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## Glossary of Commonly Used Terms and Abbreviations

| 4:3:1 | Child has received 4 or more DTP, 3 or more polio, and 1 or more MCV vaccinations. |
| :---: | :---: |
| 4:3:1:3 | Child has received 4 or more DTP, 3 or more polio, 1 or more MCV, and 3 or more Hib vaccinations. |
| 4:3:1:3:3 | Child has received 4 or more DTP, 3 or more polio, 1 or more MCV, 3 or more Hib, and 3 or more hepatitis $B$ vaccinations. |
| CAPI | Computer-assisted personal interviewing |
| CDC | Centers for Disease Control and Prevention |
| DOB | Date of birth |
| DTaP | Diphtheria, tetanus, acellular pertussis |
| DTP | Diphtheria, tetanus, pertussis |
| Hep B | Hepatitis B |
| Hib | Haemophilus influenzae type b |
| IHQ | Immunization History Questionnaire |
| IPV | Inactivated poliovirus vaccine |
| MCV | Measles-containing vaccine |
| MMR | Measles, mumps, rubella |
| NCHS | National Center for Health Statistics |
| NHIS | National Health Interview Survey |
| NIP | National Immunization Program |
| NIPRCS | National Immunization Provider Record Check Study |
| OPV | Oral poliovirus vaccine |

## Chapter 1. Introduction

Since 1991, national estimates of vaccination coverage have been available through the National Health Interview Survey - Immunization Supplement (NHIS/IM), sponsored by the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and conducted by the Census Bureau. The NHIS questionnaire includes a core module that collects demographic information on all household members, a module of health questions about one sampled adult, and a module of health questions about one sampled child. ${ }^{1}$ At the end of the core interview, the NHIS/IM is administered for the sampled child and all other children in the household between the ages of 12-35 months. The NHIS/IM asks for a vaccination history of the child. Respondents can either report vaccination dates from a written shot record, if one is available for the child, or they can report the total number of doses for each vaccine from memory recall if no shot record is available.

Reliance on household reports of childhood immunizations has two potential inaccuracies that influence the estimation of vaccination coverage (Zell et al. 1996). First, a large proportion ( $63 \%$ ) of respondents rely only on memory recall to report their child's immunization history, which is subject to the potential bias inherent in recall data. In 1999, only $37 \%$ of respondents used a shot card to report all or some of their child's vaccinations. Second, even when shot records are used, dates of vaccinations may be missing if the respondent did not have the shot record at the time of the immunization or the original shot record has been lost. Thus, the validity of the vaccination coverage estimates produced from the NHIS has been a major concern. Therefore, to determine the accuracy of the household responses in the NHIS, the NCHS and the National Immunization Program (NIP) of the CDC implemented the National Immunization Provider Record Check Study (NHIS/NIPRCS) in 1994. Its purpose is to evaluate the accuracy of household reports of children's immunization histories by comparing the household reports with the reports from the children's immunization providers, and to produce national estimates of vaccination coverage using both the household and provider reports (Ezzati-Rice et al. 1996; Peak and Cadell 1996). The estimates of vaccination coverage from the NHIS/NIPRCS are also used to adjust for non-telephone coverage bias in the National Immunization Survey (NIS), a telephone survey of households with children aged 19-35 months.

The NHIS/NIPRCS produces estimates of coverage for nine vaccines and series of vaccines. Table 1.1 lists these vaccines and the number of doses required to be up-to-date for each vaccine and series.

[^0]| Table 1.1:Vaccines and Combinations of Vaccines Monitored in the <br> $\mathbf{1 9 9 9}$ NHIS/NIPRCS |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| DTP | 4 or more doses of diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis vaccine |
| DTP3 | 3 or more doses of diphtheria-tetanus-pertussis vaccine |
| Polio | 3 or more doses of polio vaccine |
| MCV | 1 or more doses of measles-containing vaccine |
| Hib | 3 or more doses of Haemophilus influenzae type b vaccine |
| Hep B | 3 or more doses of hepatitis B vaccine |
| $4: 3: 1$ | 4 or more doses of DTP, 3 or more doses of polio, and 1 or more <br> doses of measles-containing vaccine |
| $4: 3: 1: 3$ | 4 or more doses of DTP, 3 or more doses of polio, 1 or more doses <br> of measles-containing vaccine, and 3 or more doses of Hib vaccine |
| $4: 3: 1: 3: 3$ | 4 or more doses of DTP, 3 or more doses of polio, 1 or more doses <br> of measles-containing vaccine, 3 or more doses of Hib, and 3 or <br> more doses of hepatitis B vaccine |

## General Information about the 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS

The NHIS/NIPRCS begins with households that completed an NHIS/IM for a child or children aged 12-35 months. As part of completing the Immunization Supplement, the parent or legal guardian is asked to sign a permission form allowing the survey staff to contact the child's medical providers. Only households that signed permission forms are eligible for the NHIS/NIPRCS. The permission form has space for the names and addresses of up to three providers. It also contains identifying information and the signature of the parent or guardian. Permission forms are valid for one year from the date of the interview. The permission forms are sent to the NHIS/NIPRCS contractor for data collection, Abt Associates Inc.

All providers for whom households gave adequate locating information are mailed an Immunization History Questionnaire (IHQ). (See Appendix B for a copy of the 1999 IHQ.) A label on the IHQ gives the child's name, date of birth, and gender, so the provider can locate the child's records. The form includes a grid for the provider to record the date of each vaccination the child has received. The provider is asked to enter all known vaccinations, whether they were given at that practice or elsewhere. In addition to the child's immunization history, the form collects the characteristics of the provider's practice, such as whether the practice is a public or private facility and the types of care provided.

The returned IHQs are reviewed for legibility and consistency, and edited as appropriate before being sent to a vendor for data entry. The data from the IHQ are entered in a database, with $100 \%$ double-keying, and the raw data file is returned to the contractor for cleaning and further editing.

The immunization information reported by the households and providers is compared for each child. If discrepancies are discovered, the case is eligible for reconciliation. That process contacts the providers, the household, or both to resolve the inconsistencies between the reports. The household is asked to verify some information and whether any additional providers should be contacted, and the providers are asked about specific vaccination dates or whether another provider could have immunization records for the child. If discrepancies remain in the data after these contacts, either the provider information or a combination of the household and provider information is considered to be the most accurate or the "best values" for immunization information.

The NHIS interviews were conducted between January and December of 1999. Data collection for the 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS began in June 1999 and continued through September 2000. The reconciliation was conducted between May and September of 2001.

The 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS public-use data file includes data for 2,565 children with completed NHIS/IM interviews. The variables included in the data file come from the 1999 NHIS and the 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS IHQ. The NHIS variables were selected from the following NHIS data files: Household, Family, Person, Sample Adult, Sample Child, and Immunization Supplement.

For further information on the NHIS data products, please contact the NCHS Data Dissemination Branch:

Phone: 301-458-4901
FAX: 301-458-4035
E-mail: nhislist@cdc.gov
Internet: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis.htm

## Chapter 2. Sample and Data Collection

### 2.1 Summary of 1999 Sample

The 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS sample contains 2,565 children aged 12-35 months with a completed NHIS/IM. Of these children, 772 (30.1\%) were aged 12-18 months at the time of the NHIS interview, and $1,793(69.9 \%)$ were $19-35$ months. IHQs were mailed to the providers for the 1,793 children ( $69.9 \%$ ) who had valid permission forms. Providers returned IHQs with vaccination data for 1,394 children in the original data collection, and an additional 33 children in reconciliation, for a total of $1,427(79.6 \%)$ of the children. In total, $1,427(55.6 \%)$ of the children with a completed NHIS/IM had provider data. (See Figure 2.1.)

Of the 2,565 children, best values for vaccination dates could be determined for 1,533 (59.8\%). The number of children with best values for vaccination dates is greater than the number of children with provider vaccination data. Some children without provider vaccination data have best vaccination values because they are 4:3:1:3 up-to-date from a household shot card. For the children without best values, up-to-date status was imputed. (The imputation procedures are described in Section 3.6.) Table 2.1 shows the results of the provider data collection and best value construction for the two age groups. See Appendices F and G for tables summarizing the distribution of the sample by various demographic characteristics.

| Table 2.1Distribution of Children with Provider and Best Value Data by Age <br> Group, 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Children aged <br> $12-18$ months | Children aged <br> 19-35 months | Total |
| Total number of children | 772 | 1,793 | 2,565 |
| Number of children with <br> requests mailed to providers | N/A | N/A | 1,793 |
| Number of children with <br> provider data | 431 | 996 | 1,427 |
| Number of children with <br> best values | 464 | 1,069 | 1,533 |
| Number of children with <br> imputed best values | 308 | 724 | 1,032 |

FIGURE 2.1: 1999 NHIS/ NIPRCS SAMPLE


### 2.2 NHIS Immunization Supplement

The U.S. Bureau of the Census collects data for the NHIS under a contract with the NCHS. Census Bureau interviewers conduct personal, in-home interviews with individuals in sampled households. For the Family Core component of the NHIS Basic Module, all members of an eligible household who are at home at the time of the interview and 17 years of age and over are asked to participate and to respond for themselves. For children and those adults not at home during the interview, information is provided by a knowledgeable adult family member (18 years of age or over) residing in the household. For the Sample Adult questionnaire, one adult per family is randomly selected; this individual responds for him/herself to the questions in this interview. Information for the Sample Child questionnaire is obtained from a knowledgeable adult in the household.

The 1999 NHIS interview was conducted using a computer-assisted personal interviewing (CAPI) version of the NHIS questionnaire. Interviewers administered the instrument using laptop computers, entering responses directly into the computer during the household interview. This computerized mode of administration offers distinct advantages in timeliness of the data and improved data quality.

The data for the NHIS/IM are collected for children selected for the Sample Child questionnaire, and all other children in the household between the ages of 12 and 35 months.

### 2.3 National Immunization Provider Record Check Study

The data in the provider record check study are collected in two phases: original data collection and reconciliation. In the original data collection, immunization records are collected from the providers. In reconciliation, the data collected from the providers are compared and reconciled with the data collected from the household. During reconciliation, some new IHQs are received for children for whom provider data were not obtained in the original data collection.

### 2.3.1 Original Data Collection

Once the NHIS/IM is completed, the names and addresses of immunization providers identified by household respondents are written on permission forms. The NHIS CAPI questionnaire captures whether a permission form was completed (or Ayenerated@ and whether the permission form was signed by the child干 parent or legal guardian. An electronic file of eligible household ID numbers with child and household data is forwarded to the NIPRCS contractor, Abt Associates, where it is entered into a case management and tracking system. The Regional Offices of the Census Bureau send the signed permission forms to the contractor.

The first step in data collection matches the permission forms with the file of eligible households. The file is loaded into a case management system. After the forms have been matched, provider names, addresses and telephone numbers are entered from the hard-copy permission forms. After data entry and editing are completed, a scannable label with an ISBN
bar code is printed for each case ID and attached to the appropriate permission form in order to facilitate tracking and reporting.

After the provider address information has been entered, the next step is to check its completeness. (Complete addresses are necessary to mail questionnaires to immunization providers.) When the household did not supply a complete address for a provider, locating clerks use multiple methods to find additional information, including searching a database of providers from the NIS and calling Directory Assistance.

