year_i + \gamma_4 (CM_i \times Year_i) + Cohort + TLA + TLD + State$

marriage and valid blood glucose measure, including timing of the test. A flow diagram of the study population is provided in Supplementary Material Fig. S1. We matched birth year and month of women in the two survey waves to create five birth cohorts by year of birth as follows: i)

Equation (1) was estimated separately for the two survey waves. The exponentiated value of α_1 shows the odds of high blood glucose for child marriage in respective survey waves. *Cohort* and *State* are birth cohort fixed effects and state of residence fixed effects respectively. *TLA* and

(3)



Fig. 1. Differences in prevalence of high blood glucose by child marriage, birth cohort, and survey year Note: The solid blue vertical line shows the prevalence for all women married as adults in respective survey waves. The dashed pink vertical line shows the prevalence for all women married in childhood in respective survey waves. Differences (between women married as children and as adults) were statistically significant for all birth cohorts in the NFHS-5. Differences were statistically significant for the 1975–1979 and 1980–1984 birth cohorts in the NFHS-4. Overall difference (i.e., the gap between the solid and dashed line) was statistically significant in both survey waves. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the Web version of this article.)

TLD are sets of dummy variables indicating time last ate and time last drank (other than water), respectively, before blood glucose test. Categories of *TLA* and *TLD* are provided in supplementary file 2.

 X_i is a vector of potential confounders including sociodemographic characteristics and risk factors for type-2 diabetes. The sociodemographic correlates included educational attainment, household wealth index quintiles, religion, caste, and urban/rural residence. The risk factors included body mass index (BMI) categories, tobacco smoking, parity (number of children born), pregnancy status, and lactating mother status [29]. These are the common set of correlates used in extant literature on determinants of diabetes among women in India [30]. Observations, for which data on sociodemographic correlates and risk factors were missing (n = 1710), were excluded from the adjusted analysis. Of note, our intention was not to assess these sociodemographic correlates as predictors of high blood glucose outcomes in women, but to include these correlates in the model to control for any confounding relationship and thereby to obtain an unbiased estimate of the relationship between child marriage and high blood glucose levels. However, we estimated separate logistic regression models for each of the sociodemographic characteristics and risk factors for sub-groups of women married as adults and as children to see if the associations were similar (or different) across the two groups. These results are presented in supplementary file 3.

Equations (2) and (3) were estimated for the pooled sample (i.e., both survey waves together). *Year_i* is a binary variable indicating survey wave 2019-21. The coefficient β_3 in equation (2) and γ_3 in equation (3) refers to the odds of having high blood glucose during 2019-21 compared to that during 2015-16. The coefficient γ_1 in equation (3) refers the odds of having high blood glucose for women in the 2015-16 wave, who were married as children. The coefficient γ_4 indicates whether the odds of high blood glucose for child marriage among women in the 2019-21 wave were different from that among women in the 2015-16 wave.

To achieve the power of 0.90 for an effect size (odds ratio) of 1.10,

probability of married as children being 0.40, and probability of high blood glucose among women married as adults being 0.07, the required sample size was estimated to be 70,562 [31]. For the model with interactions between child marriage and survey wave, the required sample size was estimated to be 272,827 [32]. As such, our sample size of 850, 489 (432,080 in the 2015-16 wave and 418,409 in the 2019-21 wave) was adequate to assess the differences between the two groups.

Next we estimated multinomial logistic regression models, similar to equation (3), where the outcome variable was $RBG_{j,i}$ with three categories ($j \in \{1,2,3\}$) of blood glucose ranges. Replacing the binary outcome with a categorical outcome served as a sensitivity analysis. The normal range was considered as the base outcome. Relative to the base outcome, we assessed the risk of having blood glucose levels in the "higher than normal but lower than diabetic" and "diabetic" ranges for women married as children. Regressions were estimated for the full sample as well as for sub-samples of each of the five birth cohorts.

Next, to assess a possible causal relationship between child marriage and risk of elevated blood glucose level later in life, we employed an instrumental variable regression approach. We instrumented the binary child marriage indicator with respondent's mother-in-law's years of education to estimate two-stage least squares (2SLS) regression. We estimated 2SLS linear probability models (LPM) that corresponded to equations (1)-(3) for women who had their mother-in-law living with them in the same household. The rationale behind mother-in-law's years of education being a valid instrument for child marriage was that the lower the years of education of a mother-in-law the higher is the probability of her choosing an underaged (i.e., age <18 years) girl as daughter-in-law. The exclusion restriction was satisfied under the assumption that after controlling for household environment, motherin-law's years of education impacted daughter-in-law's risk of elevated blood glucose level only through the event of daughter-in-law's marriage in childhood. In other words, accounting for household environment blocked any potential backdoor paths through which mother-inlaw's education might influence daughter-in-law's elevated blood

Descriptive statistics.

