Development, Testing, and Calibration of LINCS: A New Microsimulation Model of Maternal and Fetal Cytomegalovirus Infection

Aaron S. Wu[1], Elif Coskun[1], Malavika Prabhu[2], Emily M. Santos[1], Fatima Kakkar[5], Clare F. Flanagan[1], Caitlin M. Dugdale[1,3,4], Megan Pesch[6], *John C. Giardina[1,4], *Andrea L. Ciaranello[1,3,4]

1 Medical Practice Evaluation Center, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

2 Division of Maternal-Fetal Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

3 Division of General Medicine, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

4 Division of Infectious Diseases, Massachusetts General Hospital, Boston, Massachusetts, United States of America

5 Département de Pédiatrie, l'Université de Montréal, Montreal, Quebec, Canada

6 Division of Developmental and Behavioral Pediatrics, University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, Michigan, United States of America

*Indicates co-senior authors

Corresponding Author: Andrea Ciaranello: aciaranello@partners.org

Word count: Manuscript 4,638/5000, Abstract 223/275

Tables and figures: 4

ABSTRACT (230/275)

Background: Congenital cytomegalovirus (cCMV) is a leading cause of birth defects and the most common cause of non-genetic sensorineural hearing loss in children. There is a lack of decision modeling frameworks that can project cytomegalovirus (CMV)-related patient outcomes and inform health policy. We created, tested, and calibrated a model of CMV acquisition and transmission in pregnancy using linked mother-infant dyads.

Methods: We developed the **L**inking **IN**fants and Mothers in **C**ytomegalovirus **S**imulation (LINCS) dyad-level Monte-Carlo microsimulation model of CMV infection among pregnant people and fetuses throughout pregnancy. We parameterized the model with data from the existing literature, implemented rigorous code testing procedures, and calibrated a key set of parameters to match model output to external data on cCMV prevalence and symptom risk.

Results: A fully parameterized model for CMV among pregnant people and fetuses was developed, and the model code was confirmed to perform as specified. The calibration procedure identified parameter sets that generated model output closely matching the target values from the available data on cCMV prevalence and symptom risk.

Conclusions: The LINCS model's ability to simulate the natural history of CMV infection during pregnancy was described and demonstrated, and the model was tested and calibrated to ensure proper functioning. Base case parameters were derived for CMV infection natural history to be used in future decision analyses of CMV testing and treatment strategies.

INTRODUCTION

Congenital cytomegalovirus (cCMV) is the most frequent infectious cause of birth defects and the leading cause of non-genetic sensorineural hearing loss in newborns and infants.[1] Pregnant people are often exposed to and infected with CMV during pregnancy ("maternal infection"), frequently through contact with saliva or urine from children in daycare or preschool. CMV infection in adults often presents with minimal or no symptoms, leading to frequently missed diagnosis and treatment of infection during pregnancy, and increasing the risk of birth defects or other fetal complications. It is estimated that 0.3-0.6% of all newborns in the US are born with cCMV, which in 2022 would have been between 100,000 to 220,000 cCMV cases in newborns.[2] Of infants with cCMV, up to 30% are born with or will go on to develop cognitive impairment, vision loss, cerebral palsy, or hearing loss.[2] In addition to these health impacts, the lifetime additional costs of care for an infant with symptomatic CMV likely exceeds $1 million.[3]

Despite the major health and economic burdens of cCMV, the best practices for preventing, diagnosing, and treating CMV in pregnant people and infants remain uncertain.[4] Interventions to reduce risks of maternal infection, vertical transmission, and disease severity among affected newborns have recently emerged,[5] but the lack of accurate diagnostic tools and the uncertain benefits of treatment pose challenges in the prevention and management of cCMV. A number of countries now recommend screening for CMV serostatus among all pregnant people, and some US states have begun implementing universal screening for cCMV in newborns.[6–11] However, current guidelines from major US professional societies do not recommend universal cCMV screening or treatment in pregnancy, or universal screening among newborns, primarily due to concerns about clinical harms from imperfect diagnostic tests and costs of screening programs.[4,12,13].

Disease simulation modeling can synthesize the best available data from multiple sources, project long-term outcomes beyond the horizon of clinical trials or cohort studies, evaluate multiple strategies

simultaneously, and explicitly evaluate the tradeoffs in benefits and harms.[14–17] Modeling can add substantial value to traditional study designs such as trials or observational cohorts and can inform the development of clinical care guidelines.[18–20] However, there are no published models of CMV infection that comprehensively evaluate interrelated, clinical and economic outcomes for both members of the maternal-infant dyad. Our objective was to develop and calibrate a dyad-level Monte-Carlo microsimulation model of mothers and infants, and to project clinical outcomes of CMV infection during pregnancy.

METHODS

Overview

We developed the Linking INfants and Mothers in Cytomegalovirus Simulation (LINCS) microsimulation model to project clinical outcomes and costs among pregnant people at risk for CMV infection during pregnancy and their infants. The LINCS model can be used to evaluate current and novel testing and treatment strategies in decision analyses, including cost-effectiveness and comparative effectiveness analyses. We derived model input parameters from cohort studies and clinical trials, including rates of non-primary (reinfection or reactivation) CMV infection in pregnancy, accuracy of diagnostic tests for CMV, and effectiveness of currently available treatments (Table 1). We also calibrated key uncertain model inputs, including rates of primary (first-ever) CMV infection in pregnancy and risk of vertical transmission following primary and non-primary infection, using published estimates of neonatal cCMV prevalence and symptomatic cCMV risk.[21,22] We verified the code used to implement model structure and checked for errors by comparing model outputs to the data used as model inputs, evaluating the model at extreme parameter values, and inspecting traces of individual patient clinical trajectories. Additional code quality testing strategies were performed to verify that each part of the model and the interactions between them were behaving as specified.

