# Risk Factors for Non-Syndromic Cleft Lip and Palate in Bangladesh: A Cross-Sectional Study

Mohammad Mihrab Chowdhury*[a,b], Miftah Chowdhury*[c], Nusrat Tabassum[a,b], Abu Hossain Md Moinul Ahsan[c], Farjana Tanni[d], Bijoy Krishna Das[f], Abul Masud Md. Nurul Karim[e]

[a] *Center for Public Health Modeling and Response, Clemson University, Clemson, SC, USA*
[b] *Department of Public Health, Clemson University, Clemson, SC, USA*
[c] *Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, Bangladesh*
[d] *Islami Bank Hospital, Dhaka, Bangladesh*
[e] *Department of Epidemiology, National Institute of Preventive and Social Medicine, Dhaka, Bangladesh*
[f] *Department of Pediatric Surgery, Evercare Hospital, Dhaka, Bangladesh*

**Abstract**

Cleft lip and/or palate (CL/P) are among the most common congenital craniofacial anomalies. It arises from the incomplete fusion of facial structures during early embryonic development. CL/P can be non-syndromic (NSCL/P) or syndromic (SCL/P). NSCL/P accounts for more than half of all cases and results from genetic and environmental factors. The prevalence and risk factors vary across populations, shaped by cultural, socioeconomic, and healthcare differences. In Bangladesh, an estimated 275,000 to 300,000 people live with CL/P, many without access to timely surgical or preventive care(Ghani et al., 2004).

This study investigated risk factors associated with NSCL/P in children treated at the pediatric surgery unit of Care Hospital in Mohammadpur, Dhaka. Data were collected over 12 months through structured interviews and medical record reviews. Analysis revealed that parental education, maternal age, birth order, gender and economic conditions were significantly associated with increased risk of NSCL/P. These findings underscore the significance of socioeconomic factors and early maternal age in preventing cleft conditions. Therefore, raising awareness about modifiable risks and improving the quality of life for affected individuals, as well as enhancing access to prenatal care, may reduce the burden of NSCL/P.

Keywords: Cleft lip and palate, nonsyndromic cleft lip and palate, Risk factors, Parental education, Birth order, Bangladesh

## 1. Introduction

Cleft lip and/or palate (CL/P) affect thousands of newborns globally each year, making them a leading type of birth defect (Putri et al., 2024; Mossey et al., 2009; Vanderas, 1987). These malformations involve a spectrum of subtypes, from isolated cleft lip (CL) or cleft palate (CP) to more complex presentations involving both structures. These conditions result from the incomplete or absence of fusion of the maxillary prominences and nasal processes, which are essential for forming the upper lip and palate (Berkowitz, 2006; Vyas et al., 2020). This failure in fusion during embryonic development leads to the characteristic clefts observed in CL/P (Martinelli et al., 2020). CL/P is broadly classified into non-syndromic cleft lip and/or palate (NSCL/P) and syndromic cleft lip and/or palate (SCL/P) (Nasreddine et al., 2021). NSCL/P represents clefts that occur without associated anomalies and constitutes approximately 54.8% of all cleft cases. In contrast, SCL/P accounts for about 27.2% of cases, with an additional 18% representing isolated CPs (Nurwiadh et al., 2023; Calzolari et al., 2004; Adewale et al., 2023; Calzolari et al., 2007). Despite extensive research, genetic and environmental mechanisms underlying CL/P are not fully understood, reflecting the complexity and variability of these conditions (Dixon et al., 2011; Fraser, 1970; Lidral and Murray, 2004; Fogh-Andersen, 1967).

The etiology of CL/P is multifactorial, involving a combination of genetic and environmental factors that disrupt normal embryonic development (Hong et al., 2021). Genetic predispositions are known to contribute to the risk of CL/P, but environmental influences also play a critical role. Key environmental risk factors include maternal smoking, alcohol consumption, use of certain medications, and exposure to infectious agents during pregnancy (Trezena et al., 2023; Alghamdi et al., 2024; Xu et al., 2018; Bezerra et al., 2015). Among these, maternal smoking is a well-established risk factor for CL/P, with estimates suggesting it accounts for up to 20% of the population-attributable risk in some studies (Inchingolo et al., 2022; Sabbagh et al., 2023). However, the influence of environmental determinants varies across populations due to cultural, dietary, and socio-economic factors. For example, maternal smoking is a dominant risk factor in Western countries but not relevant in the context of south asian countries (Dien et al., 2018; Tajrin et al., 2024; Figueiredo et al., 2015). Other elements such as malnutrition, exposure to toxins, and poor prenatal care play a larger role in south asian countries(Sabbagh et al., 2023).

Beyond its physical manifestations, CL/P significantly affects both immediate health outcomes and long-term psychological and social well-being. Infants with CL/Ps often face significant breastfeeding challenges due to disrupted sucking reflexes. Approximately 73% of infants with CL/Ps experience moderate to extreme difficulties with breastfeeding(Bessell et al., 2011; Spriestersbach et al., 1973; Hooper et al., 2002). These difficulties can result in inadequate nutritional intake, poor weight gain, prolonged feeding times, and an increased risk of complications such as choking and nasal regurgitation (Asparini et al., 2023). These early struggles not only affect physical development but also contribute to parental stress. As children grow, CL/P-related speech impairments, social stigma, and self-esteem issues further impact their psychological well-being. The visible nature of these anomalies can lead to social exclusion, bullying, and negative societal perceptions (Farshidfar et al., 2023; Chung et al., 2019; Adeyemo et al., 2016). Parents may fear judgment, while young individuals with untreated clefts may struggle with social and romantic acceptance.

Globally, CL/P affects approximately 1 in every 700 live births, though prevalence varies significantly across ethnic and geographic populations (Putri et al., 2024). The highest rates are observed among Asian and Native American groups (around 1 in 500 live births), fol-

lowed by European-derived populations (1 in 1,000), while African-derived populations show the lowest incidence (about 1 in 2,500) (Alghamdi et al., 2024; Dixon et al., 2011; Leslie and Marazita, 2013; Maranhão et al., 2021). According to the Global Burden of Disease (GBD) study, oceania reports the highest rates of cleft palate only (CPO), whereas Sub-Saharan Africa records the lowest (Modell, 2012; Mossey et al., 2009). Similarly, data from EUROCAT registries in Europe show marked variation, with Finland and Malta reporting the highest CPO rates and Portugal and Romania the lowest (Martinelli et al., 2020; Maranhão et al., 2021). Within South and Southeast Asia, regional disparities are also pronounced. For instance, in Pakistan, Punjab accounts for the majority of CL/P cases (Sharif et al., 2019), and studies in India (e.g., Chennai and Gujarat) confirm a higher male prevalence and variation in cleft types (Yow et al., 2021; Shivlani et al., 2023; Neela et al., 2019). Nepal reports an annual CL/P prevalence of 1.64 per 1,000 live births, with a higher incidence in females(Singh et al., 2012). Comparable trends have been noted in the Palestinian Territories, Taiwan, the Philippines, Thailand, Singapore, and Malaysia—where CL/P is more common among males and often associated with low birth weight (Zhou et al., 2023; Yow et al., 2021).

Due to its frequency, non-syndromic cleft lip and/or palate (NSCL/P) is often considered a more pressing concern than syndromic forms (SCL/P) in public health and clinical research. Children with NSCL/P frequently face feeding difficulties that can lead to malnutrition and growth delays (Wu et al., 2022). Several studies have documented abnormal weight and height patterns among these children (Bowers et al., 1987; Gopinath and Muda, 2005; Marques et al., 2015). Because NSCL/P occurs without other congenital anomalies, identifying its causes is more complex. Moreover, treatment for NSCL/P management demands prenatal screening, surgical care, and long-term therapies like speech and nutritional support. This places a significant burden on healthcare systems. In Bangladesh, approximately 275,000 to 300,000 people live with CL/P (Ghani et al., 2004). However, despite the burden, there is limited research on the prevalence and risk factors of NSCL/P in Bangladesh. Given the country's unique socioeconomic and healthcare challenges, understanding local determinants is essential for developing targeted prevention and intervention strategies.

This study aims to identify contributing factors for healthcare interventions, specifically for NSCL/P in Bangladesh. It examines maternal, paternal, family, environmental, birth-related, and socio-demographic factors associated with NSCL/P. Understanding these factors is crucial to reducing the incidence of NSCL/P and alleviating its physical, psychological, and social burdens on affected individuals and their families. Early detection and intervention can significantly improve treatment outcomes by ensuring timely surgical corrections, speech therapy, and nutritional support (Eckstein et al., 2011; Klassen et al., 2012; de Oliveira et al., 2015; Marcusson et al., 2001). Data collection for this study was conducted over 12 months, from January 1 to December 31, 2023, from the pediatric surgery unit of Care Hospital and Diagnostic Center in Mohammadpur, Dhaka. A non-probability sampling method was used, collecting data through confidential interviews and record reviews with voluntary participation By using both univariate and multivariate analyses, we assess associations between potential risk factors and cleft subtypes. The findings will help inform future prevention strategies, promote timely interventions, and support improved maternal and child health outcomes in similar contexts.

## 2. Methods

### *2.1. Study design and Data Sources*

The study framework categorizes variables into five major risk factors associated with non-syndromic cleft lip and/or palate (NSCL/P): maternal factors, paternal and family factors, environmental factors, birth-related factors, and socio-demographic factors. Maternal factors include prenatal conditions such as diabetes, anaemia, folic acid consumption, smoking, tobacco usage, medicine, and exposure to toxins during the first trimester, while paternal and family factors focus on paternal and family member smoking. Environmental factors consider maternal exposure to hazardous substances, insecticides and radiation. Birth-related factors include mode of delivery, birth order, and blood group. Socio-demographic factors encompass the child's age, sex, religion, parental age, education, family history, birth defect, and economic status.(Natsume et al., 2000; Putri et al., 2024; Jamilian et al., 2017; Mossey et al., 2009; Molina-Solana et al., 2013). The dependent variable is the presence of NSCL/P. The computational framework in Figure 1 illustrates how these five categories interact, with arrows indicating their influence on NSCL/P development. This visualization highlights the multifactorial nature of NSCL/P and serves as a conceptual guide for identifying key contributors.

After obtaining ethical approval (NIPSOM/IRB/2023/06) from the National Institute of Preventive and Social Medicine (NIPSOM), Dhaka, Bangladesh, data was collected over 12 months (January 1 to December 31, 2023) using structured questionnaires, face-to-face interviews, and record reviews. Interviews were conducted in a designated private room to ensure confidentiality and privacy, with no invasive procedures or biological samples collected. Before participation, respondents were provided with detailed study information, and informed written consent was obtained. Each interview lasted approximately 20 minutes, and all responses were carefully documented. More details about the questionnaire are available in Appendix A.




Figure 1: Computational Framework of non-syndromic cleft lip and/or palate.

Following data collection, responses were checked for consistency and completeness and then de-identified before analysis. SPSS (Version 23) and Python 3.4.1 is used for analysis(Python Software Foundation, 2023; IBM Corp., 2023). We used frequency runs to examine the dataset for missing values and omitted them to maintain the integrity of the analysis. The structured approach to data processing enabled a comprehensive evaluation, supporting evidence-based recommendations for the NSCL/P.

### 2.2. Data Analysis Methods

We used both descriptive and inferential statistics to look at the links between possible risk factors and NSCL/P. Chi-square tests were used to identify significant associations between categorical variables. We used Generalized Linear Models (GLMs), including logistic regression, Poisson regression with robust standard errors, and log-binomial models for univariate analysis. Logistic regression was conducted to assess the strength and direction in the risk factors, adjusting for potential confounders. We applied log-binomial models to estimate relative risks, improving interpretability and accounting for the limitations of odds ratios in common outcomes. Poisson regression with robust standard errors was also used as an alternative approach which is works particularly good when dataset is small (Zou, 2004). Together, these models provided complementary insights and strengthened the validity of the findings (Barros and Hirakata, 2003).

## 3. Result

### 3.1. Descriptive Analysis

**Distribution of NSCL/P**

The study examined the distribution ofNSCL/P among 400 respondents. The findings indicate that the majority of individuals, 268 (67.0%), presented with both non-syndromic cleft lip and palate (NSCLP), while 76 (19.0%) had non-syndromic cleft palate only (NSCP), and 56 (14.0%) had non-syndromic cleft lip only (NSCL)(Table 1). These results highlight that combined NSCLP is the predominant presentation among the study population.

| Distribution of NSCL/P | Frequency (f) | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| NSCL only | 56 | 14.0 |
| NSCLP | 268 | 67.0 |
| NSCP only | 76 | 19.0 |
| **Total** | **400** | **100.0** |

Table 1: Distribution of respondents according to their type of NSCL/P

Among individuals diagnosed with NSCL (n=56), left-sided clefts were the most common (51.8%). Right-sided clefts were observed in 39.3%, while bilateral clefts were the least frequent, occurring in only 8.9% (Table 2). This suggests a slight preference for lateralization toward the left side in NSCL.

| Cleft Lip Laterality | Frequency (f) | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Left-sided cleft lip | 29 | 51.8 |
| Right-sided cleft lip | 22 | 39.3 |
| Bilateral cleft lip | 5 | 8.9 |
| **Total** | **56** | **100.0** |

Table 2: Distribution of cleft lip laterality among individuals with NSCL only

In the subgroup of individuals with both NSCLP (n=268), the cleft was positioned on the left side in 39.9% of cases, making it the most prevalent orientation. Right-sided clefts were reported in 31.0%, whereas bilateral clefts accounted for 32.7% of cases (Table 3). The observed predominance of left-sided clefts is consistent with prior findings in cleft-related epidemiological studies(Asparini et al., 2023; Yow et al., 2021).