All Auried as Adults Auried as Adults Auried as Adults (Pepoints) Children N N S 33.664 N S 33.664 N S 33.664 Birth cohorts N S 33.664 N S 33.664 N S 34.628 Birth cohorts S 35.489 N S 33.664 N S 34.628 N S 34.628 Birth cohorts S 35.481 C 10.57 15.57 15.77 16.79 2.02*** 1995-1970 145.662 83.054 63.628 17.25 16.17 18.89 2.72*** 1996-1984 172.334 100.506 71.828 2.020 2.600 2.1.92 -4.98^{**} 1996-1996 211.964 18.81.0 13.8.10 2.3.21 2.4.00 44.99 0.09*** Covariacts E E E E E E Indiantion 14.55 15.157 2.3.21 2.4.00 44.99 0.60*** Secondary 36.5.06 24.815 11		Count			Share (%)			Difference: married as children & as adults	
N = Bold, 489 N = 340, 628 N = 80, 489 N = 340, 628 N = 340, 628 Bith colors 550, 489 N = 340, 628 N = 340, 628 1969-1974 132, 414 75, 857 5, 557 15, 57 14, 77 16, 79 2, 02*** 1980-1984 172, 334 63, 650 15, 57 14, 77 18, 89 2, 72*** 1980-1986 187, 05 116, 107 70, 988 20, 26 10, 50 -1, 53*** 1990-1996 119, 64 138, 140 73, 824 24.92 26.89 21.92 -4, 98*** Covariates Covariates U 22.28 62.086 31.42 12.09 18, 75 66.65*** Secondary 28, 522 79, 878 6045 10.10 15.55 1.79 -13, 76*** Secondary 36, 552 99, 78 6045 10.10 15.55 1.79 -13, 76*** Secondary 26, 526 26, 14 13.09 73, 77 20.22 21.19 1.30, 91*** Secondary		All	Married as Adults	Married as Children	All	Married as Adults	Married as Children	(%-points)	
Birth cohorts 1969-1974 132,414 75,857 56,557 15.57 14.77 16.79 2.02*** 1975-1979 146,658 83,054 63,6528 17.25 16.17 18.89 2.72*** 1980-1984 172,334 100,506 71,828 20.26 19.57 21.33 1.76*** 1980-1985 1989 187,095 116,107 70,988 22.00 22.60 21.06 -1.53^{***} 1990-1996 211,964 138,140 73,824 24.92 26.89 21.92 -4.98^{***} Covariates Covariates Covariates Education 274,832 123,285 151,547 32.31 24.00 44.99 20.99*** Filmary 125,528 62,086 63,142 14.72 12.09 18.75 6.66*** Secondary 364,506 248,415 116,091 42.86 48.36 34.47 -13.90^{***} Higher 85,923 79,878 6045 10.10 15.55 1.79 -13.76^{***} Wealth Index Quintiles It (Poores) 170,310 84,753 85,557 20.02 16.50 25.40 8.90*** 2nd (Model) 177,106 103,729 73,377 20.82 20.19 21.76 1.59*** 4th (Richer) 166,530 109,295 57,235 19.58 21.28 16.99 -4.29^{***} 5th (Richer) 166,530 109,295 57,235 19.58 21.28 16.99 -4.29^{***} 5th (Richer) 166,530 109,295 57,235 19.58 21.28 16.99 -4.29^{***} 5th (Richer) 166,530 109,205 57,235 19.58 21.28 16.99 -4.29^{***} 5th (Richer) 166,530 109,205 57,235 19.58 21.28 10.90 -4.29^{***} 5th (Richer) 162,500 109,205 57,235 19.58 21.28 10.90 -4.29^{***} 5th (Richer) 162,530 109,205 57,235 19.58 21.28 10.45 -12.47^{***} Religion Hindu 647,011 377,278 269,733 76.08 73.45 80.08 6.63*** Musilin 104,501 63,063 41,438 12.29 12.28 12.30 0.03 Christian 57,730 42,821 14,909 6.79 8.34 44.3 -3.91^{***} Other 41,247 30,502 10,745 4.85 5.94 3.19 -2.75^{***} Case None 208,900 139,692 69,208 24.56 27.20 20.55 -6.65^{***} Scheduled cate 157,702 86,855 70,847 17.83 18.48 16.85 -1.63^{***} Mindim (247,013 360,826 266,490 73.76 70.25 79,12 8.87^{***} Coher 208,900 139,692 40,355 26.24 29.75 20.88 -8.87^{***} Coher 21,247 30,502 20,735 26.24 29.75 20.88 -8.87^{***} Coher 12,85 69,904 53,552 14.88 13.64 16.77 3.13^{***} Core Core 21,245 69,904 53,552 14.88 13.64 16.77 3.13^{***} Core 23,017 152,695 90,904 55,557 70,19.26 20.28 17.72 -2.55^{***} Core 23,019 51,697 32,852 18,84		N = 850,489	N = 513,664	N = 340,628	N = 850,489	N = 513,664	N = 340,628		
1969-1974132,41475,85756,55715,5714,7716,792.02***1975-197914,6273,8071,82812,0213,5121,301,76***1985-1989187,09511,61,0770,98822,0022,6021,08-1,53***1985-1989187,09511,61,0770,98822,0022,6021,08-1,53***CovariatsEutactionPrimary252,8252,8651,54732,3124,0044,990.09***Secondary364,50648,41516,09142,8648,3634,47-13,0***Secondary364,50648,41516,09142,8648,3634,47-13,0***Secondary165,570.0216,5025,409,0***Add(Male)10,372973,37720,8220,1921,7815,9***Add(Nale)17,10610,72973,37720,8220,1910,894,29***Colspan="4">Secondary38,29419,5821,2810,69-4,29***Add(Nale)17,71010,37226,97,3376,0873,4580,086,63***Colspan="4">C	Birth cohorts								
1975-197914.6.6283.05463.02817.2516.1718.892.72***1980-1984172,334100,50671,82822.0022.6021.08-1.53***1990-1996211,06138,14073,82424.9226.8921.92-4.98***1990-1996211,06138,14073,82424.9226.8921.92-4.98***CovariatesEducationVVNeducation27,832123,285151,54732.3124.0044.9920.99***Scondary34,65028,41814,7212.0918.756.66***Scondary34,56028,41816,01042.8648.3634.74-13.90***Higher85,92379,8786.05520.0216.5025.408.90***Scondary183,55598,14385,45221.5919.1125.376.26***21 (Poorer)183,55598,14385,45221.5919.1125.746.26***Ad (Middle)17.7010.92**57.25519.8821.2816.99-4.28***Ad (Middle)17.7010.92**15.551.291.2121.76***Ad (Middle)17.7010.75*8.7413.8416.91-2.47***Ad (Middle)17.7010.75*8.7413.8416.91-2.47*** <td>1969–1974</td> <td>132,414</td> <td>75.857</td> <td>56.557</td> <td>15.57</td> <td>14.77</td> <td>16.79</td> <td>2.02***</td>	1969–1974	132,414	75.857	56.557	15.57	14.77	16.79	2.02***	
1980-1994172,334100,50671,82820,2619,5721,381,67**1985-1989187,095116,10770,98822,0022,6021,08-1,53***1980-1960211,94181,10070,382424,9226,8921,92-4,98***CovariatsEutrationPrimary274,832123,285151,5473,3124,0044,9920,99***Primary274,832123,285151,5473,3124,0044,9920,99***Scondary86,90643,14214,7212.0918,756,66***Scondary86,90648,415116,09142,8648,3634,47-13,90***Higher85,9279,87885,55720.0216,5025,408,00***At (Richer)16,5098,45221,5910,1125,376,26***21,070183,5981,45221,5910,1125,876,26***Scondary19,2973,37720,8221,991,781,59***At (Richer)16,50103,72973,37720,8221,9210,45-4,29***Scondary12,9417,7435,20417,9822,9210,45-3,91***At (Richer)16,9014,3812,9912,3812,300,36At (Richer)16,9141,9412,906,	1975–1979	146,682	83,054	63,628	17.25	16.17	18.89	2.72***	
1985-1989187,095116,10770,98822,0022,6021,08-1.53***1990-1996211,964138,14073,82424,9226,8921,92-4,98***1990-1996211,964138,14073,82424,9226,8921,92-4,98***Rouraites5024,832123,285151,54732,3124,0044,990.09***Primary125,22862,08663,14214,7212,0918,7566***Secondary24,65024,81511,00142,8648,3634,47-13,90***Higher85,92779,878604510,1015,551.79-13,76***Vealth Index Quantize170,31084,75385,55720,0216,5025,408,90***2nd (Poorer)133,55998,14385,45221,5919,1125,376,26***2nd (Nobrer)165,530109,29557,23519,8821,2816,99-4,29***4th (Richer)166,530109,29557,23519,8821,2816,99-12,47***Hindu14,01153,05219,81412,9212,3812,390.33Other WorkNone50,90314,43812,3912,3812,390.33Other WorkNone28,90013,96269,74713,8416,9121,034,12***Sone139,69269,53274,6773,53 <t< td=""><td>1980–1984</td><td>172,334</td><td>100,506</td><td>71,828</td><td>20.26</td><td>19.57</td><td>21.33</td><td>1.76***</td></t<>	1980–1984	172,334	100,506	71,828	20.26	19.57	21.33	1.76***	
1990-1996211.964138.14073.82424.9226.8921.92-4.98***CovariatsCovariatsButactionNo education274.832123.285151.54732.3124.0044.9920.99***No education274.832123.285151.54732.3124.0044.9920.99***Secondary364.50248.415116.09142.8648.3634.47-13.00***Secondary364.50248.415116.09142.8648.3634.47-13.00***Method countInformer Sign 20.2016.5025.408.90***Advocation Sign 20.2016.5025.408.90***Advocation Sign 20.20Advocation Sign 20.2016.5025.408.90***Advocation Sign 20.2016.5025.408.90***Advocation Sign 20.2010.5125.376.26***Advocation Sign 20.2010.5125.4715.94Advocation Sign 20.2010.45-12.47***Advocation Sign 20.2010.5210.45-2.47***Advocation Sign 20.2010.45-2.47***Advocation Sign 20.2010.304.29***Advocation Sign 20.2020.5210.52-2.47***Advocation Sign 20.2020.5220.30-2.47***<	1985-1989	187,095	116.107	70.988	22.00	22.60	21.08	-1.53***	
