Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in Adults and Adolescents with HIV

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Visit the AIDS*info* website to access the most up-to-date guideline.

Register for e-mail notification of guideline updates at https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/e-news.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in Adults and Adolescents with HIV

Developed by the DHHS Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents – A Working Group of the Office of AIDS Research Advisory Council (OARAC)

How to Cite the Adult and Adolescent Guidelines:

Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents. Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in Adults and Adolescents with HIV. Department of Health and Human Services. Available at http://www.aidsinfo.nih.gov/ContentFiles/AdultandAdolescentGL.pdf. Accessed [insert date] [insert page number, table number, etc. if applicable]

It is emphasized that concepts relevant to HIV management evolve rapidly. The Panel has a mechanism to update recommendations on a regular basis, and the most recent information is available on the AIDS*info* Web site (http://aidsinfo.nih.gov).

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

What's New in the Guidelines? (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Antiretroviral Therapy to Prevent Sexual Transmission of HIV (Treatment as Prevention)

Clinical trials have shown that using effective antiretroviral therapy (ART) to consistently suppress plasma HIV RNA levels to <200 copies/mL prevents transmission of HIV to sexual partners. When ART is used to prevent HIV transmission, this strategy is called treatment as prevention (TasP), commonly known as Undetectable = Untransmittable or U=U.

The Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents (the Panel) has added a new section to help providers integrate TasP into their clinical practice. The key recommendations include:

- Providers should inform persons with HIV that maintaining HIV RNA levels <200 copies/mL with ART prevents HIV transmission to sexual partners **(AII)**.
- Persons starting ART should use another form of prevention with sexual partners for at least the first 6 months of treatment and until an HIV RNA level of <200 copies/mL has been documented **(AII)**. Many experts recommend confirming sustained suppression before assuming that there is no risk of sexual HIV transmission **(AIII)**.
- Persons with HIV who rely on ART for prevention need to maintain high levels of ART adherence **(AIII)**. They should be informed that transmission is possible during periods of poor adherence or treatment interruption **(AIII)**.
- Providers should inform patients that maintaining an HIV RNA level of <200 copies/mL does not prevent acquisition or transmission of other sexually transmitted infections **(AII)**.

Dolutegravir Recommendations for Individuals of Childbearing Potential

The latest data on neural tube defects (NTDs) in infants born to women who received dolutegravir (DTG) around the time of conception have shown that the prevalence of NTDs is lower than initially reported (the rate has been reduced from 0.9% to 0.3%). However, this rate is still higher than the rate reported for infants born to individuals who received ART that did not contain DTG (0.1%).

In the previous version of the guidelines, the Panel did not recommend the use of DTG in persons who are pregnant and within 12 weeks post-conception or persons of childbearing potential who are planning to become pregnant or who are sexually active and not using effective contraception. Based on the new data, the Panel has revised these recommendations:

- Providers should discuss the benefits of using DTG and the risk of NTDs with the person of childbearing potential, to allow the person to make informed decisions about care.
- DTG may be used as an alternative antiretroviral (ARV) drug for individuals who are of childbearing potential and trying to conceive **(BII)** and those who are sexually active and not using contraception **(BII)**.
- For individuals who are using effective contraception, DTG may be used as a recommended option **(AII)**.
- Providers should refer to the Perinatal Guidelines for recommendations on the use of DTG during pregnancy.

More detailed recommendations on the use of DTG and other integrase strand transfer inhibitors (INSTIs) in persons of childbearing potential can be found in Table 6b, as well as in different sections of the guidelines where DTG is discussed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Laboratory Testing for Initial Assessment and Monitoring of People with HIV Receiving Antiretroviral Therapy

The Panel previously recommended monitoring fasting lipid profile and fasting glucose before and after initiation of ART. The new recommendation allows for random (nonfasting) tests, in accordance with recommendations from the recently published blood cholesterol and diabetes management guidelines.

Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy

The Panel emphasizes the importance of screening and early diagnosis of HIV. In order for persons with HIV to benefit from early diagnosis, the Panel recommends that ART be started immediately or as soon as possible after diagnosis to increase the uptake of ART, decrease the time required to achieve linkage to care and virologic suppression for individual patients, reduce the risk of HIV transmission, and improve the rate of virologic suppression among persons with HIV **(AII)**.

What to Start

Based on the results of two large, randomized controlled trials that showed that a two-drug regimen of DTG plus lamivudine (DTG/3TC) was noninferior to DTG plus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF)/emtricitabine (FTC), the Panel has added DTG/3TC to the list of *Recommended Initial Regimens for Most People with HIV*, **except for individuals**:

- With pre-treatment HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL;
- Who are known to have active hepatitis B virus (HBV) coinfection; *or*
- Who will initiate ART before results of HIV genotype testing for reverse transcriptase or HBV testing are available.

Table 6b has been updated with revised recommendations on the use of DTG in individuals of childbearing potential.

Current data on the possible association between weight gain and the use of INSTIs and tenofovir alafenamide (TAF) are reviewed in the sections on INSTIs and nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors.

Optimizing Antiretroviral Therapy in the Setting of Virologic Suppression

This section has been updated with new clinical trial data from switch studies that were published or presented since the last revision.

The Panel emphasizes the importance of reviewing a patient's ART history and recognizing any past instances of treatment failure and drug resistance when selecting a new ART regimen. The Panel also emphasizes that using two-drug ART regimens is not recommended for persons with active HBV coinfection.

Acute and Recent (Early) HIV Infection

This section has been updated to emphasize the importance of initiating ART as soon as possible after diagnosis of acute and recent HIV infection **(AII)**.

Bictegravir/TAF/FTC has been added as a treatment option for persons with acute or recent HIV infection in cases where ART will be initiated before genotypic drug resistance testing results are available **(AIII)**.

HIV and the Older Person

This section has been updated with new data related to older persons with HIV. These updates focus on:

- The need to identify individuals who are at risk of HIV and the need for early diagnosis;

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

- The impact of age on HIV disease progression and the increase in age-related comorbidities; *and*
- The importance of initiating ART while being aware of the complexities of management in older persons with HIV due to polypharmacy and the potential for drug-drug interactions.

The Panel emphasizes the importance of recognizing and managing HIV-associated neurocognitive disorder (HAND), which may be associated with reduced ART adherence and poorer overall health outcomes. The Panel also recognizes that mental health disorders in older persons with HIV is a growing concern; screening for depression and management of depression are critical components of care for these patients.

Tuberculosis/HIV Coinfection

This section has been updated with newly published data on short-course regimens in the treatment of latent tuberculosis infection and new drug-drug interaction data for ARV drugs and rifampin and rifapentine.

Cost Considerations and Antiretroviral Therapy

Key updates to this section include:

- An overview of the individual and societal costs of HIV care in the United States.
- A new sub-section on cost sharing that describes how varying cost-containment practices may impact the out-of-pocket payments for patients with Medicaid, Medicare, and Ryan White (AIDS Drug Assistance Program) coverage. To help clinicians to better understand the different ART-related pricing systems in the United States, a new table entitled Table 19a. Insurance and Health Program Prescription Drug Pricing and Access was created.
- A revised discussion of ARV drug costs that highlights the increased cost of brand-name drugs and the impact that anticipated commercialization of additional generic-based regimens will have on the cost of ART.
- An updated discussion of the economic value of several HIV-specific laboratory tests.

Table Updates

The following tables have been updated using data that has become available since the last revision:

- Tables 17 and 18 in Adverse Effects of Antiretroviral Agents
- Drug-Drug Interactions Tables 21a-e, 22a, and 22b
- Appendix B: Drug Characteristics Tables

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table of Contents

What's New in the Guidelines i

Panel Roster viii

Financial Disclosure x

Introduction A-1

Table 1. Outline of the Guidelines Development Process A-2

Table 2. Rating Scheme for Recommendations A-3

Baseline Evaluation B-1

Laboratory Testing C-1

Laboratory Testing for Initial Assessment and Monitoring of Patients with HIV Receiving Antiretroviral Therapy C-1

Table 3. Laboratory Testing Schedule for Monitoring Patients with HIV Before and After Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy C-2

Plasma HIV-1 RNA (Viral Load) and CD4 Count Monitoring C-6

Table 4. Recommendations on the Indications and Frequency of Viral Load and CD4 Count Monitoring C-9

Drug-Resistance Testing C-12

Table 5. Recommendations for Using Drug-Resistance Assays C-17

Co-Receptor Tropism Assays C-22

HLA-B*5701 Screening C-26

Treatment Goals D-1

Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy E-1

Antiretroviral Therapy to Prevent Sexual Transmission of HIV (Treatment as Prevention) F-1

What to Start G-1

Table 6a. Recommended Antiretroviral Regimens for Initial Therapy G-4

Table 6b. Considerations Before Initiating Dolutegravir and Other Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors as Initial Therapy G-5

Table 7. Antiretroviral Regimen Considerations as Initial Therapy based on Specific Clinical Scenarios G-9

Table 8a. Characteristics of Dual-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor Options Recommended for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients G-13

Table 8b. Characteristics of Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors That Are Recommended for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients G-20

Table 8c. Characteristics of Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors that are Recommended for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients G-28

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 8d. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitor Options that are Recommended for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients G-34

Table 9. Advantages and Disadvantages of Antiretroviral Components Recommended as Initial Antiretroviral Therapy G-40

Table 10. Antiretroviral Components or Regimens Not Recommended as Initial Therapy G-45

What Not to Use H-1

Management of the Treatment-Experienced Patient I-1

Virologic Failure I-1

Table 11. Antiretroviral Options for Patients with Virologic Failure I-10

Poor CD4 Cell Recovery and Persistent Inflammation Despite Viral Suppression I-17

Optimizing Antiretroviral Therapy in the Setting of Virologic Suppression I-22

Discontinuation or Interruption of Antiretroviral Therapy I-33

Considerations for Antiretroviral Use in Special Patient Populations J-1

Acute and Recent (Early) HIV J-1

Table 12. Identifying, Diagnosing, and Treating Acute and Recent HIV-1 Infection J-5

Adolescents and Young Adults with HIV J-9

HIV-2 Infection J-17

HIV and the Older Person J-23

Substance Use Disorders and HIV J-37

Table 13. Medications for Treatment of Substance Use Disorders J-46

Transgender People with HIV J-54

Table 14. Potential Interactions Between the Drugs Used in Gender-Affirming Hormone Therapy and Antiretroviral Drugs J-57

Women with HIV J-64

Considerations for Antiretroviral Use in Patients with Coinfections K-1

Hepatitis B/HIV Coinfection K-1

Hepatitis C/HIV Coinfection K-6

Table 15. Concomitant Use of Selected Antiretroviral Drugs and Hepatitis C Virus Direct-Acting Antiviral Drugs for Treatment of HCV in Adults with HIV K-9

Tuberculosis/HIV Coinfection K-14

Limitations to Treatment Safety and Efficacy L-1

Adherence to the Continuum of Care L-1

Table 16. Strategies to Improve Linkage to Care, Retention in Care, Adherence to Appointments, and Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy L-7

Adverse Effects of Antiretroviral Agents L-14

Table 17. Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects Associated with Antiretroviral Therapy L-15

Table 18. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Adverse Events That Can Be Managed with Substitution of Alternative Antiretroviral Agent L-21

Cost Considerations and Antiretroviral Therapy L-24

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 19a. Insurance and Health Program Prescription Drug Pricing and Access L-27
Table 19b. Monthly Average Prices of Commonly Used Antiretroviral Drugs L-29

Drug-Drug Interactions M-1
Table 20. Mechanisms of Antiretroviral-Associated Drug Interactions M-3
Table 21a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs M-5
Table 21b. Drug Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs M-24
Table 21c. Drug Interactions between Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) M-36
Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs . M-39
Table 21e. Drug Interactions between CCR5 Antagonist (Maraviroc) and Other Drugs (including Antiretroviral Agents) M-56
Table 22a. Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Protease Inhibitors M-59
Table 22b. Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors or Protease Inhibitors M-61

Conclusion N-1

Appendix A: Key to Acronyms O-1

Appendix B: Drug Characteristics Tables P-1
Appendix B, Table 1. Coformulated Single-Tablet Regimens P-1
Appendix B, Table 2. Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor-Based, Fixed-Dose Combination Tablets for Use as Part of an Antiretroviral Regimen P-2
Appendix B, Table 3. Characteristics of NRTIs P-3
Appendix B, Table 4. Characteristics of NNRTIs P-7
Appendix B, Table 5. Characteristics of PIs P-9
Appendix B, Table 6. Characteristics of INSTIs P-13
Appendix B, Table 7. Characteristics of the Fusion Inhibitor P-14
Appendix B, Table 8. Characteristics of the CCR5 Antagonist P-15
Appendix B, Table 9. Characteristics of the CD4 Post-Attachment Inhibitor P-15
Appendix B, Table 10. Antitretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Persons with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency P-16

List of Tables

Table 1. Outline of the Guidelines Development Process A-2
Table 2. Rating Scheme for Recommendations A-3
Table 3. Laboratory Testing Schedule for Monitoring Patients with HIV Before and After Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy C-2
Table 4. Recommendations on the Indications and Frequency of Viral Load and CD4 Count Monitoring C-9
Table 5. Recommendations for Using Drug-Resistance Assays C-17

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 6a. Recommended Antiretroviral Regimens for Initial Therapy G-4
Table 6b. Considerations Before Initiating Dolutegravir and Other Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors as Initial Therapy G-5
Table 7. Antiretroviral Regimen Considerations as Initial Therapy based on Specific Clinical Scenarios G-9
Table 8a. Characteristics of Dual-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor Options Recommended for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients G-13
Table 8b. Characteristics of Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors That Are Recommended for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients G-20
Table 8c. Characteristics of Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors that are Recommended for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients G-28
Table 8d. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitor Options that are Recommended for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients G-34
Table 9. Advantages and Disadvantages of Antiretroviral Components Recommended as Initial Antiretroviral Therapy G-40
Table 10. Antiretroviral Components or Regimens Not Recommended as Initial Therapy G-45
Table 11. Antiretroviral Options for Patients with Virologic Failure I-10
Table 12. Identifying, Diagnosing, and Treating Acute and Recent HIV-1 Infection J-5
Table 13. Medications for Treatment of Substance Use Disorders J-46
Table 14. Potential Interactions between Drugs Used in Gender-Affirming Hormone Therapy and ARV Drugs J-57
Table 15. Concomitant Use of Selected Antiretroviral Drugs and Hepatitis C Virus Direct-Acting Antiviral Drugs for Treatment of HCV in Adults with HIV K-9
Table 16. Strategies to Improve Linkage to Care, Retention in Care, Adherence to Appointments, and Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy L-7
Table 17. Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects Associated with Antiretroviral Therapy L-15
Table 18. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Adverse Events That Can Be Managed with Substitution of Alternative Antiretroviral Agent L-21
Table 19a. Insurance and Health Program Prescription Drug Pricing and Access L-27
Table 19b. Monthly Average Prices of Commonly Used Antiretroviral Drugs L-29
Table 20. Mechanisms of Antiretroviral-Associated Drug Interactions M-3
Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs M-5
Table 21b. Drug Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs M-24
Table 21c. Drug Interactions between Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) M-36
Table 21d. Drug Interactions between Integrase Inhibitors and Other Drugs M-39
Table 21e. Drug Interactions between CCR5 Antagonist (Maraviroc) and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) M-56
Table 22a. Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Protease Inhibitors M-59
Table 22b. Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors or Protease Inhibitors M-61

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents Panel Members and Consultants (Last updated July 10, 2019; last reviewed July 10, 2019)

These guidelines were developed by the Department of Health and Human Services Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents (a working group of the Office of AIDS Research Advisory Council).

Panel Co-Chairs

Roy M. Gulick	Weill Cornell Medicine, New York, NY
H. Clifford Lane	National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD

Executive Secretary

Alice K. Pau	National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD

Scientific Members

Judith Aberg	Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY
Adaora Adimora	University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, NC
Allison Agwu	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD
Jason Baker	Hennepin Healthcare & University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN
Curt Beckwith	Alpert School of Medicine, Brown University, Providence, RI
Roger Bedimo	University of Texas Southwestern & VA North Texas Health Care System, Dallas, TX
R. Douglas Bruce	Cornell Scott Hill Health Center, New Haven, CT
Geetanjali Chander	Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD
Jennifer Cocohoba	University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
Susan Cu-Uvin	Alpert School of Medicine, Brown University, Providence, RI
Eric Daar	Harbor-UCLA Medical Center, Torrance, CA
Rajesh Gandhi	Massachusetts General Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
Edward Gardner	Denver Public Health & University of Colorado, Denver, CO
Thomas Giordano	Baylor College of Medicine & Michael E. DeBakey VA Medical Center Houston, TX
David Glidden	University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
Linda Gorgos	Southwest CARE Center, Santa Fe, NM
Birgit Grund	University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN
Peter Hunt	University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
Emily Hyle	Massachusetts General Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
Steven Johnson	University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO
Rami Kantor	Alpert School of Medicine, Brown University, Providence, RI
Marla J. Keller	Albert Einstein College of Medicine & Montefiore Medical Center, Bronx, NY
Arthur Kim	Massachusetts General Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
Michael Kozal	Yale School of Medicine & VA Connecticut Healthcare System, New Haven, CT
Jeffrey Lennox	Emory University, Atlanta, GA

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Susan Little	University of Californa San Diego, San Diego, CA
Susanna Naggie	Duke University, Durham, NC
Tonia Poteat	University of North Carolina School of Medicine, Chapel Hill, NC
Asa Radix	Callen-Lorde Community Health Center, New York, NY
James Raper	University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL
Daniel Reirden	University of Colorado & Children's Hospital, Colorado, Aurora, CO
Kimberly Scarsi	University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE
Serena Spudich	Yale School of Medicine, New Haven, CT
Susan Swindells	University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE
Pablo Tebas	University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA
Melanie Thompson	AIDS Research Consortium of Atlanta, Atlanta, GA
Phyllis Tien	University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
Rochelle Walensky	Massachusetts General Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA

Community Members

Danielle Campbell	Los Angeles Women's HIV/AIDS Task Force, Los Angeles, CA
David Evans	Project Inform, Pasadena, CA
Tim Horn	National Alliance of State and Territorial AIDS Directors, Washington, DC
Andy Kaytes	AIDS Treatment Activists Coalition, San Diego, CA
Steven Vargas	Association for the Advancement of Mexican Americans, Houston, TX

Members Representing Department of Health and Human Services Agencies

John T. Brooks	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA
Laura Cheever	Health Resources and Services Administration, Rockville, MD
Henry Masur	National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD
Virginia Sheikh	Food and Drug Administration, Silver Spring, MD
Kimberly Struble	Food and Drug Administration, Silver Spring, MD

Non-Voting Observers

Nahida Chakhtoura	National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD
Rohan Hazra	National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD
Safia Kuriakose	Leidos Biomedical Research, Inc., in support of National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Frederick, MD

Consultant for HIV-2 Infection

Geoffrey Gottlieb	University of Washington, Seattle, WA

Consultants for Pharmacology

Sarita Boyd	Food and Drug Administration, Silver Spring, MD
Safia Kuriakose	Leidos Biomedical Research, Inc., in support of National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Frederick, MD

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Health and Human Services Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents Financial Disclosure for Companies Related to HIV Treatment or Diagnostics (Reporting Period: February 1, 2019, to January 31, 2020) (page 1 of 3)

Member	Status	Financial Disclosure	
		Company	Relationship
Judith Aberg	M	Frontier Biotechnologies	Research Support
		Gilead Sciences	Research Support
		GlaxoSmithKline	Advisory Board, Research Support
		Janssen Pharmaceutica	Advisory Board
		Medicure, Inc.	Consultant
		Merck & Co.	Advisory Board
		Theratechnologies	Advisory Board
		ViiV Healthcare	Advisory Board, Research Support
Adaora Adimora	M	Gilead Sciences	Consultant, Research Support
		Merck & Co.	Advisory Board
		ViiV Healthcare	Consultant
Allison Agwu	M	Gilead Sciences	Advisory Board
		Merck & Co.	Advisory Board, Consultant
		Theratechnologies	Advisory Board
Jason Baker	M	None	N/A
Curt Beckwith	M	Gilead Sciences	Research Support
Roger Bedimo	M	Gilead Sciences	Advisory Board
		Merck & Co.	Advisory Board, Research Support
		ViiV Healthcare	Advisory Board, Research Support
John T. Brooks	M	None	N/A
R. Douglas Bruce	M	None	N/A
Danielle Campbell	M	ViiV Healthcare	Travel Support for attendance at a Community Summit
Geetanjali Chander	M	None	N/A
Laura Cheever	M	None	N/A
Jennifer Cocohoba	M	Genentech	Supports the University of California San Francisco Pharmacy Fellowship program in Clinical Drug Development in Oncology; Dr. Cocohoba receives salary support for being the co-director of this program.
Susan Cu-Uvin	M	None	N/A
Eric Daar	M	Genentech	Consultant
		Gilead Sciences	Consultant, Research Support
		Merck & Co.	Research Support
		ViiV Healthcare	Consultant, Research Support
David Evans	M	Gilead Sciences	Advisory Board, Travel Support
		Merck & Co.	Travel Support
Rajesh Gandhi	M	Gilead Sciences	Advisory Board
Edward Gardner	M	Cepheid, Inc	Research Support
		Gilead Sciences	Research Support
Thomas Giordano	M	None	N/A
David Glidden	M	Gilead Sciences	Consultant
		Merck & Co.	Advisory Board

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Health and Human Services Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents Financial Disclosure for Companies Related to HIV Treatment or Diagnostics (Reporting Period: February 1, 2019, to January 31, 2020) (page 2 of 3)

Member	Status	Financial Disclosure	
		Company	Relationship
Linda Gorgos	M	AbbVie	Research Support
		Gilead Sciences	Research Support
		Merck & Co.	Research Support
		Proteus Digital Health	Research Support
		Janssen Pharmaceutica	Research Support
Birgit Grund	M	None	N/A
Roy M. Gulick	C	None	N/A
Tim Horn	M	None	N/A
Peter Hunt	M	Biotron Limited	Advisory Board
		Gilead Sciences	Honoraria, Research Support
		Janssen Pharmaceutica	Honoraria
		Merck & Co.	Travel Support
Emily Hyle	M	None	N/A
Steven Johnson	M	ViiV Healthcare	Advisory Board
Rami Kantor	M	None	N/A
Andy Kaytes	M	ViiV Healthcare	Travel Support for attendance at a Community Summit
Marla J. Keller	M	None	N/A
Arthur Kim	M	None	N/A
Michael Kozal	M	Gilead Sciences	Yale University receives grant support from these companies for studies where Dr. Kozal served or serves as PI. Dr. Kozal is an employee of the federal government and does not receive any financial support from these grants.
		ViiV Healthcare	
H. Clifford Lane	C	None	N/A
Jeffrey Lennox	M	ViiV Healthcare	Advisory Board, Research Support
Susan Little	M	Gilead Sciences	Honoraria, Research Support, Travel Support
Henry Masur	M	None	N/A
Susanna Naggie	M	Vir Biotechnology	Advisory Board, Stock Holder
Alice K. Pau	ES	None	N/A
Tonia Poteat	M	ViiV Healthcare	Research Support
Asa Radix	M	None	N/A
James Raper	M	None	N/A
Daniel Reirden	M	Gilead Sciences	Research Support
Kimberly Scarsi	M	None	N/A
Virginia Sheikh	M	None	N/A
Serena Spudich	M	None	N/A
Kimberly Struble	M	None	N/A
Susan Swindells	M	ViiV Healthcare	Research Support
Pablo Tebas	M	Gilead Sciences	Research Support
		Inovio Pharmaceuticals	Research Support
		Merck & Co.	Research Support, Consultant
		ViiV Healthcare	Research Support, Consultant

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Health and Human Services Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents Financial Disclosure for Companies Related to HIV Treatment or Diagnostics (Reporting Period: February 1, 2019, to January 31, 2020) (page 3 of 3)

Member	Status	Financial Disclosure	
		Company	Relationship
Melanie Thompson	M	Bristol-Myers Squibb	Research Support
		Cepheid	Research Support
		CytoDyn	Research Support
		Frontier Biotechnologies, Inc	Research Support
		Gilead Sciences	Research Support
		GlaxoSmithKline	Research Support
		Merck, Sharpe, Dohme, Inc.	Research Support
		ViiV Healthcare	Research Support
Phyllis Tien	M	Merck & Co.	Research Support
Steven Vargas	M	None	N/A
Rochelle Walensky	M	None	N/A

Key: C = Co-Chair; ES = Executive Secretary; M = Member; PI = Principal Investigator

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Introduction (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Antiretroviral therapy (ART) for the treatment of HIV infection has improved steadily since the advent of potent combination therapy in 1996. ART has dramatically reduced HIV-associated morbidity and mortality and has transformed HIV infection into a manageable chronic condition, with life expectancy approaching that for people without HIV.[1,2] ART is also highly effective at preventing sexual transmission of HIV in patients who have adequately suppressed viral loads.[3-5] Unfortunately, in 2016, only 51% of people with HIV in the United States had maximally suppressed viral loads;[6] the lack of suppression is mostly due to undiagnosed HIV infection and failure to link or retain patients with HIV in care.

The Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents (the Panel) is a working group of the Office of AIDS Research Advisory Council (OARAC). The Panel's primary goal is to provide HIV care practitioners with recommendations that are based on current knowledge of the antiretroviral (ARV) drugs that are used to treat adults and adolescents with HIV in the United States. The Panel reviews new evidence and updates recommendations when needed. These guidelines include recommendations on baseline laboratory evaluations, treatment goals, benefits of ART and considerations when initiating therapy, choice of the initial regimen for ART-naive persons with HIV, ARV drugs or combinations to avoid, management of treatment failure, optimizing ART regimens, management of adverse effects and drug interactions, and special ART-related considerations in specific populations. This Panel works closely with the HHS Panel on Antiretroviral Therapy and Medical Management of Children Living with HIV to provide recommendations for adolescents at different stages of growth and development. Recommendations for ART regimens in these guidelines are most appropriate for postpubertal adolescents (i.e., those with sexual maturity ratings [SMRs] of 4 and 5). Clinicians should follow recommendations in the Pediatric Antiretroviral Guidelines when initiating ART in adolescents with an SMR of 3 or lower. For recommendations related to pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) and post-exposure prophylaxis (PEP) for people who do not have HIV, clinicians should consult recommendations from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.[7]

These guidelines represent current knowledge regarding the use of ARV drugs. Because the science of HIV evolves rapidly, the availability of new agents and new clinical data may change therapeutic options and preferences. Information included in these guidelines may not always be consistent with approved labeling for the specific drugs or indications, and the use of the terms "safe" and "effective" may not be synonymous with the Food and Drug Administration-defined legal standards for drug approval. The Panel frequently updates the guidelines (current and archived versions of the guidelines are available on the AIDS*info* website). However, updates to the guidelines may not keep pace with the release of new data, and the guidelines cannot offer guidance on care for all patients. Patient management decisions should be based on clinical judgement and attention to unique patient circumstances.

The Panel recognizes the importance of clinical research in generating evidence to address unanswered questions related to the optimal safety and efficacy of ART and encourages both the development of protocols and patient participation in well-designed, Institutional Review Board-approved clinical trials.

HIV Expertise in Clinical Care

Several studies have demonstrated that overall outcomes in patients with HIV are better when care is delivered by clinicians with HIV expertise (e.g., those who have cared for a large panel of patients with HIV),[8-12] reflecting the complexity of HIV transmission and its treatment. Appropriate training, continuing education, and clinical experience are all components of optimal care. Providers who do not have this requisite training and experience should consult HIV experts when needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Guidelines Development Process

Table 1. Outline of the Guidelines Development Process

Topic	Comment
Goal of the guidelines	Provide guidance to HIV care practitioners on the optimal use of antiretroviral (ARV) agents for the treatment of HIV in adults and adolescents in the United States.
Panel members	The Panel is composed of approximately 50 voting members who have expertise in HIV care and research and includes at least one representative from each of the following U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) agencies: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), Food and Drug Administration (FDA), Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA), and National Institutes of Health (NIH). Approximately two-thirds of the Panel members are nongovernmental scientific members. The Panel also includes four to five community members with knowledge of HIV treatment and care. The U.S. government representatives are appointed by their respective agencies; other Panel members are selected after an open call for nominations. Each member serves on the Panel for a 4-year term with an option for reappointment for an additional term. See the Panel Roster for a list of current Panel members.
Financial disclosure	All members of the Panel submit a written financial disclosure annually, reporting any association with manufacturers of ARV drugs or diagnostics used to manage HIV infection. The latest version of the Financial Disclosure list is available on the AIDS*info* website.
Users of the guidelines	HIV treatment providers
Developer	Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents—a working group of the Office of AIDS Research Advisory Council (OARAC)
Funding source	Office of AIDS Research, NIH
Evidence collection	The recommendations in the guidelines are based on studies published in peer reviewed journals or data available in FDA drug labels. On some occasions, particularly when new information may affect patient safety, unpublished data presented at major conferences or prepared by the FDA and/or manufacturers as warnings to the public may be used as evidence to revise the guidelines.
Recommendation grading	As described in Table 2
Method of synthesizing data	Each section of the guidelines is assigned to a working group of Panel members with expertise in the section's area of interest. The working groups synthesize available data and propose recommendations to the Panel. The Panel discusses all proposals during monthly teleconferences. Recommendations endorsed by the Panel are included in the guidelines.
Other guidelines	These guidelines focus on antiretroviral therapy (ART) for adults and adolescents with HIV. For a more detailed discussion on the use of ART in children and prepubertal adolescents (those with sexual maturity ratings of 1 to 3), clinicians should refer to the Pediatric Antiretroviral Guidelines. These guidelines also include a brief discussion on the management of women of reproductive age and pregnant women. For more details on the use of ARV drugs during pregnancy, see the Perinatal Guidelines.
Update plan	The Panel meets monthly by teleconference to review data that may warrant modification of the guidelines. Updates may be prompted by new drug approvals (or new indications, dosing formulations, or frequency of dosing), new safety or efficacy data, or other information relating to ARV drugs that may have an impact on the clinical care of persons with HIV. In the event of new data of clinical importance, the Panel may post an interim announcement with recommendations on the AIDS*info* website until the guidelines can be updated with the appropriate changes. Updated guidelines are available on the AIDS*info* website.
Public comments	A 2-week public comment period follows the release of the updated guidelines on the AIDS*info* website. The Panel reviews comments to determine whether additional revisions to the guidelines are indicated. The public may also submit comments to the Panel at any time at contactus@aidsinfo.nih.gov.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Basis for Recommendations

Recommendations in these guidelines are based on scientific evidence and expert opinion. Each recommendation statement includes a letter (**A**, **B**, or **C**) that represents the strength of the recommendation and a Roman numeral (**I**, **II**, or **III**) that represents the quality of the evidence that supports the recommendation (see Table 2).

Table 2. Rating Scheme for Recommendations

Strength of Recommendation[i]	Quality of Evidence for Recommendation
A: Strong recommendation for the statement	**I:** One or more randomized trials with clinical outcomes and/or validated laboratory endpoints
B: Moderate recommendation for the statement	**II:** One or more well-designed, non-randomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes
C: Optional recommendation for the statement	**III:** Expert opinion

References

1. Samji H, Cescon A, Hogg RS, et al. Closing the gap: increases in life expectancy among treated HIV-positive individuals in the United States and Canada. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(12):e81355. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24367482.
2. Lohse N, Obel N. Update of survival for persons with HIV infection in Denmark. *Ann Intern Med*. 2016;165(10):749-750. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27842400.
3. Cohen MS, Chen YQ, McCauley M, et al. Antiretroviral therapy for the prevention of HIV-1 transmission. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(9):830-839. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27424812.
4. Bavinton BR, Pinto AN, Phanuphak N, et al. Viral suppression and HIV transmission in serodiscordant male couples: an international, prospective, observational, cohort study. *Lancet HIV*. 2018;5(8):e438-e447. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30025681.
5. Rodger AJ, Cambiano V, Bruun T, et al. Risk of HIV transmission through condomless sex in serodifferent gay couples with the HIV-positive partner taking suppressive antiretroviral therapy (PARTNER): final results of a multicentre, prospective, observational study. *Lancet*. 2019;393(10189):2428-2438. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31056293.
6. Li Z, Purcell DW, Sansom SL, Hayes D, Hall HI. Vital signs: HIV transmission along the continuum of care–United States, 2016. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2019;68(11):267-272. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30897075.
7. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Public Health Service. Preexposure prophylaxis for the prevention of HIV in the United States—2017 update. 2017. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/risk/prep/cdc-hiv-prep-guidelines-2017.pdf.
8. Kitahata MM, Van Rompaey SE, Shields AW. Physician experience in the care of HIV-infected persons is associated with earlier adoption of new antiretroviral therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2000;24(2):106-114. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10935685.
9. Landon BE, Wilson IB, McInnes K, et al. Physician specialization and the quality of care for human immunodeficiency virus infection. *Arch Intern Med*. 2005;165(10):1133-1139. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15911726.
10. Kitahata MM, Van Rompaey SE, Dillingham PW, et al. Primary care delivery is associated with greater physician experience and improved survival among persons with AIDS. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2003;18(2):95-103. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12542583.
11. Delgado J, Heath KV, Yip B, et al. Highly active antiretroviral therapy: physician experience and enhanced adherence to prescription refill. *Antivir Ther*. 2003;8(5):471-478. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14640395.
12. O'Neill M, Karelas GD, Feller DJ, et al. The HIV workforce in New York state: does patient volume correlate with quality? *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;61(12):1871-1877. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26423383.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Baseline Evaluation (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

Every patient with HIV entering into care should have a complete medical history, physical examination, and laboratory evaluation and should be counseled regarding the implications of HIV infection. The goals of the initial evaluation are to confirm the diagnosis of HIV infection, obtain appropriate baseline historical and laboratory data, ensure patient understanding about HIV infection and its transmission, and to initiate care as recommended in HIV primary care guidelines[1] and guidelines for prevention and treatment of HIV-associated opportunistic infections.[2] The initial evaluation also should include discussion on the benefits of antiretroviral therapy (ART) for the patient's health and to prevent HIV transmission. Baseline information then can be used to define management goals and plans. In the case of previously treated patients who present for an initial evaluation with a new health care provider, it is critical to obtain a complete antiretroviral (ARV) history (including drug resistance testing results, if available), preferably through the review of past medical records. Newly diagnosed patients should also be asked about any prior use of ARV agents for prevention of HIV infection.

The following laboratory tests performed during initial patient visits can be used to stage HIV disease and to assist in the selection of ARV drug regimens:

- HIV antibody testing (if prior documentation is not available or if HIV RNA is below the assay's limit of detection) **(AI)**;
- CD4 T lymphocyte cell count (CD4 count) **(AI)**;
- Plasma HIV RNA (viral load) **(AI)**;
- Complete blood count, chemistry profile, transaminase levels, blood urea nitrogen (BUN), and creatinine, urinalysis, and serologies for hepatitis A, B, and C viruses **(AIII)**;
- Fasting blood glucose and serum lipids **(AIII)**; and
- Genotypic resistance testing **(AII)**. For patients who have HIV RNA levels <500 to 1,000 copies/mL, viral amplification for resistance testing may not always be successful **(BII)**.

In addition, other tests (including screening tests for sexually transmitted infections and tests for determining the risk of opportunistic infections and need for prophylaxis) should be performed as recommended in HIV primary care and opportunistic infections guidelines.[1,2]

Patients living with HIV infection often must cope with many social, psychiatric, and medical issues that are best addressed through a patient-centered, multi-disciplinary approach to the disease. The baseline evaluation should include an evaluation of the patient's readiness for ART, including an assessment of high-risk behaviors, substance abuse, social support, mental illness, comorbidities, economic factors (e.g., unstable housing), medical insurance status and adequacy of coverage, and other factors that are known to impair adherence to ART and increase the risk of HIV transmission. Once evaluated, these factors should be managed accordingly. The baseline evaluation should also include a discussion of risk reduction and disclosure to sexual and/or needle-sharing partners, especially with untreated patients who are still at high risk of HIV transmission.

Education about HIV risk behaviors and effective strategies to prevent HIV transmission should be provided at each patient visit.

References

1. Aberg JA, Kaplan JE, Libman H, et al. Primary care guidelines for the management of persons infected with human immunodeficiency virus: 2009 update by the *HIV Med*icine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Clin Infect Dis. Sep 1 2009;49(5):651-681. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19640227.

2. Panel on Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents. Guidelines for the Prevention and Treatment of Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents. 2017. Available at https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines/html/4/adult-and-adolescent-oi-prevention-and-treatment-guidelines/0.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Laboratory Testing

Laboratory Testing for Initial Assessment and Monitoring of Patients with HIV Receiving Antiretroviral Therapy (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Several laboratory tests are important for initial evaluation of people with HIV upon entry into care, and some tests should be performed before and after initiation or modification of antiretroviral therapy (ART) to assess the virologic and immunologic efficacy of ART and to monitor for laboratory abnormalities that may be associated with antiretroviral (ARV) drugs. Table 3 outlines recommendations on the frequency of testing from the Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents. As noted in the table, some tests may be repeated more frequently if clinically indicated.

Two surrogate markers are used to monitor people with HIV: plasma HIV RNA (viral load) to assess level of HIV viremia and CD4 T lymphocyte cell count to assess immune function. Standard (reverse transcriptase and protease) genotypic resistance testing should be used to guide selection of an ARV regimen; if transmitted integrase strand transfer inhibitor resistance is a concern, testing should also include the integrase gene (see Drug-Resistance Testing). For guidance on ART regimens to use when resistance testing results are unavailable, clinicians should consult What to Start. A viral tropism assay should be performed before initiation of a CCR5 antagonist or at the time of virologic failure that occurs while a patient is receiving a CCR5 antagonist. HLA-B*5701 testing should be performed before initiation of abacavir (ABC). Patients should be screened for hepatitis B and hepatitis C virus infection before initiating ART and, if indicated, periodically after ART initiation, as treatment of these coinfections may affect the choice of ART and likelihood of drug-induced hepatotoxicity. The rationale for and utility of some of these laboratory tests are discussed in the corresponding sections of the guidelines.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 3. Laboratory Testing Schedule for Monitoring People with HIV Before and After Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy[a] (page 1 of 4)

Laboratory Test	Timepoint or Frequency of Testing								
	Entry Into Care	ART Initiation[b] or Modification	2 to 8 Weeks After ART Initiation or Modification	Every 3 to 6 Months	Every 6 Months	Every 12 Months	Treatment Failure	Clinically Indicated	If ART Initiation is Delayed[c]
HIV Serology	√ If HIV diagnosis has not been confirmed								
CD4 Cell Count	√	√		√ During first 2 years of ART, or if viremia develops while patient is on ART, or if CD4 count is <300 cells/mm^3		√ **After 2 Years on ART with Consistently Suppressed Viral Load** *CD4 Count 300–500 cells/mm^3:* • Every 12 months *CD4 Count >500 cells/mm^3:* • CD4 monitoring is optional.	√	√	√ Every 3–6 months
HIV Viral Load	√	√	√[d]	√[e]	√[e]		√	√	Repeat testing is optional.
Resistance Testing	√[f]	√[f]					√[f]	√[f]	√[f]
HLA-B*5701 Testing		√ If considering ABC							
Tropism Testing		√ If considering a CCR5 antagonist					√ If considering a CCR5 antagonist, or for patients experiencing virologic failure on a CCR5 antagonist-based regimen	√	

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 3. Laboratory Testing Schedule for Monitoring People with HIV Before and After Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy[a] (page 2 of 4)

Laboratory Test	Timepoint or Frequency of Testing								
	Entry Into Care	ART Initiation[b] or Modification	2 to 8 Weeks After ART Initiation or Modification	Every 3 to 6 Months	Every 6 Months	Every 12 Months	Treatment Failure	Clinically Indicated	If ART Initiation is Delayed[c]
Hepatitis B Serology (HBsAb, HBsAg, HBcAb total)[g,h,i]	√	√ May repeat if patient is nonimmune and does not have chronic HBV infection[h]				√ May repeat if patient is nonimmune and does not have chronic HBV infection[h]		√ Including prior to starting HCV DAA (see HCV/HIV Coinfection)	
Hepatitis C Screening (HCV antibody or, if indicated, HCV RNA)[j]	√					√ Repeat HCV screening for at-risk patients[k]		√	
Basic Chemistry[l,m]	√	√	√		√			√	√ Every 6–12 months
ALT, AST, Total Bilirubin	√	√	√		√			√	√ Every 6–12 months
CBC with Differential[n]	√	√		√ When monitoring CD4 cell count; perform CBC cell count and CD4 concurrently		√ When no longer monitoring CD4 cell count		√	√ Every 3–6 months
Random or Fasting Lipid Profile[o]	√	√				√		√	√ If normal at baseline, annually
Random or Fasting Glucose[p]	√	√				√		√	√ If normal at baseline, annually

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 3. Laboratory Testing Schedule for Monitoring People with HIV Before and After Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy[a] (page 3 of 4)

Laboratory Test	Timepoint or Frequency of Testing								
	Entry Into Care	ART Initiation[b] or Modification	2 to 8 Weeks After ART Initiation or Modification	Every 3 to 6 Months	Every 6 Months	Every 12 Months	Treatment Failure	Clinically Indicated	If ART Initiation is Delayed[c]
Urinalysis[m,q]	√	√			√ If on TDF[l]	√		√	
Pregnancy Test[r]	√	√						√	

[a] This table pertains to laboratory tests done to select an ARV regimen and monitor for treatment responses or ART toxicities. Please refer to the HIV Primary Care Guidelines for guidance on other laboratory tests generally recommended for primary health care maintenance of HIV patients.[1]

[b] If ART is initiated soon after HIV diagnosis and entry into care, repeat baseline laboratory testing is not necessary.

[c] ART is indicated for all individuals with HIV and should be started as soon as possible. However, if ART initiation is delayed, patients should be retained in care, with periodic monitoring as noted above.

[d] If HIV RNA is detectable at 2–8 weeks, repeat testing every 4–8 weeks until viral load is suppressed to <200 copies/mL. Thereafter, repeat testing every 3–6 months.

[e] In patients on ART, viral load typically is measured every 3–4 months. More frequent monitoring may be considered in individuals who are having difficulties with ART adherence. However, for adherent patients with consistently suppressed viral load and stable immunologic status for more than 2 years, monitoring can be extended to 6-month intervals.

[f] Based on current rates of transmitted drug resistance to different ARV medications, standard genotypic drug-resistance testing in ARV-naive persons should focus on testing for mutations in the reverse transcriptase and protease genes. If transmitted INSTI resistance is a concern or if a person presents with viremia while on an INSTI, providers should also test for resistance mutations to this class of drugs. In ART-naive patients who do not immediately begin ART, repeat testing before initiation of ART is optional if resistance testing was performed at entry into care. In patients with virologic suppression who are switching therapy because of toxicity or for convenience, viral amplification will not be possible; see the section on Drug Resistance Testing for discussion of the potential limitations and benefits of proviral DNA assays in this situation. Results from prior resistance testing can be helpful in constructing a new regimen.

[g] If patient has HBV infection (as determined by a positive HBsAg or HBV DNA test result), TDF or TAF plus either FTC or 3TC should be used as part of the ARV regimen to treat both HBV and HIV infections (HBV/HIV).

[h] If HBsAg, HBsAb, and HBcAb test results are negative, hepatitis B vaccine series should be administered. Refer to the HIV Primary Care Guidelines and the Adult and Adolescent Opportunistic Infection Guidelines for detailed recommendations.[1,2]

[i] Most patients with isolated HBcAb have resolved HBV infection with loss of HBsAb. Consider performing an HBV viral load test for confirmation. If the HBV viral load test is positive, the patient may be acutely infected (and will usually display other signs of acute hepatitis) or chronically infected. If the test is negative, the patient should be vaccinated. Refer to the HIV Primary Care Guidelines and the Adult and Adolescent Opportunistic Infection Guidelines for more detailed recommendations.[1,2]

[j] The HCV antibody test may not be adequate for screening in the setting of recent HCV infection (defined as acquisition within the past 6 months), or advanced immunodeficiency (CD4 count <100 cells/mm^3). HCV RNA screening is indicated in persons who have been successfully treated for HCV or who spontaneously cleared prior infection. HCV antibody-negative patients with elevated ALT may need HCV RNA testing.

[k] Injection drug users, persons with a history of incarceration, men with HIV who have unprotected sex with men, and persons with percutaneous/parenteral exposure to blood in unregulated settings are at risk of HCV infection.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 3. Laboratory Testing Schedule for Monitoring People with HIV Before and After Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy[a] (page 4 of 4)

[l] Serum Na, K, HCO_3, Cl, BUN, creatinine, glucose, and creatinine-based estimated glomerular filtration rate. Serum phosphorus should be monitored in patients with chronic kidney disease who are on TDF-containing regimens.[3]

[m] Consult the Guidelines for the Management of Chronic Kidney Disease in HIV-Infected Patients: Recommendations of the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America for recommendations on managing patients with renal disease.[3] More frequent monitoring may be indicated for patients with evidence of kidney disease (e.g., proteinuria, decreased glomerular dysfunction) or increased risk of renal insufficiency (e.g., patients with diabetes, hypertension).

[n] CBC with differential should be done when a CD4 count is performed. When CD4 count is no longer being monitored, the recommended frequency of CBC with differential is once a year. More frequent monitoring may be indicated for persons who are receiving medications that potentially cause cytopenia (e.g., ZDV, TMP-SMX).

[o] If random lipids are abnormal, fasting lipids should be obtained. Consult the 2018 Guideline on the Management of Blood Cholesterol for diagnosis and management of patients with dyslipidemia.[4]

[p] If random glucose is abnormal, fasting glucose should be obtained. HbA1C is no longer recommended for diagnosis of diabetes in persons with HIV on ART (see the ADA Guidelines).[5]

[q] Urine glucose and protein should be assessed before initiating TAF- or TDF-containing regimens and monitored during treatment with these regimens.

[r] For people of childbearing potential.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ALT = alanine aminotransferase; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; AST = aspartate aminotransferase; BUN = blood urea nitrogen; CBC = complete blood count; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; Cl = chloride; DAA = direct-acting antiviral; FTC = emtricitabine; HbA1C = hemoglobin A1c; HBcAb = hepatitis B core antibody; HBsAb = hepatitis B surface antibody; HBsAg = hepatitis B surface antigen; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HCO_3 = bicarbonate; HCV = hepatitis C virus; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; K = potassium; Na = sodium; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TMP-SMX = trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole; ZDV = zidovudine

References

1. Aberg JA, Gallant JE, Ghanem KG, Emmanuel P, Zingman BS, Horberg MA. Primary care guidelines for the management of persons infected with HIV: 2013 update by the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;58(1):e1-34. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24235263.
2. Panel on Opportunistic Infections in Adults and Adolescents with HIV. Guidelines for the prevention and treatment of opportunistic infections in adults and adolescents with HIV: recommendations from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, and the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2019. Available at: http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult_oi.pdf.
3. Lucas GM, Ross MJ, Stock PG, et al. Clinical practice guideline for the management of chronic kidney disease in patients infected with HIV: 2014 update by the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;59(9):e96-138. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25234519.
4. Grundy SM, Stone NJ, Bailey AL, et al. 2018 AHA/ACC/AACVPR/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/ADA/AGS/APhA/ASPC/NLA/PCNA guideline on the management of blood cholesterol: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association task force on clinical practice guidelines. *Circulation*. 2019;139(25):e1082-e1143. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30586774.
5. American Diabetes Association. Classification and diagnosis of diabetes: standards of medical care in diabetes-2019. *Diabetes Care*. 2019;42(Suppl 1):S13-S28. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30559228.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Plasma HIV-1 RNA (Viral Load) and CD4 Count Monitoring (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

HIV RNA (viral load) and CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell count are the two surrogate markers of antiretroviral treatment (ART) responses and HIV disease progression that have been used for decades to manage and monitor HIV infection.

Viral load is a marker of response to ART. A patient's pre-ART viral load level and the magnitude of viral load decline after initiation of ART provide prognostic information about the probability of disease progression.[1] The key goal of ART is to achieve and maintain durable viral suppression. Thus, the most important use of the viral load is to monitor the effectiveness of therapy **after** initiation of ART.

Measurement of CD4 count is particularly useful **before** initiation of ART. The CD4 cell count provides information on the overall immune function of a person with HIV. The measurement is critical in establishing thresholds for the initiation and discontinuation of opportunistic infection (OI) prophylaxis and in assessing the urgency to initiate ART.

The management of patients with HIV has changed substantially with the availability of newer, more potent, and less toxic antiretroviral (ARV) agents. In the United States, ART is now recommended for all patients with HIV regardless of their viral load or CD4 count **(AI)** (see Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy). In the past, clinical practice, which was supported by treatment guidelines, was generally to monitor both CD4 cell count and viral load concurrently. However, because most patients with HIV in care now receive ART, the rationale for frequent CD4 monitoring is weaker. The roles and usefulness of these two tests in clinical practice are discussed in the following sections.

Plasma HIV-1 RNA (Viral Load) Monitoring

Viral load is the most important indicator of initial and sustained response to ART **(AI)** and should be measured in all patients with HIV at entry into care **(AIII)**, at initiation of therapy **(AIII)**, and on a regular basis thereafter. For those patients who choose to delay therapy, repeat viral load testing while not on ART is optional **(CIII)**. Pre-treatment viral load level is also an important factor in the selection of an initial ARV regimen because several currently approved ARV drugs or regimens have been associated with poorer responses in patients with high baseline viral load (see What to Start). Commercially available HIV-1 RNA assays do not detect HIV-2 viral load. For further discussion on HIV-2 RNA monitoring in patients with HIV-1/HIV-2 coinfection or HIV-2 mono-infection, see HIV-2 Infection.

Several systematic reviews of data from clinical trials involving thousands of participants have established that decreases in viral load following initiation of ART are associated with reduced risk of progression to AIDS or death.[1-3] Thus, viral load testing is an established surrogate marker for treatment response.[4] The minimal change in viral load considered to be statistically significant (2 standard deviations) is a three-fold change (equivalent to a 0.5 $\log_{10}$ copies/mL change). Optimal viral suppression is defined generally as a viral load persistently below the level of detection (HIV RNA <20 to 75 copies/mL, depending on the assay used). However, isolated blips (viral loads transiently detectable at low levels, typically HIV RNA <400 copies/mL) are not uncommon in successfully treated patients and are not predictive of virologic failure.[5] Furthermore, the data on the association between persistently low level but quantifiable viremia (HIV RNA <200 copies/mL) and virologic failure is conflicting. One recent study showed an increased risk of subsequent failure at this level of viremia; however, the association was not observed in other studies.[6-9] These guidelines and the AIDS Clinical Trials Group (ACTG) now define virologic failure as a confirmed viral load >200 copies/mL—a threshold that eliminates most cases of apparent viremia caused by viral load blips or assay variability[10] (see Virologic Failure and Suboptimal Immunologic Response).

Individuals who are adherent to their ARV regimens and do not harbor resistance mutations to the component drugs can generally achieve viral suppression 8 to 24 weeks after ART initiation; rarely, in some patients it

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

may take longer. Recommendations on the frequency of viral load monitoring are summarized below:

- **After initiation of ART or modification of therapy because of virologic failure.** Plasma viral load should be measured before initiation of ART and within 2 to 4 weeks but no later than 8 weeks after treatment initiation or modification **(AIII)**. The purpose of the measurements is to confirm an adequate initial virologic response to ART, indicating appropriate regimen selection and patient adherence to therapy. Repeat viral load measurement should be performed at 4- to 8-week intervals until the level falls below the assay's limit of detection **(BIII)**.
- **In virologically suppressed patients in whom ART was modified because of drug toxicity or for regimen simplification.** Viral load measurement should be performed within 4 to 8 weeks after changing therapy **(AIII)**. The purpose of viral load monitoring at this point is to confirm the effectiveness of the new regimen.
- **In patients on a stable, suppressive ARV regimen.** Viral load should be repeated every 3 to 4 months **(AIII)** or as clinically indicated to confirm continuous viral suppression. Clinicians may extend the interval to 6 months for adherent patients whose viral load has been suppressed for more than 2 years and whose clinical and immunologic status is stable **(AIII)**.
- **In patients with suboptimal response.** The frequency of viral load monitoring will depend on clinical circumstances, such as adherence and availability of further treatment options. In addition to viral load monitoring, a number of additional factors, such as patient adherence to prescribed medications, suboptimal drug exposure, or drug interactions, should be assessed. Patients who fail to achieve viral suppression should undergo resistance testing to aid in the selection of an alternative regimen (see Drug-Resistance Testing and Virologic Failure and Suboptimal Immunologic Repsonse sections).

CD4 Count Monitoring

The CD4 count is the most important laboratory indicator of immune function in patients with HIV. It is also the strongest predictor of subsequent disease progression and survival according to findings from clinical trials and cohort studies.[11,12] CD4 counts are highly variable; a significant change (2 standard deviations) between 2 tests is approximately a 30% change in the absolute count, or an increase or decrease in CD4 percentage by 3 percentage points. Monitoring of lymphocyte subsets other than CD4 (e.g., CD8, CD19) has not proven clinically useful and is more expensive than monitoring CD4 count alone; therefore, it is **not routinely recommended (BIII)**.

Use of CD4 Count for Initial Assessment

CD4 count should be measured in all patients at entry into care **(AI)**. It is the key factor in determining the need to initiate OI prophylaxis (see the Adult Opportunistic Infection Guidelines)[13] and the urgency to initiate ART **(AI)** (see the Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy section of these guidelines). Although most OIs occur in patients with CD4 counts <200 cells/mm^3, some OIs can occur in patients with higher CD4 counts.[14]

Use of CD4 Count for Monitoring Therapeutic Response

The CD4 count is used to assess a patient's immunologic response to ART. It is also used to determine whether prophylaxis for OIs can be discontinued (see the Adult Opportunistic Infection Guidelines).[13] For most patients on therapy, an adequate response is defined as an increase in CD4 count in the range of 50 to 150 cells/mm^3 during the first year of ART, generally with an accelerated response in the first 3 months of treatment. Subsequent increases average approximately 50 to 100 cells/mm^3 per year until a steady state level is reached.[15] Patients who initiate therapy with a low CD4 count[16,17] or at an older age[18] may have a blunted increase in their counts despite virologic suppression.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Frequency of CD4 Count Monitoring

ART is now recommended for all patients with HIV. In patients who remain untreated for whatever reason, CD4 counts should be monitored every 3 to 6 months to assess the urgency of ART initiation and the need for OI prophylaxis **(AIII)**.

A repeat CD4 count 3 months after ART initiation will provide information regarding the magnitude of immune reconstitution **(AIII)**. This repeat measurement is most important in patients who initiate ART with more advanced disease and require OI prophylaxis or treatment. In these patients, the magnitude and duration of CD4 count increase can be used to determine whether to discontinue OI prophylaxis and/or treatment as recommended in the guidelines for treatment and prophylaxis of opportunistic infections.[13] In this setting, and in the first 2 years following ART initiation, CD4 count can be monitored at 3- to 6- month intervals **(BII)**.

The CD4 count response to ART varies widely, but a poor CD4 response in a patient with viral suppression is rarely an indication for modifying an ARV regimen. In patients with consistently suppressed viral loads who have already experienced ART-related immune reconstitution, the CD4 count provides limited information. Frequent testing is unnecessary because the results rarely lead to a change in clinical management. One retrospective study found that declines in CD4 count to <200 cells/mm^3 are rare in patients with viral suppression and CD4 counts >300 cells/mm^3.[19] Similarly, the ARTEMIS trial found that CD4 monitoring had no clinical benefit in patients who had suppressed viral loads and CD4 counts >200 cells/mm^3 after 48 weeks of therapy.[20] Furthermore, the risk of *Pneumocystis jirovecii* pneumonia is extremely low in patients on suppressive ART who have CD4 counts between 100 and 200 cells/mm^3.[21] Although uncommon, CD4 count declines can occur in a small percentage of virologically suppressed patients and may be associated with adverse clinical outcomes such as cardiovascular disease, malignancy, and death.[22] An analysis of costs associated with CD4 monitoring in the United States estimated that reducing CD4 monitoring in treated patients from every 6 months to every 12 months could result in annual savings of approximately $10 million.[23]

For the patient on a suppressive regimen whose CD4 count has consistently ranged between 300 and 500 cells/mm^3 for at least 2 years, the Panel recommends CD4 monitoring on an annual basis **(BII)**. Continued CD4 monitoring for virologically suppressed patients whose CD4 counts have been consistently >500 cells/mm^3 for at least 2 years may be considered optional **(CIII)**. The CD4 count should be monitored more frequently, as clinically indicated, when there are changes in a patient's clinical status that may decrease CD4 count and thus prompt OI prophylaxis. Examples of such changes include the appearance of new HIV-associated clinical symptoms or initiation of treatment known to reduce CD4 cell count (e.g., interferon, chronic corticosteroids, or antineoplastic agents) **(AIII)**. In patients who fail to maintain viral suppression while on ART, the Panel recommends CD4 count monitoring every 3 to 6 months **(AIII)** (see Virologic Failure and Suboptimal Immunologic Response).

Factors that Affect Absolute CD4 Count

The absolute CD4 count is a calculated value based on the total white blood cell (WBC) count and the percentages of total and CD4 T lymphocytes. This absolute number may fluctuate in individuals or may be influenced by factors that may affect the total WBC count and lymphocyte percentages, such as use of bone marrow-suppressive medications or the presence of acute infections. Splenectomy[24,25] or coinfection with human T-lymphotropic virus type I (HTLV-1)[26] may cause misleadingly elevated CD4 counts. Alpha-interferon may reduce the absolute CD4 count without changing the CD4 percentage.[27] In all these settings, CD4 percentage remains stable and may be a more appropriate parameter to assess a patient's immune function.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 4. Recommendations on the Indications and Frequency of Viral Load and CD4 Count Monitoring[a]

Clinical Scenario	Viral Load Monitoring	CD4 Count Monitoring
Before initiating ART	At entry into care **(AIII)** If ART initiation is deferred, repeat before initiating ART **(AIII)**. In patients not initiating ART, repeat testing is optional **(CIII)**.	At entry into care **(AI)** If ART is deferred, every 3 to 6 months[b] **(AIII)**
After initiating ART	Preferably within 2 to 4 weeks (and no later than 8 weeks) after initiation of ART **(AIII)**; thereafter, every 4 to 8 weeks until viral load is suppressed **(BIII)**.	3 months after initiation of ART **(AIII)**
After modifying ART because of drug toxicities or for regimen simplification in a patient with viral suppression	4 to 8 weeks after modification of ART to confirm effectiveness of new regimen **(AIII)**.	Monitor according to prior CD4 count and duration on ART, as outlined below.
After modifying ART because of virologic failure	Preferably within 2 to 4 weeks (and no later than 8 weeks) after modification **(AIII)**; thereafter, every 4 to 8 weeks until viral load is suppressed **(BIII)**. If viral suppression is not possible, repeat viral load every 3 months or more frequently if indicated **(AIII)**.	Every 3 to 6 months **(AI)**
During the first 2 years of ART	Every 3 to 4 months **(AIII)**	Every 3 to 6 months[a] **(BII)**
After 2 years of ART (VL consistently suppressed, CD4 consistently 300-500 cells/mm^3)	Can extend to every 6 months for patients with consistent viral suppression for ≥2 years **(AIII)**.	Every 12 months **(BII)**
After 2 years of ART (VL consistently suppressed, CD4 consistently >500 cells/mm^3)		Optional **(CIII)**
While on ART with detectable viremia (VL repeatedly >200 copies/mL)	Every 3 months **(AIII)** or more frequently if clinically indicated (see Virologic Failure).	Every 3 to 6 months **(AIII)**
Change in clinical status (e.g., new HIV clinical symptom or initiation of interferon, chronic systemic corticosteroids, or antineoplastic therapy)	Every 3 months **(AIII)**	Perform CD4 count and repeat as clinically indicated[c] **(AIII)**

[a] Monitoring of lymphocyte subsets other than CD4 (e.g., CD8, CD19) has not proven clinically useful, adds to costs, and is not routinely recommended **(BIII)**.

[b] Some experts may repeat CD4 count every 3 months in patients with low baseline CD4 count (<200–300 cells/mm^3) before ART but every 6 months in those who initiated ART at higher CD4 cell count (e.g., >300 cells/mm^3).

[c] The following are examples of clinically indicated scenarios: changes in a patient's clinical status that may decrease CD4 count and thus prompt initiation of prophylaxis for opportunistic infections (OI), such as new HIV-associated symptoms, or initiation of treatment with medications which are known to reduce CD4 cell count.

References

1. Murray JS, Elashoff MR, Iacono-Connors LC, Cvetkovich TA, Struble KA. The use of plasma HIV RNA as a study endpoint in efficacy trials of antiretroviral drugs. *AIDS*. May 7 1999;13(7):797-804. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10357378.
2. Marschner IC, Collier AC, Coombs RW, et al. Use of changes in plasma levels of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 RNA to assess the clinical benefit of antiretroviral therapy. *J Infect Dis*. Jan 1998;177(1):40-47. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9419168.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

3. Thiebaut R, Morlat P, Jacqmin-Gadda H, et al. Clinical progression of HIV-1 infection according to the viral response during the first year of antiretroviral treatment. Groupe d'Epidemiologie du SIDA en Aquitaine (GECSA). *AIDS*. May 26 2000;14(8):971-978. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10853978.
4. Human immunodeficiency virus type 1 RNA level and CD4 count as prognostic markers and surrogate end points: a meta-analysis. HIV Surrogate Marker Collaborative Group. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. Aug 10 2000;16(12):1123-1133. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10954887.
5. Havlir DV, Bassett R, Levitan D, et al. Prevalence and predictive value of intermittent viremia with combination hiv therapy. *JAMA*. Jul 11 2001;286(2):171-179. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11448280.
6. Damond F, Roquebert B, Benard A, et al. Human immunodeficiency virus type 1 (HIV-1) plasma load discrepancies between the Roche COBAS AMPLICOR HIV-1 MONITOR Version 1.5 and the Roche COBAS AmpliPrep/COBAS TaqMan HIV-1 assays. *J Clin Microbiol*. Oct 2007;45(10):3436-3438. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17715371.
7. Gatanaga H, Tsukada K, Honda H, et al. Detection of HIV type 1 load by the Roche Cobas TaqMan assay in patients with viral loads previously undetectable by the Roche Cobas Amplicor Monitor. *Clin Infect Dis*. Jan 15 2009;48(2):260-262. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19113986.
8. Willig JH, Nevin CR, Raper JL, et al. Cost ramifications of increased reporting of detectable plasma HIV-1 RNA levels by the Roche COBAS AmpliPrep/COBAS TaqMan HIV-1 version 1.0 viral load test. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Aug 1 2010;54(4):442-444. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20611035.
9. Laprise C, de Pokomandy A, Baril JG, Dufresne S, Trottier H. Virologic failure following persistent low-level viremia in a cohort of HIV-positive patients: results from 12 years of observation. *Clin Infect Dis*. Nov 2013;57(10):1489-1496. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23946221.
10. Ribaudo H, Lennox J, Currier J, al e. Virologic failure endpoint definition in clinical trials: Is using HIV-1 RNA threshold <200 copies/mL better than <50 copies/mL? An analysis of ACTG studies. 16th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; February 8-11, 2009; Montreal, Canada.
11. Mellors JW, Munoz A, Giorgi JV, et al. Plasma viral load and CD4+ lymphocytes as prognostic markers of HIV-1 infection. *Ann Intern Med*. Jun 15 1997;126(12):946-954. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9182471.
12. Egger M, May M, Chene G, et al. Prognosis of HIV-1-infected patients starting highly active antiretroviral therapy: a collaborative analysis of prospective studies. *Lancet*. Jul 13 2002;360(9327):119-129. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12126821.
13. Panel on Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents. Guidelines for the prevention and treatment of opportunistic infections in HIV-infected adults and adolescents: recommendations from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, and the *HIV Med*icine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Available at http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult_oi.pdf. Accessed January 6, 2014.
14. Mocroft A, Furrer HJ, Miro JM, et al. The incidence of AIDS-defining illnesses at a current CD4 count >/= 200 cells/muL in the post-combination antiretroviral therapy era. *Clin Infect Dis*. Oct 2013;57(7):1038-1047. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23921881.
15. Kaufmann GR, Perrin L, Pantaleo G, et al. CD4 T-lymphocyte recovery in individuals with advanced HIV-1 infection receiving potent antiretroviral therapy for 4 years: the Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *Arch Intern Med*. Oct 13 2003;163(18):2187-2195. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14557216.
16. Moore RD, Keruly JC. CD4+ cell count 6 years after commencement of highly active antiretroviral therapy in persons with sustained virologic suppression. *Clin Infect Dis*. Feb 1 2007;44(3):441-446. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17205456.
17. Palella FJ, Jr., Armon C, Chmiel JS, et al. CD4 cell count at initiation of ART, long-term likelihood of achieving CD4 >750 cells/mm3 and mortality risk. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. Sep 2016;71(9):2654-2662. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27330061.
18. Althoff KN, Justice AC, Gange SJ, et al. Virologic and immunologic response to HAART, by age and regimen class. *AIDS*. Oct 23 2010;24(16):2469-2479. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20829678.
19. Gale HB, Gitterman SR, Hoffman HJ, et al. Is frequent CD4+ T-lymphocyte count monitoring necessary for persons with counts >=300 cells/muL and HIV-1 suppression? *Clin Infect Dis*. May 2013;56(9):1340-1343. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23315315.
20. Girard PM, Nelson M, Mohammed P, Hill A, van Delft Y, Moecklinghoff C. Can we stop CD4+ testing in patients with HIV-1 RNA suppression on antiretroviral treatment? *AIDS*. Nov 13 2013;27(17):2759-2763. Available at http://www.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23842127.

