**GRADE-CERQual evidence profile**

| **Statement of findings** | **Definition**  | **Studies citing this**  | **N** | **Overall methodology rating** | **Overall coherence rating** | **Overall adequacy rating** | **Overall relevance** | **Overall CERQUAL rating** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Category: Knowledge and awareness** |
| **1.1 Women’s views** |
| * + 1. Awareness

Awareness of GBS is generally low (<40%) and varies across countries and populations.  | The percentage of women in the study sample with knowledge about GBS, GBS testing/screening and treatment for GBS. | Alamri et al., 2021; Alshengeti et al. 2020; Arya et al., 2008; Bak et al., 2016; Chow et al., 2013; Constantinou et al., 2023; Darbyshire et al., 2003; De Mello et al., 2015; Giles et al., 2019; Grammeniatis et al., 2022; Peralta-Carcelen et al., 1997; Sharpe et al., 2015; Youden et al., 2005 | 13 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had no or minor methodological concerns | **Low coherence -**  although most studies found under half of the population sampled had no knowledge, there is a big range of knowledge across the studies | **High adequacy –** a large amount of studies contributing to this theme | **High relevance –** the majority of studies were published after WHO’s guidelines | **High confidence** |
| * + 1. Misconceptions about GBS

Misconceptions about GBS include believing it is an STD and it is women’s fault  | Incorrect beliefs women may hold about GBS | Alamri et al., 2021; Alshengeti et al. 2020; Chow et al., 2013; Constantinou et al., 2023; Darbyshire et al., 2003; Grammeniatis et al., 2022; Sharpe et al., 2015;  | 7 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had no or minor methodological concerns | **Low coherence -**  although most studies found low knowledge, there is a big range of knowledge across the studies | **Low adequacy -**  An appropriate amount of richness, but only 7 studies | **Moderate relevance:** three published after, three published before WHO guidelines | **Low confidence** |
| * + 1. Where does women’s knowledge about GBS come from?

Women get information about GBS from a wide variety of sources (health professionals, books, journals, family and friends, social media) | Sources and locations that women access knowledge about GBS | Alamri et al., 2021; Constantinou et al., 2023; Darbyshire et al., 2003; De Mello et al. (2015); Sharpe et al., 2015; | 5 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had no or minor methodological concerns | **Moderate coherence –** most studies (n = 3) report women get their information from health professionals, but there is still varied sources  | **Low adequacy -** An appropriate amount of richness, but only 5 studies | **High relevance –** majority of the studies were published after WHO’s guidelines | **Moderate confidence** |
| * + 1. What knowledge do women want?

Women generally want detailed information about GBS delivered face to face, provided early enough to make informed decisions. | Information that women would like to receive about GBS and how they would like to receive this information | Alamri et al., 2021; Constantinou et al., 2023; De Mello et al. 2015; Kolkman et al. 2017; Sharpe et al., 2015; | 5 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had no or minor methodological concerns | **Moderate coherence -**  studies mostly agree that women want more information and want it delivered clearly by a health professional. Delivery should be early enough to make decisions, however still variations across studies. | **Low adequacy -** An appropriate amount of richness, but only 5 studies | **High relevance –** majority of the studies were published after WHO’s guidelines | **Moderate confidence** |
| 1.1.5. Factors associated with knowledgeHigher levels of education appear to be associated with more knowledge about GBS. Other factors may impact knowledge | Demographic and health characteristics that might impact women’s GBS knowledge | Alamri et al., 2021; Alshengeti et al. 2020; Bak et al., 2016; Chow et al., 2013; Constantinou et al., 2023; Giles et al., 2019; Grammeniatis et al., 2022; Jaworowski et al., 2016; Youden et al., 2005 | 9 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had no or minor methodological concerns | **Low coherence -**  there are a lot of potential variables that could have an impact and most the data is mixed. The only characteristic with a clear pattern is education.  | **Moderate –** there are 9 studies in this theme and the richness is appropriate as all are quantitative.  | **High relevance –** the majority of studies were published after WHO’s guidelines | **Moderate confidence** |
