
Subject: Postnatal care attendance - Liberia 2013 vs 2019
Posted by [Malachi Arunda](#) on Thu, 23 Feb 2023 11:44:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear DHS experts,

There is a marked difference in PNC attendance for 2013 and 2019. The 2013 data indicates over 60% attendance within 2 months while 2019 indicates about 28.7%.
To me this is not a normal trend and is confusing. Kindly any clarifications ?

Thank you in advance.

Kind regards
Malachi

Subject: Re: Postnatal care attendance - Liberia 2013 vs 2019
Posted by [Janet-DHS](#) on Tue, 28 Feb 2023 19:58:59 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

We can look into this, but can you tell us which specific tables in the reports you are looking at? Or did you get these numbers from STATcompiler? Or calculate them yourself? Are the time intervals and the classifications of medically trained providers the same in both cases?

Subject: Re: Postnatal care attendance - Liberia 2013 vs 2019
Posted by [Malachi Arunda](#) on Thu, 02 Mar 2023 00:22:00 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Tom,

Actually the report says something different from the dataset and that's why I decided to raise your attention. For postnatal care variable m70 in the 2019 dataset indicates that only 28.7% attended PNC while the corresponding value for the 2013 dataset indicates 60%. Grateful if you can look at this.

Best regards,
Malachi

Subject: Re: Postnatal care attendance - Liberia 2013 vs 2019
Posted by [Janet-DHS](#) on Fri, 03 Mar 2023 19:32:24 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

A few days ago we posted a Stata program to construct the indicators for postnatal care for the mother and the newborn. The GitHub programs include a program for the PNC tables, but I think the program just posted is easier to follow.

The specification of the PNC indicators in the tables changed between the two Liberia surveys. You will see the difference if you look at the footnotes to the tables in the reports.

The 2019, report, following the current specification of these tables, gives the interval to PNC for the women/newborns who had a medically trained provider, and then gives the provider for intervals <48 hours. The 2013 report does not include the conditions (which I have put in italics).

The PNC duration variables in the data files DO NOT condition on the PNC having been provided by a medically trained provider, but the distribution of duration in the 2019 tables DOES condition on that. Similarly, the PNC provider variables in the data files DO NOT condition on the interval being <48 hours, but the 2019 tables DO condition on that.

To compare the 2013 and 2019 data, you would have to be consistent in whether the conditions are included or not included. Hope this is clear.

Subject: Re: Postnatal care attendance - Liberia 2013 vs 2019
Posted by [Malachi Arunda](#) on Thu, 16 Mar 2023 13:53:01 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Dear Tom,

Thank you.

The Liberia datasets for 2013 and 2019 indicate that over 85% PNC were performed by trained medical personnel.

A quick analysis of the dataset for 2013 and 2019 for PNC first 48hours shows results below (1691 attendance in 2013 and 642 in 2019). This means 2-3 times more PNC attendance by trained personnel in 2013 than in 2019. Grateful if you can clarify this discrepancy.

In the reports PNC including first week of life for both 2013 &2019 - the tables for 2019 indicate 2096 -while in 2013 corresponding figure is 2650.

Also, kindly reshare the GitHub programs include a program for the PNC tables

2019

```
tab m71 if m71<=202
```

```
      time after delivery |  
      postnatal check took |  
           place |   Freq.   Percent   Cum.  
-----+-----  
immediately/in first hour |    77    11.99    11.99
```

hours: 1	104	16.20	28.19
102	50	7.79	35.98
103	17	2.65	38.63
104	10	1.56	40.19
105	6	0.93	41.12
106	3	0.47	41.59
107	3	0.47	42.06
108	2	0.31	42.37
109	1	0.16	42.52
110	4	0.62	43.15
111	2	0.31	43.46
112	6	0.93	44.39
113	1	0.16	44.55
114	1	0.16	44.70
120	1	0.16	44.86
124	6	0.93	45.79
133	1	0.16	45.95
148	2	0.31	46.26
172	1	0.16	46.42
days: 1	183	28.50	74.92
202	161	25.08	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	642	100.00	

2013

tab m71 if m71<=202

Time after delivery postnatal check took place	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
Immediately/in first hour	124	7.33	7.33
Hours: 1	495	29.27	36.61
102	210	12.42	49.02
103	79	4.67	53.70
104	52	3.08	56.77
105	26	1.54	58.31
106	38	2.25	60.56
107	11	0.65	61.21
108	10	0.59	61.80
109	5	0.30	62.09
110	11	0.65	62.74
111	2	0.12	62.86
112	11	0.65	63.51
115	1	0.06	63.57
116	1	0.06	63.63
118	2	0.12	63.75
122	2	0.12	63.87

124	27	1.60	65.46
Hours: number missing		1	0.06 65.52
Days: 1	288	17.03	82.55
202	295	17.45	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	1,691	100.00	

Subject: Re: Postnatal care attendance - Liberia 2013 vs 2019

Posted by [Janet-DHS](#) on Mon, 20 Mar 2023 20:20:54 GMT

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

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

If you are unable to match an indicator in a final report, please tell us which table in which report. The tables have details in the titles and footnotes that are crucial. There may have been a difference in the definition of the indicators. The definition of the PNC indicator changed from DHS-6 to DHS-7. Also, the tables in the reports use the sampling weights.

We recently posted a Stata program (

https://userforum.dhsprogram.com/index.php?t=tree&goto=26242&&srch=postnatal+care#msg_26242) that reproduces the tables on postnatal care for the

mother and newborn in the 2017-18 Bangladesh survey. You should be able to adapt it to the 2019 Liberia survey. The GitHub program for PNC (in the chapter on reproductive health, https://github.com/DHSProgram/DHS-Indicators-Stata/tree/master/Chap09_RH) may use the earlier definition.