21. Costiniuk CT, Fergusson DA, Doucette S, Angel JB. Discontinuation of Pneumocystis jirovecii pneumonia prophylaxis with CD4 count <200 cells/microL and virologic suppression: a systematic review. *PLoS One*. 2011;6(12):e28570. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22194853.
22. Helleberg M, Kronborg G, Larsen CS, et al. CD4 decline is associated with increased risk of cardiovascular disease, cancer, and death in virally suppressed patients with HIV. *Clin Infect Dis*. Jul 2013;57(2):314-321. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23575194.
23. Hyle EP, Sax PE, Walensky RP. Potential savings by reduced CD4 monitoring in stable patients with HIV receiving antiretroviral therapy. *JAMA Intern Med*. Oct 14 2013;173(18):1746-1748. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23978894.
24. Zurlo JJ, Wood L, Gaglione MM, Polis MA. Effect of splenectomy on T lymphocyte subsets in patients infected with the human immunodeficiency virus. *Clin Infect Dis*. Apr 1995;20(4):768-771. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7795071.
25. Bernard NF, Chernoff DN, Tsoukas CM. Effect of splenectomy on T-cell subsets and plasma HIV viral titers in HIV-infected patients. *J Hum Virol*. Jul-Aug 1998;1(5):338-345. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10195261.
26. Casseb J, Posada-Vergara MP, Montanheiro P, et al. T CD4+ cells count among patients co-infected with human immunodeficiency virus type 1 (HIV-1) and human T-cell leukemia virus type 1 (HTLV-1): high prevalence of tropical spastic paraparesis/HTLV-1-associated myelopathy (TSP/HAM). *Rev Inst Med Trop Sao Paulo*. Jul-Aug 2007;49(4):231-233. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17823752.
27. Berglund O, Engman K, Ehrnst A, et al. Combined treatment of symptomatic human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection with native interferon-alpha and zidovudine. *J Infect Dis*. Apr 1991;163(4):710-715. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1672701.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Drug-Resistance Testing (Last updated October 25, 2018; last reviewed October 25, 2018)

Panel's Recommendations
For Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Persons:
• HIV drug-resistance testing is recommended at entry into care for persons with HIV to guide selection of the initial antiretroviral therapy (ART) regimen **(AII)**. If therapy is deferred, repeat testing may be considered at the time of ART initiation **(CIII)**.
• Genotypic, rather than phenotypic, testing is the preferred resistance testing to guide therapy in antiretroviral (ARV)-naive patients **(AIII)**.
• In persons with acute or recent (early) HIV infection, in pregnant people with HIV, or in people who will initiate ART on the day of or soon after HIV diagnosis, ART initiation should not be delayed while awaiting resistance testing results; the regimen can be modified once results are reported **(AIII)**.
• Standard genotypic drug-resistance testing in ARV-naive persons involves testing for mutations in the reverse transcriptase (RT) and protease (PR) genes. If transmitted integrase strand transfer inhibitor (INSTI) resistance is a concern, providers should ensure that genotypic resistance testing also includes the integrase gene **(AIII)**.
For Antiretroviral Therapy-Experienced Persons:
• HIV drug-resistance testing should be performed to assist the selection of active drugs when changing ART regimens in the following patients:
• Persons with virologic failure and HIV RNA levels >1,000 copies/mL **(AI)**
• Persons with HIV RNA levels >500 copies/mL but <1,000 copies/mL, drug-resistance testing may be unsuccessful but should still be considered **(BII)**
• Persons with suboptimal viral load reduction **(AII)**
• When a person with HIV experiences virologic failure while receiving an INSTI-based regimen, genotypic testing for INSTI resistance (which may need to be ordered separately) should be performed to determine whether to include a drug from this class in subsequent regimens **(AII)**.
• Drug-resistance testing in the setting of virologic failure should be performed while the person is taking prescribed ARV drugs or, if that is not possible, within 4 weeks after discontinuing therapy **(AII)**. If more than 4 weeks have elapsed since the ARVs were discontinued, resistance testing may still provide useful information to guide therapy; however, it is important to recognize that previously selected resistance mutations can be missed due to lack of drug-selective pressure **(CIII)**.
• Genotypic testing is preferred over phenotypic resistance testing to guide therapy in persons with suboptimal virologic response or virologic failure while on first- or second-line regimens and in individuals in whom resistance mutation patterns are known or not expected to be complex **(AII)**.
• The addition of phenotypic to genotypic resistance testing is recommended for persons with known or suspected complex drug-resistance mutation patterns (BIII).
• All prior and current drug-resistance test results, if available, should be considered when constructing a new regimen for a patient **(AIII)**.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional*
Rating of Evidence: *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

Genotypic and Phenotypic Resistance Assays

Genotypic and phenotypic resistance assays are used to assess viral strains and select treatment strategies. These assays provide information on resistance to nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs), non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs), protease inhibitors (PIs), and integrase strand transfer inhibitors (INSTIs). In some circumstances, INSTI-resistance tests may need to be ordered separately, and clinicians should check this with the testing laboratory. INSTI-resistance testing is particularly important in persons who experience virologic failure while taking an INSTI-containing regimen. Testing for fusion inhibitor resistance can also be ordered separately. There is currently no commercially available resistance test for the CD4 T lymphocyte post-attachment inhibitor ibalizumab. For a description of co-receptor tropism testing, see Co-receptor Tropism Assays.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Genotypic Assays

Genotypic assays detect drug-resistance mutations in relevant viral genes; in general, these assays require a plasma viral load of at least 500 to 1,000 copies/mL. Most genotypic assays involve conventional Sanger sequencing of the reverse transcriptase (RT), protease (PR), and integrase (IN) genes of circulating RNA in plasma to detect mutations that are known to confer drug resistance. A genotypic assay that assesses mutations in the gp41 (envelope) gene associated with resistance to the fusion inhibitor enfuvirtide is also commercially available. Genotypic assays can be performed rapidly and results are available within 1 to 2 weeks of sample collection. Interpreting these test results requires knowledge of the mutations selected by different antiretroviral (ARV) drugs and of the potential for cross resistance to other drugs conferred by certain mutations. The International AIDS Society-USA (IAS-USA) maintains an updated list of significant resistance-associated mutations in the RT, PR, IN, and envelope genes. The Stanford University HIV Drug Resistance Database also provides helpful guidance for interpreting genotypic resistance test results.[1] Various additional tools are also available to assist providers in interpreting genotypic test results.[2-5] Clinical trials have demonstrated that consulting with specialists in HIV drug resistance improves virologic outcomes.[6] Clinicians are thus encouraged to consult a specialist to interpret genotypic test results and design optimal new regimens.

A next-generation sequencing genotypic resistance assay that analyzes HIV-1 proviral DNA in host cells is now commercially available. This test aims to detect archived resistance mutations in patients with HIV RNA below the limit of detection or with low-level viremia.

Phenotypic Assays

Phenotypic assays measure the ability of a virus to grow in different concentrations of ARV drugs. RT, PR, and, more recently, IN and envelope gene sequences derived from patient plasma HIV RNA are inserted into the backbone of a laboratory clone of HIV or used to generate pseudotyped viruses that express the patient-derived HIV genes of interest. Replication of these viruses at different drug concentrations is monitored by expression of a reporter gene and is compared with replication of a reference HIV strain. The drug concentration that inhibits viral replication by 50% (i.e., the median inhibitory concentration [IC_{50}]) is calculated, and the ratio of the IC_{50} of test and reference viruses is reported as the fold increase in IC_{50} (i.e., fold resistance).

Automated phenotypic assays that can produce results in 2 to 3 weeks are commercially available, but they cost more to perform than genotypic assays. In addition, interpreting phenotypic assay results can be complicated by incomplete information regarding the specific resistance level (i.e., fold increase in IC_{50}) associated with drug failure, although clinically significant fold increase cutoffs have been described for some drugs.[7-11] Again, consulting with a specialist to interpret test results can be helpful.

Limitations of Genotypic and Phenotypic Assays

Limitations of both genotypic and phenotypic assays include lack of uniform quality assurance testing for all available assays, relatively high cost, and insensitivity to minor viral species. Drug-resistant viruses that constitute <10% to 20% of the circulating virus population will probably not be detected by commercially available assays. This limitation is important to note because a wild-type virus often re-emerges as the predominant population in the plasma after discontinuation of drugs that exert selective pressure on drug-resistant populations. As a consequence, the proportion of virus with resistance mutations can decrease to below the 10% to 20% threshold.[12-14] In the case of some drugs, this reversion to predominantly wild-type virus can occur in the first 4 to 6 weeks after the drugs are discontinued. Prospective clinical studies have shown that despite this plasma reversion, re-initiation of the same ARV agents (or those sharing similar resistance pathways) is usually associated with early drug failure, and that the virus present at failure is derived from previously archived resistant virus.[15] Therefore, resistance testing is most valuable when performed while a person experiencing virologic failure is still taking ARV drugs or, if that is not possible,

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

then within 4 weeks after discontinuing therapy **(AII)**. Because resistant viruses may persist longer in the plasma of some patients, resistance testing that is done 4 to 6 weeks after discontinuation of drugs or later may still detect mutations and provide useful information to guide therapy **(CIII)**. However, the absence of detectable resistance in such patients must be interpreted with caution when designing subsequent ARV regimens. Importantly, in addition to considering prior antiretroviral therapy (ART) history, prior genotypic- or phenotypic-resistance test results should be obtained from old records when possible. Because the most current drug-resistance test may not be able to detect resistance mutations that were previously detected, these prior test results are clinically important and should be used when designing a new regimen **(AIII)**.

A next-generation sequencing genotypic assay that analyzes HIV-1 proviral DNA may provide additional information on drug resistance in patients with low levels of plasma HIV RNA or in patients whose levels are below the limit of detection **(CIII)**. However, these assays might miss some or all the previous drug-resistance mutations, and they should be interpreted with caution. The usefulness of these assays in the clinic is still under investigation and has yet to be fully determined.

Use of Resistance Assays in Clinical Practice (See Table 5)

Use of Resistance Assays in Determining Initial Treatment

Transmission of drug-resistant HIV strains is well documented and associated with suboptimal virologic response to initial ART.[16-19] The risk of acquiring drug-resistant virus is related to the prevalence of drug resistance in people with HIV who engage in high-risk behaviors within a given community. In high-income countries, approximately 10% to 17% of ART-naive individuals have resistance mutations to at least one ARV drug.[20] Up to 8%, but generally <5%, of transmitted viruses will exhibit resistance to drugs from more than one class.[20-23] Transmitted resistant HIV is generally either NNRTI- or NRTI-resistant. Transmitted PI resistance is much less common, and to date, transmitted INSTI resistance is rare.[24,25]

Resistance testing can guide therapy selection to optimize virologic response in people with acute or recent (early) HIV infection, in pregnant people with HIV, or in people who will initiate ART on the day of or soon after HIV diagnosis. Therefore, resistance testing in these situations is recommended (AII). A genotypic assay is preferred for this purpose **(AIII)**. In these settings, treatment initiation should not be delayed pending resistance testing results if the individual is willing and able to begin treatment. Once results are reported, the regimen can be modified if warranted (see also Acute and Recent HIV [Early] Infection). In the absence of ART, resistant viruses may decline over time to less than the detection limit of standard resistance tests. However, when ART is eventually initiated, even low levels of resistant viruses may still increase the risk of treatment failure.[26-28] Therefore, if ART is deferred, resistance testing should still be performed during early HIV infection **(AIII)**. In this situation, the genotypic resistance test result should be used for regimen selection when the person begins ART. Repeat resistance testing at the start of treatment may also be considered, because a patient may acquire drug-resistant virus (i.e., superinfection) between entry-into-care and the initiation of ART (CIII).[29]

Interpretation of drug-resistance testing before ART initiation in persons with chronic HIV is less straightforward. The rate at which transmitted resistance-associated mutations revert to wild-type virus has not been completely delineated, but mutations present at the time of HIV transmission are more stable than those selected under drug pressure. It is often possible to detect resistance-associated mutations in viruses that were transmitted several years earlier.[30-32] Though no prospective trial has directly addressed whether drug-resistance testing before initiation of therapy confers benefit in this population, data from several studies, including one prospective clinical trial, suggest that virologic responses in persons with baseline resistance mutations are suboptimal.[16-19,33-37] In addition, an analysis of early RT and PR genotypic resistance testing in ARV-naive persons suggests that baseline testing in this population is cost effective and should be performed.[38] Therefore, resistance testing in people with chronic infections is recommended at the time of entry into HIV care **(AII)**.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Although no definitive prospective data exist to support the choice of one type of resistance testing over another, genotypic testing is generally preferred over phenotypic testing because of lower cost, more rapid turnaround time, greater sensitivity for detecting mixtures of wild-type and resistant virus, and easier interpretation of test results **(AIII)**. If therapy is deferred, repeat testing shortly before initiating ART may be considered, because the patient may have acquired drug-resistant virus (i.e., superinfection) **(CIII)**.[29] Standard genotypic drug-resistance testing in ARV-naive persons involves testing for mutations in the RT and PR genes. Although reports of transmission of INSTI-resistant virus are rare, as use of INSTIs increases, the potential for transmission of INSTI-resistant virus may also increase. Therefore, when INSTI resistance is suspected, providers should supplement standard baseline genotypic resistance testing with genotypic testing for resistance to this class of drugs, which may need to be ordered separately **(AIII)**.

The next-generation sequencing genotypic resistance assay that analyzes proviral DNA in host cells can be considered when conventional HIV RNA drug resistance testing is unsuccessful or unavailable for patients initiating therapy **(CIII)**. As outlined above, the results should be interpreted with caution, as this assay might miss some or all previously existing drug-resistance mutations.

Use of Resistance Assays in the Event of Virologic Failure

Resistance assays are important tools to inform treatment decisions for patients who experience virologic failure while on ART. Several prospective studies have assessed the utility of resistance testing to guide ARV drug selection in patients who experience virologic failure. These studies involved genotypic assays, phenotypic assays, or both.[6,39-45] In general, these studies found that changes in therapy based on resistance test results produced better early virologic response to salvage regimens than regimen changes guided only by clinical judgment.

In addition, one observational cohort study found that the use of genotypic drug-resistance testing in ART-experienced patients with detectable plasma HIV RNA was independently associated with improved survival.[46] Thus, resistance testing is recommended as a tool for selecting active drugs when changing ARV regimens because of virologic failure in persons with HIV RNA >1,000 copies/mL **(AI)** (see also Virologic Failure). In persons with HIV RNA >500 copies/mL but <1,000 copies/mL, testing may be unsuccessful but should still be considered **(BII)**. Conventional drug-resistance testing in persons with plasma viral loads <500 copies/mL is not usually recommended, because resistance assays cannot be consistently performed at low HIV RNA levels **(AIII)**.

Resistance testing can also help guide treatment decisions for patients with suboptimal viral load reduction **(AII)**. Virologic failure in the setting of ART is, for certain patients, associated with resistance to only one component of the regimen.[47-49] In this situation, substituting individual drugs in a failing regimen may be an option, but this concept will require clinical validation (see Virologic Failure).

Genotyping is preferred for resistance testing in patients who experience virologic failure or suboptimal viral load reduction while on a first or second ARV drug regimen and in individuals in whom resistance mutation patterns are known or not expected to be complex (i.e., mutations that are straightforward, usually limited in number, and/or those that have clear significance) (AII). Often in these situations, the mutation patterns detected can be interpreted by algorithms used to predict the impact of subsequent regimens on virologic response. For patients with extensive treatment history, complex mutational patterns may occur. In such situations, the interpretation of complex genotypes and the impact of the mutation pattern on subsequent treatment regimens can be challenging. For these individuals, phenotypic resistance testing may provide additional helpful information **(BIII)**. Rather than only predicting the impact of the detected mutations, these assays can measure *in vitro* the actual fold change in drug susceptibility, as well as the actual impact of mutation combinations and interactions on each drug under consideration.

When compared with phenotypic testing, genotypic testing costs less to perform and has a faster turnaround time

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

and greater sensitivity for detecting mixtures of wild-type and resistant virus. In addition, observations show that genotypic and phenotypic assays are comparable predictors of virologic response to subsequent ART regimens.[50] In patients who experience virologic failure while on INSTI-based regimens, testing for INSTI resistance should be performed to determine whether to include drugs from this class in subsequent regimens **(AII)**. In this circumstance, clinicians should confirm that, when they order a resistance test, their laboratory is testing for INSTI resistance in addition to NNRTI, NRTI, and PI resistance. If INSTI-resistance testing needs to be ordered separately (as is the case in some laboratories), clinicians should request this assay in addition to standard drug-resistance testing. Addition of phenotypic to genotypic testing is generally indicated for persons with known or suspected complex drug-resistance mutation patterns **(BIII)**.

The next-generation sequencing genotypic resistance assay that analyzes proviral DNA can be considered for patients who are experiencing treatment failure and for whom conventional HIV RNA genotypic drug-resistance testing is unavailable or unsuccessful **(CIII)**. As outlined above, results should be interpreted with caution, as these assays might miss some or all previously existing drug-resistance mutations.

When the use of a CCR5 antagonist is being considered, a co-receptor tropism assay should be performed **(AI)** (see Co-receptor Tropism Assays).

Use of Resistance Assays for Optimizing Antiretroviral Regimen in Persons with Viral Suppression

In the past decade, simpler, more potent, and better-tolerated ARV medications have become available and new ARV drugs will likely continue to emerge. Switching individual ARV drugs in a regimen is sometimes considered for patients with a suppressed viral load in order to simplify a regimen, avoid drug interactions or toxicity, or for other reasons. Because the patient's viral load is suppressed, standard drug-resistance testing will not be successful.

The next-generation sequencing genotypic resistance assay that analyzes proviral DNA can be considered for these individuals, particularly if complex or semi-complex pre-existing resistance is suspected. In individuals who have experienced no prior virologic failures and who are on their first or second regimen, or who have genotypic testing results from when they had prior virologic failures, the use of the proviral DNA genotypic test is unlikely to provide additional useful information. However, in individuals who have experienced multiple prior failures, a prolonged history of prior ARV regimens, and/or for whom prior genotypic resistance test results are not available, it may be appropriate to utilize proviral DNA genotypic testing **(CIII)**. When such testing is obtained, results should be combined with all prior genotypic and phenotypic test results to construct a cumulative genotype, which incorporates all current and previously detected drug-resistance mutations. Results from this test should be interpreted with caution, as these assays might miss some or all previously existing drug-resistance mutations. The usefulness of these assays in the clinic is still under investigation and has yet to be fully determined.

Use of Resistance Assays in Pregnancy

In pregnancy, the goal of ART is to rapidly and maximally reduce plasma HIV RNA to provide optimal maternal therapy and to prevent perinatal transmission of HIV. Genotypic resistance testing is recommended for all pregnant persons with HIV before initiation of therapy **(AIII)** and for those entering pregnancy with detectable HIV RNA levels while on therapy **(AI)**. Phenotypic testing in those found to have complex drug-resistance mutation patterns may provide additional information **(BIII)**. Optimal prevention of perinatal transmission requires prompt initiation of ART pending resistance testing results. Once the results are available, the ARV regimen can be changed as needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 5. Recommendations for Using Drug-Resistance Assays (page 1 of 2)

Clinical Setting and Recommendation	Rationale
In Acute or Recent (Early) HIV Infection: Drug-resistance testing is recommended **(AII)**. A genotypic assay is generally preferred **(AIII)**. Treatment should not be delayed while awaiting results of resistance testing **(AIII)**.	Drug-resistance testing can determine whether drug-resistant virus was transmitted. The initial regimen can be modified, if necessary, once resistance test results are available. Genotypic testing is preferred to phenotypic testing because of lower cost, faster turnaround time, and greater sensitivity for detecting mixtures of wild-type and resistant virus.
If ART is deferred, repeat resistance testing may be considered when therapy is initiated **(CIII)**. A genotypic assay is generally preferred **(AIII)**.	Repeat testing when ART is initiated may be considered because the patient may have acquired a drug-resistant virus (i.e., superinfection).
In ART-Naive Patients with Chronic HIV: Drug-resistance testing is recommended at entry into HIV care to guide selection of initial ART **(AII)**. A genotypic assay is generally preferred **(AIII)**.	Transmitted HIV with baseline resistance to at least 1 drug is seen in 10% to 17% of patients, and suboptimal virologic responses may be seen in patients with baseline resistant mutations to ARVs in the prescribed regimen. Some drug-resistance mutations can remain detectable for years in untreated patients with chronic HIV.
For pregnant persons, or if ART will be initiated on the day of or soon after HIV diagnosis, treatment can be initiated prior to receiving resistance testing results.	If necessary, the ART regimen can be modified once resistance test results are available.
If an INSTI is considered for an ART-naive patient **and/or** transmitted INSTI resistance is a concern, providers should supplement standard resistance testing with a specific INSTI genotypic resistance assay, which may need to be ordered separately **(AIII)**.	Genotypic assays provide information on resistance to NRTIs, NNRTIs, PIs, and INSTIs. In some circumstances, INSTI resistance tests need to be ordered separately (clinicians should check with the testing laboratory). Currently, transmitted INSTI resistance is infrequent, but the risk of a patient acquiring INSTI-resistant strains may be greater in certain known exposure settings.
If therapy is deferred, repeat resistance testing may be considered before initiation of ART **(CIII)**. A genotypic assay is generally preferred **(AIII)**.	Repeat testing before initiation of ART may be considered because the patient may have acquired a drug-resistant virus (i.e., a superinfection). Genotypic testing is preferred to phenotypic testing because of lower cost, faster turnaround time, and greater sensitivity for detecting mixtures of wild-type and resistant virus.
If use of a CCR5 antagonist is being considered, a co-receptor tropism assay should be performed **(AI)**.	See Co-Receptor Tropism Assays section.
In Patients with Virologic Failure: Drug-resistance testing is recommended in patients on combination ART with HIV RNA levels >1,000 copies/mL **(AI)**. In patients with HIV RNA levels >500 copies/mL but <1,000 copies/mL, testing may not be successful but should still be considered **(BII)**.	Drug-resistance testing can help determine the role of resistance in drug failure and maximize the clinician's ability to select active drugs for the new regimen.
Resistance testing should be done while the patient is taking ART or, if that is not possible, within 4 weeks after ART discontinuation **(AII)**. If >4 weeks have elapsed, resistance testing may still be useful to guide therapy; however, previously-selected mutations can be missed due to lack of drug selective pressure **(CIII)**.	The absence of detectable resistance in such patients must be interpreted with caution when designing subsequent ARV regimens, as mutations may decay with time.
A standard genotypic resistance assay is generally preferred for patients experiencing virologic failure on their first or second regimens and for those with noncomplex resistance patterns **(AII)**.	Genotypic testing is preferred to phenotypic testing because of lower cost, faster turnaround time, and greater sensitivity for detecting mixtures of wild-type and resistant HIV.
All prior and current drug-resistance testing results should be reviewed and considered when designing a new regimen for a patient experiencing virologic failure **(AIII)**.	Drug resistance mutations may decay with time, and mutations detected in prior resistance tests may not be detected in current tests, though they remain clinically relevant.
When virologic failure occurs while a patient is on an INSTI-based regimen, genotypic testing for INSTI resistance should be performed to determine whether to include drugs from this class in subsequent regimens **(AII)**.	Genotypic assays provide information on resistance to NRTI-, NNRTI-, PI-, and INSTI-associated mutations. In some circumstances, INSTI resistance tests need to be ordered separately (clinicians should check with the testing laboratory).

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 5. Recommendations for Using Drug-Resistance Assays (page 2 of 2)

Clinical Setting and Recommendation	Rationale
Adding phenotypic testing to genotypic testing is generally preferred in patients with known or suspected complex drug-resistance patterns **(BIII)**.	Phenotypic testing can provide additional useful information in patients with complex drug resistance mutation patterns.
In Patients with Suboptimal Suppression of Viral Load: Drug-resistance testing is recommended in patients with suboptimal viral load suppression after initiation of ART **(AII)**.	Testing can determine the role of resistance in suboptimal viral suppression, and it can help the clinician identify the number of active drugs available in the current regimen and assess the need for a new regimen.
In Pregnant Persons with HIV: Genotypic resistance testing is recommended for all pregnant persons before initiation of ART **(AIII)** and for those entering pregnancy with detectable HIV RNA levels while on therapy **(AI)**.	The goals of ART in pregnant persons with HIV are to achieve maximal viral suppression for treatment of maternal HIV and to prevent perinatal transmission of HIV. Genotypic resistance testing will assist the clinician in selecting the optimal regimen for the patient. However, treatment should not be delayed while awaiting results of resistance testing. The initial regimen can be modified once resistance test results are available, if needed.
In Patients with Undetectable Viral Load or Low-Level Viremia: HIV-1 proviral DNA resistance assays may be useful in patients with HIV RNA below the limit of detection or with low-level viremia, where a HIV RNA genotypic assay is unlikely to be successful **(CIII)**.	This test may provide information about previously circulating resistant viral variants that are archived within proviral DNA. These assays may miss some or all prior resistance mutations that have occurred within the viral quasi-species, and therefore they should be interpreted with caution. The clinical utility of HIV-1 proviral DNA assays has not been fully determined.

Key to Acronyms: ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitors; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse-transcriptase inhibitors; NRTI = nucleoside reverse-transcriptase inhibitors; PI = protease inhibitor

References

1. Paredes R, Tzou PL, van Zyl G, et al. Collaborative update of a rule-based expert system for HIV-1 genotypic resistance test interpretation. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(7):e0181357. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28753637.
2. Flandre P, Costagliola D. On the comparison of artificial network and interpretation systems based on genotype resistance mutations in HIV-1-infected patients. *AIDS*. 2006;20(16):2118-2120. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17053360.
3. Vercauteren J, Vandamme AM. Algorithms for the interpretation of HIV-1 genotypic drug resistance information. *Antiviral Res*. 2006;71(2-3):335-342. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16782210.
4. Gianotti N, Mondino V, Rossi MC, et al. Comparison of a rule-based algorithm with a phenotype-based algorithm for the interpretation of HIV genotypes in guiding salvage regimens in HIV-infected patients by a randomized clinical trial: the mutations and salvage study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2006;42(10):1470-1480. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16619162.
5. Torti C, Quiros-Roldan E, Regazzi M, et al. A randomized controlled trial to evaluate antiretroviral salvage therapy guided by rules-based or phenotype-driven HIV-1 genotypic drug-resistance interpretation with or without concentration-controlled intervention: the Resistance and Dosage Adapted Regimens (RADAR) study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;40(12):1828-1836. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15909273.
6. Tural C, Ruiz L, Holtzer C, et al. Clinical utility of HIV-1 genotyping and expert advice: the Havana trial. *AIDS*. 2002;16(2):209-218. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11807305.
7. Lanier ER, Ait-Khaled M, Scott J, et al. Antiviral efficacy of abacavir in antiretroviral therapy-experienced adults harbouring HIV-1 with specific patterns of resistance to nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors. *Antivir Ther*. 2004;9(1):37-45. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15040535.
8. Miller MD, Margot N, Lu B, et al. Genotypic and phenotypic predictors of the magnitude of response to tenofovir disoproxil fumarate treatment in antiretroviral-experienced patients. *J Infect Dis*. 2004;189(5):837-846. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14976601.
9. Flandre P, Chappey C, Marcelin AG, et al. Phenotypic susceptibility to didanosine is associated with antiviral activity in treatment-experienced patients with HIV-1 infection. *J Infect Dis*. 2007;195(3):392-398. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17205478.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

10. Naeger LK, Struble KA. Food and Drug Administration analysis of tipranavir clinical resistance in HIV-1-infected treatment-experienced patients. *AIDS*. 2007;21(2):179-185. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17197808.
11. Naeger LK, Struble KA. Effect of baseline protease genotype and phenotype on HIV response to atazanavir/ritonavir in treatment-experienced patients. *AIDS*. 2006;20(6):847-853. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16549968.
12. Verhofstede C, Wanzeele FV, Van Der Gucht B, De Cabooter N, Plum J. Interruption of reverse transcriptase inhibitors or a switch from reverse transcriptase to protease inhibitors resulted in a fast reappearance of virus strains with a reverse transcriptase inhibitor-sensitive genotype. *AIDS*. 1999;13(18):2541-2546. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10630523.
13. Miller V, Sabin C, Hertogs K, et al. Virological and immunological effects of treatment interruptions in HIV-1 infected patients with treatment failure. *AIDS*. 2000;14(18):2857-2867. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11153667.
14. Devereux HL, Youle M, Johnson MA, Loveday C. Rapid decline in detectability of HIV-1 drug resistance mutations after stopping therapy. *AIDS*. 1999;13(18):F123-127. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10630517.
15. Benson CA, Vaida F, Havlir DV, et al. A randomized trial of treatment interruption before optimized antiretroviral therapy for persons with drug-resistant HIV: 48-week virologic results of ACTG A5086. *J Infect Dis*. 2006;194(9):1309-1318. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17041858.
16. Little SJ, Holte S, Routy JP, et al. Antiretroviral-drug resistance among patients recently infected with HIV. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;347(6):385-394. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12167680.
17. Borroto-Esoda K, Waters JM, Bae AS, et al. Baseline genotype as a predictor of virological failure to emtricitabine or stavudine in combination with didanosine and efavirenz. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2007;23(8):988-995. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17725415.
18. Pozniak AL, Gallant JE, DeJesus E, et al. Tenofovir disoproxil fumarate, emtricitabine, and efavirenz versus fixed-dose zidovudine/lamivudine and efavirenz in antiretroviral-naive patients: virologic, immunologic, and morphologic changes—a 96-week analysis. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2006;43(5):535-540. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17057609.
19. Kuritzkes DR, Lalama CM, Ribaudo HJ, et al. Pre-existing resistance to nonnucleoside reverse-transcriptase inhibitors predicts virologic failure of an efavirenz-based regimen in treatment-naive HIV-1-infected subjects. *J Infect Dis*. 2008;197(6):867-870. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18269317.
20. World Health Organization. WHO HIV Drug Resistance Report 2012. 2012. Geneva, Switzerland. Available at: http://www.who.int/hiv/pub/drugresistance/report2012.
21. Yanik EL, Napravnik S, Hurt CB, et al. Prevalence of transmitted antiretroviral drug resistance differs between acutely and chronically HIV-infected patients. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2012;61(2):258-262. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22692092.
22. Agwu AL, Bethel J, Hightow-Weidman LB, et al. Substantial multiclass transmitted drug resistance and drug-relevant polymorphisms among treatment-naive behaviorally HIV-infected youth. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2012;26(4):193-196. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22563607.
23. Castor D, Low A, Evering T, et al. Transmitted drug resistance and phylogenetic relationships among acute and early HIV-1-infected individuals in New York City. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2012;61(1):1-8. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22592583.
24. Doyle T, Dunn DT, Ceccherini-Silberstein F, et al. Integrase inhibitor (INI) genotypic resistance in treatment-naive and raltegravir-experienced patients infected with diverse HIV-1 clades. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2015;70(11):3080-3086. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26311843.
25. Menza TW, Billock R, Samoff E, Eron JJ, Dennis AM. Pretreatment integrase strand transfer inhibitor resistance in North Carolina from 2010–2016. *AIDS*. 2017;31(16):2235-2244. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28991024.
26. Johnson JA, Li JF, Wei X, et al. Minority HIV-1 drug resistance mutations are present in antiretroviral treatment-naive populations and associate with reduced treatment efficacy. *PLoS Med*. 2008;5(7):e158. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18666824.
27. Simen BB, Simons JF, Hullsiek KH, et al. Low-abundance drug-resistant viral variants in chronically HIV-infected, antiretroviral treatment-naive patients significantly impact treatment outcomes. *J Infect Dis*. 2009;199(5):693-701.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19210162.

28. Paredes R, Lalama CM, Ribaudo HJ, et al. Pre-existing minority drug-resistant HIV-1 variants, adherence, and risk of antiretroviral treatment failure. *J Infect Dis*. 2010;201(5):662-671. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20102271.
29. Smith DM, Wong JK, Hightower GK, et al. HIV drug resistance acquired through superinfection. *AIDS*. 2005;19(12):1251-1256. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16052079.
30. Smith DM, Wong JK, Shao H, et al. Long-term persistence of transmitted HIV drug resistance in male genital tract secretions: implications for secondary transmission. *J Infect Dis*. 2007;196(3):356-360. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17597449.
31. Novak RM, Chen L, MacArthur RD, et al. Prevalence of antiretroviral drug resistance mutations in chronically HIV-infected, treatment-naive patients: implications for routine resistance screening before initiation of antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;40(3):468-474. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15668873.
32. Little SJ, Frost SD, Wong JK, et al. Persistence of transmitted drug resistance among subjects with primary human immunodeficiency virus infection. *J Virol*. 2008;82(11):5510-5518. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18353964.
33. 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(2):180-189. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15249567.
34. Jourdain G, Ngo-Giang-Huong N, Le Coeur S, et al. Intrapartum exposure to nevirapine and subsequent maternal responses to nevirapine-based antiretroviral therapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2004;351(3):229-240. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15247339.
35. Pillay D, Bhaskaran K, Jurriaans S, et al. The impact of transmitted drug resistance on the natural history of HIV infection and response to first-line therapy. *AIDS*. 2006;20(1):21-28. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16327315.
36. Kantor R, Smeaton L, Vardhanabhuti S, et al. Pretreatment HIV drug resistance and HIV-1 subtype C are independently associated with virologic failure: results from the multinational PEARLS (ACTG A5175) clinical trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;60(10):1541-1549. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25681380.
37. Phanuphak P, Sirivichayakul S, Jiamsakul A, et al. Transmitted drug resistance and antiretroviral treatment outcomes in non-subtype B HIV-1-infected patients in South East Asia. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2014;66(1):74-79. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24413039.
38. Sax PE, Islam R, Walensky RP, et al. Should resistance testing be performed for treatment-naive HIV-infected patients? A cost-effectiveness analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;41(9):1316-1323. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16206108.
39. Cingolani A, Antinori A, Rizzo MG, et al. Usefulness of monitoring HIV drug resistance and adherence in individuals failing highly active antiretroviral therapy: a randomized study (ARGENTA). *AIDS*. 2002;16(3):369-379. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11834948.
40. Durant J, Clevenbergh P, Halfon P, et al. Drug-resistance genotyping in HIV-1 therapy: the VIRADAPT randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 1999;353(9171):2195-2199. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10392984.
41. Baxter JD, Mayers DL, Wentworth DN, et al. A randomized study of antiretroviral management based on plasma genotypic antiretroviral resistance testing in patients failing therapy. CPCRA 046 Study Team for the Terry Beirn Community Programs for Clinical Research on AIDS. *AIDS*. 2000;14(9):F83-93. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10894268.
42. Cohen CJ, Hunt S, Sension M, et al. A randomized trial assessing the impact of phenotypic resistance testing on antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. 2002;16(4):579-588. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11873001.
43. Meynard JL, Vray M, Morand-Joubert L, et al. Phenotypic or genotypic resistance testing for choosing antiretroviral therapy after treatment failure: a randomized trial. *AIDS*. 2002;16(5):727-736. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11964529.
44. Vray M, Meynard JL, Dalban C, et al. Predictors of the virological response to a change in the antiretroviral treatment regimen in HIV-1-infected patients enrolled in a randomized trial comparing genotyping, phenotyping and standard of care (Narval trial, ANRS 088). *Antivir Ther*. 2003;8(5):427-434. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14640390.
45. Wegner SA, Wallace MR, Aronson NE, et al. Long-term efficacy of routine access to antiretroviral-resistance testing in

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

HIV type 1-infected patients: results of the clinical efficacy of resistance testing trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2004;38(5):723-730. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14986258.

46. Palella FJ, Jr., Armon C, Buchacz K, et al. The association of HIV susceptibility testing with survival among HIV-infected patients receiving antiretroviral therapy: a cohort study. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;151(2):73-84. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19620160.
47. Havlir DV, Hellmann NS, Petropoulos CJ, et al. Drug susceptibility in HIV infection after viral rebound in patients receiving indinavir-containing regimens. *JAMA*. 2000;283(2):229-234. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10634339.
48. Descamps D, Flandre P, Calvez V, et al. Mechanisms of virologic failure in previously untreated HIV-infected patients from a trial of induction-maintenance therapy. Trilege (Agence Nationale de Recherches sur le SIDA 072 Study Team). *JAMA*. 2000;283(2):205-211. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10634336.
49. Machouf N, Thomas R, Nguyen VK, et al. Effects of drug resistance on viral load in patients failing antiretroviral therapy. *J Med Virol*. 2006;78(5):608-613. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16555280.
50. Anderson JA, Jiang H, Ding X, et al. Genotypic susceptibility scores and HIV type 1 RNA responses in treatment-experienced subjects with HIV type 1 infection. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2008;24(5):685-694. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18462083.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Co-Receptor Tropism Assays (Last updated October 25, 2018; last reviewed October 25, 2018)

Panel's Recommendations
• A co-receptor tropism assay should be performed whenever the use of a CCR5 co-receptor antagonist is being considered **(AI)**. • Co-receptor tropism testing is recommended for patients who exhibit virologic failure on a CCR5 antagonist **(BIII)**. • A phenotypic tropism assay is preferred to determine HIV-1 co-receptor usage **(AI)**. • A genotypic tropism assay should be considered as an alternative test to predict HIV-1 co-receptor usage **(BII)**. • A proviral DNA tropism assay can be utilized for patients with undetectable HIV-1 RNA when a CCR5 antagonist is considered for use in a new regimen (e.g., as part of a regimen switch or simplification) **(BII)**.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional* ***Rating of Evidence:*** *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

HIV enters cells by a complex process that involves sequential attachment to the CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) receptor followed by binding to either the CCR5 or CXCR4 molecules and fusion of the viral and cellular membranes.[1] CCR5 co-receptor antagonists prevent HIV entry into target cells by binding to the CCR5 receptors.[2] Phenotypic and genotypic assays have been developed that can determine or predict the co-receptor tropism (i.e., use of CCR5, CXCR4, or both as either dual-tropic virus or a mixed population of viruses referred to for purposes of assay results as dual/mixed [D/M]) of the patient's dominant virus population. An older generation assay (Trofile,® Monogram Biosciences, Inc., South San Francisco, CA) was used to screen patients who were participating in clinical trials that led to the approval of maraviroc (MVC), the only CCR5 antagonist currently available. The assay has been improved and is now available with enhanced sensitivity. In addition, genotypic assays to predict co-receptor usage are commercially available.

During acute/recent infection, the vast majority of patients harbor a CCR5-utilizing virus (R5 virus), which suggests that the R5 variant is preferentially transmitted; however, up to 19% of individuals with acute/recent infection can harbor CXCR4-tropic virus.[3-5] Viruses in many untreated patients eventually exhibit a shift in co-receptor tropism from CCR5 usage to either CXCR4 usage or D/M tropism. This shift is temporally associated with a more rapid decline in CD4 counts,[6,7] but whether this tropism shift is a cause or a consequence of progressive immunodeficiency remains undetermined.[1] Antiretroviral-treated patients with extensive drug resistance or persistently high-level viremia are more likely to harbor CXCR4- or D/M-tropic variants than untreated patients with comparable CD4 counts.[8,9] The prevalence of CXCR4- or D/M-tropic variants increases to more than 50% in treated patients who have CD4 counts <100 cells/mm^3.[8,10] Since CXCR4-tropic viruses may be present at initial presentation or a patient may shift to CXCR4-tropism over the course of infection, co-receptor tropism should always be assessed prior to the use of CCR5 antagonists for treatment. Once a patient has ever been documented with detectable CXCR4- or D/M-tropic virus, it is assumed that such viruses will always be present. CCR5 co-receptor antagonists will no longer be active for that patient and should not be used.

Phenotypic Assays

Phenotypic assays characterize the co-receptor usage of plasma-derived virus. These assays involve the generation of laboratory viruses that express patient-derived envelope proteins (i.e., gp120 and gp41). These pseudoviruses, which are replication-defective, are used to infect target cell lines that express either CCR5 or CXCR4.[11,12] Using the Trofile® assay, the co-receptor tropism of the patient-derived virus is confirmed by testing the susceptibility of the virus to specific CCR5 or CXCR4 inhibitors *in vitro*. This assay takes about 2 weeks to perform and requires a plasma HIV RNA level ≥1,000 copies/mL.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

The performance characteristics of these assays have evolved. Most, if not all, patients enrolled in premarketing clinical trials of MVC and other CCR5 antagonists were screened with an earlier, less sensitive version of the Trofile® assay.[12] This earlier assay failed to routinely detect low levels of CXCR4 utilizing variants. As a consequence, some patients enrolled in these clinical trials harbored low levels of such variants at baseline, which were below the assay limit of detection, and these patients exhibited rapid virologic failure after initiation of a CCR5 antagonist.[13] The assay has been improved and is now able to detect lower levels of CXCR4-utlizing viruses. *In vitro*, the assay can detect CXCR4-utilizing clones with 100% sensitivity when those clones represent 0.3% or more of the virus population.[14] Although this more sensitive assay has had limited use in prospective clinical trials, it is now the only assay that is commercially available. For unclear reasons, a minority of samples cannot be successfully phenotyped with either generation of the Trofile® assay.

In patients with an undetectable viral load or detectable plasma HIV RNA <1,000 copies/mL, phenotypic co-receptor usage can be determined using proviral DNA obtained from peripheral blood mononuclear cells (e.g., Trofile® DNA, Monogram Sciences); however, the clinical utility of this assay remains to be determined.[15]

Genotypic Assays

Genotypic determination of HIV-1 co-receptor usage is based on sequencing of the V3-coding region of HIV-1 *env*, the principal determinant of co-receptor usage. A variety of algorithms and bioinformatics programs can be used to predict co-receptor usage from the V3 sequence.[16] When compared to the phenotypic assay, genotypic methods show high specificity (~90%) but only modest sensitivity (~50% to 75%) for the presence of a CXCR4-utilizing virus. Studies in which V3 genotyping was performed on samples from patients screened for clinical trials of MVC suggest that genotyping performed as well as phenotyping in predicting the response to MVC.[17-19] An important caveat is that the majority of patients who received MVC were first shown to have R5 virus by a phenotypic assay (Trofile®). Consequently, the opportunity to assess treatment response to MVC in patients whose virus was considered R5 by genotype but D/M or X4 by phenotype was limited to a relatively small number of patients. Other studies have also demonstrated relatively high concordance between genotypic- and phenotypic-assessed tropism;[20,21] however, there is variability between different genotypic platforms.[22]

Given these performance characteristics, genotypic tropism assays may not be sufficiently robust to completely rule out the presence of an X4 or D/M variant;[23] therefore, the Panel preferentially recommends phenotypic testing. Based on accessibility, capacity, logistics, and cost, European guidelines currently include genotypic testing as an equivalent option to phenotypic testing when determining co-receptor usage among patients with HIV RNA >1,000 copies/mL and preferentially for those with HIV RNA ≤1,000 copies/mL.[24]

HIV-1 proviral DNA genotypic tropism testing is available for patients with HIV RNA <1,000 copies/mL. These assays evaluate the HIV-1 proviral DNA integrated within infected cells for CXCR4-utilizing viral strains.[25] As discussed above, caution is advised when using such assays, as their detection limit, concordance with plasma HIV RNA tropism, and clinical utility are not yet fully determined.

Use of Assays to Determine Co-receptor Usage in Clinical Practice

An assay for HIV-1 co-receptor usage should be performed whenever the use of a CCR5 antagonist is being considered **(AI)**. This is true even in the setting of prior tropism testing showing CCR5 usage, as viral evolution may occur over the course of infection. In addition, because virologic failure may occur due to a shift from CCR5-using to CXCR4-using virus, testing for co-receptor usage is recommended in patients who exhibit virologic failure on a CCR5 antagonist **(BIII)**. Virologic failure may also be caused by resistance of a CCR5-using virus to a CCR5 antagonist, but such resistance is uncommon. Compared to genotypic testing, phenotypic testing has more evidence supporting its utility. Therefore, a phenotypic test for co-receptor usage is generally preferred **(AI)**. However, because phenotypic testing is more expensive, requires more time to

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

perform, and may have logistic challenges, a genotypic test to predict HIV-1 co-receptor usage should be considered as an alternative test **(BII)**.

As with HIV resistance testing, the results of all prior tropism tests should be obtained. If CXCR4-utlizing or D/M-tropic viruses have ever been detected previously, then repeat testing is not necessary and a CCR5 co-receptor antagonist **should not be used**.

If a CCR5 co-receptor antagonist is being considered in a patient with an undetectable HIV RNA (e.g., in cases of regimen simplification or a toxicity-related switch), a proviral DNA tropism assay can be utilized **(BII)**.[26-28] If CXCR4-utlizing or D/M-tropic viruses are detected, then the CCR5 co-receptor antagonist **should not be used**.

References

1. Moore JP, Kitchen SG, Pugach P, Zack JA. The CCR5 and CXCR4 coreceptors--central to understanding the transmission and pathogenesis of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2004;20(1):111-126. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15000703.

2. Fatkenheuer G, Pozniak AL, Johnson MA, et al. Efficacy of short-term monotherapy with maraviroc, a new CCR5 antagonist, in patients infected with HIV-1. *Nat Med*. 2005;11(11):1170-1172. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16205738.

3. Zhu T, Mo H, Wang N, et al. Genotypic and phenotypic characterization of HIV-1 patients with primary infection. *Science*. 1993;261(5125):1179-1181. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8356453.

4. Brumme ZL, Goodrich J, Mayer HB, et al. Molecular and clinical epidemiology of CXCR4-using HIV-1 in a large population of antiretroviral-naive individuals. *J Infect Dis*. 2005;192(3):466-474. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15995960.

5. Raymond S, Nicot F, Saune K, et al. Brief report: HIV-1 tropism during primary Infections in France: 1996-2014. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;72(4):376-379. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26959188.

6. Connor RI, Sheridan KE, Ceradini D, Choe S, Landau NR. Change in coreceptor use correlates with disease progression in HIV-1-infected individuals. *J Exp Med*. 1997;185(4):621-628. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9034141.

7. Koot M, Keet IP, Vos AH, et al. Prognostic value of HIV-1 syncytium-inducing phenotype for rate of CD4+ cell depletion and progression to AIDS. *Ann Intern Med*. 1993;118(9):681-688. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=8096374.

8. Hunt PW, Harrigan PR, Huang W, et al. Prevalence of CXCR4 tropism among antiretroviral-treated HIV-1-infected patients with detectable viremia. *J Infect Dis*. 2006;194(7):926-930. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16960780.

9. Agwu AL, Yao TJ, Eshleman SH, et al. Phenotypic coreceptor tropism in perinatally HIV-infected youth failing antiretroviral therapy. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2016;35(7):777-781. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27078121.

10. Wilkin TJ, Su Z, Kuritzkes DR, et al. HIV type 1 chemokine coreceptor use among antiretroviral-experienced patients screened for a clinical trial of a CCR5 inhibitor: AIDS Clinical Trial Group A5211. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2007;44(4):591-595. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17243065.

11. Trouplin V, Salvatori F, Cappello F, et al. Determination of coreceptor usage of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 from patient plasma samples by using a recombinant phenotypic assay. *J Virol*. 2001;75(1):251-259. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11119595.

12. Whitcomb JM, Huang W, Fransen S, et al. Development and characterization of a novel single-cycle recombinant-virus assay to determine human immunodeficiency virus type 1 coreceptor tropism. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2007;51(2):566-575. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17116663.

13. Westby M, Lewis M, Whitcomb J, et al. Emergence of CXCR4-using human immunodeficiency virus type 1 (HIV-1) variants in a minority of HIV-1-infected patients following treatment with the CCR5 antagonist maraviroc is from a pretreatment CXCR4-using virus reservoir. *J Virol*. 2006;80(10):4909-4920. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16641282.

14. Trinh L, Han D, Huang W, et al. Technical validation of an enhanced sensitivity Trofile HIV coreceptor tropism assay for selecting patients for therapy with entry inhibitors targeting CCR5. *Antivir Ther*. 2008;13(Suppl 3):A128.

15. Toma J, Frantzell A, Cook J, et al. Phenotypic determination of HIV-1 coreceptor tropism using cell-associated DNA derived from blood samples. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. 2010. San Francisco, CA.

16. Garrido C, Roulet V, Chueca N, et al. Evaluation of eight different bioinformatics tools to predict viral tropism in different human immunodeficiency virus type 1 subtypes. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2008;46(3):887-891. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18199789.

17. McGovern RA, Thielen A, Mo T, et al. Population-based V3 genotypic tropism assay: a retrospective analysis using screening samples from the A4001029 and MOTIVATE studies. *AIDS*. 2010;24(16):2517-2525. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20736814.

18. McGovern RA, Thielen A, Portsmouth S, et al. Population-based sequencing of the V3-loop can predict the virological response to maraviroc in treatment-naive patients of the MERIT trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2012;61(3):279-286. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23095934.

19. Archer J, Weber J, Henry K, et al. Use of four next-generation sequencing platforms to determine HIV-1 coreceptor tropism. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(11):e49602. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23166726.

20. Heger E, Kaiser R, Knops E, et al. Results of the first international HIV-1 coreceptor proficiency panel test. *J Clin Virol*. 2017;93:53-56. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28633097.

21. Kagan RM, Johnson EP, Siaw MF, et al. Comparison of genotypic and phenotypic HIV type 1 tropism assay: results from the screening samples of Cenicriviroc Study 202, a randomized phase II trial in treatment-naive subjects. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2014;30(2):151-159. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23875707.

22. Swenson LC, Dong WW, Mo T, et al. Use of cellular HIV DNA to predict virologic response to maraviroc: performance of population-based and deep sequencing. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;56(11):1659-1666. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23429552.

23. Lin NH, Kuritzkes DR. Tropism testing in the clinical management of HIV-1 infection. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS*. 2009;4(6):481-487. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20048714.

24. Vandekerckhove LP, Wensing AM, Kaiser R, et al. European guidelines on the clinical management of HIV-1 tropism testing. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2011;11(5):394-407. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21429803.

25. Fabeni L, Berno G, Svicher V, et al. Genotypic tropism testing in HIV-1 proviral DNA can provide useful information at low-level viremia. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2015;53(9):2935-2941. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26135872.

26. Vitiello P, Brudney D, MacCartney M, et al. Responses to switching to maraviroc-based antiretroviral therapy in treated patients with suppressed plasma HIV-1-RNA load. *Intervirology*. 2012;55(2):172-178. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22286889.

27. Bonjoch A, Pou C, Perez-Alvarez N, et al. Switching the third drug of antiretroviral therapy to maraviroc in aviraemic subjects: a pilot, prospective, randomized clinical trial. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2013;68(6):1382-1387. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23354282.

28. Pett SL, Amin J, Horban A, et al. Maraviroc, as a switch option, in HIV-1-infected individuals with stable, well-controlled HIV replication and R5-tropic virus on their first nucleoside/nucleotide reverse transcriptase inhibitor plus ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor regimen: Week 48 results of the randomized, multicenter MARCH Study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;63(1):122-132. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27048747.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

HLA-B*5701 Screening (Last updated December 1, 2007; last reviewed January 10, 2011)

Panel's Recommendations
• The Panel recommends screening for HLA-B*5701 before starting patients on an abacavir (ABC)-containing regimen to reduce the risk of hypersensitivity reaction (HSR) **(AI)**. • HLA-B*5701-positive patients should not be prescribed ABC **(AI)**. • The positive status should be recorded as an ABC allergy in the patient's medical record **(AII)**. • When HLA-B*5701 screening is not readily available, it remains reasonable to initiate ABC with appropriate clinical counseling and monitoring for any signs of HSR **(CIII)**.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional*
Rating of Evidence: *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

The abacavir (ABC) hypersensitivity reaction (HSR) is a multiorgan clinical syndrome typically seen within the initial 6 weeks of ABC treatment. This reaction has been reported in 5% to 8% of patients participating in clinical trials when using clinical criteria for the diagnosis, and it is the major reason for early discontinuation of ABC. Discontinuing ABC usually promptly reverses HSR, whereas subsequent rechallenge can cause a rapid, severe, and even life-threatening recurrence.[1]

Studies that evaluated demographic risk factors for ABC HSR have shown racial background as a risk factor, with white patients generally having a higher risk (5%–8%) than black patients (2%–3%). Several groups reported a highly significant association between ABC HSR and the presence of the major histocompatibility complex (MHC) class I allele HLA-B*5701.[2,3] Because the clinical criteria used for ABC HSR are overly sensitive and may lead to false-positive ABC HSR diagnoses, an ABC skin patch test (SPT) was developed as a research tool to immunologically confirm ABC HSR.[4] A positive ABC SPT is an ABC-specific delayed HSR that results in redness and swelling at the skin site of application. All ABC SPT–positive patients studied were also positive for the HLA-B*5701 allele.[5] The ABC SPT could be falsely negative for some patients with ABC HSR and, at this point, is not recommended for use as a clinical tool. The PREDICT-1 study randomized participants with HIV before starting ABC either to be prospectively screened for HLA-B*5701 (with HLA-B*5701–positive patients not offered ABC) or to standard of care at the time of the study (i.e., no HLA screening, with all patients receiving ABC).[6] The overall HLA-B*5701 prevalence in this predominately white population was 5.6%. In this cohort, screening for HLA-B*5701 eliminated immunologic ABC HSR (defined as ABC SPT positive) compared with standard of care (0% vs. 2.7%), yielding a 100% negative predictive value with respect to SPT and significantly decreasing the rate of clinically suspected ABC HSR (3.4% vs. 7.8%). The SHAPE study corroborated the low rate of immunologically validated ABC HSR in black patients and confirmed the utility of HLA-B*5701 screening for the risk of ABC HSR (100% sensitivity in black and white populations).[7]

On the basis of the results of these studies, the Panel recommends screening for HLA-B*5701 before starting an ABC-containing regimen in a person with HIV **(AI)**. HLA-B*5701–positive patients should not be prescribed ABC **(AI)**, and the positive status should be recorded as an ABC allergy in the patient's medical record (AII). HLA-B*5701 testing is needed only once in a patient's lifetime; thus, efforts to carefully record and maintain the test result and to educate the patient about its implications are important. The specificity of the HLA-B*5701 test in predicting ABC HSR is lower than the sensitivity (i.e., 33%–50% of HLA-B*5701–positive patients would likely not develop confirmed ABC HSR if exposed to ABC). HLA-B*5701 should not be used as a substitute for clinical judgment or pharmacovigilance, because a negative HLA-B*5701 result does not absolutely rule out the possibility of some form of ABC HSR. When HLA-B*5701 screening

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

is not readily available, it remains reasonable to initiate ABC with appropriate clinical counseling and monitoring for any signs of ABC HSR **(CIII)**.

References

1. Hetherington S, McGuirk S, Powell G, et al. Hypersensitivity reactions during therapy with the nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor abacavir. *Clin Ther*. 2001;23(10):1603-1614.
2. Mallal S, Nolan D, Witt C, et al. Association between presence of HLA-B*5701, HLA-DR7, and HLA-DQ3 and hypersensitivity to HIV-1 reverse-transcriptase inhibitor abacavir. *Lancet*. 2002;359(9308):727-732.
3. Hetherington S, Hughes AR, Mosteller M, et al. Genetic variations in HLA-B region and hypersensitivity reactions to abacavir. *Lancet*. 2002;359(9312):1121-1122.
4. Phillips EJ, Sullivan JR, Knowles SR, et al. Utility of patch testing in patients with hypersensitivity syndromes associated with abacavir. *AIDS*. 2002;16(16):2223-2225.
5. Phillips E, Rauch A, Nolan D, et al. Pharmacogenetics and clinical characteristics of patch test confirmed patients with abacavir hypersensitivity. *Rev Antivir Ther*. 2006:3: Abstract 57.
6. Mallal S, Phillips E, Carosi G, et al. HLA-B*5701 screening for hypersensitivity to abacavir. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;358(6):568-579.
7. Saag M, Balu R, Phillips E, et al. High sensitivity of human leukocyte antigen-b*5701 as a marker for immunologically confirmed abacavir hypersensitivity in white and black patients. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2008;46(7):1111-1118.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Treatment Goals (Last updated January 28, 2016; last reviewed January 28, 2016)

Antiretroviral therapy (ART) has reduced HIV-related morbidity and mortality at all stages of HIV infection[1-4] and has reduced HIV transmission.[5-8] Maximal and durable suppression of plasma viremia delays or prevents the selection of drug-resistance mutations, preserves or improves CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell numbers, and confers substantial clinical benefits, all of which are important treatment goals.[9,10] HIV suppression with ART may also decrease inflammation and immune activation thought to contribute to higher rates of cardiovascular and other end-organ damage reported in cohorts with HIV (see Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy). Despite these benefits, eradication of HIV infection cannot be achieved with available antiretrovirals (ARVs). Treatment interruption has been associated with rebound viremia, worsening of immune function, and increased morbidity and mortality.[11] Thus, once initiated, ART should be continued, with the following key treatment goals:

- Maximally and durably suppress plasma HIV RNA;
- Restore and preserve immunologic function;
- Reduce HIV-associated morbidity and prolong the duration and quality of survival; and
- Prevent HIV transmission.

Achieving viral suppression currently requires the use of combination ARV regimens that generally include three active drugs from two or more drug classes. Baseline patient characteristics and results from drug resistance testing should guide design of the specific regimen (see What to Start: Initial Combination Regimens for the Antiretroviral-Naive Patient). When initial HIV suppression is not achieved or not maintained, changing to a new regimen with at least two active drugs is often required (see Virologic Failure).The increasing number of ARV drugs and drug classes makes viral suppression below detection limits an achievable goal in most patients.

After initiation of effective ART, viral load reduction to below limits of assay detection usually occurs within the first 12 to 24 weeks of therapy. Predictors of virologic success include the following:

- Low baseline viremia;
- High potency of the ARV regimen;
- Tolerability of the regimen;
- Convenience of the regimen; and
- Excellent adherence to the regimen.

Strategies to Achieve Treatment Goals

Selection of Initial Combination Regimen

Several ARV regimens are recommended for use in ART-naive patients (see What to Start). Most of the recommended regimens have comparable efficacy but vary in pill burden, potential for drug interactions and/or side effects, and propensity to select for resistance mutations if ART adherence is suboptimal. Regimens should be tailored for the individual patient to enhance adherence and support long-term treatment success. Considerations when selecting an ARV regimen for an individual patient include potential side effects, patient comorbidities, possible interactions with conconcomitant medications, results of pretreatment genotypic drug-resistance testing, and regimen convenience (see Table 7).

Improving Adherence

Suboptimal adherence may result in reduced treatment response. Incomplete adherence can result from complex medication regimens; patient-related factors, such as active substance abuse, depression, or

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

the experience of adverse effects; and health system issues, including interruptions in patient access to medication and inadequate treatment education and support. Conditions that promote adherence should be maximized before and after initiation of ART (see Adherence to the Continuum of Care).

References

1. Severe P, Juste MA, Ambroise A, et al. Early versus standard antiretroviral therapy for HIV-infected adults in Haiti. *N Engl J Med*. Jul 15 2010;363(3):257-265. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20647201.

2. INSIGHT START Study Group. Initiation of antiretroviral therapy in early asymptomatic HIV infection. *N Engl J Med*. Jul 20 2015. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26192873.

3. TEMPRANO ANRS Study Group, Danel C, Moh R, et al. A trial of early antiretrovirals and isoniazid preventive therapy in africa. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 27 2015;373(9):808-822. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26193126.

4. Kitahata MM, Gange SJ, Abraham AG, et al. Effect of early versus deferred antiretroviral therapy for HIV on survival. *N Engl J Med*. Apr 30 2009;360(18):1815-1826. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19339714.

5. Mofenson LM, Lambert JS, Stiehm ER, et al. Risk factors for perinatal transmission of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 in women treated with zidovudine. Pediatric AIDS Clinical Trials Group Study 185 Team. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 5 1999;341(6):385-393. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10432323.

6. Wood E, Kerr T, Marshall BD, et al. Longitudinal community plasma HIV-1 RNA concentrations and incidence of HIV-1 among injecting drug users: prospective cohort study. *BMJ*. 2009;338:b1649. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19406887.

7. Cohen MS, Chen YQ, McCauley M, et al. Prevention of HIV-1 infection with early antiretroviral therapy. *N Engl J Med*. Aug 11 2011;365(6):493-505. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21767103.

8. Reynolds SJ, Makumbi F, Nakigozi G, et al. HIV-1 transmission among HIV-1 discordant couples before and after the introduction of antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. Feb 20 2011;25(4):473-477. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21160416.

9. O'Brien WA, Hartigan PM, Martin D, et al. Changes in plasma HIV-1 RNA and CD4+ lymphocyte counts and the risk of progression to AIDS. Veterans Affairs Cooperative Study Group on AIDS. *N Engl J Med*. Feb 15 1996;334(7):426-431. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=8552144.

10. Garcia F, de Lazzari E, Plana M, et al. Long-term CD4+ T-cell response to highly active antiretroviral therapy according to baseline CD4+ T-cell count. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Jun 1 2004;36(2):702-713. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15167289.

11. El-Sadr WM, Lundgren JD, Neaton JD, et al. CD4+ count-guided interruption of antiretroviral treatment. *N Engl J Med*. Nov 30 2006;355(22):2283-2296. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17135583.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Panel's Recommendations
• Antiretroviral therapy (ART) is recommended for all persons with HIV to reduce morbidity and mortality **(AI)** and to prevent the transmission of HIV to others **(AI)**. • The Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents recommends initiating ART immediately (or as soon as possible) after HIV diagnosis in order to increase the uptake of ART and linkage to care, decrease the time to viral suppression for individual patients, and improve the rate of virologic suppression among persons with HIV **(AII)**. • When initiating ART, it is important to educate patients regarding the benefits of ART and to deploy strategies to optimize care engagement and treatment adherence **(AIII)**.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional*
Rating of Evidence: *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

Introduction

The primary goal of antiretroviral therapy (ART) is to prevent HIV-associated morbidity and mortality. This goal is accomplished by using effective ART to achieve and maintain a plasma HIV-1 RNA (viral load) below the quantification limits of commercially available assays. Durable viral suppression improves immune function and overall quality of life, lowers the risk of both AIDS-defining and non-AIDS–defining complications, and allows persons with HIV to live a lifespan approaching that of persons without HIV.[1]

Another goal of ART is to reduce the risk of HIV transmission to sexual partners and to infants born to persons with HIV. High plasma HIV RNA levels are a major risk factor for HIV transmission; effective ART can reduce both viremia and the risk of transmission of HIV to sexual partners[2-6] and prevent perinatal transmission.[7,8] Modelling studies and ecological studies of populations with high ART uptake and high viral suppression rates suggest that expanded use of ART may lower the incidence of HIV and, eventually, the prevalence of HIV on a community or population level.[9-11]

Two large, randomized controlled trials addressed the optimal time to initiate ART—START[12] and TEMPRANO.[13] Both studies demonstrated reductions in morbidity and mortality among individuals with HIV who had CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell counts >500 cells/mm^3 and who were randomized to receive ART immediately when compared to individuals who delayed initiation of ART.

Deferring ART until CD4 counts decline puts individuals with HIV at risk of both AIDS-defining conditions and certain serious non-AIDS–defining conditions. Furthermore, the magnitude of CD4 recovery is directly correlated with CD4 count at ART initiation. Consequently, many individuals who start treatment with CD4 counts <350 cells/mm^3 do not achieve CD4 counts >500 cells/mm^3 after up to 10 years on ART,[14,15] and they have a shorter life expectancy than those who initiated therapy at higher CD4 count thresholds.[14-16]

Fundamental to the recommendation for earlier initiation of ART in these guidelines is the assumption that HIV will be diagnosed early in the course of the disease. Unfortunately, in some individuals, the diagnosis of HIV is not made until the later stages of the disease. In a survey conducted between 2016 and 2017, it was noted that fewer than 40% of American adults had ever had an HIV test.[17] Evidence shows that many people with HIV access health care years before their HIV diagnosis but are not offered HIV testing despite recommendations from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for routine testing for everyone aged 13 to 64 years.[18,19] There are also economic benefits to early diagnosis, including prolonging life, improving the quality of life, and decreasing the costs related to the management of AIDS and its co-morbidities.[20,21] Additionally, HIV screening is a key step in the Ending the HIV Epidemic initiative to prevent the transmission of HIV to others.[22]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Diagnosis of HIV is delayed more often in nonwhite individuals, those who inject drugs, those who live in rural communities, and older adults, and many individuals in these groups develop AIDS-defining illnesses within 1 year of diagnosis.[23-25] Therefore, to ensure that the current treatment guidelines have maximum impact, routine HIV screening per current CDC recommendations is essential. The U.S. Preventative Services Task Force recommends HIV testing for persons aged 15 to 65 years and for all pregnant individuals. HIV testing should also be performed for younger and older persons when indicated. This recommendation has been designated a Grade A recommendation by the U.S. Preventative Services Task Force, meaning that third-party payers should cover this service without cost to patients.[26] It is critical that everyone who receives an HIV diagnosis be educated about HIV disease and linked to care for full evaluation, follow-up, and management as soon as possible. In order for both individuals with HIV and their sexual partners to fully benefit from early diagnosis, clinicians should initiate ART as soon as possible and provide support to enhance retention in care and ART adherence (see Adherence to the Continuum of Care).

Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy

ART is recommended for all individuals with HIV to reduce the morbidity and mortality associated with HIV infection **(AI)** and to prevent HIV transmission to sexual partners and infants **(AI)**. ART should be initiated as soon as possible after HIV diagnosis **(AII)**. When initiating ART, it is important to educate patients about the goals and benefits of ART and to identify and address barriers to care engagement and treatment adherence **(AIII)**. Patients should also understand that currently available ART does not cure HIV. To improve and maintain immunologic function and maintain viral suppression, ART should be continued indefinitely without interruption. Initiating ART early is particularly important for patients with AIDS-defining conditions, those with acute or recent HIV infection, and individuals who are pregnant; delaying therapy in these subpopulations has been associated with high risks of morbidity, mortality, and HIV transmission.

Immediate Antiretroviral Therapy Initiation on the Day of HIV Diagnosis

Since individuals may fail to engage in care between the initial HIV diagnosis (or first clinic visit) and the time ART is prescribed, some groups have proposed rapid ART initiation on the same day of HIV diagnosis as a strategy to increase ART uptake and engagement in care and to accelerate the time to ART-mediated viral suppression. Rapid ART initiation also has the potential to reduce the time during which people with newly diagnosed HIV can transmit HIV. The rapid ART initiation strategy is supported by randomized controlled trials that were performed in resource-limited settings outside of the United States[27-29] and observational trials in the United States that included both immediate initiation of ART (on the day of diagnosis)[30-32] and rapid ART initiation (within days or weeks of diagnosis).[32,33] The results from some of these studies are discussed below.

A randomized controlled trial conducted in South Africa enrolled 377 individuals who had recently received HIV diagnoses (median CD4 count was 210 cells/mm^3). Participants were randomized to receive ART on the day of diagnosis or to receive the usual care (three to five additional visits over 2–4 weeks before ART initiation). Those who received immediate ART were significantly more likely to be virally suppressed at 10 months (64% vs. 51% of patients achieved viral suppression, respectively).[27] In another randomized controlled trial conducted in Haiti, a higher proportion of participants who were randomized to receive same-day ART initiation were retained in care and had viral suppression at the end of 1 year than those who initiated ART at the standard time (3 weeks after HIV testing); survival was also higher in the same-day ART initiation group.[28] A novel randomized controlled trial in Lesotho compared same-day, home-based ART to usual care and standard clinic referral (which involved a minimum of two counseling sessions prior to ART initiation). Participants randomized to receive same-day ART initiation were significantly more likely to achieve linkage to care within 90 days after enrollment (68.6% vs. 43.1%) and virologic suppression at

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

approximately 12 months (50.4% vs. 34.3%).[29]

There are many differences between health care in southern Africa and Haiti and in the United States—including differences in the health care systems, structural barriers to engagement in care, underlying HIV and tuberculosis (TB) epidemics, and ART regimens used—that limit the generalizability of the findings of the results from the studies described above. These studies, however, suggest that same-day initiation of ART is feasible and could potentially improve clinical outcomes.

