

Table S8: Regression modelling for associations of household food insecurity^a with odds of meeting both fruit and vegetable intake recommendations in a sample of 1,540 pregnant women who participated in an Australian online survey

Model 1 (<i>n</i> =1,540)		Model 2 (<i>n</i> =1,540) ^b		Model 3 (<i>n</i> =1,539) ^c		Model 4 (<i>n</i> =1,498) ^d		Model 5 (<i>n</i> =1,532) ^e		Model 6 (<i>n</i> =1,498) ^f	
Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ² : 0.031		Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ² : 0.032		Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ² : 0.064		Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ² : 0.034		Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ² : 0.031		Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ² : 0.068	
OR^g	<i>P</i> value	AOR^{b,i}	<i>P</i> value	AOR^{c,i}	<i>P</i> value	AOR^{d,i}	<i>P</i> value	AOR^{e,i}	<i>P</i> value	AOR^{f,i}	<i>P</i> value
(95% CI^h)		(95% CI^h)		(95% CI^h)		(95% CI^h)		(95% CI^h)		(95% CI^h)	
0.31	0.003	0.31	0.004	0.45	0.051	0.41	0.036	0.31	0.004	0.54	0.141
(0.14-0.67)		(0.14-0.69)		(0.20-1.00)		(0.18-0.94)		(0.14-0.68)		(0.23-1.23)	

^aReference group is high food security (food secure). Food security status was dichotomised (marginal, low, and very low food security collapsed to form the food insecure group) due to low cases meeting both the fruit and vegetable recommendations, which limited power.

^bAdjusted for age.

^cAdjusted for education. *N* lower due to missing data for this variable.

^dAdjusted for equivalised household income. *N* lower due to missing data for this variable.

^eAdjusted for relationship status. *N* lower due to missing data for this variable.

^fAdjusted for education and equivalised household income. *N* lower due to missing data for these variables.

^gOR: Odds ratio (unadjusted).

^hCI: Confidence interval.

ⁱAOR: Adjusted odds ratio.