# Syphilis screen and treat for pregnant women

### Teodora Wi

**Training Course in Sexual and Reproductive Health Research 2017** 

Twitter @HRPresearch





# Syphilis screening in pregnant women

 The WHO STI guideline recommends screening all pregnant women for syphilis during the first antenatal visit.

Strong recommendation, moderate quality evidence

*Remarks:* This recommendation applies to all settings including settings with high or low prevalence of syphilis.



### Low screening coverage

#### On-site laboratory testing - rapid syphilis test

In settings with low screening coverage and treatment of pregnant women for syphilis, high loss to follow-up of pregnant women, or limited laboratory capacity, the WHO STI guideline suggests on-site tests rather than offsite laboratory-based screen and treat strategies

*Conditional recommendation, low quality evidence* 



RST does not distinguish between previously adequately treated and untreated syphilis
Sensitivity of RST is reduced with whole blood.

Note:

3. In pregnant women, subsequent testing will likely be still seropositive, therefore, previously RST positive women could be treated without re-testing if risk of re-infection is considered high. Alternatively perform quantitative RPR testing.





# High prevalence of syphilis (≥ 5%)

- In settings with a high prevalence of syphilis (5% or greater), the WHO STI guideline suggests an onsite rapid treponemal syphilis test and if positive, provide a first dose of treatment and a rapid plasma reagin (RPR) test and then if positive, treat according to duration of syphilis.
- The WHO STI guideline suggests this sequence of tests rather than a single on-site rapid syphilis treponemal test or on-site rapid plasma reagin (RPR) test strategies

*Conditional recommendation, low quality evidence* 



#### On-site laboratory testing - Sequence of test



# Low prevalence of syphilis (<5%)

#### On-site laboratory testing - rapid syphilis test

 In settings with a low prevalence of syphilis (below 5%), the WHO STI guideline suggests a single on-site rapid syphilis treponemal test be used to screen pregnant women rather than on-site rapid plasma reagin (RPR) test strategies.

### *Conditional recommendation, low quality evidence*



#### Note:

Telle Differenti

1. RST does not distinguish between previously adequately treated and untreated syphilis 2. Sensitivity of RST is reduced with whole blood.

3. In pregnant women, subsequent testing will likely be still seropositive, therefore, previously RST positive women could be treated without re-testing if risk of re-infection is considered high. Alternatively perform quantitative RPR testing.

#### **On-site laboratory testing – RPR syphilis test**





### Best evidence from comparative studies of pregnant women Outcomes congenital syphilis,

- Randomised controlled trials: compare test strategy to another test strategy, treat and measure outcomes
  stillbirths, neonatal deaths, low birth weight
- Non-randomised trials: compare test strategy to another test strategy, treat and measure outcomes
- Test accuracy studies: compare test strategy to another test strategy for sensitivity and specificity (TP, FP, TN, FN)
  - RST : 83% Sen, 96% Spec
  - RPR: 75% Sen, 97% Spec
- Modelling studies with comparison of test strategies, treatment and outcomes





The cost-effectiveness of 10 antenatal syphilis screening and treatment

approaches in Peru, Tanzania, and Zamhia



Fem Term-Prestholt.<sup>14</sup>, Peter Vickenman.<sup>40</sup>, Sergio Torreto-Rueda.<sup>4</sup>, Nancy Santesso<sup>1</sup>, Sedona Sweeney.<sup>4</sup>, Parncia Mallma.<sup>4</sup>, Katharine D. Shefley.<sup>4</sup>, Patricka J. Gamta.<sup>4</sup>, Racheri Bosman.<sup>4</sup>, Michelle M. Gill.<sup>4</sup>, Kathalie Brontet.<sup>4</sup>, Toodonia Wil.<sup>4</sup>, Charlotte Wattis.<sup>4</sup>, David Mather<sup>4</sup>, Rosenna W. Pierling.<sup>4</sup>, Loti Newman.<sup>10</sup>

### Outcome tables: Modelling 1000 pregnant women: Prevalence 1.25% (12.5/1000)

Based	RST	Sensitivity	77	Specificity	100	Based	Sensitivity	83	Specificity	96
on			(70 to 83)			on		(58 to 98)		(89 to 100) <sup>1</sup>
field	RPR	Sensitivity	56	Specificity	99	review	Sensitivity	75	Specificity	97
data			(42 to 69)		(97-99)			(54 to 88) <sup>2</sup>		(96 to 99)

	Mass treatment	On-site RPR then RST then treat	On-site RPR then treat	RST then treat	RST treat then RPR then treat	Consequences
Screened	-	91%	91%	96%	96%	-
Treated	85%	77%	77%	89%	89%	-
# true	11.1	3.8 over	4.9	8.2	8.2	Per 1000 women treated: 5 births with
cases	(8.0 to	(1.6 to	(2.0 to 9.4)	(5.8 to	(5.8 to 16.5)	congenital syphilis; 250 gastro-intestinal side
treated	22.9)	7.3)		16.5)		effects; 70 central nervous system side effects
Missed	1.4	8.7 over	7.6	4.3	4.3	Per 1000 women missed: 160 births with
cases	(0.4 to 4.2)	(6.9 to	(6.1 to	(3.1 to	(3.1 to 10.0)	congenital syphilis; 210 stillbirths; 90 neonatal
(12.5)		20.4)	18.9)	10.0)		deaths, 60 premature births; syphilis
						transmission
Over-	841.7	0	9.8	0.8	0 under	Per 1000 women over-treated: 250 gastro-
treated	(705 to		(2.0 to	under		intestinal side effects; 70 central nervous
	900)		15.6)	(0.7 to		system side effects; 2/1 000 000 risk of penicillin
				0.9)		allergy; unnecessary medication, facility,
						personnel use; unnecessary stigma





