Table 1: Sociodemographic descriptions and comparisons of Greenlight "Lu Deng" intervention

and comparison group

		onths (n=229)		12 Months (n=208)				
Variable	Comparison (n=70)	Intervention (n=159)	p- value	Comparison (n=69)	Intervention (n=139)	p- value		
Child characteristics								
Age (months)	6.2(0.5)	6.2 (0.3)	0.4	12.2 (0.2)	12.3 (0.3)	0.1		
Assigned sex	26 (37.1%)	71 (44.7%)	0.3	33 (47.8%)	60 (43.2%)	0.5		
(female)								
First born	28 (40.0%)	66 (41.5%)	0.8	26 (37.7%)	54 (38.9%)	0.9		
Medicaid or Uninsured	67 (95.7%)	143 (89.9%)	0.1	60 (89.6%)	126 (90.7%)	0.8		
Missing (n)	0	0		2	0			
Parent charact		U		<u> </u>	0			
Age (years)	30.9 (4.6)	31.5 (4.8)	0.4	31.7 (5.3)	32.0 (4.8)	0.7		
Missing (n)	2	0	0.7	0	0	0.7		
Parent	68 (97.1%)	148 (93.7%)	0.4	66 (95.7%)	129 (92.8%)	0.6		
identifies as mother	00 (27.170)	140 (23.770)	0.4	00 (33.770)	127 (32.070)	0.0		
Missing (n)	0	1		0	0			
Marital	9 (12.9%)	23 (14.8%)	0.7	14 (20.3%)	18 (14.4%)	0.3		
status (single)	0	4		0	1.4			
Missing (n)	0	4	0.2	0	14	0.2		
Country of			0.3			0.3		
birth	(4 (01 40/)	144 (00 (0/)		(1 (00 40/)	122 (07 00/)			
China	64 (91.4%)	144 (90.6%)		61 (88.4%)	122 (87.8%)			
China (Hong Kong)	0 (0.0%)	6 (3.8%)		2 (2.9%)	7 (5.0%)			
<b>United States</b>	2 (2.9%)	5 (3.1%)		1 (1.4%)	6 (4.3%)			
Other	4 (5.7%)	4 (2.5%)		5 (7.3%)	4 (2.9%)			
Primary language spoken at home		0.3			0.1			
Mandarin	21 (30.0%)	53 (33.3%)		19 (27.5%)	46 (33.1%)			
Cantonese	16 (22.9%)	34 (21.4%)		12 (17.4%)	31 (22.3%)			
Fujianese	3 (4.3%)	5 (3.1%)		3 (4.4%)	2 (1.4%)			
English	0 (0.0%)	4 (2.5%)		1 (1.5%)	5 (3.6%)			
Other	1 (1.4%)	12 (7.6%)		1 (1.5%)	10 (7.2%)			
2 or more languages	29 (41.4%)	51 (32.1%)		33 (47.8%)	45 (32.4%)			
Missing (n)	0	0		0	0			
Preferred			0.03*			0.9		
language to read								
Simplified Chinese	58 (82.9%)	109 (68.6%)		42 (60.9%)	89 (64.0%)			

Traditional	2 (2.9%)	3 (1.9%)		2 (2.9%)	3 (2.2%)	
Chinese	2 (2.5 / 0)	3 (1.570)		2 (2.570)	3 (2.270)	
English	4 (5.7%)	9 (5.7%)		6 (8.7%)	9 (6.5%)	
2 or more	6 (8.6%)	38 (23.9%)		19 (27.5%)	38 (27.3%)	
languages		, , ,		, ,	, , , ,	
Missing (n)	0	0		0	0	
Education	12.5 (3)	13.6 (3)	0.01*	12.9 (3.5)	13.8 (3.1)	0.07
(years)	, ,	. ,		, ,	, ,	
Missing (n)	1	2		1	2	
Birthing	21.9 (3.7)	22.7 (3.1)	0.12	22.5 (3.1)	22.6 (3.1)	0.7
parent pre-						
pregnancy						
BMI (kg/m2)						
Missing (n)	12	13		10	9	

<sup>\*</sup> p < .05; We used mean and standard deviation to summarize continuous, normally distributed measures and median and interquartile range for continuous, non-normally distributed variables. We summarized categorical variables in terms of frequency and percentage.

