

ASSESSING THE IMPACT OF MOTHER’S PERCEPTION OF SUPPORT ON BREASTFEEDING INTENSITY THROUGH SIX MONTHS: STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

KATIE PALOMARES

Contents

Data Prep	2
Model Fit Summaries: Breast Feeding Intensity At Each Time Period	12
1 Month	12
Full Model	12
Control Model	13
Likelihood Ratio Test	13
Coefficient Table	13
2 Month	15
Full Model	16
Control Model	16
Likelihood Ratio Test	17
3 Month	17
Full Model	17
Control Model	18
Likelihood Ratio Test	18
4 Month	18
Full Model	19
Control Model	19
Likelihood Ratio Test	20
5 Month	20
Full Model	20
Control Model	21
Likelihood Ratio Test	21
6 Month	22
Full Model	22
Control Model	22
Likelihood Ratio Test	23

Data Prep

The code shown below implements the following process:

1. Read in full IFPS dataset
2. Subset the dataset to fields relevant to the study and apply necessary transformations
3. Fit a multinomial logistic regression model to the data in order to ascertain the significance of perception of support on breast feeding intensity.

```
data.directory <- file.path(rprojroot::find_rstudio_root_file(), "0_Data")
project.directory <- rprojroot::find_rstudio_root_file()
ifps_dt <- "ifps2.sas7bdat" %>%
  file.path(data.directory, .) %>%
  read_sas() %>%
  as.data.table()

ifps_subset_dt <- ifps_dt[, .(SAMPMIQ)]

#####
#DATA TRANSFORMATIONS
#####
# Breastfeeding difficulties, question 36 -----

N36_cols <- colnames(ifps_dt)[colnames(ifps_dt) %like% "N36"]

N36_dt <- melt(ifps_dt[, .SD, .SDcols = c("SAMPMIQ", N36_cols)],
  id.vars = "SAMPMIQ",
  value.name = "response",
  variable.name = "question")

N36_dt %<>% .[, .(response = sum(response, na.rm = TRUE)), keyby = .(SAMPMIQ)]

N36_dt[, breast_feeding_difficulties := FALSE]
N36_dt[response > 0, breast_feeding_difficulties := TRUE]

ifps_subset_dt[N36_dt,
  breast_feeding_difficulties := i.breast_feeding_difficulties,
  on = .(SAMPMIQ)]

rm(N36_dt, N36_cols)

# -----
# Breast feeding support, question 38 -----

N38_dt <- ifps_dt[, .(N38, SAMPMIQ)]
N38_dt[, breast_feeding_support := FALSE]
N38_dt[N38 == 1, breast_feeding_support := TRUE]

ifps_subset_dt[N38_dt,
  breast_feeding_support := i.breast_feeding_support,
  on = .(SAMPMIQ)]
```

```

rm(N38_dt)

# -----

# Perception of support, question 39

N39_dt <- ifps_dt[, .(N39, SAMPMIQ)]

N39_dt[N39 %in% c(1, 2), perception_of_support := "Unhelpful"]
N39_dt[N39 %in% c(3), perception_of_support := "Inconclusive"]
N39_dt[N39 %in% c(4, 5), perception_of_support := "Helpful"]

ifps_subset_dt[N39_dt,
  perception_of_support := i.perception_of_support,
  on = .(SAMPMIQ)]

rm(N39_dt)

# -----

# Breast Feeding Intensity at 2 - 6 months -----

months <- 1:6

for(i in months){

  if (i == 1) {
    feeding_cols <- colnames(ifps_dt)[colnames(ifps_dt) %like% "N40"]

    bf_feeding_col <- "N40A"
  } else {
    feeding_cols <- paste0("M", i, "A1", LETTERS[1:10])

    bf_feeding_col <- paste0("M", i, "A1A")
  }

  temp_dt <- melt(ifps_dt[, .SD, .SDcols = c("SAMPMIQ", feeding_cols)],
    id.vars = "SAMPMIQ",
    value.name = "response",
    variable.name = "question")

  temp_dt[is.na(response) & question == bf_feeding_col, response := 0]

  temp_dt %<>% .[, .(breast_feeding_intensity = response[question == bf_feeding_col]/sum(response,
    na.rm = TRUE)),
    keyby = .(SAMPMIQ)]

  temp_dt[is.nan(breast_feeding_intensity), breast_feeding_intensity := NA]

  ifps_subset_dt[temp_dt,
    breast_feeding_intensity := i.breast_feeding_intensity,
    on = .(SAMPMIQ)]

```

```

setnames(ifps_subset_dt,
         "breast_feeding_intensity",
         paste0("breast_feeding_intensity_", i, "_mo"))

rm(feeding_cols, bf_feeding_col, temp_dt)
}

# -----

# BFHI Exposure -----

BFHI_dt <- ifps_dt[, .SD, .SDcols = c("N20",
                                     "N11",
                                     "N25",
                                     "N28",
                                     paste0("N29", c("A", "B", "C")),
                                     "N32",
                                     "SAMPMIQ")]

number_BFHI_criteria <- 6

# Time until mother breastfed for the first time
BFHI_dt[N20 %in% 1:2, BFHI_exp_1 := TRUE]
BFHI_dt[N20 %in% 3:9, BFHI_exp_1 := FALSE]

# No Pacifiers
BFHI_dt[N11 %in% c(1, 3), BFHI_exp_2 := FALSE]
BFHI_dt[N11 %in% c(2), BFHI_exp_2 := TRUE]

# Rooming in
BFHI_dt[N25 %in% c(1), BFHI_exp_3 := TRUE]
BFHI_dt[N25 %in% c(2, 3), BFHI_exp_3 := FALSE]

# BF on Demand
BFHI_dt[N28 %in% c(1), BFHI_exp_4 := TRUE]
BFHI_dt[N28 %in% c(2, 3), BFHI_exp_4 := FALSE]

# Only BM
BFHI_dt[N29A == 2 & N29B == 2 & N29C == 2, BFHI_exp_5 := TRUE]
BFHI_dt[N29A %in% c(1, 3) | N29B %in% c(1, 3) | N29C %in% c(1, 3),
        BFHI_exp_5 := FALSE]

# Fostering support groups
BFHI_dt[N32 == 1, BFHI_exp_6 := TRUE]
BFHI_dt[N32 == 2, BFHI_exp_6 := FALSE]

BFHI_dt %<>% melt(., measure.vars = paste0("BFHI_exp_", 1:number_BFHI_criteria),
                variable.name = "question",
                value.name = "response")

BFHI_dt %<>% .[, .(BFHI_score = sum(response, na.rm = TRUE),
                  BFHI_all_missing = all(is.na(response))), by = .(SAMPMIQ)]