| **1.2 Health professionals** |
| 1.2.1 AwarenessHealth professionals generally have higher knowledge about GBS, but some may be less aware of risk factors. | The percentage of health professionals the study sample with knowledge about GBS, GBS testing/screening and treatment for GBS. | Alamri et al., 2021; Almohaimeed et al., 2019; Gosling et al., 2002; Melin et al. 2004; Peralta-Carcelen et al., 1997; Price et al., 2018;  | 6 | **Moderate confidence –** equal split across confidence levels, so have gone for the middle | **Moderate coherence –** The health professionals all have higher knowledge than women. However, knowledge about risk factors is more mixed and there is no clear consistent pattern across the studies. | **Low adequacy –** although two papers do provide good detail, there are only 6 papers in this theme  | **Moderate relevance –** Three were published after WHO guidelines, but three published before | **Moderate confidence** |
| 1.2.2 Factors associated with knowledgeObstetricians *may* have more knowledge about GBS than other health professionals (midwives, nurses, paediatricians). | Characteristics that might impact health professionals GBS knowledge | Almohaimeed et al., 2019; Gosling et al., 2002; Peralta-Carcelen et al. 1997; Price et al., 2018 | 4 | **High confidence -**  most studies have no methodological concerns | **High coherence –** consistent pattern regarding obstetricians having more knowledge | **Very Low adequacy –** although two papers do provide good detail, there are only 4 papers in this theme | **Moderate relevance–** Two were published after WHO guidelines, but two were published before | **Moderate confidence** |
| 1.2.3 GBS as a public health issueMost health professionals see GBS as an important public health issue | The importance of GBS as a public health issue from health professional’s perspectives | Gosling et al., 2002; Price et al., 2018 | 2 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had no or minor methodological concerns | **High coherence –** all studies saying the same thing | **Very Low adequacy –** Only 2 papers | **Moderate relevance –** one published after WHO’s guidelines, one before | **Low confidence** |
| 1.2.4 Screening as beneficialMost health professionals see GBS screening as important and beneficial to pregnant women | The benefits of screening women for GBS | Alamri et al., 2021; Almohaimeed et al., 2019; Gosling et al., 2002; Price et al., 2018 | 4 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had no or minor methodological concerns | **High coherence -**  all studies saying the majority of clinicians think GBS screening is important | **Very Low adequacy –** although two papers do provide good detail, there are only 4 papers in this theme | **High relevance –** the majority published after WHO’s guidelines | **Moderate confidence** |
| **Review category: Preferences** |
| **2.1 Women’s views** |
| 2.1.1 Preference of GBS screening strategyMost women surveyed are in favour of universal screening | Whether women prefer universal or risk-based screening | Alshengeti et al., 2020; Chow et al., 2013; Kolkman et al., 2017; Peralta-Cercelen et al., 1997 | 4 | **High confidence –** most of the studies had no methodological concerns | **High coherence –** The majority of women in all studies preferred universal screening | **Very Low adequacy –** although two papers do provide good detail, there are only 4 papers in this theme | **Moderate relevance–** Two were published after WHO guidelines, but two were published before | **Moderate confidence** |
| 2.1.2 Views in favour of GBS testingMost women surveyed would accept GBS testing and believe it is a good way to protect their baby | Women’s positive views about screening and testing for GBS | Chow et al., 2013; Constantinou et al., 2023; Kolkman et al., 2017; Sharpe et al., 2015 | 4 | **Moderate confidence –** equal split across confidence levels, so have gone for the middle | **Moderate coherence –** most feel positively about testing and would accept it, but there are some inconsistencies for example information should be provided to help with acceptance of positive GBS status | **Very Low adequacy –** although there is richness in this theme, there are only 4 papers in this theme | **Moderate relevance –** two published before and two published after WHO guidelines | **Moderate confidence** |
