



# Group B Streptococcus and the vaginal microbiome among pregnant women: a systematic review

Sungju Lim<sup>1</sup>, Shilpa Rajagopal<sup>2</sup>, Ye Ryn Jeong<sup>1</sup>, Dumebi Nzegwu<sup>3</sup> and Michelle L. Wright<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> School of Nursing, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, United States of America

<sup>2</sup> College of Natural Sciences, Biology Instructional Office, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, United States of America

<sup>3</sup> College of Liberal Arts, Department of Health and Society, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, United States of America

<sup>4</sup> Dell Medical School, Department of Women's Health, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, United States of America

## ABSTRACT

**Background.** Vaginal microbiome studies frequently report diversity metrics and communities of microbiomes associated with reproductive health outcomes. Reports of *Streptococcus agalactiae* (also known as Group B Streptococcus or GBS), the leading cause of neonatal infectious morbidity and mortality, are notably lacking from the studies of the vaginal microbiome, despite being a known contributor to preterm birth and other complications. Therefore, the purpose of this systematic review was to explore the frequency of GBS reporting in vaginal microbiome literature pertaining to pregnancy and to examine methodological bias that contributes to differences in species and genus-level microbiome reporting. Lack of identification of GBS via sequencing-based approaches due to methodologic or reporting bias may result in incomplete understanding of bacterial composition during pregnancy and subsequent birth outcomes.

**Methodology.** A systematic review was conducted following the PRISMA guideline. Three databases (PubMed, CINAHL, and Web of Science) were used to identify papers for review based on the search terms “vaginal microbiome”, “pregnancy”, and “16S rRNA sequencing”. Articles were evaluated for methods of DNA extraction and sequencing, 16S region, taxonomy classification database, number of participants or vaginal specimens, and pregnancy trimester.

**Results.** Forty-five research articles reported employing a metagenomic approach or 16S approach for vaginal microbiome analysis during pregnancy that explicitly reported taxonomic composition and were included in this review. Less than 30% of articles reported the presence of GBS ( $N = 13$ ). No significant differences in methodology were identified between articles that reported versus did not report GBS. However, there was large variability across research methods used for vaginal microbiome analysis and species-level bacterial community reporting.

**Conclusion.** Considerable differences in study design and data formatting methods may contribute to underrepresentation of GBS, and other known pathogens, in existing vaginal microbiome literature. Previous studies have identified considerable variation in methodology across vaginal microbiome studies. This study adds to this body of work because in addition to laboratory or statistical methods, how results and data

Submitted 25 January 2021

Accepted 20 April 2021

Published 17 May 2021

Corresponding author

Michelle L. Wright,  
michelle.wright@utexas.edu

Academic editor

Takeshi Kurita

Additional Information and  
Declarations can be found on  
page 10

DOI 10.7717/peerj.11437

© Copyright  
2021 Lim et al.

Distributed under  
Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

OPEN ACCESS

are shared (e.g., only analyzing genus level data or 20 most abundant microbes), may hinder reproducibility and limit our understanding of the influence of less abundant microbes. Sharing detailed methods, analysis code, and raw data may improve reproducibility and ability to more accurately compare microbial communities across studies.

**Subjects** Genomics, Microbiology, Molecular Biology, Taxonomy, Women's Health

**Keywords** Vaginal microbiome, Pregnancy, 16S ribosomal RNA, Whole genome sequencing, Streptococcus agalactiae, Group B Streptococcus, GBS

## INTRODUCTION

Variations within the vaginal microbiome have been associated with higher risk for preterm birth and other pregnancy complications, such as chorioamnionitis. Microbes associated with these complications such as *Streptococcus agalactiae* and *Gardnerella vaginalis*, are frequently present in polymicrobial, as well as *Lactobacillus* predominant vaginal microbiomes (Brooks et al., 2017). In light of these considerations, a growing body of research has focused on characterizing the vaginal microbiome using metagenomic approaches. Among the most common methodologies are those that rely on universal targets, 16S ribosomal RNA and cpn60 genes, allowing for more detailed taxonomic classification and profiling of the vaginal microbiome during pregnancy than culture based or targeted sequencing methods.

However, data from amplicon-based metagenomic characterizations suggest that such methods provide an incomplete understanding of the species-level diversity present in the vaginal microbiome (Bayar et al., 2020). For example, there is a notable lack of discussion of *S. agalactiae*, commonly referred to as Group B Streptococcus (GBS), a known pathogen associated with poor maternal, fetal, and neonatal outcomes in amplicon-based metagenomic vaginal microbiome studies during pregnancy. To date, many vaginal microbiome papers related to birth outcomes primarily focus on differences in community state types, which is largely determined by the abundance and type of *Lactobacillus* present (Brooks et al., 2017). Focus only on the larger vaginal community state type for analysis may limit evaluation and reporting of microbial species that are known pathogens of pregnancy that are present in low abundance.

Currently, in the United States, screening for GBS occurs between 36 to 38 weeks of pregnancy (Committee on Obstetric Practice, 2020), with those who test positive receiving antibiotic treatment during labor to help prevent early-onset neonatal GBS infection. Previous data indicate that approximately one in five women are colonized with GBS (Russell et al., 2017). Yet, apart from this routine clinical screening near the time of birth, there are limited metagenomic studies that identify or evaluate GBS during pregnancy. While screening for GBS prior to birth has reduced early onset neonatal sepsis caused by GBS in the US (Phares et al., 2008), the transient nature of maternal GBS colonization is not well understood (McCoy et al., 2020; Hansen et al., 2004). Improved understanding of the dynamics of maternal GBS colonization during pregnancy can provide additional

insights for preventing GBS complications affecting maternal and fetal health throughout pregnancy and birth (e.g., miscarriage and stillbirth).

