
Subject: number of women with a live birth in the 2 years preceding the survey
Posted by [huangfhq](#) on Mon, 11 Dec 2023 15:34:02 GMT

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

Our results differ from the Nepal DHS 2022 - Final Report when selecting the total sample of women with a live birth in the 2 years preceding the survey. We used MIDX=1 and B19_01<24 to obtain the number of women with a live birth in the 2 years, resulting in 2007. However, the number of women from the Nepal DHS 2022 - Final Report was 1949 in Table 9.1 (Number of antenatal care visits and timing of first visit) and 1996 in Table 9.9 (Place of delivery).

Subject: Re: number of women with a live birth in the 2 years preceding the survey
Posted by [Janet-DHS](#) on Fri, 22 Dec 2023 14:15:36 GMT

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

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

It will be easier if you use the NR file (a new type of file for DHS-8 surveys, with all the events in the pregnancy history for the past 5 years), rather than the IR file. Open NPNR82FL.dta and enter the following Stata line for the indicator in table 9.9:

*Match table 9.9.

```
tab p32 if p19<=23 & p32<=2 [iweight=v005/1000000]
```

This will match the total numbers of live births and stillbirths in table 9.9.

Table 9.1 is earlier in the tab plan but is actually a slight subsample of table 9.9. It is restricted to the most recent live birth or stillbirth in the past two years. You need to construct a recode of pidx, limited to those outcomes, and select the youngest:

* Match table 9.1

```
egen pidxr=rank(pidx) if p19<=23 & p32<=2, by(v001 v002 v003)  
tab p32 if p19<=23 & p32<=2 & pidxr==1 [iweight=v005/1000000]
```

Looking at the report, I do see a slight problem for table 9.1. The table gives 1933 births and 18 stillbirths (weighted), and a total of 1949. There is obviously some rounding here. I'd say there is also some kind of an error, because it is impossible for two numbers that round to 1933 and 18, respectively, to have a total that rounds to 1949. When I run the lines above, I get 1932.37 births and 16.64 stillbirths, before rounding, and a total of 1949.01. These numbers round to 1932 and 17 and 1949, respectively. The total of 1949 is matched exactly. I would not worry about reconciling 1933 and 18 in the report with 1932 and 17, respectively.

Subject: Re: number of women with a live birth in the 2 years preceding the survey
Posted by [Suna](#) on Wed, 09 Oct 2024 15:51:01 GMT

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

I hope you find this message.

This explanation was very easy to understand, but I had a problem with merging IR and NR.

Also, I thought it would be better not to use iweight as much as possible, but should I use it here?

I would also like to use the 2022 data, but I am having trouble because the numbers don't match.

I will mainly use the IR data for the analysis, even for the 2022 data. Would it still be better to code "Women who have had a live birth or stillbirth in the 2 years preceding the survey" with NR data?

I would appreciate it if you could also tell me the points to note and the code to use when merging IR data with NR data.

Subject: Re: number of women with a live birth in the 2 years preceding the survey
Posted by [Janet-DHS](#) on Tue, 15 Oct 2024 18:01:04 GMT

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

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

You can do this merge with the following Stata lines

* Merge IR and NR files in Nepal survey

use "...NPIR82FL.DTA", clear

*keep the variables you need from the IR file

keep v*

quietly merge 1:m v001 v002 v003 using "...\NPNR82FL.DTA"

tab _merge

* _merge=1: women who did not have a pregnancy in the past 3 years

* _merge=3: pregnancies in the past 3 years

keep if _merge==3

drop _merge

* Save this file with another name

Subject: Re: number of women with a live birth in the 2 years preceding the survey
Posted by [Suna](#) on Fri, 18 Oct 2024 04:41:29 GMT

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

Thanks, Janet, for this response; that is very helpful to know.