```

```

BFHI_dt[BFHI_all_missing == TRUE, BFHI_score := NA]

ifps_subset_dt[BFHI_dt, BFHI_score := i.BFHI_score, on = .(SAMPMIQ)]

rm(BFHI_dt, number_BFHI_criteria)
# -----

# Maternal Age -----
P9_dt <- ifps_dt[, .(P9, SAMPMIQ)]

P9_dt[, unique(P9)] %>% sort()

P9_dt[, maternal_age := cut(P9,
                             breaks = c(18, 25, 30, 35, Inf),
                             labels = c("18-24", "25-29", "30-34", "35+"),
                             include.lowest = TRUE,
                             right = FALSE)]

ifps_subset_dt[P9_dt, maternal_age := i.maternal_age, on = .(SAMPMIQ)]

rm(P9_dt)
# -----

# Race/Ethnicity -----
race_dt <- ifps_dt[, .(RACE_ETH, SAMPMIQ)]

race_dt[RACE_ETH == 1, race_eth := "White, Non-Hispanic"]
race_dt[RACE_ETH == 2, race_eth := "Black, Non-Hispanic"]
race_dt[RACE_ETH == 3, race_eth := "Hispanic"]
race_dt[RACE_ETH %in% c(4, 5), race_eth := "Other"]

ifps_subset_dt[race_dt, race_eth := i.race_eth, on = .(SAMPMIQ)]

rm(race_dt)
# -----

# Education -----
edu_dt <- ifps_dt[, .(EDUC, SAMPMIQ)]

edu_dt[EDUC %in% c(1, 2, 3), education := "Less Than High School"]
edu_dt[EDUC %in% c(4), education := "High School"]
edu_dt[EDUC %in% c(5), education := "1-3 Years College"]
edu_dt[EDUC %in% c(6, 7), education := "College Graduate"]

ifps_subset_dt[edu_dt, education := i.education, on = .(SAMPMIQ)]

rm(edu_dt)
# -----

# Parity -----
parity_dt <- ifps_dt[, .(P41_1, P41_2, SAMPMIQ)]

```

```

parity_dt[P41_1 == 0 & P41_2 == 0, parity := "nullipara"]
parity_dt[P41_1 %in% 1:12 | P41_2 %in% 1:12, parity := "primipara"]

ifps_subset_dt[parity_dt, parity := i.parity, on = .(SAMPMIQ)]

parity_dt[, .N, by = .(keyby = P41_1)]
parity_dt[, .N, by = .(keyby = P41_2)]
rm(parity_dt)
# -----

# Income Level -----

income_dt <- ifps_dt[, .(INCOME, SAMPMIQ)]

income_dt[INCOME %in% 31:37, income := "<$20,000"]
income_dt[INCOME %in% 38:46, income := "$20,000-$49,999"]
income_dt[INCOME %in% 47:57, income := ">$50,000"]

ifps_subset_dt[income_dt, income := i.income, on = .(SAMPMIQ)]

rm(income_dt)
# -----

# BMI -----

bmi_dt <- ifps_dt[, .(P7, P8FT, P8IN, SAMPMIQ)]

bmi_dt[, bmi := (P7/((P8FT * 12 + P8IN)^2)) * 703]

bmi_dt[bmi < 18.5, bmi_class := "Underweight"]
bmi_dt[bmi >= 18.5 & bmi <= 24.9, bmi_class := "Normal Weight"]
bmi_dt[bmi >= 25 & bmi <= 29.9, bmi_class := "Overweight"]
bmi_dt[bmi >= 30, bmi_class := "Obese"]

ifps_subset_dt[bmi_dt, bmi := i.bmi_class, on = .(SAMPMIQ)]

rm(bmi_dt)
# -----

# WIC Participation -----

wic_dt <- ifps_dt[, .(P6_1, P6_2, P6_3, SAMPMIQ)]

wic_dt[P6_1 == 1 | P6_2 == 1, wic_participation := TRUE]
wic_dt[P6_3 == 1, wic_participation := FALSE]

ifps_subset_dt[wic_dt,
               wic_participation := i.wic_participation,
               on = .(SAMPMIQ)]

rm(wic_dt)
# -----

```

```

# Attitude toward breast feeding -----

attitude_dt <- ifps_dt[, .(P35E, SAMPMIQ)]

attitude_dt[P35E == 1, breast_feeding_attitude := "Positive"]
attitude_dt[P35E %in% c(2:5), breast_feeding_attitude := "Negative"]

ifps_subset_dt[attitude_dt,
               breast_feeding_attitude := i.breast_feeding_attitude,
               on = .(SAMPMIQ)]

rm(attitude_dt)

# -----

# Reshaping data before going into modeling
modeling_dt <- melt(ifps_subset_dt,
                   measure.vars = paste0("breast_feeding_intensity_", 1:6, "_mo"),
                   variable.name = "time_of_bf_intens_meas",
                   value.name = "numeric_bf_intensity")

# Setting the boundaries for "low", "medium", and "high" breast feeding intensity
break_options <- c(0, .2, .8, 1)

modeling_dt[, breast_feeding_intensity := cut(numeric_bf_intensity,
                                             breaks = break_options,
                                             labels = c("Low", "Medium", "High"),
                                             include.lowest = TRUE)]

# Perform chi-squared test

chi_sq_dt <- modeling_dt[!is.na(perception_of_support) &
                        !is.na(breast_feeding_intensity), .(breast_feeding_intensity,
                                                            perception_of_support,
                                                            time_of_bf_intens_meas)]

chi_sq_dt[, time_of_bf_intens_meas := gsub("breast_feeding_intensity_", "",
                                           time_of_bf_intens_meas)]
chi_sq_dt[, time_of_bf_intens_meas := paste0(time_of_bf_intens_meas, "nth")]

chi_sq_test_list <- lapply(split(chi_sq_dt, by = "time_of_bf_intens_meas"), function(x){
  temp_table <- table(x$breast_feeding_intensity, x$perception_of_support)

  chi_sq_test <- chisq.test(temp_table)

  return(list(contingency_table = temp_table,
              chi_sq_test = chi_sq_test))
})

# Filtering down the dataset to mothers that had difficulties and support and responded
# with a perception of the support. Also filtering out all rows that contain an NA

