The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System's

2024 Summary Data Quality Report
July 25, 2025

Table of Contents

Introduction

The Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) is a state-based, CDC-assisted health-data collection project and partnership of state health departments, CDC's Population Health Surveillance Branch, and other CDC programs and offices. It comprises telephone surveys conducted by the health departments of all 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, the US Virgin Islands, and Guam.

This *Summary Data Quality Report* presents detailed descriptions of the 2024 BRFSS calling outcomes and call summary information for each of the participating states and territories. All BRFSS public-use data are collected by landline and cell phones to produce a single data set aggregated from the 2024 BRFSS territorial and state data sets. The variables and outcomes in this document apply to a combined data set of responses from participants in each of the states and territories.

The inclusion of data from cell phone interviews in the BRFSS public release data set has been standard protocol since 2011. In many respects, 2011 was a year of change—in both BRFSS's approach and methodology. As the results of cell phone interviews were added in 2011, so were new weighting procedures that could accommodate the inclusion of new weighting variables. Data users should note that weighting procedures are likely to affect trend lines when comparing BRFSS data collected before and after 2011. Because of these changes, users are advised NOT to make direct comparisons with pre-2011 data, and instead, should begin new trend lines with that year. Details of changes beginning with the 2011 BRFSS are provided in the *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, which highlights weighting and coverage effects on trend lines.[1] Each year of data collection since 2011 has included a larger percentage of calls from the cell phone sample. In 2024, a majority of the BRFSS interviews were conducted by cell phone. The annual code books provide information on the number and percentage of calls conducted by landline and cell phone by year.

The measures presented in this document summarize the quality of the 2024 BRFSS survey data. Response rates, cooperation rates, and refusal rates for BRFSS are calculated using standards set by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR). The BRFSS has calculated 2024 response rates using AAPOR response rate #4.[2]

Based on the AAPOR guidelines, response rate calculations include assumptions of eligibility among potential respondents or households that are not interviewed. Changes in the geographic distribution of cell phone numbers by telephone companies and the portability of landline numbers are likely to make it more difficult than in the past to determine which phone numbers are out-of-sample and which phone numbers represent likely households. The BRFSS calculates likely households and eligible respondents using the proportions of eligible households/respondents among all phone numbers for which eligibility has been determined. This eligibility factor appears in calculations of response, cooperation, resolution, and refusal rates.

Interpretation of BRFSS Response Rates

Because this report reflects the inclusion of BRFSS cell phone interviews, contextual information on cell phone response rates is provided below. Although cell phone response rates are generally lower than landline response rates across most surveys, the BRFSS has achieved a cell phone response rate that compares favorably with similar surveys (Table 1). Moreover, since the initial inclusion of cell phone respondents, the proportion of the

sample that is interviewed by cell phone has increased. In most states and nationally overall, cell phone respondents represent the majority of the sample. Since 2012, median BRFSS cell phone response rates have risen slightly. Overall, BRFSS response rates have leveled off in the past few years, with landline rates declining and cell phone rates improving. In 2024, the screening of eligible landline phone numbers improved—which may account for a slight improvement in the proportion of numbers identified as working phone numbers in the landline sample. This change would not necessarily increase response rates. The leveling-off of telephone survey response rates is noted for other federal surveys as well—although in one report, authors noted that the accelerated declines in response rates seen in six other surveys were not seen in BRFSS and one other survey.[3]

Table 1. Examples of Survey Response Rates		
Survey	**Year(s)**	**Overall Response Rate**
California Health Interview Survey [a]	2022–23	8.5%
National Health Interview Survey, 2024[b]	2024	47.9%
Am Time Use Survey[c]	2024	32.4%
BRFSS[d]	2024	43.9%
[a] UCLA Center for Health Policy Research. *CHIS 2023 Methodology Series: Report 4: Response Rates*. Tables 6–9. https://healthpolicy.ucla.edu/sites/default/files/2024-09/chis_2023_methodologyreport4_responserates_final_082924.pdf		
[b] National Center for Health Statistics. *Preferred Reporting Items for Complex Sample Survey Analysis (PRICSSA)*. https://ftp.cdc.gov/pub/Health_Statistics/NCHS/Dataset_Documentation/NHIS/2024/2024-NHIS-PRICSSA-508.pdf		
[c] U.S. Census Bureau. *American Time Use Survey User's Guide: Understanding ATUS 2003 to 2024.* Table 3.3. https://www.bls.gov/tus/atususersguide.pdf		
[d] BRFSS response rates are presented as median rates for all states and territories.		

The following tables present landline and cell phone calling outcomes and rates. The BRFSS cell phone survey was conducted in a manner similar to that of the BRFSS landline survey. One important difference, however, is that interviews conducted by landline phones include random selection among adults within households, while cell phone interviews are conducted with adults who are contacted on personal (nonbusiness) cell phone. This report presents data on three general types of measure by state:

1. Call outcome measures, including response rates, which are based on landline phone disposition codes.

2. Call outcome measures, including response rates, which are based on cell phone disposition codes.

3. A weighted response rate, based on a combination of the landline phone response rate with the cell phone response rate proportional to the total sample used to collect the data for a state.

For clarity, BRFSS recommends that authors and researchers referencing BRFSS data quality include the following language in their limitations, below

Response rates for BRFSS are calculated using standards set by the American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) Response Rate Formula #4 Standards-Definitions-10th-edition.pdf (aapor.org) (p86). Response rate is the number of respondents who completed the survey as a proportion of all eligible and likely to be eligible people. The median survey response rate for all states, territories and Washington, DC, in 2024 was 43.9% and ranged from 30.7% to 64.8%.[a] Response rates for states and territories included in this analysis had a median of [provide median] and ranged from [provide range],[b] For detailed information see the BRFSS Summary Data Quality Report.[c]

[a] Response rates and ranges should reflect the year(s) included in the analyses.
[b] Response rates for states selected for analysis should be included here. This sentence may be omitted if all states are used in the analysis.
[c] See the Summary Data Quality Report for the year(s) included in the analyses. The 2024 document is available at: https://www.cdc.gov/brfss/annual_data/2024/pdf/2024-sdqr-508.pdf.

BRFSS 2024 Call Outcome Measures and Response Rate Formulas

The calculations of calling-outcome rates are based on final disposition codes that are assigned after all calling attempts have been exhausted. The BRFSS may make up to 15 attempts to reach a respondent before assigning a final disposition code. In 2024, the BRFSS used a single set of disposition codes for both landline and cell phones, adapted from standardized AAPOR disposition codes for telephone surveys. A few disposition codes apply only to landline or cell phone sample numbers. For example, answering-device messages may confirm household eligibility for landline numbers but are not used to determine eligibility of cell phone numbers. Disposition codes reflect whether interviewers have completed or partially completed an interview (1000 level codes), determined that the household was eligible without completing an interview (2000 level codes), determined that a household or respondent was ineligible (4000 level codes), or was unable to determine the eligibility of a household or respondent (3000 level codes). Partially completed interviews are those that have collected all information needed to weight responses (about 12 minutes into the survey questionnaire, not including time for eligibility screening). The table below illustrates the codes the BRFSS used in 2024, and it notes the instances where codes are used only for landline or cell phone sample numbers.

The Disposition Code Table below uses the following terms to define and categorize outcomes::

- Respondent: A person who is contacted by an interviewer and who may be eligible for interview.
- Private residence: People residing in private residences or college housing are eligible. People living in group homes, military barracks or other living arrangements are not eligible. People living in vacation homes for 30 days or more are eligible. Eligibility is ascertained by asking each potential respondent whether they live in a private residence. If the respondent is unsure whether their residence qualifies, additional definitions of residences are provided.
- Landline telephone: A telephone that is used within a specific location, including traditional household telephones, Voice Over Internet Protocol (VOIP), and Internet phones connected to computers in a household.
- Cellular telephone/cell phone: A mobile device that is not tied to a specific location for use.
- Selected respondent: A person who is eligible for interview. For the cell phone sample, a selected respondent is an adult associated with the phone number who lives in a private residence or college

housing within the United States or territories covered by the BRFSS. For the landline phone sample, a selected respondent is the person chosen for interview during the household enumeration section of the screening questions.

- Personal cellular telephone/cell phone: A cell phone that is used for personal calls. Cell phones that are used for both personal and business calls may be categorized as personal telephones, and people contacted on these phones are eligible for interview. People using phones that are exclusively for business use are not eligible for interview.

Category	Code	Description
Table 2. 2024 Disposition Codes for Landline and Cell Phones		
Category	Code	Description
Interviewed (1000-level codes)	1100	Completed interview
	1200	Partially completed interview
Eligible, Non-Interview (2000 level codes)	2111	Household level refusal (used for landline only)
	2112	Selected respondent refusal
	2120	Break off/termination within questionnaire
	2210	Selected respondent never available
	2320	Selected respondent physically or mentally unable to complete interview
	2330	Language barrier of selected respondent
Unknown Eligibility	3100	Unknown if housing unit
	3130	No answer
	3140	Answering device, unknown whether eligible
	3150	Telecommunication barrier (i.e. call blocking)
	3200	Household, not known if respondent eligible
	3322	Physical or mental impairment (household level)
	3330	Language barrier (household level)
	3700	On never-call list

Table 2. 2024 Disposition Codes for Landline and Cell Phones		
Category	**Code**	**Description**
Not Eligible	4100	Out of sample
	4200	Fax/data/modem
	4300	Nonworking/disconnected number
	4400	Technological barrier (i.e., fast busy, phone circuit barriers)
	4430	Call forwarding/pager
	4460	Landline telephone number (used for cellular telephone only)
	4500	Non-residence/business
	4900	Miscellaneous, non-eligible

Factors affecting the distribution of disposition codes by state include differences in telephone systems, sample designs, surveyed populations, and data collection processes. Table 3 defines the categories of disposition codes used to calculate outcome and response rates illustrated in Tables 4A through 6.