Once the provider addresses have been reviewed and updated, the initial requests are mailed. The initial mailing packet includes the following documents:
\$ A cover letter from the Director of the NCHS describing the purpose of the NHIS/NIPRCS, the importance of provider participation, and how the parent $\mp$ consent was obtained. Separate letters are used for cases with a parent $\mp$ signature and cases with an interviewer₹ signature verifying a parent₹ verbal consent during a telephone contact.
\$ An excerpt from the permission form signed by the parent or guardian, or signed by the interviewer for cases with verbal consent.
\$ An Immunization History Questionnaire labeled with sufficient information to identify the child whose immunization records are requested.
\$ An excerpt from an article in the Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (MMWR) containing information on national vaccination rates.
\$ A pre-addressed, postage-paid return envelope.
Providers are asked to complete the IHQ, or to attach a copy of the child干 immunization records. Providers are also given the option to return the forms by mail, or to a toll-free fax number. Reminder/thank you postcards are mailed two weeks after the initial mailing. The postcards contain the CDC logo to identify study sponsorship, a Ahank-you@o those who have already returned the original IHQ, and a brief message about the need for and importance of collecting these data to measure vaccination coverage among children in the U.S.

The IHQ used in 1999 was changed from the questionnaire used in previous years. The format of the first page was changed from a vertical to a landscape orientation, and the combination vaccine hepatitis $\mathrm{B}-\mathrm{Hib}$ was added to the shot grid. Two new questions were added on the second page. One item asks if the child's shots were reported to a state or local immunization registry, and the second asks for the medical specialty of the person who ordered the child's immunizations. Two questions were dropped from the previous versions of the IHQ. (See Appendix B for the 1999 IHQ and Section 5.5 for detailed descriptions of the changes to the data file resulting from the changes to the questionnaire.)

Reminder packets containing a second copy of the IHQ are mailed three weeks after the postcard mailing (five weeks from the initial mailing) to providers who have not yet returned the IHQ from the first mailing. A one-page letter reiterates the importance of provider participation and requests return of the completed questionnaire. Seven weeks after the initial mailing, provider offices that still have not responded to the initial request or subsequent mailed reminders receive a telephone prompt from an experienced interviewer trained to elicit cooperation and record medical information. The prompting call is a final attempt to complete and return the provider questionnaires. Generally, these prompting calls serve to remind providers to return the completed questionnaires, and they provide an opportunity to mail or fax new materials to those providers who request them. In some cases, the questionnaire is completed with the interviewer over the telephone.

The IHQ is then manually edited. If a provider returned a copy of the child's medical records, the information is transcribed onto a new IHQ. Every IHQ is reviewed by a quality control clerk. The cases are then sent to a vendor for data entry. The forms are keyed twice for verification. The data from the IHQs are then merged with the NHIS data to create the initial dataset.

### 2.3.2 Matching and Reconciliation

In matching and reconciliation, every case with provider data is reviewed and compared with the corresponding data from the NHIS/IM interview. For cases in which the household and provider data are discrepant, or where provider data are missing, either the household, the provider, or both are recontacted by telephone or mail to clarify the discrepant data.

The first step in the matching process is to divide the cases into ten adjudication groups. First, the cases are separated by whether a shot card was used in the initial household interview. Cases with shot cards are further divided into five groups, depending on whether there is a discrepancy between the dates and/or doses of the household and provider reports. Cases in which the household reported only the number of doses of each vaccine from recall are divided into four groups. Finally, cases in which multiple providers responded for a child but the provider reports disagreed form the final adjudication group. Table 2.2 defines the adjudication groups and gives the number of children in each in 1999.

Table 2.2 Distribution of Cases with Provider Data by Adjudication Group before Reconciliation, 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS ${ }^{1}$

| Category | Category Description | Total Number of Cases | Cases Requiring Reconciliation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Household reports from shot record |  |  |  |
| R1 | All dates and numbers of doses matched provider reports | 55 | 5 |
| R2 | All numbers of doses matched provider reports, but at least one date was discrepant | 56 | 46 |
| R3 | At least one discrepancy in number of doses; all discrepancies involved a household over-report | 78 | 76 |
| R4 | At least one discrepancy in number of doses; all discrepancies were involved a household under-report | 225 | 109 |
| R5 | At least two discrepancies in number of doses; at least one over-report and one under-report | 72 | 69 |
| Household reports from memory (recall) |  |  |  |
| H1 | No discrepancies in number of doses (including cases where the household responded "Don $\ddagger$ Know @ | 96 | 11 |
| H2 | At least one discrepancy in number of doses; all discrepancies involved a household over-report | 155 | 118 |
| H3 | At least one discrepancy in number of doses; all discrepancies involved a household under-report | 311 | 52 |
| H4 | At least two discrepancies in number of doses; at least one over-report and one under-report | 166 | 128 |
| Multiple providers |  |  |  |
| M | Non-identical reports from two or more providers | 180 | 66 |
| Total number of children with provider data |  | 1,394 | 680 |

[^1]A matching sheet is printed for every case. The matching sheet displays key data items for the child, and all of the household and provider-reported vaccination data. The matching sheets from each adjudication group are reviewed for discrepancies. Cases that need reconciliation because of differences between household and provider reports of the number or dates of specific vaccinations are assigned problem codes that describe the type of discrepancy. These cases are sent to a specially trained team of telephone interviewers and supervisors for reconciliation. Additionally, sample children for whom no providers responded in the original data collection are sent to reconciliation. (See Figure 2.2 for an illustration of the reconciliation process.)

In reconciliation, the provider is called, and interviewers attempt to resolve the discrepancy. The providers are asked to check their medical records to verify the information returned on the IHQ or reported by the household. Providers are also asked whether the y know of any other vaccination providers for the child.

If the provider is unable to reconcile the discrepancy or cannot be reached, or if the problem appears to be in the household data, telephone interviewers attempt to contact the household to resolve the discrepancy. When contacted, the original household respondent or another knowledgeable adult is asked whether a shot card is available for the child. If the household has a shot card, specific dates are verified. If no shot card is available, the household respondent is asked to verify that the child had received vaccinations.

For those cases in which none of the providers for a child responded with vaccination data, a telephone interviewer contacts the household, verifies the names and addresses of providers previously reported, and asks for any other providers who may have immunization information for the child. This group includes cases in which:
\$ The provider reported never treating the child.
\$ The provider reported treating the child but not having immunization records, or indicated that the immunization records had been forwarded to another provider.
\$ No provider responded for the child.
\$ The provider contact information originally reported by the household was inadequate.
\$ An original provider responded with some vaccination information, but it appeared that the child may have had another vaccination provider.

Figure 2.2: Flow Diagram of 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS Reconciliation Process


These households are mailed an advance letter that includes a provider information form and a consent form that the respondent can return by mail. Ten days after the advance letter is mailed, telephone interviewers attempt to contact the household by phone. The interviewer confirms the provider information originally reported by the respondent, and probes the respondent for additional providers. The interviewer obtains verbal consent to recontact the original providers and to contact any additional providers. In 1999, 399 cases in which the original provider never responded were eligible for reconciliation.

Of the 1,079 total cases eligible for reconciliation, the provider gave new information to reconcile a discrepancy in 113 cases. In 87 cases, the household reconciled a discrepancy. Additionally, providers returned data for 33 children for whom provider data were not returned in the original data collection. These additional data were added to the original provider data for estimation. Table 2.3 summarizes the impact reconciliation had on the numbers of vaccinations reported.

| Table 2.3 Reconciliation for 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Total number of children in reconciliation | 1,079 |
| Number of children with changes to provider-reported number of doses |  |
| DTP | 44 |
| Polio | 19 |
| MCV | 10 |
| Hib | 67 |
| Hep B | 71 |
| Varicella | 31 |
| Number of children aged 19-35 months who were not 4:3:1:3 up-to-date | 227 |
| Before reconciliation | 216 |
| After reconciliation | -11 |
| Change in 4:3:1:3 up-to-date status |  |
| Number of children with changes to shot dates | 87 |
| Changes to household-reported shot dates | 113 |

### 2.4 Data Processing

After reconciliation is completed, the new data are combined with the original data for the estimation of vaccination coverage rates. The combined data are reviewed for certain kinds of discrepancies that may remain, including:

- the date of birth name, or gender given by the provider did not match the NHIS data;
- multiple providers reported different dates of birth;
- the provider reported MCV or varicella shots before 9 months of age;
- vaccination dates before the date of birth;
- a single provider reported consecutive vaccination dates within 28 days or multiple provider reports that had vaccination dates within 14 days; and
- vaccination dates that were out of sequence.

If the discrepancy can be resolved by reviewing the dates of other vaccinations the child had received (e.g., it may be evident that part of the date was transposed or incorrectly written), the data are then edited

In filling out the IHQ, a provider may not know the date of the first dose of hepatitis B. For children with fewer than three reported hepatitis B vaccinations, a program checks to see whether the "Administered at Birth" box was checked for the first dose of hepatitis B. If it was checked, and the date of the birth dose of hepatitis B was not reported, the program assigns the date of the birth dose for this vaccine. If the household used a vaccination record to report vaccination dates, those dates are examined to see whether the date of the birth dose can be taken from that record. If it is not reported in the vaccination record, a value is imputed from the distribution of provider-reported dates for the birth dose of hepatitis B. The birth dose is defined as being between the date of birth (i.e. 0 days) and the date of birth plus 7 days. This procedure was implemented in 1999. Cases in which the date of the birth dose were imputed can be identified through the variable HEP_IFLG.

Once all the data have been edited, a disposition code (DISPCODE) that indicates the completeness and validity of the immunization data is assigned to every case with provider data. Cases with DISPCODE equal to 7 have provider data, but the completeness of the provider data is unknown. Therefore, cases with DISPCODE $=7$ are not used in calculating the estimates of vaccination coverage. All other cases with a nonmissing DISPCODE are considered to have usable provider data.

### 2.5 Informed Consent, Security, and Confidentiality of Information

The data collection procedures of the NHIS assure the respondent of the confidentiality of his/her responses and the voluntary nature of the survey. Informed consent is obtained from the respondent (generally the parent or guardian of the child) to participate in the household interview and also (at the end of the interview) to contact the child's vaccination providers.

Information in the NHIS/NIPRCS is collected and processed under high security. To ensure privacy of the respondents and confidentiality of sensitive information, NCHS has established standards for release of data from all NCHS surveys. All CDC staff and contractor staff involved with the NHIS/NIPRCS sign the NCHS confidentiality agreement and follow procedures to prevent disclosure.

All information in the NHIS/NIPRCS is collected under strict confidentiality and can be used only for research purposes [Section 308(d) of the Public Health Service Act, 42 U.S. Code

242m(d), and the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 U.S. Code 552a)]. Prior to the public release, the contents of the public- use data file go through an extensive review by the NCHS Disclosure Review Board to protect confidentiality of the participants as well as the data.

## Chapter 3. Estimation of Vaccination Coverage

### 3.1 NHIS Weighting Information

The NHIS uses a multistage sample design to represent the civilian noninstitutionalized population of the U.S.; each person interviewed has a known probability of selection. The resulting sampling weights (initially equal to the reciprocal of the selection probability) are adjusted for unit nonresponse and poststratified to population control totals from the Census Bureau by sex, age, and race/ethnicity. Thus, each respondent has a sample weight that can be used to produce national estimates.

The NHIS weight that is the foundation for the 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS sampling weight is a childlevel weight that comes from the Immunization Supplment data file. This Final Annual Weight (WTFA_IM) is included in the public-use data file. It includes design, nonresponse, and poststratification adjustments for sample children under 18 years of age, and additional children aged 12-35 months in sampled households.

### 3.2 Provider-Adjusted Estimates

The provider-adjusted method of estimation produces estimates of percentages of children who are up-to-date for various vaccines and combinations of vaccines. The provider-adjusted estimates are calculated by first dividing the children into a set of weighting classes for each vaccine. Within each weighting class, the proportion of children with usable provider data who are up-to-date is calculated, and then applied to the total number of children within the weighting class. The estimated numbers of up-to-date children and the total numbers of children are then summed to produce an overall coverage estimate for that vaccine. These estimates are comparable to the estimates produced in the National Immunization Survey (Stokley et al. 2000; Bartlett et al. 2001). Section 4.1 gives detailed instructions for calculating provider-adjusted estimates.

