Intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis to prevent Group B streptococcal infections in newborn infants: a systematic review and meta-analysis comparing various strategies

Timothy J.R. Panneflek¹, Gea F. Hasperhoven², Yamikani Chimwaza³, Connor Allen⁴, Tina Lavin⁵, Arjan B. te Pas¹, Vincent Bekker¹, Thomas van den Akke $r^{6,7}$

¹ Division of Neonatology, Department of Paediatrics, Willem-Alexander Children's Hospital, Leiden University Medical Centre, Leiden, the Netherlands.

2 Department of Neonatal and Paediatric Intensive Care, Erasmus Medical Centre – Sophia Children's Hospital, Rotterdam, the Netherlands.

³ Malawi Liverpool Wellcome Clinical Research Programme, Blantyre, Malawi.

⁴ The Department of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia.

⁵ UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF/WHO/World Bank Special Programme of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction (HRP), Department of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Research, World Health Organisation, Geneva, Switzerland.

6 Department of Obstetrics, Leiden University Medical Centre, Leiden, the Netherlands.

⁷ Athena Institute, VU University, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

1

Summary

Background

Early-onset Group B Streptococcus (EOGBS) leads to substantial morbidity and mortality in newborn infants. Intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis (IAP) prevents EOGBS infection, but IAP strategies vary. The approach to the provision of IAP can be risk-based, universal or a combination of the two strategies. Previous systematic reviews reported that universal strategies might be most optimal in lowering EOGBS infection, but there is no consensus. Therefore, we aimed to provide up-to-date evidence on effectiveness of different strategies by comparing perinatal outcomes.

Methods

A systematic search for EOGBS prevention strategies was performed in MEDLINE, Embase and Web of Science. Studies were included if they reported on different strategies and outcomes of interest, including EOGBS infection, IAP administration and antimicrobial resistance. Summary data was extracted from published reports. Study quality was assessed using the ROBINS-I tool. Random-effects meta-analyses were used to determine risk ratios (RR) and 95%-confidence intervals. PROSPERO registration CRD42023411806.

Findings

A total of 6050 records were identified, of which 72 observational studies were included for synthesis with more than 10 million live births. Meta-analysis demonstrated that implementation of any strategy $(n=34 \text{ studies}, RR\,0.46\,(0.36-0.60))$, risk-based strategies (n=11 studies, RR 0.65 (0.48-0.87)), or universal strategies (n=16 studies, RR 0.37 (0.25- 0.55)) was associated with a reduced risk of EOGBS infection compared to no strategy. In direct comparison, universal strategies were associated with a reduced risk of EOGBS

compared to a risk-based strategy $(n=17 \text{ studies}, RR 0.41 (0.30-0.55))$, while the proportion of women receiving IAP did not differ between risk-based (16%) and universal (21%) strategies (n=9 studies, RR 1.29 (0.95-1.75)). There was no antimicrobial resistance of EOGBS isolates to penicillin or ampicillin (n=11 studies).

Interpretation

Any IAP strategy could reduce the risk of EOGBS infection without evidence of increasing antimicrobial resistance. Universal strategies give the largest reduction in the EOGBS burden, while not exposing a significantly higher proportion of pregnancies to IAP compared to risk-based strategies.

Funding

UNDP-UNFPA-UNICEF-WHO-World Bank Special Programme of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction, a cosponsored programme executed by the World Health Organisation.

Introduction

Early-onset Group B Streptococcus (EOGBS) infection, comprising sepsis, pneumonia and meningitis, are a leading cause of neonatal morbidity and mortality, with a worldwide incidence of 0.41 per 1000 live births and a mortality rate of 4-10% in high-income countries.^{1,2} EOGBS infections are defined as the presence of Group B Streptococcus (GBS) within 7 days of birth in normally sterile fluids, such as blood and cerebrospinal fluid.^{3,4} Infants may be infected antenatally by vertical transmission in colonised pregnant women.⁵ Globally, GBS colonisation of the recto-vaginal tract is 18% among all pregnant women at any point during pregnancy.⁶ Therefore, prevention of the sequelae of GBS colonisation contributes importantly to perinatal health.

Currently, prevention of vertical transmission consists of administration of intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis (IAP) at least 4 hours before birth, which is associated with a reduced risk of EOGBS infection.^{7,8} IAP is administered according to various screening strategies applied in different settings. Risk-factor based screening ('risk-based') strategies are used in some settings, where IAP is administered according to the presence of any risk factor for EOGBS during pregnancy.⁹ In universal microbiology-based screening ('universal') strategies GBS colonisation is determined in all pregnant women antenatally and IAP is administered to women with GBS colonisation.⁷ In addition, IAP can be administered with any combination of elements from risk-based and universal strategies ('other').^{10,11}

Previous systematic reviews and meta-analyses reported that universal strategies were associated with a lower incidence of EOGBS infection compared to risk-based strategies or having no strategy.^{12,13} However, IAP strategies still vary considerably around the world, which is partly due to discussion concerning increased antibiotic use, antimicrobial resistance development and risk of a possible increase in non-GBS early-onset sepsis (EOS), caused by pathogens like *E. coli*.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ Moreover, even when implementing universal strategies, there is no consensus of timing of GBS determination.

In order to contribute to consensus on GBS prevention strategies, this review elaborates on previous work, while incorporating up-to-date evidence on a variety of outcomes needed for evidence-based and nuanced policy-making. We evaluated the effectiveness of different prevention strategies, by comparing maternal and neonatal infectious morbidity and mortality, the frequency of IAP administration, and the presence of antimicrobial resistance. Furthermore, we evaluated timing of GBS determination in universal strategies to prevent EOGBS infection in newborns.

Methods

Protocol and Registration

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines and Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews were used to conduct and report this systematic review and meta-analysis.^{17,18} The protocol was registered in PROSPERO, with ID CRD42023411806.¹⁹

Eligibility criteria

Study designs

We included any randomised and non-randomised study with human participants that reported on any of the outcomes of interest (specified below) when comparing/describing at least two different strategies for IAP administration to prevent EOGBS infections, including no strategy. Non-randomised studies included non-randomised interventional studies (e.g. quasi-randomised controlled trials) and uncontrolled observational studies (e.g. cohort studies). Studies were eligible regardless of sample size, year, country or language of publication and temporal data collection.

Studies were excluded when:

- only qualitative data was presented;
- strategies coincided;
- data was already published in other articles¹;
- data was based on models, not actual cases;
- the full-text article could not be obtained, or;
- the article was categorised as case report, case series, letter to the editor, commentary, or conference abstract.

Participants

Participants were pregnant women and neonates.