| 2.1.3 Views against testingViews against screening include embarrassment, fear of birth plans being altered, overmedicalization of birth and implications for their baby | Reasons women provide for not accepting GBS testing | Constantinou et al., 2023; De Mello et al., 2015; Kolkman et al., 2017; Sharpe et al., 2015 | 4 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had no or minor methodological concerns | **Moderate coherence –** there are themes throughout such as impact on birth plan and overmedicalisation, but some areas that need more information such as embarrassment around swabbing | **Very Low adequacy –** Low number of papers | **High relevance–** majority published after WHO’s guidelines | **Moderate confidence** |
| 2.1.4 Views about swabbingOver half of women surveyed would accept swabbing, and the provision of clear information is vital in mitigating anxiety | Women’s attitudes towards swabbing and testing positive | Chow et al., 2013; Constantinou et al., 2023; De Mello et al., 2015; Kolkman et al., 2017; Sharpe et al., 2015 | 5 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had no or minor methodological concerns | **High coherence –** over half of women would accept the test and information is vital | **Low adequacy –** although three papers do provide good detail, there are only 5 papers in this theme | **High relevance –** the majority published after WHO’s guidelines | **High confidence** |
| 2.1.5 Preferences for HCP vs self-swabbingPreference for self-swabbing vs health professional swabbing varies across studies and countries. | The percentage of women surveys choosing health professional swabbing, self-swabbing, or no preference | Arya et al., 2008; Chen et al., 2020; Ka Ye Ko et al., 2016; Kolkman et al., 2017; Molnar et al., 1997; Price et al., 2006; Taylor et al., 1997; Torok and Dunn, 2000 | 7 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had minor methodological concerns | **Low coherence –** swabbing preferences vary by location | **Low adequacy –** richness is not high, but is fine as quantitative but only 7 studies | **Moderate relevance –** three with high relevance, three with low relevance, have gone in the middle  | **Low confidence** |
| 2.1.6 Reasons for preferring self-swabbingReasons for self-swabbing include feeling in control, being more private, and feeling more physically comfortable. | Reasons surveyed women give for preferring self-swabbing | Chen et al., 2020; Sharpe et al., 2015; Taylor et al., 1997 | 3 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had minor methodological concerns | **Very Low coherence -** the reasons given do not have much overlap across studies | **Very Low adequacy –** Only 3 papers | **Moderate relevance–** one high, one moderate and one low so have chosen the middle | **Low confidence** |
| 2.1.7 Ease of self-swabbingWomen generally find self-swabbing easy and comfortable. | How easy women found self-swabbing | Ka Ye Ko et al., 2016; Mercer et al., 1995; Nebreda-Martin et al., 2022; Taylor et al., 1997 | 4 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had minor methodological concerns | **High coherence –** all studies found that the majority of women found self-swabbing easy and comfortable | **Very Low adequacy –** Only very rich paper, but only 4 studies | **Moderate relevance –** two with high relevance, two with lower relevance so have gone in the middle. | **Moderate confidence** |
| 2.1.8 Reasons for preferring clinician swabbingIf women prefer health professional swabbing, they do so because they are concerned about doing it wrong | Reasons women gave for preferring clinician swabbing | Arya et al., 2008; Ka Ye Ko et al., 2016; Kolkman et al., 2017; Nebreda-Martin et al., 2022; Price et al., 2006; Sharpe et al., 2015; Taylor et al., 1997; Torok and Dunn, 2000 | 8 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had minor methodological concerns | **Medium confidence –** there is some overlap with results such as worrying about doing it incorrectly, but there are also some findings that are not consistent throughout the theme | **Moderate adequacy –** some richness, but only 8 papers within this theme | **Moderate relevance –** three with high relevance, three with moderate and two with low so have gone in the middle | **Moderate confidence** |
| 2.1.9 Demographics affecting preferenceIt is not clear what demographic characteristics impact swabbing preference | Demographic characteristics that might affect women’s swabbing preference | Chen et al., 2020; Molnar et al., 1997; Price et al., 2006 | 3 | **Low confidence -** most have moderate methodological concerns | **Very Low coherence –** The variables looked at across the studies are different, and where there is overlap the findings are not consistent  | **Very Low adequacy –** Only 3 studies | **Moderate relevance–** one high, one moderate and one low so have chosen the middle | **Very low confidence** |
