

Treatment of COVID-19 in pregnant women

PregCOV-19 Group

DOI:

[10.1016/j.ejogrb.2021.10.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2021.10.007)

License:

Creative Commons: Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs (CC BY-NC-ND)

Document Version

Peer reviewed version

Citation for published version (Harvard):

PregCOV-19 Group 2021, 'Treatment of COVID-19 in pregnant women: a systematic review and meta-analysis', *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, vol. 267, pp. 120-128.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2021.10.007>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

General rights

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

Take down policy

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

Treatment of COVID-19 in pregnant women: a systematic review

Author names and affiliations:

Steven Giesbers, Edwina Goh, Tania Kew, John Allotey, Heinke Kunst, Mercedes Bonet, Shakila Thangaratinam.

PregCOV-19 Group: Shaunak Chatterjee, Andrea Gae, Elena Stallings, Magnus Yap, Jameela Sheikh, Heidi Lawson, Dyuti Coomar, Anushka Dixit, Dengyi Zhou, Rishab Balaji, Megan Littmoden, Yasmin King, Luke Debenham, Anna Clavé Llavall, Kehkashan Ansari, Guirmaan Sandu, Adeolu Banjoko Helen Fraser, Tanisha Rajah, Anoushka Ramkumar, Alya Khashaba, Shruit Attarde, Kate Walker, Jim Thornton, Madelon van Wely, Elizabeth van Leeuwen, Elena Kostova, Asma Khalil, Simon Tiberi, Vanessa Brizuela, Nathalie Broutet, Edna Kara, Caron Rahn Kim, Anna Thorson, Olufemi T Oladapo, Javier Zamora, Lynne Mofenson,

Birmingham Women's and Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, United Kingdom (S Giesbers MD, E Goh BMBS); University of Birmingham, WHO Collaborating Centre for Global Women's Health, Institute of Metabolism and Systems Research (J Allotey PhD, S Thangaratinam PhD, J Zamora PhD), Institute of Applied Health Research (J Allotey PhD, S I Lee MPH, M Yuan MPH, D Coomar MSc), and Birmingham Medical School (M Yap BMedSc, S Chatterjee BSc, T Kew BSc, L Debenham BMedSc, A Clavé Llavall BMedSc, A Dixit BSc, D Zhou BMedSc, R Balaji BSc, M Littmoden, Y King BMedSc, H Lawson BMedSc, K Ansari BMedSc, G Sandu, J Sheikh BMedSc, A Banjoko BSc, H Fraser, T Rajah, A Ramkumar, A Khashaba, S Attarde), Birmingham, United Kingdom; Clinical Biostatistics Unit, Hospital Universitario Ramón y Cajal (IRYCIS), Madrid, Spain (E Stallings MSc, J

Zamora PhD); CIBER Epidemiology and Public Health (CIBERESP), Madrid, Spain (E Stallings MSc, J Zamora PhD); Division of Birth Cohort Study (X Qiu PhD, M Yuan MPH), Department of Woman and Child Health Care (X Qiu PhD), and Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology (X Qiu PhD), Guangzhou Women and Children's Medical Centre, Guangzhou Medical University, Guangzhou, China; Faculty of Medicine & Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, United Kingdom (K Walker PhD, J Thornton MD); Netherlands Satellite of the Cochrane Gynaecology and Fertility Group Netherlands (M van Wely PhD, E Kostova PhD), and Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology (E van Leeuwen MD), Amsterdam University Medical Centre, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; Blizard Institute, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom (H Kunst MD, S Tiberi MD); Barts Health NHS Trust, London, United Kingdom (H Kunst, S Tiberi); St George's University London, London, United Kingdom (A Khalil MD); UNDP/UNFPA/UNICEF/WHO/World Bank Special Programme of Research, Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction (HRP), Department of Sexual and Reproductive Health and Research, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland (V Brizuela DrPH, N Broutet MD, E Kara MBBS, C R Kim MD, A Thorson PhD, O T Oladapo MPH, M Bonet PhD); Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation, Washington DC, United States (L Mofenson MD); Birmingham Women's and Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, United Kingdom (S Thangaratinam PhD)

Correspondence to: Prof Shakila Thangaratinam, WHO Collaborating Centre for Global Women's Health, Institute of Metabolism and Systems Research, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, B15 2TT, United Kingdom

s.thangaratinam.1@bham.ac.uk

Highlights

- Pregnancy-specific interventions, such as the mode of delivery or the type of anaesthesia appears to be related with severity of disease, but not with perinatal outcomes.
- There is an association with caesarean section and the likelihood of being admitted to ICU or due to adverse effects of COVID-19 pneumonia.
- We encourage researchers to include pregnant women in their trials and when they did so, to report them separately.

Abstract page

Treatment of COVID-19 in pregnant women: a systematic review

Steven Giesbers, Edwina Goh, Tania Kew, John Allotey, Heinke Kunst, Mercedes Bonet, Shakila Thangaratinam

Objective

Clinical trials evaluating pharmacological and non-pharmacological treatment of COVID-19, either excluded pregnant women or included very few women. Unlike the numerous systematic reviews on prevalence, symptoms and adverse outcomes of COVID-19 in pregnancy, there are very few on the effects of treatment on maternal and neonatal outcomes in pregnancy. We undertook a systematic review of all published and unpublished studies on the effects of pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions for COVID-19 on maternal, pregnancy and neonatal outcomes.

