# High-throughput non-invasive prenatal testing for fetal rhesus D status in RhD-negative women not known to be sensitised to the RhD antigen: a systematic review and economic evaluation

Pedro Saramago,<sup>1</sup> Huiqin Yang,<sup>2</sup> Alexis Llewellyn,<sup>3</sup> Ruth Walker,<sup>3</sup> Melissa Harden,<sup>3</sup> Stephen Palmer,<sup>1</sup> Susan Griffin<sup>1</sup> and Mark Simmonds<sup>3</sup>\*

<sup>1</sup>Centre for Health Economics, University of York, York, UK <sup>2</sup>Peninsula Technology Assessment Group (PenTAG), University of Exeter Medical School, Exeter, UK <sup>3</sup>Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, York, UK

\*Corresponding author mark.simmonds@york.ac.uk

Declared competing interests of authors: none

Published March 2018 DOI: 10.3310/hta22130

## **Plain English summary**

Non-invasive fetal RhD status testing in RhD-negative women Health Technology Assessment 2018; Vol. 22: No. 13 DOI: 10.3310/hta22130

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

# **Plain English summary**

A bout 3 in 20 women in the UK have a blood type called rhesus blood group (D antigen) (RhD) negative. If they become pregnant, around 6 in 10 of these women will have babies who have the opposite blood type (RhD positive) and the woman's immune system can react to the baby's blood (a process called 'sensitisation'). Following sensitisation, commonly in a subsequent pregnancy, the woman's immune system may attack the baby's blood, which potentially has severe consequences, such as a need for blood transfusions or even the death of the baby. The risk of sensitisation can be substantially reduced by injecting women with a blood-based product called anti-D immunoglobulin. Currently, all pregnant women with RhD-negative blood are offered this injection during later pregnancy and after birth. However, women carrying a RhD-negative baby do not need this injection. Non-invasive prenatal testing (NIPT) may determine the blood type of the baby during pregnancy and so the anti-D injection can be avoided in women who do not need it.

This report investigated whether or not using NIPT was a reliable, effective and safe way to manage RhD-negative pregnant women and whether or not it could reduce costs for the NHS. Based on eight studies, the test was found to be highly accurate, with an incorrect result in about 2% of women, which translates to between 3 and 27 additional sensitisations per 100,000 pregnancies compared with current practice, and a small risk of loss in health. However, the test is inconclusive in around 7% of women who could still be offered the anti-D injection, and there is an increased risk of adverse health outcomes for sensitised women. The evidence suggests that using NIPT would reduce the number of women receiving anti-D unnecessarily but would lead to a small increase in the number of additional sensitisations and that this may or may not be cost saving depending on the additional cost of NIPT.

## **Health Technology Assessment**

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 4.236

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library and the Clarivate Analytics Science Citation Index.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

#### Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

#### **HTA programme**

The HTA programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was set up in 1993. It produces high-quality research information on the effectiveness, costs and broader impact of health technologies for those who use, manage and provide care in the NHS. 'Health technologies' are broadly defined as all interventions used to promote health, prevent and treat disease, and improve rehabilitation and long-term care.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

For more information about the HTA programme please visit the website: http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hta

#### This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was commissioned and funded by the HTA programme on behalf of NICE as project number 15/17/02. The protocol was agreed in January 2016. The assessment report began editorial review in June 2016 and was accepted for publication in February 2017. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health and Social Care.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2018. This work was produced by Saramago *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

## Health Technology Assessment Editor-in-Chief

**Professor Hywel Williams** Director, HTA Programme, UK and Foundation Professor and Co-Director of the Centre of Evidence-Based Dermatology, University of Nottingham, UK

### **NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief**

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the EME Programme, UK

### **NIHR Journals Library Editors**

**Professor Ken Stein** Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andrée Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

**Professor Matthias Beck** Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Director of the NIHR Dissemination Centre, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

**Dr Catriona McDaid** Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

**Professor John Norrie** Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

**Professor James Raftery** Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

**Professor Helen Snooks** Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

**Professor Jim Thornton** Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

**Professor Martin Underwood** Director, Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk