Laterality and Completeness Patterns of Nonsyndromic Clefts in a Multiethnic Cohort

Christina Spencer[1]; Ligiane A Machado-Paula[1]; Fang Qian[1]; Azeez Butali[1]; Carmen J. Buxo-Martinez[2]; Carmencita D. Padilla[3]; Claudia Restrepo-Muneton[4]; Consuelo Valencia-Ramirez[4]; Ross E. Long[5]; Seth M. Weinberg[6]; Mary L. Marazita[6]; Jeff Murray[1]; Lina M. Moreno Uribe[1]; Aline L. Petrin[1]

1 - University of Iowa
2 - University of Puerto Rico
3 - University of the Philippines
4 - Clinica Noel, Medellin, Colombia
5 - Cleft Palate Clinic, Lancaster, PA
6 - University of Pittsburg

Corresponding author:
Aline L. Petrin
Department of Orthodontics, Iowa Institute of Oral Health Research
College of Dentistry and Dental Clinics, University of Iowa
801 Newton Rd, DSB, N406A, Iowa City, IA, USA.
Email: aline-petrin@uiowa.edu
Telephone: 319-335-6523

Acknowledgments: University of Iowa Student Research Program providing the opportunity and additional financial support for the research.

Ethical approval statement: The study was approved by the University of Iowa institutional review board (IRB# 202305391). All data used were obtained from previous IRB approved studies.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding: This work was supported by the National Institutes of Health NIDCR NIH [U01DE024425, R21DE016930, R37 DE008559, R01DE011931, R00DE024571, R01DE016148], NCBDD CDC [R01DD000295], NIGMS NIH [U54GM133807], University of Iowa Department of Orthodontics, and College of Dentistry Student Research Program.

Key words: Cleft Lip and Palate, Asymmetric Cleft, Laterality, Completeness, Unilateral Cleft Lip, Bilateral Cleft, Cleft Severity, LAHSHAL

Abstract:

Objective: Orofacial clefts may involve the complete vertical thickness of the lip (complete) or partial thickness (incomplete). This study evaluates side preference for completeness in nonsyndromic asymmetric bilateral and unilateral cleft lip with or without cleft palate (NSCL/P). **Design:** We studied 4 multiethnic cohorts from North and South America, Asia, and Africa, including 3,561 individuals with NSCL/P. Associations between cleft completeness, sex, ethnicity, and race were assessed using Chi-square or Fisher's exact test (α=0.05). **Participants:** Patients with NSCL/P with complete information on cleft type and completeness were included. Our main goal was to analyze side preference of complete clefting in different demographic groups, sex and race. **Results:** Amongst asymmetric bilateral cases, left side completeness was significantly more frequent than the right side (73.7% vs. 26.3%; $p<0.001$). No associations observed for sex or race with ethnicity showing a trend toward significance (50.0% vs. 25.5%; $p=0.088$). Amongst symmetric bilateral and unilateral cases, Hispanics exhibited completeness more frequently than non-Hispanics (96.4% vs 89.5%; $p<0.001$; 84.1% vs. 79.7%; $p<0.001$). For unilateral cases, completeness showed no side preference. Caucasians were less likely to exhibit complete clefts compared to Asians, Blacks, or other racial groups (68.7% vs 84.9% or 81.2% or 81.7%; $p<0.001$). Females more frequently presented with completeness than males (81.2% vs 76.6%; $p=0.003$). **Conclusions:** In NSCL/P with bilateral asymmetry, the left side is more often complete than the right side. Although unilateral left-sided clefts are more common overall, completeness shows no side preference. Race and ethnicity demonstrate significant associations with cleft severity patterns.

Introduction:

Nonsyndromic cleft lip with or without cleft palate (NSCL/P) affects approximately 1 in 700 individuals [1,2]. The clinical presentation varies considerably, with cleft lip and palate representing approximately 45% of cases, isolated cleft palate 35%, and isolated cleft lip 20%. Unilateral cleft lips occur more frequently than bilateral presentations, with a left-sided predominance following a left:right:bilateral ratio of approximately 6:3:1[3-5]. Additionally, males are more commonly affected by CL/P than females, with sex-specific patterns varying by cleft type and ethnicity[5-7].

Among bilateral cleft lip cases, both sides could present with complete clefts affecting the lip, alveolus, and nose (symmetric completeness) or, one side may present a complete cleft while the other side is incomplete (asymmetric completeness). The ratio of occurrence and etiology underlying symmetric versus asymmetric completeness in bilateral cases remains unknown. Similarly, in unilateral cases whether complete or incomplete presentations affect each side randomly or preferentially occur on a particular side has also not been established. After a thorough literature review, no consensus was found regarding the prevalence of right versus left completeness in asymmetric bilateral CL/P or on the distribution of completeness for unilateral CL/P cases.

Limited data exist on the prevalence of bilateral CL/P subtypes. Yuzuriha et al. (2008) reported symmetrical complete (54.4%), symmetrical incomplete (22.3%), and asymmetrical (23.3%) presentations[8], while Rossell-Perry & Gavino-Gutierrez (2012) found that asymmetric cases accounted for 61.4% of their cohort[9]. Despite representing a substantial proportion of bilateral cases, asymmetric presentations remain largely uninvestigated.

