
Subject: Re: All-women factor in trend analysis

Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Mon, 24 Apr 2023 16:19:29 GMT

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

Following is a response from Senior DHS staff member, Tom Pullum:

I apologize for an error in the version of the Stata program with a "3Mar2023" date. Please use the attached version, with today's date, "24Apr2023". The only change in the corrected version is that the two lines

```
scalar mean_wt_ratio_nmw_to_emw=mean_wt_emw/mean_wt_nmw  
replace v005=v005*mean_wt_ratio_nmw_to_emw if nmw==1
```

should be used instead of the line "replace v005=v005*..... if nmw=1". That line had included mean_wt_ratio_nmw_to_emw but that scalar had not been defined. The program had correctly extracted the two means from the summarize commands and had assigned names to them, but I had not defined another scalar to be the ratio of those two means. Apparently I was doing some final streamlining of the program. The mistake is essentially a typo but a serious one.

If you make that substitution the program should work ok. I'm only posting a revised version, with today's date, in case someone else wants to use the program. Thanks for checking and seeing that v005 was missing for the never-married women. That would have a serious effect on any analysis!