Model structure

Mother-infant dyads

The LINCS model is a dyad-level Monte-Carlo microsimulation model with a weekly time step that begins at conception and ends at delivery. All patients are modeled as a linked mother-child dyad throughout pregnancy and delivery and enter the simulation at the time of conception (week 2 of gestational age). The representation of the mother and child as linked allows for more detailed simulation of both biological and clinical interactions between the mother and fetus during pregnancy, and helps account for the interactions between different prevention, screening, and treatment strategies in decision analyses. A literature review found that previous microsimulation models of CMV in pregnancy modeled

the mother and child separately, which limited the ability of those models to assess interactions between strategies involving both the mother and child.[23–26]

Maternal CMV infection

At model start, all pregnant people are assigned an age and previous CMV infection history. CMV infection history includes infection that occurred remotely before conception (for this analysis, >3 months before conception), infection that occurred recently preconception (for this analysis, ≤3 months to 3 weeks prior), infection that occurred periconception (within 3 weeks prior to conception), or no prior CMV infection. This differentiation enables the model to account for clinical and diagnostic implications of type and timing of CMV infection (and can be varied as needed). For example, this structure can be used when assessing serologic tests that do not reliably distinguish between infection 3-12 months prior to conception (conferring no risk to the fetus) or <3 months (when risk of cCMV is present, conferring a substantial risk to the fetus).[27–29]

Pregnant people with a recent preconception or periconception infection are assumed not to be at risk for another maternal CMV infection during pregnancy. All others face a weekly probability of CMV infection. Those with remote preconception infection are at risk for non-primary CMV infection (reinfection or reactivation); those with no prior CMV infection are at risk for primary infection (Table 1).[28]

Vertical transmission

The risk of vertical transmission (VT) to modeled fetuses depends on the type and timing of maternal CMV infection. With recent preconception or periconception maternal infection, simulated fetuses face a risk of VT modeled to occur at week 6, based on expert opinion that sufficient embryonic development has occurred to permit transmission.[30–32] For maternal infection that occurs during pregnancy (either primary or non-primary infection), modeled fetuses face a one-time risk of VT 6 weeks after maternal

infection occurred, allowing time for maternal viremia, placental infection, and fetal infection. VT risks are lower for maternal infections that occur in the first trimester compared to later in pregnancy, although there is a higher risk of symptomatic disease if cCMV does occur following first trimester maternal infection. VT risks are higher for primary compared to secondary maternal infection.

The model divides congenital CMV (cCMV) into "phenotypes" to reflect multiple possible manifestations of cCMV for infants/children, including 1) fully asymptomatic cCMV infection, 2) asymptomatic cCMV infection with isolated hearing loss, 3) primary neurophenotype (appears healthy at birth, aside from potentially microcephaly; develop CNS symptoms later in life),[33] 4) mild non-CNS symptoms (including petechiae/purpura, jaundice, hepatosplenomegaly, small for gestational age, thrombocytopenia, elevated liver enzymes, and chorioretinitis), and 5) severe symptoms (including seizures and microcephaly).[22] For this analysis, we populated phenotypes based on visible symptoms at birth, in two categories: asymptomatic (1 and 2) and symptomatic (3, 4, and 5), although the model program is flexible to simulate additional phenotypes.

Diagnostic testing

Maternal CMV and fetal cCMV can be diagnosed via user-specified prenatal assays. Tests to detect maternal CMV infection include serum assays such as CMV DNA polymerase chain reaction (PCR), IgM antibody, IgG antibody, and IgG avidity (feasible to assess when IgG is present; greater avidity of the IgG antibody to CMV antigens reflects longer time since infection occurred).[29] We derived the sensitivity and specificity for each of these diagnostic tests from the published literature (Table 1). In the model, these sensitivity and specificities are applied alongside modeled biologic events in pregnant people. For example, following maternal infection, CMV viremia is modeled to occur within 1 week and resolve by 3 weeks; CMV DNA PCR can detect this with the listed sensitivity. Detection of CMV DNA in maternal serum is generally considered diagnostic of maternal CMV infection. IgM antibody is modeled to develop within 2 weeks and persist for 52 weeks. IgG is modeled to develop within 3 weeks and persist lifelong.

IgG avidity is modeled as “low” when IgG first develops and rises to “high” at 13 weeks (standard deviation: 2 weeks) after infection, reflecting the cutoff values and estimated timing from commercial assays.[34]

If VT has occurred, tests that may identify cCMV infection in the fetus include routine diagnostic ultrasound (R-US), detailed diagnostic ultrasound (D-US), and amniocentesis (AC) followed by CMV DNA PCR performed on amniotic fluid.[29] The sensitivity and specificity of these tests are also applied alongside biologic events in the fetus.[35] Following VT, infant infection can lead to impaired embryogenesis or fetal development, resulting in abnormalities detectable on ultrasound after 18 weeks of gestational age.[36] These abnormalities are not specific to CMV and can occur with many other conditions, and they also do not occur in all fetal cCMV infections, creating imperfect sensitivity and specificity of ultrasounds for CMV.[37] CMV DNA may become present in amniotic fluid (which is comprised largely of fetal urine) after 20 weeks of gestation, allowing for sufficient fetal renal development to permit excretion of DNA in fetal urine, and persists until delivery.[35] Detection of CMV DNA in amniotic fluid is generally considered to confirm fetal infection.[38]

The model user can specify the proportion of primary and non-primary maternal infections that are symptomatic, and the proportion of symptomatic maternal infections that are diagnosed as CMV. The user can also specify diagnostic testing algorithms to reflect current clinical care practices or novel diagnostic algorithms. For example, IgM/IgG serologic testing can be offered as part of routine screening of all pregnant people as per European guidelines, or as part of focused testing following known exposure, maternal symptoms consistent with CMV, or fetal ultrasound findings concerning for cCMV, as is more commonly done in the US (Table 1).[4,12,39] Amniocentesis with amniotic fluid CMV DNA PCR can be offered following confirmed maternal primary infection or abnormal findings on fetal ultrasonography. These diagnostic algorithms and the clinical interpretation of test results are shown in Table 2.

Therapies

We calibrated the model assuming no antiviral therapy during pregnancy, reflecting the settings in which the data used as calibration targets were collected. However, for future policy analyses, the structure of the model permits the user to specify therapeutic interventions in pregnancy following diagnosed maternal or fetal CMV infection. For example, treatment with high dose valacyclovir (8 grams/day) is recommended in some settings following confirmed maternal primary infection in the first trimester with the goal of preventing fetal infection; this is continued through the time of amniocentesis.[39,40] We will model the effectiveness of this intervention as a reduction in VT risk (Table 1).[41] Following confirmed fetal infection, high dose valacyclovir can also be offered to a pregnant woman to treat fetal infection and reduce the severity of infant cCMV disease.[39,41,42] Although there is no randomized controlled trial evidence currently available to parameterize the effectiveness of this treatment on cCMV severity, the model structure permits sensitivity and scenario analyses on fetal treatment by adjusting the phenotype distribution for newborns with cCMV, shifting the distribution under treatment toward milder, less symptomatic cCMV phenotypes.