| Both Cleft Lip and Palate | Frequency (f) | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Left side cleft | 107 | 39.9 |
| Right-sided cleft | 83 | 31.0 |
| bilateral clefts | 78 | 32.7 |
| **Total** | **268** | **100.0** |

Table 3: Distribution of NSCLP among respondents

Analysis of NSCP positioning among 344 affected individuals revealed that a vast majority (316; 91.9%) exhibited involvement of both the hard and soft palate (Table 4). The high proportion of combined hard and soft palate involvement suggests a more complex morphological presentation, which may have implications for treatment planning and speech outcomes.

| Position of Cleft Palate | Frequency (f) | Percentage (%) |
|---|---|---|
| Both hard and soft palate | 316 | 91.9 |
| Only soft palate | 28 | 8.1 |
| **Total** | **344** | **100.0** |

Table 4: Distribution of NSCP position among respondents

### *3.2. Study Population Characteristics*

The study population consisted of 251 males (62.75%) and 149 females (37.25%), suggesting a higher prevalence of cleft conditions among males. The most common order of birth among affected individuals was first born (41.5%), followed by second born (33.0%). Regarding the mode of delivery, the cesarean section (58.25%) was more common than the normal vaginal delivery (41.50%). The majority of mothers (72.25%) were between 20–34 years of age.

Parental education showed that more than half of the mothers (54.25%) and fathers (52.75%) had education levels up to Class 10, while only 17.50% of mothers and 21.00% of fathers had higher education (Honors and above). However, missing data were present in several key variables, affecting their interpretability. Family history of cleft conditions was reported in only 4.25% of cases, reducing its reliability for genetic risk analysis, and blood relation was present in 10.75% of cases. Blood group information was unavailable for 75.00% of respondents, making it difficult to assess its association with cleft conditions. Maternal diabetes (16.25% missing) and maternal anemia (15.00% missing) also had incomplete reporting. Apart from missing data, certain variables were highly skewed, limiting their statistical significance. Birth defects were absent in 93.25% of cases, making it difficult to analyze their association with cleft conditions. Similarly, maternal tobacco use (94.25% reported no use), maternal smoking (99.50% reported no use), maternal diabetes (80.25% reported no), and maternal insecticide exposure (86.75% reported no exposure) were predominantly one-sided, reducing their value as predictive factors. Given these limitations, we did not consider: religion, child age, maternal tobacco use, maternal smoking, maternal diabetes, maternal insecticide exposure, family history, blood groups, and maternal anemia in our analysis. The complete study population characteristics are summarized in Table 5.

| Variable | Category | Frequency | Proportion (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Sex | Male | 251 | 62.75 |
| | Female | 149 | 37.25 |
| Blood group | Missing | 300 | 75.00 |
| | B+ | 33 | 8.25 |
| | A+ | 30 | 7.50 |
| | O+ | 26 | 6.50 |
| | O- | 3 | 0.75 |
| | A- | 3 | 0.75 |
| | ab+ | 3 | 0.75 |
| | ab- | 2 | 0.50 |
| Birth order | First | 166 | 41.50 |
| | Second | 132 | 33.00 |
| | Third | 85 | 21.25 |
| | Fourth or More | 17 | 4.25 |
| Mode of delivery | Cesarian Delivery | 233 | 58.25 |
| | Normal Delivery | 166 | 41.50 |
| Maternal Age | $\leq$ 19 years | 88 | 22.00 |
| | 20 years - 34 years | 289 | 72.25 |
| | $\geq$35 years | 23 | 5.75 |
| Maternal Education | Upto Class 10 | 217 | 54.25 |
| | Class 10 to HSC | 113 | 28.25 |
| | Honours and Higher | 70 | 17.50 |
| Paternal Age | $\leq$ 19 years | 4 | 1.00 |
| | 20 years - 34 years | 288 | 68.75 |
| | $\geq$ 35 years | 121 | 30.25 |
| Paternal Education | Upto Class 10 | 211 | 52.75 |
| | SSC to HSC | 105 | 26.25 |
| | Honours and Higher | 84 | 21.00 |
| Blood Relation | No | 357 | 89.25 |
| | Yes | 43 | 10.75 |
| Maternal Smoking | No | 398 | 99.50 |
| | Yes | 2 | 0.50 |
| Maternal Tobacco | No | 377 | 94.25 |
| | Yes | 23 | 5.75 |
| Paternal Smoking | No | 293 | 73.25 |
| | Yes | 107 | 26.75 |
| Family Member Smoking | No | 333 | 83.25 |
| | Yes | 67 | 16.75 |
| Abortion | No | 286 | 71.50 |
| | Yes | 114 | 28.50 |
| Birth Defect | No | 373 | 93.25 |
| | Yes | 27 | 6.75 |
| Maternal Illness | No | 301 | 75.25 |
| | Yes | 99 | 24.75 |
| Maternal Fever | No | 241 | 60.25 |
| | Yes | 158 | 39.50 |
| | Missing | 1 | 0.25 |
| Maternal Diabetes | No | 321 | 80.25 |
| | Missing | 65 | 16.25 |
| | Yes | 14 | 3.50 |
| Maternal Anemia | No | 242 | 60.50 |
| | Yes | 98 | 24.50 |
| | Missing | 60 | 15.00 |
| Maternal Folic Acid | Yes | 277 | 69.25 |
| | No | 118 | 29.50 |
| | Missing | 5 | 1.25 |
| Maternal Medicine | No | 226 | 56.50 |
| | Yes | 170 | 42.50 |
| | Missing | 4 | 1.00 |
| Maternal Insecticide | No | 347 | 86.75 |
| | Yes | 49 | 12.25 |
| | Missing | 4 | 1.00 |
| Maternal Coil | No | 217 | 54.25 |
| | Yes | 178 | 44.50 |
| | Missing | 5 | 1.25 |

| Variable | Category | Frequency | Proportion (%) |
|---|---|---|---|
| Maternal Radiation | No | 254 | 63.50 |
| | Yes | 139 | 34.75 |
| | Missing | 7 | 1.75 |
| Family History | No | 328 | 82.00 |
| | Missing | 55 | 13.75 |
| | Yes | 17 | 4.25 |
| Monthly Income | Missing | 6 | 1.5 |
| | < $20000 | 256 | 64.0 |
| | $20000 - $29999 | 77 | 19.25 |
| | ≤ $30000 | 61 | 15.25 |

Table 5: Summary of Variables with Frequency, Proportion, Unique Values, and Missing Values

### *3.3. Analysis of Contributing Factors in NSCL/P*

We used multiple regression models and chi-square tests to examine the effects of each variable and control for potential confounders. This approach gave a more precise understanding of how demographic and socioeconomic factors contribute to NSCL/P.

