

Table S6: Regression modelling for associations of household food insecurity^a with odds of meeting fruit 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> =1,492) ^f	
Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ² : 0.036		Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ² : 0.042		Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ² : 0.056		Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ² : 0.038		Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ² : 0.039		Nagelkerke <i>R</i> ² : 0.061	
OR^g	<i>P</i> value	AOR^{b,i}	<i>P</i> value	AOR^{c,i}	<i>P</i> value	AOR^{d,i} (95%	<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)		CI^h)		(95% CI^h)		(95% CI^h)	
0.51	<0.001	0.54	<0.001	0.61	<0.001	0.55	<0.001	0.53	<0.001	0.64	<0.001
(0.41-0.62)		(0.44-0.67)		(0.49-0.76)		(0.44–0.70)		(0.43-0.65)		(0.50-0.81)	

^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).

^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 age, education, equivalised household income, and relationship status. *N* lower due to missing data for these variables.

^gOR: Odds ratio (unadjusted).

^hCI: Confidence interval.

ⁱAOR: Adjusted odds ratio.