

The Assets-based infant feeding help Before and After birth (ABA) intervention for improving breastfeeding initiation and continuation

Clarke, Joanne; Ingram, Jackie; Johnson, D; Tricky, H; Dombrowski, Stephen U; Sitch, Alice; Dykes, F; Feltham, Max; MacArthur, Christine; Roberts, Tracy; Hoddinott, Pat; Jolly, Kate

DOI:

[10.1111/mcn.12907](https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12907)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

Clarke, J, Ingram, J, Johnson, D, Tricky, H, Dombrowski, SU, Sitch, A, Dykes, F, Feltham, M, MacArthur, C, Roberts, T, Hoddinott, P & Jolly, K 2019, 'The Assets-based infant feeding help Before and After birth (ABA) intervention for improving breastfeeding initiation and continuation: feasibility study results', *Maternal and Child Nutrition*. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mcn.12907>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

The Assets-based infant feeding help Before and After birth (ABA) intervention for improving breastfeeding initiation and continuation: feasibility study results

Abstract

The UK has low breastfeeding rates, with socioeconomic disparities. The Assets-based feeding help Before and After birth (ABA) intervention was designed to be inclusive and improve infant feeding behaviours. ABA is underpinned by the behaviour change wheel and offers an assets-based approach focusing on positive capabilities of individuals and communities, including use of a Genogram. This study aimed to investigate feasibility of intervention delivery within a randomised controlled trial (RCT).

Nulliparous women ≥ 16 years, (n=103) from two English sites were recruited and randomised to either intervention or usual care. The intervention – delivered through face-to-face, telephone and text message by trained Infant Feeding Helpers (IFHs) – ran from 30-weeks' gestation until 5-months postnatal. Outcomes included recruitment rates and follow-up at 3-days, 8-weeks and 6-months postnatal, with collection of future full trial outcomes via questionnaires. A mixed-methods process evaluation included qualitative interviews with 30 women, 13 IFHs and 17 maternity providers; IFH contact logs; and fidelity checking of antenatal contact recordings.

This study successfully recruited women, including teenagers, from socioeconomically disadvantaged areas; postnatal follow-up rates were 68.0%, 85.4% and 80.6% at 3-days, 8-weeks and 6-months respectively. Breastfeeding at 8-weeks was obtained for 95.1% using routine data for non-responders. It was

25 possible to recruit and train peer supporters to deliver the intervention with adequate
26 fidelity. The ABA intervention was acceptable to women, IFHs and maternity
27 services. There was minimal contamination and no evidence of intervention-related
28 harm.

29 In conclusion, the intervention is feasible to deliver within an RCT, and a definitive
30 trial required.

31 **Keywords**

32 Breastfeeding, assets-based approach, behaviour change theory, peer support,
33 randomised controlled trial, infant feeding

Introduction

Despite the benefits of breastfeeding for infants and mothers (Victora et al., 2016), the UK experiences a high drop off in breastfeeding in the two weeks following birth, very low proportions of babies exclusively breastfed to four or six months, and marked socio-economic inequalities in breastfeeding (McAndrew et al., 2012).

There is strong systematic review evidence that providing additional support to women who want to breastfeed increases breastfeeding duration (McFadden et al., 2017). In the UK, provision of breastfeeding peer support is recommended among disadvantaged populations (Department of Health and Department for Children Schools and Families 2009, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence 2008); but the coverage is variable (Grant et al., 2018). However, UK breastfeeding peer support trials have not demonstrated efficacy, possibly due to insufficiently intensive interventions, postnatal contact not commencing until after the crucial first 48 hours post hospital discharge, and contact being reactive rather than proactive (Jolly et al., 2012).

Evidence suggests more intensive contact (Jolly et al., 2012b, McFadden et al., 2017) and early contact postnatally (Hoddinott, Craig, MacLennan, Boyers, & Vale, 2012a, Ingram, MacArthur, Khan, Deeks, & Jolly, 2010) are important characteristics of effective breastfeeding support. Proactive contact was found to be effective when delivered by peer supporters (Dennis, Hodnett, Gallop, & Chalmers, 2002; Forster et al., 2019), and promising in a feasibility study of an infant feeding team (Hoddinott, Craig, Britten, & McInnes, 2012c; Hoddinott, Craig, MacLennan, Boyers, & Vale, 2012a). Woman-centred rather than breastfeeding-focussed support may improve acceptability to women (Hoddinott, Craig, Britten, & McInnes, 2012c; Trickey &

Newburn, 2014). In cultures such as the UK, where mixed feeding is common, inclusion of help with formula feeding in peer support may be important to reduce the risk of alienating women and improve reach and retention of any intervention (Thomson, Ebisch-Burton and Flacking., 2015; Trickey & Newburn, 2014). The ABA intervention combined all these components within an assets-based approach (Aradon, 2007, McLean, 2011) underpinned by behaviour change theory which considered the capability, opportunity and motivation for infant feeding mode in line with the COM-B model of the Behaviour Change Wheel framework (Michie, Atkins, & West, 2014). Assets based approaches and behaviour change theory are complimentary. The assets-based approach informed the style and principles of intervention delivery, and the Behaviour Change Wheel informed intervention content in the form of specific Behaviour Change Techniques (BCTs) based on behavioural theory.

Assets-based approaches to public health concentrate on positive capabilities, rather than deficits or needs, and aim to understand and maximise the strengths of individual and community resources (Aradon, 2007, McLean, 2011). Breastfeeding assets include resources that are both intrinsic (especially self-efficacy related to feeding and the willingness to ask for and accept help) and extrinsic (including social support from a partner, friends and family; social networks of women who have breastfed and community assets such as breastfeeding groups and peer supporters).

The overall aim of this study was to determine the feasibility of delivering the ABA intervention within a randomised controlled trial (RCT). The trial protocol is published (Jolly et al., 2018) with progression criteria for a full trial. This paper reports the feasibility study findings relating to the following objectives:

- To determine intervention uptake and engagement; fidelity of intervention delivery, contamination, and acceptability to the mothers, infant feeding helpers (IFHs) and other maternity services providers;
- To determine the feasibility of the RCT processes: recruit women from socio-economically disadvantaged populations, including teenagers and those living in areas of low breastfeeding prevalence; retain women in the study; determine the variability of the primary outcome for a future RCT; explore women's perspectives on trial processes; describe feeding support received by the 'usual care group'; and to determine the feasibility of data collection to assess the future cost-effectiveness of the intervention.
- To explore delivery by paid and volunteer feeding helpers, particularly acceptability and fidelity of the intervention.

Key Messages

1. The ABA intervention was acceptable to women, Infant Feeding Helpers and maternity providers and feasible to deliver within a randomised controlled trial with adequate fidelity. The intervention should be tested for effectiveness and cost-effectiveness in a definitive randomised controlled trial.
2. Researchers approaching women in community antenatal clinics successfully recruited teenagers and women living in socioeconomically disadvantaged areas. Introducing the research as an 'infant feeding' study enabled recruitment of women intending to formula feed.
3. Infant Feeding Helpers were able to offer a woman-centred approach using assets-based conversations that included behaviour change techniques.

