

1 Original Contribution

2

3 Spatiotemporal Trends of Birth Defects in North Carolina, 2003-2015

4

5 Haidong Lu<sup>1</sup>, Andrew F. Olshan<sup>2</sup>, Marc L. Serre<sup>3</sup>, Kurtis M. Anthony<sup>2</sup>, Rebecca C. Fry<sup>3, 4, 5</sup>, Nina E.

6 Forestieri<sup>6</sup>, Alexander P. Keil<sup>2</sup>

7

8 Affiliations:

9 <sup>1</sup> Department of Internal Medicine, Yale School of Medicine, CT, USA;

10 <sup>2</sup> Department of Epidemiology, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University of North  
11 Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA;

12 <sup>3</sup> Department of Environmental Sciences and Engineering, Gillings School of Global Public  
13 Health, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA;

14 <sup>4</sup> Institute for Environmental Health Solutions, Gillings School of Global Public Health, University  
15 of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA;

16 <sup>5</sup> Curriculum in Toxicology and Environmental Medicine, University of North Carolina at Chapel  
17 Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA;

18 <sup>6</sup> Birth Defects Monitoring Program, State Center for Health Statistics, North Carolina  
19 Department of Health and Human Services, Raleigh, NC, USA;

20

21 Running title: Birth Defects in North Carolina

22 Correspondence: Haidong Lu, PhD

23 Department of Internal Medicine  
24 Yale School of Medicine  
25 367 Cedar Street  
26 New Haven, CT 06510  
27 [haidong.lu@yale.edu](mailto:haidong.lu@yale.edu)  
28 Phone: 202-230-4639  
29 Funding sources: National Institutes of Health/ National Institute of Environmental Health  
30 Sciences R01-ES029531  
31 Conflict of interest: None declared.  
32 Data and code: Data are available on request to the authors  
33 Word count: 196/200 (abstract); 3248/4000 (main text)

34 **ABSTRACT**

35 Birth defects are a leading cause of infant mortality in the United States, but little is known  
36 about causes of many types of birth defects. Spatiotemporal disease mapping to identify high-  
37 prevalence areas, is a potential strategy to narrow the search for potential environmental and  
38 other causes that aggregate over space and time. We described the spatial and temporal trends  
39 of the prevalence of birth defects in North Carolina during 2003-2015, using data on live births  
40 obtained from the North Carolina Birth Defects Monitoring Program. By employing a Bayesian  
41 space-time Poisson model, we estimated spatial and temporal trends of non-chromosomal and  
42 chromosomal birth defects. During 2003-2015, 52,524 (3.3%) of 1,598,807 live births had at  
43 least one recorded birth defect. The prevalence of non-chromosomal birth defects decreased  
44 from 3.8% in 2003 to 2.9% in 2015. Spatial modeling suggested a large geographic variation in  
45 non-chromosomal birth defects at census-tract level, with the highest prevalence in south-  
46 eastern North Carolina. The strong spatial heterogeneity revealed in this work allowed to  
47 identify geographic areas with higher prevalence of non-chromosomal birth defects in North  
48 Carolina. This variation will help inform future research focused on epidemiologic studies of  
49 birth defects to identify etiologic factors.

50 **Key Words:** birth defects; Bayesian disease mapping; spatiotemporal analysis;

51

52 Birth defects are a leading cause of infant mortality in the US.<sup>1,2</sup> In North Carolina, about 3% of  
53 all births are affected by birth defects each year.<sup>3</sup> In spite of the substantial health impact, with  
54 a few exceptions, little is known about modifiable causes or prevention of birth defects. Over  
55 60% of birth defect cases have no known cause.<sup>4</sup> Some factors such as chemical exposures,  
56 radiation, and medications have been associated with birth defects, leaving open the possibility  
57 that an important proportion of birth defects may be attributable to environmental causes.<sup>5,6</sup>  
58 Environmental exposures to persons often occur due to emission by fixed or mobile sources,  
59 thus leading to correlated exposures of individuals who are in spatiotemporal proximity.  
60 Synthesizing spatial information and exploring spatiotemporal patterns of the occurrences of  
61 birth defects may help to identify high-risk areas and populations and narrow the search for  
62 potential environmental and other spatially situated causes.

63  
64 Disease mapping, a visual representation of disease outcomes across geographic areas, has long  
65 been undertaken to facilitate description and investigation of disease outcomes and to address  
66 disease priorities. Disease mapping can also provide additional insights in highlighting high-risk  
67 populations, identifying modifiable causes of diseases, and explaining and predicting disease  
68 patterns. One barrier to progress in describing the spatial distribution of birth defect  
69 occurrence is disease rarity, especially within small areas (e.g., census tract), which leads to  
70 large uncertainty in area estimates of prevalence. Bayesian spatiotemporal modeling, which has  
71 become increasingly popular in public health research<sup>7</sup> can reduce this concern under the  
72 assumption that areas and times in close proximity will have prevalence more similar to each  
73 other than to more distal areas and times. This technique reduces estimation uncertainty in a

74 given area/time by borrowing information from neighboring areas and adjacent times, which  
75 can improve prevalence estimates of rare diseases.<sup>8</sup>

76  
77 In this study, we applied Bayesian disease mapping techniques to analyze data from the North  
78 Carolina Birth Defects Monitoring Program which included birth defects diagnosed to North  
79 Carolina resident live births between 2003 and 2015. Our goals were to: (1) describe broad  
80 spatial and temporal trends in the prevalence of birth defects in North Carolina, and (2) assess  
81 deviations from the state-wide spatiotemporal trends in prevalence to highlight local space-  
82 time regions of concern. This descriptive analysis will help better understand existing  
83 spatiotemporal patterns as well as inform future investigations by identifying high-risk  
84 populations and priority regions in the search for environmental causes of birth defects.

