

Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

## **Acceptability and feasibility of maternal screening for Group B Streptococcus: a rapid review.**

Georgina Constantinou (PhD)<sup>1\*</sup>; Rebecca Webb (PhD)<sup>1</sup>; Susan Ayers (PhD, Prof)<sup>1</sup>; Eleanor J Mitchell (PhD)<sup>2</sup>, Jane Daniels (PhD, Prof)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Centre for Maternal and Child Health Research, School of Health and Psychological Sciences, City, University of London, EC1V 0HB, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences, Nottingham Clinical Trials Unit, University of Nottingham, Building 42, University Park, Nottingham NG7 2RD

\*Corresponding Author: Rebecca Webb, Centre for Maternal and Child Health Research, School of Health and Psychological Sciences, City, University of London, EC1V 0HB, United Kingdom; [rebecca.webb.2@city.ac.uk](mailto:rebecca.webb.2@city.ac.uk) ; (+44) 020 7040 4718

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

### Abstract

**Background:** The risks and benefits of maternal screening for GBS during pregnancy or the intrapartum period are widely debated, since screen positive results trigger prophylactic antibiotic use. There is little known about women's and health professional's views regarding GBS screening.

**Objectives:** To conduct a rapid review to synthesise evidence on women and health professionals': (1) knowledge and awareness of; (2) preferences for; and (3) acceptability of GBS screening programmes, and (4) how feasible they are to implement.

**Method:** Literature searches were conducted using online databases from their inception to 2023. Papers were included if they reported primary research from the perspectives of health professionals and women, about their knowledge and awareness, preferences, acceptability and feasibility of different types of GBS screening programmes. Data were assessed for confidence using GRADE-CERQual and analysed using a convergent synthesis approach.

**Findings:** 42 papers were eligible for inclusion. A total of 16,306 women and professionals were included. Women generally did not have extensive knowledge about GBS. Health professionals had a higher level of knowledge than women. Women were generally (but not universally) positive about GBS testing procedures. Some women were concerned about the impact on their place of birth.

**Discussion and Conclusion:** Where GBS screening programmes are available, parents must be provided with high quality information about them. Health professionals and service managers need to weigh up the benefits and risks of screening for GBS with local feasibility and treatment options, and with women's individual values and birth plans.

**Keywords:** Group B streptococcus, GBS, screening, acceptability, values, feasibility, equity systematic review, women, health professionals

Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

### Statement of significance

**Problem:** Maternal GBS colonisation at birth can lead to invasive GBS disease. The risks and benefits of screening for GBS during pregnancy is widely debated.

**What is already known:** Different countries use different GBS screening strategies, such as the universal screening strategy vs risk based.

**What this paper adds:** The World Health Organization reviewed their GBS policy guidelines in 2024. Results from this paper were used to ensure women and health professional's views were considered. This paper found that women are generally (but not universally) positive about GBS testing procedures with some concerned about the impact on their birth choices.

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

### Introduction

Group B Streptococcus (GBS) is a bacteria that is typically harmless with no symptoms, although if passed to the baby during birth it can result in infection which can be fatal for the infant if untreated.<sup>1,2</sup> Globally it is estimated that around 1 in 5 pregnant women are carriers of GBS bacteria.<sup>1</sup> Estimates show that there were 319,000 cases of invasive GBS disease globally; 205,000 were early onset GBS (EOGBS) and 114,000 cases of late onset GBS (LOGBS), with an estimation of 90,000 infants deaths worldwide.<sup>1</sup>

In many high-income maternity care settings, if maternal GBS colonisation is suspected or detected, maternal intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis (IAP) is given during labour to reduce transmission to the baby in an effort to prevent EOGBS disease.<sup>3</sup> However it is unclear if women should be targeted based on the presence of clinical risk factors or by screening for GBS colonisation during pregnancy,<sup>3</sup> therefore internationally, detection strategies vary.<sup>4</sup> Some countries deploy universal GBS screening approaches whereby all pregnant women are offered GBS testing in pregnancy such as the USA.<sup>4</sup> Whereas other countries identify women with certain clinical risk factors (e.g., GBS bacteria in current or previous pregnancy, women with risk of pre-term birth, women with a temperature of 38°C or higher<sup>5</sup>) and then prescribe IAP such as the Netherlands<sup>6</sup> and UK<sup>7</sup> There is also combination strategies, whereby all women are screened, but only those with positive GBS results and a risk factor are offered IAP.<sup>8</sup> Variation in approach is partly because women who screen positive during testing do not necessarily result in GBS being present at the time of birth, and vice versa. Missing potential GBS colonisation, and therefore failing to prevent neonatal illness or death, or widespread use of antibiotics for many women and neonates who are in fact GBS negative are debated concerns. Therefore, the ideal prevention strategy remains unclear and with rapid testing for GBS now available, this adds an additional element to these debates.<sup>9</sup>

No randomised controlled trials have previously looked at universal screening vs other types of screening programmes.<sup>2,10</sup> However, the GBS2 randomised trial tested the accuracy of the intrapartum test in diagnosing maternal GBS colonisation, compared to treatment as usual and found that the accuracy of the rapid test was acceptable<sup>11</sup>. Furthermore, the efficacy of implementing routine universal screening as opposed to a risk-factor based approach is currently being investigated in a large multi-centre clinical trial in the UK: the GBS3 trial.<sup>12</sup>

It is likely that results from these trials will be used to inform policy guidelines. For example, the World Health Organization reviewed their GBS policy guidelines in 2024, having last done so in 2015.<sup>13</sup> It is important that women and healthcare professionals views are taken into account, as

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

these are the people who will be impacted by changes to GBS policy and practice. This rapid review will therefore collate and synthesise the available evidence on women and healthcare professionals views on GBS screening strategies and provide a critical appraisal and overview of the evidence-base. These findings will be used to help inform the World Health Organizations development of GBS policy guidelines and can be used to help inform other organisations/services GBS policy and practice.

### **Methods**

#### **Aims**

To conduct a rapid review to synthesise evidence on women and health professionals': (1) knowledge and awareness of; (2) preferences for; and (3) acceptability of GBS screening programmes, and (4) how feasible they are to implement.

#### **Eligibility criteria**

Studies were included if they reported primary research including perspectives of health professionals and women, knowledge and awareness of, preferences for, and acceptability of GBS screening programmes, as well as how feasible they are to implement. These variables were chosen as they are in line with the World Health Organization's guidelines for developing guidelines.<sup>14</sup> Both qualitative and quantitative studies were included. If quantitative they must have reported information on, knowledge, awareness, preferences, acceptability, feasibility/adherence of GBS screening to participants. Studies were excluded if they: (1) did not discuss GBS screening during pregnancy or birth; (2) were non-empirical papers; (3) were reviews.

#### **Information sources**

The following online databases were searched from their inception to 2023: Academic Search Ultimate; Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL); EMBASE; Global Index Medicus; MEDLINE; PsychARTICLES; PsycINFO; PubMed; Scopus; Web of Science. The date of the last search was 12<sup>th</sup> September 2023. Forward and backward searches of included studies were completed by the 5<sup>th</sup> October 2023.

#### **Search**

Searches were carried out using search terms that were combined with Boolean operators "OR" and "AND". Search terms included, but were not limited to, women OR mother OR parent\* AND pregnan\* OR \*natal OR \*partum AND GBS OR Group B Strep OR GBS Bacteria AND test\* OR screen\* OR swab\* AND value OR view OR experience (See supplementary material A for full search syntax).

#### **Review selection**

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

Search results were imported into Eppi-Reviewer 4 and duplicates were removed by GC. The remaining papers were screened by title and abstract by GC. As per Cochrane Rapid Review guidelines,<sup>15</sup> 20% (n = 257) of the title and abstracts were double screened by RW. Decisions to include or exclude were concordant in 69.6% of cases. Full text screening was carried out by RW, and as per Cochrane Rapid Review guidelines,<sup>15</sup> 10 full texts were double screened by GC and RW. Decisions to include or exclude were concordant for 81.8% of cases. Furthermore, all excluded texts were assessed by GC to ensure they were not eligible for inclusion.

### **Data collection process and data items**

Each paper was read in full, and relevant parts of the text inputted into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet by GC. The data that were extracted included the following: authors; year of publication; country; study design; sample size; participant characteristics; type of GBS testing; outcomes (knowledge, awareness, preferences, acceptability, feasibility/adherence); strengths and limitations. The researchers obtained or confirmed missing or ambiguous data by contacting authors.

### **Critical appraisal of included studies**

The quality of the included studies was assessed using: the questionnaire critical appraisal checklist<sup>16</sup> for quantitative questionnaire papers; the Joanna Briggs Cross-Sectional Studies tool for other quantitative papers<sup>17</sup>; the Walsh and Downe<sup>18</sup> tool for qualitative studies and; the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool<sup>19</sup> for mixed method papers. Although there is a move towards a domain based approach to critical appraisal<sup>20</sup>, the studies included used a variety of methodologies so domains for each critical appraisal tool would have been difficult to compare. It has been argued there is no evidence a checklist or domains-based approach is better than the other<sup>21</sup>, and that appraisal should be logically incorporated into the overall analysis.<sup>22</sup> Therefore a score-based method was used allowing for comparisons across each study. Furthermore, no papers were excluded based on their methodological appraisal score, and in addition to using methodological appraisal ratings to determine confidence in individual papers, we also used the GRADE-CERQual approach<sup>23</sup> to look at confidence in statement of findings identified from the review (see below). The use of multiple factors in determining the confidence of findings is recommended when rating the overall quality of a body of evidence<sup>24</sup>.

