

BHIVA Guidelines

1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 HIV Testing

The Committee believe that a potentially important mechanism for limiting the HIV epidemic is the widespread use of HIV testing in a variety of clinical settings. The availability of effective antiretroviral treatment improves outcome and potentially reduces onward transmission.

1.2 Methodology

The section on methodology has been extensively updated since the last version. Additional information includes new discussion of definition of viral load end-points, including an explanation of the "time to loss of virologic response" (TLOVR) algorithm, and a section on issues surrounding non-inferiority trials.

1.3 Adherence

Current evidence does not support adherence interventions including intensive, frequent or prolonged contact with specialist staff or structured group interventions. There may be some benefit from brief individualised interventions. Treatment simplification should not be at the price of reduced clinical efficacy. Medication alarms may impede adherence.

Adherence support should be part of the routine clinical care provided by all health professionals in HIV medicine rather than being the exclusive role of specialist staff members. Every prescribing unit should adopt a standardised approach to assessing adherence and have a written policy on provision of adherence support. Staff must be appropriately trained to make delivery of such support possible. Treatment adherence data should be recorded routinely alongside other clinical parameters in order to detect patients in greatest need of additional treatment support.

1.4 Gender and ethnicity Summary

Increasing numbers of women and people of diverse ethnic backgrounds are being diagnosed with HIV in the UK. Much of the evidence underpinning therapy has been gained from observations in men from resource - rich settings . Although some gender differences in surrogate markers have been observed clinical outcomes to HAART are at least as good in women as they are in men. Adverse events may show some differences between men and women and the selection of medications needs to be mindful of women's child bearing capacity. The increasing ethnic diversity of the UK HIV positive population has particular implications for access to and uptake of care. In addition a wider range of HIV viral subtypes is being seen in clinical practice. When equal access to care is available clinical outcomes on HAART are equivalent, although some ethnic differences in adverse event profiles have been observed.

1.5 When to start treatment Summary

1.5.1 Primary HIV infection

Longer-term follow-up of small numbers of patients treated during PHI with subsequent treatment interruption have not supported initial hopes that early treatment would alter the natural history of HIV infection. It is therefore the view of the panel that we should not change the recommendation that patients diagnosed during PHI should be offered recruitment into a clinical trial that will address the issue of whether treatment is beneficial in this setting (e.g. the Spartac study in the UK).

1.5.2 Symptomatic HIV Infection

There is no change to the recommendation in the 2003 guidelines – i.e. that initiation of treatment is recommended in individuals with symptomatic disease and/or an AIDS diagnosis (with the possible exception of pulmonary tuberculosis).

1.5.3 Asymptomatic HIV Infection

1.5.3.1 Individuals with CD4 counts <200:

There is no change to the previous recommendations – i.e. that initiation of therapy is recommended before the CD4 count falls below 200 and in any individual with a confirmed CD4 <200 at diagnosis.

1.5.3.2 Individuals with CD4 counts >350:

Although some recent studies have added to the data suggesting a benefit in the short to medium term on mortality and morbidity with initiation of HAART at a CD4 of >350, these need to be interpreted with consideration to the likelihood that patients with HIV may live for decades after treatment with HAART. In this group of patients where the short-term risk of disease progression is low, it is still considered that initiation of HAART may result in greater morbidity and possibly mortality in the longer term as a result of drug toxicity and earlier exhaustion of treatment options.

1.5.3.3 Individuals with CD4 counts 201-350:

It is recommended that the majority of people should initiate therapy with CD4 counts between 200 and 350 cells/mm³. Within this range, the time of initiation in a particular individual may be based upon patient preference, the rapidity of CD4 decline, symptoms, viral load, and co-morbidity such as hepatitis C infection.

1.6 What to start with

Treatment should be given with a dual nucleoside analogue and either a non nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NNRTI) or boosted protease inhibitor (PI). Choice between an NNRTI and boosted PI remains largely a matter of opinion but more data exists for NNRTI-based regimens in terms of efficacy. Genetic fragility in NNRTIs may be a bigger disadvantage when these drugs are used later in therapy when more patients will have developed resistance to other components

of the regimen but the incidence of transmitted NNRTI resistance in the treatment naïve population is increasing. NNRTIs have long half lives which allow once daily dosing and latitude around dose timing (forgiveness) and produced fewer disturbances in lipid metabolism. In favour of boosted PI is a higher genetic barrier to resistance which leads to the rarity of both transmitted resistance and development of PI resistance with treatment failure. In the UK a number of boosted PI regimens are cheaper than NNRTIs. The Committee believes that Efavirenz is the NNRTI of choice except for women who may wish to become pregnant. Nevirapine is an alternative in women with a CD4 count of less than 250 cells mm⁻³ and men with a CD4 count below 400 cells mm⁻³ where the risks of serious adverse reactions are minimised. Lopinavir boosted with Ritonavir is the PI which has the most robust data for potency in a PI naïve population. Alternatives are Saquinavir boosted with Ritonavir and Fosamprenavir boosted with Ritonavir. The Committee believes that there is insufficient data to recommend Atazanavir/Ritonavir but individuals are advised to keep abreast of trials currently in progress as if efficacy and durability of this regimen can be confirmed, the once daily dosing and freedom from serum lipid abnormalities would be an advantage of this regimen.

Nucleoside analogues that should be considered when constructing a 2NRTI backbone for initial regimens include: Zidovudine (AZT), Lamivudine (3TC), Abacavir (ABC), Tenofovir (TDF) and Entricitabine (FTC). Three 2NRTI combinations are available as co-formulated pills (Kivexa, Truvada and Combivir). While this adds to convenience of the regimen, the Committee did not feel that this was sufficient to pay a large premium for a combination pill rather than using the components individually. Data suggests that AZT/3TC is less well tolerated than Tenofovir/FTC and produces a lower CD4 count rise than Abacavir/3TC although the clinical significance of this is unknown. AZT/3TC is likely to become considerably cheaper in the next two years as generic AZT becomes available. The extent of the continuing use of AZT/3TC combinations in the future is likely to depend upon the propensity of AZT to produce lipodystrophy which is in itself costly to treat and will be associated with poor adherence [1].

The choice between ABC/ 3TC and Tenofovir/FTC requires a discussion with the patient about the short term toxicity of Abacavir and its management versus the lack of long term data in clinic populations as opposed to selected patients in randomised controlled trials about potential long term toxicity of Tenofovir and its reversibility if it occurs. In this uncertain situation with no clear data, the relative costs of the two combinations will legitimately be an important consideration.

Reference

1. Richter A, Pladevall M, Manjunath R *et al*. Patient characteristics and costs associated with dyslipidaemia and related conditions in HIV-infected patients: a retrospective cohort study. *HIV Med*, 2005, **6**, 79-90.

1.7 When to switch therapy in the absence of virological failure

When an individual drug as part of a regimen is causing toxicity the choice of agents to switch to is often self evident and is usually within class, particularly for patients on complex regimens who are finding complete adherence difficult. Regimen simplification, for example to a triple NRTI pill of ZDV, 3TC and ABC appears to be safe in those whose previous antiretroviral treatment has not failed and may improve adherence. Switching because of the development of abnormal lipids or the fat redistribution syndrome is more complex and of less certain benefit. It is dealt with in detail in the guidelines. Any improvements in fat redistribution that occur as a result of such switching are slow.

1.8 Changing or stopping therapy for virological failure

- In patients experiencing viral load rebound a clinical assessment of factors potentially contributing to reduced plasma drug levels such as adherence and drug-drug interactions should be undertaken and managed appropriately.
- The addition of a single new agent in individuals experiencing low level viral load rebound is not recommended as the disadvantages of added toxicity and development of resistance to the new drug are probably greater than the likelihood of achieving a sustained undetectable viral load.
- Patients should be considered for a change of therapy if they show sustained rebound in viral load levels (as defined by 2 values at least one month apart > 400 copies/ml), having previously been undetectable, or have never achieved undetectable levels on their current regimen.
- A resistance test should be undertaken once sustained viral load rebound occurs and whilst the patient is still on therapy.
- The decision to change therapy should be guided by the availability of a treatment option which is likely to have the potency to suppress viral load levels to undetectable levels (<50 copies/ml) and which the patient is likely to be able to adhere to and tolerate.
- The choice of a new regimen should be guided by the results of current and previous resistance testing, anti-retroviral treatment history and the ability and likelihood of the patient to tolerate and adhere to individual drugs.
- The new regimen should contain at least 3 active drugs including one from a new drug class. Active is defined as 'where a drug is likely to have significant antiviral activity in vivo based on the antiretroviral treatment history and the results of all current and previous genotypic resistance testing'

1.9 Treatment for patients with evidence of resistance to NNRTIs, nucleoside analogues and PIs

In salvage setting where it is unlikely that durable undetectable levels of HIV RNA are achievable, the aim of treatment should shift to maintaining or preserving immunological function and preventing clinical progression. In this setting it is therefore very important to maintain the CD4 cell count rather than to attempt to get the HIV viral load undetectable with single agents

Structured Treatment Interruption is NOT recommended in salvage and needs further evaluation.

For patients not at risk of rapid clinical progression (CD4 cell count > 100 cells per cumm and not falling rapidly), it would be sensible to wait for enough new active drugs to be available in order to have a realistic chance of durable viral suppression to < 50 copies/mL

Patients with multidrug resistant HIV should be referred to or discussed with larger HIV centres where new investigational drugs are likely to be more accessible; this could be done as part of a managed clinical network or on a shared care basis

1.10 Resistance testing

- Testing for transmitted resistance is recommended in all newly diagnosed patients who present with either acute seroconversion or established infection. The most appropriate sample is the one closest to the time of diagnosis and this should preferably be tested at the time of initial presentation.
 - For existing patients, testing for transmitted resistance is recommended at the time of starting therapy.
 - Minority species of resistant virus may be missed by conventional resistance testing. In patients without evidence of transmitted resistance using such tests, a suboptimal virological response to first-line therapy ($<1 \log_{10}$ copies/ml reduction in viral load by 4-8 weeks) should prompt resistance testing at that time.
 - The reader should refer to the extended guidelines for additional recommendations.
- 1) **Primary resistance.** There is now extensive evidence for the transmission of drug resistant variants (de Ronde 2001; Pao 2005), and some evidence transmitted resistance may compromise response to first-line therapy (Grant 2002; Little 2002; Violin 2004). In some cases, the presence of resistance in an apparently drug-naïve patient may in fact reflect previous undisclosed therapy.
 - 2) **Epidemiology of drug-resistance in treatment-experienced cohorts.** Antiretroviral treatment failure continues to occur among patients on HAART and is frequently accompanied by the selection of drug resistance. In a study of UK patients who started HAART (without previous mono or dual nucleoside therapy) between 1996 and 2003, there was a 38% risk of failure and a 27% or higher risk of developing resistance over 6 years of follow-up (UK Collaborative Group on HIV Drug Resistance 2005).
 - 3) **Benefit of resistance testing in treatment-experienced patients.** Routine use of genotypic resistance testing after treatment failures has been shown to be cost effective (Corzillius 2004). The TORO-1 (Lalezari 2003) and TORO-2 (Lazzarin 2003) and RESIST-1 (Hicks 2004) and RESIST-2 (Cahn 2004) trials provided indirect evidence of the clinical benefit of resistance testing in highly drug-experienced patients.
 - 4) **Interpretation of resistance test results**
 - a. Routine resistance assays do not detect resistant viruses present at low levels ($<20\%$ of the total virus population), even if these resistant viruses were previously dominant. Although assays to detect minority species have been developed, they are not routinely available and remain research tools only. Limited data indicate that minority resistant quasispecies may affect virological responses (Bae 2004; Mellors 2004).
 - b. In the absence of drug pressure, the dominant virus population will revert to wild-type (Wirden 2004). Reversion is slower in transmitted resistance than in resistance selected by therapy (Barbour 2004; Brenner 2004; Delaugerre 2004; Gandhi 2003; Little 2004; Pao 2004). Reversion of mutations may occur through intermediates or revertants (e.g. T215D/N/S from T215Y/F). Detection of revertants should be interpreted as evidence that fully-resistant mutants are present as either minority quasispecies or archived resistance.
 - c. The interpretation of resistance test results is complex. The most informative interpretation systems are based on “clinical cut-off” values, which are being determined for a growing number of drugs.
 - d. Antiretroviral resistance should be interpreted as a continuum. For the NRTIs and PIs (but not for the NNRTIs, Wirden 2003), residual virological suppression can be observed with intermediate levels of resistance, which may reflect direct antiviral activity as well as the beneficial effects of reduced viral fitness (reviewed in Geretti 2004).

- e. Virus fitness is defined as the overall capacity of a virus to infect, replicate, and produce mature infectious progeny in a defined host environment. The Replicative Capacity Assay is a clinically available test that provides one measure of viral fitness. The clinical utility of the test has not been demonstrated.
- f. Hypersusceptibility effects can be demonstrated in vitro. Certain drug-resistance mutations confer resistance to some drugs but increase susceptibility to others. The clinical relevance of this is not clear.
- g. Certain resistance pathways have been associated with the HIV-1 subtypes. HIV genetic diversity also impacts on phenotypic resistance assays, which use a B subtype virus backbone.

1.11 TDM summary

Randomised, prospective, controlled trials remain a high priority to evaluate the usefulness of therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) of NNRTIs/Pis. TDM has been shown to be beneficial in particular clinical scenarios where drug concentrations are difficult to predict, such as the management of drug interactions, the settings of pregnancy and paediatrics, salvage therapy settings when TDM and resistance test results can be integrated, in patients with renal or hepatic impairment, transplant patients, in case of toxicity, and the use of alternative dosing regimens whose safety and efficacy have not been established.

Clinical data supporting the use of inhibitory quotient are limited; however, these appear to be superior in predicting failure compared to drug concentrations or resistance testing alone in extensively pre-treated patients commencing salvage regimens.

1.12 Metabolic complications

As the prognosis of HIV infection has markedly improved, so has our need to manage long-term morbidity associated with HIV and HAART.

Abnormalities of lipid homeostasis and fat distribution are likely to assume a central role in guiding choices for antiretroviral therapy. This is the result of the growing awareness of the increase of stigmatisation and reduction of adherence associated with lipodystrophy, especially lipoatrophy, and for the increased cardiovascular risk associated with drug induced metabolic abnormalities. Few prospective studies address the relative risk of different regimens causing the features of lipodystrophy, although ACTG384 suggests the risks are greater with PIs than with NNRTIs and greater with d4T than with AZT. Studies have shown a slow reversal of lipoatrophy when D4T and possibly AZT, are substituted by other drugs such as Abacavir and Tenofovir. There is convincing data to suggest that avoiding protease inhibitors as first line, or switching from them, leads to a better lipid profile and possibly a reduction of insulin resistance. This does class effect on lipids and insulin resistance does not apply to Atazanavir, and boosting with Ritonavir does not appear to change this.

The application of current health promotion approaches to our patients should include assessments of cardiovascular risk and their appropriate management according to the most recent international guidelines. It has been suggested that HIV, because of its proinflammatory profile, might present a greater risk for the development of cardiovascular disease. There is insufficient evidence to determine the extent to which this applies, but is another reason to adhere to state of the art management of cardiovascular risk in our HIV positive patients.

1.13 Co-infection with Chronic Hepatitis B or C

- Anti-HBV therapy should be included in ART for all HBsAg+ patients who are HBeAg+, or who have a blood HBV-DNA level $>10^4$ genome equivalents/ml, or who have cirrhosis and any detectable HBV-DNA.
- If treating HIV and HBV, tenofovir alone or in combination with lamivudine or emtricitabine is recommended as part of HAART. Lamivudine or emtricitabine should not be used alone or in combination with each other.
- Continue anti-HBV drugs if still active, even if the HIV is resistant.
- Consider all HCV+ patients for therapy with pegylated interferon and ribavirin, to commence ideally before the CD4 count has fallen to levels where ART is required.
- If ART is required in HCV+ patients, establish a stable regimen with a CD4 count >200 cells/mm³ before anti-HCV therapy is considered. Ideally avoid zidovudine, didanosine and stavudine/didanosine because of their interactions with ribavirin.
- If possible, avoid nevirapine and high dose (>1000 mg/day) ritonavir in all patients with chronic liver disease due to their potential hepatotoxicity. Low dose ritonavir can be used safely.

1.13 TB Co-infection summary

The guidelines for managing HIV infected patients co-infected with TB can be found on <http://www.bhiva.org>

The management of such patients is complex and requires a multidisciplinary approach. It is important that physicians treating such patients are not only aware of the issues around the epidemiology, prevention control and treatment of TB in HIV but also the use of HAART.

When to start HIV treatment, what with, drug interactions, the side effects, complications and their management in particular IRIS syndrome are specifically addressed in these comprehensive guidelines.

2.0 New issues in these guidelines

2.1 HIV Testing

Since the outlook for an HIV sero-positive patient has been transformed following the introduction of HAART, previous arguments about the value HIV testing are no longer relevant. Thus an important means to improve patient outcome and reduce transmission of HIV is the more widespread offer of HIV testing. It is important that clinical health care professionals are 'alert' to the symptoms and signs and histories that denote possible risk, and are then in a position to offer testing. We believe that a request to undertake a HIV test should be within the competence of all doctors and is both possible and desirable within the context of a general medical clinic or general practice surgery. There is no need for special counselling skills outside those which all clinicians (nurses and doctors) require for their daily practice. It is recognized that there might be exceptional circumstances, particularly when the risk of HIV infection is high, whether an individual might require an additional counselling either before or afterwards. It is sensible for clinicians to familiarise themselves with the most recent guidelines from the APBI

(www.abi.org.uk) on life insurance and have available telephone numbers of support organisation to help with the minority of patients who have a major reaction when a positive result is disclosed. Unfortunately there may be stigma attached to an HIV positive diagnosis, so individuals need to be informed of the strict rules of confidentiality that medical practitioners abide by. Similarly, the individuals should be advised to think through carefully the implications of disclosure of an HIV positive diagnosis to relatives and friends. Increasingly, point of care testing using assays from which the diagnosis can be obtained in 15 minutes are being used to provide a 'one stop' service. This may prove difficult in a general practice setting, and the booking of a separate time to discuss a potentially positive HIV result may be more satisfactory. The most important outcome for those individuals with a HIV positive result is the prompt referral to someone with experience in the treatment of HIV and related infections.

2.2 New Drugs

It is intended that this short summary of updated recommendations for antiretroviral treatments should be read in conjunction with the more extensive review of the existing data about such therapy present in the previous BHIVA guidelines (reference). The intention of this section is to update readers on drugs which are likely to be licensed in the near future or are already available on compassionate release.

2.2.1 Tipranavir

This protease inhibitor has been developed because of its ability to inhibit viruses which are resistant to all presently available protease inhibitors in-vitro. This ability has recently been confirmed in vivo in recently completed Phase 3 studies (Resist 1 and 2). Its pharmacokinetics require it to be administered twice daily boosting with Ritonavir and thus has a relatively high pill burden. The likelihood of a response to Tipranavir can be gauged by the resistant profile of the virus and expert advice is helpful in deciding which boosted PI is most likely to be effective in a particular patient. Abnormalities of lipids particularly triglycerides and of liver function tests, are the main laboratory side effects, although the incidence of gastrointestinal side effects is no greater than with other boosted PIs. Like other drugs essentially used as single effective agents in advanced disease, the virological responses are often short lived and the drug is much more likely to find a role in earlier stages of diseases when it is possible to construct a regimen capable of suppressing viral replication completely.

2.2.2 TMC 114

TMC114 is an investigational protease inhibitor with activity against protease inhibitor resistant HIV-1. It has been given in a liquid peg formulation but a new formulation is going to be available. 100mg of Ritonavir is needed to be taken with it to improve its pharmacokinetics.

Tibotec TMC114-207 was a randomised phase 2 open-label activity dose finding and PK study in patients who were on a failing protease inhibitor in their current regimen.

The study duration was for 14 days with a follow-up phase of 6 weeks. Three doses of TMC114 were compared to continuing the failing protease inhibitor in a four arm study using TMC114 300mg, 600mg twice daily versus 900mg once daily.

There were 50 patients in all divided between the four arms. Patients had to have multiple PI experience and were currently failing therapy with an HIV RNA greater than 2000 and their CD4

count had to be greater than 50. They had to be previously treated with between 2-4 proteases for at least 2 months each and there must be no non-nucleoside in the baseline regime.

The median HIV RNA for this group was 4.3 logs with the CD4 of 305 cells/ml. 46 percent of patients were resistance to all established proteases on phenotypic sensitivity.

After 14 days TMC114 was associated with reductions of up to 1.5 log₁₀ in the 600mg bid dose compared with a lower reductions in the other dosing arms.

At the recent CRO1 2005, a 24 week interim analysis of two 96 week dose finding phase two trials in salvage therapy were presented. Patients were experienced in three or more classes with a median viral load over 100,000 copies/ml at baseline. They all had one or more primary proteases inhibitor mutations. 497 subjects were randomised to either optimised background which included two or more nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors with or without T20 or to OB plus TMC114. The doses of TMC114 given ranged from 400mg or 800mg once a day or 400mg or 600mg given twice daily all with 100mg of Ritonavir boost. The primary end-point was the decrease in viral load at 24 weeks. The 600/100mg twice daily dosing appeared to have the best antiviral effect with a change in viral load from baseline of 1.85 log₁₀ compared with the control group of -0.27 log₁₀. There was an increase in CD4 in the TMC114 600mg bid dose of 75 cells. There was no difference in toxicity or adverse events between all the arms. For those patients who never had T20 before 67 percent in the TMC114 600mg arm had a viral load less than 50 at 24 weeks.

2.2.3 TMC125

This drug is made by Tibotec and is a potent NNRTI active against NNRTI resistant HIV. It has been tested against single and multiple mutants as well as clinical isolates with NNRTI resistance associated mutations. It appears a high number of mutations required for a significant increase in the EC50. The TMC125-C207 study was performed over an 8 day period in patients who were failing in NNRTI therapy. Median and viral load was 4 to 4.25 log at baseline and after 7 days of TMC125-C207 the viral load had dropped 1 log. Its being taken forward to phase III.

2.3 Cost Benefit Analysis

The prognosis of HIV infection has been revolutionised by antiretroviral treatment. The requirement for life long treatment, however, has meant that the total cost of antiretrovirals place a burden on third party payers. Antiretrovirals remain amongst the most cost effective treatments to save a year of life for a chronic disease with the high cost of drugs being partially offset by the reduction in expensive hospital inpatient care and the avoidance of opportunistic infections.

While the BHIVA Writing Committee continues to believe that the primary purpose of the guidelines is to produce a consensus view of optimal treatment based upon potency, durability and freedom from side effects, we are cognisant that it would not be right in the framework of medical ethics to ignore the issues of costs. These issues become more important as more expensive drugs are developed which have no clear advantages in terms of antiviral efficacy but may add to the convenience for patients.

2.3.1 Cost of antiretroviral drugs

These 2 tables display the current prices as set out in the BNF plus VAT at 17.5% for the 2NRTI backbone and the 3rd drug according to the recommendations for preferred regimens in ARV naïve patients. While formulating this list, the committee are aware that parallel importing, individual unit or regional discounting, and home delivery of drugs (which is exempt of VAT) may

affect overall price to a significant level. Moreover, total drug costs may be misleading without considering the implications of reduced adherence to more complex regimens and the high cost of managing side effects such as lipid abnormalities. However, throughout the guidelines for the first time when the Committee believes that little distinguishes various drugs apart from cost this will be mentioned.

Table 1

Cost of preferred regimens as per Table 5: monthly (30 day) cost as set out in list price + VAT at 17.5% in £

Column A:

Category	Regimen	Cost
NNRTI	EFV	263
	NVP	197
PI/r	LOP/r	390
	ATAZ/r ¹	430
	FOS/r ²	402
	SAQ/r ²	457
	IND/r ^{**2}	212
PI	ATAZ 300mg	390
	NFV	378
NRTI	ABC	280#
Entry inhibitor	T-20*	1408

r¹ or r² indicate number of ritonavir capsules per day

* For experienced patients only

** Not a preferred regimen but recognised potential cost-savings

Trizivir[®] £683

Column B

Column C

NRTI-1	Cost	NRTI-2	Cost	Total cost
ZDV 250mg	210	3TC/FTC	192	402
TDF	300			492
ABC	280			472
DDI 400mg	207			399
D4T*	217			409
Combivir [®]				402
Truvada [®]				492
Kivexa [®]				439

* D4T/3TC is as effective as other regimens but more toxic and nor a preferred regimen

Formatted: Font: (Default)
Arial, 10 pt

2.4 Structured Treatment Interruption (STI)

Supervised interruption of drug therapy may reduce drug costs and overall toxicity. Enthusiasm for this approach was initially increased by the biological plausibility that the reappearance of viral antigens in the circulation might stimulate the immune system to produce more effective control of viral replication. See the following sections:

- 1) Seroconversion, see section 5.0
- 2) Chronic disease, see section 7.3
- 3) STI in salvage, see section 9.2.3

Structured treatment interruptions of varying length with re-starting of therapy as indicated by CD4 cells has been showed to be a safe treatment, in pilot studies with potential cost benefits but less clear reductions in toxicity. This strategy is being examined in a large international randomised controlled trial with clinical end points (SMART) over the next several years.

The chief short term risks of structured treatment interruption are the development of resistant virus because of virtual monotherapy with the component of the regimen with the longest half life (usually the NNRTI). Particularly long half lives have been found with some genetic polymorphisms of the Cytochrome P450 system which may be commoner in people of African origin. It is unclear how often resistance to NNRTIs develops but it would seem a reasonable precaution either to cover the withdrawal of the NNRTI with a shorter acting PI which can subsequently stopped concomitantly with the two nucleoside analogues e.g. Kaletra or by stopping the NNRTI several days prior to the NAs. The disadvantage of this approach is the variability in the terminal half life of the NNRTI.

The Committee would only recommend a treatment interruption outside the clinical controlled trials in those patients who started antiretroviral therapy with high CD4 counts e.g. above 400 cells mm⁻³ in accordance with earlier guidelines. Such patients may be able to withdraw treatment for several years before they require treatment according to newer guidelines.

2.5 Gender and ethnicity – implications for therapy

The HIV epidemic in the UK is increasingly diverse. Although the majority of people with HIV in Britain are men the number of women is rapidly increasing. In 2003 45% of new diagnoses were in women of whom almost 70% were from African backgrounds. (1). Much of the data available on both natural history and therapy of HIV has been generated from observations of men leading to a relative lack of information about women. Ethnic diversity within the UK HIV infected population is also rapidly changing. Since 1999 new diagnoses in Africans have overtaken those in other groups. Gender and ethnicity are bound up with social, psychological and environmental factors which impact on both access to and uptake of care (2,3,4). Increasing data exist on the responses and resistance patterns of non subtype B viral strains to antiretrovirals, as described in Resistance section). The management of HIV in women who are pregnant is given in the BHIVA pregnancy guidelines (5)

Factors that influence access to care may be implicated in the observations that late presenters are more likely to be female (6) and of African background (7). In the UK African men are diagnosed at an older age and have lower CD4 counts at diagnosis than African women (8). A number of studies have shown that women are less likely to be prescribed antiretroviral drugs (9,10) and to initiate therapy later in disease progression than men (11,12)

In HIV seronegative populations women have been observed to have higher CD4 counts than men (13). At seroconversion higher CD4 cell counts have been described in women compared to men (14), which have been shown to persist with time (15). Such gender differences in CD4 counts may lead to a delay of initiation of therapy in women compared with men, which has been estimated to be of the order of 12 months (16). However despite rather later initiation of HAART, at a population level women show at least the same HAART related improvement in survival as men (17)

Viral load values in women have been noted to be lower for the same stage of disease progression and CD4 count in comparison to men. A meta-analysis (18) confirms this finding to be consistent and of the order of 41%. This is of importance in situations where when plasma HIV RNA thresholds are used to inform treatment recommendations for initiating ART. A lower threshold is indicated for women compared with men.

The childbearing potential of women with HIV will influence therapeutic decision making. Efavirenz is associated with teratogenicity and is contraindicated in pregnancy. It should not be used in women planning to conceive.

Once established on treatment women fare at least as well as men (19,20,21,22) and on starting therapy women may achieve virological suppression at a faster rate than men and have a more durable response (23). In the UK white ethnicity has been associated with greater increases in CD4 cell counts during the first 3 months of HAART (24) and in the USA with a more rapid and durable fall in viral load. (25). Large studies from the UK, Switzerland and Denmark (26,27,28,) have all confirmed the prognosis of Sub-Saharan African patients on triple therapy to be equivalent to that of Northern European patients and that race and ethnic origin play no major role in the outcome associated with HAART if access to health care is free.

Differences in tolerability of antiretroviral medications are marked, with higher rates of side effects in women. (29,30) . This difference has been observed across all drug classes. Adverse reactions to Nevirapine are up to 12 times more common in women (31, 32). This is particularly marked at CD4 counts greater than 250(33.) in whom nevirapine should not be used. A relationship between nevirapine toxicity and low body mass index (BMI) in African women has been documented(34) who should be closely monitored if nevirapine is prescribed.. High rates of neurological side effects and an associated reduced clearance of efavirenz have been closely linked with ethnicity but not gender. (35,36), Clearance has been shown to be 32% slower in African American and Hispanic patients in comparison to Caucasians. Abacavir hypersensitivity has been described more commonly in white patients (37). Drug interactions exist between protease inhibitors and oral contraceptives. Of particular note nelfinavir reduces the effectiveness of the contraceptive pill and women must be advised to use additional methods of contraception (38).

The impact of HAART on lipid and insulin metabolism appears to be more pronounced in women than in men (39,40) which may cancel out the protective cardiovascular profile usually conferred on women. HAART associated body shape changes have been noted more commonly in women (41) The pattern of fat accumulation and loss differs between the sexes, with a greater accumulation in women and loss in men. (42). In an Australian study black patients preserved both total body fat and limb fat when compared to other ethnic groups (43).

REFERENCES

1. Health Protection Agency(HIV/STI Department, Communicable Disease Surveillance Centre) AIDS/HIV QUARTERLY SURVEILLANCE TABLES CUMULATIVE UK DATA TO END

SEPTEMBER 2004 No. 64: 04/3 October 2004.

2. Green G, Smith R.

The psychosocial and health care needs of HIV-positive people in the United Kingdom: a review
HIV Medicine (2004), 5 (Suppl. 1), 5–46

3. Palacio H, Kahn JG, Richards TA, Morin SF. Effect of race and/or ethnicity in use of antiretrovirals and prophylaxis for opportunistic infection: a review of the literature *Public Health Rep.* 2002 May-Jun;117(3):233-51; discussion 231-2

4. Department of Health, African HIV Policy Network, National AIDS Trust
HIV and AIDS in African communities: A framework for better prevention and care
2004

5. Guidelines for the Management of HIV infection in Pregnant Women and the Prevention of Mother-to-Child Transmission of HIV. Draft JANUARY 2005 <http://www.bhiva.org.uk>

6. Sabin CA, Smith CJ, Gumley H, Murphy G, Lampe FC, Phillips AN, Prinz B, Youle M, Johnson MA. Late presenters in the era of highly active antiretroviral therapy: uptake of and responses to antiretroviral therapy, *AIDS*. 2004 Nov 5;18(16):2145-51

7. ref Missing – BHIVA data late presentations of Africans

8. HPA/ Katy sinka

9. Mocroft A, Gill MJ, Davidson W, Phillips AN

Are there gender differences in starting protease inhibitors, HAART, and disease progression despite equal access to care? *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2000 Aug 15;24(5):475-82

10. Giordano TP, White AC Jr, Sajja P, Graviss EA, Arduino RC, Adu-Oppong A, Lahart CJ, Visnegarwala F. Factors associated with the use of highly active antiretroviral therapy in patients newly entering care in an urban clinic. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2003 Apr 1;32(4):399-405.(a)

11. McNaghten AD, Hanson DL, Dworkin MS, Jones JL; Adult/Adolescent Spectrum of HIV Disease Group. Differences in prescription of antiretroviral therapy in a large cohort of HIV-infected patients. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2003 Apr 15;32(5):499-505.