Table 3. Categories of 2024 Landline and Cell Phone Disposition Codes		
Category	**Disposition Code Definitions**	**Formula Abbreviation**
Completed Interviews	1100+1200	COIN
Eligible	1100+1200+2111+2112+2120+2210+2320+2330	ELIG
Contacted Eligible	1100+1200+2111+2112+2120+2210+2320+2330	CONELIG
Terminations and Refusals	2111+2112+2120	TERE
Ineligible Phone Numbers	All 4000 level disposition codes	INELIG
Unknown Whether Eligible	All 3000 level disposition codes	UNKELIG
Eligibility Factor	ELIG/(ELIG + INELIG)	E

The disposition codes are categorized according to the groups illustrated in Table 3 to produce rates of resolution, cooperation, completion, refusal, and response. In accordance with population surveillance

standards, the proportions of people who may have been eligible for interview, but who were not able to be interviewed, are accounted for in the formulae.

Eligibility Factor

E = ELIG/ (ELIG + INELIG)

The eligibility factor is the proportion of eligible phone numbers from among all sample numbers for which eligibility has been determined. The eligibility factor, therefore, provides a measure of eligibility that can be applied to sample numbers with unknown eligibility. The purpose of the eligibility factor is to estimate the proportion of the sample that is likely to be eligible. The eligibility factor is used in the calculations of refusal and response rates. Separate eligibility factors are calculated for landline and cell phone samples for each state and territory.

Resolution Rate

((ELIG + INELIG) / (ELIG+INELIG+UNKELIG))*100

The resolution rate is the percentage of numbers in the total sample for which eligibility has been determined. The total number of eligible and ineligible sample phone numbers is divided by the total number of phone numbers in the entire sample. The result is multiplied by 100 to calculate the percentage of the sample for which eligibility is determined. Separate resolution rates are calculated for landline and cell phone samples for each state and territory.

Interview Completion Rate

(COIN / (COIN + TERE)) * 100

The interview completion rate is the rate of completed interviews among all respondents who have been determined to be eligible and selected for interviewing. The numerator is the number of completed and partially completed interviews. This number is divided by the number of completed interviews, partially completed interviews, and all break-offs, refusals, and terminations. The result is multiplied by 100 to provide the percentage of completed interviews among eligible respondents who are contacted by interviewers. Separate interview completion rates are calculated for landline and cell phone samples for each state and territory.

Cooperation Rate

(COIN / CONELIG) *100

The AAPOR cooperation rate is the number of complete and partially complete interviews divided by the number of contacted and eligible respondents. The BRFSS cooperation rate follows the guidelines of AAPOR cooperation rate #2. Separate cooperation rates are calculated for landline and cell phone samples for each state and territory.

Refusal Rate

(TERE / (ELIG + (E * UNKELIG))) * 100

The BRFSS refusal rate is the proportion of all eligible respondents who terminated an interview prior to the threshold required to be considered a partial interview or who refused to complete an interview. Terminations and refusals (TERE) are in the numerator, and the denominator includes all eligible numbers and a proportion of the numbers with unknown eligibility. The proportion of numbers with unknown eligibility is determined by the eligibility factor (E as described above). The result is then multiplied by 100 to provide a percentage of refusals

among all eligible and likely to be eligible numbers in the sample. Separate refusal rates are calculated for landline and cell phone samples for each state and territory.

Response Rate

(COIN / ((ELIG + (E * UNKELIG))) * 100

A response rate is an outcome rate with the number of complete and partial interviews in the numerator and an estimate of the number of eligible units in the sample in the denominator. The BRFSS response rate calculation assumes that the unresolved numbers contain the same percentage of eligible households or eligible personal cell phones as the records whose eligibility or ineligibility are determined. The BRFSS response rate follows the guidelines for AAPOR response rate #4. It also is similar to the BRFSS CASRO rates reported prior to 2011. Separate eligibility factors are calculated for landline and cell phone samples for each state and territory, and a combined response rate for landline and cell phone samples is also calculated. The combined landline and cell phone response rate is generated by weighting to the respective size of the two samples. The total sample equals the landline sample plus cell phone sample. The proportion of each sample is calculated using the total sample as the denominator. The formulae for the proportions of the sample are found below:

$$P1 = \text{TOTAL LANDLINE SAMPLE} /$$
$$(\text{TOTAL LANDLINE SAMPLE} + \text{TOTAL CELL PHONE SAMPLE})$$

$$P2 = \text{TOTAL CELL PHONE SAMPLE} /$$
$$(\text{TOTAL LANDLINE SAMPLE} + \text{TOTAL CELL PHONE SAMPLE})$$

The formula for the combined landline and cell phone weighted response rate, therefore, is described below:
$$\text{COMBINED RESPONSE RATE} =$$
$$(P1 * \text{LANDLINE RESPONSE RATE}) + (P2 * \text{CELL PHONE RESPONSE RATE}).$$

Tables of Outcomes and Rates by State

The tables on the following pages illustrate calling outcomes in categories of eligibility, rates of cooperation, refusal, resolution, and response by landline and cell phone samples.

