
Subject: Immunization coverage - India 2019
Posted by [ICEH](#) on Tue, 31 May 2022 15:07:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear all,
I have noticed some potential inconsistencies in vaccine coverage (see below) and I wonder if you could provide some guidance.

1. For the age range 12-23 mo, measles coverage is 87.9% in the published report. However, considering the variable h9 in the children dataset and using the same definition, I ended up with a coverage of 71.7%.

The indicator was calculated considering all live children and using categories h9 = 1, 2 and 3 as vaccinated.

2. For the age range 24-35 mo, the report published full immunization coverage (FIC) as low as 3.3% which is much lower than published for children aged 12-23mo (76.6%). I calculated a FIC = 64.3%. Also, all the basic vaccines included in this indicator, had a coverage above 79%.

Subject: Re: Immunization coverage - India 2019
Posted by [Janet-DHS](#) on Thu, 02 Jun 2022 17:02:33 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

We are looking into discrepancies with the immunization data in this survey and will post a more complete response as soon as we can.

Subject: Re: Immunization coverage - India 2019
Posted by [Mihir](#) on Sun, 11 Feb 2024 11:56:19 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

I have replicated the stata code provided by DHS on GitHub, but I am getting results that are different from the published report.

I am getting "All basic vaccinations according to either source" = 61.66% when using 'age>=12 & age<=23'

Please Help!

Subject: Re: Immunization coverage - India 2019
Posted by [Janet-DHS](#) on Wed, 14 Feb 2024 17:02:54 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

Please say what table you are looking at in the report, and what is the number given in that table. I want to be sure we are talking about the same thing.

Subject: Re: Immunization coverage - India 2019
Posted by [oliver-fiala](#) on Fri, 14 Jun 2024 16:34:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Good afternoon!

I noticed the same issues as explained above - using the Stata code provided in GitHub, I estimate a measles coverage amongst children 12-23 months of 71.8% (compared to 87.9% in the final report and Statcompiler).

```
recode h9 (1 2 3=1) (else=0), gen(ch_meas_either)
tab ch_meas_either [aw=v005] if b19>=12 & b19<=23
```

I was wondering if you had any updates on the questions previously posted by ICEH?

Many thanks!
Oliver

Subject: Re: Immunization coverage - India 2019
Posted by [Janet-DHS](#) on Mon, 24 Jun 2024 13:41:31 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

It happens that there was considerable internal (DHS) discussion of the estimate of measles coverage in the NFHS-5 about two years ago, after the initial post by ICEH. We learned that "There was an issue with the reporting of measles. Apparently it was written as MCV in the questionnaire and some people did not know that MCV was measles so didn't record the measles vaccinations. Thus it would give an under count."

To compensate for this undercount, IIPS made an adjustment to the table, but nothing could be done to adjust the data in the data files. DHS objected at the time. After ICEH's post we asked IIPS for more of an explanation but none was received and we did not post a followup.

The bottom line is that the value you are getting (71.8%) is consistent with the data in the files but it is known to be an under-estimate because of the "MCV" issue. The figure in the report (87.9%) is the result of an adjustment that is not defensible and is probably too high. Any estimate of measles coverage at the time of the survey, including these two estimates, is off and needs a footnote.

Subject: Re: Immunization coverage - India 2019
Posted by [oliver-fiala](#) on Mon, 24 Jun 2024 15:04:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Many thanks for those information, very much appreciated!
Oliver
