

1 **Original Review Article**

2 **Feasibility, Acceptability, and Effectiveness of Group Antenatal Care on the Continuum of**
3 **Care and Perinatal Outcomes in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Systematic Review and Meta-**
4 **analysis Protocol**

5 Meresa Berwo Mengesha¹, Tesfaye Temesgen Chekole², Hiluf Ebuy Abraha³, Etsay Weldekidan
6 Tsegay⁴, Abadi Hailay Atsbaha⁵, Mihretab Gebreslassie⁶, Zenawi Hagos Gufue⁷

7 ¹Department of Midwifery, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Adigrat University,
8 Adigrat, Ethiopia,

9 ²Department of Midwifery, Unit of Maternity and Reproductive Health, College of Medicine and
10 Health Sciences, Dilla University, Dilla, Ethiopia,

11 ³Hospital Quality, Ayder Comprehensive Hospital, Mekelle University, Mekelle, Tigray,
12 Ethiopia, PhD candidate at Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Arnold School of
13 Public Health, University of South Carolina.

14 ⁴Department of Pharmacology, Researcher at Tigray Health Research Institute, Mekelle,
15 Ethiopia,

16 ⁵Department of Public Health, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Adigrat University,
17 Adigrat, Ethiopia,

18 ⁶PhD student at Centre for Epidemiology and Community Medicine, Stockholm, Sweden,
19 Department of Global Public Health, Karolinska Institute, Sweden.

20 ⁷Department of Public Health, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Adigrat University,
21 Adigrat, Ethiopia

22

23

24

25

26 **Abstract**

27 **Introduction:** In sub-Saharan Africa, the predominant model of individualized, one-on-one
28 antenatal care has not significantly improved perinatal outcomes. Although the benefits of group
29 antenatal care have been demonstrated in developed countries, its feasibility, acceptability, and
30 effectiveness in resource limited settings, particularly in sub-Saharan African countries, have yet
31 to be fully investigated. However, pilot studies show promising evidence of its effectiveness in
32 these areas. This systematic review and meta-analysis will, therefore, review and summarize
33 available studies and provide comprehensive and robust evidence that tends to contribute to the
34 ongoing efforts to implement group prenatal care models in low-resource settings.

35 **Methods and analysis:** This systematic review protocol adheres to the Preferred Reporting
36 Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols guidelines. A comprehensive
37 literature search will be conducted across multiple electronic databases, including
38 PubMed/MEDLINE, Web of Science, EMBASE, and CINHAL, to identify pertinent articles
39 published from January 1, 2016, to June 30, 2024. Experimental studies (pre-post, quasi-
40 experimental study, cluster randomized controlled trial), prospective cohort design, prospective
41 comparative study, and qualitative and mixed method designs will be included in the review.
42 Abstract and full-text screening will be conducted by three reviewers using Covidence,
43 according to the eligibility criteria set. The Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal
44 Tools, specifically designed for JBI Systematic Reviews, will be utilized to assess the
45 methodological quality of the included studies. Statistical heterogeneity will be assessed using
46 the Higgins test. Meta-analysis will be performed using R version 3.6.1 software and STATA
47 version 16; applying random effects models to determine the weights. Pre-specified subgroup
48 analysis and sensitivity analysis will be conducted as necessary. The study results will be
49 reported sequentially, beginning with the primary outcomes, followed by secondary outcomes,
50 and important subgroup analyses.

51 **Ethics and dissemination:** Ethical approval is not applicable as no original data will be
52 collected. The findings of this review will be disseminated through publication and conference
53 presentations.

54 **PROSPERO registration number CRD42024565501.**

55

56 **Introduction**

57 Antenatal care (ANC) uptake is a crucial indicator for evaluating progress towards improving
58 maternal outcomes (1). The provision of high-quality, women-centered ANC is especially crucial
59 in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs), where pregnancy and perinatal outcomes are
60 often disproportionately poor (2, 3, 4). In LMICs, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, the
61 predominant model of individualized, one-on-one care has not significantly improved perinatal
62 outcomes (5). In contrast, group ANC (G-ANC) has emerged as a viable alternative service
63 delivery model in high-income countries, linked to increased attendance, improved satisfaction,
64 and better health outcomes for pregnant women and newborns (3, 6, 7). This model is also
65 shown to benefit marginalized women, whose perinatal outcomes are comparable to those in
66 developed countries (8, 9).