```

```

modeling_dt %<>% .[breast_feeding_difficulties == TRUE &
  breast_feeding_support == TRUE &
  !is.na(perception_of_support)] %>%
  na.omit()

modeling_dt[, numeric_bf_intensity := NULL]
modeling_dt[, time_of_bf_intens_meas := gsub("breast_feeding_intensity_", "",
  time_of_bf_intens_meas)]
modeling_dt[, time_of_bf_intens_meas := paste0(time_of_bf_intens_meas, "nth")]

# Setting categorical variable columns to be 'factor' type in data for modeling
factor_cols <- modeling_dt[, .SD, .SDcols = -c("SAMPMIQ")] %>% colnames()

modeling_dt[, (factor_cols) := lapply(.SD, as.factor), .SDcols = factor_cols]

# Relevel Factors -----

# Setting the reference level for all variables
modeling_dt[, ':= ' (perception_of_support = relevel(perception_of_support,
  ref = "Inconclusive"),
  breast_feeding_intensity = relevel(breast_feeding_intensity,
  ref = "Low"),
  BFHI_score = relevel(BFHI_score,
  ref = "0"),
  maternal_age = relevel(maternal_age,
  ref = "25-29"),
  race_eth = relevel(race_eth,
  ref = "White, Non-Hispanic"),
  education = relevel(education,
  ref = "High School"),
  parity = relevel(parity,
  ref = "primipara"),
  income = relevel(income,
  ref = "$20,000-$49,999"),
  bmi = relevel(bmi,
  ref = "Normal Weight"),
  wic_participation = relevel(wic_participation,
  ref = "FALSE"),
  breast_feeding_attitude = relevel(breast_feeding_attitude,
  ref = "Negative"))]

base_levels <- lapply(modeling_dt, function(x){
  data.table(reference_level = levels(x)[1])
}) %>% rbindlist(., idcol = 'variable')
# -----

# List of datasets for 1-6 months to sequence along for modeling
modeling_data_list <- split(modeling_dt, by = "time_of_bf_intens_meas")

response_var <- "perception_of_support"

control_vars <- modeling_dt[, .SD, .SDcols = -c("SAMPMIQ",
  "breast_feeding_difficulties",

```



```

                                "breast_feeding_support",
                                response_var,
                                "breast_feeding_intensity",
                                "time_of_bf_intens_meas")] %>%

colnames()

control_formula <- as.formula(paste("breast_feeding_intensity ~ ",
                                   paste(control_vars, collapse = "+")))

# Check for multi collinearity -----
# Computes multicollinearity diagnostic using generalized variance inflation
# factors. Metrics are computed for all control variables + perception of
# support
multi_col_model <- multinom(as.formula(paste("breast_feeding_intensity ~ ",
                                             paste(c(response_var, control_vars), collapse = "+")),
                           data = modeling_dt[time_of_bf_intens_meas == "1_month"],
                           model = TRUE)

vif_dt <- vif(multi_col_model) %>% as.data.table()

## Warning in vif.default(multi_col_model): No intercept: vifs may not be sensible.

vif_dt[, Variable := rownames(vif(multi_col_model))]

## Warning in vif.default(multi_col_model): No intercept: vifs may not be sensible.

vif_dt[, `:=` (GVIF = round(GVIF, 2),
                  `GVIF^(1/(2*Df))` = round(`GVIF^(1/(2*Df))`, 2))]

fwrite(vif_dt, file.path(project.directory, "2_Outputs/Coefficient_Tables/vif_dt.csv"))
# -----

model_fit <- list()

# This loop fits a model at each month 1-6
for(i in seq_along(modeling_data_list)){

  temp_dt <- modeling_data_list[[i]]

  # Fits a regression model using all control variables
  temp_controlModel <- multinom(control_formula, data = temp_dt)

  # Applies stepwise regression to find an optimal control variable subset for
  # the iteration
  temp_stepwiseModel <- stepAIC(temp_controlModel)

  optimal_control_variable_subset <- temp_stepwiseModel$xlevels %>% names()

  # Fits the full regression model using perception of support + optimized control
  # variables
  full_formula <- as.formula(paste("breast_feeding_intensity ~ ",
                                   paste(c(response_var, optimal_control_variable_subset),