To our knowledge, there is no systematic review addressing lack of representation of known pathogens, such as GBS, associated with pregnancy complications in existing vaginal microbiome literature. Therefore, this systematic review was conducted to: (1) determine how often GBS is reported in studies of the vaginal microbiome during pregnancy, and (2) analyze the study methods used to identify potential methodological bias in GBS reporting or underrepresentation in vaginal microbiome studies during pregnancy.

## METHODS

### Protocol and registration

This systematic review was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines ([Moher et al., 2009](#)).

### Eligibility criteria

Original studies that investigated the vaginal microbiome during human pregnancy, written in English, and published within the past 10 years were included. Only studies with pregnant women as study participants and reported microbiome taxonomy were included. Review papers, editorials, commentaries, and methodological papers including procedure/protocols were excluded. Research studies that used a targeted approach (i.e.: only include specific microbial taxa, such as *Lactobacillus* species, were analyzed via microbe specific PCR), were also excluded.

### Information sources

Three electronic databases PubMed, CINAHL, and Web of Science were used for data extraction (date last searched: June 30, 2020).

### Search

We searched these databases using two groups of search terms: (“vaginal microbiome” or “vaginal microbiota” or “pregnancy”) and (“16S ribosomal RNA” or “16S rRNA” or “whole genome sequencing”). For example, in PubMed, (((vaginal microbiome) OR (vaginal microbiota))) AND pregnancy AND ((16s ribosomal rRNA) OR (16s rRNA) OR (whole genome sequencing) OR (metagenomic)) were entered in the search window with the display option ‘best match’. Limitations of publication date as ‘10 years’, species as ‘humans’, and language as ‘English’ were used ([Appendix S1](#)).

### Study selection

After combining articles from the three databases and removing duplicates, five reviewers (SL, SR, YJ, DN, MLW) independently screened all results with titles and abstracts. Disagreements were resolved by discussion among all five reviewers to reach consensus. After the screening, eligibility was checked with full text by five reviewers (SL, SR, YJ, DN, MLW), who each reviewed one fifth of the total articles and cross-reviewed another one fifth. Disagreements were resolved by discussion to reach consensus.

### **Data collection process**

Data was extracted from the included studies by using a collaborative Google Sheets document. Each of five reviewers (SL, SR, YJ, DN, MLW) extracted one fifth of the included studies and cross-checked the accuracy of extracted data from another one fifth. Ambiguity was resolved through discussion among all reviewers.

### **Data items**

The initial data extraction tool contained the items as follows: study title, study purpose, whether GBS was reported, level of analysis - genus/species (in the case of GBS not reported), sequencing methods, 16S rRNA primer region (for studies using 16S rRNA sequencing), sequencing platform, taxonomy classification database, DNA collection kit, DNA extraction kit, number of pregnant women, number of vaginal specimens, age of pregnant women, pregnancy period in which the specimen collected, ethnicity/region of the participants/study design. In studies that reported taxonomy to the species level and GBS was not detected, we also assessed the articles to determine if *Streptococcus* at the genus level was reported.

### **Risk of bias in individual studies**

No previous studies have exclusively examined the methodology of vaginal microbiome studies related to detection of known common opportunistic pathogens, like GBS. One of the main purposes of this review was to evaluate if methodological differences/biases in vaginal microbiome studies contribute to reporting or underrepresentation of GBS in existing microbiome literature.

### **Summary measures**

Our primary outcome was to identify the number of studies that reported the presence of GBS within the vaginal microbiome. Due to methodological heterogeneity, the differences across analytic and sequencing methodologies between studies that reported versus did not report GBS were compared narratively.


### **Synthesis of results**

After data extraction, the included studies were divided into two groups: GBS reported and GBS not reported. Independent t-tests were conducted to compare the number of pregnant women and the number of vaginal specimens between GBS reported and not reported groups. The commonalities and differences among 16S rRNA primer regions used were compared. We then qualitatively compared the commonalities and differences of the other methodological categories between two groups, since methods were too varied to compare statistically.

## **RESULTS**

### **Study selection**

Our search strategy initially yielded 278 manuscripts (Fig. 1). After removing 68 duplicates, 210 article titles and abstracts were screened, and 159 studies were excluded because they did not meet inclusion criteria. Full text was reviewed for the remaining 52 manuscripts,



**Figure 1** The flow diagram of this study.

Full-size DOI: 10.7717/peerj.11437/fig-1

and six additional studies were excluded for failing to meet inclusion criteria. A total of 45 studies were included and reviewed in this study.

### Study characteristics and results of individual studies

The characteristics of each study that reported ( $n = 13$ ) (Fettweis et al., 2014; Ghartey et al., 2014; Romero et al., 2014a; Romero et al., 2014b; Bisanz et al., 2015; MacIntyre et al., 2015; Kindinger et al., 2017; Brown et al., 2018; Hočevár et al., 2019; Purkayastha et al., 2019; Romero et al., 2019; Tabatabaei et al., 2019; Al-Memmar et al., 2020) or did not report GBS ( $n = 32$ ) (Dominguez-Bello et al., 2010; Hernández-Rodríguez et al., 2011; Aagaard et al., 2012; Frank et al., 2012; Hyman et al., 2012; Hyman et al., 2014; Walther-Antônio et al., 2014; Baldwin et al., 2015; DiGiulio et al., 2015; Huang et al., 2015; Brumbaugh et al., 2016; Jayaprakash et al., 2016; Lauder et al., 2016; Nelson et al., 2016; Subramaniam et al., 2016; Callahan et al., 2017; Freitas et al., 2017; Nasioudis et al., 2017b; Nasioudis et al., 2017a;