Data sources

We performed a systematic literature search of the following databases: Medline, Embase, Cochrane database, WHO (World Health Organization) COVID-19 database, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), and Wanfang databases from 1 December 2019 to 1 December 2020.

Study eligibility criteria

Studies were only included if they involved pregnant or postnatal women who were exposed to pregnancy specific interventions like the mode of delivery and type of anaesthesia, pharmacological or non-pharmacological interventions.

Study appraisal and synthesis methods

We first screened the titles and abstracts of studies and then assessed the full text of the selected studies in detail for eligibility. Data on study design, population, type of screening for COVID-19, country, hospital, country status (high or low and middle income), treatment given (mode of delivery, type of anaesthesia, type of pharmacological and non-pharmacological treatment) was extracted. The pre-defined maternal outcomes we collected were severe or critical COVID-19 (as defined by the authors), symptomatic COVID-19, maternal death, maternal hospital admission, ICU admission, mechanical ventilation, ECMO and maternal pneumonia. The pre-defined neonatal outcomes we extracted were preterm birth (<37 weeks), mode of delivery (vaginal or by caesarean section), stillbirth, neonatal death, NICU admission, neonatal COVID-19 positive, neonatal acidosis (pH<7.0) and Apgar scores (<8 after 5 minutes). Study quality assessment was performed.

Results

From a total of 342 potential eligible studies, we included 27 studies in our systematic review. Sixteen studies had a retrospective cohort design and 11 a prospective cohort design. There were no randomised controlled trials. There was a significant association between caesarean section and admission to ICU (OR 4.99, 95% CI 1.24 to 20.12), and diagnosis of maternal COVID-19 pneumonia as defined by study authors (OR 3.09, 95% CI 1.52 to 6.28). Women who had a preterm birth were more likely to have the baby via caesarean section (OR 3.03, 95% CI 1.71 to 5.36). For pharmacological and non-pharmacological we provided estimates of the expected rates of outcomes in women exposed to various treatment of COVID-19, however comparative data for pregnant women, in particular for treatments proven to be effective in the general population, is lacking, to provide clinically meaningful interpretation.

Conclusions

We found associations for pregnancy specific interventions, like mode of delivery and outcomes of the disease, but there was too few data on pharmacological and non-pharmacological treatment in pregnant women with COVID-19. We did report the rates of complications found in the literature. We encourage researchers to include pregnant women in their trials and report the data on pregnant women separately.

Keywords

COVID-19, pregnancy, treatment, systematic review, neonatal

Introduction

Pregnant women with coronavirus disease (COVID-19) are more likely to have severe COVID-19 and complications than non-pregnant women with COVID-19 of similar age group, although symptoms and clinical presentation can be the same as in the general population.(1) In addition, adverse pregnancy outcomes, such as preterm delivery, maternal death and admission on intensive care unit (ICU), are seen in pregnant women with COVID-19 compared to those without the disease.(1) Many pharmacological interventions for treatment of COVID-19 have been used, but few, like Remdesivir and systemic steroids have been shown to be effective.(2) Non-pharmacological interventions like proning or invasive and non-invasive mechanical ventilation have been applied in pregnancy, but their impact on the course of the disease and on the pregnancy outcomes are not known in this specific group. Lastly, there are certain interventions that are specific to pregnancy, such as the mode of delivery or type of anaesthesia, which are only applicable to pregnant women. In pregnant women with COVID-19, these interventions have been used as forms of treatment, although their impact on COVID-19 and pregnancy related outcomes is not known.

Clinical trials evaluating pharmacological and non-pharmacological treatment of COVID-19, either excluded pregnant women or included very few.(3) This has resulted in very little information on maternal and neonatal outcomes in pregnant women who have been exposed to these interventions. Unlike the numerous systematic reviews on prevalence, symptoms and adverse outcomes of COVID-19 in

pregnancy, there are very few on the effects of treatment on maternal and neonatal outcomes in pregnancy.

To fill in the evidence gap, we undertook a systematic review of all published and unpublished studies on the effects of pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions for COVID-19 on maternal and neonatal pregnancy outcomes.

Methods

This systematic review is part of an ongoing set of living systematic reviews on COVID-19 in pregnancy, using a prospectively registered protocol (PROSPERO CRD42040178076; registered 22 April 2020) published elsewhere.(4) In this paper we specifically report the effects of pharmacological and non-pharmacological interventions on pregnancy outcomes. We also report on the complication rates of pregnancy specific interventions, such as mode of delivery and type of anaesthesia. We carried out our systematic review using the preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analysis (PRISMA) recommendations (see appendix xxx).

Literature search

The PregCOV-19 Living Systematic Review Consortium performed a systematic literature search of the following databases: Medline, Embase, Cochrane database, WHO (World Health Organization) COVID-19 database, China National Knowledge Infrastructure (CNKI), and Wanfang databases from 1 December 2019 to 1 December 2020. The details of the search strategy are published elsewhere.