### 3.3 Adjustment for Effect of Nonresponse Follow-Up Survey

The 1996 and 1998 NHIS/NIPRCS included a nonresponse follow-up survey (NRFUS) with households with children aged 12-35 months who had completed the NHIS/IM interview but who:

- had not given permission to contact the immunization providers,
- had not supplied adequate information to contact the providers, or
- had reported that their child had never been vaccinated.

The NRFUS recontacted these households and asked them again for permission to contact the immunization providers. If the household gave permission, the immunization data were collected from the providers using the same procedures as the original data collection. These
new data were combined with the original provider data to calculate estimates of vaccination coverage. (Abt Associates, Inc. 2002).

The 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS did not conduct a NRFUS. In order to make the estimates comparable to previous years, a set of adjustment factors were calculated from the results of the 1998 NRFUS. The adjustment factor for each vaccine was determined by dividing the provideradjusted estimate of coverage including the NRFUS data by the provider-adjusted estimate calculated from only the original data collection. For most vaccines and series, except 3+ DTP, $3+$ Polio, and $1+\mathrm{MCV}$, the addition of the NRFUS data produced a lower estimate of the number of children that were up-to-date. Therefore, the adjustment factors (shown in Table 3.1) are less than 1 for all vaccines and series except 3+ DTP, 3+ Polio, and HMCV.

| Table 3.1:1999 NHIS/NIPRCS Adjustment Factors Based on <br> 1998 NRUS data |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Vaccination | Adjustment Ratio |
| DTP | 0.9953 |
| DTP3 | 1.0021 |
| Polio | 1.0011 |
| MCV | 1.0021 |
| Hib | 0.9979 |
| Hep B | 0.9978 |
| $4: 3: 1$ | 0.9988 |
| $4: 3: 1: 3$ | 0.9975 |
| $4: 3: 1: 3: 3$ | 0.9934 |

### 3.4 Best Values

The best values combine the household and provider data to produce the most accurate vaccination report for each child. Because the best value vaccination dates include data from both sources, more children have best values for vaccination dates than have provider data. The inclusion of more children reduces the potential bias in these estimates.

For the 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS, best values for vaccination dates were developed for two main groups of children: children with no provider data who were 4:3:1:3 up-to-date according to the household report from a shot card; and all children who had usable provider-reported vaccination information (See section 2.4 for definition of useable provider data).

For the children who were 4:3:1:3 up-to-date from a shot card, the household-reported vaccination dates were evaluated to see whether they were consistent with the date of birth and the vaccination schedule. The record was also checked for the degree of agreement between vaccination dates. If the record met these criteria, then the shot card dates were inserted as best values for vaccination dates, along with any edits to the dates that seemed warranted, such as transposed dates or reports with the same month and day but in which the year was inconsistent.

For the children with usable provider data, the household and provider reports were compared. If the household used a shot card and there was no agreement between the two sources, the household-reported vaccination dates were considered unusable, and the provider vaccination dates were used as the best values for dates. (Provider reports that appeared to be inadequate or for the wrong child were previously excluded. See Section 2.4 for the definition of usable provider data.) If there was some agreement between the provider-reported and householdreported vaccination dates, the household information was deemed usable, and these shot card vaccination dates were used to supplement the provider vaccination dates to create a complete vaccination record. If the household reported from recall, the provider-reported dates were used as the best values. Children with best vaccination dates were assigned a flag (BESTVAL=1) so that they can easily be identified in the data file.

### 3.5 Best Value Weights

The sample weights of children with best values for vaccination dates were adjusted to account for children without best values. The method used to adjust the weights was similar to the method used in previous years of the NHIS/NIPRCS in order to maintain comparability between the years. A total of 11 weighting classes were formed using the following criteria: the vaccination status according to the household report (up-to-date, not up-to-date, missing), shot card use (shot card used, no shot card), and education of the respondent (high school or less, college or higher, missing). These three variables resulted in 18 cells; some cells were collapsed when they contained too few cases. Table 3.2 shows the 11 cells used in the weighting.

| 4:3:1:3 | Shot Card |  | No Shot Card |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| According to Household | High school or less, or missing | College or higher | High school or less | Education missing | College or higher |
| Up-to-date | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 4 |
| Not up-to-date |  |  | 8 |  | 9 |
| Missing | 6 | 7 | 1 |  | 11 |

The sample weight for the children with best values was adjusted by multiplying the NHIS/IM weight for the child (WTFA_IM) by the ratio of the sum of the weights for all children in the weighting class to the sum of the weights for children with best values. In addition to this adjustment, the weights were also adjusted through raking (Lohr 1999; Izrael et al. 2000) so that the sum of the weights agreed with the population control totals for poverty status, race/ethnicity, and telephone status in the U.S. The result of the raking is the best value weight (WT_BV2).

### 3.6 Imputed Best Values

For children without best values, imputation was used to calculate a total number of doses for each antigen and the up-to-date status of the child. The variables considered for forming imputation classes were the same as those used to form the weighting classes for children with best values: whether a child was up-to-date for the $4: 3: 1: 3$ series according to the household report, whether a shot card was used, and the education of the respondent. Some of the 18 cells in the cross-classification of the three variables were collapsed after looking at the distribution of children in the sample. Cells that contained few donors relative to the recipients were collapsed, resulting in a total of seven imputation classes.

| Table 3.3 Imputation Classes for Imputing Missing Best Values, 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 4:3:1:3 Status | Shot Card |  | No Shot Card |  |
| Household | High school or less or missing | College or higher | High school or less or missing | College or Higher |
| Up-to-date | 1 | 2 | 3 |  |
| Not up-to-date | 4 | 5 | 6 |  |
| Missing |  |  | 7 |  |

Within each imputation class, a hot-deck imputation procedure was used to impute the number of doses of each vaccine and series using data from children with non-missing best values. Cases in which best values were imputed are marked by the variable IMP_FLAG.

### 3.7 Children Aged 12-18 Months

In the absence of a standard definition of Aup-to-date@or children between 12 and 18 months of age for either a specific vaccine or a series of vaccines, the best values were used to calculate weighted percentages of children receiving one or more doses of each vaccine. (See Appendix C for a table with these estimates.)

## Chapter 4. Calculating Estimates of Vaccination Coverage and Standard Errors

As described in the previous chapter, the NHIS/NIPRCS uses several methods for producing estimates of vaccination coverage. This chapter provides the user of the data set with instructions for replicating these methods.

### 4.1 Provider-Adjusted Estimates of Vaccination Coverage

As described in Section 3.2, the provider-adjusted estimates use the children with usable provider data to estimate the proportion of children who are up-to-date in the sample as a whole. The steps required to obtain the estimates are given below:

Step 1: Use the sample weight WTFA_IM in the following steps.
Step 2: All children between the ages of 19 and 35 months for whom the NHIS/IM was completed are divided into weighting classes specific to each vaccine. The weighting classes form two main groups according to whether the household used a shot card. All children belonging to households that used shot cards to report the number and dates of vaccinations are in the first group, and children from households that reported from memory recall belong to the second group. Within each main group, children are divided into subgroups by the number of doses reported by the household. Table 4.1 shows the weighting classes for calculating the provider-adjusted estimate of DTP coverage.

The weighting classes for the other vaccines appear in Appendix D in the column "Number of Doses Reported by Household."

Step 3: Sum the weights (WTFA_IM) of children with usable provider data in each weighting class. This gives the estimated number of children with provider data. Call this Sum 1. (See Column 1 in Table 4.2.)

Next, sum the sample weights of all children with usable provider data who are up-todate on the specific vaccine. This gives the estimated number of children who are up-todate among children with provider data. Call this Sum 2. (See Column 2 in Table 4.2.)

Compute the ratio [ Sum 2/Sum 1]. This gives the proportion of children with usable provider data who are up-to-date in this weighting class. (See Column 3 in Table 4.2.)

| Use of Shot Card | Number of Doses of DTP |
| :---: | :---: |
| Shot Card Used | 4+ |
|  | 3 |
|  | 2 |
|  | 1 |
|  | 0 |
| No Shot Card | 4+ |
|  | 3 |
|  | 2 |
|  | 1 |
|  | 0 |
|  | All* |
|  | Don $\ddagger$ know/Missing |

* All@ndicates that the household respondent was not able to give the total number of shots received, but indicated that the child was up-to-date on this vaccine.

Step 4: Apply this proportion to the total weighted number of children in the weighting class. The total weighted number of children is obtained by simply aggregating the sample weights of all children. This product gives the estimated number of children who are up-to-date in that weighting class.

Step 5: Aggregate the estimated numbers of children who are up-to-date on the specific vaccine over all weighting classes. (See the Total entry in Column 5 in Table 4.2.)

Step 6: Divide the number obtained in Step 5 by the total estimated number of children over all the weighting classes. This is simply the sum of the weights of all children who completed the NHIS/IM. (See the Total entry in Column 4 in Table 4.2.)

Step 7: The number obtained in Step 6 (when multiplied by 100) gives the percentage of children who are up-to-date on the specific vaccine. This is the provider-adjusted estimate of coverage for that vaccine.

Table 4.2: Calculation of Provider-Adjusted Estimate for DTP, 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS

| Weighting Class | (1) <br> Sum of the weights of all children with usable provider data | (2) <br> Sum of the weights of children who are up-to-date among children in (1) | (3) $=(2) /(1)$ <br> Proportion of children who are up-to-date | (4) <br> Sum of the weights of all children with and without provider data | $(5)=(4) \times(3)$ <br> Estimated number of children who are up-to-date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shot Card 4+ | 893,242 | 838,915 | . 9392 | 1,226,851 | 1,152,258 |
| 3 | 221,610 | 148,909 | . 6719 | 363,626 | 244,119 |
| 2 | 19,629 | 11,292 | . 5753 | 59,246 | 34,084 |
| 1 | 36,479 | 28,809 | . 7897 | 70,625 | 55,773 |
| 0 | 12,533 | 8,179 | . 6526 | 25,662 | 16,747 |
| No Shot Card 4+ | 68,368 | 63,472 | . 9284 | 95,920 | 89,052 |
| 3 | 93,577 | 71,784 | . 7671 | 148,859 | 114,190 |
| 2 | 67,787 | 51,933 | .7661 | 106,480 | 81,574 |
| 1 | 30,784 | 20,441 | . 6640 | 51,091 | 33,924 |
| 0 | 35,104 | 26,466 | .7539 | 161,369 | 121,656 |
| All ${ }^{1}$ | 1,413,491 | 1,173,849 | . 8305 | 2,625,817 | 2,180,741 |
| Don $=$ Know/Missing | 238,891 | 187,873 | . 7864 | 532,247 | 418,559 |
| Total | 3,131,495 | 2,631,922 | . 8405 | 5,467,493 | 4,542,677 |
| Percentage of children who are up-to-date for DTP $=[4,572,677 / 5,467,493] \times 100=$ |  |  |  |  | 83.09 |

${ }^{\text {' }}$ All@ndicates that the household respondent was not able to give the total number of shots received, but reported that the child was up-to-date on this vaccine.

See Appendix A for the provider-adjusted estimates of coverage for other vaccines and series. The provider data in the data file includes the results from reconciliation, so estimates calculated using the provider-adjusted method will correspond to the column labeled "Initial + Reconciliation" in the table in the appendix.

### 4.2 Including the Nonresponse Follow-Up Survey Adjustment in Coverage Estimates

Both provider-adjusted estimates and best value estimates (discussed below) for individual vaccine coverage should be multiplied by the NRFUS adjustment factor in Table 3.1. For example, the provider-adjusted estimate of DTP coverage calculated in Table 4.2 ( $83.1 \%$ ) should be multiplied by the adjustment factor (0.9953) to obtain a final NRFUS-adjusted coverage estimate of $82.7 \%$. (See Appendix A for the estimates of vaccination coverage that includes the NRFUS adjustment.)

When calculating coverage estimates for the entire sample or any subgroup, these NRFUS adjustment factors should be applied.