**Univariate**

Using the contingency table results from the chi-square test (Table 6), we found that birth order and paternal education were significantly associated with the occurrence of NSCLP. This suggests that both familial structure and socioeconomic background may influence the risk of NSCLP in newborns. In addition, paternal education was also significantly associated with cases of NSCL, reinforcing the potential role of parental educational attainment in cleft outcomes. For NSCP, however, the analysis indicated a different pattern: gender and monthly income were statistically significant factors.

| NSCL/P | Significant Variables | Chi-square Statistic | P-Value | Degress of Freedom |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| NSCL | Paternal Education | 7.427866 | 0.024381 | 2 |
| NSCLP | Birth Order | 9.093302 | 0.028076 | 3 |
| | Paternal Education | 10.016229 | 0.006683 | 2 |
| NSCP | Gender | 10.326872 | 0.001311 | 1 |
| | Monthly Income | 6.103831 | 0.047268 | 2 |

Table 6: Adjusted odds ratios for chi square statistic with different types of NSCL/P(univariate)

To refine these association, we utilized three regression models: logistic regression, poisson regression with robust variance and log-binomial model. All three models, logistic regression, poisson regression and log-binomial model (Table 7,Table 8,Table 9) yielded similar results. From the logistic regression (Table 7), we found that maternal age of 20 - 35 years acts as a protective factor compared to ≤19 years to decrease the the risk of NSCL. This suggests that younger maternal age may play a role in NSCL development. Lower maternal education significantly raised NSCL odds, emphasizing the educational background's potential impact on prenatal care and nutritional awareness. Higher paternal education (Hons and above) also showed a strong correlation (OR = 2.51, p = 0.008). This can be explained by that fathers with higher education may be more likely to seek medical care, receive proper diagnoses, or participate in follow-up. In contrast, those with no or low education might not report or even recognize clefts that aren't severe or may avoid hospitals due to stigma or cost. This can inflate reported cases among the educated group. Additionally, if higher education correlates with delayed fatherhood, this age effect might appear as an education effect specifically for NSCL (de Queiroz Herkrath et al., 2012).

| NSCL/P | Significant Variables | Reference Variable | Adjusted Odds Ratio | 95% CI | P Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NSCL | Maternal Age 2 | 1 | 0.5 | [0.33, 0.93] | 0.0283 |
| | Maternal Education 2 | 1 | 2.04 | [1.08, 3.85] | 0.028 |
| | Paternal Education 3 | 1 | 2.51 | [1.27, 4.93] | 0.008 |
| NSCLP | Paternal Education 2 | 1 | 0.55 | [0.33,0.91] | 0.019 |
| | Paternal Education 3 | 1 | 0.47 | [0.27, 0.799] | 0.005 |
| NSCP | Female | Male | 2.342 | [0.344, 1.358] | $< 0.01$ |
| | Monthly Income 2 | Monthly Income 1 | 0.6468 | [0.3102, 1.3486] | 0.2451 |
| | Monthly Income 3 | Monthly Income 1 | 1.814 | [0.9628, 3.4176] | 0.0654 |

Table 7: Adjusted odds ratios for univariate logistic regression associated with different types of NSCL/P with $p < 0.05$

| NSCL/P | Significant Variables | Reference Variable | Rate Ratio | 95% CI | P Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NSCL | Maternal age 2 | 1 | .56 | [0.34, 0.93] | .02 |
| | Maternal education 2 | 1 | 1.83 | [1.07, 3.15] | 0.02 |
| | Paternal education 3 | 1 | 2.17 | [1.24, 3.8] | 0.006 |
| NSCLP | Paternal education 2 | 1 | 0.82 | [0.69, 0.98] | 0.03 |
| | Paternal education 3 | 1 | 0.77 | [0.63, 0.95] | 0.012 |
| NSCP | Female | Male | 1.97 | [1.31, 2.95] | $< 0.01$ |
| | Birth Order 2 | 1 | 1.58 | [1.009,2.49] | 0.04 |
| | Paternal Education Group 2 | 1 | 1.58 | [0.9628, 3.4176] | 0.04 |

Table 8: Adjusted odds ratios for univariate Poisson Regression Results with Robust Variance different types of NSCL/P with $p < 0.05$

For NSCLP, paternal education is a significant determinant, with higher education levels decreasing the risk and acting as a protective factor in all three models. For NSCP, gender emerged as a major determinant, with females having significantly higher odds than males in all the models (Noorollahian et al., 2015; Putri et al., 2024). A monthly income between \$20,000 and \$29,999 appears to be protective compared to lower income levels. However, an income above \$30,000 is also associated with higher risk, possibly due to delayed fatherhood, as age-related effects have been observed (de Queiroz Herkrath et al., 2012). Morevoer, for NSCP, we found that being a second child has increased odds in the Poisson and log binomial model compared to first child. Paternal education group 2 (SSC to HSC) also acts as a risk factor in the poisson model and maternal age of 20 - 35 years in the log-binomial model. According to the literature, the association of paternal and maternal age as risk factors may differ depending on whether parental ages are examined independently or in combination, underscoring the potential variability in their observed effects(Bille et al., 2005). These findings highlight the multifactorial nature of NSCL/P development, emphasizing the influence of demographic, socioeconomic, and biological factors.

Extending our analysis to unilateral and bilateral NSCLP, we found no significant associations through chi-square tests. However, logistic, Poisson, and log-binomial regression identified birth order as a key determinant. For unilateral cases, second-born children had a higher risk than first-born. In contrast, for bilateral NSCLP, second-born children had lower odds.

**Multivariate**

Using logistic, Poisson, and log-binomial regression, variables found to be important in univariate models were further investigated through multivariate analysis (Table 10,Table 11, Table 12). For NSCP only, maternal age of 20-35 years showed a consistent protective effect across all models, while paternal education group 3 (Hons and above) was associated with increased risk. Higher paternal education (both SSC to HSC and Hons and above) and

| NSCLP | Significant Variables | Reference Variable | Rate Ratio | 95% CI | P Value |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NSCL | Maternal age 2 | 1 | 0.5 | [.27, .93] | 0.03 |
| | Maternal education 2 | 1 | 2.04 | [1.08, 3.85] | 0.03 |
| | Paternal education 3 | 1 | 2.51 | [1.28, 4.93] | 0.008 |
| NSCL/P | Paternal education 2 | 1 | 0.55 | [0.33, 0.91] | 0.019 |
| | Paternal education 3 | 1 | 0.47 | [0.28, 0.799] | 0.005n |
| NSCP | Female | Male | 2.34 | [1.41, 3.89] | $< 0.01$ |
| | Birth Order 2 | 1 | 1.79 | [1.01, 3.15] | 0.04 |
| | Maternal Age Group 2 | 1 | 2.087 | [1.02, 4.27] | 0.04 |