4. There was notable difference between the two study sites in terms of level of contact between Infant Feeding Helpers and women. Context-specific factors are important in explaining some of this difference.

Methods

Study Design

An individually randomised controlled feasibility trial was undertaken with women randomised on a 1:1 ratio to either the ABA intervention or the comparator (usual care).

Setting and Participants

The study was undertaken at two distinct geographical sites in England, selected because they had contrasting volunteer and paid peer support services operating, as well as relatively high levels of socioeconomic disadvantage and low rates of breastfeeding initiation and continuation. Women were eligible if they were aged 16 years or older and pregnant with their first child. Potential participants were provided with study information by community midwives at around 25-28 weeks gestation and subsequently approached by a researcher at antenatal clinics to gain informed consent and complete a short baseline questionnaire including questions on demographics, feeding intentions and wellbeing. We aimed to recruit at least 100 women to the study (50 per site).

Randomisation

At Site A, an independent statistician devised a block randomisation list stratified by age group (<25 or ≥25 years), inaccessible to the recruiting researcher. Once a woman had given consent and completed the baseline questionnaire, the researcher telephoned the randomisation line.

At Site B, a different process was required to make sure that the number of women randomised to the intervention arm matched volunteer peer supporter availability and capacity in each sub-locality. A clinical trials unit devised a database to randomise (simultaneously) blocks of women from each sub-locality, following recruitment. In the case of there being an odd number of women, allocation favoured the intervention. An independent researcher performed the randomisation.

Intervention

Women allocated to the intervention arm were assigned an IFH, an existing peer supporter who had received a full-day training in delivery of the ABA intervention. HT led on the development of training materials and training delivery with input from Dr Kirsty Darwent (Programme Director, Family Therapy Training Network Ltd). The training aimed to (1) promote competence and confidence in intervention delivery, and (2) facilitate understanding of the study to improve fidelity of intervention delivery. The involved simulations and role-play of contact with women alongside group-based learning activities. Full details of the intervention and training are available (Jolly et al., 2018). At Site A, the intervention was delivered by a paid peer support service, whereas at Site B the peer support service was provided by volunteers.

The intervention offered proactive, woman-centred support using an assets-based approach and incorporating behaviour change techniques (BCTs). Woman-centred

support recognises each woman as an individual and supports her to make her own decision about how she feeds her baby. Core BCTs for the antenatal part of the intervention were 'social support' and 'restructuring the social environment'. Based on the COM-B model, the core BCTs are targeting Motivation (reflective) and Opportunity (social). The assets-based and women-centred approach also targeted Motivation (reflective) as well as Capability (psychological). Social support could be targeted by the IFH encouraging a woman to draw on family and friends for support or by providing direct support; restructuring the social environment could be targeted by encouraging a woman to attend a postnatal group. More information on intervention development including the full list of BCTs can be found in the protocol paper (Jolly, et al., 2018).

The intervention commenced between 30-32 weeks gestation when IFHs contacted women to offer a face-to-face meeting to discuss infant feeding. This antenatal meeting took place either at the woman's home (Site A only) or at a mutually convenient location, such as a café or Children's Centre. IFHs introduced the intervention and explored the woman's assets for infant feeding. This conversation led to co-production of a 'Genogram' (family and social network diagram adapted from Darwent, McInnes & Swanson, 2016) of support available to the woman, incorporating the wider community-based assets for infant feeding. Women were encouraged to use this support network to engage in conversations about infant feeding before and after birth. IFHs also provided women with a specially designed leaflet detailing help available locally to support infant feeding and to develop social networks, and offered to accompany women to a local breastfeeding drop-in session before birth.

The intervention continued with monthly telephone conversations/text messages during pregnancy, aiming to build strong rapport and encouraging the woman to let the IFH know once she had given birth, in order to commence postnatal support. Postnatally, daily telephone/text message contact was provided for the first two weeks, decreasing in frequency from two to eight weeks, and monthly text messages were sent at 3, 4 and 5 months. Home visits (Site A) or meetings at convenient locations were arranged. Women were able to stop contacts at any point. If a woman ceased breastfeeding, the IFH established that the woman was confident in formula feeding and support discontinued.

Comparator

Women assigned to the comparator arm received the usual care provided for infant feeding within their locality. This did not include any proactive support from peer supporters either antenatally or postnatally. Women were given a leaflet detailing usual care services to support infant feeding.

Assessment of feasibility of delivery and acceptability of the intervention

A process evaluation was undertaken to assess (1) feasibility of intervention delivery, including protocol fidelity, and (2) intervention acceptability to women, IFHs and maternity services.

Process measures included: (1) Programme reach, assessed by recruitment and retention rates and demographic characteristics of participants, (2) Fidelity of delivery and use of assets for feeding support, assessed by content analysis of recorded antenatal meetings, IFH activity logs and qualitative interviews with women and IFHs, (3) Views of women, IFHs and representatives from local maternity

services on intervention acceptability, assessed through qualitative interviews and (4) Presence of social desirability bias, assessed through comparison of IFH activity logs, qualitative interviews with women and IFHs, and feeding method reported at 8-weeks.

Qualitative methods / analysis

Thirty women (21 intervention: Site A=10, Site B=11) were interviewed postnatally at home mainly after 8-week follow-up, purposively sampled for diversity (including teenagers (n=3), women in areas of socioeconomic disadvantage, women with different feeding experiences (gauged from 8-week questionnaire), and women with different levels of intervention engagement) to explore their experiences of the intervention. Control participants were asked about experiences of 'usual care'. Possible cases of contamination between intervention and control groups were explored with all women.

Focus groups were held after completion of the intervention with IFHs at each site (n=9) (followed by one-to-one telephone interviews for those unable to attend (n=4)). They investigated intervention acceptability, satisfaction with the training, experiences of intervention delivery and any perceived barriers or facilitators to effective delivery.

Focus groups and interviews were also undertaken with maternity care providers (n=17), including community midwives and Infant Feeding staff. These explored perceptions of the intervention, any impact of intervention provision on existing services, and any possible cases of contamination.

221 Interviews and focus groups were carried out by researchers from psychology, public
222 health and midwifery backgrounds and with training in qualitative research methods
223 (JC, DJ, JI and GT). JI and GT also have experience of research/evaluation into
224 breastfeeding peer support. JC and DJ who carried out the women's interviews and
225 with JI the maternity services interviews/focus groups had met the women and some
226 of the community midwives previously at recruitment. GT who led on the IFH focus
227 groups/interviews had no previous contact with IFHs.

228 Discussions with women lasted between 45 and 90 minutes. IFH focus groups lasted
229 ~90 minutes and IFH interviews were about 30-60 minutes. Maternity services focus
230 groups and interviews lasted 30-60 minutes. Reflective notes were made after each
231 interview. All interviews were voice-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Transcripts
232 were checked for accuracy and anonymised.