85

## 86 **METHODS**

### 87 *Study Population and Data*

88 Data on liveborn infants with birth defects were obtained from the North Carolina Birth Defects  
89 Monitoring Program (NCBDMP). The NCBDMP is an active, statewide, population-based  
90 surveillance system operated by the State Center for Health Statistics that collects information  
91 about all medically diagnosed birth defect cases among North Carolina resident infants. Birth  
92 defect cases were identified through systematic review and abstraction of medical records by  
93 trained NCBDMP field staff. Diagnoses were confirmed by the supporting documentation in  
94 medical records (e.g., medical imaging, physical exams, autopsy reports). During the same  
95 years, birth certificate records were used to identify all live births in North Carolina. The

96 affected and unaffected births serve as the base population of pregnancies from which affected  
97 fetuses are assumed to arise. Each record included demographic information such as maternal  
98 age at delivery and education, and infant sex, race, birth weight, multiplicity (singleton vs.  
99 other), delivery type (vaginal vs. cesarean) and gestational age at delivery. GPS-based latitude  
100 and longitude of maternal residence at delivery was recorded for all births.

101  
102 In the present study, we included data on all North Carolina resident births between 2003 and  
103 2015. The latitude and longitude coordinates for each birth were then matched to census tracts  
104 using the R tigris package.<sup>9</sup> For each census tract, birth defect cases and unaffected births were  
105 aggregated to annual counts. Sixteen of 2,195 census tracts (0.7%) with zero births across 2003  
106 to 2015 were excluded from analysis. For subsequent modeling purposes, we created an  
107 adjacency matrix, which characterizes all bordering census tracts for each census tract in North  
108 Carolina, using the R spdep package.<sup>10</sup> This study was approved by the University of North  
109 Carolina at Chapel Hill Institutional Review Board under a waiver of informed consent.

110  
111 *Outcomes*  
112 The primary outcome was diagnosis of any non-chromosomal birth defect. In addition, based  
113 on previous work into associations between birth defects and exposures from well water in  
114 North Carolina<sup>6</sup>, several individual major non-chromosomal birth defects were evaluated: 1)  
115 Anotia and microtia; 2) Conotruncal heart defects including common truncus, tetralogy of Fallot,  
116 and transposition of the great arteries; 3) Atrioventricular septal defects and endocardial  
117 cushion defects; 4) Cleft lip with or without cleft palate; 5) Cleft palate; 6) Hypospadias; 7)

118     Gastroschisis. CDC/BPA codes for each defect are given in S1 Appendix Table 1. The prevalence  
119     of overall birth defects and chromosomal birth defects was also examined.

120

121     *Target parameters*

122     The current analysis focuses on description, rather than causal inference, so we seek to  
123     estimate the crude (i.e., unadjusted for covariates) prevalence of non-chromosomal birth  
124     defects within each census tract-year in North Carolina. The crude prevalence is calculated by  
125     taking the number of non-chromosomal birth defects and dividing by the total number of live  
126     births. We use this crude prevalence as input into our spatiotemporal mapping scheme to  
127     estimate the annual prevalence of non-chromosomal birth defects among births with the  
128     potential to be affected and recorded by NCBMDP. This approach estimates a hypothetical  
129     “underlying” prevalence of non-chromosomal birth defects from which our data are only a  
130     single realization. The target parameter we wish to estimate is the prevalence ratio which  
131     contrasts the prevalence in a specific area and time with the average prevalence across the  
132     entire study period. Thus, a prevalence ratio  $> 1.0$  for a given census-tract-year indicates higher  
133     prevalence than the North Carolina average over the study period. This approach can be  
134     considered an approximation of a fetuses-at-risk approach<sup>11</sup> (see S2 Appendix), where we  
135     deviate from such an approach by missing information on fetal losses, and timing for each birth  
136     is defined by date of delivery rather than date of conception. Estimated crude prevalence ratios  
137     will be approximately unbiased if the proportion of fetal losses to total pregnancies is  
138     approximately constant over the study area and period.

139

140 *Statistical Analyses*

141 We estimated annual prevalence of non-chromosomal birth defects by census tract in North  
142 Carolina using a Bayesian space-time model that is widely used in spatial epidemiology.<sup>7,12</sup> We  
143 opted for this approach because birth defects are rare, and we would thus expect crude  
144 prevalence estimates within a given census tract and year to be unstable, or highly variable.  
145 With such highly variable prevalence estimates, it may be difficult to intuit spatiotemporal  
146 patterns, if they exist. Our Bayesian approach overcomes this instability by using carefully  
147 constructed priors that allow partial pooling of information across adjacent census tracts within  
148 a given calendar year, as well as by partial pooling of information across time within a given  
149 census tract. Thus, the approach assumes that the underlying prevalence of non-chromosomal  
150 birth defects varies smoothly over adjacent census tracts and years. Our general approach is to  
151 do this information borrowing without imposing strong modeling assumptions for spatial or  
152 temporal trends, which could potentially obscure important patterns.

