Figure 5: Difference in Sample Log Cumulative Hazard Functions, Final Sample

Figure 6: Cumulative Hazard Plot for Depo injection at discharge in Aim 1
Unplanned index pregnancy, physical abuse during pregnancy, postpartum depression score, and age were similarly included, along with the time-varying contraceptive method variables, in the model building for Aim 2. In the adjusted model, receiving Depo injections over time satisfied the proportional hazards assumption, \( r = -0.03, \quad c^2 = 0.12, \quad p = 0.74 \). As seen in Figure 7, receiving Depo injections over time provided a strong protective factor against RRP, as expected. A significant interaction existed between physical abuse during pregnancy and postpartum depression score in the adjusted model for Aim 2. LARC did not meet the proportional hazards assumption, \( r = 0.24, \quad c^2 = 6.37, \quad p = 0.012 \), and the variable showed a significant interaction with time. Finally, a significant interaction existed between physical abuse during pregnancy and postpartum depression score. Table 5 displays the results of the model building for Aim 2 in the same manner as Table 4 does for the model building for Aim 1.
Figure 7: Cumulative Hazard Plot for Depo Injections over Time in Aim 2