67 The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends G-ANC as an alternative to individual
68 ANC, based on rigorous research and its contextual guidance promoting community mobilization
69 through facilitated participatory learning and action cycles (9). The G-ANC is a transformative
70 service delivery model that provides care to groups of eight to twelve pregnant women who are
71 at similar gestational ages through cascades of scheduled meetings (10). This model incorporates
72 physical assessments, education, skill development, and peer support and takes a more holistic,
73 woman-centered approach in contrast to traditional ANC (11).

74 The Global G-ANC Collaborative acknowledges that it is crucial to adapt G-ANC models to the
75 unique local contexts and priorities of LMICs to guarantee ownership, sustainability, and
76 expansion (10). However, several challenges hinder the implementation of G-ANC in various
77 settings, including recruiting and retaining participants, inadequate training and resources, a lack
78 of focus on individual needs, financial barriers, and poor access to healthcare (12, 13, 14). These
79 challenges can be overcome by developing effective recruitment and retention strategies,
80 utilizing mixed methods to assess fidelity and investigate the potential of G-ANC-facilitated
81 community groups, and implementing cost-effective measures (15, 16, 17).

82 Various studies have demonstrated that, as compared to the individualized care model, G-ANC is
83 associated with increased attendance at ANC visits, improved quality of care, higher rates of
84 facility-based deliveries, enhanced health literacy and client satisfaction, increased uptake of

85 family planning methods, better birth weights, and higher rates of breastfeeding initiation and
86 duration (18, 19, 20). Although the benefits of G-ANC have been demonstrated in developed
87 countries, its feasibility, acceptability, and effectiveness in LMICs, particularly in sub-Saharan
88 African, have yet to be fully researched. However, individual studies have reported encouraging
89 results regarding the model's efficacy in these areas, indicating the potential of G-ANC to
90 enhance maternal and neonatal health outcomes in low-income settings (21, 22).

91 Therefore, a comprehensive and robust review of these studies is of paramount importance to
92 evaluate the ongoing efforts to implement G-ANC models in diverse socio-economic contexts.
93 This review defines G-ANC as the combination of conventional antenatal assessments with
94 group discussions and support. The objective of this review is to synthesize the available
95 evidence on the feasibility of G-ANC service delivery models in low-resource settings, its
96 effectiveness of G-ANC in increasing ANC retention and facility-based deliveries, and its
97 acceptability among pregnant women and community health workers. Additionally, this review
98 aims to determine the overall impact of G-ANC on perinatal outcomes and the utilization of
99 other maternal health services in sub-Saharan African countries.

100 **Methods**

101 **Eligibility Criteria**

102 **Population**

103 This review focuses on adult and adolescent pregnant women of diverse vulnerable populations
104 in low-resource settings who are disadvantaged, marginalized, have normal or adverse pregnancy
105 outcomes, have limited access to quality health care, and live in sub-Saharan Africa.

106 **Exposure**

107 G-ANC and/or Participatory Group

108 **Comparator**

109 For this review, the reference group comprises women whose ANC was provided by
110 individualized, standard, conventional, or traditional models of care.

111 **Outcomes**

112 **Primary outcomes**

113 The effectiveness of G-ANC in increasing ANC retention and facility-based deliveries, its effect
114 on perinatal outcomes (such as birth weight, preterm birth, neonatal intensive care unit
115 admission, gestational age, maternal morbidity, and death), its influence on the utilization of
116 other maternal health services (including family planning, postnatal care, assisted delivery,
117 breastfeeding initiation, and duration).