Therefore, each critical appraisal question for each paper was assigned a score of: 1 = Yes if the paper fully met the criteria; 0.5 = if the paper only partially met the criteria; and 0 = if the paper did not meet the criteria. A percentage was calculated by dividing the achieved score from the total possible score and multiplying by 100.

### **Synthesis of results**

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

Findings relevant to the study aims were extracted and recorded in Excel and summarised to show each of the included studies relevant findings. A convergent synthesis<sup>25</sup> which allows for the mapping of the findings of studies from divergent methodological traditions and epistemological foundations into themes in relation to the aims of the review was used. For quantitative data means and standard deviations were calculated using Excel. There were not enough quantitative data to run analyses to account for the impact of location, national income level, screening programme, and health insurance/free health care on the outcomes in question. Themes were then refined further into statement of findings (see supplementary material B) and presented narratively.

### **Assessment of confidence in the findings**

The methodologies of papers 1-7 of the GRADE-CERQual series were used to evaluate confidence in the findings. Given the vast number of papers, and the different methodologies and aims used, certain rules were applied to allow for conclusions about confidence to be drawn (see Table 1). These rules are consistent with those used in a previous evidence synthesis regarding perinatal mental health care<sup>26</sup>. The group of papers underpinning each statement of findings was assessed on their methodological limitations<sup>27</sup>; coherence<sup>28</sup>, adequacy of data<sup>29</sup>, and relevance of data<sup>30</sup> (see supplementary materials C-F). As per GRADE-CERQual the confidence of each of these four aspects was rated as: high confidence, moderate confidence, low confidence and very low confidence. A final evidence profile was developed (see supplementary materials B).

## **Results**

### **Study selection**

Searches identified 2,096 papers and an additional 6 were identified by forward and backward searching. After 818 duplicates were removed, title and abstract screening excluded a further 1,205 papers. 74 full-text papers were screened by full text, as five were conference abstracts so did not have full texts. Of the 74 papers screened by full-text, 30 were excluded (see Figure 1). The reasons for exclusion included: the papers were not about GBS (n = 2); perinatal and non-perinatal women's views could not be separated (n = 1); outcomes not relevant to the review (n = 22); protocol, editorial, review or letter (n = 5).

### **Study characteristics**

The review included 42 papers reporting findings from 41 studies (see Table 2). The majority of papers were quantitative (n = 33), followed by qualitative (n = 5) and mixed methods (n = 4). Studies were conducted between 1995 – 2023 (Mean (M) = 2010; Median (Mdn) = 2013; Inter Quartile Range (IQR) = 2002-2018). The sample size varied from 6 to 2,809, with a total of 16,306 participants (M = 398; Mdn = 251; IQR = 163-431). Papers recruited health professionals (n = 12),

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

pregnant and postnatal women (n = 26) or both women and health professionals (n = 4). The studies were conducted in 18 countries, with most being high income countries (Australia: n = 4; Canada: n = 6; USA: n = 6). Only one study was carried out in a lower-middle income country<sup>31</sup> (Mozambique) and five were carried out in upper-middle income countries (Brazil: n = 1; China: n = 3; South Africa: n = 1). Three papers were not published in English (Greek, Polish, and Spanish) and were translated using Google translate.

### **Risk of bias within studies**

Fifty percent (n = 21) were rated as having medium confidence with the methodology; 8 were rated as high confidence; 9 were low confidence and 4 were rated as very low confidence with the methodology.

### **Synthesis of results**

Results were grouped according to the aims of the review, which led to 4 categories (Knowledge and awareness, Preferences, Acceptability, Feasibility/Adherence). Thirty-nine statements of findings were generated (see Table 3). Only statements of findings with high and moderate confidence will be discussed here. The remaining statements of findings can be found in Table 3.

### **Knowledge/Awareness**

#### *Women's views*

**Awareness of GBS is generally low (<40%) and varies across countries and populations (High confidence).** In included studies, awareness of GBS ranged from 8-37% (n = 6; M = 24.78; SD = 9.77)<sup>32-37</sup>. Awareness of GBS screening programmes ranged from 9 – 67.1% (n = 3; M = 44.27; SD = 25.30)<sup>32,38,39</sup>. This variable knowledge about GBS was corroborated by the qualitative studies which reported most women did not have an extensive knowledge about GBS<sup>40-42</sup>.

**Women get information about GBS from a wide variety of sources (moderate confidence).** These sources include: health professionals<sup>32,39,42</sup>, social media/online<sup>32,40</sup>, books or booklets<sup>32,41</sup>, their work<sup>40</sup>, family and friends<sup>40,41</sup>, personal experience<sup>40,41</sup>, and antenatal education<sup>40</sup>.

**Women generally want detailed information about GBS delivered face-to-face (Moderate confidence).** Women reported that they would like a range of information about GBS/GBS screening programmes in the form of leaflets, websites, and face-to-face detailed explanations. Positive GBS screening results should be delivered face-to-face<sup>8,40</sup>. Some women felt the information they were given was inconsistent, unclear, poorly explained or inconsistently delivered.<sup>32,39,42</sup>

**Higher levels of education appears to be associated with more knowledge about GBS. Other factors may impact knowledge (moderate confidence).** Five of seven quantitative studies



## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

found that the higher women's education level, the more knowledge they had about GBS/GBS screening programmes<sup>34-36,38,43</sup>. Three studies looked at the impact of wealth and found that those with higher income tended to be more knowledgeable<sup>34,36,44</sup>. Data suggest that more time spent in the country women are residing in can impact knowledge<sup>34,35</sup>, however this was only supported by two studies. No consistent relationship between knowledge and age<sup>32,35,38,43,45</sup>; employment status<sup>32,34,35</sup>; city vs village living<sup>38,44</sup>; past exposure to GBS<sup>32,40,44,45</sup>; or parity<sup>32,35,38,44,45</sup> was found.

### *Health professional's views*

**Health professionals generally have higher knowledge about GBS than women (moderate confidence).** GBS screening knowledge is higher in health professionals with over 75% of health professionals sampled having good or excellent knowledge about GBS screening<sup>32,46</sup>. Two studies looked at management strategies for identifying and treating GBS and found that at least 80% could identify a screening strategy.<sup>47,48</sup>

**Obstetricians may have more knowledge than other health professionals (moderate confidence).** Three quantitative studies report obstetricians tend to have more knowledge about GBS screening, management strategies and risk factors than midwives and paediatricians.<sup>37,48,49</sup> One study found that older obstetricians had more knowledge than younger ones, but more research is needed<sup>46</sup>.

**Most health professionals see screening as important and beneficial to women (moderate confidence).** Three studies found that most health professionals (between 69-91.1% of those sampled) thought screening for GBS was important<sup>32,46,49</sup> and two studies found most health professionals sampled (72-88.8%) believed screening to be beneficial for pregnant women.<sup>32,46</sup>

### **Preferences**

The review identified information about preferences in terms of women and health professional's preference towards a specific GBS screening strategy, as well as women's views in favour of screening, views against screening and preferences regarding swabbing itself.

### *Women's views*

**Most women surveyed are in favour of universal screening (moderate confidence).** Three studies<sup>34,37,45</sup> looked at universal based screening, and the majority of women (61.8%-81%) preferred this strategy. On the other hand, Kolkman et al. (2017) found that 86% of women preferred the combination strategy.

**Most women surveyed would accept GBS testing and believe it is a good way to protect their baby (moderate confidence).** Two studies (one quantitative<sup>34</sup> and one qualitative<sup>40</sup>) found that most women asked would be happy to accept GBS testing. Most women believed that testing was beneficial because it was a good way to protect their baby.<sup>40</sup> The fact EOGBS can be prevented

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

through antibiotics was seen as a positive thing, but clear information about it should be provided.<sup>8,40,42</sup>

**Views against screening include embarrassment, fear of birth plans being altered, overmedicalization of birth and implications for their baby (moderate confidence).** Four studies reported negative views around testing. A small proportion of women in De Mello et al.'s sample reported feeling embarrassed or afraid after testing.<sup>39</sup> Women were concerned about accepting screening because of the risk of increased stress and anxiety,<sup>40</sup> risk of over treatment<sup>8</sup>, risk of over medicalising birth and ruining birth plans<sup>40,42</sup>, potential negative effects for the woman and her baby are the safety of swabbing and antibiotic prophylaxis.<sup>40,42</sup>

**Over half of women surveyed would accept swabbing, and the provision of clear information is vital in mitigating anxiety (high confidence).** Two studies found the majority of women would accept vaginal swabbing<sup>8,34</sup>. However, Chow et al. (2013)<sup>34</sup> found that women were less likely to accept high vaginal swabbing (only 30% would accept) and anal swabbing (only 13% would accept). Qualitative data found that most women saw the swabs as not particularly intrusive<sup>40,42</sup>, but would want to be provided with high quality information about what it involved so they could make an informed choice<sup>40</sup>. The qualitative data also indicated that a lot of the anxiety surrounding testing and positive test results could be mitigated through clear explanations and information provided by health professionals<sup>40,42</sup>.