(1)

Study selection

Two reviewers (SG and EG) independently selected studies using a two-stage process: they first screened the titles and abstracts of studies and then assessed the full text of the selected studies in detail for eligibility. Studies were included if they involved pregnant or postnatal women who were exposed to pregnancy specific interventions like the mode of delivery and type of anaesthesia, pharmacological or non-pharmacological interventions. Pharmacological interventions includes antiviral, immunotherapy, (systemic) corticosteroids, antibiotics or combinations of these interventions and non-pharmacological interventions comprised mechanical ventilation, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) or proning. The studies also needed to report on COVID-19 related pregnancy or neonatal outcomes. Pregnancy outcomes were severe or critical COVID-19 (as defined by the individual study authors), symptomatic COVID-19, maternal death, maternal hospital admission, ICU admission, mechanical ventilation, ECMO, maternal pneumonia, preterm birth (<37 weeks), caesarean section, stillbirth, neonatal death (up to 28 days), neonatal intensive care unit (NICU) admission, neonatal COVID-19 positive, neonatal acidosis (pH <7.0) and Apgar scores (<8 after 5 minutes). Disagreements were resolved through discussion with a third reviewer (ST or JA). We included only cohort studies or case-series that reported on more than 10 women. We excluded studies that reported on duplicate data for the outcomes of interest when this was reported by the authors or when we found that the characteristics of the studies were similar to each other.

Quality assessment and data extraction

To assess the quality of comparative cohort studies for selection, comparability and outcome ascertainment bias we used the Hoy et al tool.⁽⁵⁾ For internal validity we considered studies to be of low risk of bias when the data was collected directly from the subjects, the outcomes of interest were clearly defined, the data was collected from medical records and done in the same manner for all the subjects, the follow-up time was long enough to report the outcome and the numerators and denominators for the outcomes reported were appropriate. For external validity a study was considered to be of low risk when the studies target population closely represented the national population, universal testing was used, instead of selected testing, there was no form of random selection used to select the sample and the response rate for the study was higher than 90%.

Two reviewers (SG, EG) independently extracted data using a predefined format. In all studies we extracted data on the study design, the population, type of screening for COVID-19, country, hospital, country status (high or low and middle income), treatment given (mode of delivery, type of anaesthesia, type of pharmacological and non-pharmacological treatment and their definition. The pre-defined maternal outcomes we collected were severe or critical COVID-19 (as defined by the authors), symptomatic COVID-19, maternal death, maternal hospital admission, ICU admission, mechanical ventilation, ECMO and maternal pneumonia. The pre-defined neonatal outcomes we extracted were preterm birth (<37 weeks), mode of delivery (vaginal or by caesarean section), stillbirth, neonatal death, NICU admission, neonatal COVID-19 positive, neonatal acidosis (pH<7.0) and Apgar scores (<8 after 5 minutes). We did a deduplication process by checking the data with other studies

published by the same authors or where data was collected in the same hospitals. We contacted study authors if there were any inconsistency in their data or where data was missing. Disagreements were discussed with a third reviewer (JA)

Statistical analysis


The comparative dichotomous data was pooled using random effects meta-analysis and the findings were summarized as odds ratios (OR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI). Heterogeneity was reported as I^2 statistics.

For non-comparative data we only presented narrative sentences and not a formal meta-analysis.

Results

From a total of 342 potential eligible studies, we included 27 studies in our systematic review. (Figure 1)

Figure 1 – Study selection process



Characteristics of the included studies

Of 27 studies, six (22%) were from China (6-11); five (19%) were from Italy (12-16); three from Spain (17-19); two each from Chile (20, 21), Turkey (22, 23) and the United States of America (24, 25); one each from Brazil (26), France (27), India (28), Israel (29), Mexico (30), Panama (31) and Peru (32). 15 were classified as high-income countries (12-21, 24, 25, 27, 29, 31) and 12 as low and middle-income countries (6-11, 22, 23, 26, 28, 30, 32). Sixteen studies had a retrospective cohort design (6-10, 14, 17-22, 24, 28, 29, 32) and 11 a prospective cohort design (11-13, 15, 16, 23, 25-27, 30, 31). There were no randomised controlled trials. Sixteen studies reported data on admitted women with COVID-19, eight reported data on all pregnant women and three reported data on a selected group of women, such as pregnant women with hypertension. Seven studies performed universal screening


and testing to assess for COVID-19, nine studies did symptom-based testing, four studies did risk-based testing on the basis of epidemiological history and clinical manifestations by National Health Commission of China (NHCC) guidelines(33) and in seven studies the testing strategy was not known. From the 27 studies, 21 reported on pregnancy specific interventions, consisting of 18 studies reporting on mode of delivery and three on type of anaesthesia. Six studies reported on pharmacological interventions and 11 on non-pharmacological interventions.

Quality of the included studies

Evaluation of study quality using the Newcastle Ottawa scale was overall low for 26 out of 27 studies. The risk of bias for study selection was low for 26 out of 27 studies, with one study scoring medium due to assessed outcome perceived to be present at study inception. Eleven out of 27 studies had a low risk of bias for the comparability of cohorts, on the basis of both design and selection. Thirteen studies had a medium and three a high risk of bias respectively for comparability. Risk of bias of study outcome was low in 25 out of 27 studies and medium in two out of 27 studies, due to either inadequate follow-up length or incomplete accountability of outcomes for all subjects at study termination.


Pregnancy specific interventions for COVID 19

Figure 2 – Association between mode of delivery and maternal outcomes in pregnant women with COVID-19



Eighteen studies provided data on mode of delivery and the relation with maternal and/ or neonatal outcomes (1020 women). (Figure 2) There was a significant association between caesarean section and admission to ICU (OR 4.99, 95% CI 1.24 to 20.12), and diagnosis of maternal COVID-19 pneumonia as defined by study authors (OR 3.09, 95% CI 1.52 to 6.28), although in one of the two studies reporting on pneumonia it was not clear if this was COVID-19 pneumonitis. There were no associations between mode of delivery and severe COVID-19.