153  
154 Our modeling approach can be expressed as a multi-level model.<sup>13</sup> For each non-chromosomal  
155 birth defect considered, we modelled the number of affected births  $y_{it}$  in census tract  $i$  during  
156 year  $t$  as conditionally independent and identically Poisson distributed variables with mean  
157 given by  $\lambda_{it}$ ,

$$y_{it} \sim \text{Poisson}(\lambda_{it} = e_{it} \theta_{it})$$

158 Where the mean  $\lambda_{it}$  consists of two components,  $e_{it}$  representing expected counts of non-  
159 chromosomal birth defects (described below) in the  $i$ th census tract during year  $t$ , and  $\theta_{it}$



160 representing the prevalence ratio for the  $i$ th census tract during year  $t$ . Then, the natural  
161 logarithm of  $\theta_{it}$  was modelled as

$$\ln(\theta_{it}) = \alpha_i + \varphi_t + \delta_{it}$$

162 Where  $\alpha_i$  is census tract level spatial main-effect,  $\varphi_t$  is a temporal main-effect, and  $\delta_{it}$  is an  
163 interaction term between space (census tract level) and time.

164  
165 We computed the expected counts ( $e_{it}$ ) as the product of the number of live births in the  $i$ th  
166 census tract during year  $t$  and the average prevalence across the entire study period in North  
167 Carolina. Thus, the expected count estimates the number of non-chromosomal birth defects in  
168 a given census tract-year, had that census tract-year been subject to the same average  
169 prevalence as all of North Carolina from 2003 – 2015. This construction implies that  $\theta_{it}$   
170 estimates a prevalence ratio comparing a census-tract-year prevalence to the average  
171 prevalence in North Carolina over the study period, such that values  $> 1$  imply prevalence  
172 higher than the state average that can be used to locate potentially high-risk groups.

173  
174 The spatial, temporal, and spatiotemporal interaction terms are parameterized to provide  
175 structure to the prevalence estimates without making strong modeling assumptions that might  
176 otherwise smooth over key spatial or temporal trends. The spatial term  $\alpha_i$  is a random effect  
177 that follows the conditional autoregressive model proposed by Besag, York and Mollie.<sup>14</sup> This  
178 random effect can be further decomposed into two components, an intrinsic conditional  
179 autoregressive term that smooths each census tract estimate by forming a weighted average  
180 with all adjacent census tracts, plus a spatially unstructured component that models

181 independent location-specific error and is assumed to be independently, identically, and  
182 normally distributed across census tracts. The temporal trend  $\varphi_t$ , is modeled by the sum of two  
183 components, a first-order random walk-correlated time component (which is conceptualized as  
184 a prior in which the temporal term in year  $t$  is given a normal prior centered on the value of the  
185 temporal term in year  $t - 1$ ), and a temporally unstructured component that models  
186 independent year-specific error and is independently, identically, and normally distributed  
187 across years. The space-time interaction term  $\delta_{it}$ , is modelled as an independent noise term for  
188 each census tract and time period, and allows for temporal trends in a given census tract to  
189 deviate from the overall trend, such that spatiotemporally local patterns can emerge by  
190 reducing the amount of smoothing done by the model. Penalized complexity (PC) priors<sup>15,16</sup>  
191 were applied to the precision hyperparameters in our models. Details of model specification are  
192 described in S3 Appendix.

193  
194 To estimate Bayesian model parameters, we employed integrated nested Laplace  
195 approximations (INLAs) which approximate the full posterior distribution and are a  
196 computationally efficient alternative to Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) for certain model  
197 structures (latent Gaussian models). INLA does not use iterative computation techniques like  
198 MCMC and is thus highly efficient at the cost of possible approximation error.<sup>17</sup> We used the R-  
199 INLA package for model fitting.<sup>8</sup> Model comparison was performed, and details can be found in  
200 S4 Appendix Table 2.

201

202 The prevalence of individual non-chromosomal birth defects, any birth defect (including non-  
203 chromosomal birth defects and chromosomal birth defects), and chromosomal birth defects in  
204 North Carolina was estimated using the same Bayesian approach.

205

## 206 **RESULTS**

207 Of 1,600,409 affected and unaffected births recorded in NCBDMP during the study period 2003-  
208 2015, 758 had maternal residence outside North Carolina, and 844 had inaccurate geographic  
209 information that prevented precise geocoding. After excluding these records, a total of  
210 1,598,807 live births were included in the analyses. Among these, 52,524 (3.3%) had at least  
211 one recorded birth defect. The prevalence of any birth defect decreased from 4.0% in 2003 to  
212 3.2% in 2015, as shown in Table 1. The prevalence of non-chromosomal birth defects decreased  
213 from 3.8% in 2003 to 2.9% in 2015. The numbers of individual structural birth defects (i.e.,  
214 anotia/microtia, conotruncal heart defects, atrioventricular septal defects and endocardial  
215 cushion defects, cleft lip, cleft palate, hypospadias, and gastroschisis) are also presented in  
216 Table 1.