While no randomized controlled trials have been conducted in the United States, several prospective observational studies have demonstrated the feasibility of same-day ART initiation. City-wide implementation of the San Francisco RAPID program among 225 patients who were newly diagnosed with HIV showed a median time from HIV diagnosis to ART start of 0 days (with a range of 0–56 days) and a median time from ART initiation to viral suppression (defined as <200 copies/mL) of 41 days. Over a median follow-up of 1.09 years (range 0–3.92 years), 92.1% of patients achieved virologic suppression. The RAPID study included a diverse and traditionally marginalized population, with a substantial proportion of participants having a major substance use disorder (51.4%), a major mental health disorder (48.1%), or unstable housing (30.6%).[31]

Whether rapid ART initiation improves long-term care engagement and virologic suppression is not yet known. One cohort study from France, however, found that earlier initiation of ART was negatively associated with care engagement at 1 year.[34] It should be emphasized that ART initiation on the same day of HIV diagnosis is resource intensive, and this strategy may require additional staff, multidisciplinary coordination, provision of ART starter packs, and consolidation of "usual care" patient services (e.g., clinical evaluation, education, counseling, initiation or optimization of insurance coverage, intake laboratory testing) into a 2- or 3-hour visit.[31] While the infrastructure and resources necessary to implement an immediate ART program may not be available in all health care settings, removing structural barriers in order to facilitate rapid ART initiation may improve outcomes in the United States. The Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents (the Panel) recommends initiating ART at the time of diagnosis (when possible) or soon afterwards to increase the uptake of ART, decrease the time required to achieve linkage to care and virologic suppression, and improve the rate of virologic suppression among individuals who have recently received HIV diagnoses **(AII)**. This rating for this recommendation reflects the fact that only observational trials have been conducted in the United States or other highly resourced countries, where health systems and socioeconomic contexts differ substantially from those in the countries where randomized trials were conducted.

Antiretroviral Therapy for Persons with Acute Opportunistic Infections and Malignancies

Initiation of ART in the setting of an acute, AIDS-associated opportunistic infection (OI) or malignancy can improve immune function and potentially enhance treatment success for the OI. Clinicians should refer to the Adult and Adolescent Opportunistic Infection Guidelines for a more in-depth discussion on specific OIs. Below is a list of important factors to consider when initiating ART in these situations.

- **When no effective therapy exists for the OI (e.g., cryptosporidiosis, microsporidiosis, progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy):** In these situations, ART may be the only treatment that can improve immune function and clinical outcomes. ART should be initiated without delay in these patients (see the Adult and Adolescent Opportunistic Infection Guidelines for more information).
- **Concerns regarding immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome (IRIS):** For some OIs, such as cryptococcal and TB meningitis, immediate ART initiation may increase the risk of serious IRIS. A short delay before initiating ART may be warranted.[35-38] After ART initation, the patient should be closely monitored for signs and symptoms associated with IRIS.
- **Non-meningeal TB:** In these patients, initiating ART during treatment for TB confers a significant survival advantage;[39-43] therefore, ART should be initiated as recommended in Tuberculosis/HIV Coinfection.
- **For patients with mild to moderate cutaneous Kaposi sarcoma:** Prompt initiation of ART alone without

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

chemotherapy has been associated with improvement of cutaneous Kaposi sarcoma lesions, even though initial transient progression of Kaposi sarcoma lesions as a manifestation of IRIS can also occur.[44]

- **For patients with malignancies that require chemotherapy:**
  - A diagnosis of malignancy should not delay initiation of ART, nor should initiation of ART delay treatment for the malignancy.
  - Although an IRIS-like presentation of non-Hodgkin's lymphoma after initiation of ART has been described,[45] ART-mediated viral suppression is associated with longer survival among individuals undergoing treatment for AIDS-related lymphoma.[46]
  - Drug interactions should be considered when selecting ART, as there is the potential for significant interactions between chemotherapeutic agents and some antiretroviral drugs (particularly some ritonavir-boosted or cobicistat-boosted regimens).

Evidence Supporting the Benefits of Antiretroviral Therapy in Preventing Morbidity and Mortality

Randomized Controlled Trials of Early vs. Deferred Antiretroviral Therapy

Two large randomized controlled trials, START and TEMPRANO, provide the evidence for the Panel's recommendation to initiate ART in all patients regardless of CD4 count **(AI)**. The results of these two studies are summarized below.

START was a large, multi-national, randomized controlled clinical trial designed to evaluate the role of early ART initiation in asymptomatic patients with HIV in reducing a composite clinical endpoint of AIDS-defining illnesses, serious non-AIDS events, or death. The study began at a time when initiating ART was not recommended until an individual's CD4 count fell below 350 cells/mm^3. In this study, ART-naive adults (aged >18 years) with CD4 counts >500 cells/mm^3 were randomized to initiate ART at randomization (early initiation arm) or to wait to initiate ART until their CD4 counts declined to <350 cells/mm^3 or until they developed a clinical indication for therapy (deferred initiation arm).

The study enrolled 4,685 participants, with a mean follow-up of 3 years. The primary endpoint of serious AIDS or non-AIDS events was reported in 42 participants (1.8%, or 0.60 events per 100 person-years) who were randomized to initiate ART early, and 96 participants (4.1%, or 1.38 events per 100 person-years) in the deferred ART arm (hazard ratio [HR] 0.43, favoring early ART; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.30–0.62, $P < 0.001$). The most common clinical events reported were TB and malignancies (including both AIDS and non-AIDS malignancies). The majority of clinical events (59%) in the deferred ART arm occurred in participants whose CD4 counts were still above 500 cells/mm^3, evidence for a benefit of initiating ART even before CD4 count declines below this threshold. Furthermore, the benefit of early ART was consistent across all participant subgroups, including gender, age, plasma HIV RNA levels, and income level of country. Although START was not sufficiently powered to compare the benefits of early ART initiation and deferred ART initiation for each category of clinical events, the benefit appeared to be particularly strong for AIDS events (HR 0.28), TB (HR 0.29), malignancies (HR 0.36), and severe bacterial infections (HR 0.39). The benefit at lower CD4 counts was primarily a reduction in the number of AIDS events, while the benefit at higher CD4 counts was primarily a reduction in the number of serious non-AIDS events. Importantly, early ART initiation also significantly reduced the rate of pooled serious non-AIDS events (HR 0.61).[12,47]

The TEMPRANO ANRS 12136 study was a randomized controlled trial conducted in Cote d'Ivoire. Using a two-by-two factorial design, participants with HIV who had CD4 counts <800 cells/mm^3 and who did not meet the criteria for starting ART according to World Health Organization guidelines at that time were randomized to start ART early (upon enrollment) or defer ART based on the national guidelines criteria for starting treatment. Half of the participants in each group received isoniazid for prevention of TB for 6 months and half did not. The primary study endpoint was a combination of all-cause deaths, AIDS diseases,

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

non-AIDS malignancies, and non-AIDS invasive bacterial diseases.

More than 2,000 participants enrolled in the trial, with a median follow-up of 30 months. Among the 849 participants who had baseline CD4 counts >500 cells/mm^3, 68 primary outcome events were reported in 61 patients. The risk of primary events was lower among those who were randomized to start ART early than among those in the deferred arm, with an HR of 0.56 in favor of early ART (95% CI, 0.33–0.94). On the basis of these results, the study team concluded that early ART initiation is beneficial in reducing the rate of these clinical events.[13]

The TEMPRANO and START trials had very similar estimates for the protective effect of ART among individuals with HIV who had CD4 counts >500 cells/mm^3, further supporting the Panel's recommendation that ART be initiated in all patients regardless of CD4 count.

Use of Antiretroviral Therapy to Prevent HIV Transmission

Prevention of Sexual Transmission

A randomized clinical trial[3] and several large observational cohort studies[4-6] have provided strong evidence that achieving sustained viral suppression prevents sexual transmission of HIV. Thus, a key goal of ART is to prevent transmission of HIV to seronegative sexual partners **(AI)**. All persons with HIV should be informed that maintaining a plasma HIV RNA (viral load) of <200 copies/mL, including any measurable value below this threshold value, with ART prevents sexual transmission of HIV to their partners **(AII)**. Patients may recognize this concept as Undetectable = Untransmittable, or U=U. The results of these studies are summarized in Antiretroviral Therapy to Prevent Sexual Transmission of HIV.

Prevention of Perinatal Transmission

The first well-established example of ART reducing the risk of HIV transmission is the use of ART during pregnancy to prevent perinatal transmission of HIV. Effective suppression of HIV replication is a key determinant in reducing the risk of perinatal transmission. In the setting of maternal viral load suppressed to <50 copies/mL near delivery, the use of combination ART during pregnancy has reduced the rate of perinatal HIV transmission from approximately 20% to 30% to 0.1% to 0.5%.[7,8] ART is thus recommended for all pregnant individuals with HIV, for both maternal health and for the prevention of HIV transmission to the newborn. In ART-naive pregnant individuals, ART should be initiated as soon as possible, with the goal of suppressing plasma viremia throughout pregnancy. All pregnant individuals should be tested for HIV upon confirmation of pregnancy, with testing repeated throughout pregnancy as needed for those at risk of HIV acquisition (see Maternal HIV Testing and Identification of Perinatal HIV Exposure in the Perinatal Guidelines).

Considerations When Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy

The ART regimens that are currently recommended as initial therapy in these guidelines (see What to Start) can suppress and maintain viral loads below the level of quantification in most patients who adhere to their regimens. Most of the recommended regimens have a low pill burden and are well tolerated. Once started on treatment, patients must continue ART indefinitely.

Optimizing Adherence, Antiretroviral Therapy Access, and Care Engagement

The key to successfully maintaining viral suppression is continuous access to ART and adherence to the prescribed regimen. Lack of adherence or intermittent access to ART can result in treatment failure and the emergence of drug resistance mutations that may compromise future treatment options. While optimizing adherence and linkage to care and ensuring continuous access are critical regardless of the timing of ART initiation, the evidence thus far indicates that drug resistance occurs more frequently in individuals who initiate therapy later in the course of infection than in those who initiate ART earlier.[48] It is important to

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

discuss strategies to optimize adherence, care engagement, and ART access with all patients.

Several clinical, behavioral, and social factors have been associated with poor adherence. These factors include untreated major psychiatric disorders, neurocognitive impairment, substance use disorder, unstable housing, unfavorable social circumstances, patient concerns about side effects, and poor adherence to clinic visits. Clinicians should identify areas where additional intervention is needed to improve adherence both before and after initiation of therapy. Some strategies to improve adherence are discussed in Adherence to the Continuum of Care. However, mental illness, substance use disorder, and psychosocial challenges are not reasons to withhold ART from a patient. Rather, these issues indicate the need for additional interventions to support adherence, and they may influence the ART regimen that is recommended (see What to Start).

Considerations for Special Populations

Elite HIV Controllers

A small subset of individuals with HIV maintains plasma HIV-1 RNA levels below level of quantification for years without ART. These individuals are often referred to as elite HIV controllers.[49,50] There are limited data on the benefits of initiating ART in these individuals. The START and TEMPRANO studies demonstrated that initiating ART is clearly beneficial for the patient regardless of CD4 count; therefore, delaying ART to see if a patient becomes an elite controller is **strongly discouraged**. Nevertheless, significant uncertainty remains about the optimal management of elite controllers who have maintained undetectable viremia in the absence of ART for years.

Given that ongoing HIV replication occurs even in elite controllers, ART is strongly recommended for controllers with evidence of HIV disease progression, which is defined by declining CD4 counts or the development of HIV-related complications **(AIII)**. Nonetheless, even elite controllers with normal CD4 counts show evidence of abnormally high immune activation and surrogate markers of atherosclerosis, which may contribute to an increased risk of non-AIDS–related diseases.[49,51-53] One observational study suggested that elite controllers are hospitalized more often for cardiovascular and respiratory disease than patients from the general population and ART-treated patients.[54] Moreover, elite controllers with preserved CD4 counts appear to experience a decline in immune activation after ART initiation, suggesting that treatment may be beneficial.[55] Whether this potential immunologic benefit of ART in elite controllers outweighs the potential risks of ART toxicity and results in clinical benefit is unclear. Unfortunately, it is unlikely that randomized controlled trials will be able to address this question, given the very low prevalence of elite controllers. Although the START study included a number of participants with very low viral loads and demonstrated the benefit of immediate ART initiation regardless of the extent of viremia, the study did not include a sufficient number of controllers to definitively determine the clinical impact of ART in this specific population.[56] Nevertheless, there is a clear rationale for prescribing ART to elite controllers even in the absence of detectable plasma HIV RNA levels. If ART is withheld, elite controllers should be followed closely, as some may experience CD4 cell decline, loss of viral control, or complications related to HIV infection.

Adolescents with HIV

Neither the START trial nor the TEMPRANO trial included adolescents. The Panel's recommendation to initiate ART in all patients is extrapolated to adolescents based on the expectation that they will derive benefits from early ART initiation that are similar to those observed in adults. Compared to adults, youth have demonstrated significantly lower levels of ART adherence and viral suppression, and higher rates of viral rebound following initial viral suppression.[57] In recent years, more adolescents have been prescribed once-daily regimens, which has increased the rate of viral suppression in this population, even though there has been no significant difference in treatment adherence.[58] Because youth often face psychosocial and other barriers to adherence, their ability to adhere to therapy should be carefully considered when making decisions about ART initiation. Although some adolescents may not be ready to initiate therapy, clinicians should offer ART while providing effective interventions to assess and address barriers to receiving care and to adherence.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

To optimize the benefits of ART for youth, a multidisciplinary care team should provide psychosocial and adherence support to adolescent patients (see Adolescents and Young Adults with HIV).[59]

References:

1. Antiretroviral Therapy Cohort C. Survival of HIV-positive patients starting antiretroviral therapy between 1996 and 2013: a collaborative analysis of cohort studies. *Lancet HIV*. 2017;4(8):e349-e356. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28501495.

2. Quinn TC, Wawer MJ, Sewankambo N, et al. Viral load and heterosexual transmission of human immunodeficiency virus type 1. Rakai Project Study Group. *N Engl J Med*. 2000;342(13):921-929. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10738050.

3. Cohen MS, Chen YQ, McCauley M, et al. Antiretroviral therapy for the prevention of HIV-1 transmission. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(9):830-839. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27424812.

4. Bavinton BR, Pinto AN, Phanuphak N, et al. Viral suppression and HIV transmission in serodiscordant male couples: an international, prospective, observational, cohort study. *Lancet HIV*. 2018;5(8):e438-e447. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30025681.

5. Rodger AJ, Cambiano V, Bruun T, et al. Sexual activity without condoms and risk of HIV transmission in serodifferent couples when the HIV-positive partner is using suppressive antiretroviral therapy. *JAMA*. 2016;316(2):171-181. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27404185.

6. Rodger AJ, Cambiano V, Bruun T, et al. Risk of HIV transmission through condomless sex in serodifferent gay couples with the HIV-positive partner taking suppressive antiretroviral therapy (PARTNER): final results of a multicentre, prospective, observational study. *Lancet*. 2019;393(10189):2428-2438. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31056293.

7. Tubiana R, Le Chenadec J, Rouzioux C, et al. Factors associated with mother-to-child transmission of HIV-1 despite a maternal viral load <500 copies/ml at delivery: a case-control study nested in the French perinatal cohort (EPF-ANRS CO1). *Clin Infect Dis*. 2010;50(4):585-596. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20070234.

8. Townsend CL, Cortina-Borja M, Peckham CS, de Ruiter A, Lyall H, Tookey PA. Low rates of mother-to-child transmission of HIV following effective pregnancy interventions in the United Kingdom and Ireland, 2000-2006. *AIDS*. 2008;22(8):973-981. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18453857.

9. Granich RM, Gilks CF, Dye C, De Cock KM, Williams BG. Universal voluntary HIV testing with immediate antiretroviral therapy as a strategy for elimination of HIV transmission: a mathematical model. *Lancet*. 2009;373(9657):48-57. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19038438.

10. Das M, Chu PL, Santos GM, et al. Decreases in community viral load are accompanied by reductions in new HIV infections in San Francisco. *PLoS One*. 2010;5(6):e11068. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20548786.

11. Montaner JS, Lima VD, Harrigan PR, et al. Expansion of HAART coverage is associated with sustained decreases in HIV/AIDS morbidity, mortality and HIV transmission: the "HIV Treatment as Prevention" experience in a Canadian setting. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(2):e87872. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24533061.

12. INSIGHT START Study Group, Lundgren JD, Babiker AG, et al. Initiation of antiretroviral therapy in early asymptomatic HIV infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;373(9):795-807. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26192873.

13. TEMPRANO ANRS Study Group, Danel C, Moh R, et al. A trial of early antiretrovirals and isoniazid preventive therapy in Africa. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;373(9):808-822. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26193126.

14. Moore RD, Keruly JC. CD4+ cell count 6 years after commencement of highly active antiretroviral therapy in persons with sustained virologic suppression. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2007;44(3):441-446. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17205456.

15. Palella FJJ, Armon C, Chmiel JS, et al. CD4 cell count at initiation of ART, long-term likelihood of achieving CD4 >750 cells/mm^3 and mortality risk. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2016;71(9):2654-2662. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

gov/pubmed/27330061.

16. Samji H, Cescon A, Hogg RS, et al. Closing the gap: increases in life expectancy among treated HIV-positive individuals in the United States and Canada. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(12):e81355. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24367482.

17. Pitasi MA, Delaney KP, Brooks JT, DiNenno EA, Johnson SD, Prejean J. HIV Testing in 50 local jurisdictions accounting for the majority of new HIV diagnoses and seven states with disproportionate occurrence of HIV in rural areas, 2016–2017. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2019;68(25):561-567. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31246940.

18. Wejnert C, Prejean J, Hoots B, et al. Prevalence of missed opportunities for HIV testing among persons unaware of their infection. *JAMA*. 2018;319(24):2555-2557. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29946714.

19. Hall HI, Tang T, Johnson AS, Espinoza L, Harris N, McCray E. Timing of linkage to care after HIV diagnosis and time to viral suppression. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;72(2):e57-60. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26977745.

20. Schackman BR, Metsch LR, Colfax GN, et al. The cost-effectiveness of rapid HIV testing in substance abuse treatment: results of a randomized trial. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2013;128(1-2):90-97. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22971593.

21. Fleishman JA, Yehia BR, Moore RD, Gebo KA, Network HIVR. The economic burden of late entry into medical care for patients with HIV infection. *Med Care.* 2010;48(12):1071-1079. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21063228.

22. Fauci AS, Redfield RR, Sigounas G, Weahkee MD, Giroir BP. Ending the HIV epidemic: a plan for the United States. *JAMA*. 2019;321(9):844-845. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30730529.

23. O'Connell S, Enkelmann J, Sadlier C, Bergin C. Late HIV presentation - missed opportunities and factors associated with a changing pattern over time. *Int J STD AIDS*. 2017;28(8):814-821. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27707954.

24. Lopes BLW, Eron JJ, Jr., Mugavero MJ, Miller WC, Napravnik S. HIV care initiation delay among rural residents in the Southeastern United States, 1996 to 2012. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2017;76(2):171-176. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28639994.

25. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. HIV and older americans. 2019. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/group/age/olderamericans/index.html.

26. Force USPST, Owens DK, Davidson KW, et al. Screening for HIV infection: U.S. Preventive Services Task Force recommendation statement. *JAMA*. 2019;321(23):2326-2336. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31184701.

27. Rosen S, Maskew M, Fox MP, et al. Initiating antiretroviral therapy for HIV at a patient's first clinic visit: The RapIT randomized controlled trial. *PLoS Med*. 2016;13(5):e1002015. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27163694.

28. Koenig SP, Dorvil N, Devieux JG, et al. Same-day HIV testing with initiation of antiretroviral therapy versus standard care for persons living with HIV: A randomized unblinded trial. *PLoS Med*. 2017;14(7):e1002357. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28742880.

29. Labhardt ND, Ringera I, Lejone TI, et al. Effect of offering same-day ART vs usual health facility referral during home-based HIV testing on linkage to care and viral suppression among adults with HIV in Lesotho: The CASCADE Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA*. 2018;319(11):1103-1112. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29509839.

30. Pilcher CD, Ospina-Norvell C, Dasgupta A, et al. The effect of same-day observed initiation of antiretroviral therapy on HIV viral load and treatment outcomes in a U.S. public health setting. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2017;74(1):44-51. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27434707.

31. Coffey S, Bacchetti P, Sachdev D, et al. RAPID antiretroviral therapy: high virologic suppression rates with immediate antiretroviral therapy initiation in a vulnerable urban clinic population. *AIDS*. 2019;33(5):825-832. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30882490.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

32. Colasanti J, Sumitani J, Mehta CC, et al. Implementation of a rapid entry program decreases time to viral suppression among vulnerable persons living with HIV in the Southern United States. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2018;5(6):ofy104. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29992172.

33. Hoenigl M, Chaillon A, Moore DJ, et al. Rapid HIV viral load suppression in those initiating antiretroviral therapy at first visit after HIV diagnosis. *Sci Rep.* 2016;6:32947. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27597312.

34. Cuzin L, Cotte L, Delpierre C, et al. Too fast to stay on track? Shorter time to first anti-retroviral regimen is not associated with better retention in care in the French Dat'AIDS cohort. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(9):e0222067. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31490985.

35. Torok ME, Yen NT, Chau TT, et al. Timing of initiation of antiretroviral therapy in human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)-associated tuberculous meningitis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;52(11):1374-1383. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21596680.

36. Boulware DR, Meya DB, Muzoora C, et al. Timing of antiretroviral therapy after diagnosis of cryptococcal meningitis. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;370(26):2487-2498. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24963568.

37. Phillips P, Bonner S, Gataric N, et al. Nontuberculous mycobacterial immune reconstitution syndrome in HIV-infected patients: spectrum of disease and long-term follow-up. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;41(10):1483-1497. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16231262.

38. Bicanic T, Meintjes G, Rebe K, et al. Immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome in HIV-associated cryptococcal meningitis: a prospective study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009;51(2):130-134. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19365271.

39. Velasco M, Castilla V, Sanz J, et al. Effect of simultaneous use of highly active antiretroviral therapy on survival of HIV patients with tuberculosis. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009;50(2):148-152. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19131895.

40. Abdool Karim SS, Naidoo K, Grobler A, et al. Timing of initiation of antiretroviral drugs during tuberculosis therapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362(8):697-706. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20181971.

41. Abdool Karim SS, Naidoo K, Grobler A, et al. Integration of antiretroviral therapy with tuberculosis treatment. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365(16):1492-1501. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22010915.

42. Blanc FX, Sok T, Laureillard D, et al. Earlier versus later start of antiretroviral therapy in HIV-infected adults with tuberculosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365(16):1471-1481. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22010913.

43. Havlir DV, Kendall MA, Ive P, et al. Timing of antiretroviral therapy for HIV-1 infection and tuberculosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365(16):1482-1491. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22010914.

44. Panel on Opportunistic Infections in Adults and Adolescents with HIV. Guidelines for the prevention and treatment of opportunistic infections in adults and adolescents with HIV: recommendations from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, and the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2018. Available at: http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult_oi.pdf.

45. Gopal S, Patel MR, Achenbach CJ, et al. Lymphoma immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome in the center for AIDS research network of integrated clinical systems cohort. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;59(2):279-286. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24755860.

46. Gopal S, Patel MR, Yanik EL, et al. Association of early HIV viremia with mortality after HIV-associated lymphoma. *AIDS*. 2013;27(15):2365-2373. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23736149.

47. O'Connor J, Vjecha MJ, Phillips AN, et al. Effect of immediate initiation of antiretroviral therapy on risk of severe bacterial infections in HIV-positive people with CD4 cell counts of more than 500 cells per muL: secondary outcome results from a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2017;4(3):e105-e112. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28063815.

48. Uy J, Armon C, Buchacz K, Wood K, Brooks JT. Initiation of HAART at higher CD4 cell counts is associated with a lower frequency of antiretroviral drug resistance mutations at virologic failure. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009;51(4):450-453. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19474757.

49. Hunt PW, Brenchley J, Sinclair E, et al. Relationship between T cell activation and CD4+ T cell count in HIV-seropositive

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

individuals with undetectable plasma HIV RNA levels in the absence of therapy. *J Infect Dis*. 2008;197(1):126-133. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18171295.

50. Choudhary SK, Vrisekoop N, Jansen CA, et al. Low immune activation despite high levels of pathogenic human immunodeficiency virus type 1 results in long-term asymptomatic disease. *J Virol*. 2007;81(16):8838-8842. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17537849.

51. Pereyra F, Lo J, Triant VA, et al. Increased coronary atherosclerosis and immune activation in HIV-1 elite controllers. *AIDS*. 2012;26(18):2409-2412. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23032411.

52. Hsue PY, Hunt PW, Schnell A, et al. Role of viral replication, antiretroviral therapy, and immunodeficiency in HIV-associated atherosclerosis. *AIDS*. 2009;23(9):1059-1067. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19390417.

53. Krishnan S, Wilson EM, Sheikh V, et al. Evidence for innate immune system activation in HIV type 1-infected elite controllers. *J Infect Dis*. 2014;209(6):931-939. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24185941.

54. Crowell TA, Gebo KA, Blankson JN, et al. Hospitalization rates and reasons among HIV elite controllers and persons with medically controlled HIV infection. *J Infect Dis*. 2015;211(11):1692-1702. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25512624.

55. Hatano H, Yukl SA, Ferre AL, et al. Prospective antiretroviral treatment of asymptomatic, HIV-1 infected controllers. *PLoS Pathog*. 2013;9(10):e1003691. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24130489.

56. Sereti I, Gulick RM, Krishnan S, et al. ART in HIV-positive persons with low pretreatment viremia: results from the START Trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2019;81(4):456-462. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31241541.

57. Ryscavage P, Anderson EJ, Sutton SH, Reddy S, Taiwo B. Clinical outcomes of adolescents and young adults in adult HIV care. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2011;58(2):193-197. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21826014.

58. Beer L, Mattson CL, Bradley H, Shouse RL, Medical Monitoring P. Trends in ART prescription and viral suppression among HIV-positive young adults in care in the United States, 2009–2013. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2017;76(1):e1-e6. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28489729.

59. Rudy BJ, Murphy DA, Harris DR, Muenz L, Ellen J, Adolescent Trials Network for HIVAI. Patient-related risks for nonadherence to antiretroviral therapy among HIV-infected youth in the United States: a study of prevalence and interactions. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2009;23(3):185-194. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19866536.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Antiretroviral Therapy to Prevent Sexual Transmission of HIV (Treatment as Prevention) (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Panel's Recommendations

- All persons with HIV should be informed that maintaining a plasma HIV RNA (viral load) of <200 copies/mL, including any measurable value below this threshold value, with antiretroviral therapy (ART) prevents sexual transmission of HIV to their partners. Patients may recognize this concept as Undetectable = Untransmittable or U=U **(AII)**.
- Persons with HIV who are starting ART should use another form of prevention with sexual partners (e.g., condoms, pre-exposure prophylaxis [PrEP] for the HIV-negative sexual partner, sexual abstinence) for at least the first 6 months of treatment and until a viral load of <200 copies/mL has been documented **(AII)**. Many experts would recommend confirming sustained suppression before assuming that there is no further risk of sexual HIV transmission **(AIII)**.
- When the viral load is ≥200 copies/mL, additional methods are needed to prevent transmission of HIV to sexual partners until resuppression to <200 copies/mL has been confirmed **(AIII)**.
- Persons with HIV who intend to rely upon ART for prevention need to maintain high levels of ART adherence **(AIII)**. They should be informed that transmission is possible during periods of poor adherence or treatment interruption **(AIII)**.
- At each visit for HIV care, clinicians should assess adherence to ART and counsel patients regarding the importance of ART to their own health as well as its role in preventing sexual HIV transmission **(AIII)**.
- Providers should inform patients that maintaining a viral load of <200 copies/mL does not prevent acquisition or transmission of other sexually transmitted infections (STIs) **(AII)**.
- Providers should also routinely screen all sexually active persons with HIV for STIs, both for their own health and to prevent transmission of STIs to others **(AIII)**.

Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional*

Rating of Evidence: *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

Antiretroviral therapy (ART) not only reduces morbidity and mortality for persons with HIV but has now been definitively shown to prevent sexual transmission of the virus when the plasma HIV RNA (viral load) is consistently suppressed to <200 copies/mL, which includes any measurable viral load that is lower than this threshold value. Providers who manage patients with HIV need to be aware of the data supporting treatment as prevention (TasP, which persons with HIV may recognize as Undetectable = Untransmittable or U=U), its implications, and how to operationalize this prevention strategy in clinical practice. For persons with HIV who intend to rely on TasP for HIV prevention, providers should make an individualized assessment of the person's risk tolerance, personal health, history of maintaining viral suppression on treatment, and access to health care services and ART, as well as other factors that may affect their ability to maintain a high level of adherence to ART.

Evidence that Viral Load Suppression Prevents Sexual HIV Transmission

Suppressing the HIV viral load to <200 copies/mL with ART prevents sexual transmission of HIV. Observational data collected in the early 1990s from heterosexual couples demonstrated that sexual transmission from untreated persons with HIV was rare at viral loads of <1,000 copies/mL to 1,500 copies/mL and that the risk of transmission increased in dose-response fashion with increasing viral load.[1,2] Additional reports[3-7] and a meta-analysis[8] supported the observation that sexual HIV transmission risk in heterosexual persons was correlated with plasma viral load, and transmission was infrequent below the lowest limits of quantification for the viral load assays used at the time.

The first prospective clinical trial designed specifically to address this question was HPTN 052,

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

which randomized people with HIV who were in mixed HIV status couples (previously referred to as serodiscordant couples) to initiate ART early or to delay initiation. Initial results from this study were reported in 2011,[9] with final results reported in 2016.[10] The 2016 analysis reported that no phylogenetically linked sexual transmissions of HIV occurred among 1,763 couples who were followed a median of 5.5 years while the person with HIV was on ART and had a viral load <400 copies/mL for at least 6 months. Notably, four phylogenetically linked infections occurred within the 90 days after the partner with HIV had started ART and was presumably not yet virally suppressed, and four others occurred after the partner with HIV had experienced virologic failure. There were also a number of transmission events that were not phylogenetically linked, indicating acquisition from someone other than the enrolled study index partner.[11] HPTN 052 was conducted almost exclusively among heterosexual couples that lived in Africa and Asia and did not track the number or type of sexual exposures. In addition, ART was used as an adjunct to a comprehensive prevention package that provided condoms and encouraged condom use, as well as frequent testing for HIV and other sexually transmitted infections (STIs).

Three prospective observational studies—PARTNER 1,[12] PARTNER 2,[13] and Opposites Attract[14]—provided data from more diverse populations of mixed HIV status couples in which condomless sex was common. Clinical follow-up in these studies closely mimicked that of routine clinical care. Conducted in 14 European countries (PARTNER 1 and PARTNER 2) as well as Australia, Thailand, and Brazil (Opposites Attract), the investigators followed 548 heterosexual and 1,481 male-male mixed HIV status couples that engaged in 144,631 episodes of condomless vaginal or anal sex while the partner with HIV had a suppressed viral load on ART, defined as <200 copies/mL. In these studies, no phylogenetically linked transmissions were observed; however, as in HPTN 052, there were numerous non-phylogenetically linked transmissions attributed to partners outside the enrolled study couple relationship.

Integrating the Principles of Treatment as Prevention into Clinical Care

The Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents (the Panel) recommends that providers inform all persons with HIV that maintaining an HIV viral load <200 copies/mL with ART prevents sexual transmission of HIV **(AII)**. This information may help motivate patients and help relieve stigma that can be a barrier to getting tested and entering into care, starting and remaining adherent to ART, and ultimately achieving and maintaining a viral load <200 copies/mL.[15] Although PARTNER 1, PARTNER 2, and Opposites Attract were designed to follow patients in the study as they would be typically be followed in clinical care for HIV, the participants reported high levels of ART adherence at study entry and many reported at least 1 year of condomless sex with an established sexual partner without transmission. As the principles of TasP are integrated into the clinical management of people with HIV who are on ART, implementation research will be critical to maximize the effectiveness of TasP in practice.

Frequency of Viral Load Assessment

The Panel has issued recommendations for viral load monitoring to manage the health of persons with HIV (see Plasma HIV-1 RNA (Viral Load) and CD4 Count Monitoring). However, current data are insufficient to determine whether these recommendations represent the optimal monitoring schedule for the purpose of preventing sexual transmission of HIV. In the PARTNER studies and Opposites Attract, viral loads were generally assessed every 3 to 6 months during study follow-up, usually during the course of regular HIV care. Pending further data, the Panel recommends no change to the existing recommendations for monitoring viral load (see Plasma HIV-1 RNA (Viral Load) and CD4 Count Monitoring) **(BII)**.

Time to Adequate Suppression after Starting Antiretroviral Therapy

A subgroup analysis from the Partners PrEP Study provided data regarding the risk of HIV transmission during and after the first 6 months on ART for the partner with HIV.[16] This analysis included 1,573 heterosexual East African couples in which the partners without HIV were randomized to the placebo arm

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

of the Partners PrEP Study and were tested monthly for HIV while the viral load of the partner with HIV was assessed every 6 months. Three phylogenetically linked infections were diagnosed in the 6 months prior to the first follow-up visit for the partners with HIV. The observed incidence rate of 1.79 per 100 person-years during this initial 6-month period after the partner with HIV started ART was slightly less than the 2.08 per person-years incidence rate observed in couples in which the person with HIV was not receiving ART. Viral suppression in this study was defined as <40 copies/mL, and the three infections were diagnosed at 0 days, 56 days, and 149 days after the partner with HIV started ART. After the partners with HIV had been taking ART for ≥6 months, no further transmissions were observed.

At this time, the Panel recommends that persons with HIV who are starting ART use another form of prevention with sexual partners for at least the first 6 months of treatment and until a viral load of <200 copies/mL has been documented **(AII)**. Many experts would recommend confirming sustained suppression before assuming that there is no further risk of sexual transmission of HIV **(AIII)**.

Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy

Adherence to ART is paramount for persons who intend to prevent HIV transmission by achieving and maintaining a suppressed viral load. Viral rebound typically occurs within days to weeks after ART cessation and has been observed as early as 3 to 6 days after stopping treatment.[17-29] The minimum level of adherence that is required to prevent sexual transmission has not been determined and may vary depending on the ART regimen. In the key studies that defined the efficacy of TasP, adherence levels prior to study entry and during follow-up were very high. In clinical practice, most people who start ART will achieve a viral load <200 copies/mL within 6 months, but once this viral load is achieved, maintaining viral suppression can be a challenge, especially for those who have difficulty accessing ART and other HIV care. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that during 2015, 60% of persons with HIV and 78% of persons engaged in clinical care had viral loads <200 copies/mL at their most recent assessment.[30] Observational cohort data have demonstrated that within the first year of starting ART, up to 10% of persons with HIV can experience loss of viral suppression; however, the likelihood of maintaining a suppressed viral load generally improves over time. After a few years, 5% or fewer of persons on ART may experience loss of viral suppression.[31,32]

The Panel recommends that persons with HIV who intend to rely upon TasP be made aware of the need for high levels of ART adherence **(AIII)**. The Panel further recommends that adherence be assessed and counseling be provided at each visit for HIV care to reinforce the importance of adherence for the individual's health as well as its role in preventing HIV transmission **(AIII)**. Patients should be informed that transmission is possible during periods of poor adherence or treatment interruption **(AIII)**.

Adherence can be especially challenging for certain groups of patients, such as adolescents and young adults, homeless persons, persons with active substance use disorder, and persons who are involved with the criminal justice system. Recommendations to help manage and maximize ART adherence can be found in Adherence to the Continuum of Care. Persons for whom there is concern about adherence also merit counseling on how to properly use other prevention methods, especially barrier methods that prevent STIs.

Managing Transient Viremia, or "Blips"

Highly adherent patients may experience intermittent or transient viremia, commonly termed "viral blips." Blips are defined in the context of effective treatment as a single, measurable HIV RNA level, typically <200 copies/mL, that is followed by a return to a viral load below the limit of detection or quantification. With contemporary ART regimens, about 10% of persons per year who are adherent to ART may experience a blip.[33-35] Most blips likely represent normal biological fluctuation (i.e., variation around a mean undetectable viral load) or laboratory artifact and not inadequate adherence.[36-38] Persistent viremia ≥200 copies/mL has been associated with increasing risk of virologic failure[33,39] that, in the context of TasP, can lead to increased risk of sexual transmission.[10] The PARTNER studies and Opposites Attract excluded observation time when the viral load of

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

the participant with HIV was ≥200 copies/mL. The frequency of blips <200 copies/mL was not reported in Opposites Attract; however, in PARTNER 1 and PARTNER 2, transient elevations in viral loads above the limit of detection (50 copies/mL in these studies) but <200 copies/ml were observed for 6% and 4% of the total follow-up time, respectively, during which time no phylogenetically linked infections were observed.

One of the clinical challenges with blips is that they can only be defined retrospectively once the viral load has returned to a suppressed value. The Panel recommends that when the viral load is ≥200 copies/mL, persons with HIV and their sexual partners should use another form of prevention (e.g., condoms, pre-exposure prophylaxis for sexual partners without HIV, sexual abstinence) to protect against HIV transmission until a viral load <200 copies/mL is achieved **(AII)**. This recommendation applies both to persons who are starting ART (as noted earlier) and to those who have been taking ART and have achieved viral suppression but develop viral loads ≥200 copies/mL.

In cases where a patient achieves resuppression to <200 copies/mL after a detectable viral load ≥200 copies/mL, or when a patient with a viral load <200 copies/mL switches regimens (e.g., for regimen simplification or to avoid certain side effects), providers should check the viral load per recommendations in Plasma HIV-1 RNA (Viral Load) and CD4 Count Monitoring and Optimizing Antiretroviral Therapy in the Setting of Virologic Suppression **(AIII)**. There are presently no data to guide how long, if at all, a person might need to continue to use another form of prevention in these two circumstances. Individualized assessment is recommended based on the length and quality of adherence and time with viral load <200 copies/mL preceding the viral load ≥200 copies/mL.

Effect of Sexually Transmitted Infections on Treatment as Prevention

The presence of STIs in a person with HIV does not appear to meaningfully alter the risk of sexual transmission when the person's viral load is <200 copies/mL. The PARTNER studies and the Opposites Attract study regularly assessed participants for STIs, which were diagnosed in 6% of heterosexual participants and 13% to 27% of men who have sex with men. Although the authors of the studies noted that their findings could not rule out the possibility that STIs in participants with viral loads <200 copies/mL might affect the risk of HIV transmission, when viewed collectively, these data suggest that any effect is very small, since STIs were common and no linked infections were observed. The Panel recommends that patients using TasP be informed that maintaining a viral load of <200 copies/mL does not prevent acquisition or transmission of other STIs, and that it is not substitute for condoms or behavioral modifications **(AII)**. Providers should also routinely screen all sexually active persons with HIV for STIs, both for their own health and to prevent transmission of STIs to others **(AIII)**. Refer to CDC's Sexually Transmitted Diseases Treatment Guidelines for details.

Treatment as Prevention Applies Only to Sexual Transmission of HIV

Available clinical data only support the use of TasP to prevent sexual HIV transmission in patients with viral loads <200 copies/mL. The effectiveness of this strategy to prevent transmission from blood exposure (e.g., through nonsterile drug injection) has not been determined. In addition, while suppression of maternal viral load substantially reduces the risk of perinatal transmission and transmission through breastfeeding, it does not eliminate these risks, and transmission has occurred via breastfeeding despite continuous viral suppression (refer to the Perinatal Guidelines for details).

References

1. Quinn TC, Wawer MJ, Sewankambo N, et al. Viral load and heterosexual transmission of human immunodeficiency virus type 1. Rakai Project Study Group. *N Engl J Med*. 2000;342(13):921-929. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10738050.

2. Tovanabutra S, Robison V, Wongtrakul J, et al. Male viral load and heterosexual transmission of HIV-1 subtype E in

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

northern Thailand. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2002;29(3):275-283. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11873077.

3. Apondi R, Bunnell R, Ekwaru JP, et al. Sexual behavior and HIV transmission risk of Ugandan adults taking antiretroviral therapy: 3 year follow-up. *AIDS*. 2011;25(10):1317-1327. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21522005.
4. Castilla J, Del Romero J, Hernando V, Marincovich B, Garcia S, Rodriguez C. Effectiveness of highly active antiretroviral therapy in reducing heterosexual transmission of HIV. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2005;40(1):96-101. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16123689.
5. Del Romero J, Castilla J, Hernando V, Rodriguez C, Garcia S. Combined antiretroviral treatment and heterosexual transmission of HIV-1: cross sectional and prospective cohort study. *BMJ*. 2010;340:c2205. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20472675.
6. Melo MG, Santos BR, De Cassia Lira R, et al. Sexual transmission of HIV-1 among serodiscordant couples in Porto Alegre, southern Brazil. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2008;35(11):912-915. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18607309.
7. Reynolds SJ, Makumbi F, Nakigozi G, et al. HIV-1 transmission among HIV-1 discordant couples before and after the introduction of antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. 2011;25(4):473-477. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21160416.
8. Attia S, Egger M, Muller M, Zwahlen M, Low N. Sexual transmission of HIV according to viral load and antiretroviral therapy: systematic review and meta-analysis. *AIDS*. 2009;23(11):1397-1404. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19381076.
9. Cohen MS, Chen YQ, McCauley M, et al. Prevention of HIV-1 infection with early antiretroviral therapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365(6):493-505. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21767103.
10. Cohen MS, Chen YQ, McCauley M, et al. Antiretroviral therapy for the prevention of HIV-1 transmission. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(9):830-839. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27424812.
11. Eshleman SH, Hudelson SE, Redd AD, et al. Treatment as prevention: characterization of partner infections in the HIV prevention trials network 052 trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2017;74(1):112-116. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27532476.
12. Rodger AJ, Cambiano V, Bruun T, et al. Sexual activity without condoms and risk of HIV transmission in serodifferent couples when the HIV-positive partner is using suppressive antiretroviral therapy. *JAMA*. 2016;316(2):171-181. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27404185.
13. Rodger AJ, Cambiano V, Bruun T, et al. Risk of HIV transmission through condomless sex in serodifferent gay couples with the HIV-positive partner taking suppressive antiretroviral therapy (PARTNER): final results of a multicentre, prospective, observational study. *Lancet*. 2019;393(10189):2428-2438. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31056293.
14. Bavinton BR, Pinto AN, Phanuphak N, et al. Viral suppression and HIV transmission in serodiscordant male couples: an international, prospective, observational, cohort study. *Lancet HIV*. 2018;5(8):e438-e447. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30025681.
15. Calabrese SK, Mayer KH. Providers should discuss U=U with all patients living with HIV. *Lancet HIV*. 2019;6(4):e211-e213. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30772420.
16. Mujugira A, Celum C, Coombs RW, et al. HIV transmission risk persists during the first 6 months of antiretroviral therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;72(5):579-584. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27070123.
17. Harrigan PR, Whaley M, Montaner JS. Rate of HIV-1 RNA rebound upon stopping antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. 1999;13(8):F59-62. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10371167.
18. Davey RT, Jr., Bhat N, Yoder C, et al. HIV-1 and T cell dynamics after interruption of highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART) in patients with a history of sustained viral suppression. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 1999;96(26):15109-15114. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10611346.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

19. Garcia F, Plana M, Ortiz GM, et al. The virological and immunological consequences of structured treatment interruptions in chronic HIV-1 infection. *AIDS*. 2001;15(9):F29-40. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11416735.

20. Skiest DJ, Morrow P, Allen B, et al. It is safe to stop antiretroviral therapy in patients with preantiretroviral CD4 cell counts >250 cells/microL. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2004;37(3):1351-1357. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15483464.

21. Pogany K, van Valkengoed IG, Prins JM, et al. Effects of active treatment discontinuation in patients with a CD4+ T-cell nadir greater than 350 cells/mm3: 48-week Treatment Interruption in Early Starters Netherlands Study (TRIESTAN). *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2007;44(4):395-400. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17195761.

22. Steingrover R, Pogany K, Fernandez Garcia E, et al. HIV-1 viral rebound dynamics after a single treatment interruption depends on time of initiation of highly active antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. 2008;22(13):1583-1588. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18670217.

23. Hamlyn E, Ewings FM, Porter K, et al. Plasma HIV viral rebound following protocol-indicated cessation of ART commenced in primary and chronic HIV infection. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(8):e43754. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22952756.

24. Rothenberger MK, Keele BF, Wietgrefe SW, et al. Large number of rebounding/founder HIV variants emerge from multifocal infection in lymphatic tissues after treatment interruption. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. 2015;112(10):E1126-1134. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25713386.

25. Hurst J, Hoffmann M, Pace M, et al. Immunological biomarkers predict HIV-1 viral rebound after treatment interruption. *Nat Commun*. 2015;6:8495. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26449164.

26. Li JZ, Etemad B, Ahmed H, et al. The size of the expressed HIV reservoir predicts timing of viral rebound after treatment interruption. *AIDS*. 2016;30(3):343-353. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26588174.

27. Calin R, Hamimi C, Lambert-Niclot S, et al. Treatment interruption in chronically HIV-infected patients with an ultralow HIV reservoir. *AIDS*. 2016;30(5):761-769. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26730568.

28. Colby DJ, Trautmann L, Pinyakorn S, et al. Rapid HIV RNA rebound after antiretroviral treatment interruption in persons durably suppressed in Fiebig I acute HIV infection. *Nat Med*. 2018;24(7):923-926. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29892063.

29. Namazi G, Fajnzylber JM, Aga E, et al. The control of HIV after antiretroviral medication pause (CHAMP) study: posttreatment controllers identified from 14 clinical studies. *J Infect Dis*. 2018;218(12):1954-1963. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30085241.

30. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Monitoring selected national HIV prevention and care objectives by using HIV surveillance data—United States and 6 dependent areas, 2016. HIV Surveillance Supplemental Report. 2018;23(4). Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/library/reports/surveillance/cdc-hiv-surveillance-supplemental-report-vol-23-4.pdf.

31. O'Connor J, Smith C, Lampe FC, et al. Durability of viral suppression with first-line antiretroviral therapy in patients with HIV in the UK: an observational cohort study. *Lancet HIV*. 2017;4(7):e295-e302. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28479492.

32. Marks G, Patel U, Stirratt MJ, et al. Single viral load measurements overestimate stable viral suppression among HIV patients in care: clinical and public health implications. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;73(2):205-212. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27105049.

33. Grennan JT, Loutfy MR, Su D, et al. Magnitude of virologic blips is associated with a higher risk for virologic rebound in HIV-infected individuals: a recurrent events analysis. *J Infect Dis*. 2012;205(8):1230-1238. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22438396.

34. Sorstedt E, Nilsson S, Blaxhult A, et al. Viral blips during suppressive antiretroviral treatment are associated with high baseline HIV-1 RNA levels. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2016;16:305. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27329293.

35. Warren AM, Cheng AC, Watson K, Lewin SR, Hoy JF. Outcomes following detection of low level plasma HIV RNA in

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

HIV-infected patients previously virologically suppressed on antiretroviral therapy: a retrospective observational study. *Sex Health*. 2017;14(3):238-243. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28445685.

36. Nettles RE, Kieffer TL. Update on HIV-1 viral load blips. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS*. 2006;1(2):157-161. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19372801.
37. Lee PK, Kieffer TL, Siliciano RF, Nettles RE. HIV-1 viral load blips are of limited clinical significance. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2006;57(5):803-805. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16533823.
38. Miller LG, Golin CE, Liu H, et al. No evidence of an association between transient HIV viremia ("Blips") and lower adherence to the antiretroviral medication regimen. *J Infect Dis*. 2004;189(8):1487-1496. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15073687.
39. Young J, Rickenbach M, Calmy A, et al. Transient detectable viremia and the risk of viral rebound in patients from the Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2015;15:382. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26392270.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

What to Start: Initial Combination Regimens for the Antiretroviral-Naive Patient (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Key Considerations and Recommendations

- An antiretroviral (ARV) regimen for a treatment-naive patient generally consists of two nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) administered in combination with a third active ARV drug from one of three drug classes: an integrase strand transfer inhibitor (INSTI), a non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NNRTI), or a protease inhibitor (PI) with a pharmacokinetic (PK) enhancer (also known as a booster; the two drugs used for this purpose are cobicistat and ritonavir).
- Data also support the use of the two-drug regimen, dolutegravir plus lamivudine, for initial treatment.
- Before initiating antiretroviral therapy (ART) in a person of childbearing potential, a pregnancy test should be performed **(AIII)**. Before prescribing ART to a person of childbearing potential, please refer to Table 6b for information about safety of different INSTI-based regimens taken around the time of conception.
- The Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents (the Panel) classifies the following regimens as *Recommended Initial Regimens for Most People with HIV* (in alphabetical order):
  - Bictegravir/tenofovir alafenamide/emtricitabine **(AI)**
  - Dolutegravir/abacavir/lamivudine—**only** for individuals who are HLA-B*5701 negative and without chronic hepatitis B virus (HBV) coinfection **(AI)**
  - Dolutegravir plus (emtricitabine or lamivudine) plus (tenofovir alafenamide or tenofovir disoproxil fumarate)[a] **(AI)**
  - Dolutegravir/lamivudine **(AI)**—except for individuals with HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL, HBV co-infection, or in whom ART is to be started before the results of HIV genotypic resistance testing for reverse transcriptase or HBV testing are available.
  - Raltegravir plus (emtricitabine or lamivudine) plus (tenofovir alafenamide [TAF] or tenofovir disoproxil fumarate [TDF])[a] (**BI** for TDF, **BII** for TAF)
- To address individual patient characteristics and needs, the Panel also provides a list of *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations* (Table 6a).
- Given the many excellent options for initial therapy, selection of a regimen for a particular patient should be guided by factors such as virologic efficacy, toxicity, pill burden, dosing frequency, drug-drug interaction potential, resistance test results, comorbid conditions, access, and cost. Table 7 provides guidance on choosing an ARV regimen based on selected clinical case scenarios. Table 9 highlights the advantages and disadvantages of different components in a regimen.

Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional*

Rating of Evidence: *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials, observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes, relative bioavailability/bioequivalence studies, or regimen comparisons from randomized switch studies; III = Expert opinion*

[a] TAF and TDF are two forms of tenofovir that are approved by the Food and Drug Administration. TAF has fewer bone and kidney toxicities than TDF, while TDF is associated with lower lipid levels. Safety, cost, and access are among the factors to consider when choosing between these drugs.

Introduction

More than 30 antiretroviral (ARV) drugs in seven mechanistic classes are Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved for treatment of HIV infection. These seven classes include the nucleoside/nucleotide reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs), non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs), protease inhibitors (PIs), integrase strand transfer inhibitors (INSTIs), a fusion inhibitor, a CCR5 antagonist, and a CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) post-attachment inhibitor. In addition, two drugs, ritonavir (RTV) and cobicistat (COBI) are used as pharmacokinetic (PK) enhancers (or boosters) to improve the PK profiles of PIs and the INSTI elvitegravir (EVG).

The initial ARV regimen for a treatment-naive patient generally consists of two NRTIs, usually abacavir/lamivudine (ABC/3TC) or either tenofovir alafenamide/emtricitabine (TAF/FTC) or tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine (TDF/FTC), plus a drug from one of three drug classes: an INSTI, an NNRTI, or a boosted PI. As shown in clinical trials and by retrospective evaluation of cohorts of patients in clinical care, this strategy for initial treatment has resulted in suppression of HIV replication and CD4 count increases in

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

most persons with HIV.[1-3] Additional data now support the use of the two-drug regimen dolutegravir (DTG) plus 3TC for initial treatment of people with HIV.[4]

Supporting Evidence and Rationale Used for the Panel's Recommendations

The Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents (the Panel)'s recommendations are primarily based on clinical trial data published in peer-reviewed journals and data prepared by drug manufacturers for FDA review. In select cases, the Panel considers data from abstracts presented at major scientific meetings. The Panel considers published information from a randomized, prospective clinical trial with an adequate sample size that demonstrates that an ARV regimen produces high rates of viral suppression, increases CD4 count, and has a favorable safety profile to be the strongest evidence on which to base recommendations. Comparative clinical trials of initial treatments generally show no significant differences in HIV-related clinical endpoints or survival. Thus, assessment of regimen efficacy and safety are primarily based on surrogate marker endpoints (especially rates of HIV RNA suppression) and the incidence and severity of adverse events.

In some instances, the Panel recommends regimens that include medications approved by FDA based on bioequivalence or relative bioavailability studies demonstrating that the exposure of the drug(s) in the new formulation or combination is comparable to the exposure of a reference drug(s) that has demonstrated safety and efficacy in randomized clinical trials. When developing recommendations, the Panel may also consider data from randomized switch studies in which a medication in an initial regimen that suppressed patients' viral loads is replaced by a new medication from the same class. Switch trials do not evaluate the ability of a drug or regimen to induce viral suppression; they only examine the drug or regimen's ability to maintain suppression. Therefore, results from switch trials may not be directly applicable to the selection of an initial regimen and should be considered in conjunction with other data, including data from trials conducted in treatment-naive patients and bioequivalence/bioavailability studies. In this section of the guidelines, the definition of an evidence rating of **II** is expanded to include supporting data from bioavailability/bioequivalence studies or randomized switch studies.

When developing recommendations, the Panel also considers tolerability and toxicity profiles, pill burden and dosing frequency, drug interaction potential, cost and access, post-marketing safety data, observational cohort data published in peer-reviewed publications, and the experience of clinicians and community members who are actively engaged in patient care.

The Panel reviewed the available data to arrive at two regimen classifications for ARV-naive patients: (1) *Recommended Initial Regimens for Most People with HIV* and (2) *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations* (Table 6a). *Recommended Initial Regimens for Most People with HIV* are those regimens with demonstrated durable virologic efficacy, favorable tolerability and toxicity profiles, and ease of use. The Panel also recognizes that, in certain clinical situations, other regimens may be preferred; these options are included in Table 6a in the category of *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations*. Examples of clinical scenarios in which certain drugs in these regimens may be particularly advantageous are outlined in Table 7.

There are many other ARV regimens that are effective for initial therapy but have disadvantages when compared with the regimens listed in Table 6a. These disadvantages include greater toxicity, higher pill burden, less supporting data from large comparative clinical trials, or limitations for use in certain patient populations. These other regimens are no longer included in Table 6a. A person with HIV who has a suppressed viral load and is not experiencing any adverse effects while on a regimen that is not listed in Table 6a need not necessarily change to one that is listed in the table. Clinicians should refer to Optimizing Antiretroviral Therapy in the Setting of Viral Suppression for further guidance if switching to a new regimen is desired.

Regimens and medications listed in Table 10 below are not recommended as initial therapy. In most instances, a clinician is urged to consider switching a patient who is on one of the regimens listed in Table 10 to a recommended regimen.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

In addition to these tables, several tables presented below and at the end of these guidelines provide clinicians with guidance on selecting and prescribing an optimal regimen for an individual patient. Table 9 lists the potential advantages and disadvantages of the different ARV drug components. Appendix B, Tables 3–9 list characteristics of individual ARV agents (e.g., formulations, dosing recommendations, PKs, common adverse effects). Appendix B, Table 10 provides ARV dosing recommendations for patients who have renal or hepatic insufficiency.

Changes Since the Last Revision of the Guidelines

Since the last revision of these guidelines, the Panel has made several important changes to the recommendations for initial therapy in people with HIV. Among these changes, the following deserve emphasis:

- On the basis of 96-week data from the GEMINI-1 and GEMINI-2 trials showing that the efficacy of the two-drug regimen DTG plus 3TC is similar to that of the three-drug regimen DTG plus TDF/FTC,[4] the Panel has added DTG/3TC as one of the regimens *Recommended for Initial Treatment of Most People with HIV* (except for individuals with HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL, hepatitis B virus (HBV) coinfection, or in whom antiretroviral therapy (ART) is to be started before the results of HIV genotypic resistance testing for reverse transcriptase or HBV testing are available).
- In the previous version of these guidelines, because of preliminary data raising concern that DTG use around the time of conception may be associated with an increased risk of infant neural tube defects (NTDs),[5] the Panel recommended against the use of DTG during the first trimester of pregnancy and in those of childbearing potential who are trying to conceive or who are sexually active and not using effective contraception. Now, additional results have shown that the prevalence of infant NTDs in association with DTG exposure at conception is lower than shown in the preliminary data[6,7] but still higher than with non-DTG containing regimens. These updated findings led to revisions in the Panel's recommendation for individuals of childbearing potential. Clinicians should review recommendations in Table 6b before prescribing INSTIs to these patients.
- The Panels' changes to the list of *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations* (Table 6a) include the following:
  - Efavirenz (EFV) 400 mg/TDF/3TC has been added based on additional data on the regimen's efficacy **(BI)**.[8]
  - Raltegravir (RAL) plus ABC/3TC and lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/r) plus 3TC have been removed because other regimens have advantages or more supporting data than these (relatively) less commonly used options.
- Table 7, which outlines clinical situations in which certain medications may be particularly advantageous, has been updated and revised.
- Data from studies showing increased weight gain with particular ARV medications, including some INSTIs and TAF, and especially in certain patient populations (i.e., women, Black people, and Hispanic people), are summarized.
- The section Other Antiretroviral Regimens for Initial Therapy When Abacavir, Tenofovir Alafenamide, and Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate Cannot Be Used or Are Not Optimal has been updated. DTG/3TC is the preferred regimen because it has the most robust clinical data among the two-drug options in this situation.
- The discussions on clinical trial and safety data in the sections on INSTIs, NRTIs, NNRTIs and PIs have been updated.
- Given the growing number of FDA-approved generic ARV medications, cost and access are increasingly important factors to consider when choosing an ARV regimen (see Cost Considerations and Antiretroviral Therapy).

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 6a. Recommended Antiretroviral Regimens for Initial Therapy (page 1 of 2)

Selection of a regimen should be individualized based on virologic efficacy, potential adverse effects, childbearing potential and use of effective contraception, pill burden, dosing frequency, drug-drug interaction potential, comorbid conditions, cost, access, and resistance test results. Drug classes and regimens within each class are arranged first by evidence rating, and, when ratings are equal, in alphabetical order. Table 7 provides ARV recommendations based on specific clinical scenarios.

Recommended Initial Regimens for Most People with HIV Recommended regimens are those with demonstrated durable virologic efficacy, favorable tolerability and toxicity profiles, and ease of use.
INSTI plus 2 NRTIs: **Note:** For individuals of childbearing potential, see Table 6b before prescribing one of these regimens. • BIC/TAF/FTC **(AI)** • DTG/ABC/3TC **(AI)—if HLA-B*5701 negative** • DTG plus (TAF or TDF)[a] plus (FTC or 3TC) **(AI)** • RAL plus (TAF or TDF)[a] plus (FTC or 3TC) (**BI** for TDF/[FTC or 3TC], **BII** for TAF/FTC) **INSTI plus 1 NRTI:** • DTG/3TC **(AI)**, except for individuals with HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL, HBV coinfection, or in whom ART is to be started before the results of HIV genotypic resistance testing for reverse transcriptase or HBV testing are available
Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations These regimens are effective and tolerable but have some disadvantages when compared with the regimens listed above or have less supporting data from randomized clinical trials. However, in certain clinical situations, one of these regimens may be preferred (see Table 7 for examples).

INSTI plus 2 NRTIs:
Note: For individuals of childbearing potential, see Table 6b before prescribing one of these regimens.
• EVG/c/(TAF or TDF)[a]/FTC **(BI)**
Boosted PI plus 2 NRTIs:
• In general, boosted DRV is preferred over boosted ATV
• (DRV/c or DRV/r) plus (TAF or TDF)[a] plus (FTC or 3TC) **(AI)**
• (ATV/c or ATV/r) plus (TAF or TDF)[a] plus (FTC or 3TC) **(BI)**
• (DRV/c or DRV/r) plus ABC/3TC **—if HLA-B*5701 negative (BII)**
NNRTI plus 2 NRTIs:
• DOR/TDF[a]/3TC **(BI)** or DOR plus TAF[a]/FTC **(BIII)**
• EFV plus (TAF or TDF)[a] plus (FTC or 3TC)
  • EFV 600 mg plus TDF plus (FTC or 3TC) **(BI)**
  • EFV 400 mg/TDF/3TC **(BI)**
  • EFV 600 mg plus TAF/FTC **(BII)**
• RPV/(TAF or TDF)/FTC **(BI)—if HIV RNA <100,000 copies/mL and CD4 count >200 cells/mm^3**
Regimens to Consider when ABC, TAF, and TDF Cannot be Used or Are Not Optimal:
• DTG/3TC **(AI)**, except for individuals with HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL, HBV coinfection, or in whom ART is to be started before the results of HIV genotypic resistance testing for reverse transcriptase or HBV testing are available
• DRV/r plus RAL twice a day **(CI)—if HIV RNA <100,000 copies/mL and CD4 count >200 cells/mm^3**
• DRV/r once daily plus 3TC[a] **(CI)**

Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional* ***Rating of Evidence:*** *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials, observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes, relative bioavailability/bioequivalence studies, or regimen comparisons from randomized switch studies; III = Expert opinion*

[a] TAF and TDF are two forms of TFV approved by FDA. TAF has fewer bone and kidney toxicities than TDF, while TDF is associated with lower lipid levels. Safety, cost, and access are among the factors to consider when choosing between these drugs.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 6a. Recommended Antiretroviral Regimens for Initial Therapy (page 2 of 2)

Note: The following are available as coformulated drugs: ABC/3TC, ATV/c, BIC/TAF/FTC, DOR/TDF/3TC, DRV/c, DRV/c/TAF/FTC, DTG/3TC, DTG/ABC/3TC, EFV (400 mg or 600 mg)/TDF/3TC, EFV/TDF/FTC, EVG/c/TAF/FTC, EVG/c/TDF/FTC, RPV/TAF/FTC, RPV/TDF/FTC, TAF/FTC, TDF/3TC, and TDF/FTC.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; BIC = bictegravir; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; DOR = doravirine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FTC = emtricitabine; HLA = human leukocyte antigen; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; PI = protease inhibitor; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; STR = single-tablet regimen; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TFV = tenofovir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate

Table 6b. Considerations Before Initiating Dolutegravir and Other Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors as Initial Therapy for Persons of Childbearing Potential

Background:

- Preliminary data from a study in Botswana suggested that there is an increased risk of NTDs (0.9%) in infants born to women who were receiving DTG at the time of conception.[5,9] Updated results have shown that the prevalence of NTDs in infants who were exposed to DTG at the time of conception is lower (0.3%) than reported in the preliminary data, but still higher than in infants who were exposed to ART that did not contain DTG (0.1%).[6,7]
- It is not yet known whether use of other INSTIs around the time of conception also poses a risk of NTDs (i.e., a class effect).
- There are insufficient data to determine whether use of BIC around the time of conception and during pregnancy is safe.
- There is limited data on RAL use around the time of conception. Thus far, based on data collected from the Antiretroviral Pregnancy Registry, the drug manufacturer, and in a cohort study from the United States and other countries, no case of NTD has been reported.[10-12] Among those receiving RAL during pregnancy, the rate of fetal malformations is within the expected range for pregnancy outcomes in the United States.[10-12]

Before Initiating an INSTI-Containing Regimen in a Person of Childbearing Potential:

- A pregnancy test should be performed **(AIII)**.
- To enable individuals of childbearing potential to make informed decisions, providers should discuss the benefits and risks of using DTG around the time of conception, including the low risk of NTDs and the relative lack of information on the safety of using other commonly prescribed ARV drugs, including other INSTIs, around the time of conception **(AIII)**.
- **For individuals who are trying to conceive,** the Panel recommends initiating one of the following regimens, which are designated as *Preferred* regimens during pregnancy in the Perinatal Guidelines: RAL, ATV/r or DRV/r plus TDF/FTC, TDF/3TC, or ABC/3TC. DTG would be an *Alternative*, rather than a *Preferred*, option **(BII)**.
- **For individuals who are not planning to conceive but who are sexually active and not using contraception**, consider a regimen's effectiveness and tolerability, the available data on potential teratogenicity, and the person's preferences (e.g., low pill burden) when choosing among regimens recommended for initial therapy (Table 6a). In this situation, DTG would be an *Alternative*, rather than *Preferred*, option **(BII)**. If the person becomes pregnant, changes to the ARV regimen may be warranted. Clinicians should refer to the Perinatal Guidelines for recommendations.
- **For individuals who are using effective contraception**, a DTG-based regimen is one of the recommended options; however, clinicians should discuss the risks and benefits of using DTG with patients to allow them to make an informed decision **(AIII)**.
- An approach similar to that outlined for DTG should be considered for BIC-containing ART **(AIII)**.
- EVG/c **should not be used during pregnancy** because of inadequate drug concentrations in the second and third trimesters **(AII)**.
- Clinicians should refer to the Perinatal Guidelines when prescribing ART for a pregnant person with HIV.

***Rating of Recommendations**: A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional*

***Rating of Evidence:** I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials, observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes, relative bioavailability/bioequivalence studies, or regimen comparisons from randomized switch studies; III = Expert opinion*

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; BIC = bictegravir; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FTC = emtricitabine; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; NTD = neural tube defect; RAL = raltegravir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Selecting an Initial Antiretroviral Regimen

The goal of ART is to provide a potent, safe, tolerable, and easy-to-adhere-to regimen in order to achieve sustained virologic control. Initial therapy should be with two NRTIs combined with an INSTI, the combination of DTG/3TC or, in some individuals, a combination including two NRTIs plus an NNRTI or an RTV- or COBI-boosted PI. When selecting a regimen for a person with HIV, a number of patient- and regimen-specific characteristics should be considered. Some of the factors can be grouped into the categories listed below and may influence the choice of recommended regimens listed in Table 6a or the decision to consider alternative regimens. Table 7 includes recommendations for additional regimens to use in specific clinical scenarios.

Initial Characteristics to Consider in All Persons with HIV:

- Pretreatment HIV RNA level (viral load)
- Pretreatment CD4 count
- HIV genotypic drug resistance test results. Based on current rates of transmitted drug resistance to different ARV medications, standard genotypic drug-resistance testing in ARV-naive persons should focus on testing for mutations in the reverse transcriptase (RT) and protease (PR) genes. If transmitted INSTI resistance is a concern, providers should consider also testing for resistance mutations to this class of drugs.
- HLA-B*5701 status. Those who are HLA-B*5701 positive should not receive ABC. Regimens that do not include ABC can be initiated if HLA-B*5701 test results are not yet available; see Table 7 for regimens to initiate.
- Individual preferences
- Anticipated adherence to the regimen
- Timing of ART initiation after diagnosis (i.e., immediate versus delayed)

Note that results of pretreatment HIV RNA, CD4 count, and resistance testing do not need to be available before starting ART. See Table 7 for regimens to initiate if these results are not available.

Presence of Specific Conditions:

- Comorbid conditions: Cardiovascular disease; hyperlipidemia; renal disease; liver disease; osteopenia, osteoporosis, or other conditions associated with bone mineral density (BMD) loss; psychiatric illness; neurologic disease; drug abuse or dependency requiring narcotic replacement therapy
- Pregnancy or potential to become pregnant: Clinicians should refer to Table 6b and the Perinatal Guidelines for more detailed recommendations on the safety and effectiveness of ARV drugs during conception and throughout pregnancy.
- Coinfections: HBV, hepatitis C virus, tuberculosis (TB)

Regimen-Specific Considerations:

- Regimen's barrier to resistance
- Potential adverse effects and drug toxicities, including risk for development of comorbid diseases.
- Known or potential drug interactions with other medications (see Drug-Drug Interactions)
- Convenience (e.g., pill burden, dosing frequency, availability of a fixed-dose combination [FDC] or single-tablet regimen [STR] formulations, food requirements)

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

- Cost and access (see Cost Considerations and Antiretroviral Therapy)

General Considerations for INSTI-, PI-, or NNRTI-Based Regimens

The choice between an INSTI, PI, or NNRTI in an initial ARV regimen should be guided by the ARV drug's efficacy, barrier to resistance, and adverse effects profile; convenience; the patient's comorbidities and concomitant medications; and the potential for drug-drug interactions (see Tables 7 and 9).