While left-sided predominance in unilateral clefts is well established, minimal research has been done into the completeness patterns for the unilateral clefts. Gatti et al. (2017) recorded the completeness of the unilateral CL/P patients based on side. While they presented the number of patients, they did not look specifically at the prevalence and also included syndromic cases in their sample[10]. Findings of a preferential side for complete clefting would warrant further research into the possible genetic and/or epigenetic causes.

For bilateral cases, the laterality of asymmetric presentations remains largely unexplored. No consensus exists in the literature regarding whether completeness preferentially affects one side over the other in asymmetric bilateral CL/P, nor have studies systematically compared

completeness patterns between unilateral and bilateral presentations. This gap in knowledge limits our understanding of the developmental mechanisms underlying cleft formation and their relationship to embryological laterality establishment[11].

Understanding laterality patterns in cleft completeness has important clinical implications. Bilateral cleft lip cases, particularly those with complete clefting, present greater surgical complexity and require more extensive reconstructive procedures to achieve optimal functional and aesthetic outcomes[12]. Accurate phenotypic characterization and understanding of presentation patterns can inform surgical planning and prognostic counseling. As Soofi et al. (2021) emphasized, accurate description and understanding of laterality disorder presentations is essential for diagnosis and treatment[13].

Laterality disorders can affect various organs and systems, including the heart, lungs, and abdominal organs. There are several factors that have been investigated to contribute to these disorders. During embryonic development, specific rotation of signaling molecules creates the gradient necessary for proper laterality establishment. Reversal of this rotation results in *situs inversus totalis*, where great vessels and thoracic and abdominal visceral organs develop on the opposite side from normal. While *situs inversus totalis* has complete mirroring, it is also possible to have incomplete mirroring. For instance, *situs abdominalis* has abdominal structures mirrored but not thoracic structures. Additionally, isomerism can present in the heart or lungs. Isomerism of the heart presents with many other comorbidities, such as stenosis or communication of inappropriate compartments of the vascular system. [13] While other human laterality disorders have been significantly studied, oral and craniofacial conditions remain understudied.

This study aims to determine the frequency of symmetric versus asymmetric completeness in nonsyndromic bilateral cleft lip with or without cleft palate, and to identify laterality preferences for cleft completeness across diverse populations. Specifically, we sought to (1) determine the frequency of symmetric versus asymmetric completeness in bilateral NSCL/P and identify any side preferences in asymmetric cases; (2) assess the frequency of complete versus incomplete presentations in unilateral NSCL/P by side; (3) compare completeness patterns between bilateral and unilateral presentations; and (4) examine associations between cleft completeness patterns and demographic variables including sex, ethnicity, and race.

Our work addresses critical gaps in the literature and provides groundwork for future investigations into the etiological mechanisms underlying complete versus incomplete defects and their relationship to laterality. Identification of preferential patterns would warrant further research into the genetic and epigenetic factors contributing to these presentations.

Materials and Methods:

This retrospective cross-sectional study utilized previously collected data from four multiethnic cohorts across North and South America, Asia, and Africa. The study population comprised of 3,561 individuals with nonsyndromic cleft lip with or without cleft palate (NSCL/P), including 76 cases with asymmetric bilateral CL/P and 2,670 cases with unilateral CL/P. Patients with nonsyndromic unilateral or bilateral cleft lip, with or without cleft palate, were eligible for inclusion. Cases lacking complete information on cleft type or completeness were excluded. To minimize familial confounding, only one family member was included per family unless the two individuals presented with different cleft categories (bilateral versus unilateral), as these represented distinct analytical subsets.

The LAHSHAL classification system was utilized when available to identify and characterize cleft presentations. Cases were assessed for bilateral asymmetry, defined as complete clefting of the lip on one side with incomplete clefting on the contralateral side.

For cohorts not utilizing the LAHSHAL system, data were analyzed and reclassified into a uniform classification system indicating cleft type and completeness to facilitate consistent sorting and statistical analysis. Data were organized into asymmetric nonsyndromic bilateral cleft lip with cleft palate (NSCLP) and without cleft palate (NSCL). Completeness classification was performed for both bilateral asymmetric cases to determine side preference and unilateral cases to assess laterality patterns. Symmetric bilateral cases were also analyzed as a secondary outcome.

Demographic variables included sex, race, and ethnicity. Race originally was categorized into 4 groups (Asian, Black or African American, White, Other race). However, due to a small sample size of Asian patients and the apparent significance associated with race, it was deemed best to include a second race analysis where Asian patients were included in the Other race category. Clinical characteristics included cleft lip laterality (bilateral, right unilateral, left unilateral), cleft classification (asymmetric bilateral, symmetric bilateral, unilateral), cleft

presence on right and left sides, side with more extensive clefting, cleft completeness on right and left sides (complete, incomplete), and lip cleft completeness type (left and right asymmetric complete, left complete with right incomplete, right complete with left incomplete, symmetric complete, and symmetric incomplete).

