

## **Review** Article

# Burden of Neural Tube Defects and Their Associated Factors in Africa: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Reta Wakoya <sup>1,2</sup> and Mekbeb Afework<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Biomedical Science, Menelik II Medical and Health Science College, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia <sup>2</sup>Department of Anatomy, School of Medicine, College of Health Science, Addis Ababa University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Correspondence should be addressed to Reta Wakoya; retawak@yahoo.com

Received 21 December 2022; Revised 21 May 2023; Accepted 3 June 2023; Published 21 June 2023

Academic Editor: Parth Bhatt

Copyright © 2023 Reta Wakoya and Mekbeb Afework. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Background. Neural tube defects are a type of congenital anomaly caused by an abnormality in the development of the brain and spinal cord during embryogenesis. They cause high rates of mortality, morbidity, and lifelong disability. There are several studies carried out worldwide reporting different findings on the burden and associated factors. The aim of this study is to carry out a systematic review and meta-analysis of the burden of neural tube defects and their associated factors in Africa. Methods. A total of 58 eligible articles were identified systematically using databases such as PubMed, Embase, African Journal Online Library, ProQuest, Cochrane, Google Scopus, Google Scholar, and Grey literature. Extracted data were analyzed using STATA 16.0 statistical software. The heterogeneity of studies was determined using the Cochrane Q test statistic and  $I^2$  test statistics with forest plots. A random effects model was used to examine the pooled burden of neural tube defects, subgroups of the region, subtypes of NTDs, sensitivity analysis, and publication bias. The association between NTDs and associated factors was studied using a fixed-effect model. Results. Fifty-eight studies with a total of 7,150,654 participants in 16 African countries revealed that the pooled burden of neural tube defects was 32.95 per 10,000 births (95% CI: 29.77-36.13). The Eastern African region had the highest burden in the subgroup analysis, with 111.13 per 10,000 births (95% CI: 91.85-130.42). South African countries had the lowest burden, at 11.43 per 10,000 births (95% CI: 7.51-15.34). In subtype analysis, spina bifida had the highest pooled burden at 17.01 per 10,000 births (95 percent CI: 15.00-19.00), while encephalocele had the lowest at 1.66 per 10,000 births (95% CI: 1.12-2.20). Maternal folic acid supplementation (AOR: 0.38; 95% CI: 0.16-0.94), alcohol consumption (AOR: 2.54; 95% CI: 1.08-5.96), maternal age (AOR: 3.54; 95% CI: 1.67-7.47), pesticide exposure (AOR: 2.69; 95% CI: 1.62-4.46), X-ray radiation (AOR: 2.67; 95% CI: 1.05-6.78), and history of stillbirth (AOR: 3.18; 95% CI: 1.11-9.12) were significantly associated with NTDs. Conclusion. The pooled burden of NTDs in Africa was found to be high. Maternal age, alcohol consumption, pesticide and X-ray radiation exposure, history of stillbirth, and folic acid supplementation were significantly associated with NTDs.

## 1. Introduction

Neural tube defects (NTDs) are a type of congenital anomaly caused by an abnormality in the development of the brain and spinal cord during embryogenesis [1], with nearly 300,000 cases worldwide annually [2]. The effects they cause in Africa are substantial. NTDs are the world's second most common birth defect (1 in 1000 live births) [3], with the highest rates in northern China (3.7/1000 live births) and Ireland (1.6 per 1000 live births) [4].

The prevalence and etiology of NTDs vary by population [5]. The rate of occurrence increases from the west to the east coast in the United States, with the Appalachian region having the highest frequency [3, 4, 6]. NTD affects approximately 1-3 per 1000 births in Africa each year [7]. The prevalence of NTD in Ghana is 1.6 per 1000 live births [8].

In Ethiopia, variable outcomes ranging from 30.87 to 42.5 per 1000 births were reported on the prevalence of neural tube defects. Improved maternal health, preconception care, folic acid supplementation, and routine fetal anomaly



FIGURE 1: PRISMA flow diagram depicting the selection process of studies for the systematic review and meta-analysis on the burden and associated factors of neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

scanning may all help to detect congenital anomalies earlier in pregnancy. Permanent epidemiological surveillance is required to determine the true prevalence at the national and temporal trend levels [9–11].

## 2. Methods

2.1. Search Strategy. An inclusive review and meta-analysis were undertaken on the burden and related factors of NTDs in Africa, using both published and unpublished material, regardless of publication period. The databases used to search for relevant studies were PubMed, Cochrane Library, Embase, AJOL, Google Scopus, ProQuest, Google Scholar, and other sources. The reference lists of each incorporated article were also searched manually to optimize the search strategy. The entire database will be systematically searched from December 1, 2021 to February 15, 2022.

The key terms used for the search were ((("prevalence" [All Fields]) OR ("prevalence" [MeSH Terms]) OR ("burden" [All Fields]) OR ("burden" [MeSH Terms]) OR ("epidemiology" [All Fields])))))))) "neural tube defects" [All Fields]) OR "birth defects" [All Fields]) OR "congenital malformation" [All Fields]) OR "congenital anomalies" [All Fields])) (additional file 1). The systematic review and meta-analysis were conducted in agreement with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guideline (additional file 2) [12]. 2.2. Criteria for Considering Studies. Any study in Africa that met the criteria and included relevant extractable data on the burden and associated factors of NTDs was included.

2.2.1. Study Area. All of the researches were conducted in African countries.

2.2.2. Study Design. This systemic review and meta-analysis comprised of observational studies (cross-sectional, case-control, and cohort) that reported on the burden and associated variables of NTDs.

2.2.3. Language. Both published and unpublished articles in the English language were included.

*2.2.4. Population.* Studies conducted among newborn babies were considered.

2.3. Exclusion Criteria. Irrelevant articles with missing data, duplicate studies, case reports, conference proceedings, and studies in which NTDs were not clearly reported separately excluded after reviewing their full-texts.

2.4. Selection of Study. Relevant articles were identified from the aforementioned databases and imported into Mendeley reference manager software X1.19.4 to eliminate duplicate studies. The retrieved studies were also imported into Review Manager Version 5 for evaluation of associated factors. The titles, abstracts, and full-texts of the retrieved

2022.
Africa,
ц.
defects
tube
neural
of
ourden
le l
늰
foi
studies
g
nde
f incl
0
summary
A
÷
ABLE
Γ

					(a)					
Authors	Year	Country	Region	Study design	Setting	Sample size	Number of cases	Burden/10,000	Duration of study/months	Quality of study
Abbey et al. [37]	2017	Nigeria	Western Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	7,670	28	36.51	48	Medium
Adane and Seyoum [11]	2018	Ethiopia	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	19,650	103	52.41	36	Medium
Adeleye and Olowookere [14]	2009	Nigeria	Western Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	61	33	5409.83	12	Medium
Garcon and Danielle [65]	2006	DR Congo	Central Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	8824	6	10.2	96	Medium
Airede [38]	1992	Nigeria	Western Africa	Prospective	Hospital-based	5,977	42	70.92	36	Medium
Alhassan et al. [8]	2017	Ghana	Western Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	35,426	24	6.77	48	Medium
Anyanwu et al. [39]	2021	Nigeria	Western Africa	Prospective	Hospital-based	1,456	4	27.47	6	Low
Bello et al. [40]	2008	Nigeria	Western Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	2,371	103	434.41	48	Medium
Berhane and Belachew [29]	2022	Ethiopia	Eastern Africa	Prospective	Hospital-based	48,750	522	107.07	36	High
Berihu et al. [31]	2018	Ethiopia	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	14,903	195	131	6	High
Buccimazza et al. [57]	1994	South Africa	Southern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	516,252	606	11.74	240	Medium
Chukwubuike et al. [41]	2020	Nigeria	Western Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	9492	34	35.82	4	Medium
Cornell et al. [56]	1983	South Africa	Southern Africa	Prospective	Hospital-based	116859	105	6	60	Medium
Ekanem et al. [42]	2008	Nigeria	Western Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	127929	67	5.24	276	High
Ekwochi et al. [43]	2017	Nigeria	Western Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	5,830	6	10.29	48	Medium
					(q)					
Authors	Year	Country	Region	Study design	Setting	Sample size	Number of cases	Burden/10,000	Duration of study/months	Quality of study
El-moghrabi [47]	2019	Libya	Northern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	16,765	19	11.33	12	Medium
Estifanos [23]	2017	Eriteria	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	39,803	185	46.48	56	Medium
Forci et al. [46]	2021	Morocco	Northern Africa	Prospective	Hospital-based	43923	44	10.02	65	High
Gedamu et al. [33]	2021	Ethiopia	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	2,218	11	49.59	9	Medium
Gedefaw et al. [32]	2018	Ethiopia	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	8,677	126	145.21	7	Medium
Geneti et al. [9]	2021	Ethiopia	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	45951	186	40.47	60	High
Githuku et al. [24]	2014	Kenya	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	6041	1272	2105.61	72	High
Houcher et al. [55]	2008	Algeria	Northern Africa	Prospective	Hospital-based	28500	215	75.44	36	Medium
Kalisya et al. [64]	2015	DR Congo	Central Africa	Prospective	Hospital-based	1,301	48	368.95	156	Medium
Kayembe-Kitenge et al. [66]	2019	DR Congo	Central Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	133662	146	10.92	24	High
Kindie and Mulu [34]	2022	Ethiopia	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	8,862	97	109.46	24	Medium
Kishimba et al. [25]	2015	Tanzania	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	28,217	27	10	5	High
Kromberg and Jenkins [58]	1982	South Africa	Southern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	29,633	35	11.81	12	Medium
Krzesinski et al. [59]	2019	South Africa	Southern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	93609	195	20.83	72	Low
Laamiri [48]	2017	Morocco	Northern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	819,224	330	4.03	36	Medium

## International Journal of Pediatrics

Authors		Year (	Jountry	Region	Study design	Setting	Sample size	Number of cases	Burden/10000	Duration of study/months	Quality of study
Mekonnen et al. [16]		2021 E	3thiopia	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	11177	32	28.63	72	Medium
Mekonen et al. [17]	. 1	2015 E	3thiopia	Eastern Africa	Prospective	Hospital-based	1,516	20	131.93	9	High
Barlow-Mosha et al. [2	[9]	2021 (	Jganda	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	110,752	109	9.8	40	High
Mumpe-Mwanja et al.	[27] 2	3019 (	Jganda	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	69,766	72	10.32	28	Medium
Nasri et al. [15]	. 1	2014 7	Tunisia	Northern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	3,803,889	769	2.02	240	Medium
Nnadi and Singh [43, 4	14]	2022 1	Nigeria	Western Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	10,163	22	21.63	36	High
Oumer et al. [69]	. 1	2021	Sudan	Northern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	36,785	103	28	12	Medium
Radouani et al. [49]	. 1	2015 N	Aorocco	Northern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	60,017	80	13.3	48	Low
Saib et al. [60]	. 1	2021 Sot	tth Africa	Southern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	7,516	5	6.65	12	Medium
Perinatal [53]	. 1	2021	Sudan	Northern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	20,000	72	36	5	High
Singh et al. [35]	. 1	2015 1	Vageria	Western Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	10,163	16	15.74	36	High
Sorri and Mesfin [18]	. 1	2015 E	3thiopia	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	28,961	177	61.12	36	Medium
Taye et al. [70]	. 1	2019 E	3thiopia	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	76,201	612	80.31	9	High
Taye et al. [10]	. 1	2016 E	<b>Athiopia</b>	Eastern Africa	Cross-sectional	Hospital-based	319,776	1873	58.57	48	High
						(4)					
						(m)					
Authors 1	rear	Country	Regio	n Study c	lesign Sett	ing Sample s	ize Number c	of cases Burden/	10000 Duration	of study/months	Quality of study
Theron et al. [61] 2	020 Si	outh Africa	Southern 1	Africa Cross-se	ctional Hospita	l-based 223,38	3 77	3.4	_	60	Medium
Ugwu et al. [36] 2	002	Nigeria	Western A	Africa Cross-se	ctional Hospita	ll-based 2891	31	127.	8	37	Medium
Venter et al. [62] 1	995 Sı	outh Africa	Southern 2	Africa Cross-se	ctional Hospita	l-based 10380	27	26		42	High

 $\odot$ 

High Medium

42 55

26 8.2

27 98

10380119477

Southern Africa Southern Africa

Botswana

Zash et al. [63]

1995 2019

Hospital-based

Cross-sectional

TABLE 2: A descriptive review of studies that reported associated factors for the burden of neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

		-		-				x	
Authors	Year	Country	Region	Total size	Case	Control	Variables of associate factors	OR 95% (CI)	Study of quality
Atlaw et al. [28]	2019	Ethiopia	Oromiya-Bale	462	42	420	Maternal folic acid supplementation Parental consanguinity marriage Maternal alcohol consumption Maternal history of stillbirth Maternal exposure to pesticide Maternal exposure to radiation Maternal medical illness Sex of newborn	$\begin{array}{c} 0.115 & (0.044 \hbox{-} 0.298) \\ 4.9 & (1.49 \hbox{-} 16.17) \\ 0.79 & (0.32 \hbox{-} 1.98) \\ 1.4 & (0.416 \hbox{-} 4.75) \\ 0.196 & (0.02 \hbox{-} 2.21) \\ 0.44 & (0.09 \hbox{-} 2.08) \\ 1.01 & (0.48 \hbox{-} 2.13) \\ 0.72 & (0.38 \hbox{-} 1.37) \end{array}$	Medium
Berihu et al. [30]	2018	Ethiopia	Tigray	617	205	115	Maternal alcohol consumption Maternal exposure to pesticide Maternal exposure to radiation Sex of newborn Maternal age > 35 years	$\begin{array}{c} 10.28 & (1.19-88.5) \\ 5 & (0.15-166.6) \\ 5 & (0.15-166.6) \\ 0.51 & (0.34-0.76) \\ 2.46 & (1.33-4.53) \end{array}$	High
Bourouba et al. [54]	2018	Algeria	Banta	48	44	4	Maternal folic acid supplementation Parental consanguinity marriage Maternal age > 35 years	1.17 (0.39-3.49) 0.92 (0.42-1.97) 4.15 (0.89-19.25)	Medium
Aynalem Tesfay et al. [19]	2021	Ethiopia	Addis Ababa	180	60	120	Maternal alcohol consumption Maternal exposure to pesticide Maternal exposure to radiation Sex of newborn	0.57 (0.20-1.45) 2.01 (0.98-4.16) 1.34 (0.23-8.30) 1.70 (0.91-3.20)	Medium
Gashaw et al. [20]	2021	Ethiopia	Amhara-North Shewa	243	81	162	Maternal folic acid supplementation Maternal exposure to pesticide Maternal history of stillbirth	0.16 (0.07-0.33) 5.34 (1.77-16.05) 3.63 (1.03-12.2)	High
Gedefaw et al. [32]	2018	Ethiopia	Addis Ababa	333	111	222	Maternal folic acid supplementation Sex of newborn Maternal age > 35 years	$0.47 \ (0.23-0.95) 0.56 \ (0.33-0.94)$	Medium
Study et al. [21]	2022	Ethiopia	Amhara region	381	127	254	Maternal folic acid supplementation Maternal history of stillbirth Sex of newborn Maternal medical illness Maternal age > 35 years	$\begin{array}{c} 1.80 \ (1.15-2.83) \\ 1 \ (0.63-1.4) \\ 1 \ (0.33-2.2) \\ 2.04 \ (1.03-3.4) \end{array}$	Medium
Nasri et al. [71]	2015	Tunisia	Wassila-Bourguiba center	150	75	75	Maternal folic acid supplementation Parental consanguinity marriage	6.75 (1.95-22.07) 10.70 (3.30-22.66)	Medium
Nasri et al. [51]	2016	Tunisia	Wassila-Bourguiba center	132	68	64	Parental consanguinity marriage	2.60 (12.0-0.70)	Medium
Tadesse et al. [22]	2020	Ethiopia	Amhara region	400	133	267	Maternal folic acid supplementation Maternal alcohol consumption Sex of newborn Maternal history of stillbirth	0.27 (0.17-0.44) 0.59 (0.33-1.05) 2.09 (1.34-3.29) 0.61 (0.28-1.29)	High