Coverities Enternation Education 274,832 123,285 151,547 32.31 24.00 44.99 20.99*** Primary 125,228 62.086 63,142 14.72 12.09 18.75 6.66*** Secondary 364,506 24.815 116.091 42.86 48.36 34.47 -13.90*** Higher 85,923 79,878 6045 10.10 15.55 1.79 -13.76*** Wealth Index Quintiles 11 25.37 6.26*** 6.04*** 1.99*** 13 (Pooret) 183,595 98,143 85,452 21.59 1.911 25.37 6.26*** 2nd (Middle) 177,016 103,729 73,377 2.022 10.45 -12.47*** 4th (Richer) 166,530 109.295 57.235 19.58 21.28 16.59 -24.29*** 5th (Richer) 152,948 117.744 35.204 12.78 80.08 6.63*** Muslim 104,501 63,063 41,438 <t< td=""><td>1990-1996</td><td>211,964</td><td>138,140</td><td>73,824</td><td>24.92</td><td>26.89</td><td>21.92</td><td>-4.98***</td></t<>	1990-1996	211,964	138,140	73,824	24.92	26.89	21.92	-4.98***	
BelavioreBelavior	Covariates	,		,					
No education274,832123,285151,54732.3124.0044.9920.99***Primary125,22862,08663,14214.7212,0018,756.66***Secondary36,0523,87804.0112.7213.90***-13.90***Higher85,92393,87804.0210.1015.551.79-13.76***Weath Index170,31084,75385,55720.0216.5025.408.90***2nd (Poorer)183,59593,14385,55720.0216.5025.376.26***2nd (Woorer)183,59593,14385,55720.0210.1025.376.26***2nd (Midle)170,60103,72973,37720.8220.1921.7815.99**4th (Richer)165,530109,29557.23519.5821.2816.99-4.29***Bridgion152,94817.74720.8220.9212.8210.94-4.29***Hindu647,01137.72720,8210.9812.836.03**-1.247***Bushim10445,73042,82114,9406.798.344.30-3.91***Other57.70282,82114,9406.798.344.34-3.91***Other10,95210,95210,95212.8313.9414.9414.94Scheduled rish15.70280,85260,96415.85-1.63***Other20,85319,95019,25418.5416.9121.35 <td>Education</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Education								
Primary 125,228 62,086 63,142 14,72 12,09 18,75 6.66*** Secondary 364,506 248,415 116,091 42,86 48,36 34,47 -13,90*** Higher 85,20 79,878 6045 10.00 15.55 16.50 13,76** Weatt 170,310 84,753 85,557 20.21 16.50 6,26*** 3cd (Poorer) 133,595 96,143 85,452 21.59 19.11 25.37 6,26 **** 3cd (Niddle) 177,106 103,729 73,377 20.82 20.19 1.78 1.59*** 4th (Richer) 165,01 103,729 73,377 20.82 20.19 1.28 1.63*** 5th (Richest) 104,501 37,078 269,733 17.98 20.19 1.28 16.30 1.63*** Hindu 104,501 37,052 16,501 12.28 12.30 0.63 Musin 104,501 63,063 14,493 12.29 12.28	No education	274,832	123,285	151,547	32.31	24.00	44.99	20.99***	
Secondary 364,506 248,415 16,091 42.86 48.36 34.47 -13.90*** Higher 85,923 79,878 6045 10.10 15.55 1.79 -13.90*** Higher 85,923 79,878 6045 10.10 15.55 1.79 -13.90*** Higher 170,310 84,753 85,557 20.02 16.50 25.40 8.90*** 2nd (Model) 170,61 03,729 73,377 20.82 20.19 21.78 1.59*** 4th (Richer) 166,530 109,295 57,235 19.58 21.28 16.691 -4.29*** 5th (Richer) 160,510 30,632 11,784 26.733 76.08 73.45 80.08 6.63*** Muslim 647,011 377,278 26.973 76.08 73.45 80.08 6.63*** Other 41,47 30.602 14,999 6.79 8.34 4.43 -3.91*** Other 15,7702 86,855 70,447	Primary	125,228	62,086	63,142	14.72	12.09	18.75	6.66***	
Higher 85,923 79,878 6045 10.10 15.55 1.79 -13.76*** Wealth Index Quintize 13t (Poorest) 170,310 84,753 85,557 20.02 16.50 25.40 8.90** 2nd (Pooret) 183,595 98,143 85,452 21.59 19.11 25.37 6.26*** 3rd (Middle) 177,166 103,729 73,377 20.82 20.19 21.28 15.99*** 4th (Richer) 166,530 109,295 57,235 19.58 21.28 16.799 -4.29**** 5th (Richest) 152,948 117,744 35,204 17.98 22.92 10.45 -4.29**** Hindu 647,011 377,278 269,733 76.08 73.45 80.08 6.63*** Muslim 104,501 63,063 41,438 12.29 12.28 12.30 0.03 Christian 77,070 42,821 14,909 6.79 8.34 4.3 -3.91*** Other 41,247 30,502 10,745	Secondary	364,506	248,415	116,091	42.86	48.36	34.47	-13.90***	
Weakly Index Quintils No. No. No. 1st (Poorest) 170,310 84,753 85,557 20.02 16.50 25.40 8.0*** Jad (Poorest) 183,555 98,143 85,452 21.59 19.11 25.37 6.26*** 3rd (Middle) 177,106 103,729 73,377 20.82 20.19 21.78 1.59*** 4th (Richer) 166,50 109,295 57,235 19.58 22.92 10.45 -12.47*** Religion - - - - - - Kinkinken 104,501 63,063 41,438 12.29 12.28 12.30 0.03 Christian 57,730 42,821 14,909 6.79 8.34 4.43 -3.91*** Other 41,247 30,502 10,745 4.85 5.94 3.19 -2.75*** Scheduled caste 157,702 86,855 70,847 17.83 18.48 16.85 -6.65*** Scheduled tribe	Higher	85,923	79.878	6045	10.10	15.55	1.79	-13.76***	
11 (Poorest) 170,310 84,753 85,557 20.02 16.50 25.40 8.90*** 2nd (Poorer) 183,595 98,143 85,452 21.59 19.11 25.37 6.26*** 3rd (Middle) 177,106 103,299 73,377 20.82 20.19 21.78 1.59*** 4th (Richer) 166,530 109,295 57,235 19.58 21.28 16.99 -4.29*** 5th (Richest) 152,948 117,744 352,04 17.98 22.92 10.45 -12.47*** Religion	Wealth Index Ouintile	es							
2nd (Poorer) 183,595 99,143 85,452 21.59 19.11 25.37 6.26*** 3rd (Middle) 177,106 103,729 73,377 20.82 20.19 21.78 1.59*** 4th (Richer) 166,530 109,295 57,235 19.58 21.28 16.99 -4.29*** Sth (Richest) 152,948 117,744 35.204 17.98 22.92 10.45 -12.47*** Religion	1st (Poorest)	170.310	84.753	85.557	20.02	16.50	25.40	8.90***	
3rd (Middle) 177,106 103,729 73,377 20.82 20.19 21.78 1.59*** 4th (Richer) 166,530 109,295 57,235 19.58 21.28 16.99 -4.29*** 5th (Richer) 152,948 117,744 35,204 17.98 22.92 10.45 -12.47*** Religion 52,948 17.778 269,733 76.08 73.45 80.08 6.63*** Muslim 104,501 63,063 41,438 12.29 12.28 12.30 0.03 Christian 57,730 42,821 14,099 6.79 3.54 4.43 -3.91*** Other 41,247 30,502 10,745 4.85 5.94 3.19 -2.75*** Case 57,702 86,855 70,847 18.54 16.91 21.03 4.12*** Scheduled caste 157,702 86,855 70,847 17.83 18.48 16.685 -1.63*** Other backward class 32,215 192,192 140,023 39.06 37.42 41.57	2nd (Poorer)	183,595	98.143	85,452	21.59	19.11	25.37	6.26***	
4th (Richer) 166,530 109,295 57,235 19,58 21.28 16.99 -4.29*** 5th (Richest) 152,948 117,744 35,204 17.98 22.92 10.45 -12.47*** Religion -	3rd (Middle)	177,106	103.729	73.377	20.82	20.19	21.78	1.59***	
Sth (Richest) 152,948 117,744 35,204 17.98 22.92 10.45 -12.47*** Religion	4th (Richer)	166,530	109.295	57.235	19.58	21.28	16.99	-4.29***	
Religion Hindu 647,011 377,278 269,733 76.08 73.45 80.08 6.63*** Muslim 104,501 63,063 41,438 12.29 12.28 12.30 0.03 Christian 57,730 42,821 14,409 6.79 8.34 4.43 -3.91*** Other 41,247 30,502 10,745 4.85 5.94 3.19 -2.75*** Case None 208,900 139,692 69,208 24.56 27.20 20.55 -6.65*** Scheduled caste 157,702 86,855 70,847 18.54 16.91 21.03 4.12*** Scheduled tribe 151,672 94,925 56,747 17.83 18.48 16.85 -1.63*** Scheduled tribe 151,672 94,925 56,747 17.83 18.48 16.85 -1.63*** Steidence Rural 627,316 360,826 266,490 73.76 70.25 79.12 8.87*** Urban 23,173 152,838 70,335 26.24 29.75 20.88 -8.87***	5th (Richest)	152,948	117.744	35,204	17.98	22.92	10.45	-12.47***	
Hindu647,011377,278269,73376.0873.4580.08 6.63^{***} Muslim104,501 $63,063$ $41,438$ 12.29 12.28 12.30 0.03 Christian $57,730$ $42,821$ $14,909$ 6.79 8.34 4.43 -3.91^{***} Other $41,247$ $30,502$ $10,745$ 4.85 5.94 3.19 -2.75^{***} Caste V V V V V V V None $208,900$ $139,692$ $69,208$ 24.56 27.20 20.55 -6.65^{***} Scheduled caste $157,702$ $86,855$ $70,847$ 18.54 16.91 21.03 4.12^{***} Scheduled caste $157,702$ $86,855$ $70,847$ 17.83 18.48 16.85 -1.63^{***} Scheduled tribe $151,672$ $94,925$ $56,747$ 17.83 18.48 16.85 -1.63^{***} Scheduled tribe $151,672$ $94,925$ $56,747$ 17.83 18.48 16.85 -1.63^{***} Revidence V V V V V V V Rural $627,316$ $360,826$ $266,490$ 73.76 70.25 79.12 8.87^{***} Urban $223,173$ $152,838$ $70,335$ 26.24 29.75 20.88 -8.87^{***} Dormal (18.5-24.9) $507,312$ $35,952$ 14.88 13.64 16.77 3.13^{***} (<18.5)	Religion	,	,-						