Data management was performed using Excel and statistical analyses were conducted using SAS® System version 9.4 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC, USA). Descriptive statistics were used to summarize all variables of interest, including their frequencies and corresponding percentages. Bivariate analyses were performed to examine associations between cleft lip classifications and demographic or clinical characteristics. Pearson's chi-square test or Fisher's exact test was applied as appropriate, with statistical significance set at $\alpha = 0.05$. Chi-square goodness-of-fit tests were performed to evaluate laterality preferences in asymmetric bilateral, symmetric bilateral, and unilateral cases. Cleft completeness per side and its relationships with sex, ethnicity, and race were compared across phenotypic groups.

Results:

A total of 3,561 patients with cleft lip were classified into three groups: asymmetric bilateral (n=76, 2.1%), symmetric bilateral (n=815, 22.9%), and unilateral (n=2,670, 75.0%). Table 1 presents the distribution of demographic and clinical characteristics across these classifications. Males comprised the majority of the sample (56.3%) compared to females (43.7%), with this male predominance remaining consistent across all groups: asymmetric bilateral (64.5%), symmetric bilateral (60.3%), and unilateral (54.8%).

Racial distribution showed that Black or African American patients represented the largest group (46.6%), followed by White (24.1%), Asian (12.6%), and other races (16.6%). The racial distribution varied by cleft type, with White patients comprising a higher proportion of the asymmetric bilateral group (38.1%) compared to the overall cohort (24.1%). Among the total population, 23.2% identified as Hispanic or Latino, with the highest proportion in the symmetric bilateral group (27.4%).

Among all patients, 1.6% had asymmetric left complete clefts and 0.6% had asymmetric right complete clefts. Within the asymmetric bilateral, patients had either a complete left cleft (73.7%) or a complete right cleft (26.3%). Within the symmetric bilateral group, 90.1% had complete clefts bilaterally and 9.9% had incomplete clefts bilaterally. In the unilateral group,

36.6% had complete clefts on the left and 22.4% on the right. Across all patients, 43.6% had complete right clefts and 9.5% had incomplete right clefts. These right side percentages were higher in the symmetric bilateral group (90.1% complete, 9.9% incomplete), and lower in the asymmetric bilateral group (26.3% complete, 73.7% incomplete). Among unilateral cases, 29.9% had complete right clefts and 7.5% had incomplete right clefts; 62.6% of these were left unilateral cases and therefore not applicable. Complete clefts on the left were noted in 58.7% of all patients and were more frequent in the symmetric bilateral group (90.1%) than in the asymmetric bilateral (73.7%) or unilateral group (48.8%). Incomplete left clefts occurred in 13.2% of the overall cohort.

Asymmetric Bilateral Cleft Lip Cases

In the current study, a cohort of 76 patients was classified as having an asymmetric bilateral cleft lip. Table 2 presents the distribution of patient characteristics associated with right-side completeness status. Patients were classified into two groups based on right-side cleft completeness: complete (n=20) and incomplete (n=56). The proportion of females and males did not differ significantly between the right-side completeness groups (p=0.302). Among patients with complete right-side asymmetric clefts, 33.3% were female and 66.7% were male, compared to 22.5% female and 77.5% male in the incomplete asymmetric group.

Amongst the 76 patients with asymmetric bilateral cleft lip, left side completeness was significantly more frequent than the right side (73.7% vs. 26.3%; $p<0.001$). Chi-square goodness-of-fit tests confirmed significant differences in the distribution of completeness for both right-side (30.5% complete vs. 69.5% incomplete; p=0.003) and left-side (69.5% complete vs. 30.5% incomplete; p=0.003) presentations.

No significant associations were found between race and right-side completeness status (p=0.336), with racial distribution relatively balanced across completeness groups. Ethnicity showed a trend toward significance (p=0.088), with Hispanic or Latino patients more likely to have complete right-side clefts (50.0%) compared to non-Hispanic or Latino individuals (25.5%) and those with unknown ethnicity (11.8%).

Symmetric Bilateral Cleft Lip Cases

Among 815 patients with symmetric bilateral cleft lip, 734 (90.1%) had complete bilateral clefts and 81 (9.9%) had incomplete bilateral clefts. Chi-square goodness-of-fit testing

demonstrated a significant difference in the distribution of completeness status (91.6% complete vs. 8.4% incomplete; $p<0.001$).

Table 3 presents associations between demographic variables and completeness status. Race was significantly associated with completeness ($p<0.001$), with White patients showing the lowest proportion of complete clefts (84.0%) compared to Asian (89.6%), Black or African American (90.3%), and Other Race (97.1%) patients. When race was analyzed in broader categories, the association remained significant ($p=0.002$), with White individuals consistently showing lower completeness rates.

Ethnicity was significantly associated with completeness status ($p<0.001$). Hispanic or Latino patients demonstrated the highest proportion of complete clefts (96.4%), followed by non-Hispanic patients (89.5%) and those with unknown ethnicity (75.3%). Sex was not significantly associated with completeness status ($p=0.774$), with similar rates observed among males (89.8%) and females (90.4%).