118 **Secondary outcomes**

119 The feasibility of G-ANC service and its acceptability by pregnant women and community
120 health workers will be considered secondary outcomes.

121 **Setting and language**

122 This review will focus on settings in sub-Saharan Africa, considering publication from January
123 1, 2016, to June 30, 2024, and publications published only in English.

124 **Study design**

125 Experimental studies (pre-post, quasi-experimental study, cluster randomized controlled trial),
126 prospective cohort design, prospective comparative study, and qualitative and mixed method
127 approach studies will be included in the review.

128 **Exclusion**

129 This review will exclude preprints, unpublished reviews, case reports, case series, commentaries,
130 editor's letters, and non-English publications.

131 **Information sources**

132 A comprehensive literature search will be conducted in various electronic databases, including
133 PubMed/MEDLINE, Web of Science, EMBASE, and CINHALL, to identify pertinent articles.
134 Information sources will be updated before submission to ensure all relevant studies are
135 included. To guarantee the inclusion of all relevant studies, the reference lists of selected studies
136 and systematic reviews with a similar scope will also be scanned.

137 **Search strategy**

138 The search strategy for identifying relevant literature was constructed using a combination of
139 Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) and keyword terms that pertained to both the exposure and
140 outcome of interest. Specific criteria were applied to the literature search, including restrictions
141 on the date, language, and location of publication. Table 1 displays the pilot search strategies for

142 PubMed and MEDLINE. The search will be further refined to target articles published in sub-
 143 Saharan Africa.

144 Table 1: Pilot search in the PubMed/MEDLINE database, June 30, 2024

| Database | Search restriction | Search strategy | # |
|--------------------|--|---|------------|
| PubMed/ MEDLINE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From January 1, 2016, to June 30, 2024 • English • Exclude preprints | <p>#1 AND</p> <p>("Group antenatal care"[Text Word]) OR ("who antenatal care"[Text Word]) OR ("antenatal care services"[Text Word]) OR ("prenatal care"[Text Word]) OR ("participatory group"[Text Word]) OR ("positive pregnancy experiences"[Text Word]) NOT ("traditional antenatal care"[Text Word]) NOT ("individual antenatal care"[Text Word])</p> <p>#2 AND</p> <p>("Impact"[Text Word]) OR ("effect"[Text Word]) OR ("effectiveness of care"[Text Word]) AND ("continuum of care"[Text Word]) OR ("continuity of care"[Text Word]) OR ("utilization of antenatal care"[Text Word]) OR ("antenatal care attendance"[Text Word]) OR ("facility delivery"[Text Word]) OR ("quality of care"[Text Word]) OR ("postnatal attendance"[Text Word]) AND ("maternal self-efficacy"[Text Word]) OR ("maternal outcomes"[Text Word]) OR ("fetal outcomes"[Text Word]) OR ("perinatal outcomes"[Text Word])</p> <p>#3 AND</p> <p>Angola* OR Benin* OR Botswana* OR "Burkina</p> | 111 |

| | | | |
|--|--|--|--|
| | | Faso*" OR Burundi* OR "Cape Verde*" OR Cameroon* OR "Central African Republic*" OR Chad* OR Comoros* OR Congo* OR "Democratic Republic of Congo*" OR "Republic of Cote d'Ivoire*" OR "Equatorial Guinea*" OR Eritrea* OR Eswatini* OR Swaziland* OR Ethiopia* OR Gabon* OR Gambia* OR Ghana* OR Guinea* OR Guinea-Bissau* OR Kenya* OR Lesotho* OR Liberia* OR Madagascar* OR Malawi* OR Mali* OR Mauritania* OR Mauritius* OR Mozambique* OR Namibia* OR Niger* OR Nigeria* OR Rwanda* OR "Sao Tome and Principe*" OR Senegal* OR Seychelles* OR "Sierra Leone*" OR Somalia* OR "South Africa*" OR "South Sudan*" OR Sudan* OR Tanzania* OR Togo* OR Uganda* OR Zambia* OR Zimbabwe* OR "West Africa*" OR "southern Africa*" OR "south Africa*" OR "east Africa*" OR Africa* OR "sub-Saharan Africa*" | |
|--|--|--|--|

145 **Protocol**

146 The protocol for this systematic review was reported following the Preferred Reporting Items for
147 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) guidelines (23). This review was
148 registered on PROSPERO with registration number of CRD42024565501.