Interventions

 \overline{a}

The intervention consisted of strategies for IAP administration (including no strategy). Riskbased strategies were defined as strategies where IAP was administered according to the presence of any risk factor for EOGBS during pregnancy, such as a history of an infant with EOGBS infection, presence of GBS bacteriuria during pregnancy, or presence of intrapartum fever, preterm labour or prolonged rupture of membranes >18 hours.⁹ Universal strategies

¹ If data was already published in other articles, then the study with the largest sample size was chosen and included.

were defined as strategies where GBS colonisation was determined using microbiological testing and IAP was administered to all women positive for GBS colonisation.⁷ Other strategies were defined as strategies where IAP was administered based any combination of elements from risk-based and universal strategies. 'Other' strategies usually consisted of strategies where both risk-based and universal strategies were implemented in parallel and selective strategies that only treat pregnant women positive for GBS colonisation with the presence of least one risk factor.^{10,11} Lastly, IAP was sometimes found to be administered without any official screening ('no') strategy on an individual basis and at the discretion of the attending physician.^{12,20}

Outcome measures

Review outcomes were selected based on the critical and important outcomes used in the WHO recommendations on the prevention and treatment of maternal peripartum infections.²¹ Outcomes listed below were used as primary outcomes for the review. Protocol outcomes were specified into the following outcomes:

- Incidence of EOGBS infection per 1000 live births or pregnant women (as defined by study authors).
- Incidence of non-GBS early-onset sepsis (EOS) per 1000 live births or pregnant women.
- Incidence of all EOS per 1000 live births or pregnant women.
- EOGBS-related mortality rate per 1000 live births or pregnant women.
- IAP administration (%).
- Antimicrobial resistance in EOS isolates $(\%)$.
- Maternal peripartum infection (%). (Supplementary file 2)

Information sources

Records were obtained through a systematic search of MEDLINE, Embase, and Web of Science databases. Additional publications were obtained manually by searching reference lists of relevant records and reviews.

Search strategy

The full search strategy used in MEDLINE is presented in Supplementary file 1. Search terms used included pregnancy, newborn, infant, Group B streptococcus, screening, culturebased, polymerase chain reaction, risk-based, prevention, guidelines, and early onset. In the final search, articles (regardless of language) were included until 2024. The last queries were run in May 2024.

Selection process

Potential studies were identified from the search strategy by double (independent) review (TJRP, GFH, TL, CA, YC, VB). Any disagreements were resolved by a third author (TJRP, GFH, TL, CA, YC, VB, respectively) and reviewers were not blinded. All titles and abstracts were placed in EndNote version X20 (Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, PA, USA) to automatically and manually deduplicate the list of studies. Afterwards, all articles were screened for eligibility via title and abstract in COVIDENCE (Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia). Selected studies were subject to full-text screening. Full-text screening was done using aforementioned selection criteria.

Data collection process

Two authors (TJRP, GFH) independently extracted the following data: study design, study population and outcome measures using a preformed data extraction sheet.

Data items

Data items consisted of general information about the article, on the study population, IAP strategies, and outcome information. Outcome measures were manually calculated using raw data from the article. Missing data were reported as 'No data' in the tables.

Study risk of bias assessment

Risk of bias was assessed via the Risk of Bias in Non-randomised Studies of Interventions (ROBINS-I) tool.²² Studies were assessed by two independent reviewers (TJRP, GFH), and any discrepancies were handled through discussion until consensus. Seven domains of bias were assessed: confounding, selection of participants into the study, classification of interventions, deviations from intended intervention, missing data, measurement of outcomes and selection of the reported results. Each domain was scored as low, moderate, serious, critical, or unknown risk of bias. Confounding factors relevant to this review were specified before the studies were assessed for risk of bias.

Effect measures

EOGBS infection, non-GBS EOS and all EOS incidences were presented as cases per 1000 live births or pregnant women. EOGBS-related mortality rate was presented as deaths per 1000 live births or pregnant women. IAP administration incidence was presented as the percentage of pregnant women receiving IAP. Antimicrobial resistance incidence was presented as the percentage of resistance with respect to all EOS isolates examined. Incidence rates were calculated using the data provided in the studies.

Incidence of all early-onset infections and administration of IAP were compared between strategies with pooled risk ratios (RR) and 95%-Confidence intervals (CIs). EOGBS-related mortality rate (per 1000 live births or pregnant women) and IAP administration (%) incidence were also reported as a pooled incidence of the random-effects meta-analyses with a random intercept logistic regression model. Individual study 95%-CIs were reported with normal approximation confidence intervals. Meta-regression output was presented as β-coefficient and corresponding p-value.

Synthesis methods

Studies were only included in data synthesis if they reported on at least two different strategies (including no strategy) and if raw data was provided on the incidence of the outcomes of interest. The category 'other strategies' was not included in the meta-analysis due to heterogeneity in the strategies used, but these studies were included in the 'any' vs. 'no' strategy comparison. We used R version 4.2.1 (R: The R Project for Statistical Computing (r-project.org)) within Studio version 4.2.1 (R Studio, Boston, MA, USA, 2022) to combine studies, synthesize data, and create funnel plots. Heterogeneity was assessed by i) a Chi²-test for variation between studies and ii) the I^2 statistic, which described the proportion of variation that is due to heterogeneity.

As we anticipated marked heterogeneity between studies that might influence treatment effect, in terms of study population, baseline infection incidence and timing of GBS determination, we performed subgroup analyses in addition to random-effects metaregression. Subgroup analyses included comparisons in EOGBS infection incidence in studies that reported on term case incidence. Meta-regression analyses were performed posthoc with an inverse variance method for all EOGBS comparisons that included at least 10

studies. We sought to delineate baseline EOGBS infection incidence (in cases per 1000 live births or pregnant women) and timing of GBS determination. Meta-regression analyses for timing of GBS determination were performed with two different methods in two different comparisons. In the comparison between universal and no strategy, the timing of GBS determination was compared between early determination before 33 weeks' gestation and late determination at 33-37 weeks' gestation. In the comparison between universal and risk-based strategies, timing of determination was compared between (antepartum) determination at 35- 37 weeks' gestation and (intrapartum) GBS colonisation determined within two days of birth.

We performed sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of the synthesised results by excluding all studies with a serious risk of bias in the comparisons for EOGBS infection incidence. A p-value <0.05 was considered significant.

Reporting bias assessment

Publication bias analyses were carried out via visual inspection of the funnel plots and an Egger's test for funnel plot asymmetry for meta-analyses, including at least ten studies. 23

Certainty assessment

Certainty of the outcomes was assessed using the GRADE approach of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions.²⁴ We critically evaluated study limitations, consistency of effect, imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias in the outcomes. An overall judgement of certainty assessment ranged from very low to high certainty evidence. Study limitations were evaluated with degree of risk of bias. Inconsistency was based on I^2 and overlap of 95%-CI estimates. Indirectness was not relevant

to this review. Imprecision was based on 95%-CI estimate of outcome. Publication bias was assessed as listed above.

