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Multilevel multinomial logistic regression model for identifying factors associated with anemia in children 6–59 months in northeastern states of India

Sanku Dey and Enayetur Raheem

Abstract: Objective: To examine the factors influencing the occurrence of childhood anemia in northeast India. Method: A nationally representative systematic multi-stage stratified cross-sectional sample of singleton children aged 6–59 months from all states of India. Data consist of 10,136 children in the age group 6–59 months in eight northeastern states. The level of anemia was the outcome variable with four ordinal categories (severe, moderate, mild, and non-anemic). A two-level random intercept multivariate logistic regression model was considered with state of residence as the level-2 variable. Results: About 53% of the children are anemic in the northeastern states of India. Tripura has the highest prevalence of anemia cases (74%), whereas the lowest percentage of anemia cases was in Manipur (42%). Multivariate analysis suggests that age at marriage (OR = 1.13, 95% CI: 1.05, 1.21) and the number of children ever born (OR = 1.09, 95% CI: 1.03, 1.15) have significant effects on being at or below a hemoglobin level (severely anemic). Furthermore, age
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1. Introduction

Anemia is considered the most prevalent nutritional deficiency globally (McLean, Cogswell, Egli, Wojdyla, & de Benoist, 2009). About one-third of the global population (over two billion) is anemic (de Benoist, McLean, Egli, & Cogswell, 2008) while the prevalence of anemia among preschool children is 47.4% (IIPS, 2000). According to WHO estimates, India has the highest prevalence of anemia among the South Asian countries in all age groups. The Third National Family Health Survey (IIPS, 2007) of India revealed that 70% of the children are anemic in the age group of 6–59 months, including 3% severely anemic, 40% moderately anemic, and 26% mildly anemic (IIPS, 2000). As per five major surveys (National Family Health Survey (NFHS Assunção, Santos, de Barros, Gigante, & Victora, 2007; de Benoist et al., 2008), District Level Household Survey 2 (DLHS), Indian Council of Medical Research (ICMR) Micronutrient Survey (Togeja & Singh, 2004) and Micronutrient Survey (NNMB, 2004), over 70% of preschool children are anemic in the country.

Iron deficiency (ID) is listed as one of the “top ten risk factors contributing to death” (Dubey, 1994). Iron deficiency anemia (IDA) is prevalent in South Asia, predominantly India, Bangladesh, and Pakistan. However, the prevalence of IDA has declined substantially in neighboring countries such as Bangladesh and Pakistan (Gillespie, 1997), whereas it has plummeted from 20 to 8% within a decade in China (Lokeshwar, Manglani, Rao, Patel, & Kulkarni, 1990). Studies carried out in Egypt (Seshadri, Gopaldas, Walter, & Heywood, 1989), India (Soemantri, Gopaldas, Seshadri, & Pollitt, 1989), Thailand (Pollitt, Hathirat, Kotchabhakdi, Missell, & Valyasevi, 1989), and the USA (Pollitt, 1991) revealed that iron and folate deficiency anemia reduce the learning capacity, attentiveness, and intelligence of children aged below five years. Several studies have been carried out on anemia in India since 1980. However, very few studies focused on child anemia at the national and regional levels (Bharati, Pal, Chakrabarty, & Bharati, 2015; Dey, Goswami, & Dey, 2013; Singh & Patra, 2014). The risk factors of anemia most often cited in the literature are: low family income and low maternal level of education, lack of access to health care services, inadequate sanitary conditions, and a diet with poor quantities of iron (Oliveira, Osório, & Raposo, 2007; Osório, Lira, & Ashworth, 2004).

