



**HAL**  
open science

# Term newborns at risk for early-onset neonatal sepsis: Clinical surveillance versus systematic paraclinical test

C. Schmitt, Marion Novy, J.M. Hascoët

## ► To cite this version:

C. Schmitt, Marion Novy, J.M. Hascoët. Term newborns at risk for early-onset neonatal sepsis: Clinical surveillance versus systematic paraclinical test. Archives de Pédiatrie, 2021, 28 (2), pp.117-122. 10.1016/j.arcped.2020.11.009 . hal-03258952

**HAL Id: hal-03258952**

**<https://hal.univ-lorraine.fr/hal-03258952>**

Submitted on 12 Jun 2021

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - NoDerivatives 4.0  
International License

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Term newborn at risk for Early Onset Neonatal Sepsis: clinical surveillance versus systematic paraclinical test

C. Schmitt<sup>1</sup>, M. Novy<sup>1</sup>, JM. Hascoët<sup>1,2</sup>

1. Neonatal Intensive Care Unit, Maternité Régionale, CHRU Nancy F-54000 NANCY

2. DevAH, Lorraine University, F-54000 NANCY

C. Schmitt

**Conflicts of interest: none.**

M. Novy

**Conflicts of interest: none.**

JM. Hascoët

**Conflicts of interest: none.**

Corresponding author: Dr Claire Schmitt

Mail : [c.schmitt3@chru-nancy.fr](mailto:c.schmitt3@chru-nancy.fr)

Phone : +33 383 343 645

## Abstract

### Introduction

Early onset neonatal sepsis is a rare but potentially lethal affection which is very often suspected. Previous national guidelines recommended the use of systematic paraclinic tests for healthy newborns with suspected infection. These guidelines have been updated in 2017 by the French Haute Autorité de Santé, and promote initial clinical monitoring taking into account the infectious risk level for term and near term born infants.

**Objectives:** To assess the impact of the new recommendations on antibiotic therapy prescription and on the outcomes of infants born from 36 weeks gestation.

### Materials and methods

This study compared the management and the outcome of neonates born from 36 weeks gestation in the level III University Hospital of Nancy, according to their infectious risk level during two periods, before and after the update of national recommendations: from July 1<sup>st</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup> 2017, versus July 1<sup>st</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup> 2018. Data were retrospectively collected in the infants' file. This study compared mortality, the number of documented infections, the number of invasive tests, the number and length of hospitalization between the two periods.

### Results

During the first period, among 1248 eligible newborn, 643 presented an infectious risk factor, versus 1152 newborn with 343 having an infectious risk factor during the second period.

Antibiotic treatment was initiated for 18 newborns during the first period (1.4%) and 9 during the second (0.8%) ( $p = 0.13$ ). The mean (SD) duration of the antibiotic treatment was longer in the first than in the second period: 6.3 +/- 2 days, vs 3.1 +/- 2.3 days ( $p = 0.003$ ). There was no death related to neonatal infection. One thousand and fifty-two blood samples were done in the first period versus 51 in the second ( $p < 0.01$ ). There was no documented infection. In the

1 first period, there were 18 newborns (1.4%) hospitalized for suspicion of infection versus 9  
2 (0.8%) in the second (p = 0.13). The duration of hospitalization was 5.7+/- 1.7 days in the first  
3  
4 period versus 5.2 +/- 3 days in the second (p = 0.33).  
5  
6

### 7 **Conclusion**

8  
9 The application of the new guidelines enables a reduction of antibiotic exposure without  
10  
11 additional risk.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 **Keywords: Early onset neonatal sepsis, Clinical management, term neonates, antibiotics.**  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 1. Introduction

1  
2  
3 Early onset neonatal sepsis (EOS) is a rare but serious disease occurring within the first 72  
4  
5 hours of life. It is caused by bacterial pathogen transmitted to the infants during labor or  
6  
7 delivery, identified in blood or cerebro-spinal fluid culture [1]. In term neonate, group B  
8  
9 Streptococcus (GBS) is the most common etiologic agent [2].  
10

