

UCLA

UCLA Previously Published Works

Title

Nonchromosomal birth defects and risk of childhood acute leukemia: An assessment in 15 000 leukemia cases and 46 000 controls from the Childhood Cancer and Leukemia International Consortium

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/7rv4j7x3>

Journal

International Journal of Cancer, 154(3)

ISSN

0020-7136

Authors

Lupo, Philip J
Chambers, Tiffany M
Mueller, Beth A
[et al.](#)

Publication Date

2024-02-01

DOI

10.1002/ijc.34720

Peer reviewed



HHS Public Access

Author manuscript

Int J Cancer. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2024 April 22.

Published in final edited form as:

Int J Cancer. 2024 February 01; 154(3): 434–447. doi:10.1002/ijc.34720.

Non-chromosomal birth defects and risk of childhood acute leukemia: an assessment in 15,000 leukemia cases and 46,000 controls from the Childhood Cancer and Leukemia International Consortium

Philip J. Lupo¹, Tiffany M. Chambers¹, Beth A. Mueller^{2,3}, Jacqueline Clavel⁴, John D. Dockerty⁵, David R. Doody², Friederike Erdmann^{6,7}, Sameera Ezzat^{8,*}, Tommaso Filippini^{9,13}, Johnni Hansen¹⁰, Julia E. Heck¹¹, Claire Infante-Rivard¹², Alice Y. Kang¹³, Corrado Magnani¹⁴, Carlotta Malagoli⁹, Catherine Metayer¹³, Helen D. Bailey^{15,16}, Ana M. Mora¹⁷, Evangelia Ntzani^{18,19}, Eleni Th Petridou^{20,21}, Maria S. Pombo-de-Oliveira²², Wafaa M. Rashed²³, Eve Roman²⁴, Joachim Schüz⁶, Catharina Wesseling²⁵, Logan G. Spector²⁶, Michael E. Scheurer¹

¹Department of Pediatrics, Division of Hematology-Oncology, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas, USA

Correspondence to: Philip J. Lupo in the Department of Pediatrics, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas, USA (philip.lupo@bcm.edu).

Posthumous author

Author Contributions

Philip J. Lupo: Conceptualization, Data curation, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing – original draft, and Writing – review & editing; **Tiffany M. Chambers:** Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Visualization, Writing – original draft, and Writing – review & editing; **Beth A. Mueller:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Supervision, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **Jacqueline Clavel:** Methodology, Resources, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **John D. Dockerty:** Methodology, Resources, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **David R. Doody:** Resources, and Writing – review & editing; **Friederike Erdmann:** Methodology, Resources, and Writing – review & editing; **Sameera Ezzat:** Methodology, Resources, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **Tommaso Filippini:** Resources, and Writing – review & editing; **Johnni Hansen:** Resources, and Writing – review & editing; **Julia E. Heck:** Methodology, Resources, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **Claire Infante-Rivard:** Methodology, Resources, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **Alice Y. Kang:** Funding acquisition, Project administration, Resources, and Writing – review & editing; **Corrado Magnani:** Methodology, Resources, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **Carlotta Malagoli:** Methodology, Resources, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **Catherine Metayer:** Funding acquisition, Methodology, Resources, and Writing – review & editing; **Helen D. Bailey:** Funding acquisition, Methodology, Resources, and Writing – review & editing; **Ana M. Mora:** Methodology, Resources, and Writing – review & editing; **Evangelia Ntzani:** Methodology, Resources, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **Eleni Th Petridou:** Funding acquisition, Methodology, Resources, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **Maria S. Pombo-de-Oliveira:** Methodology, Resources, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **Wafaa M. Rashed:** Methodology, Resources, and Writing – review & editing; **Eve Roman:** Methodology, Resources, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **Joachim Schüz:** Methodology, Resources, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **Catharina Wesseling:** Methodology, Resources, and Writing – review & editing; **Logan G. Spector:** Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Supervision, Validation, and Writing – review & editing; **Michael E. Scheurer:** Conceptualization, Data curation, Investigation, Methodology, Resources, Supervision, Visualization, and Writing – review & editing

The work reported in the paper has been performed by the authors, unless clearly specified in the text.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest.

Ethics Statement

All participating studies were approved by relevant ethics committees or institutional review boards. Due to the large study population, registry-based studies were approved with waiver of consent while questionnaire-data had written informed consent from either parent(s) or guardian(s) at the time of data collection.

Disclaimer

Where authors are identified as personnel of the International Agency for Research on Cancer/ World Health Organization, the authors alone are responsible for the views expressed in this article and they do not necessarily represent the decisions, policy or views of the International Agency for Research on Cancer/ World Health Organization.

- ²Public Health Sciences Division, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, Washington, USA
- ³Department of Epidemiology, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington, USA
- ⁴CRESS, UMR-S1153, INSERM, Paris-Descartes University, Villejuif, France
- ⁵Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand
- ⁶International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC), Section of Environment and Lifestyle Epidemiology, Lyon, France
- ⁷Division of Childhood Cancer Epidemiology, Institute for Medical Biostatistics, Epidemiology and Clinical Research, Department of Pediatrics, Informatics (IMBEI), Johannes Gutenberg University of Minnesota, Mainz, Germany
- ⁸Department of Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine, NLISSI Collaborative Research Center, National Liver Institute, Menoufia University, Cairo, Egypt
- ⁹CREAGEN Environmental, Genetic and Nutritional Epidemiology Research Center, Department of Biomedical, Metabolic and Neural Sciences, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy
- ¹⁰Danish Cancer Society Research Center, Copenhagen, Denmark
- ¹¹College of Health and Public Service, University of North Texas, Denton, Texas, USA
- ¹²Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Occupational Health, Faculty of Medicine, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada
- ¹³School of Public Health, University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California, USA
- ¹⁴Dipartimento di Medicina Traslazionale, Università del Piemonte Orientale, Piemonte, Novara, Italy
- ¹⁵Curtin Medical School, Faculty of Health Sciences, Curtin University, Perth, Australia
- ¹⁶Telethon Kids Institute, The University of Western Australia, Nedlands, Australia
- ¹⁷Center for Environmental Research and Community Health (CERCH), School of Public Health University of California, Berkeley, Berkeley, California, USA
- ¹⁸Department of Hygiene and Epidemiology, Medical School, University of Ioannina, Ioannina, Greece
- ¹⁹Center for Evidence Synthesis in Health, Policy and Practice, Center for Research Synthesis in Health, School of Public Health, Brown University, Providence, RI, United States
- ²⁰Department of Hygiene, Epidemiology and Medical Statistics, Medical School, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- ²¹Hellenic Society for Social Pediatrics and Health Promotion, Athens, Greece
- ²²Research Center, Instituto Nacional de Cancer, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
- ²³Faculty of Pharmacy, Ahram Canadian University (ACU)

²⁴Epidemiology and Cancer Statistics Group, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, United Kingdom

²⁵Unit of Occupational Medicine, Institute of Environmental Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden

²⁶Division of Epidemiology and Clinical Research, Department of Pediatrics, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, Minnesota, USA

Abstract

Although recent studies have demonstrated associations between non-chromosomal birth defects and several pediatric cancers, less is known about their role on childhood leukemia susceptibility. Using data from the Childhood Cancer and Leukemia International Consortium, we evaluated associations between non-chromosomal birth defects and childhood leukemia. Pooling consortium data from 18 questionnaire-based and three registry-based case-control studies across 13 countries, we used multivariable logistic regression models to estimate odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the association between a spectrum of birth defects and leukemia. Our analyses included acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL, n=13,115) and acute myeloid leukemia (AML, n=2,120) cases, along with 46,172 controls. We used the false discovery rate to account for multiple comparisons. In the questionnaire-based studies, the prevalence of birth defects was 5% among cases versus 4% in controls, whereas, in the registry-based studies, the prevalence was 11% among cases versus 7% in controls. In pooled adjusted analyses, there were several notable associations, including: 1) digestive system defects and ALL (OR=2.70, 95% CI: 1.46–4.98); 2) congenital anomalies of the heart and circulatory system and AML (OR=2.86, 95% CI: 1.81–4.52); and 3) nervous system defects and AML (OR=4.23, 95% CI: 1.50–11.89). Effect sizes were generally larger in registry-based studies. Overall, our results could point to novel genetic and environmental factors associated with birth defects that could also increase leukemia susceptibility. Additionally, differences between questionnaire- and registry-based studies point to the importance of complementary sources of birth defect phenotype data when exploring these associations.