Table 9: Adjusted odds ratios for univariate Log-Binomial Results with Robust Variance different types of NSCL/P with $p < 0.05$

being the second child were protective in both the logistic and Poisson models for NSCLP. In the log-binomial model, paternal education group 3 (Hons and above) is protective. For NSCP only, female are a strong and consistent risk factor across all models (Noorollahian et al., 2015; Putri et al., 2024). Poisson regression also identified maternal age group 3 and paternal education group 2 as risk factor. The results of the multivariate analysis align with the univariate findings and suggest that maternal age, paternal education, sex, and birth order are key variables associated with NSCL/P(Altoé et al., 2020; Tajrin et al., 2024; Maranhão et al., 2021).

| NSCL/P | Significant Variables | Adjusted Odds Ratio | 95% CI |
|---|---|---|---|
| NSCL | Maternal Age 2 | 0.44 | [0.23, 0.86] |
| | Paternal Education 3 | 2.59 | [1.11, 6.1] |
| NSCLP | Birth Order 2 | 0.61 | [0.37, 0.99] |
| | Paternal Education 2 | 0.57 | [0.34,0.95] |
| | Paternal Education 3 | 0.49 | [0.28, 0.85] |
| NSCP | Female | 2.68 | [1.55, 4.6] |

Table 10: Adjusted odds ratios for multivariate logistic regression associated with different types of NSCL/P with $p < 0.05$

| NSCL/P | Significant Variables | Rate Ratio | 95% CI |
|---|---|---|---|
| NSCL | Maternal age 2 | .58 | [0.31, 0.86] |
| | Paternal education 3 | 2.17 | [1.15, 4.1] |
| NSCLP | Birth Order 2 | 0.84 | [0.7, 1] |
| | Paternal Education 2 | 0.84 | [0.7,0.99] |
| | Paternal Education 3 | 0.78 | [0.64, 0.96] |
| NSCP | Female | 2.11 | [1.4, 3.2] |
| | Maternal Age 3 | 2.6 | [1.03,6.3] |
| | Paternal Education Group 2 | 1.58 | [1, 2.5] |

Table 11: Adjusted odds ratios for multivariate Poisson Regression Results with Robust Variance different types of NSCL/P with $p < 0.05$.

| **NSCL/P** | Significant Variables | **Rate Ratio** | **95% CI** |
|---|---|---|---|
| NSCL | Maternal age 2 | 0.5 | [.3, .83] |
| | Paternal education 3 | 2.19 | [1.128, 4.25] |
| NSCLP | Paternal education 3 | 0.8 | [0.65, 0.96] |
| NSCP | Female | 2.05 | [1.38, 3.1] |

Table 12: Adjusted odds ratios for multivariate Log-Binomial Results with Robust Variance different types of NSCL/P with $p < 0.05$

## 4. Discussion

This study provides valuable insights into the complex and multifactorial nature of non-syndromic cleft lip and/or palate (NSCL/P). By analyzing demographic, parental, and environmental factors, we explored how socioeconomic and biological conditions shape NSCL/P risk. The findings reaffirm that NSCL/P is influenced by a combination of modifiable and non-modifiable factors, underscoring the importance of maternal care and educational interventions in prevention.

The results showed that there is a gender-based risk for NSCL/P. Females are at higher risk compared to males for NSCP. This finding aligns with previous studies suggesting that genetic, hormonal, or developmental factors may contribute in cleft palate occurrence (Noorollahian et al., 2015; Putri et al., 2024). A significant proportion of parents had only secondary education, with very few attaining higher degrees. This reflects broader structural inequities in health literacy and access to prenatal services (Dardani et al., 2020; Upadhyaya et al., 2017). While anemia was also common, its direct influence on cleft formation remains unclear, possibly due to variations in dietary intake, iron supplementation, and prenatal care quality (Chattopadhyay et al., 2021). Despite a high proportion of mothers taking folic acid supplements, no significant protective effect was observed. Differences in timing, dosage, or adherence may account for this. The finding suggests that folic acid supplementation alone may not be sufficient, and other prenatal factors should also be considered (Wilcox et al., 2007; Kelly et al., 2012). Although family history and blood relation were present in some cases, these variables were either too infrequent or incomplete to be considered strong predictors. Many environmental variables, including maternal smoking, tobacco use, and insecticide exposure, were similarly skewed or underreported, limiting their interpretability.

Univariate analysis helped identify initial associations. Birth order and paternal education were significantly associated with NSCL and NSCLP, while female sex and lower household income showed associations with NSCP. These patterns suggest that each cleft subtype may have distinct contributing factors. For example, the association of cleft palate with female children suggests potential biological or developmental differences. Multivariate regression provided more understanding of how these factors operate when adjusted for potential confounders. Maternal age between 20–34 years consistently appeared protective against NSCL, compared to maternal age $\leq$19 years. Interestingly, higher paternal education was linked to an increased risk of NSCL, a pattern not observed in NSCLP or NSCP. This may reflect greater health awareness or diagnosis-seeking behavior among more educated families, or a correlation between education and older paternal age, which itself could be a risk factor (de Oliveira et al., 2015). For NSCLP, medium to higher paternal education acted as a protective factor across all models, while being second-born was also associated with reduced odds. These patterns suggest that family structure, caregiving experience, or physiological changes in later pregnancies may influence outcomes. In the case of cleft

palate, being female increases the risk almost 2 times compared to males across all models. Poisson and log-binomial models also highlighted maternal age of 35 years and older and paternal education group 2 (SSC to HSC) as contributing risk factors. These associations suggest that NSCP may be more sensitive to both biological and parental age dynamics than other cleft types. These variations possibly reflecting varying underlying biological or environmental mechanisms (Martelli et al., 2010; Altoé et al., 2020; Upadhyaya et al., 2017; Vieira and Orioli, 2002; Martinelli et al., 2020; Bille et al., 2005). Moreover, the opposing effects of birth order on unilateral versus bilateral NSCLP—where second-born children had higher odds in unilateral but lower odds in bilateral forms.

This study offers valuable insights into the multifactorial nature of non-syndromic cleft lip and/or palate (NSCL/P), yet several limitations must be acknowledged. The data were collected from a single Smile Train-affiliated surgical center in Bangladesh and included only those individuals who sought surgical intervention, potentially limiting the generalizability of the findings to the broader population of children with NSCL/P, particularly those who remain undiagnosed, untreated, or unable to access care. The relatively modest sample size may also limit the statistical power to detect subtle associations, particularly within subgroups. Moreover, some variables were skewed or underreported such as family history, consanguinity, maternal smoking, and environmental exposures like insecticide use. Additionally, several variables—such as folic acid supplementation, iron intake, and anemia—relied on caregiver recall, introducing the potential for recall bias and misclassification. The association of maternal age (20–35 years) in only one evaluation highlights the need to examine further how male-dominated decision-making influences risk. The household head has a significant influence on maternal health behaviors, prenatal care uptake, and early diagnosis, all of which may contribute to cleft outcomes. Future research should include larger, community-based samples that encompass untreated individuals, incorporate more detailed, prospectively collected data on environmental, nutritional, and parental factors. Multi-site studies across diverse geographic and healthcare settings will support the development of more equitable and effective intervention strategies.