Muslim104,50163,06341,43812.2912.2812.300.03Christian57,73042,82114,9096.798.344.43 -3.91^{***} Other41,24730,50210,7454.855.943.19 -2.75^{***} Caste V V V V V V None208,900139,69269,20824.5627.2020.55 -6.65^{***} Scheduled caste157,70286,85570,84718.5416.9121.034.12^{***}Scheduled tribe151,67294,92556,74717.8318.4816.85 -1.63^{***} Other backward clas332,215192,192140,02339.0637.4241.5741.6***Residence V V V V V V V V Normal (18.5–24.9)50,5962201,35559.7759.6859.900.22*Underweight126,25669.90456,35214.8813.6416.773.13***(<18.5)	Hindu	647.011	377.278	269.733	76.08	73.45	80.08	6.63***	
Rink57,73042,82114,9096.798.344.43 $-3.91**$ Other41,24730,50210,7454.855.943.19 $-2.75**$ Case $ -$ None208,900139,69269,20824.5627.2020.55 $ -$ Scheduled case157,7286,85570,84717.8318.4816.85 $-1.63**$ Scheduled tribe151,67294,92556,74717.8318.4816.85 $-1.63**$ Other backward class332,215192,192140,02339.0637.4241.574.16***Rural627,316360,826266,49073.7670.2579.128.87***Body Mass Index $ -$ Normal (18.5–24.9)507,312305,962201,35059.7759.6859.900.22*Underweight126,25669,90456,35214.8813.6416.773.13** (<18.5) $ -$ Overweight163,514103,94459,57019.26 20.28 17.72 $-2.55**$ Obse (≥30.0)51,69732,85218,8456.096.415.61 $ -0.80**$	Muslim	104.501	63.063	41.438	12.29	12.28	12.30	0.03	
Other 41,247 30,502 10,745 4.85 5.94 3.19 -2.75^{***} Caste None 208,900 139,692 69,208 24.56 27.20 20.55 -6.65*** Scheduled caste 157,702 86,855 70,847 18.54 16.91 21.03 4.12*** Scheduled tribe 151,672 94,925 56,747 17.83 18.48 16.85 -1.63*** Other backward class 332,215 192,192 140,023 39.06 37.42 41.57 4.16*** Residence Normal 223,173 360,826 266,490 73.76 70.25 79.12 8.87*** Body Mass Index I'reland 267,316 360,826 261,490 73.76 79.12 8.87*** Body Mass Index	Christian	57,730	42.821	14.909	6.79	8.34	4.43	-3.91***	
Caste None 208,900 139,692 69,208 24.56 27.20 20.55 -6.65^{***} Scheduled caste 157,702 86,855 70,847 18.54 16.91 21.03 4.12^{***} Scheduled tribe 151,672 94,925 56,747 17.83 18.48 16.85 -1.63^{***} Other backward class 332,215 192,192 140,023 39.06 37.42 41.57 4.16^{***} Residence Itemation Itemation 152,838 70,335 26.24 29.75 20.88 -8.87^{***} Urban 223,173 152,838 70,335 26.24 29.75 20.88 -8.87^{***} Body Mass Index Itemation Itemation 56,352 14.88 13.64 16.77 3.13^{***} Vormal (18.5–24.9) 507,312 305,962 201,350 59.77 59.68 59.90 0.22* Underweight 126,556 69,904 56,352 14.88 13.64 16.77 3.13*** (25.0–29.9) Itemation Itemation Itemation Itemation	Other	41,247	30.502	10.745	4.85	5.94	3.19	-2.75***	
None 208,900 139,692 69,208 24.56 27.20 20.55 -6.65^{***} Scheduled caste 157,702 86,855 70,847 18.54 16.91 21.03 4.12^{***} Scheduled tribe 151,672 94,925 56,747 17.83 18.48 16.85 -1.63^{***} Other backward class 332,215 192,192 140,023 39.06 37.42 41.57 41.65*** Residence Normal 627,316 360,826 266,490 73.76 70.25 79.12 8.87*** Urban 223,173 152,838 70,335 26.24 29.75 20.88 -8.87^{***} Body Mass Index Normal (18.5–24.9) 507,312 305,962 201,350 59.77 59.68 59.90 0.22* Underweight 126,256 69.904 56,352 14.88 13.64 16.77 31.3*** (25.0–29.9) 103,944 59,570 19.26 20.28 17.72 -2.55^{***} Obses (≥30.0) 51,697 32,852 18,845 6.09 6.41 5.61	Caste	.,)	- ,					
Scheduled caste 157,702 86,855 70,847 18.54 16.91 21.03 4.12*** Scheduled tribe 151,672 94,925 56,747 17.83 18.48 16.85 -1.63^{***} Other backward class 332,215 192,192 140,023 39.06 37.42 41.57 4.16*** Residence Name Name Name Name Name Name Name Rural 627,316 360,826 266,490 73.76 70.25 79.12 8.87*** Urban 223,173 152,838 70,335 26.24 29.75 20.88 -8.87^{***} Body Mass Index Normal (18.5–24.9) 507,312 305,962 201,350 59.77 59.68 59.90 0.22* Underweight 126,256 69.904 56,352 14.88 13.64 16.77 3.13*** (<18.5)	None	208,900	139.692	69.208	24.56	27.20	20.55	-6.65***	
Scheduled tribe151,67294,92556,74717.8318.4816.85 -1.63^{***} Other backward class332,215192,192140,02339.0637.4241.57 4.16^{***} ResidenceNumation of the second of	Scheduled caste	157.702	86.855	70.847	18.54	16.91	21.03	4.12***	
Child activationChild activationChild activationChild activationChild activationChild activation332,215192,192140,02339.0637.4241.574.16***Residence $32,215$ 192,192140,02339.0637.4241.574.16***Rural627,316360,826266,49073.7670.2579.128.87***Urban223,173152,83870,33526.2429.7520.88−8.87***Body Mass Index </td <td>Scheduled tribe</td> <td>151.672</td> <td>94,925</td> <td>56.747</td> <td>17.83</td> <td>18.48</td> <td>16.85</td> <td>-1.63***</td>	Scheduled tribe	151.672	94,925	56.747	17.83	18.48	16.85	-1.63***	
Residence Normal ($18.5-14$) 100 m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m m	Other backward class	332.215	192.192	140.023	39.06	37.42	41.57	4.16***	
Rural627,316360,826266,49073.7670.2579.128.87***Urban223,173152,83870,33526.2429.7520.88 -8.87^{***} Body Mass IndexNormal (18.5–24.9)507,312305,962201,35059.7759.6859.900.22*Underweight126,25669,90456,35214.8813.6416.773.13***(<18.5)	Residence			,		• • • • •			
Urban 223,173 152,838 70,335 26.24 29.75 20.88 -8.87*** Body Mass Index	Rural	627,316	360.826	266,490	73.76	70.25	79.12	8.87***	
Body Mass Index Normal (18.5–24.9) 507,312 305,962 201,350 59.77 59.68 59.90 0.22* Underweight 126,256 69,904 56,352 14.88 13.64 16.77 3.13*** (<18.5)	Urban	223,173	152.838	70.335	26.24	29.75	20.88	-8.87***	
Normal (18.5–24.9) 507,312 305,962 201,350 59.77 59.68 59.90 0.22* Underweight 126,256 69,904 56,352 14.88 13.64 16.77 3.13^{***} (<18.5) Overweight 163,514 103,944 59,570 19.26 20.28 17.72 -2.55^{***} (25.0–29.9) Obese (\geq 30.0) 51,697 32,852 18,845 6.09 6.41 5.61 -0.80^{***} Parity	Body Mass Index	-,	- ,	,					
Underweight 126,256 69,904 56,352 14.88 13.64 16.77 3.13^{***} (<18.5) Overweight 163,514 103,944 59,570 19.26 20.28 17.72 -2.55^{***} (25.0-29.9) Obese (\geq 30.0) 51,697 32,852 18,845 6.09 6.41 5.61 -0.80^{***} Parity	Normal (18.5–24.9)	507.312	305,962	201.350	59.77	59.68	59.90	0.22*	
Overweight (25.0-29.9) 163,514 103,944 59,570 19.26 20.28 17.72 -2.55*** Obese (≥30.0) 51,697 32,852 18,845 6.09 6.41 5.61 -0.80*** Parity 55 55 500 500 6.09 6.41 5.61 -0.80***	Underweight (<18.5)	126,256	69,904	56,352	14.88	13.64	16.77	3.13***	
$Obese (\geq 30.0)$ $51,697$ $32,852$ $18,845$ 6.09 6.41 5.61 -0.80^{***} Parity $55,156$ $10,600$ 5006 0.06 0.000 $E16444$	Overweight $(25.0-29.9)$	163,514	103,944	59,570	19.26	20.28	17.72	-2.55***	
Parity	Obese (>30.0)	51.697	32,852	18 845	6.09	6.41	5.61	-0.80***	
	Parity	01,057	01,001	10,010	0.05	0111	0101		
0 55.456 48.060 7.396 6.52 9.36 2.20 -7.16***	0	55,456	48.060	7396	6.52	9.36	2.20	-7.16***	
1-2 429 135 299 641 129 494 50 46 58 33 38 45 -19 89***	1-2	429 135	299 641	129 494	50.46	58.33	38.45	-19 89***	
3-4 283.077 135.096 147.981 33.28 26.30 43.93 17.63***	3-4	283,077	135.096	147,981	33.28	26.30	43.93	17.63***	
5+ 82.821 30.867 51.954 9.74 6.01 15.42 9.42***	5+	82.821	30.867	51.954	9.74	6.01	15.42	9.42***	
Smoking 12,504 6200 6304 1.47 1.21 1.87 0.66***	Smoking	12,504	6200	6304	1.47	1.21	1.87	0.66***	
Pregnant 42.611 32.674 9937 5.01 6.36 2.953.41***	Pregnant	42,611	32.674	9937	5.01	6.36	2.95	-3.41***	
Lactating 174,487 123,281 51,206 20.52 24.00 15.20 -8.80***	Lactating	174,487	123,281	51,206	20.52	24.00	15.20	-8.80***	