INSTI-Based Regimens

The Panel's *Recommended Initial Regimens for Most People with HIV* as listed in Table 6a include one of three INSTIs (BIC, DTG, or RAL) plus two NRTIs or DTG/3TC. For most patients, these INSTI-containing regimens will be highly effective and have relatively infrequent adverse effects and few drug interactions. In several head-to-head comparisons between boosted PI- and INSTI-containing regimens, the INSTI-based regimens were better tolerated and caused fewer treatment discontinuations.[13-15] The Panel now recommends a two-drug regimen of DTG/3TC for initial therapy if certain criteria are met. Data from two randomized trials showed that, in terms of virologic efficacy, DTG plus 3TC was noninferior to a three-drug regimen of DTG plus TDF/FTC. No treatment-emergent resistance was seen in either the two-drug or the three-drug group. The study inclusion criteria limited enrollment to participants with HIV RNA levels <500,000 copies/mL; no known major NRTI, PI, or NNRTI resistance; and without active hepatitis B.[4,16]

Among the INSTI-based regimens, BIC- and DTG-containing regimens have a higher barrier to resistance and lower pill burden than RAL-containing regimens. However, RAL-containing regimens may be preferred for individuals who wish to become pregnant (see Table 6b for further discussion). Treatment-emergent resistance has been reported very rarely in individuals receiving three-drug DTG-based therapy[17-19] and has not been reported in those receiving BIC-based regimens. In addition, transmitted resistance to BIC and DTG is rare. Because of this high barrier to resistance and tolerability, BIC- and DTG-containing regimens may be considered for patients who plan to start ART before resistance test results are available (e.g., with rapid initiation of ART after diagnosis). BIC-based regimens have been shown to be noninferior to DTG-based regimens in clinical trials.[20,21]

Recent studies have shown that the prevalence of infant NTDs in association with DTG exposure at conception is still higher than with non-DTG containing regimens (0.3% vs. 0.1%, respectively).[6,7] For individuals of childbearing potential who are trying to conceive, DTG would be an *Alternative*, rather than a *Preferred*, option, as recommended in the Perinatal Guidelines. Clinicians should review the revised Table 6b before prescribing ART to a person of childbearing potential.

There are now data suggesting greater weight gain with certain INSTI-based regimens and TAF than with other ARV drugs. The clinical significance of these findings is still unknown.[22-26] EVG-based regimens have the advantage of also being available as STRs and are recommended for certain clinical situations (see Table 7). However, EVG-based regimens have the potential disadvantages of a lower barrier to resistance than DTG- or BIC-containing regimens and, importantly, a greater potential for drug interactions because EVG is combined with COBI, a strong cytochrome P (CYP) 3A4 inhibitor.

Protease Inhibitor-Based Regimens

PK-enhanced PI-based regimens are recommended in certain clinical situations. Similar to elvitegravir/cobicistat (EVG/c), they carry the disadvantage of greater drug interaction potential than other ARV drugs. For those individuals in whom ART needs to begin urgently before resistance test results are available, boosted DRV may be an appropriate choice because the rate of transmitted PI resistance is low and boosted DRV has a high barrier to resistance and a low rate of treatment-emergent resistance. DRV/c/TAF/FTC is available as an STR. Boosted ATV, like boosted DRV, has relatively few metabolic adverse effects in comparison to older boosted-PI regimens; however, ATV/r had a higher rate of adverse effect-associated drug discontinuation than darunavir/ritonavir (DRV/r) or RAL in a randomized clinical trial.[13] In a substudy of this

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

trial, and in a separate cohort study, atazanavir/ritonavir (ATV/r) use was associated with slower progression of atherosclerosis, as measured by carotid artery intima medial thickness.[27,28] Large observational cohorts found an association between some PIs (DRV/r, fosamprenavir [FPV], indinavir [IDV], and LPV/r) and an increased risk of cardiovascular events; however, this association was not seen with ATV.[29-34] Further study is needed.

NNRTI-Based Regimens

NNRTI-based regimens (which include doravirine [DOR], EFV, or rilpivirine [RPV]) may be options for some patients, although these drugs, especially EFV and RPV, have low barriers to resistance. The emergence of resistance at the time of virologic failure has also been reported with DOR. EFV has a long track record of widespread use, is considered safe in persons of childbearing potential, and has minimal PK interaction with rifamycins, making it an attractive option for patients who require TB treatment. EFV-based regimens (using either 400 mg or 600 mg dosing) have excellent virologic efficacy,[35] including in patients with high HIV RNA (except when EFV is used with ABC/3TC); however, the relatively high rate of central nervous system (CNS)-related side effects reduces the tolerability of EFV-based regimens. As an STR, EFV 600 mg is available with TDF/FTC or TDF/3TC; EFV 400 mg is available with TDF/3TC. RPV has fewer adverse effects than EFV, is available as one of the smallest tablet sizes among STRs that also include TAF/FTC or TDF/FTC, and has a favorable lipid profile. However, RPV has lower virologic efficacy in patients with baseline HIV RNA levels >100,000 copies/mL and CD4 counts <200 cells/mm^3. DOR is available both as a single-drug tablet to be used with two NRTIs and as part of an STR with TDF/3TC. In randomized trials, DOR was noninferior to both EFV and DRV/r when either of these drugs were taken in combination with two NRTIs.[36,37] DOR has CNS tolerability advantages over EFV and more favorable lipid effects than DRV/r and EFV. DOR also has fewer potential drug interactions than EFV or RPV, and unlike with RPV, the virologic efficacy of DOR is not compromised in patients with high HIV RNA levels and low CD4 counts.

Regimens When Abacavir, Tenofovir Alafenamide, and Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate Cannot Be Used or Are Not Optimal

In those patients in whom ABC, TDF, or TAF cannot be used or are not optimal, there are several two-drug options that do not contain these agents. Two-drug options **should not be used** in individuals with HBV coinfection or known pre-existing resistance to either ARV in the combination. Among the two-drug regimens, DTG/3TC is preferred because there are substantial data for this combination in initial therapy, with the caveat that people with HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL were excluded from the largest trial.[4,16] Another two-drug treatment option that can be considered is the combination of DRV/r (once daily) plus RAL (twice daily), but this combination should only be used in those with baseline CD4 counts >200 cells/mm^3 and HIV RNA levels <100,000 copies/mL.[38] A small, randomized trial indicated that once-daily DRV/r plus 3TC had similar efficacy to once-daily DRV/r plus TDF/3TC, although this study has yet to be published.[39]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 7. Antiretroviral Regimen Considerations for Initial Therapy Based on Specific Clinical Scenarios (page 1 of 4)

This table guides clinicians in choosing an initial ARV regimen according to various patient and regimen characteristics and specific clinical scenarios. When more than one scenario applies to a person with HIV, clinicians should review considerations for each relevant scenario and use their clinical judgment to select the most appropriate regimen. This table is intended to guide the initial choice of regimen. However, if a person is doing well on a particular regimen, it is not necessary to switch to another regimen based on the scenarios outlined in this table. Please see Table 9 for additional information regarding the advantages and disadvantages of particular ARV medications. **Before initiating an INSTI-based regimen in a person of childbearing potential, review Table 6b for considerations in choosing the regimen.**

Patient or Regimen Characteristics	Clinical Scenario	Consideration(s)	Rationale/Comments
Pre-ART Characteristics	CD4 count <200 cells/mm^3	**Do Not Use the Following Regimens:** • RPV-based regimens • DRV/r plus RAL	A higher rate of virologic failure has been observed in those with low pretreatment CD4 counts.
	HIV RNA >100,000 copies/mL (also see next row if HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL)	**Do Not Use the Following Regimens:** • RPV-based regimens • ABC/3TC with EFV or ATV/r • DRV/r plus RAL	Higher rates of virologic failure have been observed in those with high pretreatment HIV RNA levels
	HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL	**Do Not Use the Following Regimens:** • RPV-based regimens • ABC/3TC with EFV or ATV/r • DRV/r plus RAL • DTG/3TC	For DTG/3TC, limited data are available in patients above this viral load threshold.
	HLA-B*5701 positive or result unknown	**Do not use ABC-containing regimens.**	ABC hypersensitivity, a potentially fatal reaction, is highly associated with the presence of the HLA-B*5701 allele.
	ARV should be started before HIV drug resistance results are available (e.g., in a person with acute HIV) or when ART is being initiated rapidly.	**Avoid NNRTI-based regimens and DTG/3TC.** **Avoid ABC.** **Recommended ART Regimens:** • BIC/TAF/FTC • DTG plus (TAF or TDF)[a] plus (3TC or FTC) • (DRV/r or DRV/c) plus (TAF or TDF)[a] plus (3TC or FTC)	Transmitted mutations conferring NNRTI and NRTI resistance are more likely than mutations associated with PI or INSTI resistance. HLA-B*5701 results may not be available rapidly. Transmitted resistance to DRV, BIC, and DTG is rare, and these drugs have high barriers to resistance.
ART-Specific Characteristics	A one-pill, once-daily regimen is desired	**STR Options as Initial ART Include:** • BIC/TAF/FTC • DOR/TDF/3TC • DRV/c/TAF/FTC • DTG/ABC/3TC • DTG/3TC • EFV/TDF/FTC • EFV/TDF/3TC • EVG/c/TAF/FTC • EVG/c/TDF/FTC • RPV/TAF/FTC • RPV/TDF/FTC	Do not use DTG/ABC/3TC if patient is HLA-B*5701 positive. DTG/3TC **is not recommended** if HIV RNA is >500,000 copies/mL. Do not use DTG/ABC/3TC or DTG/3TC in the setting of HBV coinfection or unknown HBV status. Do not use RPV-based regimens if HIV RNA is >100,000 copies/mL and CD4 count is <200/mm^3. See Appendix B, Table 10 for ARV dose recommendations in the setting of renal impairment.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 7. Antiretroviral Regimen Considerations for Initial Therapy Based on Specific Clinical Scenarios (page 2 of 4)

Patient or Regimen Characteristics	Clinical Scenario	Consideration(s)	Rationale/Comments
ART-Specific Characteristics, continued	Food effects	**Regimens that Can be Taken Without Regard to Food:** • BIC-, DOR-, DTG-, or RAL-based regimens	Oral bioavailability of these regimens is not significantly affected by food.
		Regimens that Should be Taken with Food: • ATV/r- or ATV/c-based regimens • DRV/r- or DRV/c-based regimens • EVG/c/TAF/FTC[a] • EVG/c/TDF/FTC[a] • RPV-based regimens	Food improves absorption of these regimens. RPV-containing regimens should be taken with ≥390 calories of food.
		Regimens that Should be Taken on an Empty Stomach: • EFV-based regimens	Food increases EFV absorption and may increase CNS side effects.
Presence of Other Conditions	Chronic kidney disease (defined as CrCl <60 mL/min)	**In general, avoid TDF.** ABC may be used if patient is HLA-B*5701 negative. If HIV RNA is >100,000 copies/mL, do not use ABC/3TC plus (EFV or ATV/r). TAF may be used if CrCl >30 mL/min or if patient is on chronic hemodialysis (only studied with EVG/c/TAF/FTC). Consider avoiding ATV. **ART Options When ABC, TAF, or TDF Cannot be Used:** • DTG/3TC (if HIV RNA <500,000 copies/mL and without HBV coinfection) • DRV/r plus 3TC • DRV/r plus RAL (if CD4 count >200 cells/mm^3 and HIV RNA <100,000 copies/mL)	TDF has been associated with proximal renal tubulopathy. Higher rates of renal dysfunction have been reported in patients using TDF in conjunction with RTV-containing regimens. An adjusted dose of TDF can be used in patients with ESRD or in those who are on hemodialysis. Refer to Appendix B, Table 10 for specific dosing recommendations. TAF has less impact on renal function and lower rates of proteinuria than TDF. ATV has been associated with chronic kidney disease in some observational studies. ABC has not been associated with renal dysfunction.
	Liver disease with cirrhosis	Some ARVs are contraindicated or may require dosage modification in patients with Child-Pugh class B or C disease.	Refer to Appendix B, Table 10 for specific dosing recommendations. Patients with cirrhosis should be carefully evaluated by an expert in advanced liver disease.
	Osteoporosis	**Avoid TDF.**[a] ABC may be used if patient is HLA-B*5701 negative. If HIV RNA is >100,000 copies/mL, **do not use** ABC/3TC plus (EFV or ATV/r).	TDF is associated with decreases in BMD along with renal tubulopathy, urine phosphate wasting, and resultant osteomalacia. TAF[a] and ABC are associated with smaller declines in BMD than TDF.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 7. Antiretroviral Regimen Considerations for Initial Therapy Based on Specific Clinical Scenarios (page 3 of 4)

Patient or Regimen Characteristics	Clinical Scenario	Consideration(s)	Rationale/Comments
Presence of Other Conditions, continued	Psychiatric illnesses	**Consider avoiding EFV- and RPV-based regimens.** Patients on INSTI-based regimens who have pre-existing psychiatric conditions should be closely monitored. Some ARVs are contraindicated, and some psychiatric medications need dose adjustments when coadministered with certain ARVs.	EFV and RPV can exacerbate psychiatric symptoms and may be associated with suicidality. INSTIs have been associated with adverse neuropsychiatric effects in some retrospective cohort studies and case series. See the drug-drug interaction tables (Tables 21a, 21b, and 21d) for dosing recommendations when drugs used for psychiatric illnesses are used with certain ARVs.
	HIV-associated dementia (HAD)	**Avoid EFV-based regimens if possible.**	The beneficial effects of ART on HAD-symptoms may be confounded by EFV-related neuropsychiatric effects.
	Medication-assisted treatment for opioid use disorder	Opioid withdrawal may occur when EFV is initiated in patients who are on a stable dose of methadone. Clinical monitoring is recommended, as medications used to treat opioid dependence may need to be adjusted in some patients.	EFV reduces methadone concentrations and may lead to withdrawal symptoms. See the drug-drug interaction tables (Tables 21a, 21b, and 21d) for dosing recommendations.
	Cardiac QTc interval prolongation	Consider avoiding EFV- or RPV-based regimens if patient is taking other medications with known risk of Torsades de Pointes, or in patients at higher risk of Torsades de Pointes.	High EFV or RPV concentrations may cause QT prolongation.
	High cardiac risk	Consider avoiding ABC- and LPV/r -based regimens. If a boosted PI is the desired option, an ATV-based regimen may have advantages over a DRV-based regimen. Refer to Hyperlipidemia below for regimens associated with more favorable lipid profiles.	An increased risk of CV events with ABC has been observed in some studies. Observational cohort studies reported an association between some PIs (DRV, IDV, FPV, and LPV/r) and an increased risk of CV events; this risk has not been seen with ATV (see text). Further study is needed. Certain ART regimens are associated with more favorable lipid profiles than other regimens, although evidence on whether this improves CV outcomes is lacking.
	Hyperlipidemia	**The Following ARV Drugs Have Been Associated with Dyslipidemia:** • PI/r or PI/c • EFV • EVG/c BIC, DOR, DTG, RAL, and RPV have fewer lipid effects. TDF lowers lipids; therefore, switching from TDF to TAF is associated with increased lipids.	TDF has been associated with lower lipid levels than ABC or TAF.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 7. Antiretroviral Regimen Considerations for Initial Therapy Based on Specific Clinical Scenarios (page 4 of 4)

Patient or Regimen Characteristics	Clinical Scenario	Consideration(s)	Rationale/Comments
Presence of Other Conditions, continued	Patients with history of poor adherence to non-ARV medications or inconsistent engagement in care	Consider using regimens with a boosted PI or BIC or DTG.	These regimens have a high genetic barrier to resistance.
	Pregnancy	Refer to Table 6b and the Perinatal Guidelines for further guidance on ARV use during pregnancy.	
	Patients of childbearing potential who are planning to become pregnant or who are sexually active and not using effective contraception	Refer to Table 6b for further guidance.	
Presence of Coinfections	HBV infection	Use TDF or TAF, with FTC or 3TC **If TDF and TAF Are Contraindicated:** • For treatment of HBV, use FTC or 3TC with entecavir and a suppressive ART regimen (see HBV/HIV Coinfection).	TDF, TAF, FTC, and 3TC are active against both HIV and HBV. 3TC- or FTC-associated HBV mutations can emerge rapidly when these drugs are used without another drug that is active against HBV.
	HCV treatment required	Refer to recommendations in HCV/HIV Coinfection, with special attention to potential interactions between ARV drugs and HCV drugs.	
	Treating TB disease with rifamycin antibiotics (rifabutin, rifampin, and rifapentine)	Recommended regimens may require dose adjustment. See the drug-drug interaction tables (Tables 21a-e) and TB/HIV Coinfection for information on ARV use with rifamycin antibiotics.	Rifamycin antibiotics are inducers of CYP3A4 and UGT1A1 enzymes, causing significant decreases in concentrations of PIs, INSTIs, and RPV.

[a] TAF and TDF are two FDA-approved forms of TFV. TAF has fewer bone and kidney toxicities than TDF, whereas TDF is associated with lower lipid levels. Safety, cost, and access are among the factors to consider when choosing between these drugs.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; BIC = bictegravir; BID = twice daily; BMD = bone mineral density; COBI = cobicistat; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; CNS = central nervous system; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CV = cardiovascular; CYP = cytochrome P; DOR = doravirine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; ESRD = end stage renal disease; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FPV = fosamprenavir; FTC = emtricitabine; HAD = HIV-associated dementia; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HCV = hepatitis C virus; HLA = human leukocyte antigen; IDV = indinavir; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LPV = lopinavir; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NTD = neural tube defect; PI = protease inhibitor; PI/c = cobicistat-boosted protease inhibitor; PI/r = ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; STR = single-tablet regimen; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TB = tuberculosis; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TFV = tenofovir; UGT = uridine diphosphate glucuronosyltransferase

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Characteristics of Antiretroviral Drugs Recommended for Initial Therapy

The following sections provide detailed information on ARV drugs that the Panel recommends for initial therapy for persons with HIV, including the drugs' characteristics and adverse effects profiles, results from related clinical trials, and Panel recommendations on their use.

Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor Options as Part of Initial Therapy

Table 8a. Characteristics of Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor Options Recommended for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients

Characteristics	ABC/3TC	3TC[a]	TDF/3TC	TAF/FTC	TDF/FTC
Dosing Frequency	Once daily	Once daily	Once daily	Once daily	Once daily
Available Coformulations for ART-Naive Patients	• ABC/3TC • DTG/ABC/3TC	DTG/3TC	• TDF/3TC • DOR/TDF/3TC • EFV 600 mg/TDF/3TC • EFV 400 mg/TDF/3TC	• TAF 25 mg/FTC • BIC/TAF 25 mg/FTC • DRV/c/TAF 10 mg/FTC • EVG/c/TAF 10 mg/FTC • RPV/TAF 25 mg/FTC	• TDF/FTC • EFV/TDF/FTC • EVG/c/TDF/FTC • RPV/TDF/FTC
Adverse Effects	**ABC:** • HSR to ABC is associated with the presence of HLA-B*5701 allele. • Increase in CV events is associated with ABC use in some, but not all, cohort studies.	See below	**TDF:** • Renal insufficiency, proximal renal tubulopathy • Decrease in BMD • Renal and bone toxicity are exacerbated by pharmacologic boosters.	**TAF:** • Renal insufficiency, proximal renal tubulopathy (less frequent than with TDF) • Decrease in BMD (less than with TDF; similar to with ABC)	**TDF:** • Renal insufficiency, proximal renal tubulopathy • Decrease in BMD • Renal and bone toxicity are exacerbated by pharmacologic boosters.
	3TC: No significant adverse effects			**FTC:** Skin discoloration	
Other Considerations	**ABC:** • Perform HLA-B*5701 testing before initiating ABC; if result is positive, do not start ABC and add ABC to patient's allergy list. **3TC:** • Epivir HBV™ is for the treatment of HBV and contains a different dose of 3TC than the formulation for ART. Thus, Epivir HBV™ should not be used for HIV treatment. • Coadministration of 3TC with sorbitol-containing drugs decreases 3TC concentration and should be avoided.			FTC should not be used as sole treatment for HBV due to development of resistance. Discontinuation may precipitate HBV flare if no other agents active against HBV are present.	
	3TC or ABC/3TC **should not be used** as treatment for HBV due to development of resistance. Discontinuation may precipitate HBV flare if no other agents active against HBV are present.		Also used for HBV treatment. Discontinuation may precipitate HBV flare. See Appendix B, Table 10 for dose recommendations in patients with renal insufficiency.		

[a] 3TC is recommended for use with DTG in ART-naive persons, and with DRV/r if ABC, TDF, and TAF are not optimal. Otherwise, dual-NRTI backbones are recommended.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; BIC = bictegravir; BMD = bone mineral density; CV = cardiovascular; DOR = doravirine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FTC = emtricitabine; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HLA = human leukocyte antigen; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; PI = protease inhibitor; RPV = rilpivirine; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Summary

FDA-approved NRTIs include zidovudine (ZDV), stavudine (d4T), didanosine (ddI), ABC, TDF, TAF, 3TC, and FTC. Older NRTIs (ZDV, d4T, ddI) are no longer recommended for use in clinical practice in the United States because of high rates of serious toxicities, including peripheral neuropathy and mitochondrial toxicity that may lead to myopathy, hepatic steatosis, lactic acidosis, lipoatrophy, and bone marrow suppression from ZDV use. The incidence of these complications is much lower with 3TC, FTC, ABC, TDF, and TAF than with older NRTIs.[40,41]

ABC/3TC, TAF/FTC, TDF/3TC, and TDF/FTC are NRTI combinations that are recommended as components of initial therapy. In addition, 3TC may be used as a single NRTI with DTG, or, in select circumstances, with boosted DRV. Table 6a provides recommendations and ratings for the individual regimens. These recommendations are based on the virologic potency and durability, short- and long-term toxicity, and dosing convenience of these drugs. TDF has been associated with bone and kidney toxicities, especially when used with a pharmacologic booster.[42] TAF is less likely to cause kidney and bone toxicities than TDF. TDF is associated with lower lipid levels than TAF. Safety, cost, and access are among the factors to consider when choosing between these drugs. ABC/3TC, TDF/3TC, and 3TC are available as generic formulations.

Clinical Trials Comparing Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors

Abacavir/Lamivudine Compared to Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Emtricitabine

Several randomized controlled trials in ART-naive participants compared ABC/3TC to TDF/FTC, each administered in combination with a third ARV drug[43-45] (see also the discussion in the Dolutegravir section).[46]

- The ACTG 5202 study, a randomized controlled trial in >1,800 participants, evaluated the efficacy and safety of ABC/3TC and TDF/FTC when each combination was used with either EFV or ATV/r. In patients with baseline HIV RNA ≥100,00 copies/mL, the time to virologic failure was significantly shorter with ABC/3TC than with TDF/FTC, regardless of whether the third active drug was EFV or ATV/r.[43] In the HEAT study, 688 participants received ABC/3TC or TDF/FTC in with once-daily LPV/r. Virologic efficacy was similar in the two study arms, including in a subgroup of participants with HIV RNA ≥100,000 copies/mL.[45]
- The ASSERT study compared open-label ABC/3TC with TDF/FTC in 385 HLA-B*5701-negative, ART-naive patients; all participants also received EFV. The primary study endpoint was renal safety of the regimens. At week 48, the proportion of participants with HIV RNA <50 copies/mL was lower among ABC/3TC-treated participants than among TDF/FTC-treated participants.[44]

Lamivudine Compared to Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Emtricitabine

An STR of DTG/3TC has now been approved as an initial ART regimen. Please refer to the INSTI section for full discussion.

GEMINI 1 and GEMINI 2 were identically designed randomized, double-blind clinical trials that found DTG plus 3TC noninferior to DTG plus TDF/FTC in ART-naive adults with HIV RNA <500,000 copies/mL and estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) ≥50 mL/min.[4,16]

Tenofovir Alafenamide Compared to Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate

- Two randomized double-blind Phase 3 clinical trials compared the safety and efficacy of EVG/c/TDF/FTC and EVG/c/TAF/FTC in 1,733 ART-naive adults with eGFR ≥50 mL/min.
  - TAF/FTC was virologically noninferior to TDF/FTC at week 48 (92% vs. 90% of participants had plasma HIV RNA <50 copies/mL, respectively),[47] but TAF/FTC was superior to TDF/FTC at week 144 (84.2% vs. 80% of participants with plasma HIV RNA <50 copies/mL), largely driven by a

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

higher rate of treatment discontinuation in the TDF arm.[48]

- Participants in the TAF arm had significantly smaller reductions in BMD at the spine and hip than those in the TDF arm through 144 weeks.[48] Those receiving TAF also had less pronounced changes in eGFR and renal biomarkers and fewer clinically significant renal events through week 96.[49] Conversely, levels of fasting low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol, high-density lipoprotein (HDL) cholesterol, and triglycerides increased more in the TAF group than in the TDF group at 96 weeks, with no change in total cholesterol to HDL ratio.[50]

- Two randomized studies have compared the safety and efficacy of TAF/FTC to TDF/FTC each combination administered with boosted DRV in ART-naive participants:
  - A Phase 2 study of coformulated darunavir/cobicistat (DRV/c) plus TAF/FTC versus DRV/c plus TDF/FTC in treatment-naive patients demonstrated similar virologic suppression rates in both arms (75% vs. 74%).[51] In the TAF arm, fewer participants developed proteinuria. Changes in BMD were also less pronounced among participants in the TAF group.
  - The AMBER study randomized ART-naive participants to receive either coformulated DRV/c/TAF/FTC or DRV/c plus TDF/FTC. At 48 weeks, HIV RNA <50 copies/mL was achieved in 91% of the DRV/c/TAF/FTC participants versus 88% of the DRV/c plus TDF/FTC participants. Participants in the TAF/FTC arm showed less decline in hip and spine BMD and eGFR than participants in the TDF/FTC arm.[52]

- One analysis evaluated data from 11 randomized trials that compared the virologic efficacy, frequency of renal events, and bone density changes associated with the use of TDF and of TAF when either drug was taken with or without PK boosters (RTV or COBI). There were no significant differences between unboosted TDF and TAF in terms of virologic efficacy or in the number of participants who discontinued treatment because of renal or bone adverse events or fractures. However, bone- and renal-related toxicities were more pronounced when TDF was used with RTV or COBI.[42]
- To assess the ability of TAF to maintain HIV and HBV suppression, 72 patients with HIV/HBV coinfection who had HIV RNA <50 copies/mL and HBV DNA <9 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL on a stable regimen were switched to EVG/c/TAF/FTC.[53] In this study, 96% of participants were on a TDF/FTC-containing regimen before the switch. Key results of the study showed that:
  - Among those who switched to EVG/c/TAF/FTC, HIV suppression was maintained in 94.4% and 91.7% of participants at 24 and 48 weeks, respectively. At 24 and 48 weeks, 86.1% and 91.7% of participants, respectively, had HBV DNA <29 $\log_{10}$ IU/mL.
  - Markers of proximal tubular proteinuria and biomarkers of bone turnover decreased in those who switched to EVG/c/TAF/FTC.[53]

Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor Options for Initial Therapy

In alphabetical order.

Abacavir/Lamivudine (ABC/3TC)

ABC plus 3TC has been studied in combination with EFV, several PIs, and DTG in ART-naive patients.[46,54-56]

Adverse Effects

Hypersensitivity Reactions:

- Clinically suspected hypersensitivity reactions (HSRs) were observed in 5% to 8% of individuals who started ABC in clinical trials conducted before the use of HLA-B*5701 testing. The risk of HSRs is highly associated with the presence of the HLA-B*5701 allele; approximately 50% of HLA-B*5701-positive patients, if given ABC, will have a related HSR.[57,58] HLA-B*5701 testing should be done if the

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

use of ABC is being considered. A patient who tests positive for HLA-B*5701 should not be given ABC and ABC hypersensitivity should be noted on the patient's allergy list. Patients who are HLA-B*5701 negative are far less likely to experience an HSR, but they should be counseled about the symptoms of the reaction. Patients who discontinue ABC because of a suspected HSR **should never be rechallenged**, regardless of their HLA-B*5701 status.

Cardiovascular Risk:

- An association between ABC use and myocardial infarction (MI) was first reported in the D:A:D study. This large, multinational, observational study group found that recent (i.e., within 6 months) or current use of ABC was associated with an increased risk of an MI, particularly in participants with pre-existing cardiac risk factors.[30,59]
- Since the D:A:D report, several studies have evaluated the relationship between ABC therapy and cardiovascular events. Some studies have found an association.[60-66] Others, including an FDA meta-analysis of 26 randomized clinical trials that evaluated ABC, have not.[29,67-70]
- An analysis of data from NA-ACCORD found that use of ABC in the previous 6 months was associated with an increased risk of both type 1 and type 2 MIs after adjusting for cardiovascular disease risk factors.[71]
- No consensus has been reached on the association between ABC use and MI risk or the mechanism for such an association.

Other Factors and Considerations:

- ABC/3TC is available as a coformulated tablet and as a coformulated STR with DTG.
- ABC and 3TC are available separately and as a coformulated tablet in generic tablet formulations.
- ABC does not cause renal dysfunction and can be used instead of TDF in patients with underlying renal dysfunction or in those who are at high risk for renal effects. No dose adjustment is required in patients with renal dysfunction.

The Panel's Recommendations:

- ABC should only be prescribed for patients who are HLA-B*5701 negative.
- On the basis of clinical trial safety and efficacy data, experience in clinical practice, and the availability of DTG/ABC/3TC as an FDC, the Panel classifies DTG/ABC/3TC as a *Recommended Initial Regimen for Most People with HIV* **(AI)** (see the discussion of DTG in this section regarding the clinical efficacy data for ABC/3TC plus DTG).
- ABC/3TC use with EFV, ATV/r, atazanavir/cobicistat (ATV/c), DRV/c, DRV/r, or RAL is only recommended for patients with pretreatment HIV RNA levels <100,000 copies/mL. See Table 6a for more detailed recommendations on the use of ABC/3TC with these drugs.
- ABC should be used with caution or avoided in patients with known high cardiovascular risk.

Lamivudine (3TC) as Single NRTI

3TC was approved for HIV treatment in 1995 and is often used in combination with ABC or TDF. Based on the GEMINI-1 and GEMINI-2 studies[4] that found DTG plus 3TC noninferior to DTG plus TDF/FTC in ART-naive patients with HIV RNA <500,000 copies/mL, 3TC may be used as a single NRTI with DTG (for more information, please refer to INSTI section). In addition, based on the ANDES trial, if ABC, TDF, and TAF cannot be used, 3TC can be used as a single NRTI with DRV/r[39] (please refer to Other Antiretroviral Regimens for Initial Therapy When Abacavir, Tenofovir Alafenamide, and Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Cannot Be Used or Are Not Optimal.)

Adverse Effects:

- Long-term experience with 3TC has shown that it is well tolerated with no significant adverse effects.

Other Factors and Considerations:

- 3TC is available as an STR with DTG.
- 3TC has activity against HBV but is insufficient for HBV treatment when used alone due to the emergence of resistance. Discontinuation of 3TC can precipitate a flare in HBV if no other HBV-active drugs are in the regimen.
- There are two brand-name formulations of 3TC (one for HIV and the other for HBV), but doses are different. The dose for HIV treatment is 3TC 300 mg daily.
- The dose of 3TC should be adjusted in patients with creatinine clearance (CrCl) <50 mL/min.
- Sorbitol-containing drugs can decrease 3TC concentration and co-administration should be avoided.

The Panel's Recommendations:

- The Panel recommends the use of DTG/3TC **(AI)** as a *Recommended Initial Regimen for Most People with HIV* with three exceptions. DTC/3TC **is not recommended** for:
  - Individuals with HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL;
  - Individuals with HBV coinfection or whose HBV status is unknown; *and*
  - Individuals starting ART before the results of genotypic resistance testing for reverse transcriptase are available.

Tenofovir Alafenamide/Emtricitabine (TAF/FTC)

TAF, an oral prodrug of tenofovir (TFV), is hydrolyzed to TFV in plasma and then converted to TFV-diphosphate (TFV-DP) intracellularly, where it exerts its activity as an NRTI. Unlike TDF, which readily converts to TFV in plasma after oral absorption, TAF remains relatively stable in plasma, resulting in lower plasma and higher intracellular TFV concentrations. After oral administration, TAF 25 mg resulted in plasma TFV concentrations that were 90% lower than those seen with TDF 300 mg. Intracellular TFV-DP concentrations, however, were substantially higher with TAF.

Adverse Effects

Renal and Bone Effects:

- The potential for adverse kidney and bone effects is lower with TAF than with TDF. In randomized controlled trials that compared TAF and TDF in treatment-naive or virologically suppressed patients, TAF had more favorable effects on renal biomarkers and bone density than TDF (described below).

Lipid Effects:

- In randomized controlled trials in ART-naive patients, as well as in switch studies (described below), levels of LDL and HDL cholesterol and triglycerides were higher in patients receiving TAF than in patients receiving TDF. However, total cholesterol to HDL ratios did not differ between patients receiving TAF and those receiving TDF. The clinical significance of this finding is not clear.[47,72,73]

Weight Gain:

- Initiation of TAF in ART-naive individuals has been associated with greater weight gain than initiation of TDF[23,24] and ABC.[23] Significant weight gain was initially reported in a cohort of patients switching from TDF-containing to TAF-containing regimens.[74] In ADVANCE, an open-label trial conducted in

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

South Africa that compared EFV/TDF/FTC versus DTG plus TDF/FTC versus DTG plus TAF/FTC in ART-naive patients, there was a greater increase in body weight with initiation of TAF than with TDF.[24] Weight gain was most pronounced in black women (10 kg over 96 weeks). This is an area of intense investigation and the clinical significance of the effect is still uncertain. It is also unclear whether change of therapy results in reversal of weight gain.

Other Factors and Considerations:

- TAF/FTC is available in FDCs with bictegravir (BIC), DRV/c, EVG/c, or RPV, allowing the regimens to be administered as a single pill taken once daily with food.
- In Phase 3 randomized trials, BIC/TAF/FTC was comparable to DTG/ABC/3TC and to DTG plus TAF/FTC (see the INSTI section below).
- TAF-containing regimens are approved for patients with eGFR ≥30 mL/min. Renal function, urine glucose, and urine protein should be assessed before initiating treatment with TAF, and these assessments should be repeated periodically during treatment. EVG/c/FTC/TAF was safe and effective in a single-arm switch study that was conducted in patients on hemodialysis with eGFR <15 mL/min.[75]
- Both TAF and FTC are active against HBV. In patients with HIV/HBV coinfection, TAF/FTC may be used as the NRTI pair in an ART regimen because these drugs have activity against both viruses (see HBV/HIV Coinfection).[53]

The Panel's Recommendation:

- On the basis of clinical trial safety and efficacy data, supportive bioequivalence data,[76] and its availability as a component of various FDCs, the Panel considers TAF/FTC a recommended NRTI combination for initial ART in most persons with HIV when prescribed with BIC, DTG, and RAL.

Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Emtricitabine (TDF/FTC) and Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Lamivudine (TDF/3TC)

TDF, with either 3TC or FTC, has been studied in combination with DOR, EFV, RPV, several boosted PIs, EVG/c, RAL, and DTG in randomized clinical trials.[77-86] In a 10-day, open-label, randomized, monotherapy trial that was not powered to find a difference between study arms, the reduction in viral load from baseline was 1.7 $\log_{10}$ for FTC 200 mg once daily and 1.5 $\log_{10}$ for 3TC 150 mg twice daily.[87] In a meta-analysis of 12 trials, there was no significant difference in treatment success between 3TC and FTC.[88] In the ATHENA cohort, virologic efficacy of TDF/FTC was compared to TDF/3TC when either was combined with an NNRTI (EFV or nevirapine [NVP])[89] or with a boosted PI.[90] TDF/3TC was associated with higher rates of virologic failure than TDF/FTC in the NNRTI analysis. However, it is noteworthy that the participants in the NNRTI cohort who were taking 3TC generally had higher viral loads, lower CD4 counts, and were more likely to be using injection drugs at the start of the study than those taking FTC.[89] There was no difference in the rates of virologic failure in people who were taking TDF/FTC and people who were taking TDF/3TC when these drug combinations were used with a boosted PI.[90] A retrospective analysis of an Italian national database found that viral resistance was more common with TDF/3TC than with TDF/FTC, but this was not observed in clinical trials.[91]

Adverse Effects

Renal Effects:

- New onset or worsening renal impairment has been associated with TDF use.[92,93] Risk factors may include advanced HIV disease, longer treatment history, low body weight (especially in women),[94] and pre-existing renal impairment.[95] Concomitant use of a PK-enhanced regimen (with a PI or EVG) can increase TDF concentrations; studies have suggested that the risk of renal dysfunction is greater when TDF is used in these regimens. As previously noted, adverse effects on renal biomarkers such as

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

proteinuria, especially tubular proteinuria, were more frequent with TDF than with TAF.[93,95-99]

- Adverse renal outcomes are more likely when TDF/FTC is coadministered with PK boosters (RTV or COBI). A meta-analysis of randomized trials found that discontinuation due to renal adverse events is more frequent in people who take TDF/FTC with PK boosting.[42]

Bone Effects:

- While initiation of all NRTI-containing regimens has been associated with a decrease in BMD, the loss of BMD is greater with TDF-containing regimens. For example, in two randomized studies that compared TDF/FTC with ABC/3TC, participants who received TDF/FTC experienced a significantly greater decline in BMD than ABC/3TC-treated participants.[100,101] BMD generally stabilizes following an early decline after ART initiation. Loss of BMD with TDF is also greater than with TAF (see above).
- Cases of osteomalacia associated with proximal renal tubulopathy have been reported with the use of TDF.[102]
- Adverse bone outcomes are more likely when TDF/FTC is coadministered with PK boosters (RTV or COBI). A meta-analysis of randomized trials found that fractures and study discontinuations due to bone adverse events occured more frequently among patients who took TDF/FTC with PK boosting than among those who took TAF/FTC with PK boosting.[42]

Other Factors and Considerations:

- TDF/FTC is available in FDCs with EFV, EVG/c, and RPV, allowing the regimens to be administered as a single pill taken once daily.
- TDF/3TC is available in FDCs with DOR 100 mg, EFV 600 mg, and EFV 400 mg.
- Renal function, urine glucose, and urine protein should be assessed before initiating treatment with TDF and periodically during treatment (see Laboratory Testing for Initial Assessment and Monitoring). In patients who have pre-existing renal insufficiency (CrCl <60 mL/min),[103] use of TDF should generally be avoided. If TDF is used, a dose adjustment is required if the patient's CrCl falls below 50 mL/min (see Appendix B, Table 10 for dose recommendations).
- TDF, FTC, and 3TC are active against HBV. In patients with HBV/HIV coinfection, TDF/FTC or TDF/3TC may be used as the NRTI pair of the ART regimen because these drugs have activity against both viruses (see HBV/HIV Coinfection).

The Panel's Recommendations:

- On the basis of clinical trial safety and efficacy data, long-term experience in clinical practice, and the combination's availability as a component of FDC drugs, the Panel considers TDF/FTC and TDF/3TC as recommended NRTI combinations for initial ART in most persons with HIV when combined with DTG or RAL. See Table 6a for recommendations regarding use of TDF/FTC with other drugs.
- TDF should be used with caution or avoided in patients with renal disease and osteoporosis.
- When TDF is used, especially in conjunction with a PK booster, clinicians should monitor for renal and bone safety during therapy. Boosters should be avoided when possible in patients taking TDF.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor–Based Regimens

Table 8b. Characteristics of Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors That Are Recommended for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients

Before starting an INSTI-based regimen in a person of childbearing potential, clinicians should refer to Table 6b for further guidance.

Characteristics	BIC	DTG	EVG	RAL
Dosing Frequency	Once daily	**Once Daily:** • In ART-naive or INSTI-naive persons **Twice Daily:** • If used with certain CYP3A4 and UGT1A1 inducers; *or* • In INSTI-experienced persons with certain INSTI drug resistance mutations	Once daily; requires boosting with COBI	• 400 mg twice daily, *or* • 1,200 mg (two 600-mg tablets) once daily
STR Available for ART-Naive Patients	BIC/TAF/FTC	• DTG/ABC/3TC • DTG/3TC	• EVG/c/TAF/FTC • EVG/c/TDF/FTC	No
Available as a Single-Drug Tablet	No	Yes	No	Yes
Approved for ART-Experienced Patients	No	Yes, with twice-daily dosing for patients with certain INSTI drug resistance mutations	No, but sometimes used in combination with DRV and TAF/FTC as part of a simplification regimen in patients with resistance.	Yes, for patients with drug resistance mutations to RTV-boosted PIs or NNRTIs, but not to INSTIs
Virologic Efficacy Against EVG- or RAL-Resistant HIV	*In vitro* data indicate activity, but clinical trial data are not available.	Yes, for some isolates; effective with DTG 50 mg twice-daily dose	No	No
Adverse Effects	Nausea, diarrhea (GI disturbance greater with EVG/c), headache, insomnia. Among ARV-naive individuals, initiation of INSTI-containing regimens has been associated with greater weight gain than NNRTI or boosted PI regimens (see text). Depression and suicidality are rare, occurring primarily in patients with pre-existing psychiatric conditions.			
	↑ CPK (4%)	Hypersensitivity, hepatotoxicity, ↑ CPK, myositis	↑ TG, ↑ LDL	↑ CPK, myopathy, hypersensitivity, SJS/TEN
CYP3A4 Drug-Drug Interactions	CYP3A4 substrate	CYP3A4 substrate (minor)	EVG is a CYP3A4 substrate; COBI is a CYP3A4 inhibitor	No
Chelation with Polyvalent Cation Supplements and Antacids	Oral absorption of all INSTIs may be reduced by polyvalent cations. See Table 21d for recommendations regarding dosing separation of INSTIs and these drugs.			
Other Key Potential Drug Interactions	UGT1A1 substrate, OCT2 and MATE1 inhibitor	P-gp substrate, UGT1A1 substrate	EVG is a UGT1A1 substrate; COBI is a P-gp inhibitor.	UGT1A1 substrate

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; BIC = bictegravir; BID = twice daily; COBI = cobicistat; CPK = creatine phosphokinase; CYP = cytochrome P; DRV = darunavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FTC = emtricitabine; GI = gastrointestinal; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LDL = low density lipoprotein; MATE = multidrug and toxic compound extrusion; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NTD = neural tube defect; OAT = organic cation transporter; P-gp = p-glycoprotein; PI = protease inhibitor; PI/r = ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor; RAL = raltegravir; SJS/TEN = Stevens Johnson Syndrome/toxic epidermal necrolysis; STR = single-tablet regimen; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TG = triglyceride; UGT = uridine diphosphate glucuronosyltransferase

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Summary

Four INSTIs—BIC, DTG, EVG, and RAL—are approved for use in ART-naive patients with HIV.

The Panel recommends one of the following INSTI-based regimens for most people with HIV:

- BIC/TAF/FTC **(AI)**
- DTG/ABC/3TC **(AI)**—if HLA-B*5701 negative
- DTG plus (TAF or TDF) with (FTC or 3TC) **(AI)**
- RAL plus (TAF or TDF) with (FTC or 3TC) (**BI** for TDF/[FTC or 3TC], **BII** for TAF/FTC)
- DTG/3TC **(AI)**, except for those with HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL, with HBV coinfection, or in whom ART is to be started before the results of HIV genotypic resistance testing for reverse transcriptase or HBV testing are available.

Among the INSTI-based regimens, RAL-containing regimens have the longest clinical experience, and they have been shown to have durable virologic efficacy; however, they have a higher pill burden than BIC- and DTG-containing regimens. EVG and RAL have lower barriers to resistance than BIC and DTG. Because of its high barrier to resistance, DTG plus two NRTIs or BIC/TAF/FTC may be considered for patients who must start ART before resistance test results are available. EVG-based regimens require boosting with COBI, which results in a greater potential for interaction with concomitant medications, Therefore, EVG-based regimens are now considered *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations*.

All INSTIs are generally well tolerated, though there are reports of insomnia in some patients. Depression and suicidal ideation, primarily in patients with a history of psychiatric illnesses, have rarely been reported in patients receiving INSTI-based regimens.[104-107]

Among ARV-naive individuals, initiation of INSTI-containing regimens has been associated with greater weight gain than NNRTI- or boosted PI-regimens.[23-26,108,109] In randomized trials of ARV-naive individuals, the mean increase in weight from baseline associated with BIC and DTG was similar and greater than with EVG/c.[23] Greater weight gain has also been observed after initiation of TAF,[20,23,24] or with a switch from TDF to TAF[74] especially in conjunction with INSTIs. While ARV-associated weight gain appears to disproportionately affect women, Blacks and Hispanics,[23,24,108,110] predictors and mechanism(s) for the weight gain are still unclear. Further questions that need to be clarified include regional distribution of the weight gain,[22] whether it is associated with significant cardio-metabolic risk,[111] and whether it is reversible upon discontinuation of the offending agent.

Preliminary data from an observational study in Botswana suggested that there may be an increased risk of NTDs in infants born to individuals who were receiving DTG at the time of conception.[5,9] Additional data show that the prevalence of NTDs in infants who were exposed to DTG at the time of conception is lower than previously reported, but still higher than in infants exposed to non-DTG regimens.[6,7] Before initiating an INSTI-based regimen in a person of childbearing potential, clinicians should review the information in Table 6b.

Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors Recommended as Part of an Initial Regimen for Most People with HIV

Bictegravir (BIC)

BIC is an INSTI that is approved by FDA for initial therapy in adults with HIV as a component of a single-tablet, once-daily regimen with TAF and FTC.

Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

- The efficacy of BIC in ART-naive adults has been evaluated in two large Phase 3 randomized double-blind clinical trials that compared BIC to DTG administered in combination with two NRTIs. The primary

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

efficacy endpoint was the proportion of participants with plasma HIV RNA <50 copies/mL at week 48.

- The GS-US-380-1490 trial randomized participants 1:1 to receive either BIC/TAF/FTC or DTG with coformulated TAF/FTC. Both regimens were given once daily. At week 96, 84% of participants in the BIC arm and 86% of those in the DTG arm achieved HIV RNA <50 copies/mL.[20]
- The GS-US-380-1489 trial randomized participants 1:1 to receive BIC/TAF/FTC or coformulated DTG/ABC/3TC once daily. At week 96, 88% of participants in the BIC/TAF/FTC arm and 90% of those in the DTG/ABC/3TC arm achieved HIV RNA <50 copies/mL.[21]

Adverse Effects:

- BIC is generally well tolerated. In clinical trials, the most commonly reported adverse reactions of any grade with an incidence ≥5% included diarrhea, nausea, and headache. Some studies have shown greater weight gain among people initiating INSTI-based regimens, particularly Black women. In a pooled analysis of eight randomized, controlled trials in ART-naive individuals, the weight gain at 96 weeks with BIC- and DTG-based regimens was similar (approximately 3.5 kg).[23]

Other Factors and Considerations:

- BIC is a CYP3A4 substrate and a UGT1A1 substrate, and its metabolism may be affected by concomitant use of CYP3A4 and UGT1A1 inducers or inhibitors. Rifampin or other rifamycins may decrease BIC or TAF concentrations, which may result in a loss of therapeutic effect. For patients who require rifamycins, BIC/FTC/TAF should not be used. Use of certain anticonvulsants and St. John's wort should also be avoided.[112]
- BIC is an inhibitor of the drug transporters OCT2 and MATE1, which may lead to increased concentrations of drugs that are substrates of these transporters. For this reason, dofetilide is **contraindicated** with BIC/TAF/FTC.
- BIC is not a CYP3A4 inducer or inhibitor; thus, unlike EVG/c, BIC is unlikely to affect the metabolism of medications that are CYP3A4 substrates.
- Like other INSTIs, oral absorption of BIC may be reduced when BIC is coadministered with polyvalent cations (e.g., aluminum-, magnesium-, or calcium-containing antacids, or calcium or iron supplements). See the BIC product label for dosing recommendations when using BIC with these products.[112]
- BIC decreases tubular secretion of creatinine without affecting glomerular function. Increases in serum creatinine are typically observed within the first 4 weeks of BIC therapy (with a median increase of 0.10 mg/dL after 48 weeks). This increase is comparable to that seen with other drugs that have a similar effect on creatinine secretion, including DTG, RPV, and COBI.
- Treatment-emergent mutations that confer BIC resistance have not yet been reported in people receiving BIC for initial therapy. BIC has not been studied in people with prior INSTI failure or INSTI-related resistance mutations, and BIC should not be used in these individuals until more data are available.
- There are insufficient data to determine whether use of BIC around the time of conception and during pregnancy is safe.

The Panel's Recommendation:

- On the basis of clinical trial data, the Panel categorizes the combination of BIC/TAF/FTC administered once daily as a *Recommended Initial Regimen for Most People with HIV* **(AI)**.
- Before prescribing BIC to a person of childbearing potential, review Table 6b. BIC should not be used in pregnancy because of insufficient safety data.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Dolutegravir (DTG)

DTG is an INSTI with a higher barrier to resistance than EVG or RAL. In ART-naive patients, DTG plus two NRTIs demonstrated high efficacy in achieving HIV suppression. DTG is given once daily, with or without food. Preliminary data from Botswana suggested that there may be an increased risk of NTDs in infants born to women who were receiving DTG at the time of conception,[5,9] but additional data indicate the risk is lower than previously reported.[6,7] More detailed discussions of this potential risk and recommendations for the use of DTG are found below and in Table 6b.

Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

- The efficacy of DTG in ART-naive patients has been evaluated in several fully powered randomized controlled clinical trials. In these trials, DTG-based regimens were noninferior or superior to a comparator INSTI-, NNRTI-, or PI-based regimen. The primary efficacy endpoint in these clinical trials was the proportion of participants with plasma HIV RNA <50 copies/mL.

DTG plus Two NRTIs versus Other INSTIs plus Two NRTIs:

- DTG-based regimens (with TAF/FTC or ABC/3TC) have been compared to BIC/TAF/FTC in two randomized controlled trials. These regimens have shown virologic efficacy that is similar to BIC/TAF/FTC (see the discussion in the BIC section above).[20,21,113,114]
- The SPRING-2 trial compared DTG 50 mg once daily to RAL 400 mg twice daily. Each drug was administered in combination with an investigator-selected, two-NRTI combination (ABC/3TC or TDF/FTC) to 822 participants. At week 96, DTG was noninferior to RAL.[86]

DTG plus Two NRTIs versus EFV plus Two NRTIs:

- The SINGLE trial compared DTG 50 mg once daily plus ABC/3TC to EFV/TDF/FTC in 833 participants. At week 48, DTG plus ABC/3TC was superior to EFV/TDF/FTC, primarily because the study treatment discontinuation rate was higher in the EFV arm than in the DTG arm.[46] At week 144, DTG plus ABC/3TC remained superior to EFV/TDF/FTC.[115]
- The ADVANCE trial, an open label, noninferiority trial conducted in South Africa, compared DTG with either TDF/FTC or TAF/FTC to EFV/TDF/FTC. At week 48, the DTG-based regimens were noninferior to the EFV regimen based on the proportion of participants with HIV-RNA levels <50 copies/mL. More participants discontinued the trial regimen in the EFV group than in the DTG group.[24]
- The NAMSAL ANRS 12313 study, an open-label, multicenter randomized noninferiority trial conducted in Cameroon, compared DTG to EFV 400 mg, both combined with TDF/3TC. At week 48, DTG was noninferior to EFV 400 mg, with HIV RNA <50 copies/mL in 74.5% and 69.0% of participants in the DTG and EFV arms respectively.[8]

DTG plus Two NRTIs versus PI/r plus Two NRTIs:

- The FLAMINGO study, a randomized open-label clinical trial, compared DTG 50 mg once daily to DRV/r 800 mg/100 mg once daily, each administered in combination with investigator-selected ABC/3TC or TDF/FTC. At week 48, DTG was superior to DRV/r, with 90% and 83% of participants achieving HIV RNA <50 copies/mL, respectively. The rate of participants who discontinued their assigned regimen was higher in the DRV/r arm.[116] The difference in efficacy between the DTG and DRV/r regimens was more pronounced in patients with pretreatment HIV RNA levels >100,000 copies/mL. At week 96, DTG remained superior to DRV/r.[117]
- The ARIA trial, an open-label, Phase 3b randomized controlled trial, compared the efficacy and safety of DTG/ABC/3TC to ATV/r plus TDF/FTC in ART-naive, nonpregnant women. At week 48, 82% of participants in the DTG group and 71% in the ATV group ($P = 0.005$) achieved HIV RNA viral loads <50

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

copies/mL. The difference was driven by a lower rate of virologic nonresponse and fewer withdrawals due to adverse events in the DTG group.[118]

DTG/3TC:

- In the GEMINI-1 and GEMINI-2 trials, 1,433 ART-naive participants with baseline HIV RNA <500,000 copies/mL and no evidence of HBV infection were randomized to receive DTG plus 3TC or DTG plus TDF/FTC. At week 96, DTG plus 3TC was noninferior to DTG plus TDF/FTC based on the proportion of participants with viral loads <50 copies/mL (86% in DTG plus 3TC group and 89.5% in DTG plus TDF/FTC group).[4] Virologic nonresponse was uncommon, occurring in 3.1% of participants who received DTG plus 3TC and 2% of participants who received DTG plus TDF/FTC. No instances of treatment-emergent NRTI or INSTI resistance occurred in either treatment group. Among participants who started the study with CD4 counts <200 cells/mm^3, the rate of those with HIV RNA <50 copies/mL at week 96 was lower in the DTG plus 3TC group than in the DTG plus TDF/FTC group; however, the difference was not related to a higher rate of virologic failures in the two-drug group.

- Two other small, non-randomized single-arm studies showed similar rates of viral suppression with DTG plus 3TC.[119,120]

Adverse Effects:

- DTG is generally well tolerated. The most commonly reported adverse reactions of moderate-to-severe intensity were insomnia and headache. As discussed earlier, some studies have shown greater weight gain among people initiating INSTI-based regimens, including regimens with DTG.[23-26]

- Case series of neuropsychiatric adverse events (e.g., sleep disturbances, depression, anxiety, suicidal ideation) associated with the initiation of DTG and RAL have been reported.[104,105] Two observational cohort studies reported a higher frequency of neuropsychiatric adverse events leading to treatment discontinuation in patients receiving DTG than in patients receiving other INSTIs.[106,107] However, analyses of data from large randomized controlled trials and a health care database demonstrated similar rates of neuropsychiatric adverse events between DTG-based regimens and other ARV regimens,[121] with neuropsychiatric events rarely leading to DTG discontinuation. Another report from the World Health Organization international pharmacovigilance database reported neuropsychiatric events with all approved INSTIs,[122] not just DTG. Further studies will be needed to clarify the true incidence and implications of these neuropsychiatric events. A pathophysiologic mechanism for these neuropsychiatric adverse events has not been defined.

- An observational surveillance study of birth outcomes among pregnant women on ART in Botswana identified five cases of NTDs among infants born to 1,683 women (0.3%) who initiated a DTG-based regimen around the time of conception. The incidence of NTDs among infants born to women who were receiving other ARV drugs at the time of conception was 0.1%, although data were limited for all other ARV agents except EFV.[9] See Table 6b for recommendations on prescribing INSTIs as part of initial therapy, including for people of childbearing potential.

- Weight gain has been reported with INSTIs, including DTG, as discussed in the Summary of this INSTI section.

Other Factors and Considerations:

- DTG, like BIC, decreases tubular secretion of creatinine without affecting glomerular function, with increases in serum creatinine observed within the first 4 weeks of treatment.

- DTG has fewer drug interactions than EVG/c. See Drug-Drug Interactions for specific drug-drug interactions that require dosage adjustment.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

- DTG absorption, like absorption for other INSTIs, may be reduced when the ARV is coadministered with polyvalent cations (see Drug-Drug Interactions). DTG should be taken at least 2 hours before or 6 hours after cation-containing antacids or laxatives are taken. Alternatively, DTG and supplements containing calcium or iron can be taken simultaneously with food.
- Treatment-emergent mutations that confer DTG resistance have been rarely reported in patients receiving DTG as part of a three-drug regimen for initial therapy.[17-19] The incidence of resistance with DTG is much lower than with EVG or RAL, which suggests that DTG, like BIC, has a higher barrier to resistance than EVG or RAL.

The Panel's Recommendations:

- On the basis of clinical trial data, the Panel categorizes DTG in combination with ABC/3TC **(AI)**, TAF/FTC **(AI)**, or TDF/(FTC or 3TC) **(AI)** as a *Recommended Initial Regimen for Most People with HIV*.
- The Panel also recommends the use of DTG/3TC **(AI)** as a *Recommended Initial Regimen for Most People with HIV* except for those with HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL, with HBV coinfection, or in whom ART is to be started before the results of HIV genotypic resistance testing for reverse transcriptase or of HBV testing are available.
- Individuals of childbearing potential should have a pregnancy test before initiating DTG **(AIII)**.
- A DTG-based regimen can be considered for individuals of childbearing potential who are using effective contraception after a discussion of the risks and benefits of the regimen so that individuals can make informed decisions (see Table 6b for details) **(BIII)**.
- For initial therapy of individuals of childbearing potential who are trying to conceive or are sexually active and not using contraception, please see Table 6b for recommendations.

Raltegravir (RAL)

RAL was the first INSTI approved for use in both ARV-naive and ARV-experienced patients.

Efficacy in Clinical Trials

RAL 400 mg Twice Daily plus Two NRTIs versus Comparator Drug plus Two NRTIs:

- The efficacy of RAL at a dose of 400 mg twice daily (with either TDF/FTC or ABC/3TC) as initial therapy was evaluated in two randomized, double-blind, controlled clinical trials and a third open-label, randomized trial.
    - STARTMRK compared RAL 400 mg twice daily to EFV 600 mg once daily, each administered in combination with TDF/FTC. RAL was noninferior to EFV at 48 weeks.[82] RAL was superior to EFV at 4 and 5 years,[85,123] in part because of more frequent discontinuations due to adverse events in the EFV group than in the RAL group.
    - The SPRING-2 trial compared DTG 50 mg once daily to RAL 400 mg twice daily, each administered in combination with investigator-selected ABC/3TC or TDF/FTC. At week 96, DTG was noninferior to RAL.
    - The SPRING-2 trial also provided nonrandomized data on the efficacy of RAL plus ABC/3TC. In this trial, 164 participants (39 participants with baseline viral loads ≥100,000 copies/mL and 125 participants with baseline viral loads <100,000 copies/mL) received RAL in combination with ABC/3TC. After 96 weeks, there was no difference in virologic response between the ABC/3TC and TDF/FTC groups when RAL was given as the third drug.[86]
    - ACTG A5257, a large randomized open-label trial, compared three NNRTI-sparing regimens

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

that contained RAL, ATV/r, or DRV/r, each given with TDF/FTC. At week 96, all three regimens had similar virologic efficacy, but RAL was superior to both ATV/r and DRV/r for the combined endpoints of virologic efficacy and tolerability. Participants had greater increases in lipid levels in the ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor (PI/r) arms than in the RAL arm, and BMD decreased to a greater extent in participants in the PI/r arms than in participants in the RAL arm.[13]

RAL 1,200 mg Once Daily plus TDF/FTC versus RAL 400 mg Twice Daily plus TDF/FTC:

- In a Phase 3, randomized, double-blind, active comparator-controlled trial (the ONCEMRK trial), the efficacy of once-daily RAL 1,200 mg (formulated as two 600-mg tablets) was compared to RAL 400 mg twice daily, each administered with TDF/FTC. At 96 weeks, a similar proportion of participants in both groups achieved HIV RNA suppression (81.5% in the once-daily arm vs. 80.1% in the twice-daily arm). The responses were similar regardless of baseline HIV RNA or CD4 count.[124]

Adverse Effects:

- RAL, when compared in a randomized trial to DRV/r or ATV/r, all with TDF/FTC, led to a greater mean increase in waist circumference.[125]
- RAL use has been associated with creatine kinase elevations. Myositis and rhabdomyolysis have been reported.
- Rare cases of severe skin reactions and systemic HSRs in patients who received RAL have been reported during post-marketing surveillance.[126]
- Neuropsychiatric adverse events (e.g., insomnia, headache, depression, and suicidal ideation) have been reported in people receiving INSTIs (see the discussion under DTG).[121,127]

Other Factors and Considerations:

- RAL can be administered as 1,200 mg (two 600-mg tablets) once daily or as 400 mg twice daily with or without food in ART-naive patients.
- Coadministration of RAL as either 400 mg twice daily or 1,200 mg once daily with aluminum-containing and/or magnesium-containing antacids **is not recommended**. Calcium carbonate-containing antacids may be coadministered with RAL 400 mg twice daily, but not with RAL 1,200 mg once daily. Polyvalent cation-containing supplements may also reduce absorption of RAL. See Table 21d for dosing recommendations.
- RAL has a lower barrier to resistance than RTV-boosted PIs, BIC, and DTG.
- Among those who received RAL during pregnancy, the rate of fetal malformations is within the expected range for pregnancy outcomes in the United States.[10-12] Data on RAL use around the time of conception is limited. Thus far, based on data collected from Antiretroviral Pregnancy Registry, the manufacturer and in a cohort study from the United States and other countries, no case of NTD has been reported.[10-12]

The Panel's Recommendations:

- On the basis of these clinical trial data, the Panel considers RAL given as 1,200 mg (two 600-mg tablets) once daily or as 400 mg twice daily plus TDF/FTC **(BI)** or TAF/FTC **(BII)** as a *Recommended Initial Regimen for Most People with HIV.*

Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors Recommended as Part of an Initial Regimen in Certain Clinical Situations

Elvitegravir (EVG)

EVG is available as a component of two STRs: EVG/c/TDF/FTC and EVG/c/TAF/FTC. COBI is a specific,

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

potent CYP3A inhibitor that has no activity against HIV. It acts as a PK enhancer of EVG, which allows for once-daily dosing of the combination but increases the likelihood of significant drug interactions.

Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

- The efficacy of EVG/c/TDF/FTC in ART-naive participants has been evaluated in two randomized, double-blind active-controlled trials.
  - At 144 weeks, EVG/c/TDF/FTC was noninferior to fixed-dose EFV/TDF/FTC.[128]
  - EVG/c/TDF/FTC was also found to be noninferior to ATV/r plus TDF/FTC.[129]
  - In a randomized, blinded trial that compared EVG/c/TDF/FTC to ATV/r plus TDF/FTC in women with HIV, EVG/c/TDF/FTC had superior efficacy, in part because of a lower rate of treatment discontinuation.[15]
- The efficacy of EVG/c/TAF/FTC in ART-naive participants has been evaluated in two randomized, double-blind controlled trials in adults with eGFR ≥50 mL/min.[47,50]
  - At 48 and 96 weeks, TAF was noninferior to TDF when both drugs were combined with EVG/c/FTC; at 144 weeks, EVG/c/TAF/FTC was superior to EVG/c/TDF/FTC.[48]

Adverse Effects:

- The most common adverse events reported with EVG/c/TDF/FTC were diarrhea, nausea, upper respiratory infection, and headache.[128,129]
- The most common adverse events reported with EVG/c/TAF/FTC were nausea, diarrhea, headache, and fatigue.[130]
- Neuropsychiatric adverse events have been reported in people receiving INSTIs (see the discussion under DTG).

Other Factors and Considerations:

- EVG is metabolized primarily by CYP3A enzymes; as a result, CYP3A inducers or inhibitors may alter EVG concentrations.
- Because COBI is a PK enhancer, it is a CYP3A enzyme inhibitor, which may lead to significant interactions with medications that are metabolized by this enzyme (see Drug-Drug Interactions).[131]
- Administration of EVG simultaneously with polyvalent cation-containing antacids or supplements lowers EVG plasma concentrations (see Drug-Drug Interactions). Separate EVG/c/TDF/FTC or EVG/c/TAF/FTC and polyvalent antacid administration by at least 2 hours; administer polyvalent cation-containing supplements at least 2 hours before or 6 hours after EVG.
- COBI inhibits active tubular secretion of creatinine, resulting in increases in serum creatinine and a reduction in estimated CrCl without reducing glomerular function.[132] Patients with a confirmed increase in serum creatinine >0.4 mg/dL from baseline while taking EVG/c/TDF/FTC should be closely monitored and evaluated for evidence of TDF-related proximal renal tubulopathy.[99]
- EVG/c/TDF/FTC **is not recommended** for patients with pretreatment estimated CrCl <70 mL/min.[99]
- EVG/c/TAF/FTC **is not recommended** for patients with estimated CrCl <30 mL/min unless they are on chronic hemodialysis. An observational study of 55 people with HIV who were on hemodialysis suggested that EVG/c/TAF/FTC given once daily (after hemodialysis on dialysis days) can be used safely in persons with no resistance to any of the ARV drugs in this STR.[133]
- At the time of virologic failure, INSTI-associated mutations were detected in some EVG/c/TDF/FTC-

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

treated patients whose therapy failed.[128,129] These mutations conferred cross-resistance to RAL, with most patients retaining susceptibility to DTG.

- EVG/c **is not recommended** during pregnancy because of low drug exposure when taken during the second and third trimesters.[134]

The Panel's Recommendation:

- On the basis of the above considerations, the Panel classifies EVG/c/TAF/FTC and EVG/c/TDF/FTC as *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations* **(BI)**. EVG/c/TAF/FTC should only be used in people with estimated CrCl ≥30 mL/min, unless they are on chronic hemodialysis. EVG/c/TDF/FTC should only be used in people with estimated CrCl ≥70 mL/min.

Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor-Based Regimens

Table 8c. Characteristics of Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors that are Recommended for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients

Characteristics	DOR	EFV	RPV
Dosing Frequency	Once daily	Once daily	Once daily
Food Requirement	With or without food	On an empty stomach	With a meal
STR Available for ART-Naive Patients	DOR/TDF/3TC	• EFV 600 mg/TDF/FTC • EFV 600 mg/TDF/3TC • EFV 400 mg/TDF/3TC	• RPV/TAF/FTC • RPV/TDF/FTC
Available as a Single-Drug Tablet	Yes	Yes	Yes
Adverse Effects	Generally well tolerated	• CNS side effects, including dizziness, abnormal dreams, headache, depression, suicidality, insomnia, somnolence • Skin rash • QTc prolongation	• Depression, headache • Skin rash • QTc prolongation
CYP3A4 Drug-Drug Interactions	CYP3A4 substrate	CYP3A4 substrate, mixed inducer/inhibitor	CYP3A4 substrate
Other Significant Drug Interactions	None	CYP2B6 and 2C19 inducer	RPV oral absorption is reduced with increased gastric pH. Use of RPV with PPIs is not recommended; see Drug-Drug Interactions for dosing recommendations when RPV is coadministered with H2 blocker or antacids.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; CNS = central nervous system; CYP = cytochrome P; DOR = doravirine; EFV = efavirenz; FTC = emtricitabine; H2 = histamine 2; PPI = proton pump inhibitor; RPV = rilpivirine; STR = single-tablet regimen; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate

Summary

Five NNRTIs (delavirdine [DLV], DOR, EFV, etravirine [ETR], NVP, and RPV) are currently approved by FDA for the treatment of HIV when used in combination with other ARV drugs.

