Subject: Nutritional status of women
Posted by sohelruhrd on Tue, 06 Jan 2015 04:57:55 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

i used the following STATA commands to get the results of nutritional status among women using Nepal DHS 2011 data.

```
**************************************************
clear all
set more off
use "C:\dhs\Nepal 2011\individual recode\NPIR60FL.DTA", clear
* generate sampling weight
g wgt=v005/1000000

** Currently pregnancy
tab v213
** height/weight measured
tab v447

tab v445 if v447==0
gen bmi=v445/100 if v447==0

gen bmic=1 if bmi<18.5
replace bmic=2 if bmi>=18.5 & bmi<25
replace bmic=3 if bmi>=25 & bmi<30
replace bmic=4 if bmi>=30 & bmi<50
label define bmic 1"Underweight" 2"Normal" 3"Overweight" 4"Obese"
label values bmic bmic

tab bmic if v213==0 & v447==0 [iw=wgt]
**************************************************
```

however, the result is not same as the NDHS report. i found higher frequency (5851) than that reported in the NDHS report (5800) (page no-183). Can anybody help me to get the exact result as reported in the NDHS 2011 report?

Subject: Re: Nutritional status of women
Posted by Liz-DHS on Wed, 04 Mar 2015 17:33:51 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear User,
Your message has been forwarded to one of our experts. Will provide an answer as soon as it becomes available.
Thank you!

Subject: Re: Nutritional status of women
Posted by Liz-DHS on Fri, 06 Mar 2015 10:18:15 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear User,
Here is a response from one of our experts, Dr. Tom Pullum:
Quote:The main reason you have not matched table 11.10 on page 183 of the Nepal 2011 report is that you did not apply all the restrictions given in the footnote to the table. You need to remove the cases with v438 coded in the 9000's; the women who are pregnant; and the women with a birth in the preceding two months. You missed the third restriction, which requires looking at v008-b3_01. Here, v008 is the cmc of interview and b3_01 is the cmc of the most recent birth. You exclude the case if that difference is 0 or 1. I will put my modification of your code below and then the tabulation that corresponds to the bottom row of table 11.10.

```
gen bmi=v445/100
gen bmic=1 if bmi<18.5
replace bmic=2 if bmi>=18.5 & bmi<25
replace bmic=3 if bmi>=25 & bmi<30
replace bmic=4 if bmi>=30 & bmi<50
label define bmic 1"Underweight" 2"Normal" 3"Overweight" 4"Obese"
label values bmic bmic
gen ht_flag=0
replace ht_flag=1 if v438>9000
gen preg_flag=0
replace preg_flag=1 if v213==1
gen months_since_last_birth=v008-b3_01
gen recent_birth_flag=0
replace recent_birth_flag=1 if months_since_last_birth<=1
tab bmic if ht_flag==0 & preg_flag==0 & recent_birth_flag==0 [iweight=v005/1000000]
```

bmic	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
Underweight	1,055.0565	18.19	18.19
Normal	3,963.9914	68.35	86.54
Overweight	650.396456	11.21	97.76
Obese	130.142492	2.24	100.00
Total	5,799.5868	100.00	

Subject: Re: Nutritional status of women
Posted by UserUkbasedresearcher on Fri, 31 Mar 2017 13:48:59 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Hello,
I am using the code supplied above to get the BMI of women. It worked well in the Bangladesh

2014 DHS data. However, using it for the Tanzania 2015 data I seem to not get results matching the report. I have 11732 observations while the report (on page 249) shows 11.634 observations. I am a little tuck here. Any help would be much appreciated! I have the pasted the code again below.
Thanks,

Chris.

```
gen bmi=v445/100
gen bmic=1 if bmi<18.5
replace bmic=2 if bmi>=18.5 & bmi<25
replace bmic=3 if bmi>=25 & bmi<30
replace bmic=4 if bmi>=30 & bmi<50
label define bmic 1"Underweight" 2"Normal" 3"Overweight" 4"Obese"
label values bmic bmic
gen ht_flag=0
replace ht_flag=1 if v438>9000
gen preg_flag=0
replace preg_flag=1 if v213==1
gen months_since_last_birth=v008-b3_01
gen recent_birth_flag=0
replace recent_birth_flag=1 if months_since_last_birth<=1
tab bmic if ht_flag==0 & preg_flag==0 & recent_birth_flag==0 [iweight=v005/1000000]
```

Subject: Re: Nutritional status of women
Posted by Liz-DHS on Fri, 31 Mar 2017 21:35:20 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

A response from Dr. Tom Pullum:
Quote:
Your Stata code should work. The discrepancy in the number of cases is small and may be due to the difference between de facto and de jure residence (see hv102 and hv103 in the household file, v134 in the IR file). Or it could be the difference between the women who are in the PR file and those who are in the IR file. These numbers may differ slightly. Please look into those possibilities. If you still can't get a match, please tell us.

Subject: Re: Nutritional status of women
Posted by Ashmita2018 on Mon, 26 Mar 2018 13:58:27 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I tried the code shared by Dr. Tom Pullum, but I tried for NDHS 2016. Although most of the variables are same it didn't replicate Table 11.10.1

Is there any specific reason for that ?

Subject: Re: Nutritional status of women
Posted by Liz-DHS on Mon, 27 Aug 2018 16:09:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Dear User,
Please refer to the following resources:
The Guide to DHS Statistics https://
dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-dhsg1-dhs-questionna ires-and-manuals.cfm,
The Standard Recode Manual https://
dhsprogram.com/publications/publication-DHSG4-DHS-Questionna ires-and-Manuals.cfm,
using Datasets for Analysis https://dhsprogram.com/data/Using-Datasets-for-Analysis.cfm and a series of videos to help
guide you with your analysis https://blog.dhsprogram.com/dhsdataintro/.
The IUPMS website is also a great resource: https://www.idhsdata.org/idhs/ For specific assistance with Stata, please visit
You may also want to search the forum for [url=
http://www.cpc.unc.edu/research/tools/data_analysis/statatut orial/][url]
keywords which might help guide your analysis. After reviewing these resources, if you still have a question, please feel free to post
again. Thank you!