Role of the funding source

This review was commissioned by the UNDP-UNFPA-UNICEF-WHO-World Bank Special Programme of HRP, SRH to inform WHO recommendations for Prevention and treatment of peripartum infections. Author TL is a staff of WHO, has access to the dataset and contributed to the decision to submit for publication.

Results

Study selection

The selection process is illustrated in a flow diagram in Figure 1. The three databases overall provided 11,025 records, which were reduced to 6,613 after removing duplicates. Title and abstract screening was done in all 6,613 records: 5,624 did not meet inclusion criteria, and the remaining 669 articles were reviewed in full-text. Ultimately, data on 82 articles²⁵⁻¹⁰⁶ were presented and 72 articles²⁵⁻⁹⁶ were included in the synthesis of the systematic review. Reasons for exclusions are listed in Figure 1. No randomised controlled trials on this subject were found.

Study characteristics

Overall, the 72 included studies included more than 10 million live births/deliveries from 20 different countries (Table 1). A total of 55 observational studies reported on EOGBS infection incidence, 18 on non-GBS EOS, 19 on all EOS, 2 on timing of GBS determination, 19 on EOGBS-related mortality, 16 on IAP administration and 16 on antimicrobial resistance. Two studies reported on timing of GBS determination. Study characteristics and results of individual studies are displayed in Table 1 and Supplementary file 2.

Risk of bias within studies

Overall risk of bias was critical in 3 studies, serious in 43 studies, moderate-serious in 3 studies, moderate in 22 studies and low in 1 study (Supplementary file 3). Many studies had problems in the domain of confounding due to a lack of data on the demographics for the total population or issues with retrospective outcome measurements, which were not standardised.

Synthesis of results

EOGBS infection

Any strategy (i.e. risk-based, universal or 'other') was associated with a reduced risk of EOGBS infection compared to no strategy (n=34 studies, RR 0.46 (0.36-0.60), I^2 =93%, Chi²test p<0.001) (Figure 2 and Supplementary files 4, 5 and 6). Similarly, risk-based ($n=11$ studies, RR 0.65 (0.48-0.87)) and universal strategies (n=16 studies, RR 0.37 (0.25-0.55)) were also associated with reduced risk of EOGBS infection as compared to no strategy (Figure 3, 4 and Supplementary file 4, 5 and 6). In direct comparison, universal strategies were significantly associated with a reduced risk of EOGBS infection compared to risk-based strategies (n=17 studies, RR 0.41 (0.30-0.55), Figure 5 and Supplementary file 4, 5 and 6). Results were similar for studies reporting on term incidence and after excluding studies with a serious risk of bias (sensitivity analyses) (Supplementary file 3, 4, 5 and 6).

Meta-regression demonstrated that there was a correlation between the baseline EOGBS infection incidence and the differences between any strategy and no strategy $(\beta = 0.463)$, p<0.001) and between universal and no strategy (β =-0.746, p<0.001). This indicates that the effect of any or universal strategies compared to no strategy is increased if the incidence in the population is higher. This was not the case in the comparison between risk-based and no strategy ($\beta = -0.328$, p=0.082).

Timing of GBS determination

Vergani et al. $²$ reported no significant differences in EOGBS infection between early and late</sup> antepartum determination (RR 1.24 (0.25-6.12)), while El Helali et al. reported that intrapartum determination significantly reduced EOGBS infection compared to antepartum determination (RR 0.21 (0.07-0.64)) (Supplementary file 2, 4 and 5).^{43,92} Meta-regression demonstrated that there was no correlation between timing of GBS determination and the differences between universal and no or risk-based strategies.

Additional early-onset infection

 \overline{a}

Any strategy was associated with a reduced risk of non-GBS EOS compared to no strategy, but individual strategies did not significantly impact non-GBS EOS (Supplementary file 2, 4, 5). Similar to EOGBS infection comparisons, any, risk-based and universal strategies were all significantly associated with a reduced risk of all EOS compared to no strategy (Supplementary file 2, 4, 5). Universal strategies were associated with a reduced risk of all EOS compared to risk-based strategies (Supplementary file 2, 4, 5).

 2 Vergani et al. used a combination strategy consisting of IAP administration to pregnant women with GBS colonisation and to those with risk-factors.

EOGBS-related mortality

The pooled EOGBS-related mortality rate during periods with no strategy (0.089 (0.047- 0.17), n=15 studies, I^2 =86%) was reduced by more than half after implementation of any strategy (0.028 (0.022-0.036, n=19 studies, $I^2=0\%$) (Table 2). EOGBS-related mortality rate was similar in periods with risk-based (0.026 (0.019-0.037), n=6 studies, I^2 =36%) and universal strategies (0.028 (0.015-0.054, n=10 studies, I^2 =0%) (Table 2).

IAP administration

Pooled IAP administration rate during periods with no strategy $(8 (3-17) %$, n=3 studies, I^2 =100%) more than doubled with any strategy (19 (16-22) %, n=16 studies, I^2 =100%). In the comparison of risk-based (16 (12-20) %, n=11 studies, $I^2=97\%$) and universal strategies (21 (18-24) %, n=12 studies, I^2 =98%) no significant difference in the rate of IAP administration was found (n=9 studies, RR 1.29 (0.95-1.75), I^2 =99%, Chi²-test p<0.001) (Table 3, and Supplementary file 4, 6).

Antimicrobial resistance

In the 11 studies reporting on antimicrobial resistance of EOGBS isolates, there was no resistance to ampicillin, penicillin or other β-lactams but varying resistance to other secondline antimicrobials, including erythromycin and clindamycin, but not vancomycin (Supplementary file 2).

Discussion

 \overline{a}

Our study adds to the data from previous reviews by expanding the number of included studies and thus the population size, as well as by exploring outcomes not previously reported (non-GBS early-onset sepsis (EOS), mortality and maternal peripartum infection).^{12,13} In this systematic review and meta-analysis of 72 studies that included more than 10 million live births and pregnant women, all strategies (i.e. any, risk-based, universal and 'other' strategies) were associated with a lower risk of early-onset Group B Streptococcal (EOGBS) infection. Universal strategies were associated with a lower risk of EOGBS infection compared to risk-based strategies, while intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis (IAP) rate was not significantly different between strategies without report of antimicrobial resistance of EOGBS isolates to penicillin or ampicillin. Pooled EOGBS-related mortality was halved in periods with any strategy compared to periods with no strategy and non-GBS EOS incidence decreased after implementation of any strategy. This systematic review and meta-analysis confirms the findings of two previous reviews that universal strategies are more effective in preventing EOGBS infection compared to having no strategy or risk-based strategies.^{12,13}

In this review, evidence was mostly derived from observational studies conducted in highand high-middle-income countries with historical controls (pre-post implementation studies). These study limitations are reflected in serious risks of bias, often due to potential confounding and potential time bias³. Regardless, after sensitivity analyses, results were similar with respect to EOGBS infection incidence, in which the data was graded as moderate-level certainty evidence. Other limitations included heterogeneity of the strategies used, which led to classifying all that did not fit the terms 'risk-based' or 'universal' into an

 3 The time bias could consist of possible improvements in care over time, but is contrasted by increased viability of premature infants and subsequent survival that could increase the amount of EOGBS cases.