Figure 3 – Associations between mode of delivery and neonatal outcomes in pregnant women with COVID-19



There was a significant association between mode of delivery and preterm birth. Women who had a preterm birth were more likely to have the baby via caesarean section (OR 3.03, 95% CI 1.71 to 5.36). There were no associations between mode of delivery and a low Apgar score, neonatal acidosis, neonatal covid, neonatal death, NICU admission or stillbirth. (figure 3)

Only three studies reported on the type of anaesthesia and maternal or neonatal outcomes. (Zhang, Martinez and Chen R). Zhang et al described a Chinese multi-centre cohort of 89 COVID-19 positive women (90 neonates) who underwent a

caesarean section with either locoregional or general anaesthesia.(10) Of the 90 neonates, 11 were born by general anaesthesia caesarean section of which five had an Apgar score lower than eight after five minutes. Seventy-nine neonates were born by caesarean section under locoregional anaesthesia of which one had an Apgar score lower than eight after five minutes. In the study by Martinez et al (41 women) more women who underwent a caesarean section under general anaesthesia had severe COVID-19 (2 out of 7) compared to women who had locoregional anaesthesia (2 out of 32).(17) Chen R et al gives a retrospective study of 17 cases of which three women underwent general anaesthesia for caesarean section, however no relevant maternal outcomes were reported according to our outcome definitions.(8) There were no adverse neonatal outcomes, like neonatal death, neonatal acidosis, neonatal covid-19 positive babies and low Apgar scores.

Pharmacological interventions for treatment of COVID-19 in pregnancy

Six studies (599 women) reported on pharmacological treatment of COVID-19 in pregnancy, which included: antiviral treatment, (systemic) corticosteroids, antibiotics and immunotherapy; however, the types and doses of the medications were not specified. The number of pregnant women exposed to intervention were small despite the big denominators, hence it was not possible to do a meta-analysis and make a conclusion about pharmacological interventions for COVID-19 treatment in pregnancy. (Table 1)

Table 1 – Pharmacological interventions for treatment of pregnant women with COVID-19

Pharmacological interventions	Drug type (reference)	Nr of studies (total nr of woman)	Women exposed to intervention	Outcomes in exposed	Outcomes in non-exposed

Antiviral	lopinavir–ritonavir, remdesivir, or darunavir (12)	1 (77)	25	Severe or critical COVID-19* (8/25)	Severe or critical COVID-19* (6/52)
	Not specified (9, 13, 26)	3 (439)	118	CS (4/5); preterm delivery (2/5); maternal death (11/112); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (0/1)	CS (0/0); preterm delivery (0/0); maternal death (25/176); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (47/145)
	Remdesivir (24)	1 (61)	2	Severe or critical COVID-19† (2/2)	Severe or critical COVID-19† (5/59)
Antibiotics	Not specified (Mostly penicillins or cephalosporins) (13)	4 (289)	50	CS* (5/5); preterm delivery (2/5); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (2/14); severe or critical COVID-19*† (14/31); neonatal death (0/5)	CS* (0/0); preterm delivery (0/0); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (45/132); severe or critical COVID-19*† (8/107); neonatal death (0/0)
Corticosteroids	Dose and type not specified (9, 24)	1 (66)	7	CS* (2/3); preterm delivery (2/3); severe/critical COVID-19† (4/4); neonatal death (0/3)	CS* (2/2); preterm delivery (0/2); severe/critical COVID-19† (3/57); neonatal death (0/2)
Antimalarials	Hydroxychloroquine (12, 13, 18, 24)	4 (306)	32	CS* (0/1); preterm delivery (0/1); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (2/8); ICU admission (0/1); severe/critical COVID-19*† (10/23); neonatal COVID-19 positive (0/1); NICU admission (0/1)	CS* (4/21); preterm delivery (3/21); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (45/138); ICU admission (1/21); severe/critical COVID-19*† (11/115); neonatal COVID-19 positive (0/21); NICU admission (2/21)
Combination of interventions	Antivirals and antibiotics (13)	1 (146)	5	Maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (4/5)	Maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (43/141)
	Hydroxychloroquine and antibiotics (13, 18)	2 (168)	15	CS* (1/1); preterm delivery (0/1); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (8/14); ICU admission (0/1); neonatal COVID-19 positive (0/1); NICU admission (1/1)	CS* (4/21); preterm delivery (3/21); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (39/132); ICU admission (1/21); neonatal COVID-19 positive (0/21); NICU admission (3/21)
	Hydroxychloroquine and antivirals (13, 18)	2 (168)	10	CS* (0/2); preterm delivery (0/2); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (7/8); ICU admission (0/2); neonatal COVID-19 positive (0/2); NICU admission (0/2)	CS* (3/20); preterm delivery (2/20); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (40/138); ICU admission (1/20); neonatal COVID-19 positive (0/20); NICU admission (2/20)
	Hydroxychloroquine and antibiotics and antivirals (13)	1 (146)	20	Maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (17/20)	Maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (30/126)
	Targeted antibiotics (13)	1 (146)	2	Maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (0/2)	Maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (47/144)

*CS=Caesarean Section ICU=Intensive Treatment Unit NICU=Neonatal Intensive Care Unit

*severe or critical COVID-19 is defined as need for urgent delivery based on maternal respiratory function and/or ICU or subintensive care admission during pregnancy or the postpartum period