Unilateral Cleft Lip Cases

Among 2,670 patients with unilateral cleft lip, 2,101 (78.7%) had complete clefts and 569 (21.3%) had incomplete clefts. Chi-square goodness-of-fit testing confirmed a significant difference in completeness distribution (80.8% complete vs. 19.2% incomplete; $p<0.001$). Completeness status showed no significant association with cleft side (left vs. right; $p=0.237$), with complete presentations occurring in 78.0% of left-sided and 79.9% of right-sided clefts.

Table 4 presents associations between demographic variables and completeness status. Sex was significantly associated with completeness ($p=0.003$), with females showing higher rates of complete clefts (81.2%) compared to males (76.6%).

Race demonstrated a significant relationship with completeness ($p<0.001$). White patients had the lowest proportion of complete clefts (68.7%) compared to Asian (84.9%), Black or African American (81.2%), and Other Race (81.7%) individuals. This pattern remained significant when analyzed in broader racial categories ($p<0.001$).

Ethnicity was also significantly associated with completeness ($p<0.001$). Hispanic or Latino patients had the highest proportion of complete clefts (84.1%), while those with unknown ethnicity had the lowest (57.0%).

Laterality Patterns in Unilateral Cleft Lip Cases

Table 5 presents the association between demographic variables and cleft side among patients with unilateral cleft lip. Of 2,670 patients with unilateral cleft lip, 1,670 (62.5%) had a left-sided cleft and 1,000 (37.5%) had a right-sided cleft, confirming the established left-side predominance. Sex was significantly associated with cleft side ($p=0.030$). Left-sided clefts occurred in 60.3% of females and 64.4% of males, while right-sided clefts occurred in 39.7% of females and 35.6% of males.

Race was also significantly associated with cleft side. In the original four-category classification, the highest proportion of left-sided clefts was observed among Asian patients (69.6%), followed by White patients (66.6%), Other race (60.4%), and Black or African American patients (59.5%) ($p<0.001$). When race was grouped into three categories (Black or African American, White, and Other race), the association remained statistically significant ($p=0.005$), with left-sided clefts occurring in 59.5% of Black or African American patients, 66.6% of White patients, and 64.4% of patients in the Other race group.

Ethnicity showed no significant association with cleft side ($p=0.380$). Left-sided clefts occurred in 61.8% of Hispanic or Latino patients, 62.3% of non-Hispanic or Latino patients, and 66.7% of patients with unknown ethnicity.

Discussion:

This study investigated laterality and completeness patterns in nonsyndromic cleft lip with or without cleft palate across a large, multiethnic cohort of 3,561 individuals. Our findings reveal significant associations between cleft completeness and laterality patterns, with notable influences of demographic factors including sex, race, and ethnicity. These results provide important insights into the phenotypic diversity of NSCL/P and establish a foundation for future investigations into the underlying developmental and genetic mechanisms.

Asymmetric Bilateral Cleft Patterns

Among asymmetric bilateral cases, we identified a striking left-side predominance for completeness, with 73.7% presenting complete clefts on the left versus 26.3% on the right ($p<0.001$). This represents the first systematic documentation of laterality preference in asymmetric bilateral presentations. The absence of significant associations with sex or race suggests that factors beyond these demographic variables influence laterality patterns in asymmetric cases.

Ethnicity showed a trend toward significance, with Hispanic individuals more frequently exhibiting right-side completeness compared to non-Hispanics (50.0% vs. 25.5%; p=0.088). Further research with larger Hispanic cohorts is warranted to definitively establish whether ethnic-specific laterality preferences exist in asymmetric bilateral presentations. Such findings would have important implications for genetic and epigenetic studies of laterality in CL/P.

Additionally, there were no associations found for sex or race for differential side clefting pattern in asymmetric bilateral cases. This is valuable information as it indicates that there are other factors beyond race or sex that are impacting the clefting patterns. The predominance of left-side completeness in asymmetric bilateral cases parallels broader patterns of laterality establishment during embryonic development. Similar to other human laterality disorders, such as *situs inversus totalis* where reversal of signaling molecule gradients results in complete body laterality reversal[13], it is plausible that localized disruptions in developmental signaling pathways contribute to the observed asymmetric cleft patterns. The interplay of genetic and environmental factors in laterality disorders, as demonstrated in heterotaxia[14], suggests that multiple factors likely contribute to the laterality patterns observed in asymmetric bilateral clefts. Like other laterality disorders, genetic and environmental factors both play significant parts in development of a disorder and cannot be isolated from each other.[15] This represents a promising area for future research into craniofacial laterality disorders.

Symmetric Bilateral and Unilateral Cleft Patterns

Among symmetric bilateral cases, 90.1% presented with complete bilateral clefts. Ethnicity was significantly associated with completeness, with Hispanic or Latino patients more frequently exhibiting complete presentations compared to non-Hispanics (96.4% vs. 89.5%; p<0.001). This finding suggests that Hispanic ethnicity may be associated with more severe cleft phenotypes in bilateral presentations.