| **2.2 Health professional’s views** |
| 2.2.1 Preferred GBS strategyIt is not clear what screening method health professionals prefer. More research is needed. | Whether health professionals prefer universal or risk-based screening | Gigante et al., 1995; Gosling et al., 2002; Kolkman et al. 2017 | 3 | **High confidence –** most of the studies had no methodological concerns | **Low coherence –** no clear pattern in the results | **Very Low adequacy –** Only 3 papers | **High relevance –** Two with high relevance | **Low confidence** |
| **Review Category: Acceptability**  |
| **3.1 Women’s views**  |
| 3.1.1 Acceptability of GBS screeningAt least 80% of women find GBS swabbing acceptable  | Percentages of women who feel screening and swabbing is acceptable.  | Cheng et al., 2006; Chow et al., 2013; Daniels et al., 2010; Ka Ye Ko et al., 2016; Madrid et al., 2018 | 5 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had minor methodological concerns | **High coherence –** all saying the same thing | **Low adequacy:** there is an adequate amount of richness, but only 5 studies | **Moderate relevance –** most studies were published between 2002-2015 | **Moderate confidence** |
| 3.1.2 Acceptability of vaginal vs rectal swabbingGenerally vaginal swabbing is more acceptable than anal swabbing | Percentage of women who find vaginal vs rectal swabbing acceptable | Chow et al., 2013; Daniels et al., 2010; Law et al., 2013 | 3 | **Moderate confidence –** gone in the middle | **Moderate coherence –** most studies find it more than 50% acceptable | **Very Low adequacy:** An adequate amount of richness but only 3 papers | **Moderate relevance –** all studies are of moderate relevance | **Moderate confidence** |
| 3.1.3 Women’s anxiety or worries surrounding GBS testingScreening may increase anxiety in women, particularly the combined strategy. | Whether screening is associated with increased anxiety levels in women | Cheng et al., 2006; Daniels et al., 2009; Daniels et al., 2010; Kolkman et al., 2020 | 4 | **Low confidence –** Most have moderate methodological concerns | **Low coherence –** all looking at anxiety but two find some difference, one doesn’t.  | **Very Low adequacy:** Although there is richness of the data for one study, there are only 4 papers | **Moderate relevance –** most studies were published between 2002-2015 | **Low confidence** |
| 3.1.4 Facilitators to acceptabilityMultiple demographics factors may influence GBS testing acceptability | Demographic and other factors that increase women’s views of acceptability of screening  | Chow et al., 2013; Constantinou et al., 2023; Madrid et al., 2018 | 3 | **Medium confidence –** have gone in the middle of high and very low | **Very Low coherence –** there is no overlap of findings | **Very Low adequacy:** Although there is richness of the data, there are only 3 papers | **High relevance -**  one high, one moderate relevance | **Low confidence** |
| 3.1.5 Barriers to acceptability Ethnicity and age may be associated with lower levels of acceptability | Demographic and other factors associated with women’s low levels of acceptability | Daniels et al., 2009; Daniels et al., 2010; Madrid et al., 2018; Sharpe et al., 2015 | 4 | **Low confidence –** Have gone in the middle on the lower end | **Low coherence –** there is some evidence that ethnicity might have an impact but these are from the same study so more research is needed | **Very Low adequacy:** Although there is richness of the data for one study, there are only 4 papers | **Moderate relevance -**  two high, two moderate relevance | **Low confidence** |
| **3.2 Health professional’s views** |
| 3.2.1 Antenatal vs intrapartum screeningIntrapartum screening is potentially acceptable | Acceptability of rapid screening | Daniels et al., 2009; Mahieu et al., 2000; Melin et al., 2004 | 3 | **Moderate confidence –** have gone in the middle | **Low coherence –** two studies kind of saying same thing, one isn’t. Not much data. | **Very Low adequacy:** Although there is richness of the data for one study, there are only 3 papers | **Moderate relevance –** most studies were published between 2002-2015 | **Moderate confidence** |
