

Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website.

Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active. **3.** United States Food and Drug Administration. Emergency use authorizations for medical devices. Coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) emergency use authorizations for medical devices. EUA authorized serology test performance. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/medical-devices/emergency-situations-medical-devices/eua-authorized-serology-test-performance. Accessed August 1, 2020.

4. Flannery DD, Gouma S, Dhudasia MB, et al. SARS-CoV-2 seroprevalence among parturient women in Philadelphia. Sci Immunol 2020;5: eabd5709.

5. Cosma S, Borella F, Carosso A, et al. The "scar" of a pandemic: cumulative incidence of COVID-19 during the first trimester of pregnancy. J Med Virol 2020. [Epub ahead of print]. **6.** Zöllkau J, Baier M, Scherag A, Schleußner E, Groten T. Period prevalence of SARS-CoV-2 in an unselected sample of pregnant women in Jena, Thuringia. Z Geburtshilfe Neonatol 2020;224:194–8.

7. New York City Health website. COVID-19: data. Available at: https:// www1.nyc.gov/site/doh/covid/covid-19-data.page. Accessed August 1, 2020.

8. He X, Lau EHY, Wu P, et al. Temporal dynamics in viral shedding and transmissibility of COVID-19. Nat Med 2020;26:672–5.

© 2020 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog. 2020.09.022

Preprocedural asymptomatic coronavirus disease 2019 cases in obstetrical and surgical units

Check for updates

OBJECTIVE: Asymptomatic severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 (SARS-CoV-2) infections remain a challenge, accounting for nearly half of all the infections.¹ The infectivity of asymptomatic patients can extend to more than 14 days, and samples isolated from their respiratory tracts have similar viral loads as those of symptomatic patients.^{1,2} To mitigate the surgical risk for patients and exposure of healthcare workers (HCW), universal testing for SARS-CoV-2 has been suggested for all patients before planned procedures,³ including delivery,⁴ regardless of the presence of symptoms. Preprocedural asymptomatic infection (PAI) rates among obstetrical patients have been reported to be as high as 14%,⁴ but the PAI rates in the general surgical population are unknown. We sought to compare the SARS-CoV-2 PAI rates between the obstetrical unit (OU) and surgical units (SUs) in 1 urban tertiary center.

STUDY DESIGN: We conducted a retrospective cohort study on the outcomes of universal preprocedural SARS-CoV-2 tests performed before all surgeries or deliveries at the Barnes-Jewish Hospital from May 28 to July 22, 2020, after the resumption of elective procedures. The study was deemed exempt because it was recognized as a quality improvement initiative. The primary outcome was the rate of PAI with SARS-CoV-2, which was compared between an 18-bed OU and the SUs composed of 72 rooms. All the positive cases underwent a chart review to confirm the asymptomatic presentation. Multivariable logistic regressions were used to adjust for confounders, including age and race. Statistical analyses were conducted using R (version 4.0.2; https://www. R-project.org/).

RESULTS: A total of 5543 preprocedural tests were performed: 532 (9.7%) were from the OU and 5011 (90.4%) were from the SUs (Table). The obstetrical patients were younger (median age, 29.0 vs 56.0; P<.001), with a greater proportion of females (100% vs 50.4%; P<.001) and patients identifying as black (40.4% vs 22.7%;

P<.001) or Hispanic (9.4% vs 1.5%; P<.001) when compared with the patients from the SUs. Overall, there were 39 (0.7%) cases of PAI (25 of 532 [4.7%] from the OU vs 14 of 5011 [0.3%] from the SUs; P<.001). After adjusting for age and race, the obstetrical patients had significantly higher odds of PAI with SARS-CoV-2 compared with the surgical patients (adjusted odds ratio [aOR], 4.7; 95% confidence interval [CI], 2.3–10.6). After excluding the male patients, the odds of PAI remained significantly higher in the OU patients (aOR, 9.6; 95% CI, 92.8–48.3) (Table).

CONCLUSION: The SARS-CoV-2 PAI rate is 15.7 times higher in the OU (4.7%) than in the SU (0.3%) in 1 hospital. The significant difference persists after adjusting for age, race, and sex. As hospitals resume their normal surgical volume and enact universal preprocedural testing policies, the testing capacity remains limited, and rationing of the supplies is necessary. Our results emphasize the need to prioritize testing and personal protective equipment in the OUs in which higher rates of asymptomatic infection increase the potential of spread, particularly during the second stage of labor with prolonged HCW exposure in an aerosol-heavy environment.4 Whether the different background characteristics of obstetrical and surgical patients can fully account for the discordance in PAI rates or whether pregnancy-induced immunomodulation increases the likelihood of asymptomatic presentation of infection is unknown and remain important questions that require further investigation.

Our study is limited by generalizability owing to sampling at only 1 hospital. However, the substantial difference in PAI rates between the OU and SUs underscores the importance of surveillance in populations that are at an increased risk for the disease. Focused SARS-CoV-2 obstetrical studies could generate valuable information regarding asymptomatic infection, which remains a poorly understood but critically important component of the pandemic.