NNRTI-based regimens have demonstrated virologic potency and durability. The major disadvantages of currently available NNRTIs (especially EFV and RPV) are the prevalence of NNRTI-resistant viral strains in ART-naive patients[135] and the drugs' low barrier for the development of resistance. Resistance testing should be performed before initiation of an NNRTI-based regimen in ART-naive patients. High-level resistance to

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

all NNRTIs (except ETR or DOR) may occur with a single mutation. In RPV-treated patients, the presence of RPV resistance mutations at virologic failure may confer cross-resistance to other NNRTIs, including ETR.[136,137] DOR-, EFV-, and RPV-based regimens are now categorized as *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations* for ART-naive patients.

Doravirine (DOR)

Efficacy in Clinical Trials

The efficacy of DOR-based therapy for treatment of HIV in ART-naive individuals was demonstrated in two randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trials.

DOR-Based Regimen versus EFV-Based Regimen:

- In DRIVE-AHEAD, 734 participants received either DOR/TDF/3TC or EFV/TDF/FTC, both as FDCs.[36]
    - At 48 weeks, DOR/TDF/3TC was noninferior to EFV/TDF/FTC, with 84.3% of participants who received DOR/TDF/3TC and 80.8% of those who received EFV/TDF/FTC achieving HIV RNA <50 copies/mL. Although virologic responses to ART overall were lower in participants with pre-ART HIV RNA >100,000 copies/mL, there was no difference between the DOR-treated and EFV-treated participants. Virologic responses overall were lower in participants with pre-ART HIV RNA >100,000 copies/mL, but there was no difference between the DOR and EFV groups.
    - A greater proportion of participants in the EFV arm discontinued their assigned ART due to adverse events than in the DOR arm (6.3% vs. 2.7%). Neuropsychiatric side effects were more common in the EFV arm.
    - Genotype resistance results were reported for 13 participants with virologic failure in the DOR arm and 10 participants in the EFV arm. For the DOR arm, seven out of 13 participants had NNRTI resistance and five out of 13 had NRTI resistance; for EFV, nine out of 10 participants had NNRTI resistance and five out of 10 had NRTI resistance.
    - LDL cholesterol and non-HDL cholesterol did not change with DOR use, whereas both increased with EFV use.
    - At 96 weeks, 77.5% and 73.6% of participants in the DOR arm and the EFV arm had maintained HIV RNA <50 copies/mL, respectively.[138]

DOR-Based Regimen versus DRV/r-Based Regimen:

- In DRIVE-FORWARD, 769 participants received DOR or DRV/r once daily along with two investigator-selected NRTIs, either ABC/3TC or TDF/FTC.[37]
    - At 48 weeks, DOR was found to be noninferior to DRV/r when these drugs were administered with two NRTIs, with 84% of study participants receiving DOR versus 80% of those receiving DRV/r achieving HIV RNA <50 copies/mL at 48 weeks.
    - Participants who received DOR plus ABC/3TC (n = 48) and those who received DOR plus TDF/FTC (n = 316) had similar virologic responses.
    - At week 96, DOR was superior to DRV/r in terms of virologic suppression,[139] with a higher rate of discontinuation in the DRV/r group.
    - Genotype resistance results were reported for seven and eight participants with virologic failure in the DOR and DRV/r arms, respectively. No drug resistance mutations were detected in either group.
    - Treatment-related diarrhea was more frequently reported in the DRV/r arm, and greater increases in fasting LDL cholesterol and triglycerides were seen in the participants who received DRV/r than in those who received DOR.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Other Factors and Considerations:

- DOR is available as a single-drug, 100-mg tablet[140] and as part of an STR that contains DOR/TDF/3TC 100 mg/300 mg/300 mg[141] and is dosed once daily, with or without food.
- DOR is primarily metabolized by the CYP3A4 enzyme and should not be coadministered with strong CYP3A4 inducers. DOR concentration may increase in the presence of a CYP3A4 inhibitor (see Table 21b). DOR is not a CYP3A4 inducer or inhibitor, so it is not expected to affect the concentrations of concomitant CYP3A4 substrates.
- Treatment-emergent resistance mutations to DOR may confer cross-resistance to certain other NNRTIs. Most isolates with DOR mutations remain susceptible to ETR.[142]
- DOR-based regimens have not been directly compared to INSTI-based regimens in clinical trials.
- There are currently no data on the safety of DOR use during pregnancy.

The Panel's Recommendations:

- On the basis of the clinical trial data discussed above, the Panel classifies DOR/TDF/3TC **(BI)** and DOR plus two NRTIs (**BI** for TDF/FTC and **BIII** for TAF/FTC) as *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations*.
- Because the number of clinical trial participants who received DOR plus ABC/3TC is much lower than the number who received TDF/FTC plus DOR, the Panel considers ABC/3TC plus DOR to be an option for initial therapy **(CI)**.

Efavirenz (EFV)

Efficacy of EFV 600 mg Daily Dose in Clinical Trials:

- Large randomized controlled trials and cohort studies in ART-naive patients have demonstrated potent and durable viral suppression in patients treated with EFV plus two NRTIs. EFV-based regimens have demonstrated superiority or noninferiority to a number of comparator regimens in ART-naive patients in several randomized controlled trials.
- In ACTG 5202, EFV was comparable to ATV/r when each was given with either TDF/FTC or ABC/3TC.[143]
- In the ECHO and THRIVE studies, EFV was noninferior to RPV, with less virologic failure. However, EFV caused more discontinuations due to adverse events. The virologic advantage of EFV was most notable in participants with pre-ART viral loads >100,000 copies/mL, and NRTI and NNRTI resistance occurred more frequently in patients who experienced failure on a regimen that included RPV.[144]
- In the GS 102 study, EFV/TDF/FTC was noninferior to EVG/c/TDF/FTC.[128]
- The DRIVE-AHEAD study compared EFV/TDF/FTC to DOR/TDF/3TC in ART-naive patients. At 48 weeks, DOR/TDF/3TC was found to be noninferior to EFV/TDF/FTC, as discussed in the DOR section. Neuropsychiatric side effects were more common in the EFV arm.
- ADVANCE, an open label, noninferiority trial, compared TDF/FTC/EFV 600 mg to DTG combined with either TDF/FTC or TAF/FTC. At week 48, the DTG regimens were noninferior to the EFV regimen based on the proportion of participants with HIV-RNA levels <50 copies/mL. More participants in the EFV group than in the DTG group discontinued the trial regimen.[24]

In clinical trials, some regimens have demonstrated superiority to those with EFV, based primarily on fewer discontinuations because of adverse events:

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

- In the SINGLE trial, a DTG-based regimen was superior to an EFV regimen at the primary endpoint of viral suppression at week 48.[46]
- In the STARTMRK trial, RAL was noninferior to EFV at 48 weeks,[82] but RAL was superior to EFV at 4 and 5 years,[85,123] in part because of more frequent discontinuations due to adverse events in the EFV group than in the RAL group.
- In the open-label STaR trial, participants with baseline viral loads ≤100,000 copies/mL had higher rates of treatment success on RPV than on EFV.[145]

Efficacy of Low-Dose Efavirenz (EFV 400 mg Daily) in Clinical Trials:

- ENCORE 1, a multinational, randomized, placebo-controlled trial, compared two once-daily doses of EFV (combined with TDF/FTC): EFV 600 mg (standard dose) versus EFV 400 mg (reduced dose). At 96 weeks, EFV 400 mg was noninferior to EFV 600 mg for rate of viral suppression.[35] While the frequency of overall adverse events was not different between groups, EFV-related adverse events and treatment-related discontinuations occurred less frequently in the EFV 400 mg group than in the EFV 600 mg group. Although there were fewer self-reported CNS events in the 400 mg group, the groups had similar rates of psychiatric events. The 400-mg dose of EFV is now approved in the United States for initial treatment of HIV infection and is coformulated with TDF and 3TC in an FDC tablet.
- NAMSAL ANRS 12313 (an open-label, multicenter randomized noninferiority trial) compared EFV 400 mg to DTG, both combined with TDF/3TC. At week 48, EFV 400 mg was noninferior to DTG based on percentage of participants with viral suppression to HIV RNA <50 copies/mL (69.0% in EFV group vs. 74.5% in DTG group).[8]
- In an open label trial, 25 pregnant women with HIV and HIV RNA <50 copies/mL while on an EFV-based regimen were switched from EFV 600 mg to EFV 400 mg daily (the TDF and FTC or 3TC components of the regimen did not change). Participants were monitored closely with EFV concentrations measured weekly and viral loads biweekly during pregnancy and postpartum. Stopping criteria were HIV RNA >50 copies/mL on two consecutive occasions or random EFV concentration <800 ng/mL on three consecutive occasions. All participants maintained viral load suppression to HIV RNA <50 copies/mL throughout the study.[146]
- A PK study enrolled 22 persons with HIV (without TB) who were on an EFV-based regimen and had HIV RNA levels <50 copies/mL. Participants were switched from EFV 600 mg to EFV 400 mg. Fourteen days after the switch, isoniazid and rifampin were started for 12 weeks. The combination resulted in only minimal reduction in EFV 400 mg PK parameters, which were within the range of concentrations seen in the ENCORE 1 trial. HIV RNA levels <50 copies/ mL were maintained in all participants during the study.[147]

Adverse Effects:

- EFV can cause CNS side effects (e.g., abnormal dreams, dizziness, headache, and depression) that resolve over a period of days to weeks in most patients. However, subtler, long-term neuropsychiatric effects can occur.
- EFV use has also been associated with suicidality; however, evidence for this association has differed among various large studies. An analysis of four ACTG comparative trials showed a higher rate of suicidality (i.e., reported suicidal ideation or attempted or completed suicide) among EFV-treated patients than among patients taking comparator regimens (LPV/r, ATV, ATV/r, or ABC-based regimens).[148] Similarly, a subgroup analysis of the START trial revealed higher risk of suicidal or self-injurious behavior among participants in the immediate ART group who took EFV than among ART-naive controls; the risk increased for those with previous psychiatric diagnoses.[149] This association, however,

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

was not found in analyses of three large observational cohorts[150,151] or in a retrospective cohort study that used U.S. administrative pharmacy claims data.[152] A prospective observational cohort study among people with HIV in Uganda revealed no evidence that EFV carried a greater risk of suicidal ideation or depression than NVP.[153]

- Delayed onset neurotoxicities, including ataxia and encephalopathy, have been reported months to years after EFV use.[154,155]
- EFV may cause elevation in LDL cholesterol and triglycerides.
- QTc interval prolongation has been observed with EFV use.[156,157] Consider an alternative to EFV in patients taking medications known to increase the risk of Torsades de Pointes, or in patients at higher risk of Torsades de Pointes.

Other Factors and Considerations:

- EFV is formulated both as a single-drug, 600-mg tablet and in an FDC tablet of EFV/TDF/FTC that allows for once-daily dosing.
- EFV is also available as a generic single-drug, 600-mg tablet and as a generic once-daily FDC tablet that includes 3TC, TDF, and either 600 mg or 400 mg of EFV; the lower-dose EFV/TDF/3TC tablet is approved for treating adults and children weighing ≥35 kg.[158,159]
- EFV is a substrate of CYP3A4 and an inducer of CYP3A4 and 2D6, and therefore, may potentially interact with other drugs that use the same pathways (see Tables 21b, 22a, and 22b).
- EFV has been associated with CNS birth defects in nonhuman primates, and cases of NTDs have been reported after first-trimester exposure in humans.[160] A link between EFV and birth defects in humans has not been supported in meta-analyses (see the Perinatal Guidelines).[161]
- People with HIV who are taking a regimen that includes EFV should be screened for depression and suicidality.

The Panel's Recommendations:

- Given the availability of regimens with fewer treatment-limiting adverse events and noninferior or superior efficacy, the Panel classifies EFV 600 mg/TDF/FTC or EFV 600 mg/TDF/3TC **(BI)** or EFV 600 mg plus TAF/FTC **(BII)** as *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations*.
- Randomized clinical trial data have demonstrated the noninferiority of EFV 400 mg compared to EFV 600 mg[35] and to DTG.[8] This dose has not been studied in a U.S. population. The Panel classifies EFV 400 mg/TDF/3TC as a *Recommended Initial Regimen in Certain Clinical Situations* **(BI)**.

Rilpivirine (RPV)

RPV is an NNRTI that is approved for use in combination with NRTIs for ART-naive patients with pretreatment viral loads <100,000 copies/mL.

Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

- Two Phase 3 randomized, double-blind clinical trials—ECHO and THRIVE—compared RPV and EFV, each combined with two NRTIs.[144] At 96 weeks, the following findings were reported:
  - RPV was noninferior to EFV overall.
  - Among participants with pre-ART viral loads >100,000 copies/mL, more RPV-treated participants than EFV-treated participants experienced virologic failure. Moreover, in this subgroup of participants with virologic failure, NNRTI and NRTI resistance were more frequently identified in those treated with RPV.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

- Among the RPV-treated participants, the rate of virologic failure was greater in those with pretreatment CD4 counts <200 cells/mm^3 than in those with CD4 counts ≥200 cells/mm^3.
- STaR, a Phase 3b, open-label study, compared the FDCs of RPV/TDF/FTC and of EFV/TDF/FTC in 786 treatment-naive patients. The results at 96 weeks[162] were similar to those reported at 48 weeks.[145]
  - RPV was noninferior to EFV overall.
  - RPV was superior to EFV in patients with pre-ART viral loads ≤100,000 copies/mL and noninferior in those with pre-ART viral loads >100,000 copies/mL. Among patients with pre-ART viral loads >500,000 copies/mL, virologic failure was more common in RPV-treated patients than in EFV-treated patients.
  - There were more participants with emergent resistance in the RPV/FTC/TDF arm than in the EFV/FTC/TDF arm (4% vs. 1%, respectively).
- The STR of RPV/TAF/FTC was approved by FDA based on results from a bioequivalence study. In this study, plasma concentrations of RPV, FTC, and TAF 25 mg in participants taking the coformulated drug were similar to those seen in participants who received RPV as the single-drug tablet and TAF/FTC as part of the STR of EVG/c/TAF 10 mg/FTC.[76]

Adverse Effects:

- RPV is generally well tolerated. In the ECHO, THRIVE, and STaR trials, fewer instances of CNS adverse events (e.g., abnormal dreams, dizziness, psychiatric side effects), skin rash, and dyslipidemia were reported in the RPV arms than in the EFV arms, and fewer patients in the RPV arms discontinued therapy due to adverse events. However, up to 9% of clinical trial participants experienced depressive disorders, including approximately 1% of participants who had suicidal thoughts or who attempted suicide. Patients receiving RPV who have severe depressive symptoms should be evaluated to assess whether the symptoms may be due to RPV and if the risks of continuing the same regimen outweigh the benefits.

Other Factors and Considerations:

- RPV is formulated both as a single-drug tablet and in STRs with TAF/FTC and with TDF/FTC. Among available STRs, RPV/TAF/FTC is the smallest tablet.
- RPV/TAF/FTC and RPV/TDF/FTC are given once daily and must be administered with a meal (containing at least 390 kcal).
- RPV is also coformulated as a once-daily FDC tablet with DTG that is used as continuation therapy for persons with HIV who have achieved viral suppression.[163] However, this combination has not been studied in ART-naive individuals, and it **is not recommended** for initial therapy (see Optimizing Antiretroviral Therapy in the Setting of Viral Suppression).
- The oral drug absorption of RPV can be significantly reduced in the presence of acid-lowering agents. RPV is **contraindicated** in patients who are receiving proton pump inhibitors (PPIs), and should be used with caution in those receiving H2 antagonists or antacids (see Drug-Drug Interactions for dosing recommendations).
- RPV is primarily metabolized in the liver by the CYP3A enzyme; its plasma concentration may be affected in the presence of CYP3A inhibitors or inducers (see Drug-Drug Interactions).
- At doses above the approved dose of 25 mg, RPV may cause QTc interval prolongation. RPV should be used with caution when coadministered with a drug known to increase the risk of Torsades de Pointes.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

The Panel's Recommendations:

- Given the availability of other effective regimens that do not have virologic and immunologic prerequisites to initiate treatment, the Panel recommends RPV/TDF/FTC and RPV/TAF/FTC as *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations*.
- Use of RPV with TAF/FTC **(BII)** or TDF/FTC **(BI)** should be limited to ART-naive patients with pretreatment viral loads <100,000 copies/mL and CD4 counts >200 cells/mm^3.
- Data on RPV plus ABC/3TC are insufficient to consider recommending this regimen.

Protease Inhibitor-Based Regimens

Table 8d. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitor Options that are Recommended for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients

Characteristics	ATV	DRV
Dosing Frequency	Once daily	• Once daily for PI-naive patients • Twice daily for PI-experienced patients with certain PI mutations
PK Boosting	PK-boosting with RTV or COBI is generally recommended. Unboosted ATV is also FDA-approved for ART-naive patients.	DRV should only be used with a PK booster (i.e., RTV or COBI).
Fixed-Dose Formulation	• ATV/c	• DRV/c • DRV/c/TAF/FTC
Available as a Single-Drug Tablet	Yes	Yes
Adverse Effects	• Jaundice • Indirect hyperbilirubinemia • Cholelithiasis • Nephrolithiasis • PR prolongation	• Skin rash • Increase in serum transaminases • Hyperlipidemia • A higher cardiovascular risk was reported in participants taking DRV-based regimens than in those taking ATV-based regimens in an observational cohort study.
CYP3A4 Drug-Drug Interactions	CYP3A4 substrate, inhibitor	CYP34A substrate, inhibitor
Other Significant Drug Interactions	ATV absorption is reduced when ATV is given with acid-lowering therapies. See Table 21a for ATV dosing recommendations when the drug is coadministered with acid-lowering agents.	N/A

Key: ART = antiretroviral therapy; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; COBI = cobicistat; CYP = cytochrome P; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FTC = emtricitabine; N/A = not applicable; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; RTV = ritonavir; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide

Summary

FDA-approved PIs include ATV, atazanavir/cobicistat (ATV/c), DRV, DRV/c, FPV, IDV, LPV/r, nelfinavir, RTV, saquinavir (SQV), and tipranavir. PI-based regimens with PK enhancement (also called boosting) have demonstrated virologic potency, durability in treatment-naive patients, and a high barrier to resistance. Because transmitted PI resistance is uncommon, PI-based regimens are generally recommended if early ART initiation is necessary, before resistance test results are available. Few or no PI mutations are detected when a patient's first PI-based regimen fails, which is not the case with NNRTI-based regimens and some INSTI-based regimens.[164,165] For this reason, PI-based regimens may be useful for patients at risk for intermittent therapy because of poor adherence. All PIs (boosted by either RTV or COBI) inhibit the CYP3A4 isoenzyme,

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

which may lead to significant drug-drug interactions (see Drug-Drug Interactions). Each PI has specific characteristics related to its virologic potency, adverse effects profile, and PK properties. The characteristics of recommended PIs are listed in Table 9 and Appendix B, Table 5.

PI-based regimens that are recommended for use in ART-naive patients should have proven virologic efficacy, once-daily dosing, a lower pill count than older PI-based regimens, and good tolerability. On the basis of these criteria, the Panel considers once-daily DRV/r, DRV/c, ATV/c, or ATV/r, each administered in combination with with two NRTIs, as PI-based regimen options in the category of *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations*. DRV/c/TAF/FTC is now available as an STR. In a large, randomized controlled trial comparing DRV/r, ATV/r, and RAL, each administered in combination with TDF/FTC, all three regimens achieved similar virologic suppression rates; however, the proportion of patients who discontinued their assigned treatment because of adverse effects, mainly hyperbilirubinemia, was greater in the ATV/r arm than in the other two arms.[13]

Several metabolic abnormalities, including dyslipidemia and insulin resistance, have been associated with PI use. The currently available PIs differ in their propensity to cause these metabolic complications, which also depends on the dose of RTV used as a PK-enhancing agent. Large observational cohort studies found an association between some PIs (i.e., DRV/r, FPV, IDV, and LPV/r) and an increased risk of cardiovascular events; this risk was not seen with ATV.[29-31,34] Another observational cohort study of predominantly male participants found a lower rate of cardiovascular events in those receiving ATV-containing regimens than in those receiving other regimens.[33] Further study is needed.

Compared to other PIs, LPV/r, FPV/r, unboosted ATV, and SQV/r have disadvantages such as greater pill burden, lower efficacy, or increased toxicity, and thus are no longer recommended as options for initial therapy.

Darunavir/Ritonavir (DRV/r)

Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

- The ARTEMIS study compared DRV/r (800 mg/100 mg once daily) with LPV/r (800 mg/200 mg once daily or 400 mg/100 mg twice daily), both administered in combination with TDF/FTC, in a randomized, open-label, noninferiority trial. DRV/r was noninferior to LPV/r at week 48,[80] and superior at week 192.[166] Among participants with baseline HIV RNA levels >100,000 copies/mL, virologic response rates were lower in the LPV/r arm than in the DRV/r arm.
- The FLAMINGO study compared DRV/r with DTG, each administered in combination with two NRTIs, in 488 ART-naive participants. The rate of virologic suppression at week 96 was significantly greater among those who received DTG than in those who received DRV/r. The higher rate of virologic failure observed in the DRV/r group was primarily related to the great number of failures among those with a viral load >100,000 copies/mL, and secondarily because there were more drug discontinuations in the DRV/r group.[14]
- ACTG A5257, a large, randomized, open-label trial, compared ATV/r to DRV/r or RAL, each given with TDF/FTC. The trial showed similar virologic efficacy for DRV/r, ATV/r, and RAL, but more participants in the ATV/r group discontinued randomized treatment because of adverse events.[13]
- The DRIVE-FORWARD study compared DRV/r to DOR, both administered with two investigator-selected NRTIs, in ART-naive participants. At 48 weeks, DOR was found to be noninferior to DRV/r, with 80% of participants who received DOR and 84% of participants who received DRV/r achieving HIV RNA levels <50 copies/mL.

Adverse Effects:

- Patients taking DRV/r may develop a skin rash, which is usually mild-to-moderate in severity and self-

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

limited. Treatment discontinuation is necessary on rare occasions when severe rash with fever or elevated transaminases occur.

- ACTG A5257 showed similar lipid changes in participants in the ATV/r and DRV/r arms. BMD decreased to a greater extent in participants in the ATV/r and DRV/r arms than in participants in the RAL arm.[13] The likelihood of developing metabolic syndrome was equivalent between the three arms, although a larger increase in waist circumference was observed at 96 weeks in participants assigned to the RAL arm than in those assigned to the DRV/r arm ($P \leq 0.02$).[167]
- An observational cohort study suggested that DRV/r is associated with increased rates of cardiovascular disease.[34]

Other Factors and Considerations:

- DRV/r is administered once daily with food in treatment-naive patients.
- DRV has a sulfonamide moiety and should be used with caution in patients with severe sulfonamide allergies. In clinical trials, the incidence and severity of rash were similar in participants with and without a history of sulfonamide allergy. Most patients with sulfonamide allergy are able to tolerate DRV.
- DRV/r is a potent CYP3A4 inhibitor, and this may lead to significant interactions with other medications metabolized through this same pathway (see Drug-Drug Interactions).

The Panel's Recommendations:

- On the basis of efficacy and safety data from clinical trials and clinical experience, the Panel classifies DRV/r with TDF/FTC **(AI)**, with TAF/FTC **(AII)**, or with ABC/3TC **(BII)** as *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations*.

Darunavir/Cobicistat (DRV/c)

In a study in healthy volunteers, DRV 800 mg with COBI 150 mg was bioequivalent to DRV 800 mg with RTV 100 mg based on the maximum concentration and area under the concentration time curve for DRV.[168] Because the minimum concentration (C_{min}) of DRV combined with COBI was 31% lower than that of DRV combined with RTV, bioequivalence for the C_{min} was not achieved.[169]

Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

- The AMBER trial enrolled 725 ART-naive participants in a Phase 3 randomized controlled trial that compared the STR DRV/c/TAF/FTC and DRV/c plus TDF/FTC. At 48 weeks, similar virologic suppression rates among participants were achieved in both arms of the study (91% and 88% had HIV RNA < 50 copies/mL, respectively). No treatment-emergent mutations associated with DRV or TAF/TDF resistance were observed in either group. In the DRV plus TAF/FTC arm, fewer participants developed proteinuria. Changes in BMD were also less pronounced among these participants.[52] At 96 weeks, 85% of participants on the STR maintained HIV RNA levels <50 copies/mL.[170]
- In a single-arm trial in which most of the patients were treatment-naive (94%), the coformulated DRV/c 800 mg/150 mg tablet was evaluated in combination with two investigator-selected NRTIs (99% of participants were given TDF/FTC). At week 48, 83% of treatment-naive participants achieved HIV RNA <50 copies/mL; 5% of participants discontinued treatment because of adverse events.[171]

Adverse Effects:

- The most common drug-related adverse events were diarrhea, nausea, fatigue, flatulence, rash, and headache.

Other Factors:

- DRV/c 800 mg/150 mg is available as a coformulated boosted PI or as an STR with TAF/FTC 10 mg/200 mg.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

The Panel's Recommendations:

- The Panel recommends DRV/c plus TAF/FTC or TDF/FTC **(AI)** and DRV/c plus ABC/3TC **(BII)** as *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situation*s.
- DRV/c plus TDF/FTC **is not recommended** for patients with CrCl <70 mL/min, whereas DRV/c plus TAF/FTC **is not recommended** for patients with CrCl <30 mL/min.

Atazanavir/Ritonavir (ATV/r) or Atazanavir/Cobicistat (ATV/c)

Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

ATV/r plus Two NRTIs versus LPV/r plus Two NRTIs

- The CASTLE study compared once-daily ATV/r (300 mg/100 mg) with twice-daily LPV/r (400 mg/100 mg), each administered in combination with TDF/FTC. In this open-label, noninferiority study, the two regimens showed similar virologic and CD4 responses at 96 weeks.[172]

ATV/r plus Two NRTIs versus EFV plus Two NRTIs

- The ACTG A5202 study compared open-label ATV/r and EFV, each given in combination with placebo-controlled TDF/FTC or ABC/3TC. Efficacy was similar in the ATV/r and EFV groups.[143] In a separate analysis, women assigned to receive ATV/r were found to have a higher risk of virologic failure than women assigned to receive EFV or men assigned to receive ATV/r.[173]

ATV/r plus Two NRTIs versus INSTI plus Two NRTIs

- In a study that compared ATV/r plus TDF/FTC to EVG/c/TDF/FTC, virologic suppression rates through 144 weeks were similar among participants in the two groups.[129] A Phase 3 clinical trial of 575 women evaluated EVG/c plus FTC/TDF versus ATV/r plus FTC/TDF.[15] At week 48, the virologic suppression rate in the EVG/c arm was superior to that in the ATV/r arm. Nineteen women in the PI arm and five women in the INSTI arm discontinued therapy because of an adverse event.
- In a Phase 3 trial, 499 ART-naive women were randomized to receive either ATV/r plus TDF/FTC or DTG/ABC/3TC. At 48 weeks, the rate of virologic suppression (HIV RNA <50 copies/mL) in the DTG arm was noninferior to that in the ATV/r arm, and fewer drug-related adverse events occurred in the DTG arm.[118]

ATV/r plus Two NRTIs versus DRV/r plus Two NRTIs versus RAL plus Two NRTIs

- In ACTG A5257, a significantly higher proportion of patients in the ATV/r arm discontinued randomized treatment because of adverse events, mostly for elevated indirect bilirubin/jaundice or gastrointestinal toxicities. Lipid changes in participants in the ATV/r and DRV/r arms were similar. BMD decreased to a greater extent in participants in the ATV/r and DRV/r arms than in participants in the RAL arm.[13]

ATV/c versus ATV/r plus Two NRTIs

- In the Gilead Study 114, all patients received TDF/FTC and ATV and were randomized to receive either RTV or COBI as PK enhancers. Both RTV and COBI were given as a separate tablet with matching placebos.[174] Through 144 weeks, the percentage of patients who achieved virologic suppression was similar in both study arms. The percentage of adverse events that caused patients to discontinue treatment, and changes in serum creatinine and indirect bilirubin levels were comparable.[175]

Adverse Effects:

- The main adverse effect associated with ATV/c or ATV/r is reversible indirect hyperbilirubinemia, with or without jaundice or scleral icterus, but without concomitant hepatic transaminase elevations. The risk for treatment-limiting indirect hyperbilirubinemia is greatest for patients who carry two UGT1A1 decreased-function alleles.[176]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

- Nephrolithiasis,[177-179] nephrotoxicity,[32] and cholelithiasis[180] have also been reported in patients who received ATV.
- Both ATV/c and ATV/r can cause gastrointestinal side effects, including diarrhea.

Other Factors and Considerations:

- ATV/c and ATV/r are dosed once daily and with food.
- ATV requires acidic gastric pH for dissolution. As a result, concomitant use of drugs that raise gastric pH (e.g., antacids, H2 antagonists, and particularly PPIs) may impair absorption of ATV. Table 21a provides recommendations for use of ATV/c or ATV/r with these agents.
- ATV/c and ATV/r are potent CYP3A4 inhibitors and may have significant interactions with other medications that are metabolized through this same pathway (see Drug-Drug Interactions).
- Large observational cohort studies found an association between some PIs (DRV/r, FPV, IDV, and LPV/r) and an increased risk of cardiovascular events; this risk was not seen with ATV.[29-31,34] Another study of an observational cohort of predominantly male participants found a lower rate of cardiovascular events in participants receiving ATV-containing regimens than in participants receiving other regimens.[33] Further study is needed.

The Panel's Recommendations:

- On the basis of clinical trial safety and efficacy data, the Panel classifies ATV/r and ATV/c plus TAF/FTC **(BII)** or TDF/FTC **(BI)** as *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations*.
- ATV/c or ATV/r plus ABC/3TC is no longer included in the list of *Recommended Initial Regimens in Certain Clinical Situations*, because it has disadvantages when compared with other regimens in this category. In a randomized trial, when combined with ATV/r, ABC/3TC was less potent than TDF/FTC in people with HIV RNA >100,000 copies/mL;[43] in a separate randomized trial, ATV/r was not as well tolerated as DRV/r.[13]
- ATV/c plus TDF/FTC **is not recommended** for patients with CrCl <70 mL/min, whereas ATV/c plus TAF/FTC **is not recommended** for patients with CrCl <30 mL/min.

Other Antiretroviral Regimens for Initial Therapy When Abacavir, Tenofovir Alafenamide, and Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate Cannot Be Used or Are Not Optimal

Most currently recommended ARV regimens consist of two NRTIs plus a third active drug. In some clinical situations, it is preferable to avoid ABC, TAF, and TDF, such as in patients who are HLA-B*5701 positive or at high risk of cardiovascular disease and with significant renal impairment. In this situation, DTC/3TC, which is recommended for most people with HIV, is the preferred option. In addition, several other NRTI-limiting two-drug regimens have been evaluated in clinical studies. Of note, two-drug regimens **should not be used** in people with HBV/HIV coinfection or during pregnancy. Clinicians should refer to HBV/HIV Coinfection for guidance on treatment of patients with HBV infection when TAF or TDF cannot be used as part of the ARV regimen.

Strategies Supported by Evidence from Clinical Trials

Dolutegravir/Lamivudine (DTG/3TC)

Among the two-drug regimens for initial therapy, the combination of DTG/3TC has the most clinical data supporting its use;[4,120,181] therefore, it is recommended over the other two-drug regimens listed below. Clinicians should refer to the INSTI section above for a summary of the data supporting the use of DTG/3TC as initial therapy for ART-naive people with HIV.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

The Panel's Recommendation:

- The Panel recommends DTG/3TC as an initial regimen for most people with HIV **(AI)**; as such, this is the preferred regimen when use of ABC, TAF, or TDF is not optimal. DTG/3TC **is not recommended** for individuals with HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL, HBV coinfection, or in whom ART is to be started before the results of HIV genotypic resistance testing for reverse transcriptase or HBV testing are available. Before prescribing DTG/3TC for a person of childbearing potential, review Table 6b for a discussion of important considerations.

Darunavir/Ritonavir plus Lamivudine (DRV/r plus 3TC)

- In the ANDES trial, 145 participants were randomized 1:1 to receive open-label, once-daily dual therapy with DRV/r plus 3TC or triple therapy with DRV/r plus TDF/3TC. This study was conducted in Argentina, and the researchers used an FDC of DRV/r 800 mg/100 mg that is available in that country. The median baseline HIV RNA was 4.5 $\log_{10}$ copies, and 24% of participants had HIV RNA >100,000 copies/mL. At week 48, 93% of the participants in the dual-therapy group and 94% of the participants in the triple-therapy group achieved an HIV RNA <50 copies/mL; dual therapy was noninferior to triple therapy.[39] The rates of virologic suppression among study participants who had pre-therapy HIV RNA levels >100,000 copies/mL were similar in the dual- and triple-therapy groups (91% and 92%, respectively).

The Panel's Recommendation:

- On the basis of results from a small study with a relatively short follow-up period, DRV/r plus 3TC can be considered for use in people who cannot take ABC, TAF, or TDF **(CI)**. Although the ANDES trial supports the use of DRV/r plus 3TC, it is smaller than other trials of NRTI-limiting regimens, and larger studies are warranted.

Darunavir/Ritonavir plus Raltegravir (DRV/r plus RAL)

- In the NEAT/ANRS 143 study, 805 treatment-naive participants were randomized to receive twice-daily RAL or once-daily TDF/FTC, each with DRV/r (800 mg/100 mg once daily). At week 96, DRV/r plus RAL was noninferior to DRV/r plus TDF/FTC based on the primary endpoint of proportion of patients with virologic or clinical failure. Among those with baseline CD4 counts <200 cells/mm^3, however, there were more virologic failures in the two-drug arm; a trend towards more failure was also observed among those with pretreatment HIV RNA ≥100,000 copies/mL.[38] High rates of virologic failure in patients with HIV RNA >100,000 copies/mL were also seen in two smaller studies of DRV/r plus RAL.[182,183]

The Panel's Recommendation:

- On the basis of these study results, the Panel recommends that DRV/r plus RAL be considered for use only in patients with HIV RNA <100,000 copies/mL and CD4 counts >200 cells/mm^3, and only in those patients who cannot take ABC, TAF, or TDF **(CI)**.

A Nucleoside-Limiting Regimen with Insufficient Supporting Data

Darunavir/Ritonavir plus Rilpivirine (DRV/r plus RPV)

- In a single-arm, open-label, pilot study, 36 ART-naive participants without genotypic evidence of resistance to DRV or RPV received DRV/r plus RPV for 48 weeks. Half of the participants (18 of 36) had baseline HIV viral loads >100,000 copies/ml. By week 36, 97% of participants (35 of 36) achieved HIV RNA <50 copies/ml, and by week 48, all achieved viral suppression (HIV RNA <50 copies/ml).[184]

The Panel's Recommendation:

- At this time, the Panel **does not recommend** DRV/r plus RPV given the small sample size of the study described above and the lack of comparative data evaluating DRV/r plus RPV as initial therapy for people with HIV.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 9. Advantages and Disadvantages of Antiretroviral Components Recommended as Initial Antiretroviral Therapy (page 1 of 5)

Note: All drugs within an ARV class are listed in alphabetical order.

ARV Class	ARV Agent(s)	Advantage(s)	Disadvantage(s)
Dual-NRTI Regimens	**ABC/3TC**	• Coformulated with DTG • Generic formulations are available for ABC/3TC, ABC, and 3TC.	• May cause life-threatening HSRs in patients who test positive for the HLA-B*5701 allele. As a result, HLA-B*5701 testing is required before use. • In the ACTG 5202 study, patients with baseline HIV RNA ≥100,000 copies/mL showed inferior virologic responses when ABC/3TC was given with EFV or ATV/r as opposed to TDF/FTC. This difference was not seen when ABC/3TC was used in combination with DTG. • ABC use has been associated with CV disease and cardiac events in some, but not all, observational studies.
	TAF/FTC	• Coformulated with BIC, DRV/c, EVG/c, or RPV • Active against HBV; a recommended dual-NRTI option for patients with HBV/HIV coinfection • Smaller decline in renal function, less proteinuria, and smaller reductions in BMD than TDF/FTC • Approved for patients with eGFR ≥30 mL/min • Can be used in patients with eGFR <30 mL/min and on chronic hemodialysis	• TDF is associated with lower lipid levels than TAF, perhaps because TDF results in higher plasma levels of tenofovir, which lowers lipids. • **Not recommended in pregnancy.**
	TDF/3TC	• Coformulated with DOR • Generic formulations are available for TDF, 3TC, TDF/3TC, and EFV/TDF/3TC. • Long-term clinical experience • Active against HBV	• Renal toxicity, including proximal tubulopathy and acute or chronic renal insufficiency, especially when combined with pharmacologic boosters. • Osteomalacia has been reported as a consequence of proximal tubulopathy. • Decreased BMD has been associated with use of TDF, especially when combined with pharmacologic boosters.
	TDF/FTC	• Coformulated with EFV, EVG/c, and RPV as STRs • Active against HBV; a recommended dual-NRTI option for patients with HIV/HBV coinfection • Better virologic responses than ABC/3TC in patients with baseline viral loads ≥100,000 copies/mL when combined with ATV/r or EFV • Associated with lower lipid levels than ABC or TAF	• Renal toxicity, including proximal tubulopathy and acute or chronic renal insufficiency, especially when combined with pharmacologic boosters. • Osteomalacia has been reported as a consequence of proximal tubulopathy. • Decreased BMD has been associated with use of TDF, especially when combined with pharmacologic boosters.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 9. Advantages and Disadvantages of Antiretroviral Components Recommended as Initial Antiretroviral Therapy (page 2 of 5)

ARV Class	ARV Agent(s)	Advantage(s)	Disadvantage(s)
Single NRTI	**3TC**	• Coformulated with DTG as STR • Avoids potential toxicities associated with TDF, TAF, ABC	• DTG/3TC **is not recommended** for individuals with HIV RNA >500,000 copies/mL, HBV co-infection, or in whom ART is to be started before the results of HIV genotypic resistance testing for reverse transcriptase or HBV testing are available.
INSTI	**BIC**	• Coformulated with TAF/FTC • Higher barrier to resistance than EVG and RAL • No food requirement	• See Table 6b for considerations related to prescribing an INSTI-based regimen to people of childbearing potential. • Oral absorption of BIC can be reduced by simultaneous administration with drugs or supplements containing polyvalent cations (e.g., Al-, Ca-, or Mg-containing antacids or supplements, or multivitamin tablets with minerals). See dosing recommendations in Table 21d. • Inhibits tubular secretion of Cr without affecting glomerular function. • CYP3A4 and UGT1A1 substrate (but not a CYP3A4 inducer or inhibitor); potential for drug-drug interactions. • **Should not be used in pregnancy** because of lack of data and coformulation with TAF. • See discussion in text regarding weight gain related to INSTIs.
	DTG	• Higher barrier to resistance than EVG or RAL • Coformulated with ABC/3TC and 3TC • No food requirement • Minimal CYP3A4 interactions • Favorable lipid profile	• Data from Botswana suggest that DTG exposure during conception may be associated with risk of NTDs in the infant (0.3% vs. 0.1% with non-DTG ARV drugs). • See Table 6b for considerations related to prescribing an INSTI-based regimen for a person of childbearing potential. • Oral absorption of DTG can be reduced by simultaneous administration with drugs containing polyvalent cations (e.g., Al-, Ca-, or Mg-containing antacids or supplements, or multivitamin tablets with minerals). See dosing recommendations in Table 21d. • Inhibits renal tubular secretion of Cr and can increase serum Cr without affecting glomerular function. • UGT1A1 substrate; potential for drug interactions (see Table 21d). • Depression and suicidal ideation (rare; usually in patients with pre-existing psychiatric conditions). • See discussion in text regarding weight gain related to INSTIs.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 9. Advantages and Disadvantages of Antiretroviral Components Recommended as Initial Antiretroviral Therapy (page 3 of 5)

ARV Class	ARV Agent(s)	Advantage(s)	Disadvantage(s)
INSTI, continued	**EVG/c**	• Coformulated with TDF/FTC or TAF/FTC • Compared with ATV/r, EVG/c causes smaller increases in total and LDL cholesterol. • EVG/c/TAF/FTC can be used in patients on chronic hemodialysis.	• See Table 6b for considerations related to prescribing an INSTI-based regimen for a person of childbearing potential. • EVG/c/TDF/FTC is only recommended for patients with baseline CrCl ≥70 mL/min; this regimen should be discontinued if CrCl decreases to <50 mL/min. • COBI is a potent CYP3A4 inhibitor, which can result in **significant interactions** with CYP3A substrates. • Oral absorption of EVG can be reduced by simultaneous administration with drugs containing polyvalent cations (e.g., Al-, Ca-, or Mg-containing antacids or supplements, or multivitamin tablets with minerals). See dosing recommendations in Table 21d. • COBI inhibits active tubular secretion of Cr and can increase serum Cr without affecting renal glomerular function. • Has a lower barrier to resistance than boosted PI-, BIC-, or DTG-based regimens. • Food requirement. • Depression and suicidal ideation (rare; usually in patients with pre-existing psychiatric conditions). • **Should not be used in pregnancy** because of low drug exposure. • See discussion in text regarding weight gain related to INSTIs.
	RAL	• Compared to other INSTIs, has longest post-marketing experience • No food requirement • No CYP3A4 interactions • Favorable lipid profile	• See Table 6b for considerations related to prescribing an INSTI-based regimen for a person of childbearing potential. • Has a lower barrier to resistance than boosted PI-, BIC-, or DTG-based regimens. • Increases in creatine kinase, myopathy, and rhabdomyolysis have been reported. • Rare cases of severe HSRs (including SJS and TEN) have been reported. • Higher pill burden than other INSTI-based regimens. • No FDC formulation. • Oral absorption of RAL can be reduced by simultaneous administration with drugs containing polyvalent cations (e.g., Al-, Ca-, or Mg-containing antacids or supplements, or multivitamin tablets with minerals). See dosing recommendations in Table 21d. • UGT1A1 substrate; potential for drug interactions (see Table 21d). • Depression and suicidal ideation (rare; usually in patients with pre-existing psychiatric conditions). • See discussion in text regarding weight gain related to INSTIs.
NNRTI	**DOR**	• Coformulated with TDF/3TC • Compared to EFV, fewer CNS side effects • No food requirement • Favorable lipid profile	• Shorter-term clinical experience than with EFV and RPV. • Potential for CYP450 drug interactions (see Tables 21b, 22a and 22b). • Treatment-emergent DOR resistance mutations may confer resistance to certain NNRTIs.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 9. Advantages and Disadvantages of Antiretroviral Components Recommended as Initial Antiretroviral Therapy (page 4 of 5)

ARV Class	ARV Agent(s)	Advantage(s)	Disadvantage(s)
NNRTI, continued	**EFV**	• EFV 600 mg is coformulated with TDF/FTC and TDF/3TC. • EFV 400 mg is coformulated with TDF/3TC. • EFV 600-mg dose has long-term clinical experience and EFV-based regimens (except for EFV plus ABC/3TC) have well-documented efficacy in patients with high HIV RNA. • EFV 400 mg has fewer CNS side effects than EFV 600 mg. • EFV 600 mg can be given with rifamycin antibiotics (rifampin, rifabutin, or rifapentine).	• Short- and long-term neuropsychiatric (CNS) side effects, including depression and, in some studies, suicidality and catatonia. Late onset ataxia and encephalopathy have also been reported. • Periodic screening for depression and suicidality is recommended in people with HIV who are taking a regimen that includes EFV. • Dyslipidemia • Rash • QTc interval prolongation; consider using an alternative to EFV in patients taking medications with known risk of causing Torsades de Pointes or in those at higher risk of Torsades de Pointes. • Transmitted resistance is more common than with PIs and INSTIs. • Greater risk of resistance at the time of treatment failure than with PIs. • Potential for CYP450 drug interactions (see Tables 21b and 22a). • Should be taken on an empty stomach (food increases drug absorption and CNS toxicities).

	RPV	• Coformulated with TDF/FTC and TAF/FTC
		• RPV/TDF/FTC and RPV/TAF/FTC have smaller pill sizes than other coformulated ARV drugs
		• Compared with EFV:
		  • Fewer CNS adverse effects
		  • Fewer lipid effects
		  • Fewer rashes
			• **Not recommended** in patients with pre-ART HIV RNA >100,000 copies/mL or CD4 counts <200 cells/mm^3 because of higher rate of virologic failure in these patients.
			• Depression and suicidality
			• QTc interval prolongation; consider using an alternative to RPV in patients taking medications with known risk of causing Torsades de Pointes or in those at higher risk of Torsades de Pointes.
			• Rash
			• Transmitted resistance is more common than with PIs and INSTIs.
			• More NNRTI-, TDF-, and 3TC-associated mutations at virologic failure than with regimens that contain EFV and 2 NRTIs.
			• Potential for CYP450 drug interactions (see Tables 21b and 22a).
			• Meal requirement (>390 kcal)
			• Requires acid for adequate absorption.
			  • **Contraindicated** with PPIs.
			  • Use with H2 antagonists or antacids with caution (see Table 21a for detailed dosing information).

PIs	**ATV/c** or **ATV/r**	• Higher barrier to resistance than NNRTIs, EVG, and RAL • PI resistance at the time of treatment failure is uncommon with PK-enhanced PIs. • ATV/c and ATV/r have similar virologic activity and toxicity profiles. • Observational cohort studies have found an association between some PIs (DRV, LPV/r, FPV, IDV) and an increased risk of CV events; this risk has not been seen with ATV. Further study is needed. See text for discussion. • Individual ATV and RTV components are available as generics.	• Commonly causes indirect hyperbilirubinemia, which may manifest as scleral icterus or jaundice. • Food requirement • Absorption depends on food and low gastric pH (see Table 21a for interactions with H2 antagonists, antacids, and PPIs). • Nephrolithiasis, cholelithiasis, nephrotoxicity • GI adverse effects • CYP3A4 inhibitors and substrates: potential for drug interactions (see Table 21a).

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 9. Advantages and Disadvantages of Antiretroviral Components Recommended as Initial Antiretroviral Therapy (page 5 of 5)

ARV Class	ARV Agent(s)	Advantage(s)	Disadvantage(s)
PIs, continued	**ATV/c** Specific considerations	Coformulated tablet	• COBI inhibits active tubular secretion of Cr and can increase serum Cr without affecting renal glomerular function. • Coadministration with TDF **is not recommended** in patients with CrCl <70 mL/min. • COBI (like RTV) is a potent CYP3A4 inhibitor, which can result in significant interactions with CYP3A substrates. • COBI **is not recommended** in pregnancy because of low drug levels.
	DRV/c or **DRV/r**	• Higher barrier to resistance than NNRTIs, EVG, and RAL • PI resistance at the time of treatment failure is uncommon with PK-enhanced PIs.	• Skin rash • Food requirement • GI adverse effects • CYP3A4 inhibitors and substrates: potential for drug interactions (see Table 21a). • Increased CV risk reported in one observational cohort study. • Hepatotoxicity has been reported, especially in those with pre-existing liver disease.
	DRV/c Specific considerations	• Coformulated as DRV/c and DRV/c/TAF/FTC	• COBI inhibits active tubular secretion of Cr and can increase serum Cr without affecting renal glomerular function. • Coadministration with TDF **is not recommended** in patients with CrCl <70 mL/min. • COBI (like RTV) is a potent CYP3A4 inhibitor, which can result in significant interactions with CYP3A substrates. • COBI **is not recommended** in pregnancy because of low drug levels.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; Al = aluminum; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; BIC = bictegravir; BMD = bone mineral density; Ca = calcium; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; CNS = central nervous system; COBI = cobicistat; Cr = creatinine; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CV = cardiovascular; CYP = cytochrome P; DOR = doravirine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FDC = fixed-dose combination; FPV = fosamprenavir; FTC = emtricitabine; GI = gastrointestinal; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HLA = human leukocyte antigen; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; IDV = indinavir; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LDL = low-density lipoprotein; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; Mg = magnesium; MI = myocardial infarction; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NTD = neural tube defect; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; PPI = proton pump inhibitor; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SJS = Stevens-Johnson syndrome; STR = single-tablet regimen; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TEN = toxic epidermal necrosis; UGT = uridine diphosphate glucuronosyltransferase

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 10. Antiretroviral Components or Regimens Not Recommended as Initial Therapy (page 1 of 2)

ARV Components or Regimens	Reasons for Not Recommending as Initial Therapy
NRTIs	
ABC/3TC/ZDV (Coformulated) As triple-NRTI combination regimen	• Inferior virologic efficacy
ABC/3TC/ZDV plus TDF As quadruple-NRTI combination regimen	• Inferior virologic efficacy
d4T plus 3TC	• Significant toxicities (including lipoatrophy, peripheral neuropathy) and hyperlactatemia (including symptomatic and life-threatening lactic acidosis, hepatic steatosis, and pancreatitis)
ddI plus 3TC (or FTC)	• Inferior virologic efficacy • Limited clinical trial experience in ART-naive patients • ddI toxicities, such as pancreatitis and peripheral neuropathy
ddI plus TDF	• High rate of early virologic failure • Rapid selection of resistance mutations • Potential for immunologic nonresponse/CD4 cell decline • Increased ddI drug exposure and toxicities
ZDV/3TC	• Greater toxicities (including bone marrow suppression, GI toxicities, skeletal muscle myopathy, cardiomyopathy, and mitochondrial toxicities such as lipoatrophy, lactic acidosis, and hepatic steatosis) than recommended NRTIs
NNRTIs	
DLV	• Inferior virologic efficacy • Inconvenient (three times daily) dosing
ETR	• Insufficient data in ART-naive patients
NVP	• Associated with serious and potentially fatal toxicity (hepatic events and severe rash, including SJS and TEN) • When compared to EFV, NVP did not meet noninferiority criteria
PIs	
ATV (Unboosted)	• Less potent than boosted ATV
DRV (Unboosted)	• Use without RTV or COBI has not been studied
FPV (Unboosted) or **FPV/r**	• Virologic failure with unboosted FPV-based regimen may result in selection of mutations that confer resistance to FPV and DRV • Less clinical trial data for FPV/r than for other RTV-boosted PIs
IDV (Unboosted)	• Inconvenient dosing (3 times daily with meal restrictions) • Fluid requirement • IDV toxicities, such as nephrolithiasis and crystalluria
IDV/r	• Fluid requirement • IDV toxicities, such as nephrolithiasis and crystalluria
LPV/r	• Higher pill burden than other PI-based regimens • Higher RTV dose than other PI-based regimens • GI intolerance
NFV	• Inferior virologic efficacy • Diarrhea
RTV as sole PI	• High pill burden • GI intolerance • Metabolic toxicity

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 10. Antiretroviral Components or Regimens Not Recommended as Initial Therapy (page 2 of 2)

ARV Components or Regimens	Reasons for Not Recommending as Initial Therapy
PIs, continued	
SQV (Unboosted)	• Inadequate bioavailability • Inferior virologic efficacy
SQV/r	• High pill burden • Can cause QT and PR prolongation; requires pretreatment and follow-up ECG
TPV/r	• Inferior virologic efficacy • Higher rate of adverse events than other RTV-boosted PIs • Higher dose of RTV required for boosting than other RTV-boosted PIs
Entry Inhibitors	
T-20 Fusion Inhibitor	• Only studied in patients with virologic failure • Twice-daily subcutaneous injections • High rate of injection site reactions
IBA CD4 Post-Attachment Inhibitor	• Only studied in a very small number of patients with virologic failure • Requires IV therapy • High cost
MVC CCR5 Antagonist	• Requires testing for CCR5 tropism before initiation of therapy • No virologic benefit when compared with other recommended regimens • Requires twice-daily dosing

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; COBI = cobicistat; d4T = stavudine; ddI = didanosine; DLV = delavirdine; DRV = darunavir; ECG = electrocardiogram; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; FPV = fosamprenavir; FPV/r = fosamprenavir/ritonavir; FTC = emtricitabine; GI = gastrointestinal; IBA = ibalizumab; IDV = indinavir; IDV/r = indinavir/ritonavir; IV = intravenous; LPV = lopinavir; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; MVC = maraviroc; NFV = nelfinavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; RTV = ritonavir; SJS = Stevens Johnson Syndrome; SQV = saquinavir; SQV/r = saquinavir/ritonavir; T-20 = enfuvirtide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TEN = toxic epidermal necrolysis; TPV = tipranavir; TPV/r = tipranavir/ritonavir; ZDV = zidovudine

References

1. Moore RD, Bartlett JG. Dramatic decline in the HIV-1 RNA level over calendar time in a large urban HIV practice. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2011;53(6):600-604. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21844006.

2. Gill VS, Lima VD, Zhang W, et al. Improved virological outcomes in British Columbia concomitant with decreasing incidence of HIV type 1 drug resistance detection. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2010;50(1):98-105. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19951169.

3. Lee FJ, Amin J, Carr A. Efficacy of initial antiretroviral therapy for HIV-1 infection in adults: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 114 studies with up to 144 weeks' follow-up. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(5):e97482. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24830290.

4. Cahn P, Madero JS, Arribas JR, et al. Durable Efficacy of Dolutegravir Plus Lamivudine in Antiretroviral Treatment-Naive Adults With HIV-1 Infection: 96-Week Results From the GEMINI-1 and GEMINI-2 Randomized Clinical Trials. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2019. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31834000.

5. Zash R, Makhema J, Shapiro RL. Neural-Tube Defects with Dolutegravir Treatment from the Time of Conception. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(10):979-981. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30037297.

6. Zash R, Holmes L, Diseko M, et al. Neural-tube defects and antiretroviral treatment regimens in Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):827-840. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31329379.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

7. Raesima MM, Ogbuabo CM, Thomas V, et al. Dolutegravir use at conception - additional surveillance data from Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):885-887. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31329378.

8. NAMSAL ANRS Study Group, Kouanfack C, Mpoudi-Etame M, et al. Dolutegravir-based or low-dose efavirenz-based regimen for the treatment of HIV-1. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):816-826. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31339676.

9. Zash R, Holmes L, Makhema J, et al. Surveillance for neural tube defects following antiretroviral exposure from conception. Presented at: 22nd International AIDS Conference (AIDS 2018); 2018; Amsterdam.

10. Shamsuddin H, Raudenbush C, Sciba B, et al. Pregnancy outcome following raltegravir exposure. Presented at: ID Week; 2019; Washington, DC. Available at: https://www.eventscribe.com/2019/IDWeek/fsPopup.asp?Mode=presInfo&PresentationID=582846.

11. Gantner P, Sylla B, Morand-Joubert L, et al. "Real life" use of raltegravir during pregnancy in France: the Coferal-IMEA048 cohort study. *PLoS One.* 2019;14(4):e0216010. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31017957.

12. Rasi V, Cortina-Borja M, Peters H, Sconza R, Thorne C. Brief report: surveillance of congenital anomalies after exposure to raltegravir or elvitegravir during pregnancy in the United Kingdom and Ireland, 2008-2018. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2019;80(3):264-268. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30531300.

13. Lennox JL, Landovitz RJ, Ribaudo HJ, et al. Efficacy and tolerability of 3 nonnucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor-sparing antiretroviral regimens for treatment-naive volunteers infected with HIV-1: a randomized, controlled equivalence trial. *Ann Intern Med.* 2014;161(7):461-471. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25285539.

14. Molina JM, Clotet B, van Lunzen J, et al. Once-daily dolutegravir versus darunavir plus ritonavir for treatment-naive adults with HIV-1 infection (FLAMINGO): 96 week results from a randomised, open-label, phase 3b study. *Lancet HIV*. 2015;2(4):e127-136. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26424673.

15. Squires K, Kityo C, Hodder S, et al. Integrase inhibitor versus protease inhibitor based regimen for HIV-1 infected women (WAVES): a randomised, controlled, double-blind, phase 3 study. *Lancet HIV*. 2016;3(9):e410-e420. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27562742.

16. Cahn P, Madero JS, Arribas JR, et al. Dolutegravir plus lamivudine versus dolutegravir plus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate and emtricitabine in antiretroviral-naive adults with HIV-1 infection (GEMINI-1 and GEMINI-2): week 48 results from two multicentre, double-blind, randomised, non-inferiority, phase 3 trials. *Lancet.* 2019;393(10167):143-155. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30420123.

17. Fulcher JA, Du Y, Zhang TH, Sun R, Landovitz RJ. Emergence of integrase resistance mutations during initial therapy containing dolutegravir. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2018;67(5):791-794. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29933437.

18. Pena MJ, Chueca N, D'Avolio A, Zarzalejos JM, Garcia F. Virological failure in HIV to triple therapy with dolutegravir-based firstline treatment: rare but possible. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 2019;6(1):ofy332. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30631792.

19. Lubke N, Jensen B, Huttig F, et al. Failure of dolutegravir first-line ART with selection of virus carrying R263K and G118R. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):887-889. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31461601.

20. Stellbrink HJ, Arribas JR, Stephens JL, et al. Co-formulated bictegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide versus dolutegravir with emtricitabine and tenofovir alafenamide for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection: Week 96 results from a randomised, double-blind, multicentre, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2019;6(6):e364-e372. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31068272.

21. Wohl DA, Yazdanpanah Y, Baumgarten A, et al. Bictegravir combined with emtricitabine and tenofovir alafenamide versus dolutegravir, abacavir, and lamivudine for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection: week 96 results from a randomised, double-blind, multicentre, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2019;6(6):e355-e363. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31068270.

22. Bhagwat P, Ofotokun I, McComsey GA, et al. Changes in waist circumference in HIV-infected individuals initiating a raltegravir or protease inhibitor regimen: effects of sex and race. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 2018;5(11):ofy201. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30465010.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

23. Sax PE, Erlandson KM, Lake JE, et al. Weight gain following initiation of antiretroviral therapy: risk factors in randomized comparative clinical trials. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2019. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31606734.

24. Venter WDF, Moorhouse M, Sokhela S, et al. Dolutegravir plus two different prodrugs of tenofovir to treat HIV. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):803-815. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31339677.

25. Bourgi K, Rebeiro PF, Turner M, et al. Greater weight gain in treatment naive persons starting dolutegravir-based antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2019. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31100116.

26. Bourgi K, Jenkins C, Rebeiro PF, et al. Greater weight gain among treatment-naive persons starting integrase inhibitors. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2019; Seattle, Washington. Available at: https://www.croiconference.org/sessions/greater-weight-gain-among-treatment-naive-persons-starting-integrase-inhibitors.

27. Stein JH, Ribaudo HJ, Hodis HN, et al. A prospective, randomized clinical trial of antiretroviral therapies on carotid wall thickness. *AIDS.* 2015;29(14):1775-1783. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26372383.

28. de Saint-Martin L, Bressollette L, Perfezou P, et al. Impact of atazanavir-based HAART regimen on the carotid intima-media thickness of HIV-infected persons: a comparative prospective cohort. *AIDS.* 2010;24(18):2797-2801. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21063175.

29. Lang S, Mary-Krause M, Cotte L, et al. Impact of individual antiretroviral drugs on the risk of myocardial infarction in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients: a case-control study nested within the French Hospital Database on HIV ANRS cohort CO4. *Arch Intern Med.* 2010;170(14):1228-1238. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20660842.

30. Worm SW, Sabin C, Weber R, et al. Risk of myocardial infarction in patients with HIV infection exposed to specific individual antiretroviral drugs from the 3 major drug classes: the data collection on adverse events of anti-HIV drugs (D:A:D) study. *J Infect Dis.* 2010;201(3):318-330. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20039804.

31. Monforte AD, Reiss P, Ryom L, et al. Atazanavir is not associated with an increased risk of cardio or cerebrovascular disease events. *AIDS.* 2013;27(3):407-415. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23291539.

32. Ryom L, Mocroft A, Kirk O, et al. Association between antiretroviral exposure and renal impairment among HIV-positive persons with normal baseline renal function: the D:A:D study. *J Infect Dis.* 2013;207(9):1359-1369. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23382571.

33. LaFleur J, Bress AP, Rosenblatt L, et al. Cardiovascular outcomes among HIV-infected veterans receiving atazanavir. *AIDS.* 2017;31(15):2095-2106. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28692532.

34. Ryom L, Lundgren JD, El-Sadr W, et al. Cardiovascular disease and use of contemporary protease inhibitors: the D:A:D international prospective multicohort study. *Lancet HIV.* 2018;5(6):e291-e300. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29731407.

35. ENCORE Study Group, Carey D, Puls R, et al. Efficacy and safety of efavirenz 400 mg daily versus 600 mg daily: 96-week data from the randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, non-inferiority ENCORE1 study. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2015;15(7):793-802. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25877963.

36. Orkin C, Squires KE, Molina JM, et al. Doravirine/Lamivudine/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate is Non-inferior to Efavirenz/Emtricitabine/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate in Treatment-naive Adults With Human Immunodeficiency Virus-1 Infection: Week 48 Results of the DRIVE-AHEAD Trial. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2019;68(4):535-544. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30184165.

37. Molina JM, Squires K, Sax PE, et al. Doravirine versus ritonavir-boosted darunavir in antiretroviral-naive adults with HIV-1 (DRIVE-FORWARD): 48-week results of a randomised, double-blind, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet HIV.* 2018;5(5):e211-e220. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29592840.

38. Raffi F, Babiker AG, Richert L, et al. Ritonavir-boosted darunavir combined with raltegravir or tenofovir-emtricitabine in antiretroviral-naive adults infected with HIV-1: 96 week results from the NEAT001/ANRS143 randomised non-inferiority trial. *Lancet.* 2014;384(9958):1942-1951. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25103176.

39. Figueroa MI, Sued OG, Gun AM, et al. DRV/R/3TC FDC for HIV-1 treatment naive patients: week 48 results of the ANDES study. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2018; Boston, MA.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

40. Birkus G, Hitchcock MJ, Cihlar T. Assessment of mitochondrial toxicity in human cells treated with tenofovir: comparison with other nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2002;46(3):716-723. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11850253.

41. Johnson AA, Ray AS, Hanes J, et al. Toxicity of antiviral nucleoside analogs and the human mitochondrial DNA polymerase. *J Biol Chem.* 2001;276(44):40847-40857. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11526116.

42. Hill A, Hughes SL, Gotham D, Pozniak AL. Tenofovir alafenamide versus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate: is there a true difference in efficacy and safety? *J Virus Erad.* 2018;4(2):72-79. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29682298.

43. Sax PE, Tierney C, Collier AC, et al. Abacavir-lamivudine versus tenofovir-emtricitabine for initial HIV-1 therapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;361(23):2230-2240. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19952143.

44. Post FA, Moyle GJ, Stellbrink HJ, et al. Randomized comparison of renal effects, efficacy, and safety with once-daily abacavir/lamivudine versus tenofovir/emtricitabine, administered with efavirenz, in antiretroviral-naive, HIV-1-infected adults: 48-week results from the ASSERT study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2010;55(1):49-57. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20431394.

45. Smith KY, Patel P, Fine D, et al. Randomized, double-blind, placebo-matched, multicenter trial of abacavir/lamivudine or tenofovir/emtricitabine with lopinavir/ritonavir for initial HIV treatment. *AIDS.* 2009;23(12):1547-1556. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19542866.

46. Walmsley SL, Antela A, Clumeck N, et al. Dolutegravir plus abacavir-lamivudine for the treatment of HIV-1 infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;369(19):1807-1818. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24195548.

47. Sax PE, Wohl D, Yin MT, et al. Tenofovir alafenamide versus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate, coformulated with elvitegravir, cobicistat, and emtricitabine, for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection: two randomised, double-blind, phase 3, non-inferiority trials. *Lancet.* 2015;385(9987):2606-2615. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25890673.

48. Arribas JR, Thompson M, Sax PE, et al. Brief report: randomized, double-blind comparison of tenofovir alafenamide (TAF) vs tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF), each coformulated with elvitegravir, cobicistat, and emtricitabine (E/C/F) for initial HIV-1 treatment: week 144 results. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2017;75(2):211-218. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28282300.

49. Rijnders BJ, Post FA, Rieger A, et al. Longer-term renal safety of tenofovir alafenamide vs tenofovir disoproxil fumarate. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2016; Boston, MA. Available at: http://www.croiconference.org/sessions/longer-term-renal-safety-tenofovir-alafenamide-vs-tenofovir-disoproxil-fumarate.

50. Wohl D, Oka S, Clumeck N, et al. Brief report: a randomized, double-blind comparison of tenofovir alafenamide versus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate, each coformulated with elvitegravir, cobicistat, and emtricitabine for initial HIV-1 treatment: week 96 results. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;72(1):58-64. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26829661.

51. Mills A, Crofoot GJ, McDonald C, et al. Tenofovir alafenamide versus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate in the first protease inhibitor-based single-tablet regimen for initial HIV-1 therapy: a randomized phase 2 study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2015;69(4):439-445. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25867913.

52. Eron JJ, Orkin C, Gallant J, et al. A week-48 randomized phase-3 trial of darunavir/cobicistat/emtricitabine/tenofovir alafenamide in treatment-naive HIV-1 patients. *AIDS.* 2018;32(11):1431-1442. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29683855.

53. Gallant J, Brunetta J, Crofoot G, et al. Efficacy and safety of switching to a single-tablet regimen of elvitegravir/cobicistat/emtricitabine/tenofovir alafenamide (E/C/F/TAF) in HIV-1/hepatitis B coinfected adults. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27171740.

54. DeJesus E, Herrera G, Teofilo E, et al. Abacavir versus zidovudine combined with lamivudine and efavirenz, for the treatment of antiretroviral-naive HIV-infected adults. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2004;39(7):1038-1046. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15472858.

55. Rodriguez-French A, Boghossian J, Gray GE, et al. The NEAT study: a 48-week open-label study to compare the antiviral efficacy and safety of GW433908 versus nelfinavir in antiretroviral therapy-naive HIV-1-infected patients. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2004;35(1):22-32. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14707788.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

56. 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 naive HIV-1-infected patients. *AIDS.* 2004;18(11):1529-1537. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15238771.

57. Saag M, Balu R, Phillips E, et al. High sensitivity of human leukocyte antigen-b*5701 as a marker for immunologically confirmed abacavir hypersensitivity in white and black patients. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2008;46(7):1111-1118. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18444831.

58. Mallal S, Phillips E, Carosi G, et al. HLA-B*5701 screening for hypersensitivity to abacavir. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;358(6):568-579. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18256392.

59. Sabin CA, Worm SW, Weber R, et al. Use of nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors and risk of myocardial infarction in HIV-infected patients enrolled in the D:A:D study: a multi-cohort collaboration. *Lancet.* 2008;371(9622):1417-1426. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18387667.

60. The SMART/INSIGHT and the D:A:D Study Groups TSIatDADSG. Use of nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors and risk of myocardial infarction in HIV-infected patients. *AIDS.* 2008;22(14):F17-24. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18753925.

61. Obel N, Farkas DK, Kronborg G, et al. Abacavir and risk of myocardial infarction in HIV-infected patients on highly active antiretroviral therapy: a population-based nationwide cohort study. *HIV Med.* 2010;11(2):130-136. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19682101.

62. Choi AI, Vittinghoff E, Deeks SG, Weekley CC, Li Y, Shlipak MG. Cardiovascular risks associated with abacavir and tenofovir exposure in HIV-infected persons. *AIDS.* 2011;25(10):1289-1298. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21516027.

63. Durand M, Sheehy O, Baril JG, Lelorier J, Tremblay CL. Association between HIV infection, antiretroviral therapy, and risk of acute myocardial infarction: a cohort and nested case-control study using Quebec's public health insurance database. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2011;57(3):245-253. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21499115.