149

150 **Patient and public involvement**

151 Patients and/or the public were not involved in the design, conduct, report or dissemination plan
152 of this research

153 **Data management**

154 The findings retrieved from the literature search will be imported, screened, and analyzed using
155 professional software platforms such as STATA, R Studio, and Covidence. Covidence will

156 facilitate the automatic elimination of duplications, coupled with a manual verification process
157 for identifying resemblances among studies (e.g., publication year, authorship, journal details,
158 etc.) conducted by the authors.

159 **Selection process**

160 Three reviewers (MG, ZHG, and HEA) will conduct abstract and full-text screening according to
161 the eligibility criteria using Covidence. Any discrepancies among the three reviewers will be
162 resolved with the assistance of other reviewers (MBM). A separate section will be set up in
163 Excel specifically for relevant studies identified during full-text screening, which will include
164 examination of reference lists of included studies and systematic reviews within the same
165 domain. Rationales for exclusion will be meticulously recorded throughout the full-text
166 screening process. A conclusive determination concerning the inclusion of studies will be
167 reached by considering the outcomes of both Covidence and the spreadsheet. The presentation of
168 study selection results will be facilitated by employing PRISMA flow diagrams (**Figure 1**).

169 **Data collection**

170 A standardized data collection tool will be developed in the form of a data extraction form.
171 Subsequently, this form will undergo a pilot test among various groups, with potential
172 modifications being made based on feedback received. Three reviewers (EWT, AHA, and TTC)
173 will independently extract data from the studies included in the analysis. To ensure consistency
174 in assessment methods, the reviewers will undergo a calibration exercise. In cases of
175 discrepancies between reviewers, the principal investigator (MBM) will be consulted for
176 resolution.

177 **Data items**

178 The following data items will be extracted from included studies: (1) Study data: title, author
179 name, year of publication, country of study, journal, sample size, study period, study design,
180 follow-up period (for experimental and cohort) and limitations; (2) Population: participant
181 characteristics (number of group of women, number of women per group, how women are
182 grouped, number of leaders in the group, who leads the group, the total number of group sessions
183 (ANC sessions), length of the group session, etc.); (3) Intervention: G-ANC, or participatory
184 group, involves assessing their experience, perspective, and outcomes within the group settings.
185 (4) Comparison: the comparator used in the studies is conventional care or individualized ANC.
186 (5) Outcomes: a composite of outcome events (feasibility, acceptability, effectiveness on

187 perinatal outcomes, and continuum of care). (6) Effect measures: reported effect measures for the
188 reported effect measures in the composite outcomes, either quantitatively or qualitatively
189 synthesized, separate outcomes if available, including P-values, standard deviation, relative risk,
190 hazard ratio, and confidence interval.

191 **Outcomes and prioritization**

192 The findings of available evidence on the feasibility of G-ANC service delivery in low-resource
193 settings and its acceptability to pregnant women and community health workers will be
194 synthesized. Comprehensive data on the effectiveness of G-ANC in increasing antenatal care
195 retention and facility-based deliveries and the effect of G-ANC on perinatal outcomes and
196 utilization of other reproductive health services will be collected. Determining the composite of
197 perinatal outcomes and continuum of care will be considered the main outcome, while the other
198 reported outcome events can be regarded as secondary outcomes.

199 **Risk of bias assessment**

200 The use of Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Critical Appraisal Tools, specifically designed for JBI
201 Systematic Reviews of both quantitative and qualitative studies, will be used to evaluate the
202 methodological quality of the included studies (24, 25). To assess the quality of articles for
203 cohort, non-randomized, quasi-experimental, and randomized controlled trial (RCT) studies, the
204 JBI Critical Appraisal Tools, which comprise specific checklists for each of the study designs,
205 will be utilized. Two assessors (MG and HEA) will evaluate the quality of each research study,
206 with a third reviewer (MBM) involved in resolving any discrepancies.