'other' category. This category consisted of at least 10 different strategies, which could not be pooled.

The results of this systematic review and meta-analysis need to be seen in context, by including consideration with regard to cost, feasibility and providers' and women's views. Universal strategies appear to be optimal in preventing EOGBS, with most protocols determining GBS colonisation between 35 and 37 weeks' gestation.^{4,7,107} However, inherently, these protocols do not take into account preterm birth occurring before determination, in which EOGBS morbidity and mortality are higher.⁴ It is known that GBS diagnostics with regard to GBS colonisation lose accuracy as time progresses between diagnosis and birth (>6 weeks), indicative of possible transient colonisation.¹⁰⁸ Earlier screening would, therefore, signify a less accurate prediction of EOGBS infection risk for infants, but our findings do not support this theory. Although intrapartum determination might lower EOGBS infection compared to antenatal determination, intrapartum testing is not yet widely available and more research to understand the potential harms and benefits is needed.

Discussion concerning the potential for IAP strategies to contribute to harm, such as increased non-GBS neonatal sepsis have featured prominently in this space, in addition to possible overtreatment and rising antimicrobial resistance with universal strategies, on account of associations between early antibiotic exposure and altered gut microbiome, asthma and obesity.^{14-16,109,110} Interestingly, instead of an increase in non-GBS EOS, we observed that implementation of any strategy was associated with a lower risk of non-GBS EOS. The studies reporting an increasing incidence of gram-negative sepsis (particularly *E. coli*) primarily focused on very low-birthweight infants, while studies in premature and term infants (not included in our meta-analysis) did not observe such an increase, similar to our findings.^{16,30,109,111} Our findings also suggest that antimicrobial resistance in EOGBS isolates

is confined to second-line antimicrobials. Hence, penicillin and ampicillin might still be the best choice for IAP in preventing vertical transmission of GBS, especially since recent evidence suggests that clindamycin is less effective than ampicillin against vertical transmission of GBS.¹¹² Moreover, our findings provide some reassurance that universal strategies are not likely to result in significantly higher antibiotic exposure compared to riskbased strategies.

Despite evidence for this systematic review and meta-analysis predominantly deriving from studies conducted in high and high-middle-income countries, GBS prevention strategies might also lower the high EOGBS burden in low- and lower-middle income countries. Low and lower-middle-income countries more commonly have no strategy for IAP, partly due to lack of resources and inadequate infrastructure for diagnostic screening and testing, while they have higher EOGBS morbidity and mortality.¹¹³⁻¹¹⁵ In our review, we included one study that reported on the adoption of a strategy in a lower-middle-income country⁴ (India).⁸³ After the adoption of a risk-based strategy, EOGBS infection incidence significantly decreased, particularly in premature infants, without any antimicrobial resistance for penicillin and ampicillin in EOGBS isolates. 83 As these results are similar to the findings in this review, IAP strategies might prove beneficial in these settings, though more research in low- and lower-middle income countries is necessary.

Worldwide annual EOGBS burden is about 205 000 affected newborn infants, of which a significant proportion results in death.¹¹⁵ Any IAP strategy aimed to lower this EOGBS burden could reduce risk of EOGBS infection and non-GBS sepsis, while also lowering EOGBS-related mortality. Specifically, universal strategies likely lead to a larger reduction in

 \overline{a}

⁴ This study was not included in the synthesis of EOGBS infection, because no raw data was available. The study characteristics and results are mentioned in the corresponding tables.

EOGBS infection compared to risk-based strategies while a similar proportion of pregnant women receive IAP. Considering that EOGBS isolates were not resistant to ampicillin or penicillin, altogether, our findings do not support evidence that IAP strategies, and in particular, universal strategies, are associated with explicit harm, though data was derived from observational studies.

Currently, the randomised multicentre GBS3 (ISRCTN49639731) trial is being conducted in the United Kingdom comparing risk-based and universal strategies (antepartum and intrapartum). It is the first trial to concurrently investigate (cost)-effectiveness of the different strategies and will provide valuable insight into the optimal GBS prevention strategy.

Contributors

Conceptualisation: TJRP, GFH, CA, TL, ABtP, VB and TvdA. Data curation: TJRP. Formal analysis: TJRP. Investigation: TJRP, GFH, YC, CA, TL and VB. Methodology: TJRP, GFH, CA, TL, ABtP, VB and TvdA. Project administration: TJRP, TL, TvdA. Resources and software: Not relevant for this review. Supervision: TL and TvdA. Validation: GFH. Visualisation: TJRP. Writing – original draft: TJRP and GFH. Writing – review $\&$ editing: YC, CA, TL, ABtP, VB and TvdA. All authors reviewed and approved the final version before submission. All authors had access to all data used in this study, approved the final version of the manuscript, and accepted the responsibility for the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Declarations of interests

Authors have no competing or conflicts of interests to declare.

Data sharing

All data were presented in the manuscript and supplementary files.

Acknowledgements

This work was funded by the UNDP-UNFPA-UNICEF-WHO-World Bank Special Programme of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction (HRP), Department of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Research (SRH), a co-sponsored programme executed by the World Health Organization. We want to acknowledge the support of MA Claudia Pees, whom assisted in search strategy formation.

References

1. Madrid L, Seale AC, Kohli-Lynch M, et al. Infant Group B Streptococcal Disease Incidence and Serotypes Worldwide: Systematic Review and Meta-analyses. *Clin Infect Dis* 2017; **65**(suppl_2): S160-s72.

2. Mynarek M, Bjellmo S, Lydersen S, Afset JE, Andersen GL, Vik T. Incidence of invasive Group B Streptococcal infection and the risk of infant death and cerebral palsy: a Norwegian Cohort Study. *Pediatr Res* 2021; **89**(6): 1541-8.

3. Hanna M, Noor A. Streptococcus Group B. StatPearls. Treasure Island (FL): StatPearls Publishing

Copyright © 2024, StatPearls Publishing LLC.; 2024.

4. Prevention of Group B Streptococcal Early-Onset Disease in Newborns: ACOG Committee Opinion, Number 797. *Obstet Gynecol* 2020; **135**(2): e51-e72.

5. Prevention of perinatal group B streptococcal disease: a public health perspective. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *MMWR Recomm Rep* 1996; **45**(Rr-7): 1-24.

6. Russell NJ, Seale AC, O'Driscoll M, et al. Maternal Colonization With Group B Streptococcus and Serotype Distribution Worldwide: Systematic Review and Meta-analyses. *Clin Infect Dis* 2017; **65**(suppl_2): S100-s11.