Study	ES (050/ CI)
ID	ES (95% CI)
Abbey et al (2017)	▲ <u>36 51 (23 01 50 01)</u>
Adape et al (2018)	52 41 (42 31 62 51)
Adeleve et al (2009)	52.11(12.51, 02.51)
Abuka et al (2006)	▲ 10 20 (3 54 16 86)
Airedale et al (1992)	70 92 (49 65 92 19)
Albassan et al (2017)	6 77 (4 06 9 48)
Anvanwu et al (2021)	2747(0.59.5435)
Bello et al (2008)	434 41 (352 36 516 46)
Berhane et al (2000)	107 07 (97 93 116 21)
Berihu et al (2018)	131 00 (112 74 149 26)
Buccimazza et al (1994)	▲ 11.00 (112:) 1, 119:20)
Chukwubuike et al (2020)	35 82 (23 80 47 84)
Cornell et al (1983)	◆ 9 00 (7 28 10 72)
Ekanem et al (2008)	524(399,649)
Ekwochi et al (2017)	◆ 10.29 (2.06, 18.52)
EI-moghrabi et al (2019)	◆ 11.33 (6.24, 16.42)
Estifanos et al (2017)	▲ 46.48 (39.80, 53.16)
Forci et al (2021)	▲ 10.02 (7.06, 12.98)
Gedamu et al (2021)	49.59 (20.36, 78.82)
Gedefaw et al (2018)	◆ 145.21 (120.04, 170.38)
Geneti et al (2021)	40 47 (34 67, 46 27)
Githuk et al (2014)	$\bullet \qquad 210561(200280,220842)$
Houcher et al (2008)	◆ 75.44 (65.39, 85.49)
Kalisva et al (2015)	◆ 368.95 (266.52, 471.38)
Kavembe-kitenge (2019)	• 10.92 (9.15, 12.69)
Kidanie et al (2022)	♦ 109.46 (87.80, 131.12)
Kishimba et al (2015)	♦ 10.00 (6.31, 13.69)
Kromberg et al (1982)	♦ 11.81 (7.90, 15.72)
Krzesinski et al (2019)	♦ 20.83 (17.91, 23.75)
Laamiri et al (2017)	♦ 4.03 (3.60, 4.46)
Mekonnen et al (2021)	◆ 28.63(18.72, 38.54)
Mekonnen et al (2015)	♦ 131.93 (74.49, 189.37)
Mosha et al (2021)	♦ 9.80 (7.96, 11.64)
Mumpe-Mwanja et al (2019)	♦ 10.32 (7.94, 12.70)
Nasri et al (2014)	◆ 2.02 (1.88, 2.16)
Nnadi et al (2022)	♦ 21.63 (12.60, 30.66)
Omer et al (2021)	◆ 28.00 (22.60, 33.40)
Radouani et al (2015)	♦ 13.30 (10.38, 16.22)
Saib et al (2021)	♦ 6.65 (0.82, 12.48)
Satti et al (2021)	♦ 36.00 (27.70, 44.30)
Singh et al (2022)	♦ 15.74 (8.03, 23.45)
Sorri et al (2015)	♦ 61.12 (52.14, 70.10)
Taye et al (2019)	♦ 80.31 (73.97, 86.65)
Taye et al (2016)	♦ 58.57 (55.93, 61.21)
Theron et al (2020)	♦ 3.44 (2.67, 4.21)
Ugwu et al (2007)	♦ 127.98 (87.01, 168.95)
Venter et al (1995)	◆ 26.00 (16.20, 35.80)
Zash et al $(2019)$	◆ 8.20 (6.58, 9.82)
Overall $(1^2 = 99.4\%, p = 0.000)$	32.95 (29.77, 36.13)
Note: Weights are from random effects analysis	
	III ISIDO

FIGURE 2: A forest plot depicting the burden of neural tube defects per 10,000 births in Africa, 2022.

articles were independently reviewed by two review authors Reta Wakoya (RW) and Mekbeb Afework (MA). Any disagreements between the reviewer were resolved through discussions.

2.5. Methodological Quality Assessment. The quality of relevant articles was assessed using the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical evaluation tool [13]. Two of the authors (RW and MA) independently evaluated the quality of the full text selected for the meta-analysis. The tool includes ten items for case-control studies, forty for cross-sectional studies, and eight for cohort studies (additional file 3 and 4). Each study's items were scored as yes (1) or no (0). The quality of each study was graded based on the number of items judged "Yes" (1) as low risk < 60%, medium (60-80%), and high >80%.

2.6. Data Extraction. Following the inclusion of the relevant papers, the two reviewers (RW and MA) extracted all of the required data separately. To retrieve all qualified articles, a consistent data extraction tool was used with Microsoft Office Excel Software.

For the burden of NTDs, the data extraction tool includes the first author, publication year, country and subregion, study design, setting, sample size, and number of NTDs. The prevalence and number of cases for each of the NTD subtypes were also included. The data for NTD-related factors was extracted in two tables. The pooled odds ratio and its corresponding 95% confidence interval (CI) were calculated based on the original study report (additional file 5 and 6).

2.7. Statistical Methods and Analysis. The retrieved data was imported into the STATA/SE version 16 program for all



FIGURE 3: The funnel graph depicts the distribution of studies included in the burden of neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

TABLE 3: Egger's test for detection of publication bias for studies included in the burden of neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

		Egger'	s test		
Std_Eff	Coef.	Std. err.	t	P >  t	(95% Conf. interval)
Slope 2.610286	1.407143	.5977176	2.35	0.023	.2040002
Bias 12.44599	9.80027	1.314385	7.46	≤0.001	7.154551

statistical analyses. The heterogeneity of all included studies was assessed using  $I^2$  statistics and the Cochrane Q test. In this meta-analysis, the test revealed significant heterogeneity among included articles ( $I^2 = 99.4$  percent, P value = 0.00). As a result, a random effects model was used. The Egger test statistics were used to examine the publication bias. The pooled burden and odds ratios, as well as their respective 95% confidence intervals, were displayed using a forest plot. To determine the associated factors for NTDs, the data was entered into Review Manager Version 5, and pooled odds ratios (ORs) with a 95% confidence interval (CI) were calculated.

2.8. Operational Definition. NTDs are a circumstance that influences all neonates with one of the following malformations: spina bifida, anencephaly, and encephalocele. The number of infants born with NTDs was divided by the total number of newborns and multiplied by a hundred to calculate the burden of neural tube defects.

Spina bifida is a congenital disorder caused by the spine and spinal cord not developing properly. In infants with spina bifida, a portion of the neural tube does not close or develop normally, leading to abnormalities in the spinal cord and spine bones. There are three types of spina bifida: myelomeningocele, meningocele, and occulta.

An encephaly is a birth defect in which the baby's brain and skull bones do not fully form while it is inside the womb. As a result, the cerebral cortex in particular does not develop as quickly in the baby's brain.

Encephalocele is a rare type of congenital abnormality of the neural tube that affects the brain. An encephalocele is a sac-like protrusion or extension of the brain and the membranes that protect it through a hole in the skull.

#### 3. Results

The numerous subheadings listed below describe the findings from this systematic review and meta-analysis.

3.1. Description of Study Selection. A total of 547 studies on the burden of neural tube defects and associated factors in African countries were found in the Medline (PubMed), Cochrane, Embase, AJOL, ProQuest, Google Scopus, Google Scholars, ResearchGate, Basebieled scholarly, Wiley Online Library, and Google databases.

Ninety articles were removed due to duplication. After reviewing the titles and abstracts of the remaining 457 papers, it was determined that 375 were irrelevant to the study and were thus eliminated. In addition, 100 full-text papers were assessed for eligibility based on the established criteria. For the final systematic review and meta-analysis, 58 papers were selected that met the criteria (Figure 1).



FIGURE 4: Results of sensitivity analysis of 45 studies after removing the three studies [15, 24, 48] in Africa, 2022.

The overall burden of neural tube defects was determined using 48 studies from among the qualifying papers. Ten more studies were considered to be explored for associated factors of neural tube defects, including ten case-control studies.

3.2. Characteristics of the Included Studies. In this systematic review and meta-analysis, 58 studies from sixteen African countries were considered eligible for assessing the prevalence of neural tube defects. Three African countries were included in the analysis of associated factors, with a total sample size of 7,150,654 participants, ranging from 61 in western African countries [14] to 3,803,889 in northern Africa [15]. Eastern African countries accounted for 23 (39.66%) [9–11, 16–34], with Ethiopia having the most 18 (31.03%) [9–11, 16–22, 28–34] and Uganda having two (3.345%) [26, 27]. Kenya, Eritrea, and Tanzania each had one study (1.72%) [23–25].

There were 12 (20.69%) studies [8, 14, 35–44] from western African countries, with Nigeria having the most with 11

(18.97%) [14, 35, 37–45] and Ghana having one (1.72%) [8] research. Eleven (18.97%) research [15, 46-55] was from northern African countries, with three (5.17%) studies [15, 46, 48–51] each from Morocco and Tunisia, two (3.45%) studies [52-55] each from Sudan and Algeria, and one (1.72%) study [47] from Libya. South Africa had the most studies from southern Africa region, with seven (12.06%) [56-62] and Botswana had only one (1.74%) [63]. Three studies (5.17%) [64-66] were from Central African countries, all from the Democratic Republic of the Congo. All research published between 1982 and 2022 that meet the criteria were eligible. There were forty cross-sectional studies (68.97%) [8-10, 14-18, 23, 24, 26, 27, 31-37, 40-44, 47-49, 52, 57-63, 65-68], eight cohort studies (13.79%) [17, 29, 38, 39, 46, 55, 56, 64], and ten case-control studies (17.24%) [19-22, 28, 30, 32, 50, 51, 54] in this analysis. Furthermore, 19 (32.76%) of the studies were rated as high quality. Only three (5.17%) studies were judged low quality, whereas 36 (62.07%) were considered medium quality (Table 1 parts a, b, c, and d and Table 2 parts a and b).

#### International Journal of Pediatrics

Authors	Year			ES (95% CI)
Western Africa Abbey et al Airedale et al Alhassan et al Anyanwu et al Chukwubuike et al Ekanem et al Ekwochi et al Nnadi et al Subtotal ( $I^2 = 100.0\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )	2017 1992 2017 2021 2020 2008 2017 2022 2022			$\begin{array}{c} 36.51 \left( 35.43, 37.59 \right) \\ 70.92 \left( 69.77, 72.07 \right) \\ 6.77 \left( 6.51, 7.03 \right) \\ 27.47 \left( 25.18, 29.76 \right) \\ 35.82 \left( 34.88, 36.78 \right) \\ 5.24 \left( 5.12, 5.36 \right) \\ 10.29 \left( 9.51, 11.07 \right) \\ 21.63 \left( 20.83, 22.43 \right) \\ 15.74 \left( 15.03, 16.45 \right) \\ 25.58 \left( 17.62, 33.55 \right) \end{array}$
Eastern Africa Adane et al Estifanos et al Gedamu et al Geneti et al Kishimba et al Mekonnen et al Mompe-Mwanja et al Sorri et al Taye et al Subtotal ( $I^2 = 100.0\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )	2018 2017 2021 2015 2021 2015 2021 2019 2015 2019 2016			52.41 (51.71, 53.11) 46.48 (45.99, 46.97) 49.59 (47.51, 51.67) 40.47 (40.02, 40.92) 10.00 (9.65, 10.35) 28.63 (27.79, 29.47) 9.80 (9.62 9.98) 10.32 (10.09, 10.55) 61.12 (60.56, 61.68) 80.31 (80.03, 80.59) 58.57 (58.40, 58.74) 40.70 (23.32, 58.07)
Central Africa Ahuka et al Kayembe-Kitenge Subtotal ( $I^2$ = 78.6%, $p$ = 0.031)	2006 2019		*	10.20 (9.57, 10.83) 10.92 (10.75, 11.09) 10.63 (9.93, 11.32)
Southern Africa Buccimazza et al Cornell et al Kromberg et al Krzesinski et al Saib et al Theron et al Venter et al Zash et al Subtotal ( $I^2 = 100.0\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )	1994 1983 1982 2019 2021 2020 1995 2019	l	*	$\begin{array}{c} 11.74 \ (11.65, 11.83) \\ 9.00 \ (8.84, 9.16) \\ 11.81 \ (11.44, 12.18) \\ 20.83 \ (20.57, 21.09) \\ 6.65 \ (6.09, 7.21) \\ 3.44 \ (3.36, 3.52) \\ 26.00 \ (25.16, 26.84) \\ 8.20 \ (8.04, 8.36) \\ 12.20 \ (8.42, 15.98) \end{array}$
Northern Africa El-moghrabi et al Forci et al Houcher et al Laamiri et al Omer et al Radouani et al Satti et al Subtotal ( $I^2 = 100.0\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )	2019 2021 2008 2017 2014 2021 2015 2021	8		11.33 (10.85, 11.81) 10.02 (9.74, 10.30) 75.44 (74.94, 75.94) 4.03 (3.99, 4.07) 2.02 (2.01, 2.03) 28.00 (27.54, 28.46) 13.30 (13.03 13.57) 36.00 (35.33, 36.67) 22.50 (18.71, 26.29)
Overall ( $I^2 = 100.0\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )			φ	25.70 (22.13, 29.27)
Note: Weights are from random effects a	analysis			
			0 50	100

FIGURE 5: Forest plot of subgroup analysis by the regions of showing the burden of neural tube defects per 10,000 births in Africa, 2022.

#### 3.3. Meta-Analysis

3.3.1. Burden of Neural Tube Defects in Africa. In this metaanalysis, to assess the burden of neural tube abnormalities in Africa, 48 studies were found to be included. The overall burden of neural tube defects was 32.95 per 10,000 infants on average (95% CI:29.77-36.13) [8–11, 14–18, 23–27, 29, 31–34, 36–44, 46–49, 52, 53, 55–66, 70, 72]. As a result, the random effects model was used to estimate the prevalence of neural tube defects in African countries (Figure 2).

3.3.2. Publication Bias. As indicated by the asymmetrical distribution of funnel plot tests, there was a publication bias in the burden of neural tube defects among the included studies. The forest plot revealed that the experiments differed greatly. The studies showed significant heterogeneity  $(I^2 = 99.4\%, P \text{ value } \le 0.001)$  (Figure 3). Egger's test, too, revealed that publication bias is statistically significant  $(p \text{ value } \le 0.001)$  (Table 3). 3.3.3. Sensitivity Analysis for the Burden of Neural Tube Defects in Africa. A sensitivity analysis was utilized to evaluate the influence of various studies on the pooled burden of NTDs in Africa. Except for three studies, it was established that the pooled burden of NTDs was estimated to be uniform across studies. After removing just one study, the burden has been determined to be 37.54 (33.41-41.58) [48]. The burden was 38.56 (34.18-42.95) after removing only one [15]. After removing only one [24], it was 29.91 (27.06-32.76). If the three studies had been excluded together, the overall estimated prevalence would have been 36.16 (31.60-40.71) [15, 24, 48] (Figure 4).