- ➢ Tables 4A and 4B provide information on the size of the sample and the numbers and percentages of completed interviews, cooperation rates, terminations and refusals, and contacts with eligible households by state and territory.
- ➢ Tables 5A and 5B provide information on the number and percentage of landline and cell phone sample numbers that are eligible, ineligible, and of unknown eligibility.
- ➢ Table 6 provides response rates for landline samples, cell phone samples, and combined samples.

Table 4A. Landline Sample.
Completions, Terminations and Refusals, Contacted Eligible Households and Total Sample by State

State	COIN*		TERE**		CONELIG***		COOP^	Total Sample
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%	
AL	965	1.7	313	0.5	1,290	2.2	74.8	57,570
AK	897	0.8	591	0.5	1,507	1.3	59.5	113,460
AZ	1,139	1.3	714	0.8	1,903	2.2	59.9	86,178
AR	1,309	1.9	715	1.1	2,058	3.0	63.6	67,860
CA	1,663	0.1	777	0.1	2,668	0.2	62.3	1158450
CO	1,024	2.1	637	1.3	1,679	3.5	61.0	47,790
CT	612	2.0	469	1.5	1,107	3.5	55.3	31,290
DE	1,202	0.4	742	0.3	2,071	0.7	58.0	289,620
DC	802	2.0	480	1.2	1,313	3.2	61.1	40,830
FL	3,218	1.3	2,609	1.0	5,996	2.4	53.7	253,590
GA	2,101	1.2	2,130	1.2	4,362	2.5	48.2	171,810
HI	1,602	1.5	664	0.6	2,345	2.2	68.3	105,900
ID	640	1.5	208	0.5	866	2.0	73.9	43,162
IL	1,058	0.8	513	0.4	1,602	1.2	66.0	131,460
IN	1,412	1.9	987	1.3	2,452	3.2	57.6	75,630
IA	1,410	2.8	487	1.0	1,978	4.0	71.3	49,650
KS	2,071	1.3	773	0.5	2,915	1.8	71.0	158,394
KY	1,521	2.0	1,116	1.4	2,699	3.5	56.4	77,430
LA	501	1.2	232	0.5	737	1.7	68.0	43,462
ME	2,071	1.4	427	0.3	2,550	1.7	81.2	146,833
MD	3,001	2.2	2,188	1.6	5,283	3.8	56.8	139,230
MA	932	2.3	685	1.7	1,663	4.1	56.0	40,800
MI	3,067	2.1	1,790	1.2	4,955	3.4	61.9	145,050
MN	1,508	2.3	1,009	1.5	2,576	3.9	58.5	65,850
MS	219	1.1	10	0.0	230	1.1	95.2	20,728
MO	1,421	1.7	486	0.6	1,949	2.3	72.9	84,993

Table 4A. Landline Sample.
Completions, Terminations and Refusals, Contacted Eligible Households and Total Sample by State

State	COIN*		TERE**		CONELIG***		COOP^	Total Sample
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%	
MT	2,075	1.1	531	0.3	2,639	1.4	78.6	182,520
NE	2,893	1.5	1,100	0.6	4,038	2.1	71.6	196,020
NV	426	1.0	147	0.3	583	1.3	73.1	43,606
NH	3,505	3.9	1,153	1.3	4,701	5.2	74.6	90,600
NJ	963	1.7	842	1.4	1,847	3.2	52.1	58,320
NM	633	1.7	372	1.0	1,044	2.7	60.6	38,070
NY	5,482	2.2	4,619	1.9	10,372	4.2	52.9	246,750
NC	412	1.3	91	0.3	508	1.6	81.1	32,430
ND	1,205	2.7	857	1.9	2,111	4.7	57.1	45,150
OH	2,022	1.6	1,615	1.3	3,734	3.0	54.2	124,830
OK	923	1.8	190	0.4	1,136	2.2	81.3	51,360
OR	574	1.4	83	0.2	669	1.6	85.8	41,067
PA	380	1.7	93	0.4	533	2.4	71.3	22,620
RI	568	2.4	417	1.8	1,019	4.3	55.7	23,610
SC	2,376	2.0	1,866	1.5	4,397	3.6	54.0	121,440
SD	1,161	0.4	223	0.1	1,402	0.5	82.8	307,546
TN	198	1.9	78	0.8	278	2.7	71.2	10,260
TX	1,111	0.6	984	0.6	2,147	1.2	51.7	171,960
UT	2,059	2.2	655	0.7	2,800	2.9	73.5	95,520
VT	962	2.4	528	1.3	1,528	3.7	63.0	40,890
VA	2,687	0.4	1,183	0.2	4,176	0.7	64.3	607,980
WA	3,905	3.2	1,813	1.5	5,772	4.7	67.7	121,638
WV	1,585	3.6	501	1.1	2,107	4.8	75.2	43,650
WI	4,678	0.5	2,033	0.2	7,338	0.8	63.8	974,280
WY	1,421	0.5	507	0.2	2,020	0.7	70.3	277,740
GU	180	1.3	120	0.8	313	2.2	57.5	14,220