Nutritional problem is very common among children below five years in all the states of India, particularly, in those states whose performances are very poor in respect of demographic and socioeconomic indicators. There are several factors responsible for IDA, for example: low dietary intake, inadequate iron (less than 20 mg/day) and folic acid intake (less than 70 mg/day), and chronic blood loss due to infection such as malaria and hookworm infestations, among others (NNMB, 2004; Togeja & Singh, 2004). A recent study on the determination of socioeconomic and demographic determinants of anemia among Indian children aged 6–59 months found an increasing trend of prevalence of anemia up to two years of age and then decreased thereafter (Goswami & Das, 2015). Therefore, it is imperative to find out the factors that contributed to anemia and to examine the contribution of existing programs in combating child anemia, especially in the less developed areas such as northeastern states of India. In view of the above, our objective is to determine the prevalence of anemia among children (6–59 months) from the northeastern states of India. To comprehend the prevalence of anemia and to identify the significant predictors, socioeconomic differentials have been taken into consideration in our study.
2. Methods
The present paper uses the data-set from the 2005–2006 National Family Health Survey (released in 2008) for the northeastern states of India. Respondents were selected through a systematic multi-stage stratified sample survey conducted in all 29 states of India (IIPS, 2007). In each state, populations were stratified by urban and rural area of residence, and the sample size at the state level was proportional to the size of the state's urban and rural population. A uniform sample design was adopted in all states. In each state, rural sample was selected in two stages: at the first stage, primary sampling units (PSUs), which are villages, were selected with probability proportional to population size (PPS). At the second stage, households within each PSU were selected randomly. In urban areas, a three-stage sampling procedure was adopted. At first, wards were selected with PPS sampling. In the second stage, one census enumeration block (CEB) was randomly selected from each sample ward. In the final stage, households were randomly selected within each sample CEB. The study population constitutes a nationally representative cross-sectional sample of singleton children aged 0–59 months and born after January 2000 or January 2001 (n = 50,750) to mothers aged 15–49 years from all 29 states of India. Information on children was obtained by a face-to-face interview with mothers, with a response rate of 94.5%. The survey also provided district-level information on the prevalence of under-nutrition [weight-for-age, using the standard deviation (SD) classification] among children in the age group of 0–59 month(s); prevalence of anemia (Hb estimation by HemoCue Hb201 + analyzer, Angelholm, Sweden) for the children aged 6–59 months, adolescent girls aged 10–19 years, and pregnant women; household availability of iodized salt; and the coverage of vitamin A program, with appropriate dosage. To meet the objectives of the study, we have produced a data-set that pertains to the northeastern states of India. Our study comprises 10,136 children within 6–59 months of age.

3. Variables
The variables of the study are briefly described in the following.

3.1. Outcome/response variable
We create the response variable using the variables that measures hemoglobin level in blood. We split the variable into four categories as per the specification of WHO to define level of anemia. In particular, we define a new variable called hglevel to indicate level of hemoglobin in blood (g/dL). We set hglevel = 1 if hemoglobin level is below 7 g/dL and call it severely low level (indicating severe anemia), hglevel = 2 if hemoglobin level is 7–9.9 g/dL (indicating moderate anemia), hglevel = 3 if hemoglobin level is 10–10.9 g/dL (indicating mild anemia), and hglevel = 4 if hemoglobin level is above 11 g/dL indicating no anemia.

3.2. Independent variables/predictors
The study includes a set of independent variables to understand the extent and differentials in the level of anemia among children aged 6–59 months.

4. Objective of the study
Our objective is to study the relationship between some household-level predictors and some maternal variables on the probability of being at or below a hemoglobin level. Based on our classification of anemic children, we calculate odds ratio and the predictive probability of being at or below a hemoglobin level based on a polytomous logistic regression model.

In particular, we like to answer the following research questions:

(1) What is the likelihood of being at or below each level of hemoglobin in the blood (g/dL) for children at a typical household?
(2) Does the likelihood of being at or below each level of hemoglobin (i.e. anemia level) vary across state of residence?
(3) What are the relationships between the household and maternal variables, and the likelihood of a child being at or below a given hemoglobin level?

5. Statistical analysis

In the present study, we employ bivariate as well as multivariate techniques to identify the factors that are associated with anemia in children of 6–59 months of age. In the bivariate analysis, cross-tabulation was made between the potential risk factors and the presence of anemia. Pearson’s chi-square test and $p$-values were used to test for the significance of each of the potential risk factor in bivariate analysis. Further analyses were carried out to study the relationship of the potential risk factors with the hemoglobin level in a multivariate setup. We use multinomial multilevel logistic regression model to predict the level of anemia as a function of mother’s age at marriage, number of children ever born to mother, religion, literacy of mother, household living standard, place of residence, sex of the child, and age of the child (in months). The wealth index was constructed using household asset data. Each household asset was assigned a score generated through principal components analysis and the resulting scores were standardized and summed up for each household (IIPS, 2007).

Due to the stratified nature of data in NFHS, the children are naturally nested into mothers, mothers are nested into households, households into PSUs, and PSUs into the states. Hence, keeping in view of the hierarchically clustered nature of the survey data, we use multilevel regression model to avoid possible under-estimation of parameters from a single-level model (Griffiths, Matthews, & Hinde, 2002). The advantage of multilevel model is that they properly account for the correlation structure of the data that frequently occurs in social sciences and in multistage survey sampling.