64. Young J, Xiao Y, Moodie EE, et al. Effect of cumulating exposure to abacavir on the risk of cardiovascular disease events in patients from the Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2015;69(4):413-421. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25932884.

65. Marcus JL, Neugebauer RS, Leyden WA, et al. Use of abacavir and risk of cardiovascular disease among HIV-infected individuals. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;71(4):413-419. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26536316.

66. Sabin CA, Reiss P, Ryom L, et al. Is there continued evidence for an association between abacavir usage and myocardial infarction risk in individuals with HIV? A cohort collaboration. *BMC Med.* 2016;14:61. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27036962.

67. Brothers CH, Hernandez JE, Cutrell AG, et al. Risk of myocardial infarction and abacavir therapy: no increased risk across 52 GlaxoSmithKline-sponsored clinical trials in adult subjects. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009;51(1):20-28. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19282778.

68. Bedimo RJ, Westfall AO, Drechsler H, Vidiella G, Tebas P. Abacavir use and risk of acute myocardial infarction and cerebrovascular events in the highly active antiretroviral therapy era. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2011;53(1):84-91. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21653308.

69. Ribaudo HJ, Benson CA, Zheng Y, et al. No risk of myocardial infarction associated with initial antiretroviral treatment containing abacavir: short and long-term results from ACTG A5001/ALLRT. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2011;52(7):929-940. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21427402.

70. Ding X, Andraca-Carrera E, Cooper C, et al. No association of abacavir use with myocardial infarction: findings of an FDA meta-analysis. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2012;61(4):441-447. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22932321.

71. Elion RA, Althoff KN, Zhang J, et al. Recent Abacavir Use Increases Risk of Type 1 and Type 2 Myocardial Infarctions Among Adults With HIV. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2018;78(1):62-72. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29419568.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

72. Gallant JE, Daar ES, Raffi F, et al. Efficacy and safety of tenofovir alafenamide versus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate given as fixed-dose combinations containing emtricitabine as backbones for treatment of HIV-1 infection in virologically suppressed adults: a randomised, double-blind, active-controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet HIV.* 2016;3(4):e158-165. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27036991.

73. Wohl D, Thalme A, Finlayson R, et al. Renal safety of tenofovir alafenamide in patients at high risk of kidney disease. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2016; Boston, MA. Available at: http://www.croiconference.org/sessions/renal-safety-tenofovir-alafenamide-patients-high-risk-kidney-disease.

74. Gomez M, Seybold U, Roider J, Harter G, Bogner JR. A retrospective analysis of weight changes in HIV-positive patients switching from a tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF)- to a tenofovir alafenamide fumarate (TAF)-containing treatment regimen in one German university hospital in 2015-2017. *Infection.* 2019;47(1):95-102. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30269210.

75. Eron JJ, Lelievre JD, Kalayjian R, et al. Safety and efficacy of E/C/F/TAF in HIV-infected adults on chronic hemodialysis. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2018; Boston, MA.

76. Zack J, Chuck S, Chu H, et al. Bioequivalence of the rilpivirine/emtricitabine/tenofovir alafenamide single-tablet regimen. *J Bioequiv Availab.* 2016;8(2):49-54. Available at: http://www.omicsonline.org/open-access/bioequivalence-of-the-rilpivirineemtricitabinetenofovir-alafenamidesingletablet-regimen-jbb-1000266.pdf.

77. Cassetti I, Madruga JV, Suleiman JM, et al. The safety and efficacy of tenofovir DF in combination with lamivudine and efavirenz through 6 years in antiretroviral-naive HIV-1-infected patients. *HIV Clin Trials.* 2007;8(3):164-172. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17621463.

78. Molina JM, Podsadecki TJ, Johnson MA, et al. A lopinavir/ritonavir-based once-daily regimen results in better compliance and is non-inferior to a twice-daily regimen through 96 weeks. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses.* 2007;23(12):1505-1514. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18160008.

79. Molina JM, Andrade-Villanueva J, Echevarria J, et al. Once-daily atazanavir/ritonavir versus twice-daily lopinavir/ritonavir, each in combination with tenofovir and emtricitabine, for management of antiretroviral-naive HIV-1-infected patients: 48 week efficacy and safety results of the CASTLE study. *Lancet.* 2008;372(9639):646-655. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18722869.

80. Ortiz R, Dejesus E, Khanlou H, et al. Efficacy and safety of once-daily darunavir/ritonavir versus lopinavir/ritonavir in treatment-naive HIV-1-infected patients at week 48. *AIDS.* 2008;22(12):1389-1397. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18614861.

81. Smith KY, Weinberg WG, Dejesus E, et al. Fosamprenavir or atazanavir once daily boosted with ritonavir 100 mg, plus tenofovir/emtricitabine, for the initial treatment of HIV infection: 48-week results of ALERT. *AIDS Res Ther.* 2008;5:5. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18373851.

82. Lennox JL, DeJesus E, Lazzarin A, et al. Safety and efficacy of raltegravir-based versus efavirenz-based combination therapy in treatment-naive patients with HIV-1 infection: a multicentre, double-blind randomised controlled trial. *Lancet.* 2009;374(9692):796-806. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19647866.

83. DeJesus E, Rockstroh JK, Henry K, et al. Co-formulated elvitegravir, cobicistat, emtricitabine, and tenofovir disoproxil fumarate versus ritonavir-boosted atazanavir plus co-formulated emtricitabine and tenofovir disoproxil fumarate for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection: a randomised, double-blind, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet.* 2012;379(9835):2429-2438. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22748590.

84. Sax PE, DeJesus E, Mills A, et al. Co-formulated elvitegravir, cobicistat, emtricitabine, and tenofovir versus co-formulated efavirenz, emtricitabine, and tenofovir for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection: a randomised, double-blind, phase 3 trial, analysis of results after 48 weeks. *Lancet.* 2012;379(9835):2439-2448. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22748591.

85. DeJesus E, Rockstroh JK, Lennox JL, et al. Efficacy of raltegravir versus efavirenz when combined with tenofovir/emtricitabine in treatment-naive HIV-1-infected patients: week-192 overall and subgroup analyses from STARTMRK. *HIV Clin Trials.* 2012;13(4):228-232. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22849964.

86. Raffi F, Jaeger H, Quiros-Roldan E, et al. Once-daily dolutegravir versus twice-daily raltegravir in antiretroviral-naive adults with HIV-1 infection (SPRING-2 study): 96 week results from a randomised, double-blind, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2013;13(11):927-935. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24074642.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

87. Rousseau FS, Wakeford C, Mommeja-Marin H, et al. Prospective randomized trial of emtricitabine versus lamivudine short-term monotherapy in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients. *J Infect Dis.* 2003;188(11):1652-1658. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14639535.

88. Ford N, Shubber Z, Hill A, et al. Comparative efficacy of Lamivudine and emtricitabine: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *PLoS One.* 2013;8(11):e79981. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24244586.

89. Rokx C, Fibriani A, van de Vijver DA, et al. Increased virological failure in naive HIV-1-infected patients taking lamivudine compared with emtricitabine in combination with tenofovir and efavirenz or nevirapine in the Dutch nationwide ATHENA cohort. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2015;60(1):143-153. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25273080.

90. Rokx C, Gras L, van de Vijver D, Verbon A, Rijnders B, Study ANOC. Virological responses to lamivudine or emtricitabine when combined with tenofovir and a protease inhibitor in treatment-naive HIV-1-infected patients in the Dutch AIDS Therapy Evaluation in the Netherlands (ATHENA) cohort. *HIV Med.* 2016;17(8):571-580. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26842457.

91. Maserati R, De Silvestri A, Uglietti A, et al. Emerging mutations at virological failure of HAART combinations containing tenofovir and lamivudine or emtricitabine. *AIDS.* 2010;24(7):1013-1018. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20124969.

92. Karras A, Lafaurie M, Furco A, et al. Tenofovir-related nephrotoxicity in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients: three cases of renal failure, Fanconi syndrome, and nephrogenic diabetes insipidus. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2003;36(8):1070-1073. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12684922.

93. Zimmermann AE, Pizzoferrato T, Bedford J, Morris A, Hoffman R, Braden G. Tenofovir-associated acute and chronic kidney disease: a case of multiple drug interactions. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2006;42(2):283-290. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16355343.

94. Gervasoni C, Meraviglia P, Landonio S, et al. Low body weight in females is a risk factor for increased tenofovir exposure and drug-related adverse events. *PLoS One.* 2013;8(12):e80242. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24312465.

95. Gallant JE, Moore RD. Renal function with use of a tenofovir-containing initial antiretroviral regimen. *AIDS.* 2009;23(15):1971-1975. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19696652.

96. Kearney BP, Mathias A, Mittan A, Sayre J, Ebrahimi R, Cheng AK. Pharmacokinetics and safety of tenofovir disoproxil fumarate on coadministration with lopinavir/ritonavir. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2006;43(3):278-283. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17079992.

97. Goicoechea M, Liu S, Best B, et al. Greater tenofovir-associated renal function decline with protease inhibitor-based versus nonnucleoside reverse-transcriptase inhibitor-based therapy. *J Infect Dis.* 2008;197(1):102-108. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18171292.

98. Kiser JJ, Carten ML, Aquilante CL, et al. The effect of lopinavir/ritonavir on the renal clearance of tenofovir in HIV-infected patients. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2008;83(2):265-272. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17597712.

99. Stribild package insert [package insert]. Gilead. 2017. Available at: http://www.gilead.com/~/media/Files/pdfs/medicines/hiv/stribild/stribild_pi.pdf.

100. Stellbrink HJ, Orkin C, Arribas JR, et al. Comparison of changes in bone density and turnover with abacavir-lamivudine versus tenofovir-emtricitabine in HIV-infected adults: 48-week results from the ASSERT study. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2010;51(8):963-972. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20828304.

101. McComsey GA, Kitch D, Daar ES, et al. Bone mineral density and fractures in antiretroviral-naive persons randomized to receive abacavir-lamivudine or tenofovir disoproxil fumarate-emtricitabine along with efavirenz or atazanavir-ritonavir: Aids Clinical Trials Group A5224s, a substudy of ACTG A5202. *J Infect Dis.* 2011;203(12):1791-1801. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21606537.

102. Perrot S, Aslangul E, Szwebel T, Caillat-Vigneron N, Le Jeunne C. Bone pain due to fractures revealing osteomalacia related to tenofovir-induced proximal renal tubular dysfunction in a human immunodeficiency virus-infected patient. *J Clin Rheumatol.* 2009;15(2):72-74. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19265350.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

103. Lucas GM, Ross MJ, Stock PG, et al. Clinical practice guideline for the management of chronic kidney disease in patients infected with HIV: 2014 update by the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2014;59(9):e96-138. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25234519.

104. Kheloufi F, Allemand J, Mokhtari S, Default A. Psychiatric disorders after starting dolutegravir: report of four cases. *AIDS.* 2015;29(13):1723-1725. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26372287.

105. Harris M, Larsen G, Montaner JS. Exacerbation of depression associated with starting raltegravir: a report of four cases. *AIDS.* 2008;22(14):1890-1892. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18753871.

106. Penafiel J, de Lazzari E, Padilla M, et al. Tolerability of integrase inhibitors in a real-life setting. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2017;72(6):1752-1759. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28333231.

107. Hoffmann C, Welz T, Sabranski M, et al. Higher rates of neuropsychiatric adverse events leading to dolutegravir discontinuation in women and older patients. *HIV Med.* 2017;18(1):56-63. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27860104.

108. Bernardino JI, Mocroft A, Wallet C, et al. Body composition and adipokines changes after initial treatment with darunavir-ritonavir plus either raltegravir or tenofovir disoproxil fumarate-emtricitabine: A substudy of the NEAT001/ANRS143 randomised trial. *PLoS One.* 2019;14(1):e0209911. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30689664.

109. Bedimo R, Li X, Adams-Huet B, et al. Differential BMI changes following PI- and InSTI-based ART initiation by sex and race. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2019; Seattle, WA.

110. Bedimo R, Adams-Huet B, Taylor BS, Lake J, Luque A. Integrase inhibitor-based HAART is associated with greater BMI gains in blacks, hispanics and women. Presented at: IDWeek; 2018; San Fransisco, CA. Available at: https://idsa.confex.com/idsa/2018/webprogram/Paper71208.html.

111. Schafer JJ, Sassa KN, O'Connor JR, Shimada A, Keith SW, DeSimone JA. Changes in body mass index and atherosclerotic disease risk score after switching from tenofovir disoproxil fumarate to tenofovir alafenamide. *Open Forum Infect Dis.* 2019;6(10):ofz414. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31660372.

112. Biktarvy Product Label [package insert]. Gilead Sciences. 2018. Available at: http://www.gilead.com/~/media/files/pdfs/medicines/hiv/biktarvy/biktarvy_pi.pdf.

113. Sax PE, Pozniak A, Montes ML, et al. Coformulated bictegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide versus dolutegravir with emtricitabine and tenofovir alafenamide, for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection (GS-US-380-1490): a randomised, double-blind, multicentre, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet.* 2017;390(10107):2073-2082. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28867499.

114. Gallant J, Lazzarin A, Mills A, et al. Bictegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide versus dolutegravir, abacavir, and lamivudine for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection (GS-US-380-1489): a double-blind, multicentre, phase 3, randomised controlled non-inferiority trial. *Lancet.* 2017;390(10107):2063-2072. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28867497.

115. Walmsley S, Baumgarten A, Berenguer J, et al. Brief report: dolutegravir plus abacavir/lamivudine for the treatment of HIV-1 infection in antiretroviral therapy-naive patients: week 96 and week 144 results from the SINGLE randomized clinical trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2015;70(5):515-519. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26262777.

116. Clotet B, Feinberg J, van Lunzen J, et al. Once-daily dolutegravir versus darunavir plus ritonavir in antiretroviral-naive adults with HIV-1 infection (FLAMINGO): 48 week results from the randomised open-label phase 3b study. *Lancet.* 2014. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24698485.

117. Molina JM, Clotet B, van Lunzen J, et al. Once-daily dolutegravir is superior to once-daily darunavir/ritonavir in treatment-naive HIV-1-positive individuals: 96 week results from FLAMINGO. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2014;17(4 Suppl 3):19490. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25393999.

118. Orrell C, Hagins DP, Belonosova E, et al. Fixed-dose combination dolutegravir, abacavir, and lamivudine versus ritonavir-boosted atazanavir plus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate and emtricitabine in previously untreated women with HIV-1 infection (ARIA): week 48 results from a randomised, open-label, non-inferiority, phase 3b study. *Lancet HIV.* 2017. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28729158.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

119. Cahn P, Rolon MJ, Figueroa MI, Gun A, Patterson P, Sued O. Dolutegravir-lamivudine as initial therapy in HIV-1 infected, ARV-naive patients, 48-week results of the PADDLE (Pilot Antiretroviral Design with Dolutegravir LamivudinE) study. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2017;20(1):1-7. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28537061.

120. Nyaku AN, Zheng L, Gulick RM, et al. Dolutegravir plus lamivudine for initial treatment of HIV-1-infected participants with HIV-1 RNA <500 000 copies/mL: week 48 outcomes from ACTG 5353. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2019;74(5):1376-1380. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30668695.

121. Fettiplace A, Stainsby C, Winston A, et al. Psychiatric symptoms in patients receiving dolutegravir. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2017;74(4):423-431. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27984559.

122. Kheloufi F, Boucherie Q, Blin O, Micallef J. Neuropsychiatric events and dolutegravir in HIV patients: a worldwide issue involving a class effect. *AIDS.* 2017;31(12):1775-1777. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28700395.

123. Rockstroh JK, DeJesus E, Lennox JL, et al. Durable efficacy and safety of raltegravir versus efavirenz when combined with tenofovir/emtricitabine in treatment-naive HIV-1-infected patients: final 5-year results from STARTMRK. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2013;63(1):77-85. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23412015.

124. Cahn P, Sax PE, Squires K, et al. Raltegravir 1200 mg once daily vs 400 mg twice daily, with emtricitabine and tenofovir disoproxil fumarate, for previously untreated HIV-1 Infection: Week 96 results from ONCEMRK, a randomized, double-blind, noninferiority Trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2018;78(5):589-598. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29771789.

125. Bhagwat P, Ofotokun I, McComsey GA, et al. Predictors of severe weight/body mass index gain following antiretroviral initiation. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2017; Seattle, Washington. Available at: https://www.croiconference.org/sessions/predictors-severe-weightbody-mass-index-gain-following-antiretroviral-initiation.

126. Isentress package insert [package insert]. Merck Sharp & Dohme Corp. 2017. Available at: http://www.merck.com/product/usa/pi_circulars/i/isentress/isentress_pi.pdf.

127. Gray J, Young B. Acute onset insomnia associated with the initiation of raltegravir: a report of two cases and literature review. *AIDS Patient Care STDS.* 2009;23(9):689-690. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19663717.

128. Wohl DA, Cohen C, Gallant JE, et al. A randomized, double-blind comparison of single-tablet regimen elvitegravir/cobicistat/emtricitabine/tenofovir DF versus single-tablet regimen efavirenz/emtricitabine/tenofovir DF for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection: analysis of week 144 results. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2014;65(3):e118-120. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24256630.

129. Clumeck N, Molina JM, Henry K, et al. A randomized, double-blind comparison of single-tablet regimen elvitegravir/cobicistat/emtricitabine/tenofovir DF vs ritonavir-boosted atazanavir plus emtricitabine/tenofovir DF for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection: analysis of week 144 results. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2014;65(3):e121-124. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24346640.

130. Genvoya package insert [package insert]. Gilead. 2017. Available at: http://www.gilead.com/~/media/files/pdfs/medicines/hiv/genvoya/genvoya_pi.pdf.

131. Mathias AA, West S, Hui J, Kearney BP. Dose-response of ritonavir on hepatic CYP3A activity and elvitegravir oral exposure. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2009;85(1):64-70. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18815591.

132. German P, Liu HC, Szwarcberg J, et al. Effect of cobicistat on glomerular filtration rate in subjects with normal and impaired renal function. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2012;61(1):32-40. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22732469.

133. Eron JJ, Jr., Lelievre JD, Kalayjian R, et al. Safety of elvitegravir, cobicistat, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide in HIV-1-infected adults with end-stage renal disease on chronic haemodialysis: an open-label, single-arm, multicentre, phase 3b trial. *Lancet HIV.* 2018. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30555051.

134. Momper JD, Best BM, Wang J, et al. Elvitegravir/cobicistat pharmacokinetics in pregnant and postpartum women with HIV. *AIDS.* 2018. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30134297.

135. Snedecor SJ, Khachatryan A, Nedrow K, et al. The prevalence of transmitted resistance to first-generation non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors and its potential economic impact in HIV-infected patients. *PLoS One.*

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

2013;8(8):e72784. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23991151.

136. Cohen CJ, Molina JM, Cahn P, et al. Efficacy and safety of rilpivirine (TMC278) versus efavirenz at 48 weeks in treatment-naive HIV-1-infected patients: pooled results from the phase 3 double-blind randomized ECHO and THRIVE Trials. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2012;60(1):33-42. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22343174.

137. Edurant package insert [package insert]. Janssen Therapeutics. 2017. Available at: http://www.edurant.com/shared/prescribing-information-edurant.pdf.

138. Orkin C, Squires K, Molina JM, et al. Doravirine/Lamivudine/Tenofovir DF continues to be non-inferior to Efavirenz/Emtricitabine/Tenofovir DF in treatment-naive adults with HIV-1 infection: week 96 results of the DRIVE-AHEAD trial. Presented at: ID Week; 2018; San Francisco, CA.

139. Molina JM, Squires K, Sax P, et al. Doravirine (DOR) versus ritonavir-boosted darunavir (DRV+r): 96-week results of the randomized, double-blind, phase 3 DRIVE-FORWARD Noninferiority trial Presented at: 22nd International AIDS Conference (AIDS 2018); 2018; Amsterdam, Netherlands.

140. Inc MC. Pifeltro prescribing information. In:2018.

141. Inc MC. Delstrigo prescribing information. In:2018.

142. Lai MT, Xu M, Ngo W, et al. Characterization of doravirine-selected resistance patterns from participants in treatment-naive Phase 3 clinical trials. Presented at: 22nd International AIDS Conference (AIDS 2018); 2018; Amsterdam, Netherlands.

143. Daar ES, Tierney C, Fischl MA, et al. Atazanavir plus ritonavir or efavirenz as part of a 3-drug regimen for initial treatment of HIV-1. *Ann Intern Med.* 2011;154(7):445-456. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21320923.

144. Cohen CJ, Molina JM, Cassetti I, et al. Week 96 efficacy and safety of rilpivirine in treatment-naive, HIV-1 patients in two Phase III randomized trials. *AIDS.* 2013;27(6):939-950. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23211772.

145. Cohen C, Wohl D, Arribas JR, et al. Week 48 results from a randomized clinical trial of rilpivirine/emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate vs. efavirenz/emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate in treatment-naive HIV-1-infected adults. *AIDS.* 2014;28(7):989-997. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24508782.

146. Lamorde M, Wang X, Neary M, et al. Pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, and pharmacogenetics of efavirenz 400 mg once daily during pregnancy and post-partum. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2018;67(5):785-790. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30124823.

147. Cerrone M, Wang X, Neary M, et al. Pharmacokinetics of efavirenz 400 mg once daily coadministered with isoniazid and rifampicin in human immunodeficiency virus-infected individuals. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2019;68(3):446-452. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30084943.

148. Mollan KR, Smurzynski M, Eron JJ, et al. Association between efavirenz as initial therapy for HIV-1 infection and increased risk for suicidal ideation or attempted or completed suicide: an analysis of trial data. *Ann Intern Med.* 2014;161(1):1-10. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24979445.

149. Arenas-Pinto A, Grund B, Sharma S, et al. Risk of Suicidal Behavior With Use of Efavirenz: Results from the Strategic Timing of Antiretroviral Treatment Trial. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2018;67(3):420-429. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29538636.

150. Smith C, Ryom L, Monforte A, et al. Lack of association between use of efavirenz and death from suicide: evidence from the D:A:D study. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2014;17(4 Suppl 3):19512. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25394021.

151. Napoli AA, Wood JJ, Coumbis JJ, Soitkar AM, Seekins DW, Tilson HH. No evident association between efavirenz use and suicidality was identified from a disproportionality analysis using the FAERS database. *J Int AIDS Soc.* 2014;17:19214. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25192857.

152. Nkhoma ET, Coumbis J, Farr AM, et al. No evidence of an association between efavirenz exposure and suicidality among HIV patients initiating antiretroviral therapy in a retrospective cohort study of real world data. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2016;95(3):e2480. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26817882.

153. Chang JL, Tsai AC, Musinguzi N, et al. Depression and Suicidal Ideation Among HIV-Infected Adults Receiving Efavirenz Versus Nevirapine in Uganda: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169(3):146-155. Available at:

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29946683.

154. Cross HM, Chetty S, Asukile MT, Hussey HS, Lee Pan EB, Tucker LM. A proposed management algorithm for late-onset efavirenz neurotoxicity. *S Afr Med J.* 2018;108(4):271-274. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29629676.

155. Variava E, Sigauke FR, Norman J, et al. Brief Report: Late Efavirenz-Induced Ataxia and Encephalopathy: A Case Series. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2017;75(5):577-579. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28520619.

156. Sustiva package insert [package insert]. Bristol-Myers Squibb. 2016. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2016/020972s049-021360s038lbl.pdf.

157. Abdelhady AM, Shugg T, Thong N, et al. Efavirenz inhibits the human ether-a-go-go related current (hERG) and induces QT interval prolongation in CYP2B6*6*6 allele carriers. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol.* 2016;27(10):1206-1213. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27333947.

158. Pharmaceuticals M. Symfi prescibing information. In:2018.

159. Pharmaceuticals M. Symfi Lo prescribing information. In:2018.

160. Fundaro C, Genovese O, Rendeli C, Tamburrini E, Salvaggio E. Myelomeningocele in a child with intrauterine exposure to efavirenz. *AIDS.* 2002;16(2):299-300. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11807320.

161. Ford N, Calmy A, Mofenson L. Safety of efavirenz in the first trimester of pregnancy: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *AIDS.* 2011;25(18):2301-2304. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21918421.

162. van Lunzen J, Antinori A, Cohen CJ, et al. Rilpivirine vs. efavirenz-based single-tablet regimens in treatment-naive adults: week 96 efficacy and safety from a randomized phase 3b study. *AIDS.* 2016;30(2):251-259. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26684822.

163. ViiV Healthcare. Juluca prescribing information. In:2017.

164. Lathouwers E, De Meyer S, Dierynck I, et al. Virological characterization of patients failing darunavir/ritonavir or lopinavir/ritonavir treatment in the ARTEMIS study: 96-week analysis. *Antivir Ther.* 2011;16(1):99-108. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21311113.

165. Soriano V, Arasteh K, Migrone H, et al. Nevirapine versus atazanavir/ritonavir, each combined with tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine, in antiretroviral-naive HIV-1 patients: the ARTEN Trial. *Antivir Ther.* 2011;16(3):339-348. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21555816.

166. Orkin C, Dejesus E, Khanlou H, et al. Final 192-week efficacy and safety of once-daily darunavir/ritonavir compared with lopinavir/ritonavir in HIV-1-infected treatment-naive patients in the ARTEMIS trial. *HIV Med.* 2013;14(1):49-59. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23088336.

167. Ofotokun I, Na LH, Landovitz RJ, et al. Comparison of the metabolic effects of ritonavir-boosted darunavir or atazanavir versus raltegravir, and the impact of ritonavir plasma exposure: ACTG 5257. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2015;60(12):1842-1851. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25767256.

168. Tybost package insert [package insert]. Gilead. 2017. Available at: http://www.gilead.com/~/media/Files/pdfs/medicines/hiv/tybost/tybost_pi.pdf.

169. Prezcobix package insert [package insert]. Janssen Therapeutics. 2017. Available at: https://www.prezcobix.com/sites/www.prezcobix.com/files/prescribing-information-prezcobix.pdf.

170. Orkin C, Eron JJ, Rockstroh J, et al. Week 96 results of a phase 3 trial of darunavir/cobicistat/emtricitabine/tenofovir alafenamide in treatment-naive HIV-1 patients. *AIDS.* 2019. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31833849.

171. Tashima K, Crofoot G, Tomaka FL, et al. Cobicistat-boosted darunavir in HIV-1-infected adults: week 48 results of a Phase IIIb, open-label single-arm trial. *AIDS Res Ther.* 2014;11:39. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25926858.

172. Molina JM, Andrade-Villanueva J, Echevarria J, et al. Once-daily atazanavir/ritonavir compared with twice-daily lopinavir/ritonavir, each in combination with tenofovir and emtricitabine, for management of antiretroviral-naive HIV-1-infected patients: 96-week efficacy and safety results of the CASTLE study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2010;53(3):323-332. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20032785.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

173. Smith KY, Tierney C, Mollan K, et al. Outcomes by sex following treatment initiation with atazanavir plus ritonavir or efavirenz with abacavir/lamivudine or tenofovir/emtricitabine. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2014;58(4):555-563. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24253247.

174. Gallant JE, Koenig E, Andrade-Villanueva J, et al. Cobicistat versus ritonavir as a pharmacoenhancer of atazanavir plus emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate in treatment-naive HIV type 1-infected patients: week 48 results. *J Infect Dis.* 2013;208(1):32-39. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23532097.

175. Gallant JE, Koenig E, Andrade-Villanueva JF, et al. Brief report: cobicistat compared with ritonavir as a pharmacoenhancer for atazanavir in combination with emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate: week 144 results. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2015;69(3):338-340. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26181707.

176. Gammal RS, Court MH, Haidar CE, et al. Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium (CPIC) Guideline for UGT1A1 and atazanavir prescribing. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2016;99(4):363-369. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26417955.

177. Chan-Tack KM, Truffa MM, Struble KA, Birnkrant DB. Atazanavir-associated nephrolithiasis: cases from the US Food and Drug Administration's Adverse Event Reporting System. *AIDS.* 2007;21(9):1215-1218. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17502736.

178. Rockwood N, Mandalia S, Bower M, Gazzard B, Nelson M. Ritonavir-boosted atazanavir exposure is associated with an increased rate of renal stones compared with efavirenz, ritonavir-boosted lopinavir and ritonavir-boosted darunavir. *AIDS.* 2011;25(13):1671-1673. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21716074.

179. Hamada Y, Nishijima T, Watanabe K, et al. High incidence of renal stones among HIV-infected patients on ritonavir-boosted atazanavir than in those receiving other protease inhibitor-containing antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2012;55(9):1262-1269. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22820542.

180. Rakotondravelo S, Poinsignon Y, Borsa-Lebas F, et al. Complicated atazanavir-associated cholelithiasis: a report of 14 cases. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2012;55(9):1270-1272. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22820540.

181. Figueroa MI, Rolón MJ, Patterson P, Gun A, Cahn P, Sued O. Dolutegravir-lamivudine as initial therapy in HIV-infected, ARV naive patients: 96 week results of the PADDLE trial. Presented at: IAS Conference on HIV Science; 2017; Paris, France. Available at: http://www.ias2017.org/Portals/1/Files/IAS2017_LO.compressed.pdf?ver=2017-07-27-211231-197.

182. Taiwo B, Zheng L, Gallien S, et al. Efficacy of a nucleoside-sparing regimen of darunavir/ritonavir plus raltegravir in treatment-naive HIV-1-infected patients (ACTG A5262). *AIDS.* 2011;25(17):2113-2122. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21857490.

183. Bedimo RJ, Drechsler H, Jain M, et al. The RADAR study: week 48 safety and efficacy of RAltegravir combined with boosted DARunavir compared to tenofovir/emtricitabine combined with boosted darunavir in antiretroviral-naive patients. Impact on bone health. *PLoS One.* 2014;9(8):e106221. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25170938.

184. Jackson A, Else L, Higgs C, et al. Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of the nucleoside sparing dual regimen containing rilpivirine plus darunavir/ritonavir in treatment-naive HIV-1-infected individuals. *HIV Clin Trials.* 2018;19(1):31-37. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29189101.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

What Not to Use (Last updated October 17, 2017; last reviewed October 17, 2017)

Some antiretroviral (ARV) regimens or components are not generally recommended because of suboptimal antiviral potency, unacceptable toxicities, or pharmacologic concerns. These are summarized below.

Antiretroviral Drugs Not Recommended

The following ARV drugs are no longer recommended for use because of suboptimal antiviral potency, unacceptable toxicities, high pill burden, or pharmacologic concerns: delavirdine (DLV), didanosine (ddI), indinavir (IDV), nelfinavir (NFV), and stavudine (d4T).

Antiretroviral Regimens Not Recommended

Monotherapy

Nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NRTI) monotherapy is inferior to dual-NRTI therapy.[1] Protease inhibitor (PI) monotherapy is inferior to combination antiretroviral therapy (ART).[2-6] Integrase strand transfer inhibitor (INSTI) monotherapy has resulted in virologic rebound and INSTI resistance **(AI)**.[7,8]

Dual-NRTI Regimens

These regimens are inferior to triple-drug combination regimens **(AI)**.[9]

Triple-NRTI Regimens

Triple-NRTI regimens have suboptimal virologic activity[10-12] or a lack of data **(AI)**.

Antiretroviral Components Not Recommended

Atazanavir plus Indinavir

Both PIs can cause Grade 3 to 4 hyperbilirubinemia and jaundice. Additive adverse effects may be possible when these agents are used concomitantly **(AIII)**.

Cobicistat plus Ritonavir as Pharmacokinetic Enhancers

This combination may be prescribed inadvertently, which may result in additive CYP3A4 enzyme inhibition and may further increase the concentrations of ARV drugs or other concomitant medications (see Tables 21a and 21d).

Didanosine plus Stavudine

The combination of ddI and d4T can result in peripheral neuropathy, pancreatitis, and lactic acidosis, and it has been implicated in the deaths of several pregnant women **(AII)**.[13]

Didanosine plus Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate

Tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF) increases ddI concentrations,[14] serious ddI-associated toxicities,[15,16] immunologic nonresponse,[17] early virologic failure,[18,19] and resistance[18,20] **(AII)**.

Two Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor Combinations

Excess clinical adverse events and treatment discontinuation were reported in patients randomized to receive treatment with two non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs).[21] Efavirenz (EFV) and nevirapine (NVP) are enzyme inducers, and both of these drugs can reduce concentrations of etravirine (ETR) and rilpivirine (RPV) **(AI)**.[22]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Emtricitabine plus Lamivudine

Both drugs have similar resistance profiles and have minimal additive antiviral activity. Inhibition of intracellular phosphorylation may occur *in vivo* **(AIII)**.[23]

Etravirine plus Unboosted Protease Inhibitor

ETR may induce the metabolism and significantly reduce the drug exposure of unboosted PIs. Appropriate doses of the PIs have not been established **(AII)**.[22]

Etravirine plus Fosamprenavir/Ritonavir

ETR may alter the concentrations of these PIs. Appropriate doses of the PIs have not been established **(AII)**.[22]

Etravirine plus Tipranavir/Ritonavir

Tipranavir/ritonavir (TPV/r) significantly reduces ETR concentrations **(AII)**.[22]

Nevirapine Initiated in ARV-Naive Women with CD4 Counts >250 cells/mm^3 or in ARV-Naive Men with CD4 Counts >400 cells/mm^3

Initiating NVP in ART-naive individuals with CD4 counts above these thresholds increases the risk of symptomatic, and sometimes life-threatening, hepatic events.[24-26] ART-experienced patients can safely switch to NVP if they have CD4 counts above these thresholds as a result of receiving effective ART **(BI)**.[27]

Unboosted Darunavir, Saquinavir, or Tipranavir

The virologic benefit of these PIs has been demonstrated only when they were used with concomitant RTV, or in the case of DRV, also with COBI **(AII)**.

Stavudine plus Zidovudine

These NRTIs are antagonistic *in vitro*[28] and *in vivo*[29] **(AII)**.

Tenofovir Alafenamide plus Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate

This combination may be prescribed inadvertently, especially during transition from one formulation to another. There is no data supporting any potential additive efficacy or toxicity if TAF and TDF are used in combination.

References

1. Katlama C, Ingrand D, Loveday C, et al. Safety and efficacy of lamivudine-zidovudine combination therapy in antiretroviral-naive patients: a randomized controlled comparison with zidovudine monotherapy. *JAMA*. Jul 10 1996;276(2):118-125. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8656503.

2. Delfraissy JF, Flandre P, Delaugerre C, et al. Lopinavir/ritonavir monotherapy or plus zidovudine and lamivudine in antiretroviral-naive HIV-infected patients. *AIDS*. Jan 30 2008;22(3):385-393. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18195565.

3. Swindells S, DiRienzo AG, Wilkin T, et al. Regimen simplification to atazanavir-ritonavir alone as maintenance antiretroviral therapy after sustained virologic suppression. *JAMA*. Aug 16 2006;296(7):806-814. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16905786.

4. Arribas JR, Horban A, Gerstoft J, et al. The MONET trial: darunavir/ritonavir with or without nucleoside analogues, for patients with HIV RNA below 50 copies/ml. *AIDS*. Jan 16 2010;24(2):223-230. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20010070.

5. Katlama C, Valantin MA, Algarte-Genin M, et al. Efficacy of darunavir/ritonavir maintenance monotherapy in patients with HIV-1 viral suppression: a randomized open-label, noninferiority trial, MONOI-ANRS 136. *AIDS*. Sep 24

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

2010;24(15):2365-2374. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20802297.

6. Stohr W, Dunn DT, Arenas-Pinto A, et al. Factors associated with virological rebound in HIV-infected patients receiving protease inhibitor monotherapy. *AIDS*. Nov 13 2016;30(17):2617-2624. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27456983.

7. Oldenbuettel C, Wolf E, Ritter A, et al. Dolutegravir monotherapy as treatment de-escalation in HIV-infected adults with virological control: DoluMono cohort results. *Antivir Ther.* 2017;22(2):169-172. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27588613.

8. Brenner BG, Thomas R, Blanco JL, et al. Development of a G118R mutation in HIV-1 integrase following a switch to dolutegravir monotherapy leading to cross-resistance to integrase inhibitors. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. Jul 2016;71(7):1948-1953. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27029845.

9. Hirsch M, Steigbigel R, Staszewski S, et al. A randomized, controlled trial of indinavir, zidovudine, and lamivudine in adults with advanced human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection and prior antiretroviral therapy. *J Infect Dis*. Sep 1999;180(3):659-665. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10438352.

10. Gallant JE, Rodriguez AE, Weinberg WG, et al. Early virologic nonresponse to tenofovir, abacavir, and lamivudine in HIV-infected antiretroviral-naive subjects. *J Infect Dis*. Dec 1 2005;192(11):1921-1930. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16267763.

11. Bartlett JA, Johnson J, Herrera G, et al. Long-term results of initial therapy with abacavir and lamivudine combined with efavirenz, amprenavir/ritonavir, or stavudine. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Nov 1 2006;43(3):284-292. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16967040.

12. Barnas D, Koontz D, Bazmi H, Bixby C, Jemsek J, Mellors JW. Clonal resistance analyses of HIV type-1 after failure of therapy with didanosine, lamivudine and tenofovir. *Antivir Ther.* 2010;15(3):437-441. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20516563.

13. Food and Drug Administration. Caution issued for HIV combination therapy with Zerit and Videx in pregnant women. *HIV Clin.* 2001;13(2):6. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11810823.

14. Kearney BP, Sayre JR, Flaherty JF, Chen SS, Kaul S, Cheng AK. Drug-drug and drug-food interactions between tenofovir disoproxil fumarate and didanosine. *J Clin Pharmacol.* Dec 2005;45(12):1360-1367. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16291710.

15. Murphy MD, O'Hearn M, Chou S. Fatal lactic acidosis and acute renal failure after addition of tenofovir to an antiretroviral regimen containing didanosine. *Clin Infect Dis.* Apr 15 2003;36(8):1082-1085. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12684925.

16. Martinez E, Milinkovic A, de Lazzari E, et al. Pancreatic toxic effects associated with co-administration of didanosine and tenofovir in HIV-infected adults. *Lancet*. Jul 3-9 2004;364(9428):65-67. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15234858.

17. Barrios A, Rendon A, Negredo E, et al. Paradoxical CD4+ T-cell decline in HIV-infected patients with complete virus suppression taking tenofovir and didanosine. *AIDS*. Mar 24 2005;19(6):569-575. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15802975.

18. Leon A, Martinez E, Mallolas J, et al. Early virological failure in treatment-naive HIV-infected adults receiving didanosine and tenofovir plus efavirenz or nevirapine. *AIDS*. Jan 28 2005;19(2):213-215. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15668550.

19. Maitland D, Moyle G, Hand J, et al. Early virologic failure in HIV-1 infected subjects on didanosine/tenofovir/efavirenz: 12-week results from a randomized trial. *AIDS*. Jul 22 2005;19(11):1183-1188. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15990571.

20. Podzamczer D, Ferrer E, Gatell JM, et al. Early virological failure with a combination of tenofovir, didanosine and efavirenz. *Antivir Ther.* 2005;10(1):171-177. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15751775.

21. 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*. Apr 17 2004;363(9417):1253-1263. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15094269.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

22. Tibotec Inc. Intelence package insert. 2009. Available at http://www.intelence.com/shared/product/intelence/prescribing-information.pdf.

23. Bethell R, Adams J, DeMuys J, et al. Pharmacological evaluation of a dual deoxycytidine analogue combination: 3TC and SPD754. Presented at Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; February 8-11, 2004; San Francisco, California.

24. Baylor MS, Johann-Liang R. Hepatotoxicity associated with nevirapine use. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Apr 15 2004;35(5):538-539. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15021321.

25. Sanne I, Mommeja-Marin H, Hinkle J, et al. Severe hepatotoxicity associated with nevirapine use in HIV-infected subjects. *J Infect Dis*. Mar 15 2005;191(6):825-829. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15717255.

26. Boehringer Ingelheim. Dear Health Care Professional Letter: Clarification of risk factors for severe, life-threatening and fatal hepatotoxicity with VIRAMUNE® (nevirapine). 2004.

27. Kesselring AM, Wit FW, Sabin CA, et al. Risk factors for treatment-limiting toxicities in patients starting nevirapine-containing antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. Aug 24 2009;23(13):1689-1699. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19487907.

28. Hoggard PG, Kewn S, Barry MG, Khoo SH, Back DJ. Effects of drugs on 2',3'-dideoxy-2',3'-didehydrothymidine phosphorylation in vitro. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. Jun 1997;41(6):1231-1236. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9174176.

29. Havlir DV, Tierney C, Friedland GH, et al. In vivo antagonism with zidovudine plus stavudine combination therapy. *J Infect Dis*. Jul 2000;182(1):321-325. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10882616.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Management of the Treatment-Experienced Patient

Virologic Failure (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Key Considerations and Recommendations

- Assessing and managing a patient who is experiencing failure of antiretroviral therapy (ART) is complex. Expert advice is critical and should be sought.
- Evaluation of virologic failure should include an assessment of adherence, drug-drug and drug-food interactions, drug tolerability, HIV RNA level and CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell count trends over time, ART history, and prior and current drug-resistance test results.
- Drug-resistance testing should be performed while the patient is taking the failing antiretroviral (ARV) regimen **(AI)** or within 4 weeks of treatment discontinuation **(AII)**. Even if more than 4 weeks have elapsed since ARV drugs were discontinued, resistance testing can still provide useful information to guide therapy, although it may not detect previously selected resistance mutations **(CIII)**.
- The goal of treatment for ART-experienced patients with drug resistance who are experiencing virologic failure is to establish virologic suppression (i.e., HIV RNA levels below the lower limits of detection of currently used assays) **(AI)**.
- A new regimen should include at least two, and preferably three, fully active agents **(AI)**. A fully active agent is one that is expected to have uncompromised activity based on the patient's ART history and current and past drug-resistance test results. A fully active agent may also have a novel mechanism of action.
- In general, adding a single ARV agent to a virologically failing regimen **is not recommended**, because this may risk the development of resistance to all drugs in the regimen **(BII)**.
- For some highly ART-experienced patients with extensive drug resistance, maximal virologic suppression may not be possible. In this case, ART should be continued **(AI)** with regimens that are designed to minimize toxicity, preserve CD4 counts, and delay clinical progression.
- It is crucial to provide continuous adherence support to all patients before and after regimen changes due to virologic failure.
- Data from an observational study in Botswana suggest that there is an increased risk of neural tube defects (NTDs) in infants born to individuals who were receiving dolutegravir (DTG) at the time of conception; however, the risk of these defects is still low. In patients with virologic failure who are of childbearing potential and who are not using effective contraception or who are contemplating pregnancy, the following factors should be considered:
  - Clinicians should review Table 6b for information to consider when choosing to initiate or continue an integrase strand transfer inhibitor.
  - If there is an active ARV agent that can be used in place of DTG, DTG should not be prescribed **(AII)**.
  - If no alternatives exist, providers and patients should discuss the possible risk of NTDs and weigh that risk against the risks of persistent viremia in the patient and HIV transmission to the fetus if pregnancy occurs while the patient is not on effective ART. The decision of whether to initiate or continue DTG should be made after carefully considering these risks.
- When it is not possible to construct a viable suppressive regimen for a patient with multidrug-resistant HIV, the clinician should consider enrolling the patient in a clinical trial of investigational agents or contacting pharmaceutical companies that may have investigational agents available.
- When switching an ARV regimen in a patient with hepatitis B virus (HBV)/HIV coinfection, ARV drugs that are active against HBV should be continued as part of the new regimen. Discontinuation of these drugs may lead to the reactivation of HBV, which may result in serious hepatocellular damage.
- Discontinuing or briefly interrupting therapy may lead to a rapid increase in HIV RNA, a decrease in CD4 count, and an increase in the risk of clinical progression. Therefore, this strategy **is not recommended** in the setting of virologic failure **(AI)**.

Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional*

Rating of Evidence: *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

Antiretroviral (ARV) regimens that are currently recommended for initial therapy in patients with HIV have a high likelihood of achieving and maintaining plasma HIV RNA levels that are below the lower limits of

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

detection (LLOD) of currently used assays (see What to Start). Patients on antiretroviral therapy (ART) who do not achieve this treatment goal or who experience virologic rebound can develop resistance mutations to one or more components of their regimen. Adherence to ART regimens can be challenging for some patients, and poor adherence can result in detectable viral loads. Depending on their treatment histories, some of these patients may have minimal or no drug resistance and others may have extensive resistance. Managing patients with extensive resistance is complex and usually requires consultation with an HIV expert. This section of the guidelines defines virologic failure in patients on ART and discusses strategies to manage ART in these individuals.

Virologic Response Definitions

The following definitions are used in this section to describe the different levels of virologic response to ART:

Virologic Suppression: A confirmed HIV RNA level below the LLOD of available assays.

Virologic Failure: The inability to achieve or maintain suppression of viral replication to an HIV RNA level <200 copies/mL.

Incomplete Virologic Response: Two consecutive plasma HIV RNA levels ≥200 copies/mL after 24 weeks on an ARV regimen in a patient who has not yet had documented virologic suppression on this regimen. A patient's baseline HIV RNA level may affect the time course of response, and some regimens may take longer than others to suppress HIV RNA levels.

Virologic Rebound: Confirmed HIV RNA level ≥200 copies/mL after virologic suppression.

Virologic Blip: After virologic suppression, an isolated detectable HIV RNA level that is followed by a return to virologic suppression.

Low-Level Viremia: Confirmed detectable HIV RNA level <200 copies/mL.

Antiretroviral Therapy Treatment Goals and Presence of Viremia While on Antiretroviral Therapy

The goal of ART is to suppress HIV replication to a level below which drug-resistance mutations do not emerge. Although not conclusive, the evidence suggests that selection of drug-resistance mutations does not occur in patients with HIV RNA levels that are persistently suppressed below the LLOD of current assays.[1]

Virologic blips are not usually associated with subsequent virologic failure.[2] In contrast, there is controversy regarding the clinical implications of persistently low HIV RNA levels that are between the LLOD and <200 copies/mL in patients on ART. Viremia at this threshold is detected with some frequency by commonly used real-time polymerase chain reaction (PCR) assays, which are more sensitive than the PCR-based viral load platforms used in the past.[3-5] Findings from a large retrospective analysis showed that, as a threshold for virologic failure, HIV RNA levels of <200 copies/mL and <50 copies/mL had the same predictive value for subsequent rebound as HIV RNA levels of >200 copies/mL.[6] Two other retrospective studies also support the supposition that virologic rebound is more likely to occur in patients with viral loads >200 copies/mL than in those with low-level viremia between 50 copies/mL and 199 copies/mL.[7,8] However, other studies have suggested that detectable viremia at this low level (<200 copies/mL) can be predictive of progressive viral rebound[9,10] and can be associated with the evolution of drug resistance.[11]

Persistent HIV RNA levels ≥200 copies/mL are often associated with evidence of viral evolution and accumulation of drug-resistance mutations.[12] This association is particularly common when HIV RNA levels are >500 copies/mL.[13] Therefore, patients who have persistent plasma HIV RNA levels ≥200 copies/mL are considered to be experiencing virologic failure.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Causes of Virologic Failure

Virologic failure can occur for many reasons. Data from patient cohorts in the earlier era of combination ART suggested that suboptimal adherence and drug intolerance/toxicity are key contributors to virologic failure and regimen discontinuations.[14,15] The presence of pre-existing (transmitted) drug resistance may also lead to virologic failure.[16] Virologic failure may be associated with a variety of factors, including:

Patient/Adherence-Related Factors (see Adherence to the Continuum of Care)

- Comorbidities that may affect adherence (e.g., active substance abuse, mental health disorders, neurocognitive impairment)
- Unstable housing and other psychosocial factors
- Missed clinic appointments
- Interruption of or intermittent access to ART
- Cost and affordability of ARV drugs (i.e., these factors may affect the ability to access or continue therapy)
- Adverse drug effects
- High pill burden and/or dosing frequency

HIV-Related Factors

- Presence of transmitted or acquired drug-resistant virus documented by current or past resistance test results
- Prior treatment failure
- Innate resistance to ARV drugs
- Higher pretreatment HIV RNA level (some regimens may be less effective at higher levels)

Antiretroviral Regimen-Related Factors

- Suboptimal pharmacokinetics (PKs) (e.g., variable absorption, metabolism, or penetration into reservoirs)
- Suboptimal virologic potency
- Low genetic barrier to resistance
- Reduced efficacy due to prior exposure to suboptimal regimens (e.g., monotherapy, dual-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NRTI) therapy, or the sequential introduction of drugs)
- Food requirements
- Adverse drug-drug interactions with concomitant medications
- Prescription errors

Managing Patients with Virologic Failure

If virologic failure is suspected or confirmed, a thorough assessment of whether one or more of the above factors could have been the cause(s) of failure is indicated. Often the causes of virologic failure can be identified, but in some cases, they are not obvious. It is important to distinguish among the causes of virologic failure because the approaches to subsequent therapy may differ depending on the cause. Potential causes of virologic failure should be explored in depth. Once virologic failure is confirmed, steps should be taken to improve virologic outcomes. Those approaches are outlined below.

Key Factors to Consider When Designing a New Antiretroviral Regimen

- Ideally, a new ARV regimen should contain at least two, and preferably three, fully active drugs, which should be selected after considering the patient's ART history and current and previous resistance test

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

results and whether an ARV drug with a new mechanistic action is available **(AI)**.[9,17-26]

- Despite the presence of some drug-resistance mutations, some ARV drugs in the regimen may still have partial activity against the patient's HIV and may be retained as part of a salvage regimen. These drugs may include NRTIs or protease inhibitors (PIs).[27] Other agents will likely have to be discontinued, as their continued use may lead to further accumulation of resistance mutations and jeopardize treatment options with newer drugs from the same drug class. These drugs may include enfuvirtide (T-20); non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs), especially efavirenz, nevirapine, and rilpivirine; and the first-generation integrase strand transfer inhibitors (INSTIs) raltegravir (RAL) and elvitegravir (EVG).[28-30]
- Using a drug that a patient has never used previously does not ensure that the drug will be fully active; there is a potential for cross-resistance among drugs from the same class.
- Archived drug-resistance mutations may not be detected by standard drug-resistance tests, particularly if testing is performed when the patient is not taking the drug in question.
- When constructing a salvage regimen, it is more important to consider drug potency and viral susceptibility based on cumulative genotype data than the number of component drugs.
- Resistance testing should be performed while the patient is still taking the failing regimen or within 4 weeks of regimen discontinuation if the patient's plasma HIV RNA level is >1,000 copies/mL **(AI)**, and possibly even if it is between 500 copies/mL and 1,000 copies/mL **(BII)** (see Drug-Resistance Testing). In some patients, resistance testing should still be considered even after treatment interruptions of >4 weeks, though clinicians should recognize that the lack of evidence of resistance in this setting does not exclude the possibility that resistance mutations may be present at low levels **(CIII)**. Drug resistance is cumulative; thus, clinicians should evaluate the extent of drug resistance, taking into account a patient's ART history and, importantly, prior genotypic or phenotypic resistance test results. Some assays only detect resistance to NRTIs, NNRTIs, or PIs; INSTI-resistance testing may need to be ordered separately. INSTI-resistance testing should be ordered in patients who experience virologic failure on an INSTI-based regimen. Additional drug-resistance tests for patients who experience failure on a fusion inhibitor **(AII)** and viral tropism tests for patients who experience failure on a CCR5 antagonist **(BIII)** are also available (see Drug-Resistance Testing).
- Discontinuing or briefly interrupting therapy in a patient with overt or low-level viremia **is not recommended**, as it may lead to a rapid increase in HIV RNA and a decrease in CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell count, and it increases the risk of clinical progression **(AI)**[27,31] (see Discontinuation or Interruption of Antiretroviral Therapy).
- When changing an ARV regimen in a patient with hepatitis B virus (HBV)/HIV coinfection, ARV drugs that are active against HBV should be continued as part of the new regimen. Discontinuation of these drugs may lead to the reactivation of HBV, which may result in serious hepatocellular damage (see Hepatitis B (HBV)/HIV Coinfection).

The Use of Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors in Persons of Childbearing Potential

Because the use of INSTIs is frequently considered for persons who are experiencing virologic failure, clinicians should be aware that preliminary data from Botswana suggest that there is an increased risk of neural tube defects (NTDs) in infants born to individuals who were receiving dolutegravir (DTG) at the time of conception (0.9%).[32,33] Follow-up data showed that the prevalence of NTDs in infants who were exposed to DTG is lower than reported in the preliminary data (0.3%), but still higher than in infants born to women who received ART that did not include DTG (0.1%).[34,35] Before initiating an INSTI-based regimen in a person of childbearing potential, clinicians should review the information in Table 6b.

When DTG is the only treatment option (or one of few treatment options) for persons of childbearing potential with virologic failure, providers and patients should discuss the possible risk of NTDs and weigh

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

that risk against the risks of persistent viremia in the patient and HIV transmission to the fetus if pregnancy occurs while the patient is not on effective ART. The decision of whether to initiate or continue DTG should be made after carefully considering these risks.

Clinicians should note that there are insufficient safety data on the use of bictegravir (BIC) around the time of conception and during pregnancy to guide evidence-based recommendations. An approach similar to that outlined for DTG should be considered for BIC-containing ART **(AIII)**.

Antiretroviral Drug Strategies

- In general, patients who receive at least three active drugs experience better and more sustained virologic response than those who receive fewer active drugs. These three drugs should be selected based on the patient's ART history and a review of their drug-resistance test results, both past and present.[18,19,21,22,36-38]
- Active drugs are ARV drugs that, based on current and previous resistance test results and ART history, are expected to have antiviral activity equivalent to the activity seen when there is no resistance to the specific drugs. ARV drugs with partial activity are those predicted to reduce HIV RNA, but to a lesser extent than when there is no underlying drug resistance.
- Active drugs may be newer members of existing drug classes that are active against HIV isolates that are resistant to older drugs in the same classes (e.g., etravirine, darunavir [DRV], and DTG).
- An active drug may also be one with a mechanism of action that is different from the mechanisms of the ARV drugs that were previously used in that individual (e.g., the fusion inhibitor T-20, the CCR5 antagonist maraviroc in patients with no detectable CXCR4-using virus, and some investigational ARV drugs).
- An increasing number of studies in ART-naive and ART-experienced patients have shown that an active, PK-enhanced PI plus one other active drug or several partially active drugs will effectively reduce viral load in most patients.[39-42]
- In the presence of certain resistance mutations, some ARV drugs, such as DTG, darunavir/ritonavir (DRV/r), and lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/r), need to be given twice daily instead of once daily to achieve the higher drug concentrations necessary to be active against a less-sensitive virus.[43,44]

Addressing Patients with Different Levels of Viremia

Patients with detectable viral loads comprise a heterogenous group of individuals with different ART exposure histories, degrees of drug resistance, durations of virologic failure, and levels of plasma viremia. Management strategies should be individualized. The first steps for all patients with detectable viral loads are to confirm the level of HIV viremia and assess and address adherence and potential drug-drug interactions (including interactions with over-the-counter products and supplements) and drug-food interactions. Some general approaches based on level of viremia are addressed below.

- **HIV RNA Above the LLOD and <200 copies/mL:** Patients who have these HIV RNA levels do not typically require a change in treatment **(AII)**.[4] Although there is no consensus on how to manage these patients, the risk that resistance will emerge is believed to be relatively low. Therefore, these patients should continue their current regimens and have HIV RNA levels monitored at least every 3 months to assess the need for changes to ART in the future **(AIII)**.

- **HIV RNA Levels ≥200 copies/mL and <1,000 copies/mL:** In contrast to patients with detectable HIV RNA levels that are persistently <200 copies/mL, those with levels that are persistently ≥200 copies/mL often develop drug resistance, particularly when HIV RNA levels are >500 copies/mL.[7,8] Patients who have persistent plasma HIV RNA levels in the range of 200 copies/mL to 1,000 copies/mL are considered to be experiencing virologic failure, and resistance testing should be attempted, particularly in patients with HIV RNA levels >500 copies/mL. Management approaches should be the same as for patients with HIV RNA >1,000 copies/mL (as outlined below). When resistance testing cannot be performed because of low HIV

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

RNA levels, the decision of whether to empirically change ARV drugs should be made on a case-by-case basis, taking into account whether a new regimen that is expected to fully suppress viremia can be constructed.

- **HIV RNA ≥1,000 copies/mL and No Drug Resistance Mutations Identified Using Current or Previous Genotypic Resistance Test Results:** This scenario is almost always associated with suboptimal adherence. Conduct a thorough assessment to determine the level of adherence, identify and address the underlying cause(s) for incomplete adherence and, if possible, simplify the regimen (e.g., decrease pill count, simplify food requirement or dosing frequency; see Adherence to the Continuum of Care). Approaches include:
  - Assessing the patient's tolerance of the current regimen and the severity and duration of side effects, keeping in mind that even minor side effects can affect adherence.
  - Addressing intolerance by treating symptoms (e.g., with antiemetics or antidiarrheals), switching one ARV agent in a regimen to another agent in the same drug class, or switching from one drug class to another class (e.g., from a NNRTI to a PI or an INSTI; see Adverse Effects of Antiretroviral Agents).
  - Reviewing food requirements for each medication and assessing whether the patient adheres to the requirements.
  - Assessing whether there is a recent history of gastrointestinal symptoms (e.g., vomiting, diarrhea) that may result in short-term malabsorption.
  - Reviewing concomitant medications and dietary supplements for possible adverse drug-drug interactions (consult Drug-Drug Interactions and Tables 21a through 22b for common interactions) and, if possible, making appropriate substitutions for ARV agents and/or concomitant medications.
  - Considering therapeutic drug monitoring if PK drug-drug interactions or impaired drug absorption leading to decreased ARV drug exposure is suspected.
  - Considering the timing of the drug-resistance test (e.g., was the patient mostly or completely ART-nonadherent for >4 weeks before testing?).
    - If the current regimen is well tolerated and there are no significant drug-drug or drug-food interactions, it is reasonable to continue the same regimen.
    - If the agents are poorly tolerated or there are important drug-drug or drug-food interactions, consider changing the regimen to an equally effective but more tolerable regimen.
    - Repeat viral load testing 2 to 4 weeks after treatment is resumed or started; if viral load remains >500 copies/mL, perform genotypic testing to determine whether a resistant viral strain has emerged **(CIII)**.
- **HIV RNA >1,000 copies/mL and Drug Resistance Identified:** If new or previously detected resistance mutations compromise the regimen, the regimen should be modified as soon as possible in order to avoid progressive accumulation of resistance mutations.[45] In addition, several studies have shown that virologic responses to new and active regimens are greater in individuals with lower HIV RNA levels and/or higher CD4 counts at the time of regimen changes; thus, the change is best done before viremia worsens or CD4 count declines.[9,46] The availability of newer ARV drugs, including some with new mechanisms of action, makes it possible to suppress HIV RNA levels to below the LLOD in most of these patients. The options in this setting depend on the extent of drug resistance and are addressed in the clinical scenarios outlined below.

Managing Virologic Failure in Different Clinical Scenarios

See Table 11 for a summary of these recommendations.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Virologic Failure with First Antiretroviral Regimen

- **NNRTI plus NRTI Regimen Failure:** These patients often have viral resistance to the NNRTI, with or without the M184V/I mutation, which confers high-level resistance to lamivudine (3TC) and emtricitabine (FTC). Additional NRTI mutations may also be present. Below are some switch options.
  - **Boosted PI plus Two NRTIs:** Three large randomized controlled trials (primarily conducted in resource-limited settings where NNRTI-based regimens have been used as first-line therapy) have explored different second-line regimen options. The studies found that regimens that contained LPV/r plus two NRTIs were as effective as regimens that contained LPV/r plus RAL.[41,42,47] Even though LPV/r was the PI used in these studies, it is likely that other boosted PIs (i.e., DRV/r or atazanavir/ritonavir) would have similar activities and may be tolerated better, although this has not been demonstrated in large clinical trials. The EARNEST study randomized participants to receive LPV/r plus two or three investigator-selected NRTIs, LPV/r plus RAL, or LPV alone. Participants did not undergo resistance testing before randomization.[42] Lower rates of virologic suppression were seen in participants who received LPV/r monotherapy, confirming that ritonavir-boosted PI (PI/r) monotherapy **cannot be recommended (AI)**.[42,48] The virologic responses were similar in the LPV/r plus NRTIs arm and the LPV/r plus RAL arm. A post-hoc analysis showed that viral suppression was achieved in over 80% of the participants who received either no active NRTIs or one active NRTI in their new regimens.[49] It should be noted that most of the participants received thymidine analogs (stavudine or zidovudine—NRTIs that are no longer used in first-line regimens in the United States) plus 3TC. The authors of this trial suggest that, as a public health approach, resistance testing after first-line failure may not be necessary in resource-limited countries. However, in settings where genotypic resistance tests are available, the Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents recommends using a boosted PI plus two NRTIs (at least one of which is active) in a regimen **(AIII)**.
  - **DTG plus One or Two Active NRTIs:** In the DAWNING trial, patients who experienced virologic failure while on a first-line, NNRTI-based regimen were randomized to receive either LPV/r or DTG; each of these drugs was given with two NRTIs, one of which had to be fully active based on real-time resistance testing. The study was stopped early after an interim analysis showed that the DTG arm was superior to the LPV/r arm.[50] Thus, DTG plus two NRTIs (at least one of which is active) can be an option after failure of a first-line, NNRTI-based therapy **(AI)**. BIC may have activity that is similar to that of DTG; however, there are currently no data to support its use. There are not enough data on the efficacy of EVG or RAL to recommend the use of these INSTIs in the setting of first-line, NNRTI-based therapy failure.
  - **Boosted PI plus an INSTI:** As noted earlier, a regimen that consisted of LPV/r plus RAL was found to be as effective as LPV/r plus two NRTIs.[41,42,47] Thus, LPV/r plus RAL can also be a treatment option for those who experienced virologic failure on an NNRTI-based regimen **(AI)**. Although data are limited, DTG combined with a boosted PI may also be an option in this setting **(AIII)**. There are no data on the efficacy of BIC or EVG with boosted PI in the setting of first-line, NNRTI-based therapy failure.
- **Boosted PI plus NRTI Regimen Failure:** In this scenario, most patients will have either no resistance or resistance that is limited to 3TC and FTC.[51,52] Failure in this setting is often attributed to poor adherence, drug-drug interactions, or drug-food interactions. Below are some management options.
  - **Maintain on the Same Regimen:** A systematic review of multiple randomized trials that investigated the failures of first-line, PI/r-based regimens showed that maintaining the same regimen while making efforts to enhance adherence is as effective as changing to new regimens with or without drugs from new classes **(AII)**.[53] If the regimen is well tolerated and there are no concerns about drug-drug or drug-food interactions or drug resistance, then the regimen can be continued with

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

adherence support and viral monitoring.

- **Switch to Another Regimen:** If poor tolerability, drug interactions, or drug resistance may be contributing to virologic failure, then the regimen can be modified to:
  - A different boosted PI plus two NRTIs (at least one of which is active) **(AIII)**; *or*
  - A different boosted PI plus an INSTI **(BIII)**; *or*
  - An INSTI plus two NRTIs (at least one of which is active) **(AIII)**. As noted above, if only one of the NRTIs is fully active or if adherence is a concern, DTG is the recommended INSTI **(AIII)**. Before considering the use of DTG in persons who are pregnant or who are of childbearing potential, please refer to the earlier discussion regarding the use of DTG and the potential risk of NTDs in infants. There are limited to no data on the efficacy of BIC or EVG in this setting.

- **INSTI plus NRTI Regimen Failure:** Virologic failure in patients on a regimen that consists of RAL or EVG plus two NRTIs may be associated with emergent resistance to 3TC or FTC and possibly the INSTI.[54] Viruses with EVG or RAL resistance often remain susceptible to DTG.[46] In contrast, in clinical trials, persons who experienced virologic failure while receiving BIC or DTG plus two NRTIs as first-line therapy were unlikely to develop phenotypic resistance to BIC or DTG.[54-56] There are no clinical trial data to guide therapy for first-line INSTI failures; therefore, treatment strategy should be based on resistance test results and the potential potency of the next regimen. Below are some treatment options, based on resistance pattern considerations.
  - **Virologic Failure without Any Resistance Mutations:** The patient should be managed as outlined above in the section on virologic failure without resistance.
  - **Virologic Failure without INSTI Resistance:** The regimen can be modified to
    - A boosted PI plus two NRTIs (at least one of which is active) **(AIII)**; *or*
    - A boosted PI plus an INSTI **(AIII)**; *or*
    - DTG plus two NRTIs (at least one of which is active) **(AIII)**.
  - **Virologic Failure with Resistance to RAL and EVG but Susceptibility to DTG:** The regimen can be modified to:
    - A boosted PI plus two NRTIs (at least one of which is active) **(AIII)**; *or*
    - Twice-daily DTG plus two NRTIs (at least one of which is active) **(AIII)**; *or*
    - Twice-daily DTG plus a boosted PI **(AIII)**.

There are currently no data on the efficacy of BIC in patients who experience virologic failure while on an EVG- or RAL-based regimen; therefore, this drug cannot be recommended in this setting.

Second-Line Regimen Failure and Beyond

Drug Resistance with Fully Active Antiretroviral Therapy Options

Using a patient's treatment history and drug-resistance data, a clinician can decide whether to include a fully active, boosted PI in future regimens. For example, those who have no documented PI resistance and who have previously never been treated with an unboosted PI likely harbor virus that is fully susceptible to PIs. In this setting, viral suppression should be achievable using a boosted PI combined with either two NRTIs or an INSTI—provided the virus is susceptible to these drugs. If a fully active, boosted PI is not an option, the new regimen should include at least two, and preferably three, fully active agents. Drugs should be selected based on the likelihood that they will be active, as determined by the patient's treatment history, past and present drug-resistance testing, and tropism testing if a CCR5 antagonist is being considered.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Multidrug Resistance without Fully Active Antiretroviral Therapy Options
Use of currently available ARV drugs has resulted in a dramatic decline in the number of patients who have few treatment options because of multiclass drug resistance.[57,58] Despite this progress, there remain patients who have experienced toxicities with and/or developed resistance to all or most currently available drugs. If maximal virologic suppression cannot be achieved, the goals of ART will be to preserve immunologic function, prevent clinical progression, and minimize the development of further resistance that may compromise future regimens.

Consensus on the optimal management of these patients is lacking. If resistance to NNRTIs, T-20, DTG, EVG, or RAL are identified, there is rarely a reason to continue using these drugs, as there is little evidence that keeping them in the regimen helps delay disease progression **(BII)**. Moreover, continuing these drugs (in particular INSTIs) may allow for selection of additional resistance mutations and development of within-class cross resistance that may limit future treatment options. It should be noted that even partial virologic suppression of HIV RNA to >0.5 $\log_{10}$ copies/mL from baseline correlates with clinical benefit.[57,59] Cohort studies provide evidence that continuing therapy, even in the presence of viremia and the absence of CD4 count increases, reduces the risk of disease progression.[60] Other cohort studies suggest that even modest reductions in HIV RNA levels continue to confer immunologic and clinical benefits.[61,62] However, these potential benefits must be balanced with the ongoing risk of accumulating additional resistance mutations. In general, adding a single fully active ARV drug to the regimen **is not recommended** because of the risk of rapid development of resistance **(BII)**.