7. Verani JR, McGee L, Schrag SJ. Prevention of perinatal group B streptococcal disease--revised guidelines from CDC, 2010. *MMWR Recomm Rep* 2010; **59**(Rr-10): 1-36. 8. Ohlsson A, Shah VS. Intrapartum antibiotics for known maternal Group B

streptococcal colonization. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014; (6): Cd007467.

9. Prevention of Early-onset Neonatal Group B Streptococcal Disease: Green-top Guideline No. 36. *Bjog* 2017; **124**(12): e280-e305.

10. Gynaecology DSoOa. Prevention and treatment of early-onset neonatal infections (Adaptation of NICE guideline). 2017.

11. Gynaecologists TRAaNZCoOa. Maternal group B streptococcus in pregnancy: screening and management. 2019.

12. Hasperhoven GF, Al-Nasiry S, Bekker V, Villamor E, Kramer B. Universal screening versus risk-based protocols for antibiotic prophylaxis during childbirth to prevent early-onset group B streptococcal disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Bjog* 2020; **127**(6): 680-91.

13. Kurz E, Davis D. Routine culture-based screening versus risk-based management for the prevention of early-onset group B streptococcus disease in the neonate: a systematic review. *JBI Database System Rev Implement Rep* 2015; **13**(3): 206-46.

14. Seedat F, Geppert J, Stinton C, et al. Universal antenatal screening for group B streptococcus may cause more harm than good. *Bmj* 2019; **364**: l463.

15. Li P, Chang X, Chen X, et al. Early-life antibiotic exposure increases the risk of childhood overweight and obesity in relation to dysbiosis of gut microbiota: a birth cohort study. *Ann Clin Microbiol Antimicrob* 2022; **21**(1): 46.

16. Bizzarro MJ, Dembry LM, Baltimore RS, Gallagher PG. Changing patterns in neonatal escherichia coli sepsis and ampicillin resistance in the era of intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis. *Pediatrics* 2008; **121(4)**: 689-96.

17. Selcuk A. A Guide for Systematic Reviews: PRISMA. *Turkish Archives of Otorhinolaryngology* 2019; **57**: 57-8.

18. Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* 2019.

19. Panneflek T.J.R BV, Hasperhoven G.F, Lavin T, Bonet M, te Pas A.B, van den Akker T. Prevention of Group B streptococcus infections in newborn infants via intrapartum

antibiotic prophylaxis based on different strategies: a systematic review and meta-analysis *PROSPERO; CRD42023411806* 2023.

20. Heath PT, Balfour G, Weisner AM, et al. Group B streptococcal disease in UK and Irish infants younger than 90 days. *Lancet* 2004; **363**(9405): 292-4.

21. WHO Guidelines Approved by the Guidelines Review Committee. WHO Recommendations for Prevention and Treatment of Maternal Peripartum Infections. Geneva: World Health Organization

Copyright © World Health Organization 2015.; 2015.

22. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *Bmj* 2016; **355**: i4919.

23. Sterne JA, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JP, et al. Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. *Bmj* 2011; **343**: d4002.

24. Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al. Updated guidance for trusted systematic reviews: a new edition of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2019; **10**(10): Ed000142.

25. Abdelmaaboud M, Mohammed AF. Universal screening vs. risk-based strategy for prevention of early-onset neonatal Group-B streptococcal disease. *J Trop Pediatr* 2011; **57**(6): 444-50.

26. Al Luhidan L, Madani A, Albanyan EA, et al. Neonatal Group B Streptococcal Infection in a Tertiary Care Hospital in Saudi Arabia: A 13-year Experience. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2019; **38**(7): 731-4.

27. Alarcon A, Peña P, Salas S, Sancha M, Omeñaca F. Neonatal early onset Escherichia coli sepsis: trends in incidence and antimicrobial resistance in the era of intrapartum antimicrobial prophylaxis. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2004; **23**(4): 295-9.

28. Andreu A, Sanfeliu I, Viñas L, et al. [Decreasing incidence of perinatal group B streptococcal disease (Barcelona 1994-2002). Relation with hospital prevention policies]. *Enferm Infecc Microbiol Clin* 2003; **21**(4): 174-9.

29. Angstetra D, Ferguson J, Giles WB. Institution of universal screening for Group B streptococcus (GBS) from a risk management protocol results in reduction of early-onset GBS disease in a tertiary obstetric unit. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol* 2007; **47**(5): 378-82.

30. Bekker V, Bijlsma MW, van de Beek D, Kuijpers TW, van der Ende A. Incidence of invasive group B streptococcal disease and pathogen genotype distribution in newborn babies in the Netherlands over 25 years: a nationwide surveillance study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2014; **14**(11): 1083-9.

31. Björklund V, Nieminen T, Ulander VM, Ahola T, Saxén H. Replacing risk-based early-onset-disease prevention with intrapartum group B streptococcus PCR testing. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med* 2017; **30**(3): 368-73.

32. Brozanski BS, Jones JG, Krohn MA, Sweet RL. Effect of a screening-based prevention policy on prevalence of early-onset group B streptococcal sepsis. *Obstet Gynecol* 2000; **95**(4): 496-501.

33. Chan YTV, Lau SYF, Hui SYA, et al. Incidence of neonatal sepsis after universal antenatal culture-based screening of group B streptococcus and intrapartum antibiotics: A multicentre retrospective cohort study. *Bjog* 2023; **130**(1): 24-31.

34. Chen KT, Puopolo KM, Eichenwald EC, Onderdonk AB, Lieberman E. No increase in rates of early-onset neonatal sepsis by antibiotic-resistant group B Streptococcus in the era of intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2005; **192**(4): 1167-71.

35. Chen KT, Tuomala RE, Cohen AP, Eichenwald EC, Lieberman E. No increase in rates of early-onset neonatal sepsis by non-group B Streptococcus or ampicillin-resistant organisms. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2001; **185**(4): 854-8.

36. Coco AS. Comparison of two prevention strategies for neonatal group B streptococcal disease. *J Am Board Fam Pract* 2002; **15**(4): 272-6.

37. Darlow BA, Voss L, Lennon DR, Grimwood K. Early-onset neonatal group B streptococcus sepsis following national risk-based prevention guidelines. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol* 2016; **56**(1): 69-74.

38. Davis RL, Hasselquist MB, Cardenas V, et al. Introduction of the new Centers for Disease Control and Prevention group B streptococcal prevention guideline at a large West Coast health maintenance organization. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2001; **184**(4): 603-10.

39. Eberly MD, Rajnik M. The effect of universal maternal screening on the incidence of neonatal early-onset group B streptococcal disease. *Clin Pediatr (Phila)* 2009; **48**(4): 369-75.