Table 4A. Landline Sample.
Completions, Terminations and Refusals, Contacted Eligible Households and Total Sample by State

State	COIN*		TERE**		CONELIG***		COOP^	Total Sample
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%	
PR	77	0.9	27	0.3	114	1.3	67.5	8,640
VI	101	0.6	45	0.3	148	0.9	68.2	15,720
Minimum	77	0.1	10	0.0	114	0.2	48.2	8,640
Maximum	5,482	3.9	4,619	1.9	10,372	5.2	95.2	1158450
Mean	1,491	1.6	809	0.8	2,370	2.5	65.7	139,277
Median	1,202	1.7	591	0.8	1,978	2.4	63.8	75,630

Table 4a Footnotes:
*   COIN= number of complete and partially complete interviews
**   TERE= all break-offs, refusals, and terminations
*** CONELIG= number of contacted and eligible respondents
^   COOP= Cooperation rate

Table 4B. Cell Phone Sample.
Completions, Terminations and Refusals, Contacted Eligible Households and Total Sample by State

State	COIN*		TERE**		CONELIG***		COOP^	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%	Total Sample
AL	4,005	3.3	824	0.7	4,842	4.0	82.7	119,577
AK	4,481	1.8	791	0.3	5,378	2.2	83.3	245,640
AZ	7,252	2.4	1,844	0.6	9,371	3.1	77.4	300,150
AR	4,039	2.5	858	0.5	5,136	3.1	78.6	163,740
CA	5,676	0.7	897	0.1	6,627	0.8	85.6	780,150
CO	9,962	3.9	1,982	0.8	12,270	4.8	81.2	255,008
CT	6,742	3.0	1,696	0.7	8,788	3.9	76.7	226,500
DE	3,279	1.3	489	0.2	3,791	1.5	86.5	246,030
DC	2,201	2.3	441	0.5	2,746	2.9	80.2	95,790
FL	8,850	2.5	2,622	0.7	11,936	3.3	74.1	359,910
GA	4,901	2.1	1,557	0.7	6,740	2.9	72.7	235,770
HI	4,935	4.5	831	0.8	5,881	5.3	83.9	110,670
ID	3,718	1.9	482	0.3	4,373	2.3	85.0	191,850
IL	11,048	1.9	3,287	0.6	14,875	2.5	74.3	584,010
IN	11,866	3.4	2,648	0.8	14,965	4.3	79.3	351,210
IA	7,453	6.0	1,024	0.8	8,620	6.9	86.5	125,220
KS	9,103	2.9	1,573	0.5	10,806	3.4	84.2	315,981
KY	5,981	2.1	1,300	0.5	7,690	2.7	77.8	287,310
LA	4,112	1.7	1,143	0.5	5,312	2.2	77.4	243,272
ME	10,435	2.8	753	0.2	11,439	3.0	91.2	377,173
MD	12,002	3.6	2,581	0.8	14,958	4.5	80.2	330,000
MA	8,575	3.1	2,184	0.8	11,167	4.1	76.8	275,520
MI	8,328	2.8	1,888	0.6	10,764	3.6	77.4	301,050
MN	13,911	3.9	2,735	0.8	17,223	4.9	80.8	354,592
MS	2,729	1.7	398	0.2	3,147	1.9	86.7	164,839
MO	5,768	3.3	1,024	0.6	7,222	4.1	79.9	175,500

Table 4B. Cell Phone Sample.
Completions, Terminations and Refusals, Contacted Eligible Households and Total Sample by State