217

218 The posterior geometric means of spatial random effect for the prevalence (“spatial prevalence  
219 ratio” – holding temporal terms constant) of any non-chromosomal birth defect are  
220 summarized in Figure 1. This map reveals a large variability of the spatial term of the model, as  
221 shown with prevalence ratio varying geographically from a low of below 0.6 to a high of about  
222 2.0 across the state. The spatial prevalence ratio identifies areas at heightened prevalence of  
223 birth defects in North Carolina throughout the 2003-2015 period. Of note, the southeastern

224 region of North Carolina had the highest prevalence of birth defects, though higher prevalence  
225 was also noted in the Appalachian and Northern Piedmont areas.

226  
227 Posterior geometric means of the temporal random effect (“temporal prevalence ratio” –  
228 holding spatial terms constant) is depicted in Figure 2. The temporal prevalence ratio was  
229 highest during the first two years (2003 and 2004), and then dropped. While there was a slight  
230 spike during 2009-2010, the overall prevalence appeared constant over time since 2005.

231  
232 Posterior geometric means of the independent yearly space-time interaction term are  
233 presented for four of the study period years in Figure 3. These interactions capture local  
234 deviations from overall spatial and temporal trends. As shown in Figure 3, there are some  
235 census tracts with elevated prevalence of any birth defect in 2004. But generally, the space-  
236 time interaction term varies only from about 0.88 to 1.14 (Figure 3), which is a narrower range  
237 of variability than that of the spatial term (Figure 1). This result suggests that birth defects  
238 might be associated with factors that are purely geographical, or factors that have a stronger  
239 variation over space than time.

240  
241 The spatial and temporal patterns of individual birth defects (i.e., anotia/microtia, conotruncal  
242 heart defects, atrioventricular septal defects and endocardial cushion defects, cleft lip, cleft  
243 palate, hypospadias, gastroschisis) are depicted in S5 Appendix. Generally, the prevalence of  
244 these individual birth defects remains constant across the 2003-2015 period, suggesting that  
245 the temporal trend observed in all birth defects combined was not solely attributable to any of

246 these specific defects. In terms of spatial heterogeneity, there was some variation in patterns  
247 for defect groups. The central and southern regions of North Carolina experienced the highest  
248 prevalence of conotruncal heart defects; the west and south parts of North Carolina had  
249 increased prevalence of cleft lip and cleft palate as well as gastroschisis; the areas with higher  
250 prevalence ratios for hypospadias were strongly concentrated in the middle (Raleigh) and  
251 southern (Wilmington) urban parts of North Carolina (see S5 Appendix).

252  
253 The spatial and temporal patterns of any birth defect (including non-chromosomal birth defects  
254 and chromosomal birth defects) are depicted in S6 Appendix. The geographic distributions and  
255 temporal trends of any birth defect are similar to those of non-chromosomal birth defects. The  
256 spatial and temporal patterns of chromosomal birth defects are depicted in S7 Appendix. For  
257 chromosomal birth defects, the prevalence was higher in the middle part of North Carolina,  
258 compared with other regions. The spatial trends suggest that the prevalence of chromosomal  
259 birth defects increased after 2008.

260

## 261 **DISCUSSION**

262 In the present study we examined the spatial and temporal patterns of birth defects in North  
263 Carolina during 2003-2015 using small-area Bayesian spatiotemporal models. To our knowledge,  
264 it is among the first studies to map the distributions of non-chromosomal birth defects,  
265 chromosomal birth defects, and individual birth defects over time in North Carolina. We  
266 identified some regions of North Carolina, particularly in the Southern Coastal region to have  
267 relatively high prevalence of non-chromosomal birth defects compared to the average

268 prevalence across the state. We also found that, while the prevalence of non-chromosomal  
269 birth defects was relatively high during 2003-2004 with approximately 4% among all livebirths,  
270 the prevalence dropped down and stayed constant at about 3% in the subsequent years.  
271 Furthermore, spatial heterogeneity was also apparent for several individual birth defect groups  
272 including conotruncal heart defects, cleft lip, cleft palate, hypospadias, and gastroschisis.  
273 Although there is some commonality in relatively high prevalence of several birth defects (e.g.,  
274 cleft lip, cleft palate, gastroschisis) in western and southern parts of North Carolina, the spatial  
275 patterning generally appeared to differ according to each defect.

276  
277 Geographic variation in birth defects has been described in previous studies.<sup>18-21</sup> We employed  
278 small-area statistical techniques and identified some areas with higher prevalence (relative to  
279 the state average) of birth defects (particularly non-chromosomal birth defects) at census-tract  
280 level. Because our analysis was descriptive in nature, we did not directly assess etiologic  
281 hypotheses. In addition, our model only included spatiotemporal terms and no terms for  
282 previously studied factors such as socioeconomic status and environmental exposures.  
283 However, our mapping result could be used to integrate with other spatiotemporal data to  
284 inform further research on potential causes for birth defects in North Carolina. For example, a  
285 previous study of toxic metals in private wells and birth defects prevalence in North Carolina in  
286 2003-2008, showed that the elevated manganese levels in the central part of the state were  
287 associated with a higher prevalence of conotruncal heart defects.<sup>6</sup> This study was consistent  
288 with our finding that the central region of North Carolina has heightened prevalence of  
289 conotruncal heart defects. We have identified some regions that have a higher prevalence of

290 non-chromosomal birth defects and some individual birth defects including conotruncal heart  
291 defects, cleft lip, cleft palate, hypospadias and gastroschisis, compared with other regions.  
292 Since we found that the spatial term of the birth defect model is significantly greater than the  
293 space-time interaction term, future work should focus on associations between birth defect  
294 prevalence and geographical factors, such as well water contamination that persists over long  
295 durations.