### 4.3 Best Value Estimates and Using Imputed Best Values

Best value estimates should be calculated using the best value weight (WT_BV2), which incorporates an adjustment for children without best values. The results should then be multiplied by the NRFUS adjustment to derive the Final Best Value estimates.

When using the imputed best values, the NHIS/IM sampling weight (WTFA_IM) should be used. Cases for which best values were imputed are flagged in the data set (IMP_FLAG =1).

See Appendix A for the coverage estimates for each vaccine and series using the best value and imputed best value data.

### 4.4 Calculating Standard Errors

### 4.4.1 Standard Errors of NHIS Estimates

Data users should refer to the report Design and Estimation for the 1995-2004 National Health Interview Survey (Series 2, No. 130), available on the NCHS Web site http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis.htm, for detailed instructions on how to calculate standard errors (using SUDAAN) for the 1999 NHIS estimates.

### 4.4.2 Standard Errors of Best Value Estimates

Vaccination coverage rates are ratio estimates, and the Taylor linearization method can be used to compute the standard errors of these estimates (Nixon et al. 1996). For computing the standard errors of best value estimates of vaccination coverage rates, the "pseudo strata" created for the NHIS with two PSUs were first considered. Because only a subset of the sample of children had best values, many of the strata were empty in the sense that the two PSUs in the stratum did not have children with best values. Therefore, the 337 NHIS strata were collapsed to 186 strata such that each stratum had two PSUs with children with best values. The standard errors of the best value estimates were computed using SUDAAN software (Shah et al. 1999).

Appendix E gives an example of a SUDAAN program that was used to calculate standard errors, including the specifications for collapsing the 1999 NHIS strata. For the 1997 NHIS/NIPRCS, strata were manually collapsed as needed to ensure a minimum of two PSUs per stratum. In later years, an algorithm (SAS program) was used to collapse the strata. Applying that program to 1997 could yield a somewhat different set of collapsed strata and therefore standard errors might differ slightly. Other software such as STATA (Stata Corporation 2001) or SAS (SAS Institute Inc. 1999) can also be used to estimate the standard errors by the Taylor linearization method.

The standard errors of the best value estimates for all vaccines and series can be found in Appendix A.

### 4.4.3 Standard Errors of Estimates Based on Imputed Best Values

Treating the imputed best values as if they are responses and then computing the variance estimates, using a standard method like Taylor linearization, generally results in underestimation of the variance. Alternative methods of variance estimation take into account the presence of imputed values and adjust for this underestimation. A jackknife variance estimation method suggested by Rao and Shao (1992) was used to compute the variance of the estimates based on imputed values. For details of this procedure, see the internal methodology report. (Abt Associates Inc. 2002). The standard errors can be found in Appendix A of this guide.

## Chapter 5. Public-Use Data File

This chapter contains details about the 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS data file and information for users and analysts of these data. The data file is in ASCII format. A code book and a program for reading the data into SAS are available with this data file.

### 5.1 File Description

Data in the PUF come from two sources: the 1999 NHIS/IM and the 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS. The source of each variable is noted in the code book. Data are provided at the child level; that is, each child has one record, which includes the household and provider information. The data file contains 2,565 records for children aged 12-35 months. If more than one child was interviewed in a household, the household variables, including the ID number, are included in each child干 record.

### 5.2 Data Cleaning

Data from the Immunization History Questionnaire (IHQ) were checked for internal consistency, including skip-pattern logic and out-of-range or otherwise invalid values. The provider data file was checked for duplicate records from the same provider. When a child had data from more than one IHQ , decision rules were applied to produce the most complete record of the child₹ immunization history. The analyst should refer to the documentation provided by the NCHS for data collected in the NHIS or the NHIS/IM.

As described in Sections 2.3.2 and 2.4, some provider data may have been edited as a result of the reconciliation and file preparation processes.

For shot date variables from the IHQ, if the day of the month was missing, it was imputed to " 15 " for the purpose of calculating the age in days at the time of vaccination. If this value created a vaccination date before the child干 date of birth, the value would be changed to be equal to the date of birth.

### 5.3 Missing Value Codes

A standard coding scheme, based on the NHIS protocol, designates Arefused@and Adon $\neq k n o w @$ responses on all variables. ARefused@esponses are coded as $A @$ with leading 9s filling the
 code of A8@ndicates Anot ascertained@responses, which typically occur when an in-the-universe respondent had a blank field or the field contained an invalid code.

Because the appropriateness of some questions depended on the availability of shot records, not all questions were asked of all respondents. Cases that were not eligible to answer specific questions are coded as A <BLANK: NOT IN UNIVERSE>." The notes in the code book describe the universe for each question.

### 5.4 Variable Naming Conventions

The provider data from the Immunization History Questionnaires are used to create numerous child-level composite variables, as described below. The names of the variables giving the number of doses received for each vaccine begin with P_NUM. For example, P_NUMHEP gives the number of doses of hepatitis B vaccine received by the child according to the provider data.

The provider data are also used to form variables for age in days and age in months at each vaccination. For age in days and age in months, either 4 or 8 variables are created, depending on the number of doses recommended for the vaccine. The variable names for age in months end with AGn, where n is the dose number. For example, HEPAG1 to HEPAG8 give age in months for 8 possible doses of hepatitis B vaccine. Similarly, for age in days at vaccination, the variable names start with D and end with AGn. DHEPAG1 to DHEPAG8 give age in days for 8 possible hepatitis B vaccination doses.

An up-to-date status indicator variable was created for each vaccine. These variables use the best values. Each of these variables begins with B_UTD. For example, the variable B_UTDHEP indicates whether the child received 3 or more doses of hepatitis B vaccine.

To accommodate the large number of types of vaccinations, a vaccination-type variable was created for each shot or dose. For example, the vaccination-type variable for DTP indicates whether the specific dose was a DTP, DTaP, DT, unknown (unmarked) type of DTP, DTP-Hib, DTaP-Hib, or an unknown (unmarked) type of DTP-Hib vaccination.

### 5.5 Changes from 1998 Data File

### 5.5.1 New Variables

Eighty-two new variables appear in the 1999 public-use data file. Three of these are the result of rewording of the race and ethnicity questions in the NHIS/IM. The addition of the hepatitis B-Hib combination vaccine created 16 new variables to indicate the type of hepatitis B dose administered for each vaccination date. A flag was added to indicate if the first hepatitis B shot date was imputed. The other 62 new variables come from changes made to the questions that appear on the second page of the IHQ.

HISPNR_P Replaces HISPAN_R for the item about Hispanic ethnicity.
RACE_R Replaces RACE.

## RACERECR Replaces RACEREC.

HEPTY1-HEPTY8 These variables indicate the type of hepatitis B vaccination administered for the 8 possible provider-reported doses.

BHEPTY1-BHEPTY8 These variables provide the type of hepatitis B vaccination for each best value vaccination date for the 8 possible best value doses.

NEWFA4A1-NEWFA4A4, NEWFA4B1-NEWFA4B4, NEWFA4C1-NEWFA4C4 NEWFA4D1-NEWFA4D4, NEWFA4E1-NEWFA4E4, NEWFA4F1-NEWFA4F4
These 24 variables replace the 4 variables NEWFAC1-NEWFAC4. The item about the type of facility the provider was changed from a single response question to a multiple response item. (See Appendix B.)

## PERSPE11-PERSPE14, PERSPE21-PERSPE24, PERSPE31-PERSPE34

PERSPE41-PERSPE44, PERSPE51-PERSPE54, PERSPE61-PERSPE64
PERSPE71-PERSPE74, PERSPE81-PERSPE84 These 32 variables were created when a new item was added to the questionnaire that asked for the medical specialty of the person who ordered the vaccinations for the child. (See Appendix B)

PERSP This composite variable combines the responses from all providers about the medical specialty of the person who ordered the vaccinations for the child into a single child-level variable.

REG1-REG4 These 4 variables come from a new item that was added to the IHQ which asked whether the child's immunizations were reported to a state or local registry. (See Appendix B.)

REGISTRY This composite variable combines the responses from the individual providers. It indicates whether any of the child's providers reported his or her shots to a registry.

HEP_IFLG This variable indicates whether the first hepatitis B shot date for the child was imputed.

### 5.5.2 Variables with Different Response Categories

HIBTY1-HIBTY8 The 8 variables that indicate the type of Hib vaccination administered for each provider-reported dose include HepB-Hib as a type.

BHIBTY1-BHIBTY8 The 8 variables that indicate the type of Hib vaccination administered for each best value dose include HepB-Hib as a type.

### 5.5.3 Variables Not Included in 1999 Data File

In addition to the variables that were replaced by new versions described above, 13 variables were eliminated due to changes to the IHQ. Two questions were dropped: one item that asked if the provider was the medical home for the child; and a second that asked for the medical specialty of the child's primary care provider.

### 5.6 Explanatory Notes for Specific Variables

ADJ_GRP The adjudication groups are used for assessing agreement and consistency between the provider report(s) and the household report of vaccinations. See Section 2.3.2 for a more detailed explanation of the matching and reconciliation procedures.

## Household reports from shot record

R1 All dates and number of doses match provider reports
R2 All numbers of doses match provider reports, but at least one date is discrepant
R3 At least one discrepancy in number of doses; all discrepancies involve a household over-report
R4 At least one discrepancy in number of doses; all discrepancies involve a household under-report
R5 At least two discrepancies in number of doses; at least one over-report and one under-report

## Household reports from memory recall

H1 No discrepancies in number of doses (includes cases where the household responds ADon $\ddagger$ Know@
H2 At least one discrepancy in number of doses; all discrepancies involve a
household over-report
H3 At least one discrepancy in number of doses; all discrepancies involve a household under-report
H4 At least two discrepancies in number of doses; at least one over-report and one under-report
Multiple provider reports
M Children with non-identical reports from two or more providers

DISPCODE The DISPCODE refers to the completeness and validity of the immunization information from all the Immunization History Questionnaires returned for the child.

1 All identified providers responded, no problems indicated in cross-check between household and provider shot dates.
2 All identified providers responded, no shot card to cross-check.
3 All identified providers responded, poor immunization history matching results.
4 All identified providers responded, poor immunization history matching results, additional mismatch indicators present.
5 Some but not all identified providers responded, but provider information indicates 4:3:1:3:3 up-to-date.

6 Some but not all identified providers responded, but provider information matches shot card immunization history.
7 Some but not all identified providers responded, completeness of provider immunization history is unknown.
8 Some but not all identified providers responded, but provider information indicates 4:3:1:3:3 up-to-date when immunizations after the interview date are included.
9 Some but not all identified providers responded, but provider information indicates at least as many doses for each vaccine as the household respondent (or at least 1 dose for MCV).
10 Some but not all identified providers responded, but the household reported an inexact number of vaccinations (All,@ADon $\ddagger$ Know, @Refused@or missing) for one or more vaccines, and any exact responses meet previous criteria (for DISPCODE 9).
11 Some but not all identified providers responded, but definite number of shots was reported by household not from a shot card for one or more vaccines, and any other vaccines meet previous criteria (for DISPCODE 9 or 10).

When analyzing children with provider data, cases with DISPCODE $=7$ should not be included.

NUM_DTP, NUM_POLI, NUM_MMR, NUM_HIB, NUM_HEPB, NUM_CPOX

These variables were calculated by totaling the number of each type of vaccination reported by the household respondent in the NHIS/IM, either from a shot card or from recall.

PSU The variable identifies the primary sampling unit (PSU) and is used in variance estimation. Refer to the NHIS/IM documentation for more information.

STRATUM To calculate the standard errors of the best value estimates of vaccination coverage, the original NHIS strata need to be collapsed. See Appendix E for an example program.

### 5.7 Flags

The following flag variables are included in the data file:
BDOBFLAG A value of 1 indicates that no provider date of birth information was obtained and BEST_DOB is the date of birth reported by the household respondent.