3.3.4. Subgroup Analysis of the Burden of Neural Tube Defects. Subgroup analysis was carried out based on the regions where the studies were conducted. The highest burden was observed in the eastern Africa region with a burden of 111.13 per 10,000 births (95% CI: 91.85, 130.42) followed by western Africa at 34.39 per 10,000 (95% CI: 23.78, 45.01), Central Africa at 26.66 per 10,000 (95% CI: 3.88, 49.45), and

Study	
ID	ES (95% CI)
Abbey et al (2017)	31 29 (18 79 43 79)
Adape et al (2018)	31.29(10.7), 45.79(10.7)
A deleve et al (2009)	3770 49 (2554 28 4986 70)
Abuka et al (2006)	
Airadala at al (1002)	54.04(25.45, 72.62)
Albesson et al (2017)	54.04(35.45, 72.05) = 02(2,20, 9,47)
Annassan et al (2017)	(3.33, 0.47) 13 74 (5 20, 32 77)
Pollo et al (2021)	15.74(-5.29, 52.77) 266.02(201.25, 442.61)
Perhana et al (2002)	(271.25, 442.01)
Berihu et al (2010)	45.55(57.70, 49.40)
Bussimerre et al (2018)	04.40(51.50, 77.24)
Chalmazza et al (1994)	(,,,,,,,
Element al (2000)	30.55(19.45, 41.05)
Ekanem et al (2008)	3.6/(2.62, 4.72)
Ekwochi et al (2017)	6.86 (0.14, 13.58)
El-mognrabl et al (2019)	5.37(1.80, 8.88)
Estimation et al $(2017)$	6.78(4.22, 9.34)
Forci et al (2021) $\diamond$	3.87 (2.03, 5.71)
Gedamu et al (2021)	18.03 (0.37, 35.69)
Gedefaw et al (2018)	58.78 (42.70, 74.86)
Geneti et al (2021)	11.10 (8.06, 14.14)
Githuk et al (2014)	• 1959.94 (1859.84, 2060.04)
Houcher et al (2008)	48.84 (38.91, 54.77)
Kalisya et al (2015)	353.57 (253.22, 453.92)
Kidanie et al (2022)	38.37 (25.50, 51.24)
Kishimba et al (2015)	3.67 (1.44, 5.90)
Kromberg et al (1982)	7.76 (4.59, 10.93)
Krzesinski et al (2019)	11.54 (9.37, 13.71)
Laamiri et al (2017))	1.81 (1.52, 2.10)
Mekonnen et al (2021)	13.42 (6.63, 20.21)
Mekonnen et al (2015)	125.33 (69.33, 181.33)
Mosha et al (2021)	5.69 (4.29, 7.09)
Nasri et al (2014)	$0.79\ (0.70,\ 0.88)$
Nnadi et al (2022)	15.74 (8.03, 23.45)
Omer et al (2021)	19.30 (14.81, 23.79)
Radouani et al (2015)	5.17 (3.35, 6.99)
Saib et al (2021)	2.66 (-1.03, 6.35)
Satti et al (2021)	33.00 (25.05, 40.95)
Singh et al (2022) ◆	10.82 (4.43, 17.21)
Sorri et al (2015)	32.80 (26.21, 39.39)
Taye et al (2019)	42.78 (38.15, 47.41)
Taye et al (2016)	31.12 (29.19, 33.05)
Theron et al (2020)	2.57 (1.91, 3.23)
Ugwu et al (2007)	107.23 (69.69, 144.77)
Venter et al (1995)	11.56 (5.02, 18.10)
Zash et al (2019)	4.10 (2.95, 5.25)
Overall ( $I^2 = 99.0\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )	17.01 (15.00, 19.03)
Note: Weights are from random effects analysis	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
500	

FIGURE 6: Forest plot showing the burden of spina bifida per 10,000 in Africa, 2022.

northern Africa at 15.93 per 10,000 (95% CI: 12.96, 18.90). The lowest burden was observed in southern Africa, with 11.43 per 10,000 births (95% CI: 7.51, 15.34) (Figure 5).

3.3.5. Burden of NTDs by Subtypes in Africa. This metaanalysis looked into the subtypes of neural tube defects. Spina bifida had the highest burden among the subtypes of neural tube defects in African countries, at 17.01 (95% CI: 15.00, 19.00) (Figure 6), followed by an encephaly at 6.46 (95% CI: 5.52, 7.40) (Figure 7) and encephalocele at 1.66 (95% CI: 1.12, 2.20) (Figure 8). The burden of spina bifida was highest at 176.42 (95% CI: -163.33, 516.16) in Central Africa and lowest at 6.53 (95% CI: 3.89, 9.16) in southern Africa countries (Figure 9). The burden of anencephaly was highest at 20.87 (95% CI: 16.49, 25.24) in eastern Africa countries and lowest at 1.13 (95% CI: 1.09, 3.35) in Central African countries (Figure 10). The frequency of encephalocele was highest at 5.16 (2.12, 8.19) in Eastern African countries and lowest at 0.56 (0.19, 0.93) in northern African countries (Figure 11).

3.3.6. Associated Factors of Neural Tube Defects. This metaanalysis included maternal folic acid supplementation, parental consanguinity marriage, maternal alcohol consumption, maternal history of stillbirth, maternal pesticide exposure, maternal radiation exposure, maternal medical illness, infant sex, and mother's age > 35 years old as associate factors for neural tube defects, with ten papers [19–22, 28, 30, 32, 51, 54, 71] retrieved into the review. For sensitivity analysis, each variable was carefully examined. However, sensitivity analysis revealed that neither of the linked parameters was significant. A separate analysis was conducted for each variable.

(1) Maternal Age and Neural Tube Defects. From three [20, 21, 30] studies, we found that maternal age above 35 years of age during pregnancy was significantly associated with NTDs among newborn infants with odds ratio 3.54 (95% CI: 1.67–7.47). This suggests that infants born to mothers over 35 were 3.54 times more likely to have NTDs during pregnancy than infants born to mothers under 35. The study

