

---

Subject: District borders

Posted by [MiFoo](#) on Tue, 05 Jul 2022 14:20:56 GMT

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

---

Hi everyone,

I am using the NFHS-4 and the NFHS-5 for a cross-sectional analysis and I would like to analyze the changes of indicators at the district level. However, I realized that the number of districts drastically increased from 640 to 932 between survey rounds. Is it possible to determine which district the PSUs from the NFHS-5 would have belonged to in the NFHS-4. Alternatively, I could combine all districts that have been split, merged, or changed their borders to get a consistent set of borders across survey rounds. I thought about using the longitude and latitude of PSUs provided in the GIS dataset but I guess a classification based on long and lat won't be reliable due to random dislocation.

I am looking forward to you advice!

Sarah

---

---

Subject: Re: District borders

Posted by [fred.arnold@icf.com](mailto:fred.arnold@icf.com) on Wed, 06 Jul 2022 18:09:18 GMT

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

---

At the time that the NFHS-5 sample design was finalized, there were 707 districts in India, and the sample included all of those districts. In NFHS-5, 132 newly created districts (79 in Phase 1 and 53 in Phase 2) were formed since NFHS-4. The 132 new districts in NFHS-5 have district codes of 801-932. The 132 newly formed districts in NFHS-5 are not comparable with the NFHS-4 districts even if some of them have the same district name in NFHS-5 and NFHS-4. We recommend limiting your comparison between NFHS-4 and NFHS-5 only to the 575 districts with district codes below 801 in NFHS-5. You are right that due to random displacement of the GPS coordinates for the primary sampling units, the GPS coordinates should not be used for the purpose you mentioned.

---