**Template for Requests for Revisions to the DHS Model Questionnaires, Optional Modules, and Biomarkers for DHS-8 (2018-2023)**

# **Section I. Information about the requesting party**

1. Is this request being submitted on behalf of a group? If so, please provide the name of the group and the participating parties.

PMI VectorWorks project

# **Section II. Indicator definition and rationale**

2. Please define the indicator or indicators you are requesting The DHS Program to incorporate. *Multiple indicators derived from a single set of questions should be included in the same submission.* (Response required)

**Optional Net Preference Module**

Reported preferences for net specifications & observed net specifications

* Percent distribution of households by preferred shape/color/textile/height/width
* Percent distribution of nets by shape/color/textile/ height/width

The information from the two questions can be combined to assess the proportion of nets used that are the household’s preferred shape/color/textile/etc, and compared to the proportion of nets used that are NOT the preferred type. The results (particularly when included in a regression controlling for other net use determinants) can be used to answer the question of whether net preferences have an association with net use.

3. What is the rationale for measuring this indicator (each of these indicators) in DHS surveys? (Response required)

National Programmes are being asked to justify requests for certain net specifications, such as color, size, shape, and textile. Only DHS/MIS surveys provide enough power to assess the associations between reported preference and use of nets of given specifications, as well as to assess trends or variations across different areas of the country. National programs are often convinced that their populations will not use nets if they are not a certain shape/height/color; programs need data to better understand the influence (or lack thereof) of user preferences on net use. Likewise, large donors are not accepting justifications for particular net specifications that rely on small scale qualitative studies or survey data from a few selected sites within the country. Both donors and programs need more solid data on the associations between preferences and use in order to come to agreement for future net procurements.

With new restricted specifications, as well as next generation nets, there are fewer and fewer options for shape, color, and height. It will be important to monitor whether there is an impact on net use that is attributable to the specifications not matching with user expectations/preferences. The new restricted specifications are based on a relatively limited set of data from five countries, only one of which (Malawi) asked both questions about preferences and observed the net characteristics. There is a need to expand the evidence base for the policy.

As countries continue on the Journey Towards Self-Reliance, the private sector market for ITNs may play an increasing role in contributing to high levels of ITN access. Data on reported preferences will be useful to monitor trends and shifts in consumer preferences, which ITN manufacturers may find useful to target specific types of retail products in different areas and audience segments.

# **Section III. Proposed additions/revisions to the questionnaires or biomarkers**

4. Please describe the requested addition or revision.

*If the requested change is the addition of new questions to the DHS questionnaires or modules, complete questions 4.1 and 4.1.1. If the requested change is a revision to existing questions, complete question 4.2. If the change relates to anthropometry or a biomarker, please complete question 4.3.*

4.1. **For additions**: If you have developed a question or set of questions to measure the indicator(s), please provide them in the space below or in a separate file attached with your submission.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Household Questionnaire |  |
|  | Which material of the net do you prefer? | POLYESTHER (soft)....... 1  POLYETHYLENE (hard) . . . . . 2  NO PREFERENCE.......9 |
|  | Which color of net do you prefer? | BLUE.......1  WHITE.......2  GREEN .......3  OTHER.......8  NO PREFERENCE.......9 |
|  | What shape of net do you prefer? | RECTANGULAR.......1  CONICAL.......2  NO PREFERENCE.......9 |
|  | What height of net do you prefer? | HEIGHT OF MY CURRENT NET.......1  TALLER THAN MY CURRENT NET.......2  SHORTER THAN MY CURRENT NET.......3  NO PREFERENCE.......9 |
|  | What width of net do you prefer? | SINGLE BED.......1  DOUBLE BED.......2  LARGE DOUBLE BED.......3  NO PREFERENCE.......9 |
|  |  |  |
|  | Net Roster |  |
|  | Observe the shape of the net | RECTANGULAR.......1  CONICAL.......2 |
|  | Observe the color of the net | BLUE.......1  WHITE.......2  GREEN .......3  OTHER.......8 |
|  | Observe or ask the width of the net | SINGLE BED.......1  DOUBLE BED.......2  LARGE DOUBLE BED.......3  UNKNOWN.......9 |
|  | Measure the height of the net from top seam to bottom seam | \_\_\_ \_\_\_ \_\_\_\_cm |

Note that the net textile does not need to be observed as it can be recoded from the data on the brand of the net.