Abbey et al (2017)       1.30 (-1.25, 3.8         Adam et al (2018)       3.56 (0.92, 6.2         Ahuka et al (2006)       1.13 (-1.09, 3.3         Airedale et al (1992)       3.35 (-1.29, 7.9         Anyanwu et al (2021)       6.87 (-6.59, 2.0)         Berlo et al (2020)       4.22 (-4.05, 1.2)         Berlo et al (2020)       5.33 (-1.29, 7.9         Buccimazza et al (1994)       6.87 (-6.59, 2.0)         Chukwubuke et al (2020)       5.37 (1.68, 8.8         Ekanem et al (2020)       5.37 (1.68, 8.8         Estifanos et al (2017)       1.86 (4.48, 5.2)         Gedéraw et al (2021)       5.37 (1.08, 8.8         Gederau et al (2021)       5.37 (1.03, 3.17         Gederau et al (2021)       7.837 (59.82, 9.6         Kidanie et al (2021)       7.837 (59.82, 9.6         Kishimba et al (2015)       5.14 (2.50, 7.7         Krzesinski et al (2019)       2.22 (1.90, 2.5*         Laamiri et al (2015)       6.60 (-6.33, 1.92         Mekonnen et al (2021)       8.80 (6.7, 4.102         Mash et al (2021)       8.20 (6.1, 9.22         Ormer et al (2021)       8.20 (6.1, 9.22         Mash et al (2021)       8.20 (6.1, 9.22         Soft et al (2021)       8.20 (6.7, 4.102         Sabt et al (2021)	Study		ES (95% CI)
Abbey et al (2017) Adam et al (2018) Anyanwu et al (2021) Bello et al (2020) Bello et al (2020) Bello et al (2020) Berhane et al (2020) Exiname et al (2021) Gedarmu et al (2021) Mosha et al (2017) Mosha et al (2021) Mosha et al (2021)			
Adua et al (2018) Aluka et al (2006) Aricdale et al (1992) Anyawu et al (2021) Berhane et al (2022) Berhane et al (2020) Berhane et al (2020) Berhane et al (2020) Elameghrabi et al (2019) Estimos et al (2017) Forci et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2021) Mekonnen et al (2021) Mekonnen et al (2021) Mekonnen et al (2021) Mosha et	Abbey et al (2017)	•	1.30 (-1.25, 3.85)
Ahuka et al (2006) Airedale et al (1992) Anyanwu et al (2021) Berhane et al (2022) Berhane et al (2022) Berhane et al (2020) Ekanem et al (2021) Gedarnu et al (2021) Houcher et al (2022) Kishimba et al (2015) Krzesinski et al (2017) Houcher et al (2021) Mekonnen et al (2021) M	Adane et al (2018)	◆	3.56 (0.92, 6.20)
Airedale et al (1992) Anyanwu et al (2021) Berlhu et al (2022) Berlhu et al (2022) Berlhu et al (2022) Berlhu et al (2020) El.moghrabi et al (2019) El.moghrabi et al (2017) Gedamu et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2022) Kishimba et al (2015) Kromberg et al (2015) Krestinski et al (2017) Mekonnen et al (2021) Mekonnen et al (2021) Mekonen et al (2021) Mekonen et al (2021) Mekonen	Ahuka et al (2006)	•	1.13 (-1.09, 3.35)
Anyanvu et al (2021) Bello et al (2008) Berihue et al (2022) Berhane et al (2022) Berhane et al (2022) Berkanem et al (2020) Etamoghrab et al (2019) Etamoghrab et al (2019) Etamoghrab et al (2019) Etamoghrab et al (2019) Berkanem et al (2019) Etamoghrab et al (2011) Gedarau et al (2021) Gedarau et al (2021) Gedarau et al (2021) Gedarau et al (2021) Gedarau et al (2021) Houcher et al (2021) Houcher et al (2015) Kishimba et al (2015) Krzesinski et al (2017) Hekonnem et al (2017) Mekonnem et al (2017) Masri et al (2011) Mosha et al (2021) Mekonnem et al (2012) Naari et al (2021) Mekonnem et al (2012) Naari et al (2021) Saib et al (2021) Tay et al (2015) Strit et al (2021) Strit et al (2021) Strit et al (2021) Strit et al (2021) Strit et al (2021) Ansri et al (2021) Mekonnem et al (2015) Strit et al (2021) Ansri et al (2021) Strit et al (2021) Strit et al (2021) Ansri et al (2021) Ansri et al (2021) Strit et al (2021) Strit et al (2021) Ansri et al (2020) Ansri et al	Airedale et al (1992)	- <b>+</b> -	3.35 (-1.29, 7.99)
Bello et al (2008) 4.22 (-4.05, 12. Berhane et al (2012) 5.35 (79, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20, 20	Anyanwu et al (2021)	•	6.87 (-6.59, 20.33)
Berhane et al (2022) Berihu et al (2018) Buccimazza et al (1994) Chukwubuike et al (2020) Ekanem et al (2020) El-moghrabi et al (2019) Estifanos et al (2017) Forci et al (2021) Gedafaw et al (2018) Geneti et al (2021) Houcher et al (2020) Kishimba et al (2021) Houcher et al (2020) Kishimba et al (2021) Houcher et al (2020) Kishimba et al (2015) Krzesinski et al (2019) Laamiri et al (2017) Mosha et al (2011) Mosha et al (2021) Mosha et al (2021) Saib et al (2021) Sorri et al (2015) Saib et al (2021) Sorri et al (2021) Sorri et al (2015) Saib et al (2021) Sorri et al (2015) Sorri et al (2015) Sor	Bello et al (2008)	<b>•</b>	4.22 (-4.05, 12.49)
Berihu et al (2018) Buccimazza et al (1994) Chukwubuike et al (2020) El-moghrabi et al (2019) Estifanos et al (2019) Estifanos et al (2017) Gedamu et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2021) Houcher et al (2020) Kishimba et al (2015) Krzesinski et al (2019) Laamiri et al (2021) Mekonnen et al (2021) Mosha et al (2021) Mosha et al (2021) Mekonnen et al (2021) Mosha et al (2021	Berhane et al (2022)		54.36 (47.83, 60.89)
Buccimazza et al (1994) Chukwubuike et al (2020) Ekanem et al (2008) Estifanos et al (2017) Forci et al (2021) Gedamu et al (2021) Gedamu et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2018) Geneti et al (2022) Kishimba et al (2022) Kishimba et al (2015) Kromberg et al (1982) Mekonnen et al (2010) Laamiri et al (2017) Mosha et al (2018) Mosha et al (2019) Mosha et al (2021) Mosha et al (2020) Mosha et al (2020) Mosha et a	Berihu et al (2018)		66.40 (53.36, 79.44)
Chukwubuike et al (2020) Ekanem et al (2008) Estifanos et al (2017) Forci et al (2021) Gedaru et al (2021) Gedaru et al (2021) Gedaru et al (2021) Gedaru et al (2021) Houcher et al (2022) Kishimba et al (2015) Kromberg et al (2021) Mekonnen et al (2017) Mekonnen et al (2017) Mekonnen et al (2017) Mekonnen et al (2017) Masri et al (2017) Masri et al (2017) Masri et al (2021) Mekonnen et al (2021) Mosha et	Buccimazza et al (1994)	•	3.17 (2.68, 3.66)
Ekanem et al (2008) El-moghrabi et al (2019) Estifanos et al (2017) Gedafam et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2020) Kishimba et al (2022) Kishimba et al (2022) Krzesinski et al (2015) Mosha et al (2015) Mosha et al (2017) Mosha et al (2018) Mosha et al (2019) Mosha et al (20	Chukwubuike et al (2020)	<b>•</b>	1.05 (-1.01, 3.11)
El-moghrabi et al (2019) Estifanos et al (2017) Forci et al (2021) Gedamu et al (2021) Gedamu et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2018) Geneti et al (2021) Houcher et al (2020) Kishimba et al (2015) Krzesinski et al (2019) Laamiri et al (2017) Mosha et al (2018) Mosha et al (2019) Mosha et al (2019)	Ekanem et al (2008)	<ul> <li>Image: A set of the set of the</li></ul>	1.56 (0.88, 2.24)
Estifanos et al (2017) Forci et al (2021) Gedamu et al (2021) Gedamu et al (2021) Houcher et al (2022) Kidanie et al (2022) Kishimba et al (2015) Krzesinski et al (2019) Laamiri et al (2017) Mosha et al (2018) Mosha et al (2019) Mosha	El-moghrabi et al (2019)	+	5.37 (1.86, 8.88)
Forci et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2021) Gedefaw et al (2021) Houcher et al (2021) Houcher et al (2022) Kishimba et al (2022) Kishimba et al (2015) Kromberg et al (1982) Laamiri et al (2017) Mekonnen et al (2019) Laamiri et al (2017) Mosha et al (2021) Mosha et al (2020) More et al (2020) More et al (2020) Sorri et al (2015) Satti et al (2021) Sorri et al (2019) Taye et al (2019) Taye et al (2019) Caye et al (2019) Caye et al (2019) More Weights are from random effects analysis	Estifanos et al (2017)	<b>~</b>	18.84 (14.58, 23.10)
Gedamu et al (2021) $31.56 (8.22, 54.9)$ Gedefaw et al (2018) $78.7 (59.82, 96.)$ Geneti et al (2021) $13.71 (10.33, 17.)$ Houcher et al (2008) $28.2 (42.08, 34.)$ Kitdanie et al (2015) $59.81 (43.76, 75.)$ Krzesinski et al (2019) $4.05 (1.76, 6.34.)$ Laamiri et al (2017) $4.05 (1.76, 6.34.)$ Mekonnen et al (2021) $5.21 (7.99, 22.4.)$ Mekonnen et al (2021) $2.22 (1.90, 2.56.)$ Mosha et al (2021) $2.80 (1.81, 3.79.)$ Mosha et al (2021) $2.80 (1.81, 3.79.)$ Madouani et al (2021) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22.)$ Satti et al (2021) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22.)$ Satti et al (2021) $3.99 (-52, 8.5.)$ Satti et al (2021) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22.)$ Sorri et al (2021) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22.)$ Sorri et al (2021) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22.)$ Sorri et al (2019) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22.)$ Taye et al (2019) $4.72 (3.18, 6.20.)$ Satti et al (2020) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22.)$ Venter et al (1995) $2.25 (5.72, 19.3.)$ Zash et al (2019) $2.76 (1.82, 3.70.)$ Overall (I <sup>2</sup> = 97.3%, p = 0.000) <td>Forci et al (2021)</td> <td>•</td> <td>5.01 (2.92, 7.10)</td>	Forci et al (2021)	•	5.01 (2.92, 7.10)
Gedefaw et al (2018)       78.37 (59.82, 96.         Geneti et al (2021)       13.71 (10.33, 17.         Houcher et al (2008)       59.81 (43.76, 75.         Kishimba et al (2015)       5.14 (2.50, 7.74.         Krzesinski et al (2019)       4.05 (1.76, 6.3.         Laamiri et al (2021)       5.14 (2.50, 7.74.         Mekonnen et al (2017)       2.22 (1.90, 2.55.         Mekonnen et al (2017)       2.22 (1.90, 2.55.         Mosha et al (2021)       5.21 (7.99, 22.4.         Mekonnen et al (2015)       6.60 (-6.33, 19.9.         Nasri et al (2021)       2.80 (1.81, 3.79.         Mosha et al (2021)       4.92 (0.61, 9.23.         Omer et al (2021)       4.89 (2.63, 7.11.         Saib et al (2021)       3.99 (-0.52, 8.5.         Satti et al (2021)       3.99 (-0.52, 8.5.         Satti et al (2015)       4.92 (0.61, 9.23.         Sorri et al (2015)       2.65.88 (20.65, 3.2.         Taye et al (2019)       4.72 (3.18, 6.20.         Taye et al (2019)       5.72 (4.89, 6.55.         Theron et al (2020)       0.49 (0.20, 0.76.         Venter et al (1995)       2.25 (5.72, 19.3.         Zash et al (2019)       2.76 (1.82, 3.70.         Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%, p = 0.000$ )       6.46 (5.52, 7.4.0. <td>Gedamu et al (2021)</td> <td>• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •</td> <td>31.56 (8.22, 54.90)</td>	Gedamu et al (2021)	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	31.56 (8.22, 54.90)
Geneti et al (2021) $13.71 (10.33, 17. 28.24 (22.08, 34. 22.08, 34. 35. 28. 29. 21. 21. 21. 21. 21. 21. 21. 21. 21. 21$	Gedefaw et al (2018)	• •	
Houcher et al (2008) Kidanie et al (2022) Kishimba et al (2015) Krzesinski et al (2019) Laamiri et al (2017) Mekonnen et al (2021) Mosha et al (2021) Mosha et al (2021) Nasri et al (2021) Nasri et al (2021) Sori et al (2021) Saib et al (2021) Sori et al (2015) Sait et al (2021) Sori et al (2015) Sait et al (2021) Sori et al (2015) Sait et al (2016) Taye et al (2017) Venter et al (1995) Zash et al (2019) Coverall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ ) Nute: Weights are from random effects analysis	Geneti et al (2021)	<b>•</b>	13.71 (10.33, 17.09)
Kidanie et al (2022)59.81 (43.76, 75.Kishimba et al (2015)5.14 (2.50, 7.7)Kromberg et al (1982)4.05 (1.76, 6.3)Krzesinski et al (2019)2.22 (190, 2.5)Laamiri et al (2017)2.22 (190, 2.5)Mekonnen et al (2021)15.21 (7.99, 22.4)Mosha et al (2021)6.60 (-6.33, 19.9)Nasri et al (2014)0.46 (0.39, 0.53)Nadi et al (2021)4.92 (0.61, 9.22)Omer et al (2021)8.00 (5.74, 10.2)Saib et al (2021)8.00 (5.74, 10.2)Saib et al (2021)8.00 (5.74, 10.2)Saib et al (2021)3.99 (-0.52, 8.5)Satt et al (2015)8.00 (5.74, 10.2)Singh et al (2021)4.92 (0.61, 9.22)Sorri et al (2015)4.92 (0.61, 9.22)Sorri et al (2015)4.92 (0.61, 9.22)Sorri et al (2019)4.72 (3.18, 6.20)Taye et al (2016)5.72 (4.89, 6.55)Theron et al (2020)0.49 (0.20, 0.7)Venter et al (1995)2.52 (5.72, 19.3)Zash et al (2019)2.76 (1.82, 3.70)Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )6.46 (5.52, 7.40)Note: Weights are from random effects analysis4.40	Houcher et al (2008)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	28.24 (22.08, 34.40)
Kishimba et al (2015) $\bullet$ $5.14 (2.50, 7.74$ Kromberg et al (1982) $4.05 (1.76, 6.3)$ Krzesinski et al (2019) $6.30 (4.69, 7.9)$ Laamiri et al (2017) $2.22 (1.90, 2.54)$ Mekonnen et al (2021) $15.21 (7.99, 22.4)$ Mosha et al (2021) $6.60 (-6.33, 19.2)$ Mosha et al (2021) $2.80 (1.81, 3.75)$ Nasri et al (2021) $2.80 (1.81, 3.75)$ Nadi et al (2022) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22)$ Omer et al (2021) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22)$ Saib et al (2021) $8.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Saib et al (2021) $8.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Saib et al (2021) $1.50 (-0.20, 3.2)$ Sorri et al (2015) $8.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Sorri et al (2015) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22)$ Sorri et al (2015) $26.58 (20.65, 32)$ Taye et al (2016) $1.50 (-0.20, 3.2)$ Taye et al (2016) $5.72 (4.89, 6.55)$ Theron et al (2020) $0.49 (0.20, 0.76)$ Venter et al (2019) $2.76 (1.82, 3.70)$ Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%, p = 0.000$ ) $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$ Note: Weights are from random effects analysis $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$	Kidanie et al (2022)	<b>↓</b>	59.81 (43.76, 75.86)
Kromberg et al (1982)       4.05 (1.76, 6.34         Krzesinski et al (2019)       6.30 (4.69, 7.9)         Laamiri et al (2017)       2.22 (1.90, 2.55         Mekonnen et al (2021)       15.21 (7.99, 22.4         Mosha et al (2015)       6.60 (-6.33, 19.1)         Nasri et al (2014)       0.46 (0.39, 0.53         Nnadi et al (2022)       4.92 (0.61, 9.23         Ormer et al (2021)       4.89 (2.63, 7.15         Radouani et al (2015)       8.00 (5.74, 10.2         Saib et al (2021)       3.99 (-0.52, 8.55         Satti et al (2021)       1.50 (-0.20, 3.2         Sorri et al (2015)       26.58 (20.65, 32.         Taye et al (2019)       4.72 (3.18, 6.20         Taye et al (2016)       5.72 (4.89, 6.55         Theron et al (2020)       0.49 (0.20, 0.78         Venter et al (2019)       2.76 (1.82, 3.70         Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )       6.46 (5.52, 7.40	Kishimba et al (2015)	•	5.14 (2.50, 7.78)
Krzesinski et al (2019) $6.30 (4.69, 7.9)$ Laamiri et al (2017) $2.22 (1.90, 2.54)$ Mekonnen et al (2021) $15.21 (7.99, 22.4)$ Mosha et al (2021) $6.60 (-6.33, 19.9)$ Nasri et al (2014) $0.46 (0.39, 0.55)$ Nnadi et al (2022) $4.92 (0.61, 9.25)$ Omer et al (2021) $4.89 (2.63, 7.15)$ Radouani et al (2015) $8.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Saib et al (2021) $8.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Saib et al (2021) $8.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Sorri et al (2015) $8.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Sorri et al (2015) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22)$ Sorri et al (2015) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22)$ Sorri et al (2015) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22)$ Sorri et al (2016) $7.72 (4.89, 6.52)$ Theron et al (2020) $0.49 (0.20, 0.76)$ Venter et al (1995) $12.52 (5.72, 19.2)$ Zash et al (2019) $2.76 (1.82, 3.77)$ Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ ) $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$ Note: Weights are from random effects analysis $4.81 (2.52) (2.57, 2.49)$	Kromberg et al (1982)	•	4.05 (1.76, 6.34)
Laamiri et al (2017) Mekonnen et al (2021) Mekonnen et al (2021) Mosha et al (2021) Nasri et al (2021) Nasri et al (2022) Omer et al (2021) Radouani et al (2021) Saib et al (2022) Sorri et al (2015) Satti et al (2022) Sorri et al (2015) Satti et al (2022) Sorri et al (2015) Taye et al (2016) Taye et al (2020) Venter et al (2020) Note: Weights are from random effects analysis	Krzesinski et al (2019)	•	6.30 (4.69, 7.91)
Mekonnen et al (2021)       15.21 (7.99, 22.4         Mekonnen et al (2015)       6.60 (-6.33, 19.4)         Mosha et al (2021)       2.80 (1.81, 3.79)         Nasri et al (2014)       0.46 (0.39, 0.5)         Nadi et al (2022)       4.92 (0.61, 9.22)         Omer et al (2021)       4.89 (2.63, 7.15)         Radouani et al (2015)       8.00 (5.74, 10.2)         Saib et al (2021)       3.99 (-0.52, 8.5)         Satti et al (2021)       3.99 (-0.52, 8.5)         Sorri et al (2021)       1.50 (-0.20, 3.2)         Sorri et al (2015)       26.58 (20.65, 32.         Taye et al (2016)       5.72 (4.89, 6.55)         Theron et al (2020)       9.49 (0.20, 0.76)         Venter et al (2019)       2.76 (1.82, 3.70)         Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )       6.46 (5.52, 7.40)         Note: Weights are from random effects analysis       6.46 (5.52, 7.40)	Laamiri et al (2017)	•	2.22 (1.90, 2.54)
Mekonnen et al (2015) $6.60 (-6.33, 19.4)$ Mosha et al (2021) $2.80 (1.81, 3.79)$ Nasri et al (2014) $0.46 (0.39, 0.55)$ Nnadi et al (2022) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22)$ Omer et al (2021) $8.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Saib et al (2021) $8.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Saib et al (2021) $9.99 (-0.20, 3.2)$ Sorri et al (2022) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22)$ Sorri et al (2015) $1.50 (-0.20, 3.2)$ Taye et al (2015) $4.72 (3.18, 6.20)$ Taye et al (2016) $5.72 (4.89, 6.55)$ Theron et al (2020) $0.49 (0.20, 0.76)$ Venter et al (2019) $2.76 (1.82, 3.70)$ Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%, p = 0.000$ ) $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$ Note: Weights are from random effects analysis $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$	Mekonnen et al (2021)	-	15.21 (7.99, 22.43)
Mosha et al (2021)       2.80 (1.81, 3.79)         Nasri et al (2014)       0.46 (0.39, 0.52)         Sindai et al (2022)       4.92 (0.61, 9.22)         Omer et al (2021)       8.00 (5.74, 10.2)         Saib et al (2021) $3.99 (-0.52, 8.5)$ Satti et al (2021) $1.50 (-0.20, 3.2)$ Singh et al (2022) $4.92 (0.61, 9.22)$ Sorri et al (2015) $1.50 (-0.20, 3.2)$ Taye et al (2015) $4.72 (3.18, 6.20)$ Taye et al (2016) $5.72 (4.89, 6.55)$ Theron et al (2020) $0.49 (0.20, 0.76)$ Venter et al (1995) $2.76 (1.82, 3.70)$ Zash et al (2019) $2.76 (1.82, 3.70)$ Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%, p = 0.000$ ) $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$	Mekonnen et al (2015)	<b>_</b>	6.60 (-6.33, 19.53)
Nasri et al (2014) $0.46 (0.39, 0.5)$ Nnadi et al (2022) $4.92 (0.61, 9.2)$ Omer et al (2021) $8.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Saib et al (2021) $8.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Saib et al (2021) $3.99 (-0.52, 8.5)$ Satti et al (2022) $4.92 (0.61, 9.2)$ Sorri et al (2021) $1.50 (-0.20, 3.2)$ Sorri et al (2015) $4.92 (0.61, 9.2)$ Sorri et al (2015) $4.92 (0.61, 9.2)$ Taye et al (2016) $4.72 (3.18, 6.20)$ Theron et al (2020) $4.72 (3.18, 6.20)$ Venter et al (1995) $2.52 (5.72, 19.3)$ Zash et al (2019) $2.76 (1.82, 3.70)$ Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%, p = 0.000$ ) $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$ Note: Weights are from random effects analysis $4.62 (1.92, 10.2)$	Mosha et al (2021)	•	2.80 (1.81, 3.79)
Nnadi et al (2022) $4.92 (0.61, 9.2)$ Omer et al (2021) $4.89 (2.63, 7.1)$ Radouani et al (2015) $8.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Saib et al (2021) $3.99 (-0.52, 8.5)$ Satti et al (2021) $1.50 (-0.20, 3.2)$ Singh et al (2022) $4.92 (0.61, 9.2)$ Sorri et al (2015) $4.92 (0.61, 9.2)$ Taye et al (2015) $4.92 (0.61, 9.2)$ Taye et al (2016) $4.72 (3.18, 6.20)$ Theron et al (2020) $0.49 (0.20, 0.78)$ Venter et al (1995) $2.76 (1.82, 3.70)$ Zash et al (2019) $2.76 (1.82, 3.70)$ Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%, p = 0.000$ ) $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$	Nasri et al (2014)	•	0.46 (0.39, 0.53)
Omer et al (2021) $4.89$ (2.63, 7.15         Radouani et al (2015) $8.00$ (5.74, 10.2         Saib et al (2021) $3.99$ ( $-0.52$ , 8.5         Satti et al (2021) $1.50$ ( $-0.20$ , 3.2         Singh et al (2022) $4.92$ ( $0.61$ , 9.22         Sorri et al (2015) $26.58$ ( $20.65$ , 32.         Taye et al (2019) $4.72$ ( $3.18$ , $6.26$ Taye et al (2016) $5.72$ ( $4.89$ , $6.55$ Theron et al (2020) $0.49$ ( $0.20$ , $0.78$ Venter et al (1995) $2.76$ ( $1.82$ , $3.70$ Zash et al (2019) $2.76$ ( $1.82$ , $3.70$ Overall ( $t^2 = 97.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ ) $6.46$ ( $5.52$ , $7.40$	Nnadi et al (2022)	<b>•</b>	4.92 (0.61, 9.23)
Radouani et al (2015) $\$.00 (5.74, 10.2)$ Saib et al (2021) $3.99 (-0.52, 8.5)$ Satti et al (2021) $1.50 (-0.20, 3.2)$ Singh et al (2022) $4.92 (0.61, 9.2)$ Sorri et al (2015) $4.72 (3.18, 6.26)$ Taye et al (2016) $5.72 (4.89, 6.55)$ Theron et al (2020) $0.49 (0.20, 0.76)$ Venter et al (1995) $2.76 (1.82, 3.77)$ Zash et al (2019) $2.76 (1.82, 3.77)$ Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%, p = 0.000$ ) $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$	Omer et al (2021)	•	4.89 (2.63, 7.15)
Saib et al (2021) Satti et al (2021) Sorri et al (2022) Sorri et al (2015) Taye et al (2016) Theron et al (2020) Venter et al (2020) Venter et al (2019) Zash et al (2019) Note: Weights are from random effects analysis	Radouani et al (2015)	•	8.00 (5.74, 10.26)
Satti et al (2021) Satti et al (2022) Sorri et al (2015) Taye et al (2019) Theron et al (2020) Venter et al (2016) Cashe et al (2019) Cashe et al (2019) Overall $(1^2 = 97.3\%, p = 0.000)$ Note: Weights are from random effects analysis	Saib et al (2021)	-	3.99(-0.52, 8.50)
Singh et al (2022)       4.92 ( $0.61, 9.2$ ;         Sorri et al (2015)       26.58 ( $20.65, 32$ .         Taye et al (2019)       4.72 ( $3.18, 6.24$ Taye et al (2016)       5.72 ( $4.89, 6.55$ Theron et al ( $2020$ )       0.49 ( $0.20, 0.76$ Venter et al (1995)       12.52 ( $5.72, 19.3$ Zash et al (2019)       2.76 ( $1.82, 3.77$ Overall ( $1^2 = 97.3\%, p = 0.000$ )       6.46 ( $5.52, 7.40$	Satti et al (2021)	•	1.50(-0.20, 3.20)
Sorri et al (2015) Taye et al (2019) Taye et al (2016) Theron et al (2020) Venter et al (2020) Venter et al (1995) Zash et al (2019) Overall $(I^2 = 97.3\%, p = 0.000)$ Note: Weights are from random effects analysis	Singh et al (2022)	- <b>+</b> -	4.92 (0.61, 9.23)
Taye et al (2019) $4.72 (3.18, 6.20)$ Taye et al (2016) $5.72 (4.89, 6.52)$ Theron et al (2020) $0.49 (0.20, 0.76)$ Venter et al (1995) $12.52 (5.72, 19.3)$ Zash et al (2019) $2.76 (1.82, 3.70)$ Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ ) $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$ Note: Weights are from random effects analysis $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$	Sorri et al (2015)		26.58 (20.65, 32.51)
Taye et al (2016) $5.72 (4.89, 6.55)$ Theron et al (2020) $0.49 (0.20, 0.76)$ Venter et al (1995) $12.52 (5.72, 19.3)$ Zash et al (2019) $2.76 (1.82, 3.70)$ Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ ) $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$ Note: Weights are from random effects analysis $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$	Tave et al (2019)	•	4.72 (3.18, 6.26)
Theron et al (2020) $0.49 (0.20, 0.76)$ Venter et al (1995) $12.52 (5.72, 19.3)$ Zash et al (2019) $2.76 (1.82, 3.70)$ Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ ) $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$ Note: Weights are from random effects analysis $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$	Tave et al (2016)	•	5.72 (4.89, 6.55)
Venter et al (1995)       12.52 (5.72, 19.3)         Zash et al (2019)       2.76 (1.82, 3.70)         Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )       6.46 (5.52, 7.40)         Note: Weights are from random effects analysis       6.46 (5.52, 7.40)	Theron et al (2020)	•	0.49(0.20, 0.78)
Zash et al (2019) $2.76$ (1.82, 3.70         Overall ( $t^2 = 97.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ ) $6.46$ (5.52, 7.40         Note: Weights are from random effects analysis $6.46$ (5.52, 7.40	Venter et al (1995)	_ <b>_</b>	12.52 (5.72, 19.32)
Overall $(I^2 = 97.3\%, p = 0.000)$ $6.46 (5.52, 7.40)$ Note: Weights are from random effects analysis	Zash et al $(2019)$	•	2.76 (1.82, 3.70)
Note: Weights are from random effects analysis	Overall $(I^2 = 97.3\%, p = 0.000)$	0	6.46 (5.52, 7.40)
rote, it eights are noth fundom encets analysis	Note: Weights are from random effects analysis		
		0 50	100