**Women generally find self-swabbing easy (Moderate confidence).** Four studies explored ease of self-swabbing, and all found that the majority of women found it to be easy.<sup>50-53</sup>

**Preference for health professional swabbing is because some women are concerned about doing it wrong (Moderate confidence).** Eight studies reported reasons women gave for preferring health professional swabbing. Reasons given were: fears of doing it incorrectly<sup>33,42,51,53-55</sup>; women's concerns about the accuracy of the swab;<sup>8,50</sup> the belief that health professionals have more knowledge of swabbing;<sup>50,51</sup> physical difficulties performing the swab e.g., bump getting in the way;<sup>50,51,53</sup> women generally not liking the idea of self-swabbing, or touching their genitals to perform the swab;<sup>50,53,54</sup> and concern about hurting their baby if they self-swabbed.<sup>53</sup>

### Acceptability

15 studies looked at acceptability of GBS screening programmes to women and health professionals, anxiety around screening as well as facilitators and barriers to acceptability.

#### *Women's views*

**At least 80% of women find GBS testing acceptable (moderate confidence).** Five studies<sup>34,50,56-58</sup> looked at the levels of acceptability for women in being screened for GBS, and how the screening was performed, with acceptability ranging from 81-100% (M = 94; SD = 6.95).

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

**Generally vaginal swabbing is more acceptable than anal swabbing (moderate confidence).** Three studies reported percentages related to the acceptability of vaginal vs rectal swabbing<sup>34,57,59</sup>. Acceptability for vaginal swabbing ranged from 62-90% (M = 78.13; SD = 11.82). Acceptability for rectal swabbing ranged from 13-84% (M = 55.7; SD = 30.72).

### *Health Professionals views*

**Intrapartum screening is potentially acceptable (moderate confidence).** Three studies looked at the acceptability of antenatal vs intrapartum screening and although most health professionals found antenatal screening more acceptable<sup>47,60</sup>, the proportion of the health professionals saying they would use rapid testing if it became available, was clinically proven and effective varied across studies (5% and 47%). Furthermore, a qualitative study found that most midwives felt that rapid testing was acceptable and possible during labour. However, they prioritised safe labour and birth care, and stated that they would not take swabs if it was inappropriate. Practical issues were raised with rapid intrapartum testing in terms of the difficulty of multi-tasking on a busy labour ward, or the speed at which some women labour. These issues were linked to staff shortages and if rapid testing was to become part of routine practice midwives believed there should be a dedicated person to do it. On the other hand, some respondents said it may not be worth adding an additional task to be carried out during labour given the low levels of EOGBS<sup>61</sup>.

### **Feasibility**

Eight studies were identified that reported barriers and facilitators to screening programmes. Ten studies were also identified that looked at adherence to GBS screening protocols and can therefore be used as a proxy for feasibility, as low adherence is likely to reflect low feasibility.

### *Health Professional Views*

**Barriers to GBS screening programmes include organisational barriers, fear of the consequence (e.g., anxiety, overmedicalization of birth); lack of clarity around guidelines and lack of training (moderate confidence).** The most commonly cited barrier was related to the organisation in which they worked including supervisors not supporting the use of the GBS protocol, or time constraints<sup>8,32,46,48,49,62</sup>. Another common barrier was fear of the consequences of screening and providing antibiotics<sup>8,32,46,49</sup> including concerns over maternal discomfort and anxiety<sup>8</sup>, the risk of over treatment, antibiotic resistance, over medicalisation of birth and a reduction of the choice for women to home birth<sup>8,49</sup>. Other reasons given were lack of clarity around the guidelines<sup>8,62</sup>, medico-legal/political reasons<sup>8,62</sup>; and lack of training<sup>32,46</sup>

**Most health professionals saw training as important for increasing adherence (moderate confidence).** Training in GBS was seen as important to improve adherence to GBS screening programmes.<sup>32,46,48</sup> In a qualitative study, health professionals stated that engagement with GBS

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

protocols could be encouraged by receiving feedback regarding the wellbeing of a neonate that had been affected by GBS infection, as this could sensitise them to the issue. They also stated that campaigns and media information focused on GBS could be important in improving engagement.<sup>48</sup>

### Discussion

The aim of this rapid review was to collate and synthesise the relevant evidence regarding GBS screening and provide a critical appraisal and overview of the evidence-base. The review looked at knowledge and awareness, preferences, acceptability and feasibility/adherence of GBS screening programmes for women and health professionals and identified a total of 4 categories and 39 statements of findings.

#### Main findings

One of the statement of findings that had high confidence in the evidence was women's low knowledge about GBS screening programmes. This is likely due to many reasons, including a lack of public awareness of GBS. Hunt (2012) speculated that this poor knowledge may be influenced by screening programmes generally being risk-based, rather than universal, meaning many midwives are not fully informed about GBS themselves, making it difficult to advise women in their care.<sup>63</sup> This suggestion is supported by this review which found that obstetricians tend to have higher knowledge of GBS and may be more likely to discuss, screen for, and follow policies related to GBS than nursing and midwifery professionals<sup>32,37,48,49,64</sup>.

The other statement of findings that had high confidence in the evidence was that women's attitudes are mostly, but not universally, positive towards GBS testing procedures, and that women generally prefer the universal based screening strategy (moderate confidence)<sup>34,37,45</sup>. This finding is consistent with other research which has found that women tend to find GBS vaccinations acceptable.<sup>65</sup> A previous systematic review found that women value maintaining a healthy pregnancy for themselves and their baby.<sup>66</sup> This may make testing more acceptable, as it could mean women feel they are mitigating risk and ensuring a healthy baby.<sup>40</sup>

However, this review also highlighted the importance of considering issues with over medicalising labour and birth, and in some cases iatrogenic harm for some women and babies in the case of antibiotic prophylaxis. Some women wish to focus on more of a holistic model of pregnancy and birth, with a view to minimise medical procedures as much as possible.<sup>67</sup> This is supported by the statement of findings that some women are against testing due to stress and anxiety it could cause to the mother and the baby, the risk of over-medicalising birth, preventing home birth and the safety of swabbing and antibiotic treatment for the mother and their baby.<sup>8,40,42</sup>

#### Strengths and limitations

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

The strengths of this rapid review are that it synthesises a large amount of information from 42 papers and used the CERQual<sup>27</sup> approach to grade confidence with the evidence. This information can therefore be used to identify recommendations for the design and delivery of care<sup>69</sup>. In addition, no papers were excluded based on the language they were published in, meaning papers from 18 different countries were included. A limitation is that only papers published in academic journals were included. Relevant papers from health services, charities, third sector organisations and other grey literature may have been missed. Another limitation is that a score-based approach was used to categorise studies risk of bias into low, medium and high confidence, rather than a domain based approach<sup>20</sup>. This was done to allow for comparisons across studies.

### **Interpretation**

Women's low knowledge about GBS suggests women need to be provided with high quality information regarding GBS, GBS screening procedures and antibiotic prophylaxis during antenatal care, or through antenatal education. Providing women with information about this will enable them to make informed decisions about their care. Health professionals may require more training on GBS screening to ensure they can provide the high quality information to women that they need.<sup>40</sup> This is supported by two of the studies from the review which found that health professionals would like more training<sup>32,46</sup>, and that a lack of training was seen as a barrier to implementing GBS screening procedures.

Women's generally positive attitudes towards the GBS testing procedure suggest that most women would be happy to be swabbed for GBS. However, the review also identified concerns around a positive GBS result impacting women's birth plans, and some concerns about the potential over-use of antibiotics. Given the importance of women's birth plans being met in terms of increased birth satisfaction and reduced birth trauma and post-traumatic stress symptoms<sup>68</sup> it is important for health professionals and service managers to weigh up the positives of screening for GBS, whilst also taking into account women's individual values and birth plans.

Overall, half of the statement of findings were rated as having low confidence or very low confidence with the evidence (n = 21). This suggests more high-quality research is needed that examines women and health professionals' views on knowledge, preferences, acceptability, and feasibility of GBS screening. There was no research on equity of delivering GBS screening. More research should therefore be carried out to identify what women and health professionals' values surrounding GBS screening and treatment are, and what the key equity issues might be. Furthermore, the studies were carried out in 18 countries reflecting a very broad range of medical practice, social values, beliefs and medico-legal environments. It is likely that the heterogeneity may have impacted

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

the results, therefore future research should focus on cross-cultural comparisons of knowledge, preferences, acceptability and adherence for GBS screening programmes.

### **Conclusion**

The aim of this rapid review was to synthesise evidence on women and health professionals': (1) knowledge and awareness of; (2) preferences for; and (3) acceptability of GBS screening programmes, and (4) how feasible they are to implement. This is the first review that has been carried out that looks at women and health professionals views related to GBS screening preferences. Overall, only two statements of findings were rated as having high quality with the evidence and these were women's low knowledge of GBS and GBS screening programmes, and most women's generally positive attitudes towards swabbing for GBS. The results from the review suggest that women should be provided with high quality information about GBS and GBS screening programmes in order to make informed decisions about their care. Health professional training may need to be increased in order to do this. Furthermore, it is important for health professionals and service managers to weigh up the positives of screening for GBS, whilst also taking into account women's individual values and birth plans. More research is needed on this topic, specifically around the equity and feasibility of implementing GBS screening programmes.



## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

### References

1. 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-S219.
2. Rao GG, Khanna P. To screen or not to screen women for Group B Streptococcus (*Streptococcus agalactiae*) to prevent early onset sepsis in newborns: recent advances in the unresolved debate. *Ther Adv Infect Dis*. 2020;7:2049936120942424.
3. Brown AP, Denison FC. Selective or universal screening for GBS in pregnancy (review). *Early Hum Dev*. 2018;126:18-22. doi:10.1016/j.earlhumdev.2018.09.002
4. 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-S151.
5. ACOG Committee Opinion No. 485: Prevention of early-onset group B streptococcal disease in newborns. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2011;117(4):1019-1027. doi:10.1097/AOG.0b013e318219229b
6. Evidence Based RichtlijnOntwikkeling. Preventie en behandeling van early-onset neonatale infecties (Adaptatie van de NICE-richtlijn). Published online 2017. Accessed April 30, 2024. <https://www.nvog.nl/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/Preventie-en-behandeling-van-early-onset-neonatale-infecties-1.0-07-06-2017.pdf>
7. Hughes RG, Brocklehurst P, Steer PJ, Heath P, Stenson BM. Prevention of Early-onset Group B Streptococcal Disease (Green-top Guideline No. 36). Published online 2017. Accessed April 30, 2024. <https://www.rcog.org.uk/guidance/browse-all-guidance/green-top-guidelines/prevention-of-early-onset-group-b-streptococcal-disease-green-top-guideline-no-36/>
8. Kolkman DGE, Fleuren MAH, Wouters MG AJ, de Groot CJM, Rijnders MEB. Barriers and facilitators related to the uptake of four strategies to prevent neonatal early-onset group B haemolytic streptococcus disease: a qualitative study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2017;17(139):1-9.
9. Di Renzo GC, Melin P, Berardi A, et al. Intrapartum GBS screening and antibiotic prophylaxis: a European consensus conference. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med*. 2015;28(7):766-782. doi:10.3109/14767058.2014.934804
10. Walker K, Plumb J, Gray J, Thornton J, Avery AJ, Daniels JP. Should all pregnant women be offered testing for group B streptococcus? *Br Med J*. 2021;373:n882. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n882>
11. Daniels JP, Dixon E, Gill A, et al. Rapid intrapartum test for maternal group B streptococcal colonisation and its effect on antibiotic use in labouring women with risk factors for early-onset neonatal infection (GBS2): cluster randomised trial with nested test accuracy study. *BMC Med*. 2022;20(1):9. doi:10.1186/s12916-021-02202-2
12. ISRCTN - ISRCTN49639731: Routine testing for Group B Streptococcus in pregnancy (GBS3 trial). doi:10.1186/ISRCTN49639731

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

13. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations for prevention and treatment of maternal peripartum infections. Published online 2015. Accessed October 26, 2023. [https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/186171/9789241549363\\_eng.pdf?sequence=1](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/186171/9789241549363_eng.pdf?sequence=1)
14. World Health Organization. *WHO Handbook for Guideline Development*. 2nd ed. World Health Organization; 2014. Accessed November 22, 2023. [https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/145714/9789241548960\\_eng.pdf?sequence=1](https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/145714/9789241548960_eng.pdf?sequence=1)
15. Garritty C, Gartlehner G, Nussbaumer-Streit B, et al. Cochrane Rapid Reviews Methods Group offers evidence-informed guidance to conduct rapid reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2021;130:13-22.
16. National Institute for Health and Care Research. Critical appraisal checklist for a questionnaire study. In: *NICE Clinical Guideline 143 – Sickle Cell Acute Painful Episode (Appendix E)*. CG143. NICE; 2012:143-144. Accessed November 28, 2023. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg143/evidence/appendix-e-evidence-tables-pdf-186634335>
17. Joanna Briggs Institute. Checklist for analytical cross-sectional studies. Published online 2020. Accessed October 1, 2023. [https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fjbi.global%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2F2021-10%2FChecklist\\_for\\_Cohort\\_Studies.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK](https://view.officeapps.live.com/op/view.aspx?src=https%3A%2F%2Fjbi.global%2Fsites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2F2021-10%2FChecklist_for_Cohort_Studies.docx&wdOrigin=BROWSELINK)
18. Walsh D, Downe S. Appraising the quality of qualitative research. *Midwifery*. 2006;22(2):108-119.
19. Hong QN, Fàbregues S, Bartlett G, et al. The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) version 2018 for information professionals and researchers. *Educ Inf*. 2018;34(4):285-291.
20. Tod D, Booth A, Smith B. Critical appraisal. *Int Rev Sport Exerc Psychol*. 2022;15(1):52-72. doi:10.1080/1750984X.2021.1952471
21. JBI releases revised Critical Appraisal Tools | JBI. Accessed January 19, 2024. <https://jbi.global/news/article/jbi-releases-revised-critical-appraisal-tools>
22. Frampton G, Whaley P, Bennett M, et al. Principles and framework for assessing the risk of bias for studies included in comparative quantitative environmental systematic reviews. *Environ Evid*. 2022;11(1):12. doi:10.1186/s13750-022-00264-0
23. Lewin S, Booth A, Glenton C, et al. Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings: introduction to the series. *Implement Sci*. 2018;13(1):2. doi:10.1186/s13012-017-0688-3
24. Kolaski K, Logan LR, Ioannidis JPA. Guidance to best tools and practices for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. 2023;12(1):96. doi:10.1186/s13643-023-02255-9
25. Noyes J, Booth A, Moore G, Flemming K, Tunçalp Ö, Shakibazadeh E. Synthesising quantitative and qualitative evidence to inform guidelines on complex interventions: clarifying the purposes, designs and outlining some methods. *BMJ Glob Health*. 2019;4(Suppl 1):e000893.
26. Webb R, Ford E, Easter A, et al. The MATRIx Models – Conceptual frameworks of barriers and facilitators to perinatal mental health care. *Br J Psychiatry Open*. Published online 2023.



## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

27. Munthe-Kaas H, Bohren MA, Glenton C, et al. Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 3: how to assess methodological limitations. *Implement Sci.* 2018;13(1):9. doi:10.1186/s13012-017-0690-9
28. Colvin CJ, Garside R, Wainwright M, et al. Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 4: how to assess coherence. *Implement Sci.* 2018;13(1):13. doi:10.1186/s13012-017-0691-8
29. Glenton C, Carlsen B, Lewin S, et al. Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 5: how to assess adequacy of data. *Implement Sci.* 2018;13(1):14. doi:10.1186/s13012-017-0692-7
30. Noyes J, Booth A, Lewin S, et al. Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings—paper 6: how to assess relevance of the data. *Implement Sci.* 2018;13(1):4. doi:10.1186/s13012-017-0693-6
31. OECD. DAC List of ODA Recipients | Effective for reporting on 2024 and 2025 flows. Published online 2023. Accessed November 21, 2023. <https://www.oecd.org/dac/financing-sustainable-development/development-finance-standards/DAC-List-of-ODA-Recipients-for-reporting-2024-25-flows.pdf>
32. Alamri Y, Albasri S, Abduljabbar GH, Alghamdi H, Balkhair AM, AlAam R. Awareness of Pregnancy Screening for Group B Streptococcus Infection Among Women of Reproductive Age and Physicians in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. *Cureus.* 2021;13(10):e18765.
33. Arya A, Cryan B, O’Sullivan K, Greene RA, Higgins JR. Self-collected versus health professional-collected genital swabs to identify the prevalence of group B streptococcus: A comparison of patient preference and efficacy. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol.* 2008;139(1):43-45. doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2007.12.005
34. Chow TY, To WWK, Chan D L W. Knowledge and Attitudes of Hong Kong Pregnant Women on Group B Streptococcus Screening. *Hong Kong J Gynaecol Obstet Midwifery.* 2013;13(1):45-51.
35. Giles ML, Buttery J, Davey MA, Wallace E. Pregnant women’s knowledge and attitude to maternal vaccination including group B streptococcus and respiratory syncytial virus vaccines. *Vaccine.* 2019;37:6743-6749.
36. Grammeniatis A, Ioannidis A, Pappa K, Rothi-Burriel A. Reviewing acceptability of a Group B Streptococcus vaccine among pregnant women in Greece/ Διερεύνηση της αποδεκτικότητας εμβολιασμού για τον Β αιμολυτικό Στρεπτόκοκκο από τις γκυμονούσες στον Ελλαδικό χώρο. *Sci Chron.* 2022;27(2):312-331.
37. Peralta-Carcelen M, Fargason CA, Coston D, Dolan J. Preferences of Pregnant Women and Physicians for 2 Strategies for Prevention of Early-Onset Group B Streptococcal Sepsis in Neonates. *Arch Pediatr Adolesc Med.* 1997;151(7):712-718.
38. Bak B, Sikorski M, Wozniak A. Demographic conditioning of awareness of prophylaxis against Streptococcus agalactiae (GBS) infections among parturients. *Med Stud.* 2016;32(3):170-178.
39. de Mello DS, Tsunehiro MA, Mendelski CA, Pierre SA, Silva AR, Padoveze MC. Group B Streptococcus: Compliance with the information in prenatal card records and knowledge of pregnant women. *Am J Infect Control.* 2015;43:400-401.