233 We undertook thematic analysis (Braun & Clarke, 2006) of the qualitative data using
234 NVivo 11 (QSR International Pty Ltd. Version 11, 2015). First, three researchers (JC,
235 DJ and GT) listened to the recordings and read/re-read the transcripts of four
236 participant interviews (one intervention and one usual care from each site) before
237 independently conducting line-by-line inductive coding. Codes were discussed and
238 developed into an initial coding framework of themes and sub-themes. JC and DJ
239 then coded the remaining transcripts using the coding framework, which was
240 iteratively refined to accommodate new themes. There were frequent discussions
241 between the three researchers during the development of the coding framework and
242 before the final coding framework was agreed by the wider team (JC, DJ, GT, JI, SD,
243 KJ).

244 For each of the women's interviews, BCTs delivered by IFHs were coded as
245 standalone themes, based on reports of the IFH behaviour, regardless of participant
246 response. BCTs delivered by people other than the IFHs (e.g. midwives) were not
247 coded in this analysis.

248 ***Assessment of fidelity***

249 IFHs were asked to audio-record antenatal visits. Recordings were analysed against
250 fidelity criteria and a checklist of core/non-core BCTs. Additionally, qualitative
251 interviews with women were checked for reports of BCTs and woman-centredness.

252 IFHs were asked to log each contact with women, recording mode of contact and
253 response received.

254 ***Outcomes for a future trial***

255 Data were collected on breastfeeding, health-related and economic outcomes to
256 explore feasibility of data collection for a future definitive trial. These included the
257 proposed primary outcome for a definitive trial – any breastfeeding at 8-weeks – and
258 a number of secondary outcomes: breastfeeding initiation; exclusive breastfeeding at
259 6-8 weeks; any/exclusive breastfeeding at 6-months; duration of any breastfeeding
260 (if ceased); maternal wellbeing (Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale)
261 (Tennant et al., 2007) at 8-weeks and 6-months, maternal satisfaction with feeding
262 experience and support (single-item scale from Hoddinott Hoddinott, Craig,
263 MacLennan, Boyers, & Vale, 2012a), use of health and feeding support services and
264 receipt of benefits at 8-weeks.

265 Outcome data were collected at three time-points. At 2-3 days postnatally,
266 participants were sent a text message asking them to respond with their feeding

method since birth (formula milk, breastmilk or both). At 8-weeks and 6-months postnatally, women were sent a questionnaire to complete and return by post (or by telephone if preferred). Women were sent a £25 shopping voucher following return of the 6-month questionnaire. Routinely collected health visitor data were accessed for missing 8-week feeding outcomes.

Sample Size

We calculated that a sample size of 100 women would allow a reasonable level of precision in estimation of feasibility outcomes, enabling bounds for 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for recruitment, follow-up and questionnaire completion to be within 15% of the estimate calculated using an estimate of 50% for all outcomes.

Statistical Analysis

We used STATA 15 (Texas, USA) for statistical analysis. Descriptive statistics were used to outline participant characteristics by site and randomisation allocation.

To measure trial feasibility, we reported recruitment and follow-up rates (with 95% binomial exact CIs) and data completeness. We described number and method of IFH contacts with women in the intervention and control arms to assess level of intervention delivery and any contamination in the control group.

Although this study was not powered to ascertain differences between intervention and control arms, we calculated percentages (with 95% CIs) for breastfeeding and health-related outcome measures. The variability in the primary outcome between IFHs was assessed by calculating the intra-cluster correlation coefficient (ICC) using a null linear model with a random effect for IFH. These data will inform sample size calculation for a future definitive trial. We describe women's characteristics by

allocation group and present summaries for each outcome measure. Primary analysis was by modified intention to treat, which included all randomly assigned patients with available data on the primary endpoint (self-report or routinely collected).

Ethical considerations

Ethical approval was received in November 2016 from South West – Cornwall and Plymouth Research Ethics Committee (16/SW/0336). The study was registered with the International Standard Randomised Controlled Trial Register (ISRCTN14760978).

Results

Participant recruitment and follow-up

Of 135 eligible women invited to participate, 103 (76.3%, 95% CIs: 68.2-83.2%) consented and were randomly assigned to the intervention (n=50) and usual care (n=53) groups (Figure 1). Recruitment took place February-May 2017 at Site A and April-August 2017 at Site B. Recruitment finished when at least 50 women had been recruited from each site.

Participant characteristics are shown in Table 1. The sample included nine teenagers (8.7%), and 38 women (37.3%) from the two most deprived Index of Multiple Deprivation quintiles. Fourteen women (13.9%) intended to feed their baby either 'formula milk only' or 'mainly formula'.

Late birth notifications (median age of baby when IFH notified of birth=3 days, IQR 0, 30) resulted in delays sending out the postnatal text to collect feeding status at 2-3 days. We were able to send a postnatal text to 84/103 (81.6%) women within 10 days of birth and received responses from 70 (68%, 95% CI: 58.0-76.8%) women.

Follow up questionnaires were returned by 88 (85.4%, 95% CI: 77.1-91.6%) and 83 (80.6%, 95% CI: 71.6-87.7%) women at 8-weeks and 6-months respectively. We accessed routine health visitor data for an additional 10 participants who did not return their 8-week questionnaire, meaning we had available data on 'any breastfeeding at 8-weeks' for 95.1% (95% CI: 89.0-98.4%) of women.

Comparison of demographic characteristics of responders and non-responders revealed that non-responders were: younger; more were White British, single and breastfeeding at 8-weeks; and, fewer were employed, educated to degree level, and reported intention to breastfeed at baseline [Web-table 1].

Two women withdrew from the study (one immediately after randomisation – no reason given, and one between the two follow-ups – no longer wanted to participate). One woman suffered a stillbirth and was withdrawn by the study team.

Women's and maternity services providers' views on recruitment and randomisation processes

All the women interviewed found the recruitment processes and timing acceptable

330 but would not have wanted to be approached before the 20-week scan.

331 *I didn't really want to acknowledge until the 20-week scan, ... 12-weeks... I*
332 *don't think I was even thinking about post birth. (Participant 16 – Intervention,*
333 *Site B)*

334 While there were variations as to when women received the study leaflet - some
335 received the leaflet early, others received it on the day of recruitment - this did not
336 affect women's willingness to be involved, although there was a preference for
337 receiving the invitation earlier.

338 *I guess if the midwife of the previous appointment said there's a feeding study*
339 *going on, this is the leaflet about what they are doing, they're going to be here*
340 *next time and they might want to have a chat with you, then I suppose that*
341 *could have given me a bit more time to have a think about it. But I wasn't*
342 *really thinking I wish I had more time to think about it or anything like that.*
343 *(Participant 17 – Usual care, Site B)*

344 Women provided diverse responses regarding midwifery staff involvement in study
345 recruitment. Some felt it was more important to discuss the purpose and
346 practicalities with the researcher, whilst others felt that midwifery endorsement
347 helped to authenticate the study.

348 *I probably wouldn't have done anything if it was just you [researcher] if I was*
349 *honest, it was because my midwife said... this is a research would you want to*
350 *take part?... it was nice to have that confirmation that it is an actual study*
351 *going on. (Participant 28 – Usual care, Site B)*

Overall, women across both study arms found the randomisation process to be acceptable. Women wanted to be part of a study, which may or may not have direct personal benefits, but might make a difference to others.