BESTVAL A value of 1 indicates that Abest value@accination dates were determined. A value of 2 indicates that the child does not have Abest values.@

BRDOBFLG A value of 1 indicates that BEST_DOB was assigned after recontacting the household and/or providers to reconcile differences.

IMP_FLAG A value of 1 indicates that Abest value@accination dates were imputed.

PRO_FLAG A value of 1 indicates that the child was 4:3:1:3 up-to-date according to the household $\mp$ shot record. A value of 2 indicates the child was not 4:3:1:3 up-todate. The value is missing for children in households that did not use shot cards.

HEP_IFLG This variable indicates whether the first hepatitis B shot date for the child was imputed.

### 5.8 Data Alerts

The information provided in this section details known problems with the data.
Although all provider-reported shot dates are reviewed and sent for reconciliation, some inconsistencies may remain in the data that could not be verified. These include shot dates that are too close together, and certain shots given before 38 days of age that are not recommended.

Further, any variables derived from the provider reports (e.g., VISITS) may contain inaccuracies if those data could not be reconciled or verified.

### 5.9 Code Book

A complete listing of the variables included in the public-use data file is available in the 1999 National Health Interview Survey/National Immunization Provider Record Check Study PublicUse Data File Code Book. The code book contains a table of contents and an alphabetic list of variables. Then each variable is listed with either 1) the frequency of a given response, the response value, and the formatted response label; 2) a count of missing and non-missing values with summary statistics; or 3 ) a count of missing/non-missing values.

For categorical variables, the code book gives the frequency of each category. For continuous variables, the mean, median, minimum, and maximum values are displayed.

### 5.10 Guidelines for Citation of Data

Any published material derived from the data should acknowledge NCHS as the original source. The suggested citation to appear at the bottom of all tables is as follows:

Source: CDC, NIP and NCHS (2002), 1999 National Health Interview
Survey/National Immunization Provider Record Check Study

In a bibliography, the citation should read:
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. 1999 National Health Interview Survey/National Immunization Provider Record Check Study (machine readable data file and documentation). National Center for Health Statistics, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Hyattsville, MD, 2002.

The published material should also include a disclaimer that credits any analyses, interpretations, or conclusions reached to the author (recipient of the data file) and not to NCHS, which is responsible only for the initial data. Consumers who wish to publish a technical description of the data should make an effort to ensure that the description is not inconsistent with that published by the NCHS.

Please place the acronym NHIS/NIPRCS in the titles, keywords, or abstracts of journal articles and other publications in order to facilitate the retrieval of such materials in bibliographic searches.
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## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A
ESTIMATES OF VACCINATION COVERAGE AMONG CHILDREN AGED 19-35 MONTHS

Estimates of Vaccination Coverage in the 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS

|  | Provider-Adjusted Estimates |  |  | Best Value Estimates and Standard Errors |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccination Or Series ${ }^{1}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Initial } \\ \text { Estimate }^{2} \end{gathered}$ | Initial + Reconciliation | Final ProviderAdjusted ${ }^{3}$ | Before NRFUS <br> Adjustment ${ }^{4}$ | Final Be | alues ${ }^{5}$ | Including | ed Best Values ${ }^{6}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  | Estimate | S.E | Estimate | Rao-Shao S.E. ${ }^{7}$ |
| DTP | 81.5 | 83.1 | 82.7 | 84.6 | 84.2 | 1.3 | 84.5 | 1.3 |
| DTP3 | 95.5 | 96.0 | 96.2 | 96.6 | 96.8 | 0.7 | 96.7 | 0.6 |
| POLIO | 89.3 | 89.6 | 89.7 | 91.1 | 91.2 | 1.0 | 91.0 | 1.2 |
| MCV | 91.7 | 92.1 | 92.3 | 92.2 | 92.4 | 1.0 | 92.1 | 1.1 |
| HIB | 92.3 | 93.5 | 93.3 | 93.9 | 93.7 | 0.9 | 93.7 | 0.7 |
| HEPB | 86.9 | 87.7 | 87.5 | 89.8 | 89.6 | 1.0 | 90.0 | 1.0 |
| 4:3:1 | 78.3 | 79.6 | 79.5 | 81.3 | 81.2 | 1.4 | 81.0 | 1.4 |
| 4:3:1:3 | 76.4 | 78.3 | 78.1 | 80.0 | 79.8 | 1.4 | 79.7 | 1.4 |
| 4:3:1:3:3 | 71.4 | 73.3 | 72.8 | 75.6 | 75.1 | 1.4 | 75.3 | 1.4 |

 2 Provider-adjusted estimates are calculated from provider-reported data. See Section 4.1 for a complete description on how provider-adjusted estimates are calculated. The initial estimate is calculated from unreconciled data and cannot be reproduced using the public-use file.
3 The provider-adjusted estimates, including reconciliation, are multiplied by a ratio calculated from the 1996 NRFUS. See Section 3.3 for a description of the NRFUS adjustment procedures. 4 Best value estimates are calculated for all children with best vaccination values. The weight used to calculate these estimates is WT_BV2. See Section 3.4 for a description of the best value procedures.
5 The Final Best Value estimates have the NRFUS adjustment applied. See Section 4.4 for a description of the standard errors.
6 The up-to-date status is imputed for children who do not have best value vaccination values. See Section 3.6 for a description of the imputation process.
7 See Section 4.4 for a description of variance estimation for imputed values.

## APPENDIX B

1999 NHIS/NIPRCS IMMUNIZATION HISTORY QUESTIONNAIRE

| $d 0$ | do | do | do | do | $\ldots$ | do |  | do | do | d8IO <br> do $\quad 100$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & -=- \\ & \text { i0 } \end{aligned}$ | d0 | do | do | $\begin{aligned} & \square=- \\ & \text { do } \end{aligned}$ |  | d0 |  | d0 |  | delag <br> do $\quad 10 \square$ |
| do | dO | do | む | do | do | $d 0$ | do | do |  |  |
| $d C$ | do | d0 | $\begin{aligned} & -=- \\ & d 0 \end{aligned}$ | do | $\qquad$ | do |  | do | do <br> Q！H／dera 口 9！ $1 / d \perp 10$ ロ $\square$ |  |
| do | $\begin{aligned} & =- \\ & \text { do } \end{aligned}$ | do | d0 | $\begin{aligned} & -=- \\ & \text { do } \end{aligned}$ | do |  |  | d0 | $\qquad$ |  |
| （Rysods） <br>  | STJ！azjoy | ع\｜әэ！⿺𠃊 | Kıuo solsean | YWW | （exep dad xoq әu0 уәәц） （ Adl 10 AdO ）O！lod | （x09＞904） дo oxep joutuol a su！！edaH | $\begin{gathered} \text { (oyep yod } \\ \times \times q \text { ouo yoxp) } \\ \text { q!H } \end{gathered}$ |  9！ $1 \mathrm{H}-\mathrm{g}$ deh |  | （oyep sed xoq 000 乡304p） dBLO／dicho |
| （леәК＇Кер＇чұиош）ио！ұеz！ипшш！¢0 seped |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |







$3 \square$ c．Have no record of providing care to this child
（Go to Question 2 below．）
$2 \square$ b．Have provided care to this child，but do not have his／her immunization record．
$1 \square$ a Have immunization record for this child．（Go to Question 2 below．）
1．Which of the following best describes your records of immunizations for this child？（Check only one box．） INSTRUCTIONS：Please review your records and complete this questionnaire for the child identified below．Then mail it in the postage－paid envelope provided or FAX it to：1－800－293－5155．




APPENDIX C
ESTIMATES OF VACCINATION COVERAGE AMONG CHILDREN AGED 12-18 MONTHS

## ESTIMATES OF VACCINATION COVERAGE AMONG CHILDREN AGED 12-18 MONTHS

| Weighted Best Value Estimates of Vaccination Coverage Among Children Aged 12-18 Months ( $\mathrm{n}=464$ ) , 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vaccine/ <br> Series | Percent of children receiving number of doses of vaccines |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | None |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 3 |  | 4+ |  | Total |
|  | Est <br> (\%) | S.E. | Est <br> (\%) | S.E | Est <br> (\%) | S.E | Est <br> (\%) | S.E | Est <br> (\%) | S.E. |  |
| DTP | - | - | 1.9 | 0.8 | 4.0 | 1.1 | 63.3 | 2.5 | 30.8 | 2.2 | 100\% |
| Polio ${ }^{1}$ | - | - | 2.1 | 0.8 | 41.7 | 2.8 | 56.2* | 2.7 | - | - | 100\% |
| MCV | 40.0 | 2.4 | 60.0* | 2.4 | - | - | - | - | - | - | 100\% |
| Hib | - | - | 3.1 | 1.0 | 8.4 | 1.5 | 88.5* | 1.6 | - |  | 100\% |
| НерВ | 2.3 | 0.7 | 2.9 | 0.9 | 12.8 | 1.8 | 82.0* | 1.7 | - | - | 100\% |

Note: A dash in the cell means that the sample contained no children in this category.
*This number may include children who have more than the recommended number of doses (i.e., more than 1 MCV or varicella vaccination, or more than 3 polio, Hib, or Hep B vaccinations.)

[^2]
## APPENDIX D <br> WEIGHTING CLASSES AND CALCULATIONS FOR PROVIDER-ADJUSTED ESTIMATES

Provi der adj usted esti mat es
Chil dren 19-35 months ol d DTP

|  | Number of Doses Reported By Househol d | W thout Provi der Dat a | Total Wth Provi der Dat a | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Up to o } \\ & \text { dāt } \end{aligned}$ | Per cent | Tot al | Final Provi der adj usted up- to-dat e | Fi nal Provi der adj usted up-t odate( $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shot | Card, 4+ | 333609 | 893242 | 838915 | 93. 92 | 1226851 | 1152258 |  |
|  |  | 141716 | 221610 | 148909 | 67. 19 | 363326 | 244119 |  |
|  |  | 39617 | 19629 | 11292 | 57. 53 | 59246 | 34084 |  |
|  |  | 34146 | 36479 | 28809 | 78. 97 | 70625 | 55773 |  |
|  |  | 13129 | 12533 | 8179 | 65. 26 | 25662 | 16747 |  |
|  | DK/ M ssi ng | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0. 00 | 0 | 0 |  |
| No Shot | Card, 4+ | 27552 | 68368 | 63472 | 92. 84 | 95920 | 89052 |  |
|  | 3 | 55282 | 93577 | 71784 | 76. 71 | 148859 | 114190 |  |
|  | 2 | 38693 | 67787 | 51933 | 76. 61 | 106480 | 81574 |  |
|  | 1 | 20307 | 30784 | 20441 | 66. 40 | 51091 | 33924 |  |
|  | 0 | 126265 | 35104 | 26466 | 75. 39 | 161369 | 121656 |  |
|  | Al I | 1212326 | 1413491 | 1173849 | 83. 05 | 2625817 | 2180741 |  |
|  | DK/ Mi ssing | 293356 | 238891 | 187873 | 78. 64 | 532247 | 418559 |  |
|  | Tot al | 2335998 | 3131495 | 2631922 | 84.05 | 5467493 | 4542677 | 83. 09 |