†severe COVID-19 is defined as dyspnoea, respiratory frequency $\geq 30/\text{min}$, blood oxygen saturation $\leq 93\%$, partial pressure of arterial oxygen to fraction of inspired oxygen ratio < 300 , and lung

infiltrates >50% on chest x-ray; and critical COVID-19 was defined as respiratory failure, septic shock, and multiple organ failure

Non-pharmacological interventions for COVID-19 in pregnancy

Eleven studies reported on non-pharmacological interventions, of which mechanical ventilation was reported in 6 studies and oxygen administration in 8 studies. In total 1738 women were included in these studies and 240 were exposed to interventions, 28 patients had mechanical ventilation and 212 had oxygen administration. (Table 2)

There were no studies reporting on proning during pregnancy and no studies were found that report on extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO), haemodialysis or inotropic treatment.

Table 2 – Non-pharmacological interventions for treatment of pregnant women with COVID-19

Non-pharmacological interventions	Type	Nr of studies (total nr of woman)	Women exposed to intervention	Outcomes in exposed	Outcomes in non-exposed
Mechanical ventilation	Invasive respiratory support (13, 26)	2 (434)	40	Maternal death (21/27); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (10/13)	Maternal death (15/261); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (37/133)
	Not specified (20, 23, 24, 30)	4 (531)	15	Preterm delivery (1/2); maternal death (1/4); severe/ critical COVID-19† (1/1); neonatal death (0/2); neonatal COVID-19 positive (1/8); NICU admission (1/2)	Preterm delivery (3/35); maternal death (6/304); severe/ critical COVID-19† (6/60); neonatal death (1/35); neonatal COVID-19 positive (3/117); NICU admission (4/35)
Oxygen administration	Nasal cannula (9)	1 (5)	1	CS (1/1); preterm delivery (1/1); neonatal death (0/1)	CS (1/1); preterm delivery (1/1); neonatal death (0/1)
	Oxygen support or non-invasive ventilation (9, 12, 14, 26, 27)	5 (1133)	215	CS (26/30); preterm delivery (15/30); maternal death (5/166); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (22/28); severe/ critical COVID-19* (11/20); NICU admission (14/30); stillbirth (0/29)	CS (65/156); preterm delivery (37/156); maternal death (32/739); maternal COVID-19 pneumonia (25/118); severe/ critical COVID-19* (3/57); NICU admission (23/160); stillbirth (7/152)
	Not specified (19, 20, 24)	3 (130)	26	Preterm delivery (0/1); ICU admission (2/18); severe/ critical COVID-19† (7/7); neonatal death (0/1); NICU admission (0/1)	Preterm delivery (4/36); ICU admission (0/14); severe/ critical COVID-19† (0/54); neonatal death (1/36); NICU admission (5/36)

Nasal cannula, CPAP (14)	1 (42)	7	CS (5/7)	CS (13/35)
-----------------------------	--------	---	----------	------------

*CS=Caesarean Section ICU=Intensive Treatment Unit NICU=Neonatal Intensive Care Unit

*severe/critical COVID-19 is defined as need for urgent delivery based on maternal respiratory function and/or ICU or subintensive care admission during pregnancy or the postpartum period

†Dyspnoea, respiratory frequency ≥ 30 /min, blood oxygen saturation $\leq 93\%$, partial pressure of arterial oxygen to fraction of inspired oxygen ratio < 300 , and lung infiltrates $> 50\%$ on chest x-ray; and critical disease was defined as respiratory failure, septic shock, and multiple organ failure

Discussion

Summary of findings

All interventions, either pregnancy specific or COVID-19 related interventions in pregnant women diagnosed with the disease were poorly reported. None of the randomised trials reported outcomes specific for pregnant women. The RECOVERY Trial included outcomes however this has yet to be published,

Pregnancy-specific interventions, such as the mode of delivery or the type of anaesthesia appears to be related with severity of disease, but not with perinatal outcomes. We are unable to ascertain the temporality on all cases. There is an association with caesarean section and the likelihood of being admitted to ICU or due to adverse effects of COVID-19 pneumonia.

We provide estimates of the expected rates of outcomes in women exposed to various pharmacological treatment of COVID-19 and non-pharmacological interventions such as oxygen administration and ventilation, however comparative data for pregnant women, in particular for treatments proven to be effective in the general population, is lacking, to provide clinically meaningful interpretation.

Strengths and limitations of this review

To our knowledge this is the first systematic review looking into management and treatment of pregnant women with COVID-19. We did this in a structured manner

and included not only pharmacological treatment, but also non-pharmacological and pregnancy specific interventions, such as mode of delivery. We also looked at the quality of the studies. We refrained from doing meta-analysis for non-comparative cohorts. We set strict criteria whether a paper would be considered. The studies we have included are clear about the included women, the treatment given and the outcomes reported. If the relation between treatment and outcome were not clear, the paper would be excluded. Extensive collaboration and capturing of data through different databases allowed for a big pool of studies to be reviewed. There was no language restrictions.

We were limited by the paucity of the data and the heterogeneity in the participants. We could not establish the temporality for some of the interventions such as caesarean section as it is possible that some women admitted to ICU for severe COVID-19 might have had caesarean section for maternal reasons. There were no randomised controlled trials, and it is very likely that the intervention was influenced by the characteristics of the participant, the setting and the availability of resources as most of the trials were in high income settings and there is the issue of generalisability, and therefore the rate of outcomes may not reflect the effect of treatment, but it could be more indicative of the underlying severity of the disease of the mother. We were also restricted with producing meta-analysis for most of the data due to the small number of reported treatment and outcomes and could only provide narrative sentences for those interventions.