40. Ecker KL, Donohue PK, Kim KS, Shepard JA, Aucott SW. The impact of group B Streptococcus prophylaxis on early onset neonatal infections. *J Neonatal Perinatal Med* 2013; **6**(1): 37-44.

41. Edwards RK, Jamie WE, Sterner D, Gentry S, Counts K, Duff P. Intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis and early-onset neonatal sepsis patterns. *Infect Dis Obstet Gynecol* 2003; **11**(4): 221-6.

42. Eisenberg E, Craig AS, Gautam S, et al. Beyond screening: identifying new barriers to early onset group B streptococcal disease prevention. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2005; **24**(6): 520-4. 43. El Helali N, Habibi F, Azria E, et al. Point-of-Care Intrapartum Group B

Streptococcus Molecular Screening: Effectiveness and Costs. *Obstet Gynecol* 2019; **133**(2): 276-81.

44. Factor SH, Levine OS, Nassar A, et al. Impact of a risk-based prevention policy on neonatal group B streptococcal disease. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1998; **179**(6 Pt 1): 1568-71. 45. Freitas FT, Romero GA. Early-onset neonatal sepsis and the implementation of group B streptococcus prophylaxis in a Brazilian maternity hospital: a descriptive study. *Braz J Infect Dis* 2017; **21**(1): 92-7.

46. Garland SM. EARLY ONSET NEONATAL GROUP-B STREPTOCOCCUS (GBS) INFECTION - ASSOCIATED OBSTETRIC RISK-FACTORS. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol* 1991; **31**(2): 117-8.

47. Gibbs RS, McDuffie RS, Jr., McNabb F, Fryer GE, Miyoshi T, Merenstein G. Neonatal group B streptococcal sepsis during 2 years of a universal screening program. *Obstet Gynecol* 1994; **84**(4): 496-500.

48. Gilson GJ, Christensen F, Romero H, Bekes K, Silva L, Qualls CR. Prevention of group B streptococcus early-onset neonatal sepsis: comparison of the Center for Disease Control and prevention screening-based protocol to a risk-based protocol in infants at greater than 37 weeks' gestation. *J Perinatol* 2000; **20**(8 Pt 1): 491-5.

49. Gopal Rao G, Townsend J, Stevenson D, et al. Early-onset group B Streptococcus (EOGBS) infection subsequent to cessation of screening-based intrapartum prophylaxis: findings of an observational study in West London, UK. *BMJ Open* 2017; **7**(11): e018795.

50. Gosling IA, Stone PR, Grimwood K. Early-onset group B streptococcus prevention protocols in New Zealand public hospitals. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol* 2002; **42**(4): 362-4.

51. Hafner E, Sterniste W, Rosen A, et al. Group B streptococci during pregnancy: a comparison of two screening and treatment protocols. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1998; **179**(3 Pt 1): 677-81.

52. Håkansson S, Källén K, Bullarbo M, et al. Real-time PCR-assay in the delivery suite for determination of group B streptococcal colonization in a setting with risk-based antibiotic prophylaxis. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med* 2014; **27**(4): 328-32.

53. Hong JY, Kim SH, Kim SM, et al. Evaluation of the Early Onset Neonatal Sepsis according to Two Antenatal Group B Streptococcus Screening Methods: Risk-Based versus Universal Screening. *pn* 2019; **30**(4): 200-7.

54. Horváth B, Grasselly M, Bödecs T, Boncz I, Bódis J. Screening pregnant women for group B streptococcus infection between 30 and 32 weeks of pregnancy in a population at high risk for premature birth. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 2013; **122**(1): 9-12.

55. Isaacs D, Royle JA. Intrapartum antibiotics and early onset neonatal sepsis caused by group B Streptococcus and by other organisms in Australia. *Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal* 1999; **18(6)**: 524-8.

56. Jeffery HE, Moses Lahra M. Eight-year outcome of universal screening and intrapartum antibiotics for maternal group B streptococcal carriers. *Pediatrics* 1998; **101**(1): E2.

57. Johansson Gudjónsdóttir M, Elfvin A, Hentz E, Adlerberth I, Tessin I, Trollfors B. Changes in incidence and etiology of early-onset neonatal infections 1997-2017 - a retrospective cohort study in western Sweden. *BMC Pediatr* 2019; **19**(1): 490.

58. Katz PF, Hibbard JU, Ranganathan D, Meadows W, Ismail M. Group B streptococcus: to culture or not to culture? *J Perinatol* 1999; **19**(5): 337-42.

59. Katz VL, Moos MK, Cefalo RC, Thorp JM, Jr., Bowes WA, Jr., Wells SD. Group B streptococci: results of a protocol of antepartum screening and intrapartum treatment. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1994; **170**(2): 521-6.

60. Lee J, Naiduvaje K, Chew KL, et al. Preventing early-onset group B streptococcal sepsis: clinical risk factor-based screening or culture-based screening? *Singapore Med J* 2021; **62**(1): 34-8.

61. Levine EM, Ghai V, Barton JJ, Strom CM. Intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis increases the incidence of gram-negative neonatal sepsis. *Infect Dis Obstet Gynecol* 1999; **7**(4): 210-3.

62. Lin CY, Hsu CH, Huang FY, et al. The changing face of early-onset neonatal sepsis after the implementation of a maternal group b streptococcus screening and intrapartum prophylaxis policy - A study in one medical center. *Pediatrics and Neonatology* 2011; **52(2)**: 78-84.

63. Locksmith GJ, Clark P, Duff P. Maternal and neonatal infection rates with three different protocols for prevention of group B streptococcal disease. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 1999; **180**(2 Pt 1): 416-22.

64. López Sastre JB, Fernández Colomer B, Coto Cotallo GD, Ramos Aparicio A. Trends in the epidemiology of neonatal sepsis of vertical transmission in the era of group B streptococcal prevention. *Acta Paediatr* 2005; **94**(4): 451-7.

65. Lu IC, Chang YC, Chen YT, et al. Epidemiological evolution of early-onset neonatal sepsis over 12 years: A single center, population-based study in central Taiwan. *J Neonatal Perinatal Med* 2022; **15**(3): 575-82.

66. Lukacs SL, Schrag SJ. Clinical sepsis in neonates and young infants, United States, 1988-2006. *J Pediatr* 2012; **160**(6): 960-5.e1.

67. Main EK, Slagle T. Prevention of early-onset invasive neonatal group B streptococcal disease in a private hospital setting: the superiority of culture-based protocols. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2000; **182**(6): 1344-54.

68. Matsubara K, Hoshina K, Suzuki Y. Early-onset and late-onset group B streptococcal disease in Japan: a nationwide surveillance study, 2004-2010. *Int J Infect Dis* 2013; **17**(6): e379-84.