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

40. Constantinou G, Ayers S, Mitchell EJ, et al. Women's knowledge of and attitudes towards group B streptococcus (GBS) testing in pregnancy: a qualitative study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2023;23(339):1-12.
41. Darbyshire P, Collins C, McDonald HM, Hiller JE. Taking Antenatal Group B Streptococcus Seriously: Women's Experiences of Screening and Perceptions of Risk. *Birth*. 2003;30(2):116-123.
42. Sharpe M, Dennis K, Cates EC. Deconstructing dissonance: Ontario midwifery clients speak about their experiences of testing Group B streptococcus-positive. *Rev Can Rech Prat Sage-Femme*. 2015;14(2):18-33.
43. 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):1006-1012.
44. Jaworowski AP, Huras H, Zembala-Szczerba M, et al. Ocena realizacji programu profilaktyki zakażenia paciorkowcem grupy B w przebiegu ciąży i zapobiegania zakażeniom u noworodków w świetle aktualnych rekomendacji Polskiego Towarzystwa Ginekologicznego: badanie ankietowe. *Przegląd Lek*. 2016;73(9). Accessed November 1, 2023. [https://ruj.uj.edu.pl/xmlui/bitstream/handle/item/273355/jaworowski\\_et-al\\_ocena\\_realizacji\\_programu\\_profilaktyki\\_zakazenia\\_2016.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](https://ruj.uj.edu.pl/xmlui/bitstream/handle/item/273355/jaworowski_et-al_ocena_realizacji_programu_profilaktyki_zakazenia_2016.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
45. Alshengeti A, Alharbi A, Alraddadi S, Alawfi A, Aljohani B. Knowledge, attitude and current practices of pregnant women towards group B streptococcus screening: cross-sectional study, Al-Madinah, Saudi Arabia. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(2):e032487.
46. Almohaimed M, Al-Arfaj G, Kofi MA. Awareness of Primary Care Physicians about Pregnancy Screening of Group B Streptococcus Infection at Prince Sultan Military Medical City, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. *Int J Adv Community Med*. 2019;2(1):23-29.
47. Melin P, Verschraegen G, Mahieu L, Claeys G, De Mol P. Towards a Belgian consensus for prevention of perinatal group B streptococcal disease. *Indian J Med Res*. 2004;119:197-200.
48. Price CA, Green-Thompson L, Mammen VG, Madhi SA, Lala SG, Dangor Z. Knowledge gaps among South African healthcare providers regarding the prevention of neonatal group B streptococcal disease. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(10):e0205157.
49. Gosling I, Stone P, Grimwood K. Awareness, knowledge and attitudes of lead maternity carers towards early-onset neonatal group B streptococcal disease. *N Z Med J*. 2002;115(1149):106-107.
50. Ko JKY, Yung SSF, Seto MTY, Lee CP. A questionnaire study on the acceptability of self-sampling versus screening by clinicians for Group B Streptococcus. *J Chin Med Assoc*. 2016;79(2):83-87. doi:10.1016/j.jcma.2015.08.005
51. Taylor MC, Mercer BM, Engelhardt KF, Fricke JL. Patient preference for self-collected cultures for group B streptococcus in pregnancy - ScienceDirect. *J Nurse Midwifery*. 1997;42(5):410-413.
52. Mercer BM, Taylor MC, Fricke JL, Baselski VS, Sibai BM. The accuracy and patient preference for self-collected group B Streptococcus cultures. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 1995;173(4):1325-1328. doi:10.1016/0002-9378(95)91380-7

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

53. Nebreda-Martín L, Albusu-Del Campo A, Valle-Ruiz de Larrea L, González-Rodríguez G, Arana-Arri E, Paz-Pascual C. [Effectiveness of the vagino-rectal exudate self-sampling for prenatal screening of Streptococcus agalactiae infection. GALL study]. *Aten Primaria*. 2022;54(6):102366. doi:10.1016/j.aprim.2022.102366
54. Price D, Shaw E, Howard M, Zazulak J, Waters H, Kaczorowski J. Self-Sampling for Group B Streptococcus in Women 35 to 37 Weeks Pregnant Is Accurate and Acceptable: A Randomized Cross-Over Trial. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can*. 2006;28(12):1083-1088. doi:10.1016/S1701-2163(16)32337-4
55. Torok PG, Dunn JR. Self-Collection of Antepartum Anogenital Group B Streptococcus Cultures. *J Am Board Fam Med*. 2000;13(2):107-110.
56. Cheng PJ, Shaw SW, Lin PY, Huang SY, Soong YK. Maternal anxiety about prenatal screening for group B streptococcus disease and impact of positive colonization results - ScienceDirect. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2006;128:29-33.
57. Daniels JP, Gray J, Pattison HM, et al. Intrapartum tests for group B streptococcus: accuracy and acceptability of screening. *BJOG Int J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2011;118:257-265.
58. Madrid L, Maculve SA, Vilajeliu A, et al. Maternal Carriage of Group B Streptococcus and Escherichia c... □: The Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2018;37(11):1145-1153.
59. Law KSK, Parmar P, Gregora M, Abbott J. A comparative study assessing the efficacy and acceptability of anorectal swabs for antenatal GBS screening. *J Med Screen*. 2013;20(1):46-48.
60. Mahieu L, De Dooy JJ, Leys E. Obstetricians' compliance with CDC guidelines on maternal screening and intrapartum prophylaxis for group B streptococcus. *J Obstet Gynaecol*. 2000;20(5):460-464.
61. Daniels J, Gray J, Pattison HM, et al. Rapid testing for group B streptococcus during labour: a test accuracy study with evaluation of acceptability and cost-effectiveness. *Health Technol Assess*. 2009;13(42):1-192.
62. Davies HD, Adair CE, Schuchat A, Low DE, Sauve RS, McGeer A. Physicians' prevention practices and incidence of neonatal group B streptococcal disease in 2 Canadian regions. *CMAJ*. 2001;164(4):479-485.
63. Hunt L. Raising awareness of Group B Strep. *Midwives*. 2012;15(4):44.
64. Lynfield R, White K, Danila R, Roome A, Linardos H, Hadler J. Adoption of Perinatal Group B Streptococcal Disease Prevention Recommendations by Prenatal-Care Providers — Connecticut and Minnesota, 1998. *Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2000;49(11):228-232.
65. McCormack S, Thompson C, Chathasaigh CN, et al. GP254 Maternal awareness, acceptability and willingness towards group B streptococcus (GBS) vaccination during pregnancy. *Arch Dis Child*. 2019;104(Suppl 3):A136-A136. doi:10.1136/archdischild-2019-epa.313
66. Downe S, Finlayson K, Tunçalp □., Metin Gülmezoglu A. What matters to women: a systematic scoping review to identify the processes and outcomes of antenatal care provision that are

## Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

important to healthy pregnant women. *BJOG Int J Obstet Gynaecol.* 2016;123(4):529-539. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.13819

67. Davis-Floyd RE. *Birth as an American Rite of Passage.* 2nd ed. University of California Press; 2004.
68. Webb R, Ayers S, Bogaerts A, et al. When birth is not as expected: a systematic review of the impact of a mismatch between expectations and experiences. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth.* 2021;21(1):475. doi:10.1186/s12884-021-03898-z
69. Using Qualitative Evidence in Decision Making for Health and Social Interventions: An Approach to Assess Confidence in Findings from Qualitative Evidence Syntheses (GRADE-CERQual) | PLOS Medicine. Accessed November 28, 2023. <https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1001895>

Acceptability and feasibility of Group B Strep Screening

**Manuscript Word Count:** 4379

**Availability of data, code and other materials:** Available on request

**Table/Figure Caption List**


Figure 1. *Prisma Flow Diagram*

Table 1. GRADE-CERQUAL Rules

Table 2. Study characteristics

Table 3. Categories and statement of findings

**PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases and registers only**



\*Consider, if feasible to do so, reporting the number of records identified from each database or register searched (rather than the total number across all databases/registers).

\*\*If automation tools were used, indicate how many records were excluded by a human and how many were excluded by automation tools.

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

For more information, visit: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>

Table 1. GRADE-CERQUAL Rules

	<b>High confidence</b>	<b>Medium confidence</b>	<b>Low confidence</b>	<b>Very low confidence</b>	<b>Total score</b>
<b>Methodology</b>	Scores 80% or more on methodological ratings	Scores between 60-79%	Scores between 40-59%	Scores below 40%	Where most studies were no methodological concerns = high confidence Where most had no or minor concerns = moderate confidence Where most had low, or some methodological concerns = low Where most studies had lots of methodological concerns – very low confidence
<b>Coherence</b>	All summaries were consistent in their content	Over half of the summaries were consistent in their content	Summary contents had a mix of two different themes	No consistency across summary contents	
<b>Adequacy</b>	12+ papers and more than half of the papers had thick data descriptions (where appropriate)	8-11 papers and more than half of the papers had thick data descriptions (where appropriate)	5-7 papers and/or less than half of the papers had thick data descriptions (where appropriate)	4 or less papers and/or less than half of the papers had thick data descriptions (where appropriate)	
<b>Relevance</b>	Studies carried out in or after	Studies carried out between 2002-2015	Studies carried out prior to 2002	Studies carried out prior to 1996 where	

<b>Overall rating</b>	2015, following the release of WHO guidelines about GBS		– when revised guidelines by the CDC were released <sup>1</sup>	the first consensus guideline was introduced <sup>1</sup>
	Three or all aspects (methodology, coherence, adequacy, relevance) of a concept rated as high confidence	Three or all aspects of a concept was rated as moderate confidence.	Three or all aspects of a concept was rated as low confidence.	Three or all aspects of a concept was rated as very low confidence.

Note. Methodological limitations were assessed based on the critical appraisal discussed above. For each theme, papers were placed under the relevant heading (e.g., a paper with high confidence would be placed under the high confidence column). This allowed us to understand how many high quality-low quality papers there were within a given theme. See supplementary materials C.

Coherence was assessed by looking at the evidence assigned to that theme and identifying any outliers or ambiguous elements in the data. The same process as described above was carried out for each theme. See supplementary materials D for more information.

Adequacy was assessed by looking at both the quantity and richness (‘thickness’ and ‘thinness’) of the data for each theme. In the case of this research, a ‘thin’ description was defined as a set of statements rather than a description which provides the context of experiences and circumstances<sup>2</sup>. It is argued that the extent to which a text provides a thick description shows evidence of the authenticity of the results<sup>3</sup>. The same process as described above was carried out for each theme. See supplementary materials E for more information.