In contrast to our hypothesis, completeness in unilateral cases showed no association with laterality (78.0% left vs. 79.9% right; p=0.237). This finding indicates that while left-sided predominance is well established for unilateral cleft occurrence, there is not a side preference for completeness in unilateral cases[3,4,16].

Sex-Related Differences in Cleft Severity

Within unilateral cases, females demonstrated significantly higher rates of complete clefts compared to males (81.2% vs. 76.6%; p=0.003), indicating more severe phenotypic presentations

in affected females. This aligns with previous studies[17] that similarly observed greater completeness in female CLP patients. The higher severity in affected females may relate to sex-specific developmental factors.

Interestingly, Hayashi et al. (1976) found that females with clefts matured earlier than males but exhibited greater underdevelopment in both maxillary and mandibular structures[18]. It is possible that the observed pattern of increased completeness in females reflect interactions between accelerated developmental timing and maxillary underdevelopment.

The male predominance observed in our overall cohort (56.3%) is consistent with established epidemiological patterns showing higher CL/P prevalence in males[6,7]. While females are less likely to be affected by cleft lip, our findings demonstrate that when affected, they tend to present with more severe phenotypes in unilateral cases. This sex-specific severity pattern warrants further investigation into the underlying biological mechanisms.

Racial and Ethnic Influences on Cleft Severity

Race and ethnicity demonstrated significant associations with cleft completeness patterns. Across both symmetric bilateral and unilateral presentations, White/Caucasian patients exhibited lower rates of complete clefts compared to Asian, Black or African American, and other racial groups (symmetric bilateral: 84.0% vs. 89.6-97.1%, $p<0.001$; unilateral: 68.7% vs. 81.2-84.9%, $p<0.001$). Similarly, Hispanic ethnicity was associated with higher completeness rates in both symmetric bilateral (96.4% vs. 89.5%, $p<0.001$) and unilateral cases (84.1% vs. 79.7%, $p<0.001$).

Hispanic and certain racial minority groups appear predisposed to more severe cleft presentations when affected. These findings are particularly notable given that baseline cleft prevalence differs by race and ethnicity, with lower rates reported in Black and Hispanic populations.[19] The observation that Hispanic and African populations present with more severe clefts despite lower overall prevalence suggests complex interactions between protective factors for cleft occurrence and factors influencing cleft severity.

Interestingly, racial and ethnic disparities have been observed in other laterality-related conditions, such as breast cancer, where Hispanic and African American women show similar patterns in disease markers[20], suggesting potential shared biological mechanisms worthy of exploration.

Clinical Implications

Our findings have important clinical relevance for surgical planning and patient counseling. The identification of left-side predominance in asymmetric bilateral cleft completeness and the associations between completeness patterns and demographic variables can inform preoperative assessment and surgical strategy. As emphasized by Soofi et al. (2021), accurate phenotypic characterization of laterality disorders is essential for optimal diagnosis and treatment[13]. Understanding that certain demographic groups are more likely to present with complete clefts may help clinicians anticipate surgical complexity and counsel families appropriately regarding treatment expectations and outcomes.

Bilateral cleft lip cases, particularly those with complete presentations, require more extensive reconstructive procedures to achieve optimal functional and aesthetic outcomes[11]. The demographic associations identified in this study may assist in risk stratification and resource allocation for complex cleft care.

Limitations

Some limitations should be considered when interpreting these findings. First, the retrospective design and reliance on existing databases may introduce selection bias, particularly given the overrepresentation of certain racial groups relative to population-based cleft prevalence. Second, the relatively small number of asymmetric bilateral cases (n=76) limited statistical power for detecting associations within this subgroup, particularly for the ethnicity analysis that approached but did not reach significance. Finally, this study focused on cleft lip completeness and did not systematically analyze palate involvement patterns, which warrants future investigation.

Future Directions

This research establishes important groundwork for future mechanistic studies. The identification of laterality preferences in asymmetric bilateral cases and demographic associations with cleft severity points toward potential genetic, epigenetic, and environmental factors worthy of investigation. Future research should explore the developmental biology underlying laterality establishment in craniofacial structures, examine gene-environment interactions that may contribute to observed racial and ethnic differences, and investigate the mechanisms underlying sex-specific severity patterns. Additionally, expanded cohorts with adequate representation of Hispanic and other minority populations are needed to definitively establish ethnic-specific patterns. Integration of genetic data with phenotypic characterization

will be essential for elucidating the etiological mechanisms underlying the diverse presentations of NSCL/P.

Understanding the factors that determine whether a cleft occurs as well as its laterality and severity represents a key step toward personalized medicine approaches utilized in cleft care. The molecular pathways controlling laterality in other organ systems, such as those involving signaling molecule gradients[13] and the genetic contributors to heterotaxia[15,21], provide promising avenues for investigation in the craniofacial context.

Conclusions

This large multiethnic study provides the first systematic documentation of laterality preferences in asymmetric bilateral NSCL/P, demonstrating significant left-side predominance for completeness. While unilateral clefts show well-established left-sided occurrence predominance, completeness appears independent of side in these cases. Importantly, we identified significant associations between cleft completeness and demographic factors, with females, non-White racial groups, and Hispanic ethnicity associated with more severe (complete) presentations. These findings enhance our understanding of NSCL/P phenotypic diversity and provide a foundation for future investigations into the genetic, epigenetic, and environmental mechanisms underlying cleft laterality and severity. The demographic associations identified may also inform clinical practice through improved risk stratification and surgical planning.