12. Easterbrook P J, Phillips A N, Hill T, Matthias R, Sabin C, Fisher M, Gazzard B, Gilson R, Scullard G, U K The CHIC Study Patterns and predictors of antiretroviral drug use at treatment initiation in the UK .The XV International AIDS Conference, 2004 Abstract no. TuPeB4543

13. Maini MK, Gilson RJ, Chavda N, et al. Reference ranges and sources of variability of CD4 counts in HIV-seronegative women and men. *Genitourin Med.* 1996;72:27-31.

14. CASCADE Collaboration. Differences in CD4+ cell counts at seroconversion and decline among 5739 HIV-1-infected individuals with well-estimated dates of seroconversion. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2003;34:76-83.

15. Delmas AC, Jadand C, De Vincenzi I, et al. Gender differences in CD4+ cell counts persist after HIV-1 infection. *AIDS.* 1997;11:1071-1073.

16. Maria Prinsa, J. Roy Robertsonb, Raymond P. Brettlec, Ildefonso Hernández Aguadod, Barbara

Broerse, Faroudy Boufassaf, David J. Goldbergg, Robert Zangerleh, Roel A. Coutinho,i and Anneke van den Hoeka. Do gender differences in CD4 cell counts matter? *AIDS* 1999, 13:2361–2364

17. Prins M Meyer L. Considering the dynamics of HIV infection by sex, should treatment guidelines be revisited? The XV International AIDS Conference, 2004 Abstract MedGenMed. 2004 Jul 11;6(3):TuPeB4539

18. Napravnik S, Poole C, Thomas JC, Eron JJ. Gender difference in HIV RNA levels: a meta-analysis of published studies. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2002;31:11-19.

19. Giordano TP, Wright JA, Hasan MQ, White AC Jr, Graviss EA, Visnegarwala F. Do sex and race/ethnicity influence CD4 cell response in patients who achieve virologic suppression during antiretroviral therapy? *Clin Infect Dis.* 2003 Aug 1;37(3):433- (b)

20. Moore AL, Sabin CA, Johnson MA, Phillips AN Gender and clinical outcomes after starting highly active antiretroviral treatment: a cohort study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2002 Feb 1;29(2):197-202

21. Moore AL, Kirk O, Johnson AM, Kalama C, Blaxhult A, Dietrich M, Colebunders R, Chiesi A, Lungren JD, Phillips AN; EuroSIDA group. Virologic, immunologic, and clinical response to highly active antiretroviral therapy: the gender issue revisited *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2003 Apr 1;32(4):452-61

22. Patterson K, Napravnik S, Eron J, et al. Age and sex effect on response to initial HAART. Program and abstracts of the 12th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; February 22-25, 2005; Boston, Massachusetts. Abstract 596

23. Moore AL, Mocroft A, Madge S, Devereux H, Wilson D, Phillips AN, Johnson M. Gender differences in virologic response to treatment in an HIV-positive population: a cohort study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2001 Feb 1;26(2):159-63.

24. Smith CJ, Sabin CA, Youle MS, Kinloch-de Loes S, Lampe FC, Madge S, Cropley I, Johnson MA, Phillips AN. Factors influencing increases in CD4 cell counts of HIV-positive persons receiving long-term highly active antiretroviral therapy. *J Infect Dis.* 2004 Nov 15;190(10):1860-8

25. Anastos K, Schneider M. Effect of race on the response to highly- active antiretroviral therapy. Program and abstracts of the 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; February 8-11, 2004; San Francisco, California. Abstract 560.

26. Frater AJ, Dunn DT, Beardall AJ, Ariyoshi K, Clarke JR, McClure MO, Weber JN. Comparative response of African HIV-1-infected individuals to highly active antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS.* 2002 May 24;16(8):1139-46.

27. Staehelin C, Rickenbach M, Low N, Egger M, Ledergerber B, Hirschel B, D'Acremont V, Battegay M, Wagners T, Bernasconi E, Kopp C, Furrer H; Swiss HIV Cohort Study. Migrants from Sub-Saharan Africa in the Swiss HIV Cohort Study: access to antiretroviral therapy, disease progression and survival *AIDS.* 2003 Oct 17;17(15):2237-44

28. Jensen-Fangel S, Pedersen L, Pedersen C, Larsen CS, Tauris P, Moller A, Sorensen HT, Obel N. The effect of race/ethnicity on the outcome of highly active antiretroviral therapy for human immunodeficiency virus type 1-infected patients *Clin Infect Dis.* 2002 Dec 15;35(12):1541-8.

29. Lucas GM, Chaisson RE, Moore RD. Highly active antiretroviral therapy in a large urban clinic: risk factors for virologic failure and adverse drug reactions. *Ann Intern Med* 1999;131:81–7.
30. Walmsley S L, Saskin R, Raboud J, Thompson C Safety and efficacy of highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART) in a clinical cohort of HIV infected Women
The XV International AIDS Conference, 2004 Abstract no. B10988.
31. Mazhude C, Jones S, Murad S, Taylor C, Easterbrook P. Female sex but not ethnicity is a strong predictor of non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor-induced rash. *AIDS*. 2002 Jul 26;16(11):1566-8.
32. Bersoff-Matcha SJ, Miller WC, Aberg JA, van Der Horst C, Hamrick Jr HJ, Powderly WG, Mundy LM. Sex differences in nevirapine rash *Clin Infect Dis*. 2001 Jan;32(1):124-9. Epub 2000 Dec 13.
33. Wit FW, Weverling GJ, Weel J, Jurriaans S, Lange JM. Incidence and risk factors for severe hepatotoxicity associated with antiretroviral combination therapy. *J Infect Dis* 2002;186:23–31.
34. Sanne I, Mommeja-Marin H, Hinkle J, Bartlett JA, Lederman MM, Maartens G, Wakeford C, Shaw A, Quinn J, Gish RG, Rousseau F. Severe Hepatotoxicity Associated with Nevirapine Use in HIV-Infected Subjects *J Infect Dis*. 2005 Mar 15;191(6):825-9. Epub 2005 Feb 10.
35. Ribaldo H, Clifford D, Gulick R, et al. Relationships between efavirenz pharmacokinetics, side effects, drug discontinuation, virologic response, and race: results from ACTG A5095/A5097s. Program and abstracts of the 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; February 8-11, 2004; San Francisco, California. Abstract 132.
36. Haas D, Ribaldo H, Kim R, et al. A common CYP2B6 variant is associated with efavirenz pharmacokinetics and central nervous system side effects: AACTG study NWCS214. Program and abstracts of the 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; February 8-11, 2004; San Francisco, California. Abstract 133
37. Easterbrook PJ, Waters A, Murad S, Ives N, Taylor C, King D, Vyakarnam A, Thorburn D. Epidemiological risk factors for hypersensitivity reactions to abacavir. *HIV Med*. 2003 Oct;4(4):321
- 37b Symonds W, Cutrell A, Edwards M, Steel H, Spreen B, Powell G, McGuirk S, Hetherington S. Risk factor analysis of hypersensitivity reactions to abacavir. *Clin Ther*. 2002 Apr;24(4):565-73. .
38. Clark RA, Theall K. Population-based study evaluating association between selected antiretroviral therapies and potential oral contraceptive failure. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2004;37:1219-1220.
39. Schindl A, Rieger A, Wagner OF, Quehenberger P. Sex differences in HAART-associated dyslipidaemia *AIDS*. 2001 Apr 13;15(6):725-34
40. Pernerstorfer-Schoen H, Jilma B, Perschler A, Wichlas S, Schindler K, Schindl A, Rieger A, Wagner OF, Quehenberger P. Sex differences in HAART-associated dyslipidaemia *AIDS*. 2001 Apr 13;15(6):725-34

41. Galli M, Cozzi-Lepri A, Ridolfo AL, Gervasoni C, Ravasio L, Corsico L, Gianelli E, Vaccarezza M, Vullo V, Cargnel A, Minoli L, Coronado O, Giacometti A, Antinori A, Antonucci G, D'Arminio Monforte A, Moroni M; LipolCoNa Study. Incidence of adipose tissue alterations in first-line antiretroviral therapy: the LipolCoNa Study. *Arch Intern Med.* 2002 Dec 9-23;162(22):2621-8.
42. Mulligans K, Anastos K, Justman J, et al. Fat distribution in HIV-infected women in the United States: DEXA substudy in the Women's Interagency HIV Study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2004;38:18-22.
43. Raghavan S, M Law, W El-Sadr, A Carr Ethnic Differences in Objective Measures of Lipodystrophy (LD The XV International AIDS Conference, 2004 Abstract no. WePeB5939. *MedGenMed.* 2004 Jul 11;6(3):WePeB5939 [eJIAS].

3.0 Methodology

3.1 Basing recommendations on evidence

The committee used an evidence-based medicine approach to produce these guidelines. In reality, if only the most reliable form of clinical evidence was taken into account (i.e. results of one or more randomized controlled trials with clinical end-points), it would be impossible to formulate these guidelines. Many important aspects of clinical practice remain to be formally evaluated and very few trials with clinical end-points are ongoing or planned. Many trials have been performed in order to obtain licensing approval for a drug. In many cases they are the only source of evidence for comparing two drug regimens. However, the designs are not ideally suited to addressing questions concerning clinical use. The most significant drawbacks of such trials are their short duration and the lack of follow-up data on patients who switch therapy. In most cases the only available data on long term outcomes are from routine clinical cohorts. While such cohorts are representative of routine clinical populations, the lack of randomization to different regimens means that comparisons between the outcomes of different regimens are highly susceptible to bias [Pocock, Phillips]. Expert opinion forms an important part of all consensus guidelines; however, this is the least valuable and robust form of evidence.

3.2 Implications for research

Unless guidelines are interpreted and applied cautiously and sensibly, valuable research initiatives that might improve standards of care will be stifled. It would be wrong to suggest that certain clinical controlled trials would be unethical if they did not conform to the guidelines, especially when these guidelines are based mainly upon expert opinion rather than more reliable evidence. [Hurwitz].

3.3 Use of surrogate marker data

CD4 cell counts and plasma viral load are used as markers of the effect of antiretroviral therapy. Reduction in viral load leads to a rise in peripheral blood CD4 count, with greater rises being seen in those with greater and more sustained viral suppression [Staszewski]. Changes in these markers in response to therapy are strongly associated with clinical response [Grabar, Pozniak, Food and Drug Administration, Delta Co-ordinating Committee, Mocroft 2000]. CD4 counts measured in people on antiretroviral therapy have been associated with a risk of AIDS defining diseases no higher than that expected in untreated individuals with similar CD4 counts [Mocroft

2000, Miller 1999, Miller 2001, Weverling, Ledergerber 2001]. The CD4 count is a better indicator of the immediate risk of AIDS defining diseases than the viral load in those on antiretroviral therapy [Miller 2002, Ledergerber 2004]. However, it should be remembered that CD4 count and viral load responses do not precisely reflect the expected clinical outcome and are not perfect surrogates of the clinical response [Fleming, De Gruttola Delta Co-ordinating Committee]. This is because the drugs have other effects with clinical consequences besides those reflected in viral load and CD4 count changes. Even so, for patients with a given CD4 count and viral load, the risk of AIDS disease appears to be similar regardless of the specific antiretroviral drugs being used [Holkmann-Olsen]. The relatively short length of trials designed to obtain drug approval means that, at the time of licensing, little can be known about the drugs' long term consequences.

3.4 Issues concerning design and analysis of clinical trials

3.4.1 Issues concerning design and analysis of clinical trials: Trial designs

As stated above, most antiretroviral drug trials are performed by pharmaceutical companies as part of their efforts to obtain licensing approval and the designs are often not ideally suited to deriving information on using the drugs in clinical practice. Besides the short duration of follow-up, their key limitation is the lack of data on outcomes in people who change from the original randomized regimen, along with a description of what those new regimens are. The results are therefore only clearly interpretable as long as a high proportion of participants remain on the original allocated regimens. Clinical questions about which drugs to start with or switch to require longer term trials that continue despite changes to the original treatment. From a clinical perspective it makes little sense to ignore what happens to patients after a specific regimen has been discontinued. Use of a given drug can affect outcomes long after it has been stopped. For example, it may select for virus resistant to drugs not yet encountered or cause toxicities which overlap with those caused by other drugs. However, interpretation of such trials is not straightforward, and account must be taken of which drugs were used subsequent to the original regimen in each arm.

The committee generally favours entry into well-constructed trials for patients whose clinical circumstances are complex, with a number of specific instances being mentioned in these guidelines. NAM maintains a list of trials currently recruiting in the UK at www.aidsmap.com, and treatment units should work to ensure arrangements are in place to enable eligible patients to enter trials at centres within or indeed outside their clinical networks.

3.4.2 Issues concerning design and analysis of clinical trials: Viral load outcome measures

In most efficacy trials treatments are compared in terms of viral load as defined by plasma HIV RNA. Depending on the target population, the primary outcome measure may be defined to include the achievement of viral suppression below a certain limit (usually 50 HIV RNA copies per mL) at a pre-specified time (e.g. 24 or 48 weeks after randomization), time to viral rebound or time-weighted average change from baseline. To avoid selection bias, all enrolled patients must be included in an analysis comparing the treatments as randomised (the intention to treat principle). However, the inability to assess outcomes for some patients, leading to missing data e.g. due to patients dropout before completion of the trial, is a potential source of bias. The frequency and reasons for missing outcomes may be affected by many factors including the efficacy of treatments, toxicity and length of follow-up. Interpretation of the results of the trial is particularly problematic if a substantial number of patients drop out for reasons related to the outcome whether by design, as in many pharmaceutical industry trials where patients are withdrawn when they change their randomised treatment, or otherwise. This problem can be addressed at three levels; in the design, conduct and analysis stages of the trial. Changes in treatment during the trial must be anticipated and it is necessary to continue collecting data on all patients, even if they have switched from the original regimen, and to pre-specify the statistical methods to be used for handling missing outcomes. In general, these methods impute values for those patients who have dropped out of the trial. When the outcome is the proportion of people

with viral load <50 copies/mL at a given time point, the approach almost universally adopted is to assign >50 copies/mL to all patients with missing outcome (and those who have switched from the randomized treatment, regardless of whether they remain under follow-up), known as the missing=failure (MEF) approach [Gilbert, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration, Phillips and Walker 2004]. This approach to missing outcome is used in trials for drug licensing because it assigns anyone who has to stop the drug of interest as having failed and thus prevents any tendency for drugs used in a patient after the drug of interest has failed to influence the trial results. Such an approach implicitly equates failure of a regimen due to inadequate potency and/or viral drug resistance with, not only, the inability to tolerate a regimen due to pill burden, inconvenience and/or adverse effects, but also with missing assessments due to other reasons, including randomly missing visits, even though the implications of these outcomes are likely to be substantially different. This approach is often labeled conservative because it gives a minimum proportion <50 copies/mL for any given treatment group over all possible approaches. However, the primary purpose of an end-point is to compare treatment arms and the reasons for missing outcomes may well differ between treatments. In this context, this approach is not conservative in any general sense and its indiscriminate use without consideration to its inherent limitations involves a degree of risk of bias, which could be greater than simply ignoring missing values. For these reasons, trials that are conducted for purposes of licensing a particular drug, and which treat stopping of the drug as treatment failure and ignore outcomes occurring after the drug has stopped, do not always provide the type of information that is most useful for clinical practice.

In the past, trials have generally considered whether the viral load is below 50 copies/mL or not at a given time point (e.g. 48 weeks). In recent years, the tendency has been to consider whether virologic failure (or "loss of virologic response", usually defined as two consecutive values > 50 copies/mL) has occurred *by* a certain time point, rather than whether the viral load *at* the time point is < 50 copies/mL or not. In the (common) case where missing viral load values and switches in therapy are treated the same as values > 50 copies/mL, this approach uses a "time to loss of virologic response" (TLOVR) algorithm [U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration]. The two approaches will give similar but not identical results, as for example patients can fulfill the definition of loss of virologic response before 48 weeks but then have a viral load value < 50 copies/mL at 48 weeks itself, without any change in regimen.

Randomization in a trial ensures balance in prognosis between the treatment arms at baseline. Inability to assess outcomes for some patients can disturb this balance and create bias in the comparison between the treatment arms. In order to avoid risk of such bias, analysis by intention to treat includes outcomes for all randomized patients. So called "on treatment" analyses consider outcomes only in those still receiving the original allocated treatment. Here, the difference between assessing the proportion with viral load < 50 copies/mL *at* a given time point, or the proportion with viral load > 50 copies/mL *by* a given time point, becomes greater. In the context of an assessment of the proportion of people with viral load <50 copies/mL at a given time point, on treatment analyses make little sense because therapy has been switched in patients who experience viral load rebound during a trial. Hence all regimens which leads to a viral load < 50 copies/mL in at least one person should lead to a value of 100%, unless there are patients who have viral load > 50 copies/mL at the time point but are yet to have their regimen switched. In contrast, an assessment of whether the viral load was > 50 copies/mL by a given time point (i.e. time to virological failure or loss of virologic response), which censors observation on patients once they have switched from the original randomized regimen may be more revealing, but is still subject to potential bias.

3.4.3 Issues concerning design and analysis of clinical trials: Non-inferiority

In contrast to superiority trials where the primary objective is to demonstrate that a new treatment regimen, or strategy, is more efficacious than a well established treatment, the aim of a non-inferiority trial is to show that there is no important loss of efficacy if the new treatment is used instead of the established reference [d'Agostino RB]. This is particularly relevant in evaluating simplification strategies where the new treatment strategy is better than the reference treatment in aspects other than efficacy, e.g. toxicity, tolerability or cost. To demonstrate non-inferiority, large numbers of patients are usually required because of the need to exclude moderate loss of efficacy with the new treatment. The trial protocol must pre-specify a non-inferiority margin (e.g. the proportion with viral load < 50 copies per mL at 48 week, in people receiving the new treatment, is not smaller than the same proportion in the reference treatment by more than 5%). The choice of the non-inferiority margin depends on what is considered to be a clinically unimportant difference in efficacy taking into account other potential advantages of the new treatment. Stating that the response to the new treatment was not significantly different from that of the reference treatment is not evidence for non-inferiority. Graphical representations that show overlapping increased CD4 cell counts or decreased viral loads in response to therapy may hide differences in efficacy between drugs. Non-inferiority is indicated when the (95%) confidence interval for the difference between the two treatments excludes loss of efficacy greater than the pre-specified non-inferiority margin.

It is important to note that a very high standard of trial conduct (e.g. minimizing violations of entry criteria, non-adherence to allocated regimens and loss to follow-up) is more critical in non-inferiority than in superiority trials. Such deviations from the protocol would tend to bias the difference between the two treatments towards zero and thus increase the chance of erroneously concluding non-inferiority.

3.4.4 Issues concerning design and analysis of clinical trials: Cross-study comparisons: presentation of data

It is tempting to compare results of individual drug combinations assessed in different trials. Such comparisons are, however, difficult to interpret because of differences in entry criteria (particularly with respect to viral load and CD4 cell counts), methods of analysis (e.g. intention to treat versus on treatment), degrees of adherence and sensitivities of viral load assays [Phillips 2003].

3.5 Adverse event reporting

Many previously unsuspected side effects of antiretroviral therapy have been reported only after drug licensing. It is vital that prescribers report any adverse events as soon as possible so that these events are swiftly recognized. A blue-card scheme, organized by the Medicines Control Agency, the Committee for Safety of Medicines (CSM) and the MRC, operates in the UK for reporting adverse events relating to the treatment of HIV [MCA website]

REFERENCES

- Pocock SJ, Elbourne DR. Randomized trials or observational tribulations? *N Engl J Med* 2000; 342: 1907–1909.
- Phillips AN, Grabar S, Tassie JM, Costagliola D, Lundgren JD, Egger M for the EuroSIDA, the French Hospital Database on HIV and the Swiss HIV Cohort Study Groups. Use of observational databases to evaluate the effectiveness of antiretroviral therapy for HIV infection: comparison of cohort studies with randomized trials. *AIDS* 1999; 13: 2075–2082.
- Hurwitz B. Legal and political considerations of clinical practice guidelines. *BMJ* 1999; 318: 661–664.
- Staszewski S, Miller V, Sabin CA *et al.* Determinants of sustainable CD4 lymphocyte count increases in response to antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS* 1999; 13: 951–956.
- Pozniak A. Surrogacy in HIV-1 clinical trials. *Lancet* 1998; 351: 536–537.
- Grabar S, Le Moing V, Goujard C *et al.* Clinical outcome of patients with HIV-1 infection according to immunologic and virologic response after 6 months of highly active antiretroviral therapy. *Ann Intern Med* 2000; 133: 401–410.
- Food and Drug Administration. Guidance For Industry (draft). Clinical Considerations For Accelerated and Traditional Approval of Antiretroviral Drugs Using Plasma HIV RNA Measurements. Washington DC, FDA, 1999. <http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/3182dft.htm>
- Delta Coordinating Committee and Virology Group. HIV-1 RNA response to antiretroviral treatment in 1280 participants in the Delta trial: an extended virology study. *AIDS* 1999; 13: 57–65.
- Mocroft A, Katlama C, Johnson MA *et al.* AIDS across Europe, 1994–98: the EuroSIDA study. *Lancet* 2000; 356: 291–296.
- Mocroft A, Vella S, Benfield TL *et al.* Changing patterns of mortality across Europe in patients infected with HIV-1. EuroSIDA Study Group. *Lancet* 1998; 352: 1725–1730.
- Miller V, Staszewski S, Nisius G, Cozzi Lepri A, Sabin CA, Phillips AN. Risk of new AIDS diseases in people on triple therapy. *Lancet* 1999; 353: 463.
- Weverling GJ, Mocroft A, Ledergerber B *et al.* Discontinuation of *Pneumocystis carinii* pneumonia prophylaxis after the initiation of highly active antiretroviral therapy in HIV infection. *Lancet*; 353: 1293–1298
- Ledergerber B, Mocroft A, Reiss P *et al.* Discontinuation of secondary prophylaxis against *Pneumocystis carinii* pneumonia in patients with HIV infection who have a response to antiretroviral therapy. Eight European Study Groups. *N Engl J Med* 2001; 344: 168–174.
- Miller V, Phillips AN, Clotet B, Mocroft A, Ledergerber B, Kirk O *et al.* Association of virus load, CD4 cell count, and treatment with clinical progression in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients with very low CD4 cell counts. *J Infect Dis* 2002 July 15;186(2):189-97.
- Ledergerber B, Lundgren JD, Walker AS, Sabin C, Justice A, Reiss P *et al.* Predictors of trend in CD4-positive T-cell count and mortality among HIV-1-infected individuals with virological failure to all three antiretroviral-drug classes. *Lancet* 2004 July 3;364(9428):51-62.
- Fleming, TR, Demets DL. Surrogate end points in clinical trials: are we being misled? *Ann Intern Med* 1996; 125: 605–613.
- De Gruttola V, Fleming T, Lin DY, Coombs R. Perspective: validating surrogate markers: are we being naive? *J Infect Dis* 1997; 175: 237–246.

Holkmann Olsen C, Gatell J, Ledergerber B, Katlama C, Friis-Møller N, Weber J, Horban A, Staszewski S, Lundgren JD, Phillips AN, for the EuroSIDA Study Group. Risk of AIDS and death at given HIV-RNA and CD4 cell count levels, according to specific antiretroviral drugs in the regimen. AIDS 2005 (in press).

Gilbert PB, DeGruttola V, Hammer SM, Kuritzkes DR. Virologic and regimen termination surrogate end-points in AIDS clinical trials. JAMA 2001; 285:777-784.

Phillips AN, Walker AS. Drug switching and virologic-based end-points in trials of antiretroviral drugs for HIV infection. AIDS 2004; 18 (3): 365-370.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Food and Drug Administration. Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER). Guidance for Industry. Antiretroviral Drugs Using Plasma HIV RNA Measurements — Clinical Considerations for Accelerated and Traditional Approval. Oct 2002. <http://www.fda.gov/cder/guidance/index.htm>

D'Agostino RB. Non-inferiority trials: advances in concepts and methodology. Statistics in Medicine 2003; 22 (2): 165-167.

Phillips AN. Trial and error: cross-trial comparisons of antiretroviral regimens. AIDS 2003; 17 (4): 619-623.

<http://www.mca.gov.uk/aboutagency/regframework/csm/csmhome.htm>

4.0 Adherence

The leading determinant of a successful and durable virological and immunological responses to HAART is adherence sustained without lapse at extraordinarily high levels for many years. Therefore a core component of the clinical care of HIV positive patients must be adherence support. This should commence before HAART is introduced and continue at varying intensity throughout the treatment course.

High adherence to therapy is the sum of many daily decisions to take therapy under the influence of diverse factors internal and external to the patient which change over time. While clinical trials for adherence support can only explore single or structured interventions, it is implausible that any single intervention will be effective in a sustained manner for all patients. A systematic review of all published studies of adherence interventions across medical specialties found that only 33 were adequately powered to detect clinically important effects. Effective interventions were usually complex and included combinations of information, counselling, reminders, self monitoring, reinforcement and more convenient care; large improvements in adherence were not observed [1]. Therefore the approach to supporting adherence in the clinic should be to deploy a range of techniques (based on evidence as it emerges from clinical trials) individualised to the need of each patient at any given time in their treatment career. Increased support may be required not only when starting and changing therapy or when side effects occur, but also when other non-treatment related factors intervene (e.g. mental illness, social upheaval).

Readers are referred to comprehensive guidelines produced in 2003 by BHIVA and the Medical Society for the Study of Venereal Diseases (MSSVD) for a full exploration of these issues. These are available from the BHIVA website (<http://www.bhiva.org/guidelines.htm>) and have recently been published [2]. Developments in the field since this document was produced are summarised below:

4.1 Adherence and resistance

In conceptual terms the most significant development has been the emergence of evidence that different patterns of non-adherence may promote resistance by drug class: while for unboosted PIs risk of viral resistance has been found to be greatest in those with high adherence [3-6], for NNRTIs the risk may be greatest for those with the lowest adherence [7] or those who take unplanned drug holidays > 2 days [8]. Whether level of adherence has an effect on emergence of resistance to RTV boosted PIs is unknown, but it is possible that it is most likely to occur within a narrow range of moderate adherence which is sufficient to permit replication of less fit resistant virus [9].

4.2 Treatment simplification strategies

Unexpectedly poor results from recently reported trials of combinations which might have had a role in constructing simplified regimens serve as a caution against the use of untested combinations [10-13] in this context. Where there is a desire to offer a simpler regimen in the hope of optimising adherence the chosen combination should have demonstrated clinical efficacy and safety. Once daily HAART has yet to show a clear advantage over twice daily treatment; in the field of hypertension a 6 month study showed that in a highly adherent population once daily therapy did not significantly reduce the number of doses missed, but it did reduce the number of late doses [14]. A recent systematic review of all published studies of adherence interventions found only one study with adequate follow up in which adherence was shown to be higher on once daily versus twice daily therapy [1,15].

4.3 Interventions to improve knowledge and skills

These are the most common forms of adherence support in current clinical practice. Several randomised trials have now been published; however many have significant methodological problems, principally the lack of a predefined primary end-point. Rather than describing virological outcome, the effect on patient self reported adherence was most frequently measured in these studies which in this context may be particularly vulnerable to self-presentational bias.

Two studies reported a positive effects from educational interventions: a large study of 4 individual educational sessions compared with standard care reported increases in self reported adherence sustained for 18 months [16]. A smaller study using electronic means to measure adherence more objectively appeared to support these findings but the study was limited by inadequate follow up (12 weeks) and high rates of attrition of participants [17].

In contrast the only study powered to detect a protective effect against virological rebound showed no benefit from frequent contact with a trained staff member delivering an individually tailored programme of adherence support [18]. Similarly a large unpowered trial found no effect on either adherence (measured electronically) or virological response of a structured programme of 4 weekly small group training sessions compared with standard care [19]. A small pilot study showed no significant effect on adherence over standard care of motivational interviewing techniques in adherence support [20].

4.4. Cognitive-behavioural interventions

A large RCT of 3 sessions of a cognitive-behavioural intervention reported increases in self reported adherence compared with standard care sustained for 6 months and also a small effect on virological outcome [21]. A study of a similar brief intervention using an electronic measure of adherence was underpowered but showed superior adherence results on some but not all

adherence measures at 4 weeks. By 24 weeks the rate of loss to follow up was too high to allow conclusions to be drawn [28]. Two trials comparing prolonged cognitive-behavioural interventions with either a video including similar content [22] or standard care [23] showed no overall beneficial effect on adherence or virological treatment outcome [23].

4.5 Pagers/ alarms etc.

A very large RCT powered to detect an effect on virological rebound showed a significantly higher rate of virological treatment failure in patients randomised to a dose time alarm compared to no alarm (relative risk 1.25; $p=0.02$) [18]. Whether the same applies to watch or mobile 'phone alarms which may be more acceptable to patients is unknown.

4.6 Pre-HAART practice placebo dosing

A large RCT showed no benefit in terms of objectively measured adherence of a 2-week pre-treatment practice period taking placebo pills before commencing HAART [28].

4.7 Directly observed therapy (DOT)

In an institutional setting, DOT may be associated with improved adherence and virological outcome to standard care [24]. While lessons may be drawn from the treatment of tuberculosis, DOT for HIV presents unique difficulties including the need for indefinite treatment and the highly stigmatised nature of the condition. Modified DOT is being explored in randomised trials in marginalised populations in the USA; results are awaited. A small non-randomised study among methadone users starting a new HAART regimen showed significantly better virological responses at 6 months for those receiving modified DOT with their methadone dose than for those receiving standard care (58% v 22%; $p=0.002$); adherence data were not reported [25]. Given the inherent difficulties of ensuring patient follow up with DOT, modelling have suggested that large increases in adherence may reduce deaths and AIDS events but may increase the prevalence of drug resistance [26].

4.8 Injectable therapy

In a clinical trial setting self reported adherence to injectable therapy with enfuvirtide was high: 84% patients reported adherence of at least 95%; adherence to enfuvirtide did not differ from that reported for concomitant oral antiretrovirals [27].

4.9 Recommendations

Current evidence does not support adherence interventions including intensive, frequent or prolonged contact with specialist staff or structured group interventions. There may be some benefit from brief individualised interventions. Treatment simplification should not be at the price of reduced clinical efficacy. Medication alarms may impede adherence.

Adherence support should be part of the routine clinical care provided by all health professionals in HIV medicine rather than being the exclusive role of specialist staff members. Every prescribing unit should adopt a standardised approach to assessing adherence and have a written policy on provision of adherence support. Staff must be appropriately trained to make delivery of such support possible. Treatment adherence data should be recorded routinely alongside other clinical parameters in order to detect patients in greatest need of additional treatment support.