11  
12 The incidence is rare, estimated at 0.01 to 0.5/1000 newborn in France [3], but with  
13  
14 potentially serious to lethal consequences. Term newborn's mortality is estimated at about  
15  
16 twelve percent and higher for preterm neonate [4].  
17

18  
19 In France, guidelines for the management of suspected EOS were published in 2002 by the  
20  
21 Agence Nationale d'Accréditation et d'Évaluation de la Santé [5]. Accordingly, many  
22  
23 systematic blood and bacteriological tests used to be performed in newborns when an  
24  
25 infection risk factor was identified. Several variations in practice were then observed and  
26  
27 many asymptomatic newborns received unnecessary antibiotic therapy in intensive care units.  
28  
29 Excessive antibiotic exposure is associated with consequences on the bacterial ecosystem of  
30  
31 each newborn, the risk of promoting multidrug resistant bacteria, the separation of the mother-  
32  
33 child dyad and the additional cost of hospitalization [6]. Thus, experts in neonatology and  
34  
35 pediatric infectious disease of the Haute Autorité de Santé (HAS) have updated the  
36  
37 recommendation in 2017 [7]. Recommendations for the management of neonates now consist  
38  
39 mainly in close clinical monitoring defining specific risk levels.  
40  
41

42  
43 The main objective of this study was to assess the impact of the new HAS recommendations  
44  
45 on antibiotic therapy administration to infants born from 36 weeks gestation in every day  
46  
47 practice.  
48  
49

50  
51 The secondary objectives were to evaluate the compliance to the new guidelines, and then to  
52  
53 compare, before and after using the new guidelines, the outcome of the infants: mortality, the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 number of documented infections, the number of invasive tests, the number and length of  
2 hospitalization.  
3  
4  
5  
6

## 7 **2. Methods and population**

### 8 **2.1. Type of study**

9 This was an observational, retrospective comparative cohort study with a before-after design.  
10  
11

12 The study was performed at the level III Maternity Hospital of the CHRU of Nancy  
13 (FRANCE), in three units of hospitalization: delivery room, postpartum and neonatology  
14 units.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

### 21 **2.2. Study design**

22 During the first 6-month period, from July 1<sup>st</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup> 2017, the previous ANAES  
23 guidelines were the gold standard [5]. This period was followed by a 6-month washout period  
24 to prevent a recruitment bias and allow for education of the caregivers about the new  
25 guidelines of the HAS [7]. Then, infants born from July 1<sup>st</sup> to December 31<sup>st</sup> 2018 were  
26 studied following the new HAS guidelines.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

### 36 **2.3. Inclusion/exclusion criteria**

37 All inborn neonates from 36 weeks gestation (GA) were included. Outborns were excluded  
38 from this study.  
39  
40  
41  
42

### 43 **2.4. First period: year 2017**

44 Risk factors were classified in two groups, minors and majors, defining which exams to  
45 perform according to the ANAES guidelines.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51 Major risk factors were : suspicion of chorioamnionitis (not precisely defined), twin infected,  
52 maternal fever before or during labor  $\geq 38^{\circ}\text{C}$ , spontaneous prematurity  $\leq 35$  weeks gestation,  
53 prolonged rupture membrane  $\geq 18$  hours incomplete maternal GBS prophylaxis, history of  
54 GBS infection in previous pregnancy, vaginal or urinary GBS maternal colonization.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

Minor risk factors were : prolonged rupture of membrane between 12 and 18 hours, spontaneous prematurity between 37 and 35 weeks gestation, fetal tachycardia, fetal cardiac rhythm abnormalities or unexplained bad neonatal adaptation, dyed or meconial amniotic fluid.

Biological and bacteriological samplings were systematic if one major risk factor or two minor risk factors were observed.

Infection was quoted “certain” when a bacteria was isolated in a blood sample or in the cerebrospinal fluid, associated with clinical signs.

Infection was quoted “probable” when there were clinical signs or biological abnormalities consistent with bacterial infection but no bacteria isolation. In that situation, neonates were hospitalized and received intravenous antibiotic therapy lasting at least 5 days.