Graphical Abstract

Leukemia Risk by Birth Defect Groupings

	ALL	AML
Nervous system anomalies		
Eye anomalies		
congenital cataract		
Ear, face, & neck anomalies		
Respiratory system anomalies		
Heart anomalies		
Cleft lip/palate		
Digestive system anomalies		
Genitourinary system anomalies		*
hypospadias	*	
Musculoskeletal system anomalies		*
Skin anomalies		

Strength of effect

- <1
- null
- 1-2
- 2-5
- >5
- not evaluated

*borderline significance after FDR correction

Keywords

Epidemiology; childhood leukemia; birth defects; acute lymphoblastic leukemia; acute myeloid leukemia

Introduction

Leukemia accounts for around a third of all cancers diagnosed in individuals younger than 15 years of age, with acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) as the most common (~75%) subtype and acute myeloid leukemia (AML) as the second most common (~15%).^{1, 2} While five-year survival for children with ALL and AML has improved over the past several decades approaching 90% in some settings,^{3, 4} survival remains poor for those with relapsed disease. Furthermore, survivors experience an excess risk of adverse health outcomes related to their cancer diagnosis and treatment.⁵ Despite the incidence and clinical importance of these malignancies, outside of the approximately 5% of cases that are due to genetic syndromes, a majority of cases are of unknown etiologies.⁶

One of the strongest genetic risk factors for developing ALL and AML is being born with trisomy 21 (i.e., Down syndrome).⁷⁻⁹ Compared to their contemporaries, children with Down syndrome are 20-times more likely to develop ALL and 200-times more likely to develop AML, respectively.¹⁰ This and certain other chromosomal anomalies are well-established risk factors for ALL and AML; however, much less is known about the potential etiologic role of non-chromosomal birth defects, which affect approximately 6% of pregnancies worldwide.¹¹

There is strong evidence indicating non-chromosomal birth defects are associated with a range of pediatric solid tumors.^{10, 12-24} However, associations between specific non-chromosomal birth defects and leukemia are less clear. Therefore, we sought to comprehensively evaluate the association between non-chromosomal birth defects and

leukemia using data from the Childhood Cancer and Leukemia International Consortium (CLIC).²⁵

Methods

CLIC

CLIC is a consortium of leukemia-focused questionnaire- and registry-based case-control studies (which is now open to other pediatric tumors as well). It was established in 2007 with the goal of overcoming the limitations of single epidemiological studies and allowing the assessment of relatively infrequent potential risk factors, including specific non-chromosomal birth defects. Further comprehensive descriptions of CLIC have been published previously.^{25–31}

Study Subjects

Data for our pooled analyses were provided from 18 questionnaire-based and three registry-based case-control studies in 13 countries. Each eligible study provided both birth defect and leukemia data. Depending on the study design, questionnaires, hospital records, birth records, population-based birth defect registries, and cancer registries were used to identify cases and select controls. Children born with recognized chromosomal anomalies and/or single gene disorders (as defined below) were excluded from this assessment. Our overall study population consisted of 46,172 controls and 15,235 acute leukemia cases (ALL n=13,115 and AML n=2,120). In separate analyses, we evaluated all cases (ALL or AML) diagnosed at 12 months of age (i.e., infant leukemia, n=1,152). Additional information on each study site is provided in Supplemental Table 1.

Leukemia and Birth Defects Diagnoses

As noted, leukemia diagnoses were ascertained by study site and included both ALL and AML cases. Birth defect diagnoses were provided by: 1) diagnosis name; 2) codes using the Eighth, Ninth, or Tenth Revisions of the World Health Organization's International Classification of Diseases, Clinical Modification (i.e., ICD-8, ICD-9, and ICD-10); or 3) codes using the Western Australian Register of Developmental Anomalies (WARDA).³² All diagnoses were converted to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) modification of the British Paediatric Association Classification of Diseases (BPA) using coding-specific crosswalks obtained from the National Birth Defects Prevention Network (NBDPN) and WARDA.^{32, 33} For this assessment, we evaluated major birth defects included as part of the NBDPN annual report or the National Birth Defects Prevention Study.^{34, 35}

Study Variables

In addition to data on birth defects and leukemia, the following variables were obtained from each study: child's sex, age at leukemia diagnosis (cases), age at study entry (controls) histological subtype, ALL immunophenotype, year of birth, birthweight, gestational age, child's race/ethnicity, plurality, as well as maternal age at child's birth and maternal education. Data were standardized across studies. No frequency matching was conducted for the pooled analysis; however, all models were adjusted for study site.

Statistical Methods

We used frequencies and percentages to describe demographic and clinical characteristics among the study population. We used logistic regression models to calculate odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) for each birth defect-leukemia combination, while adjusting for the following variables: study site, sex, birthweight (<2,500; 2,500–3,999; >3,999 grams), gestational age (preterm [<37 weeks]; term [≥ 37 weeks]), maternal age (<25; 25–29; 30–34; 35–39; ≥ 40 years), birth year, and child's race/ethnicity (non-Hispanic White; non-Hispanic Black; Hispanic; and other – these categories varied by study and were harmonized based on previous CLIC assessments).^{29, 30, 36} These variables were selected based on previous assessments and to be consistent with other studies evaluating associations between non-chromosomal birth defects and pediatric cancer.^{10, 26–31} Additionally, the categorical variables were designed similarly to what was used in previous CLIC assessments^{27–30}. However, unadjusted ORs and 95% CIs were also calculated and presented. In these models, we also included study site. Additionally, we evaluated the impact of missing data on results in unadjusted models and found no differences. Based on that, unadjusted models include all cases.

We first evaluated the associations between leukemia subtypes of interest (ALL, AML, and infant leukemia) and specific birth defects (e.g., ventricular septal defect), as well as larger birth defect groupings (e.g., congenital anomalies of the heart and circulatory system). Based on standard data suppression rules,¹⁰ our analyses were restricted to patterns where there were ≥ 5 co-occurring cases. We used the false discovery rate (FDR) to account for multiple comparisons.³⁷ To evaluate the impact of differences in birth defect reporting, candidate associations were stratified by study design (i.e., questionnaire- vs. registry-based studies). Lastly, we evaluated the association between number of birth defects (0 defects, 1 defect, and ≥ 2 defects) and leukemia risk. Logistic regression models were used for all analyses. All statistical analyses were performed using Stata 15.0 (StataCorp LP, College Station, TX).

Results

Overall, there were 46,172 controls and 15,235 cases: 13,115 ALL; 2,120 AML; 1,152 infant (Table 1). The distribution of demographic characteristics across cases and controls was largely consistent with some exceptions. Overall, the prevalence of non-chromosomal birth defects was 5.7% and 5.8% in cases and controls, respectively (Table 2). Prevalence in each study was also calculated by case-control status and histology. In the questionnaire-based studies, the prevalence of birth defects was 5% among cases versus 4% in controls; whereas, in the registry-based studies, the prevalence was 11% among cases versus 7% in controls (Supplemental Table 2). Across these groups, prevalence was largely the same in each study but prevalence did vary across studies (Supplemental Table 2). Moreover, as described below, there were some notable differences for ALL, AML, and infant leukemia by birth defect group and by specific birth defects.

Non-Chromosomal Birth Defects and ALL

Among the 10 non-chromosomal birth defect groups evaluated (Table 2), three were significantly associated with ALL in adjusted models after correcting for multiple comparisons: 1) congenital anomalies of the heart and circulatory system (OR=1.46, 95% CI: 1.10–1.95); 2) congenital anomalies of the digestive system (OR=2.70, 95% CI: 1.46–4.98); and 3) congenital anomalies of the skin (OR=1.43, 95% CI: 1.11–1.85). While hypospadias was associated with ALL (OR=2.12, 95% CI: 1.16–3.85), it was not statistically significant after correcting for multiple comparisons ($p_{FDR}=0.066$). The only specific birth defect associated with ALL after correcting for multiple comparisons was congenital cataracts (OR=18.62, 95% CI: 4.36–79.49, $p_{FDR}=0.002$).

To account for differences in birth defect reporting, associations were then stratified by study design (i.e., questionnaire- vs. registry-based). The direction and magnitude of the effect estimates were consistent for congenital anomalies of the digestive system and congenital anomalies of the skin (Table 3). This was not the case for congenital anomalies of the heart and circulatory system and musculoskeletal system where the OR in questionnaire-based studies was 0.84 (95% CI: 0.55–1.28) and 0.66 (95% CI: 0.44–0.99), respectively compared to 2.36 (95% CI: 1.66–3.34) and 1.23 (95% CI: 0.83–1.82) in registry-based studies.