Model outcomes

In each week of the simulation, the model tracks true maternal CMV infection status, true fetal cCMV status, true biomarker status (e.g. IgM, IgG, DNA presence in maternal serum; DNA presence in amniotic fluid), and fetal survival. At the end of each week, there are three possible pregnancy-related health states: continuation of the pregnancy into the following week, live birth (considered premature if before week 37), or fetal demise (considered spontaneous abortion [SA] if before 20 weeks, and intrauterine fetal demise [IUFD] if after 20 weeks; probability depends on true fetal cCMV status and week of gestation). If neither live birth nor fetal demise occur, the pregnancy continues into the next week (Figure 1). After birth, a user-specified proportion of infants with hearing loss or visible symptoms will be diagnosed with cCMV, and a probability of immediate neonatal death depends on true cCMV status and the week of

gestation at which birth occurred. After the entire cohort is simulated, summary statistics are tallied, including number of live births, number of preterm deliveries, neonates with cCMV, distribution of neonatal cCMV phenotypes, number ofmaternal infections diagnosed during pregnancy, and number of neonates diagnosed with cCMV..

Unit testing and functional testing of model dynamics

Unit testing and functional testing are code and software development methodologies to ensure code quality and correct function in accordance with specifications. Testing was performed at each step in the development of the simulation model to ensure code quality and proper function. Descriptions of these methods can be found in the supplemental materials.

Model calibration

Overview of calibration approach

We separately calibrated two independent components of the model. First, we adjusted three parameters related to neonatal cCMV incidence with the goal of assessing how modeled prevalence of cCMV at birth matched the observed prevalence in a universal screening program in Minnesota reported by Kaye *et al*.[21] These three parameters were: (1) maternal infection rate (2) primary VT risk; and (3) relative non-primary VT risk (compared to primary infection). For this calibration, we calculated the likelihood of the model output given the observed data, further described below, and then chose the parameter set with the highest likelihood as the best-fitting parameter set.[43,44] Second, we adjusted two parameters related to cCMV symptom status; our goal was to assess how modeled risk of symptomatic cCMV in newborns (among those with any cCMV infection) matched the observed risk reported in a review by Pesch et al.[22] These two parameters were: (1) primary symptomatic risk at birth following maternal primary infection, stratified by timing of maternal primary infection; and (2) relative non-primary symptomatic risk for infant infections that follow non-primary compared to primary maternal infection. Since Pesch *et al*. could not calculate uncertainty bounds for the proportion of all cCMV that is symptomatic at birth, we did

not construct a likelihood function and instead chose the parameter set with the lowest absolute error as the best-fitting parameter set.

Modeled population for calibration runs

Large cohorts (often between 10 million and 50 million maternal-fetal dyads) are simulated to generate stable model outcomes and reduce the impacts of statistical noise. All simulation runs performed for these calibration analyses included cohorts of 30 million mother-infant dyads. The ages of the pregnant people at model start (15 – 49) were drawn from a truncated normal distribution with a mean of 29 years and a standard deviation of 5 years,[45] and the base case parameter values from Table 1 were used (alongside the parameters being calibrated) with no treatments applied. The seroprevalence used in each run was set by extrapolating the rate of maternal primary CMV infection in each calibration run over the lifetime of each patient until model start (as determined by the mean age). We simulate only singleton, viable pregnancies for this analysis. All modeled pregnant people are otherwise healthy and remain alive throughout the duration of the simulation.

Calibration to neonatal cCMV prevalence

To derive parameters used for our calibration, we use the results in Kaye *et al.*[21] of a universal cCMV screening program for newborns in Minnesota; out of 60,115 tests, they report 174 positive results within the first 21 days of life, giving an observed prevalence of 0.3%.[21] The LINCS model tracks prevalence among newborns, but before directly comparing the LINCS output to the Kaye *et al.* data, we first adjusted for the imperfect sensitivity in the dried blood spot (DBS) test used in the Minnesota screening program. Dollard *et al.*[46] separately reported that the relevant type of DBS-based assay correctly identified 41 out of 56 cases (73% sensitivity), with perfect specificity.

The output from the LINCS model is the true prevalence of neonatal cCMV (i.e., detectable if a perfect test were used). We used the results from Kaye *et al.*[21] and Dollard *et al.*[46] to construct a likelihood

function for the true prevalence in the Minnesota cohort, in order to assess the fit of the model to these data points. The likelihood function represents the probability of observing the data from Kaye *et al.*[21] given the underlying true prevalence estimated in the model. If the test sensitivity were known with certainty, the likelihood function would be proportional to the probability mass function of the binomial distribution, which we denote $a(174;\ 60{,}115,\ p \cdot s)$, where p is the overall prevalence, s is the sensitivity, and 60,115 is the number of tests and 174 is the number of positive tests reported by Kaye *et al*.[21] To account for the uncertainty in assay sensitivity (given the small sample size in Dollard *et al*.[46]), we assume that the sensitivity follows a beta distribution; combining the results from Dollard *et al*.[46] with an assumed uniform prior distribution, the probability density function (PDF) for the sensitivity is $b(s;\ \alpha = 41\ +\ 1,\ \beta = 56\ - 41 + 1)$, where b is the PDF for the beta distribution.[47] Averaging a over the potential sensitivity values gives the following likelihood for the overall prevalence p: $\mathcal{L}(p) = \int_0^1 a(174; 60{,}115, p * s) b(s; 42{,}16) ds$. The prevalence level that gives the maximum likelihood value is 0.00394 (or 0.394%).

We then ran the model under a range of parameter values for the three parameters related to neonatal cCMV incidence, with ranges in Table 3: (1) *maternal infection rate*; (2) *primary VT risk*; and (3) *relative non-primary VT risk*. The ranges for the *maternal infection rate* and *primary VT risk* were drawn from reported 95% confidence intervals from Balegamire *et al.* and Chatzakis *et al.,* respectively; the range for the *relative VT risk* was set based on prior knowledge that VT risk from non-primary infection is lower than from primary infection.[29,48] Note that Balegamire *et al*. report maternal infection risk from a cohort based in Quebec, Canada; we assume the range of the 95% confidence interval is applicable to the US context.

To search the parameter space, we used a grid search method, where we ran the model for an exhaustive combination of equally spaced points from the ranges in Table 3; we selected 15 points from the range of

maternal infection rate, 9 from the ranges of *primary VT risk*, and 5 from the range of *relative non-primary VT risk*. Note that for the *primary VT risk*, we calibrated multiple parameters, reflecting the 5 time points of maternal infection (recent preconception, periconception, and 1st, 2nd, and 3rd, trimester). Since the values of these risks are likely correlated across times (e.g., if the true recent preconception VT risk is high, the periconception VT risk is also high), these values were varied together in the runs (e.g., for the run with the 3rd highest recent preconception VT risk, the 3rd highest 1st trimester VT risk was also used). After running the model, we extracted the overall cCMV prevalence at birth for each run and calculated the corresponding likelihood using the function derived above. We then identified the parameter set with the highest likelihood as the best-fitting parameter set. As a secondary comparison, we then compared the values for the *maternal infection rate* and *primary VT risk* in the best-fitting parameter set to the mean estimates reported by Balegamire *et al*. and Chatzakis *et al*.[28,45] All calculations were conducted in R 4.4.0.

This calibration procedure can also be interpreted as a modified version of the Bayesian calibration procedure described by Menzies *et al.,*[44] with the grid search approach standing in for draws from a uniform prior distribution for each of the parameters across their ranges (many of which are constrained to plausible values by using previously reported confidence intervals).[44] To facilitate the implementation of a sampling-importance-resampling approach to generating a posterior distribution of the parameter sets, which can later be used as part of probabilistic sensitivity analyses (PSAs), we report the individual likelihood values for each parameter set; these likelihood values can be used as weights to draw parameter sets for a PSA.[44]

Calibration to proportion of cCMV that is symptomatic at birth

Pesch *et al*. reported frequencies of various clinical outcomes among newborns with cCMV.[22] We grouped the outcomes to estimate the risk of cCMV being defined as "symptomatic" at birth (phenotypes 3, 4, and 5). To calculate this proportion from Pesch *et al*., we included all infants reported to have

seizures and microcephaly, or 2.9% of infants. We additionally included infants reported to have petechiae/purpura, jaundice, hepatosplenomegaly, small for gestational age, thrombocytopenia, elevated liver enzymes, or chorioretinitis), or 4.7% of infants (averaging the reported risks of each of these symptoms). The sum of these, or 7.6% of infants, is the target used in this calibration; this target can readily be updated for future analyses as new data about symptom distribution at birth emerge.

We then ran the model under a range of parameter values for the two parameters related to cCMV symptom status, with ranges in Table 3: (1) *primary symptomatic risk*; and (2) *relative symptomatic risk*. The ranges for *primary symptomatic risk* were drawn from reported 95% confidence intervals from Chatzakis *et al*;[28] the range for the *relative symptomatic risk* was set based on prior knowledge that symptomatic cCMV risk from non-primary infection is lower than primary infection.[48]

We again used a grid search method, where we ran the model for an exhaustive combination of equally spaced points from the ranges in Table 3; we selected 7 points from the range of *primary symptomatic risk* and 11 points from the range of *relative symptomatic risk*. Note that for the proportion of cCMV that is symptomatic at birth, we calibrated multiple parameters for different infection timings. Since the values of these risks are likely correlated across times (e.g., if the true periconception symptomatic risk is high, the 1st trimester risk is also high), these values were varied together in the runs (as described in the preceding calibration). After running the model, we extracted the overall proportion of cCMV that is symptomatic at birth for each run and calculated the absolute difference between the model output and the 7.6% risk derived from Pesch et al.[22] We used the absolute difference as the measure of fit instead of a likelihood function because Pesch *et al*. could not report uncertainty estimates for the symptom frequencies, which are required to calculate a likelihood. We then identified the parameter set with the smallest absolute difference as the best-fitting parameter set. As a secondary comparison, we then compared the values for the *primary symptomatic risk* in the best-fitting parameter set to the mean estimate reported by Chatzakis *et al*.[28]

RESULTS

Unit and functional testing

Unit and functional testing were satisfactory to ensure the logic and performance of the model, with selected input parameters all accurately reproduced from the model output within 1% of the true value. Extreme value testing and trace file examination verified that the model was performing as expected. These results are reported in Table S1.

Calibration

The best-fitting parameter sets generated by the calibration procedures are reported in Table 3. Likelihood values from the simulations to calibrate prevalence of cCMV at birth are reported in Table S2. Using the best-fitting parameter sets, the modeled prevalence of cCMV at birth was 0.397% (comparing with the target value of 0.394% described in methods above). The modeled proportion of symptomatic cCMV was 7.6% (comparing with the target value of 7.6% described above).

In the secondary comparisons, our calibrated input parameters were similar to or slightly higher than the mean estimates from the literature. For *primary VT risk*, our calibrated values ranged from 9.5-72.2%, depending on the timing of maternal infection, slightly higher than the mean estimates of 5.5-66.2% from Chatzakis *et al*.[28] For *maternal infection rate*, our calibrated value was 1.9/100PY, similar to the 1.8/100PY reported by Balegmire *et al*.[45] For *primary symptomatic risk*, our calibrated values ranged from 1.5-42.0%, depending on the timing of maternal infection, higher than the mean estimates of 0.4-28.8% from Chatzakis *et al*.[28]

DISCUSSION

We developed a patient-level simulation model of CMV disease progression, testing, and treatment among mother-infant pairs during pregnancy. We tested and calibrated our modeling framework using published estimates from various cohort studies. The LINCS model presents several novel contributions to the CMV simulation modeling literature. First, the simulation of mother-infant dyads enables us to easily model interactions between maternal and fetal health states and allows for the incorporation of epidemiologic data for both maternal and fetal CMV outcomes during pregnancy. This not only results in more detailed and realistic simulation dynamics, but also will facilitate analyses that identify cCMV testing and treatment strategies that are optimal for both the pregnant person and child. The LINCS model structure additionally provides flexibility in its ability to specify testing and treatment algorithms, the characteristics of diagnostic assays, and the effectiveness of therapies, allowing for comparison of the clinical impact of alternative testing and treatment strategies. This flexibility will allow the model to evaluate a range of potential clinical practices and guidelines, including in the context of comparative or cost-effectiveness analyses, to help guide clinicians and policymakers.