When a pathogen was isolated in the gastric fluid, without any clinical or biological anomaly, the situation was quoted “colonization”.

## **2.5. Second period: year 2018**

Management of EOS followed the HAS guidelines [7].

Risk factors were : GBS maternal colonization (vaginal or urinary), except in case of caesarian section out of labor and with intact membranes, history of neonatal GBS infection in a previous pregnancy, prolonged rupture of membranes longer than 12 hours, spontaneous birth before 37 SA, and maternal fever  $\geq 38^{\circ}\text{C}$  per partum and up to 2 hours after delivery.

When a risk factor for EOS was identified, newborns were classified according to the risk level and clinical management adjusted. There were 3 groups: A, B and C; A being the lowest risk and C the highest.

The group A included newborns whose mother received adequate antibiotic prophylaxis, for the following infectious risk factors: GBS maternal colonization (vaginal or urinary), except in case of caesarian section out of labor and with intact membranes, history of neonatal GBS

1 infection in a previous pregnancy, prolonged rupture of membranes longer than 12 hours,  
2 spontaneous birth before 37 SA.  
3

4 The group B included newborns whose mother received inadequate antibiotic prophylaxis for  
5 previous risk factors, or those whose mother received adequate antibiotic therapy in the  
6 context of maternal fever  $\geq 38^{\circ}\text{C}$  per partum and up to 2 hours after delivery.  
7

8 The group C included newborns whose mother received inadequate antibiotic therapy in  
9 context of maternal fever.  
10

11 Antibiotic prophylaxis is considered adequate when given intravenously, with an initial dose  
12 of two grams, at least four hours before delivery, using penicillin G, ampicillin, amoxicillin or  
13 cefazolin.  
14

15 The midwife in the delivery room had to evaluate the group and to indicate this group into the  
16 files of mother and newborn. A systematic program of clinical monitoring was then conducted  
17 by midwives and nurses, according to the group.  
18

19 A pediatrician was sought to guide in the adequate unit all newborn classified in group C.  
20

21 In group A, the usual simple clinical monitoring was realized in post-natal unit. There was no  
22 discharge before 48 hours of life.  
23

24 In group B, a standardized grid was used, based on possible clinical signs of neonatal  
25 infection during 48 hours: checked every 4 hours during day 1 and every 6 hours during day 2  
26 (annex I). The grid was filed by the midwife or paramedic in charge of the mother and her  
27 child in post-natal unit, both previously trained for taking care of newborns at risk for EOS.  
28

29 This grid had to be added to the medical file.  
30

31 In group C, the same standardized grid as in group B was necessary, with the same modalities.  
32

33 In this group, infants had a systematic clinical examination by a pediatrician between 6 and 12  
34 hours of life.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



## **2.6. Data collection**

Inclusions were retrospective and data related to the neonatal period were collected from the medical files of the mothers and infants. The data were anonymized.

## **2.7. Statistics**

Descriptive data were presented as median values and interquartile ranges and/or mean with standard deviation. Comparison between groups was performed by bivariate analysis with Mann and Whitney U test for the continuous variables and Chi 2 test for the discontinuous variables. A p value below 0.05 was chosen to indicate statistical significance. Statistical analyses were performed using SYSTAT 13 software (2009; Systat Software Inc., San Jose, California, USA).

## **2.8. Ethics**

This retrospective observational study was performed in accordance with the methodology MR003, developed by the French commission of data protection and approved in the CHRU of Nancy. Parents were systematically informed and provided written consent for the possible use of medical information about their children at the time of birth.

## **3. Results**

### **3.1. Descriptive analysis of the population**

During the first period of the study 1248 newborns were evaluated; 643 (51% of births) had risk factors for EOS. Median (min ; max) GA was 39 weeks (36 ; 42) weeks; 50.4% of these infants were males. One hundred and twenty-three mothers presented with GBS colonization (9.8%).