```

```

collapse = "+"))))

temp_fullModel <- multinom(full_formula,
  data = temp_dt)

# Create a table of variable coefficients and their associated odds ratios at
# different levels of the variable

coef_dt <- coef(temp_fullModel) %>% as.data.table()

coef_dt[, response_level := attributes(coef(temp_fullModel))$dimnames[[1]]]

coef_dt %<>% melt(., id.vars = "response_level", variable.name = "variable", value.name = "coefficient")

model_levels <- temp_fullModel$xlevels %>%
  lapply(., as.data.table) %>%
  rbindlist(., idcol = "variable")

setnames(model_levels, "V1", "level")

model_levels[, combined_name := paste0(variable, level)]

coef_dt[model_levels, ':= ' (variable_name = i.variable,
  variable_level = i.level), on = .(variable = combined_name)]
coef_dt[base_levels, reference_level := i.reference_level, on = .(variable_name = variable)]

coef_dt %<>% .[!is.na(variable_name)]

coef_dt[, odds_ratio := exp(coefficient)]

confint_dt <- confint(temp_fullModel) %>% as.data.table()

confint_dt %<>% dcast(., ... ~ V2, value.var = "value")

setnames(confint_dt, c("variable", "response_level", "lower_log_odds_interval", "upper_log_odds_interval"))

confint_dt[, ':= ' (lower_odds_ratio_interval = exp(lower_log_odds_interval),
  upper_odds_ratio_interval = exp(upper_log_odds_interval))]

coef_dt <- merge(coef_dt,
  confint_dt,
  by = c("variable", "response_level"),
  all.x = TRUE)

coef_dt[, variable := NULL]
# Returns list of iteration results
model_fit[[i]] <- list(full_model = temp_fullModel,
  full_model_summary = summary(temp_fullModel),
  control_model = temp_stepwiseModel,
  stepwise_results = temp_stepwiseModel$anova,
  optimal_control_variables = optimal_control_variable_subset,
  likelihood_ratio_test = lrtest(temp_fullModel,
    temp_stepwiseModel),
  coef_dt = coef_dt)

```

```
}  
  
names(model_fit) <- names(modeling_data_list)  
  
saveRDS(model_fit, file.path(project.directory, "2_Outputs/R_Objects/model_fit.RDS"))  
  
fwrite(modeling_dt, file.path(data.directory, "modeling_dt.csv"))
```

Model Fit Summaries: Breast Feeding Intensity At Each Time Period

Modeling results are shown below. For each month (1:6), a full and control model are fit, according to the following structure.

Full Model: Breast Feeding Intensity at i_{th} Month \sim Perception of Support + Control Variables

Control Model: Breast Feeding Intensity at i_{th} Month \sim Control Variables

Each model is a **Multinomial Logistic Regression**. The control variables to be used are determined from a **bidirectional stepwise regression** using the Akaike Information Criterion.

Once the full and control models are fit, a likelihood ratio test is performed between the two.

The likelihood ratio test yields the following statistic:

$$\lambda_{LR} = -2 \ln \left[\frac{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta_0} \mathcal{L}(\theta)}{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathcal{L}(\theta)} \right]$$

According to Wilks' theorem, this statistic will asymptotically be chi-squared distributed (χ^2) with degrees of freedom equal to the difference in dimensionality of Θ and Θ_0

Leveraging this result, we can draw conclusions about the significance of perception of support in predicting breast feeding intensity.

Multicollinearity between the predictors was measured through generalized variance inflation factors (Cox and Monette Citation)

1 Month

The control variables determined are: BFHI_score, education, parity, bmi, breast_feeding_attitude

The likelihood ratio test is performed between the model fit with only the control variables (Control Model) and the model fit with both the control variables and perception of support (Full Model).

The test statistic derived from the likelihood ratios of each model is: 152.6212563

This asymptotically approaches a chi-squared distribution with degrees of freedom: 4

The sample size for this test is: 1080

This corresponds to a model p-value of: $5.5841168 \times 10^{-32}$

Full Model

```
## Call:
## multinom(formula = full_formula, data = temp_dt)
##
## Coefficients:
##      (Intercept) perception_of_supportHelpful perception_of_supportUnhelpful
## Medium    -0.0138623                0.9788665                -0.8725202
## High       0.4594915                1.4296641                -1.1268962
##      BFHI_score1 BFHI_score2 BFHI_score3 BFHI_score4 BFHI_score5 BFHI_score6
## Medium    -0.4452068   -1.0080376   -0.5532182   -0.5086780   -0.3636077   0.04684917
## High      -0.6827954   -0.7036692   -0.3001999    0.2453935    0.9106883   1.23565523
##      education1-3 Years College educationCollege Graduate
## Medium              0.01037884              0.8829022
```

```
## High          0.52402595          1.5183682
##      educationLess Than High School paritynullipara    bmiObese bmiOverweight
## Medium          0.04313044      -0.0782227  0.4372239  0.02789186
## High          -0.49591415      -0.5642831 -0.3526216  -0.10334683
##      bmiUnderweight breast_feeding_attitudePositive
## Medium      -0.7700416          -0.8480540
## High        -0.2708775          -0.9925298
##
## Residual Deviance: 1645.806
## AIC: 1713.806
```

Control Model

```
## Call:
## multinom(formula = breast_feeding_intensity ~ BFHI_score + education +
##      parity + bmi + breast_feeding_attitude, data = temp_dt)
##
## Coefficients:
##      (Intercept) BFHI_score1 BFHI_score2 BFHI_score3 BFHI_score4 BFHI_score5
## Medium  -0.2598538 -0.07660189 -0.57346254 -0.1399831  0.02105644  0.02971873
## High    0.2748865 -0.12794852 -0.05499423  0.3145135  1.01250303  1.50814167
##      BFHI_score6 education1-3 Years College educationCollege Graduate
## Medium  0.4006353          -0.08668363          0.8593959
## High    1.8221076          0.38500155          1.4860665
##      educationLess Than High School paritynullipara    bmiObese bmiOverweight
## Medium          -0.03786449      0.03052586  0.3460351  0.0168030
## High          -0.47303247      -0.40117172 -0.4561887  -0.1262089
##      bmiUnderweight breast_feeding_attitudePositive
## Medium      -1.0550613          -0.8208175
## High        -0.5844698          -0.9783816
##
## Residual Deviance: 1798.427
## AIC: 1858.427
```

Likelihood Ratio Test

```
## Likelihood ratio test
##
## Model 1: breast_feeding_intensity ~ perception_of_support + BFHI_score +
##      education + parity + bmi + breast_feeding_attitude
## Model 2: breast_feeding_intensity ~ BFHI_score + education + parity +
##      bmi + breast_feeding_attitude
##      #Df LogLik Df Chisq Pr(>Chisq)
## 1 34 -822.90
## 2 30 -899.21 -4 152.62 < 2.2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

Coefficient Table