Together, these findings highlight the complex interplay among parental education, maternal age, birth order, and child gender in shaping the risk of non-syndromic cleft lip and/or palate (NSCL/P). While some of these factors are non-modifiable, many are closely linked to broader social determinants of health, such as access to prenatal care, health education, and socioeconomic conditions. Enhancing maternal health literacy, promoting equitable healthcare access, and reducing harmful environmental exposures during pregnancy may contribute meaningfully to the prevention of cleft conditions. Moreover, the associations observed suggest that different cleft subtypes may arise from distinct etiological pathways, emphasizing the need for a more integrated understanding of risk factors. The influence of parental age, for instance, may vary depending on whether it is considered independently or jointly, further illustrating the complexity of these relationships. These insights underscore the importance of developing refined screening approaches and targeted interventions that account for the heterogeneity within NSCL/P. By tailoring prevention and care strategies in this way, health systems can enhance early detection, address disparities, and improve long-term outcomes for children affected by cleft conditions.

## 5. Conclusions

This descriptive cross-sectional study, conducted at the pediatric surgery unit of Care Hospital in Dhaka, investigated risk factors associated with non-syndromic cleft lip and/or

palate (NSCL/P) in a sample of 400 children. The findings reinforce the multifactorial nature of NSCL/P, with significant associations observed for parental education, maternal age, and birth order. Lower educational attainment of both parents was linked to higher risk, underscoring the role of health literacy and awareness of prenatal care. Younger maternal age, particularly in adolescent mothers, was associated with increased risk, likely reflecting inadequate nutrition and limited access to antenatal services. Additionally, later birth order was linked to elevated risk, possibly due to maternal nutritional depletion or cumulative reproductive health challenges.

These results highlight the importance of addressing modifiable risk factors through targeted public health interventions. Strengthening community-level awareness, enhancing prenatal counseling, and supporting adolescent mothers with accessible healthcare and education may contribute to a reduction in preventable cleft cases. Furthermore, the observed variation in risk across cleft subtypes points to the need for more nuanced screening and intervention strategies. Future studies should aim to validate these findings using larger, population-based samples and explore more detailed environmental and biological risk factors. By integrating these insights into maternal and child health programs, healthcare systems can better support early detection, equitable care delivery, and improved outcomes for children and families affected by NSCL/P.

## 6. Ethics Statement

After obtaining ethical approval from the Ethical Review Committee of the National Institute of Preventive and Social Medicine (NIPSOM), data collection begins. Respondents are briefed, motivated to participate, and provided with a written informed consent form in Bengali, translated from English for clarity. The study's aims, objectives, risks, benefits, and confidentiality measures are explained before obtaining consent. Participants are assured that their information will remain confidential, with no identifying details published. They have the freedom to withdraw at any time, and no invasive procedures or biological sample collection are involved. Data is gathered through questionnaires, and sensitive questions are handled with care. Privacy and confidentiality are strictly maintained during interviews.

## 7. Role of the funding source

The study's funders had no role in study design, data collection, data analysis, data interpretation, or writing of the report.

## 8. Funding Source

Miftah Chowdhury is partially funded by the Bangladesh Medical Research Council (BMRC), Ministry of Health and Family Welfare, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh.

## 9. Acknowledgement

We would like to thank, Dr. Kripalini Roy, Orthodontic Surgeon, New Life Hospital Ltd, for helping with the data collection.

## References


Adewale AO, Ojikutu R, Olawale O, Olugbenga AT, Taofiq O, Olufeyisola AO (2023) Risk factors associated with cleft etiology: a multicenter experience. Saudi J Oral Dent Res 8(8):233–239

Adeyemo WL, James O, Butali A (2016) Cleft lip and palate: parental experiences of stigma, discrimination, and social/structural inequalities. Annals of maxillofacial surgery 6(2):195–203

Alghamdi SM, Aljohar AJ, Alamoudi RA, Alrejaye NS, Abdulhameed FD, Alhussain RM, AlGudaibi LY, Sabbagh HJ (2024) Assessment of non-syndromic orofacial cleft severity and associated environmental factors in saudi arabia: A cross-sectional study. The Saudi Dental Journal 36(3):480–485

Altoé SR, Borges ÁH, Neves ATdSC, Aranha AMF, Borba AM, Espinosa MM, Volpato LER (2020) Influence of parental exposure to risk factors in the occurrence of oral clefts. Journal of Dentistry 21(2):119

Asparini RR, Dirgantara SB, Hermayanti D (2023) Differences in folate and vitamin b12 serum levels between mothers whose children were diagnosed with non-syndromic cleft lip and cleft lip with palate. KnE Medicine pp 91–98

Barros AJ, Hirakata VN (2003) Alternatives for logistic regression in cross-sectional studies: an empirical comparison of models that directly estimate the prevalence ratio. BMC medical research methodology 3:1–13

Berkowitz S (2006) Cleft lip and palate. Springer

Bessell A, Hooper L, Shaw WC, Reilly S, Reid J, Glenny AM (2011) Feeding interventions for growth and development in infants with cleft lip, cleft palate or cleft lip and palate. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (2)

Bezerra J, Oliveira G, Soares C, Cardoso M, Ururahy MAG, Neto F, Lima-Neto LG, Luchessi A, Silbiger VN, Fajardo C, et al. (2015) Genetic and non-genetic factors that increase the risk of non-syndromic cleft lip and/or palate development. Oral Diseases 21(3):393–399

Bille C, Skytthe A, Vach W, Knudsen LB, Andersen AMN, Murray JC, Christensen K (2005) Parent's age and the risk of oral clefts. Epidemiology 16(3):311–316

Bowers EJ, Mayro RF, Whitaker LA, Pasquariello PS, Larossa D, Randall P (1987) General body growth in children with clefts of the lip, palate, and craniofacial structure. Scandinavian Journal of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery 21(1):7–14

Calzolari E, Bianchi F, Rubini M, Ritvanen A, Neville AJ (2004) Epidemiology of cleft palate in europe: implications for genetic research. The Cleft palate-craniofacial journal 41(3):244–249

Calzolari E, Pierini A, Astolfi G, Bianchi F, Neville AJ, Rivieri F, Group EW (2007) Associated anomalies in multi-malformed infants with cleft lip and palate: An epidemiologic study of nearly 6 million births in 23 eurocat registries. American journal of medical genetics Part A 143(6):528–537