| | COIN* | | TERE** | | CONELIG*** | | COOP^ | |
State	N	%	N	%	N	%	%	Total Sample
MT	4,866	2.7	363	0.2	5,251	3.0	92.7	176,970
NE	10,113	2.8	1,464	0.4	11,699	3.2	86.4	365,400
NV	2,225	2.5	366	0.4	2,641	3.0	84.2	88,530
NH	3,501	5.8	461	0.8	4,022	6.6	87.0	60,510
NJ	7,760	2.2	2,170	0.6	10,373	2.9	74.8	358,020
NM	2,700	3.9	569	0.8	3,299	4.8	81.8	68,850
NY	40,155	2.5	13,122	0.8	55,703	3.5	72.1	1602870
NC	3,368	3.4	482	0.5	3,899	3.9	86.4	99,591
ND	4,802	4.8	818	0.8	5,741	5.7	83.6	100,890
OH	8,065	2.3	1,751	0.5	10,337	3.0	78.0	347,400
OK	6,091	3.0	963	0.5	7,125	3.5	85.5	203,400
OR	5,407	3.6	272	0.2	5,807	3.8	93.1	152,271
PA	2,514	1.3	544	0.3	3,253	1.7	77.3	192,660
RI	5,086	3.8	1,165	0.9	6,555	4.9	77.6	134,430
SC	7,125	2.7	1,676	0.6	9,380	3.6	76.0	261,660
SD	4,797	1.6	237	0.1	5,143	1.7	93.3	309,323
TN	1,583	1.8	412	0.5	2,013	2.3	78.6	86,217
TX	10,430	2.2	2,681	0.6	13,899	2.9	75.0	485,040
UT	11,006	4.8	1,436	0.6	13,262	5.8	83.0	229,377
VT	5,441	4.1	833	0.6	6,415	4.9	84.8	131,130
VA	3,767	1.9	408	0.2	4,194	2.1	89.8	202,590
WA	22,257	6.0	3,768	1.0	26,421	7.1	84.2	370,830
WV	4,306	3.2	465	0.3	4,809	3.6	89.5	134,820
WI	8,557	0.8	1,287	0.1	9,970	0.9	85.8	1108770
WY	3,300	1.2	290	0.1	3,614	1.3	91.3	268,830
GU	1,480	3.1	293	0.6	1,828	3.8	81.0	48,030

Table 4B. Cell Phone Sample.
Completions, Terminations and Refusals, Contacted Eligible Households and Total Sample by State

State	COIN*		TERE**		CONELIG***		COOP^	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	%	Total Sample
PR	4,306	7.6	191	0.3	4,537	8.0	94.9	57,030
VI	1,408	3.0	307	0.6	1,750	3.7	80.5	47,550
Minimum	1,408	0.7	191	0.1	1,750	0.8	72.1	47,550
Maximum	40,155	7.6	13,122	1.6	55,703	8.0	94.9	1602870
Mean	6,880	3.0	1,397	0.5	8,544	3.6	82.2	271,326
Median	5,407	2.8	897	0.6	6,555	3.5	81.8	229,377

Table 4b Footnotes:
*   COIN= number of complete and partially complete interviews
**   TERE= all break-offs, refusals, and terminations
*** CONELIG= number of contacted and eligible respondents
^   COOP= Cooperation rate

Table 5A. Landline Sample.
Categories of Eligibility by State (Landline Only).

State	ELIG*		INELIG**		UNKELIG***	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
AL	1,290	2.2	41,334	71.8	14,946	26.0
AK	1,507	1.3	104,350	92.0	7,603	6.7
AZ	1,903	2.2	69,533	80.7	14,742	17.1
AR	2,058	3.0	57,137	84.2	8,665	12.8
CA	2,668	0.2	1074643	92.8	81,139	7.0
CO	1,679	3.5	35,875	75.1	10,236	21.4
CT	1,107	3.5	21,187	67.7	8,996	28.8
DE	2,071	0.7	245,557	84.8	41,992	14.5
DC	1,313	3.2	31,343	76.8	8,174	20.0
FL	5,996	2.4	201,257	79.4	46,337	18.3
GA	4,362	2.5	137,173	79.8	30,275	17.6
HI	2,345	2.2	81,687	77.1	21,868	20.6
ID	866	2.0	35,624	82.5	6,672	15.5
IL	1,602	1.2	105,212	80.0	24,646	18.7
IN	2,452	3.2	61,244	81.0	11,934	15.8
IA	1,978	4.0	40,008	80.6	7,664	15.4
KS	2,915	1.8	134,332	84.8	21,147	13.4
KY	2,699	3.5	60,876	78.6	13,855	17.9
LA	737	1.7	35,191	81.0	7,534	17.3
ME	2,550	1.7	109,296	74.4	34,987	23.8
MD	5,283	3.8	103,087	74.0	30,860	22.2
MA	1,663	4.1	28,045	68.7	11,092	27.2
MI	4,955	3.4	112,321	77.4	27,774	19.1
MN	2,576	3.9	49,169	74.7	14,105	21.4
MS	230	1.1	18,209	87.8	2,289	11.0
MO	1,949	2.3	67,122	79.0	15,922	18.7
MT	2,639	1.4	140,819	77.2	39,062	21.4

Table 5A. Landline Sample.
Categories of Eligibility by State (Landline Only).