```
##      response_level coefficient      variable_name      variable_level
## 1:      High -0.68279539      BFHI_score      1
```

## 2:	Medium	-0.44520680	BFHI_score	1
## 3:	High	-0.70366923	BFHI_score	2
## 4:	Medium	-1.00803764	BFHI_score	2
## 5:	High	-0.30019994	BFHI_score	3
## 6:	Medium	-0.55321818	BFHI_score	3
## 7:	High	0.24539346	BFHI_score	4
## 8:	Medium	-0.50867804	BFHI_score	4
## 9:	High	0.91068834	BFHI_score	5
## 10:	Medium	-0.36360772	BFHI_score	5
## 11:	High	1.23565523	BFHI_score	6
## 12:	Medium	0.04684917	BFHI_score	6
## 13:	High	-0.35262160	bmi	Obese
## 14:	Medium	0.43722389	bmi	Obese
## 15:	High	-0.10334683	bmi	Overweight
## 16:	Medium	0.02789186	bmi	Overweight
## 17:	High	-0.27087750	bmi	Underweight
## 18:	Medium	-0.77004164	bmi	Underweight
## 19:	High	-0.99252976	breast_feeding_attitude	Positive
## 20:	Medium	-0.84805404	breast_feeding_attitude	Positive
## 21:	High	0.52402595	education	1-3 Years College
## 22:	Medium	0.01037884	education	1-3 Years College
## 23:	High	1.51836823	education	College Graduate
## 24:	Medium	0.88290220	education	College Graduate
## 25:	High	-0.49591415	education	Less Than High School
## 26:	Medium	0.04313044	education	Less Than High School
## 27:	High	-0.56428315	parity	nullipara
## 28:	Medium	-0.07822270	parity	nullipara
## 29:	High	1.42966411	perception_of_support	Helpful
## 30:	Medium	0.97886653	perception_of_support	Helpful
## 31:	High	-1.12689617	perception_of_support	Unhelpful
## 32:	Medium	-0.87252024	perception_of_support	Unhelpful
##	response_level	coefficient	variable_name	variable_level
##	reference_level	odds_ratio	lower_log_odds_interval	upper_log_odds_interval
## 1:		0 0.5052028	-1.927413997	0.56182322
## 2:		0 0.6406918	-1.767094644	0.87668104
## 3:		0 0.4947666	-1.888366354	0.48102789
## 4:		0 0.3649344	-2.289585334	0.27351005
## 5:		0 0.7406701	-1.478888158	0.87848829
## 6:		0 0.5750961	-1.821681958	0.71524560
## 7:		0 1.2781241	-0.949054299	1.43984122
## 8:		0 0.6012899	-1.807066392	0.78971031
## 9:		0 2.4860332	-0.355382021	2.17675871
## 10:		0 0.6951638	-1.770689242	1.04347380
## 11:		0 3.4406322	-0.335227428	2.80653790
## 12:		0 1.0479639	-1.706469229	1.80016757
## 13:	Normal Weight	0.7028431	-0.799373331	0.09413013
## 14:	Normal Weight	1.5484027	-0.064129056	0.93857683
## 15:	Normal Weight	0.9018141	-0.557186887	0.35049324
## 16:	Normal Weight	1.0282845	-0.517743795	0.57352751
## 17:	Normal Weight	0.7627099	-1.250810381	0.70905539
## 18:	Normal Weight	0.4629938	-2.155091650	0.61500838
## 19:	Negative	0.3706379	-1.653052385	-0.33200714
## 20:	Negative	0.4282475	-1.652951689	-0.04315640
## 21:	High School	1.6888131	0.009882923	1.03816898

## 22:	High School	1.0104329	-0.576894490	0.59765217
## 23:	High School	4.5647705	0.964601598	2.07213486
## 24:	High School	2.4179068	0.264018624	1.50178578
## 25:	High School	0.6090139	-1.778574568	0.78674626
## 26:	High School	1.0440741	-1.279718394	1.36597927
## 27:	primipara	0.5687677	-0.940670788	-0.18789551
## 28:	primipara	0.9247585	-0.508738992	0.35229360
## 29:	Inconclusive	4.1772958	0.963823625	1.89550459
## 30:	Inconclusive	2.6614379	0.430976066	1.52675700
## 31:	Inconclusive	0.3240375	-1.616397702	-0.63739464
## 32:	Inconclusive	0.4178970	-1.464431286	-0.28060919
##	reference_level	odds_ratio	lower_log_odds_interval	upper_log_odds_interval
##	lower_odds_ratio_interval	upper_odds_ratio_interval		
## 1:		0.1455240	1.7538673	
## 2:		0.1708286	2.4029113	
## 3:		0.1513188	1.6177364	
## 4:		0.1013085	1.3145706	
## 5:		0.2278909	2.4072579	
## 6:		0.1617535	2.0446888	
## 7:		0.3871069	4.2200257	
## 8:		0.1641349	2.2027582	
## 9:		0.7009056	8.8176792	
## 10:		0.1702156	2.8390622	
## 11:		0.7151754	16.5525124	
## 12:		0.1815055	6.0506613	
## 13:		0.4496106	1.0987027	
## 14:		0.9378840	2.5563407	
## 15:		0.5728182	1.4197677	
## 16:		0.5958634	1.7745156	
## 17:		0.2862727	2.0320708	
## 18:		0.1158926	1.8496721	
## 19:		0.1914646	0.7174822	
## 20:		0.1914839	0.9577616	
## 21:		1.0099319	2.8240414	
## 22:		0.5616398	1.8178458	
## 23:		2.6237421	7.9417596	
## 24:		1.3021524	4.4896995	
## 25:		0.1688787	2.1962388	
## 26:		0.2781156	3.9195595	
## 27:		0.3903659	0.8287013	
## 28:		0.6012533	1.4223261	
## 29:		2.6217017	6.6559061	
## 30:		1.5387587	4.6032243	
## 31:		0.1986129	0.5286680	
## 32:		0.2312094	0.7553235	
##	lower_odds_ratio_interval	upper_odds_ratio_interval		

2 Month

The control variables determined are: BFHI_score, maternal_age, education, parity, breast_feeding_attitude

The likelihood ratio test is performed between the model fit with only the control variables (Control Model) and the model fit with both the control variables and perception of support (Full Model).

The test statistic derived from the likelihood ratios of each model is: 142.4039367

This asymptotically approaches a chi-squared distribution with degrees of freedom: 4

The sample size for this test is: 939

This corresponds to a model p-value of: $8.6283368 \times 10^{-30}$

Full Model

