
Subject: Re: Table on Fertility Planning Status from NFHS-4 data

Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Mon, 26 Feb 2018 18:43:18 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Following is a response from Senior DHS Stata Specialist, Tom Pullum:

I apologize for the delay in this response to your Feb. 4 posting. The table on "fertility planning status"--table 4.18 in the India 2015-16 report--is a relatively difficult table to reproduce in Stata. I am attaching a Stata program, as a text file, that reproduces table 4.18, and the accompanying log file. To use the program you must change the paths. The structure of the program, with subprograms, may seem too complex, but it is actually much easier to segment the procedure as I have done, because the IA71 files are huge and you waste time just waiting for them to open.

Everything can be done from the IR file. You first break out the births in the past five years, using "reshape long" and save them. Then you return to the IR file and break out the pregnancies. You then append the pregnancies to the births. There are actually two problems with table 4.18 as it appears in the report, both of them with the "number of births" column for "mother's age at birth". The problem is for the cases that are current pregnancies, rather than actual births. The mother's age at birth, for current pregnancies, is calculated by assuming that the cmc of the birth will be the cmc of interview plus 9 minus the number of months pregnant. The number of months pregnant is given by v214. The distribution of v214 has two problems. One is that there are 7 cases in which the woman says she is pregnant but the duration of pregnancy is not given. The numbers given do not actually add up to 281,067 because of those 7 cases. More important, there are 75 women who give the duration of their current pregnancy as 10 months. The calculation that I just gave, in those cases, would mean that the child with whom the woman is pregnant was already born, the month before the interview! It would have been better to recode duration=10 months to 9 months. Of course, there are actually many errors in the reporting of v214, and the effect of those 75 cases is negligible. In the program I indicate where this particular problem could be "corrected".

File Attachments

- 1) [fert_planning_log_26Feb2018.smcl](#), downloaded 754 times
 - 2) [fert_planning_do_26Feb2018.txt](#), downloaded 861 times
-