207

208 **Data synthesis**

209 The characteristics of pregnant women (number of groups, group size, number of women
210 grouped, number of leaders in the group, who leads the group, the total number of group sessions
211 (number of ANC), follow-up periods for the outcome and setups for G-ANC) will be assessed.
212 Statistical heterogeneity will be assessed using the Higgins test, where the I^2 statistics will be
213 determined and reported. If the studies included in the analysis are homogeneous, a meta-
214 analysis will be conducted to calculate the overall effect of G-ANC on the continuum of care and
215 perinatal outcomes compared to conventional individualized care.

216 This analysis will be performed using R version 3.6.1 software, and random effects will be used
217 to determine the weights for the meta-analysis if necessary after carefully exploring the presence

218 and nature of heterogeneity. If there is high heterogeneity ($I^2 \geq 50\%$ or $P < 0.1$) or if the data is
219 incomplete, a qualitative synthesis will be conducted instead of a meta-analysis. If various types
220 of effect measures are utilized in the original studies, such as odds ratios, risk ratios, and hazard
221 ratios, the meta-analysis will be conducted for each type of effect measures. The study results
222 will be reported sequentially, commencing with primary outcomes, followed by secondary
223 outcomes and important subgroup analysis based on design, setup, country/region context, and
224 methods of group classification. These methods will be conducted to investigate the possible
225 causes of variability between studies and to explore the strength of the meta-analysis.

226 Given that the effectiveness of G-ANC can be greatly affected by the country's context, policy,
227 and resources, stratification will be made based on the country's context or region (Eastern
228 Africa, Western Africa, South Africa, and Central Africa). Additionally, study results will be
229 stratified based on the setup where the G-ANC was conducted (facility-based vs. community-
230 based intervention). Furthermore, study results will be stratified based on study design to assess
231 whether the study design influences the association between exposure and outcomes. The
232 number of women in a group and how they are grouped may impact the effectiveness of G-ANC.

233 For qualitative synthesis, we will put forward summary and narrative statements and quotes from
234 the experience of pregnant women, group leaders, and health workers toward the feasibility and
235 acceptability of G-ANC.

236 **Meta-bias (es)**

237 Outcome reporting biases will be assessed by comparing outcomes documented in research
238 protocols with those reported in the actual study reports. Additionally, sensitivity analysis using
239 STATA will evaluate the impact of selective reporting on the results of meta-analyses, if deemed
240 necessary. The use of funnel plots will also be employed to investigate potential publication bias.

241 **Confidence in cumulative evidence**

242 The Grading of Recommendations, Assessment, Development, and Evaluation working group
243 methodology will be used to assess the quality of evidence for all outcomes. The assessment will
244 consider the domains of risk of bias, consistency, directness, precision, and publication bias. Due
245 to the mixed nature of the studies comprising this review, including both observational and
246 experimental research, the evidence will initially be assessed as moderate. However, if a

247 substantial effect size is present, a dose-response relationship is established, or all potential
248 biases are minimal, the strength of the evidence may be potentially being upgraded (26).

249 **Ethics and dissemination**

250 Ethical approval is not applicable, as no original data will be collected. The findings of this
251 review will be disseminated through publication and conference presentations.