```
## Call:
## multinom(formula = full_formula, data = temp_dt)
##
## Coefficients:
##      (Intercept) perception_of_supportHelpful perception_of_supportUnhelpful
## Medium    -0.8439529                0.9845895                -1.2772594
## High      -0.3049678                1.4044424                -0.9948526
##      BFHI_score1 BFHI_score2 BFHI_score3 BFHI_score4 BFHI_score5 BFHI_score6
## Medium    -0.5180133  -0.4719143 -0.016757691 0.009083122  0.04367779  -1.0137215
## High      -0.6814904  -0.1618762  0.009334441 0.581871593  1.07855822  0.8715902
##      maternal_age18-24 maternal_age30-34 maternal_age35+
## Medium      -0.6029313                0.1453383                0.6093710
## High        -0.4623580                -0.4669722                -0.2906949
##      education1-3 Years College educationCollege Graduate
## Medium                0.0884754                0.6459188
## High                  0.6862602                1.7191280
##      educationLess Than High School paritynullipara
## Medium                -0.8309637                -0.2217353
## High                  -0.1567405                -0.7730123
##      breast_feeding_attitudePositive
## Medium                -0.3569204
## High                  -0.8847283
##
## Residual Deviance: 1436.52
## AIC: 1504.52
```

Control Model

```
## Call:
## multinom(formula = breast_feeding_intensity ~ BFHI_score + maternal_age +
##      education + parity + breast_feeding_attitude, data = temp_dt)
##
## Coefficients:
##      (Intercept) BFHI_score1 BFHI_score2 BFHI_score3 BFHI_score4 BFHI_score5
## Medium    -1.1128326 -0.01714679 -0.01021714  0.4662055  0.6463949  0.4102403
## High      -0.2631806 -0.14075799  0.32547402  0.5196883  1.2677795  1.5063008
##      BFHI_score6 maternal_age18-24 maternal_age30-34 maternal_age35+
## Medium    -0.4524963        -0.5881140        0.07536571        0.6628798
## High       1.5017088        -0.4662058        -0.56688262        -0.2603723
##      education1-3 Years College educationCollege Graduate
## Medium                -0.06002677                0.578789
## High                  0.50786575                1.633140
##      educationLess Than High School paritynullipara
## Medium                -0.68036776                -0.07678941
## High                  0.09053182                -0.58651971
##      breast_feeding_attitudePositive
```



```
## Medium -0.3559735
## High -0.9403434
##
## Residual Deviance: 1578.924
## AIC: 1638.924
```

Likelihood Ratio Test

```
## Likelihood ratio test
##
## Model 1: breast_feeding_intensity ~ perception_of_support + BFHI_score +
##   maternal_age + education + parity + breast_feeding_attitude
## Model 2: breast_feeding_intensity ~ BFHI_score + maternal_age + education +
##   parity + breast_feeding_attitude
##   #Df LogLik Df Chisq Pr(>Chisq)
## 1 34 -718.26
## 2 30 -789.46 -4 142.4 < 2.2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

3 Month

The control variables determined are: BFHI_score, education, parity, income, wic_participation, breast_feeding_attitude

The likelihood ratio test is performed between the model fit with only the control variables (Control Model) and the model fit with both the control variables and perception of support (Full Model).

The test statistic derived from the likelihood ratios of each model is: 107.5468823

This asymptotically approaches a chi-squared distribution with degrees of freedom: 4

The sample size for this test is: 878

This corresponds to a model p-value of: $2.4269525 \times 10^{-22}$

Full Model

```
## Call:
## multinom(formula = full_formula, data = temp_dt)
##
## Coefficients:
##   (Intercept) perception_of_supportHelpful perception_of_supportUnhelpful
## Medium -0.6165658 0.5254519 -1.513267
## High -0.0684540 1.0538432 -1.052466
##   BFHI_score1 BFHI_score2 BFHI_score3 BFHI_score4 BFHI_score5 BFHI_score6
## Medium -0.8647416 -0.6504192 -0.7984589 -0.4477310 0.1665694 -0.6141569
## High -0.7220260 -0.3601878 -0.2522491 0.1071132 0.9615728 1.1873432
##   education1-3 Years College educationCollege Graduate
## Medium 0.6446439 0.7823663
## High 0.6552588 1.5125067
##   educationLess Than High School paritynullipara income<$20,000
## Medium -12.13114135 -0.1542112 -1.2336301
## High -0.04617887 -0.7280019 -0.3853355
```

```
##          income>$50,000 wic_participationTRUE breast_feeding_attitudePositive
## Medium      -0.1032504          0.03568936          -1.7314095
## High        -0.3777242          -0.36546419          -0.8885289
##
## Residual Deviance: 1379.108
## AIC: 1447.108
```

Control Model

```
## Call:
## multinom(formula = breast_feeding_intensity ~ BFHI_score + education +
##          parity + income + wic_participation + breast_feeding_attitude,
##          data = temp_dt)
##
## Coefficients:
##          (Intercept) BFHI_score1 BFHI_score2 BFHI_score3 BFHI_score4 BFHI_score5
## Medium  -1.2504255 -0.23667596 -0.008213213 -0.09348726  0.3271856  0.7386566
## High    -0.3261573 -0.02324604  0.346735151  0.50122021  0.9531380  1.6033679
##          BFHI_score6 education1-3 Years College educationCollege Graduate
## Medium  0.07954725          0.5431474          0.7221084
## High    1.95789187          0.5217109          1.4212075
##          educationLess Than High School paritynullipara income<$20,000
## Medium          -11.918757270          -0.04363083          -1.2178192
## High           -0.005036037          -0.57571893          -0.3597286
##          income>$50,000 wic_participationTRUE breast_feeding_attitudePositive
## Medium      -0.1287525          -0.1048463          -1.800499
## High        -0.4122519          -0.5032220          -1.019435
##
## Residual Deviance: 1486.655
## AIC: 1546.655
```