Comparison with existing evidence

Pregnant women are known to be more often affected by severe COVID-19 than women in the general population.(1) In our systematic review, we found an association between having a caesarean section and being admitted to ICU or having a COVID-19 pneumonia. This, however, may be influenced by pregnancy. By performing a caesarean section, the concern of impaired lung capacity due to the gravid uterus is diminished. Delivery allows for more option of treatment postpartum and minimised the risk of causing harm to the fetus in-utero and ventilation is easier postpartum.

The association we found between mode of delivery and preterm birth is also likely to reflect the severity of the need for more intensive treatment. The PregCOV-19 Living Systematic Review estimated the risk of preterm birth at approximately 17%, of which approximately 94% were iatrogenic.(1)

The Royal College of Anaesthetists came up with a recommendation of types of anaesthesia to be offered to pregnant women with COVID-19, however, to date, no trials have been done in regards to management or outcomes for such women. The RCoA recommends epidural analgesia in labour to minimise the need for general anaesthesia if urgent delivery is required.(34) In the event of a caesarean delivery, it is recommended to avoid general anaesthesia unless absolute necessary for standard indications.

With regards to pharmacological interventions for treatment of COVID-19, corticosteroids, in particular betamethasone, are beneficial when people are admitted in hospital and require oxygen support.(35) To date there is no subgroup

analysis performed on pregnant women, but the RCOG and WHO made the statement that no harm is expected from steroid use, although the first choice should be prednisolone, instead of dexamethasone, because prednisolone is extensively metabolised in the placenta resulting in minimal transfer to the fetus. (2, 36)

The use of antiviral medication, such as Remdesivir, is currently not recommended by WHO in patients with COVID-19.(2) The RCOG guideline, like the WHO guideline, recommends avoiding Remdesivir, unless clinicians believe the benefit of the treatment outweighs the risks, although no randomised controlled data for pregnant women has been published.(2, 36) There is sufficient data that tocilizumab, an interleukine-6 antagonist improves outcomes, including survival, in hospitalised patients with hypoxia with evidence of systemic inflammation. (37) NICE guidance recommends using tocilizumab in hospitalized patients that are having or had completed a course of steroids, an increase of C-reactive protein (CRP) >75, the need for supplemental oxygen, or within 48 hours of initiating mechanical ventilation. The data for the use of tocilizumab in pregnancy is scarce, but there is no adverse effects reported to date. The RCOG advice is to offer tocilizumab to pregnant women when they fit the criteria and the decision is taken by a multi-disciplinary team (MDT) and given the benefits outweigh the risks. Although we had some studies included which looked at the effects of hydroxychloroquine and antibiotics, this has now been shown to be not beneficial and is not recommended for either non-pregnant patients or pregnant women.(2, 38)

The same treatment principles applies to pregnant women as to non-pregnant patients with regards to non-pharmacological interventions, such as oxygen

supplementation or mechanical ventilation. A very gravid uterus can cause difficulty in regards to ventilation and the need for supplemental oxygen. This is due to the increased demand of oxygen in pregnancy due to the higher metabolic rate and the increased consumption of oxygen.(39) Mechanical ventilation is more difficult when a woman is pregnant, due to the gravid uterus, lung capacity can be impaired and it can be difficult to get the required volumes to support adequate ventilation.(40, 41) In the presence of ARDS, proning has been proven to help ventilate patients.(42) This cannot be practiced when a patient has a wound of a caesarean section or when she is over 34 weeks pregnant, the heavily pregnant uterus can make this position more difficult. Furthermore, after 24-28 weeks there is the risk of aortocaval compression when proning a pregnant woman. Although there are no trials performed with pregnant woman, there are techniques describing how proning can be done in this particular group of patients.(41) The authors of this article describe how they place pillows in a specific way to place the pregnant woman in a comfortable position without compromising the pregnancy.

Relevance for clinical practice and research

A hurdle which was acknowledged and acted upon during the pandemic was that of recruitment of COVID-19 positive patients into trials. Traditionally, pregnant women have been excluded from clinical trials. There are concerns of the effect of the drugs on fetus both in short term and long term which has led to the reluctance in evaluating the use of drugs in pregnancy. Researchers have previously highlighted their concerns regarding the issue of pregnant women being excluded from trials during various endemics and pandemics and COVID-19 has highlighted this issue even more.(43) To date only three international trials worldwide have involved

pregnant women.(44) The SOLIDARITY trial now includes pregnant women, and the RECOVERY trial allows pregnant and lactating women to participate with informed consent. Though the numbers are small, the acceptance and initiative are a step forward in health sciences.

In summary, we need more data involving pregnant women in clinical trials. Where trials are not available we need more data on the outcomes when drugs are given in clinical practice. Interventions and outcomes as shown in this article do appear to be associated with the severity of the disease. There is a paucity of data in regards to pregnant and postnatal women and clinical trials need to include pregnant women.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The Authors state that they do not have any conflict of interest.