According to GRADE-CERQUAL, relevance is the extent to which the data supporting a review finding is applicable to the context specified in the review question. Relevance was therefore assessed based on the time when the research was published. This is because the WHO guidelines are being updated in 2024, and they have not been updated since 2015. Therefore, any papers published between 2015-2024 were deemed as most relevant as they would not have been included in previous guidelines. Studies carried out prior to 1996 when the first GBS consensus guideline was introduced was rated as very low relevance as these studies are likely to have been included in previous guidelines. Studies that were carried out prior to 2002 (but after 1996), when revised consensus guidelines by the CDC were released, were rated as having low relevance. Studies carried out between 2002-2015 were rated as having moderate relevance, and studies carried out in or after 2015, following the release of the most recent WHO guidelines about GBS<sup>4</sup> were rated as having high confidence. The same process as described above was carried out for each theme. See supplementary materials F for more information.



For the evidence profile, where a concept had an even split of ratings and the ratings were next to each other in quality (e.g., high, high, medium, medium) the lower rating was given. Where a concept had an even split of ratings, but the ratings were apart from each other in terms of quality (e.g., high, high, low low), the rating in the middle of these was given (e.g., medium). A decision was made to not assign any higher than 'low confidence' to concepts where adequacy was given a 'very low' rating. This was to avoid putting too much emphasis on concepts where more research is needed. A decision was made to keep concepts that were rated as having 'very low' or 'low' confidence and these were highlighted for future research.

**Table 2. Study characteristics**

Author (Year)	Country  Language of publication	Design	Quality rating	Focus of the study	Sample N	Sample characteristics
Almari et al. (2021)	Saudi Arabia English	Quantitative – Cross Sectional Survey	76.92 % High confidence	Knowledge, Attitudes and Awareness of screening	Physicians N = 25  Women of reproductive age N = 720	<p>Health professionals were: family medicine or obstetrics and gynecology physicians; their ages ranged from 20 to 50 years old, but they were mainly 41 to 50 years, which accounted for 44% of all participants. Saudi physicians completed the survey more often than did non-Saudi physicians, as the percentage of Saudi physicians enrolled in the study was significantly higher (84%). Most of the participants had a bachelor's degree (72%), followed by a master's degree (20%), and a Ph.D. (8%). The majority of physicians were employed; only 16% were unemployed. Their professional titles included staff physician (16.7%), resident (25%), and registrar or senior registrar (8.3%).</p> <p>Women were aged 20-50 years old and Unmarried women were excluded from the study; 39.2% comprised the maximum age group, and 9.6% comprised the minority of non-Saudi participants. All but 11 participants were highly educated. Nearly all the women were married, and only 9.3% of them were pregnant. The reports of their gestational age (GA) were distributed equally before and after 30 weeks. The largest percentage of women planned to deliver vaginally (74.6%).</p> <p>69% were less than 40 years old 50.6% were females formed 40.4% had less than 5 years of experience formed 40.4%, 27.0% had 5-9 years of experience 11.2% had 10-15 years of experience 21.3% had over 15 years of experience 61.8% were educated regionally. The professional title of these physicians were residents (37.1%), registrar/senior</p>
Almohaimed et al. (2019)	Saudi Arabia English	Quantitative – Questionnaire	65% Medium confidence	Knowledge and barriers to screening	Primary care physicians N = 89	<p>69% were less than 40 years old 50.6% were females formed 40.4% had less than 5 years of experience formed 40.4%, 27.0% had 5-9 years of experience 11.2% had 10-15 years of experience 21.3% had over 15 years of experience 61.8% were educated regionally. The professional title of these physicians were residents (37.1%), registrar/senior</p>

Alshengeti et al. (2020)	Saudi Arabia English	Quantitative – Cross sectional survey	84.38% High confidence	Knowledge and preference for GBS screening strategies	Pregnant women N = 377	registrar (30.3%), and consultants (21.3%). Pregnant women attending Madinah Maternity and Children Hospital, Al-Madinah, Saudi Arabia Majority unemployed (86.2%) Majority completed postsecondary education (33.2%)
Arya et al. (2008)	Ireland English	Quantitative – prospective cohort study. Women were asked to collect a swab and then complete a questionnaire.	33.33% Very low confidence	Preference for HP vs self-collected swabs	Pregnant women N = 600	Pregnant women, two main teaching maternity hospitals in Cork. The mean age of the women was 31 years. The majority of women were married (64.3%), worked outside of home (59.0%) and had at least one child (55.7%)
Bak et al. (2016)	Poland English	Quantitative – survey	59.38% Low confidence	Knowledge of GBS	Pregnant women in early labour N = 164	Average age = 27.9 years, most women (43.3% ) were aged from 26 to 30 years. 54.3% live in the city while the remaining part 56.1% had completed higher education 59.8% were multiparas
Berikopolou et al. (2021)	Greece English	Quantitative – cross sectional survey	83.30% High confidence	Adherence	Pregnant women N = 604	Pregnant from private (n = 339) and public (n = 265) hospitals Average age = 34.2 84.1% were Greek, 7.8% were Albanian, and 8.1% belonged to various ethnic groups. 84.4% lived in Attica 95.2% were married 55.6% worked in the private sector 70.5% had public health insurance.
Chen et al. (2020)	China English	Quantitative – cross sectional survey	60% Medium confidence	Preference for HP vs self-collected swabs	Pregnant women N = 522	Average age was 30.2 years Gestational age ranged from 35 to 40 weeks. 58.9% women were primipara. 79.7% had received college or university degree
Cheng et al. (2006)	Taiwan English	Quantitative – survey	75% Medium confidence	Acceptability around GBS testing	Pregnant women N = 183	NR
Chow et al. (2013)	China English	Quantitative – survey	84.62% High confidence	Knowledge, attitudes acceptability towards screening.	Pregnant women N = 213	Pregnant women (n= 109 first trimester n=104 third trimester). 55 participants were new immigrants and 6 were visitors from China.
Constantinou et al. (2023)	UK English	Qualitative – semi structured interviews	91.67 High confidence	Women's knowledge of GBS testing and attitudes towards.	Perinatal women N = 19	Pregnant (n = 5) and postnatal (n = 14) women. Participants were aged between 25 and 42 years. Average = 32 (SD = 4.6) Three participants had experienced or intended to have a home birth.

Daniels et al. (2009)	UK English	Mixed - Quantitative questionnaire for mothers and free text comments; qualitative focus group for midwives.	81.25% High confidence	Acceptability of rapid screening	Pregnant women N = 1880 decliners N = 946 who completed the anxiety measure Midwives N = 12	The participants were White British and Asian British Three (16%) had received diagnosis of GBS Decliners: 36% White British; 25% Pakistani 29.3% 26-30 years old; 27.7% 21-25 years old
Daniels et al. (2010)	UK English	Quantitative – questionnaire	40% Low confidence	Acceptability of rapid screening	Pregnant women in labour N = 1400	Age M = 29.6 (SD = 5.9) 52.6% first time mothers 62% White
Darbyshire et al. (2003)	Australia English	Qualitative – focus groups	70.83% Medium confidence	Knowledge about GBS	Pregnant women N = 35	Average age = 29; (range: 21–37 yr). 48.6% had a diploma 54.2% were first time mothers 34% planned to birth at a birthing center, 26% in midwifery care, 20% cared for by an obstetrician or registrar, 20% in general practitioner shared care.
Davies et al. (2001)	Canada English	Quantitative – cross sectional survey	78.13% Medium confidence	Adherence	Obstetric care providers N = 2809	Obstetric care providers over 3 localities (Alberta, Toronto and Peel) in Canada and across 3 years (1994, 1995, 1997)
De Mello et al. (2015)	Brazil English	Quantitative – cross-sectional quantitative interview and a review of prenatal medial cards	37.50% Very low confidence	Adherence	Pregnant women N = 391	Average age = 24.8 (Range: 13-40) Average education years = 9.4 (range, 2-16 years), 51.9% in paid work 80.1% in a relationship First time pregnancy = 49.1%
Gigante et al. (1995)	USA English	Quantitative – survey	80.76% High confidence	Attitudes towards universal screening	Obstetricians N = 135	Average age = 44 years old Average years of practice = 13 years 77% were male 82% were board certified 86% members of the AOCG One-third of the respondents practiced in an urban location. 76% attended more than 10 births a month 78% attended more than 20 outpatient visits a day 78% attended the birth of babies who had subsequently developed EOGBS
Giles et al. (2019)	Australia	Quantitative -	75%	Knowledge and	Pregnant	Mean age = 30.4 years (SD = 5.4 years).