Likelihood Ratio Test

```
## Likelihood ratio test
##
## Model 1: breast_feeding_intensity ~ perception_of_support + BFHI_score +
##          education + parity + income + wic_participation + breast_feeding_attitude
## Model 2: breast_feeding_intensity ~ BFHI_score + education + parity +
##          income + wic_participation + breast_feeding_attitude
##   #Df LogLik Df  Chisq Pr(>Chisq)
## 1  34 -689.55
## 2  30 -743.33 -4 107.55 < 2.2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

4 Month

The control variables determined are: BFHI_score, maternal_age, race_eth, education, parity, bmi, breast_feeding_attitude

The likelihood ratio test is performed between the model fit with only the control variables (Control Model) and the model fit with both the control variables and perception of support (Full Model).

The test statistic derived from the likelihood ratios of each model is: 89.6741977

This asymptotically approaches a chi-squared distribution with degrees of freedom: 4

The sample size for this test is: 835

This corresponds to a model p-value of: $1.5442318 \times 10^{-18}$

Full Model

```
## Call:
## multinom(formula = full_formula, data = temp_dt)
##
## Coefficients:
##      (Intercept) perception_of_supportHelpful perception_of_supportUnhelpful
## Medium -1.0379685          0.8261718          -1.157627
## High -0.3028838          0.9064421          -1.086357
##      BFHI_score1 BFHI_score2 BFHI_score3 BFHI_score4 BFHI_score5 BFHI_score6
## Medium -0.180079362  0.2473348  0.04363267  0.6673407  0.893345  0.2358818
## High  0.003847364  0.4079742  0.65651316  0.9648640  1.540329  2.0985056
##      maternal_age18-24 maternal_age30-34 maternal_age35+
## Medium -0.3110884          0.08201945          0.1582488
## High -0.8754652          -0.44176411          -0.3492439
##      race_ethBlack, Non-Hispanic race_ethHispanic race_ethOther
## Medium -0.2885354          0.2820050          0.3915950
## High -1.1463913          -0.7013685          -0.8115947
##      education1-3 Years College educationCollege Graduate
## Medium 0.02539152          -0.0088503
## High 0.19494537          0.8689077
##      educationLess Than High School paritynullipara  bmiObese bmiOverweight
## Medium -1.523951          -0.2444323 -0.7489698 -0.3241959
## High -1.268125          -0.6922133 -0.5012849 -0.2155584
##      bmiUnderweight breast_feeding_attitudePositive
## Medium -1.1696910          -0.5232184
## High 0.6219217          -0.6398411
##
## Residual Deviance: 1389.846
## AIC: 1481.846
```

Control Model

```
## Call:
## multinom(formula = breast_feeding_intensity ~ BFHI_score + maternal_age +
##      race_eth + education + parity + bmi + breast_feeding_attitude,
##      data = temp_dt)
##
## Coefficients:
##      (Intercept) BFHI_score1 BFHI_score2 BFHI_score3 BFHI_score4 BFHI_score5
## Medium -1.3557665  0.2948746  0.7768683  0.6043726  1.270105  1.318541
## High -0.4346053  0.3694362  0.8212371  1.1141557  1.481830  1.885413
##      BFHI_score6 maternal_age18-24 maternal_age30-34 maternal_age35+
## Medium 0.7812003          -0.2618447          0.01549564          0.1999526
## High 2.5621854          -0.8644166          -0.51881749          -0.3241663
##      race_ethBlack, Non-Hispanic race_ethHispanic race_ethOther
```

```
## Medium          -0.0149664          0.3958450          0.5537887
## High            -0.8486210          -0.5844132          -0.6206701
##      education1-3 Years College educationCollege Graduate
## Medium          -0.06065954          0.07108468
## High            0.10517408          0.93168366
##      educationLess Than High School paritynullipara    bmiObese bmiOverweight
## Medium          -1.2376614          -0.1099372 -0.8179699    -0.2849731
## High            -0.8912046          -0.5521237 -0.5803604    -0.1962082
##      bmiUnderweight breast_feeding_attitudePositive
## Medium          -1.5527249          -0.6400901
## High            0.2379298          -0.7740436
##
## Residual Deviance: 1479.521
## AIC: 1563.521
```

Likelihood Ratio Test

```
## Likelihood ratio test
##
## Model 1: breast_feeding_intensity ~ perception_of_support + BFHI_score +
##      maternal_age + race_eth + education + parity + bmi + breast_feeding_attitude
## Model 2: breast_feeding_intensity ~ BFHI_score + maternal_age + race_eth +
##      education + parity + bmi + breast_feeding_attitude
##      #Df LogLik Df Chisq Pr(>Chisq)
## 1  46 -694.92
## 2  42 -739.76 -4 89.674 < 2.2e-16 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

5 Month

The control variables determined are: BFHI_score, maternal_age, race_eth, education, parity, bmi

The likelihood ratio test is performed between the model fit with only the control variables (Control Model) and the model fit with both the control variables and perception of support (Full Model).

The test statistic derived from the likelihood ratios of each model is: 55.8542557

This asymptotically approaches a chi-squared distribution with degrees of freedom: 4