References

1. McDonald HP, Garg AX, Haynes RB. Interventions to enhance patient adherence to medication prescriptions: scientific review. *JAMA*. 2002 Dec 11;288(22):2868-79.
2. Poppa A, Davidson O, Deutsch J, Godfrey D, Fisher M, Head S, Horne R, Sherr L. British HIV Association (BHIVA)/British Association for Sexual Health and HIV (BASHH) guidelines on provision of adherence support to individuals receiving antiretroviral therapy (2003). *HIV Med*. 2004 Jul;5 Suppl 2:46-60.
3. Bangsberg, D. R., Hecht, F. M., Charlebois, E. D. et al. Adherence to protease inhibitors, HIV-1 viral load, and development of drug resistance in an indigent population. *AIDS*. 2000; 14: 357–66.
4. Walsh, J. C., Pozniak, A. L., Nelson, M. R. et al. Virologic rebound on HAART in the context of low treatment adherence is associated with a low prevalence of antiretroviral drug resistance. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes* 2002; 30: 278–87.
5. Gallego, O., de Mendoza, C., Perez-Elias, M. J. et al. Drug resistance in patients experiencing early virological failure under a triple combination including indinavir. *AIDS*. 2001; 15: 1701–6.
6. Bangsberg, D. R., Charlebois, E. D., Grant, R. M. et al. High levels of adherence do not prevent accumulation of HIV drug resistance mutations. *AIDS*. 2003; 17: 1925–32.
7. Bangsberg DR, Guzman D, Riley ED. Non nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NNRTI) resistance occurs at lower levels of adherence than protease inhibitor (PI) resistance. 15th International AIDS Conference. Bangkok July 2004 [Abstract WePeB5820].
8. Parienti JJ, Massari V, Descamps D, Vabret A, Bouvet E, Larouze B, Verdon R. Predictors of virologic failure and resistance in HIV-infected patients treated with nevirapine- or efavirenz-based antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2004 May 1;38(9):1311-6.
9. Bangsberg DR, Moss AR, Deeks SG. Paradoxes of adherence and drug resistance to HIV antiretroviral therapy. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2004 May;53(5):696-9.
10. Gulick RM et al. Triple-nucleoside regimens versus efavirenz-containing regimens for the initial treatment of HIV-1 infection. *N Engl J Med* 2004 Apr 29; 350:1850-61.
11. Gallant JE, Rodriguez AE, Weinberg W, et al. Early non-response to tenofovir DF (TDF) + abacavir (ABC) and lamivudine (3TC) in a randomized trial compared to efavirenz (EFV) + ABC and 3TC: ESS30009 unplanned interim analysis. Program and abstracts of the 43rd Annual ICAAC; September 14-17, 2003; Chicago, Illinois. Abstract H-1722a
12. Podzamczar D, Ferrer E, Gatell JM, et al. Early virologic failure and occurrence of resistance in naive patients receiving tenofovir, didanosine and efavirenz. XIII International HIV Drug Resistance Workshop. June 8-12, 2004. Tenerife, Canary Islands. Abstract 156.
13. Maitland D, Moyle G, Hand J, et al. Early virological failure in persons with viral loads >100,000 cps/ml and CD4 counts <200/mm³ receiving didanosine (ddI) /tenofovir (TDF) /efavirenz (EFV): 12 week results from a randomised comparative trial. 7th International Congress on Drug Therapy in HIV infection. November 14-18, 2004, Glasgow. Abstract PL2.5.
14. Andrejak M, Genes N, Vaur L, Poncelet P, Clerson P, Carre A. Electronic pill-boxes in the evaluation of antihypertensive treatment compliance: comparison of once daily versus twice daily regimen. *Am J Hypertens*. 2000 Feb;13(2):184-90.
15. Baird MG, Bentley-Taylor MM, Carruthers SG, et al. A study of efficacy, tolerance and compliance of once-daily versus twice-daily metoprolol (Betaloc) in hypertension: Betaloc Compliance Canadian Cooperative Study Group. *Clin Invest Med*. 1984;7:95–102.
16. Goujard C, Bernard N, Sohier N, Peyramond D, Lancon F, Chwalow J, Arnould B, Delfraissy JF. Impact of a patient education program on adherence to HIV medication: a randomized clinical trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2003 Oct 1;34(2):191-4.
17. Smith SR, Rublein JC, Marcus C, Brock TP, Chesney MA. A medication self-management program to improve adherence to HIV therapy regimens. *Patient Educ Couns*. 2003 Jun;50(2):187-99.
18. Mannheimer S, Morse E, Matts J. Sustained Benefit from a Long-term Antiretroviral (AR)

- Adherence Intervention: Results of a Large Randomized Clinical Trial. 15th International AIDS Conference. Bangkok July 2004 [Abstract LbOrB15].
19. Rawlings MK, Thompson MA, Farthing CF, Brown LS, Racine J, Scott RC, Crawford KH, Goodwin SD, Tolson JM, Williams VC, Shaefer MS. Impact of an educational program on efficacy and adherence with a twice-daily lamivudine/ zidovudine/ abacavir regimen in underrepresented HIV-infected patients. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2003 Oct 1;34(2):174-83.
 20. Dilorio C, Resnicow K, McDonnell M, Soet J, McCarty F, Yeager K. Using motivational interviewing to promote adherence to antiretroviral medications: a pilot study. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care*. 2003 Mar-Apr;14(2):52-62.
 21. Pradier C, Bentz L, Spire B, Tourette-Turgis C, Morin M, Souville M, Rebillon M, Fuzibet JG, Pesce A, Dellamonica P, Moatti JP. Efficacy of an educational and counselling intervention on adherence to highly active antiretroviral therapy: French prospective controlled study. *HIV Clin Trials*. 2003 Mar-Apr;4(2):121-31.
 22. Jones DL, Ishii M, LaPerriere A, Stanley H, Antoni M, Ironson G, Schneiderman N, Van Splunteren F, Cassells A, Alexander K, Gousse YP, Vaughn A, Brondolo E, Tobin JN, Weiss SM. Influencing medication adherence among women with AIDS. *AIDS Care*. 2003 Aug;15(4):463-74.
 23. Weber R, Christen L, Christen S, Tschopp S, Znoj H, Schneider C, Schmitt J, Opravil M, Gunthard HF, Ledergerber B; Swiss HIV Cohort Study. Effect of individual cognitive behaviour intervention on adherence to antiretroviral therapy: prospective randomized trial. *Antivir Ther*. 2004 Feb;9(1):85-95.
 24. Fischl M, Rodriguez A, Scerpella E. Impact of directly observed therapy on outcomes in HIV clinical trials. 7th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections, San Francisco, abstract 71, 2000
 25. Lucas GM, Weidle PJ, Hader S, Moore RD. Directly administered antiretroviral therapy in an urban methadone maintenance clinic: a nonrandomized comparative study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2004 Jun 1;38 Suppl 5:S409-13.
 26. Kagay CR, Porco TC, Liechty CA, Charlebois E, Clark R, Guzman D, Moss AR, Bangsberg DR. Modelling the impact of modified directly observed antiretroviral therapy on HIV suppression and resistance, disease progression, and death. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2004 Jun 1;38 Suppl 5:S414-20.
 27. Witek J, Rockstroh J, Donatucci L. Adherence to enfuvirtide and to background antiretroviral therapy over 48 weeks and its impact on treatment efficacy. 15th International AIDS Conference. Bangkok July 2004 [Abstract WePeB5822].
 28. Glenn Wagner, D Kanouse, L Miller et al. Cognitive-behavioral Intervention to Enhance Adherence to ART: A Randomized Clinical Trial (CCTG 578). 12th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections, Boston, abstract 614, 2005

5.0 When to start treatment

With currently available antiretroviral agents, eradication of HIV infection is not likely to be possible [32]. The main aim of treatment is thus to prolong life and improve quality of life by maintaining suppression of virus replication for as long as possible.

The three groups of treatment naive patients for whom treatment guidelines are required are: patients with symptomatic HIV disease or AIDS, patients with asymptomatic HIV infection and patients with primary HIV infection. The recommendations are summarised in Table 2.

5.1 Primary HIV infection

5.1.1 Treatment of primary HIV infection to alter the natural history

There is one placebo-controlled study of ZDV monotherapy in primary HIV infection (PHI) [33] and it showed short-term benefit only. As yet, there is no evidence of long term clinical benefit from any study of treatment of PHI compared with deferring treatment until later, however. If it is

recognised clinically, the diagnosis of PHI may represent a unique opportunity for therapeutic intervention. It is likely that, at the time of PHI: (1) there is a narrowing of the genetic diversity of the infecting virus compared with the virus in the index case [34,35]; (2) viral ability to infect different cell types may be limited; and (3) the capacity to mount an immune response is usually greater than it is later on. Therefore, the treatment of PHI may preserve HIV specific immune responses and it has been hypothesized that long term benefit may ensue. A variety of triple drug therapy regimens appear able to suppress viral replication in the plasma, lymph nodes and gut for the majority of patients treated within a few months of PHI [35, 36]. Recent studies have demonstrated that shortly after PHI there is a specific and strong CD4 helper HIV response [37-40]. This is in contrast to chronic infection where, with the exception of long term non-progressors [39], the HIV specific CD4 helper response is generally lost [41]. These CD4 helper responses may be important in maintaining an adequate CD8 response. Such immune responses appear to be maintained in people treated with potent antiretroviral therapy shortly after PHI and perhaps represent the best biological evidence that treatment at this time might be beneficial. Recent data suggest that there is more rapid and complete immune reconstitution in patients starting therapy during PHI than in those starting later [42]. There is still no answer to the question of whether treatment at such an early stage will influence the longer term natural history.

Control of viral replication with no return of viraemia after withdrawal of antiretroviral therapy has apparently occurred in a few patients treated very soon after PHI [43]. However, longer-term follow-up of patients treated during PHI with subsequent treatment interruption have not supported these initial hopes that early treatment would alter the natural history of HIV infection (Ref. Kaufmann DE, Lichterfeld M, Altfeld M, Addo MM, Johnston MN, Lee PK, Wagner BS, Kalife ET, Strick D, Rosenberg ES, Walker BD. Limited Durability of Viral Control following Treated Acute HIV Infection. PLoS Med. 2004 Nov;1(2):e36. Epub 2004 Oct 26.) The role of drugs that are known to inhibit CD4 activation, such as hydroxyurea [44] and cyclosporin A [45 + CROI 2005 abstract], in the suppression of viral replication and boosting of CD4 lymphocyte responses in this setting is unclear and requires further evaluation. Given the present lack of clarity, it remains reasonable to consider treating PHI, ideally within a clinical trial. These putative benefits of treatment during PHI should be tempered by the known risks of toxicity, including lipodystrophy [46, 47] and the potential for developing drug resistance at an early stage. The potential difficulties of long term adherence to available regimens cannot be overstated. It is possible that short-term antiretroviral therapy in PHI may be of some immunological benefit [48], but it is not known if this is associated with improved clinical outcome.

5.1.2 Treatment during PHI for immediate clinical benefit

Individuals who present with severe or prolonged symptoms (such as meningoencephalitis) due to PHI may improve if treated with antiretrovirals. However the duration of therapy needed is unknown, and the possibility of further acute retroviral syndrome on withdrawal of therapy must be considered.

5.1.3 Treatment during PHI to reduce onward transmission

One study has suggested that many recently infected patients have acquired the infection from others who were themselves recently infected with HIV. Identification and treatment of PHI might thus have some effect on reducing HIV incidence [Pao et al AIDS 2005]. Even if treatment is not started during PHI, there are many benefits of recognizing early HIV infection. These include recognition and monitoring of primary drug resistance, partner notification and contact tracing and the possibility of preventing HIV transmission. Particular effort should thus be directed to identifying patients with PHI who may present to a wide range of healthcare providers.

5.1.4 Recommendations for starting treatment in PHI [CIII]

At the time of PHI patients and physicians should make the most appropriate decision based on the limited data available.

- The biological plausibility that early treatment may be beneficial for the immune system should be balanced against considerations of adherence to long term therapy, potential toxicity and development of resistance. The committee's first choice would be for patients to enter a clinical controlled trial, where available. The Spartac study is currently recruiting at many centres across the UK.
- For those who are treated at this time there are currently no available data as to the best therapeutic regimen. Thus a regimen appropriate for treatment of chronic HIV infection should be used.
- If treatment is started the decision to stop or continue may be reviewed in the light of evolving data or poor adherence.
- Patients who are currently being treated with antiretroviral therapy started during PHI who may wish to stop treatment should be encouraged to do so in the context of a clinical study.

5.2 Symptomatic HIV infection

All patients with late disease and/or symptomatic HIV infection with a CD4 lymphocyte count consistently <200 cells/mm³, or who have been diagnosed with AIDS or severe/recurrent HIV related illnesses* or tumour at any CD4 count, should start therapy. This is because of the high risk of further opportunistic infections which, although treatable, may cause irreversible damage or be life threatening.

**With the possible exception of pulmonary tuberculosis*

5.3 Asymptomatic HIV infection

There are no ongoing controlled studies that address the optimum time to start therapy [55]. This question. Current guidelines are therefore based upon previous studies of monotherapy and data from large clinical cohorts. Since the quality of evidence is relatively poor, opinion is divided on this question. The absolute CD4 count forms the basis of these guidelines, but treatment may also be considered for patients with a CD4 percentage below 12%.

In the UK, patients are diagnosed with HIV infection at a late stage. Over 30% present with a CD4 count of <200 cells/mm³ [56] and, consequently, the 'early versus late' debate is irrelevant to many. The decision on when to start treatment will be influenced principally by two considerations: the short term risk of developing AIDS prior to treatment and the potential efficacy of starting treatment at various CD4 counts. Although it may be biologically plausible to start treatment early, this has to be tempered by the known potential for significant drug toxicity, difficulties with long-term adherence, and the selection of drug-resistant virus.

5.3.1 Individuals with CD4 counts <200 cells/mm³

Patients with CD4 counts <200 cells/mm³ have a high short-term risk of disease progression and death [57]. Several cohort studies have suggested that patients who initiate therapy when the CD4 count is <200 cells/mm³ have an increased mortality [58-60] compared with those starting with CD4 counts above this level. Some prospective studies have suggested that for some antiretroviral regimens, patients with a low baseline CD4 count have a poorer virological response

[61, 62]. All of these strands of data suggest that it is better to start therapy before the CD4 count has fallen to <200 cells/mm³.

5.3.2 Individuals with CD4 counts >350 cells/mm³

If the CD4 count is > 350 cells/mm³, the risk of clinical progression in the short term is generally low [57] although individuals with a high viral load have a greater (but still small) short-term risk of disease progression [Table 2]. Although some recent studies have added to the data suggesting a benefit in the short to medium term on mortality and morbidity with initiation of HAART at a CD4 of >350 (ref: [63] Wang et al, JID 2004; Palella et al, Ann Intern Med 2003, others e.g. Sterling CID 2003), these need to be interpreted with consideration to the likelihood that patients with HIV may live for decades after treatment with HAART (ref Phillips, AIDS 2003). In this group of patients where the short-term risk of disease progression is low, it is still considered that initiation of HAART may result in greater morbidity and possibly mortality in the longer term as a result of drug toxicity and earlier exhaustion of treatment options. Furthermore, a large cohort study [64] has suggested no difference in disease progression in individuals commencing therapy with CD4 counts >350 versus 201-350 cells/mm³. For the majority of patients with CD4 counts >350 cells/mm³ it is reasonable to defer therapy until the CD4 count is below 350 but above 200 cells/mm³.

Previous studies have suggested that delaying therapy until the CD4+ lymphocyte count has fallen to < 350 cells/mm³ might be associated with a greater subsequent risk of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma (ref. Matthews GV, Bower M, Mandalia S et al. Changes in acquired immunodeficiency syndrome-related lymphoma since the introduction of highly active antiretroviral therapy. Blood. 2000; 96: 2730-2734.). Recent data (Bhaskaran K, Brettle R, Porter K, Walker AS; CASCADE Collaboration. Systemic non-Hodgkin lymphoma (NHL) in individuals with known dates of HIV seroconversion: incidence and predictors. AIDS. 2004 Mar 5;18(4):673-81; Fisher et al., BASHH/BHIVA April 2005) have suggested that the association between CD4+ count and risk of NHL is most strongly associated with current and not nadir CD4+ count, and that the risk of NHL rises steeply only when counts are <100 cells/mm³.

In our view these data support the view that HAART should not be started in the majority of patients with CD4+ counts > 350 cells/mm³.

5.3.3 Individuals with CD4 counts 201-350 cells/mm³

Ideally, most individuals with established HIV infection should start therapy when the CD4 count is in the range 201-350 cells/mm³. It is important not to let the CD4 count fall below this level before starting treatment for the reasons outlined above. Whilst it may be safe to monitor the CD4 count in some individuals with counts in this range, in others there will be an unacceptable risk of disease progression or of CD4 count falling to <200 cells/mm³. These individuals may include those with a high viral load (e.g. > 60,000 copies/ml [65], >100,000 copies/ml [57]). Patients with a rapidly falling CD4 count (e.g. falling >80 cells/mm³ per year on repeated testing [66]) have an increased risk of CD4 cell count decline to <200 cells/mm³ in the next 6 months. People in these groups may thus be considered for initiation of therapy relatively earlier within the CD4 count range 200–350 cells/mm³. A further group in whom earlier initiation of therapy may be considered are those with hepatitis C co-infection, since progression of liver disease occurs more rapidly with lower CD4 counts [67, 68] and antiretroviral treatment is associated with a reduced rate of progression of liver disease [69]. An alternative strategy may be to treat the hepatitis C before it becomes necessary to treat the HIV.

5.3.4 Recommendations regarding asymptomatic chronic HIV infection

- Currently, our recommendation is that patients start therapy before the CD4 count falls to <200 cells/mm³. (AIII)
- Given the available data and the limitations of currently available treatment, treatment is not indicated in asymptomatic individuals with a CD4 count >350 cells/mm³. (AII)
- Within the range 200–350 cells/mm³, individuals with a rapidly falling CD4 count (AII), a high viral load (AII) or hepatitis C co-infection (CIII) may be considered for earlier intervention.

If patients to whom these recommendations apply choose not to go on treatment, it is suggested that their CD4 count and viral load be monitored intensively (e.g. every 2 months) and the decision to start treatment be reviewed at regular intervals. (AIII)

Table 2

Recommendations for starting treatment		
Presentation	Surrogate markers	Recommendation
PHI		Treatment only recommended in a clinical trial, or if severe illness (CIV)
Established infection	CD4 <200, any viral load	Treat (AI)
	CD4 201-350	Start treatment, taking into account viral load (BIII), rate of CD4 decline (BIII), patient's wishes, presence of hepatitis C (CIV)
	CD4 >350	Defer treatment (BIII)
Symptomatic disease or AIDS	Any CD4 count or viral load	Treat (AI)

6.0 What to start with

There is overwhelming evidence from cohort studies that the very dramatic fall in AIDS-related mortality and frequency of AIDS events seen in the developed world over the last 8 years coincides with the introduction of HAART [18, 70]. Any HAART regimen should be individualized in order to achieve the best potency, adherence and tolerability; to minimize potential long-term toxicity and to avoid any likely drug–drug interactions (<http://www.hiv-druginteractions.org/>). The cost of the regimen should also be considered.

A measurement of a regimen's success is achieving a viral load of <50 HIV-1 RNA copies/ml within 3-6 months of starting therapy and then maintaining this thereafter. Regardless of the baseline viral load, a level of 1000 copies/ml has been found to be achievable in the majority of people by 4 weeks from start of therapy. Failure to achieve this is strongly associated with failure

to reach viral load below 50 copies/ml within 24 weeks. Therefore, if the viral load measured 4 weeks after the initiation of therapy remains above 1000 copies/ml, this should prompt questions over possible poor adherence or other reasons such as reduced drug levels or primary drug resistance.

6.1 Which HAART regimen is best?

There have been no definitive controlled trials in naïve patients to demonstrate the clinical superiority of a HAART regimen containing a currently recommended boosted protease inhibitor (PI) when compared with a regimen containing a non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NNRTI). Studies have however shown the superiority of Efavirenz over Nelfinavir, boosted saquinavir, and boosted Amprenavir containing regimens. There is however no data comparing Efavirenz with Lopinavir/Ritonavir, Fosamprenavir/Ritonavir or Atazanavir/Ritonavir. We therefore believe that patients should continue to be informed about and encouraged to participate in available clinical trials to further answer this clinical question.

It is important to select a regimen best suited to the individual patient, and therefore to fully assess baseline risk factors for resistance, for hepatitis B/hepatitis C co-infection, cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and psychiatric disease. In addition lifestyle issues including smoking, obesity and recreational drug use and alcohol use should be taken into account. The advantages and disadvantages in terms of potency, adherence, toxicity, salvageability and potential drug–drug interactions are summarised in (Table 3).

Previous guidelines suggested that patients with high viral loads may need more than three active drugs to achieve a rapid decline in viral load. Evidence from clinical trials however does not support this approach and we do not recommend this strategy.

Table 3

Initial HAART regimens			
Choices of initial therapy: summary of recommendations			
Regimen	Recommendation	Advantages	Disadvantages
2NRTIs + NNRTI*	Recommended	1. Equivalent or superior in surrogate marker trials compared with PI based regimens at 104 weeks of follow-up 2. Easier adherence	1. No RCT clinical end-point data 2. Shorter follow-up 3. Single mutations may lead to cross-class resistance
2NRTIs + boosted PI‡	Recommended	3. Evidence of improved surrogate end-point efficacy for	4. No RCT clinical end-point data

		lopinavir/ritonavir compared with a single PI 4. Better PK 5. Easier adherence 6. Less resistance at virological failure	5. Possible increased toxicity and drug interactions
3 NRTIs	Not ordinarily recommended except for patients with low VL and major adherence concerns, but see section 4.2.3.	7. Spares PI and NNRTI classes 8. Fewer drug interactions 9. Low pill burden	1. No RCT clinical end-point data 2. Short term surrogate marker data suggests less potent than NNRTIs or PIs 3. Is less effective at high viral loads
*The recommended NNRTI is efavirenz with nevirapine being an alternative.			

6.1.1 Two NRTIs plus an NNRTI

Efavirenz (EFV) is the recommended NNRTI for initial therapy.

6.1.1.1 Efavirenz – Recommended Regimen

Efavirenz in many randomised controlled trials has demonstrated efficacy when compared to other treatment regimens including PIs, boosted PIs, Nevirapine and 3NRTI based regimens. In the 2NN study [62], data compared Efavirenz with Nevirapine in a randomized manner and showed that EFV and NVP were comparable in potency. However, equivalence was not formally proven, with a small chance that NVP was superior to EFV and a greater chance of the reverse. In an important sensitivity analysis - one in which those not starting the NNRTI to which they were randomized – efavirenz was significantly superior to nevirapine. However, the principal reason for the recommendation of EFV as the preferred NNRTI is related to toxicity in the nevirapine arm which will be discussed in the next section.

Efavirenz appears to be potent when used in patients with high viral loads and low CD4 counts. Data also has demonstrated long term durability of Efavirenz based regimens.

The major limitations of Efavirenz as for all currently available NNRTIs is the low genetic barrier to resistance. This is becoming a major concern due to the rising incidence of primary resistance. A single mutation is sufficient to confer resistance to Efavirenz and the loss of this class in future regimens (at least until next generation inhibitors of this class are available). It is also almost always accompanied by the emergence of nucleoside mutations limiting options for this class as well.

The major side effect of EFV is dysphoria. Manifestations include vivid dreams, depression, drowsiness and, in some, insomnia. Most are self-limited and it is unusual for patients to discontinue the drug for this reason within trials [76], though this may be more common in clinical practice. Rashes do occur, but severe rashes with EFV are unusual (the incidence of Stevens-Johnson syndrome is 0.1%). Lipid abnormalities, mainly rises in cholesterol above baseline values, have been observed in patients on EFV containing combinations [77].

This drug may be teratogenic, so women of childbearing potential should be warned about becoming pregnant whilst on EFV. Wherever possible, it should be avoided in women who may contemplate pregnancy.

Efavirenz has a long half life when compared with nucleosides and caution is needed when stopping this regimen.

6.1.1.2 Nevirapine (NVP) – Alternative Regimen

As discussed above NVP has been compared with EFV in the 2NN Study and was shown to be of comparable potency. In this study however there was more serious toxicity in the NVP arm with two drug related deaths, one from liver failure and one from methicillin-resistant *Staphylococcus aureus* septicaemia in a patient with Stevens-Johnson syndrome.

The major side effects are rash which does occasionally manifest as Stevens-Johnson (incidence 0.3%) with occasional fatalities. The rash with NVP can be made worse by the co-administration of steroids [78-80] and these should not be prescribed. Hepatitis is the other major side effect in patients treated with NVP and reports of fulminant liver failure and deaths have been described. NVP is currently used twice a day, but the pharmacokinetics and now clinical trial data indicate that once daily dosing is possible, although there are more abnormalities of liver function as a result of using it once a day [62]. Recent analyses have shown a 12 fold higher incidence of serious hepatic events in women with CD4 counts >250 and this drug should therefore be avoided in those patients.

Based on these data Nevirapine is not now recommended as a preferred regimen in patients starting HAART and should be reserved for use to patients with contraindications to other regimens.

6.1.1.3 Delavirdine – not recommended

Delavirdine is currently unlicensed in the UK and is not recommended.

6.1.2 Two NRTIs plus a boosted PI

The dramatic decline in clinical progression and HIV related deaths followed the introduction of the PI class of antiretrovirals. These agents have shown clinical and surrogate marker efficacy in clinical practice. Sustained suppression of plasma HIV-1 RNA levels has been observed with more than 7 years of continued immunological recovery

Most clinicians now use a boosted PI in combination with low dose RTV to provide a pharmacokinetic boosting effect when they start antiretroviral naïve patients on a PI based regimen. The committee feels that there is now enough data to suggest that if a PI is chosen as part of an initial HAART regimen that this should be a boosted agent. This is because Ritonavir boosting increases drug exposure, prolongs the drug half life and reduces the pill burden and dosing frequency, improves adherence, and limits the development of resistance. The disadvantage of this approach is a possible risk of greater lipid abnormalities, particularly raised fasting triglycerides. The Committee recommends Lopinavir/Ritonavir as the preferred regimen with alternative regimen to include Fosamprenavir/Ritonavir, Saquinavir (hard gel capsule)/Ritonavir and Atazanavir/Ritonavir.

The incidence of resistance has been shown in two studies, albeit non-randomized, to be higher in those starting with NNRTI compared to those starting with boosted PI (Harrigan paper JID; UK CHIC/Resistance database paper to appear in AIDS).

6.1.2.1.– Lopinavir/Ritonavir recommended

Data from the 863 study [62] showed superior surrogate marker end-point for patients using Lopinavir/Ritonavir when compared to Nelfinavir with low numbers of patients discontinuing for side effects. Additionally, patients randomised to lopinavir/RTV who developed virological failure had no evidence of PI resistance, only 3TC mutations, while most of the patients in the NFV arm had PI mutations in addition to 3TC resistance. The main side effects of this regimen are lipid abnormalities and gastro-intestinal side effects with diarrhoea being the predominant symptom.

6.1.2.2 – Fosamprenavir/Ritonavir (alternative regimen)

Fosamprenavir and Fosamprenavir boosted by Ritonavir have been compared to Nelfinavir in clinical studies in naïve patients. More patients randomised to ritonavir-boosted Fosamprenavir with viral loads >100,000 achieved viral load suppression than those receiving Nelfinavir. Data has also shown that Ritonavir boosted Fosamprenavir shows durable responses out to 96 weeks. In naïve patients treated with Fosamprenavir/Ritonavir, there has been no emergent PI resistance reported to date.

This regimen is convenient with a relatively low pill burden, flexible dosing, and is generally well tolerated with lipid abnormalities being a potential long term toxicity issue. It is licensed dosed twice daily in the UK

6.1.2.3 - Atazanavir/Ritonavir (alternative regimen)

Atazanavir unboosted has been shown to have similar efficacy to Nelfinavir and Efavirenz in three clinical studies. Ritonavir boosted Atazanavir has also been shown to have similar efficacy to Lopinavir/Ritonavir in PI experienced patients. It is suggested that this may be occasionally used as an initial alternative regimen in naïve patients when there are contraindications to the use of Lopinavir/Ritonavir in naïve patients and this advice may change pending the results of clinical trials.

The main advantages of Atazanavir/Ritonavir is the drug is convenient, once daily and has less adverse effects on lipids than other boosted PI regimens. Its main side effect is hyperbilirubinaemia with or without jaundice but this is not associated with liver enzyme changes and seldom results in the need to discontinue treatment. It is not licensed in the UK in naïve patients.

Table 4: Comparison of boosted PIs

	Lopinavir/r	Atazanavir/r*	Fosamprenavir/r
Potency naives	++++	+++**	+++
Durability	++++	++	+++
Convenience	+	+++	+++
Tolerability	++	+++	+++
Lipid profile	+	++++	++
Fat changes profile***	+	+++	++
Resistance barrier	++++	+++**	++++
Interaction profile	+++	+	++
Active against resistant virus	++++	++++	+++

++++ excellent +++ very good ++ moderately good + not good - poor

* Very limited data on ritonavir-boosted atazanavir in naive patients. However, the committee feels there is sufficient evidence available for boosted-PIs to allow careful extrapolation of data

** For atazanavir/r only

*** Limited data available

6.1.3 Three NRTIs

There is now surrogate marker end-point data suggesting that ZDV/3TC/ABC (usually combined as Trizivir is less potent than combining two NRTIs with either an NNRTI or a PI [88]. In ACTG 5095 the 3 NRTI arm was stopped by the DSMB [73], as Trizivir® was less potent than the other two arms (Trizivir®/EFV or Combivir®/EFV). Fewer patients had suppressed their viral load to <50 copies/ml by 48 weeks in the Trizivir® arm when compared to the other two arms (61% vs. 81%). This finding was found both at high and low entry viral loads. Adherence was unlikely to have been a factor in these results as the pill burden was low in all groups. The committee now feels that Trizivir® should only be considered as a starting regimen in very occasional circumstances, for example informed patient choice based on likely poor adherence if alternative options are used, or concomitant medication needed such as for TB. Non-thymidine containing 3NRTI regimens (e.g., ABC/3TC/TDF or DDI/3TC/TDF) should not be used because of unacceptably high rates of virological failure. Currently, no 3NRTI/NtRTI regimen can be recommended. However, 48w data suggests ZDV/3TC/ABC with TDF is a possible option when a PI or NNRTI-based HAART cannot be administered.

Table 5: Preferred regimens

Choose one drug from columns A, B and C

Regimen	A	B	C
Preferred			
	EFV	ZDV ^{>}	3TC ^{>x}
	LOP/r	ABC ^x	FTC ⁺
		TDF ⁺	
		DDI	
Alternative			
	FOS/r ^{\$}		
	SAQ/r		
Specific groups			
	NVP ^{**}		
	ATAZ ^{#-}		
	ATAZ/r ^{#-}		
Not recommended			
	ABC [*]	ZDV	
	Unboosted PI ^{***}		
		D4T ^{****}	

* Only where PI and NNRTI cannot be used. Consider additional TDF

** Only when CD4 <250 females, <400 males

*** Atazanavir and Nelfinavir (in pregnancy only) the exceptions

**** D4T/3TC is as effective as other regimens but more toxic

~ Where established CVDx risk factors and PI required

#. Currently unlicensed for naïve patients in the UK

\$. Circumstances where preferable over LOP/r (see text)

>. Co-formulated as Combivir[®]

&. Co-formulated as Kivexa[®]

+. Co-formulated as Truvada[®]

6.2 Choice of 2NRTI/NtRTI (Table 5)

2NRTIs remain an integral component of HAART with either an NNRTI or a PI. As yet, there is no evidence that a 3rd NRTI provides additional benefits or that NRTI-sparing combinations are as effective. There are now 8NRTI/NtRTI analogues, 3 2NRTI/NtRTI co-formulations, and one 3NRTI combination to choose from. The availability of 2 new co-formulations (TDF/FTC & ABC/3TC) in addition to ZDV/3TC has the potential to have a significant impact on prescribing patterns with clinicians likely to be choosing the 2NRTI/NtRTI backbone from one of these three. Considerations in the choice include tolerability, convenience, fit with other components of the combination, long term toxicity, and the expected resistance pattern and therefore future options on virological failure. Pre-existing primary drug resistance will also influence choice of initial NRTIs. Major difference in costs between these combination pills also exists in some countries including the UK.