Table 2: Infant feeding practices by intervention status at 6 months (n=229)

	Unadjusted			Adjusted <sup>1</sup>			
Variable	Comparison (n=70)	Intervention (n=159)	p-value	Odds Ratio <sup>2</sup> [95% CI]	p-value		
Breastfeeding Practices							
Currently	16 (22.9%)	52 (33.1%)	0.1	-	-		
breastfeeding							
Exclusive	5 (7.1%)	21 (13.4%)	0.2	-	-		
breastfeeding							
Sugar-Sweetened Beverage Intake							
Number of	2.5 (2.1)	1.75 (0.7)	0.7	-	-		
daily ounces							
Avoidance	62 (88.6%)	145 (96.0%)	0.03*	5.69	$0.006^{**}$		
of sugar-				[1.7, 19.6]			
sweetened							
beverages							
(no intake)							
Missing (n)	0	8					

<sup>\*</sup>p < 0.05, \*\*p < 0.01; CI: confidence interval

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Adjusted logistic regression models were only performed for unadjusted models significant at a p-value < 0.05. Adjusted models controlled for: assigned sex (male vs. female), Medicaid status (yes/no), birthing parent age (years), marital status (single vs. all others), language preference (Chinese vs. all others), education (years), and pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m2). <sup>2</sup> Odds as compared to the historical comparison group who did not receive the intervention

Table 3: Infant feeding practices by intervention status at 12 months (n=208)

Table 3: Infant fo	Table 3: Infant feeding practices by intervention status at 12 months (n=208)							
		Unadjusted		Adjusted <sup>1</sup>				
Variable	Comparison (n=69)	Intervention (n=139)	p-value	Odds Ratio [95% CI]	p-value			
Breastfeeding								
Currently	12 (17.4%)	16 (11.5%)	0.2	-	-			
breastfeeding								
Exclusive	3 (4.4%)	8 (5.8%)	0.7	-	-			
breastfeeding								
<b>Breastfed for</b>	21 (31.8%)	43 (31.6%)	1.0	-	-			
$\geq$ 6 months								
(180 days)								
Missing (n)	3	3	-	-	-			
Sugar-Sweetened	Beverage Intake							
Number of	2.5 (1.8)	2.3 (1.6)	0.8	-	-			
daily ounces								
Avoidance of	27 (40.9%)	126 (92.0%)	<0.001***	15.2	<0.001***			
sugar-	, ,	, , ,		[6.3, 36.6]				
sweetened								
beverages (no								
intake)								
Missing (n)	3	2	-	-	-			
Cup use (bottle w	veaning)							
Cup use (any)	43 (64.2%)	119 (86.2%)	<0.001***	2.3 [1.1, 5.2]	0.04*			
Missing (n)	2	1	-	-	-			
Age at cup	9 [7, 11]	7.5 [6, 10]	0.01*	-0.8	0.08			
initiation				$[-1.7, 0.1]^{\dagger}$				
(months),								
median [IQR]								
Missing (n)	2	0	-	-	-			
Fruit and Vegeta	ble Intake							
Fruit at least	62 (91.2%)	123 (89.1%)	0.7	-	-			
once/day								
Missing (n)	1	1	-	-	-			
Vegetable at	54 (79.4%)	106 (76.8%)	0.7	-	-			
least once/day								
Missing (n)	1	1	-	-	-			
Sugary Snack an	d Junk Food Inta							
Any sugary	37 (51.4%)	48 (34.8%)	0.007**	0.4	0.003**			
snack intake				[0.2, 0.7]				
Missing (n)	1	1	-	-	-			
Any junk food	18 (26.5%)	21 (15.2%)	0.05	-	-			
intake								
Missing (n)	1	1	-	<u>-</u>	-			
*p <0.05, **p<0.01, **	*p<0.001; †linear regi	ression coefficient; C	I: confidence int	erval				

<sup>1</sup>Adjusted logistic regression models were only performed for unadjusted models significant at a p-value < 0.05. Adjusted models controlled for: assigned sex (male vs. female), Medicaid status (yes/no), birthing parent age (years), marital status (single vs. all others), language preference (Chinese vs. all others), education (years), and pre-pregnancy BMI (kg/m2) <sup>2</sup>Odds as compared to the historical comparison group who did not receive the intervention