Note: Shares add to 100 across rows for respective characteristics. The shares between women married as adults and as children were statistically different for all characteristics. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05.

glucose outcome. As a proxy for household environment, we accounted for respondent's relationship to household head, household head's sex, household size, adult (age 18+ years) male to female ratio, and husband's presence in the household. These variables, along with other individual- and household-level covariates in the original model ensured that the exclusion restriction was met and thereby our proposed instrument was valid.

Since we pooled two survey waves together, we could not apply the complex survey weights that were wave specific. As such, robust standard errors were obtained by clustering at the state level. The level of significance was set at 0.05. Statistical analyses were conducted using Stata 17.0 software (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA).

3. Results

3.1. Descriptive results

Around 40 % of the women in our sample (336,825 of 850,489) were married before the age of 18 years. A higher prevalence of women in the older cohorts were married as children compared to women in the younger cohorts. In 2015–2016, the prevalence of high blood glucose was 5.8 %. The prevalence of high blood glucose specifically among women married as children was 6.2 %, which was 0.6 %-points (11.3 %) higher than that of women married as adults.

The prevalence of high blood glucose increased in 2019-21 to 8.6 %. Within this period, the prevalence of high blood glucose among women married as children increased to 9.5 %, which was 1.3 %-points (15.9 %) higher than that of women married as adults. In both survey waves, a greater proportion of women married as children had blood glucose higher than normal but lower than diabetic (i.e., 141–199 mg/dl), as

Unadjusted and adjusted odds ratios from binomial logistic regression.

	Survey wave 2015- 16	Survey wave 2019- 21	Both waves without interaction	Both waves with interaction
A. Unadjusted				
Child marriage	1.219***	1.216***	1.219***	1.194***
	(1.172,	(1.162,	(1.175, 1.265)	(1.135, 1.257)
	1.266)	1.272)		
Year ₂₀₁₉			1.460***	1.438***
			(1.314, 1.622)	(1.286, 1.608)
Child marriage				1.036
\times Year ₂₀₁₉				(0.966, 1.111)
Observations	432,080	418,409	850,489	850,489
B. Adjusted				
Child marriage	1.130***	1.133***	1.132***	1.116***
	(1.093,	(1.096,	(1.104, 1.161)	(1.074, 1.160)
	1.167)	1.171)		
Year ₂₀₁₉			1.456***	1.441***
			(1.317, 1.610)	(1.291, 1.608)
Child marriage				1.025
\times Year ₂₀₁₉				(0.958, 1.097)
Observations	431,304	417,475	848,779	848,779

Note: All models accounted for timing of blood glucose test and state of residence fixed effects. Robust standard errors were obtained by clustering at the state level. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05. 95 % confidence intervals are in parenthesis. Multivariable specifications accounted for birth cohort fixed effects, education, household wealth index quintiles, religion, caste, urban/rural residence, BMI category, tobacco smoking, parity (i.e., number of children born), current pregnancy status, and lactating mother status.

well as within the diabetic (i.e., $\geq\!200$ mg/dl) range compared to women married as adults.

Fig. 1 presents the prevalence of high blood glucose by birth cohorts and child marriage. Prevalence was lowest for the youngest birth cohort and gradually increased with age. Within each birth cohort, in general, women who were married as children had a higher prevalence of high blood glucose compared to women who were married as adults. The differences between the two groups were more evident in 2019-21 than in 2015-16.

Table 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the study population by child marriage. While a greater proportion (45.0 %) of women married as children had no education, nearly two-third (63.9 %) of women married as adults had secondary or higher level of education. Half (50.8 %) of women married as children were from poor households (bottom two quintiles of household wealth index), whereas 44.2 % of women married as adults were from wealthier households (top two quintiles of

Public Health in Practice 8 (2024) 100556

household wealth index). Around 70.3 % of women married as adults live in rural areas, in comparison to 79.1 % for women married as children. The association between high blood glucose levels and these covariates were very similar across women married as children and as adults (Supplementary Material Fig. S2).

Results of the binomial logistic regressions for the full sample are presented in Table 2. In 2015-16, the adjusted odds of having high blood glucose for women married as children were 1.1 times that of their counterparts married as adults. Similar trends were seen in 2019-21. In addition, while women, both married as children and as adults, were more likely (AOR: 1.5) to have high blood glucose in the 2019-21 wave, the interaction term (between child marriage and survey year) was not found to be statistically significant.

Results of the binomial logistic regressions by birth cohorts are presented in Table 3. Except for the youngest birth cohort, women married as children within all birth cohorts had higher adjusted odds of having high blood glucose (AOR ranging from 1.1 to 1.2). While the odds were higher for the 2019-21 wave (AOR ranging from 1.3 to 1.8), the coefficients of the interaction terms were not statistically significant.

Table 4 presents the relative risk ratios of blood glucose levels at the "higher than normal but lower than diabetic" and "diabetic" ranges, relative to the base outcome of within normal range. Women married as children had higher relative risks of having blood glucose at the higher than normal but lower than diabetic (ARRR: 1.1) and diabetic (ARRR: 1.2) ranges. The relative risks of higher than normal but lower than diabetic range outcomes were higher for women in 2019-21. Similar to the binary outcome (in Table 2), the estimates of the interaction terms were not statistically significant.

Similar results were seen in multinomial specifications across birth cohorts. The higher relative risk of having blood glucose at "higher than normal but lower than diabetic" range for women married as children were evident in the three older birth cohorts (i.e., 1969–1974, 1975–1979, and 1980–1984). The relative risk of having blood glucose in the diabetic range was higher for women married as children in all birth cohorts except for the youngest birth cohort (i.e., 1990–1996). Like the binomial results, the relative risks were higher for the 2019-21 wave, and the interaction terms were not statistically significant.

Results of the instrumental variable regressions, presented in Table 5, suggest a possible causal relationship between child marriage and elevated blood glucose level later in life. Data on mother-in-law's years in education that we used as an instrument for child marriage were available for 31.4 % of the sample. In this sub-population, we found that being married in childhood increased the likelihood of having high blood glucose by 6.6 %.

Table 3

	1 11	1	• •	1 1 1 .
I poduletod opd odileto	1 odde rotioe trom	hipomial logictic	rogroccion bi	v birth cohort
	1 0005 14005 0000	DITIONNAL IOPISIIC	ICALCOMOU D.	• חחחח נטווטוו
				,

	Birth cohort: 1969–1974	Birth cohort: 1975–1979	Birth cohort: 1980-1984	Birth cohort: 1985–1989	Birth cohort: 1990-1996
A. Unadjusted					
Child marriage	1.089**	1.111***	1.172***	1.152**	1.001
	(1.034, 1.148)	(1.056, 1.168)	(1.088, 1.263)	(1.042, 1.275)	(0.934, 1.073)
Year ₂₀₁₉	1.331***	1.502***	1.598***	1.762***	1.624***
	(1.185, 1.495)	(1.309, 1.722)	(1.409, 1.812)	(1.547, 2.006)	(1.431, 1.843)
Child marriage \times Year ₂₀₁₉	1.057	1.048	0.957	0.995	1.123*
	(0.992, 1.126)	(0.957, 1.149)	(0.858, 1.066)	(0.869, 1.139)	(1.020, 1.237)
Observations	132,414	146,682	172,334	187,095	211,964
B. Adjusted					
Child marriage	1.110***	1.114***	1.178***	1.127*	1.029
	(1.055, 1.169)	(1.065, 1.164)	(1.092, 1.270)	(1.006, 1.263)	(0.956, 1.108)
Year	1.356***	1.439***	1.517***	1.609***	1.563***
	(1.215, 1.513)	(1.264, 1.638)	(1.342, 1.716)	(1.417, 1.828)	(1.379, 1.772)
Child marriage \times Year ₂₀₁₉	1.045	1.052	0.959	1.010	1.072
	(0.982, 1.113)	(0.963, 1.150)	(0.861, 1.068)	(0.881, 1.158)	(0.970, 1.185)
Observations	132,071	146,392	171,996	186,744	211,576

Note: Regressions were separately estimated for each birth cohort. All models accounted for timing of blood glucose test and state of residence fixed effects. Robust standard errors were obtained by clustering at the state level. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05. 95 % confidence intervals are in parenthesis. Multivariable specifications accounted for birth year fixed effects, education, household wealth index quintiles, religion, caste, urban/rural residence, BMI category, tobacco smoking, parity (i.e., number of children born), current pregnancy status, and lactating mother status.