296  
297 Following global trends, fewer births were recorded in the years immediately prior to the 2008  
298 financial crash relative to the years immediately following.<sup>22</sup> We estimated higher prevalence in  
299 birth defects occurring after 2008 relative to birth defects occurring 2005-2008. This pattern  
300 suggests that economic shocks may also play a role in the temporal patterns of birth defects  
301 across the state, especially if fertility patterns shift such that pregnancy becomes relatively  
302 more common among women with higher risk of affected offspring (e.g. older mothers due to  
303 delayed childbearing).<sup>23,24</sup> The average maternal age at birth in our data was relatively steady  
304 between 2003 and 2009 (26.9-27.0) but rose steadily thereafter to 28.0 by 2015, which closely  
305 mirrors the patterns of chromosomal defects we observed and supports a maternal age  
306 hypothesis.

307  
308 Our study had several limitations. Outcome ascertainment and classification may be a source of  
309 measurement error. Although we found that in 2003 and 2004 North Carolina experienced  
310 relatively high prevalence of non-chromosomal birth defects compared with other years, this  
311 might be due to changes in ascertainment and classification of birth defects over time. This

312 could also apply to individual birth defects. It is likely that we captured some birth defects  
313 better than others, which can result in loss of information when identifying the regions at high  
314 prevalence of certain individual birth defects. Cleft lip and cleft palate, which are easily clinically  
315 assessed, both demonstrated spatial patterning without strong temporal trends, suggesting  
316 that measurement may underly the temporal trends observed in any birth defect. In addition,  
317 since we only adopted the information of maternal residence at delivery for geocoding, it is  
318 possible that non-differential misclassification may be introduced by the likelihood of maternal  
319 mobility during pregnancy. We also recognize that an any birth defect group that combines  
320 individual defects with different embryologic mechanisms and potential risk factors introduces  
321 etiologic heterogeneity.

322  
323 Using Bayesian disease mapping techniques, our descriptive study examined the spatial and  
324 temporal patterns of birth defects in North Carolina during 2003-2015. We identified some  
325 geographic areas with increased prevalence of non-chromosomal birth defects and some  
326 individual birth defect groups at census tract level. The etiology of birth defects is multifactorial,  
327 and the causes for most defects remain unknown. Given the potential geographic variation in  
328 toxic environmental contaminants in North Carolina that are likely tied to the birth defects<sup>6</sup>,  
329 further studies are warranted to explore the potential environmental causes (e.g., well water  
330 contamination) for each type of birth defects.

331

332



333 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

334 This work was supported in part by the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences (grant R01  
335 ES029531), and a cooperative agreement from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC;  
336 U50CCU422096) to the North Carolina Center for Birth Defects Research and Prevention, and through  
337 cooperative agreements under PA 96043, PA 02081, and FOA DD09-001 from the CDC to other Centers  
338 for Birth Defects Research and Prevention participating in the National Birth Defects Prevention Study.  
339 We are also thankful for the support from the North Carolina Center for Birth Defects Research and  
340 Prevention.

341 **Conflicts of Interest:** None.

342

343 **REFERENCES:**

- 344 1. Petrini J, Damus K, Russell R, Poschman K, Davidoff MJ, Mattison D. Contribution of  
345 birth defects to infant mortality in the United States. *Teratology*. 2002;66((Supp  
346 1)):S3-S6. doi:10.1002/tera.90002
- 347 2. Mathews TJ, Macdorman MF, Thoma ME. Infant mortality statistics from the 2013  
348 period linked birth/infant death data set. *National Vital Statistics Reports*.  
349 2015;64(9):1-30.
- 350 3. North Carolina State Center for Health Statistics. N.C. Birth Defects, Statewide Totals.  
351 Published 2017. <https://schs.dph.ncdhhs.gov/interactive/query/>
- 352 4. Brent RL. Environmental Causes of Human Congenital Malformations: The  
353 Pediatrician's Role in Dealing with These Complex Clinical Problems Caused by a  
354 Multiplicity of Environmental and Genetic Factors. *Pediatrics*. 2004;113(Supp 4):957-  
355 968.
- 356 5. Brender JD, Suarez L, Felkner M, et al. Maternal exposure to arsenic, cadmium, lead,  
357 and mercury and neural tube defects in offspring. *Environmental Research*. Published  
358 online 2006. doi:10.1016/j.envres.2005.08.003
- 359 6. Sanders AP, Desrosiers TA, Warren JL, et al. Association between arsenic, cadmium,  
360 manganese, and lead levels in private wells and birth defects prevalence in North  
361 Carolina: A semi-ecologic study. *BMC Public Health*. 2014;14(955):1-12.  
362 doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-955
- 363 7. Lawson AB. *Bayesian Disease Mapping: Hierarchical Modeling in Spatial Epidemiology,*  
364 *3rd Edition.*; 2018.
- 365 8. Blangiardo M, Cameletti M, Baio G, Rue H. Spatial and spatio-temporal models with  
366 R-INLA. *Spatial and Spatio-temporal Epidemiology*. 2013;7:39-55.  
367 doi:10.1016/j.sste.2013.07.003
- 368 9. Walker K. Tigris: An r package to access and work with geographic data from the us  
369 census bureau. *R Journal*. Published online 2016. doi:10.32614/rj-2016-043
- 370 10. Anselin L, Assunção R, Berke O, et al. Package 'spdep'. *R-Cran*. Published online 2012.
- 371 11. Yudkin PL, Wood L, Redman CWG. Risk of Unexplained Stillbirth At Different  
372 Gestational Ages. *The Lancet*. 1987;329(8543):1192-1194. doi:10.1016/S0140-  
373 6736(87)92154-4
- 374 12. Lu H, Crawford FW, Gonsalves GS, Grau LE. Geographic and temporal trends in  
375 fentanyl-detected deaths in Connecticut , 2009 – 2019. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2023;79:32-38.  
376 doi:10.1016/j.annepidem.2023.01.009
- 377 13. Gelman A. Multilevel (hierarchical) modeling: What It can and cannot do.  
378 *Technometrics*. 2006;48(3):432-435. doi:10.1198/004017005000000661
- 379 14. Besag J, York J, Mollié A. Bayesian image restoration, with two applications in spatial  
380 statistics. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*. Published online 1991.  
381 doi:10.1007/BF00116466