During the second period, 1152 newborns were evaluated; 343 (29% of births) had risk factors. Median GA was 39 (36 ; 42), and 58.1% were males. Among the 343 newborns

1 presenting risk factors, 165 were in group A, 153 in group B, and 25 in the group C. One  
2 hundred and twenty-three mothers presented with GBS colonization (10.6 %).

3  
4 Caesarian section was performed for 11.7% of births during the first period, and 9.9 % of  
5  
6  
7 births during the second period.

### 8 9 **3.2. Postnatal antibiotic therapy**

10 Antibiotic treatment was initiated for 18 newborns during the first period (1.4%), and nine  
11  
12 during the second period (0.8%) ( $p = 0.13$ ). The mean (SD) duration of antibiotics was higher  
13  
14 in first period comparing to the second period: 6.3 +/- 2 days ( $p = 0.003$ ), vs 3.1 +/- 2.3 days.  
15  
16  
17

### 18 19 **3.3. Compliance to guidelines (HAS)**

#### 20 21 **3.3.1. Compliance to ranking**

22 The classification of the risk level was inappropriate for 28 newborns. Among them, 22 were  
23  
24 not classified at all, whereas they presented risk factors for EOS (1.9% of the total  
25  
26 population). Eleven of 28 (39%) belonged to group A, 9 to group B (32%) and 2 to group C  
27  
28 (7.1%). Group error was observed for 6 newborns (1.7 % of the population with risk factors).  
29  
30 Sixteen infants with classification error were hospitalized in the neonatal intensive care unit  
31  
32 (NICU) for other reasons.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

#### 38 39 **3.3.2. Compliance to postnatal surveillance**

40 A grid of monitoring was used, as required in group B and C, for 146 files (82% of those  
41  
42 expected). All of the required items was noted in 129 cases (88.3%). Reasons for  
43  
44 inappropriate monitoring were: 12 of them changed of group after initial decision (27.5%), 2  
45  
46 infants were directly hospitalized at birth (5%), no risk level was noted on the grid in 6 cases  
47  
48 (15%), no traceability of paramedic visits was realized in 11 cases (27.5%) and there was an  
49  
50 unknown reason in 10 cases (25%).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 Systematic pediatric exam in group C infants was performed to 18 newborns (82% of  
2 newborns classified in group C). The medical exam was not performed for three infants, the  
3  
4 last one being watched according to the older protocol.  
5  
6

7 Nine newborns were examined by a pediatrician for clinical signs, four of them had at least  
8  
9 one blood sample to search for biological sign of infection (CRP) after this exam and none  
10  
11 was hospitalized after it.  
12  
13

### 14 **3.4. Comparative analysis**

#### 15 **3.4.1. Mortality**

16  
17 There was no mortality related to EOS, during the study period.  
18  
19

#### 20 **3.4.2. Number and duration of hospitalization for suspected EOS**

21  
22 There were more newborns hospitalized for suspicion of infection in the first than in the  
23  
24 second period (18 (1.4%) vs 9 (0.8%)  $p = 0.13$ ).  
25  
26

27  
28 The duration of hospitalization was slightly longer in the first than in the second period  
29  
30 (5.7+/- 1.7 days versus 5.2 +/- 3 days,  $p = 0.33$ ).  
31  
32

#### 33 **3.4.3. Documented EOS**

34  
35 Eleven newborns had probable infection and 123 newborns had colonization in the first period  
36  
37 of the study. There was no documented infection during the second period of the study.  
38  
39

#### 40 **3.4.4. Invasive tests**

41  
42 One thousand and fifty-two blood samples were done in the first period versus 51 in the  
43  
44 second period ( $p < 0.01$ ). During the first period, 332 newborns (26.6% of all newborns) had  
45  
46 at least one blood sample vs. 15 newborns (1.3% of all newborns) ( $p < 0.05$ ) during the  
47  
48 second period.  
49  
50

51  
52 With regards to blood culture, 25 were realized in the first period, and 9 in the second period  
53  
54 ( $p = 0.29$ ). Gastric fluid examination was realized for 622 newborns in 2017 (96.7%) and for  
55  
56 1 newborn in 2018 (0.3%) ( $p < 0.05$ ).  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

#### 4. Discussion

This observational study conducted for newborns from 36 weeks gestation confirms that the clinical surveillance of neonates at risk for EOS according to the new HAS guidelines is appropriate. These recommendations result in lower duration of antibiotics, a trend to lower prescription of antibiotics and much lower unnecessary invasive tests.