To properly account for the hierarchical nature of the data, we consider state of residence as the level-2 variable under which the respondents are nested. Thus, respondent-level variables are the level-1 variables used in this study to predict the level of anemia in children. Our outcome variable is ordinal polytomous with four levels for anemia. The model for such data uses a multinomial distribution and cumulative logit link function to compute the cumulative odds for each category of the response (O’Connell, Goldstein, Rogers, & Peng, 2008).

For the polytomous response variable, let us denote $\eta_{kij}$ as the log odds of a child in the $i$th household in the $j$th state being at or below $k$th level of hemoglobin in blood. The model for level-1 may be written as:

$$\eta_{kij} = \log \left( \frac{P(R_{ij} \leq k)}{1 - P(R_{ij} \leq k)} \right) = \beta_0j + \beta_1jX_{ij} + \delta_k$$

Here, $\beta_0j$ is the intercept, assumed to be random, represents the average log odds of being at or below severely low hemoglobin level; $P(R_{ij} \leq k)$ represents the probability of responding at or below $k$th level of the outcome variable; $X_{ij}$ represents level-1 predictor; $\beta_1j$ is the slope coefficient corresponding to $X_{ij}$ which measures the change in the probability of being at a given hemoglobin level per unit change in the level-1 predictor; and $\delta_k$ represents the difference between the $k$th category and the preceding one. Essentially, for $k = 1$, we have $\delta_1 = 0$.

We consider the intercept to be random having the following model:

$$\beta_0j = \gamma_{00} + u_{0j},$$

where $\gamma_{00}$ is the log odds of severe anemia relative to no anemia when the predictor variables in the model are evaluated at zero, and $u_{0j}$ is the random error term with $u_{0j} \sim N(0, \tau_{00})$ where $\tau_{00}$ is the level-2 error variance.
Now, substituting the expression for $\beta_{ij}$ in equation (McLean et al., 2009), we get

$$
\eta_{kij} = \log \left( \frac{P(R_{ij} \leq k)}{1 - P(R_{ij} \leq k)} \right) = \gamma_{00} + \beta_{ij} X_{ij} + \delta_{k} + u_{ij}
$$

This model represents a scenario with no level-2 predictor (as in our case), and one level-1 predictor. However, in our study, we have more than one level-1 predictor, and so the model is meant to be augmented by those additional covariates as they are considered in the analysis.

Model (2) gives log odds when fitted to data. Alternatively, predicted probability of the event of interest (e.g. being at or below a hemoglobin level) can be calculated using the following formula as discussed in (Ene, Leighton, Blue, & Bell, 2014):

$$
\text{Predicted probability (PP)} \theta_{kij} = \frac{e^{\eta_{kij}}}{1 + e^{\eta_{kij}}}
$$

This is simply a conversion of log odds of the event of interest to probability of the event of interest in order to provide a meaningful interpretation of the numbers. In this expression, $\theta_{kij}$ is the probability of the event (e.g. being at or below a hemoglobin level), $1 - \theta_{kij}$ is the corresponding probability of being above a given hemoglobin level, $\eta_{kij}$ represents the log odds of the event of interest, and $e$ is approximately 2.72.

We used PROC GLIMMIX in SAS 9.4 for multinomial distribution, and CLOGIT link function. To the best of our knowledge, there is no model diagnostic procedure available under PROC GLIMMIX for multinomial model. We considered several candidate models, and the best model was selected based on $-2 \log$ likelihood as a criterion. Details are discussed later in the paper.

### 5.1. Model-building strategies for multilevel logistic regression

A multilevel multinomial logistic regression model was considered to predict the probability of being at or below a hemoglobin level using the available predictors. Since the outcome variable is ordinal, we consider cumulative logit link function. The steps of the model-building process are outlined in Table 3. We consider random intercept model where the model is fitted with only the intercept (Model 1). Then, in Model 2, we add maternal characteristics such as number of children ever born (2 or less, 3–4, and 5 or more) and age at marriage (below 18, 18–26, and above 26 years of age). In Model 3, we add child’s age in months (<48 months, 48, or more months). To get Model 4, we add religion and literacy of mother to Model 3. Finally, we augment Model 4 by adding the sex of the child, household living standard (low, medium, high), and place of residence (urban vs. rural). We call it Model 5.

### 6. Results

#### 6.1. Bivariate analysis

Of the 10,136 children included in this study, 51.6% were male and 48.4% were female. Fifty-two percent of the children were anemic (53% male and 52% female). Table 1 presents cross-tabulation of prevalence of anemia (frequency and percentages) by level of anemia for northeastern states of India. The last column shows total number of children in the study sample from each state along with the percentages of children with anemia. The last column of Table 1 shows crude prevalence rate of each type of anemia per hundred children in the sample. Overall, 12% of the children have severe anemia, 34% have moderate anemia, 6% have mild anemia, and 48% have no anemia. We observe that Tripura has the highest percentage (74%) of anemia cases among the children in the sample. Of the 361 children in Tripura, about 19% are severely anemic, 50% moderate, and 6% have mild anemia. Sikkim falls next to Tripura with about 71% anemia cases (22% severe, 43% moderate,
and 6% mildly anemic). Nagaland and Meghalaya each have 47% anemia cases, while Arunachal Pradesh has 45% followed by Manipur which has the lowest percentage of anemia cases (42%). Sikkim has the highest percentage of severely anemic children (about 23%) followed by Tripura (about 19%). Mizoram has the lowest rate of severely anemic children with only 8% prevalence rate.

Pearson’s chi-square test for association shows that the place of residence is associated with the level of anemia ($\chi^2 = 622.84$, $p < 0.0001$). In other words, prevalence of anemia among children varies significantly among the states.

Anemia is slightly more prevalent among males (53%) than females (52%). Among the severely anemic children, 85% are in rural areas compared to 15% in urban areas. Similarly, 79% of moderately anemic children and 75% of mildly anemic children live in rural areas. Muslim children have the highest prevalence rate of any form of anemia (62%) followed by 56% among Hindus. Christians have the lowest prevalence of anemia (48%). However, among the severely anemic child, 44% are Hindu, 7% Muslim, 29% are Christian (Table not shown).

Of the severely anemic cases, 62% are from households with low living standard, 27% are from medium, and 10% are from high living standard households. Interestingly, prevalence of any form of anemia is low among the mothers who cannot read or write. However, the association is not statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 6.43$, $p = .09$). Among the mothers of severely anemic children, 46% have two or less children, 36% have three to four children, and 18% have more than five children. Majority of the mothers of severely anemic children (63%) were married between the ages 18 and 26 years, 32% were married below 18 years, while 5% were married when they were above 26 years of age.

### Table 1. Prevalence of anemia by state of residence

| State          | Severely anemic | Moderately anemic | Mildly anemic | Non-anemic | Total (% anemic) |
|----------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|------------|-----------------|
| Sikkim         | 159             | 301               | 42           | 206        | 708             |
|                | 22.46%          | 42.51%            | 5.93%        | 29.10%     | 71%             |
| Arunachal Pradesh | 317             | 724               | 261          | 1,611      | 2,913           |
|                | 10.88%          | 24.85%            | 8.96%        | 55.30%     | 45%             |
| Nagaland       | 33              | 180               | 35           | 277        | 525             |
|                | 6.29%           | 34.29%            | 6.67%        | 52.76%     | 47%             |
| Manipur        | 241             | 526               | 118          | 1,198      | 2,083           |
|                | 11.57%          | 25.25%            | 5.66%        | 57.51%     | 42%             |
| Mizoram        | 51              | 258               | 57           | 296        | 662             |
|                | 7.70%           | 38.97%            | 8.61%        | 44.71%     | 55%             |
| Tripura        | 67              | 181               | 20           | 93         | 361             |
|                | 18.56%          | 50.14%            | 5.54%        | 25.76%     | 74%             |
| Meghalaya      | 22              | 55                | 17           | 105        | 199             |
|                | 11.06%          | 27.64%            | 8.54%        | 52.76%     | 47%             |
| Assam          | 334             | 1,189             | 136          | 1,026      | 2,685           |
|                | 12.44%          | 44.28%            | 5.07%        | 38.21%     | 62%             |
| Total (crude %)| 1,224           | 3,414             | 686          | 4,812      | 10,136          |
|                | (12%)           | (34%)             | (6%)         | (48%)      |                 |

Note: Overall Pearson’s chi-square statistics value is 622.84 with a $p$-value of <0.0001. We found statistically significant association between state of residence and anemia level.
Results of bivariate analysis are presented in Table 2. We observe that there is a statistically significant association between the level of anemia (severe, moderate, mild, and none) and religion of the respondents \((p < 0.0001)\), and place of residence \((p < 0.0001)\), and between the level of anemia and age of mother at marriage \((p = 0.0425)\). There is no statistically significant association found between anemia level and household living standard, sex of child, literacy of mother, total children ever born to mother, and age of the child (months). Owing to this, we investigate the relationship between anemia level and the variables cited above using multilevel polytomous logistic regression.

