

---

Subject: Not matching with Table  
Posted by [Rupon](#) on Wed, 29 Nov 2023 12:01:11 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hi,

I am using NFHS-5 (2019-21) for India. I tried calculating the number of MOST RECENT LIVE BIRTH (midx==1) not delivered in health facility (TABLE 8.14 in report). Following a reply to another comment at [https:// userforum.dhsprogram.com/index.php?t=msg&goto=18260&srch=institutional%20delivery&SQ=c6f7e7a62ac4917bd6ea269bff619101&](https://userforum.dhsprogram.com/index.php?t=msg&goto=18260&srch=institutional%20delivery&SQ=c6f7e7a62ac4917bd6ea269bff619101&), I modified and ran the following command in Stata:

```
*generating weight  
gen wt = v005/1000000
```

```
*recoding delivery place  
recode m15 (11 = 4 "Own home") (12 = 5 "Other home") (13 = 6 "Parents' home") ///  
(21/27 = 1 "Public Sector") (33 = 2 "NGO") (31/32 = 3 "Private") ///  
(96 . =7 "Other"), gen(facdel)
```

```
*recoding delivery place  
recode facdel (4 5 6 = 2 "Home") (1 2 3 = 1 "Facility") (7 = 3 "Other"), gen(facdel2)
```

```
*institutional and non-institutional  
recode facdel2 (1 = 1 "Institutional") (2 3 =2 "Non-institutional"), gen (facdel3)
```

```
*tabulation for most recent live birth  
tab facdel3 [iw=wt] if midx==1
```

\*RESULT: Total NON-INSTITUTIONAL BIRTHS did not match with the table [in Table 17016, vs. our result 17395]. It seems that 'OTHER' is taken as 'INSTITUTIONAL' in calculating the report result.

Kindly note that for all live births, the calculated result matches with the report Table 8.13 with this command, however.

Your support is highly appreciated.

Thank you

Regards  
Rupon Basumatary

---

---

Subject: Re: Not matching with Table  
Posted by [Janet-DHS](#) on Wed, 06 Dec 2023 21:56:05 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

Thanks for pointing this out. Yes, it is possible that there was inconsistent treatment of m15=98 ("Other"). I have cross-tabulated m15 with the various m65 variables, which give the reasons for not having a facility ("Institutional") birth. Here's an example (for bidx=1:

```
. tab m15 m65a,m
```

place of delivery	reason didn't deliver   at health facility:		Total
	no	yes	
respondent's home	16,019	2,922	18,941
other home	163	33	196
parents' home	1,730	352	2,082
public: govt./munic.	53,283	0	53,283
public: govt. dispens	3,104	0	3,104
public: uhc/uhp/ufwc	2,416	0	2,416
public: chc/rural hos	41,151	0	41,151
public: phc/additiona	12,621	0	12,621
public: sub-centre	2,072	0	2,072
other public sector h	305	0	305
private: hospital/mat	38,480	0	38,480
other private sector	1,189	0	1,189
ngo or trust hospital	611	0	611
other	372	20	392
<b>Total  </b>	<b>173,516</b>	<b>3,327  </b>	<b>176,843</b>

In this table, "Other" (m15=98) is classified with home births. You say that in table 8.14 it was classified with institutional births. If so, that would be an inconsistency.

I see an error in the coding of the m65 variables that could have led to this. For example, m65a takes the values 0 and 1 but is never "." for NA. All of the m65 variables should have been coded NA for non-institutional births, corresponding with a skip in the questionnaire. The questions about reasons for not delivering in a facility should only be asked for births that were not in a facility.

I think you have answered your own question. If table 8.14 were calculated correctly, it would not include births for which m15=98. If it does include the births with m15=98, then there is either an error or an inconsistency.