Fi nal dj usted up-t oat e(\%)
83. 09

Provi der adj usted estimat es
Chil dren 19-35 months ol d DTP3

|  | Number of Doses Reported By Househol d | W thout Provi der Dat a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shot | Card, 3+ | 475325 |
|  | 2 | 39617 |
|  | 1 | 34146 |
|  | 0 | 13129 |
|  | DK/ M ssi ng | 0 |
| No Shot | Card, 3+ | 82834 |
|  | 2 | 38693 |
|  | 1 | 20307 |
|  | 0 | 126265 |
|  | AI I | 1212326 |
|  | DK/ M ssi ng | 293356 |
|  | Tot al | 2335998 |


| Tot al $W$ th <br> Provi der <br> Data | Up_to- <br> date | Percent | Tot al |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1114852 | 1102651 | 98.91 | 1590177 |
| 19629 | 12513 | 63.75 | 59246 |
| 36479 | 32196 | 88.26 | 70625 |
| 12533 | 12533 | 100.00 | 25662 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 161945 | 154596 | 95.46 | 244779 |
| 67787 | 64465 | 95.10 | 106480 |
| 30784 | 22167 | 72.01 | 51091 |
| 35104 | 31245 | 89.01 | 161369 |
| 1413491 | 1354817 | 95.85 | 2625817 |
| 238891 | 232783 | 97.44 | 532247 |
| 3131495 | 3019966 | 96.44 | 5467493 |
|  |  |  |  |

Provi der adj usted estimat es Chil dren 19-35 mont hs ol d
POLI O

|  | Number of Doses Reported By Househol d |
| :---: | :---: |
| Shot | $\begin{array}{ll} \text { Card, } & 3+ \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ & \\ & \\ & \text { DK/ M ssi ng } \end{array}$ |
| No Shot | $\begin{array}{ll}\text { Car d, } & 3+ \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ & 0\end{array}$ <br> Al I DK/ Missing Tot al |

W thout
Provi der
Dat a
432834
75256
32302
21825
0
66676
50777
19900
117465
1205916
313047
2335998

| Total Wth <br> Provi der <br> Data | Up to <br> date | Percent | Tot al |
| ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1004422 | 950011 | 94.58 | 1437256 |
| 111662 | 99387 | 89.01 | 186918 |
| 42435 | 34549 | 81.42 | 74737 |
| 24974 | 24974 | 100.00 | 46799 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 108880 | 104648 | 96.11 | 175556 |
| 99530 | 72249 | 72.59 | 150307 |
| 56078 | 39793 | 70.96 | 75978 |
| 42178 | 34206 | 81.10 | 159643 |
| 1404570 | 1252144 | 89.15 | 2610486 |
| 236766 | 206373 | 87.16 | 549813 |
| 3131495 | 2818334 | 90.00 | 5467493 |

Fi nal Provi der adj ust ed up-todate(\%)
1572844
37769
62334
25662
233666
101262
36791
143635
2516846
518621
5249430
96. 01

Fi nal Provi der adj usted up-to-
dat e( $\%$ )

Final
Provider up-to-date

1359357
166376
60851
46799
0
168727
109108 53914
129470 129470 2327248 4901067
89. 64

Provi der adj usted esti mates
Chil dren 19-35 mont hs old

## MMR



Fi nal adjusted up- to-
date $\%$
92.07

Fi nal
Provi der up- todat e(\%)
93.45

Provi der adj usted esti mates Children 19-35 months old HEP B
Number of
Dosed Reported
By Househol d

| Shot Card, | $3+$ |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | 2 |
|  | 1 |
|  | 0 |
|  | DK/ M ssi ng |

No Shot Card, DK/ M ssing , 3+ 3
2
1
0
Al DK/ M ssing Tot al

## W thout Provi der Dat a

437452 437452
45651
38418
40696 0
85012 34992
33696 33696
191727 1003493 424861
2335998

| Total $W$ th |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :--- | :--- |
| Provi der | Upto |  |  |
| Data | datē | Percent | Total |


|  | Final |
| :---: | :---: |
| Final | Provider |
| Provider | adjusted |
| adjusted | up-to- |
| up-to-date | date( $\%$ ) |

1340071
111360
60863
75245
0
261667
105487
47050
231284
1926733
633828
4793588

Provider adjusted esti mates Chil dren 19-35 mont hs ol d 4: 3: 1

| Number of | W thout |
| ---: | ---: |
| Doses Reported | Provi der |
| By Househol d | Dat a |
| Shot Card, Up- to- Date | 301380 |
| Not Up- to- Date | 260837 |
| DK/ M ssing | 1128663 |
| No Shot Card, Up-to- Dat e | 11940 |
| Up-t o- Dat e, Number | 308302 |
| Not Up-to- Date | 324876 |
| DK/ M ssing | 2335998 |


| Total wth <br> Provi der <br> Data | Up_to_ <br> date | Percent | Tot al |
| :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
| 843307 | 762954 | 90.47 | 1144687 |
| 340186 | 231981 | 68.19 | 601023 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 |
| 1322296 | 1068807 | 80.83 | 2450959 |
| 52562 | 47666 | 90.69 | 64502 |
| 319321 | 219128 | 68.62 | 627623 |
| 253823 | 192076 | 75.67 | 578699 |
| 3131495 | 2522612 | 80.56 | 5467493 |


| Final | Final <br> Provider |
| :---: | :---: |
| Provider | adjusted |
| adjusted | up-to- <br> up- to-date |
| dat e(\%) |  |
| 1035598 |  |
| 409838 |  |
| 1981110 |  |
| 58497 |  |
| 430675 |  |
| 437902 | 79.63 |

Provi der adj usted esti mates Chi I dren 19-35 mont hs ol d

$$
4: 3: 1: 3
$$

Number of
Doses Reported
By Househol d
Shot Card, Up-to Date
Not Up-to-Date
DK/Missing
No Shot Card, Up-to-Date
Up-to-Dat e-Number
Not Up-to-Date
DK/M ssing
Tot al
W t hout
Provi der
Dat a
261786
300431
0
1016897
3836
388568
364480
2335998

| Total wth <br> Provi der <br> Data | Upto <br> dat e- | Percent |
| :---: | ---: | :---: |
| 727579 | 654559 | 89.96 |
| 455914 | 321524 | 70.52 |
| 0 | 0 | 0.00 |
| 1228146 | 973857 | 79.29 |
| 40664 | 39033 | 95.99 |
| 389231 | 272279 | 69.95 |
| 289961 | 216613 | 74.70 |
| 3131495 | 2477865 | 79.13 |

Provi der adj usted esti mates
Chil dren 19-35 months ol d 4: 3: 1: 3: 3

| Number of Doses Reported By Househol d | W thout Provi der Dat a | Total Wth Provi der Dat a | $\text { Up } \mathrm{t} \text { dat } \mathrm{e}^{-}$ | Percent | Tot al | Final Provi der adj usted up- to-dat e | Final Provi der adjusted up-t odate( $\%$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Shot Card, Up-to-Dat e | 246588 | 687880 | 577878 | 84. 01 | 934468 | 785047 |  |
| Not Up-to-Date | 315629 | 495613 | 340852 | 68.77 | 811242 | 557891 |  |
| DK/ M ssing | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0.00 | 0 | 0 |  |
| No Shot Card, Up-to-Date | 927989 | 1128735 | 820579 | 72. 70 | 2056724 | 1495238 |  |
| Up-t o- Dat e, Number | 0 | 39214 | 37583 | 95. 84 | 39214 | 37583 |  |
| Not Up-to-Date | 433096 | 447445 | 289886 | 64.79 | 880541 | 570503 |  |
| DK/ M ssi ng | 412696 | 332608 | 250022 | 75. 17 | 745304 | 560245 |  |
| Tot al | 2335998 | 3131495 | 2316800 | 73. 98 | 5467493 | 4006507 | 73. 28 |

APPENDIX E
EXAMPLE OF A SAS-CALLABLE SUDAAN PROGRAM FOR CALCULATING STANDARD ERRORS
**************************************************************************************
SE_NIPR99.SAS
THIS PROGRAM WILL PRODUCE ESTIMATES AND STANDARD ERRORS FOR BEST VALUE UP-TO-DATE STATUS USING SAS- CALLABLE SUDAAN.

```
SUDAAN NOTES:
    1. ALL VARIABLES USED MUST BE NUMERIC.
    2. VARIABLES IN THE SUBGROUP STATEMENT MUST HAVE VALUES 1,2,...K
        WHERE K IS THE NUMBER OF LEVELS FOR EACH VARIABLE.
    3. DATA MUST BE SORTED ACCORDING TO THE SAMPLE DESIGN VARIABLES
        (STRATUM AND PRIMARY SAMPLING UNIT), SPECIFIED IN THE NEST STATEMENT.
***************************************************************************************;
```

title 'SUD_NIPR.SAS';
options nofmterr ls=80;
libname data v612 'c:Inprpuf99'; **** SPECIFY PATH TO SAS DATA SET;
proc format ;

> value utdf $1=$ 'UP-TO-DATE'
> $2=$ 'NOT UP-TO-DATE';
run;
data o;
set data.nprpuf99 /** SPEIFY NAME OF THE DATA SET **/
(where=(19<=icagemr<=35 and bestval=1)); ** AGE 19-35 MO **
** AND HAVE BEST VALUE **;
run;
/*****AUTOMATICALLY COLLAPSES STRATA TO HAVE AT LEAST TWO PSU PER STRATUM

If the original NHIS stratum has 2 PSUs with eligible children, it is retained. If the NHIS stratum contains only one non-empty PSU, it is merged with the last retained stratum. See the list of original and new collapsed strata in the table following this program to collapse the strata manually. ******/
/*** DEFINE UP-TO-DATE STATUS FOR EACH VACCINE AND SERIES ***/
proc sort nodupkey out=o1(keep=stratum psu);
by stratum psu ;
data o2(keep=stratum goodstra);
set o1;
by stratum psu;
retain goodstra 1 ;
if first.stratum and ^last.stratum then do; /* STRATA WITH 2 PSU */
goodstra=stratum; end;
if last.stratum and first.stratum then do; /* STRATA WITH ONE PSU */
output; end;
proc sort nodupkey;
by stratum;
proc sort data=o;
by stratum;
data o;
merge o(in=_1) o2(in=_2);
by stratum;
if _1;
if _2 then stratum=goodstra;
format b_u: but: utdf.;
run;
proc sort; $\quad$ * SORT BY NEST VARIABLES */
by stratum psu;
run;
proc crosstab data=o filetype=sas design=wr;
weight wt_bv2;
nest stratum $\mathrm{psu} /$ missunit;
subgroup b_utddtp b_utddt3 b_utdpol b_utdmmr b_utdhib b_utdhib b_utdhep b_utd431 butd4313 but43133;
levels 222222222 ;
tables b_utddtp b_utddt3 b_utdpol b_utdmmr b_utdhib b_utdhib b_utdhep b_utd431 butd4313 but43133 ;
output / filename=se tablecell=default replace;
run;

COLLAPSED STRATA: Table to show which NHIS strata were collapsed in to new NHIS/NIPRCS strata for analysis

| Stratum | Stratum |
| :---: | :---: |
| with | Collapsed |
| 1 PSU | Into |


| 185 | 183 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 189 | 187 |
| 191 | 190 |
| 192 | 190 |
| 194 | 190 |
| 197 | 196 |
| 198 | 196 |
| 199 | 196 |
| 205 | 203 |
| 206 | 203 |
| 207 | 203 |
| 210 | 208 |
| 213 | 212 |
| 214 | 212 |
| 216 | 215 |
| 217 | 215 |
| 220 | 219 |
| 221 | 219 |
| 223 | 222 |
| 224 | 222 |
| 227 | 226 |
| 229 | 228 |
| 230 | 228 |
| 236 | 234 |
| 237 | 234 |
| 243 | 242 |
| 246 | 245 |
| 248 | 247 |
| 250 | 249 |
| 252 | 249 |
| 254 | 253 |
| 257 | 256 |
| 263 | 262 |
| 264 | 262 |
| 268 | 267 |
| 273 | 272 |
| 274 | 272 |
| 276 | 275 |
| 277 | 275 |
| 278 | 275 |
| 281 | 280 |
| 282 | 280 |
| 283 | 280 |
| 285 | 284 |
| 291 | 290 |
| 292 | 290 |
| 294 | 293 |
| 295 | 293 |
| 300 | 299 |
| 303 | 302 |
| 307 | 306 |
| 308 | 306 |
| 313 | 312 |
| 316 | 314 |
| 318 | 317 |
| 328 | 326 |
| 331 | 330 |
| 335 | 334 |
| 336 | 334 |
| 338 | 334 |
| 339 | 334 |