Chattopadhyay D, Vathulya M, Naithani M, Jayaprakash PA, Palepu S, Bandyopadhyay A, Kapoor A, Nath UK (2021) Frequency of anemia and micronutrient deficiency among children with cleft lip and palate: a single-center cross-sectional study from uttarakhand, india. Archives of Craniofacial Surgery 22(1):33

Chung KY, Sorouri K, Wang L, Suryavanshi T, Fisher D (2019) The impact of social stigma for children with cleft lip and/or palate in low-resource areas: a systematic review. Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery–Global Open 7(10):e2487

Dardani C, Howe LJ, Mukhopadhyay N, Stergiakouli E, Wren Y, Humphries K, Davies A, Ho K, Weinberg SM, Marazita ML, et al. (2020) Cleft lip/palate and educational attainment: cause, consequence or correlation? a mendelian randomization study. International Journal of Epidemiology 49(4):1282–1293

Dien VH, McKinney CM, Pisek A, Pitiphat W (2018) Maternal exposures and risk of oral clefts in south vietnam. Birth defects research 110(6):527–537

Dixon MJ, Marazita ML, Beaty TH, Murray JC (2011) Cleft lip and palate: understanding genetic and environmental influences. Nature Reviews Genetics 12(3):167–178

Eckstein DA, Wu RL, Akinbiyi T, Silver L, Taub PJ (2011) Measuring quality of life in cleft lip and palate patients: currently available patient-reported outcomes measures. Plastic and reconstructive surgery 128(5):518e–526e

Farshidfar N, Ajami S, Sahmeddini S, Goli A, Foroutan HR (2023) Epidemiological and spatiotemporal descriptive analysis of patients with nonsyndromic cleft lip and/or palate: A 12-year retrospective study in southern iran. BioMed Research International 2023(1):7624,875

Figueiredo JC, Ly S, Magee KS, Ihenacho U, Baurley JW, Sanchez-Lara PA, Brindopke F, Nguyen THD, Nguyen V, Tangco MI, et al. (2015) Parental risk factors for oral clefts among central africans, southeast asians, and central americans. Birth Defects Research Part A: Clinical and Molecular Teratology 103(10):863–879

Fogh-Andersen P (1967) Genetic and non-genetic factors in the etiology of facial clefts. Scandinavian Journal of Plastic and Reconstructive Surgery 1(1):22–29

Fraser F (1970) The genetics of cleft lip and cleft palate. American journal of human genetics 22(3):336

Ghani S, Mannan A, Sen S, Uzzaman M, Harrison M (2004) The problems of establishing modern cleft lip and palate services in bangladesh. The Journal of Surgery 2(1):43–47

Gopinath V, Muda W (2005) Assessment of growth and feeding practices in children with cleft lip and palate. Southeast Asian J Trop Med Public Health 36(1):254–258

Hong Y, Xu X, Lian F, Chen R (2021) Environmental risk factors for nonsyndromic cleft lip and/or cleft palate in xinjiang province, china: A multiethnic study. The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal 58(4):489–496

Hooper L, Shaw W, Reilly S, Reid J, Glenny A, et al. (2002) Feeding interventions for growth and development in infants with cleft lip, cleft palate or cleft lip and palate.

IBM Corp (2023) Ibm spss statistics for windows. Version 23.0

Inchingolo AM, Fatone MC, Malcangi G, Avantario P, Piras F, Patano A, Di Pede C, Netti A, Ciocia AM, De Ruvo E, et al. (2022) Modifiable risk factors of non-syndromic orofacial clefts: a systematic review. Children 9(12):1846

Jamilian A, Sarkarat F, Jafari M, Neshandar M, Amini E, Khosravi S, Ghassemi A (2017) Family history and risk factors for cleft lip and palate patients and their associated anomalies. Stomatologija 19(3):78–83

Kelly D, O'Dowd T, Reulbach U (2012) Use of folic acid supplements and risk of cleft lip and palate in infants: a population-based cohort study. British Journal of General Practice 62(600):e466–e472

Klassen AF, Tsangaris E, Forrest CR, Wong KW, Pusic AL, Cano SJ, Syed I, Dua M, Kainth S, Johnson J, et al. (2012) Quality of life of children treated for cleft lip and/or palate: a systematic review. Journal of Plastic, Reconstructive & Aesthetic Surgery 65(5):547–557

Leslie EJ, Marazita ML (2013) Genetics of cleft lip and cleft palate. In: American Journal of Medical Genetics Part C: Seminars in Medical Genetics, Wiley Online Library, vol 163, pp 246–258

Lidral AC, Murray JC (2004) Genetic approaches to identify disease genes for birth defects with cleft lip/palate as a model. Birth Defects Research Part A: Clinical and Molecular Teratology 70(12):893–901

Maranhão SC, Sá J, Cangussú MCT, Coletta RD, Reis SR, Medrado AR (2021) Non-syndromic oral clefts and associated risk factors in the state of bahia, brazil. European Archives of Paediatric Dentistry 22:121–127

Marcusson A, Akerlind I, Paulin G (2001) Quality of life in adults with repaired complete cleft lip and palate. The Cleft palate-craniofacial journal 38(4):379–385

Marques IL, Nackashi J, Borgo HC, Martinelli APMC, De Souza L, De Cássia Rillo Dutka J, Williams WN, Pegoraro-Krook MI (2015) Longitudinal study of growth of children with unilateral cleft lip and palate: 2 to 10 years of age. The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal 52(2):192–197

Martelli DRB, da Cruz KW, de Barros LM, Silveira MF, Swerts MSO, Júnior HM (2010) Maternal and paternal age, birth order and interpregnancy interval evaluation for cleft lip-palate. Brazilian journal of otorhinolaryngology 76(1):107–112

Martinelli M, Palmieri A, Carinci F, Scapoli L (2020) Non-syndromic cleft palate: an overview on human genetic and environmental risk factors. Frontiers in cell and developmental biology 8:592,271

Modell B (2012) Epidemiology of oral clefts 2012: an international perspective. Cleft lip and palate Epidemiology, aetiology and treatment Frontiers in oral biology 16:1–18

Molina-Solana R, Yáñez-Vico RM, Iglesias-Linares A, Mendoza-Mendoza A, Solano-Reina E (2013) Current concepts on the effect of environmental factors on cleft lip and palate. International journal of oral and maxillofacial surgery 42(2):177–184

Mossey PA, Little J, Munger RG, Dixon MJ, Shaw WC (2009) Cleft lip and palate. The Lancet 374(9703):1773–1785

Nasreddine G, El Hajj J, Ghassibe-Sabbagh M (2021) Orofacial clefts embryology, classification, epidemiology, and genetics. Mutation Research/Reviews in Mutation Research 787:108,373

Natsume N, Kawai T, Ogi N, Yoshida W (2000) Maternal risk factors in cleft lip and palate: case control study. British Journal of Oral and Maxillofacial Surgery 38(1):23–25