- 382 15. Simpson D, Rue H, Riebler A, Martins TG, Sørbye SH. Penalising model component  
383 complexity: A principled, practical approach to constructing priors. *Statistical Science*.  
384 2017;32(1):1-28. doi:10.1214/16-STS576
- 385 16. Riebler A, Sørbye SH, Simpson D, et al. An intuitive Bayesian spatial model for disease  
386 mapping that accounts for scaling. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*.  
387 2016;25(4):1145-1165. doi:10.1177/0962280216660421
- 388 17. Rue H, Martino S. Approximate Bayesian inference for latent Gaussian models by  
389 using integrated nested Laplace approximations. *J R Stat Soc Series B Stat Methodol*.  
390 2009;71(2):319-392.
- 391 18. Bassil KL, Yang J, Arbour L, et al. Spatial variability of gastroschisis in Canada, 2006–  
392 2011. *Canadian Journal of Public Health*. 2016;107(1):2006-2011.  
393 doi:10.17269/CJPH.107.5084
- 394 19. Dowling E, Meyer RE, Emch ME. Evidence of localized clustering of gastroschisis births  
395 in North Carolina , 1999 – 2004. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2009;68(8):1361-1367.  
396 doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2009.01.034
- 397 20. Tang IW. A spatial analysis of birth defects in Texas , 1999 – 2011. *Birth Defects*  
398 *Research*. 2021;(April):1-16. doi:10.1002/bdr2.1940
- 399 21. Yazdy MM, Werler MM, Feldkamp ML, et al. Spatial Analysis of Gastroschisis in the  
400 National Birth Defects Prevention Study. *BIRTH DEFECTS RESEARCH (PART*.  
401 2015;103(544-553):2015. doi:10.1002/bdra.23375
- 402 22. Fund IM. World Economic Outlook. 2018.  
403 [https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2018/09/24/world-economic-](https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2018/09/24/world-economic-outlook-october-2018)  
404 [outlook-october-2018](https://www.imf.org/en/Publications/WEO/Issues/2018/09/24/world-economic-outlook-october-2018)
- 405 23. Gill SK, Broussard C, Devine O, Green RF, Rasmussen SA. Association between  
406 Maternal Age and Birth Defects of Unknown Etiology - United States , 1997 – 2007.  
407 *Birth Defects Research (Part A)*. 2012;94:1010-1018. doi:10.1002/bdra.23049
- 408 24. Harris BS, Bishop KC, Kemeny HR, Walker JS, Rhee E, Kuller JA. Risk Factors for Birth  
409 Defects. *OBSTETRICAL AND GYNECOLOGICAL SURVEY*. 2017;72(2):123-135.

411 Table 1. Number of births by year among 1,598,807 live births (52,524 birth defects) in North Carolina in 2003-2015

Year	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
No. of births	118192	119658	122949	127543	130604	130444	126620	122008	120340	119751	118979	120915	120804
Male <sup>a</sup>	60784 (51.4)	61018 (51.0)	62789 (51.1)	65370 (51.3)	67016 (51.3)	66878 (51.3)	64884 (51.2)	62343 (51.1)	61473 (51.1)	61129 (51.0)	60560 (50.9)	61786 (51.1)	61798 (51.2)
Female	57407 (48.6)	58639 (49.0)	60157 (48.9)	62173 (48.7)	63586 (48.7)	63565 (48.7)	61734 (48.8)	59665 (48.9)	58866 (48.9)	58620 (49.0)	58417 (49.1)	59124 (48.9)	59005 (48.8)
Missing	1	1	3	0	2	1	2	0	1	2	2	5	1
No. (%) of birth defects <sup>b</sup>	4714 (4.0)	5291 (4.4)	3513 (2.9)	3661 (2.9)	3832 (2.9)	3727 (2.9)	4229 (3.3)	4260 (3.5)	3995 (3.3)	3766 (3.1)	3724 (3.1)	4003 (3.3)	3809 (3.2)
Non-chromosomal	4480	5049	3244	3415	3598	3480	3945	3943	3667	3493	3450	3640	3503
Chromosomal	234	242	269	246	234	247	284	317	328	273	274	363	306
Individual non-chromosomal birth defects													
Anotia/Microtia	20	11	32	23	19	19	32	14	22	20	18	20	13
Conotruncal heart defects	116	118	94	116	94	87	98	119	91	83	78	108	96
AVSD/ECD	63	53	53	65	76	68	73	89	78	65	57	58	67
Cleft lip	107	105	98	112	112	96	107	100	110	77	105	100	89
Cleft palate	65	70	62	73	88	75	81	67	72	68	70	56	62
Hypospadias	387	443	340	367	375	374	327	384	340	351	301	386	436
Gastroschisis	42	48	37	37	52	42	63	60	44	52	36	57	44