Non-Chromosomal Birth Defects and AML

Three non-chromosomal birth defect groups were significantly associated with AML in adjusted models after correcting for multiple comparisons (Table 2): 1) congenital anomalies of the nervous system (OR=4.23, 95% CI: 1.50–11.89); 2) congenital anomalies of the heart and circulatory system (OR=2.86, 95% CI: 1.81–4.52); and 3) congenital anomalies of the skin (OR=0.36, 95% CI: 0.18–0.70). The OR for congenital anomalies of the skin was <1.0, suggesting children with AML were less likely to have these non-chromosomal birth defects compared to controls. None of the specific birth defects with 5 co-occurring cases was significantly associated with AML.

When numbers were sufficient to conduct sensitivity analyses for AML stratified by study design, results were consistent in terms of direction of effect (Table 4); however, effect estimates from the registry-based studies were larger. For example, associations with congenital anomalies of the heart and circulatory system were stronger in registry-based studies (OR=5.39, 95% CI: 3.14–9.24) compared to questionnaire-based studies (OR=1.28, 95% CI: 0.61–2.67).

Non-Chromosomal Birth Defects and Infant Leukemia

While there were no significant associations between non-chromosomal birth defects and infant leukemia after correcting for multiple comparisons, there was a strong association with congenital anomalies of the digestive system and infant leukemia (OR=4.55, 95% CI: 1.06–19.62) (Table 2), which was stronger when evaluating effects in questionnaire-based studies (OR=7.31, 95% CI: 1.20–44.63) (data not shown). However, these associations were based on a small number of co-occurring cases ($n=6$) within questionnaire-based studies. There were no observations to evaluate specific associations in registry-based studies.

Risk of Leukemia by Number of Birth Defects

While there was a significant p-for-trend when evaluating the association between increasing number of non-chromosomal birth defects and ALL ($p_{\text{trend}}=0.006$), the association was neither strong nor statistically significant for children with 2 defects ($OR_{\text{ALL}}=1.32$, 95% CI: 0.90–1.94; Table 5). For both AML and infant leukemia, risk was greater for children with 2 birth defects ($OR_{\text{AML}}=1.96$, 95% CI: 1.10–3.46 and $OR_{\text{infant leukemia}}=1.71$, 95% CI: 0.93–1.35) compared to children with 1 defect ($OR_{\text{AML}}=0.92$, 95% CI: (0.72–1.18 and $OR_{\text{infant leukemia}}=0.97$, 95% CI: 0.69–1.35) (Table 5).

Discussion

In this large assessment of leukemia risk among children with non-chromosomal birth defects, which included >15,000 cases and >46,000 controls, we report several birth defect-leukemia associations including: 1) congenital anomalies of the digestive system-ALL; 2) congenital cataracts-ALL; 3) anomalies of the skin-ALL; 4) congenital anomalies of the heart-ALL; 5) congenital anomalies of the heart-AML; and 6) congenital anomalies of the nervous system-AML. Several of our observations are consistent with previous findings,¹⁰ including anomalies of the skin-ALL and congenital anomalies of the heart and circulatory system-AML.

While these associations are notable, our study points to two important findings in relation to non-chromosomal birth defects and leukemia susceptibility. First, there are not as many associations reported for leukemia as with some solid tumors (e.g., germ cell tumors are associated with a larger spectrum of birth defects).^{10, 21} Second, associations are not as strong as reported for other pediatric cancers (e.g., neuroblastoma).^{10, 17, 19, 20} However, some of these differences could be due to the variability in birth defect reporting between questionnaire-based studies and registry-based studies. In our assessment, the prevalence of birth defects was higher in registry-based studies compared to questionnaire-based studies. Additionally, birth defect-leukemia associations from registry-based studies were generally stronger compared to questionnaire-based studies. This suggests to the likelihood of underreporting in questionnaire-based studies, as well as the potential for differential reporting. In fact, there are reported differences in birth defect reporting across many modalities (e.g., birth certificates, questionnaires, active surveillance).^{38–41} Because of that, it is important to leverage multiple sources of data when evaluating these conditions and their impact on cancer risk. Future studies of leukemia risk in children with non-chromosomal birth defects should utilize data from expanded registry linkages. Nevertheless, our assessment yielded new insights regarding birth defect-leukemia associations.

We found generally consistent associations for congenital anomalies of the digestive system and ALL (while not statistically significant, similar patterns were seen for AML and infant leukemia); congenital cataracts and ALL; congenital anomalies of the nervous system and AML; and congenital anomalies of the heart and circulatory system for both ALL and AML. These observed associations could be due to a range of factors. First, each of these structural birth defects is more common in children with Down syndrome.⁴² Although we excluded children with Down syndrome from this assessment, it is possible that genetic variation on

chromosome 21 could explain the co-occurrence of these conditions, or that cases of Down syndrome were misclassified.^{7, 43} Second, it is also possible that these associations could be due to other known syndromes that were not diagnosed in these individuals. For example, children with Fanconi anemia, an AML predisposition syndrome, are more likely to have heart and gastrointestinal defects compared to unaffected children.⁴⁴ Third, it is possible that these associations could represent “yet-to-be-discovered” cancer predisposition syndromes or shared genetic effects across phenotypes (i.e., pleiotropy) that could be leveraged to discover novel genetic variants underlying the occurrence of both birth defects and leukemia.

A largely unexplored potential explanation for the overlap between non-chromosomal birth defects and leukemia, as well as other pediatric cancers, is the role of non-genetic *in utero* factors and exposures that could lead to both phenotypes (e.g., maternal diabetes) or postnatal exposures that children with birth defects are more likely to receive (e.g., diagnostic procedures that involve radiation).²¹ However, outside of a recent assessment evaluating the impact of *in vitro* fertilization (IVF) on the co-occurrence of birth defects and pediatric cancer, which reported that IVF-exposed children were more likely to develop both birth defects and cancer compared to naturally conceived children,⁴⁵ there have been few attempts to evaluate the role of various exposures on the overlap between these conditions.

Our study must be considered in the light of certain limitations. First, and as noted, it is possible that birth defects may have been incompletely ascertained. Our study relied separately on self-reported birth defects (questionnaire-based studies) and independent assessment of birth defects (registry-based studies). Each of these approaches has limitations.²¹ However, for defects with sufficient numbers to evaluate associations by study design, the direction of effects were largely consistent, with findings from registry-based studies being stronger. Also, while incomplete ascertainment of birth defects may bias our effect estimates, most studies of birth defects and cancer risk (independent of birth defect ascertainment method) have comparable findings.²¹ Related to this, it is possible that selection bias could influence results derived from the case-control studies. However, the inclusion of data from registry-based studies aided in the evaluation of this potential bias across study types. Even in our large study, sample size issues or data availability limited our ability to evaluate subtypes based on immunophenotype, cytogenetic features, or other genomic characteristics. This could be particularly important as there is evidence that etiologic factors differ by tumor characteristics.⁴⁶ Finally, an issue inherent in studies of birth defects and cancer is that children diagnosed with cancer may undergo additional diagnostic scrutiny compared to children without a malignancy, which results in the increased identification of birth defects in cases compared to controls.¹⁰ However, previous assessments have indicated this is likely not a driver of observed birth defect-pediatric cancer associations.¹⁰

The present study has considerable strengths, most notably its large sample size (>15,000 cases), which enabled us to evaluate specific non-chromosomal birth defects that have not been included in previous assessments. Another strength of our assessment is the inclusion of different study designs (questionnaire- versus registry-based) as well as leukemia types (ALL, AML, and infant acute leukemia), which allowed us to conduct sensitivity analyses to evaluate differences by case ascertainment method, helping us to confirm associations.