The difference between the number of antibiotics prescriptions is not significant between the 2 periods. This may be related to a too small population because of the low prevalence of EOS in that population. Also, we observed no difference in mortality, which indicates that the monitoring seems safe in the studied population.

Of note, with the changes in risk factor definition, the population of neonates at risk for EOS appears to be different between the 2 periods (643 vs 344 neonates). With regards to previous studies, the number of neonates with risk factors, before using new guidelines, was already low [8]. With more specific risk factors [9], as defined in the new HAS guidelines, the population at risk requiring thorough clinical monitoring has decreased widely.

During the second period, we noted classification errors for 28 newborns (2.4%). The majority was the absence of ranking for 22 patients (1.9%). This could have potential dramatic consequences as clinical surveillance is the only way to detect sick newborns. However, half of the neonates concerned with ranking problem were actually hospitalized in a neonatal unit immediately after birth, which explain the lack of ranking as they were already continuously monitored. Therefore, the clinical surveillance, as proposed in the recommendations, is mandatory and needs to be reinforced to improve the nurses' clinical surveillance.

We noted a lot of neonates in group B, which suggests inappropriate antibiotic therapy before labor. This involves higher risk of infection and overload of work in the following 48 hours,

1 to supervise the infant with the grid. We have to insist on the importance of this prophylaxis  
2 at the obstetricians' level [10, 11].  
3

4 The grid is adapted to the multiple unspecific signs of infection. It was easily adopted by the  
5 healthcare givers involved in the clinical monitoring. The grid was well filled except for some  
6 exams missing at some time points. Again, some exams were also missing when children  
7 were hospitalized in a neonatal unit. The computerization of this grid would probably lead to  
8 a more rigorous filling and avoid lack of information that was observed during the study.  
9

10 Pediatric exam for group C neonates was mostly realized as requested in the  
11 recommendations. The only cases of missing medical exam were symptomatic newborns  
12 hospitalized and treated early after birth. However, this systematic clinical exam has to be  
13 done between 6 and 12 hours of life which confers little flexibility in terms of organization,  
14 including on-call periods.  
15

16 As expected, the number and duration of hospitalizations had a trend to be less important  
17 thanks to the change of practice. This should reduce the rate of mother-to-child separation and  
18 promote breastfeeding.  
19

20 In our population, the rate of antibiotic therapy was 1.4% in the first period and 0.8% in the  
21 second period which is consistent with the literature. Cantoni, in his prospective study in  
22 2013, compared two periods [12]. In the first one, a biological exam was done to every  
23 asymptomatic newborn after the Centers of Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC)  
24 recommendations risk factors (blood count and blood culture). In the second period, only a  
25 clinical exam was done until 48 hours of life. The rate of antibiotic therapy in the first period  
26 was 1.2% vs 0.5% in the second period ( $p < 0,01$ ). Moreover, several studies showed that  
27 asymptomatic term newborn at risk for infection can be monitored with clinical criteria. In  
28 those studies, no infection was found in asymptomatic newborn [13-15]. Antibiotics early in  
29 life have long term side effects that are well described. They disturb the microbiota colonizing  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1 the neonate and might be associated with important health problems and self-immune  
2 pathologies such as eczema and allergies [16, 17]. Thus, indications of antibiotic treatment  
3  
4 have to be as specific as possible. When reasonably administered, the probabilistic antibiotic  
5  
6 treatment has to target the most common germ responsible for newborn infections which is  
7  
8 GBS. In addition, antibiotic treatment has to be as short as possible. Indeed, reducing neonatal  
9  
10 exposure to antibiotic could reduce bacterial selection pressure [18]. The bacterial selection  
11  
12 pressure is responsible for emergence of bacteria resistant to antibiotics, especially gram-  
13  
14 negative pathogens [19, 20]. Thus, appropriate antibiotic prescription is indeed a public health  
15  
16 problem and an ecological medical unit problem.  
17  
18