State	ELIG*		INELIG**		UNKELIG***	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
NE	4,038	2.1	158,399	80.8	33,583	17.1
NV	583	1.3	34,842	79.9	8,181	18.8
NH	4,701	5.2	63,944	70.6	21,955	24.2
NJ	1,847	3.2	43,234	74.1	13,239	22.7
NM	1,044	2.7	31,873	83.7	5,153	13.5
NY	10,372	4.2	174,587	70.8	61,791	25.0
NC	508	1.6	25,341	78.1	6,581	20.3
ND	2,111	4.7	34,923	77.3	8,116	18.0
OH	3,734	3.0	98,016	78.5	23,080	18.5
OK	1,136	2.2	44,300	86.3	5,924	11.5
OR	669	1.6	31,767	77.4	8,631	21.0
PA	533	2.4	16,655	73.6	5,432	24.0
RI	1,019	4.3	17,445	73.9	5,146	21.8
SC	4,397	3.6	94,343	77.7	22,700	18.7
SD	1,402	0.5	275,349	89.5	30,795	10.0
TN	278	2.7	7,638	74.4	2,344	22.8
TX	2,147	1.2	141,361	82.2	28,452	16.5
UT	2,800	2.9	79,079	82.8	13,641	14.3
VT	1,528	3.7	33,104	81.0	6,258	15.3
VA	4,176	0.7	544,954	89.6	58,850	9.7
WA	5,772	4.7	91,859	75.5	24,007	19.7
WV	2,107	4.8	30,813	70.6	10,730	24.6
WI	7,338	0.8	858,489	88.1	108,453	11.1
WY	2,020	0.7	249,932	90.0	25,788	9.3
GU	313	2.2	11,108	78.1	2,799	19.7
PR	114	1.3	7,413	85.8	1,113	12.9
VI	148	0.9	14,344	91.2	1,228	7.8

Table 5A. Landline Sample.
Categories of Eligibility by State (Landline Only).

State	ELIG*		INELIG**		UNKELIG***	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Minimum	114	0.2	7,413	67.7	1,113	6.7
Maximum	10,372	5.2	1074643	92.8	108,453	28.8
Mean	2,370	2.5	116,742	79.8	20,165	17.7
Median	1,978	2.4	60,876	79.4	13,641	18.3

Footnotes for Table 5A
ELIG*= Eligible
INELIG**=Ineligible
UKELIG**=Unknown whether eligible

Table 5B. Cell Phone Sample.
Categories of Eligibility by State (Cell Phone Only).

State	ELIG		INELIG		UNKELIG	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
AL	4,842	4.0	49,702	41.6	65,033	54.4
AK	5,378	2.2	191,715	78.0	48,547	19.8
AZ	9,371	3.1	145,363	48.4	145,416	48.4
AR	5,136	3.1	91,344	55.8	67,260	41.1
CA	6,627	0.8	223,812	28.7	549,711	70.5
CO	12,270	4.8	107,598	42.2	135,140	53.0
CT	8,788	3.9	81,895	36.2	135,817	60.0
DE	3,791	1.5	65,315	26.5	176,924	71.9
DC	2,746	2.9	48,940	51.1	44,104	46.0
FL	11,936	3.3	175,503	48.8	172,471	47.9
GA	6,740	2.9	126,180	53.5	102,850	43.6
HI	5,881	5.3	36,150	32.7	68,639	62.0
ID	4,373	2.3	48,893	25.5	138,584	72.2
IL	14,875	2.5	274,969	47.1	294,166	50.4
IN	14,965	4.3	174,025	49.6	162,220	46.2
IA	8,620	6.9	60,546	48.4	56,054	44.8
KS	10,806	3.4	183,395	58.0	121,780	38.5
KY	7,690	2.7	172,450	60.0	107,170	37.3
LA	5,312	2.2	105,985	43.6	131,975	54.2
ME	11,439	3.0	145,671	38.6	220,063	58.3
MD	14,958	4.5	148,771	45.1	166,271	50.4
MA	11,167	4.1	131,304	47.7	133,049	48.3
MI	10,764	3.6	161,381	53.6	128,905	42.8
MN	17,223	4.9	161,550	45.6	175,819	49.6
MS	3,147	1.9	81,016	49.1	80,676	48.9
MO	7,222	4.1	69,505	39.6	98,773	56.3
MT	5,251	3.0	68,748	38.8	102,971	58.2

Table 5B. Cell Phone Sample.
Categories of Eligibility by State (Cell Phone Only).