Lastly, as this is an international study, we included diverse populations from multiple settings and geographical locations.²⁵

In conclusion, while associations between non-chromosomal birth defects and leukemia risk were observed, they were not as numerous or strong as those reported for other less common pediatric cancers. However, these findings contribute to our understanding of leukemia risk. Future assessments should evaluate the mediating effects of key variables, including birthweight and gestational age. Additionally, we recommend leveraging associations related to the role of anomalies of the heart, skin, and digestive system to evaluate the role of shared genetic effects and non-genetic exposures, thereby yielding new insights into the overlap between non-chromosomal birth defects and acute leukemia, as well as acute leukemia susceptibility in general.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgements

AUS-ALL: The AUS-ALL consortium conducted the AUS-ALL study and the Telethon Kids Institute (formerly Telethon Institute for Child Health Research; TICHR), University of Western Australia, was the coordinating center. Bruce Armstrong (Sydney School of Public Health), Elizabeth Milne (TICHR), Frank van Bockxmeer (Royal Perth Hospital), Michelle Haber (Children's Cancer Institute Australia), Rodney Scott (University of Newcastle), John Attia (University of Newcastle), Murray Norris (Children's Cancer Institute Australia), Carol Bower (TICHR), Nicholas de Klerk (TICHR), Lin Fritschi (WA Institute for Medical Research, WAIMR), Ursula Kees (TICHR), Margaret Miller (Edith Cowan University), Judith Thompson (WA Cancer Registry) were the research investigators, and Helen Bailey (TICHR) was the project coordinator. The clinical investigators were: Frank Alvaro (John Hunter Hospital, Newcastle); Catherine Cole (Princess Margaret Hospital for Children, Perth); Luciano Dalla Pozza (Children's Hospital at Westmead, Sydney); John Daubenton (Royal Hobart Hospital, Hobart); Peter Downie (Monash Medical Centre, Melbourne); Liane Lockwood (Royal Children's Hospital, Brisbane); Maria Kirby (Women's and Children's Hospital, Adelaide); Glenn Marshall (Sydney Children's Hospital, Sydney); Elizabeth Smibert (Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne); Ram Suppiah (previously Mater Children's Hospital, Brisbane). AUS-ALL was funded by the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia Grant Number 254539.

Baylor College of Medicine: Research reported in this publication was supported by the U.S. Department of Defense under award number CA190214 (PJ Lupo).

California Childhood Leukemia Study: The CCLS thanks the families for their participation and the clinical investigators at the following collaborating hospitals for help in recruiting patients: University of California Davis Medical Center (Dr. J. Ducore), University of California San Francisco (Drs. M. Loh and K. Matthay), Children's Hospital of Central California (Dr. V. Crouse), Lucile Packard Children's Hospital (Dr. G. Dahl), Children's Hospital Oakland (Dr. J. Feusner), Kaiser Permanente Roseville (former Sacramento; Drs. K. Jolly and V. Kiley), Kaiser Permanente Santa Clara (Drs. C. Russo, A. Wong, and D. Taggart), Kaiser Permanente San Francisco (Dr. K. Leung), and Kaiser Permanente Oakland (Drs. D. Kronish and S. Month). Finally, the CCLS thanks the entire study staff and former University of California, Berkeley Survey Research Center for their effort and dedication. This work was supported by the National Institute for Environmental Health Sciences (NIEHS) grants R01ES009137, P42ES004705, R24ES028524, and P01ES018172, the United States Environmental Protection Agency grant RD83451101, and with the additional support from the Children with Cancer UK (CWCUK). The content of this manuscript is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the funding sponsors.

NARECHEM-ST: The authors wish to acknowledge the contribution of the network (narechem.gr) of pediatric hematologists-oncologists, radiologists, immunologists, and pediatricians who made this study possible; the field coordinator Evanthia Bouka, MPH and the statisticians Nick Dessypris M.Sc., Ph.D and George Markozannes M.Sc., Ph.D. Continuous clinical support by Margarita Baka M.D. (Department of Pediatric Hematology–Oncology, “P&A Kyriakou” Children's Hospital, Athens), Maria Moschovi M.D., Sophia Polychronopoulou M.D.(Departments of Pediatric Hematology–Oncology, “A. Sophia” Children's Hospital, Athens); Emmanouel Hatzipantelis M.D., Ph.D (Pediatric Hematology Oncology Unit, 2nd Pediatric Department of Aristotle University, AHEPA General Hospital, Thessaloniki); Maria Kourti M.D.(Pediatric Oncology Department, Hippokraton

Hospital, Thessaloniki); Eftychia Stiakaki M.D.(Department of Pediatric Hematology-Oncology, University Hospital of Heraklion, Heraklion); Maria Karalexi and Ioannis Matsoukis M.D. (Department of Hygiene, Epidemiology and Medical Statistics, Athens University Medical School, 11527 Athens) should be also acknowledged. The Study has been supported in part since 1996 by the Hellenic Society for Social Pediatrics and Health Promotion.

Data Availability Statement

Supporting data may be obtained by formal application to each of the participating Principal Investigators and the relevant ethical and regulatory bodies. Further information is available from the corresponding author upon request.

Abbreviations:

ALL	acute lymphoblastic leukemia
AML	acute myeloid leukemia
CI	confidence interval
CLIC	Childhood Cancer and Leukemia International Consortium
FDR	false discovery ratio
NBDPN	National Birth Defects Prevention Network
OR	odds ratio

References

1. Johnston WT, Erdmann F, Newton R, Steliarova-Foucher E, Schuz J, Roman E. Childhood cancer: Estimating regional and global incidence. *Cancer Epidemiol* 2021;71: 101662. [PubMed: 31924557]
2. Steliarova-Foucher E, Colombet M, Ries LAG, Moreno F, Dolya A, Bray F, Hesselting P, Shin HY, Stiller CA, contributors I-. International incidence of childhood cancer, 2001–10: a population-based registry study. *Lancet Oncol* 2017;18: 719–31. [PubMed: 28410997]
3. Barrington-Trimis JL, Cockburn M, Metayer C, Gauderman WJ, Wiemels J, McKean-Cowdin R. Trends in childhood leukemia incidence over two decades from 1992 to 2013. *Int J Cancer* 2017;140: 1000–8. [PubMed: 27778348]
4. Pui CH, Yang JJ, Hunger SP, Pieters R, Schrappe M, Biondi A, Vora A, Baruchel A, Silverman LB, Schmiegelow K, Escherich G, Horibe K, et al. Childhood Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia: Progress Through Collaboration. *J Clin Oncol* 2015;33: 2938–48. [PubMed: 26304874]
5. Hudson MM, Ness KK, Gurney JG, Mulrooney DA, Chemaitilly W, Krull KR, Green DM, Armstrong GT, Nottage KA, Jones KE, Sklar CA, Srivastava DK, et al. Clinical ascertainment of health outcomes among adults treated for childhood cancer. *Jama* 2013;309: 2371–81. [PubMed: 23757085]
6. Zhang J, Walsh MF, Wu G, Edmonson MN, Gruber TA, Easton J, Hedges D, Ma X, Zhou X, Yergeau DA, Wilkinson MR, Vadodaria B, et al. Germline Mutations in Predisposition Genes in Pediatric Cancer. *The New England journal of medicine* 2015;373: 2336–46. [PubMed: 26580448]
7. Buitenkamp TD, Izraeli S, Zimmermann M, Forestier E, Heerema NA, van den Heuvel-Eibrink MM, Pieters R, Korbijn CM, Silverman LB, Schmiegelow K, Liang DC, Horibe K, et al. Acute lymphoblastic leukemia in children with Down syndrome: a retrospective analysis from the Ponte di Legno study group. *Blood* 2014;123: 70–7. [PubMed: 24222333]
8. Krivit W, Good RA. Simultaneous occurrence of mongolism and leukemia; report of a nationwide survey. *AMA J Dis Child* 1957;94: 289–93. [PubMed: 13457660]