Unadjusted and adjusted relative risk ratios from multinomial logistic regression by birth cohort.

		Unadjusted		Adjusted		
	Base outcome: Normal range	Outcome I: > Normal but < diabetic range	Outcome II: Diabetic range	Outcome I: > Normal but < diabetic range	Outcome II: Diabetic range	
	≤140 mg/dl	141–199 mg/dl	≥200 mg/dl	141–199 mg/dl	≥200 mg/dl	
A. All						
Child marriage		1.164***	1.346***	1.090***	1.227***	
		(1.100, 1.232)	(1.246, 1.454)	(1.042, 1.141)	(1.150, 1.310)	
Year ₂₀₁₉		1.416***	1.545***	1.415***	1.573***	
		(1.259, 1.592)	(1.361, 1.755)	(1.259, 1.591)	(1.395, 1.773)	
Child marriage \times		1.036	1.032	1.026	1.015	
Year ₂₀₁₉		(0.961, 1.117)	(0.949, 1.123)	(0.955, 1.103)	(0.928, 1.110)	
B. Birth cohort: 1969-1	1974					
Child marriage		1.061*	1.178**	1.075*	1.224***	
		(1.008, 1.117)	(1.056, 1.314)	(1.015, 1.139)	(1.112, 1.348)	
Year ₂₀₁₉		1.332***	1.327***	1.347***	1.384***	
		(1.177, 1.507)	(1.163, 1.514)	(1.195, 1.517)	(1.232, 1.554)	
Child marriage \times		1.083*	0.985	1.072*	0.971	
Year ₂₀₁₉		(1.011, 1.159)	(0.875, 1.109)	(1.002, 1.148)	(0.863, 1.092)	
C. Birth cohort: 1975–	1979					
Child marriage		1.101***	1.149	1.102***	1.156	
		(1.048, 1.157)	(0.977, 1.351)	(1.050, 1.157)	(0.994, 1.345)	
Year ₂₀₁₉		1.440***	1.761***	1.388***	1.645***	
		(1.260, 1.646)	(1.434, 2.162)	(1.217, 1.583)	(1.371, 1.975)	
Child marriage \times		1.037	1.086	1.040	1.101	
Year ₂₀₁₉		(0.948, 1.135)	(0.889, 1.327)	(0.953, 1.136)	(0.900, 1.347)	
D. Birth cohort: 1980–	1984					
Child marriage		1.155***	1.269**	1.149**	1.339***	
		(1.062, 1.257)	(1.096, 1.470)	(1.054, 1.252)	(1.176, 1.524)	
Year ₂₀₁₉		1.528***	2.036***	1.460***	1.871***	
ot 11 1		(1.342, 1.739)	(1.675, 2.474)	(1.281, 1.664)	(1.571, 2.230)	
Child marriage ×		0.939	1.033	0.942	1.044	
Year ₂₀₁₉		(0.828, 1.065)	(0.895, 1.191)	(0.830, 1.068)	(0.918, 1.187)	
E. Birth cohort: 1985–1	1989	1 101*	1 051**	1 000	1 00 4**	
Child marriage		1.131^	1.351**	1.099	1.384**	
Vee		(1.01/, 1.25/)	(1.08/, 1.6/8)	(0.9/7, 1.237)	(1.090, 1.756)	
rear ₂₀₁₉		1.0/1***	2.634***	1.545***	2.203***	
Child momions v		(1.459, 1.915)	(2.253, 3.079)	(1.344, 1.776)	(1.936, 2.506)	
Veer		1.012	0.870	1.025	0.891	
E Birth cohort: 1000 1	1004	(0.879, 1.165)	(0.879, 1.115)	(0.889, 1.183)	(0.694, 1.142)	
Child marriage	1990	0.002	1 115	1.014	1 107	
Cillia Illalliage		0.992	(0.709, 1.667)	(0.040, 1.004)	(0.950, 1.692)	
Vear		1 604***	1 962***	1 552***	1 650**	
1 ca12019		(1 414 1 821)	(1 318 2 630)	(1 360 1 763)	(1 213 2 242)	
Child marriage v		1 120*	1 146	1.076	1 034	
Vearana		(1 027 1 222)	(0.731 1.796)	(0.981, 1.180)	(0.671 1.503)	
1 Cd12019		(1.047, 1.222)	(0./31, 1./90)	(0.901, 1.100)	(0.0/1, 1.393)	

Note: Regressions were separately estimated for each birth cohort. All models accounted for timing of blood glucose test and state of residence fixed effects. Robust standard errors were obtained by clustering at the state level. ***p < 0.001, *p < 0.05. 95 % confidence intervals are in parenthesis. Other covariates in the multivariable specifications include birth year fixed effects, education, household wealth index quintiles, religion, caste, urban/rural residence, BMI category, tobacco smoking, parity (i.e., number of children born), current pregnancy status, and lactating mother status.

4. Discussion

The objective of this study was to examine whether child marriage (i. e., marriage before age 18 years) was associated with the risk of having high blood glucose in women from same birth cohorts. We find that the risk of having high blood glucose was higher among women who were married as children compared to women who were married as adults in respective birth cohorts. Since women from different birth cohorts had differential odds of getting married in childhood as well as differential likelihood of having hyperglycemia due to aging, investigating the association within birth cohorts provided us with more compelling results compared to those in previous studies. Further, we employed an instrumental variable approach to provide evidence on the possible causal relationship between child marriage and hyperglycemia. Our results of the instrumental variable analyses implied a higher risk of hyperglycemia in women during later in life, attributable to getting married in childhood.

Our study adds to the burgeoning literature examining the long-term health consequences of child marriage beyond the widely studied reproductive health outcomes. Findings from the current study, however, are subject to some limitations. First, the blood glucose level measures were random, and not fasting levels. As such, hyperglycemia was not clinically diagnosed in our sample. However, the random blood glucose measure can be rendered as a proxy for the risk of high blood glucose at the population level. Second, the timing of the test was not uniform for all respondents, which might influence the blood glucose measures. However, to mitigate any bias emanating from the differential timing of the test, we controlled the time when a respondent last ate and last drank before taking the test. Third, the practice of child marriage in India encompasses many factors such as poverty, gender inequality, patriarchal cultural values, as well as local traditions and societal norms. The intersectionality of these psychosocial contributors and consequences of child marriage may influence differential risks of high blood glucose among women in India. As such, our results could be specific to Indian population, and may not be generalizable to other societal and cultural settings. Future qualitative research will improve our understanding of these aspects. Fourth, marital age in the survey was selfreported, which might be subject to some recall bias. However,

Results from instrumental variable (2SLS-LPM) regression.

	Survey wave 2015-16	Survey wave 2019-21	Both waves without interaction	Both waves with interaction
A. OLS				
Child marriage	0.003*	0.006**	0.005**	0.002
	(0.000,	(0.002,	(0.002, 0.008)	(-0.001,
	0.007)	0.010)		0.006)
Year ₂₀₁₉			0.017***	0.015***
			(0.010, 0.025)	(0.008, 0.023)
Child marriage				0.006
\times Year ₂₀₁₉				(-0.000,
				0.012)
Observations B. IV	143,606	123,516	267,122	267,122
Child marriage	0.081*	0.048	0.065*	0.066*
	(0.011,	(-0.032,	(0.001, 0.130)	(0.004, 0.129)
	0.150)	0.129)		
Year ₂₀₁₉			0.022***	0.022***
			(0.013, 0.031)	(0.010, 0.034)
Child marriage				-0.001
\times Year ₂₀₁₉				(-0.027,
				0.024)
Observations	143,606	123,516	267,122	267,122

Note: Child marriage was instrumented by mother-in-law's years of education. Respondent's relationship to household head, household head's sex, household size, adult (age 18+) male to female ratio, and husband's presence in the household were controlled as proxies for household environment. Robust standard errors were obtained by clustering at the state level. ***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05. 95 % confidence intervals are in parenthesis. All models accounted for timing of blood glucose test, state of residence fixed effects, birth cohort fixed effects, education, household wealth index quintiles, religion, caste, urban/rural residence, BMI category, tobacco smoking, parity (i.e., number of children born), current pregnancy status, and lactating mother status.

instead of continuous marital age, using a binary indicator (based on the cut-off value of age 18 years) helped mitigating the potential influence of such recall biases. Fifth, due to the cross-sectional nature of the data, we were unable to explore any causal pathways of the relationship between child marriage and the risk of hyperglycemia. However, our birth cohort analysis, previously unexplored in the literature, allowed assessing the risk within different cohorts. Additionally, our instrumental variable analysis indicated a possible causal relationship between child marriage and elevated blood glucose level later in life.