	English	questionnaire	Medium confidence	acceptability	women N = 495	237 women were born overseas and came from 48 different countries, the most common being India (69 women), Afghanistan (25 women), and China (22 women).
Gosling et al. (2003)	New Zealand  English	Quantitative – Survey	80% High confidence	Knowledge, awareness and attitudes	Health professionals N = 59 midwives N = 18 general practitioners N = 7 obstetricians	79.7% were females 60.7% were aged > 40 years, 51.2% had overseas training 61.9% had practiced antenatal care for < 10 years.
Grammeniatis et al. (2022)	Greece  Greek	Quantitative – survey	72% Medium confidence	Knowledge and acceptability	Pregnant women N = 574	The majority of participants had secondary or higher education with a low to average annual income (<20,000 euros). The majority of participants were of Greek nationality and had public health insurance. 90% of women were pregnant for the first or second time
Jaworowski et al. (2016)	Poland  Polish	Quantitative – survey	43.33% Low confidence	Knowledge and awareness	Pregnant women N = 172	Median age was 30 years. The majority of women were married women, with higher education and in a good financial situation. Most already had one child and lived in a city with over 500,000 inhabitants
Ka Ye Ko et al. (2016)	China  English	Quantitative – questionnaire	60% Medium confidence	Preference for HP vs self-collected swabs	Pregnant women N = 320	The mean age 32.1 Median gestational age = 35 weeks. Occupations: housewife 20.1%, manual worker 1.4%, Professional 15.3%, sedentary work 53.3%, Unemployed 8.8%, Other 1.1%. Education: Primary 1.6%, Secondary 39.7%, Tertiary 58.7%.
Kolkman et al. (2017)	The Netherlands  English	Qualitative – focus groups interviews	72.33% Medium Confidence	Barriers and facilitators to strategies	Pregnant women N = 14 Care providers N = 27	Pregnant women (n = 14) and care providers (n = 27). 50% of the pregnant women were Dutch. The other countries of origin were Hungary, Bosnia, Morocco, Suriname and Turkey. 50% had high education level One woman was not pregnant, but mother of a child with long term EOGBS complications. The median week of gestation of the pregnant women was 34 (range:26–38);

						57.1% were nulliparous 50% of women wanted a home birth.
Kolkman et al. (2020)	The Netherlands  English	Quantitative – survey, validated Cambridge Worry Scale	50% Low confidence	Acceptability of screening in the form of worries	Pregnant women N = 1369	Nulliparity, Education, Country of Origin, Civil State and SES. Before implementation (T0) ( N = 519): Region A Dutch strategy N = 195, Region B Dutch strategy N = 200, Region C Dutch strategy N = 124. During implementation (T1) ( N = 850): Region A Risk-based strategy N = 300, Region B Combination strategy N = 256, Region C Dutch strategy N = 294.
Konrad et al. (2007)	Canada  English	Quantitative survey	78.13% Medium confidence	Adherence	Health professionals N =85	Obstetricians 21 (25%), Family physicians 23 (27%), Obstetric residents 17 (20%), Family medicine residents 24 (28%) Median age = 29 (IQR 25–33)
Law et al. (2013)	Australia  English	Quantitative - survey	54.17% Medium confidence	Acceptability of vaginal vs rectal swabbing	Pregnant women N = 267	Median gestation = 36.3 weeks (IQR 35.9–36.9). 95% were white 16.9% were smokers
Lynfield et al. (2000)	USA  English	Quantitative Survey	57.69% Low confidence	Adherence to guidelines.	Health professionals N=431	The Connecticut and Minnesota state health departments surveyed prenatal-care providers including; Obstetricians, Gynaecologists, Family Physicians and Nurses
Madrid et al. (2018)	Mozambique  English	Mixed – quantitative collection of GBS swabs and Qualitative semi-structured interviews.	20.83% Very low confidence	Acceptability of screening	Pregnant and Postnatal women N = 20	
Mahieu et al. (2000)	Belgium  English	Quantitative survey	71.88% Medium confidence	Adherence	Health professionals N = 310	The response rate differed between provinces: 78% in Limburg, 58% in Antwerp, 47% in East-Flanders, 45% in West-Flanders and only 27% in the Flemish-Brabant province. The average respondents age was 42 years (range 25± 79 years), most participants were male (62%) and board certified (85%). The vast majority (82%) had an urban practice mostly in a private non-academic centre. The average number of deliveries conducted by each

McLaughlin & Crowther (2000)	Australia English	Quantitative survey	73.33% Medium confidence	Acceptability of Universal Screening	Health professionals N = 311	<p>respondant was 158 per year ranging from 10 to 500 per year. Most respondents had obstetrical interests (61%). Members in a group practice made up slightly over half of the sample.</p> <p>Obstetricians (n = 271) and neonatologists (n = 40). All Members and Fellows of the then Royal Australian College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RACOG). In addition, neonatologists in Australia whose contact details were in the 1996/1997 Directory of Neonatal Intensive Care Units within Australia. Members and Fellows of the RACOG through the college.</p>
Melin et al (2004)	Belgium English	Mixed – Quantitative survey and consensus meeting	50% Low confidence	Acceptability and preferences of screening	Not stated	<p>Obstetricians, neonatologists, microbiologists, infectious disease specialists. The majority of the participants (67 %) practiced in the North of Belgium (the Fl community), whereas only 18 per cent came from the South (Fr community) and 15 per cent from Brussels.</p> <p>Non-university hospitals or clinics were represented by 48 per cent of the participants; 39 per cent practiced in university hospitals and 13 per cent practiced in private and non university hospitals or clinics.</p>
Mercer et al. (1995)	USA English	Quantitative	33.33% Very low confidence	Preference for HP vs self collected swabs	Pregnant women N = 251	<p>The mean age of participants was 23.9 (-+5.6) years. Median gravidity and parity were 2 and 1, respectively, with 33.1% of women being nulliparous. The mean gestational age at testing Was 36.1 (-+4.3) weeks. A total of 81.3% of women were black.</p>
Molnar et al. (1997)	Canada English	Quantitative survey & collection of GBS swab	50% Low confidence	Preference for HP vs self collected swabs	Pregnant women N = 161	<p>Age: 16-25 n=13, 26-35 n=119, &gt;35 n=28. Parity: 0 46%, 1 36%, 2 13%, &gt;2 5%. Education: High school 21%, College 27%, University 39%, Graduate studies 13%, Prior knowledge of GBS Yes n= 43 (26%), No/unsure n=117 (73%)</p> <p>Medical training: Yes n=30 (20%)</p>

						<p>No n=127 (80%). Prior GBS swab taken</p> <p>Yes n=23 (2 1%), No/unsure n=84 (79%)</p> <p>The women's health care provider: Family physician n=37 (23%), Obstetrician n=123 (77%)</p>
Nabreda-Martin et al. (2022)	Spain Spanish	Quantitative survey & collection of GBS swab	70.83% Medium confidence	Preference for HP vs self collected swabs	Pregnant women N = 190	<p>72.5% of the participants were between 30 and 39 years old, 12.70% between 25 and 29 years old, 6.30% were from 18 to 29 years old, and 8.50% were over 40 years old.</p> <p>96.3% of the participants were white, with a medium or higher level of education in 89%, and basic in 11%.</p>
Peralta-Carcelen et al. (1997)	USA English	Quantitative survey	80.77% High confidence	Acceptability of screening and knowledge	Pregnant women N =83 Health professionals N = 80	<p>Pregnant women n= 83 and pediatricians n=40; obstetricians n=40. The demographic characteristics of these women: The mean maternal age was 24 years (range, 18-45 years). Fifty-eight subjects (70%) were not currently employed. Forty-four mothers (53%) had a history of an adverse pregnancy event. None of the mothers had had an infant infected with GBS. Only 8% (7/83) had heard of GBS infections before our interview. White (26, 31.3%), Black (56, 67.5%), Other (1, 1.2%). Gravidity: Primigravida (27, 32.5%), Multigravida (56, 67.5%). Insurance Status: Medicaid (77, 92.8%), Private (3, 3.6%), None (3, 3.6%). Education: Did not complete high school (25, 30.1%), completed high school (28, 33.7%), attended college (30, 30.6%). Characteristics of the Obstetricians: Female (7, 17.5%), Male (33, 82.5%), White (40, 100%), Type of practice: Solo (3, 7.5%), Group (21, 77.5%), Multispecialty (4, 10%), Public health (1, 2.5%), Other (1, 2.5%) Location: University (9, 22.5%), Urban (26, 65%), Suburban (5, 12.5%), Years in practice, median 9 years, patients per year median 177. Characteristics of the Pediatricians: Female (17, 42.5%), Male (23, 57.5%), White (36, 90%), Black (4, 10%) Type of practice: Solo (4, 10%), Group (28, 70%), Multispecialty (3, 7.5%), Public health (1, 2.5%), Health maintenance organization (1, 2.5%), Other (3, 7.5%)</p>



						Location: University (6, 15%), Urban (21, 52.5%), Suburban (13, 32.5%), Years in practice, median 15.5 years, patients per year median 75.6
Price et al. (2006)	Canada English	Quantitative survey & collection of GBS swab	54.17% Low confidence	Preference for HP vs self collected swabs	Pregnant women N = 361	The average age of the women who participated was 27.2 years (standard deviation 5.42), and 58.9% (192/326) were primiparous. Characteristics of women who participated and refused self-sampling for GBS: Participants (n=330): Age <20 8.3% (27/327), Never married 13.8% (45/327), High school incomplete 6.7% (22/326), Primigravid 58.6% (192/326), Prefer physician sampling 21.2% (69/326), Speak a language other than English at home 23.1% (66/286). Refusers (n=31): Age <20 19.4% (6/31), Never married 32.3% (10/31), High school incomplete 16.1% (5/31), Primigravid 53.3% (16/30), Prefer physician sampling 54.8% (17/31), Speak a language other than English at home 23.1% (66/286)
Price et al. (2018)	South Africa English	Mixed - Quantitative questionnaire & Qualitative Focus Groups.	53.13% Low confidence	Acceptability of screening types and knowledge	Health professionals N = 238	150 (63.0%) doctors and 88 (37.0%) nurses. 121 (62.7%) of 193 employed interns, 29 (48.3%) of the 60 senior doctors and 88 (53.7%) of 164 nurses working in the Obstetric Department. Of the 150 doctors, 121 (80.7%) were interns, 3 (2.0%) medical officers, 16 (10.7%) residents, and 10 (6.6%) attending obstetricians. Of the 88 nurses, 19 (21.6%) were advanced midwives, 44 (50.0%) professional, 15 (17.0%) enrolled, and 10 (11.4%) auxiliary nurses.
Sharpe et al. (2015)	Canada English	Qualitative - semi structured interviews	66.66% Medium confidence	Knowledge and experience of GBS testing	Postpartum women N = 6	The participants were from six different midwifery practices in Toronto, Ontario within six months of the participants' giving birth.
Taylor et al. (1997)	USA	Qualitative - closed questions	61.54% Medium	Preference for HP vs self collected swabs	Pregnant women	Mean age of participants was 23.9 (+- 5.6) years. Median gravidity and parity

