Subject: Re: Calculating Under 5 Mortality Rate
Posted by lonrwo1 on Wed, 28 Sep 2016 05:25:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thank you Liz/Dr Pullum,

Thank you very much indeed for your reply. Unfortunately I'm working to an end of the week deadline, so the stata program in two weeks will sadly be of no use to me.

My understanding was that the code I am running to generate U5 mortality rate matches what is described by Dr Tom in his post and also on section C page 94 of the Guide to DHS Statistics.

```
gen hypage=(v008-b3)
gen survivelength=.
replace survivelength=hypage
replace survivelength=b7 if b5==0
gen dead=(b5==0)
ltable survivelength dead if hypage <60, int(0,1,3,6,12,24,36,48,60) failure
```

When running the above code I get the following lifetable output

Interval		Beg. Total	Deaths	Cum. Lost	Std. Failure	Error	[95% Conf.	Int.]
0	1	6079	176	61	0.0291	0.0022	0.0252	0.0337
1	3	5842	38	219	0.0355	0.0024	0.0311	0.0405
3	6	5585	38	315	0.0423	0.0026	0.0375	0.0477
6	12	5232	47	652	0.0515	0.0029	0.0461	0.0575
12	24	4533	53	1119	0.0641	0.0033	0.0579	0.0710
24	36	3361	14	1147	0.0688	0.0036	0.0622	0.0761
36	48	2200	6	1093	0.0722	0.0038	0.0651	0.0800
48	60	1101	1	1100	0.0739	0.0042	0.0662	0.0825

You can see that the cumulative failure for the last interval 48 - 60 months is 0.739, x 1000 =73.9 or 74 per 1,000. This is the U5 mortality rate reported in the KDHS 2009 - Fig 8.2 page 107, so this seems to me, to confirm that this is the correct method to use. My confusion comes from the fact that when including other variables e.g. by(province) to the ltable code i.e.

```
ltable survivelength dead if hypage <60, by (province) int(0,1,3,6,12,24,36,48,60) failure
```

the U5 rates (cumulative failure for last age interval x 1,000) for each province are;

1. very different from what is reported in the report(## per 1,000)

2. alongside being different the observed difference in rates is also not proportionate to what is reported in the report e.g. Central Province (No. 2) is 51 per 1,000 in the report but increases to 79 when using the above ltable, compared to Nyanza province (No.5) which is 151 per 1,000 in

the report but reduces to 126 when using the above ltable method. It something to do with the way DHS calculate the stratum specific (e.g. province) rates?

I would be most grateful if you could provide any further insight into this apparent discrepancy.

Kind Regards,

Rob