69. Matsubara K, Kawai M, Nakahata T, et al. Procedures for prevention of perinatal group B streptococcal diseases: a multicenter questionnaire survey of hospitals in the Kyoto Neonatal Disease Study Group, Japan. *J Infect Chemother* 2007; **13**(1): 59-62.

70. O'Sullivan CP, Lamagni T, Patel D, et al. Group B streptococcal disease in UK and Irish infants younger than 90 days, 2014-15: a prospective surveillance study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2019; **19**(1): 83-90.

71. Petersen KB, Johansen HK, Rosthøj S, Krebs L, Pinborg A, Hedegaard M. Increasing prevalence of group B streptococcal infection among pregnant women. *Dan Med J* 2014; **61**(9): A4908.

72. Phares CR, Lynfield R, Farley MM, et al. Epidemiology of invasive group B streptococcal disease in the United States, 1999-2005. *Jama* 2008; **299**(17): 2056-65.

73. Poulain P, Betremieux P, Donnio PY, Proudhon JF, Karege G, Giraud JR. Selective intrapartum anti-bioprophylaxy of group B streptococci infection of neonates: a prospective study in 2454 subsequent deliveries. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol* 1997; **72**(2): 137-40. 74. Puopolo KM, Eichenwald EC. No change in the incidence of ampicillin-resistant,

neonatal, early-onset sepsis over 18 years. *Pediatrics* 2010; **125**(5): e1031-8.

75. Renner RM, Renner A, Schmid S, et al. Efficacy of a strategy to prevent neonatal early-onset group B streptococcal (GBS) sepsis. *J Perinat Med* 2006; **34**(1): 32-8.

76. Rottenstreich M, Rotem R, Bergman M, et al. Assessment of maternal GBS colonization and early-onset neonatal disease rate for term deliveries: a decade perspective. *J Perinat Med* 2019; **47**(5): 528-33.

77. Sagrera X, Raspall F, Sala P, et al. Evaluation of the efficacy of a protocol for the prevention of neonatal sepsis by group B streptococcus. [Catalan]. *Pediatria Catalana* 2001; **61(1)**: 17-21.

78. Sakata H. Evaluation of intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis for the prevention of earlyonset group B streptococcal infection. *J Infect Chemother* 2012; **18**(6): 853-7.

79. Schrag SJ, Zell ER, Lynfield R, et al. A population-based comparison of strategies to prevent early-onset group B streptococcal disease in neonates. *N Engl J Med* 2002; **347**(4): 233-9.

80. Schuchat A, Roome A, Zell ER, Linardos H, Zywicki S, O'Brien KL. Integrated monitoring of a new group B streptococcal disease prevention program and other perinatal infections. *Matern Child Health J* 2002; **6**(2): 107-14.

81. Share L, Chaikin S, Pomeranets S, Kiwi R, Jacobs M, Fanaroff AA. Implementation of guidelines for preventing early onset group B streptococcal infection. *Semin Perinatol* 2001; **25**(2): 107-13.

82. Simetka O, Petros M, Podesvova H. Prevention of early-onset neonatal group B streptococcal infection: neonatal outcome after introduction of national screening guideline. [Czech]. *Ceska gynekologie / Ceska lekarska spolecnost J* 2010; **Ev. Purkyne. 75(1)**: 41-6.

83. Sridhar S, Grace R, Nithya PJ, et al. Group B streptococcal infection in a tertiary hospital in India-1998-2010. *Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal* 2014; **33(10)**: 1091-2.

84. Sutkin G, Krohn MA, Heine RP, Sweet RL. Antibiotic prophylaxis and non-group B streptococcal neonatal sepsis. *Obstet Gynecol* 2005; **105**(3): 581-6.

85. Tapia IJ, Reichhard TC, Saldías RM, et al. [Neonatal sepsis in the era of antenatal antibiotic prophylaxis]. *Rev Chilena Infectol* 2007; **24**(2): 111-6.

86. Towers CV, Briggs GG. Antepartum use of antibiotics and early-onset neonatal sepsis: the next 4 years. *Am J Obstet Gynecol* 2002; **187**(2): 495-500.

87. Trijbels-Smeulders M, de Jonge GA, Pasker-de Jong PC, et al. Epidemiology of neonatal group B streptococcal disease in the Netherlands before and after introduction of guidelines for prevention. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed* 2007; **92**(4): F271-6.

88. Trijbels-Smeulders MA, Kimpen JL, Kollée LA, et al. Serotypes, genotypes, and antibiotic susceptibility profiles of group B streptococci causing neonatal sepsis and meningitis before and after introduction of antibiotic prophylaxis. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2006; **25**(10): 945-8.

89. Uy IP, D'Angio CT, Menegus M, Guillet R. Changes in early-onset group B beta hemolytic streptococcus disease with changing recommendations for prophylaxis. *J Perinatol* 2002; **22**(7): 516-22.

90. van den Hoogen A, Gerards LJ, Verboon-Maciolek MA, Fleer A, Krediet TG. Longterm trends in the epidemiology of neonatal sepsis and antibiotic susceptibility of causative agents. *Neonatology* 2010; **97**(1): 22-8.

91. Van Dyke MK, Phares CR, Lynfield R, et al. Evaluation of universal antenatal screening for group B streptococcus. *N Engl J Med* 2009; **360**(25): 2626-36.

92. Vergani P, Patanè L, Colombo C, Borroni C, Giltri G, Ghidini A. Impact of different prevention strategies on neonatal group B streptococcal disease. *Am J Perinatol* 2002; **19**(6): 341-8.

93. Wang X, Chan PHY, Lau HYS, Tsoi K, Lam HS. Epidemiologic Changes of Neonatal Early-onset Sepsis After the Implementation of Universal Maternal Screening for Group B Streptococcus in Hong Kong. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2023; **42**(10): 914-20.

94. Wicker E, Lander F, Weidemann F, Hufnagel M, Berner R, Krause G. Group B Streptococci: Declining Incidence in Infants in Germany. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2019; **38**(5): 516-9.

95. Youden L, Downing M, Halperin B, Scott H, Smith B, Halperin SA. Group B streptococcal testing during pregnancy: survey of postpartum women and audit of current prenatal screening practices. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can* 2005; **27**(11): 1006-12.

96. Yücesoy G, Calişkan E, Karadenizli A, et al. Maternal colonisation with group B streptococcus and effectiveness of a culture-based protocol to prevent early-onset neonatal sepsis. *Int J Clin Pract* 2004; **58**(8): 735-9.

97. Bauserman MS, Laughon MM, Hornik CP, et al. Group B Streptococcus and Escherichia coli infections in the intensive care nursery in the era of intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2013; **32**(3): 208-12.

98. Björnsdóttir ES, Martins ER, Erlendsdóttir H, et al. Group B Streptococcal Neonatal and Early Infancy Infections in Iceland, 1976-2015. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2019; **38**(6): 620-4.