| 3.2.2 Universal vs risk based It is not clear if health professionals find universal or risk-based screening more acceptable | Acceptability of universal screening vs risk based screening | Daniels et al., 2009; Kolkman et al., 2017; McLaughlin and Crowther, 2000; Melin et al., 2004; Yamaguchi and Ohashi, 2019 | 5 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had minor methodological concerns | **Low coherence –** half of the studies say one thing and half say another | **Low quality:** Although two studies provide richness, there are only 5 studies. | **Moderate relevance –** two high, two moderate, one low so have gone in middle | **Low confidence** |
| 3.3.3 Vaginal vs rectal swabsAnal swabs are generally less acceptable than vaginal swabs | Health professionals views on the acceptability for the use of vaginal vs rectal swabs | Daniels et al., 2009; Mahieu et al., 2000 | 2 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had minor methodological concerns | **High coherence –** both find the same thing | **Very Low adequacy:** Adequate detail, but only 2 studies | **Low relevance –** one moderate, one low relevance | **Low confidence** |
| 3.3.4 Acceptability of antibiotic treatmentMidwives appear to be opposed to universal antibiotic use, but obstetricians may be more for its use | Health professional’s views on the acceptability of universal antibiotic treatment | Daniels et al., 2009; Konrad et al., 2007 | 2 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had minor methodological concerns | **Very Low coherence –** there is not a clear pattern here, each variable is very different | **Very Low adequacy:** Although there is richness of the data for one study, there are only 2 papers | **Moderate relevance –** all published between 2002-2015 | **Very low confidence**  |
| **Review category: Feasibility/Adherence** |
| **4.1 Women’s views** |
| 4.1.1 Adherence based on medical recordsAccording to medical records, not all eligible women were swabbed, and 30.2-53% of swabs were caried out outside of recommended time points | The percentage of women who are swabbed for GBS based on medical records | Berikopoulou et al., 2021; De Mello et al. 2015; Jaworowski et al., 2016 | 3 | **Moderate confidence –** have gone in the middle | **Low coherence –** although two studies found over half of women were swabbed for GBS, but differences are big and reasons are varied | **Very Low adequacy:** Adequate detail, but only 2 studies | **High relevance –** all studies published after WHO guidelines | **Low confidence** |
| 4.1.2 Women’s recollection of being offered or receiving GBS testingMost women asked did not recall being offered or receiving GBS testing | Whether women remember the offer of GBS testing and whether they remember receiving it | Alamri et al., 2021; Berikopoulou et al., 2021; De Mello et al., 2015 | 3 | **Moderate confidence –** most studies had no or minor methodological concerns | **Low coherence –** One found low awareness, two found high | **Very Low adequacy:** Adequate detail, but only 2 studies | **High relevance –** most published after WHO guidelines | **Low confidence** |
| 4.1.3 Medical records vs women’s recollectionCoherence between women’s recollection and medical records vary across studies | How often GBS testing information is recorded in women’s medical records compared to women’s recollection of testing | Berikopoulou et al., 2021; De Mello et al., 2015 | 2 | **Low confidence –** have gone in the middle on the lower side | **Very Low coherence –** opposing findings | **Very Low adequacy:** Adequate detail, but only 2 studies | **Moderate relevance –** one high relevance, one moderate | **Very low confidence** |
| **4.2 Health professional’s views** |
| 4.2.1 BarriersBarriers to GBS screening programmes include organisational barriers, fear of the consequences (e.g., anxiety, overmedicalisation of birth); lack of clarity around guidelines; medicolegal reasons and lack of training. | Health professional’s views on barriers to screening and treating GBS | Alamri et al., 2021; Almohaimeed et al., 2019; Davies et al., 2001; Gosling et al., 2002; Kolkman et al., 2017; Price et al., 2018 | 6 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had no or minor methodological concerns | **Moderate coherence –** there are some themes within this theme, mainly being organisation barriers, fear of consequences, guidelines and training. | **Low adequacy:** There is one paper that has very rich descriptions. However, there are only 6 papers. | **High relevance –** most published after WHO guidelines | **Moderate confidence** |
