

Supplementary Material

The Cost-Effectiveness of Group B Streptococcus Screening Strategies in Pregnant Women for the Prevention of Newborn Early-onset Group B Streptococcus : A Systematic Review

Corresponding author:

Dr Enamul Hogue (enamul.hoque@uwa.edu.au)

Table of Contents

<i>Suppl. Table 1. PRISMA 2020 Checklist</i>	<i>2</i>
<i>Suppl. Table 2. Search Strategy.....</i>	<i>4</i>
<i>Suppl. Table 3. Excluded Studies</i>	<i>5</i>
<i>Suppl. Table 4. Extended Consensus Health Economic Criteria (CHEC-E).....</i>	<i>6</i>
<i>Suppl. Table 5. Results of CHEC-E Assessments</i>	<i>7</i>

Suppl. Table 1. PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Page 1
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Page 2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Page 3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Page 5
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Pages 5-6
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Page 6
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Suppl. files
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 6
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 6
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Page 5
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Page 5
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Page 6
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Page 7
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Page 7
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Page 7
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Page 8
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Page 7
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Page 7
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Page 8
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	Page NA
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Page NA
RESULTS			

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Page 7
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Suppl Files
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Table 1
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Table 2; Suppl Table
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Page Table 2
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Table 2, Suppl Files
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	Table 2
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	NA
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Page 8
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	NA
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	NA
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Page 13
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Page 14
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Page 14
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Page 14
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Page 5
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Page 5
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	Page 5
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Page 1
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Page 1
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Suppl. Files

Suppl. Table 2. Search Strategy

The initial search was conducted in May 2023 followed by an updated search executed in May 2024.

Search Strategy MEDLINE

("streptococcus agalactiae"[MeSH] OR "streptococcus agalactiae"[tw] OR "group b streptococcus"[tw] OR "streptococci agalactiae"[tw] OR "group b streptococci"[tw] OR "group b streptococcal"[tw])

AND

("pregnancy"[MeSH] OR "pregnancy"[tw] OR "pregnancies"[tw] OR "pregnant"[Tw] OR "maternal"[Tw] OR "intrapartum"[Tw] OR "intra partum"[Tw] OR "antepartum"[Tw] OR "ante partum"[Tw] OR "peripartum"[Tw] OR "peri partum"[Tw] OR "Infant, Newborn"[Mesh] OR "Newborn"[Tw] OR "Newborns"[Tw] OR "Neonate"[Tw] OR "Neonates"[Tw] OR "neonatal"[tw] OR "Neonatal Sepsis"[mesh])

AND

("screening"[tw] OR "screenings"[tw] OR "screen"[tw] OR "screens"[tw] OR "screened"[tw] OR "culture based"[tw] OR "culturebased"[tw] OR "risk based"[tw] OR "risk factor"[tw] OR "riskbased"[tw] OR "Guideline"[Publication Type] OR "guidelines"[Tw] OR "guideline"[Tw] OR "prevention and control" [Subheading] OR "prevention"[Tw] OR "preventions"[Tw] OR "prevent"[Tw] OR "prevents"[Tw] OR "preventing"[tw] OR "early onset"[Tw] OR "Polymerase Chain Reaction"[Mesh] OR "Polymerase Chain Reaction"[Tw] OR "Polymerase Chain Reactions"[Tw] OR "PCR"[Tw])

Suppl. Table 3. Excluded Studies*Studies that appeared to meet inclusion criteria that were ultimately excluded*

Study	Reason for exclusion
Jones et al. 2019 (1)	Wrong/no comparator/wrong intervention (compared universal IAP to all women with risk-based approach)
Fargason et al. 1997 (2)	Wrong article type (eg. Conference abstract, guideline, model analysis with no actual data, protocol, review or letter) - review
Kolkman et al. 2013 (3)	Wrong article type (eg. Conference abstract, guideline, model analysis with no actual data, protocol, review or letter) - protocol
Mukhonpadhy et al. 2014 (4)	Wrong study design
Nguyen et al. 2014 (5)	Wrong article type (eg. Conference abstract, guideline, model analysis with no actual data, protocol, review or letter) - abstract
Zheng (6)	Wrong article type (eg. Conference abstract, guideline, model analysis with no actual data, protocol, review or letter) - letter
Coco (7)	Wrong study design – no cost evaluation included
Rausch et al. 2009 (8)	Wrong study design
Scheftelowitz 2021 (9)	Wrong study design
Rijinder 2007 (10)	Full text not available or translation not available
Van Akker 2003 (11)	Wrong article type (eg. Conference abstract, guideline, model analysis with no actual data, protocol, review or letter) – conference poster

Suppl. Table 4. Extended Consensus Health Economic Criteria (CHEC-E)

