
Subject: Re: Not matching with Table

Posted by [Janet-DHS](#) on Wed, 06 Dec 2023 21:56:05 GMT

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

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

Thanks for pointing this out. Yes, it is possible that there was inconsistent treatment of m15=98 ("Other"). I have cross-tabulated m15 with the various m65 variables, which give the reasons for not having a facility ("Institutional") birth. Here's an example (for bidx=1:

. tab m15 m65a,m

reason didn't deliver			
at health facility:			
cost too much			
place of delivery	no	yes	Total
-----+-----+-----			
respondent's home	16,019	2,922	18,941
other home	163	33	196
parents' home	1,730	352	2,082
public: govt./munic.	53,283	0	53,283
public: govt. dispens	3,104	0	3,104
public: uhc/uhp/ufwc	2,416	0	2,416
public: chc/rural hos	41,151	0	41,151
public: phc/additiona	12,621	0	12,621
public: sub-centre	2,072	0	2,072
other public sector h	305	0	305
private: hospital/mat	38,480	0	38,480
other private sector	1,189	0	1,189
ngo or trust hospital	611	0	611
other	372	20	392
-----+-----+-----			
Total	173,516	3,327	176,843

In this table, "Other" (m15=98) is classified with home births. You say that in table 8.14 it was classified with institutional births. If so, that would be an inconsistency.

I see an error in the coding of the m65 variables that could have led to this. For example, m65a takes the values 0 and 1 but is never "." for NA. All of the m65 variables should have been coded NA for non-institutional births, corresponding with a skip in the questionnaire. The questions about reasons for not delivering in a facility should only be asked for births that were not in a facility.

I think you have answered your own question. If table 8.14 were calculated correctly, it would not include births for which m15=98. If it does include the births with m15=98, then there is either an error or an inconsistency.
