
Subject: Re: Combine weights Men and Women - Cambodia DHS

Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Fri, 10 Jul 2020 13:36:09 GMT

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

Following is another response from DHS Research & Data Analysis Director, Tom Pullum:

Very interesting question. A big conceptual issue is that the relationship between the outcome and pre-test counseling is not deterministic and if you could change the level of pre-test counseling (in a real population) then the other covariates in the model might change too. However, this is less serious for an intervention than for other covariates and it could be a way to generate target levels of pre-test counseling.

Think of x as the observed proportion (not percentage) of women with 1 on the intervention, in the entire survey or (better) in a more homogeneous sub-population. Say that P is the corresponding proportion who have 1 on the outcome. Say that b is the coefficient for the intervention (preferable in a model that includes controls). Say that X is the target level of x .

The observed P corresponds with the observed x , and $P=.9$ corresponds with the target X . Therefore $\log(.9/.1) - \log[P/(1-P)]$ equals $b(X-x)$. The other terms in the regression equation drop out. Solving for X , the only unknown, you have
$$X = x + \frac{[\log(.9) - \log[P/(1-P)]]}{b}$$
. This is a simple approach but it may be TOO simple, because I see that it can generate values of X that are greater than 1, and that would not be legal for a probability. I suggest you try it. Maybe other forum users will have suggestions.