Subject: Nutritional status of children
Posted by jamshed on Thu, 11 Mar 2021 05:13:47 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hi everyone,

There is a question which disturbing me very much.

My research data shows that -3 SD is higher than -2 SD while in DHS data and customer tell me that it should be the opposite. this problem is with Weight-for-height and Height-for-age but Weight-for-age is fine (shows -3 SD less than -2 SD).

Now, my question is, what could be the reason for having data on Weight-for-height and Height-for-age where -3 SD more than 2- SD.

Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

Regards,
Husein

Subject: Re: Nutritional status of children
Posted by Bridgette-DHS on Thu, 11 Mar 2021 20:55:44 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

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

Do you mean that you are getting larger percentage below -3 than below -2? You have probably accidentally reversed an inequality sign. Here's the Stata code I would use for height-for-age. You could compare with what you are using.

gen haz=hc70/100 if hc70<600 & hc70>-600
gen stunted=0 if haz<.
replace stunted=1 if haz<-2

gen severely_stunted=0 if haz<.
replace severely_stunted=1 if haz<-3

Subject: Re: Nutritional status of children
Posted by jamshed on Sat, 13 Mar 2021 04:57:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Its required to clarify, what would be the reason for having the large number of -3 SD in comparison with -2 SD? In DHS it shows opposite. What may affect such results?

Subject: Re: Nutritional status of children
Posted by Bridgette-DHS on Tue, 16 Mar 2021 19:14:09 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

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

I still do not understand your question. The number of cases below -3 sd should be less than the number of cases below -2 sd. Any other result would be impossible. It would not just be unusual, it would be impossible.

Are you referring to something you saw in a DHS report? If so, please say where you saw it. Or are you referring to something you got in your own analysis of DHS data? If so, please say which survey and give me the numbers.

Subject: Re: Nutritional status of children
Posted by Surbhi Agarwal on Wed, 09 Aug 2023 10:11:49 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear All,

I need to use weight for Height z-score for my analysis. For this I just need to confirm if we can use variable hc72 or hw72 directly as z scores or we need to convert it into z scores first. If yes, then how?
According to my understanding hc72 or hw72 itself represents WHZ scores so it need not be changed before using.

Thank you

Subject: Re: Nutritional status of children
Posted by Janet-DHS on Wed, 09 Aug 2023 20:52:37 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thank you for submitting your question.

Could you please provide some more detailed information so we can better advise you?

Can you let us know:
• Which survey you are using (Include country name and year)?
• Which data files you are referring to?
• Which software you are using (Stata, SPSS, R, etc.)?

If you are trying to match a Table in a final report, please also indicate which table and which estimate you are trying to match.

Subject: Re: Nutritional status of children
Posted by Bridgette-DHS on Mon, 14 Aug 2023 15:45:53 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

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

Yes, in the PR file, hc70, hc71, and hc72 are the HAZ, WAZ, and WHZ, respectively, except that they include a factor of 100 and there are codes for not measured, etc. You can get those codes from the labels (the label for hc70, for example, is usually either hc70 or HC70). In the KR and BR files, the prefix is hw rather than hc and the cases are limited to the children of interviewed mothers.