Patients with ongoing detectable viremia who lack sufficient treatment options to construct a fully suppressive regimen may be candidates for the recently approved CD4 post-attachment inhibitor ibalizumab (IBA).[63] A single-arm, multicenter clinical trial enrolled 40 heavily ART-experienced participants who had multidrug-resistant HIV and who were experiencing virologic failure on an ARV regimen. Subjects received intravenous infusions of IBA every 2 weeks in addition to an optimized background regimen that included at least one additional agent to which the subject's virus was susceptible. At Week 24, 43% of participants achieved HIV RNA <50 copies/mL, and 50% of participants achieved HIV RNA <200 copies/mL.[64] Of the 27 participants who continued on to the 48-week follow-up study, 59% and 63% had HIV RNA <50 copies/mL and <200 copies/mL, respectively. All 15 patients who had HIV RNA <50 copies/mL at Week 24 maintained viral suppression up to Week 48.[65]

Patients who continue to have detectable viremia and who lack sufficient treatment options to construct a fully suppressive regimen may also be candidates for research studies or expanded access programs, or they may qualify for single-patient access to an investigational new drug as specified in Food and Drug Administration regulations. Information about agents that are in late-stage clinical studies (e.g., fostemsavir, PRO-140), can be found in the drug fact sheets available on AIDS*info*'s website.

Antiretroviral Therapy-Experienced Patients with Suspected Drug Resistance Who Present with Limited Information (Incomplete or No Self-Reported History, Medical Records, or Resistance Test Results)
Every effort should be made to obtain the patient's ARV history and prior drug-resistance test results; however, this may not always be possible. One strategy is to restart the most recent ARV regimen and assess drug resistance in 2 to 4 weeks to guide the selection of the next regimen. Another strategy is to start two or three drugs that are predicted to be active based on the patient's treatment history. If no ARV history is available, a clinician may consider using agents with a high barrier to resistance, such as twice-daily DTG and/or boosted DRV, as part of the regimen. Before considering the use of DTG in persons who are pregnant or who are of childbearing potential, please refer to the earlier discussion regarding the use of DTG and the potential risk of NTDs in infants. HIV RNA and resistance testing should be obtained approximately 2 to 4 weeks after re-initiation of therapy, and patients should be closely monitored for virologic responses. Lastly, since there are no safety data on the use of BIC around the time of conception to guide evidence-based recommendations, an approach similar to that outlined for DTG may be implemented before considering the use of BIC-containing ART in those of childbearing potential.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 11. Antiretroviral Options for Patients with Virologic Failure

Designing a new regimen for patients who are experiencing treatment failure should always be guided by ARV history and results from current and past resistance testing. This table summarizes the text above and displays the most common or likely clinical scenarios seen in patients with virologic failure. For more detailed descriptions, please refer to the text above and/or consult an expert in drug resistance to assist in the design of a new regimen. It is also crucial to provide continuous adherence support to all patients before and after regimen changes.

Clinical Scenario	Type of Failing Regimen	Resistance Considerations	New Regimen Options[a,b]	Goal
First Regimen Failure	NNRTI plus two NRTIs	Most likely resistant to NNRTI +/- 3TC or FTC (i.e., NNRTI mutations +/- M184V/I).[c] Additional NRTI mutations may also be present.	Boosted PI plus two NRTIs (at least one active) **(AIII)**; *or* DTG[d] plus two NRTIs (at least one active) **(AI)**; *or* Boosted PI plus INSTI **(AIII)**	Resuppression
	Boosted PI plus two NRTIs	Most likely no resistance, or resistance only to 3TC or FTC (i.e., M184V/I, without resistance to other NRTIs)[c]	Continue same regimen **(AII)**; *or* Another boosted PI plus two NRTIs (at least one active) **(AII)**; *or* INSTI plus two NRTIs (at least one active; if only one of the NRTIs is fully active, or if adherence is a concern, DTG[d] is preferred over other INSTIs) **(AIII)**; *or* Another boosted PI plus INSTI **(BIII)**	Resuppression
	INSTI plus two NRTIs	No INSTI resistance (can have 3TC or FTC resistance, i.e., only M184V/I, usually without resistance to other NRTIs)[c]	Boosted PI plus two NRTIs (at least one active) **(AIII)**; *or* DTG[d] plus two NRTIs (at least one active) **(AIII)**; *or* Boosted PI plus INSTI **(BIII)**	Resuppression
		EVG or RAL +/- 3TC or FTC resistance Resistance to first-line BIC or DTG is rare.	Boosted PI plus two NRTIs (at least one active) **(AIII)**; *or* DTG[d,e] twice daily (if HIV is sensitive to DTG) plus two active NRTIs **(AIII)**; *or* DTG[d,e] twice daily (if HIV is sensitive to DTG) plus a boosted PI **(AIII)** BIC has not been studied in this setting and **cannot be recommended**.	Resuppression
Second Regimen Failure and Beyond	Drug resistance with active treatment options	Use past and current genotypic +/- phenotypic resistance testing and ART history when designing new regimen.	At least two, and preferably three, fully active agents **(AI)** Partially active drugs may be used when no other options are available. Consider using an ARV drug with a different mechanism of action.	Resuppression

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 11. Antiretroviral Options for Patients with Virologic Failure, continued

Clinical Scenario	Type of Failing Regimen	Resistance Considerations	New Regimen Options[a,b]	Goal
Second Regimen Failure and Beyond, continued	Multiple or extensive drug resistance with few treatment options	Use past and current genotypic and phenotypic resistance testing to guide therapy. Consider viral tropism assay when use of MVC is considered. Consult an expert in drug resistance, if needed.	Identify as many active or partially active drugs as possible based on resistance test results. Consider using an ARV drug with a different mechanism of action. Consider enrollment into clinical trials or expanded access programs for investigational agents, if available. Discontinuation of ARV drugs **is not recommended**.	Resuppression, if possible; otherwise, keeping viral load as low as possible and CD4 count as high as possible.
ART-Experienced Patients with Suspected Drug Resistance and Limited or Incomplete ARV and Resistance History	Unknown	Obtain medical records, if possible. Resistance testing may be helpful in identifying drug resistance mutations, even if the patient has been off ART. Keep in mind that resistance mutations may not be detected in the absence of drug pressure.	Consider restarting the old regimen, and obtain viral load and resistance testing 2–4 weeks after reintroduction of therapy. If no ARV history is available, consider initiating a regimen with drugs with high genetic barriers to resistance (e.g., DTG[d,e] and/or boosted DRV).	Resuppression

[a] There are insufficient data to provide a recommendation for the continuation of 3TC or FTC in the presence of M184V/I.

[b] When switching an ARV regimen in a patient with HBV/HIV coinfection, ARV drugs that are active against HBV should be continued as part of the new regimen. Discontinuation of these drugs may lead to the reactivation of HBV, which may result in serious hepatocellular damage.

[c] If other NRTI resistance mutations are present, use resistance test results to guide NRTI usage in the new regimen.

[d] Data from an observational study in Botswana suggest that there is an increased risk of NTDs in infants born to individuals who were receiving DTG at the time of conception; however, the risk of these defects is still low. Please refer to the discussion in the text and in Table 6b before prescribing DTG in persons of childbearing potential.

[e] Response to DTG depends on the type and number of INSTI mutations.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; BIC = bictegravir; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; DRV = darunavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EVG = elvitegravir; FTC = emtricitabine; HBV = hepatitis B virus; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; MVC = maraviroc; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NTD = neural tube defect; PI = protease inhibitor; RAL = raltegravir

Isolated Central Nervous System Virologic Failure and Neurologic Symptoms

Presentation with new-onset central nervous system (CNS) signs and symptoms has been reported as a rare form of "compartmentalized" virologic failure. These patients present with new, usually subacute, neurological symptoms that are associated with breakthrough of HIV infection within the CNS compartment despite plasma HIV RNA suppression.[66-68] Clinical evaluation frequently shows abnormalities on magnetic resonance imaging and abnormal cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) findings with characteristic lymphocytic pleocytosis.[69] Measurement of CSF HIV RNA shows higher concentrations in the CSF than in plasma, and in most (though not all) patients, there is evidence of drug-resistant CSF virus. Drug-resistance testing of HIV in CSF can be used to guide changes in the treatment regimen according to the principles outlined above for plasma HIV RNA resistance **(CIII)**. In these patients, it may also be useful to consider CNS PKs during drug selection to assure adequate concentrations of drugs within the CNS **(CIII)**. If CSF HIV resistance testing is not available, the regimen may be changed based on the patient's treatment history or on predicted drug penetration into the CNS **(CIII)**.[70-73]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

This "neurosymptomatic" CNS viral escape should be distinguished from:

- The incidental detection of asymptomatic and mild CSF HIV RNA elevation, which is similar to plasma blips in that it is usually transient with low levels of CSF HIV RNA;[74,75] *or*
- A transient increase in CSF HIV RNA that is related to other CNS infections that can induce a brief increase in CSF HIV RNA (e.g., herpes zoster).[76]

There does not appear to be an association between these asymptomatic CSF HIV RNA elevations and the relatively common chronic, usually mild, neurocognitive impairment in patients with HIV who show no evidence of CNS viral breakthrough.[77] Unlike the "neurosymptomatic" CNS viral escape, these latter conditions do not currently warrant a change in ART.[78]

Summary

The management of ART-experienced patients with virologic failure often requires expert advice to construct virologically suppressive regimens. Before modifying a regimen, it is critical to carefully evaluate the potential cause(s) of virologic failure, including incomplete adherence, poor tolerability, and drug-drug and drug-food interactions, as well as review HIV RNA and CD4 count changes over time, complete treatment history, and current and previous drug-resistance test results. If HIV RNA suppression is not possible with currently approved agents, consider the use of investigational agents through participation in clinical trials or expanded/single-patient access programs. If virologic suppression is still not achievable, the choice of regimens should focus on minimizing toxicity and preserving treatment options while maintaining CD4 counts to delay clinical progression.

References

1. Kieffer TL, Finucane MM, Nettles RE, et al. Genotypic analysis of HIV-1 drug resistance at the limit of detection: virus production without evolution in treated adults with undetectable HIV loads. *J Infect Dis*. 2004;189(8):1452-1465. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15073683.
2. Nettles RE, Kieffer TL, Kwon P, et al. Intermittent HIV-1 viremia (blips) and drug resistance in patients receiving HAART. *JAMA*. 2005;293(7):817-829. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15713771.
3. Lima V, Harrigan R, Montaner JS. Increased reporting of detectable plasma HIV-1 RNA levels at the critical threshold of 50 copies per milliliter with the Taqman assay in comparison to the Amplicor assay. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009;51(1):3-6. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19247185.
4. Gatanaga H, Tsukada K, Honda H, et al. Detection of HIV type 1 load by the Roche Cobas TaqMan assay in patients with viral loads previously undetectable by the Roche Cobas Amplicor Monitor. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2009;48(2):260-262. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19113986.
5. Willig JH, Nevin CR, Raper JL, et al. Cost ramifications of increased reporting of detectable plasma HIV-1 RNA levels by the Roche COBAS AmpliPrep/COBAS TaqMan HIV-1 version 1.0 viral load test. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2010;54(4):442-444. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20611035.
6. Ribaudo H, Lennox J, Currier J, al e. Virologic failure endpoint definition in clinical trials: Is using HIV-1 RNA threshold <200 copies/mL better than <50 copies/mL? An analysis of ACTG studies. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2009; Montreal, Canada.
7. Antiretroviral Therapy Cohort C. Impact of low-level viremia on clinical and virological outcomes in treated HIV-1-infected patients. *AIDS*. 2015;29(3):373-383. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25686685.
8. Boillat-Blanco N, Darling KE, Schoni-Affolter F, et al. Virological outcome and management of persistent low-level viraemia in HIV-1-infected patients: 11 years of the Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *Antivir Ther*. 2014. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24964403.
9. Eron JJ, Cooper DA, Steigbigel RT, et al. Efficacy and safety of raltegravir for treatment of HIV for 5 years in the BENCHMRK studies: final results of two randomised, placebo-controlled trials. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2013;13(7):587-596.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23664333.

10. Laprise C, de Pokomandy A, Baril JG, Dufresne S, Trottier H. Virologic failure following persistent low-level viremia in a cohort of HIV-positive patients: results from 12 years of observation. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;57(10):1489-1496. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23946221.

11. Taiwo B, Gallien S, Aga S, et al. HIV drug resistance evolution during persistent near-target viral suppression. *Antiviral Therapy* 2010;15:A38.

12. Aleman S, Soderbarg K, Visco-Comandini U, Sitbon G, Sonnerborg A. Drug resistance at low viraemia in HIV-1-infected patients with antiretroviral combination therapy. *AIDS*. 2002;16(7):1039-1044. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11953470.

13. Karlsson AC, Younger SR, Martin JN, et al. Immunologic and virologic evolution during periods of intermittent and persistent low-level viremia. *AIDS*. 2004;18(7):981-989. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15096800.

14. d'Arminio Monforte A, Lepri AC, Rezza G, et al. Insights into the reasons for discontinuation of the first highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART) regimen in a cohort of antiretroviral naive patients. I.CO.N.A. Study Group. Italian Cohort of Antiretroviral-Naive Patients. *AIDS*. 2000;14(5):499-507. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10780712.

15. Mocroft A, Youle M, Moore A, et al. Reasons for modification and discontinuation of antiretrovirals: results from a single treatment centre. *AIDS*. 2001;15(2):185-194. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11216926.

16. Paredes R, Lalama CM, Ribaudo HJ, et al. Pre-existing minority drug-resistant HIV-1 variants, adherence, and risk of antiretroviral treatment failure. *J Infect Dis*. 2010;201(5):662-671. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20102271.

17. Cooper DA, Steigbigel RT, Gatell JM, et al. Subgroup and resistance analyses of raltegravir for resistant HIV-1 infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;359(4):355-365. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18650513.

18. Lazzarin A, Clotet B, Cooper D, et al. Efficacy of enfuvirtide in patients infected with drug-resistant HIV-1 in Europe and Australia. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;348(22):2186-2195. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12773645.

19. Lalezari JP, Henry K, O'Hearn M, et al. Enfuvirtide, an HIV-1 fusion inhibitor, for drug-resistant HIV infection in North and South America. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;348(22):2175-2185. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12637625.

20. Reynes J, Arasteh K, Clotet B, et al. TORO: ninety-six-week virologic and immunologic response and safety evaluation of enfuvirtide with an optimized background of antiretrovirals. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2007;21(8):533-543. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17711378.

21. Clotet B, Bellos N, Molina JM, et al. Efficacy and safety of darunavir-ritonavir at week 48 in treatment-experienced patients with HIV-1 infection in POWER 1 and 2: a pooled subgroup analysis of data from two randomised trials. *Lancet*. 2007;369(9568):1169-1178. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17416261.

22. Steigbigel RT, Cooper DA, Kumar PN, et al. Raltegravir with optimized background therapy for resistant HIV-1 infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;359(4):339-354. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18650512.

23. Katlama C, Haubrich R, Lalezari J, et al. Efficacy and safety of etravirine in treatment-experienced, HIV-1 patients: pooled 48 week analysis of two randomized, controlled trials. *AIDS*. 2009;23(17):2289-2300. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19710593.

24. Gulick RM, Lalezari J, Goodrich J, et al. Maraviroc for previously treated patients with R5 HIV-1 infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;359(14):1429-1441. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18832244.

25. Fatkenheuer G, Nelson M, Lazzarin A, et al. Subgroup analyses of maraviroc in previously treated R5 HIV-1 infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;359(14):1442-1455. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18832245.

26. Cahn P, Pozniak AL, Mingrone H, et al. Dolutegravir versus raltegravir in antiretroviral-experienced, integrase-inhibitor-naive adults with HIV: week 48 results from the randomised, double-blind, non-inferiority SAILING study. *Lancet*. 2013;382(9893):700-708. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23830355.

27. 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(7):472-480.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11172188.

28. Deeks SG, Hoh R, Neilands TB, et al. Interruption of treatment with individual therapeutic drug classes in adults with multidrug-resistant HIV-1 infection. *J Infect Dis*. 2005;192(9):1537-1544. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16206068.

29. Deeks SG, Lu J, Hoh R, et al. Interruption of enfuvirtide in HIV-1 infected adults with incomplete viral suppression on an enfuvirtide-based regimen. *J Infect Dis*. 2007;195(3):387-391. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17205477.

30. Wirden M, Simon A, Schneider L, et al. Raltegravir has no residual antiviral activity in vivo against HIV-1 with resistance-associated mutations to this drug. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2009;64(5):1087-1090. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19717396.

31. Lawrence J, Mayers DL, Hullsiek KH, et al. Structured treatment interruption in patients with multidrug-resistant human immunodeficiency virus. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;349(9):837-846. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12944569.

32. Zash R, Makhema J, Shapiro RL. Neural-Tube Defects with Dolutegravir Treatment from the Time of Conception. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(10):979-981. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30037297.

33. Zash R, Holmes L, Makhema J, et al. Surveillance for neural tube defects following antiretroviral exposure from conception. Presented at: 22nd International AIDS Conference (AIDS 2018); 2018; Amsterdam.

34. Zash R, Holmes L, Diseko M, et al. Neural-tube defects and antiretroviral treatment regimens in Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):827-840. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31329379.

35. Raesima MM, Ogbuabo CM, Thomas V, et al. Dolutegravir use at conception - additional surveillance data from Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):885-887. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31329378.

36. Hicks CB, Cahn P, Cooper DA, et al. Durable efficacy of tipranavir-ritonavir in combination with an optimised background regimen of antiretroviral drugs for treatment-experienced HIV-1-infected patients at 48 weeks in the Randomized Evaluation of Strategic Intervention in multi-drug reSistant patients with Tipranavir (RESIST) studies: an analysis of combined data from two randomised open-label trials. *Lancet*. 2006;368(9534):466-475. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16890833.

37. Molina JM, Lamarca A, Andrade-Villanueva J, et al. Efficacy and safety of once daily elvitegravir versus twice daily raltegravir in treatment-experienced patients with HIV-1 receiving a ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor: randomised, double-blind, phase 3, non-inferiority study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2012;12(1):27-35. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22015077.

38. Reece R, Delong A, Matthew D, Tashima K, Kantor R. Accumulated pre-switch resistance to more recently introduced one-pill-once-a-day antiretroviral regimens impacts HIV-1 virologic outcome. *J Clin Virol*. 2018;105:11-17. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29807234.

39. Cahn P, Andrade-Villanueva J, Arribas JR, et al. Dual therapy with lopinavir and ritonavir plus lamivudine versus triple therapy with lopinavir and ritonavir plus two nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors in antiretroviral-therapy-naive adults with HIV-1 infection: 48 week results of the randomised, open label, non-inferiority GARDEL trial. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2014;14(7):572-580. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24783988.

40. Raffi F, Babiker AG, Richert L, et al. Ritonavir-boosted darunavir combined with raltegravir or tenofovir-emtricitabine in antiretroviral-naive adults infected with HIV-1: 96 week results from the NEAT001/ANRS143 randomised non-inferiority trial. *Lancet*. 2014;384(9958):1942-1951. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25103176.

41. Second-Line Study Group, Boyd MA, Kumarasamy N, et al. Ritonavir-boosted lopinavir plus nucleoside or nucleotide reverse transcriptase inhibitors versus ritonavir-boosted lopinavir plus raltegravir for treatment of HIV-1 infection in adults with virological failure of a standard first-line ART regimen (SECOND-LINE): a randomised, open-label, non-inferiority study. *Lancet*. 2013;381(9883):2091-2099. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23769235.

42. Paton NI, Kityo C, Hoppe A, et al. Assessment of second-line antiretroviral regimens for HIV therapy in Africa. *N Engl J Med*. 2014;371(3):234-247. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25014688.

43. Tivicay package insert [package insert]. ViiV Healthcare. 2016. Available at: https://www.gsksource.com/pharma/content/dam/GlaxoSmithKline/US/en/Prescribing_Information/Tivicay/pdf/TIVICAY-PI-PIL.PDF.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

44. Prezista package insert [package insert]. Janssen Pharmaceuticals. 2017. Available at: https://www.prezista.com/sites/default/files/pdf/us_package_insert.pdf.

45. Hosseinipour MC, van Oosterhout JJ, Weigel R, et al. The public health approach to identify antiretroviral therapy failure: high-level nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor resistance among Malawians failing first-line antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. 2009;23(9):1127-1134. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19417582.

46. Castagna A, Maggiolo F, Penco G, et al. Dolutegravir in antiretroviral-experienced patients with raltegravir- and/or elvitegravir-resistant HIV-1: 24-week results of the phase III VIKING-3 study. *J Infect Dis*. 2014. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24446523.

47. La Rosa AM, Harrison LJ, Taiwo B, et al. Raltegravir in second-line antiretroviral therapy in resource-limited settings (SELECT): a randomised, phase 3, non-inferiority study. *Lancet HIV*. 2016;3(6):e247-258. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27240787.

48. Bunupuradah T, Chetchotisakd P, Ananworanich J, et al. A randomized comparison of second-line lopinavir/ritonavir monotherapy versus tenofovir/lamivudine/lopinavir/ritonavir in patients failing NNRTI regimens: the HIV STAR study. *Antivir Ther*. 2012;17(7):1351-1361. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23075703.

49. Paton NI, Kityo C, Thompson J, et al. Nucleoside reverse-transcriptase inhibitor cross-resistance and outcomes from second-line antiretroviral therapy in the public health approach: an observational analysis within the randomised, open-label, EARNEST trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2017;4(8):e341-e348. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28495562.

50. Aboud M, Kaplan R, Lombaard J, et al. Superior efficacy of dolutegravir (DTG) plus 2 nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) compared with lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/RTV) plus 2 NRTIs in second-line treatment: interim data from the DAWNING study. Presented at: IAS Conference on HIV Science; 2017; Paris, France. Available at: http://www.ias2017.org/Portals/1/Files/IAS2017_LO.compressed.pdf?ver=2017-07-27-211231-197.

51. Lathouwers E, De Meyer S, Dierynck I, et al. Virological characterization of patients failing darunavir/ritonavir or lopinavir/ritonavir treatment in the ARTEMIS study: 96-week analysis. *Antivir Ther*. 2011;16(1):99-108. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21311113.

52. Stebbing J, Nathan B, Jones R, et al. Virological failure and subsequent resistance profiles in individuals exposed to atazanavir. *AIDS*. 2007;21(13):1826-1828. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17690587.

53. Zheng Y, Lambert C, Arendt V, Seguin-Devaux C. Virological and immunological outcomes of elvitegravir-based regimen in a treatment-naive HIV-2-infected patient. *AIDS*. 2014;28(15):2329-2331. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25313590.

54. White KL, Raffi F, Miller MD. Resistance analyses of integrase strand transfer inhibitors within phase 3 clinical trials of treatment-naive patients. *Viruses*. 2014;6(7):2858-2879. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25054884.

55. Sax PE, Pozniak A, Montes ML, et al. Coformulated bictegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide versus dolutegravir with emtricitabine and tenofovir alafenamide, for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection (GS-US-380-1490): a randomised, double-blind, multicentre, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet*. 2017;390(10107):2073-2082. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28867499.

56. Gallant J, Lazzarin A, Mills A, et al. Bictegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide versus dolutegravir, abacavir, and lamivudine for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection (GS-US-380-1489): a double-blind, multicentre, phase 3, randomised controlled non-inferiority trial. *Lancet*. 2017;390(10107):2063-2072. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28867497.

57. De Luca A, Dunn D, Zazzi M, et al. Declining prevalence of HIV-1 drug resistance in antiretroviral treatment-exposed individuals in Western Europe. *J Infect Dis*. 2013;207(8):1216-1220. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23315324.

58. Paquet AC, Solberg OD, Napolitano LA, et al. A decade of HIV-1 drug resistance in the United States: trends and characteristics in a large protease/reverse transcriptase and co-receptor tropism database from 2003 to 2012. *Antivir Ther*. 2014;19(4):435-441. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24518099.

59. Murray JS, Elashoff MR, Iacono-Connors LC, Cvetkovich TA, Struble KA. The use of plasma HIV RNA as a study endpoint in efficacy trials of antiretroviral drugs. *AIDS*. 1999;13(7):797-804. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10357378.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

60. Miller V, Sabin C, Hertogs K, et al. Virological and immunological effects of treatment interruptions in HIV-1 infected patients with treatment failure. *AIDS*. 2000;14(18):2857-2867. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11153667.

61. Ledergerber B, Lundgren JD, Walker AS, 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;364(9428):51-62. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15234856.

62. Raffanti SP, Fusco JS, Sherrill BH, et al. Effect of persistent moderate viremia on disease progression during HIV therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2004;37(1):1147-1154. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15319674.

63. Theratechnologies I, Trogarzo package insert. In:2018.

64. Emu B, Fessel J, Schrader S, et al. Phase 3 Study of Ibalizumab for Multidrug-Resistant HIV-1. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(7):645-654. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30110589.

65. Emu B, Fessel WJ, Schrader S, et al. 48-week safety and efficacy on-treatment analysis of Ibalizumab in patients with multi-drug resistant HIV-1. Presented at: ID Week; 2017; San Diego, CA.

66. Canestri A, Lescure FX, Jaureguiberry S, et al. Discordance between cerebral spinal fluid and plasma HIV replication in patients with neurological symptoms who are receiving suppressive antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2010;50(5):773-778. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20100092.

67. Peluso MJ, Ferretti F, Peterson J, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid HIV escape associated with progressive neurologic dysfunction in patients on antiretroviral therapy with well controlled plasma viral load. *AIDS*. 2012;26(14):1765-1774. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22614889.

68. Ferretti F, Gisslen M, Cinque P, Price RW. Cerebrospinal fluid HIV escape from antiretroviral therapy. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2015;12(2):280-288. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25860317.

69. Kugathasan R, Collier DA, Haddow LJ, et al. Diffuse white matter signal abnormalities on magnetic resonance imaging are associated with human immunodeficiency virus Type 1 viral escape in the central nervous system among patients with neurological symptoms. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017;64(8):1059-1065. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28329096.

70. Letendre S. Central nervous system complications in HIV disease: HIV-associated neurocognitive disorder. *Top Antivir Med*. 2011;19(4):137-142. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22156215.

71. Letendre SL, Mills AM, Tashima KT, et al. ING116070: a study of the pharmacokinetics and antiviral activity of dolutegravir in cerebrospinal fluid in HIV-1-infected, antiretroviral therapy-naive subjects. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;59(7):1032-1037. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24944232.

72. Calcagno A, Di Perri G, Bonora S. Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of antiretrovirals in the central nervous system. *Clin Pharmacokinet*. 2014;53(10):891-906. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25200312.

73. Smurzynski M, Wu K, Letendre S, et al. Effects of central nervous system antiretroviral penetration on cognitive functioning in the ALLRT cohort. *AIDS*. 2011;25(3):357-365. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21124201.

74. Eden A, Fuchs D, Hagberg L, et al. HIV-1 viral escape in cerebrospinal fluid of subjects on suppressive antiretroviral treatment. *J Infect Dis*. 2010;202(12):1819-1825. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21050119.

75. Eden A, Nilsson S, Hagberg L, et al. Asymptomatic cerebrospinal fluid HIV-1 viral blips and viral escape during antiretroviral therapy: a longitudinal study. *J Infect Dis*. 2016;214(12):1822-1825. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27683820.

76. Moling O, Rossi P, Rimenti G, Vedovelli C, Mian P. Varicella-zoster virus meningitis and cerebrospinal fluid HIV RNA. *Scand J Infect Dis*. 2001;33(5):398-399. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11440237.

77. Heaton RK, Franklin DR, Ellis RJ, et al. HIV-associated neurocognitive disorders before and during the era of combination antiretroviral therapy: differences in rates, nature, and predictors. *J Neurovirol*. 2011;17(1):3-16. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21174240.

78. Ellis RJ, Letendre S, Vaida F, et al. Randomized trial of central nervous system-targeted antiretrovirals for HIV-associated neurocognitive disorder. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;58(7):1015-1022. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24352352.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Poor CD4 Cell Recovery and Persistent Inflammation Despite Viral Suppression (Last updated April 8, 2015; last reviewed April 8, 2015)

Panel's Recommendations
• Morbidity and mortality from several AIDS and non-AIDS conditions are increased in individuals with HIV despite antiretroviral therapy (ART)-mediated viral suppression, and are predicted by persistently low CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell counts and/or persistent immune activation. • ART intensification by adding antiretroviral (ARV) drugs to a suppressive ART regimen does not consistently improve CD4 cell recovery or reduce immune activation and is not recommended **(AI)**. • In individuals with viral suppression, switching ARV drug classes does not consistently improve CD4 cell recovery or reduce immune activation and is not recommended **(BIII)**. • No interventions designed to increase CD4 cell counts and/or decrease immune activation are recommended at this time (in particular, interleukin-2 **is not recommended** **[AI]**) because no intervention has been proven to decrease morbidity or mortality during ART-mediated viral suppression. • Monitoring markers of immune activation and inflammation **is not recommended** because no immunologically targeted intervention has proven to improve the health of individuals with abnormally high biomarker levels, and many markers that predict morbidity and mortality fluctuate widely in individuals **(AII)**. • Because there are no proven interventions to improve CD4 cell recovery and/or inflammation, efforts should focus on addressing modifiable risk factors for chronic disease (e.g., encouraging smoking cessation, a healthy diet, and exercise; treating hypertension and hyperlipidemia) **(AII)**.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional* ***Rating of Evidence:*** *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

Despite marked improvements in antiretroviral treatment (ART), morbidity and mortality in individuals with HIV continues to be greater than in the general population, particularly when ART is delayed until advanced disease stages. These morbidities include cardiovascular disease, many non-AIDS cancers, non-AIDS infections, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, osteoporosis, type II diabetes, thromboembolic disease, liver disease, renal disease, neurocognitive dysfunction, and frailty.[1] Although health-related behaviors and toxicities of antiretroviral (ARV) drugs may also contribute to the increased risk of illness and death, poor CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell recovery, persistent immune activation, and inflammation likely also contribute to the risk.

Poor CD4 Cell Recovery

As long as ART-mediated viral suppression is maintained, peripheral blood CD4 cell counts in most individuals with HIV will continue to increase for at least a decade. The rate of CD4 cell recovery is typically most rapid in the first 3 months of suppressive ART, followed by more gradual increases over time.[2-4] If ART-mediated viral suppression is maintained, most individuals will eventually recover CD4 counts in the normal range (>500 cells/mm^3); however, approximately 15% to 20% of individuals who initiate ART at very low CD4 counts (<200 cells/mm^3) may plateau at abnormally low CD4 cell counts.[3-5] Early initiation of ART in individuals with recent HIV diagnoses likely provides the best opportunity for maximal CD4 cell recovery.[6]

Persistently low CD4 cell counts despite ART-mediated viral suppression are associated with increased risk of morbidity and mortality. For example, individuals with HIV who have CD4 counts <200 cells/mm^3 despite at least 3 years of suppressive ART had a 2.6-fold greater risk of mortality than those with higher CD4 cell counts.[7] Lower CD4 cell counts during ART-mediated viral suppression are associated with an increased risk of non-AIDS morbidity and mortality,[8-11] including cardiovascular disease,[12] osteoporosis and

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

fractures,[13] liver disease,[14] and infection-related cancers.[15] The prognostic importance of higher CD4 cell counts likely spans all ranges of CD4 cell counts, though incremental benefits are harder to discern once CD4 counts increase to >500 cells/mm^3.[16]

Individuals with poor CD4 cell recovery should be evaluated for modifiable causes of CD4 cell lymphopenia. Concomitant medications should be reviewed, with a focus on those known to decrease white blood cells or, specifically, CD4 cells (e.g., cancer chemotherapy, interferon, zidovudine,[17] or the combination of tenofovir disoproxil fumarate [TDF] and didanosine [ddI]).[18,19] If possible, these drugs should be substituted for or discontinued. Untreated coinfections (e.g., HCV, HIV-2) and serious medical conditions (e.g., malignancy) should also be considered as possible causes of CD4 lymphopenia, particularly in individuals with consistently declining CD4 cell counts (and percentages) and/or in those with CD4 counts consistently below 100 cells/mm^3. In many cases, no obvious cause for suboptimal immunologic response can be identified.

Despite strong evidence linking low CD4 cell counts and increased morbidity during ART-mediated viral suppression, no adjunctive therapies that increase CD4 cell count beyond levels achievable with ART alone have been proven to decrease morbidity or mortality. Adding ARV drugs to an already suppressive ART regimen does not improve CD4 cell recovery,[20-25] and does not reduce morbidity or mortality. Therefore, ART intensification is not recommended as a strategy to improve CD4 cell recovery **(AI)**. In individuals maintaining viral suppression, switching ARV drug classes in a suppressive regimen also does not consistently improve CD4 cell recovery and is not recommended **(BIII)**.[26] Two large clinical trials, powered to assess impact on clinical endpoints (AIDS and death), evaluated the role of interleukin-2, an immune-based therapy, in improving CD4 cell recovery. Interleukin-2 adjunctive therapy resulted in CD4 cell count increases but with no observable clinical benefit. Therefore, interleukin-2 **is not recommended (AI)**.[27] Other immune-based therapies that increase CD4 cell counts (e.g., growth hormone, interleukin-7) are under investigation. However, none of the therapies have been evaluated in clinical endpoint trials; therefore, whether any of these approaches will offer clinical benefit is unclear. Currently, such immune-based therapies should not be used except in the context of a clinical trial.

Persistent Immune Activation and Inflammation

Although poor CD4 cell recovery likely contributes to morbidity and mortality during ART-mediated viral suppression, there is increasing focus on persistent immune activation and inflammation as potentially independent mediators of risk. HIV infection results in heightened systemic immune activation and inflammation, effects that are evident during acute infection, persist throughout chronic untreated infection, and predict more rapid CD4 cell decline and progression to AIDS and death, independent of plasma HIV RNA levels.[28] Although immune activation declines with suppressive ART, it often persists at abnormal levels in many individuals with HIV maintaining long-term ART-mediated viral suppression—even in those with CD4 cell recovery to normal levels.[29,30] Immune activation and inflammatory markers (e.g., IL-6, D-dimer, hs-CRP) also predict mortality and non-AIDS morbidity during ART-mediated viral suppression, including cardiovascular and thromboembolic events, cancer, neurocognitive dysfunction, and frailty.[28] Although individuals with poor CD4 cell recovery (i.e., counts persistently <350 cells/mm^3) tend to have greater immune activation and inflammation than those with greater recovery,[29] the relationship between innate immune activation and inflammation and morbidity/mortality is largely independent of CD4 cell count.[31,32] Even in individuals with CD4 counts >500 cells/mm^3, there is evidence that immune activation and inflammation contribute to morbidity and mortality.[33] Thus, innate immune activation and inflammation are potentially important targets for future interventions.

Although the drivers of persistent immune activation during ART are not completely understood, HIV persistence, coinfections, and microbial translocation likely play important roles.[28] Interventions to reduce each of these presumed drivers are currently being investigated. Importantly, adding ARV drugs to an already suppressive ART regimen (ART intensification) does not consistently improve immune activation.[20-23,25]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Although some studies have suggested that switching an ART regimen to one with a more favorable lipid profile may improve some markers of immune activation and inflammation,34,35 these studies have limitations and results are not consistent across markers and among studies. Thus, at this time, ART modification cannot be recommended as a strategy to reduce immune activation **(BIII)**. Other commonly used medications with anti-inflammatory properties (e.g., statins, aspirin) are being studied, and preliminary evidence suggests that some may reduce immune activation in treated HIV infection.[36,37] However, because no intervention specifically targeting immune activation or inflammation has been studied in a clinical outcomes trial in treated HIV infection, no interventions to reduce immune activation are recommended at this time.

In the absence of proven interventions, there is currently no clear rationale to monitor levels of immune activation and inflammation in treated HIV infection. Furthermore, many of the inflammatory markers that predict morbidity and mortality fluctuate significantly in individuals with HIV. Thus, clinical monitoring with immune activation or inflammatory markers **is not currently recommended** **(AII)**. The focus of care to reduce chronic non-AIDS morbidity and mortality should be on maintaining ART-mediated viral suppression and addressing strategies to reduce risk factors (e.g., smoking cessation, healthy diet, and exercise) and managing chronic comorbidities such as hypertension, hyperlipidemia, and diabetes **(AII)**.

References

1. Deeks SG. HIV infection, inflammation, immunosenescence, and aging. *Annu Rev Med*. Feb 18 2011;62:141-155. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21090961.
2. Bartlett JA, DeMasi R, Quinn J, Moxham C, Rousseau F. Overview of the effectiveness of triple combination therapy in antiretroviral-naive HIV-1 infected adults. *AIDS*. Jul 27 2001;15(11):1369-1377. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11504958.
3. Kelley CF, Kitchen CM, Hunt PW, et al. Incomplete peripheral CD4+ cell count restoration in HIV-infected patients receiving long-term antiretroviral treatment. *Clin Infect Dis*. Mar 15 2009;48(6):787-794. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19193107.
4. Lok JJ, Bosch RJ, Benson CA, et al. Long-term increase in CD4+ T-cell counts during combination antiretroviral therapy for HIV-1 infection. *AIDS*. Jul 31 2010;24(12):1867-1876. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20467286.
5. Moore RD, Keruly JC. CD4+ cell count 6 years after commencement of highly active antiretroviral therapy in persons with sustained virologic suppression. *Clin Infect Dis*. Feb 1 2007;44(3):441-446. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17205456.
6. Le T, Wright EJ, Smith DM, et al. Enhanced CD4+ T-cell recovery with earlier HIV-1 antiretroviral therapy. *N Engl J Med*. Jan 17 2013;368(3):218-230. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23323898.
7. Engsig FN, Zangerle R, Katsarou O, et al. Long-term mortality in HIV-positive individuals virally suppressed for >3 years with incomplete CD4 recovery. *Clin Infect Dis*. May 2014;58(9):1312-1321. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24457342.
8. Lewden C, Bouteloup V, De Wit S, et al. All-cause mortality in treated HIV-infected adults with CD4 >=500/mm^3 compared with the general population: evidence from a large European observational cohort collaboration{dagger}. *Int J Epidemiol*. Apr 2012;41(2):433-445. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22493325.
9. Baker JV, Peng G, Rapkin J, et al. CD4+ count and risk of non-AIDS diseases following initial treatment for HIV infection. *AIDS*. Apr 23 2008;22(7):841-848. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18427202.
10. Achhra AC, Amin J, Law MG, et al. Immunodeficiency and the risk of serious clinical endpoints in a well studied cohort of treated HIV-infected patients. *AIDS*. Jul 31 2010;24(12):1877-1886. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20588170.
11. Smurzynski M, Wu K, Benson CA, Bosch RJ, Collier AC, Koletar SL. Relationship between CD4+ T-cell counts/HIV-1 RNA plasma viral load and AIDS-defining events among persons followed in the ACTG longitudinal linked randomized trials study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Sep 1 2010;55(1):117-127. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20622677.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

12. Lichtenstein KA, Armon C, Buchacz K, et al. Low CD4+ T cell count is a risk factor for cardiovascular disease events in the HIV outpatient study. *Clin Infect Dis*. Aug 15 2010;51(4):435-447. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20597691.

13. Yong MK, Elliott JH, Woolley IJ, Hoy JF. Low CD4 count is associated with an increased risk of fragility fracture in HIV-infected patients. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Jul 1 2011;57(3):205-210. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21522014.

14. Weber R, Sabin CA, Friis-Moller N, et al. Liver-related deaths in persons infected with the human immunodeficiency virus: the D:A:D study. *Arch Intern Med*. Aug 14-28 2006;166(15):1632-1641. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16908797.

15. Monforte A, Abrams D, Pradier C, et al. HIV-induced immunodeficiency and mortality from AIDS-defining and non-AIDS-defining malignancies. *AIDS*. Oct 18 2008;22(16):2143-2153. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18832878.

16. Young J, Psichogiou M, Meyer L, et al. CD4 cell count and the risk of AIDS or death in HIV-Infected adults on combination antiretroviral therapy with a suppressed viral load: a longitudinal cohort study from COHERE. *PLoS Med*. 2012;9(3):e1001194. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22448150.

17. Huttner AC, Kaufmann GR, Battegay M, Weber R, Opravil M. Treatment initiation with zidovudine-containing potent antiretroviral therapy impairs CD4 cell count recovery but not clinical efficacy. *AIDS*. May 11 2007;21(8):939-946. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17457087.

18. Barrios A, Rendon A, Negredo E, et al. Paradoxical CD4+ T-cell decline in HIV-infected patients with complete virus suppression taking tenofovir and didanosine. *AIDS*. Mar 24 2005;19(6):569-575. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15802975.

19. Negredo E, Bonjoch A, Paredes R, Puig J, Clotet B. Compromised immunologic recovery in treatment-experienced patients with HIV infection receiving both tenofovir disoproxil fumarate and didanosine in the TORO studies. *Clin Infect Dis*. Sep 15 2005;41(6):901-905. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16107993.

20. Gandhi RT, Zheng L, Bosch RJ, et al. The effect of raltegravir intensification on low-level residual viremia in HIV-infected patients on antiretroviral therapy: a randomized controlled trial. *PLoS Med*. 2010;7(8). Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20711481.

21. Hatano H, Strain MC, Scherzer R, et al. Increase in 2-Long Terminal Repeat Circles and Decrease in D-dimer After Raltegravir Intensification in Patients With Treated HIV Infection: A Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Trial. *J Infect Dis*. Nov 2013;208(9):1436-1442. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23975885.

22. Hunt PW, Shulman NS, Hayes TL, et al. The immunologic effects of maraviroc intensification in treated HIV-infected individuals with incomplete CD4+ T-cell recovery: a randomized trial. *Blood*. Jun 6 2013;121(23):4635-4646. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23589670.

23. Dinoso JB, Kim SY, Wiegand AM, et al. Treatment intensification does not reduce residual HIV-1 viremia in patients on highly active antiretroviral therapy. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*. Jun 9 2009;106(23):9403-9408. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19470482.

24. Cuzin L, Trabelsi S, Delobel P, et al. Maraviroc intensification of stable antiviral therapy in HIV-1-infected patients with poor immune restoration: MARIMUNO-ANRS 145 study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Dec 15 2012;61(5):557-564. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22986949.

25. Buzon MJ, Massanella M, Llibre JM, et al. HIV-1 replication and immune dynamics are affected by raltegravir intensification of HAART-suppressed subjects. *Nat Med*. Apr 2010;16(4):460-465. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20228817.

26. Martinez E, Larrousse M, Llibre JM, et al. Substitution of raltegravir for ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitors in HIV-infected patients: the SPIRAL study. *AIDS*. Jul 17 2010;24(11):1697-1707. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20467288.

27. Abrams D, Levy Y, Losso MH, et al. Interleukin-2 therapy in patients with HIV infection. *N Engl J Med*. Oct 15 2009;361(16):1548-1559. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19828532.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

28. Lederman MM, Funderburg NT, Sekaly RP, Klatt NR, Hunt PW. Residual immune dysregulation syndrome in treated HIV infection. *Adv Immunol*. 2013;119:51-83. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23886064.

29. Lederman MM, Calabrese L, Funderburg NT, et al. Immunologic failure despite suppressive antiretroviral therapy is related to activation and turnover of memory CD4 cells. *J Infect Dis*. Oct 15 2011;204(8):1217-1226. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21917895.

30. Hunt PW, Martin JN, Sinclair E, et al. T cell activation is associated with lower CD4+ T cell gains in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients with sustained viral suppression during antiretroviral therapy. *J Infect Dis*. May 15 2003;187(10):1534-1543. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12721933.

31. Hunt PW, Sinclair E, Rodriguez B, et al. Gut Epithelial Barrier Dysfunction and Innate Immune Activation Predict Mortality in Treated HIV Infection. *J Infect Dis*. Apr 21 2014. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24755434.

32. Tenorio AR, Zheng Y, Bosch RJ, et al. Soluble Markers of Inflammation and Coagulation but Not T-Cell Activation Predict Non-AIDS-Defining Morbid Events During Suppressive Antiretroviral Treatment. *J Infect Dis*. May 1 2014. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24795473.

33. Tien PC, Choi AI, Zolopa AR, et al. Inflammation and mortality in HIV-infected adults: analysis of the FRAM study cohort. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Nov 2010;55(3):316-322. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20581689.

34. Martinez E, D'Albuquerque PM, Llibre JM, et al. Changes in cardiovascular biomarkers in HIV-infected patients switching from ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitors to raltegravir. *AIDS*. Nov 28 2012;26(18):2315-2326. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23018438.

35. Lake JE, McComsey GA, Hulgan T, et al. Switch to raltegravir decreases soluble CD14 in virologically suppressed overweight women: the Women, Integrase and Fat Accumulation Trial. *HIV Med*. Aug 2014;15(7):431-441. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24506429.

36. Funderburg NT, Jiang Y, Debanne SM, et al. Rosuvastatin treatment reduces markers of monocyte activation in HIV-infected subjects on antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Infect Dis*. Feb 2014;58(4):588-595. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24253250.

37. O'Brien M, Montenont E, Hu L, et al. Aspirin attenuates platelet activation and immune activation in HIV-infected subjects on antiretroviral therapy: A Pilot Study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Feb 12 2013. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23406976.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Optimizing Antiretroviral Therapy in the Setting of Viral Suppression (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Key Considerations and Panel's Recommendations
• Advances in antiretroviral (ARV) treatment and a better understanding of HIV drug resistance make it possible to consider switching a person with HIV from an effective regimen to an alternative regimen in some situations. • The fundamental principle of regimen optimization is to maintain viral suppression without jeopardizing future treatment options. • Adverse events, drug-drug or drug-food interactions, pill burden, pregnancy, cost, or the desire to simplify a regimen may prompt a regimen switch. • It is critical to review a patient's full ARV history, including virologic responses, past ARV-associated toxicities and intolerances, and cumulative resistance test results, before selecting a new antiretroviral therapy regimen **(AI)**. • Monotherapy with either a boosted protease inhibitor or an integrase strand transfer inhibitor has been associated with unacceptable rates of virologic failure and the development of resistance; therefore, monotherapy as a switch strategy **is not recommended (AI)**. • When switching an ARV regimen in a person with hepatitis B virus (HBV)/HIV coinfection, ARV drugs that are active against HBV infection should be continued **(AII)**. Using 3TC or FTC as the only drug in a regimen with HBV activity **is not recommended (AII)**, as HBV resistance to these drugs can emerge. Discontinuation of HBV drugs may lead to reactivation of HBV, which may result in serious hepatocellular damage. • Consultation with an HIV specialist is recommended when planning a regimen switch for a patient with a history of resistance to one or more drug classes **(AIII)**. • Close monitoring to assess tolerability, viral suppression, adherence, and safety is recommended during the first 3 months after a regimen switch **(AIII)**.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional* ***Rating of Evidence:*** *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

With currently available antiretroviral therapy (ART), most persons with HIV can achieve and maintain HIV viral suppression. Furthermore, advances in antiretroviral (ARV) treatment and a better understanding of drug resistance make it possible to consider switching a person with HIV from one effective regimen to another in some situations (see below). When considering such a switch, clinicians must keep several key principles in mind to maintain viral suppression while addressing the concerns with the current regimen.

Reasons to Consider Regimen Optimization in the Setting of Viral Suppression

- To simplify a regimen by reducing pill burden and/or dosing frequency
- To enhance tolerability and/or decrease short- or long-term toxicity (see Adverse Effects of Antiretroviral Agents and Table 18 for a more in-depth discussion of possible toxicities)
- To prevent or mitigate drug-drug interactions (see Drug-Drug Interactions)
- To eliminate food or fluid requirements
- To allow for optimal use of ART during pregnancy or in cases where pregnancy may occur (see the Perinatal Guidelines)
- To reduce costs (see Cost Considerations and Antiretroviral Therapy)

General Principles of Regimen Optimization

Maintain Viral Suppression

The fundamental principle of regimen optimization is to maintain viral suppression without jeopardizing future treatment options. If a regimen switch results in virologic failure with the emergence of new resistance

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

mutations, the patient may require more complex and/or expensive regimens.

Careful Review of Antiretroviral Treatment and Drug Resistance History Before Optimization

The review of a patient's full ARV history—including virologic responses and past ARV-associated intolerances, toxicities, and adverse reactions—is critical before any treatment switch **(AI)**.

If a patient with pre-ART wild-type HIV achieves and maintains viral suppression after ART initiation, one can safely assume that no new drug resistance mutation emerged while the patient was on the suppressive regimen. In patients with a history of virologic failure or pre-treatment drug resistance, review of cumulative resistance test results and clinical response to prior regimens is essential when designing a new regimen. Cumulative resistance test results refer to all previous and currently available results from standard genotype, proviral DNA genotype, phenotype, and tropism assays that can be used to guide the selection of a new regimen. Once selected, a drug-resistance mutation—even when it is not detected in the patient's most recent drug resistance test—can be archived in the HIV reservoir and is likely to re-emerge under the appropriate selective drug pressure. When resistance data are not available, resistance can often be inferred from a patient's ARV history. For patients with documented failure on a regimen that includes drugs with relatively low barriers to resistance, such as a non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NNRTI), elvitegravir (EVG), raltegravir (RAL), lamivudine (3TC), or emtricitabine (FTC), one should assume that there is resistance to these drugs. If there is uncertainty about prior resistance, it is generally not advisable to switch a suppressive ARV regimen unless the new regimen is likely to be at least as active against potential resistant virus as the current suppressive regimen. This principle is particularly applicable when switching ARV-experienced individuals from a regimen with a relatively high barrier to resistance, such as those that include pharmacologically boosted protease inhibitors (PIs), dolutegravir (DTG), or bictegravir (BIC), to one with a lower barrier to resistance.[1] The Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents recommends that clinicians consult an HIV specialist when contemplating a regimen switch for a patient with a history of resistance to one or more drug classes **(AIII)**.

If regimen switching is considered in patients with suppressed viral loads who do not have prior drug resistance data, proviral DNA genotypic resistance testing can be considered. For patients who have no prior virologic failures and who are on their first or second regimen, or for those who have genotypic test results from prior virologic failures, the use of the proviral DNA genotypic test is unlikely to provide valuable information. In individuals with a history of multiple prior failures or multiple prior ARV regimens, the use of proviral DNA genotypic testing may be useful. However, whenever proviral DNA genotypic testing is used, the results must be interpreted with caution because these assays may not detect all of a patient's drug resistance mutations, especially those that were selected by a previous ART regimen. In addition, these assays may identify mutations that appear to be inconsistent with a patient's response to treatment, making the clinical relevance of the assay results questionable. Overall, the clinical utility of these assays remains an area of active investigation (see Drug-Resistance Testing).

Optimization in a Person with Hepatitis B Virus Coinfection

When switching an ARV regimen in a patient with hepatitis B virus (HBV)/HIV coinfection, tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF) or tenofovir alafenamide (TAF) should be continued as part of the new regimen, unless these drugs are contraindicated. Both TDF and TAF are active against HBV.[2] Discontinuation of these drugs may lead to reactivation of HBV, which may result in serious hepatocellular damage. In persons with HIV/HBV coinfection, using 3TC or FTC as the only drug in a regimen with HBV activity **is not recommended (AII)**, as HBV resistance to these drugs can emerge. If TDF or TAF cannot be used as part of the ARV regimen, refer to Hepatitis B Virus/HIV Coinfection for recommendations.

Assess for Potential Drug Interactions

Before switching a regimen, it is important to review the ARV drugs in the new regimen and concomitant

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

medications to assess whether there are any potential drug-drug interactions. For example, rilpivirine (RPV) may interact with acid-lowering agents, and TAF and BIC may interact with rifamycins (see Drug-Drug Interactions). In addition to new drug interactions, the discontinuation of some ARV drugs may also necessitate adjusting the dosage of concomitant medications. For example, discontinuation of pharmacokinetic (PK) boosters (ritonavir or cobicistat) may reduce the concentrations of some concomitant medications. Concomitant medications which may have previously been managed with dose adjustments will need to be re-evaluated in the context of the new ART regimen.

Assess for Potential for Pregnancy and Use of INSTI in Persons of Childbearing Potential

Persons of childbearing potential should have a pregnancy test before switching ART. If a person with HIV is found to be pregnant, clinicians should refer to the Perinatal Guidelines for recommendations on the safety and efficacy of ARV use in pregnancy.

Before initiating an INSTI-based regimen in a person of childbearing potential, clinicians should review Table 6b for information to consider when choosing an ART regimen. Preliminary data from a study conducted in Botswana suggested that there is an increased risk of neural tube defects (NTDs) (0.9%) in infants born to women who were receiving DTG at the time of conception.[3,4] Follow-up data, however, showed that the prevalence of infant NTDs in association with maternal DTG exposure at conception is lower (0.3%), but still higher than in infants exposed to non-DTG containing ARV regimens (0.1%).[5,6] There are insufficient safety data on the use of BIC around the time of conception and during pregnancy to determine whether it is safe. An approach similar to that outlined for DTG should be considered for BIC-containing ART **(AIII)**.

Monitoring after Switch

Close monitoring to assess tolerability, viral suppression, adherence, and safety is recommended during the first 3 months after a regimen switch (see below).

Specific Regimen Optimization Considerations

As with ART-naive patients, the use of a two-drug (as discussed below) or three-drug combination regimen is generally recommended when switching patients with suppressed viral loads **(AI)**. Patients who have no resistance mutations or history of virologic failure can likely switch to any regimen that has been shown to be highly effective in ART-naive patients. Patients with prior drug resistance can be switched to a new regimen based on their ARV history and resistance testing results. Monotherapy with either a boosted PI or an INSTI has been explored in several trials or cohort studies. Monotherapy has been associated with a higher rate of virologic failure than combination regimens and has been associated with the development of resistance, especially INSTI monotherapy; therefore, **monotherapy as an optimization strategy is not recommended (AI)**.

Optimization Strategies with Good Supporting Evidence for Persons with No History of Drug Resistance

Many clinical trials have enrolled participants with stably suppressed viral loads without underlying drug resistance and switched them to another regimen, typically including at least two fully active drugs. Most of these studies demonstrated maintenance of viral suppression; some of these studies are referenced below. The SWITCHMRK 1 and 2 studies illustrated the importance of considering the possibility of underlying drug resistance before switching therapy in those with virologic suppression.[1] This is particularly important when the new regimen may not include three fully active agents. In the two SWITCHMRK studies, those with viral suppression on two NRTIs plus lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/r) were switched to two NRTIs plus RAL. The studies showed that individuals with a history of previous virologic failure had an increased risk of virologic failure when switching to the RAL-based regimen. A possible explanation for this finding is that,

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

when only one of the accompanying NRTIs is fully active, viral suppression can be maintained by drugs with relatively high barriers to resistance, such as boosted PIs, DTG, and BIC, but not by those with lower barriers to resistance such as EVG, RAL, and NNRTIs. The strategies listed below support these observations and principles of optimizing therapy.

Three-Drug Regimens

Within-Class Switches

Within-class switches may be prompted by adverse events or the availability of ARVs in the same class that offer a better safety profile, reduced dosing frequency, higher barrier to resistance, lower pill burden, or do not require PK boosting. Within-class switches usually maintain viral suppression, provided there is no drug resistance to the new ARV. Some examples of within-class switch strategies that have been studied in individuals without underlying drug resistance include switching from:

- TDF[7,8] or abacavir (ABC)[9] to TAF
- RAL to DTG
- DTG,[10,11] EVG/c,[12] or RAL to BIC
- Efavirenz (EFV) to RPV,[8,13] or to doravirine (DOR)[14]
- Boosted atazanavir (ATV/c or ATV/r) to unboosted ATV (when used with ABC/3TC)[15-17]

Between-Class Switches

Between-class switches generally maintain viral suppression, provided there is no resistance to the other components of the regimen. In general, such switches should be avoided if there is any doubt about the activity of the other agents in the regimen. As noted earlier, prior resistance test results will be very informative in guiding this switch. The following are between-class switches that have been studied:

- Replacing a boosted PI with an INSTI (e.g., DTG,[18] BIC,[19] or EVG[20,21])
- Replacing a boosted PI with RPV[22] or DOR[14]
- Replacing an NNRTI with an INSTI[23,24]
- Replacing a boosted PI with maraviroc (MVC).[25] When switching to MVC, co-receptor usage in patients with virologic suppression can be determined from proviral DNA (see Co-receptor Tropism Assays).[25-27]

Two-Drug Regimens

There is growing evidence that some two-drug regimens are effective in maintaining virologic control in patients who initiated therapy and achieved virologic suppression with three-drug regimens, provided their HIV is susceptible to both ARV drugs in the new regimen. However, since none of the two-drug regimens discussed below has adequate anti-HBV activity, these regimens are not recommended for individuals with HBV coinfection **(AIII)**. Below are examples of successful strategies for switching from three- to two-drug regimens in persons with suppressed HIV.

Dolutegravir plus Rilpivirine

Two Phase 3 trials enrolled 1,024 participants with viral suppression for ≥1 year (defined by no HIV RNA >50 copies/mL in the past 6 months, and no more than one instance of HIV RNA 50–200 copies/mL in the 6–12 months before enrollment) who were on their first or second regimen and had no history of virologic failure and no documented evidence of any major drug-resistance mutations.[28] Participants were randomized to remain on their combination ART regimen or to switch to a regimen of once-daily DTG plus RPV (early-switch arm). Viral suppression was maintained in 95% to 96% of the participants in both arms at 48 weeks. At 52 weeks, those who were randomized to remain on their current regimens were allowed to switch to DTG plus RPV (late-switch arm). At 100 weeks, 89% of participants in the early-switch arm and 93% of those in the late-switch arm maintained HIV RNA <50 copies/mL.[29] DTG plus RPV is available as a

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

coformulated single-tablet regimen. It is a reasonable option when the use of nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) is not desirable. DTG plus RPV should only be given to patients who do not have chronic HBV infection, have no evidence of resistance to either DTG or RPV, and have no significant drug-drug interaction that might reduce the concentration of either drug **(AI)**.

Dolutegravir plus Lamivudine

A switch from three-drug regimens to DTG plus 3TC as maintenance strategy in patients with virologic suppression has been examined in a large randomized clinical trial (TANGO),[30] in two small clinical trials,[31,32] and in observational studies[33,34] with good success. The result of the TANGO trial is discussed below.

The Phase 3 TANGO study enrolled participants who were on their first ARV regimen with HIV RNA <50 copies/mL for ≥6 months. Participants were randomized to switch to open label DTG plus 3TC (n = 369) or to continue their TAF-based triple therapy (n = 372). The participants had no history of virologic failure or evidence of resistance to DTG or 3TC and did not have HBV coinfection. At week 48, switching to DTG plus 3TC was non-inferior to continuing on the current regimen, with 93% of participants in both arms maintaining HIV RNA <50 copies/mL. No unexpected adverse events were identified as related to DTG or 3TC.[30] Switching to a DTG plus 3TC regimen can be a good option for individuals who have no evidence of resistance to either drug and do not have HBV coinfection **(AI)**.

Ritonavir-Boosted Protease Inhibitor plus Lamivudine

A ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor (PI/r) plus 3TC may be a reasonable option when the continued use of TDF, TAF, or ABC is contraindicated or not desirable. There is growing evidence that a PI/r-based regimen plus 3TC can maintain viral suppression in patients who initiated triple-drug therapy, who achieved sustained viral suppression for ≥1 year, and who have no evidence of, or risk for drug resistance to, either the PI/r or 3TC. Examples of boosted PI plus 3TC regimens that have been studied in clinical trials include the following:

- ATV/r plus 3TC **(CI)**,[35,36]
- Darunavir/ritonavir (DRV/r) plus 3TC **(BI)**,[37]
- LPV/r plus 3TC **(CI)**.[38]

Boosted Darunavir plus Dolutegravir

An open-label, Phase 3b, non-inferiority clinical trial randomized 263 participants who were on boosted DRV plus two NRTIs to continue on the same regimen or switch to boosted DRV plus DTG (study recruitment was stopped prematurely due to slow recruitment). At 48 weeks, the study demonstrated that switching to DTG plus boosted DRV was non-inferior to continuing triple therapy. In both arms, approximately 87% of participants maintained viral suppression at HIV RNA <50 copies/mL, and both groups had comparable rates of adverse events.[39] Because of the small sample size of this study, the regimen of boosted DRV plus dolutegravir is only recommended if there are no other alternative options **(CI)**. Similar results were observed in two small observational studies (13 participants and 56 participants).[40,41]

Optimization Strategies for Persons with Viral Suppression and a History of Limited Drug Resistance

There are some data demonstrating the safety and efficacy of within-class switches for individuals with underlying drug resistance who are on a stable ARV regimen with suppressed HIV RNA. However, there are limited data regarding between-class switches in this population, and support for such a switch generally depends on findings extrapolated from other studies, as discussed below.

Within-Class Switch from One High-Resistance Barrier Drug to Another (e.g., from DTG to BIC [BI])

The GS 4030 study enrolled 565 individuals who were stably suppressed on DTG plus two NRTIs. The participants were randomized to either remain on their current regimen or switch to BIC/FTC/TAF. After 48

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

weeks, the groups had similar rates of sustained suppression.[42] The rates of viral suppression were similar for those with a documented history of NRTI resistance (approximately 25% of participants) and those without a history of NRTI resistance.[43]

Between-Class Switch from One High-Resistance Barrier Drug to Another (e.g., from a Boosted PI to a BIC- or DTG-Containing Regimen with At Least One Fully Active NRTI)

The GS 4030 study provides theoretical support for replacing a boosted PI-regimen with a BIC- or DTG-containing regimen, if at least one of the NRTIs in the regimen is fully active.[42,43] Although there are no switch studies testing this strategy, based on the GEMINI studies in treatment-naive patients, a DTG plus 3TC regimen (**when both ARVs are fully active**) is highly effective. In addition, the TANGO study (described above), demonstrated that in the setting of no underlying drug resistance, DTG plus 3TC, as the active NRTI, was a very effective switch strategy. In the DAWNING study,[44] in the setting of virologic failure with underlying NRTI resistance, DTG plus one fully active NRTI was more effective than LPV/r plus one fully active NRTI. Based upon standard optimization principles, if DTG plus two NRTIs, one of which is fully active, was effective in those with virologic failure, it should also be effective in those already virologically suppressed **(BIII)**.

Optimization Strategies for Persons with Viral Suppression and a History of Complex Underlying Resistance

Before optimization of the ARV regimen of a person with viral suppression who has a history of treatment failure and drug resistance, a careful review of the individual's ARV history and cumulative drug resistance profile should be undertaken. Consultation with a clinician with expertise in HIV drug resistance is recommended **(AIII)**.

One randomized controlled trial conducted in this patient population is described below.

Elvitegravir/Cobicistat/Tenofovir Alafenamide/Emtricitabine plus Darunavir

Switching to the combination of EVG/c/TAF/FTC plus DRV has been shown to be a potential optimization strategy in patients on complicated salvage regimens.[45] A randomized controlled trial enrolled 135 patients with virologic suppression who were receiving DRV-containing ART and had resistance to at least two ARV drug classes, but no INSTI resistance. Participants had up to three thymidine analog resistance mutations and/or the K65R mutation, but no history of either the Q151M mutation or T69 insertion. The participants were randomized 2:1 to either switch to a regimen of EVG/c/TAF/FTC plus DRV or remain on their current regimen. At 48 weeks, optimization to EVG/c/TAF/FTC plus DRV was superior to continuation on a current regimen with 94.4% of participants in the switch arm and 76.1% in the continuation arm maintaining viral suppression. With regimen simplification, the pill burden was reduced from an average of five tablets per day to two tablets per day. EVG/c/TAF/FTC plus DRV would be an appropriate option for individuals who have treatment and drug resistance histories similar to those of participants included in this study **(AI)**.

Optimization Strategies Not Recommended

Boosted Protease Inhibitor Monotherapy

The strategy of switching patients with virologic suppression without PI resistance from one ART regimen to PI/r monotherapy has been evaluated in several studies. The rationale for this strategy is to avoid NRTI toxicities and decrease costs while taking advantage of the high barrier to resistance of PIs. PI/r monotherapy maintains virologic suppression in most patients, but at lower rates than regimens that include one or two NRTIs.[46-48] Low-level viremia, generally without the emergence of PI resistance, appears to be more common with monotherapy than with regimens that include one or two NRTIs. In most studies, resuming NRTIs in patients who are experiencing low-level viral rebound has led to re-suppression.[49-52] No clinical trials have evaluated the use of coformulated PI/c regimens as monotherapy or compared different PI/r monotherapy regimens. Based on the results from these studies, boosted-PI monotherapy **is not recommended (AI)**.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Dolutegravir Monotherapy
The strategy of switching patients with virologic suppression to DTG monotherapy has been evaluated in cohort studies and in clinical practice[53,54] and in a randomized controlled trial.[55] This strategy has been associated with an unacceptable rate of virologic failure and subsequent development of INSTI resistance; therefore, a switch to DTG monotherapy **is not recommended (AI)**.

Boosted Atazanavir plus Raltegravir
In a randomized study, patients with virologic suppression switched to a regimen consisting of ATV/r plus RAL or ATV/r plus TDF/FTC. The ATV/r plus RAL regimen switch was associated with higher rates of virologic failure and treatment discontinuation than the switch to ATV/r plus TDF/FTC.[56] A regimen consisting of ATV/r plus RAL **cannot currently be recommended (AI)**.

Maraviroc plus Boosted Protease Inhibitor
In a randomized controlled trial, patients with virologic suppression who were on a regimen of two NRTIs plus a boosted PI and who had only CCR5-tropic HIV (as detected by proviral DNA testing) were randomized to continue their current regimen or to switch to MVC plus two NRTIs or to MVC plus a boosted PI. The boosted PI plus MVC regimen switch was associated with higher rates of virologic failure and treatment discontinuation than the other two regimens. Based on these results, a regimen consisting of a boosted PI and MVC **cannot be recommended (AI)**.[57]

Maraviroc plus Raltegravir
In a nonrandomized pilot study, patients with virologic suppression were switched from their prescribed regimen to MVC plus RAL. This combination led to virologic relapse in five out of 44 patients.[58] Based on these study results, use of MVC plus RAL **is not recommended (AII)**.

Monitoring after Treatment Changes

After a treatment switch, patients should be evaluated closely for 3 months (e.g., a clinic visit or phone call 1 to 2 weeks after the change and a viral load test to check for rebound viremia 4 to 8 weeks after the switch) **(AIII)**. The purpose of this close monitoring is to assess medication tolerance and to conduct targeted laboratory testing if the patient had pre-existing laboratory abnormalities or if there are potential concerns with the new regimen. For example, if lipid abnormality is a reason for the ARV change or is a concern with the new regimen, fasting cholesterol subsets and triglycerides should be assessed within 3 months after the change in therapy. In the absence of any new complaints, laboratory abnormalities, or evidence of viral rebound at this 3-month visit, clinical and laboratory monitoring of the patient may resume on a regularly scheduled basis (see Laboratory Testing for Initial Assessment and Monitoring).

References

1. Eron JJ, Young B, Cooper DA, et al. Switch to a raltegravir-based regimen versus continuation of a lopinavir-ritonavir-based regimen in stable HIV-infected patients with suppressed viraemia (SWITCHMRK 1 and 2): two multicentre, double-blind, randomised controlled trials. *Lancet.* 2010;375(9712):396-407. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20074791.