The study for us I just wanted to be part of it in regards to if it helps somebody else, if it helps us in the future, but if it helps somebody then it's worth being part of. (Participant 2 – Intervention, Site A)

The midwives did not experience any particular difficulties in giving women the leaflets or introducing the study. They valued the researcher's presence and their knowledge and time to explain the study. None of the midwives interviewed experienced any problems in women not wanting to participate. This they believed could be attributed in part to their personal introductions, such as 'we've got a study', thereby demonstrating their endorsement. Some professionals also considered women were willing to participate due to the general approach being '*infant feeding rather than just breastfeeding*'.

Infant Feeding Helper recruitment and training

We were able to recruit a sufficient number of existing peer supporters to the ABA IFH role, with 13 out of a possible 16 peer supporters agreeing to be involved.

Although, overall, IFHs reported the ABA training to be acceptable, IFHs at Site B were generally more positive about it than IFHs at Site A:

The role play was really useful... and doing the genogram was really useful, having a bit of the formula section was really useful because... it's not something I know a lot about, but that was helpful. (IFH – Site B, Focus Group)

375 IFHs at Site A felt that the training offered little new to them and were uncertain
376 about the perceived 'prescriptive' nature of the intervention:

377 *I thought the whole conversation thing [role play] was a little bit patronising,*
378 *because it's what we do anyway... it was a bit like we knew how to sit and talk*
379 *to mums, so other than that though it was fine. (IFH – Site A, Interview)*

380 ***Intervention delivery and uptake***

381 IFH activity logs were provided for 49/50 (98%) women. The missing log related to a
382 woman the IFH had been unable to contact. IFHs attempted to contact all women
383 assigned to the intervention arm to offer an antenatal visit (Table 2). In total 39/50
384 (78%) women completed an antenatal meeting, four (8%) could not be contacted,
385 four (8%) gave birth prematurely before contact was established, two (4%) withdrew
386 from the intervention and one (2%) declined. No women took up the offer to be
387 accompanied to a breastfeeding group antenatally.

388 Postnatally, IFHs attempted to contact 46/49 (93.9%) women to offer support, with
389 24/49 (49.0%) contacted within 48 hours of birth; one woman had a stillbirth so is
390 omitted from the denominator. Forty women (81.6%) received postnatal support, five
391 (10%) could not be contacted and one woman declined support. At Site A, IFHs
392 reported home visits to 7/24 (29.2%) women postnatally. In the first two postnatal
393 weeks the IFH sent a text/call on a median of 4 days (IQR 2,8). The median number
394 of days in which two-way contact between IFH and a woman occurred was 2 days
395 (IQR 1,7) in the first 2-weeks postnatally, and 2 days (IQR 0,4) from 2-8-weeks
396 postnatally. For women known to be breastfeeding in the first two weeks postnatally,
397 IFHs made or attempted contact on 57.2% of possible days after they had been
398 notified of birth. Between 8-weeks and 5-months postnatally, 24/49 women (49.0%)

399 received some support. There was notable variation between sites, with Site B IFHs
400 maintaining a considerably higher level of contact. Many women reported that they
401 preferred to text.

402 *...text message was better because at that point I was always feeding him, so*
403 *it was quite difficult to get the phone, so with the text it was more easy*
404 *because I just answer when I could and she [IFH] the same. (Participant 27,*
405 *Site B)*

406 ***Intervention fidelity***

407 Fidelity checking was undertaken on 18 recordings of antenatal meetings (two Site
408 A; 16 Site B). Results suggest that woman-centred assets-based conversations,
409 including BCTs, can be delivered by IFHs. Analysis of qualitative interviews with
410 women showed IFHs were able to offer a woman-centred approach. There was
411 evidence of delivery of the core BCTs 'social support' and 'restructuring the social
412 environment' (reported in 18/21 and 20/21 interviews with intervention women
413 respectively). IFHs completed a genogram with 38 of the 39 women who took part in
414 an antenatal meeting.

415 ***Intervention acceptability***

416 Qualitative analysis showed the intervention was acceptable to women, IFHs and
417 maternity services at both sites.

418 Women valued the opportunity of support from someone with similar experiences
419 and learning about what was available.

420 *I think just having that additional person to talk to makes you feel less alone*
421 *..... so it puts you at ease really about how you can actually do it. I think*

422 *that's essentially what you want, you want someone to have the same*
423 *experiences as you, you want someone to be like no it's fine, you're okay.*
424 *(Participant 2 Site A)*

425 Overall IFHs appreciated the chance to meet women antenatally, to continue contact
426 for several months, and offer woman-centred support.

427 *When you first started meeting antenatally, you were excited about it, and*
428 *planning where to meet, and meeting these women. We were so amazed by*
429 *the diversity of the women and that was really powerful, and how different*
430 *they were to women we were meeting in our ordinary groups ..., they were*
431 *really different. (IFH manager Site B focus group)*

432 The antenatal meetings between women and their IFHs were described as relaxed
433 discussions with an opportunity to have a 'chat' about infant feeding whatever their
434 preference.

435 *It sometimes opens up that conversation .., it might be easier this way, so*
436 *definitely having that information at least we know then and we don't look like*
437 *we're just the breastfeeding police kind of thing, we can speak to them about*
438 *what they want to do as well. So, it's good I suppose. (IFH3 Site A focus*
439 *group)*

440 Women provided mostly positive views about the mapping exercise (genogram).

441 *She did a really useful thing actually, which was we did a map of people in my*
442 *life that I could ask any help for feeding advice and things like that...and just it*
443 *just made me rethink and evaluate how much I appreciate having some family*
444 *closer by. (Participant 23 - Site B)*

445

446 Postnatally women appreciated the proactive contacts from their helpers and valued
447 the range of methods of contact with the IFH, whether by phone, text or in person.
448 With some of the women identifying the importance of the support on their infant
449 feeding experiences.

450 *I genuinely believe if it wasn't for the study and for [IFH] and introducing me to*
451 *the breast friends' group, I don't think I would have got this far and certainly*
452 *not breastfeeding exclusively. (Participant 19 Site B)*

453 Midwives also reported on the complementary role of the intervention with usual
454 care.

455 *I think it would help us as well knowing that actually they are being supported*
456 *that if we haven't got that time necessarily that they are still being supported.*
457 *(Maternity services Site A focus group)*

458 **Usual care**

459 Peer support services at a woman's request existed at both sites prior to and during
460 this study. Of 42 women in the usual care arm responding to a question at 8-weeks
461 on use of feeding support services for advice on infant feeding, seven (16.7%)
462 reported accessing support from an infant feeding counsellor/breastfeeding
463 supporter and 11 (26.2%) had attended a breastfeeding group (web-table 2).

464 **Contamination and adverse events**

465 We identified one case of contamination. One woman at Site B reported sharing the
466 assets leaflet with friends who were in the usual care group. The impact of this is

likely to have been low as the assets leaflet represents only one component of the intervention. There were no reported adverse events related to the intervention.

Outcomes for a definitive trial

Whilst recognising that this feasibility trial was not powered to detect differences between study arms, we found the proportion of intervention women reporting breastfeeding initiation and any breastfeeding at 8-weeks and 6-months was consistently higher than in the usual care group (Table 3). There was no evidence of social desirability bias. Wellbeing and satisfaction with support are reported in web-table 2. We demonstrated the feasibility of data collection for a future cost-effectiveness analysis; use of feeding support services are reported in web-table 2.