### 6.2. Multivariate analysis

In multivariate analysis, the fitted models along with the estimated effects and their standard errors are presented in Table 4. We used Laplace estimation method so that we can compare the models based on negative 2 log likelihood \((-2LL)\) or the deviance test. The last row of Table 4 shows the \(p\)-values for the deviance test based on Chi-square statistic.

We consider five difference models and they are presented in Table 3. Notice that Model 1 is nested under Model 2, which in essence is nested under Model 3, and this in turn is nested under Model 4, and again Model 4 nested under Model 5. This allows us to compare these models based on \(-2LL\). We found Model 3 to be better than Model 1 as the drop in \(-2LL\) is statistically significant \((p < 0.0001)\), and Model 3 to be better than Model 2 \((p = 0.0452)\) as well. Models 4 and 5 include more variables and thus reduce the \(-2LL\) values further. However, the gain in reduction of \(-2LL\) is not statistically significant enough to consider them for our analysis. We, therefore, resort to Model 3 and use this model to answer our research questions.

In regard to our first research question about the likelihood of being at or below a given hemoglobin level (indicative of anemia level) at a given household, we consider the fixed effects estimates provided under Model 1 of Table 4. The estimated effects in Table 4 (Model 1) are the log-odds of being at or below a hemoglobin level with typical background characteristics (no covariates in the model). We use these estimates to calculate the predictive probability (PP) of a child being at or below a hemoglobin level. For example, the probability of being at or below severely low hemoglobin level (i.e. severely anemic) for a given child with average background characteristics (with no covariate in the model) is

\[
P \text{(being at or below severe anemic level)} = \frac{e^{\gamma}}{1 + e^{\gamma}} = \frac{e^{-1.95}}{1 + e^{-1.95}} = \frac{0.1423}{1 + 0.1423} = 0.1247
\]

Similarly, the probability of being at or below moderately anemic level is 0.4825 and at or below mildly anemic is 0.5523. These are cumulative probabilities of being at or below a given level of anemia. In order to obtain the exact probability of being at a given level, we have to subtract the adjacent probabilities. For example, the predicted probability of being at or below severely anemic level is 0.1247, at the moderately anemic level is \((0.4825 - 0.1247 =) 0.3578\), and at the mild anemic level is \((0.5523 - 0.4825 =) 0.0698\). Also, probability of being non-anemic is \(1 - 0.5523 = 0.4477\).

In the second research question, we wanted to know if the likelihood of being at or below each level of hemoglobin (i.e. anemia level) varies across state of residence. To answer this question, we estimated the covariance parameter for the variable “state.” The estimated intercept for “state” is 0.2015 \((z = 1.94, p = 0.0263)\). Thus, there exists a statistically significant variation across states for the likelihood of being at or below a hemoglobin level. Additionally, the intra-class correlation coefficient (ICC) was computed using the covariance parameter estimate for the state \((0.2015)\). The ICC indicates how much of the total variation in the probability of being at or below a hemoglobin level is due to the variation among the states. Following the procedure of (Snijders & Bosker, 1999), we calculate ICC as:
Table 2. Frequency distribution of anemia level by the predictors of anemia. The first column shows chi-square test for independence; the cells represent the frequency (first row), row percentage (second row). The last column shows crude odds ratio for overall anemia.