FIGURE 7: Forest plot depicting the burden of an encephaly per 10,000 in Africa, 2022.

showed moderate heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 69\%$ ,  $P \le 0.001$ ) (Figure 12); hence, random model effect was used.

(2) Maternal Alcohol Consumption and Neural Tube Defects. Three [22, 28, 30] studies showed that the women who had alcohol consumption during pregnancy were significantly associated with NTDs, odds ratio 2.54 (95% CI: 1.08-5.96). This indicated that infants of mother who had alcohol consumption were 2.54 times more likely to have babies with NTDs than women who had never consumed alcohol during pregnancy. The study showed moderate heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 52\%$ , P <0.12) (Figure 13). Hence, random model effect was computed.

(3) Maternal Folic Acid Supplementation and Neural Tube Defect. From seven [20–22, 28, 32, 54, 71] studies, we found that maternal folic acid supplementation during pregnancy was significantly associated with NTDs, odds ratio 0.38 (95% CI: 0.16-0.94). In epidemiological expressions, this showed us that infants born from mothers who took folic acid supple-

mentation during pregnancy were 62% times less likely to have NTDs. The study showed high heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 89\%$ ,  $P \le 0.001$ ) (Figure 14). Hence, random model effect was used.

(4) Maternal Exposure to Pesticide and Neural Tube Defects. This research looked at four studies [19, 20, 28, 30] to assess the maternal exposure to pesticide and neural tube defects. The neural tube defect pooled odds ratio found that women who were exposed to pesticides during pregnancy were 2.69 times more likely to have a baby with neural tube defects (OR, 95 percent CI; 2.69 (1.62-4.46)). The study was considered with the heterogeneity test, which found low heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 0$ , P < 0.67) (Figure 15). As a result, the fixed-effects model was adopted in this study.

(5) Maternal Exposure to X-Ray Radiation and Neural Tube Defects. Three studies [19, 28, 30] looked at maternal radiation exposure during pregnancy to realize if there was a link to neural tube defects. The combined odds were analyzed.

Study ID	ES (95% CI)
Abbey et al (2017)	◆ 3.91 (-0.51, 8.33)
Adeleve et al (2009)	1639.00 (710.03, 2567.97)
Ahuka et al (2006)	◆ 2.27 (-0.87, 5.41)
Airedale et al (1992)	◆ 13.38 (4.11, 22.65)
Alhassan et al (2017)	◆ 0.84 (-0.11, 1.79)
Anvanwu et al (2021)	♦ 6.87 (-6.59, 20.33)
Bello et al (2008)	63.26 (31.35, 95.17)
Berhane et al (2022)	♦ 9.03 (6.36, 11.70)
Buccimazza et al (1994)	♦ 0.79 (0.55, 1.03)
Chukwubuike et al (2020)	♦ 4.21 (0.08, 8.34)
Ekwochi et al (2017)	♦ 3.43 (-1.32, 8.18)
El-moghrabi et al (2019)	◆ 0.60 (-0.57, 1.77)
Forci et al (2021)	◆ 1.12 (0.13, 2.11)
Gedefaw et al (2018)	◆ 8.07 (2.10, 14.04)
Geneti et al (2021)	◆ 0.87 (0.02, 1.72)
Githuk et (2014)	<ul> <li>♦ 691.52 (627.54, 755.50)</li> </ul>
Houcher et al (2008)	◆ 0.35 (-0.34, 1.04)
Kalisya et al (2015)	◆ 15.37 (-5.92, 36.66)
Kidanie et al (2022)	<ul> <li>◆ 11.28 (4.29, 18.27)</li> </ul>
Kishimba et al (2015)	◆ 1.10 (-0.12, 2.32)
Krzesinski et al (2019)	<ul> <li>◆ 2.99 (1.88, 4.10)</li> </ul>
Mosha et al (2021)	◆ 1.40 (0.70, 2.10)
Nasri et al (2014)	◆ 0.36 (0.30, 0.42)
Nnadi et al (2022)	◆ 0.98 (-0.94, 2.90)
Omer et al (2021)	◆ 3.81 (1.82, 5.80)
Radouani et al (2015)	◆ 0.17 (-0.16, 0.50)
Satti et al (2021)	◆ 1.50 (-0.20, 3.20)
Sorri et al (2015)	◆ 1.73 (0.22, 3.24)
Taye et al (2016)	◆ 0.78 (0.47, 1.09)
Theron et al (2020)	◆ 0.36 (0.11, 0.61)
Ugwu et al (2007)	◆ 20.75 (4.16, 37.34)
Venter et al (1995)	◆ 1.92 (-0.75, 4.59)
Zash et al (2019)	◆ 1.25 (0.62, 1.88)
Overall ( $I^2 = 94.9\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )	1.66 (1.12, 2.20)
Note: Weights are from random effects analysis	
	6000

FIGURE 8: Forest plot showing the burden of encephalocele per 10,000 in Africa, 2022.

Women who had been exposed to radiation were 2.67 times more likely to have infants with neural tube defects than women who had not been exposed to radiation (OR, 95% CI: 2.67 (1.05-6.78)). Low heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 0$ , P < 0.55) was found. This study utilized a fixed-effects model (Figure 16).

(6) Paternal Consanguineous Marriage and Neural Tube Defects. Based on the four studies [28, 51, 54, 71], the link between parental consanguineous marriage and neural tube defects was rigorously analyzed. There was no difference in the combined odds ratio of neural tube defects between parents who were consanguineous and those who were not (OR 95 percent CI: 1.07 (0.40-2.91)).  $I^2 = 75\%$  and  $P \le 0.001$  revealed moderate heterogeneity. As a result, in the final analysis, the random effects model was used (Figure 17).

(7) Sex of Newborn Infants and Neural Tube Defects. The results of the six studies [19, 21, 22, 28, 30, 32] revealed that there is no difference in the burden of neural tube defects between male and female newborns (OR, 95% CI: 0.83 (0.55-1.23)). The heterogeneity was then found to be moderate ( $I^2 = 74\%$ ,  $P \le 0.001$ ). The random effect was used (Figure 18).

(8) Maternal Medical Illness and Neural Tube Defects. The pooled odds ratio for neural tube defects between the two studies [21, 28] found no difference between pregnant women with and without medical illness (OR, 95 percent CI: 1.38 (0.83-2.28)) (Figure 19). The heterogeneity was then found to be low ( $I^2 = 35\%$ , P < 0.20). The fixed effect was therefore assessed.

(9) Maternal History of Stillbirth and the Outcome. Three [20–22, 28] studies revealed that women who had a stillbirth were 3.18 times more likely to have a newborn with neural tube defects than women who had not had a stillbirth, (95% CI: 1.11–9.12). The study discloses high heterogeneity ( $I^2 = 82\%$ ,  $P \le 0.001$ ). As a result, a random effects model was contemplated (Figure 20).

## 4. Discussion

The burden of subtype analysis of neural tube defects was evaluated by region for the first time in Africa. The overall burden of NTDs was 32.95 per 10,000 infants (95% CI: 29.77–36.13). This finding is higher than the studies conducted in California which reported a prevalence of 9 per 10,000 births [73], low- and middle-income countries (11

#### International Journal of Pediatrics

Authors	Year		ES (95% CI)
Western Africa		<b>_</b>	
Abbey et al	2017		31.29 (18.79, 43.79)
A deleve et al	2009	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	3770 49 (2554 28 4986 70)
Airodala at al	1002		5770.47(2554.20, 4700.70)
Alledale et al	1992		54.04 (55.45, 72.05)
Alhassan et al	2017	<b>•••••</b>	5.93 (3.39, 8.47)
Anyanwu et al	2021		13.74 (-5.29, 32.77)
Bello et al	2008		366.93 (291.25, 442.61)
Chukwubuike et al	2020		30,55 (19,45, 41,65)
Ekanem et al	2008		3 67 (2 62 4 72)
Elsus ali at al	2000		(2.02, 4.72)
Ekwochi et al	2017		0.80 (0.14, 15.08)
Nhadi et al	2022		15.74 (8.03, 23.45)
Singh et al	2022	•	10.82 (4.43, 17.21)
Ugwu et al	2007		107.23 (69.69, 144.77)
Subtotal ( $I^2 = 95.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )	2007		24.57 (16.23, 32.91)
Eastern Africa			
Adane et al	2018		30.03 (22.38, 37.68)
Berhane et al	2022		43.55 (37.70, 49.40)
Berihu et al	2018		64 40 (51 56 77 24)
Estifance et al	2010		679(422024)
	2017		(0.76(4.22, 9.54))
Gedamu et al	2021		18.03 (0.37, 35.69)
Gedefaw et al	2018		58.78 (42.70, 74.86)
Geneti et al	2021	<b>4</b>	 11.10 (8.06, 14.14)
Githuk et al	2014	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1959 94 (1859 84 2080 04)
	2014		1) 5) . 54 (105) . 64, 2000 . 64)
Kidanie et al	2022		38.37 (25.50, 51.24)
Kishimba et al	2015	•	3.67 (1.44, 5.90)
Mekonnen et al	2021		13.42 (6.63, 20.21)
Mekonnen et al	2015		125 33 (69 33 181 33)
Mosha at al	2013		E 60 (4 20, 700)
iviosita et al	2021		(4.29, 7.09)
Sorri et al	2015		32.80 (26.21, 39.39)
Taye et al	2019		42.78 (38.15, 47.41)
Tave et al	2018		31.12 (29.19, 33.05)
Subtotal $(I^2 \otimes A)$ $p = 0.000)$	2010		55 53 (43 10 67 96)
Subtotal (1 $99.4\%, p = 0.000)$			55.55 (45.10 07.50)
Central Africa			
	2000		(00(12(1224)))
Anuka et al	2008		6.80 (1.36, 12.24)
Kalisya et al	2015	Y CARACTER STATE	353.57 (253.22, 453.92)
Subtotal ( $I^2 = 97.8\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )		~	 176.42 (-163.33, 516.16)
Southorn Africa			
Southern Annea	1004		
Buccimazza et al	1994		7.77 (7.01, 8.53)
Kromberg et al	1982		7.76 (4.59, 10.93)
Krzesinski et al	2019		11.54 (9.37, 13.71)
Saib et al	2021		2.68(1.03, 6.35)
There at al	2021		2.00(-1.03, 0.33)
Ineron et al	2020		2.57 (1.91, 3.23)
Venter et al	1995		11.58 (5.02, 18.10)
Zash et al	2019		4.10 (296, 5.25)
Subtotal ( $I^2 = 95.9\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )		<b>•</b>	6.53 (3.89, 9.16)
Northern Africa			
El-moghrabi et al	2019		5.37 (1.86, 8.88)
Forci et al	2021		3 87 (2 03 5 71)
Houcher et al	2008		A6 QA (2001 EA 77)
Loomini et al	2000		40.04(30.91, 34.77)
Laaminietai	2017		1.81 (1.52, 2.10)
Nasri et al	2014		0.79(0.70, 0.88)
Omer et al	2021		19.30 (14.81, 23.79)
Radouani et al	2015		5 17 (3 35, 6 99)
Satti at al	2013		33.00(25.05, 40.05)
Subtotal $(I^2 = 97.9\%, p = 0.000)$	2021		7.22 (5.52, 8.93)
$Q = 11 (T^2 - Q Q Q) + Q Q Q)$			1= 01 (1= 00, 10, 02)
Overall $(1^2 = 99.0\%, p = 0.000)$	ata analyzia		17.01 (15.00, 19.03)
inote: weights are from random effe			
		<b>150</b> 0	
		4000	

FIGURE 9: Forest plot showing the burden of spina bifida by subregion per 10,000 in Africa, 2022.

per 10,000) [74], Africa (21.42 per 10,000) [69]. However, the overall burden found in this study is lower than the previous studies conducted in Africa which reported a prevalence value of 50.74 per 10,000 and India (45 per 10,000) and 42.48 per 10,000) [75–77]. This may be due to several factors, including variable birth record system, study design, and population size. Inclusion or exclusion criteria of articles among reviews may also have an effect in the findings. Furthermore, data loss and less organized system might also be a reason for the heterogeneity of the burden rate among the various studies.

The subgroup analysis of this study showed that the burden of NTDs among newborn infants significantly var-

ies across the regions. The highest burden was observed in the eastern Africa region with a burden of 111.13 per 10,000 births (95% CI: 91.85, 130.42), and the lowest burden was in southern Africa, with 11.43 per 10,000 births (95% CI: 7.51, 15.34). This has been linked to varying folic acid supplementation trends. The eastern region had a higher burden. This may be due to a greater deficiency in folic acid supplementation with the staple foods lacking adequate amount of folic acid fortification. On the other hand, the reason for the lower burden in the southern countries may be due to better folic acid supplementation practices and fortification policies in their staple foods [78–80].