Discussion

This study aimed to determine the feasibility of delivering the ABA intervention in a definitive RCT. Our results indicate that (1) we were successful in recruiting women from areas of socioeconomic disadvantage and teenagers, with adequate follow up rates; (2) it was feasible to recruit and train existing peer supporters to the new ABA role, and they were able to deliver the intervention with satisfactory fidelity, incorporating the delivery of core BCTs in line with behavioural theory and a woman-centred approach; (3) the intervention was acceptable to women, IFHs and maternity services; and (4) there were no harms associated with the intervention, and contamination was low. To our knowledge, this is the first infant feeding study in the UK to provide woman-centred infant feeding support to women regardless of feeding intention using an assets-based approach.

Whilst systematic reviews of peer support report benefit (McFadden et al., 2017) UK trials of breastfeeding peer support have not been effective (Jolly et al., 2012). Many of the trials in systematic reviews are from low-income countries, the usual care group received a lower level of support for feeding than is standard care in the UK and the interventions were often more intensive than delivered in UK trials (Jolly et al., 2012) hence the need to further explore effectiveness of feeding peer support in the UK.

An uncontrolled UK feasibility trial of a breastfeeding peer support intervention including motivational interviewing by paid peer supporters (Mam-Kind study) (Copeland et al., 2018) and a feasibility RCT of proactive and reactive telephone support for breastfeeding women living in disadvantaged areas (FEST) study (Hoddinott et al., 2012a, 2012b) were both shown to be feasible and acceptable. Detailed process evaluations of these studies enable comparisons to be drawn with the ABA study.

The ABA recruitment method (researcher approaching potentially eligible women in community antenatal clinics) was more successful than the approach taken in the Mam-Kind study where community midwives were asked to pass on women's details to the research team for recruitment. In the ABA study, our recruitment rate was 76%, versus 24% in Mam-Kind. We also recruited a higher proportion of teenagers, women with lower educational attainment and women from ethnic minorities, possibly in part due to Mam-Kind's exclusion of women not planning to breastfeed. The Mam-Kind study contacted a higher proportion of women within 48-hours of birth (73% compared to 48% in ABA). Within Mam-Kind the midwife supervising the peer support teams encouraged hospital midwives to notify peer supporters of births. Reasonable intervention fidelity was achieved in both the Mam-Kind and ABA

514 studies. Mam-Kind reported difficulties for peer supporters in moving away from
515 information-giving to a more collaborative approach. This resonated with the ABA
516 study's experience of working with paid peer supporters. Some women in the Mam-
517 Kind study reported that cessation of support at 14-days (with facilitated transition to
518 a breastfeeding/community support group) felt somewhat abrupt, adding validation to
519 the ABA approach of a longer support period and a more gradual withdrawal of
520 support to encourage breastfeeding maintenance.

521 In the FEST intervention a feeding team met women face to face after birth in
522 hospital and aimed to provide daily proactive telephone calls to breastfeeding
523 women (n=35) in the week following hospital discharge, with the option of continuing
524 daily calls up until 14-days; a median of eight proactive calls/woman occurred in the
525 14-days following hospital discharge. In the ABA study, the number of days where
526 two-way contact was established between woman and IFH in the first two-weeks
527 postnatally varied from zero to 14, with a median of two. A lower level of two-way
528 contact compared to FEST was partly due to delays in birth notifications. Also, the
529 inclusive nature of the ABA intervention meant that women who were formula
530 feeding required less day-to-day support and the woman-centred approach meant
531 that contact frequency was negotiated. This was particularly the case at Site A, with
532 a lower proportion of women breastfeeding.

533 Contextual differences between the two ABA study sites may also have contributed
534 to the lower overall contact between IFHs and women at Site A, where there were
535 several preterm births and more women living in socio-economically disadvantaged
536 and challenging circumstances, as well as uncertainty about the continuation of their
537 peer support service. Also, at Site A paid IFHs provided support primarily within

office hours, whereas at Site B volunteer IFHs were more flexible in their approach to contacting women in the evenings and at weekends.

Strengths and limitations

This study used robust methods including a usual care group and a comprehensive process evaluation. Delays in birth notifications were a limitation, resulting in delays in collection of postnatal feeding status data and delivery of the postnatal intervention for some women, which has been a recurring challenge in previous UK trials of peer support (Graffy, Taylor, Williams, & Eldridge, 2004, Jolly et al., 2012). All qualitative interviews were with women who returned an 8-week questionnaire. This could have led to positive bias in the responses of interviewees, as the socio-demographic characteristics of non-responders at 8-weeks were those known to be associated with lower rates of breastfeeding (McAndrew et al., 2012). For the fidelity assessment we only had two recorded antenatal meetings from Site A due to IFH concerns that recording might affect the interaction. Thus the fidelity results can only be applied with confidence to Site B. The qualitative researchers had different health related backgrounds, and some had prior experience of evaluating peer support. These qualities increased the robustness of the analysis. It is possible that IFHs may have altered the support they provided to any usual care women who they saw in a breastfeeding group (26.2% of usual care responders attended a breastfeeding group). However, the use of the genogram and initial discussion of local assets took place antenatally. No usual care women had antenatal contact with the IFHs and no contamination was reported by IFHs.

Recommendations for future research

561 We met our criteria for progression to a future trial: the intervention was acceptable
562 to women, IFHs and health service staff; we recruited more than 75 women in 5
563 months; at least 5% of women recruited were teenagers; over 75% of the women in
564 the intervention group received a contact in both the antenatal and postnatal periods
565 and over 75% received the assets-based contact; and data on any breastfeeding
566 was obtained for over 80% of participants at 8 weeks and 6 months. Thus we
567 consider that the ABA intervention was feasible to deliver within an RCT and a future
568 definitive RCT is required to determine effectiveness and cost-effectiveness. UK
569 collection of routine data for feeding method at 8-weeks by health visitors facilitates
570 high completion for the proposed primary outcome in a full trial.

571 Contamination was low in this feasibility study, so we recommend an individually
572 randomised trial with clustering by IFH accounted for in the sample size calculation
573 for the intervention arm.

574 For future intervention delivery, we would need to identify localities with existing peer
575 support services with stable commissioning and good managerial support to enable
576 adoption of the ABA approach. Whilst a cluster RCT would reduce contamination
577 between the intervention and comparator group, the required sample size would
578 render such a trial not cost-effective. We therefore recommend an individually
579 randomised trial with any breastfeeding at 8-weeks as the primary outcome. Such a
580 trial would need a large sample size (>2500), and large number of sites to enhance
581 generalisability; this would enable us to explore differences in delivery and outcomes
582 in different contexts. Randomisation should be stratified by site to take into account
583 different population characteristics and delivery. We recommend targeting areas with
584 low breastfeeding rates in a future trial and we would investigate how to obtain more
585 timely birth notification.