**Table 1** Comparison of GBS reported and GBS not reported studies.

	GBS Reported ( <i>n</i> = 13)	GBS Not Reported ( <i>n</i> = 32)
Trimesters	1st trimester (1) 2nd trimester (0) 3rd trimester (3) All trimesters (5) 2nd and 3rd (2) Unspecified (2)	1st trimester (5) 2nd trimester (6) 3rd trimester (6) All trimesters (12) 1st and 2nd (2) 2nd and 3rd (5) Unspecified (1)
Number of pregnant women	Mean: 111.154 (SD 121.817) Range [8–450], Total # 1445	Mean: 82.594 (SD 91.331) Range [6–461], Total # 2643
Number of vaginal specimens	(11/13 studies; 2 unspecified) Mean: 184 Standard deviation: 155.793 Range: [8–450] Total #: around 2086	(32/32 studies) Mean: 214 Standard deviation: 418.706 Range: [4–2179] Total #: around 6848
DNA extraction kit	QIAamp DNA Mini Kit (6) MoBio PowerSoil Kit (3) Custom (4)	QIAamp (6) MoBio (13) DNeasy (2) Others (5) Custom (5)
Sequencing method	16S rRNA Sequencing (13)	16S rRNA Sequencing (29) Shotgun sequencing (2) Cpn60 (2)
16S rRNA region	V1–V2 (4), V1–V3 (3), V3–V4 (1), V4 (3), V6 (1), full (1)	V1–V2 (2), V1–V3 (8), V2 (1), V3 (1), V3–V4 (3), V3–V5 (7), V4 (5), V4–V5 (1), V4–V6 (1), full (6)

*Roesch et al., 2017; Stout et al., 2017; Goltsman et al., 2018; Leizer et al., 2018; Matsumoto et al., 2018; Wylie et al., 2018; Chen et al., 2019; Dobbler et al., 2019; He et al., 2019; Jefferson et al., 2019; Liu et al., 2019; Price et al., 2019; Witkin et al., 2019*) are described in [Tables S1](#) and [S2](#) respectively.

## Synthesis of results

Among the 45 studies reviewed, less than 30% of manuscripts reported the presence of GBS within the results, figures, or microbial taxonomy tables. To determine the frequency in which GBS was reported, and to compare analytic methods across studies, we analyzed: time of sample collection, number of research participants and samples, DNA extraction method, type of sequencing completed, and database used to assign taxonomy ([Table 1](#)).

## Participant and sample characteristics

There were no differences in the sample sizes (mean comparison of the number of specimens:  $t = 0.372$ ,  $df = 43$ ,  $p = 0.712$ ; number of women:  $t = 0.862$ ,  $df = 43$ ,  $p = 0.394$ ). However, there was large variability in sample size and number of specimens collected in studies that reported and did not report GBS. Additionally, four manuscripts that did not report GBS within the taxonomy analyzed, or overall metagenomic results, did report positive culture-based GBS clinical screening results for women within the study (*Brumbaugh et al., 2016; Jayaprakash et al., 2016; Roesch et al., 2017; Leizer et al., 2018*).

### **DNA extraction kits, Sequencing method, and Taxonomy classification**

A variety of approaches were employed for DNA extraction; custom developed protocols, along with two standard extraction kits (Table 1) were used in studies reporting GBS within the vaginal microbiome. However, these kits and custom approaches were also used in studies that did not report GBS. In terms of sequencing methods, all studies reporting GBS used 16S rRNA sequencing, as well as most studies that did not report the presence of GBS. Additionally, there was no notable difference found in the 16S rRNA hypervariable region used across either set of studies. Similarly, multiple taxonomy databases were used for studies that did and did not report the presence of GBS.

### **Risk of bias across studies**

The included studies were not originally conducted with a specific focus on GBS. However, most studies were evaluating the composition of the microbiome across pregnancy, or related to birth outcomes that GBS can influence, such as preterm birth (Tables S1 and S2). There is notable bias against GBS reporting when only genus level data are reported. And the practice of only speciating *Lactobacillus* in vaginal microbiome studies may need to be reconsidered, given GBS cannot be differentiated without also speciating *Streptococcus*. For example, seven studies that did not report GBS only assigned taxonomy to the genus level, 9 studies only assigned species level assignments for *Lactobacillus* spp., three studies only assigned species to *Lactobacillus* spp. and *Gardnerella*, and three studies that did assign taxonomy to species level for analysis did not report species level results (Table S1). Given that species other than *Lactobacillus* can negatively impact vaginal health and birth outcomes, these methods of analysis and reporting contribute to positive bias towards *Lactobacillus* reporting in the vaginal microbiome literature and negative bias towards other relevant pathogenic species that are less prevalent. Further, four studies only reported the top 15–21 most abundant species or taxa (Table S1). Since some vaginal pathogens present in low abundance can cause pregnancy complications the underrepresentation of these pathogens, such as GBS, may indicate bias against reporting of microbes that are not the most abundant taxonomic groups but still could be contributing to the poor outcomes being studied.

## **DISCUSSION**

In this review, we explored how often GBS was reported in studies of the vaginal microbiome during pregnancy. Methods related to GBS reporting were compared to identify potential methodological bias. Among 45 studies, 13 (28.9%) reported GBS. However, due to the heterogeneity of methods across study approaches, we were not able to detect any systematic differences that appeared to enhance or hinder GBS reporting.