Authors	Year		ES (95% CI)
Western Africa		•	
Abbey et al	2017		1.30 (-1.25, 3.85)
Airedale et al	1992		3.35 (-1.29, 7.99)
Anyanwu et al	2021		6.87 (-6.59, 20.33)
Bello et al	2008		4.22(-4.05, 12.49)
Chukwubuike et al	2020		1.05 (-1.01, 3.11)
Ekanem et al	2008		1.56(0.88, 2.24)
Nnadi et al	2022		4.92 (0.61, 9.23)
Singh et al	2022	<b>—</b>	4.92 (0.61, 9.23)
Subtotal ( $I^2 = 0.0\%$ , $p = 0.502$ )		<b>•</b>	1.69 (1.08, 2.30)
Eastern Africa			
Adane et al	2018		3 56 (0.92, 6.20)
Berhane et al	2022	$\bullet$	54 36 (47 83 60 89)
Berihu et al	2018		66 40 (53 36 79 44)
Estifanos et al	2017		18 84 (14 58 23 10)
Cadamu at al	2017		31 56 (8 22 54 00)
Gedefaw et al	2021		
Consti et al	2018		
Geneti et al	2021		
Kidanie et al	2022		59.81 (43.76, 75.86)
Kisnimba et al	2015		5.14 (2.50, 7.78)
Mekonnen et al	2021		15.21 (7.99, 22.43)
Mekonnen et al	2015		6.60 (-6.33, 19.53)
Mosha et al	2021		2.80 (1.81, 3.79)
Sorri et al	2015		26.58 (20.65, 32.51)
Taye et al	2019		4.72 (3.18, 6.26)
Taye et al	2016	•	5.72 (4.89, 6.55)
Subtotal ( $I^2 = 97.5\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )		• 🗢	20.87 (16.49, 25.24)
Central Africa			
Ahuka et al	2006		1.13 (-1.09, 3.35)
Subtotal ( $I^2 = .\%, p = .$ )			1.13 (-1.09, 3.35)
Southern Africa			
Buccimazza et al	1994		3 17 (2 68 3 66)
Kromberg et al	1982	<b>—</b>	4.05(1.76, 6.34)
Krzesinski et al	2019		6 30 (4 69 7 91)
Saib et al	2021		3.99(-0.52, 8.50)
Theron et al	2020		0.49(0.20, 0.78)
Vontor et al	1005		0.49(0.20, 0.70) 12 52 (5 72, 10 22)
Zash at al	2019		(12.32 (3.72, 19.32)) 2.76 (1.82, 3.70)
$\sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}$	2019		2.70(1.02, 5.70) 2.76(2.01, 5.50)
Subtotal ( $T = 98.0\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )		~	5.76 (2.01, 5.50)
Northern Africa			
El-moghrabi et al	2019		5.37 (1.86, 8.88)
Forci et al	2021	•	5.01 (2.92, 7.10)
Houcher et al	2008		28.24 (22.08, 34.40)
Laamiri et al	2017	<b>•</b> • •	2.22 (1.90, 2.54)
Nasri et al	2014		0.46 (0.39, 0.53)
Orner et al	2021		4.89 (2.63, 7.15)
Radouani et al	2015		8.00 (5.74, 10.26)
Satti et al	2021		1.50 (-0.20, 3.20)
Subtotal ( $I^2 = 97.4\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )		\$	4.65 (3.15, 6.14)
Overall ( $I^2 = 97.3\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )		<b>\$</b>	6.46 (5.52, 7.40)
Note: Weights are from random effe	ects analysis		
		0	 50 100
		v	20 100

FIGURE 10: Forest plot depicting the pooled burden of anencephaly by subregion per 10,000 in Africa, 2022.

In African countries, spina bifida had the highest burden among the subtypes of NTDs with 17.01 (95% CI: 15.00, 19.00), followed by anencephaly at 6.46 (95% CI: 5.52, 7.40) and encephalocele at 1.66 (95% CI: 1.12, 2.20). Based on the regions, the burden of spina bifida was highest at 176.42 (95% CI: -163.33, 516.16) in central Africa and lowest at 6.53 (95% CI: 3.89, 9.16) in southern African countries. The burden of anencephaly was highest at 20.87 (95% CI: 16.49, 25.24) in eastern African countries and lowest at 1.13 (95% CI: 1.09, 3.35) in central African countries. The burden of encephalocele was highest at 5.16 (2.12, 8.19) in eastern African countries and lowest at 0.56 (0.19, 0.93) in northern African countries. The current review showed that the burden of spina bifida was higher than a previous study conducted in Africa with a value of 13 per 10,000 births [81]. On the other hand the burden of an encephaly and encephalocele were lower than that of a previous study carried out in Africa, with a value of 14 per 10,000 and 2 per 10,000, respectively [82, 83]. This variation in the burden of the subtypes of NTD may be due to the differences in defect identification and detection methods over time, as well as differences in location, income level, and institutional folic acid fortification policy [74, 80, 84].

In this study, 10 studies [19–22, 28, 30, 32, 51, 54, 71] were retrieved in order to identify protective and associated factors with NTDs in newborns. After reviewing 2,946 sample sizes, 946 cases and 1703 controls were investigated. Infants born to mothers over the age of 35 during pregnancy were 3.54 times more likely to have NTDs than infants born to mothers under the age of 35, according to the combined

Authors	Year	ES (95% CI)
Western Africa		
Abbey et al	2017	3.91 (-0.51, 8.33)
Adeleye et al	2009	1639.00 (710.03, 2567.97)
Airedale et al	1992	13.38 (4.11, 22.65)
Alhassan et al	2017	0.84 (-0.11, 1.79)
Anyanwu et al	2021	6.87 (-6.59, 20.33)
Bello et al	2008	63.26 (31.35, 95.17)
Chukwubuike et al	2020	4.21 (0.08, 8.34)
Ekwochi et al	2017	343(-132, 818)
Nnadi et al	2022	0.98(-0.94, 2.90)
Llown et al	2007	20.75(4.16,37.34)
Subtotal ( $I^2 = 79.5\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )	2007	4.66 (1.47, 7.84)
Central Africa		
Ahuka et al	2006	2.27 (-0.87.541)
Kalisva et al	2015	15.37 (-5.92, 36.66)
Subtotal ( $I^2$ 29.8%, $p = 0.233$ )	2010	4.42 (-5.09, 13.92)
Eastern Africa		
Berhane et al	2022	9.03 (6.36, 11.70)
Gedefaw et al	2018	8.07 (2.10, 14.04)
Geneti et al	2021	
Githuk et al	2014	691 52 (627 54 755 50)
Kidanie et al	2014	
Kichimba et al	2022	11.20(4.2), 10.27)
Mosha et al	2013	1.10(-0.12, 2.32) 1.40(0.70, 2.10)
Nosila et al	2021	1.40(0.70, 2.10)
Soffiet al	2015	1.75(0.22, 5.24)
1 aye et al $(I^2 \rightarrow 0.40)$	2016	0.78(0.47, 1.09)
Subtotal $(1^2 = 98.4\%, p = 0.000)$		5.16 (2.12, 8.19)
Southern Africa		
Buccimazza et al	1994	0.79 (0.55, 1.03)
Krzesinski et al	2019	2.99 (1.88, 4.10)
Theron et al	2020	0.36 (0.11, 0.61)
Venter et al	1995	1.92 (-0.75, 4.59)
Zash et al	2019	1.25 (0.62, 1.88)
Subtotal ( $I^2 = 85.6\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )		1.14 (0.55, 1.72)
Northern Africa		
El-moghrabi et al	2019	0.60 (-0.57, 1.77)
Forci et al	2021	1.12 (0.13, 2.11)
Houcher et al	2008	0.35 (-0.34, 1.04)
Nasri et al	2014	0.36 (0.30, 0.42)
Omer et al	2021	3.81 (1.82, 5.80)
Radouani et al	2015	0.17 (-0.16, 0.50)
Satti et al	2021	1.50 (-0.20, 3.20)
Subtotal ( $I^2 = 64.6\%$ , p = 0.010)	-	<b>T</b> 0.56 (0.19, 0.93)
Overall ( $I^2 = 94.9\%$ , $p = 0.000$ )		1.66 (1.12, 2.20)
Note: Weights are from random effe	ects analysis	
		<b>GO</b> O

FIGURE 11: Forest plot showing the pooled burden of encephalocele by subregion per 10,000 in Africa, 2022.

odds. A finding of this study, which a fetus with NTDs is more likely to have chromosomal abnormalities as maternal age increases, was consistent with a previous study that found a link between maternal age and infants born with NTDs that have chromosomal abnormalities [85]. Meiotic division restriction leads to increased aneuploidy [86, 87].

Women with a history of alcohol use were 2.54 more likely to have infants with NTDs than women that had never consumed alcohol during pregnancy. This finding contradicts with the findings from studies that reported no link between maternal alcohol consumption and NTDs. This finding in the study has explained very well that this could be due to underreporting of alcohol consumption, which is directly related to the social stigma of drinking during pregnancy [88, 89].

Women who had been exposed to radiation were 2.67 times more likely to have infants with neural tube defects than women who had not been exposed to radiation. This finding is in line with the study's findings of altered chromatin structure, altered gene expression, and DNA damage. It may be due to radiation's ability to alter global DNA methylation, which in turn can affect altered gene expression, altered chromatin structure, and DNA damage [90]. Apoptotic mutations caused by X-rays combine with

Study on subsystem	Matern	al age	No mate	No maternal age Waight Odds ratio		Odds ratio			Odd	dds ratio		
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	M-H, random, 95% C		CI	M-H, random, 959			CI	
Berihu et al 2018	52	72	153	544	38.8%	6.64 [3.84, 11.50]				-	-	
Gedefaw et al 2018	8	16	103	320	25.9%	2.11 [0.77, 5.77]				+	-	
Mulu et al 2021	20	104	20	237	35.2%	2.58 [1.32, 5.04]						
Total (95% CI)		192		1101	100.0%	3.54 [1.67, 7.47]					•	
Total events	80		276									
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 =$	0.30; $\chi^2 =$	6.49, df	= 2 (P = 0	.04); $I^2 =$	69%		_					
Test for overall effec	t: $Z = 3.31$	(P = 0.0)	0009)				0.01	0.	1	1	10	100
								Materna	al age	Non	maternal	age

FIGURE 12: Forest plot showing the association between maternal age and the neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

Study or subgroup	Alcol	hol 1ption	No al consur	cohol nption	Weight	Odds ratio		Ode	ds ratio	
orday of subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	weight	M-H, random, 95% CI		M-H, ran	dom, 95% CI	
Atlaw et al 2019	6	55	36	407	37.7%	1.26 [0.51, 3.51]		_		
Berihu et al 2018	5	6	200	611	12.7%	10.28 [1.19, 88.53]				
Tadesse et al 2020	27	50	90	321	49.6%	3.01 [1.64, 5.53]				
Total (95% CI)		111		1339	100.0%	2.54 [1.08, 5.96]			•	
Total events	38		326							
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 =$	0.29; $\chi^2 =$	4.18, df	= 2 (P = 0)	$(.12); I^2 =$	52%					
Test for overall effect	t: $Z = 2.14$	P = 0.0	03)				0.01	0.1	1 10	100
							(ex	Favours perimental)	Favours (control)	

FIGURE 13: Forest plot depicting the association between maternal alcohol consumption and neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

<u></u>	Folic	acid	No foli	ic acid Weight		Odds ratio			Odds ratio	D		
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	otal Weight M-H, random, 95% C		CI	M-H, random, 95% CI				
Atlaw et al 2019	5	287	37	230	14.6%	0.09 [0.04, 0.24]						
Bourouba et al 2018	2	15	46	118	11.5%	0.24 [0.05, 1.12]						
Gashaw et al 2021	5	148	76	200	14.6%	0.06 [0.02, 0.15]		-				
Gedefaw et al 2018	6	9	3	23	10.0%	13.33 [2.11, 84.13]			-			
Mulu et al 2021	39	152	88	229	16.7%	0.55 [0.35, 0.87]						
Nasri et al 2015	34	65	36	75	15.9%	1.19 [0.61, 2.31]			-			
Tadesse et al 2020	28	157	99	224	16.6%	0.27 [0.17, 0.45]			-			
Total (95% CI)		833		1099	100.0%	0.38 [0.16, 0.94]						
Total events	119		385									
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 1$	.18; $\chi^2 =$	55.59, di	f = 6 (P <	0.00001);	$I^2 = 89\%$		0.01	0.1	1	10	100	
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.11 (P = 0.04)$						Favours (experimental) Favours			avours (cont	rol)		

FIGURE 14: Forest plot illustrating the associations between maternal folic acid supplementation and the burden of neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

neurodevelopment to increase the likelihood of NTD closure failure. Chronic low-dose radiation may affect the growth of neural progenitor cells and disrupt brain development [90].

The link between parental consanguineous marriage and NTDs has been extensively examined. There was no difference in the combined odds ratio of NTD among with and without consanguineous marriages. This observational study contradicts the findings of an Indian study that had reported that consanguinity increases the risk of NTD [91]. Consanguineous marriage alters the communal genetic frequency due to the gene residing in the family's genetic tree, which has a significant impact on NTD [92].

Study or subgroup	Pesticide exposure		No p exp	No pesticide exposure		lo pesticide exposure Weight		Odds ratio	Odds ratio					
study of subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	weight	M-H, fixed, 95% CI		M-H	I, fixed, 95	% CI				
Atlaw et al 2019	1	3	41	459	2.0%	5.10 [0.45, 57.43]								
Berihu et al 2018	5	7	200	610	7.4%	513 [0.99, 26.65]								
Filmawit et al 2021	18	39	42	141	56.2%	2.02 [0.98, 4.17]								
Gashaw et al 2021	15	26	66	217	34.3%	3.12 [1.36, 7.16]			-					
Total (95% CI)		75		1427	100.0%	2.69 [1.62, 4.46]								
Total events	39		349											
Heterogeneity: $\chi^2$ =	= 1.58; df =	3(P = 0.6)	57); $I^2 = 0$	%			0.01	0.1	1	10	100			
Test for overall effe	ct: $Z = 3.85$	5(P = 0.00)	001)				0.01	0.1	1	10	100			
							Favou	s (experim	ental) Fa	wours (conti	rol)			

FIGURE 15: Forest plot showing the linkage between the maternal exposure to pesticide and neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

	Radia	tion	No rad	liation							
Study or subgroup	expos	sure	expo	sure	Weight	Odds ratio	Odds ratio				
	Events	Total	Events	Total	0	M-H, fixed, 95% CI		M-H, fixe	ed, 95% CI		
Atlaw et al 2019	2	11	40	451	32.5%	2.28 [0.48, 10.93]					
Berihu et al 2018	5	7	200	610	27.1%	5.13 [0.99, 26.65]			<b></b>		
Filmawit et al 2021	2	5	58	175	40.4%	1.34 [0.22, 8.27]					
Total (95% CI)		23		1236	100.0%	2.67 [1.05, 6.78]			•		
Total events	9		298								
Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 =$	1.19, df =	2(P = 0	.55); $I^2 = 0$	)%				I			
Test for overall effec	t: $Z = 2.07$	V(P = 0.0)	04)				0.01	0.1	1 10	100	
							(ez	Favours (perimental)	Favours (control)		

FIGURE 16: Forest plot showing the linkage between the maternal exposure to X-ray radiation and neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

Study or subgroup	Consang	guinity	No consa	onsanguinity Weight Odds ratio		Odds ratio		(	Odds rati	0	
	Events	Total	Events	Total	weight	M-H, random, 95% CI		M-H, r	95% CI		
Atlaw et al 2019	3	118	39	344	22.9%	0.20 [0.06, 0.67]			_		
Bourouba et al 2018	15	40	33	93	28.3%	1.09 [0.51, 2.35]				-	
Nasri et al 2015	15	23	60	127	26.3%	2.09 [0.83, 5.29]			+	<u> </u>	
Nasri et al 2016	10	14	58	118	22.6%	2.59 [0.77, 8.71]			-		
Total (95% CI)		195		682	100.0%	1.07 [0.40, 2.91]			$\blacklozenge$	•	
Total events	43		190								
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0$	0.76; $\chi^2 =$	11.87, d	f = 3 (P = 0)	$0.008); I^2$	= 75%		0.01	0.1	1	10	100
Test for overall effect	: Z = 0.14	(P = 0.	89)				0.01	0.1	1	10	100
								Favours		Favours	
								(experimental	l)	(control)	

FIGURE 17: Forest plot depicting the association between the parental consanguineous marriage and neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

The results of the present study show no difference between male and female newborns in the burden of neural tube defects. These results go against a study [76] from India that found that newborn girls are more likely than newborn boys to have NTD.

It is unlikely that the outcome can be used to predict vulnerability to NTDs and was most likely caused by the rate of embryonic development. Due to females' slower rate of growth and the length of time spent undergoing neurulation, males appear to have made advancements in a few areas of the neurulation process, which increases the risk of NTDs [93]. The prevalence of NTDs was reduced due to extensive folic acid supplementation in both sexes [94].

Study on submour	Sex of n	ewhorn	No sex of	o sex of newhorn Events Total Weight M-H, ra		Odds ratio			Odds ra	tio	
Study of subgroup	Events	Total	Events			M-H, random, 95% C	I	M-H	I, random	, 95% CI	
Atlaw et al 2019	24	206	18	232	14.4%	1.57 [0.82, 2.98]				-	
Berihu et al 2018	66	218	50	206	18.1%	1.35 [0.88, 2.08]				_	
Filmawit et al 2021	25	91	35	75	14.4%	0.48 [0.25, 0.90]					
Gedefaw et al 2018	52	179	59	154	17.6%	0.66 [0.42, 1.04]					
Mulu et al 2021	82	246	45	135	17.8%	1.00 [0.64, 1.56]			-+-		
Tadesse et al 2020	38	158	89	223	17.7%	0.48 [0.30, 0.75]					
Total (95% CI)		1098		1029	100.0%	0.83 [0.55, 1.23]			•		
Total events	287		296								
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 =$	0.18; $\chi^2 =$	19.06, d	f = 5 (P =	0.002); I <sup>2</sup> :	= 74%		0.01	0.1	1	10	100
Test for overall effec	t: Z = 0.95	5(P = 0.1)	34)						-		
							Favo	urs (experi	mental)	Favours (co	ontrol)

FIGURE 18: Forest plot illustrating the association of the sex of newborn infant and neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

Study or subgroup	Mate medical	rnal illness	No medical	) illness	Weight	Odds ratio	Odds ratio M-H, fixed, 95% CI				
	Events	Total	Events	Total	0	M-H, fixed, 95% CI					
Atlaw et al 2019	10	111	32	351	56.7%	0.99 [0.47, 2.08]					
Mulu et al 2021	18	37	67	201	43.3%	1.89 [0.93, 3.85]				-	
Total (95% CI)		148		552	100.0%	1.38 [0.83, 2.28]					
Total events	28		99								
Heterogeneity: $\chi^2 =$	1.55, df =	1 (P = 0	.21); $I^2 = 3$	35%						1	
Test for overall effect	t: $Z = 1.26$	5(P = 0.	21)				0.01	0.1	1	10	100
							Favou	rs (experime	ental) Fa	vours (cont	rol)

FIGURE 19: Forest plot showing the association of maternal medical illness and neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

Study on sub-moun	History of stillbirth No history of stillbirth Weight Odds ratio Events Total Events Total M-H, random, 959		No his stillt	No history of stillbirth		Odds ratio			Odds ratio	I	
study of subgroup			M-H, random, 95% C	I	M-H, random, 95% CI						
Atlaw et al 2019	3	44	39	418	22.0%	0.71 [0.21, 2.40]		_			
Gashaw et al 2021	12	17	69	226	23.5%	5.46 [1.85, 16.10]			_		
Mulu et al 2021	45	54	82	246	26.8%	10.00 [4.66, 21.45]					
Tadesse et al 2020	18	37	102	337	27.6%	2.18 [1.10, 4.33]					
Total (95% CI)		152		1227	100.0%	3.18 [1.11, 9.12]					
Total events	78		292								
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2$ =	= 0.92; $\chi^2$ =	16.34, df	= 3 ( <i>P</i> =	0.0010); <i>1</i>	$1^2 = 82\%$					1	
Test for overall effe	ct: $Z = 2.16$	5(P = 0.0)	3)				0.01	0.1	1	10	100
							Favor	urs (experim	ental) Fa	vours (conti	ol)

FIGURE 20: Forest plot depicting the association of the maternal history of stillbirth and neural tube defects in Africa, 2022.

The pooled odds ratio for neural tube defects among the studies found no difference between pregnant women with and without medical illness, according to this metaanalysis. These findings are consistent with a study carried out in the United States [95], which found no difference in NTD prevalence between HIV-exposed pregnant women and the general population. On the other hand, it contradicts a previous study that found a higher risk of NTDs linked to fever during the first trimester of pregnancy [96]. In addition, a study done on Mexican-Americans had also reported that the occurrence of stressful life events was associated with NTD risk [97]. Women who had a history of stillbirth were 3.18 times more likely to have a newborn with neural tube defects than women who had not had a stillbirth. This finding is consistent with previous study that a previous miscarriage increases the risk of NTDs. The risk of recurrent stillbirth and termination pregnancies rises with NTD [98].

Reviewing the overall prevalence and contributing factors of neural tube defects among newborns in Africa has revealed significant advancements made possible by incorporating newer studies and up-to-date research to attract more attention and address a variety of studies. Therefore, the main aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis was to estimate the burden of neural tube defects and their associated factors in Africa. In order to minimize the occurrence of neural tube defects in Africa, policymakers and program planners could use the findings of this review as a guide when developing suitable interventions. The evaluation could also be used as a starting point for future studies on associated subjects.

## 5. Strength and Limitations of the Study

Strength of the study is inclusion of cross-sectional, cohort, and case-control type of additional and current studies to increase attention and address many studies to show the burden of NTDs in Africa. On the other hand, as a limitation, only a few original studies have been conducted in some African regions and included in this review. The studies reviewed are hospital-based studies, which may likely limit the coverage of the study population to assess the overall burden of NTDs in Africa.

## 6. Conclusion

This review has revealed the burden of NTDs among newborn infants in African countries. The burden of NTDs varies in different regions of Africa and varies in relation with different risk factors. Folic acid supplementation is found as a protective factor of NTDs. The recommendation of this study is to implement a preconception folic acid therapy policy for all women of childbearing age, as well as a policy of mandatory food fortification is critical.

#### Abbreviations

NTDs:	Neural tube defects
CI:	Confidence interval
JBI:	Joanna Briggs Institute
MeSH:	Medical subject headings.

#### Data Availability

The datasets used and/or evaluated in this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

## **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

## **Authors' Contributions**

The protocol and design of the study were developed by Reta Wakoya. Reta Wakoya and Mekbeb Afework conducted the article search, data extraction, and analysis. Reta Wakoya was a substantial contributor to the manuscript. Mekbeb Afework read and evaluated the manuscript. The final manuscript was examined and approved by both authors.

#### Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude and appreciation to all Addis Ababa University, School of Medicine, Department

## References

- L. E. Mitchell, "Epidemiology of neural tube defects," American Journal of Medical Genetics Part C: Seminars in Medical Genetics, vol. 135C, no. 1, p. 88, 2005.
- [2] H. Blencowe, V. Kancherla, S. Moorthie, M. W. Darlison, and B. Modell, "Estimates of global and regional prevalence of neural tube defects for 2015: a systematic analysis," *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, vol. 1414, no. 1, pp. 31–46, 2018.
- [3] E. Rampersaud, A. G. Bassuk, D. S. Enterline et al., "Whole genomewide linkage screen for neural tube defects reveals regions of interest on chromosomes 7 and 10," *Journal of Medical Genetics*, vol. 42, no. 12, pp. 940–946, 2005.
- [4] J. C. R. M. MacHenry, N. C. Nevin, and J. D. Merrett, "Comparison of central nervous system malformations in spontaneous abortions in northern Ireland and South-East England," *British Medical Journal*, vol. 1, no. 6175, pp. 1395–1397, 1979.
- [5] M. D. Al-Mendalawi, "Epidemiology of neural tube defects," Saudi Medical Journal, vol. 36, no. 3, pp. 373-374, 2015.
- [6] B. Irvine, W. Luo, and J. A. León, "Congenital anomalies in Canada 2015: a perinatal health surveillance report by the public health agency of Canada's Canadian perinatal surveillance system," *Health Promotion and Chronic Disease Prevention in Canada*, vol. 35, pp. 21-22, 2015.
- [7] S. A. Farkas, A. K. Böttiger, H. S. Isaksson et al., "Epigenetic alterations in folate transport genes in placental tissue from fetuses with neural tube defects and in leukocytes from subjects with hyperhomocysteinemia," *Epigenetics*, vol. 8, no. 3, pp. 303–316, 2013.
- [8] A. Alhassan, A. Adam, and D. Nangkuu, "Prevalence of neural tube defect and hydrocephalus in northern Ghana," *Journal of Medical and Biomedical Sciences*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 18–23, 2017.
- [9] S. A. Geneti, G. G. Dimsu, D. A. Sori, L. D. Amente, and Z. M. Kurmane, "Prevalence and patterns of birth defects among newborns in southwestern Ethiopia: a retrospective study," *The Pan African Medical Journal*, vol. 40, p. 40, 2021.
- [10] M. Taye, M. Afework, W. Fantaye, E. Diro, and A. Worku, "Magnitude of birth defects in central and Northwest Ethiopia from 2010-2014: a descriptive retrospective study," *PLoS One*, vol. 11, no. 10, pp. 1–12, 2016.
- [11] F. Adane and G. Seyoum, "Prevalence and associated factors of birth defects among newborns at referral hospitals in Northwest Ethiopia," *The Ethiopian Journal of Health Development*, vol. 32, no. 3, 2018.
- [12] A. Liberati, D. G. Altman, J. Tetzlaff et al., "The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration," *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, vol. 62, no. 10, pp. e1–34, 2009.
- [13] J. Grant and A. Hunter, "Measuring inconsistency in knowledgebases," *Journal of Intelligent Information System*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 159–184, 2006.
- [14] A. O. Adeleye and K. G. Olowookere, "Central nervous system congenital anomalies: a prospective neurosurgical observational study from Nigeria," *Congenital Anomalies*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 258–261, 2009.

- [15] K. Nasri, M. K. Ben Fradj, T. Hamdi et al., "Epidemiology of neural tube defect subtypes in Tunisia, 1991-2011," *Pathology*, *Research and Practice*, vol. 210, no. 12, pp. 944–952, 2014.
- [16] D. Mekonnen, M. Taye, and W. Worku, "Congenital anomalies among newborn babies in Felege-Hiwot comprehensive specialized referral hospital, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 1–8, 2021.
- [17] H. K. Mekonen, B. Nigatu, and W. H. Lamers, "Birth weight by gestational age and congenital malformations in northern Ethiopia," *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, vol. 15, no. 1, pp. 1–8, 2015.
- [18] G. Sorri and E. Mesfin, "Patterns of neural tube defects at two teaching hospitals in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia a three years retrospective study," *Ethiopian Medical Journal*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 119–126, 2015.
- [19] F. Aynalem Tesfay, F. Bulte Aga, and T. G. Sebsibie, "Determinants of neural tube defect among children at zewditu memorial hospital, addis ababa, ethiopia a case control study," *Nursing Science*, vol. 15, article 100318, 2021.
- [20] A. Gashaw, S. Shine, O. Yimer, and M. Wodaje, "Risk factors associated to neural tube defects among mothers who gave birth in North Shoa Zone Hospitals, Amhara Region, Ethiopia 2020: case control study," *PLoS One*, vol. 16, no. 4, 2021.
- [21] Study C, G. B. Mulu, B. T. Atinafu, and F. N. Tarekegn, "Factors associated with neural tube defects among newborns delivered at Debre Berhan Specialized Hospital, North Eastern Ethiopia, 2021. Case-control study," *Frontiers in Pediatrics*, vol. 9, article 795637, 2022.
- [22] A. W. Tadesse, A. M. Kassa, and S. B. Aychiluhm, "Determinants of neural tube defects among newborns in Amhara region, Ethiopia: a case-control study," *International Journal Of Pediatrics*, vol. 2020, Article ID 5635267, 9 pages, 2020.
- [23] D. Estifanos, "The prevalence, trend, and associated demographic factors of neural tube defects at Orotta National Referral Maternity Hospital, Asmara: retrospective record review study," *Science Journal of Public Health*, vol. 5, no. 6, p. 452, 2017.
- [24] J. N. Githuku, A. Azofeifa, D. Valencia et al., "Assessing the prevalence of spina bifida and encephalocele in a Kenyan hospital from 2005-2010: implications for a neural tube defects surveillance system," *The Pan African Medical Journal*, vol. 18, p. 60, 2014.
- [25] R. S. Kishimba, R. Mpembeni, J. M. Mghamba, D. Goodman, and D. Valencia, "Birth prevalence of selected external structural birth defects at four hospitals in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, 2011-2012," *Journal of Global Health*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 1–6, 2015.
- [26] L. Barlow-Mosha, R. Serunjogi, D. Kalibbala et al., "Prevalence of neural tube defects, maternal HIV status, and antiretroviral therapy from a hospital-based birth defect surveillance in Kampala, Uganda," *Birth Defects Research*, vol. 114, no. 3–4, pp. 95–104, 2022.
- [27] D. Mumpe-Mwanja, L. Barlow-Mosha, D. Williamson et al., "A hospital-based birth defects surveillance system in Kampala, Uganda," *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2019.
- [28] D. Atlaw, A. Worku, M. Taye, D. Woldeyehonis, and A. Muche, "Neural tube defect and associated factors in Bale zone hospitals, Southeast Ethiopia," *Journal of Pregnancy and Child Health*, vol. 6, no. 3, p. 412, 2019.
- [29] A. Berhane and T. Belachew, "Trend and burden of neural tube defects among cohort of pregnant women in Ethiopia:

where are we in the prevention and what is the way forward?," *PLoS One*, vol. 17, no. 2, article e0264005, 2022.