6.2.1 Co-formulated 2NRTI/NtRTI

ZDV/3TC (co-formulated as Combivir) is the most studied of the dual NRTI backbones with both NNRTIs 1-6 and PIs 1,3,7,8 and has been the most popular 2NRTI combination in the UK.⁹ It has similar virological efficacy to ABC/3TC and TDF/FTC at 48w.^{4, 10} Limitations include twice daily dosing and ZDV-related side effects of nausea/vomiting, anaemia, and after prolonged use, fat wasting. In a randomised trial comparing co-formulated ZDV/3TC with individually dosed FTC/TDF both dosed with EFV, 48 week results demonstrated a significantly higher frequency of adverse events leading to discontinuation in the ZDV/3TC arm (9% vs. 4%).¹⁰ Evaluation of a TDF/FTC backbone is restricted to Kaletra 11 (no comparator 2NRTI) and efavirenz 10 (compared to ZDV/3TC). However given the comparability of FTC and 3TC, extrapolating the data from Gilead 903 seems justifiable. This demonstrated TDF/3TC with EFV to be highly and durably active with good tolerability and minimal long-term toxicity.¹² Data out to 144 weeks demonstrates VL <50 copies/ml in 73% with only 3% suffering virological failure. ABC/3TC is the third co-formulated compound. The 2NRTI combination has been studied with EFV 4,13,14,15 and with FOS/r 16. At 48w, 8-10% suffered virological failure. Hypersensitivity reactions from ABC were identified in approximately 8% in these studies. Higher CD4 counts at 48 weeks have been demonstrated with both TDF/FTC and ABC/3TC when compared to ZDV/3TC.^{4,10}

All three NRTI/NtRTI combinations perform well. Most clinician experience exists for ZDV/3TC with EFV. However, there are genuine concerns about lipoatrophy with ZDV in the long-term. TDF with either 3TC or FTC is durably potent with few virological failures: when combined with EFV, it is better tolerated than ZDV/3TC with significantly fewer discontinuations in the first 48w.¹⁰ There is a general perception that the K65R mutation is common with this combination although this was only seen in 2.4% of patients on EFV/TDF/3TC at 144w and mainly in those with CD4 <50 and viral loads >100,000 copies/ml: K65R has not been observed in patients with pre-treatment wild-type virus when receiving EFV/TDF/FTC out to 48 weeks.¹⁰ The development of this mutation may also be influenced by the choice of NNRTI or boosted-PI. ABC/3TC is also potent and well tolerated: hypersensitivity reactions may occur early and patients need counselling. Where HLA genotyping is available, the absence of the HLA B*5701 allele has a negative predictive value of >99% and the risk of drug hypersensitivity is reduced to <1-2%.^{16b} The L74V mutation is seen in approximately 26% of virological failures where genotypic testing is successful. Both K65R and L74V mutations can lead to difficulties in choice of subsequent NRTI drugs if they develop. These three NRTI/NtRTI backbones probably offer comparable antiviral efficacy and can all be recommended. When combined with EFV, TDF/FTC gives rise to significantly less outcome failures at 48 weeks when compared to ZDV/3TC.¹⁰ This difference is driven by ZDV-related toxicity in the first 24 weeks. Ongoing monitoring for long-term toxicity and resistance development with TDF/FTC and ABC/3TC co-formulations will be important. The relative costs of the individual NRTIs are given in Table 1.

6.2.2 Other 2NRTI/NtRTI combinations

D4T/3TC is a well-studied nucleoside combination^{12,14,17,18} with equal antiviral effectiveness to TDF/3TC¹² and ABC/3TC¹⁴ but with significantly greater D4T-related mitochondrial toxicity. Because of this, D4T is not recommended for initial therapy. TDF/DDI is at first site an attractive combination because it allows the DDI to be given simultaneously with TDF once daily and with food. However, clinical data on this backbone are lacking. In a small study comparing DDI with either TDF or 3TC and EFV, an unacceptably high rate of failure from early resistance was identified which was most marked in patients with more advanced disease.¹⁹ There is also potential for TDF to potentiate DDI-related toxicity. The combination is not recommended. DDI/3TC^{19,20} or DDI/FTC²¹ as a 2NRTI combination is well tolerated and effective. However, DDI-related restrictions on food and the potential for long-term mitochondrial toxicity make this choice less popular. ZDV/DDI was a common 2NRTI combination prior to HAART. However, no

data exists with ZDV/enteric coated DDI in HAART. Similarly, TDF/ABC and ABC/DDI have not been evaluated in naïve patients: none of these 2NRTI/NtRTIs can be recommended.

6.3 Conclusions

Most clinicians in the UK favour an NNRTI based regimen for initial therapy reserving boosted PIs for later use based on the perceived risk of toxicity and the ease of administration. There is no conclusive comparative evidence to support this stance. However, there are cost benefits for selecting an Efavirenz based regimen in contrast to a boosted PI and this needs to be taken into account. With the reported increasing levels of primary resistance in newly acquired HIV infections, clinical practice may change with low pill burden PI containing regimens becoming available which do not produce lipid abnormalities. It is anticipated that clinicians will favour one of the three co-formulated NRTI/NtRTI drugs. They offer comparable antiviral efficacy but differ in dosing schedule, tolerability, short and long-term toxicity, and cost. The committee feel that there is insufficient evidence as yet to make recommendations between them.

References NRTI section

1. Robbins GK, De Gruttola V, Shafer RW, et al. Comparison of Sequential Three-Drug Regimens as Initial Therapy for HIV-1 Infection. *NEJM* 2003; 349: 2293-2303
2. Gulick RM, Ribaldo HJ, Shikuma CM, et al. Triple-Nucleoside Regimens versus Efavirenz-Containing Regimens for the Initial Treatment of HIV-1 Infection. *N Engl J Med* 2004; 350: 1850-1861
3. Staszewski S, Morales JM, Tashima KT, et al. Efavirenz plus zidovudine and lamivudine, efavirenz plus indinavir, and indinavir plus zidovudine and lamivudine in the treatment of HIV-1 infection in adults. *N Engl J Med* 1999; 341: 1865-73
4. DeJesus E, Herrera G, Teofilo E, et al. Abacavir versus zidovudine combined with lamivudine and efavirenz, for the treatment of antiretroviral-naïve HIV-infected adults. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2004; 39: 1038-46
5. Gallant J, Rodriguez A, Weinberg W, et al. Early non-response of tenofovir in combination with abacavir and lamivudine in a randomized trial comparing this regimen to efavirenz in combination with abacavir and lamivudine: ESS30009 unplanned interim analysis. 43rd Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy, Chicago, Illinois, USA, 14-17 September 2003; Abstract H1722a.
6. Podzamczar D, Ferrer E, Consiglio E, et al. A randomized clinical trial comparing nelfinavir or nevirapine associated to zidovudine/lamivudine in HIV-infected naïve patients (the Combine Study). *Antivir Ther* 2002. 7(2):81-90.
7. Squires K, Lazzarin A, Gatell JM, et al. Comparison of Once-Daily Atazanavir With Efavirenz, Each in Combination With Fixed-Dose Zidovudine and Lamivudine, As Initial Therapy for Patients Infected With HIV. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2004; 36: 1011-1019
8. Staszewski S, Keiser P, Montaner J, et al. for the CNAAB3005 International Study Team. Abacavir-lamivudine-zidovudine vs indinavir-lamivudine-zidovudine in antiretroviral-naïve HIV-infected adults: A randomized equivalence trial. *JAMA* 2001. 285(9):1155-63.
9. Curtis H, Sabin CA, Johnson MA. Findings from the first national clinical audit of treatment for people with HIV. *HIV Med.* 2003; 4(1): 11-17
10. Gazzard B et al. The Combination of Tenofovir DF (TDF), Emtricitabine (FTC) and Efavirenz (EFV) Has Significantly Greater Response vs. Fixed Dose Zidovudine/Lamivudine (CBV) and EFV in Antiretroviral Naïve Patients: A 24 week Preliminary Analysis. 44th ICAAC 2004, Washington DC 2004. Oral presentation H-1137c
11. Gathe J, Podzamczar D, Johnson M, et al. Once-daily vs. twice-daily lopinavir/ritonavir in antiretroviral naïve patients: 48 week results. 11th CROI, San Francisco 2004, abstract 716.

12. Gallant JE, Staszewski S, Pozniak A et al. Efficacy and Safety of Tenofovir DF vs. Stavudine in Combination Therapy in Antiretroviral-Naive Patients. A 3-Year Randomized Trial. *JAMA* 2004; 292: 191-201
13. Moyle G, DeJesus E, Cahn P, *et al.* Abacavir Once or Twice Daily Combined With Once-Daily Lamivudine and Efavirenz for the Treatment of Antiretroviral-Naive HIV-Infected Adults: Results of the Ziagen Once Daily in Antiretroviral Combination Study. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*. 38(4):417-425, April 1, 2005.
14. Podzamczar D, Ferrer E, Sanchez P, *et al.* Toxicity and efficacy of 3TC/EFV associated with stavudine or abacavir in antiretroviral-naïve patients: 48 week results of a randomized open and multicentre trial (ABCDE study). 11th CROI, 2004, abstract 783.
15. Bartlett JA, Johnson J, Herrera G, *et al.* Initial therapy with abacavir + lamivudine (ABC+3TC) combined with efavirenz (NNRTI), amprenavir/ritonavir (PI) or stavudine (NRTI): ESS40001 (CLASS). Program and Abstracts of the 15th International AIDS Conference, Bangkok, Thailand, 11-16 July 2004; Abstract TuPeB4544.
16. Gathe JC Jr, Ive P, Wood R, *et al.* SOLO: 48-week efficacy and safety comparison of once daily fosamprenavir/ritonavir versus twice-daily nelfinavir in naïve HIV-1-infected patients. *AIDS* 2004; 18: 1529-37.
- 16b. Martin AM, Nolan D, Gaudieri S, *et al.* Predisposition to abacavir hypersensitivity conferred by HLA-B*5701 and a haplotypic Hsp70-Homvariant. *PNAS* 2004; 101: 4180–4185
17. Walmsley S, Bernstein HB, King MK, *et al.* Lopinavir-ritonavir versus nelfinavir for the initial treatment of HIV infection. *N Engl J Med* 2002; 346: 2039-46
18. van Leth F, Phanuphak P, Ruxrungtham K, *et al.* Comparison of first-line antiretroviral therapy with regimens including nevirapine, efavirenz, or both drugs, plus stavudine and lamivudine: a randomised open-label trial, the 2NN Study. *Lancet* 2004; 363: 1253–63
19. Maitland D, Moyle G, Hand J, *et al.* Early virological failure in persons with viral loads > 100 000 copies/ml and CD4 counts < 200/mm³ receiving didanosine (ddl)/tenofovir (TDF)/efavirenz (EFV): 12 week results from a randomised comparative trial. *Int Cong Drug Therapy HIV* 2004 Nov 14-18;7: Abstract No. PL2.5
20. Maggiolo F, Ripamonti D, Migliorino G, *et al.* Virologic efficacy of three once-a-day HAART regimens. Planned interim analysis. *Int Cong Drug Therapy HIV* 2004 Nov 14-18; 7: Abstract No. P10
21. Saag MS, Cahn P, Raffi F *et al.* Efficacy and Safety of Emtricitabine vs. Stavudine in Combination Therapy in Antiretroviral-Naive Patients. A Randomized Trial. *JAMA* 2004; 292: 180-190

7.0 Changing or stopping therapy in the absence of virological failure

7.1 Patients started on regimens that are not currently recommended for initial therapy

Many patients are currently established on regimens that are no longer recommended for initial therapy. Such patients should be advised of recent study results and should have explained to them where changes in therapy may reduce the risk of virological rebound and improve their quality of life. Those who are stable with evidence of sustained virological suppression (viral load < 50 copies/ml for 6 months or more) and who are not experiencing side effects (including lipoatrophy), may prefer to remain on their current therapy as the longer the period of complete suppression, the lower the risk of subsequent virological rebound is likely to be.

7.1.1 2NRTI plus unboosted PI regimens

Patients who are on PIs suitable for boosting (i.e. IDV or SQV) may find a boosted regimen simpler to take, with fewer daily doses and food restrictions. Although switching to a boosted regimen may improve quality of life [212], some studies have shown evidence of a significant increase in toxicity [85]. NFV is not suitable for boosting and can be continued if the patient is stable with undetectable viral load.

7.1.2 3NRTIs

Patients taking triple NRTI regimens should be advised of recent trial results indicating a higher risk of virological rebound as compared with currently recommended regimens. A change in therapy should be considered for those who have not achieved sustained virological suppression (< 50 copies/ml for more than six months) or who have achieved viral suppression but have previously received mono or dual nucleoside therapy.

7.1.3 Regimens containing stavudine

D4T is no longer recommended for initial therapy largely because of data from several studies suggesting that it is associated with an increased risk of lipoatrophy [213]. Patients who are on a D4T-containing regimen should consider switching if treatment history and resistance data suggest that an alternative drug is likely to be active. A switch to ZDV may delay but is not likely to prevent the development of lipodystrophy. However, a switch to either ABC or TFV is associated with an increase in subcutaneous fat, [214,215 (new ref 295: Moyle G, Sabin C, Carledge J et al. A 48-week, randomized, open-label comparative study of tenofovir DF vs abacavir as substitutes for a thymidine analogue in persons with lipoatrophy and sustained virological suppression on HAART. 12th CROI, Boston, 2005, (Abstract 44LB)]. Alternatively, reducing the dose of D4T (from 40 to 30 mg BD in those over 50kg) may be associated with reduced risk of lipoatrophy (?ref).

7.1.4 Regimens containing zidovudine

In view of the increasing recognition that long term treatment with zidovudine may lead to lipoatrophy, physicians may wish to discuss the option of switching to either ABC or TFV. Since lipoatrophy may not be fully reversible by switching after it has developed, patients may prefer to make such a switch preemptively.

7.1.5 Non-HAART regimens

A small number of patients may still remain on non-HAART regimens (e.g. 2 NRTIs). Even if plasma viral load is undetectable or low, there is likely to be significant ongoing viral replication [216] and thus evolution of drug resistance, which will limit future options. Consideration should thus be given to switching all remaining patients to HAART regimens. Patients currently on a non-HAART regimen who started therapy with a high nadir CD4 count (e.g. above 300) should be considered for treatment interruption (see section 2.4 and 7.3.3).

7.2 Patients on recommended regimens

Patients who have difficulty with adherence should be assessed individually in accordance with the adherence guidelines. Where appropriate, they may be switched to simpler regimens such as once daily therapy. This appears to be safe, except in those who have had either sub-optimal therapy or therapy which may have produced viruses with reduced sensitivity (resistance) to drugs involved in the simplification regimen.

When switching because of life-threatening toxicity, eg fulminant hepatic failure, all drug therapy should be stopped until the patient has recovered.

7.2.1 Switching from PI-based regimens

A number of studies have evaluated the approach of switching the PI in a HAART regimen to a NNRTI [217] or to ABC in patients who have a persistently suppressed viral load. There are several potential advantages of such an approach, including the reduction of central adiposity and hyperlipidaemia. A variable proportion of patients in such studies have experienced early virological failure, often because of pre-existing NRTI resistance before switching [218]. It is very important to consider the possibility of NRTI resistance, particularly in patients who have previously experienced virological failure, by reviewing treatment history and the results of resistance tests (carried out on stored samples if available), as switching one or more NRTIs may also be necessary at the same time to ensure continued virological suppression.

7.2.2 Switching between NNRTIs

For a serious skin rash in individuals taking an NNRTI containing regimen, the drug needs to be stopped immediately. It is probably safe to switch to an alternative NNRTI, although patients who develop a severe rash after starting NVP and switch to EFV may have an increased risk of developing a rash due to EFV.

The optimum policy for switching from EFV to NVP remains to be determined in large studies. One small study has indicated that switching to full dose NVP immediately produces drug levels of a therapeutic range [219]. This is because EFV also induces cytochrome P450, enhancing the metabolism of NVP.

However, the manufacturer of NVP has recently issued a warning regarding the increased risk of life-threatening hepatic and cutaneous reactions to the drug in women with CD4 counts over 250 and men with CD4 counts over 400. Thus close monitoring is required if making a switch from EFV to NVP if the CD4 count has risen above these levels on the previous treatment.

7.2.3 Stopping NNRTI-based regimens in non-emergency situations

EFV and NVP have long plasma half-lives; although variable this has been found to be as long as 3 weeks in some patients. If all the drugs in a regimen containing 2 NRTIs and one of these drugs are stopped at the same time, levels of the NRTIs are likely to fall more rapidly than the NNRTI, leaving a period of functional NNRTI monotherapy. This may be sufficient to select

NNRTI-resistant virus [220, 221]. Ways to limit this risk are to switch the NNRTI to a PI for 1-2 weeks before stopping the whole regimen or to continue with the two NRTI drugs for 7 further days after stopping the NNRTI.

7.3 Stopping therapy in individuals with complete viral suppression (structured treatment interruption)

STI has been investigated in chronic therapy both to enhance immune responses and as a means of decreasing drug exposure with the potential of limiting toxicity and perhaps reducing costs. Results have varied depending on the pattern of treatment interruption used.

7.3.1 Intermittent on-off therapy cycles of one month or longer

The largest study of longer intermittent therapy cycles is the Swiss–Spanish Intermittent Treatment (SSIT) trial of patients who had <50 copies/mL for longer than 6 months [222]. The patients then stop therapy for 2 months, followed by 8 weeks back on therapy. After four such cycles, therapy is stopped until the patient's HIV RNA load increases to >5000 copies/ml. There was no significant difference between the continuous and intermittent therapy groups on the primary outcome of the study, which was the change in viral load pre- and post-treatment.

Another controlled trial of 70 patients being treated with cycles of one month on followed by one month off therapy [223] was abandoned after the virus rebounded with each interruption in the first 15 subjects, leading to the development of drug resistance in several patients.

7.3.2 Intermittent on-off therapy cycles of one week

Another approach involved a cohort of 11 subjects given cycles of intermittent therapy, consisting of 1 week on followed by 1 week off therapy [224]. Although short-term results looked promising, this study was also discontinued due to the later development of viral rebound and drug resistance. In addition, data from a sub-group of the SSIT Trial showed that even after one week of treatment interruption significant viral replication can be induced [225]. The HIVNAT 014 study was also unsuccessful in respect of a group of treatment experienced patients using one-week on-off therapy cycles, 20-30% of whom showed viral breakthrough, with development of resistance in some cases. In conclusion, the committee feels there is insufficient data to recommend intermittent cycling of treatment outside rigorously controlled clinical trials.

7.3.3 Discontinuation of therapy with re-start based on CD4 count (CII)

In individuals with complete virological suppression, treatment interruption tends to lead to viral load rebound in a few days and CD4 count decline. In individuals whose CD4 count never fell to low levels, interruption is unlikely to rapidly result in CD4 count decline to levels associated with substantial risk of clinical disease. Interruption of therapy is therefore an option in such patients, if there is a strong desire to do so, due to toxicity or other reasons. The HIVNAT 014 study used this approach and a larger study with similar CD4 count guidance is being undertaken by the CPCRA [226]. It should be understood that it may require years of therapy after the interruption to re-attain the CD4 count level prior to the interruption.

We would recommend that any structured treatment interruption should be planned, that particular care should be taken with withdrawal of drugs with extremely long half-life such as efavirenz, and that treatment should be re-started based on the CD4 count. Patients should be counselled and understand these issues. The issues associated with treatment interruption should all be discussed in detail, including the need for relatively frequent CD4 monitoring during an interruption, the small risk of developing an acute antiretroviral syndrome similar to PHI, and the risk of onward transmission which will probably increase as the viral load rises.

8.0 Changing or stopping therapy for virological failure

The viral load nadir achieved within the first few months on treatment is predictive of the subsequent risk of virological failure [227]. To limit the risk of virological treatment failure an objective of initial therapy (and subsequent treatment regimens if achievable) is to suppress viral load to <50copies/ml. Once suppressed, patients may subsequently experience transient rises in viral load to just above detectable (blips) or sustained viral load rebound.

Recommendations on action to be taken on first virological failure are shown in (Table 6).

At all stages of virological failure, patients should be clinically assessed to determine factors which may have reduced plasma drug levels to below optimal levels such as drug-drug interactions, poor adherence, incorrect dosing or factors which may have increased viral replication such as inter-current infections and vaccinations.

8.1 Viral load blips

Transient rises in viral load to levels to just above detectable (viral blip) are reported to occur in a significant proportion of patients on treatment over time [228, 229]. Patients who are developing sustained virological rebound (failure) would show further increases in viral load whereas those whose viral load is transiently detectable because of assay related problems or other factors will show no further rise or revert to undetectable usually within 4-6 weeks. It is controversial whether viral blips are associated with an increased future risk of virological failure in those who have already achieved viral suppression. One study showed no such association [229] but another [228] suggested that although a low level viral blip was not a predictor of failure those with repeated episodes or sustained low level viral rebound were more likely to experience virological failure in the future. Patients with frequent blips related to possible inadequate drug potency in the absence of genotypic resistance to their current regimen may be candidates for intensification or change of therapy.

8.2 Sustained viral load rebound

Falls in CD4 count and clinical disease progression are not usually seen in patients experiencing low level viral load rebound but are the usual eventual outcome in patients whose viral load continues to rise towards pre treatment levels [230]. Although resistance to all drugs in a treatment regimen may not be detected in patients experiencing virological failure, it is likely that the higher the copy number the more probable the development of resistance. For some drugs (e.g. 3TC, NNRTIs) mutations at one position in the reverse transcriptase gene can cause high level phenotypic resistance and usually emerge at low levels of viral load rebound. Reduced susceptibility to other drugs requires the accumulation of two or more mutations in the viral genome and occurs with ongoing viral replication in the presence of drugs. Thus if significant levels of viral replication develop and persist on therapy and other options are available which can completely suppress it then therapy should be changed. The lower limit for a definition of significant levels of viral replication is somewhat arbitrary. For practical reasons many clinicians would accept a persistent (two values at least one month apart) viral load level of >400 copies/ml for consideration of a treatment switch. This may change as further information is gained on the frequency and the emergence of genotypic mutations at low level viraemia on different drug combinations and how this may influence the treatment response to subsequent regimens, together with improvement in the sensitivity of assays to detect drug resistance, which is presently only reliable with viral loads of >1000 copies/ml.

8.3 Changing therapy [BII]

Patients should be considered for a change of therapy if they show sustained rebound in viral load levels, having previously been undetectable, or have never achieved undetectable levels on their current treatment regimen. The likelihood of achieving an undetectable viral load on changing therapy is predicted by the number of active drugs in the new regimen [231, 232] plus factors influencing tolerability and adherence. The decision to change therapy should be guided by the availability of a treatment option which is likely to have the potency to suppress viral load to undetectable levels (<50 copies/ml) and which the patient is likely to be able to adhere to and tolerate.

Although the addition of a single new agent in individuals experiencing low level viral load rebound may result in a proportion becoming undetectable [233] this strategy is not recommended as the disadvantages in terms of added toxicity and development of resistance to the new drug are probably greater than the likelihood of achieving a sustained undetectable viral load.

The choice of a new regimen should be guided by the results of current and previous resistance testing, treatment history and the ability of the patient to adhere and tolerate individual drugs. Resistance testing is important to identify which drugs will possibly be of most benefit i.e. active. Active is defined as 'where a drug is likely to have significant antiviral activity in vivo based on the antiretroviral treatment history and the results of all current and previous resistance testing'.

8.3.1 Virological failure with no resistance

Patients may experience virological failure but have no resistance mutations detected on genotypic resistance testing. Failure here is probably due to poor treatment adherence with drug levels that are both insufficient to maintain viral load suppression and inadequate to select out viral mutations associated with drug resistance. However the absence of detectable resistant mutations does not exclude the presence of mutations in minor virus populations (refs).

In this situation factors affecting adherence and drug exposure should be fully evaluated and the choice of the next regimen guided by previous treatment experience and the likelihood of the patient to adhere to and tolerate individual drugs.

8.3.2 Virological failure with PI mutations [BII]

There is no clear randomised control trial evidence to guide the optimal treatment strategy in patients with PI mutations with or without NRTI mutations which may follow treatment failure with 2 nucleoside analogues and a protease inhibitor.

One option is to change both NRTIs and introduce a new class by switching the PI to an NNRTI. If there is cross-resistance amongst the NRTIs, limiting the benefit of new NRTIs, there is likely to be a high risk of more rapid virological failure and development of resistance to the NNRTI with this strategy. In this situation a more effective option would be a new PI plus 1 or 2 active NRTIs with or without a NNRTI. In a number of cohort studies lopinavir, with low dose RTV in combination with either EFV or NVP, reduced viral loads to below detectable limits in NNRTI naive, PI experienced patients [234, 235]. The decision to include a NNRTI or not may depend on the extent of cross resistance amongst the NRTIs and thus the availability of active NRTI .

There are comparative data assessing which ritonavir boosted PI regimen is more effective in PI experienced patients with detectable PI mutations at baseline and further data will be available from ongoing trials. Similar virological efficacy at 48 weeks has been demonstrated between

lopinavir/RTV and atazanavir/RTV in patients who have previously failed at least 2 regimens including at least 1 containing a PI (BMS 045 study ref). Gastrointestinal side effects and hyperlipidaemia were more common with lopinavir/RTV. Hyperbilirubinaemia and in a small number of patients clinical jaundice was the most common side effect with atazanavir/RTV.

In patients who had previously experienced treatment failure to 1 or 2 PIs, non inferiority of fosamprenavir/RTV compared to lopinavir/RTV using the primary end-point of time averaged change in viral load from baseline could not be established (Context study ref). However similar proportions of patients achieved VL<50 copies /ml at 48 weeks with lopinavir/RTV and twice daily fosamprenavir/RTV but not once daily. Once daily fosamprenavir/RTV is not recommended in patients with previous PI failure.

Although saquinavir/RTV was inferior to lopinavir/RTV In one study this was due mainly to tolerability problems of the saquinavir formulation. (MaxCmin 2 study ref). The choice of which boosted PI to use, is likely to be determined by the pattern and number of PI mutations detected, the side effect profile and factors affecting adherence and tolerability.

8.3.3 Virological failure with NNRTI mutations [BIII]

No randomised comparative study has addressed the optimal treatment strategy in patients who have NNRTI mutations plus or minus NRTI mutations, following failure of 2 nucleoside analogues plus a NNRTI. Unlike PIs the presence of 1 or more NNRTI associated mutations usually indicates cross resistance to both Nevirapine and Efavirenz.

As a PI-based regimen improves the clinical outlook after NRTI therapy [237] it is likely to do so after 2NRTIs and an NNRTI. Thus most physicians would treat virological failure with the presence of NNRTI mutations by discontinuing the NNRTI, and guided by resistance testing change to two active NRTIs and add a boosted PI. There is little data from studies in patients who are ART experienced but PI naïve to guide choice of the boosted PI. Data from trials in PI experienced patients (see section 7.2.2) and ART naïve patients may help to inform choice. In ART naïve patients, when compared to nelfinavir, lopinavir/RTV (ref) has greater virological efficacy whilst in another study once daily fosamprenavir/RTV (SOLO ref) similar virological efficacy at 48 weeks. In the first study nelfinavir was dosed three times a day and in the second twice daily. Although by Intent to treat analysis virological efficacy was similar fewer patients experienced protocol defined virological failure In the fosamprenavir arm than with nelfinavir. Studies comparing different boosted PIs in patients who are PI naïve are ongoing.

8.3.4 Virological failure with NRTI mutations alone [BIV]

Virological failure with NRTI mutations alone may follow treatment with triple NRTI regimens or 2NRTIs and a PI. It is unusual to fail with NRTI mutations alone in patients experiencing treatment failure on 2NRTIs and a NNRTI. In patients who have failed a NNRTI containing regimen minor populations of NNRTI mutations may be present which are not detectable on routine resistance testing but are likely to affect response to future NNRTI containing regimens (ref: Nevirapine MTC data, plus ACTG data)

The number and pattern of genotypic mutations in the reverse transcriptase gene will determine the extent of cross resistance amongst the NRTIs and whether 2 active and potent NRTIs could be included in the new regimen. If there is none or limited cross resistance detected then an option is to switch to a regimen comprising two active and potent NRTIs plus either a boosted PI or a NNRTI. Although the latter may not be as effective as a boosted PI because of the low genetic resistance barrier of a NNRTI or the presence of NNRTI mutations In minor virus populations from previous NNRTI exposure and the possible presence of greater

cross resistance amongst the NRTIs than detected by current genotypic assays. If the likelihood of cross resistance amongst the NRTIs is high (i.e. there are not 2 fully active drugs) then switching to a regimen comprising a boosted PI with 2 (at least partially) active NRTIs is recommended. In patients who are NNRTI naïve a regimen containing a boosted PI and a NNRTI and 1 or 2 active NRTIs is an alternative. In patients who are PI experienced but do not have detectable PI mutations It is not known whether their virological response to a new regimen containing a PI is different to those who are PI treatment naïve.

8.3.5 Use of enfuvirtide

Enfuvirtide has recently been licensed for use in treatment experienced patients. Optimally, it should be used with one or more active drugs in the regimen. Predictive factors for response to enfuvirtide have been identified and may be helpful to identify patients suitable for treatment with enfuvirtide (*Montaner J et al., XV International AIDS Conference, 2004. Poster TuPeB4483*)

T20 (enfuvirtide) is a 36 amino acid peptide derived from HIV GP41. It inhibits GP41 mediated fusion and its active in nanomolar ranges in T-cell lines. It is active against NSI and SI viruses and is synergistic with reverse transcriptase inhibitors, PIs and other entry inhibitors. It is self-administered by subcutaneous injection, the usual dose being 90 mg twice daily. It shows no cross resistance with other antiretroviral classes. Because it works extra-cellularly it has a low potential for both drug/drug interaction and for any interaction with cellular metabolic processes. Its activity is independent of co-receptor usage.