9. Marlow EC, Ducore J, Kwan ML, Cheng SY, Bowles EJA, Greenlee RT, Pole JD, Rahm AK, Stout NK, Weinmann S, Smith-Bindman R, Miglioretti DL. Leukemia Risk in a Cohort of 3.9 Million Children with and without Down Syndrome. *The Journal of pediatrics* 2021;234: 172–80 e3. [PubMed: 33684394]
10. Lupo PJ, Schraw JM, Desrosiers TA, Nembhard WN, Langlois PH, Canfield MA, Copeland G, Meyer RE, Brown AL, Chambers TM, Sok P, Danysh HE, et al. Association Between Birth Defects and Cancer Risk Among Children and Adolescents in a Population-Based Assessment of 10 Million Live Births. *JAMA Oncol* 2019;5: 1150–8. [PubMed: 31219523]
11. Christianson A, Howson C, Modell B, Global Report on Birth Defects: The Hidden Toll of Dying and Disabled Children, 2006.
12. Agha MM, Williams JI, Marrett L, To T, Zipursky A, Dodds L. Congenital abnormalities and childhood cancer. *Cancer* 2005;103: 1939–48. [PubMed: 15770693]
13. Altmann AE, Halliday JL, Giles GG. Associations between congenital malformations and childhood cancer. A register-based case-control study. *British Journal of Cancer* 1998;78: 1244–9. [PubMed: 9820188]
14. Bjorge T, Cnattingius S, Lie RT, Tretli S, Engeland A. Cancer risk in children with birth defects and in their families: a population based cohort study of 5.2 million children from Norway and Sweden. *Cancer epidemiology, biomarkers & prevention : a publication of the American Association for Cancer Research, cosponsored by the American Society of Preventive Oncology* 2008;17: 500–6.
15. Botto LD, Flood T, Little J, Fluchel MN, Krikov S, Feldkamp ML, Wu Y, Goedken R, Puzhankara S, Romitti PA. Cancer risk in children and adolescents with birth defects: a population-based cohort study. *PLoS One* 2013;8: e69077. [PubMed: 23874873]
16. Carozza SE, Bae H, Meath T, Branscum A, Bovbjerg ML, Langlois PH. Evaluation of maternal health and labor and delivery conditions as risk factors for childhood leukemias in children with Down syndrome. *Cancer Epidemiol* 2017;46: 36–41. [PubMed: 28012443]
17. Daltveit DS, Klungsoyr K, Engeland A, Ekbohm A, Gissler M, Glimelius I, Grotmol T, Madanat-Harjuoja L, Ording AG, Saether SMM, Sorensen HT, Troisi R, et al. Cancer risk in individuals with major birth defects: large Nordic population based case-control study among children, adolescents, and adults. *BMJ* 2020;371: m4060. [PubMed: 33268348]
18. Dawson S, Charles AK, Bower C, de Klerk NH, Milne E. Risk of cancer among children with birth defects: a novel approach. *Birth defects research Part A, Clinical and molecular teratology* 2015;103: 284–91. [PubMed: 25808250]
19. Fisher PG, Reynolds P, Von Behren J, Carmichael SL, Rasmussen SA, Shaw GM. Cancer in children with nonchromosomal birth defects. *The Journal of pediatrics* 2012;160: 978–83. [PubMed: 22244463]
20. Janitz AE, Neas BR, Campbell JE, Pate AE, Stoner JA, Magzamen SL, Peck JD. Childhood cancer in children with congenital anomalies in Oklahoma, 1997 to 2009. *Birth defects research Part A, Clinical and molecular teratology* 2016;106: 633–42. [PubMed: 26945683]
21. Johnson KJ, Lee JM, Ahsan K, Padda H, Feng Q, Partap S, Fowler SA, Druley TE. Pediatric cancer risk in association with birth defects: A systematic review. *PLoS One* 2017;12: e0181246. [PubMed: 28749971]
22. Narod SA, Hawkins MM, Robertson CM, Stiller CA. Congenital anomalies and childhood cancer in Great Britain. *American journal of human genetics* 1997;60: 474–85. [PubMed: 9042906]
23. Norwood MS, Lupo PJ, Chow EJ, Scheurer ME, Plon SE, Danysh HE, Spector LG, Carozza SE, Doody DR, Mueller BA. Childhood cancer risk in those with chromosomal and non-chromosomal congenital anomalies in Washington State: 1984–2013. *PLoS One* 2017;12: e0179006. [PubMed: 28594943]
24. Rankin J, Silf KA, Pearce MS, Parker L, Ward Platt M. Congenital anomaly and childhood cancer: A population-based, record linkage study. *Pediatric blood & cancer* 2008;51: 608–12. [PubMed: 18623214]
25. Metayer C, Milne E, Clavel J, Infante-Rivard C, Petridou E, Taylor M, Schuz J, Spector LG, Dockerty JD, Magnani C, Pombo-de-Oliveira MS, Sinnen D, et al. The Childhood Leukemia International Consortium. *Cancer Epidemiol* 2013;37: 336–47. [PubMed: 23403126]

26. Bailey HD, Fritschi L, Infante-Rivard C, Glass DC, Miligi L, Dockerty JD, Lightfoot T, Clavel J, Roman E, Spector LG, Kaatsch P, Metayer C, et al. Parental occupational pesticide exposure and the risk of childhood leukemia in the offspring: findings from the childhood leukemia international consortium. *Int J Cancer* 2014;135: 2157–72. [PubMed: 24700406]
27. Karalexi MA, Dessypris N, Clavel J, Metayer C, Erdmann F, Orsi L, Kang AY, Schuz J, Bonaventure A, Greenop KR, Milne E, Petridou ET, et al. Coffee and tea consumption during pregnancy and risk of childhood acute myeloid leukemia: A Childhood Leukemia International Consortium (CLIC) study. *Cancer Epidemiol* 2019;62: 101581. [PubMed: 31416015]
28. Karalexi MA, Dessypris N, Ma X, Spector LG, Marcotte E, Clavel J, Pombo-de-Oliveira MS, Heck JE, Roman E, Mueller BA, Hansen J, Auvinen A, et al. Age-, sex- and disease subtype-related foetal growth differentials in childhood acute myeloid leukaemia risk: A Childhood Leukemia International Consortium analysis. *Eur J Cancer* 2020;130: 1–11. [PubMed: 32163883]
29. Marcotte EL, Thomopoulos TP, Infante-Rivard C, Clavel J, Petridou ET, Schuz J, Ezzat S, Dockerty JD, Metayer C, Magnani C, Scheurer ME, Mueller BA, et al. Caesarean delivery and risk of childhood leukaemia: a pooled analysis from the Childhood Leukemia International Consortium (CLIC). *Lancet Haematol* 2016;3: e176–85. [PubMed: 27063976]
30. Metayer C, Petridou E, Arangure JM, Roman E, Schuz J, Magnani C, Mora AM, Mueller BA, de Oliveira MS, Dockerty JD, McCauley K, Lightfoot T, et al. Parental Tobacco Smoking and Acute Myeloid Leukemia: The Childhood Leukemia International Consortium. *Am J Epidemiol* 2016;184: 261–73. [PubMed: 27492895]
31. Panagopoulou P, Skalkidou A, Marcotte E, Erdmann F, Ma X, Heck JE, Auvinen A, Mueller BA, Spector LG, Roman E, Metayer C, Magnani C, et al. Parental age and the risk of childhood acute myeloid leukemia: results from the Childhood Leukemia International Consortium. *Cancer Epidemiol* 2019;59: 158–65. [PubMed: 30776582]
32. Government of Western Australia Department of Health. WARDA – Diagnostic codes for birth defects. Available from: https://ww2.health.wa.gov.au/Articles/U_Z/WARDA-Diagnostic-codes-for-birth-defects
33. Network NBDP. Birth Defects Surveillance Guidelines. Available from: <https://www.nbdpn.org/guidelines.php#New>
34. Mai CT, Isenburg JL, Canfield MA, Meyer RE, Correa A, Alverson CJ, Lupo PJ, Riehle-Colarusso T, Cho SJ, Aggarwal D, Kirby RS, National Birth Defects Prevention N. National population-based estimates for major birth defects, 2010–2014. *Birth Defects Res* 2019;111: 1420–35. [PubMed: 31580536]
35. Yoon PW, Rasmussen SA, Lynberg MC, Moore CA, Anderka M, Carmichael SL, Costa P, Druschel C, Hobbs CA, Romitti PA, Langlois PH, Edmonds LD. The National Birth Defects Prevention Study. *Public Health Rep* 2001;116 Suppl 1: 32–40.
36. Schraw JM, Bailey HD, Bonaventure A, Mora AM, Roman E, Mueller BA, Clavel J, Petridou ET, Karalexi M, Ntzani E, Ezzat S, Rashed WM, et al. Infant feeding practices and childhood acute leukemia: Findings from the Childhood Cancer & Leukemia International Consortium. *Int J Cancer* 2022;151: 1013–23. [PubMed: 35532209]
37. Benjamini Y, Drai D, Elmer G, Kafkafi N, Golani I. Controlling the false discovery rate in behavior genetics research. *Behav Brain Res* 2001;125: 279–84. [PubMed: 11682119]
38. Mai CT, Isenburg J, Langlois PH, Alverson CJ, Gilboa SM, Rickard R, Canfield MA, Anjohrin SB, Lupo PJ, Jackson DR, Stallings EB, Scheuerle AE, et al. Population-based birth defects data in the United States, 2008 to 2012: Presentation of state-specific data and descriptive brief on variability of prevalence. *Birth defects research Part A, Clinical and molecular teratology* 2015;103: 972–93. [PubMed: 26611917]
39. Reefhuis J, Gilboa SM, Anderka M, Browne ML, Feldkamp ML, Hobbs CA, Jenkins MM, Langlois PH, Newsome KB, Olshan AF, Romitti PA, Shapira SK, et al. The National Birth Defects Prevention Study: A review of the methods. *Birth defects research Part A, Clinical and molecular teratology* 2015;103: 656–69. [PubMed: 26033852]
40. Rutkowski RE, Salemi JL, Tanner JP, Matas JL, Kirby RS. Assessing the Impact of Different Race-Bridging Algorithms on the Reported Rate of Birth Defects. *J Registry Manag* 2017;44: 146–56. [PubMed: 30133431]