Data on many aspects of the biology of cCMV are limited, so we calibrated some particularly uncertain and influential parameters in our model. In our calibration analyses, the best-fitting parameter sets produced model output that matched the targets from the literature well (Table 3). Additionally, for the calibration to prevalence of cCMV at birth, we generated likelihood values representing the fit between the parameter sets and targets; in planned policy analyses using the LINCS model, these likelihood values can be used to conduct probabilistic sensitivity analyses that more fully capture the uncertainty in the available data.

Through the calibration, we found that the risks of VT after maternal primary infection (*primary VT risk*) and the proportion of cCMV infections that are symptomatic when they occur after maternal primary infection (*primary symptomatic risk*) needed to be slightly higher than values previously reported in the

literature for model output to match the calibration targets. This may suggest that these underlying biologic risks are higher than the risks that are able to be observed in clinical trials or cohort studies; that definitions of phenotypes used in clinical studies differ slightly from those used in our model; or that there is a mismatch between other, non-calibrated model parameters (e.g., non-primary maternal infection rates) and the corresponding values for the populations from the calibration targets (e.g., prevalence of neonatal cCMV in Minnesota); this could lead to higher *primary VT* and *symptomatic risk* values in the calibration that does not reflect the underlying biology. Future analyses should conduct appropriate sensitivity analyses to assess the robustness of model output to changes in these parameters, or potentially perform additional calibration if new targets become available.

Limitations

This analysis has several limitations. The lack of comprehensive data for many of the model inputs required deriving data from several different studies, often in different geographic settings. Extrapolation of data between geographic settings was felt to be a reasonable assumption for biological parameters such as length of time of infection and test sensitivities and specificities, which are likely similar across regions and populations. In contrast, the calibration target for the prevalence of neonatal cCMV was drawn from a single US state (Minnesota) and the parameter for non-primary maternal infection rate was from estimates in a health system in Israel, and these values might differ more substantially across populations.[21,49] Future analyses may require further calibration with regional data to obtain appropriate and accurate results.

Conclusion

We report the development, testing, and calibration of the LINCS model of CMV infection during pregnancy. We have demonstrated that the model provides a reasonable simulation of risks of CMV

vertical transmission, compared to estimates in the literature. We anticipate future expansions of the model to include details of prevention and treatment, as well as long-term infant outcomes, diagnosis, and care. LINCS will provide a framework that can be used in future work evaluating the clinical and economic impacts of prenatal CMV screening strategies, vertical transmission prevention methods, and novel treatments in development.

REFERENCES

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Congenital CMV infection. May 31, 2019. Accessed November 1, 2021. https://www.cdc.gov/cmv/clinical/congenital-cmv.html

2. Pesch MH, Schleiss MR. Emerging concepts in congenital cytomegalovirus. *Pediatrics*. 2022;150(2):e2021055896. doi:10.1542/peds.2021-055896

3. Grosse SD, Dollard SC, Ortega-Sanchez IR. Economic assessments of the burden of congenital cytomegalovirus infection and the cost-effectiveness of prevention strategies. *Semin Perinatol*. 2021;45(3):151393. doi:10.1016/j.semperi.2021.151393

4. Society for Maternal-Fetal Medicine (SMFM), Hughes BL, Gyamfi-Bannerman C. Diagnosis and antenatal management of congenital cytomegalovirus infection. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2016;214(6):B5-B11. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2016.02.042

5. Sartori P, Egloff C, Hcini N, et al. Primary, secondary, and tertiary prevention of congenital cytomegalovirus infection. *Viruses*. 2023;15(4):819. doi:10.3390/v15040819

6. News release: Congenital cytomegalovirus approved for addition to newborn screening panel. Minnesota Department of Health. Accessed October 4, 2022. https://content.govdelivery.com/accounts/MNMDH/bulletins/308c2bf

7. Iowa Legislature - BillBook. Accessed July 30, 2024. https://www.legis.iowa.gov/legislation/BillBook?ga=87&ba=SF%2068

8. Illinois General Assembly - Full text of Public Act 099-0424. Accessed July 30, 2024. https://www.ilga.gov/legislation/publicacts/fulltext.asp?Name=099-0424

9. Kentucky SB105 | 2022 | Regular session. LegiScan. Accessed July 30, 2024. https://legiscan.com/KY/text/SB105/id/2590029

10. Utah CMV legislation. Accessed July 30, 2024. https://le.utah.gov/xcode/Title26B/Chapter7/26B-7-S105.html

11. Virginia legislation on CMV. Accessed July 30, 2024. https://law.lis.virginia.gov/admincode/title12/agency5/chapter80/section150/

12. Practice bulletin no. 151: Cytomegalovirus, parvovirus B19, varicella zoster, and toxoplasmosis in pregnancy. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2015;125(6):1510-1525. doi:10.1097/01.AOG.0000466430.19823.53

13. Kimberlin DW, Banerjee R, Barnett ED, Lynfield R, Sawyer MH, eds. Cytomegalovirus infection. In: *Red Book: 2024–2027 Report of the Committee on Infectious Diseases*. 33rd ed. American Academy of Pediatrics345 Park Blvd, Itasca, IL 60143; 2024:344-352. doi:10.1542/9781610027373-S3_003_015

14. Hunink MGM. *Decision Making in Health and Medicine: Integrating Evidence and Values*. Second edition. Cambridge University Press; 2014.

15. Roberts M, Russell LB, Paltiel AD, Chambers M, McEwan P, Krahn M. Conceptualizing a model: A report of the ISPOR-SMDM modeling good research practices task force–2. *Med Decis Making*. 2012;32(5):678-689. doi:10.1177/0272989X12454941

16. Caro JJ, Briggs AH, Siebert U, Kuntz KM. Modeling good research practices—overview: a report of the ISPOR-SMDM modeling good research practices task force–1. *Med Decis Making*. 2012;32(5):667-677. doi:10.1177/0272989X12454577

17. Briggs AH, Weinstein MC, Fenwick EAL, et al. Model parameter estimation and uncertainty analysis: a report of the ISPOR-SMDM modeling good research practices task force working group-6. *Med Decis Making*. 2012;32(5):722-732. doi:10.1177/0272989X12458348

18. Francke JA, Penazzato M, Hou T, et al. Clinical impact and cost-effectiveness of diagnosing HIV infection during early infancy in South Africa: Test timing and frequency. *J Infect Dis*. 2016;214(9):1319-1328. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiw379