- [30] B. A. Berihu, A. L. Welderufael, Y. Berhe et al., "Maternal risk factors associated with neural tube defects in Tigray regional state of Ethiopia," *Brain and Development*, vol. 41, no. 1, pp. 11–18, 2019.
- [31] B. A. Berihu, A. L. Welderufael, Y. Berhe et al., "High burden of neural tube defects in Tigray, northern Ethiopia: hospitalbased study," *PLoS One*, vol. 13, no. 11, article e0206212, 2018.
- [32] A. Gedefaw, S. Teklu, and B. T. Tadesse, "Magnitude of neural tube defects and associated risk factors at three teaching hospitals in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia," *BioMed Research International*, vol. 2018, Article ID 4829023, 10 pages, 2018.
- [33] S. Gedamu, E. G. Sendo, and W. Daba, "Congenital anomalies and associated factors among newborns in Bishoftu General Hospital, Oromia, Ethiopia: a retrospective study," *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, vol. 2021, Article ID 2426891, 6 pages, 2021.
- [34] Z. Kindie and A. Mulu, "Prevalence of neural tube defects at Debre Berhan Referral Hospital, North Shewa, Ethiopia. A hospital based retrospective crosssection study," *PLoS One*, vol. 17, no. 2, article e0261177, 2022.
- [35] S. Singh, D. Chukwunyere, J. Omembelede, and B. Onankpa, "Foetal congenital anomalies: an experience from a tertiary health institution in North-West Nigeria (2011-2013)," *The Nigerian Postgraduate Medical Journal*, vol. 22, no. 3, pp. 174–178, 2015.
- [36] R. O. Ugwu, A. U. Eneh, and R. S. Oruamabo, "Neural tube defects in a university teaching hospital in southern Nigeria: trends and outcome," *Nigerian Journal of Medicine*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 368–371, 2007.
- [37] M. Abbey, O. A. Oloyede, G. Bassey et al., "Prevalence and pattern of birth defects in a tertiary health facility in the Niger delta area of Nigeria," *International Journal of Women's Health*, vol. Volume 9, pp. 115–121, 2017.
- [38] K. I. Airede, "Neural tube defects in the middle belt of Nigeria," *Journal of Tropical Pediatrics*, vol. 38, no. 1, pp. 27–30, 1992.
- [39] L.-J. C. Anyanwu, B. Danborno, and W. O. Hamman, "The prevalence of neural tube defects in live born neonates in Kano, north-western Nigeria," *Journal of Medicine*, vol. 2, no. 3, p. 105, 2015.
- [40] M. Bello, A. Abubakar, R. Akuhwa, S. Yahaya, S. Adamu, and Y. Mava, "Neural tube defects: epidemiologic factors, clinical presentation and outcome in north eastern Nigeria," *Sahel Medical Journal*, vol. 11, no. 1, 2008.
- [41] K. Chukwubuike, I. Ozor, and N. Enyi, "Prevalence and pattern of birth defects in the two tertiary hospitals in Enugu, south East Nigeria: a hospital-based observational study," *African Journal* of *Paediatric Surgery*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 85–89, 2020.
- [42] T. B. Ekanem, D. E. Okon, A. O. Akpantah, O. E. Mesembe, M. A. Eluwa, and M. B. Ekong, "Prevalence of congenital malformations in Cross River and Akwa Ibom states of Nigeria from 1980–2003," *Congenital Anomalies*, vol. 48, no. 4, pp. 167–170, 2008.
- [43] U. Ekwochi, I. N. Asinobi, D. C. I. Osuorah et al., "Pattern of congenital anomalies in newborn: a 4-year surveillance of newborns delivered in a tertiary healthcare facility in the South-East Nigeria," *Journal of Tropical Pediatrics*, vol. 64, no. 4, pp. 304–311, 2018.
- [44] D. Nnadi and S. Singh, "The prevalence of neural tube defects in North-West Nigeria," *Saudi Journal for Health Sciences*, vol. 5, no. 1, p. 6, 2016.

- [45] R. O. Ugwu and A. U. Eneh, "Myelomeningocoele in Dizygotic Twins," *Nigerian Journal of Clinical Practice*, vol. 12, pp. 196– 199, 2009.
- [46] K. Forci, E. A. Bouaiti, M. H. Alami, A. Mdaghri Alaoui, and A. Thimou Izgua, "Incidence of neural tube defects and their risk factors within a cohort of Moroccan newborn infants," *BMC Pediatrics*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–10, 2021.
- [47] H. El-moghrabi, Congenital malformations and its relation with consanguineous marriages at congenital malformations and its relation with consanguineous marriages at Benghazi Libya, Journal of Biomedical Science and Research, 2020.
- [48] F. Z. Laamiri, "Prevalence of neural tube closure defects and the oro-facial clefts, during three consecutive years (2012-2014) in 20 public hospitals in Morocco," *World Journal of Pharmaceutical Research*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 101–118, 2017.
- [49] M. A. Radouani, N. Chahid, L. Benmiloud et al., "Prevalence of neural tube defects: Moroccan study 2008-2011," *Open Journal* of *Pediatrics*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 248–255, 2015.
- [50] K. Nasri, M. K. Ben Fradj, M. Aloui et al., "An increase in spina bifida cases in Tunisia, 2008-2011," *Pathology, Research and Practice*, vol. 211, no. 5, pp. 369–373, 2015.
- [51] K. Nasri, M. K. Ben Fradj, M. Feki et al., "Maternal 25hydroxyvitamin D level and the occurrence of neural tube defects in Tunisia," *International Journal of Gynecology & Obstetrics*, vol. 134, no. 2, pp. 131–134, 2016.
- [52] I. M. Omer, O. M. Abdullah, I. N. Mohammed, and L. A. Abbasher, "Research: prevalence of neural tube defects Khartoum, Sudan august 2014-July 2015," *BMC Research Notes*, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1–4, 2016.
- [53] N. Perinatal, *Neural Tube Defects in Australia*, Australian Institute of Health and Welfare 2008, 2016.
- [54] R. Bourouba, B. Houcher, and N. Akar, "Risk factors of neural tube defects: a reality of Batna region in Algeria," *Egyptian Journal of Medical Human Genetics*, vol. 19, no. 3, pp. 225– 229, 2018.
- [55] B. Houcher, R. Bourouba, F. Djabi, and Z. Houcher, "The prevalence of neural tube defects in Sétif University Maternity Hospital, Algeria-3 years review (2004-2006)," *Pteridines*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 12–18, 2008.
- [56] J. Cornell, M. M. Nelson, and P. Beighton, "Neural tube defects in the Cape Town area, 1975-1980," *South African Medical Journal*, vol. 64, no. 3, pp. 83-84, 1983.
- [57] S. S. Buccimazza, C. D. Molteno, T. T. Dunne, and D. L. Viljoen, "Prevalence of neural tube defects in Cape Town, South Africa," *Teratology*, vol. 50, no. 3, pp. 194–199, 1994.
- [58] J. G. R. Kromberg and T. Jenkins, "Common birth defects in south African blacks," *South African Medical Journal*, vol. 62, no. 17, pp. 599–602, 1982.
- [59] E. I. Krzesinski, L. Geerts, and M. F. Urban, "Neural tube defect diagnosis and outcomes at a tertiary south African hospital with intensive case ascertainment," *South African Medical Journal*, vol. 109, no. 9, pp. 698–703, 2019.
- [60] M. Z. Saib, B. L. Dhada, C. Aldous, and H. L. Malherbe, "Observed birth prevalence of congenital anomalies among live births at a regional facility in KwaZulu Natal Province, South Africa," *PLoS One*, vol. 16, no. 8, pp. 1–17, 2021.
- [61] N. Theron, G. Joubert, and B. D. Henderson, "Neural tube defects in the free state province from 2012 to 2016. Is there an increase?," *Southern African Journal of HIV Medicine*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–7, 2020.

- [62] P. A. Venter, A. L. Christianson, C. M. Hutamo, M. P. Makhura, and G. S. Gericke, "Congenital anomalies in rural black south-African neonates - a silent epidemic?," *South African Medical Journal*, vol. 85, no. 1, pp. 15–20, 1995.
- [63] R. Zash, L. Holmes, M. Diseko et al., "Neural-tube defects and antiretroviral treatment regimens in Botswana," *The New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 381, no. 9, pp. 827–840, 2019.
- [64] L. M. Kalisya, K. Nyavandu, B. Machumu, S. Kwiratuwe, and P. H. Rej, "Patterns of congenital malformations and barriers to care in eastern democratic republic of Congo," *PLoS One*, vol. 10, no. 7, pp. 1–10, 2015.
- [65] J. Garcon, B. Danielle, and M. F. Civil, "Malformations Congenitales: prevalence and risk factors," *Marsyas*, vol. 6, no. 34, 2021.
- [66] T. Kayembe-Kitenge, P. Musa Obadia, T. Kasole Lubala et al., "Incidence of congenital malformations and proximity to mining in Lubumbashi, DR Congo," *Environmental Epidemiology*, vol. 3, p. 194, 2019.
- [67] F. Adane, M. Afework, G. Seyoum, and A. Gebrie, "Prevalence and associated factors of birth defects among newborns in sub-Saharan African countries: a systematic review and meta-analysis," *The Pan African Medical Journal*, vol. 36, pp. 1–22, 2020.
- [68] R. S. Kishimba, R. Mpembeni, and J. Mghamba, "Factors associated with major structural birth defects among newborns delivered at Muhimbili National Hospital and municipal hospitals in Dar Es Salaam, Tanzania 2011–2012," *The Pan African Medical Journal*, vol. 20, pp. 1–7, 2015.
- [69] M. Oumer, A. Tazebew, and M. Silamsaw, "Birth prevalence of neural tube defects and associated risk factors in Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis," *BMC Pediatrics*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–13, 2021.
- [70] M. Taye, M. Afework, W. Fantaye, E. Diro, and A. Worku, "Congenital anomalies prevalence in Addis Ababa and the Amhara region, Ethiopia: a descriptive cross-sectional study," *BMC Pediatrics*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 1–11, 2019.
- [71] K. Nasri, M. K. Ben Fradj, A. Touati et al., "Association of maternal homocysteine and vitamins status with the risk of neural tube defects in Tunisia: a case-control study," *Birth Defects Research Part A: Clinical and Molecular Teratology*, vol. 103, no. 12, pp. 1011–1020, 2015.
- [72] K. Singh, W. M. S. Johnson, R. Archana, and A. Kumar, "The prevalence and pattern of neural tube defects and other major congenital malformations of nervous system detected at birth in Barbados," *Journal of the Anatomical Society of India*, vol. 65, pp. S20–S24, 2016.
- [73] L. B. Feuchtbaum, R. J. Currier, S. Riggle, M. Roberson, F. W. Lorey, and G. C. Cunningham, "Neural tube defect prevalence in California (1990-1994): eliciting patterns by type of defect and maternal race/ethnicity," *Genetic Testing*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 265–272, 1999.
- [74] A. Lo, D. Polšek, and S. Sidhu, "Estimating the burden of neural tube defects in low- and middle-income countries," *Journal* of Global Health, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–9, 2014.
- [75] D. Atlaw, Y. Tekalegn, B. Sahiledengle et al., "Magnitude and determinants of neural tube defect in Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis," *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 1–15, 2021.
- [76] K. P. Allagh, B. R. Shamanna, G. V. S. Murthy et al., "Birth prevalence of neural tube defects and orofacial clefts in India:

a systematic review and meta-analysis," *PLoS One*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 1–15, 2015.

- [77] P. Bhide, G. S. Sagoo, S. Moorthie, H. Burton, and A. Kar, "Systematic review of birth prevalence of neural tube defects in India," *Birth Defects Research Part A: Clinical and Molecular Teratology*, vol. 97, no. 7, pp. 437–443, 2013.
- [78] F. Bationo, L. T. Songré-Ouattara, F. Hama-Ba et al., "Folate status of women and children in Africa-current situation and improvement strategies," *Food Reviews International*, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 1–14, 2020.
- [79] I. M. Orioli, R. Lima do Nascimento, J. S. López-Camelo, and E. E. Castilla, "Effects of folic acid fortification on spina bifida prevalence in Brazil," *Birth Defects Research Part A: Clinical and Molecular Teratology*, vol. 91, no. 9, pp. 831–835, 2011.
- [80] J. Rosenthal, J. Casas, D. Taren, C. J. Alverson, A. Flores, and J. Frias, "Neural tube defects in Latin America and the impact of fortification: a literature review," *Public Health Nutrition*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 537–550, 2014.
- [81] M. Oumer, M. Taye, H. Aragie, and A. Tazebew, "Prevalence of spina bifida among newborns in Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis," *Scientifica*, vol. 2020, Article ID 4273510, 12 pages, 2020.
- [82] M. Oumer, A. A. Kibret, A. Girma, A. Tazebew, and M. Silamsaw, "Prevalence of anencephaly in Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 11, no. 1, article 23707, 2021.
- [83] M. Oumer and A. D. Kassahun, "Birth prevalence of encephalocele in Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis," *BMJ Paediatrics Open*, vol. 5, no. 1, article e001117, 2021.
- [84] C. A. M. Atta, K. M. Fiest, A. D. Frolkis et al., "Global birth prevalence of spina bifida by folic acid fortification status: a systematic review and meta-analysis," *American Journal of Public Health*, vol. 106, no. 1, p. 159, 2016.
- [85] C. Chen and S. Bifida, "Chromosomal abnormalities associated with NTDs in fetal and newborn patients," *Taiwanese Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 325– 335, 2007.
- [86] C. Chen, "Chromosomal abnormalities associated with neural tube defects (II): partial aneuploidy," *Taiwanese Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology*, vol. 46, no. 4, pp. 336–351, 2007.
- [87] H. Kurahashi, M. Tsutsumi, S. Nishiyama, H. Kogo, H. Inagaki, and T. Ohye, "Molecular basis of maternal agerelated increase in oocyte aneuploidy," *Congenital Anomalies*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 8–15, 2012.
- [88] C. M. Lakhani, B. T. Tierney, A. K. Jian, and M. Y. C. Pate, "Barriers to use contraceptive methods among rural young married couples in Maharashtra, India: Qualitative findings," *Physiology & Behavior*, vol. 176, no. 3, pp. 139–148, 2019.
- [89] L. Suarez, M. Felkner, J. D. Brender, M. Canfield, and K. Hendricks, "Maternal exposures to cigarette smoke, alcohol, and street drugs and neural tube defect occurrence in offspring," *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, vol. 12, no. 3, pp. 394–401, 2008.
- [90] J. D. Brender, M. Felkner, L. Suarez, M. A. Canfield, and J. P. Henry, "Maternal pesticide exposure and neural tube defects in Mexican Americans," *Annals of Epidemiology*, vol. 20, no. 1, pp. 16–22, 2010.
- [91] M. L. Kulkarni and M. Kurian, "Consanguinity and its effect on fetal growth and development: a south Indian study," *Journal of Medical Genetics*, vol. 27, no. 6, pp. 348–352, 1990.

- [92] P. Cointegration and M. L. P. Neural, The relationship among political instability, consanguineous marriage, genetic structure and economic development: panel cointegration the relationship among political instability, consanguineous marriage, genetic structure and economic development, Panel Cointegration Regression, Panel Cointegration MLP Neural Network and Panel Cointegration SVM Models 1, 2011.
- [93] F. A. Brook, J. P. Estibeiro, and A. J. Copp, "Female predisposition to cranial neural tube defects is not because of a difference between the sexes in the rate of embryonic growth or development during neurulation," *Journal of Medical Genetics*, vol. 31, no. 5, pp. 383–387, 1994.
- [94] J. Liu, J. Xie, Z. Li, N. D. E. Greene, and A. Ren, "Sex differences in the prevalence of neural tube defects and preventive effects of folic acid (FA) supplementation among five counties in northern China: results from a population-based birth defect surveillance programme," *BMJ Open*, vol. 8, no. 11, article e022565, 2018.
- [95] J. Reefhuis, L. F. Fitzharris, K. M. Gray, S. Nesheim, S. C. Tinker, and J. Isenburg, "Neural tube defects in pregnancies among women with diagnosed HIV infection — 15 jurisdictions, 2013-2017," *MMWR. Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 1–5, 2020.
- [96] A. Milunsky, M. Ulcickas, K. J. Rothman, W. Willett, S. S. Jick, and H. Jick, "Maternal heat exposure and neural tube defects," *JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association*, vol. 268, no. 7, pp. 882–885, 1992.
- [97] L. Suarez, K. Cardarelli, and K. Hendricks, "Maternal stress, social support, and risk of neural tube defects among Mexican Americans," *Epidemiology*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 612–616, 2003.
- [98] H. S. Cuckle, "Recurrence risk of neural tube defects following a miscarriage," *Prenatal Diagnosis*, vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 287–289, 1983.