| Variables (Chi-square and p-value) | Severely anemic | Moderately anemic | Mildly anemic | Non-anemic | Crude odds ratio |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------|-----------------|
| Place of residence               |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Chi-square = 27.16               |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| $p < 0.0001$                      |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Rural                            | 1,035           | 2,705             | 516           | 3,818      | 1.04            |
| 12.82%                           | 33.50%          | 6.39%             | 47.29%        |            |                 |
| Urban (ref)                      | 189             | 709               | 170           | 994        |                 |
| 9.17%                            | 34.38%          | 8.24%             | 48.21%        |            |                 |
| Religion                          |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Chi-square = 166.35              |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| $p < 0.0001$                      |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Hindu                            | 537             | 1,330             | 238           | 1,667      | 1.23*           |
| 14.24%                           | 35.26%          | 6.31%             | 44.19%        |            |                 |
| Muslim                           | 83              | 442               | 48            | 350        | 1.59*           |
| 8.99%                            | 47.89%          | 5.20%             | 37.92%        |            |                 |
| Christian                        | 352             | 1,050             | 245           | 1,824      | 0.88            |
| 10.14%                           | 30.25%          | 7.06%             | 52.55%        |            |                 |
| Others (ref)                     | 252             | 592               | 155           | 971        |                 |
| 12.79%                           | 30.05%          | 7.87%             | 49.29%        |            |                 |
| Household living standard        |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Chi-square = 8.33                |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| $p = 0.2146$                      |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Low (ref)                        | 764             | 2,031             | 400           | 2,956      |                 |
| 12.42%                           | 33.02%          | 6.50%             | 48.06%        |            |                 |
| Medium                           | 336             | 999               | 199           | 1,312      | 1.01            |
| 11.81%                           | 35.10%          | 6.99%             | 46.10%        |            |                 |
| High                             | 124             | 384               | 87            | 544        | 1.08            |
| 10.89%                           | 33.71%          | 7.64%             | 47.76%        |            |                 |
| Sex of child                     |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Chi-square = 2.08                |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| $p = 0.3548$                      |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Male                             | 636             | 1,772             | 368           | 2,453      | 1.08            |
| 12.16%                           | 33.89%          | 7.04%             | 46.91%        |            |                 |
| Female (ref)                     | 588             | 1,642             | 318           | 2,359      |                 |
| 11.98%                           | 33.46%          | 6.48%             | 48.07%        |            |                 |
| Literacy of Mother               |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Chi-square = 6.43                |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| $p = 0.923$                      |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Can read & write (ref)           | 692             | 2,024             | 385           | 2,771      |                 |
| 11.78%                           | 34.47%          | 6.56%             | 47.19%        |            |                 |
| Can’t read & write               | 497             | 1,257             | 276           | 1,867      | 0.97            |
| 12.75%                           | 32.26%          | 7.08%             | 47.91%        |            |                 |
| Total children ever born to mother|                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Chi-square = 9.72                |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| $p = 0.1366$                      |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Up to two children               | 548             | 1,444             | 276           | 2,014      | 0.91            |
| 12.80%                           | 33.72%          | 6.45%             | 47.03%        |            |                 |
| Three or four children           | 423             | 1,214             | 271           | 1,805      | 0.97            |
| 11.39%                           | 32.70%          | 7.30%             | 46.61%        |            |                 |
| Five or above children (ref)     | 218             | 623               | 114           | 819        |                 |
| 12.29%                           | 35.12%          | 6.43%             | 46.17%        |            |                 |
| Age at marriage                  |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Chi-square = 13.03               |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| $p = 0.0425$                      |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Below 18 years                   | 384             | 1,016             | 183           | 1,556      | 1.03            |
| 12.23%                           | 32.37%          | 5.83%             | 49.57%        |            |                 |
| 18 to 26 years                   | 768             | 2,090             | 445           | 2,846      | 0.91            |
| 12.20%                           | 34.10%          | 7.26%             | 46.43%        |            |                 |
| Above 26 Years (ref)             | 57              | 175               | 33            | 236        |                 |
| 11.38%                           | 34.93%          | 6.59%             | 47.11%        |            |                 |
| Age of child in months           |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| Chi-square = 5.07                |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| $p = 0.1669$                      |                 |                   |               |            |                 |
| >48 months                       | 499             | 1,477             | 313           | 2,034      | 1.03            |
| 11.54%                           | 34.17%          | 7.24%             | 47.05%        |            |                 |
| <48 months                       | 725             | 1,937             | 373           | 2,778      |                 |
| 12.47%                           | 33.32%          | 6.42%             | 47.79%        |            |                 |