1. Allotey J, Stallings E, Bonet M, Yap M, Chatterjee S, Kew T, et al. Clinical manifestations, risk factors, and maternal and perinatal outcomes of coronavirus disease 2019 in pregnancy: living systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2020;370:m3320.
2. World Health Organisation. Therapeutics and COVID-19: living guideline 2021 [Available from: <https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/340374/WHO-2019-nCoVtherapeutics-2021.1-eng.pdf>.
3. Taylor MM, Kobeissi L, Kim C, Amin A, Thorson AE, Bellare NB, et al. Inclusion of pregnant women in COVID-19 treatment trials: a review and global call to action. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2021;9(3):e366-e71.
4. Yap M, Debenham L, Kew T, Chatterjee SR, Allotey J, Stallings E, et al. Clinical manifestations, prevalence, risk factors, outcomes, transmission, diagnosis and treatment of COVID-19 in pregnancy and postpartum: a living systematic review protocol. *BMJ Open*. 2020;10(12):e041868.

5. Hoy D, Brooks P, Woolf A, Blyth F, March L, Bain C, et al. Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2012;65(9):934-9.
6. Cao D, Yin H, Chen J, Tang F, Peng M, Li R, et al. Clinical analysis of ten pregnant women with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: A retrospective study. *Int J Infect Dis.* 2020;95:294-300.
7. Chen L, Li Q, Zheng D, Jiang H, Wei Y, Zou L, et al. Clinical Characteristics of Pregnant Women with Covid-19 in Wuhan, China. *N Engl J Med.* 2020;382(25):e100.
8. Chen R, Zhang Y, Huang L, Cheng BH, Xia ZY, Meng QT. Safety and efficacy of different anesthetic regimens for parturients with COVID-19 undergoing Cesarean delivery: a case series of 17 patients. *Can J Anaesth.* 2020;67(6):655-63.
9. Xu L, Yang Q, Shi H, Lei S, Liu X, Zhu Y, et al. Clinical presentations and outcomes of SARS-CoV-2 infected pneumonia in pregnant women and health status of their neonates. *Sci Bull (Beijing).* 2020;65(18):1537-42.
10. Zhang Y, Chen R, Wang J, Gong Y, Zhou Q, Cheng H-h, et al. Anaesthetic management and clinical outcomes of parturients with COVID-19: a multicentre, retrospective, propensity score matched cohort study. *medRxiv.* 2020:2020.03.24.20042176.
11. Tang FaL, WanJun and Wang, Xiaowen and Chen, Zhi and Li, Hui and Liu, Weiyong and Zheng, Nannan and Hu, Xijiang and Li, Ran and Liu, Jie and Shao, Jianbo and Song, Qifa. , An Observational Study of Intrauterine Vertical Transmission of SARS-CoV-2 in 20 Neonates. Available at SSRN (preprints with Lancet). 2020.
12. Savasi VM, Parisi F, Patane L, Ferrazzi E, Frigerio L, Pellegrino A, et al. Clinical Findings and Disease Severity in Hospitalized Pregnant Women With Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Obstet Gynecol.* 2020;136(2):252-8.
13. Maraschini A, Corsi E, Salvatore MA, Donati S, It OSSC-WG. Coronavirus and birth in Italy: results of a national population-based cohort study. *Ann Ist Super Sanita.* 2020;56(3):378-89.
14. Ferrazzi E, Frigerio L, Savasi V, Vergani P, Prefumo F, Barresi S, et al. Vaginal delivery in SARS-CoV-2-infected pregnant women in Northern Italy: a retrospective analysis. *BJOG.* 2020;127(9):1116-21.
15. Bertino E, Moro GE, De Renzi G, Viberti G, Cavallo R, Coscia A, et al. Detection of SARS-CoV-2 in Milk From COVID-19 Positive Mothers and Follow-Up of Their Infants. *Front Pediatr.* 2020;8:597699.
16. Biasucci G, Cannalire G, Raymond A, Capra ME, Benenati B, Vadacca G, et al. Safe Perinatal Management of Neonates Born to SARS-CoV-2 Positive Mothers at the Epicenter of the Italian Epidemic. *Front Pediatr.* 2020;8:565522.
17. Martinez-Perez O, Vouga M, Cruz Melguizo S, Forcen Acebal L, Panchaud A, Munoz-Chapuli M, et al. Association Between Mode of Delivery Among Pregnant Women With COVID-19 and Maternal and Neonatal Outcomes in Spain. *JAMA.* 2020;324(3):296-9.
18. Pereira A, Cruz-Melguizo S, Adrien M, Fuentes L, Marin E, Perez-Medina T. Clinical course of coronavirus disease-2019 in pregnancy. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand.* 2020;99(7):839-47.
19. San-Juan R, Barbero P, Fernandez-Ruiz M, Lopez-Medrano F, Lizasoain M, Hernandez-Jimenez P, et al. Incidence and clinical profiles of COVID-19 pneumonia in pregnant women: A single-centre cohort study from Spain. *EClinicalMedicine.* 2020;23:100407.