19  
20  
21 Maintaining an appropriate compliance to the recommendations is a challenge because of the  
22  
23 low prevalence of EOS [3]. With no EOS documented up till now in our population with risk  
24  
25 factors, care givers could minimize the importance of strict monitoring. All the staff involved  
26  
27 in the surveillance of neonates has to stay vigilant.  
28  
29

30  
31 Many clinical signs for EOS are not specific and can be observed in non-infectious situation.  
32

33  
34 Therefore, following the grid, which also take into account the evolution, is mandatory.  
35

36  
37 As expected, the number of additional exams was significantly reduced in the second period.  
38

39  
40 In Sikias's study in 2013, 54% babies had a bacteriological gastric sample at birth and 25%  
41  
42 had a blood sample [8]. In our study, 50% of all newborns of the first period had a  
43  
44 bacteriological gastric sample at birth and 26.6 % had at least one blood sample. With the new  
45  
46 recommendations, the only babies requiring blood sampling are those presenting suspect  
47  
48 clinical signs of EOS. No gastric sampling is performed anymore, as recommended.  
49

50  
51 Our study has strength and limitations. When starting new recommendations, we chose to  
52  
53 apply them to newborns from 36+0 weeks gestation, and not from 34+0 weeks gestation [7].  
54

55  
56 We wanted to evaluate the safety and feasibility of the guidelines first, before involving late  
57  
58 premature infants. Indeed, preterm population is twice more at risk for EOS and is more  
59  
60

1 vulnerable than term population [21]. In addition, in our maternity hospital 34 to 36 weeks  
2 gestation infants are mostly hospitalized and monitored for a few days in a Neonatology Unit  
3  
4 which is different from term infants. This is a retrospective study, and data were collected on  
5  
6 files. Some informations are missing due to a lack of transcription. However, strength is the  
7  
8 number of patients included in each cohort with a before-after design and a washout period  
9  
10 allowing good representativeness of the study.  
11  
12

13 For the future, new diagnostic tools are developed: GBS DNA-based real time PCR is  
14  
15 available [22, 23] to detect a GBS vaginal colonization during labor, which could help for a  
16  
17 better screening of the infectious risk. It has a good negative predictive value (NPV) of 92%  
18  
19 and could have an impact on intrapartum antibiotic prophylaxis (IAP) because 10% of  
20  
21 prenatally GBS-negative women were positive during labor and missed IAP and 50% of  
22  
23 prenatally GBS-positive women were negative during labor and received IAP [23].  
24  
25

26 In the same time, use for more specific biomarkers is studied, as PCT dosed on cord blood  
27  
28 [24, 25]. Those complementary strategies might be additional tolls in the future, to enhance  
29  
30 the clinical exam sensibility.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

## 40 **5. Conclusion**

41  
42 Our study confirms that clinical surveillance of neonates over 36 weeks gestation at risk for  
43  
44 EOS, according to new guidelines, is safe and associated with lower invasive biological tests  
45  
46 and lower duration of antibiotics. However, the unspecific character of the clinical signs of  
47  
48 EOS implies the greatest attention of all the medical and paramedical staff. New diagnostic  
49  
50 tolls are developed that might enhance the clinical exam sensibility.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## References