### **Methodologic differences and sources of bias**

There are known sources of bias in metagenomic studies associated with analysis methods (Committee on Obstetric Practice, 2020; Brooks et al., 2015; Knight et al., 2018). Brooks and colleagues determined that microbiome community composition can be biased at various steps including DNA extraction, PCR amplification, sequencing, and taxonomic

classification (Brooks et al., 2015). The researchers reported that more than 85% of the microbiome community results were biased by small variations in methods (less than 5%). Specifically, it has been determined that variations in DNA extraction and amplification can result in decreased representation of *Streptococcus* species. If women with GBS colonization only harbor small amounts of the bacteria, it is possible that bias introduced by these steps could have contributed to the limited representation of GBS in vaginal microbiome data.

Such underrepresentation of known pathogens can significantly limit the clinical scope of vaginal microbiome studies. For example, many studies only reported results related to community state types or analyzed the most abundant species. Consequently, if thresholds for inclusion are based on sample abundance (e.g., 5% of sample or 5,000 reads), GBS data may have been excluded if it did not meet the threshold. Furthermore, selection of 16S regions for amplification and associated primers can influence genus and species level resolution (Graspeuntner et al., 2018). For example, it is generally more difficult to distinguish *Lactobacillus* species within the V4 region, but may be easier to do so in V1–V3 (Fettweis et al., 2012). Conversely, *G. vaginalis* is more difficult to detect and differentiate within the V1–V2 region because its sequence is highly variable prior to the V1 region, making primer selection more complex (Graspeuntner et al., 2018). These biases can be partially mitigated by recognizing the characteristics of 16S rRNA sequencing and thoughtfully selecting primers. Studies that evaluate the influence of selected 16S regions on GBS representation have not yet been published. From our findings, the 13 studies that detected GBS used 16S regions between V1–V4 or V6. However, the 32 studies that did not report GBS also used the same regions. Thus, assessment of bias by 16S region is important when designing and evaluating future vaginal microbiome studies, and further targeted studies evaluating the influence of primer region on known pregnancy pathogens should be completed.

Given limitations in exploring the true proportions within the microbial community, studies have increasingly employed whole genome sequencing (WGS), which allows for higher resolution up to the strain level. In our review, two studies employed WGS but did not report GBS (Goltsman et al., 2018; Price et al., 2019). Both papers initially selected some of the most prevalent species-level taxa, which are frequently *Lactobacillus* and *Gardnerella* species, to continue further analysis. This approach may have constrained the strength of WGS, causing researchers to miss less abundant, yet clinically important genus, species, and strains. If WGS was completed to gain a more inclusive representation of all species in the vaginal microbiome, analysis should include more taxa instead of only including the same top taxa that were included in previous 16S studies.

### **Limited assessment and lack of focus on low abundance organisms**

The above results indicate that reporting strategies, rather than methodology, may contribute to the underreporting of less abundant pathogens in metagenomic vaginal microbiome studies during pregnancy. As the majority of studies in our review explored the compositional variation of vaginal microbiome during pregnancy, underreporting can be a serious issue because known pathogens may not be analyzed as potential contributors to pregnancy complications.



We observed differences in threshold determinants for analysis or reporting. Among the 32 studies that did not report GBS, 24 analyzed the microbiome at the species level, but only reported the most prevalent genus (i.e., *Lactobacillus* species). This may lead to a misclassification error, in which only the most abundant bacteria or species is associated with the outcome of interest. Additionally, 20 studies reported *Streptococcus* at the genus level, but did not conduct further species-level analysis. It is possible that studies that did not speciate *Streptococcus* had GBS present within their population, a result which could be re-evaluated if raw sequencing data is made available.

Moreover, four studies that did not report GBS in their results or microbiome data identified GBS-positive women in their study based on culture-based clinical testing ([Brumbaugh et al., 2016](#); [Jayaprakash et al., 2016](#); [Roesch et al., 2017](#); [Leizer et al., 2018](#)). This suggests that there may be a benefit to using both sequence-based and culture-based methods to verify presence or absence of low abundance microbes within vaginal microbiome communities. Previous studies have shown discordance in culture-based GBS colonization results between antenatal screening and culture on admission for delivery ([McCoy et al., 2020](#); [Hussain et al., 2019](#)). In a study by McCoy and colleagues, nearly 40% of women that were positive at GBS screening were not GBS positive at the time of admission ([McCoy et al., 2020](#)). Alternatively, [Hussain et al. \(2019\)](#) reported a discordance rate of 11%. While the transient nature of GBS colonization is known, factors that contribute to loss or gain of maternal GBS colonization remain uncertain ([Hansen et al., 2004](#)).

Evaluation of culture-based GBS screening previously determined that GBS transmission to neonates is more likely when maternal colonization is heavy, as determined by the number of colonies grown at the time of screening ([Berardi et al., 2014](#); [Seedat et al., 2018](#)). However, it is unclear how well clinical culture-based microbial assessments correlate with the detection of clinically relevant pathogens in sequencing-based vaginal microbiome studies. Furthermore, much of the research investigating risk of neonatal GBS infection related to maternal bacterial load was completed in the 1980s and has not been evaluated using sequencing-based methods ([Seedat et al., 2018](#)). Future studies that concurrently evaluate the accuracy of GBS reporting within microbial communities via metagenomic sequencing approaches and culture-based methods are needed.

### Strengths and limitations

Strengths of this review include the evaluation of factors that may influence the reporting of less abundance vaginal pathogens in existing microbiome literature for a known pathogen that is rarely discussed in the vaginal microbiome literature. We identified studies from multiple databases and assessed differences across studies at various decision points to analyze metagenomic data.

The heterogeneity across studies in methods and data reporting limited the ability to pool and re-analyze the data. This was further complicated by the fact that some studies reported most microbial taxa at solely the genus level, whereas other studies only included species-level data for specific genus like *Lactobacillus*. Furthermore, the format and availability of data associated with manuscripts also varied greatly (e.g., raw data versus including only taxonomy tables used in the analysis). In cases where the full microbial

datasets were not available, it was difficult to determine whether the absence of GBS reporting was due to lack of detection, exclusion from analysis because of low abundance, or some other factor. These limitations highlight the importance of making study analysis code and raw data freely available upon publication in order to encourage reproducibility and comparison.