References:

1. Dixon MJ, Marazita ML, Beaty TH, Murray JC. Cleft lip and palate: understanding genetic and environmental influences. *Nat Rev Genet*. Mar 2011;12(3):167–78. doi:10.1038/nrg2933

2. Mossey PA, Little J, Munger RG, Dixon MJ, Shaw WC. Cleft lip and palate. *Lancet*. Nov 21 2009;374(9703):1773–85. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(09)60695-4

3. Jamilian A, Lucchese A, Darnahal A, Kamali Z, Perillo L. Cleft sidedness and congenitally missing teeth in patients with cleft lip and palate patients. *Progress in Orthodontics*. 2016/05/09 2016;17(1):14. doi:10.1186/s40510-016-0127-z

4. Yılmaz HN, Özbilen E, Üstün T. The Prevalence of Cleft Lip and Palate Patients: A Single-Center Experience for 17 Years. *Turk J Orthod*. Sep 2019;32(3):139–144. doi:10.5152/TurkJOrthod.2019.18094

5. Carlson JC, Taub MA, Feingold E, et al. Identifying Genetic Sources of Phenotypic Heterogeneity in Orofacial Clefts by Targeted Sequencing. *Birth Defects Res*. Apr 22 2017;doi:10.1002/bdra.23605

6. Mossey PA, Modell B. Epidemiology of oral clefts 2012: an international perspective. *Front Oral Biol*. 2012;16:1–18. doi:10.1159/000337464

7. Carlson JC, Taub MA, Feingold E, et al. Identifying Genetic Sources of Phenotypic Heterogeneity in Orofacial Clefts by Targeted Sequencing. *Birth Defects Res*. Jul 17 2017;109(13):1030–1038. doi:10.1002/bdr2.23605

8. Yuzuriha S, Oh AK, Mulliken JB. Asymmetrical bilateral cleft lip: complete or incomplete and contralateral lesser defect (minor-form, microform, or mini-microform). *Plast Reconstr Surg*. Nov 2008;122(5):1494–1504. doi:10.1097/PRS.0b013e318189169b

9. Rossell-Perry P, Gavino-Gutierrez AM. Asymmetric bilateral cleft lip: classification and a surgical technique. *J Craniofac Surg*. Sep 2012;23(5):1367–72. doi:10.1097/SCS.0b013e31824f6480

10. Gatti GL, Freda N, Giacomina A, Montemagni M, Sisti A. Cleft Lip and Palate Repair. *J Craniofac Surg*. Nov 2017;28(8):1918–1924. doi:10.1097/SCS.0000000000003820

11. Mulliken JB. Repair of Bilateral Complete Cleft Lip and Nasal Deformity—State of the Art. *The Cleft Palate Craniofacial Journal*. 2000/07/01 2000;37(4):342–347. doi:10.1597/1545-1569_2000_037_0342_robccl_2.3.co_2

12. Mulliken JB. Repair of bilateral complete cleft lip and nasal deformity--state of the art. *Cleft Palate Craniofac J*. Jul 2000;37(4):342–7. doi:10.1597/1545-1569_2000_037_0342_robccl_2.3.co_2

13. Soofi M, Alpert MA, Barbadora J, Mukerji B, Mukerji V. Human Laterality Disorders: Pathogenesis, Clinical Manifestations, Diagnosis, and Management. *Am J Med Sci*. Sep 2021;362(3):233–242. doi:10.1016/j.amjms.2021.05.020

14. Peeters H, Devriendt K. Human laterality disorders. *Eur J Med Genet*. Sep–Oct 2006;49(5):349–62. doi:10.1016/j.ejmg.2005.12.003

15. Li AH, Hanchard NA, Azamian M, et al. Genetic architecture of laterality defects revealed by whole exome sequencing. *Eur J Hum Genet*. Apr 2019;27(4):563–573. doi:10.1038/s41431-018-0307-z

16. Carlson JC, Standley J, Petrin A, et al. Identification of 16q21 as a modifier of nonsyndromic orofacial cleft phenotypes. *Genet Epidemiol*. Nov 10 2017;doi:10.1002/gepi.22090

17. Jiang L, Jiang C, Wang Y, Song T, Yin N. Heterogeneity of Orofacial Clefts and Associated Anomalies in China. *J Craniofac Surg*. Oct 1 2023;34(7):e698–e701. doi:10.1097/SCS.0000000000009611

18. Hayashi I, Sakuda M, Takimoto K, Miyazaki T. Craniofacial growth in complete unilateral cleft lip and palate: a roentgeno-cephalometric study. *Cleft Palate J*. Jul 1976;13:215–37.