In different birth cohorts, the elevated risk of high blood glucose among women married as children was evident after accounting for various demographic and anthropometric risk factors notably associated with diabetes prevalence and/or child marriage, including state of residence and urban/rural locality, educational attainment, household wealth, and caste [33,34]. The results though should be cautiously interpreted, keeping in mind the interplay between the causes and consequences of child marriage. Interestingly, however, we found no differences in the risk of high blood glucose among women married as children and as adults in the youngest birth cohort. This cohort primarily included women aged 20-26 years in 2015-16 and women aged 22-30 years in 2019-21. The insignificant difference in odds in the youngest cohort may be due to the generally lower risk of type-2 diabetes among women in this age group, with evidence suggesting significantly lower risk of diabetes among women in their 20s, compared to those in their 30s and 40s [35].

Obesity is one of the major risk factors for elevated blood glucose levels. In our study population, we observed that women who had BMI at the obese level had a significantly higher odds of having high blood glucose. This was evident among women in both marital-age groups, i.e., married as adults and as children. The role of obesity on the risk of high blood glucose, therefore, deemed similar in both groups, and the relationship between child marriage and hyperglycemia persisted after accounting for obesity in the analyses. Another interesting finding was that the estimates of the interaction term between child marriage and survey year indicators were not statistically significant either in the full-sample or in birth cohort subgroups. This suggests that the heightened risk of high blood glucose among women who were married as children, compared to their counterparts married as adults, did not change over time within the birth cohorts. In other words, differential risk may remain with the changes in population level risk of hyperglycemia in women.

Of note, the prevalence of child marriage in India has notably declined in recent years after the enactment of the "Prevention of Child Marriage Act" in 2006. However, considerable variations in the progress of preventing child marriage were observed across states [36]. The burden of diabetes in India, on the other hand, has been gradually increasing with varying rates being observed across states [37]. Our models included state fixed effects to account for state-level variations in trends of child marriage and elevated blood glucose levels.

There are potential mechanisms which may explain these results. Several studies have established the association between interpersonal violence (IPV) and diabetes [38,39], and child marriage was found associated with higher risk of experiencing IPV [11,40]. As such, IPV exposure may influence the risk of high blood glucose in women married as children. Another potential channel could be lack of dietary diversity, which is linked to the risk of type 2 diabetes [41]. Lack of knowledge and awareness about nutrition is one of the key barriers of dietary diversity among women in India [42]. This can further be linked to lower educational attainment associated with child marriage [5], influencing perceptions of the importance of dietary diversity [43]. Poor economic conditions, along with lack of agency and bargaining power associated with child marriage [44], could impact women's access to balanced diet [43], and thereby may influence the risk of high blood glucose.

The eco-biological framework of childhood adversity and long-term health risk, proposed by Shonkoff et al. (2009) [45], can be a potential pathophysiological mechanism behind the relationship between child marriage and risk of high blood glucose. This framework suggests that two processes can occur: i), cumulative exposures to stressful experiences, namely toxic stress, lead to poor health; or ii) repeated environmental insults during sensitive developmental periods lead to biologic injury. The prolonged activation of the body's stress response system, known as "allostatic load", may cause certain physiological changes [45, 46], which could contribute to the risk of developing high blood glucose [47]. Future research using appropriate data is needed to explore and validate these potential pathways.

This paper, using nationally representative data from India, demonstrates an association between child marriage and later life risk of hyperglycemia in women. Given the chronic nature of diabetes, prompt diagnosis and treatment are essential to preventing long-term health adversity. Unfortunately, India and other LMICs have an alarmingly high proportion of adults with undiagnosed diabetes, estimated at 50 % or 210 million people worldwide, with 39 million in India alone [48]. The WHO Global Diabetes Compact has recommended 5 strategic global diabetes coverage targets for 2030, which include 80 % of people with diabetes being diagnosed [49]. Based on the current study, women married as children should become a prioritized subgroup for strategic public health initiatives for screening and diagnosis of diabetes. Targets for this vulnerable population should also include diabetes prevention, timely access to diabetes care, and modification of other risk factors which might contribute to developing diabetes in later life. At the same time, elimination of child marriage is critical for the primary prevention of such chronic health outcomes in the future.

The findings of this study thus encompass at least two targets of the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) – eliminating child marriage (Target 5.3) and reducing pre-mature mortality from non-communicable diseases (Target 5.4) [50]. This creates opportunities to potentially embed dual objectives in policy actions to simultaneously achieving progress on multiple SDG targets. All together, policymakers, researchers, and social advocates should consider

concerted socioeconomic and public health efforts to end the harmful practice of child marriage and to improve the health and wellbeing of women who were married in childhood.

Ethics approval

Our study did not require an ethical board approval because we used publicly available anonymized secondary data for analyses. The dataset used in this study meet the definition of National Institutes of Health (NIH) Exempt Human Subjects Research under the following exemption criteria: "Exemption 4: involves the collection/study of data or specimens if publicly available, or recorded such that subjects cannot be identified". The original survey protocol was approved by the institutional review boards of International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS) and ICF. The survey complied with the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services regulations for the protection of human subjects (45 CFR 46).

Declaration of interests

None.

Competing interests

None.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

Not applicable.

Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data to this article can be found online at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.puhip.2024.100556.

References

- United Nation Children's Fund (UNICEF), Child Marriage: Latest Trends and Future Prospects, UNICEF, 2018. https://data.unicef.org/resources/child-marriage-latest -trends-and-future-prospects/.
- [2] K.A.S. Wickrama, D.L. Baltimore, Adolescent precocious development and young adult health outcomes, Adv. Life Course Res. 15 (4) (2010) 121–131, https://doi. org/10.1016/j.alcr.2010.08.003.
- [3] K.A.S. Wickrama, T.K. Lee, C.W. O'Neal, Stressful life experiences in adolescence and cardiometabolic risk factors in young adulthood, J. Adolesc. Health 56 (4) (2015) 456–463, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.12.009.
- [4] R.A. Burgess, M. Jeffery, S.A. Odero, K. Rose-Clarke, D. Devakumar, Overlooked and unaddressed: a narrative review of mental health consequences of child marriages, in: Behere AP (Ed.), PLOS Glob Public Health 2 (1) (2022) e0000131, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgph.0000131.
- [5] J. Parsons, J. Edmeades, A. Kes, S. Petroni, M. Sexton, Q. Wodon, Economic impacts of child marriage: a review of the literature, The Review of Faith & International Affairs 13 (3) (2015) 12–22, https://doi.org/10.1080/ 15570274.2015.1075757.
- [6] A. Kohno, T. Techasrivichien, S.P. Suguimoto, M. Dahlui, N.D. Nik Farid, T. Nakayama, Investigation of the key factors that influence the girls to enter into child marriage: a meta-synthesis of qualitative evidence, in: J. Jong (Ed.), PLoS One 15 (7) (2020) e0235959, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0235959.