	Question
1	Is the study population clearly described?
2	Are competing alternatives clearly described?
3	Is a well-defined research question posed in answerable form?
4	Is the economic study design appropriate to the stated objective?
5	Are the structural assumptions and the validation methods of the model properly reported?
6	Is the chosen time horizon appropriate to include relevant costs and consequences?
7	Is the actual perspective chosen appropriate?
8	Are all important and relevant costs for each alternative identified?
9	Are all costs measured appropriately in physical units?
10	Are costs valued appropriately?
11	Are all important and relevant outcomes for each alternative identified?
12	Are all outcomes measured appropriately?
13	Are outcomes valued appropriately?
14	Is an incremental analysis of costs and outcomes of alternatives performed?
15	Are all future costs and outcomes discounted appropriately?
16	Are all important variables, whose values are uncertain, appropriately subjected to sensitivity analysis?
17	Do the conclusions follow from the data reported?
18	Does the study discuss the generalizability of the results to other settings and patient/client groups?
19	Does the article indicate that there is no potential conflict of interest of study researcher(s) and funder(s)?
20	Are ethical and distributional issues discussed appropriately?

Author, date	Overall rating	1. Patient population	2. Competing alternatives	3. Research question	4. Economic study design	5. Model description	6. Time horizon	7. Study perspective	8. Costs identification	9. Costs measurement	10. Costs valuation	11. Outcomes identification	12. Outcomes measurement	13. Outcomes valuation	14. Incremental CE analysis	15. Discounting	16. Uncertainty analysis	17. Conclusions	18. Generalizability	19. Conflict of interests	20. Ethical issues
Haberland et al., 2002 (20)	17/20	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Kaambwa et al., 2010 (21)	20/20	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Mohle-Boetani et al., 1993 (22)	15/20	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N
Mohle-Boetani et al., 1999 (23)	15/20	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N
Russel et al., 2000 (24)	11/20	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	N	N
Stan et al., 2001 (25)	18/20	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N
Strickland et al., 1990 (26)	9/20	Y	N	N	Y	N	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	Y	Y	N	N
Turrentine et al., 2009 (27)	17/20	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N

Author, date	Overall rating	1. Patient population	2. Competing alternatives	3. Research question	4. Economic study design	5. Model description	6. Time horizon	7. Study perspective	8. Costs identification	9. Costs measurement	10. Costs valuation	11. Outcomes identification	12. Outcomes measurement	13. Outcomes valuation	14. Incremental CE analysis	15. Discounting	16. Uncertainty analysis	17. Conclusions	18. Generalizability	19. Conflict of interests	20. Ethical issues
Williams et al., 2020 (28)	20/20	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Yancey et al., 1994 (29)	8/20	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	N	N	N	N	N	N