41. Salemi JL, Tanner JP, Sampat DP, Rutkowski RE, Anjohrin SB, Marshall J, Kirby RS. Evaluation of the Sensitivity and Accuracy of Birth Defects Indicators on the 2003 Revision of the U.S. Birth Certificate: Has Data Quality Improved? *Paediatr Perinat Epidemiol* 2017;31: 67–75. [PubMed: 27859434]
42. Heinke D, Isenburg JL, Stallings EB, Short TD, Le M, Fisher S, Shan X, Kirby RS, Nguyen HH, Nestoridi E, Nembhard WN, Romitti PA, et al. Prevalence of structural birth defects among infants with Down syndrome, 2013–2017: A US population-based study. *Birth Defects Res* 2021;113: 189–202. [PubMed: 33348463]
43. Brown AL, de Smith AJ, Gant VU, Yang W, Scheurer ME, Walsh KM, Chernus JM, Kallsen NA, Peyton SA, Davies GE, Ehli EA, Winick N, et al. Inherited genetic susceptibility to acute lymphoblastic leukemia in Down syndrome. *Blood* 2019;134: 1227–37. [PubMed: 31350265]
44. Walsh MF, Chang VY, Kohlmann WK, Scott HS, Cunniff C, Bourdeaut F, Molenaar JJ, Porter CC, Sandlund JT, Plon SE, Wang LL, Savage SA. Recommendations for Childhood Cancer Screening and Surveillance in DNA Repair Disorders. *Clin Cancer Res* 2017;23: e23–e31. [PubMed: 28572264]
45. Luke B, Brown MB, Nichols HB, Schymura MJ, Browne ML, Fisher SC, Forestieri NE, Rao C, Yazdy MM, Gershman ST, Ethen MK, Canfield MA, et al. Assessment of Birth Defects and Cancer Risk in Children Conceived via In Vitro Fertilization in the US. *JAMA Netw Open* 2020;3: e2022927. [PubMed: 33119107]
46. Lupo PJ, Spector LG. Cancer Progress and Priorities: Childhood Cancer. *Cancer epidemiology, biomarkers & prevention : a publication of the American Association for Cancer Research, cosponsored by the American Society of Preventive Oncology* 2020;29: 1081–94.

Novelty and Impact

Little is known about the potential etiologic role non-chromosomal birth defects have on childhood leukemia risk. Therefore, we sought to identify associations between leukemia and non-chromosomal birth defects in a pooled cohort from studies participating in the Childhood Cancer and Leukemia International Consortium. Certain birth defects were strongly associated with increased leukemia risk. These associations could point to novel genetic and environmental factors associated with birth defects that could also increase leukemia susceptibility.

Table 1.

Demographics of Subjects from the Childhood Cancer and Leukemia International Consortium

Study Site ^d	Controls (N=46,172)	Cases (N=15,235)	ALL ^a (N=13,115)	AML ^b (N=2,120)	Infant ^c (N=1,152)
Australia (Aus-ALL)	1,246 (2.7)	387 (2.5)	387 (2.6)	0 (0.0)	10 (0.9)
Brazil	541 (1.3)	578 (3.8)	428 (3.2)	150 (7.1)	135 (11.7)
Canada	790 (1.7)	753 (4.9)	753 (5.7)	0 (0.0)	24 (2.1)
Costa Rica	578 (1.2)	291 (1.9)	251 (1.9)	40 (1.9)	13 (1.1)
Denmark	15,871 (34.4)	1,582 (10.4)	1,333 (10.1)	249 (11.8)	86 (7.5)
Egypt	351 (0.8)	296 (1.9)	296 (2.2)	0 (0.0)	5 (0.4)
France (Adele)	288 (0.6)	275 (1.8)	240 (1.8)	35 (1.7)	16 (1.4)
France (Electre)	567 (1.2)	458 (3.0)	399 (3.0)	59 (2.8)	11 (0.9)
France (Escalé)	1,681 (3.6)	738 (4.8)	641 (4.8)	97 (4.6)	29 (2.5)
France (Estelle)	1,420 (3.1)	727 (4.8)	628 (4.7)	99 (4.7)	34 (2.9)
Germany	2,056 (4.5)	720 (4.7)	622 (4.7)	98 (4.6)	44 (3.8)
Greece (NARECHEM-ST)	1,433 (3.1)	1,297 (8.5)	1,233 (9.3)	64 (3.0)	41 (3.6)
Italy (MORE)	528 (1.1)	110 (0.7)	106 (0.8)	4 (0.2)	7 (0.6)
Italy (SETIL)	1,044 (2.2)	677 (4.4)	596 (4.5)	81 (3.8)	30 (2.6)
New Zealand (NZCCS)	303 (0.7)	118 (0.8)	96 (0.7)	22 (1.0)	5 (0.4)
United Kingdom (UKCCS)	7,610 (16.5)	1,672 (11.0)	1,437 (10.9)	235 (11.1)	90 (7.8)
USA (California Childhood Leukemia Study)	1,225 (2.7)	944 (6.2)	813 (6.1)	131 (6.2)	45 (3.9)
USA (Children's Cancer Group)	2,596 (5.6)	2,428 (15.9)	1,911 (14.4)	517 (24.3)	34 (2.9)
USA (Children's Cancer Group – AE24)	324 (0.7)	433 (2.8)	262 (2.0)	171 (8.0)	440 (38.2)
USA (Texas)	426 (0.9)	347 (2.3)	334 (3.3)	13 (0.8)	35 (3.0)
USA (Washington)	5,294 (11.5)	404 (2.7)	349 (2.6)	55 (2.6)	18 (1.6)
Sex					
Male	24,909 (53.9)	8,380 (55.0)	7,283 (55.5)	1,097 (51.8)	563 (48.9)
Female	21,262 (46.1)	6,854 (45.0)	5,831 (44.5)	1,023 (48.2)	589 (51.1)
Missing	1	1	1	0	0

	Controls (N=46,172)	Cases (N=15,235)	ALL ^a (N=13,115)	AML ^b (N=2,120)	Infant ^c (N=1,152)
Birthweight (in grams)					
<2500 grams	2,515 (5.9)	768 (5.2)	659 (5.2)	109 (5.3)	55 (4.9)
2500–3999 grams	34,835 (81.0)	11,927 (81.1)	10,241 (80.9)	1,686 (82.3)	915 (81.7)
>3999 grams	5,636 (13.1)	2,009 (13.7)	1,756 (13.9)	253 (12.4)	150 (13.4)
Missing	3,186	531	459	72	32
Maternal Age					
<25 years	12,410 (27.2)	4,170 (27.7)	3,522 (27.2)	648 (30.8)	295 (26.4)
25–29 years	16,268 (35.6)	5,147 (34.2)	4,431 (34.3)	716 (34.0)	341 (30.5)
30–34 years	11,647 (25.5)	3,907 (26.0)	3,408 (26.3)	499 (23.7)	324 (28.9)
35–39 years	4,52 (9.9)	1,516 (10.1)	1,314 (10.2)	202 (9.6)	129 (11.5)
40 years	872 (1.9)	303 (2.0)	264 (2.0)	39 (1.9)	31 (2.8)
Missing	473	192	176	16	32
Child Race/Ethnicity					
Non-Hispanic White	38,145 (89.3)	11,247 (80.5)	9,644 (80.6)	1,603 (79.8)	810 (76.0)
Non-Hispanic Black	718 (1.7)	350 (2.5)	269 (2.3)	81 (4.0)	60 (5.6)
Hispanic	1,693 (4.0)	1,207 (8.6)	1,036 (8.7)	171 (8.5)	114 (10.7)
Other	2,181 (5.1)	1,170 (8.4)	1,015 (8.5)	155 (7.7)	82 (7.7)
Missing	3,435	1,261	1,151	110	86
Gestational Age^e					
Preterm	2,425 (6.4)	952 (7.3)	827 (7.4)	125 (6.7)	68 (6.7)
Term	35,421 (93.6)	12,047 (92.7)	10,295 (92.6)	1,752 (93.3)	942 (93.3)
Missing	8,326	2,236	1,993	243	142
Maternal Education					
Less than Secondary Education	7,471 (30.1)	4,042 (32.2)	3,499 (32.3)	543 (31.6)	231 (22.9)
Completed Secondary Education	9,360 (37.7)	4,289 (34.2)	3,586 (33.1)	703 (40.9)	292 (28.9)
Above Secondary Education	7,983 (32.2)	4,227 (33.7)	3,752 (34.6)	475 (27.6)	489 (48.3)
Missing	21,358	2,677	2,278	399	140
Plurality					
Singleton	42,740 (96.8)	13,423 (95.9)	11,541 (95.5)	1,882 (98.5)	944 (97.4)

