Supplementary Material

Supplementary Table S1. Bivariate screening of all candidate variables

Variable	OR	95% CI	p-value
Family support	5.31	1.97–15.13	**0.001**
Fear of partner disclosure	0.21	0.04–0.74	**0.013**
Financial support	2.97	1.13–8.17	**0.027**
Knowledge of legal services	3.03	1.13–8.94	**0.027**
Financial independence	3.05	1.13–8.33	**0.029**
Financial barrier to care	3.05	1.13–8.33	**0.029**
Someone who listens	3.83	1.14–12.72	**0.030**
Living arrangement	0.11	0.01–0.92	**0.042**
Overwhelmed by parenting	0.40	0.15–1.04	0.061
Education	0.08	0.00–1.58	0.095
Friend support	2.17	0.82–5.78	0.120
Partner refusal to register child	2.10	0.75–5.76	0.155
Emotional support	1.96	0.76–5.25	0.166
Knowledge of mental health services	1.93	0.74–5.11	0.178
School reintegration	2.08	0.71–7.27	0.187
Alcohol or drug use to cope	1.82	0.57–7.49	0.327
Emotional abuse	1.60	0.58–4.28	0.361
Peer group participation	1.55	0.59–4.07	0.369
Marital status	1.60	0.43–5.24	0.459
Unplanned pregnancy	1.60	0.43–5.24	0.459
Religious group participation	1.37	0.52–3.86	0.532
Occupation	0.60	0.06–3.00	0.570
Access to quality healthcare	0.77	0.27–2.04	0.606
Body image distortion	1.32	0.31–4.70	0.684
Physical abuse	1.23	0.43–3.32	0.690
Age	0.82	0.30–2.48	0.718
School dropout	1.16	0.41–3.11	0.779
Positive parenting training	0.88	0.34–2.35	0.798
Perpetrator of abuse	0.91	0.31–2.87	0.874
Lack of parenting information	1.04	0.32–2.99	0.950
Previous mental health antecedents	1.04	0.36–3.33	0.950
Religious exclusion	1.02	0.36–2.74	0.963

Abbreviations: CI = 95% profile penalised-likelihood confidence interval; OR = odds ratio from bivariate Firth penalised logistic regression.

Note: Financial independence and financial barrier to care were perfectly correlated and are therefore redundant.

Bold represent significant p-value

Supplementary Table S2. Missingness for all analysis variables

Variable	Number (n) valid	Number (n) missing	Percentage (%) missing
All model variables	96	0	0.0
Where to go for mental health help (conditional)	23	73	76.0
Known or used legal services (conditional)	29	67	69.8
Coping mechanisms in use (conditional)	50	46	47.9
Other risk factors (open text)	1	95	99.0

Note: Conditional variables were asked only of participants who responded affirmatively to the preceding question. These variables were reported descriptively and excluded from regression modelling because the missingness was structural, not random.

Supplementary Table S3. Full individual-level model results

Variable	Coefficient	SE	OR	95% CI	p-value
Intercept	−0.972	0.379	—	—	0.008
Overwhelmed by parenting (No vs Yes)	−0.895	0.491	0.41	0.15–1.06	0.066
Education (Secondary vs Primary or less)	0.539	0.555	1.71	0.55–5.04	0.342
Unplanned pregnancy (No vs Yes)	0.459	0.634	1.58	0.42–5.33	0.480
Model likelihood ratio test					0.191

Supplementary Table S4. Sensitivity analysis using 3+ symptom threshold

Variable	Number meeting outcome / total (n/N)	Percentage (%) meeting outcome
Family support		
Yes	1/66	1.5
No	5/30	16.7
Fear of partner disclosure		
Yes	5/66	7.6
No	1/30	3.3
Financial support		
Yes (has support)	3/39	7.7
No (lacks support)	3/57	5.3
Knowledge of legal services		
Yes (knows)	4/48	8.3

No (does not know)	2/48	4.2
Financial independence		
Yes (has independence)	1/27	3.7
No (lacks independence)	5/69	7.2

Note: The total number of participants meeting the 3+ threshold was 6 (6.3%). Formal multivariable modelling was not feasible with this number of events. The direction of association for family support was consistent with the primary analysis. The direction for fear of partner disclosure and financial support was weakly consistent. The direction for knowledge of legal services and financial independence was not consistent with the primary analysis.