The sample size for this test is: 814

This corresponds to a model p-value of: $2.1513338 \times 10^{-11}$

Full Model

```
## Call:
## multinom(formula = full_formula, data = temp_dt)
##
## Coefficients:
##      (Intercept) perception_of_supportHelpful perception_of_supportUnhelpful
## Medium    -1.4599357          0.7002114          -0.5500734
## High      -0.8921212          0.6411545          -1.1315517
##      BFHI_score1 BFHI_score2 BFHI_score3 BFHI_score4 BFHI_score5 BFHI_score6
```

```
## Medium -0.6147097 -0.3674178 0.1212188 0.2057755 0.5899097 0.6112258
## High 0.1054278 0.1884573 0.7800807 0.8399955 1.5179842 1.4916505
## maternal_age18-24 maternal_age30-34 maternal_age35+
## Medium -0.0840991 0.3549348 0.4590868
## High -0.6881010 -0.2179056 -0.1159345
## race_ethBlack, Non-Hispanic race_ethHispanic race_ethOther
## Medium -0.3386765 -1.0252539 -1.1299382
## High -1.4330618 -0.3247655 -0.7277537
## education1-3 Years College educationCollege Graduate
## Medium 0.47578752 0.7948221
## High 0.05025695 0.8530679
## educationLess Than High School paritynullipara bmiObese bmiOverweight
## Medium 0.1167817 -0.06860125 -0.4081087 -0.5563470
## High -0.8477036 -0.78531374 -0.4058040 -0.1787254
## bmiUnderweight
## Medium -0.5047747
## High 1.0321955
##
## Residual Deviance: 1511.322
## AIC: 1599.322
```

Control Model

```
## Call:
## multinom(formula = breast_feeding_intensity ~ BFHI_score + maternal_age +
## race_eth + education + parity + bmi, data = temp_dt)
##
## Coefficients:
## (Intercept) BFHI_score1 BFHI_score2 BFHI_score3 BFHI_score4 BFHI_score5
## Medium -1.527219 -0.2504072 0.01864237 0.5216734 0.6920569 0.9945373
## High -1.092104 0.4697776 0.61159324 1.2336851 1.3897258 1.9488520
## BFHI_score6 maternal_age18-24 maternal_age30-34 maternal_age35+
## Medium 1.059877 -0.09097232 0.2829557 0.4409128
## High 1.973546 -0.74889496 -0.3093805 -0.1406696
## race_ethBlack, Non-Hispanic race_ethHispanic race_ethOther
## Medium -0.1654867 -0.9156492 -1.0086447
## High -1.2057402 -0.2216399 -0.5544973
## education1-3 Years College educationCollege Graduate
## Medium 0.430937229 0.8320524
## High -0.002684187 0.8911063
## educationLess Than High School paritynullipara bmiObese bmiOverweight
## Medium 0.1079934 0.00227044 -0.4907037 -0.5657038
## High -0.7440011 -0.68505299 -0.5197281 -0.1905656
## bmiUnderweight
## Medium -0.8501933
## High 0.6448180
##
## Residual Deviance: 1567.176
## AIC: 1647.176
```

Likelihood Ratio Test

```
## Likelihood ratio test
```

```
##
## Model 1: breast_feeding_intensity ~ perception_of_support + BFHI_score +
##      maternal_age + race_eth + education + parity + bmi
## Model 2: breast_feeding_intensity ~ BFHI_score + maternal_age + race_eth +
##      education + parity + bmi
##      #Df  LogLik Df  Chisq Pr(>Chisq)
## 1   44 -755.66
## 2   40 -783.59 -4  55.854  2.151e-11 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```

6 Month

The control variables determined are: BFHI_score, education, parity, wic_participation, breast_feeding_attitude

The likelihood ratio test is performed between the model fit with only the control variables (Control Model) and the model fit with both the control variables and perception of support (Full Model).

The test statistic derived from the likelihood ratios of each model is: 44.067581

This asymptotically approaches a chi-squared distribution with degrees of freedom: 4

The sample size for this test is: 793

This corresponds to a model p-value of: 6.2117187×10^{-9}

Full Model

```
## Call:
## multinom(formula = full_formula, data = temp_dt)
##
## Coefficients:
##      (Intercept) perception_of_supportHelpful perception_of_supportUnhelpful
## Medium    -0.8359758                0.7114572                -0.5373398
## High      -0.9811014                0.3372067                -1.1009581
##      BFHI_score1 BFHI_score2 BFHI_score3 BFHI_score4 BFHI_score5 BFHI_score6
## Medium    -1.1135066   -0.1871546  -0.03798082   0.1763498   0.5542448   0.3109669
## High      -0.2108983   0.1463532   0.34881558   0.6139083   1.2194792   1.3229189
##      education1-3 Years College educationCollege Graduate
## Medium                -0.1106402                0.5194893
## High                  0.1050900                0.6122665
##      educationLess Than High School paritynullipara wic_participationTRUE
## Medium                -13.7142044                -0.4661623                -0.07665814
## High                  -0.5020559                -0.7943058                -0.64851072
##      breast_feeding_attitudePositive
## Medium                0.01470685
## High                  -1.52610532
##
## Residual Deviance: 1525.905
## AIC: 1585.905
```

Control Model

```
## Call:
```

```
## multinom(formula = breast_feeding_intensity ~ BFHI_score + education +
##   parity + wic_participation + breast_feeding_attitude, data = temp_dt)
##
## Coefficients:
##   (Intercept) BFHI_score1 BFHI_score2 BFHI_score3 BFHI_score4 BFHI_score5
## Medium -0.8872428 -0.7543070  0.2077108  0.3795163  0.6601895  0.9529569
## High -1.3760473  0.1448146  0.5609146  0.7709868  1.0976509  1.6098030
##   BFHI_score6 education1-3 Years College educationCollege Graduate
## Medium  0.8044008                -0.18041995                0.5096893
## High  1.8183353                0.04937147                0.6157491
##   educationLess Than High School paritynullipara wic_participationTRUE
## Medium                -13.6229180                -0.3860040                -0.1154495
## High                -0.3559629                -0.7171135                -0.6910866
##   breast_feeding_attitudePositive
## Medium                -0.05697779
## High                -1.60309478
##
## Residual Deviance: 1569.972
## AIC: 1621.972
```

Likelihood Ratio Test

```
## Likelihood ratio test
##
## Model 1: breast_feeding_intensity ~ perception_of_support + BFHI_score +
##   education + parity + wic_participation + breast_feeding_attitude
## Model 2: breast_feeding_intensity ~ BFHI_score + education + parity +
##   wic_participation + breast_feeding_attitude
##   #Df LogLik Df Chisq Pr(>Chisq)
## 1 30 -762.95
## 2 26 -784.99 -4 44.068 6.212e-09 ***
## ---
## Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1
```