TABLE

Background characteristics of the patients who underwent preprocedural testing for SARS-CoV-2 and a comparison of the preprocedural asymptomatic positive results between the obstetrical and surgical units

Background characteristics	Obstetrical unit (n=532)	Surgical units (n=5011)	P value
Age, y			
Median (SD)	29.0 (6.0)	56.0 (18.1)	<.001 ^a
<18	6 (1.1)	41 (8.2)	<.001 ^a
18—45	525 (98.7)	1349 (26.9)	
>45	1 (0.2)	3621 (72.2)	
Female	532 (100.0)	2524 (50.4)	<.001 ^a
Race			<.001 ^a
White	245 (46.2)	3708 (74.0)	
Black or African American	214 (40.4)	1136 (22.7)	
Asian	13 (2.4)	47 (0.9)	
Pacific Islander	3 (0.6)	4 (0.1)	
American Indian or Alaska Native	1 (0.2)	4 (0.1)	
Hispanic	50 (9.4)	73 (1.5)	
Unable to answer	3 (0.6)	21 (0.4)	
Declined	3 (0.6)	18 (0.4)	
Asymptomatic positive results following unive	ersal preprocedural testing		
Overall asymptomatic positive cases	25 (4.7)	14 (0.3)	<.001 ^a
OR (95% CI)	13.2 (6.9–25.2)		
aOR ^b (95% CI)	4.7 (2.3–10.6)		
Age, y			
Median (SD)	30.0 (5.9)	38.0 (19.8)	<.001 ^a
<18	1 (4.0)	1 (7.1)	.006 ^a
18–45	24 (96.0)	9 (64.3)	
>45	0 (0)	4 (28.6)	
Female	25 (100)	5 (36)	<.001 ^a
Race			
White	0 (0.0)	4 (28.6)	.036 ^a
Black or African American	2 (8.0)	9 (64.3)	
Asian	10 (40.0)	0 (0.0)	
Pacific Islander	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
American Indian or Alaska Native	1 (4.0)	0 (0.0)	
Hispanic	0 (0.0)	1 (7.1)	
Unable to answer	11 (44.0)	0 (0.0)	
Declines	1 (4.0)	0 (0.0)	

TABLE

Background characteristics of the patients who underwent preprocedural testing for SARS-CoV-2 and a comparison of the preprocedural asymptomatic positive results between the obstetrical and surgical units (continued)

	Baseline characteristics of the patients who underwent universal preprocedural testing	
--	----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--

Background characteristics	Obstetrical unit (n $=$ 532)	Surgical units (n $=$ 5011)	P value
Surgical service			<.001 ^a
Obstetrics	25 (100.0)		
Orthopedic surgery		7 (50.0)	
Ophthalmology		2 (14.2)	
Acute critical care surgery		4 (28.6)	
Minimally invasive surgery		1 (7.1)	
Asymptomatic positive, men excluded	25 (4.7)	5 (0.1)	<.001 ^a
OR (95% CI)	24.8 (9.4–65.1)	_	
a0R ^b (95% CI)	9.6 (2.8–48.3)		

Data are presented as number (percentage) unless noted otherwise.

aOR, adjusted odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; OR, odds ratio; SARS-CoV-2, severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2; SD, standard deviation.

^a Statistically significant result; ^b Adjusted for age (as categorical variable) and race.

Kelly. Asymptomatic preprocedural coronavirus disease 2019 cases. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2021.

Jeannie C. Kelly, MD, MS Nandini Raghuraman, MD, MS Ebony B. Carter, MD, MPH Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology Washington University School of Medicine 4901 Forest Park Ave. Center for Outpatient Health, 10th floor, Campus Box 8064 St. Louis, MO 63108 jckelly@wustl.edu

Arvind Palanisamy, MD, FRCA Division of Obstetric Anesthesiology Department of Anesthesiology Washington University School of Medicine St. Louis, MO

Molly J. Stout, MD, MSCI Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI

The authors report no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Oran DP, Topol EJ. Prevalence of asymptomatic SARS-CoV-2 infection: a narrative review. Ann Intern Med 2020;173:362–7.

2. Lee S, Kim T, Lee E, et al. Clinical course and molecular viral shedding among asymptomatic and symptomatic patients with SARS-CoV-2 infection in a community treatment center in the Republic of Korea. JAMA Intern Med 2020. [Epub ahead of print].

3. Local resumption of elective surgery guidance. American College of Surgeons. Available at: https://www.facs.org/covid-19/clinical-guidance/resuming-elective-surgery. Accessed August 27, 2020.

4. Sutton D, Fuchs K, D'Alton M, Goffman D. Universal screening for SARS-CoV-2 in women admitted for delivery. N Engl J Med 2020;382: 2163–4.

© 2020 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajog. 2020.09.023

Pregnancy as a "golden opportunity" for patient activation and engagement

Check for updates

OBJECTIVE: Pregnancy represents a period during which uptake of information and engagement in care are critical. It is often considered a window of opportunity to improve health-related behaviors; however, limited data are available to support the concept of increased engagement during pregnancy. Patient activation is a term used to describe the

concept of patient engagement and confidence in managing one's own healthcare; activated patients, correspondingly possess the skills, knowledge, and motivation to participate in their own healthcare.^{1—3} Increased patient activation is associated with better adherence to treatment and less frequent hospitalizations.⁴ Although differential activation has