References

1. Jones DM, Haikal SO, Whitham MD, Howard DL. Universal versus Risk-Based Management of Unknown Group B Streptococcus Status at Term. *AJP Rep.* 2019;9(3):e315-e22.
2. Fargason CA, Jr., Peralta-Carcelen M, Rouse DJ, Cutter GR, Goldenberg RL. The pediatric costs of strategies for minimizing the risk of early-onset group B streptococcal disease. *Obstet Gynecol.* 1997;90(3):347-52.
3. Kolkman DG, Rijnders ME, Wouters MG, van den Akker-van Marle ME, van der Ploeg CK, de Groot CJ, et al. Implementation of a cost-effective strategy to prevent neonatal early-onset group B haemolytic streptococcus disease in the Netherlands. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2013;13:155.
4. Mukhopadhyay S, Dukhovny D, Mao W, Eichenwald EC, Puopolo KM. 2010 perinatal GBS prevention guideline and resource utilization. *Pediatrics.* 2014;133(2):196-203.
5. Nguyen N, Worstell T, Griffin E, Beigi R, Pereira L, Caughey A. 489: Repeat antepartum GBS screening: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *American Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology.* 2014;210(1):S244.
6. Zheng J., Zhang H., H. Chen. 2017. Group B Streptococci Screening Before Repeat Cesarean Delivery: A Cost-Effectiveness Analysis. *Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 130(1).
7. Coco AS. Comparison of two prevention strategies for neonatal group B streptococcal disease. *J Am Board Fam Pract.* 2002;15(4):272-6.
8. Rausch AV, Gross A, Droz S, Bodmer T, Surbek DV. Group B Streptococcus colonization in pregnancy: prevalence and prevention strategies of neonatal sepsis. *J Perinat Med.* 2009;37(2):124-9.
9. Scheftelowitz Cohen R, Chodik G, Eisenberg VH. Re-evaluating Perinatal Group B Streptococcal screening in Israel - Is it time for a change in policy? *Prev Med.* 2021;153:106716.
10. Rijnders, M. E. B.; Van Den Akker-Van Marle, M. E.; Van Dommelen, P.; Amelink-Verburg, M. P.; Van Wouwe, J. P.; Verkerk, P. H. *Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde* 20 Jan 2007;151(3):189-193.
11. van den Akker E, Rijnders M, van Dommelen P. Cost-effectiveness of different treatments strategies with intrapartum antibiotics prophylaxis to prevent early-onset Group B Streptococcal Disease. *TNO Preventie en Gezondheid, Leiden, Zuid Holland, Netherlands.*
12. Akker-van Marle ME, Rijnders ME, Dommelen P, Fekkes M, Wouwe JP, Amelink-Verburg MP, et al. Cost-effectiveness of different treatment strategies with intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis to prevent early-onset group B streptococcal disease. *Bjog.* 2005;112(6):820-6.
13. Albright CM, MacGregor C, Sutton D, Theva M, Hughes BL, Werner EF. Group B streptococci screening before repeat cesarean delivery. *Obstetrics & Gynecology.* 2017;129(1):111-9.
14. Benitz WE, Gould JB, Druzin ML. Preventing early-onset group B streptococcal sepsis: strategy development using decision analysis. *Pediatrics.* 1999;103(6):e76-e.
15. Colbourn TE, Asseburg C, Bojke L, Philips Z, Welton NJ, Claxton K, et al. Preventive strategies for group B streptococcal and other bacterial infections in early infancy: cost effectiveness and value of information analyses. *BMJ.* 2007;335(7621):655.
16. El Helali N, Giovangrandi Y, Guyot K, Chevet K, Gutmann L, Durand-Zaleski I. Cost and effectiveness of intrapartum group B streptococcus polymerase chain reaction screening for term deliveries. *Obstetrics & Gynecology.* 2012;119(4):822-9.
17. El Helali N, Habibi F, Azria E, Giovangrandi Y, Autret F, Durand-Zaleski I, et al. Point-of-care intrapartum group B streptococcus molecular screening: effectiveness and costs. *Obstetrics & Gynecology.* 2019;133(2):276-81.
18. Garland SM, Kelly N. Early-onset neonatal group B streptococcal sepsis: economics of various prevention strategies. *Medical journal of Australia.* 1995;162(8):413-7.
19. Ginsberg GM, Eidelman AI, Shinwell E, Anis E, Peyser R, Lotan Y. Should Israel screen all mothers-to-be to prevent early-onset of neonatal group B streptococcal disease? A cost-utility analysis. *Israel Journal of Health Policy Research.* 2013;2:1-8.
20. Haberland CA, Benitz WE, Sanders GD, Pietzsch JB, Yamada S, Nguyen L, et al. Perinatal screening for group B streptococci: cost-benefit analysis of rapid polymerase chain reaction. *Pediatrics.* 2002;110(3):471-80.

21. Kaambwa B, Bryan S, Gray J, Milner P, Daniels J, Khan KS, et al. Cost-effectiveness of rapid tests and other existing strategies for screening and management of early-onset group B streptococcus during labour. *Bjog*. 2010;117(13):1616-27.
22. Mohle-Boetani JC, Schuchat A, Plikaytis BD, Smith JD, Broome CV. Comparison of prevention strategies for neonatal group B streptococcal infection: a population-based economic analysis. *Jama*. 1993;270(12):1442-8.
23. Mohle-Boetani JC, Lieu TA, Ray GT, Escobar G, Neonatal GBSPWG. Preventing Neonatal Group B Streptococcal Disease: Cost-Effectiveness in a Health Maintenance Organization and the Impact of Delayed Hospital Discharge for Newborns Who Received Intrapartum Antibiotics. *Pediatrics* (Evanston). 1999;103(4):703-10.
24. Russell CS, Griffin D, Hume RF, Wagner RK, Tomich D, Calhoun BC. Cost consequences of elimination of the routine Group B streptococcus culture at a teaching hospital. *The Journal of Maternal-Fetal Medicine*. 2000;9(2):126-30.
25. Stan CM, Boulvain M, Bovier PA, Auckenthaler R, Berner M, Irion O. Choosing a strategy to prevent neonatal early-onset group B streptococcal sepsis: economic evaluation. *British Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology*. 2001;108(8):840-7.
26. Strickland DM, Yeomans ER, Hankins GD. Cost-effectiveness of intrapartum screening and treatment for maternal group B streptococci colonization. *American journal of obstetrics and gynecology*. 1990;163(1):4-8.
27. Turrentine MA, Ramirez MM, Mastrobattista JM. Cost-effectiveness of universal prophylaxis in pregnancy with prior group B streptococci colonization. *Infect Dis Obstet Gynecol*. 2009;2009:934698.
28. Williams M, Zantow E, Turrentine M. Cost Effectiveness of Latest Recommendations for Group B Streptococci Screening in the United States. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2020;135(4):789-98.
29. Yancey MK, Duff P. An analysis of the cost-effectiveness of selected protocols for the prevention of neonatal group B streptococcal infection. *Obstet Gynecol*. 1994;83(3):367-71.