412 Abbreviations: AVSD: Atrioventricular septal defects; ECD, endocardial cushion defects


413 <sup>a</sup> Number (percentage among all live births in each year) of male and female births is presented.

414 <sup>b</sup> Percent to birth defects means the percentage of birth defects among all live births in each year.

415


416

417 Figure 1. Posterior geometric mean prevalence ratio for any non-chromosomal birth defect across North Carolina, spatiotemporal  
418 model of North Carolina census tracts, 2003-2015. It represents the autoregressive spatial term.




419  
420

421 Figure 2. Temporal trend term of non-chromosomal birth defects, spatio-temporal model of North Carolina census tracts, 2003-2015



422  
423

424 Figure 3. Posterior means of the independent space-time interaction term, spatio-temporal model of North Carolina census tracts,  
425 2003-2015. Note that posterior mean log-prevalence ratios are exponentiated to represent posterior geometric mean prevalence  
426 ratios. Regions with lighter color suggest no space-time interaction and no local deviations from overall spatial and temporal trends,  
427 while regions with deeper color suggest there is space-time interaction and local shock that deviates from overall spatial and  
428 temporal trends.



429

430 **APPENDIX**

431 **S1 Appendix**

432 **Appendix Table 1: CDC/BPA codes for individual non-chromosomal birth defects.**

Anotia/microtia: 741.01, 741.21
Conotruncal heart defects
Common truncus: 745.00
TOF: 745.20-745.21, 747.31
TGA: 745.10-745.12, 745.18-745.19
AVSD/endocardial cushion defects: 745.60-745.69, 745.487
Cleft lip: 749.10-749.19
Cleft palate: 749.00-749.09
Hypospadias: 752.60-752.62 (excluding 752.61 and 752.621)
Gastroschisis: 756.71

433

434



435 **S2 Appendix**

436 **Approximation to fetuses-at-risk approach**

437 The crude census-tract-year specific prevalence ratios estimated in the study can be expressed as the quantity

438  $r_{jk} = \left(\frac{D_{jk}}{D_{jk} + N_{jk}}\right) / \left(\frac{D}{D + N}\right)$ , where  $D_{jk}$  and  $N_{jk}$  are the (observed) counts of birth defects and unaffected births in the  $j$ th census tract

439 and the  $k$ th year, and  $D$  and  $N$  are the counts across the entire study period and area. In a fetuses-at-risk approach, the prevalence

440 ratio would instead equal  $= \left(\frac{D_{jk}}{D_{jk} + N_{jk} + L_{jk}}\right) / \left(\frac{D}{D + N + L}\right)$ , where  $L_{jk}$  is the (unobserved) count of fetal losses  $j$ th census tract and the  $k$ th

441 year (and, similarly  $L$  is the total summed over the study period and area). The prevalence of fetal losses in a given census-tract year

442 can be expressed as  $q_{jk} = \frac{L_{jk}}{D_{jk} + N_{jk} + L_{jk}}$ , and we denote the average prevalence over the entire study period and area as  $q$ . Note that

443  $L = q / (1 - q) * (D + N)$ , so that we can express the prevalence ratio as a function of observed data and the odds of fetal loss

444  $o = q / (1 - q)$

$$\frac{\left(\frac{D_{jk}}{(D_{jk} + N_{jk}) * (1 + o_{jk})}\right)}{\left(\frac{D}{(D + N) * (1 + o)}\right)} = r_{jk} \frac{1 + o}{1 + o_{jk}}$$

445

446 which reduces to our crude prevalence ratio in the case where the prevalence odds of fetal loss are constant across all study census-

447 tract-years ( $o = o_{jk}$ , which is implied by  $q = q_{jk}$ , for all  $j, k$ ). We note that, for this condition to hold, the census-tract-year specific

448 probability of fetal loss would necessarily be inversely related to the census-tract-year specific probability of a birth defect. We

449 expect it is more likely that the opposite is true and that some spatially related causes of birth defects will also be causes of fetal

450 loss. In this case, higher values of  $r_{jk}$  would generally imply higher values of  $o_{jk}$ , so that, had we been able to include fetal losses in

451 the data, our estimates of  $r_{jk}$  would in general be smaller than those reported in our analysis. Thus, shared causes of fetal loss and

452 fetal death likely result in bias away from the null of census-tract-year specific prevalence ratios.