19. Croen LA, Shaw GM, Wasserman CR, Tolarova MM. Racial and ethnic variations in the prevalence of orofacial clefts in California, 1983-1992. *Am J Med Genet*. Aug 27 1998;79(1):42–7. doi:10.1002/(sici)1096-8628(19980827)79:1<42::aid-ajmg11>3.0.co;2-m

20. John EM, Koo J, Ingles SA, et al. Risk factors for second primary breast cancer by laterality, age, and race and ethnicity. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. Mar 1 2025;117(3):436–449. doi:10.1093/jnci/djae254

21. Peeters H, Devriendt K. Human laterality disorders. *Eur J Med Genet*. 2006/09/01/ 2006;49(5):349–362. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejmg.2005.12.003

Table 1. Patient Demographics and Clinical Cleft Characteristics by Cleft Lip Classification

	Total N=3,561 n (%)	Asymmetric Bilateral N=76 n (%)	Symmetric Bilateral N=815 n (%)	Unilateral N=2,670 n (%)
Demographics:				
Sex				
Female	1,556 (43.7)	27 (35.5)	324 (39.7)	1,205 (45.1)
Male	2,004 (56.3)	49 (64.5)	491 (60.3)	1,464 (54.8)
Unknown/Blank	1 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)
Race				
Asian	450 (12.6)	13 (17.1)	125 (15.4)	312 (11.7)
Black or African of American	1,660 (46.6)	24 (31.6)	330 (40.5)	1,306 (48.9)
White	856 (24.1)	29 (38.1)	187 (22.9)	640 (24.0)
Other Race	591 (16.6)	10 (13.2)	172 (21.1)	409 (15.3)
Unknown/Refuse to Answer	4 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)	3 (0.1)
Ethnicity				
Hispanic or Latino	826 (23.2)	12 (15.8)	223 (27.4)	591 (22.1)
Non-Hispanic or Latino	2,404 (67.5)	47 (61.8)	515 (63.2)	1,842 (69.0)
Unknown	331 (9.3)	17 (22.4)	77 (9.4)	237 (8.9)
Clinical Cleft Characteristics:				
Bilateral/Unilateral				
Bilateral	891 (25.0)	76 (100.0)	815 (100.0)	0 (0.0)
Right Unilateral	1,000 (28.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1,000 (37.5)
Left Unilateral	1,670 (46.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1,670 (62.5)
Completeness of Lip Cleft				
Asymmetric, Left Complete	56 (1.6)	56 (73.7)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Asymmetric, Right Complete	20 (0.6)	20 (26.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)
Left Complete	1,302 (36.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1,302 (48.8)
Left Incomplete	368 (10.3)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	368 (13.8)
Symmetric Complete	734 (20.6)	0 (0.0)	734 (90.1)	0 (0.0)
Symmetric Incomplete	81 (2.3)	0 (0.0)	81 (9.9)	0 (0.0)
Right Complete	799 (22.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	799 (29.9)
Right Incomplete	201 (5.6)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	201 (7.5)
Right-Side Cleft				
Yes	1,891 (53.1)	76 (100.0)	815 (100.0)	1,000 (37.5)
No	1,670 (46.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1,670 (62.5)

Right-Side Completeness				
Complete	1,553 (43.6)	20 (26.3)	734 (90.1)	799 (29.9)
Incomplete	338 (9.5)	56 (73.7)	81 (9.9)	201 (7.5)
NA/Left Unilateral Case	1,670 (46.9)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1,670 (62.6)
Left-Side Cleft				
Yes	2,561 (71.9)	76 (100.0)	815 (100.0)	1,670 (62.5)
No	1,000 (28.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1,000 (37.5)
Left-Side Completeness				
Complete	2,092 (58.7)	56 (73.7)	734 (90.1)	1,302 (48.8)
Incomplete	469 (13.2)	20 (26.3)	81 (9.9)	368 (13.8)
NA/Right Unilateral Case	1,000 (28.1)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1,000 (37.4)
Side of Biggest Cleft				
Left	1, 726 (48.5)	56 (73.7)	0 (0.0)	1,670 (62.5)
Right	1,020 (28.6)	20 (26.3)	0 (0.0)	1,000 (37.5)
NA/Symmetric Case	815 (22.9)	0 (0.0)	815 (100.0)	0 (0.0)

Table 2. Variables Associated with Right-Side Completeness Status among Patients With An Asymmetric Bilateral Cleft Lip (N=76)

Variables	**Right-Side Completeness Status**		
	Complete (N=20) n (%)	**Incomplete (N=56) n (%)**	***p-value****
Left completeness			**<0.001***
Complete (n=56)	0 (0.0)	56 (100.0)	
Incomplete (n=20)	20 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	
Sex			0.302
Female (n=27)	9 (33.3)	18 (66.7)	
Male (n=49)	11 (22.5)	38 (77.5)	
Race			0.462
Asian (n=13)	4 (30.8)	9 (69.2)	
Black or African of American (n=24)	7 (29.2)	17 (70.8)	
White (n=29)	5 (17.2)	24 (82.8)	
Other Race (n=10)	4 (40.0)	6 (60.0)	
Race (regrouped)			0.336
Black or African of American (n=24)	7 (29.2)	17 (70.8)	
White (n=29)	5 (17.2)	24 (82.8)	
Other Race (n=23)	8 (34.8)	15 (65.2)	
Ethnicity			0.088
Hispanic or Latino (n=12)	6 (50.0)	6 (50.0)	
Non Hispanic or Latino (n=47)	12 (25.5)	35 (74.5)	
Unknown (n=17)	2 (11.8)	15 (88.2)	

*Statistically significant using Fisher's exact test ($p<0.05$).