A challenge relating to the study includes recording the antenatal interaction between the IFH and women. Interestingly, most women asked in Site B were happy for the discussion to be recorded anonymously (i.e. no identifying data was recorded). Concerns were only raised by the IFHs in Site A who did not ask women whether they would be willing for the recording to take place. The recordings provided valuable information about fidelity of delivery. Moving forward to a definitive trial we would recommend that anonymised recording of some interactions take place and that women are specifically asked whether they would agree to this recording on the consent form.

Conclusion

This study has demonstrated that it is feasible to deliver the ABA intervention within an RCT with adequate fidelity. It is feasible to recruit teenagers, women from socioeconomically disadvantaged areas, and women planning to formula feed. Women were willing to be randomised and follow-up rates were satisfactory. The intervention was acceptable to women, IFHs and maternity services. There is a need for a future definitive trial to test both effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the intervention in improving rates of breastfeeding initiation and continuation.

References

- Aradon, G. (2007). *On the borderline: Development Trusts Tackling Poverty in the UK*. In. Retrieved from <http://www.communityplanning.net/pub-film/pdf/OnTheBorderline.pdf>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Copeland, L., Merrett, L., McQuire, C., Grant, A., Gobat, N., Tedstone, S., . . . Hunter, B. (2018). Feasibility and acceptability of a motivational interviewing breastfeeding peer support intervention. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, e12703.

612 Darwent, K., McInnes, R., Swanson, V. (2016) The Infant Feeding Genogram: a tool
613 for exploring family infant feeding history and identifying support needs. BMC
614 Pregnancy and Childbirth, 16.

615 Dennis, C.-L., Hodnett, E., Gallop, R., & Chalmers, B. (2002). The effect of peer
616 support on breast-feeding duration among primiparous women: a randomized
617 controlled trial. Canadian Medical Association Journal, 166(1), 21-28.

618 Department of Health and Department for Children Schools and Families. (2009).
619 Commissioning local breastfeeding support services. Retrieved from Department of
620 Health:
621 [http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130123200620/http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130123200620/http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_106501)
622 [Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_106501](http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20130123200620/http://www.dh.gov.uk/en/Publicationsandstatistics/Publications/PublicationsPolicyAndGuidance/DH_106501)

623 Forster, D.A., McLardie-Hore, F.E., McLachlan, H.L., Davey, M.A., Grimes, H.A., ...
624 Amir, L.H. (2019). Proactive Peer (Mother-to-Mother) Breastfeeding Support by
625 Telephone (Ringing up About Breastfeeding Early [RUBY]): A Multicentre,
626 Unblinded, Randomised Controlled Trial. Lancet 8, 20-28.

627 Graffy, J., Taylor, J., Williams, A., & Eldridge, S. (2004). Randomised controlled trial
628 of support from volunteer counsellors for mothers considering breast feeding. BMJ,
629 328(7430), 26.

630 Grant A., McEwan, K., Tedstone, S., Greene, G., Copeland, L., . . . Paranjothy, S.
631 (2018). Availability of breastfeeding peer support in the United Kingdom: A cross-
632 sectional study. Maternal & Child Nutrition, 14(1), e12476.

633 Hoddinott, P., Craig, L., MacLennan, G., Boyers, D., & Vale, L. (2012a). The FEeding
634 Support Team (FEST) randomised, controlled feasibility trial of proactive and
635 reactive telephone support for breastfeeding women living in disadvantaged areas.
636 BMJ open, 2(2), e000652.

637 Hoddinott, P., Craig, L., MacLennan, G., Boyers, D., & Vale, L. (2012b). Process
638 evaluation for the FEeding Support Team (FEST) randomised controlled feasibility
639 trial of proactive and reactive telephone support for breastfeeding women living in
640 disadvantaged areas. BMJ open, 2(2), e001039.

641 Hoddinott, P., Craig, L. C., Britten, J., & McInnes, R. (2012c). A serial qualitative
642 interview study of infant feeding experiences: Idealism meets realism. BMJ Open,
643 2(2).

644 Ingram, L., MacArthur, C., Khan, K., Deeks, J. J., & Jolly, K. (2010). Effect of
645 antenatal peer support on breastfeeding initiation: a systematic review. Canadian
646 Medical Association Journal, 182(16), 1739-1746.

647 Jolly, K., Ingram, J., Clarke, J., Johnson, D., Trickey, H., Thomson, G., . . .
648 Hoddinott, P. (2018). Protocol for a feasibility trial for improving breast feeding
649 initiation and continuation: assets-based infant feeding help before and after birth
650 (ABA). BMJ Open, 8(1), e019142. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-019142

651 Jolly, K., Ingram, L., Freemantle, N., Khan, K., Chambers, J., Hamburger, R., . . .
652 MacArthur, C. (2012a). Effect of a peer support service on breast-feeding
653 continuation in the UK: a randomised controlled trial. Midwifery, 28(6), 740-745.

654 Jolly, K., Ingram, L., Khan, K. S., Deeks, J. J., Freemantle, N., & MacArthur, C.
655 (2012b). Systematic review of peer support for breastfeeding continuation:
656 metaregression analysis of the effect of setting, intensity, and timing. *BMJ*, 344,
657 d8287.

658 McAndrew, F., Thompson, J., Fellows, L., Large, A., Speed, M., & Renfrew, M. J.
659 (2012). *Infant feeding survey 2010*. Leeds: Health and Social Care Information
660 Centre.

661 McFadden, A., Gavine, A., Renfrew, M. J., Wade, A., Buchanan, P., Taylor, J. L., . . .
662 Neiman, S. (2017). Support for healthy breastfeeding mothers with healthy term
663 babies. *The Cochrane Library*.

664 McLean, J. (2011). *Asset Based Approaches to Health Improvement: Redressing the*
665 *Balance*. Glasgow Centre for Population Health.

666 Michie, S., Atkins, L., & West, R. (2014). *The behaviour change wheel: a guide to*
667 *designing interventions*. Great Britain: Siverback Publishing.

668 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2008). *Maternal and Child*
669 *Nutrition*. London: NICE.

670 Tennant, R., Hiller, L., Fishwick, R., Platt, S., Joseph, S., Weich, S., . . . Stewart-
671 Brown, S. (2007). The Warwick-Edinburgh mental well-being scale (WEMWBS):
672 development and UK validation. *Health and Quality of life Outcomes*, 5(1), 63.

673 Trickey, H., & Newburn, M. (2014). Goals, dilemmas and assumptions in infant
674 feeding education and support. Applying theory of constraints thinking tools to
675 develop new priorities for action. *Maternal & Child Nutrition*, 10(1), 72-91.
676 doi:doi:10.1111/j.1740-8709.2012.00417.x

677 Victora, C.G., Bahl, R., Barros, A.J.D., França, G.V.A., Horton, S., Krasevec, J., . . .
678 Rollin, N.C. (2016). Breastfeeding in the 21st century: epidemiology, mechanisms,
679 and lifelong effect. *Lancet*, 387, 475-490.