Although clinical efficacy has been demonstrated in individuals with triple class experience (TORO studies refs), it is more effective to use this drug where it can be combined with other active agents, rather than as an add-on to a failing regimen or where it is the sole active agent in a new combination, as resistance can occur rapidly. A higher virological response rate was seen in patients who had lower plasma viral load and higher CD4 count at baseline, a history of exposure to fewer antiretroviral agents and 2 or more other active drugs in the regimen.(TORO ref)

References:

tba

Table 6

Changing therapy on first virological failure [BIII]		
Presentation	Viral load pattern	Recommended action
Inadequate virological response to initial regimen	Failure to achieve VL < 50 copies/ml	Consider factors affecting plasma drug levels ¹ . If drug exposure optimal and likelihood of resistance low, consider augmenting treatment regimen. If likelihood of resistance

		high, consider changing all drugs
Persistent viral load rebound where previously < 50 copies/ml	Viral load >50 and <400 copies/ml	Consider factors affecting plasma drug levels ¹ .
	Sustained viral load rebound to >400 copies/ml ²	Consider: 1. Changing all drugs if effective option available likely to reduce viral load to undetectable levels 2. Continue regimen and monitor if no effective option currently available for reasons of drug potency, likely poor adherence or tolerability ³ .
<p>1. Factors affecting plasma drug levels include poor adherence, intolerability, drug interactions and incorrect dosing.</p> <p>2. A viral load rebound to >1,000 copies/ml will allow resistance testing to be performed. Resistance testing with expert interpretation has been shown to have a benefit on short term virological response to the subsequent regimen.</p> <p>3. There is a risk of developing further mutations by allowing a patient to remain on a virologically failing regimen, which could limit further options for treatment.</p>		

Table 7 What to do after first virological failure: A summary of recommendations

What to change to after first virological failure: summary of recommendations [BII/IV]	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Change all drugs if possible ▪ Resistance test recommended 	
Initial regimen	Options to consider

2NRTIs + PI (with or without low dose ritonavir)	2NRTIs ^{1,2} + NNRTI or 2NRTIs ¹ + boosted PI ³ or 2NRTIs ¹ + NNRTI ⁴ + boosted PI
2NRTIs + NNRTI	boosted PI + 2NRTIs ¹
3NRTIs	2NRTIs ^{1,2} + NNRTI or boosted PI + 2NRTIs ¹ or boosted PI + 2NRTIs ¹ + NNRTI ⁴
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change to 2 new and active NRTIs guided if possible by resistance testing. 2. This could lead to rapid development of resistance to NNRTIs if the potential exists for NRTI cross-resistance. 3. Low dose ritonavir boosted PI should be considered if resistance to PIs is not found or limited. 4. Studies with low dose ritonavir boosted PI + an NNRTI have shown good results. 	

9.0 Treatment for patients with evidence of resistance to NNRTIs, nucleoside analogues and PIs

9.1 Patients whose therapy fails having used at least three classes of drugs ('salvage therapy')

The term salvage therapy is commonly used by both physicians and patients, but is not always clearly defined. One possible definition is treatment following exposure to multiple drugs from all available classes of antiretroviral agents, yet many so-called 'salvage studies' have been carried out in patients who are naive with respect to one class of drugs. Moreover, this definition of salvage becomes a moving target as more classes of drugs (e.g. chemokine or fusion inhibitors) become available. Based on the UK CHIC cohort study, it is estimated that nearly 38% of HIV-infected patients in the UK have experienced all main classes of antiretroviral drugs and of these 15% are known to have virologically failed all three classes. (Reference: CA Sabin, T Hill, F Lampe, R Matthias, S Bhagani, R Gilson, MS Youle, MA Johnson, M Fisher, G Scullard, P Easterbrook, B Gazzard, AN Phillips on behalf of the UK CHIC Steering Committee. How long will the benefits of highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART) last? Treatment exhaustion among individuals infected with HIV in the UK: a multicenter cohort study. BMJ in press).

The reasons for drug failure are complex. To date, most studies of therapy after more than one treatment failure have not distinguished between virological failure due to poor adherence and failure due to other causes, such as poor pharmacokinetics. Individuals who have been poorly adherent to therapy but have not developed resistant virus may be effectively treated if adherence is improved. Low blood levels of PIs, either because of poor absorption or unforeseen pharmacokinetic interactions, may also lead to failure with or without the development of resistance to PIs.

9.1 Criteria for success in patients exposed to multiple drug classes

Suppressing viral load to below detectability (i.e. to below 50 copies/mL) at 24–48 weeks has become an accepted measure of success in antiviral therapy. This criterion may not be useful in determining success in highly antiretroviral experienced patients in whom the potency of subsequent regimens is attenuated because of the presence of resistant virus. The goals of therapy in treatment-experienced patients may also need to be reconsidered, and it must be recognized that complete suppression of viral replication is not always an achievable goal. As options for new regimens decrease, increasing importance should be attached to preserving immune function and maximizing suppression of viral replication while minimizing toxicity as much as possible. Data from a number of large clinical end-point studies, mainly in treatment naive patients, show that much more modest declines in viral load correlate with improvements in clinical outcome. Viral load reductions of greater than 0.5 log₁₀ copies/mL may be responsible for clinical improvement and may imply that such a regimen is worth pursuing [16, 29]. Increases in CD4⁺ cell count of only 25 cells/mm³ was predictive of an improved outcome in patients who did not achieve full virologic suppression. *Loutfy M, Walmsley SL, Mullin C, Perez G, Neaton J. CD4+ cell increase to highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART) at one year is predictive of clinical outcome despite incomplete viral suppression. Antivir Ther. 2003;8(suppl 1):S218-S219. Abstract 144*

Many salvage studies have been of short duration with little follow-up data, making it difficult to judge whether or not any viral suppression will be maintained over the long term. In late disease, the immediate risk of death is much more closely associated with the CD4 count than with the viral load and thus, perhaps, a more important criterion in salvage studies is the degree to which the CD4 count rises.

In late stage disease where it is unlikely that durable undetectable levels of HIV RNA are achievable, the aim of treatment should shift to maintaining or preserving immunological function and preventing clinical progression. In this setting it is therefore important to maintain the CD4 cell count rather than to attempt to get the HIV viral load undetectable with single agents

In many patients the CD4⁺ cell count is stable despite a stable or rising viral load. In one study of 380 HIV-infected adults receiving long-term protease inhibitor (PI)-based therapy, patients with HIV RNA levels persistently above 1500 copies/mL generally had CD4⁺ cell counts that remained greater than pretherapy baseline levels through 96 weeks of follow-up. *4. Deeks SG, Barbour JD, Martin JN, Swanson MS, Grant RM. Sustained CD4+ T cell response after virologic failure of protease inhibitor—based regimens in patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection. J Infect Dis 2000; 181:946-53.*

A subsequent study showed that maintenance of stable CD4⁺ cell counts depended on continuing antiretroviral therapy, even in the face of virologic failure of their antiretroviral regimen. *Deeks SG, Wrin T, Liegler T, et al. Virologic and immunologic consequences of discontinuing combination antiretroviral-drug therapy in HIV-infected patients with detectable viremia. N Engl J Med. 2001;344:472-480*

In that study, discontinuation of therapy for 12 weeks was associated with a median decrease in CD4⁺ cell count of nearly 130 cells/mm³ and an increase in plasma HIV-1 RNA of more than 0.8 log₁₀ copies/mL

The benefits of continued administration of antiretroviral therapy in this setting must be balanced against potential drug toxicity and the accumulation of additional drug resistance mutations leading to broader cross-resistance limiting future drug options *Jiang H, Deeks S, Kuritzkes DR, et al. Assessing resistance costs of highly active antiretroviral therapy via measures of future drug options. J Infect Dis. 2003;*

It is important to remember that continuing a failing regimen is merely a temporising measure until new drugs are available: Over time patients' viruses become increasingly resistant, with slowly increasing viral load and declining immune competence *Deeks SG, Barbour JD, Grant RM, Martin JN. Duration and predictors of CD4+ T-cell gains in patients who continue combination therapy despite detectable plasma viremia. AIDS. 2002;16:201-207.*

The immediate increase in viral load following treatment interruption suggests that residual activity of the antiretroviral regimen contributes to the maintenance of partial viral suppression, despite high-level drug resistance. More recent studies have suggested that it is the nucleoside RT inhibitors, rather than the PIs, that retain partial activity.[6] These findings have been corroborated in two separate studies in which interruption of stavudine or lamivudine was associated with a significant increase in plasma HIV-1 RNA levels and decline in CD4+ cell count, despite the presence of stavudine- or lamivudine-resistant virus, respectively.[7,8]

9.1.1. Principles of optimising success in highly treatment experienced patients

Both cohort and clinical controlled studies identify a number of general principles to consider when deciding upon a salvage regimen. First, success is most likely if individuals are naive to one class of drugs. It seems to be particularly important to give these agents whenever possible as part of a fully suppressive regimen to avoid the rapid emergence of resistance.

Second, improved outcome is more likely with the use of drugs *within classes* to which the patient has not been exposed and to which resistance is unlikely or proven to be absent.

Third, therapy is more successful at reducing the viral load to undetectable levels in those who commence at a lower viral load (e.g. <5000–10,000 copies/mL). This has been attributed to an accumulation of additional mutations within the viral population in those who continue on failing therapy with a high viral load, which increases the likelihood of cross-resistance to new agents tried subsequently. Additionally, the potency of new regimens may be sub-optimal but enough to suppress low viral loads.

Fourth, resistance testing is strongly recommended in all cases where there are difficult choices to make concerning the most beneficial treatment. A number of retrospective and prospective studies demonstrate that responses to drugs in failing regimens can be predicted by genotype or phenotype.

Finally, plasma drug concentrations may influence therapy outcome. The Viradapt study [245] demonstrated the best virological response in patients who had optimal drug concentration as well as genotyping to guide future choices. See TDM section 11.0. for further information.

9.1.2 Patient assessment

Where there is any doubt about management, we recommend that advice be sought from or the patient be referred to a larger HIV centre where there is more clinical expertise with multi drug resistance HIV and where new investigational drugs would be more readily available. At present a number of new promising investigational drugs are available on a trial basis (see section on new investigational drugs). We recommend that the care of such patients be delivered on a shared care basis or part of a clinical network.

9.2 Management of patients with multiple class resistance

A number of approaches have been tried in this situation.

9.2.1 Stopping therapy long term

Stopping therapy long term is not recommended as data indicates that this produces a large fall in CD4 count and rise in viral load. However, stopping certain components of therapy may be associated with reduced toxicity and less resistance development while maintaining CD4 count.

9.2.2 MEGA HAART

Although responses in viral load are likely to be small when using a drug to which the virus is resistant, it is possible that using a number of such drugs together might have a cumulative benefit which outweighs the potential toxicity [247]. Varying success has been reported by combining five or more drugs [248], so-called mega-HAART or giga-HAART [249], despite resistance to many of the individual components. A number of small cohort studies have reported successful maintenance of the viral load below 400 copies/mL for up to 2 years in individuals exposed to all three classes of drugs [250] using a mega HAART approach. Such studies are difficult to analyse and, in the long term, toxicity is likely to outweigh benefit. Although the regimens contain multiple drugs, drug adherence was often relatively good, partly because the drugs were taken only twice a day. However, in the French GIGA HAART just under half of the patients remained on the same treatment at one year.

While we are waiting for new drugs to be made available, it appears best for patients to be maintained on some form of antiretroviral therapy rather than have a prolonged treatment interruption with its associated rise in viral load, drop in CD4 count and potential for disease progression [251, 252]. This type of strategy probably relies on the poor fitness of a virus with multiple mutations to maintain the status quo.

9.2.3 STI

One postulated strategy for managing patients who have failed treatment with HIV resistance to multiple drugs is the use of STI to allow drug sensitive virus to outgrow and replace resistant virus, with the hope of enhancing responses to subsequent therapy. Unfortunately, resistant virus that had previously evolved is likely to re-emerge during subsequent therapy despite STI. There can be an immunological price to pay for STI. In 22 heavily experienced patients, after a median STI of 20 weeks, there was a mean CD4 decrease of 88 cells/mm³ and three patients developed opportunistic infections. After restarting a new salvage regimen, most patients eventually increased their CD4 counts to the pre-STI level [253]. In one study patients infected with multidrug-resistant HIV, a four month structured interruption followed by a change in antiretroviral regimen was associated with greater progression of disease and did not confer immunologic or virologic benefits or improve the overall quality of life (*Lawrence J et al Structured treatment interruption in patients with multidrug-resistant human immunodeficiency virus N Engl J Med. 2003 Aug 28;349(9):837-46*). On the other hand, a French study of an eight week treatment interruption followed by multidrug therapy (minimum of 7 drugs) in patients with multi drug failures and CD4 cell count < 200 cells per cu ml (median CD4 count was only 25 cells) found that treatment interruption was beneficial in terms of viral load outcome for treatment-experienced HIV-infected patients with advanced HIV disease and multidrug-resistant virus. (*Katlama C et al Benefit of treatment interruption in HIV-infected patients with multiple therapeutic failures: a randomized controlled trial (ANRS 097) AIDS. 2004 Jan 23;18(2):217-26*). Each trial enrolled a distinctive patient population, studied different treatment regimens and different durations of treatment interruption. The strategy of STI in the setting of drug-resistant virus may only be beneficial in patients similar to, and treated in a like manner as, those in the GIGA HAART trial and not those in CPCRA 064.[1] Patients in the CPCRA study had higher CD4 cell counts and

more treatment options while those in the GIGA HAART study had no options with much more intensive therapy. Further studies will hopefully clarify this situation (e.g. Optima Study).

In those patients who have other antiretroviral options then we would not recommend a structured treatment interruption. In these patients structured treatment interruption may lead to an increase in the rate of progression to AIDS and large falls in CD4 counts, which may not be regained for up to 48 weeks after restarting treatment [254].

In those patients who have no obvious treatment options then the ANRS study [254] of an 8 week interruption followed by GIGA HAART using minimum of seven drugs appears to give an advantage at 48 weeks in term of surrogate marker responses over those patients who did not have a structured treatment interruption.

9.2.4 New Agents

In multi drug class resistant patients, the long term outcome is crucially dependent upon the development of new drugs which when used in combination may be successful in suppressing viral replication completely. The addition of single new agents in individuals with a stable CD4 count above 50 cells mm⁻³ needs to be reviewed with caution outside of a controlled trial setting as resistance is likely to develop rapidly unless the addition of a new drug is capable of reducing the viral load to undetectable limits. The long term outcome of patients may be improved by delaying the introduction of new drugs until several can be combined together to achieve virological undetectability.

RESIST-1 and 2 studies provide data that the protease inhibitor tipranavir is an active agent for the management of drug-resistant HIV in highly treatment-experienced patients. Around one third of patients in the tipranavir arm had viral loads of <400 copies at week 24, compared with 14-17% in the comparator arm without tipranavir. Close scrutiny of the studies emphasises the fact that having a favourable resistance pattern and another active drug available as well as tipranavir (in this case T-20) increases substantially the rate of virological response. A limitation of the use of tipranavir is its wide range of interactions with other drugs, particularly with other PIs, but also with fluconazole, atorvastatin, antacids, and rifampin.

Hicks C. RESIST-1: a phase 3, randomized, controlled, open-label, multicenter trial comparing tipranavir/ritonavir to an optimized comparator protease inhibitor/r regimen in antiretroviral experienced patients: 24-week data. Program and abstracts of the 44th Annual ICAAC Meeting; October 30 - November 2, 2004; Washington, DC. Abstract H-1137a.

Cahn P, for the RESIST 2 Study Group. 24-week data from RESIST-2: phase 3 study of the efficacy and safety of either tipranavir/ritonavir (TPV/r) or an optimized ritonavir (RTV)-boosted standard-of-care (SOC) comparator PI (CPI) in a large randomized multicenter trial in treatment-experienced HIV+ patients. Program and abstracts of the Seventh International Congress on Drug Therapy in HIV Infection; November 14-18, 2004; Glasgow, United Kingdom. Abstract PL14.3.

Leith J, Walmsley S, Katlama C, et al. Pharmacokinetics and safety of tipranavir/ritonavir (TPV/r) alone or in combination with saquinavir (SQV) amprenavir (APV), or lopinavir (LPV): interim analysis of B1182.51. Program and abstracts of the 5th International Workshop on Clinical Pharmacology of HIV Therapy; April 1-3, 2004; Rome, Italy. Abstract 5.1.

9.2.4.1 Use of T20 (enfuvirtide)

See section 8.3.5.

9.3 Recommendations for subsequent virological failure (third or more regimen)

Reasons for virological failure should be assessed.

- Test for genotypic resistance: a phenotypic assay or virtual phenotype may be necessary if the genotype assay is difficult to interpret.
- If a new regimen that contains at least 2 or 3 active drugs is available then the advice would be to strongly consider changing treatment. In this situation
- Change as many drugs as possible only if a number of active drugs are available;
- A new class of drugs should be introduced preferably combined with one or more active drugs .
- If such a regimen can not be constructed then it would be better to defer any change in treatment until such options are available especially in patients maintaining a CD4 of >100cells Some patients may benefit in terms of reducing pill burden and side effects if part of the regimen was stopped and close monitoring showed a stable cd4 count and viral load subsequently
- Treatment intensification is generally not recommended as it is a strategy used in less treatment experienced patients with viral loads of less than 1-2000 copies/ml.
- Referral to centres running clinical trials of new agents and/or with expertise in the management of such Complex patients should be considered .

10.0 Resistance testing

10.1 Drug-naïve patients

There is now extensive evidence for the transmission of drug resistant variants (de Ronde 2001; Pao 2005). In some cases, the presence of resistance in an apparently drug-naïve patient may in fact reflect previous undisclosed therapy. The reported prevalence of primary resistance varies from 5% to 26% in different cohorts (Grant 2002, Little 2002, UK Collaborative Group 2001; reviewed in Pillay 2004; Bennet 2005), reflecting heterogeneity of methodologies used and definitions used for resistance.

In newly diagnosed patients with established infection, the overall prevalence of primary resistance appears to be lower than in acute seroconverters. This may be explained by the fact that the time of infection for these individuals could have occurred some years previously, prior to the upsurge in transmission of resistance. Alternatively, transmitted resistant virus may subsequently evolve, with reversion to wild type. Recent data indicate that transmitted resistant strains often persist for years (Barbour 2004; Brenner 2004; Delaugerre 2004; Little 2004; Pao 2004), indicating that it is of value to test any available sample prior to initiating therapy. However, variations in the rate of reversion of transmitted drug-resistant mutants indicate that the optimal sample for resistance testing remains the earliest available following diagnosis (Gandhi 2003). Transmitted resistance appears to compromise the speed of response to first-line therapy when initiated soon after primary infection (Grant 2002; Little 2002) and, when including T215 variants in reverse transcriptase, responses to thymidine analogue containing therapy (Violin 2004). Although the long term impact on disease progression and response to treatment remains to be determined, knowledge of such resistance prior to initiating HAART will allow optimisation of first-line therapy. Cost effectiveness analyses have shown that when prevalence rates

for primary resistance reach between 4% and 10% there is an advantage to test for resistance in antiretroviral-naive patients [186, 187].

10.2 Drug-experienced patients

Antiretroviral treatment failure continues to occur among patients on HAART and is frequently accompanied by the selection of drug resistance. In a study of UK patients who started HAART (without previous mono or dual nucleoside therapy) between 1996 and 2003, there was a 38% risk of failure and a 27% or higher risk of developing resistance over 6 years of follow-up (UK Collaborative Group on HIV Drug Resistance 2005). In a Canadian cohort of 1191 drug-naive adults initiating HAART, drug-resistance mutations were detected in 25% of subjects during 30 months of follow-up. Factors significantly associated with the detection of drug-resistance mutations included high baseline viral load and adherence (Harrigan 2005).

Antiretroviral drug resistance has been described retrospectively, *in vitro* and *in vivo*, to be associated with poor virological and clinical outcomes. Short-term prospective, randomized controlled trials have, in some studies, demonstrated the short term benefits of resistance testing over standard of care [164-174]. It is likely that the relatively modest benefits demonstrated are due to in part to inadequate interpretation of results at the time of the study. Other factors leading to differences between studies include the proportion of patients who are NNRTI naive at time of therapy switch, the availability of expert advice (EA), and the overall therapy experience of participants. A meta-analysis of the VIRADAPT, GART, HAVANA, ARGENTA, NARVAL and VIRA301 [175] showed a higher proportion of patients had undetectable viral loads at 3 and 6 months in the genotype testing groups. This particular analysis supports the use of genotypic but not phenotypic resistance tests and shows that EA can increase the virological response. Further, the MRC ERA Study, which randomised drug-experienced patients to genotypic or genotypic plus phenotypic testing, found no clear evidence that phenotypic resistance testing provided added value relative to genotypic resistance testing [176]. Genotypic assays are cheaper than phenotypic assays, and can be normally undertaken within specialist clinical virology laboratories. By contrast, real time phenotypic assays are generally provided by a few commercial laboratories and currently require dedicated category 3 facilities. It is unlikely that randomised, controlled studies of resistance assays will be undertaken in the future, and further insight into the best use of resistance tests may come from large cohort studies and clinical database analysis.

The TORO-1 (Lalezari 2003) and TORO-2 (Lazzarin 2003) and RESIST-1 (Hicks 2004) and RESIST-2 (Cahn 2004) trials provided indirect evidence of the clinical benefit of resistance testing in highly drug-experienced patients. In these studies, the selection of active drugs in the background regimens guided by resistance testing improved responses to enfuvirtide (TORO studies) or ritonavir-boosted PIs (RESIST studies).

Routine use of genotypic resistance testing after treatment failures has been shown to be cost effective (Corzillius 2004). In drug experienced patients who stop therapy, pre-existing "wild type" virus, archived from prior to therapy, can rapidly emerge within 1 month [188], and resistance testing subsequent to this time will only yield this non-resistant strain. It is therefore uninformative. If possible testing should always be undertaken on virus from a patient while receiving therapy.

10.3 Interpretation of resistance

Resistance interpretation is continually updated. Readers are referred to the latest IAS-USA algorithm [163].

Resistance testing has technical limitations. Both genotypic and phenotypic testing depend on polymerase chain reaction (PCR) amplification of virus from plasma, and therefore do not address the properties of different virus components (i.e. whole virus vs reverse transcriptase/protease genes alone). The likelihood of generating sufficient genome product to undertake the further analysis depends on the starting concentration of virus. Therefore, most current assays require at least 1000 copies/ml to reliably provide a result, although it may be possible to obtain results at lower viral load levels using nested PCR techniques and a larger starting quantity of blood.

Routine resistance assays do not detect resistant viruses present at low levels (<20% of the total virus population), even if these resistant viruses were previously dominant. Although assays to detect minority species have been developed, they are not routinely available and remain research tools only. Limited data indicate that minority resistant quasispecies may affect virological responses (Bae 2004; Mellors 2004). Thus, in NNRTI-experienced patients, suboptimal virological responses to NNRTI-based therapy have been observed in patients with NNRTI resistance demonstrable only by ultrasensitive methods (Mellors 2004).

In the absence of drug pressure, the dominant virus population will revert to wild-type (Wirden 2004). Reversion is slower in transmitted resistance than in resistance selected by therapy (Barbour 2004; Brenner 2004; Delaugerre 2004; Gandhi 2003; Little 2004; Pao 2004). Reversion of mutations may occur through intermediates or revertants (e.g. T215D/N/S from T215Y/F). Detection of revertants should be interpreted as evidence that fully-resistant mutants are present as either minority quasispecies or archived resistance, and may contribute to treatment failure (Violin 2004).

The interpretation of resistance test results is complex. The most informative interpretation systems are based on "clinical cut-off" values, which are being determined for a growing number of drugs. Clinical cut-offs correlate specific mutation patterns with viral phenotype and the phenotype with subsequent *in vivo* virological response. However they may vary depending on the phenotypic assay used. For many drugs, both an upper and a lower cut-off are being proposed, the first indicating a threshold for diminished responses and the second indicating the level of resistance at which responses are essentially lost.

Antiretroviral resistance should be interpreted as a continuum. For the NRTIs and PIs (but not for the NNRTIs, Wirden 2003), residual virological suppression can be observed with intermediate levels of resistance, which may reflect direct antiviral activity as well as the beneficial effects of reduced viral fitness (reviewed in Geretti 2004).

Virus fitness is defined as the overall capacity of a virus to infect, replicate, and produce mature infectious progeny in a defined host environment. The Replicative Capacity Assay is a clinically available test that provides one measure of viral fitness, by testing the growth of a recombinant resistant virus in the absence of drug pressure, relative to the growth of a recombinant wild-type virus. The clinical utility of the test has not been demonstrated.

Hypersusceptibility effects can be demonstrated *in vitro*. Certain drug-resistance mutations confer resistance to some drugs but increase susceptibility to others. Overall, the clinical relevance of this is not clear, but hypersusceptibility to amprenavir in viruses with N88S (Zachary 2001) and to the NNRTIs in viruses with NRTI mutations (189, 190, Tozzi 2004) have been associated with improved virological responses. Such findings may not yet be represented within interpretation algorithms.

HIV-1 genetic diversity within the UK is widening. In 2002, heterosexual infection from Sub-Saharan Africa represented the majority of new diagnoses. These individuals are infected with viruses with significant genetic difference from the subtype B virus common within the gay epidemic. The impact on resistance testing is two-fold. Firstly, PCR-based assays require optimisation of efficiently produce results from such viruses, and secondly, the presence of "secondary" resistance mutations as normal variants in such viruses may

require modification of resistance interpretation systems. Certain resistance pathways have been associated with the HIV-1 subtypes. For example, efavirenz failure in patients infected with subtype C occurs frequently in association with the V106M mutations, which is uncommonly seen in patients infected with B subtype (Brenner 2003). HIV genetic diversity also impacts on phenotypic resistance assays, which use a B subtype virus backbone.

10. 4 Recommendations

- Testing for transmitted resistance is recommended in all newly diagnosed patients who present with either acute seroconversion or established infection. The most appropriate sample is the one closest to the time of diagnosis. This should preferably be tested at the time of initial presentation, as facilities for long-term sample storage may be limited and sample deterioration is likely to occur over several years of storage. In addition, knowledge of baseline resistance impacts on patient management by informing decisions on when to start therapy and what drugs to use. Once testing of the baseline sample has been performed, repeat testing prior to starting therapy is not considered cost-effective and is not currently recommended.
- For existing patients, testing for transmitted resistance is recommended at the time of starting therapy. The most appropriate sample is the one closest to the time of diagnosis, provided it is available and suitable for testing.
- Although superinfection has been described, there is currently insufficient evidence to undertake testing of multiple samples prior to initiation of therapy.
- Minority species of resistant virus may be missed by conventional resistance testing. In patients without evidence of transmitted resistance using such tests, a suboptimal virological response to first-line therapy ($<1\log_{10}$ copies/ml reduction in viral load by 4-8 weeks) should prompt resistance testing at that time, having excluded problems with adherence and, where indicated, drug levels.
- For patients on therapy, resistance testing should be undertaken at each point of viral rebound (although, as stated above, a viral load of at least 1000 copies/ml is required for a reliable assay), unless a patient is on a treatment interruption.
- There is little evidence for an advantage of phenotypic over genotypic testing. Both require interpretation of complex data, and the interpretation systems for fold resistance (phenotype, and phenotypic interpretation of genotype –virtual phenotype) and mutations (genotype) are subject to change as more clinical outcome data becomes available. Genotypic assays are currently cheaper, more rapid and more widely available than phenotypic assays.
- It is essential that interpretation of resistance testing and choice of new therapy is taken in the light of all clinical information, including prior therapies and toxicities. Previous resistance test results must be considered, and resistance apparent at that previous time must be assumed to be permanently represented within the virus population. Samples taken for viral load should be stored frozen within the laboratory, in order that retrospective resistance testing can be undertaken.
- In drug experienced patients, resistance testing should be undertaken while the patient is receiving therapy, to avoid misleading results.
- Resistance tests are technically demanding, and external quality control is essential. This is addressed by national and international pathology laboratory accreditation programmes. Laboratories undertaking resistance testing should be equipped to provide clinical support to HIV clinics, and demonstrate participation in external quality control programmes and accreditation by national/international agencies (Clinical Pathology Accreditation in the UK). They should store samples and assay data according to guidelines of the Royal College of Pathologists.

References

1. Bae A, Waters J, Margot N, Borroto-Esoda K, Miller M. Pre-existing L74V is a risk factor for virological non-response and development of K65R in patients taking tenofovir DF (TDF) *Antivir Ther.* 2004;9:S174.
2. Barbour JD, Hecht FM, Wrin T, Liegler TJ, Ramstead CA, Busch MP, Segal MR, Petropoulos CJ, Grant RM. Persistence of primary drug resistance among recently HIV-1 infected adults. *AIDS.* 2004;18:1683-9.
3. Bennet D, McCormick L, Kline R, Wheeler W, Hemmen M, Smith A, Zaidi I, Dondero T. U.S. Surveillance of HIV drug resistance at diagnosis using HIV diagnostic sera. Program and abstracts of the 12th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; February 22-25, 2005; Boston, Massachusetts. Abstract 674.
4. Benson C, Downey G, Havlir D. A 16-week treatment interruption does not improve the virologic response to multidrug salvage therapy in treatment-experienced patients: 48-week results from ACTG A5086. Program and abstracts of the 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; February 8-11, 2004; San Francisco, California. Abstract 58.
5. Brenner B, Turner D, Oliveira M, Moisi D, Detorio M, Carobene M, Marlink RG, Schapiro J, Roger M, Wainberg MA. A V106M mutation in HIV-1 clade C viruses exposed to efavirenz confers cross-resistance to non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors. *AIDS.* 2003;17:F1-5.
6. Brenner B, Routy JP, Quan Y, Moisi D, Oliveira M, Turner D, Wainberg MA. Persistence of multidrug-resistant HIV-1 in primary infection leading to superinfection. *AIDS.* 2004;18:1653-60.
7. Cahn P et al. 24-week data from RESIST-2: phase 3 study of the efficacy and safety of either tipranavir/ritonavir (TPV/r) or an optimized ritonavir (RTV)-boosted standard-of-care (SOC) comparator PI (CPI) in a large randomized multicenter trial in treatment-experienced HIV+ patients. 7th International Congress on Drug Therapy in HIV Infection, Glasgow, Scotland, Abstract PL14.3, 2004.
8. Corzillius M, Muhlberger N, Sroczynski G, Jaeger H, Wasem J, Siebert U. Cost effectiveness analysis of routine use of genotypic antiretroviral resistance testing after failure of antiretroviral treatment for HIV. *Antivir Ther.* 2004;9:27-36.
9. Delaugerre C, Morand-Joubert L, Chaix ML, Picard O, Marcelin AG, Schneider V, Krivine A, Compagnucci A, Katlama C, Girard PM, Calvez V. Persistence of multidrug-resistant HIV-1 without antiretroviral treatment 2 years after sexual transmission. *Antivir Ther.* 2004;9:415-21.
10. de Ronde A, van Dooren M, van Der Hoek L, Bouwhuis D, de Rooij E, van Gemen B, de Boer R, Goudsmit J. Establishment of new transmissible and drug-sensitive human immunodeficiency virus type 1 wild types due to transmission of nucleoside analogue-resistant virus *J Virol.* 2001;75:595-602.
11. Gandhi RT, Wurcel A, Rosenberg ES, Johnston MN, Hellmann N, Bates M, Hirsch MS, Walker BD. Progressive reversion of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 resistance mutations in vivo after transmission of a multiply drug-resistant virus. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2003;37:1693-8.
12. Geretti AM. Essential benefits of nucleoside analogue regimens in failing therapy. *J HIV Ther.* 2004;9:28-33.
13. Grant RM, Hecht FM, Warmerdam M, Liu L, Liegler T, Petropoulos CJ, Hellmann NS, Chesney M, Busch MP, Kahn JO. Time trends in primary HIV-1 drug resistance among recently infected persons. *JAMA.* 2002;288:181-8.
14. Harrigan PR, Hogg RS, Dong WW, Yip B, Wynhoven B, Woodward J, Brumme CJ, Brumme ZL, Mo T, Alexander CS, Montaner JS. Predictors of HIV drug-resistance mutations in a large antiretroviral-naive cohort initiating triple antiretroviral therapy. *J Infect Dis.* 2005;191:339-47.
15. Hicks C. et al. RESIST-1: A Phase 3 Randomized, Controlled, Open-Label Multicenter Trial Comparing Tipranavir/Ritonavir (TPV/r) to an Optimized Comparator Protease Inhibitor/r (CPI/r) Regimen in Antiretroviral (ARV) Experienced Patients: 24-Week Data, 44th Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy; October 31 - November 2, 2004, Washington, D.C. Abstract H-1137a.