| 4.2.2. FacilitatorsFacilitators to GBS screening programmes vary across studies | Factors health professionals believe are facilitators to screening and treating GBS | Davies et al., 2001; Konrad et al., 2007; Mahieu et al., 2000 | 3 | **Moderate confidence –** all studies had minor methodological concerns | **Very Low coherence –** there is no overlap, no themes within the group | **Very Low adequacy:** Although there is richness of the data for one study, there are only 3 papers | **Low relevance –** most have low relevance | **Very low confidence** |
| 4.2.3 Adherence to screening protocolsAdherence to screening protocols varies across studies ranging from 21.3-100% for universal screening and 10-55% for screening under certain conditions | The percentages of health professionals or services that reported using a screening strategy  | Alamri et al., 2021; Almohaimeed et al., 2019; Davies et al., 2001; Gosling et al., 2002; Konrad et al., 2007; Lynfield et al., 2000; Mahieu et al., 2000; Melin et al., 2004; Peralta-Carcelen et al., 1997 | 9 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had no or minor methodological concerns | **Low coherence –** all about the same thing but the rates vary widely across all studies | **Moderate adequacy:** There is an adequate level of detail considering study design, and 9 papers in this theme | **Low relevance –** most studies published between 1996-2001 | **Low confidence** |
| 4.2.4 Adherence to timing of screening protocolsThere is not a clear pattern about whether health professionals adherence to vaginal vs rectal swabbing guidelines | When health professionals carry out swabbing | Davies et al., 2001; Lynfield et al., 2000; Yamaguchi and Ohashi, 2018 | 3 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had minor methodological concerns | **Low coherence –** again, same theme but very different results | **Very Low adequacy:** Adequate detail, but only 3 studies | **Low relevance –** most studies published between 1996-2001 | **Low confidence** |
| 4.2.5 Adherence to vaginal vs rectal swabbingThere is not a clear pattern about whether health professionals adherence to vaginal vs rectal swabbing guidelines | The number of health professionals who report vaginal vs rectal swabbing | Davies et al., 2001; Lynfield et al., 2000;  | 2 | **Low confidence –** most studies had minor or moderate methodological concerns | **Very Low coherence –** no clear pattern | **Very Low adequacy:** Adequate detail, but only 2 studies | **Low relevance –** all studies published between 1996-2001 | **Very low confidence** |
| 4.2.6 Adherence to antibiotic prophylaxis protocolsPositive test antibiotic use ranged from: 50-87%; positive screen + positive risk factor antibiotic use ranged from: 13-99%; Positive risk factor but no positive screen antibiotic use ranged from: 38-80% | The percentage of health professionals or service providers who reported using antibiotic treatment | Alamri et al., 2021; Almohaimeed et al., 2019; Davies et al., 2001; Konrad et al., 2007; Lynfield et al., 2000; Mahieu et al. 2000; McLaughlin & Crowther, 2000; Yamaguchi and Ohashi, 2018 | 8 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had minor methodological concerns | **Low coherence –** about the same topic but again the rates vary widely | **Moderate adequacy:** There is an adequate level of detail considering study design, and 8 papers in this theme | **Low relevance –** most studies published between 1996-2001 | **Low confidence** |
| 4.2.7 Professional characteristics and adherence Obstetricians and gynaecologists may be more likely to follow policies than nurses/midwives, and those who have worked less time may be more likely to follow policies | Characteristics that are associated with adherence to swabbing protocols and procedures | Alamri et al., 2021; Davies et al., 2001; Lynfield et al., 2000; Mahieu et al., 2000 | 4 | **Moderate confidence –** most of the studies had minor methodological concerns | **Low coherence –** different finds related to most variables apart from clinician | **Very Low adequacy:** Adequate detail, but only 4 studies | **Low relevance –** most studies published between 1996-2001 | **Low confidence** |
| 4.2.8 Improving adherenceMost health professionals saw training as important for increasing adherence  | Factors health professionals see as important for improving engagement with GBS protocols | Alamri et al., 2021; Almohaimeed et al., 2019; Price et al., 2006 | 3 | **Moderate confidence –** all studies had minor methodological concerns | **Moderate coherence –** most think it is an important training need | **Very Low adequacy:** Adequate detail, but only 3 studies | **High relevance –** most published after WHO guidelines | **Moderate confidence**  |