State	ELIG		INELIG		UNKELIG	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
NE	11,699	3.2	212,886	58.3	140,815	38.5
NV	2,641	3.0	38,299	43.3	47,590	53.8
NH	4,022	6.6	23,818	39.4	32,670	54.0
NJ	10,373	2.9	157,000	43.9	190,647	53.3
NM	3,299	4.8	39,143	56.9	26,408	38.4
NY	55,703	3.5	704,136	43.9	843,031	52.6
NC	3,899	3.9	41,535	41.7	54,157	54.4
ND	5,741	5.7	51,076	50.6	44,073	43.7
OH	10,337	3.0	173,513	49.9	163,550	47.1
OK	7,125	3.5	117,249	57.6	79,026	38.9
OR	5,807	3.8	55,462	36.4	91,002	59.8
PA	3,253	1.7	90,244	46.8	99,163	51.5
RI	6,555	4.9	51,811	38.5	76,064	56.6
SC	9,380	3.6	114,202	43.6	138,078	52.8
SD	5,143	1.7	178,014	57.5	126,166	40.8
TN	2,013	2.3	32,158	37.3	52,046	60.4
TX	13,899	2.9	218,929	45.1	252,212	52.0
UT	13,262	5.8	116,650	50.9	99,465	43.4
VT	6,415	4.9	54,654	41.7	70,061	53.4
VA	4,194	2.1	59,064	29.2	139,332	68.8
WA	26,421	7.1	156,142	42.1	188,267	50.8
WV	4,809	3.6	77,701	57.6	52,310	38.8
WI	9,970	0.9	227,888	20.6	870,912	78.5
WY	3,614	1.3	146,898	54.6	118,318	44.0
GU	1,828	3.8	22,005	45.8	24,197	50.4
PR	4,537	8.0	31,137	54.6	21,356	37.4
VI	1,750	3.7	31,475	66.2	14,325	30.1

Table 5B. Cell Phone Sample.
Categories of Eligibility by State (Cell Phone Only).

State	ELIG		INELIG		UNKELIG	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Minimum	1,750	0.8	23,828	20.6	14,325	19.8
Maximum	55,703	8.0	704,136	78.0	870,912	78.5
Mean	8,544	3.6	119,316	46.3	143,466	50.1
Median	6,555	3.5	105,985	45.8	107,170	50.4

Footnotes for Table 5B
ELIG*= Eligible
INELIG**=Ineligible
UKELIG**=Unknown whether eligible

Table 6. Response Rates for Landline and Cell Phone Samples

State	Landline Response Rate	Cell Phone Response Rate	Combined Response Rate
AL	55.4	37.7	43.5
AK	55.5	66.9	63.3
AZ	49.6	39.9	42.1
AR	55.5	46.3	49.0
CA	58.0	25.3	44.8
CO	47.9	38.2	39.7
CT	39.4	30.7	31.8
DE	49.6	24.3	38.0
DC	48.9	43.2	44.9
FL	43.9	38.6	40.8
GA	39.7	41.0	40.4
HI	54.2	31.9	42.8
ID	62.5	23.6	30.7
IL	53.7	36.9	39.9
IN	48.5	42.7	43.7
IA	60.3	47.8	51.3
KS	61.6	51.8	55.0
KY	46.3	48.8	48.2
LA	56.2	35.4	38.6
ME	61.9	38.0	44.7
MD	44.2	39.8	41.1
MA	40.8	39.7	39.8
MI	50.0	44.2	46.1
MN	46.0	40.7	41.5
MS	84.7	44.3	48.8

Table 6. Response Rates for Landline and Cell Phone Samples

State	Landline Response Rate	Cell Phone Response Rate	Combined Response Rate
MO	59.3	34.9	42.9
MT	61.8	38.7	50.5
NE	59.4	53.1	55.3
NV	59.4	39.0	45.7
NH	56.5	40.0	49.9
NJ	40.3	35.0	35.7
NM	52.4	50.5	51.2
NY	39.6	34.2	34.9
NC	64.6	39.4	45.6
ND	46.8	47.1	47.0
OH	44.1	41.3	42.0
OK	71.9	52.3	56.2
OR	67.8	37.5	43.9
PA	54.2	37.5	39.3
RI	43.6	33.7	35.2
SC	43.9	35.9	38.4
SD	74.5	55.2	64.8
TN	55.0	31.2	33.7
TX	43.2	36.0	37.9
UT	63.0	47.0	51.7
VT	53.3	39.5	42.8
VA	58.1	28.0	50.6
WA	54.3	41.5	44.6
WV	56.7	54.8	55.3
WI	56.7	18.4	36.3
WY	63.8	51.1	57.6
GU	46.2	40.2	41.5

Table 6. Response Rates for Landline and Cell Phone Samples

State	Landline Response Rate	Cell Phone Response Rate	Combined Response Rate
PR	58.8	59.4	59.3
VI	62.9	56.2	57.9

	Landline Response Rate	Cell Phone Response Rate	Combined Response Rate
Minimum	39.4	18.4	30.7
Maximum	84.7	66.9	64.8
Mean	54.2	40.9	45.2
Median	54.3	39.8	43.9

References

1. Pierannunzi C, Town M, Garvin W, Shaw F, Balluz L. Methodologic changes in the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System in 2011 and potential effects on prevalence estimates. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep.* 2012;61(22):410–413. http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/mm6122a3.htm

2. American Association for Public Opinion Research. *Standard Definitions: Final Dispositions of Case Codes and Outcome Rates for Surveys* (Revised 2023). Pp. 86–87. https://aapor.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/Standards-Definitions-10th-edition.pdf

3. Czajka JL, Beyler A. *Declining Response Rates in Federal Surveys: Trends and Implications* (2016). pviii. https://aspe.hhs.gov/system/files/pdf/255531/Decliningresponserates.pdf