16. Katlama C, Dominguez S, Gourlain K, Duvivier C, Delaugerre C, Legrand M, Tubiana R, Reynes J, Molina JM, Peytavin G, Calvez V, Costagliola D. Benefit of treatment interruption in HIV-infected patients with multiple therapeutic failures: a randomized controlled trial (ANRS 097). *AIDS*. 2004;18:217-26.
17. Lawrence J, Mayers DL, Hullsiek KH, Collins G, Abrams DI, Reisler RB, Crane LR, Schmetter BS, Dionne TJ, Saldanha JM, Jones MC, Baxter JD. Structured treatment interruption in patients with multidrug-resistant human immunodeficiency virus. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;349:837-46.
18. Lazzarin A, Clotet B, Cooper D, Reynes J, Arasteh K, Nelson M, Katlama C, Stellbrink HJ, Delfraissy JF, Lange J, Huson L, DeMasi R, Wat C, Delehanty J, Drobnes C, Salgo M. Efficacy of enfuvirtide in patients infected with drug-resistant HIV-1 in Europe and Australia. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;348:2186-95.
19. Lalezari JP, Henry K, O'Hearn M, Montaner JS, Piliero PJ, Trottier B, Walmsley S, Cohen C, Kuritzkes DR, Eron JJ Jr, Chung J, DeMasi R, Donatucci L, Drobnes C, Delehanty J, Salgo M. Enfuvirtide, an HIV-1 fusion inhibitor, for drug-resistant HIV infection in North and South America. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;348:2175-85.
20. Little SJ, Holte S, Routy JP, Daar ES, Markowitz M, Collier AC, Koup RA, Mellors JW, Connick E, Conway B, Kilby M, Wang L, Whitcomb JM, Hellmann NS, Richman DD. Antiretroviral-drug resistance among patients recently infected with HIV. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;347:385-94.
21. Little SJ, Koelsch KK, Ignacio CC, Wong JK, Lie Y, Frost SDW, Richman DD. Persistence of Transmitted Drug-resistant Virus among Subjects with Primary HIV Infection Deferring Antiretroviral Therapy. 11th CROI 2004, San Francisco, Abstract 36LB.
22. Mellors J, Palmer S, Nissley D, et al. Low-frequency NNRTI-resistant variants contribute to failure of efavirenz-containing regimens. Program and abstracts of the 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; February 8-11, 2004; San Francisco, California. Abstract 39.
23. Pao D, Fisher M, Hue S, Dean G, Murphy G, Cane PA, Sabin CA, Pillay D. Transmission of HIV-1 during primary infection: relationship to sexual risk and sexually transmitted infections. *AIDS*. 2005;19:85-90.
24. Pao D, Andradý U, Clarke J, Dean G, Drake S, Fisher M, Green T, Kumar S, Murphy M, Tang A, Taylor S, White D, Underhill G, Pillay D, Cane P. Long-Term Persistence of Primary Genotypic Resistance After HIV-1 Seroconversion. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2004;37:1570-157.
25. Pillay D. Current patterns in the epidemiology of primary HIV drug resistance in North America and Europe. *Antivir Ther*. 2004;9:695-702.
26. Tozzi V, Zaccarelli M, Narciso P, Trotta MP, Ceccherini-Silberstein F, De Longis P, D'Offizi G, Forbici F, D'Arrigo R, Boumis E, Bellagamba R, Bonfigli S, Carvelli C, Antinori A, Perno CF. Mutations in HIV-1 reverse transcriptase potentially associated with hypersusceptibility to nonnucleoside reverse-transcriptase inhibitors: effect on response to efavirenz-based therapy in an urban observational cohort. *J Infect Dis*. 2004;189:1688-95.
27. UK Collaborative Group on Monitoring the Transmission of HIV Drug Resistance. Analysis of prevalence of HIV-1 drug resistance in primary infections in the UK. *Brit Med J*. 2001;322:1087-8.
28. UK Collaborative Group on HIV Drug Resistance, UK CHIC Study Group. Long term probability of detection of HIV-1 drug resistance after starting antiretroviral therapy in routine clinical practice. *AIDS*. 2005;19:487-494.
29. Violin M, Cozzi-Lepri A, Velleca R, Vincenti A, D'Elia S, Chiodo F, Ghinelli F, Bertoli A, d'Arminio Monforte A, Perno CF, Moroni M, Balotta C. Risk of failure in patients with 215 HIV-1 revertants starting their first thymidine analog-containing highly active antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. 2004;18:227-35.
30. Wirden M, Simon A, Schneider L, Tubiana R, Paris L, Marcelin AG, Delaugerre C, Legrand M, Herson S, Peytavin G, Katlama C, Calvez V. Interruption of nonnucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NNRTI) therapy for 2 months has no effect on levels of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 in plasma of patients harboring viruses with mutations associated with resistance to NNRTIs. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2003;41:2713-5.

31. Wirden M, Delaugerre C, Marcelin AG, Ktorza N, Ait Mohand H, Dominguez S, Schneider L, Ghosn J, Pauchard M, Costagliola D, Katlama C, Calvez V. Comparison of the dynamics of resistance-associated mutations to nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors, nonnucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors, and protease inhibitors after cessation of antiretroviral combination therapy. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2004;48:644-7.
32. Zachary KC, Hanna GJ, D'Aquila RT. Human immunodeficiency virus type 1 hypersusceptibility to amprenavir in vitro can be associated with virus load response to treatment in vivo. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2001;33:2075-2077.

Changes in old references:

163: Changes to : International AIDS Society-USA Drug Resistance Mutations Group. Update of the Drug Resistance Mutations in HIV-1: 2004. *Top HIV Med* 2004;12:119-124].

169: Changes to: Haubrich RH, Kemper CA, Hellmann NS, Keiser PH, Witt MD, Tilles JG, Forthal DN, Leedom J, Leibowitz M, McCutchan JA, Richman DD A randomized, prospective study of phenotype susceptibility testing versus standard of care to manage antiretroviral therapy: CCTG 575. *AIDS.* 2005;19:295-302.

172: Changes to: Wegner SA, Wallace MR, Aronson NE, Tasker SA, Blazes DL, Tamminga C, Fraser S, Dolan MJ, Stephan KT, Michael NL, Jagodzinski LL, Vahey MT, Gilcrest JL, Tracy L, Milazzo MJ, Murphy DJ, McKenna P, Hertogs K, Rinehart A, Larder B, Bix DL. Long-term efficacy of routine access to antiretroviral-resistance testing in HIV type 1-infected patients: results of the clinical efficacy of resistance testing trial. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2004;38:723-30.

173: Changes to: Mazzotta F, Lo Caputo S, Torti C, Tinelli C, Pierotti P, Castelli F, Lazzarin A, Angarano G, Maserati R, Gianotti N, Ladisa N, Quiros-Roldan E, Rinehart AR, Carosi G. Real versus virtual phenotype to guide treatment in heavily pretreated patients: 48-week follow-up of the Genotipo-Fenotipo di Resistenza (GenPheRex) trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2003;32:268-80.

174: Changes to: Perez-Elias MJ, Garcia-Arota I, Munoz V, Santos I, Sanz J, Abaira V, Arribas JR, Gonzalez J, Moreno A, Dronda F, Antela A, Pumares M, Marti-Belda P, Casado JL, Geijos P, Moreno S; Phenotype or virtual phenotype for choosing antiretroviral therapy after failure: a prospective, randomized study. *Antivir Ther.* 2003;8:577-84.

184: Changes to: Weinstock HS, Zaidi I, Heneine W, Bennett D, Garcia-Lerma JG, Douglas JM Jr, LaLota M, Dickinson G, Schwarcz S, Torian L, Wendell D, Paul S, Goza GA, Ruiz J, Boyett B, Kaplan JE. The epidemiology of antiretroviral drug resistance among drug-naive HIV-1-infected persons in 10 US cities. *J Infect Dis.* 2004;189:2174-80.

11.0 Therapeutic drug monitoring

This section discusses the role of TDM for PIs and NNRTIs. TDM is likely to be of little value for NRTIs as these agents require intracellular activation and levels of intracellular drug-triphosphate bear little relationship to plasma levels of the parent compound. The abbreviations C_{min} , C_{max} and AUC refer to the plasma trough (usually at end of the dosing interval), peak plasma levels and

area under the concentration-time curve, respectively.

Europe has seen increasing uptake of TDM and incorporation of TDM into national HIV treatment guidelines in several countries. This is despite a surprising lack of data to confirm the benefit of TDM in routine clinical use, and the opportunity to conduct these trials has largely passed.

Nevertheless, prospective surveys suggest ~20% patients in clinic have sub-therapeutic (below target for wild-type HIV) plasma concentrations of PIs and NNRTIs [191-193]. Moreover, the inter-individual variability in plasma concentrations is immense (≥ 50 -fold difference) despite standard dosing [191], and may vary according to ethnicity [haas], gender [laporte] and body weight [hsu].

11.1 Evidence of a concentration-effect relationship

11.1.1 Efficacy

A large number of observational studies have confirmed that drug exposure (C_{min} or AUC) of PIs correlate with virological suppression in patients prospectively followed up in Phase II studies (SQV, IDV, amprenavir (APV)), treatment-naïve patients (including phase III studies) commencing therapy (SQV, NFV, IDV, RTV), dual PI regimens (SQV, NFV, RTV), salvage antiretroviral therapy (SQV, IDV, RTV) or else a broader population of clinic patients on antiretroviral therapy (SQV, NFV, IDV, RTV) [reviewed in Back et al.]. In general, the association between drug concentrations and virological response varies according to patient group, and is less apparent in heavily pre-treated patients (in whom resistance is likely).

For NNRTIs data are less convincing. NVP concentrations were associated with treatment response in treatment-naïve patients in the INCAS trial, but not in unselected clinic patients who may have been treatment-experienced [196, 197]. A relationship between EFV concentrations and both efficacy and CNS toxicity has been reported [Marzolini, Haas]. In a subset of adherent patients from the 2NN study, patients with predicted EFV C_{min} >1.1 µg/mL were less likely to experience virological failure whereas NVP C_{min} was a poor predictor of virological failure [van Leth CROI 2005 #80]; associations with toxicity were not analysed.

11.1.2 Toxicity

High plasma PI concentrations have been associated with some toxicities, e.g. renal or urological toxicity (IDV) [dieleman, Burger AAC], gastrointestinal (RTV, NFV, LPV, SQV) [Merry, Gathe, Reijers], elevated lipids (RTV, and possibly LPV) [200-202], hyperbilirubinaemia [de requena CROI 2005] and possibly lipodystrophy (NFV, LPV) [treluyer, guiterrez].

An association between CNS toxicity and EFV concentrations has been reported [marzolini] in a cross-sectional study of 130 patients receiving the drug for an average of 8 months, and in patients with genetic polymorphism of cytochrome 2B6 (G516T) in whom both higher EFV exposure and CNS toxicity at 1 week were more common [haas]. Data relating NVP exposure to hepatotoxicity are conflicting; however the higher rate of hepatotoxicity with once-daily compared with twice-daily NVP in the 2NN study suggests that liver injury may be related to exposure (C_{max}) of NVP [van Leth].

11.2 Controlled trials of TDM

Randomised, controlled trials of TDM have been few, difficult to interpret and may not reflect commonly used regimens today. An intensive study [206] of 49 adults commencing ZDV, 3TC and IDV randomised patients to receive conventional therapy vs TDM, where full plasma profiles for all 3 drugs plus subsequent multiple sampling for was performed. Patients in the TDM arm had significantly more rapid and durable virological responses to therapy. In the ATHENA study [207], a subset of treatment-naïve patients randomised to receive TDM had improved efficacy (NFV) or reduced toxicity (IDV). However, these analyses were post-hoc, and in the overall study cohort, analysis was complicated by 'unblinding' of controls as well as low compliance to TDM

recommendations by attending clinicians. Two French studies (Genophar and Pharmadapt) have failed to observe any benefit of TDM [208, 209] in a group of pre-treated patients. Assessment of TDM was limited by only a short window in which to observe any effect, since any dose modification was only instituted at 8 weeks for TDM arm, while all patients in the non-TDM arm received TDM from week 12 onwards. A US study (CCTG 578) seeks to evaluate TDM and adherence in a randomized, factorial design. Results are awaited.

11.3 Other potential problems with TDM

Many of the potential problems with TDM have been overcome. A consensus of what efficacy targets should be for each drug has emerged [www.hivpharmacology.com] (although toxicity targets are more problematic). An international quality assurance programme is now in place. For most centres, a trough measurement (+/- post-dose concentration) is preferred. The important question of whether dose modification successfully achieves the desired change in plasma drug concentrations has not been properly evaluated. One recent study [Mentre CROI 2005 # 639] reported that this was readily achieved with LPV and IDV-containing regimens, but not NFV (in contrast to the ATHENA Study [Burger]). Moreover, PIs (and to a lesser degree, NNRTIs) appear to have significant intra-individual variability [CROI] suggesting that clinical decisions should not be made solely on the basis of a single TDM result, where possible.

11.4 Utility of TDM

How TDM should be used in clinical practice needs to be assessed. The utility of TDM as an investigation goes beyond the identification of patients with sub-therapeutic or excessive drug concentrations, since a 'normal' result can be clinically useful in discounting a significant interaction, or provide reassurance that a chosen dose is correct, or caution against dose reduction for toxicity or pill burden, where little scope for doing so exists. Where clinical options are limited, TDM may also allow use of drug combinations which are relatively contra-indicated such as lopinavir with fosamprenavir, or PIs with anti-tuberculous therapy, or proton pump inhibitors with certain PIs. Formal studies assessing the utility of TDM are difficult to design, but urgently required.

11.5 Inhibitory quotients

Inhibitory quotients (IQs) comprise the C_{min} of drug divided by some measure of resistance (phenotype, 'virtual' phenotype or genotype). Lack of standardization means that even within the major forms of (phenotypic) IQ, (genotypic) gIQ, ('virtual') vIQ and ('normalised') nIQ, there are important variations in practice e.g. correction for protein binding, which mutations 'count' for gIQs and how population denominators are calculated for nIQ and gIQ 'units'. Nevertheless, inhibitory quotients appear to be superior in predicting failure compared to drug concentrations or resistance testing alone, in patients undergoing salvage therapy with lopinavir, amprenavir/fosamprenavir, saquinavir, indinavir and atazanavir [16-27]. An attempt to establish a target inhibitory quotient has been made for lopinavir (IQ, gIQ, vIQ, nIQ) [16-19], amprenavir/fosamprenavir (IQ, gIQ, nIQ) [20-23], saquinavir (IQ, gIQ, nIQ) [24-26], IDV (IQ, vIQ) [25,27] and nelfinavir (IQ) [25]. Preliminary data are also available for atazanavir (gIQ) [28] and tipranavir (IQ) [29]. However, there is no convincing evidence that inhibitory quotients are of value with NNRTIs, perhaps because of their low genetic barrier to resistance. It is important to recognise that the target IQ for optimal response is likely to be different for different drugs- thus cross comparisons between different agents is not valid. The key question as to whether inhibitory quotients can be sufficiently improved by dose escalation to positively influence virological suppression remains unanswered.

11.6 TDM Recommendations

BHIVA recommendations for TDM in adults are shown in [Table 8].

Routine, unselected patients. Despite the large inter-individual variability and significant minority of clinic patients who may have sub-optimal drug exposure, there are insufficient data to recommend the routine use of TDM in unselected clinic patients.

TDM should therefore be considered a niche investigation, and is recommended for particular scenarios such as:

i) **drug interactions (BIII)**. PIs and NNRTIs are extensively metabolized by cytochrome P450 isoenzymes. Not only may they affect the metabolism of other drugs that share the same metabolic pathway, but they may themselves be affected by those drugs. Individual drug interactions are beyond the scope of this discussion and are found elsewhere (e.g. <http://www.hiv-druginteractions.org>). TDM could be considered in situations where multiple drugs are given which have direct or indirect interactions with each other, e.g. dual PIs, PI + NNRTI or other inducers /inhibitors of CYP3A4. This would include patients undergoing chemotherapy or organ transplantation.

Recent data have highlighted difficulties in predicting interactions with widely prescribed co-medications. Examples include: the adverse interactions observed with the use of proton pump inhibitors, H2 receptor antagonists (and to a lesser extent antacids) and PIs (atazanavir [1], fosamprenavir [2], indinavir [3] and possibly tipranavir [4]); as well as the remarkable inter individual variability observed for efavirenz clearance (especially in black African women) [5] as a result of genetic variability in drug metabolism [6]. This is especially true when cytochrome P450 inducers (rifampicin and efavirenz) are co-administered: efavirenz concentrations at standard doses (600 mg once daily) ranged from sub-therapeutic to excessively high in studies from Thailand [7] and South Africa [8 - friedland CROI], making dose optimisation in any single individual difficult without TDM.

ii) **Liver impairment (BIII)**. The risk of marked elevation of PI/NNRTI concentrations progressively increases with increasing liver damage (rather than with hepatitis B or C status *per se* [9]). This has most clearly been demonstrated with NFV, IDV, APV and NVP [10,11,12, de requena, bossi]. The optimal dose for any patient cannot easily be predicted and TDM offers a means of tailoring the dose to fit the patient.

iii) **Pregnancy (BIII)**. With PIs increasingly preferred over nevirapine for prevention of perinatal infection, data show that drug exposure is substantially reduced during pregnancy (typically third trimester) for nelfinavir, lopinavir, saquinavir, ritonavir and indinavir [13]. Despite lack of data, similar effects are also likely with atazanavir and fosamprenavir. To allow sufficient time for dose optimisation, TDM should be undertaken as soon as steady-state is reached (~ 2 weeks after commencing a PI) in previously untreated mothers.

iv) **minimising concentration-related toxicities (BIII for EFV, IDV and ATV; CIII for other drugs)**. Some toxicities e.g. rash / hypersensitivity are idiosyncratic and probably not related to plasma drug concentrations. TDM may be useful for concentration-related toxicities such as those listed in 5.5.1 above. Most importantly, TDM may be utilised to allow dosage reduction in patients who are most at risk of drug toxicity because of previous intolerance, concurrent medication with overlapping toxicities or other pre-existing disease.

v) Adherence (CIII). The short half-life of most PIs (even with RTV) only gives an indicator of recent adherence, in contrast to longer half-lives of NNRTIs. An adequate or high plasma PI concentration only provides information about adherence to the preceding few doses rather than over the long term. Near/ complete absence of detectable drug in plasma is a good indicator of poor adherence. Sub-therapeutic levels are a less useful indicator of adherence except on a background of repeatedly optimal concentrations, or when concentrations are adequate following observed ingestion of medication.

Comparison against MEMS and unannounced pill counts [14, 15] suggests that TDM may contribute to the assessment of adherence over and above taking an adherence history, with limited sensitivity of 44% but reasonable specificity of 88% for indinavir, nelfinavir, nevirapine and efavirenz [15].

vi) Virological Failure (CIII). TDM is of little value once high level antiviral resistance has developed. TDM may be considered when treatment intensification is an option (e.g. suboptimal viral load response early in a new regimen), when viral resistance testing suggests that resistance is unlikely or to overcome a low level virological rebound.

vii) Malabsorption (BIII). TDM should be considered in patients with chronic gastrointestinal disease e.g. cryptosporidiosis or other evidence of malabsorption.

viii) 'Unusual' or unlicensed dosing regimens (CIII). Once-daily PI regimens containing SQV, NFV, IDV, LPV and APV are associated with large variability towards the end of the dosing interval, and may not be sufficiently robust for some patients. TDM should be considered for these, and other regimens using unlicensed doses, in order to individualise dosing.

In addition, PENTA guidelines recommend TDM for very young children (<http://www.ctu.mrc.ac.uk/penta/guidelin.pdf>).

Table 8

BHIVA Guidelines for the use of therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM)	
Indication	Recommendation
Routine use	Not recommended. Insufficient data.
Drug interaction	Recommended (BIII).
Liver impairment	Recommended (BIII).
Pregnancy	Recommended (BIII).
Minimizing toxicity	Recommended (BIII) for IDV, EFV and ATV. Consider (CIII) for other drugs.
Monitoring adherence	Consider (CIII).
Virological Failure	Consider (CIII).
Malabsorption	Recommended (BIII).

Unusual or unlicensed dosing regimens	Consider (CIII). Examples are once-daily boosted (LPV, SQV, APV, IDV) or unboosted (NFV) regimens.
Children	Recommended (BIII)

References

1. BMS warning. REYATAZ® (atazanavir sulfate) with or without Norvir® (ritonavir) and proton pump inhibitors should not be coadministered: important new pharmacokinetic data. December 2004.
2. Ford SL, Wire MB, Lou Y, Baker KL, Stein DS. Effect of antacids and ranitidine on the single-dose pharmacokinetics of fosamprenavir. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2005; 49: 467-9.
3. Rublein JC, Donovan BJ, Hollowell SB, Min SS, Theodore D, Raasch RH, Kashuba ADM. Effect of omeprazole on the plasma concentrations of indinavir in HIV-negative subjects. Single dose 800mg IDV. Cmin and AUC were similar to historical control when IDV administered with 200mg RTV. 43rd Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy. Chicago, IL, USA, 14-17 September 2003. Abstr. A-1611
4. van Heeswijk R, Sabo JP, Cooper C, Cameron W, MacGregor TR, Elgadi M, Harris F, McCallister S, Mayers D. The pharmacokinetic interaction between Tipranavir/Ritonavir (500/200) bid and atorvastatin, antacid, and CYP3A4 in healthy adult volunteers. 5th International Workshop on Clinical Pharmacology of HIV Therapy. Rome, Italy, 1-3 April 2004. Abstr. 5.2.
5. Taylor S, Allen S, Fidler S, White D, Gibbons S, Fox J, Clarke J, Weber J, Cane P, Wade A, Smit E, Back D. Stop Study: After discontinuation of efavirenz, plasma concentrations may persist for 2 weeks or longer. 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. 8-11 February 2004, San Francisco, CA, USA. Abstr. 131.
6. Haas DW, Ribaldo HJ, Kim RB, Tierney C, Wilkinson GR, Gulick RM, Clifford DB, Hulgian T, Marzolini C, Acosta EP. Pharmacogenetics of efavirenz and central nervous system side effects: an Adult AIDS Clinical Trials Group study. *AIDS* 2004; 18: 2391-400.
7. Manusothi
8. Friedland
9. Gonzalez de requena 2004
10. Regazzi M, Maserati R, Villani P, Cusato M, Zucchi P, Briganti E, Roda R, Sacchelli L, Gatti F, Delle Foglie P, Nardini G, Fabris P, Mori F, Castelli P, Testa L. Clinical Pharmacokinetics of Nelfinavir and Its Metabolite M8 in Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV)-Positive and HIV-Hepatitis C Virus-Coinfected Subjects. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2005; 49: 643-9.
11. Veronese L, Rautureau J, Sadler BM, Gillotin C, Petite JP, Pillegand B, Delvaux M, Masliah C, Fosse S, Lou Y, Stein DS. Single-dose pharmacokinetics of amprenavir, a human immunodeficiency virus type 1 protease inhibitor, in subjects with normal or impaired hepatic function. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2000; 44: 821-6.
12. Wyles DL, Gerber JG. Antiretroviral drug pharmacokinetics in hepatitis with hepatic dysfunction. *Clin Infect Dis* 2005; 40: 174-81.
13. Mirochnick M, Capparelli E. Pharmacokinetics of antiretrovirals in pregnant women. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2004; 43: 1071-87.
14. Alexander CS, Asselin JJ, Ting LS, Montaner JS, Hogg RS, Yip B, O'Shaughnessy MV, Harrigan PR. Antiretroviral concentrations in untimed plasma samples predict therapy outcome in a population with advanced disease. *J Infect Dis* 2003; 188: 541-8.
15. Liechty C, Alexander C, Harrigan R, Guzman D, Charlebois ED, Moss AR, Bangsberg DR. Are random antiretroviral drug levels associated with objectively measured adherence behaviour? 10th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. Boston, MA, USA, 10-14 February 2003. Abstr. 529.

16. Gonzalez de Requena D, Gallego O, Valer L, Jimenez-Nacher I, Soriano V. Prediction of virological response to lopinavir/ritonavir using the genotypic inhibitory quotient. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses* 2004; 20: 275-8
17. Castagna A, Danise A, Hasson H, Boeri E, Lazzarin A, Peeters M, Piscitelli S, Hoetelmans R. The Normalized Inhibitory Quotient (NIQ) of Lopinavir Is Predictive of Viral Load Response over 48 Weeks in a Cohort of Highly Experienced HIV-1-Infected Individuals. 9th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. 24-28 February 2002, Seattle, WA, USA. Abstr. 128.
18. **Chantret**
19. Bertz R, Li J, King M, Kempf D, Podzamczek D, Flexner C, Katlama C, Havir DV, Letendre S, Eron J, Weiss L, Gatell J, Simon A, Robinson K, Brun S. Lopinavir inhibitory quotient predicts virologic response in highly antiretroviral-experienced patients receiving high-dose lopinavir/ritonavir. 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. 8-11 February 2004, San Francisco, CA, USA. Abstr. 134.
20. Marcelin AG, Lamotte C, Delaugerre C, Ktorza N, Ait Mohand H, Cacace R, Bonmarchand M, Wirden M, Simon A, Bossi P, Bricaire F, Costagliola D, Katlama C, Peytavin G, Calvez V; Genophar Study Group. Genotypic inhibitory quotient as predictor of virological response to ritonavir-amprenavir in human immunodeficiency virus type 1 protease inhibitor-experienced patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2003; 47: 594-600.
21. **Marcellin Glasgow**
22. **Xu**
23. De Luca A, Baldini F, Cingolani A, Di Giambenedetto S, Hoetelmans RM, Cauda R. Deep Salvage With Amprenavir and Lopinavir/Ritonavir: Correlation of Pharmacokinetics and Drug Resistance With Pharmacodynamics. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2004; 35: 359-366.
24. Valer L, De Mendoza C, De Requena DG, Labarga P, Garcia-Henarejos A, Barreiro P, Guerrero F, Vergara A, Soriano V; Fortogene Spanish Study Group. Impact of HIV genotyping and drug levels on the response to salvage therapy with saquinavir/ritonavir. *AIDS* 2002; 16: 1964-6.
25. Casado JL, Moreno A, Sabido R, Marti-Belda P, Antela A, Drona F, Perez-Elias MJ, Moreno S. Individualizing salvage regimens: the inhibitory quotient (C_trough/IC₅₀) as predictor of virological response. *AIDS* 2003; 17: 262-4.
26. Fletcher CV, Jiang H, Brundage RC, Acosta EP, Haubrich R, Katzenstein D, Gulick RM. Sex-based differences in saquinavir pharmacology and virologic response in AIDS Clinical Trials Group Study 359. *J Infect Dis* 2004; 189: 1176-84.
27. **schulman**
28. Barrios A, Rendón A, Ríos P, Martin-Carbonero L, Gonzalez de Requena D, Gallego O, Valer L, Maida I, Jimenez-Nacher I, Gonzalez-Lahoz J, Soriano V. Atazanavir plasma levels associated with efficacy and safety in protease inhibitor-experienced HIV-infected patients. 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. 8-11 February 2004, San Francisco, CA, USA. Abstr. 606.
29. **data from dart meeting**

Gutierrez F, Padilla S, Masia M, Navarro A, Gallego J, Hernandez I, et al. Changes in body fat composition after 1 year of salvage therapy with lopinavir/ritonavir-containing regimens and its relationship with lopinavir plasma concentrations. *Antivir Ther* 2004;9(1):105-13.

Treluyer JM, Morini JP, Dimet J, Gorin I, Rey E, Deleuze J, et al. High concentrations of nelfinavir as an independent risk factor for lipodystrophy in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2002;46(12):4009-12.

Gathe J PD, Johnson M, Schwartz R, Yeh V, Travers N, Luff K, Tressler R, Brun S. Once-daily vs. Twice-daily Lopinavir/ritonavir in Antiretroviral naive-Patients: 48-Week Results. In: 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 8-11 February 2004; San Francisco, CA, USA; 8-11 February 2004. p. Abstr. 507

Reijers MH, Weigel HM, Hart AA, Ten Kate RW, Mulder JW, Reiss P, et al. Toxicity and drug exposure in a quadruple drug regimen in HIV-1 infected patients participating in the ADAM study. *Aids* 2000;14(1):59-67.

Merry C, Barry M, Gibbons S, Mulcahy F, Back D. Improved tolerability of ritonavir derived from pharmacokinetic principles. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 1996;42(6):787

Dieleman JP, Gyssens IC, van der Ende ME, de Marie S, Burger DM. Urological complaints in relation to indinavir plasma concentrations in HIV-infected patients. *Aids* 1999;13(4):473-8

Burger D, Boyd M, Duncombe C, Felderhof M, Mahanontharit A, Ruxrungtham K, et al. Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of indinavir with or without low-dose ritonavir in HIV-infected Thai patients. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2003;51(5):1231-8.

Gonzalez de Requena D, Nunez M, Jimenez-Nacher I, Soriano V. Liver toxicity caused by nevirapine. *Aids* 2002;16(2):290-1.

Bossi P, Peytavin G, Lamotte C, Calvez V, Bricaire F, Costagliola D, et al. High indinavir plasma concentrations in HIV-positive patients co-infected with hepatitis B or C virus treated with low doses of indinavir and ritonavir (400/100 mg twice a day) plus two nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors. *Aids* 2003;17(7):1108-10.

12. Metabolic Complications

Figure 1: Management algorithm for HIV-associated lipodystrophy

12.1 Lipodystrophy

Lipodystrophy has a two-fold clinical significance. There are the stigmata of body shape changes, which may not cause physical morbidity, but can be psychologically and socially debilitating [94]. This may lead patients to delay initiation of therapy, to stop therapy, or may promote poor adherence. Also, there are the metabolic changes, which do not usually affect the patient in the short-term, but add to the long-term risks of morbidity and mortality.

Because we are dealing with a set of conditions with multifactorial and uncertain aetiologies, there is little robust trial evidence to direct our management. Furthermore, it may be that the underlying pro-inflammatory nature of HIV infection means that HIV in itself might multiply any existing inherent cardiovascular risk. These issues should be regularly assessed, at least to the extent recommended for the general population.

Arguments continue as to the linkage of the main components of the syndrome and indeed as to whether several different, overlapping syndromes may exist. The main components, which may be observed individually or in combination include:

- Dyslipidaemia with raised total cholesterol, low HDL cholesterol and raised triglycerides with increased lipid cycling or turnover
- Insulin resistance with hyperglycaemia, particularly in susceptible individuals
- Visceral, breast and/or local fat accumulation
- Generalized diminution of subcutaneous fat mass possibly with fat cell loss.

In addition, other metabolic and physical changes may be present in individuals on long term antiretroviral therapy including raised serum lactate, low bone mineral density, hypogonadism (and possibly other endocrine abnormalities) and hypertension.

A clinical case definition, based on physician and patient agreement regarding significant and characteristic morphological changes, potentially enabling more homogeneous populations to be studied and comparisons made across intervention studies has been developed [95].

This case definition is of limited value for individual patient assessment and management, because of its lack of specificity, and we do not recommend its routine use in this context.

The estimated prevalence of HIV-associated LPD depends both on the extent of investigation & examination, and also the patient population concerned, particularly in relation to age and antiretroviral use. This is reflected by reported prevalences between 11 and 83% in cross-sectional studies [Carr et al, Lancet 99, Gervasconi et al 99].