## APPENDIX F

UNWEIGHTED DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN AGED 12-35 MONTHS IN THE 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

| Demogr aphi c Characteristic | I mmuni zation Suppl ement ( n \%) |  | Shot Card Users |  |  | Shot Card Users | Wth Provi der Dat a |  | No Provi der Dat a |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tot al | 2565 |  | 890 |  | 1675 |  | 1427 |  | 1138 |  |
| Age of Child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 12-18 | 772 | 30. 1 | 294 | 33. 0 | 478 | 28. 5 | 431 | 30. 2 | 341 | 30. 0 |
| 2. 19-24 | 597 | 23. 3 | 208 | 23.4 | 389 | 23. 2 | 337 | 23.6 | 260 | 22.8 |
| 3. 25-29 | 533 | 20. 8 | 177 | 19. 9 | 356 | 21. 3 | 311 | 21. 8 | 222 | 19. 5 |
| 4. 30-35 | 663 | 25. 8 | 211 | 23.7 | 452 | 27.0 | 348 | 24. 4 | 315 | 27. 7 |
| Gender of Child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Male | 1343 | 52. 4 | 472 | 53. 0 | 871 | 52. 0 | 742 | 52. 0 | 601 | 52.8 |
| 2. Femal e | 1222 | 47. 6 | 418 | 47.0 | 804 | 48. 0 | 685 | 48. 0 | 537 | 47. 2 |
| Race/ Et hni city of Child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Hi spani c | 748 | 29. 2 | 328 | 36. 9 | 420 | 25. 1 | 382 | 26. 8 | 366 | 32. 2 |
| 2. Black, nonHi spani c | 394 | 15. 4 | 102 | 11. 5 | 292 | 17. 4 | 181 | 12. 7 | 213 | 18. 7 |
| 3. White, nonHi spani c | 1325 | 51. 7 | 425 | 47.8 | 900 | 53. 7 | 821 | 57. 5 | 504 | 44. 3 |
| 4. Ot her, nonHi spani c | 98 | 3. 8 | 35 | 3. 9 | 63 | 3. 8 | 43 | 3. 0 | 55 | 4. 8 |
| Poverty St at us |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Bel ow | 457 | 17. 8 | 193 | 21. 7 | 264 | 15. 8 | 261 | 18. 3 | 196 | 17. 2 |
| 2. Above | 1564 | 61.0 | 574 | 64. 5 | 990 | 59. 1 | 961 | 67. 3 | 603 | 53. 0 |
| 3. Unknown | 544 | 21.2 | 123 | 13. 8 | 421 | 25. 1 | 205 | 14. 4 | 339 | 29. 8 |
| I ncome |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. \$20,000 and above | 1789 | 69. 7 | 611 | 68. 7 | 1178 | 70. 3 | 1041 | 73. 0 | 748 | 65.7 |
| 2. Less than \$20,000 | 662 | 25.8 | 250 | 28. 1 | 412 | 24. 6 | 349 | 24. 5 | 313 | 27.5 |
| 3. Unknown | 114 | 4. 4 | 29 | 3. 3 | 85 | 5. 1 | 37 | 2. 6 | 77 | 6. 8 |
| Education of Mother |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Less than Hi gh School | 528 | 20. 6 | 202 | 22. 7 | 326 | 19. 5 | 274 | 19. 2 | 254 | 22. 3 |
| 2. High School | 650 | 25. 3 | 221 | 24. 8 | 429 | 25. 6 | 352 | 24. 7 | 298 | 26. 2 |
| 3. Some Coll ege | 681 | 26. 5 | 225 | 25. 3 | 456 | 27. 2 | 399 | 28. 0 | 282 | 24. 8 |
| 4. Coll ege Graduate | 503 | 19. 6 | 175 | 19. 7 | 328 | 19.6 | 303 | 21. 2 | 200 | 17.6 |
| 5. Unknown | 203 | 7. 9 | 67 | 7. 5 | 136 | 8. 1 | 99 | 6. 9 | 104 | 9. 1 |


| Demographic Characteristic | I mmuni zation Suppl ement ( n \%) |  | Shot Card Users ( n \%) |  | No Shot Card Users ( n \%) |  | W th Provi der Dat a ( n \%) |  | No Provi der Dat a |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | ( n | \% |  |  |  |  |
| Census Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Northeast | 446 | 17. 4 |  |  | 131 | 14. 7 | 315 | 18. 8 | 219 | 15. 3 | 227 | 19. 9 |
| 2. M dwest | 531 | 20. 7 | 165 | 18. 5 | 366 | 21. 9 | 342 | 24. 0 | 189 | 16. 6 |
| 3. South | 905 | 35. 3 | 304 | 34. 2 | 601 | 35. 9 | 539 | 37. 8 | 366 | 32. 2 |
| 4. West | 683 | 26. 6 | 290 | 32.6 | 393 | 23. 5 | 327 | 22. 9 | 356 | 31. 3 |
| MSA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. $5,000,000$ or more | 291 | 11. 3 | 103 | 11. 6 | 188 | 11. 2 | 107 | 7. 5 | 184 | 16. 2 |
| 2. 2,500,000-4,999,999 | 364 | 14. 2 | 120 | 13. 5 | 244 | 14. 6 | 206 | 14. 4 | 158 | 13. 9 |
| 3. 1, 000, $000-2,499,999$ | 681 | 26. 5 | 240 | 27.0 | 441 | 26. 3 | 351 | 24. 6 | 330 | 29. 0 |
| 4. 500,000 - 999, 999 | 293 | 11. 4 | 105 | 11. 8 | 188 | 11. 2 | 174 | 12. 2 | 119 | 10. 5 |
| 5. 250, 000 - 499, 999 | 273 | 10. 6 | 86 | 9. 7 | 187 | 11. 2 | 158 | 11. 1 | 115 | 10. 1 |
| 6. Under 250, 000 | 192 | 7. 5 | 57 | 6. 4 | 135 | 8. 1 | 118 | 8. 3 | 74 | 6. 5 |
| 7. Non-MSA | 471 | 18. 4 | 179 | 20. 1 | 292 | 17.4 | 313 | 21.9 | 158 | 13. 9 |
| RACE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. White | 1857 | 72.4 | 663 | 74. 5 | 1194 | 71. 3 | 1088 | 76. 2 | 769 | 67.6 |
| 2. Black | 382 | 14. 9 | 97 | 10. 9 | 285 | 17.0 | 173 | 12. 1 | 209 | 18. 4 |
| 3. AI AN | 25 | 1. 0 | 7 | 0. 8 | 18 | 1. 1 | 15 | 1. 1 | 10 | 0. 9 |
| 4. API | 63 | 2. 5 | 24 | 2. 7 | 39 | 2. 3 | 26 | 1. 8 | 37 | 3. 3 |
| 5. Ot her | 158 | 6. 2 | 67 | 7. 5 | 91 | 5. 4 | 77 | 5. 4 | 81 | 7. 1 |
| 6. Multiple race | 69 | 2. 7 | 26 | 2. 9 | 43 | 2. 6 | 43 | 3. 0 | 26 | 2. 3 |
| 7. Unknown | 11 | 0. 4 | 6 | 0. 7 | 5 | 0. 3 | 5 | 0. 4 | 6 | 0.5 |
| HI SPNR_P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0. Multi pl e Hi spani c | 18 | 0. 7 | 9 | 1. 0 | 9 | 0. 5 | 12 | 0. 8 | 6 | 0. 5 |
| 1. Puerto Ri can | 54 | 2. 1 | 10 | 1. 1 | 44 | 2. 6 | 19 | 1. 3 | 35 | 3. 1 |
| 2. Mexi can | 165 | 6. 4 | 80 | 9. 0 | 85 | 5. 1 | 75 | 5. 3 | 90 | 7. 9 |
| 3. Mexi can- Ameri can | 383 | 14. 9 | 186 | 20. 9 | 197 | 11. 8 | 218 | 15. 3 | 165 | 14. 5 |
| 4. Cuban/ Cuban- Amer i can | 16 | 0. 6 | 2 | 0. 2 | 14 | 0.8 | 6 | 0. 4 | 10 | 0.9 |
| 5. Domi ni can Republ ic | 18 | 0. 7 | 6 | 0.7 | 12 | 0.7 | 7 | 0.5 | 11 | 1. 0 |
| 6. Central of South America | 68 | 2. 7 | 27 | 3. 0 | 41 | 2. 4 | 28 | 2. 0 | 40 | 3. 5 |
| 8. Other Spani sh | 14 | 0. 5 | 4 | 0.4 | 10 | 0.6 | 8 | 0.6 | 6 | 0.5 |
| 9-11. Hi spani c/ Spani sh, unk | 12 | 0.5 | 4 | 0. 4 | 8 | 0.5 | 9 | 0. 6 | 3 | 0. 3 |
| 12. Non Hi spani c/ Spani sh Orig | 1817 | 70.8 | 562 | 63. 1 | 1255 | 74. 9 | 1045 | 73. 2 | 772 | 67.8 |

APPENDIX G
WEIGHTED DISTRIBUTION OF CHILDREN AGED 12-35 MONTHS IN THE 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

## WEI GHTED DI STRI BUTI ON OF CH LDREN Aged 12- 35 MDNTHS I N THE 1999 NH S/ NI PRCS

## BY SELECTED DEMOGRAPH C CHARASTERI STI CS (VEI GHT = VUFA I M

| Demogr aphi c characteristic | I mmuni zation Suppl ement ( n \% |  | Shot Card Users ( n \%) |  | No Shot Card ( $\mathrm{n} \quad \%$ |  | Wth Provi der Dat a ( $\mathrm{n} \%$ |  | No Provi der Dat a ( $\mathrm{n} \%$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total | 778121 |  | 2585902 |  | 519530 |  | 447148 |  | 330972 |  |
| Age of Child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 12-18 | 2313718 | 29. 7 | 840192 | 32. 5 | 1473526 | 28. 4 | 1339991 | 30. 0 | 973727 | 29. 4 |
| 2. 19-24 | 1822162 | 23. 4 | 631405 | 24. 4 | 1190757 | 22. 9 | 1063927 | 23. 8 | 758235 | 22. 9 |
| 3. 25-29 | 1640999 | 21. 1 | 513528 | 19. 9 | 1127471 | 21. 7 | 997070 | 22. 3 | 643929 | 19. 5 |
| 4. 30-35 | 2004332 | 25.8 | 600777 | 23. 2 | 1403555 | 27.0 | 1070498 | 23. 9 | 933834 | 28. 2 |
| Gender of Child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Mal e | 3977070 | 51. 1 | 1351267 | 52. 3 | 2625803 | 50. 5 | 2283358 | 51. 1 | 1693712 | 51. 2 |
| 2. Femal e | 3804141 | 48. 9 | 1234635 | 47.7 | 2569506 | 49. 5 | 2188128 | 48. 9 | 1616013 | 48. 8 |
| Race/ Et hni city of Child |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Hi spani C | 1448876 | 18. 6 | 599339 | 23. 2 | 849537 | 16. 4 | 735714 | 16. 5 | 713162 | 21. 5 |
| 2. Black, nonHi spani c | 1110629 | 14. 3 | 295326 | 11. 4 | 815303 | 15.7 | 520818 | 11. 6 | 589811 | 17.8 |
| 3. White, nonHi spani c | 4879022 | 62.7 | 1565508 | 60.5 | 3313514 | 63. 8 | 3057915 | 68.4 | 1821107 | 55. 0 |
| 4. Ot her, nonHi spani c | 342684 | 4. 4 | 125729 | 4. 9 | 216955 | 4. 2 | 157039 | 3. 5 | 185645 | 5. 6 |
| Poverty St at us |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Bel ow | 1161560 | 14. 9 | 459699 | 17. 8 | 701861 | 13. 5 | 673277 | 15. 1 | 488283 | 14. 8 |
| 2. Above | 5083832 | 65. 3 | 1802305 | 69. 7 | 3281527 | 63. 2 | 3169702 | 70. 9 | 1914130 | 57.8 |
| 3. Unknown | 1535819 | 19. 7 | 323898 | 12. 5 | 1211921 | 23. 3 | 628507 | 14. 1 | 907312 | 27.4 |
| I ncome |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. \$20,000 and above | 5737631 | 73. 7 | 1911001 | 73. 9 | 3826630 | 73. 7 | 3420877 | 76. 5 | 2316754 | 70. 0 |
| 2. Less than \$20,000 | 1710430 | 22.0 | 596023 | 23. 0 | 1114407 | 21. 5 | 933707 | 20. 9 | 776723 | 23. 5 |
| 3. Unknown | 333150 | 4. 3 | 78878 | 3. 1 | 254272 | 4. 9 | 116902 | 2. 6 | 216248 | 6. 5 |
| Educat i on of Mot her |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Less than High School | 1259247 | 16. 2 | 421120 | 16. 3 | 838127 | 16. 1 | 675136 | 15. 1 | 584111 | 17. 6 |
| 2. Hi gh School | 1985001 | 25. 5 | 657067 | 25. 4 | 1327934 | 25. 6 | 1100383 | 24. 6 | 884618 | 26. 7 |
| 3. Some Coll ege | 2223042 | 28. 6 | 726059 | 28. 1 | 1496983 | 28. 8 | 1337866 | 29. 9 | 885176 | 26. 7 |
| 4. Coll ege Graduate | 1770478 | 22. 8 | 626216 | 24. 2 | 1144262 | 22.0 | 1094974 | 24. 5 | 675504 | 20. 4 |
| 5. Unknown | 543443 | 7. 0 | 155440 | 6. 0 | 388003 | 7. 5 | 263127 | 5. 9 | 280316 | 8. 5 |