680 **Table 1: Demographic and delivery characteristics of participants**

	Site A			Site B			Overall		
Characteristic	Intervention N=25	Usual care N=28	All N=53	Intervention N=25	Usual care N=25	All N=50	Intervention N=50	Usual care N=53	All N=103
Age at baseline (years), mean (SD)	27.9 (5.2)	27.7 (5.9)	27.8 (5.5)	29.2 (20.5)	29.3 (5.6)	29.3 (5.4)	28.6 (5.2)	28.5 (5.8)	28.5 (5.5)
Age range, minimum-maximum (years)	17.7-37.7	17.9-39.0	17.7-39.0	20.5-43.0	17.9-42.9	17.9-43.0	17.7-43.0	17.9-42.9	17.7-43.0
Missing, n (%)	0 (0)	1 (3.6)	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	1 (1.0)
Ethnicity, n (%)									
White British	21 (84.0)	22 (81.5)	43 (82.7)	22 (88.0)	23 (92.0)	45 (90.0)	43 (86.0)	45 (86.5)	88 (86.3)
White Other	1 (4.0)	3 (11.1)	4 (7.7)	2 (8.0)	1 (4.0)	3 (6.0)	3 (6.0)	4 (7.7)	7 (6.9)
Asian	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (4.0)	1 (2.0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	1 (1.0)
Black African	0 (0)	1 (3.7)	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	1 (1.0)
Black Caribbean	1 (4.0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2.0)	1 (1.9)	1 (1.0)
Mixed	1 (4.0)	1 (3.7)	2 (3.9)	1 (4.0)	0 (0)	1 (2.0)	2 (4.0)	1 (1.9)	3 (2.9)
Other	1 (4.0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2.0)	0 (0)	1 (1.0)
Missing	0 (0)	1 (3.6)	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	1 (1.0)
Employment status, n (%)									

In paid work	18 (72.0)	25 (92.6)	43 (82.7)	22 (88.0)	25 (100)	47 (94.0)	40 (80.0)	50 (96.2)	90 (88.2)
Unemployed	6 (24.0)	1 (3.7)	7 (13.5)	2 (8.0)	0 (0)	2 (4.0)	8 (16.0)	1 (1.9)	9 (8.8)
Full-time education or training	0 (0)	1 (3.7)	1 (1.9)	1 (4.0)	0 (0)	1 (2.0)	1 (2.0)	1 (2.0)	2 (2.0)
Missing	0 (0)	1 (3.6)	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	1 (1.0)
Highest level of Qualification, n (%)									
No formal qualification	1 (4.0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2.0)	0 (0)	1 (1.0)
GCSE or equivalent	6 (24.0)	5 (18.5)	11 (21.2)	6 (24.0)	5 (20.0)	11 (22.0)	12 (24.0)	10 (19.2)	22 (21.6)
A/AS-level or equivalent	8 (32.0)	6 (22.2)	14 (26.9)	12 (48.0)	7 (28.0)	19 (38.0)	20 (40.0)	13 (25.0)	33 (32.4)
Degree level or higher	10 (40.0)	16 (59.3)	26 (50.0)	7 (28.0)	13 (52.0)	20 (40.0)	17 (34.0)	29 (55.8)	46 (45.1)
Missing	0 (0)	1 (3.6)	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	1 (1.0)
Relationship status, n (%)									
Married/registered civil partnership	9 (36.0)	12 (46.2)	21 (41.2)	13 (52.0)	14 (56.0)	27 (54.0)	22 (44.0)	26 (51.0)	48 (47.5)
Living together	9 (36.0)	11 (42.3)	20 (39.2)	9 (36.0)	9 (36.0)	18 (36.0)	18 (36.0)	20 (39.2)	38 (37.6)
Single	7 (28.0)	3 (11.5)	10 (19.6)	3 (12.0)	2 (8.0)	5 (10.0)	10 (20.0)	5 (9.8)	15 (14.9)
Missing	0 (0)	2 (7.1)	2 (3.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (3.8)	2 (1.9)
Index of Multiple Deprivation quintile, n (%)									
1 (most deprived)	13 (52.0)	11 (40.7)	24 (46.2)	1 (4.0)	0 (0)	1 (2.0)	14 (28.0)	11 (21.2)	25 (24.5)
2	3 (12.0)	6 (22.2)	9 (17.3)	2 (8.0)	2 (8.0)	4 (8.0)	5 (10.0)	8 (15.4)	13 (12.8)

3	1 (4.0)	7 (25.9)	8 (15.4)	8 (32.0)	3 (12.0)	11 (22.0)	9 (18.0)	10 (19.2)	19 (18.6)
4	7 (28.0)	3 (11.1)	10 (19.2)	6 (24.0)	11 (44.0)	17 (34.0)	13 (26.0)	14 (26.9)	27 (26.5)
5 (least deprived)	1 (4.0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	8 (32.0)	9 (36.0)	17 (34.0)	9 (18.0)	9 (17.3)	18 (17.7)
Maternal wellbeing (WEMWBS), mean (SD)	54.1 (9.8)	55.0 (9.2)	54.6 (9.4)	53.4 (6.2)	53.7 (8.4)	53.6 (7.3)	53.7 (8.1)	54.4 (8.7)	54.1 (8.4)
Missing, n (%)	0 (0)	1 (3.6)	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	1 (1.0)
Intention to feed, n (%)									
Breastmilk only	10 (40.0)	9 (33.3)	19 (36.5)	7 (28.0)	9 (37.5)	16 (32.7)	17 (34.0)	18 (35.3)	35 (34.7)
Mainly breastmilk	7 (28.0)	7 (25.9)	14 (26.9)	10 (40.0)	6 (25.0)	16 (32.7)	17 (34.0)	13 (25.5)	30 (29.7)
Half and half	4 (16.0)	6 (22.2)	10 (19.2)	6 (24.0)	6 (25.0)	12 (24.5)	10 (20.0)	12 (23.5)	22 (21.8)
Mainly formula	2 (8.0)	2 (7.4)	4 (7.7)	1 (4.0)	0 (0)	1 (2.0)	3 (6.0)	2 (3.9)	5 (5.0)
Formula milk only	2 (8.0)	3 (11.1)	5 (9.6)	1 (4.0)	3 (12.5)	4 (8.2)	3 (6.0)	6 (11.8)	9 (8.9)
Missing	0 (0)	1 (3.6)	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	1 (4.0)	1 (2.0)	0 (0)	2 (3.8)	2 (1.9)
How participant was fed as a baby, n (%)									
Breastfed entirely	7 (28.0)	8 (29.6)	15 (28.9)	9 (36.0)	12 (48.0)	21 (42.0)	16 (32.0)	20 (38.5)	36 (35.3)
Formula fed entirely	8 (32.0)	13 (48.2)	21 (40.4)	5 (20.0)	3 (12.0)	8 (16.0)	13 (26.0)	16 (30.8)	29 (28.4)
Mixed feeding	10 (40.0)	5 (18.5)	15 (28.9)	7 (28.0)	6 (24.0)	13 (26.0)	17 (34.0)	11 (21.2)	28 (27.5)
Don't know	0	1 (3.7)	1 (1.9)	4 (16.0)	4 (16.0)	8 (16.0)	4 (8.0)	5 (9.6)	9 (8.8)
Missing	0 (0)	1 (3.6)	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	1 (1.0)
Knows anyone who has	22 (88.0)	25 (92.6)	47 (90.4)	21 (84.0)	25 (100)	46 (92.0)	43 (86.0)	50 (96.2)	93 (91.2)