19. Evidence, policy, impact. WHO guide for evidence-informed decision-making. Published online 2021. https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/350994/9789240039872-eng.pdf?sequence=1

20. Mumtaz G, Jabbour M, Makhoul M, Harb A, El-Jardali F. Modeling COVID-19 vaccine rollout in Lebanon for better impact (full version). *American University of Beirut Knowledge to Policy Center*. Published online May 10, 2021. https://www.aub.edu.lb/k2p/Documents/Modeling%20COVID-19%20vaccine%20rollout_full%20document_.pdf

21. Kaye T. Notes from the field: Universal newborn screening and surveillance for congenital cytomegalovirus — Minnesota, 2023–2024. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2024;73. doi:10.15585/mmwr.mm7332a2

22. Pesch MH, Kuboushek K, McKee MM, Thorne MC, Weinberg JB. Congenital cytomegalovirus infection. *BMJ*. 2021;373:n1212. doi:10.1136/bmj.n1212

23. Périllaud-Dubois C, Hachicha-Maalej N, Lepers C, et al. Cost-effectiveness of screening and valaciclovir-based treatment strategies for first-trimester cytomegalovirus primary infection in pregnant women in France. *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology*. 2023;n/a(n/a). doi:10.1002/uog.26226

24. Fisher SA, Miller ES, Yee LM, Grobman WA, Premkumar A. Universal first-trimester cytomegalovirus screening and valaciclovir prophylaxis in pregnant persons: A cost-effectiveness analysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM*. 2022;4(5):100676. doi:10.1016/j.ajogmf.2022.100676

25. Albright CM, Werner EF, Hughes BL. Cytomegalovirus screening in pregnancy: A cost-effectiveness and threshold analysis. *Am J Perinatol*. 2019;36(7):678-687. doi:10.1055/s-0038-1676495

26. Phillips VL, Xu J, Park A, Gantt S, Dedhia K. The cost-effectiveness of targeted screening for congenital cytomegalovirus in newborns compared to clinical diagnosis in the US. *Int J Pediatr Otorhinolaryngol*. 2023;166:111450. doi:10.1016/j.ijporl.2023.111450

27. Enders G, Daiminger A, Bäder U, Exler S, Enders M. Intrauterine transmission and clinical outcome of 248 pregnancies with primary cytomegalovirus infection in relation to gestational age. *J Clin Virol*. 2011;52(3):244-246. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2011.07.005

28. Chatzakis C, Ville Y, Makrydimas G, Dinas K, Zavlanos A, Sotiriadis A. Timing of primary maternal cytomegalovirus infection and rates of vertical transmission and fetal consequences. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2020;223(6):870-883.e11. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2020.05.038

29. Iijima S. Pitfalls in the serological evaluation of maternal cytomegalovirus infection as a potential cause of fetal and neonatal involvements: A narrative literature review. *J Clin Med*. 2022;11(17):5006. doi:10.3390/jcm11175006

30. Davis NL, King CC, Kourtis AP. Cytomegalovirus infection in pregnancy. *Birth Defects Research*. 2017;109(5):336-346. doi:10.1002/bdra.23601

31. Benoist G, Leruez-Ville M, Magny JF, Jacquemard F, Salomon LJ, Ville Y. Management of pregnancies with confirmed cytomegalovirus fetal infection. *Fetal Diagnosis and Therapy*. 2013;33(4):203-214. doi:10.1159/000342752

32. Salomè S, Corrado FR, Mazzarelli LL, et al. Congenital cytomegalovirus infection: The state of the art and future perspectives. *Front Pediatr*. 2023;11. doi:10.3389/fped.2023.1276912

33. Singh S, Maheshwari A, Boppana S. CMV-induced hearing loss. *Newborn (Clarksville)*. 2024;2(4):249-262. doi:10.5005/jp-journals-11002-0081

34. Prince HE, Lapé-Nixon M. Role of cytomegalovirus (CMV) IgG avidity testing in diagnosing primary CMV infection during pregnancy. *Clinical and Vaccine Immunology*. 2014;21(10):1377-1384. doi:10.1128/CVI.00487-14

35. Dinsmoor MJ, Fette LM, Hughes BL, et al. Amniocentesis to diagnose congenital cytomegalovirus infection following maternal primary infection. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM*. 2022;4(4):100641. doi:10.1016/j.ajogmf.2022.100641

36. Pass RF, Arav-Boger R. Maternal and fetal cytomegalovirus infection: Diagnosis, management, and prevention. *F1000Res*. 2018;7:255. doi:10.12688/f1000research.12517.1

37. Leruez-Ville M, Ren S, Magny JF, et al. Accuracy of prenatal ultrasound screening to identify fetuses infected by cytomegalovirus which will develop severe long-term sequelae. *Ultrasound in Obstetrics & Gynecology*. 2021;57(1):97-104. doi:10.1002/uog.22056

38. Pesch MH, Saunders NA, Abdelnabi S. Cytomegalovirus infection in pregnancy: Prevention, presentation, management and neonatal outcomes. *J Midwifery Womens Health*. 2021;66(3):397-402. doi:10.1111/jmwh.13228

39. Leruez-Ville M, Chatzakis C, Lilleri D, et al. Consensus recommendation for prenatal, neonatal and postnatal management of congenital cytomegalovirus infection from the European congenital infection initiative (ECCI). *The Lancet Regional Health – Europe*. 2024;40. doi:10.1016/j.lanepe.2024.100892

40. Boucoiran I, Yudin M, Poliquin V, Caddy S, Gantt S, Castillo E. Guideline no. 420: Cytomegalovirus infection in pregnancy. *Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology Canada*. 2021;43(7):893-908. doi:10.1016/j.jogc.2021.05.015

41. Chatzakis C, Shahar-Nissan K, Faure-Bardon V, et al. The effect of valacyclovir on secondary prevention of congenital cytomegalovirus infection, following primary maternal infection acquired periconceptionally or in the first trimester of pregnancy. An individual patient data meta-analysis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Published online July 18, 2023:S0002-9378(23)00470-2. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2023.07.022

42. Leruez-Ville M, Ghout I, Bussières L, et al. In utero treatment of congenital cytomegalovirus infection with valacyclovir in a multicenter, open-label, phase II study. *American Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 2016;215(4):462.e1-462.e10. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2016.04.003