	Controls (N=46,172)	Cases (N=15,235)	ALL ^a (N=13,115)	AML ^b (N=2,120)	Infant ^c (N=1,152)
Multiple	1,408 (3.2)	568 (4.1)	539 (4.5)	29 (1.5)	25 (2.6)
Missing	2,024	1,244	1,035	209	183
Age at Diagnosis/Inclusion (Mean/SD)	5.7 (4.2)	5.5 (4.0)	5.4 (3.7)	6.2 (5.3)	0.5 (0.4)
Year of Birth					
1965–1976	9,137 (19.9)	968 (6.4)	757 (5.8)	211 (9.9)	38 (3.3)
1977–1986	9,423 (20.6)	2,895 (19.0)	2,434 (18.6)	461 (21.8)	28 (2.4)
1987–1996	14,964 (32.7)	5,344 (35.1)	4,661 (35.5)	683 (32.2)	271 (23.5)
1997–2006	9,963 (21.8)	4,592 (30.1)	3,997 (30.5)	595 (28.1)	678 (58.9)
2007–2016	2,310 (5.0)	1,436 (9.4)	1,266 (9.7)	170 (8.0)	137 (11.9)
Missing	375	0	0	0	0

^a Acute lymphoblastic leukemia

^b Acute myeloid leukemia

^c Infant leukemia includes any leukemia case diagnosed at < 12 months of age

^d The studies in Denmark, Italy(MORE), and Washington are registry based, all others are questionnaire-based

^e Preterm: <37 weeks; Term: ≥ 37 weeks

Table 2.

Risk of Childhood Leukemia by Birth Defect Group and Leukemia Subtype

	ALL ^a						AML ^b						Infant ^c					
	Controls N=46,172	Exposed N=13,115	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P	pFDR	Cases N=2,120	Exposed N=129	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P	pFDR	Cases N=1,152	Exposed N=124	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P	pFDR
Congenital anomalies of the nervous system	49 (1.8)	13 (1.7)	0.93 (0.51–1.72)	1.60 (0.77–3.31)	0.207	0.570	5 (3.9)	5 (3.9)	2.23 (0.89–5.59)	4.23 (1.50–11.89)	0.006	0.024	3 (2.4)	3 (2.4)	--	--	--	--
Congenital anomalies of the eye	73 (2.7)	31 (4.1)	1.50 (0.98–2.28)	1.55 (0.93–2.58)	0.095	0.299	5 (3.9)	5 (3.9)	1.49 (0.60–3.70)	1.75 (0.65–4.59)	0.258	0.387	2 (1.6)	2 (1.6)	--	--	--	--
Anophthalmia or microphthalmia	25 (1.0)	6 (0.7)	0.84 (0.35–2.06)	0.58 (0.17–1.98)	0.384	0.590	1 (0.8)	1 (0.8)	--	--	--	--	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	--	--	--	--
Congenital cataract	3 (0.1)	7 (0.9)	8.22 (2.12–31.79)	18.62 (4.36–79.49)	<0.001	0.002	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	--	--	--	--	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	--	--	--	--
Congenital anomalies of the ear, face and neck	241 (9.1)	30 (3.9)	0.44 (0.30–0.64)	0.91 (0.57–1.45)	0.684	0.836	6 (4.7)	6 (4.7)	0.54 (0.24–1.22)	1.28 (0.54–3.02)	0.570	0.664	5 (4.1)	5 (4.1)	0.83 (0.34–2.02)	1.27 (0.38–4.23)	0.700	0.900
Congenital anomalies of the respiratory system	39 (1.5)	9 (0.1)	0.81 (0.39–1.68)	0.93 (0.34–2.58)	0.894	0.790	3 (2.3)	3 (2.3)	--	--	--	--	3 (2.4)	3 (2.4)	--	--	--	--
Congenital anomalies of the heart and circulatory system	408 (15.3)	129 (17.1)	1.11 (0.91–1.36)	1.46 (1.10–1.95)	0.009	0.050	31 (24.0)	31 (24.0)	1.66 (1.15–2.40)	2.86 (1.81–4.52)	<0.001	0.001	16 (13.0)	16 (13.0)	1.58 (0.96–2.61)	1.57 (0.75–3.27)	0.227	0.681
Right ventricular outflow tract defects	123 (4.6)	60 (7.9)	1.72 (1.26–2.34)	0.72 (0.35–1.48)	0.366	0.590	10 (7.8)	10 (7.8)	1.77 (0.93–3.39)	1.30 (0.47–3.59)	0.608	0.664	8 (6.5)	8 (6.5)	2.62 (1.28–5.37)	1.35 (0.38–4.74)	0.641	0.900
Pulmonary valve atresia and stenosis	122 (4.6)	60 (7.9)	1.73 (1.27–2.36)	0.73 (0.35–1.50)	0.381	0.590	10 (7.8)	10 (7.8)	1.79 (0.94–3.41)	1.32 (0.48–3.64)	0.594	0.664	8 (6.5)	8 (6.5)	2.64 (1.29–5.41)	1.40 (0.39–4.98)	0.605	0.900

	ALL ^a						AML ^b						Infant ^c					
	Controls N=46,172	Cases N=13,115	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P	p ^{FDR}	Cases N=2,120	Exposed N=129	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P	p ^{FDR}	Cases N=1,152	Exposed N=124	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P	p ^{FDR}
	Exposed N=2,662	Exposed N=753																
<i>Septal defects</i>	90 (3.4)	15 (2.0)	0.59 (0.34–1.01)	1.11 (0.60–2.04)	0.743	0.861	5 (3.9)	1.21 (0.49–2.98)	2.37 (0.85–6.66)	0.100	0.172	1 (0.8)						
Ventricular septal defect	63 (2.4)	7 (0.9)	0.39 (0.18–0.85)	0.68 (0.30–1.56)	0.359	0.590	1 (0.8)											
Atrial septal defect	35 (1.3)	8 (1.0)	0.80 (0.37–1.73)	2.17 (0.89–5.25)	0.090	0.299	4 (3.1)											
Cleft palate and cleft lip	70 (2.6)	13 (1.7)	0.65 (0.36–1.18)	0.71 (0.34–1.22)	0.348	0.590	2 (1.6)											
<i>Cleft palate without cleft lip</i>	35 (1.3)	10 (1.3)	1.01 (0.50–2.03)	0.70 (0.29–1.62)	0.402	0.590	2 (1.6)											
Congenital anomalies of the digestive system	48 (1.8)	25 (3.3)	1.84 (1.13–2.98)	2.70 (1.46–4.98)	0.002	0.022	5 (3.9)	2.27 (0.90–5.71)	3.09 (0.97–9.91)	0.057	0.114	6 (4.9)	5.03 (2.15–11.78)	4.55 (1.06–19.62)	0.042	0.378		
Congenital anomalies of the genitourinary system	623 (23.4)	123 (16.3)	0.69 (0.57–0.84)	1.00 (0.78–1.27)	0.979	0.979	28 (21.7)	0.98 (0.67–1.43)	1.60 (1.02–2.51)	0.041	0.099	17 (13.8)	1.10 (0.67–1.78)	0.84 (0.40–1.76)	0.645	0.900		
<i>Renal agenesis and hypoplasia</i>	71 (2.7)	35 (4.6)	1.74 (1.16–2.61)	1.20 (0.64–2.25)	0.572	0.787	6 (4.7)	1.84 (0.80–4.25)	0.75 (0.16–3.51)	0.719	0.719	5 (4.1)	2.83 (1.14–7.02)	0.76 (0.09–6.59)	0.804	0.905		
<i>Obstructive genitourinary defects</i>	43 (1.6)	9 (1.1)	0.74 (0.36–1.51)	1.23 (0.55–2.74)	0.610	0.790	2 (1.6)											
<i>Hypospadias</i>	57 (2.1)	18 (2.4)	1.08 (0.64–1.84)	2.12 (1.16–3.85)	0.015	0.066	0 (0.0)											
Congenital anomalies of the	461 (17.3)	92 (12.2)	0.70 (0.56–0.88)	0.88 (0.66–1.17)	0.381	0.590	10 (7.8)	0.47 (0.25–0.88)	0.42 (0.18–0.97)	0.041	0.099	6 (4.9)	0.52 (0.23–1.16)	0.44 (0.16–1.18)	0.101	0.455		