- 1  
2  
3 [1] Simonsen KA, Anderson-Berry AL, Delair SF, et al. Early-Onset Neonatal Sepsis.  
4 Clin Microbiol Rev 2014;27(1):2147.  
5
- 6 [2] Colicchia LC, Lauderdale DS, Du H, et al. Recurrence of group B streptococcus  
7 colonization in successive pregnancies. J Perinatol 2015;35(3):1736.  
8  
9
- 10 [3] Van Herk W, Helou S el, Janota J, et al. Variation in Current Management of Term  
11 and Late-preterm Neonates at Risk for Early-onset Sepsis: An International Survey and  
12 Review of Guidelines. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2016;35(5):494500.  
13
- 14 [4] Edmond KM, Kortsalioudaki C, Scott S, et al. Group B streptococcal disease in infants  
15 aged younger than 3 months: systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet  
16 2012;379(9815):54756.  
17
- 18 [5] Diagnostic et traitement curative de l'infection bactérienne précocede nouveau-né,  
19 Recommandation pour la bonne pratique clinique, Agence Nationale d'Accréditation et  
20 d'Evaluation en Santé 2002, [https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/synthese-\\_inn\\_-\\_mel2006.pdf](https://www.has-sante.fr/upload/docs/application/pdf/synthese-_inn_-_mel2006.pdf).  
21  
22  
23
- 24 [6] Mukhopadhyay S, Lieberman ES, Puopolo KM, et al. Effect of Early-Onset Sepsis  
25 Evaluations on In-Hospital Breastfeeding Practices Among Asymptomatic Term Neonates.  
26 Hosp Pediatr 2015;5(4):20310.  
27  
28  
29
- 30 [7] Label de la HAS - Prise en charge du nouveau-né à risque d'infection néonatale  
31 bactérienne précoce ( $\geq 34$  SA), Recommandation de bonne pratique, Société Française de  
32 Néonatalogie et Société Française de Pédiatrie 2017, [https://www.has-  
33 sante.fr/jcms/c\\_2803349/fr/label-de-la-has-prise-en-charge-du-nouveau-ne-a-risque-d-  
34 infection-neonatale-bacterienne-precoce-34-sa](https://www.has-sante.fr/jcms/c_2803349/fr/label-de-la-has-prise-en-charge-du-nouveau-ne-a-risque-d-infection-neonatale-bacterienne-precoce-34-sa).  
35  
36
- 37 [8] Sikias P, Parmentier C, Imbert P, et al. Infections néonatales bactériennes précoces :  
38 évaluation des pratiques professionnelles dans 14 maternités d'Île-de-France en 2013. Arch  
39 Pédiatr 2015;22(10):10216.  
40
- 41 [9] Puopolo KM, Draper D, Wi S, et al. Estimating the Probability of Neonatal Early-  
42 Onset Infection on the Basis of Maternal Risk Factors. Pediatrics 2011;128(5):e1155-63.  
43  
44
- 45 [10] Russell NJ, Seale AC, O'Sullivan C, et al. Risk of Early-Onset Neonatal Group B  
46 Streptococcal Disease With Maternal Colonization Worldwide: Systematic Review and Meta-  
47 analyses. Clin Infect Dis 2017;65(suppl\_2):S152-9.  
48  
49
- 50 [11] Lin F-YC, Weisman LE, Azimi P, Young AE, Chang K, Cielo M, et al. Assessment of  
51 Intrapartum Antibiotic Prophylaxis for the Prevention of Early-onset Group B Streptococcal  
52 Disease: Pediatr Infect Dis J 2011;30(9):75963.  
53  
54
- 55 [12] Cantoni L, Ronfani L, Da Riolo R, et al. Physical Examination Instead of Laboratory  
56 Tests for Most Infants Born to Mothers Colonized with Group B Streptococcus: Support for  
57 the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's 2010 Recommendations. J Pediatr  
58 2013;163(2):568-573.e1.  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1 [13] Ottolini MC, Lundgren K, Mirkinson LJ, et al. Utility of complete blood count and  
2 blood culture screening to diagnose neonatal sepsis in the asymptomatic at risk newborn.  
3 *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2003;22(5):4304.

4 [14] Berardi A, Spada C, Reggiani MLB, et al. Group B Streptococcus early-onset disease  
5 and observation of well-appearing newborns. Simeoni U, éditeur. *PLoS One*  
6 2019;14(3):e0212784.

7 [15] Duvoisin G, Fischer C, Maucort-Boulch D, et al. Reduction in the use of diagnostic  
8 tests in infants with risk factors for early-onset neonatal sepsis does not delay antibiotic  
9 treatment. *Swiss Med Wkly [Internet]* 2014 <http://doi.emh.ch/smw.2014.13981>

10 [16] Torrazza RM, Neu J. The developing intestinal microbiome and its relationship to  
11 health and disease in the neonate. *J Perinatol* 2011;31(S1):S2934.