Neela PK, Reddy SG, Husain A, Mohan V (2019) Association of cleft lip and/or palate in people born to consanguineous parents: A 13-year retrospective study from a very high-volume cleft center. Journal of Cleft Lip Palate and Craniofacial Anomalies 6(1):33–37

Noorollahian M, Nematy M, Dolatian A, Ghesmati H, Akhlaghi S, Khademi GR (2015) Cleft lip and palate and related factors: A 10 years study in university hospitalised patients at mashhad—iran. African Journal of Paediatric Surgery 12(4):286–290

Nurwiadh RA, Sjamsudin E, Sribudiani Y, Ichwan SJ, Sufiawati I (2023) A preliminary study on clinical profiles of non-syndromic cleft lip with or without cleft palate during community services in indonesia 2020-2022. Journal of International Dental and Medical Research 16(3):1153–1157

de Oliveira RLB, de Santana Santos T, de Almeida Teixeira JL, Martins-Filho PRS, da Silva LCF (2015) Health-related quality of life patients with a cleft lip and/or palate. Journal of Craniofacial Surgery 26(8):2315–2319

Putri FA, Pattamatta M, Anita SES, Maulina T (2024) The global occurrences of cleft lip and palate in pediatric patients and their association with demographic factors: a narrative review. Children 11(3):322

Python Software Foundation (2023) Python: A programming language. URL https://www.python.org/, version 3.4.1

de Queiroz Herkrath APC, Herkrath FJ, Rebelo MAB, Vettore MV (2012) Parental age as a risk factor for non-syndromic oral clefts: a meta-analysis. Journal of dentistry 40(1):3–14

Sabbagh HJ, Baghlaf KK, Jamalellail HM, Bakhuraybah AS, AlGhamdi SM, Alharbi OA, AlHarbi KM, Hassan MH (2023) Environmental tobacco smoke exposure and non-syndromic orofacial cleft: systematic review and meta-analysis. Tobacco Induced Diseases 21:76

Sharif F, Mahmood F, Azhar MJ, Asif A, Zahid M, Muhammad N, Rehman IU, Neil S (2019) Incidence and management of cleft lip and palate in pakistan. J Pak Med Assoc 69(5):632–639

Shivlani VI, Niranjane PP, Diagavane PS, Madhu PP (2023) Demographic profile of patients with cleft lip and palate anomaly: 15-year experience from a tertiary care hospital and teaching institute in wardha district of maharashtra, india. International Journal of Clinical Pediatric Dentistry 16(Suppl 3):278

Singh V, Sagtani R, Sagtani A (2012) Prevalence of cleft lip and cleft palate in a tertiary hospital in eastern nepal. Mymensingh Medical Journal: MMJ 21(1):151–154

Spriestersbach D, Dickson DR, Fraser FC, Horowitz SL, McWilliams BJ, Paradise JL, Randall P (1973) Clinical research in cleft lip and cleft palate: the state of the art. The Cleft palate journal 10(2):113–165

Tajrin A, Ruslin M, Rasul MI, Mubarak H, Oginawati K, Fahimah N, Tanziha I, Damayanti AD, Mukhaiyar U, Arumsari A, et al. (2024) Distribution of maternal risk factors for orofacial cleft in infants in indonesia: a multicenter prospective study. Archives of Craniofacial Surgery 25(1):11

Trezena S, Machado RA, de Almeida Reis SR, Scariot R, Rangel ALCA, de Oliveira FES, Borges AJ, Silva AT, Martelli DRB, Martelli Júnior H (2023) Isolated nonsyndromic cleft palate: multicenter epidemiological study in the brazil. BMC oral health 23(1):486

Upadhyaya DN, Reddy GP, Mishra RK, Singh AK (2017) Impact of educational and socioeconomic status of parents on healthcare access in cleft patients. Journal of Cleft Lip Palate and Craniofacial Anomalies 4(2):109–113

Vanderas AP (1987) Incidence of cleft lip, cleft palate, and cleft lip and palate among races: a review. Cleft palate J 24(3):216–225

Vieira AR, Orioli IM (2002) Birth order and oral clefts: a meta analysis. Teratology 66(5):209–216

Vyas T, Gupta P, Kumar S, Gupta R, Gupta T, Singh HP (2020) Cleft of lip and palate: A review. Journal of family medicine and primary care 9(6):2621–2625

Wilcox AJ, Lie RT, Solvoll K, Taylor J, McConnaughey DR, Åbyholm F, Vindenes H, Vollset SE, Drevon CA (2007) Folic acid supplements and risk of facial clefts: national population based case-control study. Bmj 334(7591):464

Wu X, Kuang W, Zheng J, Yang Z, Ren M, Yang R, Yuan W (2022) Skeletal maturation in patients with cleft lip and/or palate: a systematic review. The Cleft Palate-Craniofacial Journal 59(3):307–319

Xu DP, Qu Wd, Sun C, Cao RY, Liu Dw, Du Pg (2018) A study on environmental factors for nonsyndromic cleft lip and/or palate. Journal of Craniofacial Surgery 29(2):364–367

Yow M, Jin A, Yeo GSH (2021) Epidemiologic trends of infants with orofacial clefts in a multiethnic country: a retrospective population-based study. Scientific Reports 11(1):7556

Zhou X, Jiang Y, Fang J, Wang H, Xie D, Kuang H, Li T, Liu Q, He J (2023) Incidence of cleft lip and palate, and epidemiology of perinatal deaths related to cleft lip and palate in hunan province, china, 2016–2020. Scientific Reports 13(1):10,304

Zou G (2004) A modified poisson regression approach to prospective studies with binary data. American journal of epidemiology 159(7):702–706

# Appendix

## A. Questionnaire

After preliminary observation and a review of the relevant literature, a semi-structured questionnaire was developed as the primary research instrument. Initially prepared in English, the questionnaire was translated into Bangla and subsequently back-translated into English by an independent third researcher to ensure the accuracy of the translation. The questionnaire was designed using selected variables based on the specific objectives of the study. A pretest was conducted with 20 respondents at Islami Bank Hospital, Motijheel, Dhaka, and necessary revisions were made based on the feedback received. Both the English and Bangla versions of the finalized questionnaire used for data collection will be provided upon request.

The first section gathered baseline socio-demographic information, including age, sex, and religion (categorized as Islam, Hinduism, Buddhism, or Christianity). The second section captured clinical details such as the position of the cleft lip and/or palate, blood group (ABO and Rh status), birth order based on live births, and mode of delivery (normal vaginal delivery or cesarean section). The third section collected parental information, including age, educational qualifications (primary, secondary, higher secondary, graduation, post-graduation), average monthly family income (in Bangladeshi currency), history of smoking or tobacco use, history of miscarriage, disabled child births, and presence of blood relation between parents. The fourth section focused on maternal health during the first trimester, including history of infection, fever, anemia, diabetes mellitus, use of medications (iron, folic acid, and vitamins), and exposure to insecticides, mosquito coils, or x-rays.