99. Cho CY, Tang YH, Chen YH, et al. Group B Streptococcal infection in neonates and colonization in pregnant women: An epidemiological retrospective analysis. *J Microbiol Immunol Infect* 2019; **52**(2): 265-72.

100. Clemens CJ, Gable EK. The development of a group B streptococcus prevention policy at a community hospital. *J Perinatol* 2002; **22**(7): 523-5.

101. Hung LC, Kung PT, Chiu TH, et al. Risk factors for neonatal early-onset group B streptococcus-related diseases after the implementation of a universal screening program in Taiwan. *BMC Public Health* 2018; **18**(1): 438.

102. Jourdan-da Silva N, Antona D, Six C. Neonatal group B streptococcus infections in France: Incidence from 1997 to 2006 and current prevention practices in maternity wards. *BEH* 2008; **14**: 110-3.

103. Ko MH, Chang HY, Li ST, et al. An 18-year retrospective study on the epidemiology of early-onset neonatal sepsis - emergence of uncommon pathogens. *Pediatr Neonatol* 2021; **62**(5): 491-8.

104. Ma TWL, Chan V, So CH, et al. Prevention of early onset group B streptococcal disease by universal antenatal culture-based screening in all public hospitals in Hong Kong. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med* 2018; **31**(7): 881-7.

105. Sorg AL, Obermeier V, Armann J, Klemme M, Von Kries R. Decrease in Group B Streptococcal Infections in Neonates: Analysis of Health Insurance Data 2005 to 2017. [German]. *Klinische Padiatrie* 2021; **233(1)**: 17-23.

106. Trollfors B, Melin F, Gudjonsdottir MJ, et al. Group B streptococcus - a pathogen not restricted to neonates. *IJID Reg* 2022; **4**: 171-5.

107. Dhudasia MB, Flannery DD, Pfeifer MR, Puopolo KM. Updated Guidance: Prevention and Management of Perinatal Group B Streptococcus Infection. *Neoreviews* 2021; **22**(3): e177-e88.

108. Yancey MK, Schuchat A, Brown LK, Ventura VL, Markenson GR. The accuracy of late antenatal screening cultures in predicting genital group B streptococcal colonization at delivery. *Obstet Gynecol* 1996; **88**(5): 811-5.

109. Stoll BJ, Hansen N, Fanaroff AA, et al. Changes in pathogens causing early-onset sepsis in very-low-birth-weight infants. *N Engl J Med* 2002; **347**(4): 240-7.

110. Zhang Z, Wang J, Wang H, et al. Association of infant antibiotic exposure and risk of childhood asthma: A meta-analysis. *World Allergy Organ J* 2021; **14**(11): 100607.

111. Doenhardt M, Seipolt B, Mense L, et al. Neonatal and young infant sepsis by Group B Streptococci and Escherichia coli: a single-center retrospective analysis in Germany-GBS screening implementation gaps and reduction in antibiotic resistance. *Eur J Pediatr* 2020; **179**(11): 1769-77.

112. Ujiie G, Murase M, Asai H, et al. Intrapartum prophylactic efficacy of ampicillin versus clindamycin in preventing vertical transmission of group B Streptococcus. *Acta Paediatrica, International Journal of Paediatrics* 2024.

113. Shabayek S, Ferrieri P, Spellerberg B. Group B Streptococcal Colonization in African Countries: Prevalence, Capsular Serotypes, and Molecular Sequence Types. *Pathogens* 2021; **10**(12).

114. Le Doare K, O'Driscoll M, Turner K, et al. Intrapartum Antibiotic Chemoprophylaxis Policies for the Prevention of Group B Streptococcal Disease Worldwide: Systematic Review. *Clin Infect Dis* 2017; **65**(suppl_2): S143-s51.

115. Seale AC, Bianchi-Jassir F, Russell NJ, et al. Estimates of the Burden of Group B Streptococcal Disease Worldwide for Pregnant Women, Stillbirths, and Children. *Clin Infect Dis* 2017; **65**(suppl_2): S200-s19.

Legends to Figures

Figure 1: PRISMA study inclusion flowchart

PRISMA flowchart of retrieved and included studies.

Figure 2: Forest plot of EOGBS infection: any vs no strategy

Forest plot of risk ratio (with 95%-CI) of EOGBS infection in any strategy versus no strategy.

Figure 3: Forest plot of EOGBS infection: risk vs. no strategy

Forest plot of risk ratio (with 95%-CI) of EOGBS infection in risk-based strategies versus no strategy.

Figure 4: Forest plot of EOGBS infection: universal vs. no strategy

Forest plot of risk ratio (with 95%-CI) of EOGBS infection in universal strategies versus no strategy.

Figure 5: Forest plot of EOGBS infection: universal vs. risk strategies

Forest plot of risk ratio (with 95%-CI) of EOGBS infection in universal strategies versus riskbased strategies.

Table 1: Early-onset infection

The copyright holder for this preprint this version posted June 17, 2024. [;](https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.06.17.24309017) he copyright holder for this preprint this version posted June 17, 2024. ; he copyright holder for this preprint

PRSIMA flow diagram

	Universal attributy							
Study	Events		Total Events	Toyotal	Rick Ratio	RR		95% Cl Weight
Abdictionalist at A. Mohammed 2011	23	45400	55	18000	٠		0.04 10.47 1511	9.1%
ALC: Note: 2016	22	noning	18	15630			023 012 0441	8.5%
morand 2017	d	5611	٠	3399 -			2.12 (2.01: 2.2%)	0.25
D'or 223	67	113331	138	130430			025 010 033	12.5%
Edge 2013		DV19	12	12557			146 (212) 2148	626
Filicents 2023		\$300	$\overline{1}$	1207			040 020 130	62%
Fearning 2005	11	25037	50	10491			047 023 057	7.6%
DISAN 2003		1956		2055			0.00 0.00 1.04	125
Gred Rep 2017		50/57	34	50320			0.25 0.00 0.568	44%
Histoire 1976		502	z	2700			2.12 0.00 0.54	0.25
Threa 2010		024		1331			$+0.47$ (0.02, 1151)	ors
1002221		2551		1150			0.23 10.01 4.028	10%
Mit is A Nightle 20ad		1970	$\overline{\mathbf{1}}$	13201.5	×	0.66	RUST 9.981	18%
Francis & Enterworld 2010	ш	10/247	56	14934			416 1525 0408	19.8%
Hotensteint 2912	$\overline{\mathbf{r}}$	99326	$\overline{15}$	40WEZ			268 828 1911	85%
Sitree Mid-		122554		SPECIAL AND			048 058 0511	12.9%
Толово 2004		200		909			St 81 W (4.35)	15%
Random effects model		341 1092790		677 711302			8.41 T0.00: 0.551 100.0%	
International AVC of CARL ex CO.								
				0.00	o s 05:2	10		

Force criteral states: Ensus ink and states