	ALL ^a					AML ^b					Infant ^c						
	Controls N=46,172	Cases N=13,115	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P	p ^{FDR}	Cases N=2,120	Exposed N=129	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P	p ^{FDR}	Exposed N=124	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P	p ^{FDR}
musculoskeletal system																	
<i>Congenital hip dislocation</i>	79 (3.0)	12 (1.6)	0.53 (0.29–0.98)	1.01 (0.51–2.02)	0.967	0.979	1 (0.8)	--	--	--	--	1 (0.8)	--	--	--	--	--
<i>Congenital anomalies of the skin</i>	221 (8.3)	135 (17.9)	2.16 (1.74–2.68)	1.43 (1.11–1.85)	0.006	0.044	16 (12.4)	1.58 (0.95–2.63)	0.36 (0.18–0.70)	0.003	0.018	32 (26.0)	5.94 (4.08–8.65)	1.02 (0.54–1.90)	0.959	0.959	

Adjusted for study site, sex, maternal age, birth year, birthweight, gestational age, and race/ethnicity

^aAcute lymphoblastic leukemia

^bAcute myeloid leukemia

^cInfant leukemia includes any leukemia case diagnosed at < 12 months of age

Table 3.

Risk of ALL^a by Birth Defect Group and Study Design

	Registry-Based Studies				Questionnaire-Based Studies				P
	Controls N=21,693	Cases N=1,788	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	Controls N=24,479	Cases N=11,327	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	
Congenital anomalies of the nervous system	Exposed N=1,623	Exposed N=186	3.22 (1.58–6.56)	2.30 (0.88–6.05)	Exposed N=1,039	Exposed N=567	0.87 (0.37–2.01)	1.13 (0.41–3.09)	0.815
Congenital cataract	2 (0.1)	6 (3.2)	30.88 (6.23–153.11)	31.85 (6.10–166.17)	1 (0.1)	1 (0.2)	--	--	--
Congenital anomalies of the heart and circulatory system	239 (14.7)	44 (23.7)	2.62 (1.97–3.49)	2.36 (1.66–3.35)	169 (16.3)	85 (15.0)	1.16 (0.91–1.48)	0.84 (0.55–1.28)	0.418
Congenital anomalies of the digestive system	27 (16.6)	10 (5.4)	4.20 (2.08–8.48)	3.88 (1.63–9.19)	21 (2.0)	15 (2.6)	1.75 (0.95–3.23)	2.00 (0.89–4.52)	0.094
Congenital anomalies of the genitourinary system	445 (27.4)	41 (22.0)	1.18 (0.88–1.58)	1.08 (0.76–1.54)	178 (17.1)	82 (14.5)	1.05 (0.82–1.34)	0.92 (0.66–1.28)	0.724
Hypospadias	36 (2.2)	8 (4.3)	2.29 (1.06–4.93)	2.92 (1.33–6.40)	21 (2.0)	10 (1.8)	0.92 (0.45–1.90)	1.50 (0.64–3.53)	0.356
Congenital anomalies of the musculoskeletal system	169 (10.4)	18 (9.7)	1.26 (0.90–1.76)	1.23 (0.83–1.82)	142 (13.7)	57 (10.1)	0.84 (0.63–1.13)	0.66 (0.44–0.99)	0.046
Congenital anomalies of the skin	86 (5.2)	15 (8.1)	1.92 (1.12–3.27)	1.83 (0.97–3.48)	135 (13.0)	120 (21.2)	1.85 (1.46–2.35)	1.36 (1.04–1.80)	0.025

* Adjusted for study site, sex, maternal age, birth year, birthweight, gestational age, and race/ethnicity

^a Acute lymphoblastic leukemia

Table 4.

Risk of AML^a by Birth Defect Group and Study Design

	Registry-Based Studies				Questionnaire-Based Studies					
	Controls N=21,693	Cases N=308	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P	Controls N=24,479	Cases N=1,812	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P
	Exposed N=1,623	Exposed N=40	Exposed N=40	Exposed N=40		Exposed N=1,039	Exposed N=89	Exposed N=89	Exposed N=89	
Congenital anomalies of the nervous system										
	32 (2.0)	3 (7.5)	--	--	--	17 (1.6)	2 (2.2)	--	--	--
Congenital cataract	2 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	--	--	--	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	--	--	--
Congenital anomalies of the heart and circulatory system										
	239 (14.7)	16 (40.0)	2.62 (1.99–3.49)	5.39 (3.14–9.24)	<0.001	169 (16.3)	15 (16.9)	1.16 (0.91–1.48)	1.28 (0.61–2.67)	0.514
Congenital anomalies of the digestive system										
	27 (16.6)	1 (2.5)	--	--	--	21 (2.0)	4 (4.5)	--	--	--
Congenital anomalies of the genitourinary system										
	445 (27.4)	10 (25)	1.18 (0.88–1.58)	1.73 (0.87–3.45)	0.118	178 (17.1)	18 (20.2)	1.05 (0.81–1.34)	1.58 (0.86–2.88)	0.139
Hypospadias	36 (2.2)	0 (0.0)	--	--	--	21 (2.0)	0 (0.0)	--	--	--
Congenital anomalies of the musculoskeletal system										
	169 (10.4)	4 (10)	--	--	--	142 (13.7)	6 (6.7)	0.84 (0.63–1.13)	0.28 (0.85–0.91)	0.035
Congenital anomalies of the skin										
	86 (5.2)	1 (2.5)	--	--	--	135 (13.0)	15 (16.9)	1.85 (1.46–2.35)	0.42 (0.22–0.79)	0.007

* Adjusted for study site, sex, maternal age, birth year, birthweight, gestational age, and race/ethnicity

^a Acute myeloid leukemia

Table 5. Risk of Childhood Leukemia by Number of Birth Defects and Leukemia Subtype

	ALL ^a				AML ^b				Infant ^c				
	Controls (n=46,172)	Cases (n=13,115)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P _{trend}	Cases (n=2,120)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P _{trend}	Cases (n=1,152)	Unadjusted OR (95% CI)	Adjusted OR* (95% CI)	P _{trend}
No Defects	43,510 (94.2)	12,362 (94.3)	1.00 (Ref)	1.00 (Ref)		1,991 (93.9)	1.00 (Ref)	1.00 (Ref)		1,028 (89.2)	1.00 (Ref)	1.00 (Ref)	
1 Defect	2,436 (5.3)	704 (5.4)	1.01 (0.93– 1.10)	1.15 (1.03– 1.28)		108 (5.1)	1.01 (0.93– 1.10)	0.92 (0.72– 1.18)	0.442	94 (8.2)	1.63 (1.31– 2.02)	0.97 (0.69– 1.35)	
2 Defects	226 (0.5)	49 (0.4)	0.96 (0.73– 1.25)	1.32 (0.90– 1.94)	0.006	21 (1.0)	0.96 (0.73– 1.24)	1.96 (1.10– 3.46)		30 (2.6)	5.62 (3.82– 8.26)	1.71 (0.93– 1.35)	0.270

* Adjusted for study site, sex, maternal age, birth year, birthweight, gestational age, and race/ethnicity

^a Acute lymphoblastic leukemia

^b Acute myeloid leukemia

^c Infant leukemia includes any leukemia case diagnosed at < 12 months of age