12 [17] Bedford Russell A, Murch S. Could peripartum antibiotics have delayed health  
13 consequences for the infant? *BJOG* 2006;113(7):75865.

14 [18] Carr D, Barnes EH, Gordon A, et al. Effect of antibiotic use on antimicrobial antibiotic  
15 resistance and late-onset neonatal infections over 25 years in an Australian tertiary neonatal  
16 unit. *Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed.* 2017;102(3):F24450.

17 [19] Thibaudon Baveux C, Stroebel Noguer A, Boulard Mallet I, et al. Prévention des  
18 infections bactériennes néonatales précoces à streptocoque B. *J Gynécol Obstet Hum Reprod*  
19 2008;37(4):3929.

20 [20] Huang J, Li S, Li L, et al. Alarming regional differences in prevalence and  
21 antimicrobial susceptibility of group B streptococci in pregnant women: A systematic review  
22 and meta-analysis. *J Glob Antimicrob Resist* 2016;7:16977.

23 [21] Cohen-Wolkowicz M, Moran C, Benjamin DK, et al. Early and Late Onset Sepsis in  
24 Late Preterm Infants. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2010;13.

25 [22] Davies HD, Miller MA, Faro S, Gregson D, Kehl SC, Jordan JA. Multicenter Study of  
26 a Rapid Molecular-Based Assay for the Diagnosis of Group B Streptococcus Colonization in  
27 Pregnant Women. *Clin Infect Des* 2004 :7.

28 [23] Faro JP, Bishop K, Riddle G, Ramirez MM, Katz AR, Turrentine MA, et al. Accuracy  
29 of an Accelerated, Culture-Based Assay for Detection of Group B Streptococcus. *Infect Dis*  
30 *Obstet Gynecol* 2013 :14.

31 [24] Oria de Rueda Salguero O, Beceiro Mosquera J, Barrionuevo González M, et al.  
32 Procalcitonina en sangre de cordón en la valoración del riesgo de sepsis neonatal precoz. *An*  
33 *Pediatr (Barc)* 2017;87(2):8794.

34 [25] Su H, Chang S-S, Han C-M, et al. Inflammatory markers in cord blood or maternal  
35 serum for early detection of neonatal sepsis—a systemic review and meta- analysis. *J*  
36 *Perinatol* 2014;34(4):26874.

## Annex 1

## GRILLE DE SURVEILLANCE CLINIQUE POUR EVALUATION DES NOUVEAU-NES A RISQUE

### D'INFECTION NEONATALE BACTERIENNE PRECOCE(INBP)

A remplir par l'auxiliaire puériculture ou sage-femme ou infirmière

Si signe absent : mettre 0. Si signe présent : mettre 1 croix, et appel du pédiatre.

**Groupe à risque**

**INBP :**

**Etiquette enfant**

**Date et heure de naissance :**

**Chambre maman :**

Heure précise	H4=	H8=	H12=	H16=	H20=	H24=	H30=	H36=	H42=	H48=
Nom de soignante										
<b>Température :</b> < 36 ou >37.9°C										
<b>Fréquence cardiaque:</b> au calme < 80 ou >160 bpm										
<b>Signes respiratoires</b>										
Tirage										
FR >60 /mn										
Geignement										
Apnée										
Cyanose										
<b>Signes hémodynamiques</b>										
Teint pâle ou gris										
Marbrures										
<b>Signes généraux</b>										
Somnolence, irritabilité, hypotonie										
Vomissements ou refus de boire										
Appel du pédiatre										
Nom du pédiatre										

Prévenir le pédiatre

- Si une croix est cochée dans une case
- devant tout signe clinique ou tout changement de comportement du NN
- *jours ouvrables appeler un pédiatre de maternité sur leur Bip ou 21506*
- *la nuit, W end et jours fériés, appeler la réanimation : poste 43635, 44456 ou 44609.*