## CONCLUSION

Only a small proportion of vaginal microbiome studies reported the presence of GBS during pregnancy. No systematic differences in factors previously known to introduce bias in microbiome studies were associated with the lack of GBS reporting. However, there was considerable heterogeneity in research methods employed across studies. Consideration of less abundant, but clinically meaningful microbes in vaginal microbiome studies may improve our understanding of how the vaginal microbiota influences pregnancy outcomes. GBS was reported in studies across all trimesters of pregnancy using metagenomic methods, although reporting of culture based GBS does not always correlate with metagenomic GBS reporting. Therefore, studies evaluating the presence of GBS may need to adopt both confirmatory testing for GBS via culture and parallel comparison with results obtained from metagenomic/meta-taxonomic approaches.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The content is solely the responsibility of the author and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH.

## ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND DECLARATIONS

### Funding

Michelle L. Wright is supported by the National Institute of Nursing Research (K01NR017903). The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

### Grant Disclosures

The following grant information was disclosed by the authors:  
National Institute of Nursing Research: K01NR017903.

### Competing Interests

The authors declare there are no competing interests.

### Author Contributions

- Sungju Lim, Shilpa Rajagopal and Michelle L. Wright conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the paper, and approved the final draft.
- Ye Ryn Jeong and Dumebi Nzegwu performed the experiments, analyzed the data, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the paper, and approved the final draft.

## Data Availability

The following information was supplied regarding data availability:

This study is a systematic review.

## Supplemental Information

Supplemental information for this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.11437#supplemental-information>.

## REFERENCES

- Aagaard K, Riehle K, Ma J, Segata N, Mistretta TA, Coarfa C, Raza S, Rosenbaum S, Van den Veyver I, Milosavljevic A, Gevers D, Huttenhower C, Petrosino J, Versalovic J. 2012. A metagenomic approach to characterization of the vaginal microbiome signature in pregnancy. *PLOS ONE* 7(6):e36466 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0036466.
- Al-Memar M, Bobdiwala S, Fourie H, Mannino R, Lee YS, Smith A, Marchesi JR, Timmerman D, Bourne T, Bennett PR, MacIntyre DA. 2020. The association between vaginal bacterial composition and miscarriage: a nested case-control study. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology* 127(2):264–274 DOI 10.1111/1471-0528.15972.
- Baldwin EA, Walther-Antonio M, MacLean AM, Gohl DM, Beckman KB, Chen J, White B, Creedon DJ, Chia N. 2015. Persistent microbial dysbiosis in preterm premature rupture of membranes from onset until delivery. *PeerJ* 3:e1398 DOI 10.7717/peerj.1398.
- Bayar E, Bennett PR, Chan D, Sykes L, MacIntyre DA. 2020. The pregnancy microbiome and preterm birth. *Seminars in Immunopathology* 42(4):487–499 DOI 10.1007/s00281-020-00817-w.
- Berardi A, Rossi C, Guidotti I, Vellani G, Lugli L, Reggiani MLB, Ferrari F, Facchinetti F, Ferrari F. 2014. Factors associated with intrapartum transmission of group B Streptococcus. *Pediatric Infectious Disease Journal* 33(12):1211–1215 DOI 10.1097/INF.0000000000000439.
- Bisanz JE, Enos MK, PrayGod G, Seney S, Macklaim JM, Chilton S, Willner D, Knight R, Fusch C, Fusch G, Gloor GB, Burton JP, Reid G. 2015. Microbiota at multiple body sites during pregnancy in a rural tanzanian population and effects of Moringa-supplemented probiotic yogurt. *Applied and Environmental Microbiology* 81(15):4965–4975 DOI 10.1128/AEM.00780-15.
- Brooks JP, Buck GA, Chen G, Diao L, Edwards DJ, Fettweis JM, Huzurbazar S, Rakitin A, Satten GA, Smirnova E, Waks Z, Wright ML, Yanover C, Zhou Y. 2017. Changes in vaginal community state types reflect major shifts in the microbiome. *Microbial Ecology in Health and Disease* 28(1):1303265 DOI 10.1080/16512235.2017.1303265.
- Brooks JP, Edwards DJ, Harwich MD, Rivera MC, Fettweis JM, Serrano MG, et al. 2015. The truth about metagenomics: quantifying and counteracting bias in 16S rRNA studies Ecological and evolutionary microbiology. *BMC Microbiology* 15(1):1–14.