### Outcome tables: Modelling 1000 pregnant women: Prevalence 5.14% (51.4/1000)

Based on	RST	Sensitivity	71 (55 to 83)	Specificity	93 (91 to 95)	Based on	Sensitivity	83 (58 to 98)	Specificity	96 (89 to 100) <sup>1</sup>
field data	RPR	Sensitivity	46 (29 to 63)	Specificity	97 (95 to 98)	review	Sensitivity	75 (54 to 88) <sup>1</sup>	Specificity	97 (96 to 99)

	Mass treatmen t	On-site RPR then RST then treat	On-site RPR then treat	RST then treat	RST treat then RPR then treat	Consequences
Screened	-	18%	18%	86%	86%	-
Treated	83%	74%	74%	94%	94%	-
# treated	48.2 (8.9 to 130)	2.0 (0.3 to 15.3)	2.9 (0.4 to 23.0)	29.3 (5.5 to 74.9)	29.3 (5.5 to 74.9)	Per 1000 women treated: 5 births with congenital syphilis; 250 gastro-intestinal side effects; 70 central nervous system side effects
Missed cases	3.1 (0.4 to 13.4)	49.3 (8.5 to 13)	48.5 (8.2 to 129)	22.1 (3.8 to 74.1)	22.1 (3.8 to 74.1)	Per 1000 women missed: 160 births with congenital syphilis; 210 stillbirths; 90 neonatal deaths, 60 premature births; syphilis transmission
Over- treated	760.5 (579 to 857)	0.3 (0.1 to 1.3)	3.9 (1.0 to 18.7)	50.7 (31.6 to 67.0)	1.2 (0.7 to 1.6)	Per 1000 women over-treated: 250 gastro- intestinal side effects; 70 central nervous system side effects; 2/1 000 000 risk of penicillin allergy; unnecessary medication, facility, personnel use; unnecessary stigma



### Outcome tables: Modelling 1000 pregnant women: Prevalence 9.04% (90.4/1000)

Based	RST	Sensitivity	71	Specificity	93	Based	Sensitivity	83	Specificity	96
on			(55 to 83)		(91 to 95)	on		(58 to 98)		(89 to 100) <sup>1</sup>
field	RPR	Sensitivity	46	Specificity	97	review	Sensitivity	75	Specificity	97
data			(29 to 63)		(95 to 98)			(54 to 88) <sup>1</sup>		(96 to 99)

	Mass treatment	On-site RPR then RST then treat	On-site RPR then treat	RST then treat	RST treat then RPR then treat	Consequences
Screened	-	80%	80%	97%	97%	-
Treated	75%	57%	57%	77%	77%	-
# treated Missed cases	70.0 (19.8 to 193) 20.5 (4.6 to 66.3)	12.4 (0.7 to 29.9) 78.1 (24.5 to 228)	17.6 (1.0 to 44.1) 72.9 (22.7 to 218.8)	48.0 (13.5 to 126) 42.5 (11.6 to 134)	48.0 (13.5 to 126) 42.5 (11.6 to 134)	Per 1000 women treated: 5 births with congenital syphilis; 250 gastro-intestinal side effects; 70 central nervous system side effects Per 1000 women missed: 160 births with congenital syphilis; 210 stillbirths; 90 neonatal deaths, 60 premature births; syphilis transmission
Over- treated	683.0 (499-768)	0.8 (0.1 to 1.4)	12.7 (1.2 to 19.7)	45.2 (28.1 to 59.2)	1.1 (0.6 to 1.4)	Per 1000 women over-treated: 250 gastro- intestinal side effects; 70 central nervous system side effects; 2/1 000 000 risk of penicillin allergy; unnecessary medication, facility, personnel use; unnecessary stigma



# **Summary of evidence**

- RST versus RPR : greater number of pregnant women treated
- Overtreatment
  - Low prevalence setting : no difference between RST and RPR
  - High prevalence setting: higher overtreatment with RST
- Missed treatment
  - Low prevalence setting: RST=RPR
  - High prevalence setting: higher missed treatment with RPR
- Cost effective: RST
- Acceptability and feasibility of RST
- Sequence of test may be unaffordable



# **Research gaps**

### Treatment

- New treatment option –oral and short course that cross the placental and blood-brain barrier
- Appropriate dosage of ceftriaxone
- Ceftriaxone use in infants
- □ Screen and treat for pregnant women
  - Real test accuracy of sequential test
    - Cohort of women to determine feasibility of sequential test
  - Combined treponemal and non-treponemal test
  - Dual HIV and syphilis screening test and treat

