

---

Subject: Contraceptive prevalence rate  
Posted by [cyk3121](#) on Wed, 11 Dec 2024 18:31:51 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Hello, I am trying to calculate the mCPR using BDHS 2022, but my estimate does not match the report. I am getting 36.5% while the report says 54.7%. I have downloaded the data multiple times but can't seem to match the report. Has anyone else had this issue? Are there special considerations for Bangladesh that don't apply to other countries? I have calculated it for 14 other countries correctly except for Bangladesh.

Thanks!

---

---

Subject: Re: Contraceptive prevalence rate  
Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Fri, 13 Dec 2024 12:39:48 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

I opened BDIR81FL.dta in Stata and entered the following line:

```
tab v313 if v501==1 [iweight=v005/1000000]
```

Here is the result:

The results include the 54.7% given in table 7.1.1 for the mCPR. This is the standard way to get the mCPR. I wonder what you were doing differently for the other surveys where you say you were getting a match.

The Bangladesh surveys only include ever-married women in the IR file but that should not affect the calculation of the mCPR, which is defined for currently married women.

---

### File Attachments

1) [v313.png](#), downloaded 245 times

---

---

Subject: Re: Contraceptive prevalence rate  
Posted by [cyk3121](#) on Mon, 16 Dec 2024 17:43:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Thank you for your response! I was using the FP module code on GitHub which generated an fp\_cruse\_mod variable from v313.

I see now that the Bangladesh data has missing values in v313 whereas the other countries in my analysis do not have missing data in this variable so that affected my denominator. Appreciate your insight.

\*\*\* Current use of contraceptive methods \*\*\*

```
//Currently use any method
gen fp_cruse_any = (v313>0 & v313<8)
label var fp_cruse_any "Currently used any contraceptive method"

//Currently use modern method
gen fp_cruse_mod = v313==3
label var fp_cruse_mod "Currently used any modern method"
```

---

Subject: Re: Contraceptive prevalence rate  
Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Tue, 17 Dec 2024 12:20:55 GMT  
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

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

Whenever I see a substantial number of cases with a dot (for Not Applicable or NA) on a key variable, I enter "lookfor select" to see if there is a selection variable for a subsample. One of the variables that comes up in this survey if you do that is "seligbm":

seligbm      byte    %8.0g    SELIGBM    hh selected for biomarker and long/short woman qre

which has the following distribution:

hh selected for biomarker and   long/short woman qre	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+-----			
household selected for biomarker and fu	10,053	33.42	33.42
household selected for full woman quest	9,934	33.03	66.45
household selected for short woman ques	10,091	33.55	100.00
-----+-----			
Total	30,078	100.00	

It appears that there was indeed subsampling in this survey. 10,091 women were in households selected for a "short" women's questionnaire that omitted questions about contraceptive use. That is, women with seligbm=3 are NA on v313 (and many other variables). Those women must be ignored for the calculation of the mCPR. This subsampling may affect other variables in your analysis.

This sort of thing is one of the hazards of using DHS data and the GitHub programs. Someone could say that analysts should read about the sampling design before starting to use the data but we (you and I!) usually just plunge in and then find these exceptional features the hard way. The good thing is that you tried to calibrate your estimate against the report and found a discrepancy, and it led to the evidence of subsampling. That's good practice. Subsampling is one of the main reasons why users cannot match reports.

---