| Demogr aphi c characteristic | I mmuni zation Suppl ement ( n \% |  | Shot Card Users ( n \% |  | No Shot ( $\mathrm{n} \%$ | Card | Wth $(\mathrm{n} \quad \text { ) }$ |  | der $(\mathrm{n} \quad \%$ | Provi der Dat a |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Census Region |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Northeast | 1482360 | 19. 1 | 428170 | 16. 6 | 1054190 | 20. 3 | 770621 | 17.2 | 711739 | 21. 5 |
| 2. M dwest | 1828351 | 23.5 | 569279 | 22. 0 | 1259072 | 24. 2 | 1198824 | 26. 8 | 629527 | 19. 0 |
| 3. South | 2719339 | 34. 9 | 866390 | 33. 5 | 1852949 | 35. 7 | 1631754 | 36. 5 | 1087585 | 32. 9 |
| 4. West | 1751161 | 22.5 | 722063 | 27. 9 | 1029098 | 19. 8 | 870287 | 19. 5 | 880874 | 26. 6 |
| MSA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. 5, 000, 000 or more | 729084 | 9. 4 | 243634 | 9. 4 | 485450 | 9. 3 | 295251 | 6. 6 | 433833 | 13. 1 |
| 2. 2,500, $000-4,999,999$ | 1127847 | 14. 5 | 371840 | 14. 4 | 756007 | 14. 6 | 656406 | 14. 7 | 471441 | 14. 2 |
| 3. 1, 000, $000-2,499,999$ | 2027835 | 26.1 | 685584 | 26. 5 | 1342251 | 25.8 | 1086250 | 24. 3 | 941585 | 28. 4 |
| 4. 500,000 - 999, 999 | 885519 | 11. 4 | 313822 | 12. 1 | 571697 | 11.0 | 526559 | 11.8 | 358960 | 10.8 |
| 5. 250, 000 - 499,999 | 862575 | 11. 1 | 261191 | 10. 1 | 601384 | 11. 6 | 496639 | 11. 1 | 365936 | 11. 1 |
| 6. Under 250, 000 | 618730 | 8. 0 | 166035 | 6. 4 | 452695 | 8. 7 | 385427 | 8. 6 | 233303 | 7. 0 |
| 7. Non- MSA | 1529621 | 19. 7 | 543796 | 21. 0 | 985825 | 19. 0 | 1024954 | 22. 9 | 504667 | 15. 2 |
| RACE |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. White | 5867859 | 75. 4 | 1988676 | 76. 9 | 3879183 | 74. 7 | 3536916 | 79. 1 | 2330943 | 70. 4 |
| 2. Bl ack | 1059472 | 13.6 | 274566 | 10. 6 | 784906 | 15. 1 | 494988 | 11. 1 | 564484 | 17. 1 |
| 3. Al AN | 75432 | 1. 0 | 18364 | 0. 7 | 57068 | 1. 1 | 43333 | 1. 0 | 32099 | 1. 0 |
| 4. API | 224417 | 2. 9 | 87383 | 3. 4 | 137034 | 2. 6 | 97693 | 2. 2 | 126724 | 3. 8 |
| 5. Ot her | 328492 | 4. 2 | 132045 | 5. 1 | 196447 | 3. 8 | 163463 | 3. 7 | 165029 | 5. 0 |
| 6. Multiple race | 201637 | 2. 6 | 73337 | 2. 8 | 128300 | 2. 5 | 126132 | 2. 8 | 75505 | 2. 3 |
| 7. Unknown | 23902 | 0.3 | 11531 | 0.4 | 12371 | 0. 2 | 8961 | 0. 2 | 14941 | 0. 5 |
| Hl SPNR_P |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 0. Multi pl e Hi spani c | 36974 | 0.5 | 15025 | 0.6 | 21949 | 0. 4 | 21424 | 0. 5 | 15550 | 0. 5 |
| 1. Puerto Ri can | 115097 | 1. 5 | 17821 | 0.7 | 97276 | 1. 9 | 41513 | 0. 9 | 73584 | 2. 2 |
| 2. Mexi can | 314248 | 4. 0 | 146192 | 5. 7 | 168056 | 3. 2 | 151692 | 3. 4 | 162556 | 4. 9 |
| 3. Mexi can- Ameri can | 721185 | 9. 3 | 339169 | 13. 1 | 382016 | 7. 4 | 399676 | 8. 9 | 321509 | 9. 7 |
| 4. Cuban/ Cuban-Amer i can | 27009 | 0. 3 | 2488 | 0.1 | 24521 | 0. 5 | 9585 | 0. 2 | 17424 | 0. 5 |
| 5. Domi ni can Republ i c | 35630 | 0.5 | 10929 | 0.4 | 24701 | 0. 5 | 13481 | 0.3 | 22149 | 0. 7 |
| 6. Central of South America | 146029 | 1. 9 | 53810 | 2. 1 | 92219 | 1. 8 | 67248 | 1. 5 | 78781 | 2. 4 |
| 8. Ot her Spani sh | 29283 | 0. 4 | 6739 | 0. 3 | 22544 | 0. 4 | 15898 | 0. 4 | 13385 | 0.4 |
| 9-11. Hi spani c/ Spani sh, unk | 23421 | 0.3 | 7166 | 0. 3 | 16255 | 0. 3 | 15197 | 0. 3 | 8224 | 0. 2 |
| 12. Non Hi spani c/ Spani sh Orig | 6332335 | 81.4 | 1986563 | 76. 8 | 4345772 | 83. 6 | 3735772 | 83. 5 | 2596563 | 78. 5 |

APPENDIX H
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR TWO SAMPLING WEIGHT VARIABLES INCLUDED IN THE 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS DATA FILE

DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS FOR TWO SAMPLING WEIGHT VARIABLES INCLUDED IN 1999 NHIS/NIPRCS DATA FILE CHILDREN AGED 12-35 MONTHS IN IMMUNIZATION SUPPLEMENT

|  | NI PRCS 1999 <br> WEI GHT - WFA_I M |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBER CHI LDREN | SUM OF WEI GHTS | M NI MUM VALUE | MAXI MUM VALUE | MEAN | COEFFI CI ENT OF VARI ATI ON |
| Total | 2565 | 7781211 | 778 | 8280 | 3033. 61 | 39. 2981 |
| Age of Child <br> $\begin{array}{ll}\text { 1. } & 12-18 \\ \text { 2. } & 19-35\end{array}$ | 772 1793 | 2313718 5467493 | 778 815 | 8222 8280 | 2997. 04 3049.35 | 41.7643 38.2240 |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Male | 1343 | 3977070 | 778 | 7705 | 2961. 33 | 39. 0218 |
| 2. Female | 1222 | 3804141 | 914 | 8280 | 3113.05 | 39. 4044 |
| Race/ Et hni city |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Hi spani C | 748 | 1448876 | 778 | 6640 | 1937. 00 | 44. 6198 |
| 2. Black, nonHi spani c | 394 | 1110629 | 1033 | 7682 | 2818. 86 | 32. 4918 |
| 3. White, nonHi spanic | 325 | 4879022 | 1007 | 8280 | 3682. 28 | 25. 4055 |
| 4. Other, nonHi spani c | 98 | 342684 | 1007 | 8280 | 3496. 78 | 29. 2396 |

## CHILDREN AGED 12-35 MONTHS WITH BEST VALUES FOR DATES

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { NI PRCS } 1999 \\ & \text { WEI GHT - WT_BV2 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | NUMBER <br> CHI LDREN | SUM OF WEI GHTS | M NI MUM VALUE | MAXI MUM VALUE | MEAN | COEFFI CI ENT OF VARI ATI ON |
| Total | 1533 | 7781211. 00 | 910. 85 | 18169. 74 | 8075. 81 | 47. 9177 |
| Age of Child <br> 1. 12-18 | 464 | 2313718. 01 | 910. 85 | 18169. 74 | 4986. 46 | 49. 2188 |
| 2. 19-35 | 1069 | 5467492.99 | 1017. 04 | 17848. 02 | 5114. 59 | 47. 3683 |
| Gender |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Male | 800 | 3951675. 58 | 910. 85 | 17848. 02 | 4939. 59 | 48. 2715 |
| 2. Femal e | 733 | 3829535. 42 | 1017. 04 | 18169. 74 | 5224. 47 | 47. 4002 |
| Race/Ethni city 1448876.001017 .0417328 .41 3425.24 03.0488 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Hi spani c | 423 | 1448876. 00 | 1017. 04 | 17328. 41 | 3425. 24 | 63. 0488 |
| 2. Black, nonHi spani c | 195 | 1110628. 99 | 1731. 84 | 12907. 33 | 5695. 53 | 40. 2736 |
| 3. White, nonHi spanic | 886 | 4952485. 22 | 910.85 | 18169. 74 | 5718. 81 | 38. 7513 |
| 4. Ot her, nonHi spani c | 49 | 269220. 79 | 2077. 90 | 11612. 59 | 5494. 30 | 40. 0001 |


[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ For details on the NHIS sample design and data collection procedures, see the documentation on the NHIS Web site: http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nhis.htm

[^1]:    ${ }^{1}$ The distribution of adjudication groups in this table is different than the values of the variable ADJ_GRP in the final data file. This table shows the number of cases in each group before reconciliation. A case may have a different adjudication group after reconciliation is completed. For example, the final data file contains 59 cases with ADJ_GRP = R1, as some cases had their discrepancies resolved.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ In 1999, the Advisory Council on Immunization Practices changed the recommendation for childhood polio vaccinations from 2 doses of injected poliovirus (IPV) and two doses of oral poliovirus (OPV) to four doses of IPV. The third polio vaccination is recommended for children between 6-18 months of age. See http://www.cdc.gov/epo/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm4827a4.htm for more information.