252

253

254

255

256

257

258

259 **References**

- 260 1. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive
261 pregnancy experience: screening, diagnosis and treatment of tuberculosis disease in
262 pregnant women: evidence-to-action brief: highlights and key messages from the World
263 Health Organization's 2016 global recommendations. [Internet]. World Health
264 Organization; 2022 [cited 2024 Jun 18]. Available from:
265 <https://iris.who.int/handle/10665/365953>.
- 266 2. Ickovics JR, Kershaw TS, Westdahl C, Magriples U, Massey Z, Reynolds H, et al. Group
267 prenatal care and perinatal outcomes: a randomized controlled trial. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2007
268 Aug;110(2 Pt 1):330-9. Erratum in: *Obstet Gynecol*. 2007 Oct;110(4):937.
- 269 3. Earnshaw VA, Rosenthal L, Cunningham SD, Kershaw T, Lewis J, Rising SS, et al.
270 Exploring Group Composition among Young, Urban Women of Color in Prenatal Care:
271 Implications for Satisfaction, Engagement, and Group Attendance. *Womens Health Issues*.
272 2016 Jan-Feb;26(1):110-5.

- 273 4. Ickovics JR, Earnshaw V, Lewis JB, Kershaw TS, Magriples U, Stasko E, et al. Cluster
274 Randomized Controlled Trial of Group Prenatal Care: Perinatal Outcomes Among
275 Adolescents in New York City Health Centers. *Am J Public Health*. 2016 Feb;106(2):359-
276 65.
- 277 5. Ahmed SAE, Mahimbo A, Dawson A. Quality intrapartum care expectations and
278 experiences of women in sub-Saharan African Low and Low Middle-Income Countries: a
279 qualitative meta-synthesis. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2023 Jan 14; 23(1):27.
- 280 6. Magriples U, Boynton MH, Kershaw TS, Lewis J, Rising SS, Tobin JN, et al. The impact of
281 group prenatal care on pregnancy and postpartum weight trajectories. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*.
282 2015 Nov;213(5):688.e1-9.
- 283 7. Tanner-Smith EE, Steinka-Fry KT, Gesell SB. Comparative effectiveness of group and
284 individual prenatal care on gestational weight gain. *Matern Child Health J*. 2014
285 Sep;18(7):1711-20.
- 286 8. Picklesimer AH, Billings D, Hale N, Blackhurst D, Covington-Kolb S. The effect of
287 Centering Pregnancy group prenatal care on preterm birth in a low-income population. *Am J*
288 *Obstet Gynecol*. 2012 May;206(5):415.e1-7.
- 289 9. Liu R, Chao MT, Jostad-Laswell A, Duncan LG. Does Centering Pregnancy Group Prenatal
290 Care Affect the Birth Experience of Underserved Women? A Mixed Methods Analysis. *J*
291 *Immigr Minor Health*. 2017 Apr;19(2):415-422.
- 292 10. World Health Organization. WHO recommendations on antenatal care for a positive
293 pregnancy experience – Highlights and Key Messages [Internet]. [cited 2024 Jun 18].
294 Available from: <https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/WHO-RHR-18.02>.
- 295 11. Grenier L, Lori JR, Darney BG, Noguchi LM, Maru S, Klima C, et al. Building a Global
296 Evidence Base to Guide Policy and Implementation for Group Antenatal Care in Low- and
297 Middle-Income Countries: Key Principles and Research Framework Recommendations
298 from the Global Group Antenatal Care Collaborative. *J Midwifery Womens Health*. 2020
299 Sep;65(5): 694-699.
- 300 12. Sharma J, O'Connor M, Rima Jolivet R. Group antenatal care models in low- and middle-
301 income countries: a systematic evidence synthesis. *Reprod Health*. 2018 Mar 5;15(1):38.