43. Chrysanthopoulou SA, Rutter CM, Gatsonis CA. Bayesian versus empirical calibration of microsimulation models: a comparative analysis. *Med Decis Making*. 2021;41(6):714-726. doi:10.1177/0272989X211009161

44. Menzies NA, Soeteman DI, Pandya A, Kim JJ. Bayesian methods for calibrating health policy models: A tutorial. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2017;35(6):613-624. doi:10.1007/s40273-017-0494-4

45. Balegamire SJ, Renaud C, Mâsse B, et al. Frequency, timing and risk factors for primary maternal cytomegalovirus infection during pregnancy in Quebec. *PLoS One*. 2021;16(6):e0252309. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0252309

46. Dollard SC, Dreon M, Hernandez-Alvarado N, et al. Sensitivity of dried blood spot testing for detection of congenital cytomegalovirus infection. *JAMA Pediatr*. 2021;175(3):e205441. doi:10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.5441

47. Gelman A, Carlin JB, Stern HS, Dunson DD, Vehtari A, Rubin DB. *Bayesian Data Analysis*. 3rd Edition. Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2013.

48. Hadar E, Dorfman E, Bardin R, Gabbay-Benziv R, Amir J, Pardo J. Symptomatic congenital cytomegalovirus disease following non-primary maternal infection: A retrospective cohort study. *BMC Infectious Diseases*. 2017;17(1):31. doi:10.1186/s12879-016-2161-3

49. Ben Shoham A, Schlesinger Y, Miskin I, Kalderon Z, Michaelson-Cohen R, Wiener-Well Y. Cytomegalovirus (CMV) seroprevalence among women at childbearing age, maternal and congenital CMV infection: Policy implications of a descriptive, retrospective, community-based study. *Israel Journal of Health Policy Research*. 2023;12(1):16. doi:10.1186/s13584-023-00566-9

50. Fowler K, Mucha J, Neumann M, et al. A systematic literature review of the global seroprevalence of cytomegalovirus: Possible implications for treatment, screening, and vaccine development. *BMC Public Health*. 2022;22(1):1659. doi:10.1186/s12889-022-13971-7

51. Waldenström U, Cnattingius S, Vixner L, Norman M. Advanced maternal age increases the risk of very preterm birth, irrespective of parity: A population-based register study. *BJOG*. 2017;124(8):1235-1244. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.14368

52. Magnus MC, Wilcox AJ, Morken NH, Weinberg CR, Håberg SE. Role of maternal age and pregnancy history in risk of miscarriage: Prospective register based study. *BMJ*. 2019;364:l869. doi:10.1136/bmj.l869

53. American Academy of Pediatrics, American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists, eds. *Guidelines for Perinatal Care*. Eighth edition. American Academy of Pediatrics ; The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists; 2017.

54. Périllaud-Dubois C, Bouthry E, Jadoui A, Leng AL, Roque-Afonso AM, Vauloup-Fellous C. Positive predictive values of CMV-IgM and importance of CMV-IgG avidity testing in detecting primary infection in three different clinical settings. A French retrospective cohort study. *Journal of Clinical Virology*. 2020;132:104641. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2020.104641

55. Leruez-Ville M, Foulon I, Pass R, Ville Y. Cytomegalovirus infection during pregnancy: State of the science. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2020;223(3):330-349. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2020.02.018

56. Abdullahi Nasir I, Babayo A, Shehu MS. Clinical significance of IgG avidity testing and other considerations in the diagnosis of congenital cytomegalovirus infection: A review update. *Med Sci (Basel)*. 2016;4(1):5. doi:10.3390/medsci4010005

57. Berth M, Benoy I, Christensen N. Evaluation of a standardised real-time PCR based DNA-detection method (Realstar®) in whole blood for the diagnosis of primary human cytomegalovirus (CMV) infections in immunocompetent patients. *Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis*. 2016;35(2):245-249. doi:10.1007/s10096-015-2537-0

Figure 1. Schematic diagram of the structure of the LINCS model



Table 1. Selected data inputs for the LINCS model of CMV in pregnancy

Input	Value	Source
Cohort		
Maternal age, mean (SD)	29 (5)	[45]
Maternal primary CMV risk, per week, %	Included as calibration parameter, see Table 3	
Maternal non-primary CMV risk during pregnancy, %	0.2	[49]
Maternal CMV seroprevalence, %[a]	25 – 81	[50]
Probability of vertical transmission (by maternal infection type and timing), %	Included as calibration parameter, see Table 3	
Probability of fetal infection causing symptoms, by timing of maternal infection, %	Included as calibration parameter, see Table 3	
Probability of premature birth, range by maternal age, %	Weeks 24-31: 0.6 – 1.2 Weeks 32-36: 3.9 – 5.2	[51]
Probability of fetal demise,[b] range by maternal age, %	SA: 0.2 – 0.4 IUFD: 9.7 – 56.9	[52]
Baseline prenatal visit schedule		
Obstetric visit frequency, by trimester	Weeks 6-28: 1/month Weeks 29-36: 1-2 weeks Weeks 36-39: 1/week	[53]
Timing of first anatomic scan ultrasound	20 weeks	[53]
Testing		
Assays to detect maternal primary CMV infection during pregnancy		
Serum IgM sensitivity / specificity, %	90 / 96	[54]
Serum IgG sensitivity / specificity, %	97 /96	[55]
Serum IgG avidity sensitivity / specificity %	94.3 / 100	[56]
Serum CMV DNA PCR sensitivity / specificity, %	94 / 99	[57]
Assays to detect fetal cCMV infection		
Amniotic fluid CMV DNA PCR sensitivity / specificity, %	86 / 100	[35]
Probability of follow-up testing after abnormal ultrasound result, %	60-100	Assumption
Probability of follow-up testing after abnormal IgM-IgG result, %	95-100	Assumption
Therapies		
Valacyclovir for primary infection in periconception and first trimester, odds ratio of vertical transmission risk	0.34	[41]

a. Range by socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, and geographic region. **b**. SA (spontaneous abortion) is fetal demise until 20 weeks of gestation; IUFD (intrauterine fetal demise) is fetal demise after 20 weeks of gestation. **CMV**: cytomegalovirus; **Ig**: immunoglobulin; **PCR**: polymerase chain reaction; **SD**: standard deviation.

