

---

Subject: Re: Reproducing Table 11.20 in NFHS-4 and NFHS-5 Reports  
Posted by [asriva](#) on Mon, 11 Dec 2023 20:51:34 GMT

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

---

Ah sorry, I should have provided more context about why I haven't been able to reproduce those estimates.

I did use the variable that refers to the question about visits to a health facility or camp in the previous 3 months from the women's recode (S368), along with weights, to find the percentage of women per state as per Table 11.20. However, the estimates I am getting from the IR data are much higher than the table. For Rajasthan in NFHS-5, the table reports 11.8% women went to a health facility or camp. But, I get 30.4% running this command -

```
tab s368 [iw=v005/1000000]
```

The skip patterns from the questionnaire indicate that Q.368 was asked if the respondent hadn't already indicated visiting a health facility or camp in two of the previous questions. Considering that the case, I replace the missing values in S368 with 1, which raises the percentage even more to 38.62% -

```
replace s368 = 1 if s368 == .  
tab s368 [iw=v005/1000000]
```

I don't understand how the estimate in the report is so much lower than what I get using the womens recode data. By being able to reproduce the estimates for the first and third, I mean the percentages I get from the data matches the percentages I see in the report table.

Please let me know if I am choosing the incorrect sample somehow, or if there was some post processing done on the variable to achieve the estimates in the table.

I would greatly appreciate it.

---