breastfed their baby, n (%)									
Missing	0 (0)	1 (3.6)	1 (1.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.9)	1 (1.0)
Gestational age at birth (weeks), mean (SD)	39.0 (2.3)	40.1 (1.2)	39.6 (1.9)	39.7 (1.7)	39.3 (1.8)	39.5 (1.8)	39.4 (2.0)	39.7 (1.6)	39.5 (1.8)
Missing	1 (2.0)	1 (3.6)	2 (3.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2.0)	1 (1.9)	2 (1.9)
Premature baby, n (%)	5 (20.8)	0 (0)	5 (9.8)	2 (8.0)	2 (8.0)	4 (8.0)	7 (14.3)	2 (3.9)	9 (8.9)
Missing	1 (2.0)	1 (3.6)	2 (3.8)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2.0)	1 (1.9)	2 (1.9)
Mode of delivery, n (%)									
Vaginal birth	5 (26.3)	10 (50.0)	15 (38.5)	10 (47.6)	12 (50.0)	22 (48.9)	15 (37.5)	22 (50.0)	37 (44.1)
C-section (planned)	1 (5.3)	1 (5.0)	2 (5.1)	2 (9.5)	2 (8.3)	4 (8.9)	3 (7.5)	3 (6.8)	6 (7.1)
C-section (emergency)	4 (21.1)	4 (20.0)	8 (20.5)	4 (19.1)	6 (25.0)	10 (22.2)	8 (20.0)	10 (22.7)	18 (21.4)
Forceps, ventouse, vacuum delivery	9 (47.4)	5 (25.0)	14 (35.9)	5 (23.8)	4 (16.7)	9 (20.0)	14 (35.0)	9 (20.5)	23 (27.4)
Missing	6 (24.0)	8 (28.6)	14 (26.4)	4 (16.0)	1 (4.0)	5 (10.0)	10 (20.0)	9 (17.0)	19 (18.4)
Duration of mother hospital stay, n (%)									
<24hrs	3 (15.8)	6 (30.0)	9 (23.1)	5 (23.8)	4 (16.7)	9 (20.0)	8 (20.0)	10 (22.7)	18 (21.4)
24-48hrs	11 (57.9)	6 (30.0)	17 (43.6)	7 (33.3)	6 (25.0)	13 (28.9)	18 (45.0)	12 (27.3)	30 (35.7)
>48hrs	5 (26.3)	7 (35.0)	12 (30.8)	9 (42.9)	14 (58.3)	23 (51.1)	14 (35.0)	21 (47.7)	35 (41.7)
Home birth	0	1 (5.0)	1 (2.6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2.3)	1 (1.2)
Missing	6 (24.0)	8 (28.6)	14 (26.4)	4 (16.0)	1 (4.0)	5 (10.0)	10 (20.0)	9 (17.0)	19 (18.4)

Baby admitted to neonatal unit, n (%)	4 (21.1)	2 (10.0)	6 (15.4)	3 (14.3)	2 (8.3)	5 (11.1)	7 (17.5)	4 (9.1)	11 (13.1)
Missing	6 (24.0)	8 (28.6)	14 (26.4)	4 (16.0)	1 (4.0)	5 (10.0)	10 (20.0)	9 (17.0)	19 (18.4)

681 WEMWBS = Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Wellbeing Scale⁹⁷ (score ranging from 14-70; 70 indicates highest level of mental wellbeing)

682 Table 2: **Infant Feeding Helper reported contact with women**

	Site A	Site B	Overall
Antenatal contact attempted	25/25 (100%)	25/25 (100%)	50/50 (100%)
Antenatal visit completed	17/25 (68%)	22/25 (88%)	39/50 (78%)
Postnatal contact attempted ^a	24/24 (100%)	22/25 (88%)	46/49 (93.9%)
Postnatal support provided	18/24 (75%)	22/25 (88%)	40/49 (81.6%)
Contact attempted by Infant Feeding Helper within 48 hours of birth	6/24 (25%)	18/25 (72%)	24/49 (49%)
Number of days contact made/attempted by IFH in 14 days postnatal, median (IQR)	N=24 2.5 (1.5,3)	N=25 8 (4,14)	N=49 4 (2,8)
Number of days two-way contact established in 14 days postnatal, median (IQR)	N=24 1 (0,2)	N=25 7 (3,13)	N=49 2 (1,7)
Number (%) of days contact made/attempted by IFH in 14 days postnatal (denominator women who were known to be breastfeeding (from 8wQ) that IFH had been informed about birth)	Eligible days for support=162 ^b 29 (17.9%)	Eligible days for support=235 ^c 198 (84.3%)	Eligible days for support=397 227 (57.2%)
Number of two-way contact days from 2-8 weeks postnatal, median (IQR)	N=24 1 (0,2)	N=25 4 (1,7)	N=49 2 (0,4)
Support provided 8-weeks to 5-months	9/24 (37.5%)	15/25 (60%)	24/49 (49.0%)

683 ^a one woman suffered stillbirth and was withdrawn from the study

684 ^b excludes stillbirth (n=1), no 8-week questionnaire data (n=4), no IFH notes available (n=1)

685 ^c excludes declined support (n=2), out of the country (n=1)

Table 3: Estimates from feasibility study: breastfeeding initiation, any and exclusive breastfeeding at 8 weeks and 6 months

	Intervention N=50		Usual care N=53		All N=103	
	n/N	% (95%CI)	n/N	% (95%CI)	n/N	% (95%CI)
Breastfeeding initiation	35/41	85.4 (70.8, 94.4)	36/47	76.6 (62.0, 87.7)	71/88	80.7 (70.9, 88.3)
Any breastfeeding at 8 weeks	23/41	56.1 (39.7, 71.5)	22/47	46.8 (32.1, 61.9)	45/88	51.1 (40.2, 61.9)
Any breastfeeding at 8 weeks (including health visitor data) ¹	24/48	50.0 (35.2, 64.8)	22/50	44.0 (30.0, 58.7)	46/98	46.9 (36.8, 57.3)
Any breastfeeding at 6 months	18/39	46.2 (30.1, 62.8)	16/44	36.4 (22.4, 52.2)	34/83	41.0 (30.3, 52.3)
Exclusive breastfeeding at 6-8 weeks (last 24hrs)	16/41	39.0 (24.2, 55.5)	17/47	36.2 (22.7, 51.5)	33/88	37.5 (27.4, 48.5)
Exclusive breastfeeding at 6-8 weeks (since birth)	11/41	26.8 (14.2, 42.9)	12/47	25.5 (13.9, 40.3)	23/88	26.1 (17.3, 36.6)
Exclusive breastfeeding at 6 months (last 24hrs definition)	12/39	30.8 (17.0, 47.6)	13/44	29.5 (16.8, 45.2)	25/83	30.1 (20.5, 41.2)
Exclusive breastfeeding at 6 months (no other food/drink ever definition)	3/39	7.7 (1.6, 20.9)	2/44	4.5 (0.5, 20.9)	5/83	6.0 (2.0, 13.5)

¹ICC for infant feeding helpers 0.039