*Significant results based on 95% confidence interval for the odds ratio.
Table 3. Model-building strategies

| Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 | Model 5 |
|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| No predictors but only random effects for the “state” | Model 1 + level-1 fixed effects that are related to maternal characteristics such as number of children ever born (2 or less, 3–4, and 5 or more) and age at marriage (below 18, 18–26, and above 26 years). | Model 2 + age of the child (months) | Model 3 + level-1 fixed effects religion and literacy of mother | Model 4 + sex of child (male/female), household living standard (low, medium, and high), and place of residence (urban/rural) |
| Results used to determine the percentage variation in anemia level explained by the level-2 units (state of residence) | Results indicate the relationship between level-1 (household level) predictors and the anemia level | Results indicate if addition of child’s age improves the fit. | Results indicate whether addition of demographic variables improves the model fit | Results indicate whether addition of SES variables improves the model fit |

Table 4. Estimates for two-level multinomial logistic regression models for predicting anemia level (N = 10,136)

| Fixed effects | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 | Model 4 | Model 5 |
|---------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Intercept 1 (severely anemic) | −1.95* (0.16) | −2.29* (0.19) | −2.35* (0.19) | −2.42* (0.20) | −2.23* (0.23) |
| Intercept 2 (moderately anemic) | −0.07 (0.16) | −0.42 (0.19) | −0.48* (0.19) | −0.55 (0.20) | −0.37 (0.23) |
| Intercept 3 (mildly anemic) | 0.21 (0.16) | −0.14 (0.19) | −0.19 (0.19) | −0.27 (0.20) | −0.08 (0.23) |
| Age at marriage | 0.12* (0.04) | 0.12* (0.04) | 0.12* (0.04) | 0.12* (0.04) | 0.12* (0.04) |
| Total children ever born | 0.08* (0.03) | 0.09* (0.03) | 0.08* (0.03) | 0.08* (0.03) | 0.08* (0.03) |
| Age of child (<48 months) | −0.08* (0.04) | 0.08* (0.04) | 0.08* (0.04) | 0.08* (0.04) | 0.08* (0.04) |
| Religion | 0.03 (0.02) | 0.02 (0.02) | 0.03 (0.02) | 0.02 (0.02) | 0.03 (0.02) |
| Literacy of mother | 0.02 (0.04) | 0.003 (0.04) | 0.02 (0.04) | 0.003 (0.04) | 0.02 (0.04) |
| Household living standard | −0.02 (0.03) | −0.02 (0.03) | −0.02 (0.03) | −0.02 (0.03) | −0.02 (0.03) |
| Place of residence | −0.06 (0.05) | −0.06 (0.05) | −0.06 (0.05) | −0.06 (0.05) | −0.06 (0.05) |
| Sex of child | −0.03 (0.04) | −0.03 (0.04) | −0.03 (0.04) | −0.03 (0.04) | −0.03 (0.04) |
| Error variance | Intercept 0.2015* (0.10) | 0.2015* (0.10) | 0.2015* (0.10) | 0.2015* (0.10) | 0.2015* (0.10) |
| Model fit | −2LL | 23,063.22 | 22,228.13** (p < 0.0001) | 22,224.12** (p = 0.0452) | 22,222.03 (p = 0.3517) |
| | | | | | 22,218.83 (p = 0.3618) |

Note: Entries in the table are estimated effects while the standard errors are reported in the parenthesis.

*Level of significance at p < 0.05.

**Significant LR test; ICC = 0.0577. PROC GLIMMIX in SAS 9.4 with Laplace estimation method was used.

\[
\text{ICC} = \frac{r_{00}}{r_{00} + 3.29} = \frac{0.2015}{0.2015 + 3.29} = 0.0577
\]
The ICC = 0.0577 indicates that approximately 6% of the total variation in the response is accounted for by the states. Thus, the remaining 94% variability is due to the variation within the respondents/households and other unknown factors.

Finally, to answer our last research question, we use the best fit model (Model 3) as discussed earlier. Model 3 contains three significant covariates (age at marriage, number of children ever born, and age of the child in months). We find significant effect of age at marriage ($\hat{\beta} = 0.12, p = 0.04$), number of children ever born ($\hat{\beta} = 0.09, p = 0.03$), and age of the child ($\hat{\beta} = 0.08, p = 0.04$). The estimates for mother’s age at marriage and the number children ever born have positive effects on the log odds, whereas age of child has a negative effect. This implies if the age at marriage increases by one unit, the corresponding change in the log odds is 0.12. Similarly, a unit increase in the number of children ever born to mother increases the log odds by 0.09, and getting 48 months or older reduces the log odds by 0.08 units. In other words, age at marriage and number of children born to women increase the probability of being at the severely anemic level. On the other hand, increase in age of the child decreases the probability of being at a given anemia level. Since we have four levels for the outcome variables, we have three intercepts as shown in Table 4. We performed significance tests for these fixed intercepts and they were all found to be significant (result not shown). We calculated odds ratio for these predictors for easier interpretation. For age at marriage (OR = 1.13, 95% CI: 1.05, 1.21), one unit increase in age at marriage results in 1.13 times increase of having lower hemoglobin level (i.e. becoming more anemic). For number of children even born (OR = 1.09, 95% CI: 1.03, 1.15), one unit increase in the number of children born to women inflates the odds of having low hemoglobin level (indicating severely anemic) by 1.09. On the other hand, age of the child (OR = 0.92, 95% CI: 0.86 – 1.00) indicates odds of being at a lower hemoglobin level and decreases if the child is 48 months or older.