	English	interview.	confidence		N = 251	were 2 and 1, respectively, with 33.1% of women being nulliparous. The mean gestational age at testing was 36.1 (+/- 4.3) weeks. Mean height and weight were 64.2 inches and 187.2 lbs, respectively. The population of women was 81% African-American, 80% indigent, and ranged in age from 14 to 40, with a gestational age of 24 to 42 weeks. Previous research at this rite had established the rate of GBS colonization at 15-20%.
Torok & Dunn (1997)	USA English	Quantitative survey & collection of GBS swab	70.83% Medium confidence	Preference for HP vs self collected swabs	Pregnant women N = 250	Pregnant women 35-37 weeks gestation. The patients were a diverse blend of Army soldiers and spouses of varying racial and ethnic backgrounds with high school and university educational levels. The study made no attempt to control for these characteristics.
Yamaguchi & Ohashi (2018)	Japan English	Quantitative - cross sectional survey.	66.67% Medium confidence	Adherence	Maternity homes N=204	Overall, maternity homes employed 1–14 midwives, and the most frequent number of midwives employed was 2, in 38.1% of maternity homes. Moreover, 22.8% of maternity homes employed 1 midwife and 16.3% employed 3 midwives. The number of deliveries in 2014 ranged 0–208, and the most frequent number of deliveries was 15, which was reported for 5.4% of maternity homes. The median number of deliveries was 16, and 20.9% of maternity homes reported managing fewer than 5 deliveries in a year.
Yamaguchi & Ohashi (2019)	Japan English	Quantitative survey	66.67% Medium confidence	Acceptability - screening types	Health professionals N = 235	Paediatricians. The mean duration (years) that the respondents had experienced in practice as paediatricians was $20.6 \pm 7.6$ years (N = 232). Of these, 94.9% and 74.9% had experience in treating neonates with GBS and receiving neonates transferred from maternity homes because of several abnormal conditions, respectively. The mean annual number of livebirths and neonatal transfers was $600.0 \pm 341.7$ (N = 227) and $89.3 \pm 129.3$ (N = 195), respectively.

Youden et al. (2005)	Canada English	Quantitative - survey and review of medical records.	75% Medium confidence	Knowledge	Pregnant women N = 273	<p>Women who gave birth to a live infant at the IWK Health during a 7 week study period. The majority of participants were aged 25 to 34, had post-secondary education, and were primigravidas. The majority of the participants (80.6%) had all their prenatal care in the Halifax Regional Municipality (HRM), and 93% of the study population had some of their care in the HRM. Information regarding GBS screening was available for 273 (97.8%) of the 279 study participants. A total of 24.5% (67/273) of study participants (95% CI 19.6-30.1) had GBS screening using culture of a vaginal-rectal swab at 35 to 37 weeks' gestation (culture method). The remaining 75.5% of participants (95% CI 69.9-80.4) were assumed to have had risk factor analysis during labour for GBS colonization. Screening by culture identified 19.4% (95% CI 10.8-30.9) of those tested as needing chemoprophylaxis (i.e., they had positive swab cultures), and 76.9% of these women (95% CI 46.2-95.0) were given chemoprophylaxis in labour. The risk factor approach identified 25.2% (95% CI 19.5-31.7) of those women assessed as needing chemoprophylaxis (i.e., they had risk factors), and 94.2% of these women (95% CI 84.1-98.8) were given chemoprophylaxis during labour.</p>
----------------------	-------------------	---	--------------------------	-----------	------------------------------	--

**Table 3 – Categories and statement of findings**

Review Category	Statement of findings
<b>Knowledge and awareness</b>	1.1 Women’s views 1.1.1 Awareness of GBS is generally low (<40%) and varies across countries and populations (High confidence) 1.1.2 Misconceptions about GBS include believing it is an STD and it is women’s fault (Low confidence) 1.1.3 Women get information about GBS from a wide variety of sources (health professionals, books, journals, family and friends, social media) (Moderate confidence) 1.1.4 Women generally want detailed information about GBS delivered face to face, provided early enough to make informed decisions (Moderate confidence) 1.1.5 Higher levels of education appear to be associated with more knowledge about GBS. Other factors <i>may</i> impact knowledge (Moderate confidence) 1.2 Health professional’s views 1.2.1 Health professionals generally have higher knowledge about GBS than women, but some may be less aware of risk factors (Moderate confidence) 1.2.2 Obstetricians <i>may</i> have more knowledge about GBS than other health professionals (midwives, nurses, pediatricians) (Moderate confidence) 1.2.3 Most health professionals see GBS as an important public health issue (Low confidence) 1.2.4 Most health professionals see GBS screening as important and beneficial to pregnant women (Moderate confidence).
<b>Preferences</b>	2.1 Women’s views 2.1.1 Most women surveyed are in favour of universal screening (Moderate confidence) 2.1.2 Most women surveyed would accept GBS testing and believe it is a good way to protect their baby (Moderate confidence) 2.1.3 Views again screening include embarrassment, fear of birth plans being altered, overmedicalization of birth and implications for their baby (Moderate confidence) 2.1.4 Over half of women surveyed would accept swabbing, and the provision of clear information is vital in mitigating anxiety (High confidence) 2.1.5 Preferences for self-swabbing vs health professional swabbing varies across studies and countries (Low confidence)

	<p>2.1.6 Reasons for self-swabbing include: feeling in control, being more private and feeling more physically comfortable (Low confidence)</p> <p>2.1.7 Women generally find self-swabbing easy and comfortable (Moderate confidence)</p> <p>2.1.8 If women prefer health professional swabbing, they do so because they are concerned about doing it wrong (Moderate confidence)</p> <p>2.1.9 It is not clear what demographic characteristics impact swabbing preference (Very low confidence)</p> <p>2.2. Health professionals views</p> <p>2.2.1 It is not clear what screening method health professionals prefer. More research is needed (Low confidence)</p>
<b>Acceptability</b>	<p>3.1 Women’s views</p> <p>3.1.1 At least 80% of women find GBS swabbing acceptable (Moderate confidence)</p> <p>3.1.2 Generally vaginal swabbing is more acceptable than anal swabbing (Moderate confidence)</p> <p>3.1.3 Screening may increase anxiety in women, particularly the combined strategy (Low confidence)</p> <p>3.1.4 Multiple demographic factors may influence GBS testing acceptability (Very low confidence)</p> <p>3.1.5 Ethnicity and age may be associated with lower levels of acceptability (Low confidence)</p> <p>3.2 Health professional’s views</p> <p>3.2.1 Intrapartum screening is potentially acceptable (Moderate confidence)</p> <p>3.2.2 It is not clear if health professionals find universal or risk-based screening more acceptable (Low confidence)</p> <p>3.2.3 Anal swabs are generally less acceptable than vaginal swabs (Low confidence)</p> <p>3.2.4 Midwives appear to be opposed to universal antibiotic use, but obstetricians may be more for its use (Very low confidence)</p>
<b>Feasibility/ Adherence</b>	<p>4.1 Women’s views</p> <p>4.1.1 According to medical records, not all eligible women were swabbed, and 30.2-53% of swabs were carried out outside of recommended time points (Low confidence)</p> <p>4.1.2 Most women asked did not recall being offered or receiving GBS testing (Low confidence)</p> <p>4.1.3 Coherence between women’s recollection and medical records varies across studies (Very low confidence)</p> <p>4.2 Health professional’s views</p> <p>4.2.1 Barriers to GBS screening programmes include organisational barriers, fear of the consequence (e.g., anxiety, overmedicalization of birth); lack of clarity around guidelines and lack of training (Moderate confidence)</p> <p>4.2.2 Facilitators to GBS screening programmes vary across studies (Very low confidence)</p>

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>4.2.3 Adherence to screening protocols varies across studies range from 21.3-100% for universal screening and 10-55% for screening under certain conditions (Low confidence)</li><li>4.2.4 Health professionals conduct testing at the recommended time 47.5-82% of the time (Low confidence)</li><li>4.2.5 There is not a clear pattern about whether health professionals adhere to vaginal vs rectal swabbing guidelines (Very low confidence)</li><li>4.2.6 Antibiotic use ranged: Positive test 50-87%; Positive test plus risk factor: 13-100%; Risk factor: 38-80% (Low confidence)</li><li>4.2.7 Obstetricians and gynaecologists <i>may</i> be more likely to follow policies than nurses/midwives and those who have worked in their role for less time <i>may</i> be more likely to follow policies (Low confidence)</li><li>4.2.8 Most health professionals saw training as important for increasing adherence (Moderate confidence)</li></ul> |
|--|--|