- Brown RG, Marchesi JR, Lee YS, Smith A, Lehne B, Kindinger LM, et al. 2018.** Vaginal dysbiosis increases risk of preterm fetal membrane rupture, neonatal sepsis and is exacerbated by erythromycin. *BMC Medicine* **16**(1):1–15.
- Brumbaugh DE, Arruda J, Robbins K, Ir D, Santorico SA, Robertson CE, Frank DN. 2016.** Mode of delivery determines neonatal pharyngeal bacterial composition and early intestinal colonization. *Journal of Pediatrics Gastroenterology and Nutrition* **63**(3):320–328 DOI [10.1097/MPG.0000000000001124](https://doi.org/10.1097/MPG.0000000000001124).
- Callahan BJ, DiGiulio DB, Aliaga Goltsman DS, Sun CL, Costello EK, Jeganathan P, Biggio JR, Wong RJ, Druzin ML, Shaw GM, Stevenson DK, Holmes SP, Relman DA. 2017.** Replication and refinement of a vaginal microbial signature of preterm birth in two racially distinct cohorts of US women. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **114**(37):9966–9971 DOI [10.1073/pnas.1705899114](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1705899114).
- Chen Y, Hong Z, Wang W, Gu L, Gao H, Qiu L, et al. 2019.** Association between the vaginal microbiome and high-risk human papillomavirus infection in pregnant Chinese women. *BMC Infectious Diseases* **19**(1):1–11.
- Committee on Obstetric Practice. 2020.** Prevention of Group B streptococcal early-onset disease in newborns. *The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists* **135**(2):e51-e71 DOI [10.1097/AOG.0000000000003668](https://doi.org/10.1097/AOG.0000000000003668).
- DiGiulio DB, Callahan BJ, McMurdie PJ, Costello EK, Lyell DJ, Robaczewska A, Sun CL, Goltsman DSA, Wong RJ, Shaw G, Stevenson DK, Holmes SP, Relman DA. 2015.** Temporal and spatial variation of the human microbiota during pregnancy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **112**(35):11060–11065 DOI [10.1073/pnas.1502875112](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1502875112).
- Dobbler P, Mai V, Procianoy RS, Silveira RC, Corso AL, Roesch LFW. 2019.** The vaginal microbial communities of healthy expectant Brazilian mothers and its correlation with the newborn's gut colonization. *World Journal of Microbiology and Biotechnology* **35**(10):1–14 DOI [10.1007/s11274-018-2566-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11274-018-2566-9).
- Dominguez-Bello MG, Costello EK, Contreras M, Magris M, Hidalgo G, Fierer N, Knight R. 2010.** Delivery mode shapes the acquisition and structure of the initial microbiota across multiple body habitats in newborns. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **107**(26):11971–11975 DOI [10.1073/pnas.1002601107](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1002601107).
- Fettweis JM, Serrano MG, Huang B, Brooks JP, Glascock AL, Sheth NU, Vaginal Microbiome Consortium, Strauss 3rd JF, Jefferson KK, Buck GA. 2014.** An emerging mycoplasma associated with trichomoniasis, vaginal infection and disease. *PLOS ONE* **9**(10):e110943 DOI [10.1371/journal.pone.0110943](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0110943).
- Fettweis JM, Serrano MG, Sheth NU, Mayer CM, Glascock AL, Brooks JP, et al. 2012.** Species-level classification of the vaginal microbiome. *BMC Genomics* **13**(Suppl 8):S17.
- Frank DN, Manigart O, Leroy V, Meda N, Valéa D, Zhang W, Dabis F, Pace NR, Van de Perre P, Janoff EN. 2012.** Altered vaginal microbiota are associated with perinatal mother-to-child transmission of HIV in African women from

- Burkina Faso. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes* **60**(3):299–306  
DOI [10.1097/QAI.0b013e31824e4bdb](https://doi.org/10.1097/QAI.0b013e31824e4bdb).
- Freitas AC, Chaban B, Bocking A, Rocco M, Yang S, Hill JE, et al. 2017. The vaginal microbiome of pregnant women is less rich and diverse, with lower prevalence of Mollicutes, compared to non-pregnant women. *Scientific Reports* **7**(1):1–16.
- Ghartey JP, Smith BC, Chen Z, Buckley N, Lo Y, Ratner AJ, Herold BC, Burk RD. 2014. Lactobacillus crispatus dominant vaginal microbiome is associated with inhibitory activity of female genital tract secretions against Escherichia coli. *PLOS ONE* **9**(5):1–8.
- Goltsman DSA, Sun CL, Proctor DM, DiGiulio DB, Robaczewska A, Thomas BC, Shaw GM, Stevenson DK, Holmes SP, Banfield JF, Relman DA. 2018. Metagenomic analysis with strain-level resolution reveals fine-scale variation in the human pregnancy microbiome. *Genome Research* **28**(10):1467–1480 DOI [10.1101/gr.236000.118](https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.236000.118).
- Graspeuntner S, Loeper N, Künzel S, Baines JF, Rupp J. 2018. Selection of validated hypervariable regions is crucial in 16S-based microbiota studies of the female genital tract. *Scientific Reports* **8**(1):9678 DOI [10.1038/s41598-018-27757-8](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-27757-8).
- Hansen SM, Uldbjerg N, Kilian M, Sørensen UBS. 2004. Dynamics of Streptococcus agalactiae colonization in women during and after pregnancy and in their infants. *Journal of Clinical Microbiology* **42**(1):83–89 DOI [10.1128/JCM.42.1.83-89.2004](https://doi.org/10.1128/JCM.42.1.83-89.2004).
- He Y, Huang Y, Zhang Z, Yu F, Zheng Y. 2019. Exploring profile and potential influencers of vaginal microbiome among asymptomatic pregnant Chinese women. *PeerJ* **7**:e8172 DOI [10.7717/peerj.8172](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.8172).
- Hernández-Rodríguez C, Romero-González R, Albani-Campanario M, Figueroa-Damián R, Meraz-Cruz N, Hernández-Guerrero C. 2011. Vaginal microbiota of healthy pregnant mexican women is constituted by four Lactobacillus species and several vaginosis-associated bacteria. *Infectious Diseases in Obstetrics and Gynecology* 2011.
- Hočevar K, Maver A, Šimic M, Vidmar, Hodžić A, Haslberger A, Seršen TPremru, et al. 2019. Vaginal microbiome signature is associated with spontaneous preterm delivery. *Frontiers in Medicine* **6**(September):1–12.
- Huang Y-E, Wang Y, He Y, Ji Y, Wang L-P, Sheng H-F, Zhang M, Huang Q-T, Zhang D-J, Wu J-J, Zhong M, Zhou H-W. 2015. Homogeneity of the vaginal microbiome at the cervix, posterior fornix, and vaginal canal in pregnant chinese women. *Microbial Ecology* **69**(2):407–414 DOI [10.1007/s00248-014-0487-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00248-014-0487-1).
- Hussain FN, Al-Ibraheemi Z, Pan S, Francis AP, Taylor D, Lam MC, et al. 2019. The accuracy of group beta streptococcus rectovaginal cultures at 35 to 37 weeks of gestation in predicting colonization intrapartum. *AJP Reports* **9**(3):e302–9.
- Hyman RW, Fukushima M, Jiang H, Fung E, Rand L, Johnson B, Chi Vo K, Caughey AB, Hilton JF, Davis RW, Giudice LC. 2014. Diversity of the vaginal microbiome correlates with preterm birth. *Reproductive Sciences* **21**(1):32–40 DOI [10.1177/1933719113488838](https://doi.org/10.1177/1933719113488838).
- Hyman RW, Herndon CN, Jiang H, Palm C, Fukushima M, Bernstein D, Vo KC, Zelenko Z, Davis RW, Giudice LC. 2012. The dynamics of the vaginal microbiome