Using Model 3, the predicted probability of being at a given anemia level can be calculated following the formula given in Equation (3).

7. Discussion

Detection of the risk factors is detrimental to planning and implementation of programs to eradicate child anemia, especially in those groups where prevalence is very high. Our analysis suggests that childhood anemia is highly prevalent in the northeastern states of India. The overall prevalence of anemia in children in the northeastern states is 53%. There are important and significant relationships between anemia and some of the selected potential risk factors. Bivariate analysis suggests that there is no significant association between anemia level and household living standard, sex of child, literacy of mother, total children ever born to mother, and age of the child (months), whereas results from multivariate analysis show that age of the child, mother’s age at marriage, and number of children ever born have significant effects on child anemia. We also found statistically significant variation across states for the chance of being at or below a certain hemoglobin level. The intra-class correlation coefficient, ICC = 0.0577, indicates approximately 6% of the total variation in the response variable explained by the state of residence. This is a sizeable contribution in explaining the total variability in the response variable.

In contrary to our findings, several other studies (le Cessie et al., 2002; Unsal, Bor, Tozun, Dinleyici, & Erenturk, 2007) indicated that male children were at greater risk of anemia than female children. Also, children living in rural areas were at greater risk of anemia as compared to their urban counterparts. Results also show that children belonging to households with low and medium standards of living index are more susceptible to anemia compared to their counterparts which corroborates the findings in Brazil and other countries (Assunção et al., 2007; Mamiro et al., 2005). We also notice that there is a declining tendency of the prevalence of anemia after two years of age. This may be due to the iron intake which improves with age as a result of a more varied diet, including the introduction of meat and other hemoglobin-containing diets.
Interestingly, the prevalence of any form of anemia is low among illiterate mothers. Results also indicate that the highest prevalence rate of any form of anemia was among the Muslim children (62%) followed by Hindus (56%) and Christians (48%). The reason might be that the children from Muslim and Hindu religions are from lowest quintiles and illiterate mothers. The fertility of the mother impacted anemia in children i.e. the higher number of children of the mother increases the requirement for childcare, demand for food, and inadequate supply of nutritional diet to all the children which ultimately make the children more vulnerable to the risk of anemia (Singh & Patra, 2014).

Mother's age at marriage had also a considerable effect on anemia in their children. Children of women who got married between 18 and 26 years were at greater risk of anemia (Agho, Dibley, D’Este, & Gibberd, 2008; Unsal et al., 2007).

The results from this study indicate that ignoring the hierarchical nature of the data could result in over statement of the significance of some of the variables included in the model. Most importantly, the standard errors would be biased downward. Anemia is a widespread health problem in India, especially in less developed regions like northeastern states of India. The strength of the paper is that it provides important information for policy-makers, program planners, and implementers that seek to reduce childhood anemia in northeastern states of India. The study findings have some important and relevant policy messages. High prevalence of mild and moderate anemia demands multiple interventions and strategies to tackle the burden of anemia. Special policies must be formulated and executed for prevention of anemia.

The present study demonstrates the endemicity of childhood anemia in northeastern states of India which may be due biological, social, and cultural factors. However, in this study, mother’s age at marriage and the number of children ever born are the factors significantly associated with anemia in children. Results also suggest that age of the child is also a significant predictor, as the child ages to 48 months or more, the likelihood of severe anemia decreases. This study throws light on the fact that anemia intervention needs to focus more at state level followed by individual level. The limitations of the study are that indicators such as mother’s anemia level, serum ferritin, dietary intake, worm infestations, malaria, and infectious diseases (Sinha, Deshmukh, & Garg, 2008) have not been considered.
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