- [7] M. Liang, S. Simelane, S. Chalasani, R. Snow, New estimations of child marriage: evidence from 98 low- and middle-income countries, in: B. Mahapatra (Ed.), PLoS One 16 (10) (2021) e0258378, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0258378.
- [8] S. Yaya, E.K. Odusina, G. Bishwajit, Prevalence of child marriage and its impact on fertility outcomes in 34 sub-Saharan African countries, BMC Int. Health Hum. Right 19 (1) (2019) 33, https://doi.org/10.1186/s12914-019-0219-1.
- [9] M.S. Pantell, A.A. Prather, J.M. Downing, N.P. Gordon, N.E. Adler, Association of social and behavioral risk factors with earlier onset of adult hypertension and diabetes, JAMA Netw. Open 2 (5) (2019) e193933, https://doi.org/10.1001/ jamanetworkopen.2019.3933.
- [10] M. Marmot, R. Bell, Social determinants and non-communicable diseases: time for integrated action, BMJ 28 (2019) l251, https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l251. Published online January.
- [11] S. Fan, A. Koski, The health consequences of child marriage: a systematic review of the evidence, BMC Publ. Health 22 (1) (2022) 309, https://doi.org/10.1186/ s12889-022-12707-x.
- [12] B.K. Datta, M.J. Husain, D. Kostova, Hypertension in women: the role of adolescent childbearing, BMC Publ. Health 21 (1) (2021) 1481, https://doi.org/10.1186/ s12889-021-11488-z.
- [13] B. Datta, A. Tiwari, Adding to her woes: child bride's higher risk of hypertension at young adulthood, J. Public Health (2022), https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/ fdac026. Published online March 6:fdac026.
- [14] B.K. Datta, M.R. Haider, A. Tiwari, M. Jahan, The risk of hypertension among child brides and adolescent mothers at age 20 s, 30 s, and 40 s: Evidence from India, J. Hum. Hypertens. (2022), https://doi.org/10.1038/s41371-022-00730-9. Published online July 23.
- [15] A. Tiwari, B.K. Datta, M.R. Haider, M. Jahan, The role of child marriage and marital disruptions on hypertension in women - a nationally representative study from India, SSM - Population Health 22 (2023) 101409, https://doi.org/10.1016/j. ssmph.2023.101409.
- [16] K. Vikram, Early marriage and health among women at midlife: evidence from India, J. Marriage Fam. 83 (5) (2021) 1480–1501, https://doi.org/10.1111/ jomf.12793.
- [17] T. Tamayo, H. Christian, W. Rathmann, Impact of early psychosocial factors (childhood socioeconomic factors and adversities) on future risk of type 2 diabetes, metabolic disturbances and obesity: a systematic review, BMC Publ. Health 10 (2010) 525, https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-10-525.
- [18] B. Datta, A. Tiwari, L. Glenn, Stolen childhood taking a toll at young adulthood: the higher risk of high blood pressure and high blood glucose comorbidity among child brides, PLOS Glob Public Health 2 (6) (2022) e0000638, https://doi.org/10.1371/ journal.pgph.0000638.
- [19] B. Datta, A. Tiwari, Early marriage in adolescence and risk of high blood pressure and high blood glucose in adulthood: evidence from India, WomenWise 2 (3) (2022) 189–203, https://doi.org/10.3390/women2030020.
- [20] United Nation Children's Fund (UNICEF), Ending child marriage: a profile of progress in India. https://data.unicef.org/resources/ending-child-marriage-a-profile-of-progress-in-india/, 2019.
- [21] P. Ranasinghe, R. Jayawardena, N. Gamage, N. Sivanandam, A. Misra, Prevalence and trends of the diabetes epidemic in urban and rural India: a pooled systematic review and meta-analysis of 1.7 million adults, Ann. Epidemiol. 58 (2021) 128–148, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annepidem.2021.02.016.
- [22] International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS), ICF, National Family Health Survey (NFHS-4), 2015-16: India, IIPS, 2017. https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/ FR339/FR339.pdf.
- [23] International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS), ICF, National Family Health Survey (NFHS-5), 2019-21: India, IIPS, 2021. https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/ FR375/FR375.pdf.
- [24] M. Short Fabic, Y. Choi, S. Bird, A systematic review of Demographic and Health Surveys: data availability and utilization for research, Bull. World Health Organ. 90 (8) (2012) 604–612, https://doi.org/10.2471/BLT.11.095513.
- [25] National Institute of Health, Exempt human subjects research infographic. https:// grants.nih.gov/sites/default/files/exemption_infographic_v8_508c_1-15-2020.pdf, 2023.
- [26] International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS), National family health survey 2015-16 (NFHS-4): interviewer's manual. http://rchiips.org/NFHS/NFHS4/m anual/NFHS-4/20Interviewer/20Manual.pdf, 2014. Published online December.
- [27] International Institute for Population Sciences (IIPS), National family health survey 2019-20 (NFHS-5): interviewer's manual. http://rchiips.org/NFHS/NFHS5/ma nuals/NFHS-5/20Interviewer/20Manual_Eng.pdf, 2019. Published online October.
- [28] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Diabetes tests, Published online August 10, https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/basics/getting-tested.html, 2021.
- [29] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Diabetes risk factors, Published online April 5, https://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/basics/risk-factors.html, 2022.
- [30] P. Puri, A. Shil, A. Shetty, et al., Contribution of modifiable risk factors on the burden of diabetes among women in reproductive age-group in India: a population based cross-sectional study, J. Publ. Health Pol. 43 (1) (2022) 89–108, https://doi. org/10.1057/s41271-021-00334-6.
- [31] E. Demidenko, Sample size determination for logistic regression revisited, Stat. Med. 26 (18) (2006) 3385–3397, https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.2771.
- [32] E. Demidenko, Sample size and optimal design for logistic regression with binary interaction, Stat. Med. 27 (1) (2008) 36–46, https://doi.org/10.1002/sim.2980.
- [33] D.J. Corsi, S.V. Subramanian, Socioeconomic gradients and distribution of diabetes, hypertension, and obesity in India, JAMA Netw. Open 2 (4) (2019) e190411, https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.0411.
- [34] V.S. Binu, V. Sridhar, S.H. Subba, P.V. Prathyusha, K.M. Sabu, Direct and indirect factors associated with child marriage: evidence from India using NFHS-4 data,

B.K. Datta et al.

Child Abuse Negl. 131 (2022) 105785, https://doi.org/10.1016/j. chiabu.2022.105785.

- [35] Thakur R. Sujata, Unequal burden of equal risk factors of diabetes between different gender in India: a cross-sectional analysis, Sci. Rep. 11 (1) (2021) 22653, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-02012-9.
- [36] J. Gausman, R. Kim, A. Kumar, S. Ravi, S.V. Subramanian, Prevalence of girl and boy child marriage across states and Union Territories in India, 1993–2021: a repeated cross-sectional study, Lancet Global Health 12 (2) (2024) e271–e281, https://doi.org/10.1016/S2214-109X(23)00470-9.
- [37] R.M. Anjana, R. Unnikrishnan, M. Deepa, et al., Metabolic non-communicable disease health report of India: the ICMR-INDIAB national cross-sectional study (ICMR-INDIAB-17), Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 11 (7) (2023) 474–489, https:// doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(23)00119-5.
- [38] J.S. Chandan, T. Thomas, C. Bradbury-Jones, J. Taylor, S. Bandyopadhyay, K. Nirantharakumar, Risk of cardiometabolic disease and all-cause mortality in female survivors of domestic abuse, J. Am. Heart Assoc. 9 (4) (2020) e014580, https://doi.org/10.1161/JAHA.119.014580.
- [39] X. Goldberg, C. Espelt, D. Porta-Casteràs, D. Palao, R. Nadal, A. Armario, Noncommunicable diseases among women survivors of intimate partner violence: critical review from a chronic stress framework, Neurosci. Biobehav. Rev. 128 (2021) 720–734, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neubiorev.2021.06.045.
- [40] B.O. Ahinkorah, O.M. Onayemi, A.A. Seidu, O.E. Awopegba, A.I. Ajayi, Association between girl-child marriage and intimate partner violence in sub-saharan africa: insights from a multicountry analysis of demographic and health surveys, J. Interpers Violence 37 (15–16) (2022) NP13560–NP13580, https://doi.org/ 10.1177/08862605211005139.
- [41] A.I. Conklin, P. Monsivais, K.T. Khaw, N.J. Wareham, N.G. Forouhi, Dietary diversity, diet cost, and incidence of type 2 diabetes in the United Kingdom: a prospective cohort study, PLoS Med. 13 (7) (2016) e1002085, https://doi.org/ 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002085.

- [42] S. Gupta, N. Sunder, P.L. Pingali, Market access, production diversity, and diet diversity: evidence from India, Food Nutr. Bull. 41 (2) (2020) 167–185, https:// doi.org/10.1177/0379572120920061.
- [43] A.G. Azene, A.M. Aragaw, H.T. Wubetie, et al., Dietary diversity among pregnant women and associated factors in Ethiopia: systematic review and meta-analysis, in: R. Diana (Ed.), PLoS One 16 (6) (2021) e0251906, https://doi.org/10.1371/ journal.pone.0251906.
- [44] Q. Wodon, A. Savadogo, A. Kes, Economic Impacts of Child Marriage: Work. Earnings, and Household Welfare, World Bank Group, 2017. https://documents. worldbank.org/en/publication/documents-reports/documentdetail/31276149851 2784050/work-earnings-and-household-welfare-brief.
- [45] J.P. Shonkoff, W.T. Boyce, B.S. McEwen, Neuroscience, molecular biology, and the childhood roots of health disparities: building a new framework for health promotion and disease prevention, JAMA 301 (21) (2009) 2252–2259, https://doi. org/10.1001/jama.2009.754.
- [46] J.P. Shonkoff, A.S. Garner, Committee on psychosocial aspects of child and family health, committee on early childhood, adoption, and dependent care, section on developmental and behavioral pediatrics. The lifelong effects of early childhood adversity and toxic stress, Pediatrics 129 (1) (2012) e232–e246, https://doi.org/ 10.1542/peds.2011-2663.
- [47] A. Steptoe, R.A. Hackett, A.I. Lazzarino, et al., Disruption of multisystem responses to stress in type 2 diabetes: investigating the dynamics of allostatic load, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A 111 (44) (2014) 15693–15698, https://doi.org/10.1073/ pnas.1410401111.
- [48] International Diabetes Federation (IDF), IDF Diabetes Atlas, tenth ed., 2021. https://diabetesatlas.org/atlas/tenth-edition/.
- [49] World Health Organization, Political declaration of the third high-level meeting of the General Assembly on the prevention and control of noncommunicable diseases, Published online January 11, https://apps.who.int/gb/ebwha/pdf_files/EB150/ B150_7-en.pdf, 2022.
- [50] United Nations, Sustainable development Goals, Published online, https://sdgs.un. org/goals, 2023.