- during infertility therapy with in vitro fertilization-embryo transfer. *Journal of Assisted Reproduction and Genetics* 29(2):105–115 DOI 10.1007/s10815-011-9694-6.
- Jayaprakash TP, Wagner EC, Van Schalkwyk J, Albert AYK, Hill JE, Money DM, PPRM Study Group. 2016. High diversity and variability in the vaginal microbiome in women following Preterm Premature Rupture of Membranes (PPROM): a prospective cohort study. *PLOS ONE* 11(11):1–19 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0166794.
- Jefferson KK, Parikh HI, Garcia EM, Edwards DJ, Serrano MG, Hewison M, Shary JR, Powell AM, Hollis BW, Fettweis JM, Strauss III JF, Buck GA, Wagner CL. 2019. Relationship between vitamin D status and the vaginal microbiome during pregnancy. *Journal of Perinatology* 39(6):824–836 DOI 10.1038/s41372-019-0343-8.
- Kindinger LM, Bennett PR, Lee YS, Marchesi JR, Smith A, Cacciatore S, Holmes E, Nicholson JK, Teoh TG, MacIntyre DA. 2017. The interaction between vaginal microbiota, cervical length, and vaginal progesterone treatment for preterm birth risk. *Microbiome* 5(1):1–14 DOI 10.1186/s40168-016-0223-9.
- Knight R, Vrbanac A, Taylor BC, Aksenov A, Callewaert C, Debelius J, Gonzalez A, Kosciolk T, McCall L-I, McDonald D, Melnik AV, Morton JT, Navas J, Quinn RA, Sanders JG, Swafford AD, Thompson LR, Tripathi A, Xu ZZ, Zaneveld JR, Zhu Q, Gregory Caporaso J, Dorrestein PC. 2018. Best practices for analysing microbiomes. *Nature Reviews Microbiology* 16(7):410–422 DOI 10.1038/s41579-018-0029-9.
- Lauder AP, Roche AM, Sherrill-Mix S, Bailey A, Laughlin AL, Bittinger K, et al. 2016. Comparison of placenta samples with contamination controls does not provide evidence for a distinct placenta microbiota. *Microbiome* 4:1–11.
- Leizer J, Nasioudis D, Forney LJ, Schneider GM, Gliniewicz K, Boester A, Witkin SS. 2018. Properties of Epithelial Cells and Vaginal Secretions in Pregnant Women When *Lactobacillus crispatus* or *Lactobacillus iners* Dominate the Vaginal Microbiome. *Reproductive Sciences* 25(6):854–860 DOI 10.1177/1933719117698583.
- Liu CJ, Liang X, Niu ZY, Jin Q, Zeng XQ, Wang WX, Li MY, Xue-Rong Chen X-R, Meng H-Y, Shen R, Sun SY, Luo Y-Y, Yang E, Geng J-W, Li X-R. 2019. Is the delivery mode a critical factor for the microbial communities in the meconium? *EBioMedicine* 49:354–363 DOI 10.1016/j.ebiom.2019.10.045.
- MacIntyre DA, Chandiramani M, Lee YS, Kindinger L, Smith A, Angelopoulos N, Lehne B, Arulkumaran S, Brown R, Teoh TG, Holmes E, Nicholson JK, Marchesi JR, Bennett PR. 2015. The vaginal microbiome during pregnancy and the postpartum period in a European population. *Scientific Reports* 5(1):8988 DOI 10.1038/srep08988.
- Matsumoto A, Yamagishi Y, Miyamoto K, Oka K, Takahashi M, Mikamo H. 2018. Characterization of the vaginal microbiota of Japanese women. *Anaerobe* 54:172–177 DOI 10.1016/j.anaerobe.2018.10.001.
- McCoy JA, Elovitz MA, Alby K, Koelper NC, Nissim I, Levine LD. 2020. Association of Obesity With Maternal and Cord Blood Penicillin Levels in Women With Group B Streptococcus Colonization. *Obstetrics & Gynecology* 136(4):756–764 DOI 10.1097/AOG.0000000000004020.

- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Altman D, Antes G, et al. 2009. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLOS Medicine* 6(7).
- Nasioudis D, Forney LJ, Schneider GM, Gliniewicz K, France MT, Boester A, Sawai M, Scholl J, Witkin SS. 2017a. The composition of the vaginal microbiome in first trimester pregnant women influences the level of autophagy and stress in vaginal epithelial cells. *Journal of Reproductive Immunology* 123(March):35–39 DOI 10.1016/j.jri.2017.08.009.
- Nasioudis D, Forney LJ, Schneider GM, Gliniewicz K, France M, Boester A, Sawai M, Scholl J, Witkin SS. 2017b. Influence of Pregnancy History on the Vaginal Microbiome of Pregnant Women in their First Trimester. *Scientific Reports* 7(1):1–6 DOI 10.1038/s41598-017-09857-z.
- Nelson DB, Shin H, Wu J, Dominguez-Bello MG. 2016. The Gestational Vaginal Microbiome and Spontaneous Preterm Birth among Nulliparous African American Women. *American Journal of Perinatology* 33(9):887–893 DOI 10.1055/s-0036-1581057.
- Phares CR, Lynfield R, Farley MM, Mohle-Boetani J, Harrison LH, Petit S, Craig AS, Schaffner W, Zansky SM, Gershman K, Stefonek KR, Albanese BA, Zell ER, Schuchat A, Schrag SJ. 2008. Epidemiology of invasive group B streptococcal disease in the United States, 1999–2005. *JAMA* 299(17):2056–2065 DOI 10.1001/jama.299.17.2056.
- Price JT, Vwalika B, Hobbs M, Nelson JAE, Stringer EM, Zou F, et al. 2019. Highly diverse anaerobe-predominant vaginal microbiota among HIV-infected pregnant women in Zambia. *PLOS ONE* 14(10):1–17.
- Purkayastha SD, Bhattacharya MK, Prasad HK, Upadhyaya H, Lala SD, Pal K, Das M, Sharma GD, Bhattacharjee MJ. 2019. Contrasting diversity of vaginal lactobacilli among the females of Northeast India. *BMC Microbiology* 19(1):1–10 DOI 10.1186/s12866-019-1568-6.
- Roesch LFW, Silveira RC, Corso AL, Dobbler PT, Mai V, Rojas BS, et al. 2017. Diversity and composition of vaginal microbiota of pregnant women at risk for transmitting Group B Streptococcus treated with intrapartum penicillin. *PLOS ONE* 12(2):1–13.
- Romero R, Gomez-Lopez N, Winters AD, Jung E, Shaman M, Bieda J, Panaitescu B, Pacora P, Erez O, Greenberg JM, Ahmad MM, Hsu C-D, Theis KR. 2019. Evidence that intra-amniotic infections are often the result of an ascending invasion - a molecular microbiological study. *Journal of Perinatal Medicine* 47(9):915–931 DOI 10.1515/jpm-2019-0297.
- Romero R, Hassan SS, Gajer P, Tarca AL, Fadrosh DW, Bieda J, Chaemsaihong P, Miranda J, Chaiworapongsa T, Ravel J. 2014a. The Vaginal microbiota of pregnant women who subsequently have spontaneous preterm labor and delivery and those with a normal delivery at term. *Microbiome* 2:18.
- Romero R, Hassan SS, Gajer P, Tarca AL, Fadrosh DW, Nikita L, et al. 2014b. The composition and stability of the vaginal microbiota of normal pregnant women is different from that of non-pregnant women. *Microbiome* 2(1):1–19.

- Russell NJ, Seale AC, O'Driscoll MC, O'Sullivan C, Bianchi-Jassir F, Gonzalez-Guarin J, Lawn JE, Baker CJ, Bartlett L, Cutland C, Gravett MG, Heath PT, Doare KL, Madhi SA, Rubens CE, Schrag S, Sobanjo-ter Meulen A, Vekemans J, Saha SK, Ip M, for the GBS Maternal Colonization Investigator Group. 2017. Maternal Colonization With Group B Streptococcus and Serotype Distribution Worldwide: systematic Review and Meta-analyses. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 65(suppl 2):S100–S111 DOI 10.1093/cid/cix658.
- Seedat F, Brown CS, Stinton C, Patterson J, Geppert J, Freeman K, et al. 2018. Bacterial load and molecular markers associated with early-onset group B streptococcus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Pediatric Infectious Disease* 37(12):e306–14.
- Stout MJ, Zhou Y, Wylie KM, Tarr PI, Macones GA, Tuuli MG. 2017. Early pregnancy vaginal microbiome trends and preterm birth. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology* 217(3):356.e1–356.e18.
- Subramaniam A, Kumar R, Cliver SP, Zhi D, Szychowski JM, Abramovici A, et al. 2016. Vaginal Microbiota in Pregnancy: evaluation Based on Vaginal Flora, Birth Outcome, and Race. *American Journal of Perinatology* 33(4):401–408.
- Tabatabaei N, Eren AM, Barreiro LB, Yotova V, Dumaine A, Allard C, Fraser WD. 2019. Vaginal microbiome in early pregnancy and subsequent risk of spontaneous preterm birth: a case–control study. *BJOG: An International Journal of Obstetrics & Gynaecology* 126(3):349–58 DOI 10.1111/1471-0528.15299.
- Walther-Antônio MRS, Jeraldo P, Miller ME, Berg, Yeoman CJ, Nelson KE, Wilson BA, et al. 2014. Pregnancy's stronghold on the vaginal microbiome. *PLOS ONE* 9(6):1–10.
- Witkin SS, Nasioudis D, Leizer J, Minis E, Boester A, Forney LJ. 2019. Epigenetics and the vaginal microbiome: influence of the microbiota on the histone deacetylase level in vaginal epithelial cells from pregnant women. *Minerva Ginecologica* 71(2):171–175.
- Wylie KM, Blankenship SA, Tuuli MG, Macones GA, Stout MJ. 2018. Evaluation of patient- versus provider-collected vaginal swabs for microbiome analysis during pregnancy. *BMC Research Notes* 11(1):5–11 DOI 10.1186/s13104-017-3122-7.