We acknowledge that measuring the height of the net requires extra effort on the part of the interviewer as well as procurement of tape measures. However, height of nets has been a key sticking point in many recent country procurement discussions.

4.1.1 If requesting multiple questions, please specify the relative priority of each new question.

From highest to lowest priority, but both questions for a given characteristic (preference and observed net specification) need to be paired in the household/net questionnaire:

1. Color
2. Textile
3. Height
4. Width
5. Shape

4.2. **For revisions to existing questions**: Please specify the DHS-7 question number, the proposed revision to the question, and the rationale.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **DHS-7 question number** | **DHS-7 question text** | **Proposed new question** | **Rationale** |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

4.3. **For anthropometry and biomarkers**: Please describe the measurement procedures or specimen collection procedures, point-of-care or laboratory testing procedures (as relevant), and any recommendations for return of results.

5. Can any related questions be deleted from the questionnaire to make room for the proposed new content? If so please specify which questions using the DHS-7 question numbers.

6. What are the implications of these requested changes on measurement of trends using DHS data?

None.

# **Section IV. Indicator calculation**

7. Indicate how to calculate the indicator(s). Include detailed definitions of the numerator and denominator of each individual indicator. If you have developed a tabulation plan for the indicator(s), please attach a file including the suggested table(s) with your submission.

See Tables 3.11 and 3.12 in the Malawi 2017 MIS report. Similar tables would be used for the size and height.

For measured height of the net itself, would recommend cutting these at 10cm intervals from 150cm to 210cm and reporting by interval.



8. Is the indicator useful when measured at the national level, or is it useful only when disaggregated to specific subnational areas, such as endemicity zones or project intervention regions?

*For each indicator, select one of the three options by clicking in the appropriate box.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Indicator | Useful only for subnational endemicity zones or project intervention regions. A single estimate at the national level is not meaningful. | Useful at both national and subnational regions, as sample size allows. | Useful only at the national level. Subnational estimates are not needed. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |

# **Section V. Prior testing of the proposed question(s)**

9. Have the proposed questions undergone any formal validation; i.e., have the questions been tested against a “gold standard” to assess their accuracy? If yes, please describe how well or poorly the questions performed and/or provide a publication or report of the validation exercise (or a link).

Shape, color, and textile have been used in multiple MIS surveys. Height and width have not been used. Koenker et al “[Effect of user preferences on ITN use: a review of literature and data](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5455118/)” provides a rundown.

10. Have the questions undergone any other kind of testing; e.g., cognitive testing, pilot testing. If so, please describe the results of the testing and/or provide a publication or report of the findings (or a link).

See above.

# **Section VI. Other considerations**

11. Please provide information relevant to the kinds of questions below, and/or anything else you wish to share with us about this indicator (these indicators).

* Describe how the data for this indicator are being used (or will be used).
  + Are the data produced by this indicator actionable?
  + Who will use the data?
  + What kinds of decisions will be made using these data?
* For what kinds of countries would the indicator(s) be most useful?
* Does the DHS survey offer any particular advantage over other available data sources for measuring this indicator? If so, what?

We are proposing this as an optional module for countries that want to explore justifications for procuring ITNs of certain characteristics.

National Programmes are being asked to justify requests for certain net specifications, such as color, size, shape, and textile. Only DHS/MIS surveys provide enough power to assess the associations between reported preference and use of nets of given specifications, as well as to assess trends or variations across different areas of the country. National programs are often convinced that their populations will not use nets if they are not a certain shape/height/color; programs need data to better understand the influence (or lack thereof) of user preferences on net use. Likewise, large donors are not accepting justifications for particular net specifications that rely on small scale qualitative studies or survey data from a few selected sites within the country. Both donors and programs need more solid data on the associations between preferences and use in order to come to agreement for future net procurements.

With new restricted specifications, as well as next generation nets, there are fewer and fewer options for shape, color, and height. It will be important to monitor whether there is an impact on net use that is attributable to the specifications not matching with user expectations/preferences. The new restricted specifications are based on a relatively limited set of data from five countries, only one of which (Malawi) asked both questions about preferences and observed the net characteristics. There is a need to expand the evidence base for the policy.

As countries continue on the Journey Towards Self-Reliance, the private sector market for ITNs may play an increasing role in contributing to high levels of ITN access. Data on reported preferences will be useful to monitor trends and shifts in consumer preferences, which ITN manufacturers may find useful to target specific types of retail products in different areas and audience segments.