Table 3. Variables Associated with Right or Left Completeness Status among the Patients With A Symmetric Bilateral Cleft Lip (N=815)

Variables	**Right or Left Completeness Status**		
	Complete (N=734) n (%)	**Incomplete (N=81) n (%)**	***p-value***
Left completeness			**<0.001***
Complete (n=734)	734 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	
Incomplete (n=81)	0 (0.0)	81 (100.0)	
Sex			0.774
Female (n=324)	293 (90.4)	31 (9.6)	
Male (n=491)	441 (89.8)	50 (10.2)	
Race			**<0.001****
Asian (n=125)	112 (89.6)	13 (10.4)	
Black or African of American (n=330)	298 (90.3)	32 (9.7)	
White (n=187)	157 (84.0)	30 (16.0)	
Other Race (n=172)	167 (97.1)	5 (2.9)	
Race (regrouped)			**0.002****
Black or African of American (n=330)	298 (90.3)	32 (9.7)	
White (n=187)	157 (84.0)	30 (16.0)	
Other Race (n=297)	279 (93.9)	18 (6.1)	
Ethnicity			**<0.001****
Hispanic or Latino (n=223)	215 (96.4)	8 (3.6)	
Non-Hispanic or Latino (n=515)	461 (89.5)	54 (10.5)	
Unknown (n=77)	58 (75.3)	19 (24.7)	

*Statistically significant using Fisher's exact test (p<0.05)

** Statistically significant using chi-square test (p<0.05)

Table 4. Variables Associated with Cleft Completeness Status among the Patients with A Unilateral Cleft Lip (N=2,670)

Variables	Cleft Completeness Status		
	Complete (N=2,101) n (%)	**Incomplete (N=569) n (%)**	***p-value***
Side of Biggest Cleft			0.237
Left (n=1,670)	1,302 (78.0)	368 (22.0)	
Right (n=1,000)	799 (79.9)	201 (20.1)	
Sex			**0.003****
Female (n=1,205)	979 (81.2)	226 (18.8)	
Male (n=1,464)	1,121 (76.6)	343 (23.4)	
Race			**<0.001****
Asian (n=312)	265 (84.9)	47 (15.1)	
Black or African of American (n=1,306)	1,061 (81.2)	245 (18.8)	
White (n=640)	440 (68.7)	200 (31.3)	
Other Race (n=409)	334 (81.7)	75 (18.3)	
Race (regrouped)			**<0.001****
Black or African of American (n=1,306)	1,061 (81.2)	245 (18.8)	
White (n=640)	440 (68.7)	200 (31.3)	
Other Race (n=721)	599 (83.1)	122 (16.9)	
Ethnicity			**<0.001****
Hispanic or Latino (n=591)	497 (84.1)	94 (15.9)	
Non-Hispanic or Latino (n=1,842)	1,469 (79.7)	373 (20.3)	
Unknown (n=237)	135 (57.0)	102 (43.0)	

** Statistically significant using chi-square test ($p<0.05$)

Table 5. Association of Demographic and Clinical Variables with Cleft Side in Patients with Unilateral Cleft Lip (N = 2,670)

Variables	**Side of Biggest Cleft in Unilateral/Which is Clefted**		
	Left **N=1,670** **n (%)**	**Right** **N=1,000** **n (%)**	***p-value***
Cleft Lip Completeness			**<0.001**** **(actual: p<0.0001)**
Left complete (n=1,302)	1,302 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	
Left incomplete (n=368)	368 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	
Right complete (n=799)	0 (0.0)	799 (100.0)	
Right incomplete (n=201)	0 (0.0)	201 (100.0)	
Sex			**0.030****
Female (n=1,205)	727 (60.3)	478 (39.7)	
Male (n=1,464)	943 (64.4)	521 (35.6)	
Race			**<0.001****
Asian (n=312)	217 (69.6)	95 (30.4)	
Black or African of American (n=1,306)	777 (59.5)	529 (40.5)	
White (n=640)	426 (66.6)	214 (33.4)	
Other Race (n=409)	247 (60.4)	162 (39.6)	
Race (regrouped)			**0.005****
Black or African of American (n=1,306)	777 (59.5)	529 (40.5)	
White (n=640)	426 (66.6)	214 (33.4)	
Other Race (n=721)	464 (64.4)	257 (35.6)	
Ethnicity			0.380
Hispanic or Latino (n=591)	365 (61.8)	226 (38.2)	
Non-Hispanic or Latino (n=1,842)	1,147 (62.3)	695 (37.7)	
Unknown (n=237)	158 (66.7)	79 (33.3)	

******Statistically significant using chi-square test or Fisher's exact test (p<0.05)