12.1.1 Aetiology

Understanding the aetiology of LPD is important but remains speculative. Evidence from cross sectional surveys point to an interaction between HIV disease and/or immune recovery and antiretroviral medication [96], with PIs and nucleoside analogues being implicated [97-99]. Evidence to date suggests these hypotheses to be, at best, incomplete [100, 101]. Patients with the syndrome who have never received PIs [102, 103] or have never received (or have developed the syndrome whilst not receiving) nucleoside analogues [104-106] have been reported, indicating that these agents alone are probably not the sole cause of LPD Mallon P et al AIDS 2003. The highest cumulative prevalence of morphologic abnormalities in these studies appear to be in persons receiving both PIs and nucleoside analogues together, relative to dual or triple nucleoside or nucleoside plus non-nucleoside regimens. As D4T appears to have the highest relative risk of lipoatrophy Mallon AIDS 02, Dube 02, particularly in combination with DDI, its use should generally be restricted to individuals not suitable for alternative agents such as ABC, DDI, and ZDV. The co-administration of D4T and DDI should be especially avoided. Although AZT compares favourably with D4T in terms of the extent of fat atrophy Cherry JAIDS 2005, McComsey AIDS 2005, McComsey Clin Inf Dis 2004, nonetheless it is also closely associated with lipoatrophy Bogner JAIDS 2001, Smith DE AIDS 2002, Martin A AIDS 2004, Maisonneuve Antiviral Ther 2004. Hence, until the situation becomes clearer, the increased likelihood of lipoatrophy mitigates against the choice of AZT as initial therapy (either alone or in combivir). Furthermore, for those already on AZT, consideration should be given to the issue of lipoatrophy, and whether a switch might be indicated. Clearly for many patients the current efficacy and tolerability of their AZT containing combination will weigh towards its continued use. There will be patients, however, for whom the possibility of lipoatrophy causes sufficient anxiety such that they will elect to switch after the issues are discussed with them.

12.1.2 Lipid abnormalities

A large cross sectional study, the DAD study, noted an increase in cholesterol (>6.2 mmol/l) in 27% on regimens including a PI, compared to 23% and 10% respectively for NNRTI and NRTI regimens, and 8% for those naïve to treatment [Fris-Moller AIDS 2003]. The respective values for triglycerides raised above 2.3mmol/l were 40, 32, 23 & 15%. These results must be interpreted with caution. Eg D4T containing regimens are more closely associated with dyslipidaemia than other NRTIs (Gallant JAMA 2004). Most PIs are associated with dyslipidaemia, but there are distinct variations, (Lenhard Thromb Vasc, Periard, Circuln 1999);

Kaletra primarily raises triglycerides, Atazanavir does not significantly perturb any lipid fraction REFS. Switching from a PI associated regimen tends to improve lipid parameters REFS. Insulin resistance is an important, and under-recognised consequence of HIV therapy. Diabetes mellitus, occurred in 7% of patients with fat atrophy or accumulation in one study, which was 14 times commoner than healthy matched controls. Woerle, Diabetes 2003. The mechanisms whereby ART leads to glucose intolerance have been suggested by a number of studies [Galli, JAIDS 2003, Tong, J Clin End 2003, Bastard Lancet 2002, Murata 2000, Rudich 2001, Ben-Romano, 2003, Noor M 2002, Lee 2004]. Interference with the transport of glucose through the cell by inhibition of the GLUT 4 enzyme, is strongly implicated in insulin resistance, but there are several other associated mechanisms that are implicated in addition Bryant NJ et al. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol. 2002 Apr;3(4):267-77. The main drug class that is implicated is the PIs but the NRTIs might also have an indirect affect by promoting changes in fat distribution. Although most PIs are associated with significant glucose intolerance, saquinavir has relatively little effect, and atazanavir appears to have no discernable effect [Noor CROI 2004, Kurowski HIV Med 2003].

12.1.3 Management of Lipodystrophy

Treatment for many of the aspects of LPD lead to disappointing outcomes, therefore prevention is an important goal. Issues for prevention include the following:

- Increased awareness amongst patient and physician and regular assessment.
- Choice of regimens that avoid combining PIs and NRTIs.
- Choice of regimens that favour agents that are less associated with LPD such as tenofovir or ABC rather than those with a stronger association such as the thymidine analogues (especially D4T but also AZT).
- Consideration of early intervention for metabolic changes as these may be harbingers of lipodystrophy
- Dietary advice, possibly dietary supplementation (fibre, omega-3 fatty acids) and exercise.

Possibly also the initiation of therapy before 200 CD4 cells/mm³ and before AIDS is diagnosed.

Benefits for these suggestions are not fully established from randomised clinic trials but are extrapolated from cross-sectional and limited prospective data with their incumbent limitations.

A structured approach needs to be adopted by those looking after patients with HIV, and a summary of our recommendations is given in the algorithm. It is important that all patients are made aware of the potential manifestations of lipodystrophy, especially in terms of body shape changes. In the algorithm, when we refer to CV risk assessment, we include a full lipid profile, including HDL, LDL, fasting glucose and also possibly insulin levels and OGTTs. Once established, the management of lipodystrophy or individual metabolic problems falls into five categories:

- Adequate assessment and follow-up (see management algorithm)
- Lifestyle such as smoking, diet, possibly dietary supplementation and exercise
- Additional therapies, generally focussing on managing individual manifestations
- Modifying the treatment regimen away from D4T (and possibly ZDV) to ABC (and possibly tenofovir)
- Corrective procedures.

The risk versus benefit of these approaches has not been comprehensively tested, although the risk of diet and exercise can be considered minimal. Broadly, dietary advice should include a

Mediterranean diet rich in omega-3 fatty acids, fresh fruit and vegetables. Fibre is known to improve insulin sensitivity. Evidence of benefit for specific food supplements is not established. Regular exercise, a mixture of cardio and weight training may also improve some metabolic parameters and abdominal shape [131].

Individuals switching therapy must consider that they may risk their long-term HIV management in exchange for an uncertain outcome with regard to their lipodystrophy. Specifically benefits in terms of clinically evident lipoatrophy have not been consistently observed in trials and, anecdotally, do not appear evident with even prolonged (>6 months) of treatment interruption. The majority of switch studies that have reported data have focused on switching away from PIs [107]. As mentioned, whilst metabolic benefits are achieved by switching away from PIs to NNRTIs or ABC in many patients, morphological benefits are more limited or absent. Switching away from D4T and possibly ZDV to ABC, tenofovir or to a PI NNRTI regimen (ref CROI) is associated with some gain in fat detectable by DEXA scanning over 24-48 weeks MITOX study ref. It is not known if this recovery of fat is complete or durable. Improvements in metabolic parameters with this switch are not impressive.

Switching away from a PI-NRTI based regimen to a PI-sparing regimen does, however, currently represent the first step in management of metabolic abnormalities when ever feasible. NVP, EFV and ABC perform similarly virologically in treatment naive persons but ABC should be avoided in those with prior NRTI resistance or mono/dual therapy exposure. Additionally, consideration should be given as to whether ABC should be used as an alternative to an NNRTI or PI or to another NRTI. Lipids and insulin sensitivity generally improve with all these approaches; cholesterol improvement may be greatest with ABC although HDL may rise most with NVP (REF).

Switching away from PI-based regimens may be most beneficial with regards to metabolic parameters but is not effective at managing peripheral lipoatrophy. Switching away from thymidine analogues, especially d4T but probably also AZT, to ABC or tenofovir appears the only successful approach in this regard.

12.1.4 Other therapies

Metformin may benefit fat accumulations, insulin resistance and may improve some lipid and coagulability factors(132). Benefits on peripheral lipoatrophy have not been reported(ref). Studies with glitazones are now underway in the US, Australia and the UK. Evidence of their efficacy, increasing fat mass in familial lipodystrophy [133] provides no guarantee of benefit in HIV-associated lipodystrophy. In HIV associated lipodystrophy a small randomized trial of rosiglitazone showed no benefit during short-term follow up, although larger studies are now in progress. Additionally, the safety and potential for pharmacokinetic interactions with these drugs in people with HIV requires clarification before their use can be considered or recommended in persons with HIV, especially those with a hepatitis co-infection [134, 135].

Growth hormone may improve fat management [136] and lead to improvements in appearance of both fat accumulation and lipoatrophy, including facial changes. However its use is likely to be limited by expense and adverse effects including the risk of diabetes mellitus.

Anabolic steroids may be best avoided, due to concerns regarding worsening lipid profiles, fat loss and potential for liver function disturbances, although testosterone replacement for repeatedly hypogonadal and symptomatic men, who are not hypogonadal due to previous anabolic steroid, use may be considered.

The use of statins and fibrates is appropriate for the management of dyslipidemia but no benefits have been described with regards to morphologic changes. The benefits of these agents appear

similar to improvements in cholesterol or triglycerides described in endogenous dyslipidemia [137, 138] although relatively few individuals are reported to have achieved response goals as outlined in NCEP guidelines [139]. Pravastatin is the most well studied agent due to the low likelihood of drug interactions with protease inhibitors. Simvastatin is contraindicated due to substantial risk of drug interactions with PIs and atorvastatin levels may be increased about 2-fold suggesting caution should be used when using this agent. Interactions between statins and NNRTIs have not been described. Interactions with fibrates and PIs or NNRTIs are not expected to be clinically important. Advice from a lipidologist should be sought before combining fibrates and statins.

12.1.5 Corrective procedures for HAART-associated lipoatrophy

Despite switching away from thymidine drugs when possible, restoration of fat in patients with HAART-associated lipoatrophy [LA] is likely to be incomplete and, if severe, often clinically undetectable. There is currently no treatment to reverse fat loss or to generate new fat cells to grow after significant loss caused by HIV treatment. Rates of new onset lipoatrophy are now lower because physicians proactively choose newer drugs that are less likely to cause fat loss and follow guidelines that urge avoidance rather than treatment. Nevertheless this leaves a significant minority of patients with a significantly reduced quality of life, often leading to complicated social problems and withdrawal. Consequently, a range of bioabsorbable and permanent injectable skin fillers and fat/dermal transplants that are used to correct lost tissue mass have been assessed. Bioabsorbable products include hyaluronic acid, collagen, and polylactic acid (NewFill), with polymethylacrylate, silicon and polyalkylamide (Bio-Alcamid) being examples of permanent fillers. Bioabsorbable products have only been evaluated in facial LA. Each filler/implant has its limitations and very limited scientific data exists to support their use. However, polylactic acid has been approved in most industrialised nations in recognition of the importance of this complication and the striking benefits of treatment. This is despite the absence of large comparative trials with long-term follow-up. Whichever technique is used, the training of operators is crucial to safety and success. For permanent fillers and implants, the procedure should only be performed by an accredited plastic surgeon or dermatologist.

In the UK, most experience has been gained with polylactic acid [Sculptra, New-fill] which is offered by several larger HIV centres. PLA is immunologically inert causing only limited inflammatory response. It stimulates dermal fibroblasts to produce collagen leading to thicker skin which persists despite resorption of PLA. Sunken facial areas are built up with multiple small-volume injections spaced fortnightly. There is an immediate mechanical improvement relating to volume of injection but this disappears and is followed by more durable tissue replacement. Following a course of 3-4 injections, the majority of patients have a satisfactory result with thickening of the buccal and temporal tissues which may continue for several months following the final injection.¹⁻¹⁰ The number of treatments required to obtain a successful correction is largely related to the severity of fat loss. Patients with severe wasting can require 6 or more rounds of injections to achieve reasonable results. There are few data on the long-term use of NewFill or specifically on its use in women or dark-skinned men. However after 18-24 months, approximately half the patients need a further injection.⁷ Side effects include mild to moderate pain, post-inflammatory nodules, and occasional bruising. Massage of the injected tissues in the first few days is vital to prevent palpable tissue nodules. Other biodegradable products such as hyaluronic acid and collagen produce similar effects but are less durable and repeated injections are often needed after 3-6 months. The low relative cost of this procedure, the recognition that it is a reparative procedure to reverse treatment related toxicity and the high impact on quality of life has lead to PLA being provided by some health trusts. However, availability and funding for polylactic acid remain major issues for many other patients and physicians.

Transplanting autologous harvested fat cells is more invasive and requires general anaesthesia and hospitalisation, as well as a longer recovery period. Other problems include the absence of suitable fat to transfer, the likelihood that transplanted fat will undergo the same atrophic process

as the original cells, and the higher associated costs. However, in suitable patients results can be very effective¹⁰⁻¹² and at 24 weeks comparable to NewFill.¹⁰ Nevertheless, it is likely to be suitable for only a minority of patients.

Polyalkylamide (Bio-Alcamid) is a permanent filler which has been demonstrated to correct HAART-associated LA without significant side-effects.¹³⁻¹⁴ Its major advantages are that fewer injections are required (1-4), higher volumes can be used, non-facial lipoatrophy can be potentially corrected, and it may be able to be removed in the case of over-filling. Insufficient scientific information exists on Bio-Alcamid to base any guidance on. However, as first occurred with PLA, many patients are accessing private clinics for treatment and patient satisfaction is high. Costs to achieve successful results in severe cases are comparable to or less than using PLA. As severe lipoatrophy is likely to be life-long, a permanent solution for these patients would provide longer-term cost and QoL advantages. There is limited data on other permanent fillers such as polymethylmethacrylate (Artecoll [PMMA]).¹⁵⁻¹⁶ However, in experienced hands, these techniques have demonstrated effective and durable results. Silicone readily migrates and cannot be removed and therefore should not be used.

There is a general concern with permanent fillers that if lipoatrophy continues to worsen the edges of the filler may become visible and if fat mass increases (after switching nucleosides) the permanent filler may over-correct the original defect and become obvious. Non-surgical removal may also not be straightforward. These concerns are greatest for those with mild to moderate fat loss. In the majority of cases of mild facial LA associated with a thymidine-containing combination, a switch to a non-thymidine HAART should be tried before recourse to using any facial filler. Where moderate facial LA exists or in milder disease when ZDV or D4T cannot be switched, PLA is recommended as the facial filler of choice. For patients with severe LA, it is unlikely that PLA will correct the defect durably or completely and Bio-Alcamid may be preferable. Long-term safety data are important, but this should not be used as an obstacle to treatment for patients requiring treatment now. A comparative study between these two agents is needed.

1. Valantina M, Aubron-Oliviera C, Ghosna J, et al. Poly(lactic acid) implants (New-Fill) to correct facial lipoatrophy in HIV-infected patients: results of the open-label study VEGA. *AIDS* 2003, 17:2471–2477
2. Moyle GJ, Lysakova L, Brown S, et al. A randomized open-label study of immediate versus delayed poly(lactic acid) injections for the cosmetic management of facial lipoatrophy in persons with HIV infection *HIV Medicine* (2004), 5, 82–87
3. Boix V. Poly(lactic acid) implants. A new smile for lipoatrophic faces? *AIDS* 2003; 17:2533–2535.
4. Mest DR and Humble G. Safety and efficacy of intradermal poly-L-lactic acid (Sculptra) injections in patients with HIV-associated facial lipoatrophy. 6th International Workshop on Adverse Drug Reactions and Lipodystrophy in HIV, Washington, DC, 2004, Abstract 59
5. Hillebrand ME, Strackee SD, van Ulden BGJ. Treatment of facial lipoatrophy with poly(lactic acid): the PLA-Study. The XIV International AIDS Conference, 2002 Abstract no C10946
6. Lafaurie M, Dolivo J, Boulu D, et al. Treatment of HIV-associated lipoatrophy of the face with intradermal injections of poly(lactic acid). 9th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*, 2005, 38, 393-398.
7. Lafaurie M, Dolivo M, Boulu D, et al. Treatment of facial lipoatrophy with injections of poly(lactic acid) in HIV-infected patients: results from a cohort of 94 patients. 11th CROI 2004, abstract 726
8. FDA report on poly(lactic acid) 2004
9. FDA report on poly(lactic acid) 2004
10. Guaraldi G, Orlando G, De Fazio D, et al. Prospective, partially randomized, 24-week study to compare the efficacy and durability of different surgical techniques and interventions for the treatment of HIV-related facial lipoatrophy. 6th International Workshop on Adverse Drug Reactions and Lipodystrophy in HIV 2004, Washington, DC, abstract 12

11. Guaraldi G, Orlando G, De Fazio D, et al. Autologous fat transfer for the treatment of HIV-related face lipoatrophy: a long follow-up experience. 6th International Workshop on Adverse Drug Reactions and Lipodystrophy in HIV, Washington DC 2004, abstract 87
12. Levan P, Nguyen TH, Lallemand F, et al. Correction of facial lipoatrophy in HIV infected patients on highly active antiretroviral therapy by injection of autologous fatty tissue. AIDS 2002; 16:1985–1987.
13. Protopapa C, Sito G, Caporale D wet al. Bio-Alcamid in druginduced lipodystrophy. J Cosmet Laser Ther 2003; 5:226–230.
14. Casavantes JC and Gottlieb M. Bio-Alcamid, a high-volume injectable prosthesis for facial reconstitution in HIV-related lipoatrophy: report on 100 patients. 6th International Workshop on Adverse Drug Reactions and Lipodystrophy in HIV, Washington, DC, 2004, abstract 60
15. Serra MS and Oyafuso LK. Soft tissue augmentation with polymethymethacrylate (PMMA) for correction of lipodystrophy related body fat atrophy. 6th International Workshop on Adverse Drug Reactions and Lipodystrophy in HIV, Washington, DC, 2004. Abstract 49
16. Oyafuso LKM, Serra MS, Troppe BM. Polymethylmethacrylate (PMMA) for facial atrophy treatment: 5 years follow-up. The XV International AIDS Conference, 2004, abstract no. MoOrB1060

12.1.6 Conclusions

Lipoatrophy is best avoided as it is difficult to treat. Its appearance may be delayed by avoiding D4T and judicious use of ZDV in the initial regimen.

- Insulin resistance should be treated with metformin.
- Abnormal lipid profiles should be treated by switching drugs wherever possible and by the use of both statins and fibrates.
- Exercise and diet may have a modest effect on both body habitus and lipid abnormalities.
- Controlled trial evidence exists for the use of New Fill[®] injections in established lipoatrophy.

12.2 Mitochondrial toxicity and lactic acidosis

The link between NRTIs and mitochondrial damage was first suggested in 1989 in relation to myopathy in patients on ZDV. Subsequently, mitochondrial toxicity has been implicated in a wide range of other NRTI associated toxicities, including neurological disease in infants, peripheral neuropathy, hepatic steatosis and lactic acidosis. The role of mitochondrial toxicity in causing these NRTI associated toxicities has yet to be established in most cases. However, the link for which evidence appears strongest, lactic acidosis, is one with a potentially fatal outcome.

12.2.1 Aetiology of NRTI induced mitochondrial toxicity

NRTIs inhibit gamma DNA polymerase, the enzyme responsible for copying mitochondrial DNA [142]. Inhibitory effects of NRTIs on other enzymes key to normal mitochondrial function have also been described. Evidence to support DNA polymerase inhibition has been shown by studies that demonstrate reduced mitochondrial respiratory chain enzyme complex activity, reduced mitochondrial DNA concentrations, as well as electromyographic changes seen previously with mitochondrial muscle damage [143-145]. Different NRTIs preferentially affect different cell lineages leading to a variety of clinical syndromes. Hence there appears to be an hierarchy for which NRTIs cause DNA polymerase gamma inhibition, with D4T, DDC and DDI causing more inhibition of mitochondrial DNA replication [142, 146] whereas ZDV may inhibit other mitochondrial enzymes [147] and cause more cytotoxicity in some cell lines [148]. Some evidence for this is suggested by the improvement in laboratory findings and clinical features when D4T was switched to ZDV or ABC in patients with symptomatic hyperlactataemia [149]. Mitochondrial toxicity may, however, represent only one mechanism by which NRTIs cause adverse effects

[147]. For example, recent data in volunteers have suggested that within 2 weeks of administering thymidine analogue, mRNA and PPAR- γ are significantly lowered and this is not reversed by rosiglitazone (REF: P Mallon, R Sedwell, G Rogers et al. The effect of rosiglitazone on PPAR γ expression in human adipose tissue is limited by continued exposure to thymidine NRTI, 12th CROI, abstr. 41).

12.2.2 Lactic acidosis and hyperlactataemia

These two terms are not interchangeable. Hyperlactataemia may occur in physiological as well as pathological circumstances and is not necessarily accompanied by changes in blood pH or anion gap. The clinical significance of hyperlactataemia is not established and routine screening of asymptomatic individuals is not currently recommended. Lactic acidosis is always a serious condition requiring immediate withdrawal of antiretroviral therapy and other supportive therapy. Definitions are as follows:

Hyperlactataemia: venous lactate > 2.5–5 mmol/L.

Lactic acidosis: arterial pH <7.35, venous lactate >5 mmol/L.

12.2.2.1 Incidence

Fatal lactic acidosis associated with NRTI use was first reported in 1993 [150]. A review of a heterogeneous group of patients receiving antiretroviral therapy in the 5-year period beginning 1989 showed that the risk of developing lactic acidosis with hepatomegaly and hepatic steatosis was approximately 0.1% per patient per year [151]. More recent estimates are higher, at 1% to 2% per year, particularly if 'symptomatic hyperlactataemia' is included [152-154]. The risk increases with increased weight, and the risk is greater in females [158-159]. The definition of symptomatic hyperlactataemia is unclear and in general has included a range of symptoms also present in persons with consistently normal lactates (e.g. fatigue). Asymptomatic hyperlactataemia may present in up to 16% or more of individuals on therapy and may be intermittent in nature [155, 156]. This compares to a reported incidence of 2% of those not on ART [156]. The duration of the ART is important in some studies, and certainly an exposure of at least several months appears to be the norm for most reported cases [157].

12.2.2.2 Clinical and laboratory features

Hyperlactataemia, defined as between 2 or 2.5 and 5 mmol/L, is often asymptomatic. Intervention is not required but the individual should be carefully monitored with repeat lactate samples taken uncuffed and at rest. If accompanied by symptoms such as nausea, malaise, weight loss, abdominal pain, tender hepatomegaly, worsening of hepatic enzyme abnormalities and/or biochemical changes, therapy should be interrupted.

Clinical features commonly accompany lactate levels of >5 mmol/L. Features of lactic acidosis include weight loss, fatigue, abdominal pain, tender hepatomegaly, respiratory distress and failure. As well as a raised lactate and acidosis and an anion gap that is usually widened (>18 mmol/L), other laboratory features that might be present include raised hepatic aminotransferases, raised creatine kinase, lactate dehydrogenase and amylase [107]. The anion gap is calculated as $[Na^+ + K^+] - [Cl^- + HCO_3^-]$ and should be <12 mmol/L.

Lactic acidosis has been reported in infants of mothers receiving ZDV or ZDV+3TC during pregnancy. Additionally, d4T+ddI has been associated with several reports of lactic acidosis in women who became pregnant while taking these medications. Consideration should be given to monitoring lactate in women receiving antiretroviral therapy during pregnancy.

12.2.3 Management of hyperlactataemia and lactic acidosis

There is currently no rationale for performing routine serum lactate measurements or evidence for the routine use of anion gap or lactate : pyruvate ratios. Instead, it is important to maintain a high index of suspicion for lactic acidosis on the basis of associated symptoms and signs that could justify the measurement of serum lactate.

A clinician's decision to reintroduce NRTIs in patients who have had previous acidosis would justify monitoring serum lactate in those patients. However, there is insufficient evidence to establish whether NRTIs can be safely re-introduced following hyperlactataemia and, if so, for which group of patients.

The management of lactic acidosis is cessation of antiretrovirals (and any other possible contributory agents) and exclusion of other causes. Supportive measures such as ensuring adequate perfusion, providing oxygen or if necessary assisted ventilation, haemodialysis or dichloracetate may also be useful [160]. Components required by the mitochondrial respiratory pathway, such as thiamine [161], riboflavin [162] and co-enzyme Q and carnitine, have been administered without apparent toxicity, but the evidence for their use is anecdotal.

12.2.4 Recommendations for managing lactic acidosis

The recommended minimum requirements for managing lactic acidosis are:

- All patients should be informed of possible signs and symptoms and encouraged to attend an available clinic.
- All clinicians should be fully conversant with the clinical presentations of lactic acidosis and symptomatic hyperlactataemia and have immediate access to means of measuring lactate levels in specified patients.
- All clinicians should be familiar with means of managing lactic acidosis. Identifying symptomatic patients whose current antiretroviral medication should be immediately stopped is of particular importance.

References

- Lichtenstein KA, Ward DJ, Moorman AC, et al. Clinical assessment of HIV-associated lipodystrophy in an ambulatory population. *AIDS* 2001;15:1389-1398.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]
- Bernasconi E, Boubaker K, Junghans C, et al. Abnormalities of body fat distribution in HIV-infected persons treated with antiretroviral drugs: the Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2002;31:50-55.[Medline]
- Miller J, Carr A, Emery S, et al. HIV lipodystrophy: prevalence, severity and correlates of risk in Australia. *HIV Med* 2003;4:293-301.[CrossRef][Medline]
- Carr A, Samaras K, Thorisdottir A, Kaufmann GR, Chisholm DJ, Cooper DA. Diagnosis, prediction, and natural course of HIV-1 protease-inhibitor-associated lipodystrophy, hyperlipidaemia, and diabetes mellitus: a cohort study. *Lancet* 1999;353:2093-2099.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]
- Gervasoni C, Ridolfo AL, Trifiro G, et al. Redistribution of body fat in HIV-infected women undergoing combined antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS* 1999;13:465-471.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]
- Grunfeld C. Basic science and metabolic disturbances. In: Program and abstracts of the XIV International AIDS Conference, Barcelona, Spain, July 7-12, 2002:81. abstract.
- Carr A, Emery S, Law M, Puls R, Lundgren JD, Powderly WG. An objective case

definition of lipodystrophy in HIV-infected adults: a case-control study. *Lancet* 2003;361:726-735.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Carr A, Cooper DA. Lipodystrophy associated with an HIV-protease inhibitor. *N Engl J Med* 1998;339:1296-1296.[Full Text]

Mallon PW, Miller J, Cooper DA, Carr A. Prospective evaluation of the effects of antiretroviral therapy on body composition in HIV-1-infected men starting therapy. *AIDS* 2003;17:971-979.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Dube M, Zackin R, Tebas P, et al. Prospective study of regional body composition in antiretroviral-naive subjects randomized to receive zidovudine + lamivudine or didanosine + stavudine combined with nelfinavir, efavirenz, or both: A5005s, a study of ACTG 384. *Antivir Ther* 2002:L18.

Martinez E, Mocroft A, Garcia-Viejo MA, et al. Risk of lipodystrophy in HIV-1-infected patients treated with protease inhibitors: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet* 2001;357:592-598.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Heath KV, Hogg RS, Singer J, Chan KJ, O'Shaughnessy MV, Montaner JS. Antiretroviral treatment patterns and incident HIV-associated morphologic and lipid abnormalities in a population-based cohort. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2002;30:440-447.[ISI][Medline]

Bastard JP, Caron M, Vidal H, et al. Association between altered expression of adipogenic factor SREBP1 in lipoatrophic adipose tissue from HIV-1-infected patients and abnormal adipocyte differentiation and insulin resistance. *Lancet* 2002;359:1026-1031.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Caron M, Auclair M, Vigouroux C, Glorian M, Forest C, Capeau J. The HIV protease inhibitor indinavir impairs sterol regulatory element-binding protein-1 intranuclear localization, inhibits preadipocyte differentiation, and induces insulin resistance. *Diabetes* 2001;50:1378-1388.[Abstract/Full Text]

Dowell P, Flexner C, Kwiterovich PO, Lane MD. Suppression of preadipocyte differentiation and promotion of adipocyte death by HIV protease inhibitors. *J Biol Chem* 2000;275:41325-41332.[Abstract/Full Text]

Lenhard JM, Furfine ES, Jain RG, et al. HIV protease inhibitors block adipogenesis and increase lipolysis in vitro. *Antiviral Res* 2000;47:121-129.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Caron M, Auclair M, Sterlingot H, Kornprobst M, Capeau J. Some HIV protease inhibitors alter lamin A/C maturation and stability, SREBP-1 nuclear localization and adipocyte differentiation. *AIDS* 2003;17:2437-2444.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Reiss P, Casula M, de Ronde A, Weverling G, Goudsmit J, Lange JM. Greater and more rapid depletion of mitochondrial DNA in blood of patients treated with dual (zidovudine + didanosine or zidovudine + zalcitabine) vs. single (zidovudine) nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors. *HIV Med* 2004;5:11-14.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Nolan D, Hammond E, Martin A, et al. Mitochondrial DNA depletion and morphologic changes in adipocytes associated with nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor therapy. *AIDS* 2003;17:1329-1338.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Pace CS, Martin AM, Hammond EL, Mamotte CD, Nolan DA, Mallal SA. Mitochondrial proliferation, DNA depletion and adipocyte differentiation in subcutaneous adipose tissue of HIV-positive HAART recipients. *Antivir Ther* 2003;8:323-331.[Medline]

Hadigan C, Borgonha S, Rabe J, Young V, Grinspoon S. Increased rates of lipolysis among human immunodeficiency virus-infected men receiving highly active antiretroviral therapy. *Metabolism* 2002;51:1143-1147.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Roche R, Poizot-Martin I, Yazidi CM, et al. Effects of antiretroviral drug combinations on the differentiation of adipocytes. *AIDS* 2002;16:13-20.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Galli M, Veglia F, Angarano G, et al. Gender differences in antiretroviral drug-related adipose tissue alterations: women are at higher risk than men and develop particular lipodystrophy patterns. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2003;34:58-61.[CrossRef][Medline]

Sutinen J, Hakkinen AM, Westerbacka J, et al. Increased fat accumulation in the liver in HIV-infected patients with antiretroviral therapy-associated lipodystrophy. *AIDS* 2002;16:2183-2193.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Gan SK, Samaras K, Thompson CH, et al. Altered myocellular and abdominal fat partitioning predict disturbance in insulin action in HIV protease inhibitor-related lipodystrophy. *Diabetes* 2002;51:3163-3169.

Behrens GM, Boerner AR, Weber K, et al. Impaired glucose phosphorylation and transport in skeletal muscle cause insulin resistance in HIV-1-infected patients with lipodystrophy. *J Clin Invest* 2002;110:1319-1327.