453

454 **S3 Appendix**455 **Priors on random effects in Bayesian space-time Poisson model for overall opioid-detected overdose deaths**

$$\ln(\theta_{it}) = \alpha_i + \varphi_t + \delta_{it}$$

$$\alpha_i = u_i + v_i, \quad u_i \sim N(0, \tau_u^{-1}Q^-), \quad v_i \sim N(0, \tau_v^{-1}I)$$

$$\varphi_t = \Delta\pi_i + \rho_t, \quad \Delta\pi_i = \pi_i - \pi_{i-1} \sim N(0, \tau_\pi^{-1}), \quad \rho_t \sim N(0, \tau_\rho^{-1}I),$$

456 where  $u_i \sim N(0, \tau_u^{-1}Q)$  represents the spatial structured random effect and is modeled under the class of intrinsic Gaussian Markov  
 457 random fields models.  $Q$  denotes the precision matrix (neighboring matrix), and  $Q^-$  is the generalized inverse of the matrix  $Q$ . The  
 458 marginal variances are  $\tau_u^{-1}[Q^-]_{ii}$ , which are dependent on the matrix  $Q$ .  $v_i \sim N(0, \tau_v^{-1}I)$  is the spatial unstructured random effect  
 459 and  $\tau_v^{-1}$  is the marginal variance. Penalized complexity (PC) priors are assigned to  $\tau_u$  and  $\tau_v$ . Here, we let  $\tau_u, \tau_v \sim PC(0.2/$   
 460  $0.31, 0.01)$ , which corresponds to  $Pr(1/\sqrt{\tau} > 0.2/0.31) = 0.01$ .

461  
 462  $\Delta\pi_i = \pi_i - \pi_{i-1} \sim N(0, \tau_\pi^{-1})$  is first order random walk temporal random effect defined as a random step at each point in time ( $\Delta\pi_i$ ).  
 463 All random steps are independent and identically distributed.  $\rho_t \sim N(0, \tau_\rho^{-1}I)$  is the temporal unstructured random effect and  $\tau_\rho^{-1}$  is  
 464 the marginal variance. Penalized complexity (PC) priors are assigned to  $\tau_\pi$  and  $\tau_\rho$ . Here, we let  $\tau_\pi, \tau_\rho \sim PC(0.2/0.31, 0.01)$ , which  
 465 corresponds to  $Pr(1/\sqrt{\tau} > 0.2/0.31) = 0.01$ .

466

467

468 **S4 Appendix**

469 **Appendix Table 2: Results of model comparison**

Model	Deviance Information Criterion (DIC)									
	Defect									
	Anotia	AVSD/E CD	Cleft lip w/wo Cleft palate	Cleft palate	Conotruncal heart defects	Gastroschisis	Hypospadias	Non-chromosomal	Chromosomal	Any defect
Conditional autoregressive term for census tract + linear calendar year + unstructured temporal term for calendar year	2872.5	7847.5	10351.1	7836.8	10212.8	5757.8	25911.7	85803.3	21303.6	88111.8
Conditional autoregressive term for census tract + first order random walk term for calendar year	2871.1	7486.3	10346.7	7834.7	10213.8	5757.3	25879.7	85803.3	21302.5	88111.7
Conditional autoregressive term for census tract + first order random walk term for calendar year + unstructured temporal term for calendar year	2871.1	7486.2	10346.8	7834.8	10213.6	5757.3	25875.0	85803.2	21302.4	88112.4
Conditional autoregressive term for census tract + first order random walk term for calendar year + space-time interaction term	2872.3	7486.2	10349.4	7835.7	10211.5	5757.8	25886.9	85784.5	21301.4	88096.7
Conditional autoregressive term for census tract + first order random walk term for calendar year + unstructured temporal term for calendar year + space-time interaction term	2871.1	7486.2	10349.0	7834.7	10213.5	5757.2	25877.4	85780.2	21303.5	88094.2



Abbreviations: AVSD/ECD, atrioventricular septal defect/endocardial cushion defect.

470

471



472 **S5 Appendix: Spatial and temporal patterns of individual non-chromosomal birth defects**

473 Appendix Figure 5.1. Spatial and temporal patterns of individual birth defect – anotia/microtia, North Carolina, 2003-2015





474  
475  
476

477 Appendix Figure 5.2. Spatial and temporal patterns of individual birth defect – conotruncal heart defects, North Carolina, 2003-2015



478  
479  
480



481 Appendix Figure 5.3. Spatial and temporal patterns of individual birth defect – atrioventricular septal defects and endocardial  
482 cushion defects, North Carolina, 2003-2015



483  
484

485 Appendix Figure 5.4. Spatial and temporal patterns of individual birth defect – cleft lip, North Carolina, 2003-2015



486



487

488



489 Appendix Figure 5.5. Spatial and temporal patterns of individual birth defect – cleft palate, North Carolina, 2003-2015



490  
491





492 Appendix Figure 5.6. Spatial and temporal patterns of individual birth defect – hypospadias, North Carolina, 2003-2015  
493



494  
495

496 Appendix Figure 5.7. Spatial and temporal patterns of individual birth defect – gastroschisis, North Carolina, 2003-2015





497  
498

499 **S6 Appendix: Spatial and temporal patterns of any birth defect including non-chromosomal and chromosomal birth defects**

500 Appendix Figure 6.1. Spatial and temporal patterns of any birth defect, North Carolina, 2003-2015



501



502

503

504 **S7 Appendix: Spatial and temporal patterns of chromosomal birth defects**  
505 Appendix Figure 7.1. Spatial and temporal patterns of chromosomal birth defects, North Carolina, 2003-2015



506  
507  
508  
509  
510