- 302 13. Ahrne M, Byrskog U, Essén B, Andersson E, Small R, Schytt E. Group antenatal care
303 compared with standard antenatal care for Somali-Swedish women: a historically controlled
304 evaluation of the Hooyo Project. *BMJ Open*. 2023 Jan 25;13(1):e066000.
- 305 14. Singh K. Group Antenatal Care in Rwanda: Examining Successes and Challenges in
306 Implementation [Internet]. UC Berkeley; 2020 [cited 2024 Jun 18]. Available from:
307 <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/0bb114x3>.
- 308 15. Umar MA. The Role of Group Antenatal Care in Reducing Maternal Morbidity and
309 Mortality Rate Among Pregnant Mothers Attending Primary Health Care Facilities: A Case
310 Study of Angwan Waje PHCC in Keffi LGA of Nasarawa State, Nigeria. *TEXILA Int J*
311 *PUBLIC Health*. 2022 Sep 30;10(3):329–39.
- 312 16. Lori J, Munro ML, Ofofu-darkwah H, Chuey M, Boyd C, Adanu R. Improving health
313 literacy through facilitated group focused antenatal care. *Ann Glob Health*. 2015 Mar
314 12;81(1):78.
- 315 17. Wiggins M, Sawtell M, Wiseman O, McCourt C, Eldridge S, Hunter R, et al. Group
316 antenatal care (Pregnancy Circles) for diverse and disadvantaged women: study protocol for
317 a randomised controlled trial with integral process and economic evaluations. *BMC Health*
318 *Services Research*. 2020 Dec;20:1-4.
- 319 18. Hale N, Picklesimer AH, Billings DL, Covington-Kolb S. The impact of Centering
320 Pregnancy Group Prenatal Care on postpartum family planning. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2014
321 Jan; 210(1):50.e1-7.
- 322 19. Manant A, Dodgson JE. Centering Pregnancy: an integrative literature review. *J Midwifery*
323 *Womens Health*. 2011 Mar-Apr;56(2):94-102.
- 324 20. McKinnon B, Sall M, Vander Morris A, Traoré M, Lamesse-Diedhiou F, McLaughlin K, et
325 al. Feasibility and preliminary effectiveness of group antenatal care in Senegalese health
326 posts: a pilot implementation trial. *Health Policy Plan*. 2020 Jun 1;35(5):587-599.
- 327 21. Sawtell M, Wiggins M, Wiseman O, Mehay A, McCourt C, Sweeney L, et al. Group
328 antenatal care: findings from a pilot randomised controlled trial of REACH Pregnancy
329 Circles. *Pilot Feasibility Stud*. 2023 Mar 16;9(1):42.
- 330 22. Lori JR, Williams JEO, Kukula VA, Apetorgbor VEA, Awini EA, Amankwah G, et al.
331 Group Antenatal Care in Ghana: Protocol for a Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial. *JMIR*
332 *Res Protoc*. 2022 Sep 9;11(9):e40828.

- 333 23. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
334 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015:
335 elaboration and explanation. *BMJ*. 2015 Jan 2; 350: g7647.
- 336 24. Moola S, Munn Z, Tufanaru C, Aromataris E, Sears K, Sfetcu R, et al. Systematic reviews
337 of etiology and risk (2020). Aromataris E, Lockwood C, Porritt K, Pilla B, Jordan Z,
338 editors. *JBIM Manual for Evidence Synthesis*. JBI; 2024. Available
339 from: <https://synthesismanual.jbi.global>. <https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-24-06>.
- 340 25. Porritt K, Gomersall J, Lockwood C. JBI's Systematic Reviews: Study selection and critical
341 appraisal. *Am J Nurs*. 2014 Jun;114(6):47-52.
- 342 26. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Kunz R, Falck-Ytter Y, Alonso-Coello P, et al. GRADE:
343 an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations.
344 *BMJ*. 2008 Apr 26;336(7650):924-6.

345

346 **Authors Contributions**

347 All the authors have made substantial intellectual contributions to the development of the
348 protocol; MBM and ZHG conceptualized and designed the study. MBM and EWT
349 formulated the search strategy. HEA developed the data synthesis section. MG and AHA
350 drafted the risk of bias assessment section. TTC and HEA developed the meta-bias and
351 confidence in cumulative evidence sections. TTC drafted the information sources and search
352 strategy sections. MBM drafted the remaining sections of the protocol. ZHG and MG
353 critically reviewed and revised the protocol. All authors read and approved the final version
354 of the protocol. MBM serves as the guarantor of the protocol.

355 **Funding:** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,
356 commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

357 **Competing interests:** The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

358




Figure 1 : PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases, registers and other sources