Subject: Re: accounting clustering effects of women's data when using baby-based analysis Posted by rkinoshita on Sun, 29 Sep 2013 14:21:05 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi. Thank you so much for all of useful inputs- they will be fruits for thoughts for my paper when I discuss about limitations and interpretations of the significant (or non-significant) results.

As for the number of clusters, please see below, women by area but limiting to those women who have ever married or in union because they also responded to my two violence variables (main exposure and outcome variables). Number of strata is 17 and PSU is 731. I am guessing that this would probably make less justifiable to use cluster model (which makes more precise estimates of SE than Robust model)- then again, my question is for which model do I need to use now???

I was discussing with my supervisor and we agreed that we will stick to birth-based analysis for associations between intimate partner violence and infant/child outcomes and discuss possible biases arising from repeated data of women with more than one birth.

My supervisor also found that svy + logistic is the same as using just logistic with vce(cluster) as an option, but with added value of weighting too. she suggested me to stick to svy + logistic because in order to pass this thesis and get my degree out, I don't need to learn new methods. Later on, I would need to look at this though, as I am hoping to publish this.

anyway, thanks a lot, again! Rinko

. svy: tab Area if QW814F==1, obs cell count format(%10.4f) (running tabulate on estimation sample)

Number of strata = 1 Number of PSUs = 7	
Area de	
Residenci	
a count proporti	ons obs
+	
Urbano 9419.3941	0.5822 5935.0000
Rural 6759.2356 (0.4178 6130.0000
Total 16178.6297	1.0000 12065.0000
Key: count = weighted counts propor~s = cell proportions obs = number of observations	

Page 2 of 2 ---- Generated from The DHS Program User Forum