Table 2. Diagnostic algorithms and interpretations for CMV in pregnancy and congenital CMV[39]

IgM	IgG	Avidity	Interpretation	Follow-up test	Follow-up result	Follow-up interpretation
Negative	Negative	--	No prior CMV infection	n/a	n/a	n/a
Negative	Positive	--	Remote PI	No follow-up	n/a	n/a
Positive	Negative	--	Recent PI **or** FP IgM	Serum CMV DNA PCR	Positive	Recent PI
					Negative	No prior infection, FP IgM
Positive	Positive	Low	Recent PI	--	--	--
		High	Remote PI, with recent NPI **or** FP IgM	Amniocentesis with amniotic fluid CMV DNA PCR	Positive	Vertical transmission
					Negative	No vertical transmission
PI: primary infection. FP: false positive. NPI: non-primary infection.						

Table 3. LINCS model calibration results

Parameter	Calibration range	Best-fitting input parameter value	Target	Best-fitting model output
Maternal primary infection rate (*Maternal infection rate*)	1.2 – 2.6/100 person-years[45]	1.9/100 person-years	0.394%[c]	0.397%
Risk of vertical transmission following maternal primary infection, stratified by timing of maternal primary infection (% risk)[a,b] (*Primary VT risk*)	Recent preconception: 0.1% – 10.8% Periconception: 8.4% – 33.6% 1st trimester: 31.9% – 41.6% 2nd trimester: 35.5% – 45.1% 3rd trimester: 58.2% – 74.1%	Recent preconception: 9.475% Periconception: 30.45% 1st trimester: 40.4% 2nd trimester: 42.7% 3rd trimester: 72.15%		
Relative risk of vertical transmission from non-primary compared to primary infection *(Relative VT risk)*	0 – 1	0.75		
Risk of symptomatic illness among infants with cCMV				
Proportion of cCMV that is symptomatic at birth following maternal primary infection, stratified by timing of maternal primary infection (% risk)[a,b] *(Primary symptomatic risk)*	Pre/periconception[d]: 2.4% – 55.1% 1st trimester: 12.2% – 26.4% 2nd trimester: 0% – 2.4% 3rd trimester: 0% – 1.5%	Pre/periconception[d]: 41.95% 1st trimester: 26.4% 2nd trimester: 2.4% 3rd trimester: 1.5%	7.6%[22]	7.6%
Relative risk of symptomatic cCMV for infant infections that follow non-primary compared to primary maternal infection *(Relative symptomatic risk)*	0 – 1	1		

a. Since the true values of these risks are likely correlated across different infection times, in the calibration procedure, these values were varied together (e.g., for the simulation with the 3rd highest preconception VT risk, the 3rd highest 1st trimester VT risk was also used).
b. Ranges drawn from 95% confidence intervals reported in meta-analysis from Chatzakis et al.[28]
c. This target output was calculated by identifying the overall prevalence value that maximizes the likelihood function listed in the main text.
d. The preconception and periconception time periods are grouped here because ranges were only available from Chatzakis et al.[28] for the periconception time period; we assume that the primary symptomatic risk for the preconception period is the same for the periconception period.

cCMV: congenital cytomegalovirus; **VT**: vertical transmission.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Unit testing and functional testing of model dynamics

Code testing is typically done by checking that model code produces expected outputs when provided with a specified set of inputs. Given the complex and often nonlinear nature of simulation models, however, it is often not straightforward or possible to calculate the expected outputs explicitly. To address this, we adapt a testing paradigm from software engineering that we refer to as *unit testing* and *functional testing*, which are code validation methods that ensure that the code works as specified. Unit testing involves testing individual functions or portions of code and can help identify structural and logical errors in the code. For deterministic (e.g., structural) unit testing, conditional responses were added in key functions that automatically returned errors if unreasonable or nonsensical events occurred. This prevented potential errors from propagating through the rest of the model before being caught, which would have increased the complication of diagnosing and fixing the issues. For example, in the section of the code that draws from a probability for vertical transmission of CMV infection to the fetus, we created a conditional response that forced the model to return an error warning if vertical transmission occurred without previous maternal CMV infection. Unit testing was also performed to ensure that events were occurring at the rate at which they were specified, such as making sure that the sensitivities and specificities of the simulated prenatal tests matched their input values.

Functional tests, in contrast to unit tests, are passed through multiple functions and model parts to evaluate performance across linked or nested functions, testing to see whether the integrated system behaves as expected in various scenarios. An example of a functional test that was performed entailed confirming that the number of each prenatal test performed appropriately correlated with the user-defined proportion of active maternal infections that are symptomatic and the proportion of symptomatically infected individuals who seek healthcare. Functional testing allowed us to verify that increasing the proportion of symptomatic CMV infections, increasing the proportion of pregnant people with symptoms who seek healthcare, and increasing the proportion of those seeking healthcare who get tested for CMV

all directly correlate to a greater number of maternal CMV cases diagnosed, which is logically to be expected given our model structure. A schematic of this test is outlined in Figure S1.

Figure S1. Unit and functional testing. In this simplified and noncomprehensive model schematic, we compare examples of unit and functional testing that were performed.



Table S1. Results of functional testing: Sample inputs and intermediate outcomes

Parameter	Target value	Observed value	Relative difference	Approach to tracking
IgM sensitivity and specificity	90%, 96%	89.8%, 95.99%	<1%, <1%	The model code tracks the total number of true positives, false positives, true negatives, and false negatives for each test. These values were then used to calculate the observed sensitivity and specificity for each prenatal test.
IgG sensitivity and specificity	97%, 96%	97.06%, 95.99%	<1%, <1%	
IgG avidity sensitivity and specificity	94.3%, 100%	94.32%, 100%	<1%, <1%	
Serum CMV DNA PCR sensitivity and specificity	94%, 99%	93.99%, 98.999%	<1%, <1%	
Amniotic fluid CMV DNA PCR sensitivity and specificity	86%, 100%	85.6%, 100%	<1%, <1%	
Number of tests performed	N/A			It was verified that increasing the proportion of infected mothers who are symptomatic, increasing the number of symptomatic mothers who seek healthcare, and increasing the probability of those who seek healthcare getting tested all resulted in more prenatal tests being performed. This allowed us to ensure that all of these interrelated parts of the model were functioning together properly.
Other structural checks	N/A			Model run is stopped and error is displayed if: (1) Test results return any value that is not either true (1) or false (0), (2) A test that is not fully specified by the user is called upon.