20. Diaz-Corvillon P, Monckeberg M, Barros A, Illanes SE, Soldati A, Nien JK, et al. Routine screening for SARS CoV-2 in unselected pregnant women at delivery. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(9):e0239887.
21. Vielma O SLA, Marcia; Bustos V, Juan Carlos; Assar, Rodrigo; Valdés P, Fernanda. Premature delivery in COVID-19 patients at San Juan de Dios Hospital / Parto prematuro en pacientes COVID-19 en Hospital San Juan de Dios. *Rev chil obstet ginecol (En línea)*. 2020;85(supl.1): S59-S66, set. 2020. tab.
22. Alay I, Yildiz S, Kaya C, Yasar KK, Aydin OA, Karaosmanoglu HK, et al. The clinical findings and outcomes of symptomatic pregnant women diagnosed with or suspected of having coronavirus disease 2019 in a tertiary pandemic hospital in Istanbul, Turkey. *J Obstet Gynaecol Res*. 2020.
23. Oncel MY, Akin IM, Kanburoglu MK, Tayman C, Coskun S, Narter F, et al. A multicenter study on epidemiological and clinical characteristics of 125 newborns born to women infected with COVID-19 by Turkish Neonatal Society. *Eur J Pediatr*. 2021;180(3):733-42.
24. Brandt JS, Hill J, Reddy A, Schuster M, Patrick HS, Rosen T, et al. Epidemiology of coronavirus disease 2019 in pregnancy: risk factors and associations with adverse maternal and neonatal outcomes. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2021;224(4):389 e1- e9.
25. Khoury R, Bernstein PS, Debolt C, Stone J, Sutton DM, Simpson LL, et al. Characteristics and Outcomes of 241 Births to Women With Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome Coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) Infection at Five New York City Medical Centers. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2020;136(2):273-82.
26. Brazilian Ministry of Health. Profile of pregnant and children and adolescents with COVID-19. 2020.
27. Kayem G, Lecarpentier E, Deruelle P, Bretelle F, Azria E, Blanc J, et al. A snapshot of the Covid-19 pandemic among pregnant women in France. *J Gynecol Obstet Hum Reprod*. 2020;49(7):101826.
28. Anand P, Yadav A, Debata P, Bachani S, Gupta N, Gera R. Clinical profile, viral load, management and outcome of neonates born to COVID 19 positive mothers: a tertiary care centre experience from India. *Eur J Pediatr*. 2021;180(2):547-59.
29. Lopian M, Kashani-Ligumsky L, Czeiger S, Cohen R, Schindler Y, Lubin D, et al. Safety of vaginal delivery in women infected with COVID-19. *Pediatr Neonatol*. 2021;62(1):90-6.
30. Lumbreras-Marquez MI, Campos-Zamora M, Lizaola-Diaz de Leon H, Farber MK. Maternal mortality from COVID-19 in Mexico. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet*. 2020;150(2):266-7.
31. Vigel - de Gracia PV, Caballero LC, Sanchez J, Espinosa J, Campana S, Quintero A, et al. Pregnancies recovered from SARS-CoV-2 infection in second or third trimester: obstetric evolution. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2020;56(5):777-8.
32. Coronado-Arroyo JC, Concepcion-Zavaleta MJ, Zavaleta-Gutierrez FE, Concepcion-Urteaga LA. Is COVID-19 a risk factor for severe preeclampsia? Hospital experience in a developing country. *Eur J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*. 2021;256:502-3.
33. Diagnosis and Treatment Protocol for Novel Coronavirus Pneumonia (Trial Version 7). *Chin Med J (Engl)*. 2020;133(9):1087-95.
34. ICM Anaesthesia COVID-19. Management of pregnant women with known or suspected COVID-19 2020 [Available from: <https://icmanaesthesiacovid-19.org/management-of-pregnant-women-with-known-or-suspected-covid-19>].
35. Group RC, Horby P, Lim WS, Emberson JR, Mafham M, Bell JL, et al. Dexamethasone in Hospitalized Patients with Covid-19. *N Engl J Med*. 2021;384(8):693-704.

36. Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists. Coronavirus (COVID-19) infection and pregnancy 2021 [updated 19-02-2021. Available from: <https://www.rcog.org.uk/en/guidelines-research-services/guidelines/coronavirus-pregnancy/>.
37. Group RC. Tocilizumab in patients admitted to hospital with COVID-19 (RECOVERY): a randomised, controlled, open-label, platform trial. *Lancet*. 2021;397(10285):1637-45.
38. Singh B, Ryan H, Kredo T, Chaplin M, Fletcher T. Chloroquine or hydroxychloroquine for prevention and treatment of COVID-19. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2021;2:CD013587.
39. Mockridge A, Maclennan K. Physiology of pregnancy. *Anaesthesia & Intensive Care Medicine*. 2019;20(7):397-401.
40. Pacheco LD, Saade GR, Hankins GD. Mechanical ventilation during pregnancy: sedation, analgesia, and paralysis. *Clin Obstet Gynecol*. 2014;57(4):844-50.
41. Tolcher MC, McKinney JR, Eppes CS, Muigai D, Shamshirsaz A, Guntupalli KK, et al. Prone Positioning for Pregnant Women With Hypoxemia Due to Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19). *Obstet Gynecol*. 2020;136(2):259-61.
42. Guerin C, Reignier J, Richard JC, Beuret P, Gacouin A, Boulain T, et al. Prone positioning in severe acute respiratory distress syndrome. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;368(23):2159-68.
43. Costantine MM, Landon MB, Saade GR. Protection by Exclusion: Another Missed Opportunity to Include Pregnant Women in Research During the Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Pandemic. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2020;136(1):26-8.
44. Smith DD, Phippen JL, Adesomo AA, Rood KM, Landon MB, Costantine MM. Exclusion of Pregnant Women from Clinical Trials during the Coronavirus Disease 2019 Pandemic: A Review of International Registries. *Am J Perinatol*. 2020;37(8):792-9.