Martin A, Smith DE, Carr A, et al. Reversibility of lipoatrophy in HIV-infected patients 2 years after switching from a thymidine analogue to abacavir: the MITOX Extension Study. *AIDS* 2004;18:1029-1036.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Hadigan C, Meigs JB, Corcoran C, et al. Metabolic abnormalities and cardiovascular disease risk factors in adults with human immunodeficiency virus infection and lipodystrophy. *Clin Infect Dis* 2001;32:130-139.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Friis-Møller N, Weber R, Reiss P, et al. Cardiovascular disease risk factors in HIV patients -- association with antiretroviral therapy: results from the DAD study. *AIDS* 2003;17:1179-1193.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Riddler SA, Smit E, Cole SR, et al. Impact of HIV infection and HAART on serum lipids in men. *JAMA* 2003;289:2978-2982.[Abstract/Full Text]

Grunfeld C, Pang M, Doerrler W, Shigenaga JK, Jensen P, Feingold KR. Lipids, lipoproteins, triglyceride clearance, and cytokines in human immunodeficiency virus infection and the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 1992;74:1045-1052.[Abstract]

Hellerstein MK, Grunfeld C, Wu K, et al. Increased de novo hepatic lipogenesis in human immunodeficiency virus infection. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 1993;76:559-565.[Abstract]

Grunfeld C, Doerrler W, Pang M, Jensen P, Weisgraber KH, Feingold KR. Abnormalities of apolipoprotein E in the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 1997;82:3734-3740.[Abstract/Full Text]

Christeff N, Melchior JC, de Truchis P, Perronne C, Gougeon ML. Increased serum interferon alpha in HIV-1 associated lipodystrophy syndrome. *Eur J Clin Invest* 2002;32:43-50.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Matthews GV, Moyle GJ, Mandalia S, Bower M, Nelson M, Gazzard BG. Absence of association between individual thymidine analogues or nonnucleoside analogues and lipid abnormalities in HIV-1-infected persons on initial therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2000;24:310-315.[ISI][Medline]

Gallant JE, Staszewski S, Pozniak AL, et al. Efficacy and safety of tenofovir DF vs stavudine in combination therapy in antiretroviral-naive patients: a 3-year randomized trial. *JAMA* 2004;292:191-201.[Abstract/Full Text]

van der Valk M, Kastelein JJ, Murphy RL, et al. Nevirapine-containing antiretroviral therapy in HIV-1 infected patients results in an anti-atherogenic lipid profile. *AIDS* 2001;15:2407-2414.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Lenhard JM, Croom DK, Weiel JE, Winegar DA. HIV protease inhibitors stimulate

hepatic triglyceride synthesis. *Arterioscler Thromb Vasc Biol* 2000;20:2625-2629.[Abstract/Full Text]

Murphy RL, Sanne I, Cahn P, et al. Dose-ranging, randomized, clinical trial of atazanavir with lamivudine and stavudine in antiretroviral-naive subjects: 48-week results. *AIDS* 2003;17:2603-2614.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Periard D, Telenti A, Sudre P, et al. Atherogenic dyslipidemia in HIV-infected individuals treated with protease inhibitors: the Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *Circulation* 1999;100:700-705.[Abstract/Full Text]

Schmitz M, Michl GM, Walli R, et al. Alterations of apolipoprotein B metabolism in HIV-infected patients with antiretroviral combination therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2001;26:225-235.[ISI][Medline]

Liang JS, Distler O, Cooper DA, et al. HIV protease inhibitors protect apolipoprotein B from degradation by the proteasome: a potential mechanism for protease inhibitor-induced hyperlipidemia. *Nat Med* 2001;7:1327-1331.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Bonnet E, Ruidavets JB, Tuech J, et al. Apoprotein c-III and E-containing lipoparticles are markedly increased in HIV-infected patients treated with protease inhibitors: association with the development of lipodystrophy. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2001;86:296-302.[Abstract/Full Text]

Brown TT, Cole SR, Li X, et al. Prevalence and incidence of pre-diabetes and diabetes in the Multicenter AIDS Cohort Study. In: *Proceedings of the 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections, San Francisco, February 8–11, 2004*:73. abstract.

Tong Q, Sankale JL, Hadigan CM, et al. Regulation of adiponectin in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients: relationship to body composition and metabolic indices. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2003;88:1559-1564.[Abstract/Full Text]

Murata H, Hruz PW, Mueckler M. The mechanism of insulin resistance caused by HIV protease inhibitor therapy. *J Biol Chem* 2000;275:20251-20254.[Abstract/Full Text]

Rudich A, Vanounou S, Riesenber K, et al. The HIV protease inhibitor nelfinavir induces insulin resistance and increases basal lipolysis in 3T3-L1 adipocytes. *Diabetes* 2001;50:1425-1431.[Abstract/Full Text]

Ben-Romano R, Rudich A, Torok D, et al. Agent and cell-type specificity in the induction of insulin resistance by HIV protease inhibitors. *AIDS* 2003;17:23-32.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Noor MA, Seneviratne T, Aweeka FT, et al. Indinavir acutely inhibits insulin-stimulated glucose disposal in humans: a randomized, placebo-controlled study. *AIDS* 2002;16:F1-F8.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Lee GA, Seneviratne T, Noor MA, et al. The metabolic effects of lopinavir/ritonavir in HIV-negative men. *AIDS* 2004;18:641-649.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Noor MA, Grasela D, Parker RA, et al. The effect of atazanavir vs lopinavir/ritonavir on insulin-stimulated glucose disposal rate in healthy subjects. In: *Proceedings of the 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections, San Francisco, February 8–11, 2004*:702. abstract.

Kurowski M, Sternfeld T, Sawyer A, Hill A, Mocklinghoff C. Pharmacokinetic and tolerability profile of twice-daily saquinavir hard gelatin capsules and saquinavir soft gelatin capsules boosted with ritonavir in healthy volunteers. *HIV Med* 2003;4:94-100.[CrossRef][Medline]

Woerle HJ, Mariuz PR, Meyer C, et al. Mechanisms for the deterioration in glucose tolerance associated with HIV protease inhibitor regimens. *Diabetes* 2003;52:918-925.[Abstract/Full Text]

Bozzette SA, Ake CF, Tam HK, Chang SW, Louis TA. Cardiovascular and

cerebrovascular events in patients treated for human immunodeficiency virus infection. *N Engl J Med* 2003;348:702-710.[Abstract/Full Text]

Klein D, Hurley LB, Quesenberry CP Jr, Sidney S. Do protease inhibitors increase the risk for coronary heart disease in patients with HIV-1 infection? *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2002;30:471-477.[ISI][Medline]

Mary-Krause M, Cotte L, Simon A, Partisani M, Costagliola D. Increased risk of myocardial infarction with duration of protease inhibitor therapy in HIV-infected men. *AIDS* 2003;17:2479-2486.[CrossRef][Medline]

Currier JS, Taylor A, Boyd F, et al. Coronary heart disease in HIV-infected individuals. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2003;33:506-512.[Medline]

The Data Collection on Adverse Events of Anti-HIV Drugs (DAD) Study Group. Combination antiretroviral therapy and the risk of myocardial infarction. *N Engl J Med* 2003;349:1993-2003. [Erratum, *N Engl J Med* 2004;350:955.][Abstract/Full Text]

d'Arminio A, Sabin CA, Phillips AN, et al. Cardio- and cerebrovascular events in HIV-infected persons. *AIDS* 2004;18:1811-1817.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Law MG, D'Arminio Monforte A, Friis-Moller N, et al. Cardio- and cerebrovascular events and predicted rates of myocardial infarction in the D:A:D: study. In: Proceedings of the 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections, San Francisco, February 8–11, 2004:737. abstract.

Wilson PW, D'Agostino RB, Levy D, Belanger AM, Silbershatz H, Kannel WB. Prediction of coronary heart disease using risk factor categories. *Circulation* 1998;97:1837-1847.[Abstract/Full Text]

Stein JH, Klein MA, Bellehumeur JL, et al. Use of human immunodeficiency virus-1 protease inhibitors is associated with atherogenic lipoprotein changes and endothelial dysfunction. *Circulation* 2001;104:257-262.[Abstract/Full Text]

Hsue PY, Lo JC, Franklin A, et al. Progression of atherosclerosis as assessed by carotid intima-media thickness in patients with HIV infection. *Circulation* 2004;109:1603-1608.[Abstract/Full Text]

Koppel K, Bratt G, Schulman S, Bylund H, Sandstrom E. Hypofibrinolytic state in HIV-1-infected patients treated with protease inhibitor-containing highly active antiretroviral therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2002;29:441-449.[ISI][Medline]

Dressman J, Kincer J, Matveev SV, et al. HIV protease inhibitors promote atherosclerotic lesion formation independent of dyslipidemia by increasing CD36-dependent cholesteryl ester accumulation in macrophages. *J Clin Invest* 2003;111:389-397.[Abstract/Full Text]

Henry K, Melroe H, Huebesch J, Hermundson J, Simpson J. Atorvastatin and gemfibrozil for protease-inhibitor-related lipid abnormalities. *Lancet* 1998;352:1031-1032.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Miller J, Brown D, Amin J, et al. A randomized, double-blind study of gemfibrozil for the treatment of protease inhibitor-associated hypertriglyceridaemia. *AIDS* 2002;16:2195-2200.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Moyle GJ, Lloyd M, Reynolds B, Baldwin C, Mandalia S, Gazzard BG. Dietary advice with or without pravastatin for the management of hypercholesterolaemia associated with protease inhibitor therapy. *AIDS* 2001;15:1503-1508.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Calza L, Manfredi R, Chiodo F. Statins and fibrates for the treatment of hyperlipidaemia in HIV-infected patients receiving HAART. *AIDS* 2003;17:851-859.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Martínez E, Arnaiz JA, Podzamczar D, et al. Substitution of nevirapine, efavirenz, or abacavir for protease inhibitors in patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection. *N Engl J Med*

2003;349:1036-1046.[Abstract/Full Text]

Martinez E, Conget I, Lozano L, Casamitjana R, Gatell JM. Reversion of metabolic abnormalities after switching from HIV-1 protease inhibitors to nevirapine. *AIDS* 1999;13:805-810.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Barreiro P, Soriano V, Blanco F, Casimiro C, de la Cruz JJ, Gonzalez-Lahoz J. Risks and benefits of replacing protease inhibitors by nevirapine in HIV-infected subjects under long-term successful triple combination therapy. *AIDS* 2000;14:807-812.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Roubenoff R, Schmitz H, Bairos L, et al. Reduction of abdominal obesity in lipodystrophy associated with human immunodeficiency virus infection by means of diet and exercise: case report and proof of principle. *Clin Infect Dis* 2002;34:390-393.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Jones SP, Doran DA, Leatt PB, Maher B, Pirmohamed M. Short-term exercise training improves body composition and hyperlipidaemia in HIV-positive individuals with lipodystrophy. *AIDS* 2001;15:2049-2051.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Thoni GJ, Fedou C, Brun JF, et al. Reduction of fat accumulation and lipid disorders by individualized light aerobic training in human immunodeficiency virus infected patients with lipodystrophy and/or dyslipidemia. *Diabetes Metab* 2002;28:397-404.[ISI][Medline]

Driscoll SD, Meininger GE, Lareau MT, et al. Effects of exercise training and metformin on body composition and cardiovascular indices in HIV-infected patients. *AIDS* 2004;18:465-473.[ISI][Medline]

Driscoll SD, Meininger GE, Ljungquist K, et al. Differential effects of metformin and exercise on muscle adiposity and metabolic indices in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2004;89:2171-2178.[Abstract/Full Text]

Barrios A, Blanco F, Garcia-Benayas T, et al. Effect of dietary intervention on highly active antiretroviral therapy-related dyslipemia. *AIDS* 2002;16:2079-2081.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Badiou S, Merle De Boever C, Dupuy AM, Baillat V, Cristol JP, Reynes J. Fenofibrate improves the atherogenic lipid profile and enhances LDL resistance to oxidation in HIV-positive adults. *Atherosclerosis* 2004;172:273-279.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Fichtenbaum CJ, Gerber JG, Rosenkranz SL, et al. Pharmacokinetic interactions between protease inhibitors and statins in HIV seronegative volunteers: ACTG Study A5047. *AIDS* 2002;16:569-577.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Hadigan C, Meigs JB, Rabe J, et al. Increased PAI-1 and tPA antigen levels are reduced with metformin therapy in HIV-infected patients with fat redistribution and insulin resistance. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2001;86:939-943.[Abstract/Full Text]

Hadigan C, Corcoran C, Basgoz N, Davis B, Sax P, Grinspoon S. Metformin in the treatment of HIV lipodystrophy syndrome: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2000;284:472-477.[Abstract/Full Text]

Hadigan C, Rabe J, Grinspoon S. Sustained benefits of metformin therapy on markers of cardiovascular risk in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients with fat redistribution and insulin resistance. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2002;87:4611-4615.[Abstract/Full Text]

Saint-Marc T, Touraine JL. Effects of metformin on insulin resistance and central adiposity in patients receiving effective protease inhibitor therapy. *AIDS* 1999;13:1000-1002.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Martinez E, Domingo P, Ribera E, et al. Effects of metformin or gemfibrozil on the lipodystrophy of HIV-infected patients receiving protease inhibitors. *Antivir Ther* 2003;8:403-410.[Medline]

Arioglu E, Duncan-Morin J, Sebring N, et al. Efficacy and safety of troglitazone in the treatment of lipodystrophy syndromes. *Ann Intern Med* 2000;133:263-274.[Abstract/Full Text]

Sutinen J, Hakkinen AM, Westerbacka J, et al. Rosiglitazone in the treatment of HAART-associated lipodystrophy -- a randomized double-blind placebo-controlled study. *Antivir Ther* 2003;8:199-207.[Medline]

Hadigan C, Yawetz S, Thomas A, Havers F, Sax PE, Grinspoon S. Metabolic effects of rosiglitazone in HIV lipodystrophy: a randomized, controlled trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2004;140:786-794.[Abstract/Full Text]

Carr A, Workman C, Carey D, et al. No effect of rosiglitazone for treatment of HIV-1 lipoatrophy: randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet* 2004;363:429-438.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Calmy A, Hirschel B, Hans D, Karsegard VL, Meier CA. Glitazones in lipodystrophy syndrome induced by highly active antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS* 2003;17:770-772.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Gelato MC, Mynarcik DC, Quick JL, et al. Improved insulin sensitivity and body fat distribution in HIV-infected patients treated with rosiglitazone: a pilot study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2002;31:163-170.[Medline]

Engelson ES, Glesby MJ, Mendez D, et al. Effect of recombinant human growth hormone in the treatment of visceral fat accumulation in HIV infection. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2002;30:379-391.[ISI][Medline]

Kotler DP, Muurahainen N, Grunfeld C, et al. Effects of growth hormone on abnormal visceral adipose tissue accumulation and dyslipidemia in HIV-infected patients. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2004;35:239-252.[Medline]

Koutkia P, Canavan B, Breu J, Torriani M, Kissko J, Grinspoon S. Growth hormone-releasing hormone in HIV-infected men with lipodystrophy: a randomized, controlled trial. *JAMA* 2004;292:210-218.[Abstract/Full Text]

Moyle GJ, Lysakova L, Brown S, et al. A randomized open label study of immediate versus delayed poly lactic acid injections for the cosmetic management of facial lipoatrophy in persons with HIV infection. *HIV Med* 2004;5:82-87.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

John M, McKinnon EJ, James IR, et al. Randomized, controlled, 48-week study of switching stavudine and/or protease inhibitors to combivir/abacavir to prevent or reverse lipoatrophy in HIV-infected patients. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2003;33:29-33.[Medline]

Moyle GJ, Baldwin C, Langroudi B, Mandalia S, Gazzard BG. A 48-week, randomized, open-label comparison of three abacavir-based substitution approaches in the management of dyslipidemia and peripheral lipoatrophy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2003;33:22-28.[Medline]

Negredo E, Ribalta J, Paredes R, et al. Reversal of atherogenic lipoprotein profile in HIV-1 infected patients with lipodystrophy after replacing protease inhibitors by nevirapine. *AIDS* 2002;16:1383-1389.[CrossRef][ISI][Medline]

Shlay J, Visnegarwala F, Bartsch GE, et al. Rates of change in body composition among antiretroviral naive HIV-infected patients randomized to a didanosine/stavudine versus abacavir/lamivudine containing regimen in the Flexible Initial Retrovirus Suppressive Therapies (FIRST) Study, CPCRA 058. *Antivir Ther* 2003;8:L12-L12. abstract.

Mallon PW, Miller J, Cooper DA, Carr A. Prospective evaluation of the effects of antiretroviral therapy on body composition in HIV-1-infected men starting therapy. *AIDS*. 2003;17:971-9.

Mallon PW, Carr A, Cooper DA. HIV-associated lipodystrophy: description, pathogenesis, and molecular pathways. *Curr Diab Rep*. 2002;2:116-24. Review.

Friis-Moller N, Weber R, Reiss P, Thiebaut R, Kirk O, d'Arminio Monforte A, Pradier C, Morfeldt L, Mateu S, Law M, El-Sadr W, De Wit S, Sabin CA, Phillips AN, Lundgren JD; DAD study group. Cardiovascular disease risk factors in HIV patients--association with antiretroviral therapy. Results from the DAD study. *AIDS*. 2003;17:1179-93.

Gallant JE, Staszewski S, Pozniak AL, DeJesus E, Suleiman JM, Miller MD, Coakley DF, Lu B, Toole JJ, Cheng AK; 903 Study Group. Efficacy and safety of tenofovir DF vs stavudine in combination therapy in antiretroviral-naive patients: a 3-year randomized trial. *JAMA*. 2004;292:191-201.

Periard D, Telenti A, Sudre P, Cheseaux JJ, Halfon P, Reymond MJ, Marcovina SM, Glauser MP, Nicod P, Darioli R, Mooser V. Atherogenic dyslipidemia in HIV-infected individuals treated with protease inhibitors. The Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *Circulation*. 1999;100:700-5.

Schmitz M, Michl GM, Walli R, Bogner J, Bedynek A, Seidel D, Goebel FD, Demant T. Alterations of apolipoprotein B metabolism in HIV-infected patients with antiretroviral combination therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2001;26:225-35.

Liang JS, Distler O, Cooper DA, Jamil H, Deckelbaum RJ, Ginsberg HN, Sturley SL. HIV protease inhibitors protect apolipoprotein B from degradation by the proteasome: a potential mechanism for protease inhibitor-induced hyperlipidemia. *Nat Med*. 2001;7:1327-31.

Bonnet E, Ruidavets JB, Tuech J, Ferrieres J, Collet X, Fauvel J, Massip P, Perret B. Apoprotein c-III and E-containing lipoparticles are markedly increased in HIV-infected patients treated with protease inhibitors: association with the development of lipodystrophy. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2001;86:296-302.

Galli M, Veglia F, Angarano G, Santambrogio S, Meneghini E, Gritti F, Cargnel A, Mazzotta F, Lazzarin A. Gender differences in antiretroviral drug-related adipose tissue alterations. Women are at higher risk than men and develop particular lipodystrophy patterns. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2003;34:58-61.

Tong Q, Sankale JL, Hadigan CM, Tan G, Rosenberg ES, Kanki PJ, Grinspoon SK, Hotamisligil GS. Regulation of adiponectin in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients: relationship to body composition and metabolic indices. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2003;88:1559-64.

Bastard JP, Caron M, Vidal H, Jan V, Auclair M, Vigouroux C, Lubinski J, Laville M, Maachi M, Girard PM, Rozenbaum W, Levan P, Capeau J. Association between altered expression of adipogenic factor SREBP1 in lipotrophic adipose tissue from HIV-1-infected patients and abnormal adipocyte differentiation and insulin resistance. *Lancet.* 2002;359:1026-31.

Rudich A, Vanounou S, Riesenber K, Porat M, Tirosh A, Harman-Boehm I, Greenberg AS, Schlaeffer F, Bashan N. The HIV protease inhibitor nelfinavir induces insulin resistance and increases basal lipolysis in 3T3-L1 adipocytes. *Diabetes.* 2001;50:1425-31.

Ben-Romano R, Rudich A, Torok D, Vanounou S, Riesenber K, Schlaeffer F, Klip A, Bashan N. Agent and cell-type specificity in the induction of insulin resistance by HIV protease inhibitors. *AIDS.* 2003;17:23-32.

Noor MA, Seneviratne T, Aweeka FT, Lo JC, Schwarz JM, Mulligan K, Schambelan M, Grunfeld C. Indinavir acutely inhibits insulin-stimulated glucose disposal in humans: a randomized, placebo-controlled study. *AIDS.* 2002;16:F1-8.

Lee GA, Seneviratne T, Noor MA, Lo JC, Schwarz JM, Aweeka FT, Mulligan K, Schambelan M, Grunfeld C. The metabolic effects of lopinavir/ritonavir in HIV-negative men. *AIDS.* 2004;18:641-9.

Kurowski M, Sternfeld T, Sawyer A, Hill A, Mocklinghoff C. Pharmacokinetic and tolerability profile of twice-daily saquinavir hard gelatin capsules and saquinavir soft gelatin capsules boosted with ritonavir in healthy volunteers. *HIV Med.* 2003;4:94-100.

Cherry CL, Lal L, Thompson KA, McLean CA, Ross LL, Hernandez J, Wesselingh SL, McComsey G. Increased Adipocyte Apoptosis in Lipoatrophy Improves Within 48 Weeks of Switching Patient Therapy From Stavudine to Abacavir or Zidovudine. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2005 Mar 1;38(3):263-267. PMID: 15735442 [PubMed - as supplied by publisher]

2: McComsey GA, Paulsen DM, Lonergan JT, Hessenthaler SM, Hoppel CL, Williams VC, Fisher RL, Cherry CL, White-Owen C, Thompson KA, Ross ST, Hernandez JE, Ross LL. Improvements in lipoatrophy, mitochondrial DNA levels and fat apoptosis after replacing stavudine with abacavir or zidovudine. *AIDS.* 2005 Jan 3;19(1):15-23. PMID: 15627029 [PubMed - as supplied by publisher]

3: Maisonneuve C, Igoudjil A, Begriche K, Letteron P, Guimont MC, Bastin J, Laigneau JP, Pessayre D, Fromenty B. Effects of zidovudine, stavudine and beta-aminoisobutyric acid on lipid

homeostasis in mice: possible role in human fat wasting.

Antivir Ther. 2004 Oct;9(5):801-10.

PMID: 15535418 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]

4: van der Valk M, Casula M, Weverlingz GJ, van Kuijk K, van Eck-Smit B, Hulsebosch HJ, Nieuwkerk P, van Eeden A, Brinkman K, Lange J, de Ronde A, Reiss P.

Prevalence of lipoatrophy and mitochondrial DNA content of blood and subcutaneous fat in HIV-1-infected patients randomly allocated to zidovudine- or stavudine-based therapy.

Antivir Ther. 2004 Jun;9(3):385-93.

PMID: 15259901 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]

5: Martin A, Smith DE, Carr A, Ringland C, Amin J, Emery S, Hoy J, Workman C, Doong N, Freund J, Cooper DA; Mitochondrial Toxicity Study Group.

Reversibility of lipoatrophy in HIV-infected patients 2 years after switching from a thymidine analogue to abacavir: the MITOX Extension Study.

AIDS. 2004 Apr 30;18(7):1029-36.

PMID: 15096806 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]

6: McComsey GA, Ward DJ, Heshenthaler SM, Sension MG, Shalit P, Lonergan JT, Fisher RL, Williams VC, Hernandez JE; Trial to Assess the Regression of Hyperlactatemia and to Evaluate the Regression of Established Lipodystrophy in HIV-1-Positive Subjects (TARHEEL; ESS40010) Study Team.

Improvement in lipoatrophy associated with highly active antiretroviral therapy in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients switched from stavudine to abacavir or zidovudine: the results of the TARHEEL study.

Clin Infect Dis. 2004 Jan 15;38(2):263-70. Epub 2003 Dec 18.

PMID: 14699460 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]

7: Smith DE, Carr A, Law M, Martin A, Hudson J, Hoy J, Cooper DA.

Thymidine analogue withdrawal for lipoatrophic patients on protease-sparing therapy improves lipoatrophy but compromises antiviral control: the PIILR extension study.

AIDS. 2002 Dec 6;16(18):2489-91. No abstract available.

PMID: 12461429 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]

8: Bogner JR, Vielhauer V, Beckmann RA, Michl G, Wille L, Salzberger B, Goebel FD.

Stavudine versus zidovudine and the development of lipodystrophy.

J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2001 Jul 1;27(3):237-44.

PMID: 11464142 [PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE]

13.0 Treating Patients with Chronic Hepatitis B or C

This section should be read in conjunction with the BHIVA hepatitis B or hepatitis C management guidelines [1,2].

Someone with chronic hepatitis B or C is at risk of progression to cirrhosis and liver cancer and this risk is increased when there is HIV co-infection, with a 25-30% lifetime risk for either complication [3-5]. The mortality rate of dual HIV/HBV or HIV/HCV infected patients is approximately ten times higher than those infected with either infection alone [5,6]. Therefore the

treatment of HBV and HCV is assuming increasing significance as the prognosis of HIV has so dramatically improved.

13.1 Hepatitis B

There are three licensed antiretrovirals which also have significant anti-HBV activity: lamivudine (3TC), emtricitabine (FTC) and tenofovir. All are very effective at suppressing HBV-DNA and normalising the aminotransferase levels when used in the long term but HBeAg to anti-Hbe seroconversion is less likely than in HIV-negative patients. The main problem with 3TC and FTC is acquired resistance in the HBV (7,8). Tenofovir resistance seems to be less common, although experience in treating HBV with this drug is still quite short (9). Early experience of combining tenofovir with 3TC shows that this is effective in the short term (up to 2 years) at reducing HBV-DNA, normalising aminotransferase levels and inducing HBeAg seroconversion (10,11). Current evidence also suggests that 3TC resistance is reduced when given in combination with tenofovir, with no tenofovir resistance in the small number of patients reported (10,11).

13.2 Hepatitis C

Three large multicentre trials have shown that cure is possible for chronic hepatitis C in HIV-positive patients when treated with pegylated interferon and ribavirin for up to 12 months. Sustained response rates were 11-29% for genotype 1 and 43-73% for non-type 1 genotypes (usually 2 or 3) (12-14). Other factors influencing response include the CD4 count, HCV viral load and presence/absence of cirrhosis. The decision to treat is based largely on the degree of liver damage (based on the Ishak score of histology), especially for those with genotype 1. There is an argument for treating those with genotypes 2/3 irrespective of the liver histology (except cirrhosis) as the response is quite good. Treatment is best given at a high CD4 count, preferably before ART has been commenced. If the patient meets the criteria for ART then this should be given and the patient stabilised on this before anti-HCV therapy is considered. Ideally the CD4 count should have risen to >200 cells/mm³ before anti-HCV therapy is commenced. Because of significant interactions with ribavirin, the following antiretrovirals should be avoided: zidovudine (anaemia); didanosine or stavudine/didanosine (lactic acidosis) (15-17).

13.3 Avoiding antiretroviral hepatotoxicity

All antiretrovirals have a potential to cause acute and long-term hepatotoxicity and this risk is increased 2-3 fold in the presence of chronic liver disease such as that due to hepatitis B or C. Patients should be carefully monitored for hepatotoxicity when HAART is commenced or changed. There is some evidence that nevirapine and high dose ritonavir (1000 mg/day) increase the incidence of severe acute hepatotoxicity (18,19) and nevirapine may also be linked to increased liver fibrosis (20). High dose ritonavir is no longer recommended in HAART and low-dose ritonavir (in doses used to boost other PIs) is not associated with significant liver problems. Until further information is available, it is recommended that nevirapine is only used where necessary in HIV/hepatitis co-infected individuals.

13.4 Recommendations

- All patients who are HBeAg positive or HBV-DNA positive $>10^4$ genome equivalents/ml should be treated, as should those with cirrhosis positive for HBV-DNA at any level.
- All patients who require anti-retroviral and anti-HBV therapy should receive tenofovir or tenofovir plus 3TC or FTC as part of the regimen. 3TC or FTC should not be used alone or in combination with each other. If showing continuing anti-HBV activity, tenofovir

and 3TC/FTC should not be stopped when changing the anti-retroviral regimen because of HIV-resistance. This therefore may mean adding three further anti-retroviral agents.

- Consideration should be given to treating (as above) other HBsAg-positive patients who do not meet the treatment criteria, as a means of preventing future disease relapse or progression.
- All patients with chronic hepatitis C should be assessed for treatment with pegylated interferon and ribavirin. Ideally anti-HCV therapy should be given before ART is commenced and when there is a high CD4 count.
- If ART needs to be started then avoid zidovudine, didanosine and stavudine/didanosine combination in any patient who is going to be commenced on anti-HCV therapy.
- Nevirapine and high dose ritonavir (>1000mg/day) should be avoided if possible in all patients with liver disease including chronic HBV and HCV.

References

1. Brook MG, Gilson, R, Wilkins E and the BHIVA Hepatitis Guidelines Writing Committee. BHIVA Guidelines: HIV and Chronic Hepatitis. Co-Infection with HIV and Hepatitis B Virus Infection. www.bhiva.org
2. Nelson M, Matthews G, Brook MG and the BHIVA Hepatitis Guidelines Writing Committee. BHIVA Guidelines: HIV and Chronic Hepatitis. Co-Infection with HIV and Hepatitis C Virus Infection. www.bhiva.org.
3. Rockstroh J, Konopnicki D, Soriano V et al. Hepatitis B and Hepatitis C in the EuroSIDA cohort: prevalence and effect on mortality, AIDS progression and response to HAART. 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. San Francisco 2004 Abstract 799
4. Lok A. Chronic hepatitis B. *N Engl J Med* 2002; 346: 1682-1683.
5. Rosenthal E, Poirée M, Pradier C et al. Mortality due to hepatitis C-related liver disease in HIV-infected patients in France (Mortavic 2001 study). *AIDS* 2003;17:1803-9
6. Thio C, Seaberg EC, Skolasky R et al. HIV-1, hepatitis B virus, and risk of liver-related mortality in the Multicenter Cohort Study (MACS). *Lancet* 2002;360:1921-6
7. Benhamou Y, Bochet M, Thibault V. Long-term incidence of hepatitis B virus resistance to lamivudine in HIV-infected patients. *Hepatology* 1999; 30: 1302-1306.
8. Gish R, Leung N, Wang C, et al. Resistance to emtricitabine may develop less frequently than to lamivudine. 53rd AASLD, Boston 2002 abstract 838.
9. Nelson M, Porstmouth S, Stebbing J. An open-label study of tenofovir in HIV-1 and hepatitis B virus coinfecting individuals. *AIDS* 2003; 17: F7-F10.
10. Bani-Sadr F, Palmer P, Scieux C, Molina JM. Ninety-six week efficacy of combination therapy with lamivudine and tenofovir in patients coinfecting with HIV-1 and wild type hepatitis B virus. *Clin Infect Dis* 2004; 39: 1062-1064.
11. Dore GJ, Cooper DA, Pozniak A et al. Efficacy of tenofovir disoproxil fumarate in antiretroviral therapy-naïve and -experienced patients coinfecting with HIV-1 and hepatitis B virus. *J Infect Dis* 2004;189:1185-92
12. Torriani FJ, Rodriguez-Torres M, Rockstroh JK et al. Peginterferon Alfa-2a plus ribavirin for chronic hepatitis C virus infection in HIV-infected patients. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:438-50
13. Carrat F, Bani-Sadr, Pol S et al. Pegylated interferon alfa-2b vs standard interferon alfa-2b, plus ribavirin, for chronic hepatitis C in HIV-infected patients: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2004;292:2839-48.
14. Chung R, Anderson J, Volberding P et al. Peginterferon Alfa-2a plus ribavirin versus interferon alfa-2a plus ribavirin for chronic hepatitis C in HIV-coinfecting persons. *N Engl J Med* 2004;351:451-9
15. Lefeuvre A, Hittinger G, Chapadaud S. Increased mitochondrial toxicity with ribavirin in HIV/HCV coinfection. *Lancet* 2001;357:280-281.
16. Kakuda T, Brinkman K. Mitochondrial toxic effects of ribavirin. *Lancet* 2001;357:1802-1803.

17. Montes RML, Rodríguez ZM. Report of three cases of hyperlactacidemia/lactic acidosis after treatment of hepatitis C with pegylated interferon and ribavirin in HIV coinfecting patients. *Rev Clin Esp* 2002;202:543-5
18. Sulkowski MS, Thomas D, Chaisson RE, et al. Hepatotoxicity associated with antiretroviral therapy in adults infected with Human Immunodeficiency Virus and the role of Hepatitis B or C infection. *JAMA* 2000;283:74-80.
19. Gonzalez de Requena D, Nunez M, Jimenez-Nacher I, et al. Liver toxicity due to nevirapine. *AIDS* 2002;16:290-291.
20. Macías J, Castellano V, Merchante N et al. Effect of antiretroviral drugs on liver fibrosis in HIV-infected patients with chronic hepatitis C: harmful impact of nevirapine. *AIDS* 2004;18:767-74