2. Terrault NA, Lok ASF, McMahon BJ, et al. Update on prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of chronic hepatitis B: AASLD 2018 hepatitis B guidance. *Hepatology.* 2018;67(4):1560-1599. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29405329.

3. Zash R, Holmes L, Makhema J, et al. Surveillance for neural tube defects following antiretroviral exposure from conception. Presented at: 22nd International AIDS Conference. 2018. Amsterdam.

4. Zash R, Makhema J, Shapiro RL. Neural-Tube Defects with Dolutegravir Treatment from the Time of Conception. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(10):979-981. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30037297.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

5. Zash R, Holmes L, Diseko M, et al. Neural-tube defects and antiretroviral treatment regimens in Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):827-840. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31329379.

6. Raesima MM, Ogbuabo CM, Thomas V, et al. Dolutegravir use at conception - additional surveillance data from Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):885-887. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31329378.

7. Gallant JE, Daar ES, Raffi F, et al. Efficacy and safety of tenofovir alafenamide versus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate given as fixed-dose combinations containing emtricitabine as backbones for treatment of HIV-1 infection in virologically suppressed adults: a randomised, double-blind, active-controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2016;3(4):e158-165. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27036991.

8. Hagins D, Orkin C, Daar ES, et al. Switching to coformulated rilpivirine (RPV), emtricitabine (FTC) and tenofovir alafenamide from either RPV, FTC and tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF) or efavirenz, FTC and TDF: 96-week results from two randomized clinical trials. *HIV Med.* 2018. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30101539.

9. Winston A, Post FA, DeJesus E, et al. Tenofovir alafenamide plus emtricitabine versus abacavir plus lamivudine for treatment of virologically suppressed HIV-1-infected adults: a randomised, double-blind, active-controlled, non-inferiority phase 3 trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2018;5(4):e162-e171. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29475804.

10. Molina JM, Ward D, Brar I, et al. Switching to fixed-dose bictegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide from dolutegravir plus abacavir and lamivudine in virologically suppressed adults with HIV-1: 48 week results of a randomised, double-blind, multicentre, active-controlled, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2018;5(7):e357-e365. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29925489.

11. Bictegravir/emtricitabine/tenofovor alafenamine (Biktarvy) [package insert]. Food and Drug administration. 2018. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2019/210251s006lbl.pdf.

12. Kityo C, Hagins D, Koenig E, et al. Switching to fixed-dose bictegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide (B/F/TAF) in virologically suppressed HIV-1 infected women: a randomized, open-label, multicenter, active-controlled, phase 3, noninferiority trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2019;82(3):321-328. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31609930.

13. Mills AM, Cohen C, Dejesus E, et al. Efficacy and safety 48 weeks after switching from efavirenz to rilpivirine using emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate-based single-tablet regimens. *HIV Clin Trials.* 2013;14(5):216-223. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24144898.

14. Johnson M, Kumar P, Molina JM, et al. Switching to doravirine/lamivudine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (DOR/3TC/TDF) maintains HIV-1 virologic suppression through 48 weeks: results of the DRIVE-SHIFT trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2019;81(4):463-472. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30985556.

15. Squires KE, Young B, DeJesus E, et al. ARIES 144 week results: durable virologic suppression in HIV-infected patients simplified to unboosted atazanavir/abacavir/lamivudine. *HIV Clin Trials.* 2012;13(5):233-244. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23134624.

16. Ghosn J, Carosi G, Moreno S, et al. Unboosted atazanavir-based therapy maintains control of HIV type-1 replication as effectively as a ritonavir-boosted regimen. *Antivir Ther.* 2010;15(7):993-1002. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21041914.

17. Wohl DA, Bhatti L, Small CB, et al. The ASSURE study: HIV-1 suppression is maintained with bone and renal biomarker improvement 48 weeks after ritonavir discontinuation and randomized switch to abacavir/lamivudine + atazanavir. *HIV Med.* 2016;17(2):106-117. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26176344.

18. Gatell JM, Assoumou L, Moyle G, et al. Switching from a ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor to a dolutegravir-based regimen for maintenance of HIV viral suppression in patients with high cardiovascular risk. *AIDS.* 2017;31(18):2503-2514. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29112070.

19. Daar ES, DeJesus E, Ruane P, et al. Efficacy and safety of switching to fixed-dose bictegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide from boosted protease inhibitor-based regimens in virologically suppressed adults with HIV-1: 48 week results of a randomised, open-label, multicentre, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2018;5(7):e347-e356. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29925490.

20. Arribas JR, DeJesus E, van Lunzen J, et al. Simplification to single-tablet regimen of elvitegravir, cobicistat, emtricitabine, tenofovir DF from multi-tablet ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor plus coformulated emtricitabine and tenofovir DF regimens: week 96 results of STRATEGY-PI. *HIV Clin Trials.* 2017;18(3):118-125. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

nih.gov/pubmed/28555519.

21. Hodder S, Squires K, Kityo C, et al. Brief Report: Efficacy and safety of switching to coformulated elvitegravir, cobicistat, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide (E/C/F/TAF) in virologically suppressed women. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2018;78(2):209-213. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29481486.

22. Palella FJ Jr, Fisher M, Tebas P, et al. Simplification to rilpivirine/emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate from ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor antiretroviral therapy in a randomized trial of HIV-1 RNA-suppressed participants. *AIDS.* 2014;28(3):335-344. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24670520.

23. Pozniak A, Markowitz M, Mills A, et al. Switching to coformulated elvitegravir, cobicistat, emtricitabine, and tenofovir versus continuation of non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor with emtricitabine and tenofovir in virologically suppressed adults with HIV (STRATEGY-NNRTI): 48 week results of a randomised, open-label, phase 3b non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2014;14(7):590-599. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24908550.

24. Arribas JR, Pialoux G, Gathe J, et al. Simplification to coformulated elvitegravir, cobicistat, emtricitabine, and tenofovir versus continuation of ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor with emtricitabine and tenofovir in adults with virologically suppressed HIV (STRATEGY-PI): 48 week results of a randomised, open-label, phase 3b, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2014;14(7):581-589. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24908551.

25. Pett SL, Amin J, Horban A, et al. Week 96 results of the randomized, multicentre Maraviroc Switch (MARCH) study. *HIV Med.* 2018;19(1):65-71. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28703491.

26. Vitiello P, Brudney D, MacCartney M, et al. Responses to switching to maraviroc-based antiretroviral therapy in treated patients with suppressed plasma HIV-1-RNA load. *Intervirology.* 2012;55(2):172-178. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22286889.

27. Bonjoch A, Pou C, Perez-Alvarez N, et al. Switching the third drug of antiretroviral therapy to maraviroc in aviraemic subjects: a pilot, prospective, randomized clinical trial. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2013;68(6):1382-1387. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23354282.

28. Llibre JM, Hung CC, Brinson C, et al. Efficacy, safety, and tolerability of dolutegravir-rilpivirine for the maintenance of virological suppression in adults with HIV-1: phase 3, randomised, non-inferiority SWORD-1 and SWORD-2 studies. *Lancet.* 2018;391(10123):839-849. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29310899.

29. Aboud M, Orkin C, Podzamczer D, et al. Efficacy and safety of dolutegravir-rilpivirine for maintenance of virological suppression in adults with HIV-1: 100-week data from the randomised, open-label, phase 3 SWORD-1 and SWORD-2 studies. *Lancet HIV.* 2019;6(9):e576-e587. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31307948.

30. van Wyk J, Ajana F, Bisshop F, et al. Switching to DTG+3TC fixed dose combination (FDC) is non-inferior to continuing a TAF-based regimen (TBR) in maintaining virologic suppression through 24 weeks (TANGO Study). Presented at: IAS Conference on HIV Science. 2019. Mexico City, Mexico.

31. Taiwo BO, Marconi VC, Berzins B, et al. Dolutegravir plus lamivudine maintains human immunodeficiency virus-1 suppression through Week 48 in a pilot randomized trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2018;66(11):1794-1797. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29293895.

32. Joly V, Burdet C, Landman R, et al. Dolutegravir and lamivudine maintenance therapy in HIV-1 virologically suppressed patients: results of the ANRS 167 trial (LAMIDOL). *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2019;74(3):739-745. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30476165.

33. Maggiolo F, Gulminetti R, Pagnucco L, et al. Lamivudine/dolutegravir dual therapy in HIV-infected, virologically suppressed patients. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2017;17(1):215. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28302065.

34. Borghetti A, Baldin G, Lombardi F, et al. Efficacy and tolerability of lamivudine plus dolutegravir as a switch strategy in a multicentre cohort of patients with suppressed HIV-1 replication. *HIV Med.* 2018. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29573320.

35. Perez-Molina JA, Rubio R, Rivero A, et al. Dual treatment with atazanavir-ritonavir plus lamivudine versus triple treatment with atazanavir-ritonavir plus two nucleos(t)ides in virologically stable patients with HIV-1 (SALT): 48 week results from a randomised, open-label, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2015;15(7):775-784. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26062881.

36. Fabbiani M, Gagliardini R, Ciccarelli N, et al. Atazanavir/ritonavir with lamivudine as maintenance therapy in virologically

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

suppressed HIV-infected patients: 96 week outcomes of a randomized trial. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2018. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29668978.

37. Pulido F, Ribera E, Lagarde M, et al. Dual therapy with darunavir and ritonavir plus lamivudine versus triple therapy with darunavir and ritonavir plus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate and emtricitabine or abacavir and lamivudine for maintenance of HIV-1 viral suppression: randomised, open label, non-inferiority DUAL-GESIDA 8014-RIS-EST45 trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29020293.

38. Arribas JR, Girard PM, Landman R, et al. Dual treatment with lopinavir-ritonavir plus lamivudine versus triple treatment with lopinavir-ritonavir plus lamivudine or emtricitabine and a second nucleos(t)ide reverse transcriptase inhibitor for maintenance of HIV-1 viral suppression (OLE): a randomised, open-label, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2015;15(7):785-792. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26062880.

39. Spinner C, Kümmerle T, Schneider J, et al. A switch to dolutegravir in combination with boosted darunavir is safe and effective in suppressed patients with HIV—a subanalysis of the dualis study. Presented at: IAS Conference on HIV Science. 2019. Mexico City, Mexico.

40. Capetti AF, Cossu MV, Orofino G, et al. A dual regimen of ritonavir/darunavir plus dolutegravir for rescue or simplification of rescue therapy: 48 weeks' observational data. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2017;17(1):658. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28964268.

41. Wheeler J, Chan S, Harrigan PR, Becker M, Kasper K, Keynan Y. Dolutegravir with boosted darunavir treatment simplification for the transmitted HIV thymidine analog resistance in Manitoba, Canada. *Int J STD AIDS*. 2018;29(5):520-522. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29513131.

42. Sax PE, Rockstroh J, Luetkemeyer A, et al. Switching to a single-tablet regimen bictegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide (B/F/TAF) from dolutegravir (DTG) plus emtricitabine and either tenofovir alafenamide or tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (F/TAF or F/TDF). Presented at: International AIDS Society. 2019. Mexico City, Mexico.

43. Acosta R, Willkom M, Andreatta K, et al. Keeping the pressure on archived NRTI resistance: Switching to bictegravir/emtricitabine/tenofovir alafenamide (B/F/TAF) triple therapy in study 4030. Presented at: International AIDS Society. 2019.F Mexico City, Mexico.

44. Aboud M, Kaplan R, Lombaard J, et al. Dolutegravir versus ritonavir-boosted lopinavir both with dual nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor therapy in adults with HIV-1 infection in whom first-line therapy has failed (DAWNING): an open-label, non-inferiority, phase 3b trial. *Lancet Infect Dis.* 2019;19(3):253-264. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30732940.

45. Huhn GD, Tebas P, Gallant J, et al. A randomized, open-label trial to evaluate switching to elvitegravir/cobicistat/emtricitabine/tenofovir alafenamide plus darunavir in treatment-experienced HIV-1-infected adults. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2017;74(2):193-200. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27753684.

46. Bierman WF, van Agtmael MA, Nijhuis M, Danner SA, Boucher CA. HIV monotherapy with ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitors: a systematic review. *AIDS.* 2009;23(3):279-291. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19114854.

47. Arribas JR, Clumeck N, Nelson M, Hill A, van Delft Y, Moecklinghoff C. The MONET trial: week 144 analysis of the efficacy of darunavir/ritonavir (DRV/r) monotherapy versus DRV/r plus two nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors, for patients with viral load < 50 HIV-1 RNA copies/mL at baseline. *HIV Med.* 2012;13(7):398-405. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22413874.

48. Ciaffi L, Koulla-Shiro S, Sawadogo AB, et al. Boosted protease inhibitor monotherapy versus boosted protease inhibitor plus lamivudine dual therapy as second-line maintenance treatment for HIV-1-infected patients in sub-Saharan Africa (ANRS12 286/MOBIDIP): a multicentre, randomised, parallel, open-label, superiority trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2017. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28566227.

49. Guiguet M, Ghosn J, Duvivier C, et al. Boosted protease inhibitor monotherapy as a maintenance strategy: an observational study. *AIDS.* 2012;26(18):2345-2350. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22695301.

50. Karlstrom O, Josephson F, Sonnerborg A. Early virologic rebound in a pilot trial of ritonavir-boosted atazanavir as maintenance monotherapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2007;44(4):417-422. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17159658.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

51. Katlama C, Valantin MA, Algarte-Genin M, et al. Efficacy of darunavir/ritonavir maintenance monotherapy in patients with HIV-1 viral suppression: a randomized open-label, noninferiority trial, MONOI-ANRS 136. *AIDS.* 2010;24(15):2365-2374. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20802297.

52. Vernazza P, Daneel S, Schiffer V, et al. The role of compartment penetration in PI-monotherapy: the Atazanavir-Ritonavir Monomaintenance (ATARITMO) Trial. *AIDS.* 2007;21(10):1309-1315. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17545707.

53. Blanco JL, Rojas J, Paredes R, et al. Dolutegravir-based maintenance monotherapy versus dual therapy with lamivudine: a planned 24 week analysis of the DOLAM randomized clinical trial. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2018. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29608685.

54. Oldenbuettel C, Wolf E, Ritter A, et al. Dolutegravir monotherapy as treatment de-escalation in HIV-infected adults with virological control: DoluMono cohort results. *Antivir Ther.* 2017;22(2):169-172. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27588613.

55. Wijting I, Rokx C, Boucher C, et al. Dolutegravir as maintenance monotherapy for HIV (DOMONO): a phase 2, randomised non-inferiority trial. *Lancet HIV.* 2017;4(12):e547-e554. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29107562.

56. van Lunzen J, Pozniak A, Gatell JM, et al. Brief report: switch to ritonavir-boosted atazanavir plus raltegravir in virologically suppressed patients with HIV-1 infection: a randomized pilot study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;71(5):538-543. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26605505.

57. Pett SL, Amin J, Horban A, et al. Maraviroc, as a switch option, in HIV-1-infected individuals with stable, well-controlled HIV replication and R5-tropic virus on their first nucleoside/nucleotide reverse transcriptase inhibitor plus ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor regimen: Week 48 results of the randomized, multicenter MARCH Study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;63(1):122-132. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27048747.

58. Katlama C, Assoumou L, Valantin MA, et al. Maraviroc plus raltegravir failed to maintain virological suppression in HIV-infected patients with lipohypertrophy: results from the ROCnRAL ANRS 157 study. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2014;69(6):1648-1652. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24535278.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Discontinuation or Interruption of Antiretroviral Therapy (Last updated April 8, 2015; last reviewed April 8, 2015)

Discontinuation of antiretroviral therapy (ART) may result in viral rebound, immune decompensation, and clinical progression.[1-5] Thus, planned interruptions of ART are not generally recommended. However, unplanned interruption of ART may occur under certain circumstances as discussed below.

Short-Term Therapy Interruptions

Reasons for short-term interruption (days to weeks) of ART vary and may include drug toxicity; intercurrent illnesses that preclude oral intake, such as gastroenteritis or pancreatitis; surgical procedures; or interrupted access to drugs. Stopping ART for a short time (i.e., less than 1 to 2 days) because of a medical/surgical procedure can usually be done by holding all drugs in the regimen. Recommendations for some other scenarios are listed below:

Unanticipated Short-Term Therapy Interruption

When a Patient Experiences a Severe or Life-Threatening Toxicity or Unexpected Inability to Take Oral Medications:

- All components of the drug regimen should be stopped simultaneously, regardless of drug half-life.

Planned Short-Term Therapy Interruption (Up to 2 Weeks)

When All Regimen Components Have Similar Half-Lives and Do Not Require Food for Proper Absorption:

- All drugs may be given with a sip of water, if allowed; otherwise, all drugs should be stopped simultaneously. All discontinued regimen components should be restarted simultaneously.

When All Regimen Components Have Similar Half-Lives and Require Food for Adequate Absorption, and the Patient Cannot Take Anything by Mouth for a Short Time:

- Temporary discontinuation of all drug components is indicated. The regimen should be restarted as soon as the patient can resume oral intake.

When the Antiretroviral Regimen Contains Drugs with Different Half-Lives:

- Stopping all drugs simultaneously may result in functional monotherapy with the drug with the longest half-life (typically a non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor [NNRTI]), which may increase the risk of selection of NNRTI-resistant mutations. Some experts recommend stopping the NNRTI first and the other antiretroviral drugs 2 to 4 weeks later. Alternatively, the NNRTI may be replaced with a ritonavir- or cobicistat-boosted protease inhibitor (PI/r or PI/c) for 4 weeks. The optimal time sequence for staggered discontinuation of regimen components, or replacement of the NNRTI with a PI/r or PI/c, has not been determined.

Planned Long-Term Therapy Interruptions

Planned long-term therapy interruptions are **not recommended** outside of controlled clinical trials **(AI)**. Several research studies are evaluating approaches to a functional (virological control in the absence of therapy) or sterilizing (virus eradication) cure of HIV infection. Currently, the only way to reliably test the effectiveness of these strategies may be to interrupt ART and closely monitor viral rebound over time in the setting of a clinical trial.

If therapy must be discontinued, patients should be aware of and understand the risks of viral rebound, acute retroviral syndrome, increased risk of HIV transmission, decline of CD4 count, HIV disease progression, development of minor HIV-associated manifestations such as oral thrush or serious non-AIDS complications (e.g., renal, cardiac, hepatic, or neurologic complications), development of drug resistance, and the need for

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

chemoprophylaxis against opportunistic infections as a result of CD4 decline. Patients should be counseled about the need for close clinical and laboratory monitoring during therapy interruptions.

References

1. Holkmann Olsen C, Mocroft A, Kirk O, et al. Interruption of combination antiretroviral therapy and risk of clinical disease progression to AIDS or death. *HIV Med*. 2007;8(2):96-104. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17352766.

2. Kousignian I, Abgrall S, Grabar S, et al. Maintaining antiretroviral therapy reduces the risk of AIDS-defining events in patients with uncontrolled viral replication and profound immunodeficiency. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2008;46(2):296-304. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18171266.

3. Danel C, Moh R, Minga A, et al. CD4-guided structured antiretroviral treatment interruption strategy in HIV-infected adults in west Africa (Trivacan ANRS 1269 trial): a randomised trial. *Lancet*. 2006;367(9527):1981-1989. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?db=pubmed&cmd=Retrieve&dopt=AbstractPlus&list_uids=16782488&itool=iconabstr&query_hl=147&itool=pubmed_docsum.

4. DART Trial Team DTT. Fixed duration interruptions are inferior to continuous treatment in African adults starting therapy with CD4 cell counts < 200 cells/microl. *AIDS*. 2008;22(2):237-247. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18097226.

5. El-Sadr WM, Lundgren JD, Neaton JD, et al. CD4+ count-guided interruption of antiretroviral treatment. *N Engl J Med*. 2006;355(22):2283-2296. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17135583.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Considerations for Antiretroviral Use in Special Patient Populations

Acute and Recent (Early) HIV Infection (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Key Considerations and Recommendations

- Antiretroviral therapy (ART) is recommended for all individuals with HIV, including those with early[a] HIV infection **(AI)**. ART should be initiated as soon as possible after HIV diagnosis **(AII)**.
- The goal of ART is to suppress plasma HIV RNA to undetectable levels **(AI)** and to prevent transmission of HIV **(AI)**. Testing for plasma HIV RNA levels, CD4 T lymphocyte cell counts, and toxicity monitoring should be performed as recommended for persons with chronic HIV infection **(AII)**.
- A sample for genotypic testing should be sent before initiation of ART **(AIII)**. ART can be initiated before drug resistance testing and HLA B*5701 test results are available. In this setting, one of the following ART regimens is recommended **(AIII)**:
  - Bictegravir (BIC)/tenofovir alafenamide (TAF)/emtricitabine (FTC)
  - Dolutegravir (DTG) with (TAF or tenofovir disoproxil fumarate [TDF])[b] plus (FTC or lamivudine [3TC])
  - Boosted darunavir (DRV) with (TAF or TDF)[b] plus (FTC or 3TC)
- Pregnancy testing should be performed in individuals of childbearing potential before initiation of ART **(AIII)**.
- Data from an observational study in Botswana suggest there may be an increased risk of neural tube defects in infants born to individuals who were receiving DTG at the time of conception. Before initiating an integrase strand transfer inhibitor-based regimen in a person of childbearing potential, clinicians should review Table 6b for information to consider when choosing an ART regimen.
- As there are no safety data for BIC use around the time of conception, an approach similar to that outlined for DTG should be considered for BIC-containing ART **(AIII)**.
- When the results of drug resistance and HLA-B*5701 testing are available, the treatment regimen can be modified if needed **(AII)**.
- Providers should inform individuals starting ART of the importance of adherence to achieve and maintain viral suppression **(AIII)**.

Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional*

Rating of Evidence: *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

[a] Early infection represents either acute or recent infection.

[b] TAF and TDF are two forms of tenofovir that are approved in the United States. TAF has fewer bone and kidney toxicities than TDF, while TDF is associated with lower lipid levels. Safety, cost, and accessibility are among the factors to consider when choosing between these drugs.

Introduction

Acute HIV infection is the phase of HIV disease that occurs immediately after transmission, which is typically characterized by viremia as detected by the presence of HIV RNA or p24 antigen. Anti-HIV antibodies are not yet detectable early during this phase of HIV infection. Recent HIV infection is generally considered the phase of HIV disease ≤6 months after infection, during which anti-HIV antibodies develop and become detectable. Throughout this section, the term "early HIV infection" is used to refer to either acute or recent HIV infection. Persons with acute HIV infection may experience fever, lymphadenopathy, pharyngitis, skin rash, myalgia, arthralgia, and other symptoms; however, illness is generally nonspecific and can be relatively mild or the person can be asymptomatic.[1-6] Clinicians may fail to recognize acute HIV infection because its manifestations are often similar to those of many other viral infections, such as influenza and infectious mononucleosis. Table 12 provides practitioners with guidance to recognize, diagnose, and manage acute HIV infection.

Diagnosing Acute HIV Infection

Health care providers should consider a diagnosis of acute HIV infection in a person who has a suggestive clinical syndrome—especially those who report recent high-risk behavior (see Table 12).[7] Individuals may not

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

always disclose high-risk behaviors or perceive that such behaviors put them at risk for HIV acquisition. Thus, even in the absence of reported high-risk behaviors, practitioners should have a low threshold for considering a diagnosis of acute HIV infection, especially in high-prevalence areas (areas where ≥1% of people have HIV infection). Health care encounters in an emergency department create an opportunity to screen for acute or established HIV infection, as well as other sexually transmitted infections. Testing of remnant blood specimens from emergency departments identified acute HIV in approximately 1% of patients presenting with flu-like symptoms[8] and in 1% presenting for evaluation of possible mononucleosis with negative heterophile antibody tests.[9] A retrospective analysis of nine emergency departments in six U.S. cities using a laboratory-based, fourth generation antigen-antibody screening algorithm found that a new HIV diagnosis was made in 0.4% of 214,524 adolescents and adults screened. Among those with newly diagnosed HIV, 14.5% had acute HIV infection.[10] Current statistics on the prevalence of HIV in geographical areas in the United States can be found at these websites: AIDSVu and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC)'s AtlasPlus.

Acute HIV infection is usually defined as detectable HIV RNA or p24 antigen in serum or plasma in the setting of a negative or indeterminate HIV antibody test result.[7,11] Combination immunoassays that detect HIV-1 and HIV-2 antibodies and HIV p24 antigen (Ag/Ab assay) are now the preferred initial HIV screening test,[12] primarily due to their enhanced ability to detect acute HIV infection. The recommended laboratory testing algorithm is initiated using an HIV-1/2 Ag/Ab assay for HIV screening. Specimens that are reactive on an initial Ag/Ab assay should be tested with an immunoassay that differentiates HIV-1 from HIV-2 antibodies. Specimens that are reactive on the initial assay and have either negative or indeterminate antibody differentiation test results should be tested for quantitative or qualitative HIV RNA; an undetectable HIV RNA test result indicates that the original Ag/Ab test result was a false positive. Detection of HIV RNA in this setting indicates that acute HIV infection is highly likely.[13] HIV infection should be confirmed by repeat quantitative HIV RNA test or subsequent testing to document HIV antibody seroconversion. Persons receiving antiretroviral therapy (ART) during acute or very early HIV infection may demonstrate weaker reactivity to screening antibody assays or incomplete HIV antibody evolution; remain non-reactive to confirmatory antibody assays; and in the setting of sustained virologic suppression, may have complete or partial seroreversion.[14-18] Persons who acquire HIV while taking PrEP may sometimes also have ambiguous HIV test results. Options for confirming HIV infection and managing such cases is an area of evolving science recently summarized by CDC.[19] Clinicians seeking urgent advice can contact the Clinical Consultation Center's PrEP Service at 1-855-HIV-PREP.

Some health care facilities may still be using HIV testing algorithms that only recommend testing for anti-HIV antibodies. In such settings, when acute HIV infection is suspected in a patient with a negative or indeterminate HIV antibody test result, a quantitative or qualitative HIV RNA test should be performed. A negative or indeterminate HIV antibody test result and a positive HIV RNA test result indicate that acute HIV infection is highly likely. Providers should be aware that a low-positive quantitative HIV RNA level (e.g., <10,000 copies/mL) may represent a false-positive result, because HIV RNA levels in acute infection are generally (but not always) very high (e.g., >100,000 copies/mL).[1,2,4] Therefore, when a low-positive quantitative HIV RNA test result is obtained, the HIV RNA test should be repeated using a different specimen from the same patient, because repeated false-positive HIV RNA tests are unlikely.[2] The diagnosis of HIV infection should be confirmed by subsequent documentation of HIV antibody seroconversion.

Treating Early HIV Infection

As in chronic HIV infection, the goal of ART during early HIV infection is to suppress plasma HIV RNA to undetectable levels **(AI)** and to prevent the transmission of HIV **(AI)**. Importantly, as with chronic infection, persons with early HIV infection must be willing and able to commit to life-long ART. Individuals who do not begin ART immediately should be maintained in care and every effort made to initiate therapy as soon as they are ready.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Clinical trial data regarding the treatment of early HIV infection are limited. However, a number of studies suggest that individuals who are treated during early infection may experience immunologic and virologic benefits.[20-32] In addition, early HIV infection is often associated with high viral loads and increased infectiousness,[33] and the use of ART at this stage of infection to achieve and maintain a viral load <200 copies/mL is expected to substantially reduce the risk of HIV transmission.[34-37]

The START and TEMPRANO trials evaluated the timing of ART initiation (see Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy). Although neither trial collected specific information on participants with early infection, the strength of the overall results from both studies' and the evidence from the other studies described above strongly suggest that, whenever possible, persons with HIV should begin ART upon diagnosis of early infection.

Drug Resistance Testing in the Setting of Early HIV Infection

Prior to the widespread use of integrase strand transfer inhibitors (INSTIs), data from the United States and Europe demonstrated that transmitted virus may be resistant to at least one antiretroviral (ARV) drug in up to 16% of persons with HIV.[38,39] In one study, 21% of isolates from persons with acute HIV infection demonstrated resistance to at least one ARV drug, with transmitted resistance consistently most common to non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs).[40-42] Therefore, before initiating ART in a person with early HIV infection, a specimen should be sent for drug resistance testing, though treatment **should not be delayed** pending resistance test results. The test results should be used to modify the ARV regimen if necessary **(AII)**. The Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents does not currently recommend routine genotype testing for INSTI resistance in treatment-naive persons given the low rate of transmitted INSTI resistance and high barrier to resistance of dolutegravir (DTG) and bictegravir (BIC), unless transmitted INSTI resistance is a concern **(AIII)**. However, with the increasing use of INSTIs in recent years, the rate of transmitted INSTI resistance has increased (from 0.8% to 1.1%, $P = 0.04$), indicating a need for ongoing population monitoring.[43,44]

Considerations for Preventing HIV Transmission During Early HIV Infection

Persons with early HIV usually have a higher viral load than those with chronic HIV, and therefore are at a higher risk of sexual transmission to others. Prompt initiation of ART and subsequent viral load suppression can substantially reduce HIV transmission. Sustained viral suppression to <200 copies/mL can prevent transmission to sexual partners. Individuals starting ART should use another form of prevention with sexual partners (e.g., condoms, PrEP for partners who are HIV negative, or sexual abstinence) for at least the first 6 months of treatment and until they have a documented viral load <200 copies/mL **(AII)**. Many experts would recommend confirming sustained suppression before assuming no risk of sexual transmission of HIV **(AIII)** (see Antiretroviral Therapy to Prevent Sexual Transmission of HIV).

Treatment Regimens for Early HIV Infection

ART should be initiated with one of the combination regimens recommended for persons with chronic HIV infection **(AIII)** (see What to Start). Providers should inform individuals starting ART of the importance of adherence to achieve and maintain viral suppression **(AII)**. If available, the results of ARV drug resistance testing or the resistance pattern of the source person's virus should be used to guide selection of the regimen. All persons of child-bearing potential should have a pregnancy test before initiating ART **(AIII)**.

If ART is to be initiated before the results of drug resistance and HLA-B*5701 testing are available, one of the following regimens are appropriate options **(AIII)**:

- DTG with (emtricitabine [FTC] or lamivudine [3TC]) plus (tenofovir disoproxil fumarate [TDF] or tenofovir alafenamide [TAF])
- BIC/TAF/FTC

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

- Boosted darunavir (DRV) with (FTC or 3TC) plus (TAF or TDF)

DTG is a good treatment option because transmission of DTG-resistant HIV is rare, and DTG has a higher barrier to resistance than raltegravir and elvitegravir. Based on data from *in vitro* studies and clinical trials in ART-naive participants, it is anticipated that BIC, like DTG, also has a high barrier to resistance. However, clinical data and experience defining the BIC barrier to resistance are relatively limited at this time.

Preliminary data from Botswana suggested that there is an increased risk of neural tube defects (NTDs) (0.9%) in infants born to women who were receiving DTG at the time of conception.[45] Follow-up data, however, showed that the prevalence of NTDs in association with DTG exposure at conception is lower (0.3%), but still slightly higher than with non-DTG containing ARV regimens (0.1%).[46,47] Before initiating an INSTI-based regimen in a person of childbearing potential, clinicians should review Table 6b for information to consider when in choosing an ART regimen.

A pharmacologically boosted protease inhibitor (PI)-based regimen (e.g., boosted DRV) is also an option, as resistance to PIs emerges slowly and clinically significant transmitted resistance to PIs is uncommon. Abacavir/3TC is not recommended as part of an empiric treatment of acute HIV infection unless the patient is known to be HLA-B*5701 negative—information that is seldom available when individuals with acute infection present for care. Therefore, TDF/FTC or TAF/FTC is generally recommended as a backbone in this setting. Baseline laboratory testing recommended for individuals with chronic HIV infection should be performed (see Laboratory Testing for Initial Assessment and Monitoring of Patients with HIV Receiving Antiretroviral Therapy). Individuals with HBV/HIV coinfection should remain on TDF/FTC or TAF/FTC as part of their ART regimen.

Given the increasing use of TDF/FTC as pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in individuals who are HIV negative,[48-50] early infection may be diagnosed in some persons while they are taking TDF/FTC for PrEP. In this setting, drug resistance results are particularly important; however, the regimens listed above remain as reasonable treatment options pending resistance testing results.

Treatment Regimens for Early HIV Infection During Pregnancy

All individuals of childbearing potential who receive a diagnosis of early HIV infection should have a pregnancy test **(AIII)**. Because early HIV infection, especially in the setting of high-level viremia, is associated with a high risk of perinatal transmission, all pregnant individuals with HIV should start combination ART as soon as possible to prevent perinatal transmission. Clinicians should refer to the Perinatal Guidelines for information on the safety and efficacy of ARV use in pregnancy.

Follow-Up After ART Initiation

After ART initiation, testing for plasma HIV RNA levels and CD4 T lymphocyte cell counts, and toxicity monitoring should be performed as described in Laboratory Testing for Initial Assessment and Monitoring of Patients with HIV Receiving Antiretroviral Therapy (e.g., HIV RNA testing 2 to 8 weeks after ART initiation, then every 4 to 8 weeks until viral suppression, and thereafter, every 3 to 4 months) **(AII)**.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 12. Identifying, Diagnosing, and Treating Acute and Recent HIV Infection

Suspicion of Acute HIV Infection:

- Health care providers should consider the possibility of acute HIV infection in individuals with the signs, symptoms, or laboratory findings described below, and recent (within 2 to 6 weeks) high risk of exposure to HIV.[a]
  - Signs, symptoms, or laboratory findings of acute HIV infection may include but are not limited to one or more of the following: fever, lymphadenopathy, skin rash, myalgia, arthralgia, headache, diarrhea, oral ulcers, leucopenia, thrombocytopenia, and transaminase elevation.
  - High-risk exposures include sexual contact with a person who has HIV or a person at risk of HIV infection; sharing needles and syringes to inject drugs, as well as equipment used to prepare drugs for injection; or any exposure in which an individual's mucous membranes or any breaks in the skin come in contact with bodily fluid that potentially carries HIV.

Differential Diagnosis:

- The differential diagnosis of acute HIV infection may include but is not limited to viral illnesses such as EBV and non-EBV (e.g., CMV) infectious mononucleosis syndromes, influenza, viral hepatitis, streptococcal infection, or syphilis. Diagnosis of any STI should prompt HIV testing and consideration of acute or early HIV infection.

Testing to Diagnose/Confirm Acute HIV Infection:

- Acute HIV infection is defined as detectable HIV RNA or p24 antigen (the specific antigen used in currently available HIV-1/2 Ag/Ab combination assays) in the setting of a negative or indeterminate HIV antibody test result.
- A reactive HIV antibody test result or Ag/Ab combination test result must be followed by supplemental confirmatory testing.
- A negative or indeterminate HIV antibody test result in a person with a reactive Ag/Ab test result or in whom acute HIV infection is suspected requires plasma HIV RNA testing to diagnose acute HIV infection.
- A positive result on a quantitative or qualitative plasma HIV RNA test in the setting of a negative or indeterminate antibody test result indicates that acute HIV infection is highly likely. In this case, the diagnosis of HIV infection should be later confirmed by subsequent documentation of HIV antibody seroconversion.

ART After Diagnosis of Early HIV Infection:

- ART is recommended for all individuals with HIV, including those with early[a] HIV infection **(AI)**. ART should be initiated as soon as possible after HIV diagnosis **(AII)**.
- Once initiated, the goals of ART are to achieve sustained plasma virologic suppression and to prevent HIV transmission **(AII)**.
- All individuals of childbearing potential who receive a diagnosis of early HIV infection should have a pregnancy test **(AIII)**.
- Pregnant individuals with early HIV infection should begin ART as soon as possible for their own health and to prevent perinatal transmission of HIV **(AI)**.
- A blood sample for genotypic drug resistance testing should be obtained before initiation of ART to guide the selection of the regimen **(AII)**, but ART should be initiated as soon as possible, often before resistance test results are available. If resistance is subsequently identified, treatment should be modified as needed.
- ART can be initiated before the results of drug resistance testing are known. In this setting, one of the following ART regimens is recommended **(AIII)**:
  - DTG with (TAF or TDF)[b] plus (FTC or 3TC)
  - BIC/TAF/FTC
  - Boosted DRV with (TAF or TDF)[b] plus (FTC or 3TC)
- Pregnancy testing should be performed in individuals of childbearing potential before initiation of ART **(AIII)**.
- Preliminary data from Botswana suggested that there is an increased risk of NTDs (0.9%) in infants born to women who were receiving DTG at the time of conception.[45] Follow-up data, however, showed that the prevalence of NTDs in association with DTG exposure at conception is lower (0.3%), but still slightly higher than with non-DTG containing ARV regimens (0.1%).[46,47] Before initiating an INSTI-based regimen in a person of childbearing potential, clinicians should review Table 6b for information to consider when choosing an ART regimen.

[a] In some settings, behaviors that increase the risk of HIV infection may not be recognized or perceived as risky by the health care provider or the patient, or both. Thus, even in the absence of reported high-risk behaviors, symptoms and signs consistent with acute retroviral syndrome should motivate practitioners to consider a diagnosis of acute HIV infection.

[b] TAF and TDF are two forms of TFV that are approved in the United States. TAF has fewer bone and kidney toxicities than TDF, while TDF is associated with lower lipid levels. Safety, cost, and accessibility are among the factors to consider when choosing between these drugs.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; Ag/Ab = antigen/antibody; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; BIC = bictegravir; CMV = cytomegalovirus; DRV = darunavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EBV = Epstein-Barr virus; FTC = emtricitabine; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; NTD = neural tube defect; STI = sexually transmitted infection; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TFV = tenofovir

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

References

1. Daar ES, Little S, Pitt J, et al. Diagnosis of primary HIV-1 infection. Los Angeles County Primary HIV Infection Recruitment Network. *Ann Intern Med*. 2001;134(1):25-29. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11187417.
2. Hecht FM, Busch MP, Rawal B, et al. Use of laboratory tests and clinical symptoms for identification of primary HIV infection. *AIDS*. 2002;16(8):1119-1129. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12004270.
3. McKellar MS, Cope AB, Gay CL, et al. Acute HIV-1 infection in the southeastern United States: a cohort study. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2013;29(1):121-128. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22839749.
4. Robb ML, Eller LA, Kibuuka H, et al. Prospective study of acute HIV-1 infection in adults in east Africa and Thailand. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;374(22):2120-2130. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27192360.
5. Kuruc JD, Cope AB, Sampson LA, et al. Ten years of screening and testing for acute HIV infection in North Carolina. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;71(1):111-119. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26761274.
6. Hoenigl M, Green N, Camacho M, et al. Signs or symptoms of acute HIV infection in a cohort undergoing community-based screening. *Emerg Infect Dis*. 2016;22(3):532-534. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26890854.
7. Branson BM, Handsfield HH, Lampe MA, et al. Revised recommendations for HIV testing of adults, adolescents, and pregnant women in health-care settings. *MMWR Recomm Rep*. 2006;55(RR-14):1-17. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16988643.
8. Pincus JM, Crosby SS, Losina E, King ER, LaBelle C, Freedberg KA. Acute human immunodeficiency virus infection in patients presenting to an urban urgent care center. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2003;37(12):1699-1704. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14689354.
9. Rosenberg ES, Caliendo AM, Walker BD. Acute HIV infection among patients tested for mononucleosis. *N Engl J Med*. 1999;340(12):969. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10094651.
10. White DAE, Giordano TP, Pasalar S, et al. Acute HIV discovered during routine HIV screening with HIV antigen-antibody combination tests in 9 U.S. emergency departments. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2018;72(1):29-40 e22. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29310870.
11. Pilcher CD, Christopoulos KA, Golden M. Public health rationale for rapid nucleic acid or p24 antigen tests for HIV. *J Infect Dis*. 2010;201 Suppl 1:S7-15. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20225950.
12. Branson BM, Owen SM, Wesolowski LG, et al. Laboratory testing for the diagnosis of HIV infection: updated recommendations. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and Association of Public Health Laboratories. 2014. Available at: https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/23447.
13. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Association of Public Health Laboratories. Laboratory testing for the diagnosis of HIV infection: updated recommendations. 2014. Available at: https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/23447.
14. Hare CB, Pappalardo BL, Busch MP, et al. Seroreversion in subjects receiving antiretroviral therapy during acute/early HIV infection. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2006;42(5):700-708. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16447118.
15. Kassutto S, Johnston MN, Rosenberg ES. Incomplete HIV type 1 antibody evolution and seroreversion in acutely infected individuals treated with early antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;40(6):868-873. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15736021.
16. Killian MS, Norris PJ, Rawal BD, et al. The effects of early antiretroviral therapy and its discontinuation on the HIV-specific antibody response. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2006;22(7):640-647. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16831088.
17. de Souza MS, Pinyakorn S, Akapirat S, et al. Initiation of antiretroviral therapy during acute HIV-1 infection leads to a high rate of nonreactive HIV serology. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;63(4):555-561. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27317797.
18. Manak MM, Jagodzinski LL, Shutt A, et al. Decreased seroreactivity in individuals initiating antiretroviral therapy during acute HIV infection. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2019;57(10). Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31217270.
19. Smith DK, Switzer WM, Peters P, et al. A strategy for PrEP clinicians to manage ambiguous HIV test results during follow-up visits. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2018;5(8):ofy180. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30568989.
20. Rosenberg ES, Altfeld M, Poon SH, et al. Immune control of HIV-1 after early treatment of acute infection. *Nature*. 2000;407(6803):523-526. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11029005.
21. Guadalupe M, Reay E, Sankaran S, et al. Severe CD4+ T-cell depletion in gut lymphoid tissue during primary human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection and substantial delay in restoration following highly active antiretroviral therapy. *J*

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Virol. 2003;77(21):11708-11717. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14557656.

22. Mehandru S, Poles MA, Tenner-Racz K, et al. Primary HIV-1 infection is associated with preferential depletion of CD4+ T lymphocytes from effector sites in the gastrointestinal tract. *J Exp Med*. 2004;200(6):761-770. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15365095.
23. Strain MC, Little SJ, Daar ES, et al. Effect of treatment, during primary infection, on establishment and clearance of cellular reservoirs of HIV-1. *J Infect Dis*. 2005;191(9):1410-1418. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15809898.
24. Grijsen ML, Steingrover R, Wit FW, et al. No treatment versus 24 or 60 weeks of antiretroviral treatment during primary HIV infection: the randomized Primo-SHM trial. *PLoS Med*. 2012;9(3):e1001196. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22479156.
25. Hamlyn E, Ewings FM, Porter K, et al. Plasma HIV viral rebound following protocol-indicated cessation of ART commenced in primary and chronic HIV infection. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(8):e43754. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22952756.
26. Hogan CM, Degruttola V, Sun X, et al. The setpoint study (ACTG A5217): effect of immediate versus deferred antiretroviral therapy on virologic set point in recently HIV-1-infected individuals. *J Infect Dis*. 2012;205(1):87-96. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22180621.
27. SPARTAC Trial Investigators, Fidler S, Porter K, et al. Short-course antiretroviral therapy in primary HIV infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;368(3):207-217. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23323897.
28. Schuetz A, Deleage C, Sereti I, et al. Initiation of ART during early acute HIV infection preserves mucosal Th17 function and reverses HIV-related immune activation. *PLoS Pathog*. 2014;10(12):e1004543. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25503054.
29. Ananworanich J, Chomont N, Eller LA, et al. HIV DNA set point is rapidly established in acute HIV infection and dramatically reduced by early ART. *EBioMedicine*. 2016;11:68-72. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27460436.
30. Smith MK, Rutstein SE, Powers KA, et al. The detection and management of early HIV infection: a clinical and public health emergency. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2013;63 Suppl 2:S187-199. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23764635.
31. Le T, Wright EJ, Smith DM, et al. Enhanced CD4+ T-cell recovery with earlier HIV-1 antiretroviral therapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;368(3):218-230. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23323898.
32. Okulicz JF, Le TD, Agan BK, et al. Influence of the timing of antiretroviral therapy on the potential for normalization of immune status in human immunodeficiency virus 1-infected individuals. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2015;175(1):88-99. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25419650.
33. Wawer MJ, Gray RH, Sewankambo NK, et al. Rates of HIV-1 transmission per coital act, by stage of HIV-1 infection, in Rakai, Uganda. *J Infect Dis*. 2005;191(9):1403-1409. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15809897.
34. Cohen MS, Chen YQ, McCauley M, et al. Antiretroviral therapy for the prevention of HIV-1 transmission. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(9):830-839. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27424812.
35. Rodger AJ, Cambiano V, Bruun T, et al. Sexual activity without condoms and risk of HIV transmission in serodifferent couples when the HIV-positive partner is using suppressive antiretroviral therapy. *JAMA*. 2016;316(2):171-181. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27404185.
36. Rodger AJ, Cambiano V, Bruun T, et al. Risk of HIV transmission through condomless sex in serodifferent gay couples with the HIV-positive partner taking suppressive antiretroviral therapy (PARTNER): final results of a multicentre, prospective, observational study. *Lancet*. 2019;393(10189):2428-2438. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31056293.
37. Bavinton BR, Pinto AN, Phanuphak N, et al. Viral suppression and HIV transmission in serodiscordant male couples: an international, prospective, observational, cohort study. *Lancet HIV*. 2018;5(8):e438-e447. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30025681.
38. Kim D, Ziebell R, Saduvala N, al. e. Trend in transmitted HIV-1 ARV drug resistance-associated mutations: 10 HIV surveillance areas, US, 2007-2010. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. 2013. Atlanta, GA.
39. Hofstra LM, Sauvageot N, Albert J, et al. Transmission of HIV drug resistance and the predicted effect on current first-line regimens in Europe. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;62(5):655-663. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26620652.
40. Yanik EL, Napravnik S, Hurt CB, et al. Prevalence of transmitted antiretroviral drug resistance differs between acutely and chronically HIV-infected patients. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2012;61(2):258-262. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

nih.gov/pubmed/22692092.

41. Baxter JD, Dunn D, White E, et al. Global HIV-1 transmitted drug resistance in the INSIGHT Strategic Timing of AntiRetroviral Treatment (START) trial. *HIV Med*. 2015;16 Suppl 1:77-87. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25711326.
42. Levintow SN, Okeke NL, Hue S, et al. Prevalence and transmission dynamics of HIV-1 transmitted drug resistance in a southeastern cohort. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2018;5(8):ofy178. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30151407.
43. McClung RP, Banez Ocfemia MC, Saduvala N, et al. Integrase and other transmitted HIV drug resistance: 23 US jurisdictions, 2013-2016. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. 2019. Seattle, WA.
44. Wang Z, Collura RV, Rosenthal M, et al. Integrase genotypic testing and drug resistance among new HIV dianoses in New York. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. 2019. Seattle, WA.
45. Zash R, Makhema J, Shapiro RL. Neural-tube defects with dolutegravir treatment from the time of conception. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(10):979-981. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30037297.
46. Zash R, Holmes L, Diseko M, et al. Neural-tube defects and antiretroviral treatment regimens in botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):827-840. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31329379.
47. Raesima MM, Ogbuabo CM, Thomas V, et al. Dolutegravir use at conception—additional surveillance data from Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):885-887. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31329378.
48. Grant RM, Lama JR, Anderson PL, et al. Preexposure chemoprophylaxis for HIV prevention in men who have sex with men. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;363(27):2587-2599. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21091279.
49. Baeten JM, Donnell D, Ndase P, et al. Antiretroviral prophylaxis for HIV prevention in heterosexual men and women. *N Engl J Med*. 2012;367(5):399-410. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22784037.
50. Thigpen MC, Kebaabetswe PM, Paxton LA, et al. Antiretroviral preexposure prophylaxis for heterosexual HIV transmission in Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2012;367(5):423-434. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22784038.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Adolescents and Young Adults with HIV (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Key Considerations and Recommendations
• Adolescents living with HIV largely belong to two distinct groups—those who acquired HIV in infancy and are heavily antiretroviral therapy (ART)-experienced, and those who acquired HIV more recently during their teens. • ART is recommended for all individuals with HIV **(AI)** to reduce morbidity and mortality and to prevent HIV transmission. Therefore, ART is also recommended for ART-naive adolescents. • Before initiation of therapy, adolescents' readiness and ability to adhere to therapy within their psychosocial context need to be carefully considered as part of therapeutic decision making **(AIII)**. • Once ART is initiated, appropriate support is essential to reduce potential barriers to adherence and maximize the likelihood of achieving sustained viral suppression **(AII)**. • Data from an observational study in Botswana suggest that there may be an increased risk of neural tube defects in infants born to individuals who were receiving dolutegravir at the time of conception. Before initiating an integrase strand transfer inhibitor-based regimen in an adolescent of childbearing potential, clinicians should review Table 6b for information to consider when choosing an ART regimen. • The adolescent sexual maturity rating (SMR) can help guide regimen selection when initiating or changing an ART regimen as recommended by either the Adult and Adolescent Antiretroviral Guidelines or the Pediatric Antiretroviral Guidelines. The Adult and Adolescent Aniretroviral Guidelines are more appropriate for postpubertal adolescents (i.e., those with SMRs of 4 or 5) **(AIII)**. • Pediatric and adolescent care providers should prepare adolescents for the transition into adult care settings. Adult providers should be sensitive to the challenges associated with such transitions, consulting and collaborating with adolescent HIV care providers to ensure adolescents' successful transition and continued engagement in care **(AIII)**.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional* ***Rating of Evidence:*** *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

Older children and adolescents now make up the largest percentage of children with HIV who receive care at pediatric HIV clinics in the United States. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that 26% of the approximately 50,000 people with newly diagnosed HIV in 2010 were youth 13 to 24 years of age. In this age group, 57% of the infections were among young black/African Americans and 75% were among young men who have sex with men (MSM).[1] Among youth living with HIV in 2010, CDC estimates that almost 60% had undiagnosed infections and were unaware they had HIV.[1] Trends in HIV/AIDS prevalence indicate that the disproportionate burden of HIV among racial minorities is even greater among minority youth aged 13 to 24 years than among those older than 24 years.[2] Furthermore, trends for all HIV diagnoses among adolescents and young adults decreased or remained stable for all transmission categories except among young MSM in 46 states and five U.S.-dependent areas from 2007 to 2010. Adolescents with HIV represent a heterogeneous group in terms of socio-demographics, mode of HIV acquisition, sexual and substance abuse history, clinical and immunologic status, psychosocial development, and readiness to adhere to medications. Many of these factors may influence decisions concerning when to start antiretroviral therapy (ART) and what antiretroviral (ARV) medications to use.

Most adolescents who acquire HIV do so through sex. Many of them have recently acquired HIV and are unaware of their HIV status. Many are in an early stage of HIV infection, which makes them ideal candidates for early interventions, such as prevention counseling, linkage to and engagement in care, and initiation of ART.[3] High-grade viremia was reported in a cohort of youth living with HIV who were identified by adolescent HIV specialty clinics in 15 major metropolitan U.S. cities. The mean HIV viral load for the cohort was 94,398 copies/mL; 30% of the youth were not successfully linked to care.[4] In a study of youths with

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

recent HIV infection, as determined by the detuned antibody testing assay strategy, which defined recent infection as occurring within 180 days of testing, primary genotypic resistance mutations were reported in 18% of the youths.[5] In an ARV treatment trial, a cohort of ART-naive youth who had behaviorally acquired HIV showed substantial multiclass resistance.[6] As these youth were naive to all ARV drugs, these results reflect transmission of resistant virus. This transmission dynamic indicates that a substantial proportion of the study participants' sexual partners were likely to be older and ART-experienced; thus, it is imperative that clinicians use baseline resistance testing to guide initial therapy in youth who have recently acquired HIV and who are naive to ART.

A limited but increasing number of adolescents with HIV are long-term survivors of HIV that was acquired perinatally or in infancy through blood products. These adolescents are usually heavily ART-experienced and may have a unique clinical course that differs from that of adolescents who acquire HIV later in life.[7] Adolescents who acquired HIV perinatally or in infancy often initiated ART early in life with mono- or dual-therapy regimens, resulting in incomplete viral suppression and emergence of viral resistance. If these heavily ART-experienced adolescents harbor resistant virus, optimal ARV regimens should be selected using the same guiding principles used for heavily ART-experienced adults (see Virologic Failure).

Developmentally, adolescents are at a difficult crossroad. Their needs for autonomy and independence and their evolving decisional capacity compete with their concrete thinking processes, risk-taking behaviors, preoccupation with self-image, and need to fit in with their peers. This makes it challenging to sustain adolescents' focus on maintaining their health, particularly for those with chronic illnesses. These challenges are not specific to any particular transmission mode or stage of disease. Thus, irrespective of disease duration or mode of HIV transmission, every effort must be made to engage and retain adolescents in care so they can improve and maintain their health for the long term.

Given the challenges of retaining youth in care and achieving long-term viral suppression,[8] more intensive case management approaches may be considered for adolescents with HIV.[9,10] Adolescents may seek care in several settings, including pediatric-focused HIV clinics, adolescent/young adult clinics, and adult-focused clinics.[11] When available, youth services may help enhance HIV care engagement and retention among adolescents.[12] Regardless of the setting, expertise in caring for adolescents is critical to creating a supportive environment for engaging youth in care.[11]

Antiretroviral Therapy Considerations in Adolescents

The START and TEMPRANO trials are discussed elsewhere in these guidelines (see Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy).[13,14] The results of these trials supported the initiation of ART in all individuals who are able and willing to commit to treatment, and who can understand the benefits and risks of therapy and the importance of excellent adherence.[13,14] Neither of these trials included adolescents; however, the recommendations that were developed using the data from these trials apply to adolescent patients as well as adult patients. Adolescents are expected to derive benefits from early ART initiation that are similar to those observed in adults. Given the psychosocial turmoil that may occur frequently in the lives of American youth with HIV, their ability to adhere to therapy needs to be carefully considered as part of therapeutic decision making. Once ART is initiated, appropriate support is essential to reduce potential barriers to adherence and maximize the likelihood of achieving sustained viral suppression.

The adolescent sexual maturity rating (SMR; also known as the Tanner stage) can be helpful when ART initiation is being considered for this population (see this SMR table from the World Health Organization). Adult guidelines for ART initiation (see What to Start) or regimen changes are usually appropriate for postpubertal adolescents (SMR 4 or 5) because the clinical course of HIV infection in postpubertal adolescents who acquired HIV sexually or through injection drug use during adolescence is more similar to that in adults than that in children. Adult guidelines can also be useful for postpubertal youth who acquired HIV perinatally and whose long-term HIV infection has not affected their sexual maturity (SMR 4 or 5).

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Pediatric guidelines for ART may be more appropriate for adolescents who acquired HIV during their teen years (e.g., through sex) but who are sexually immature (SMR 3 or less), and for adolescents who acquired HIV perinatally with stunted sexual maturation (i.e., delayed puberty) from long-standing HIV infection or other comorbidities (SMR 3 or less; see What to Start in the Pediatric Antiretroviral Guidelines).

Postpubertal youth who acquired HIV perinatally often have treatment challenges associated with the long-term use of ART that mirror those of ART-experienced adults, such as extensive resistance, complex regimens, and adverse drug effects (see Virologic Failure, Optimizing Antiretroviral Therapy in the Setting of Virologic Suppression, and Adverse Effects of Antiretroviral Agents). Postpubertal adolescents who acquired HIV perinatally may also have comorbid cognitive impairments that compound adherence challenges that are common among youth.[15]

Dose of ARV drugs should be prescribed according to the patient's SMR and not solely based on age. Adolescents in early puberty (SMR 3 or less) should be administered doses on pediatric schedules, whereas those in late puberty (SMR 4 or 5) should follow adult dosing schedules. However, SMR and age are not necessarily directly predictive of drug pharmacokinetics (PKs). Because puberty may be delayed in children with perinatally acquired HIV,[16] continued use of pediatric doses in puberty-delayed adolescents can result in medication doses that are higher than the usual adult doses. Data are lacking on the optimal doses for each ARV drug for this group of children; therefore, issues such as toxicity, pill or liquid volume burden, adherence, and virologic and immunologic parameters should be considered when determining when to transition youth from pediatric to adult doses. Youth who are in their growth spurt period (i.e., SMR 3 in females and SMR 4 in males) and who are following adult or pediatric dosing guidelines and adolescents who have transitioned from pediatric to adult doses should be closely monitored for medication efficacy and toxicity. Therapeutic drug monitoring can be considered in these circumstances to help guide therapy decisions. PK studies of drugs in youth are needed to better define appropriate dosing. For a more detailed discussion, see the Pediatric Antiretroviral Guidelines.

Preliminary data from a study in Botswana reported an increased prevalence of neural tube defects (NTDs) among infants born to women who were receiving dolutegravir (DTG) at the time of conception; the prevalence of NTDs in these infants was found to be 0.9%.[17,18] Follow-up data showed that the prevalence of NTDs in infants who had been exposed to DTG at conception was lower than originally reported (0.3%), but still higher than the prevalence in infants who were exposed to ARV regimens that did not contain DTG (0.1%).[19,20] There are insufficient safety data on the use of bictegravir (BIC) at the time of conception and during pregnancy to determine whether it is safe to use. An approach similar to that outlined for DTG should be considered for BIC-containing ART **(AIII)**. Before initiating an integrase strand transfer inhibitor-based regimen in an adolescent of childbearing potential, clinicians should review the information in Table 6b.

Clinicians should refer to the Perinatal Guidelines for information on the safety and efficacy of ARV use in pregnancy.

Adherence Concerns in Adolescents

Adolescents with HIV are especially vulnerable to specific adherence problems because of their psychosocial and cognitive developmental trajectory. To meet the medical and psychosocial needs of adolescents with HIV, who frequently lack both health insurance and experience with health care systems, comprehensive systems of care are required. Studies of adolescents who acquired HIV during their teen years and adolescents with perinatal acquisition demonstrate that many adolescents in both groups face numerous barriers to adherence.[21-23] Compared with adults, these youth have lower rates of viral suppression and higher rates of virologic rebound and loss to follow up.[24] Reasons that adolescents with HIV often have difficulty adhering to medical regimens include the following:

- Denial and fear of their HIV diagnosis;

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

- Misinformation;
- Distrust of the medical establishment;
- Fear of ART and lack of confidence in the effectiveness of medications;
- Low self-esteem;
- Unstructured and chaotic lifestyles;
- Mood disorders and other mental illness;
- Lack of familial and social support;
- Lack of or inconsistent access to care or health insurance; *and*
- Risk of inadvertent disclosure of their HIV status if parental health insurance is used.

Clinicians selecting treatment regimens for adolescents must balance the goal of prescribing a maximally potent ART regimen with a realistic assessment of existing and potential support systems to facilitate adherence. Adolescents benefit from reminder systems (e.g., apps, timers, and pill boxes) that are stylish and/or inconspicuous.[25] In a randomized controlled study among nonadherent youth aged 15 years to 24 years, youth who received medication reminders through their cell phones demonstrated significantly better adherence and lower viral loads than youth who did not receive the reminder calls.[26] It is important to make medication adherence user-friendly and to avoid HIV-related stigma as much as possible for the older child or adolescent. Adolescents may not understand the importance of taking medications when they are asymptomatic, particularly when the medications have side effects. Adherence to complex regimens is particularly challenging at a time of life when adolescents do not want to be different from their peers.[27-29] Directly observed therapy may be considered for some adolescents with HIV, such as those with mental illness.[30-34]

Difficult Adherence Problems

Predicting long-term adherence in an adolescent can be very challenging because adolescence is characterized by rapid changes in physical maturation, cognitive processes, and life style. A young person's ability to adhere to therapy needs to be considered as part of therapeutic decision-making. Erratic adherence may result in the development of resistance mutations, which can limit future regimen options. Clinicians who care for adolescents with HIV frequently manage youth who pose significant concerns regarding their ability to adhere to therapy. In these cases, the following strategies can be considered:

- A short-term deferral of ART until adherence is more likely or while adherence-related problems are aggressively addressed;
- An adherence testing period in which a placebo (e.g., vitamin pill) is administered; *and*
- The avoidance of any regimens with low resistance barriers.

Such decisions should ideally be individualized to reflect each patient's clinical status. For a more detailed discussion on specific therapy and adherence issues for adolescents with HIV, see Adherence to the Continuum of Care and the Pediatric Antiretroviral Guidelines.

Other Considerations in Adolescents

All adolescents should be screened for sexually transmitted infections (STIs), especially human papilloma virus (HPV). In young MSM, screening for STIs may require sampling from several body sites because oropharyngeal, rectal, and urethral infections may be present in this population.[35] For a more detailed discussion on STIs, see the most recent CDC guidelines,[36] the Adult and Adolescent Opportunistic Infection Guidelines, and the Pediatric Opportunistic Infection Guidelines on HPV among adolescents with HIV.

Family planning counseling, including a discussion of the risks of perinatal HIV transmission and methods to reduce those risks, should be provided to all youth. Providing gynecologic care for female adolescents with

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

HIV is especially important. Choice of ART may also be affected by a patient's potential for pregnancy and choice of contraception, since some ARV drugs can interact with hormonal contraceptives (see Drug-Drug Interactions).

Finally, transgender youth with HIV represent an important population that requires additional psychosocial and health care considerations. For a more detailed discussion, see Adolescent Trials Network Transgender Youth Resources.

Transitioning Care

HIV is a lifelong infection that requires treatment through several stages of growth and development; therefore, HIV care programs and providers need to be flexibile in order to appropriately transition care for children, adolescents, and young adults with HIV. A successful transition requires an awareness of the fundamental differences between many adolescent and adult HIV care models.

In most adolescent HIV clinics, care is more teen-centered and multidisciplinary, with primary care highly integrated into HIV care. Teen services, such as sexual and reproductive health, substance abuse treatment, mental health, treatment education, and adherence counseling are all found in one clinic setting. In contrast, some adult HIV clinics may rely more on referring the patient to separate subspecialty care settings, such as gynecology. Transitioning the care of an emerging young adult includes considering areas such as access to medical insurance; the adolescent's degree of independence/autonomy and decisional capacity; patient confidentiality; and informed consent. Also, adult clinic settings tend to be larger and can easily intimidate younger, less-motivated patients.

As an additional complication to this transition, adolescents with HIV belong to two epidemiologically distinct subgroups with unique biomedical and psychosocial needs:

- Adolescents who acquired HIV perinatally. These adolescents are likely to have longer histories of disease burden, complications, and chronicity; less functional autonomy; a greater need for ART; and higher mortality risks.
- Youth who more recently acquired HIV during their adolescence. These adolescents are likely to be in earlier stages of HIV infection and have higher CD4 T lymphocyte cell counts; they are also less likely to have drug resistance mutations and may benefit from simpler treatment regimens.

Interventions to facilitate transition should be implemented early to ensure a successful transition.[37] These interventions include the following:

- Developing an individualized transition plan to address comprehensive care needs, including medical, psychosocial, and financial aspects of transitioning;
- Optimizing provider communication between adolescent clinics and adult clinics;
- Identifying adult care providers who are willing to care for adolescents and young adults;
- Addressing patient and family resistance to transition of care caused by lack of information, concerns about stigma or risk of disclosure, and differences in practice styles;
- Helping youth develop life skills, including counseling them on the appropriate use of a primary care provider and how to manage appointments; the importance of prompt symptom recognition and reporting; and the importance of self-efficacy in managing medications, insurance, and assistance benefits;
- Identifying an optimal clinic model based on specific needs (i.e., simultaneous transition of mental health and/or case management versus a gradual phase-in);
- Implementing ongoing evaluation to measure the success of a selected clinic model;
- Engaging adult and adolescent care providers in regular multidisciplinary case conferences;
- Implementing interventions that may improve outcomes, such as support groups and mental health

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

consultation;

- Incorporating a family planning component into clinical care; *and*
- Educating HIV care teams and staff about transitioning.

Discussions regarding transition should begin early, before the actual transition process.[38] Attention to the key interventions noted above will likely improve adherence to appointments and allow the youth to be retained in care.

References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Vital signs: HIV infection, testing, and risk behaviors among youths - United States. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2012;61(47):971-976. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23190571.

2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. HIV surveillance in adolescents and young adults. 2011. Available at: http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/statistics_surveillance_Adolescents.pdf.

3. Philbin MM, Tanner AE, Duval A, Ellen J, Kapogiannis B, Fortenberry JD. Linking HIV-positive adolescents to care in 15 different clinics across the United States: Creating solutions to address structural barriers for linkage to care. *AIDS Care.* 2014;26(1):12-19. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23777542.

4. Ellen JM, Kapogiannis B, Fortenberry JD, et al. HIV viral load levels and CD4+ cell counts of youth in 14 cities. *AIDS*. 2014;28(8):1213-1219. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25028912.

5. Viani RM, Peralta L, Aldrovandi G, et al. Prevalence of primary HIV-1 drug resistance among recently infected adolescents: a multicenter adolescent medicine trials network for HIV/AIDS interventions study. *J Infect Dis*. 2006;194(11):1505-1509. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17083034.

6. Agwu AL, Bethel J, Hightow-Weidman LB, et al. Substantial multiclass transmitted drug resistance and drug-relevant polymorphisms among treatment-naive behaviorally HIV-infected youth. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2012;26(4):193-196. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22563607.

7. Van Dyke RB, Patel K, Siberry GK, et al. Antiretroviral treatment of US children with perinatally acquired HIV infection: temporal changes in therapy between 1991 and 2009 and predictors of immunologic and virologic outcomes. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2011;57(2):165-173. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21407086.

8. Zanoni BC, Mayer KH. The adolescent and young adult HIV cascade of care in the United States: exaggerated health disparities. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2014;28(3):128-135. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24601734.

9. Hightow-Weidman LB, Smith JC, Valera E, Matthews DD, Lyons P. Keeping them in "STYLE": finding, linking, and retaining young HIV-positive black and Latino men who have sex with men in care. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2011;25(1):37-45. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21162690.

10. Sitapati AM, Limneos J, Bonet-Vazquez M, Mar-Tang M, Qin H, Mathews WC. Retention: building a patient-centered medical home in HIV primary care through PUFF (Patients Unable to Follow-up Found). *J Health Care Poor Underserved*. 2012;23(3 Suppl):81-95. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22864489.

11. Tanner AE, Philbin MM, Duval A, et al. "Youth friendly" clinics: Considerations for linking and engaging HIV-infected adolescents into care. *AIDS Care.* 2014;26(2):199-205. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23782040.

12. Davila JA, Miertschin N, Sansgiry S, Schwarzwald H, Henley C, Giordano TP. Centralization of HIV services in HIV-positive African-American and Hispanic youth improves retention in care. *AIDS Care.* 2013;25(2):202-206. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22708510.

13. INSIGHT START Study Group, Lundgren JD, Babiker AG, et al. Initiation of antiretroviral therapy in early asymptomatic HIV infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;373(9):795-807. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26192873.

14. TEMPRANO ANRS Study Group, Danel C, Moh R, et al. A trial of early antiretrovirals and isoniazid preventive therapy in Africa. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;373(9):808-822. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26193126.

15. Nichols SL, Brummel SS, Smith RA, et al. Executive Functioning in Children and Adolescents With Perinatal HIV

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Infection. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2015;34(9):969-975. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26376309.

16. Buchacz K, Rogol AD, Lindsey JC, et al. Delayed onset of pubertal development in children and adolescents with perinatally acquired HIV infection. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2003;33(1):56-65. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12792356.

17. Zash R, Holmes L, Makhema J, et al. Surveillance for neural tube defects following antiretroviral exposure from conception. Presented at: 22nd International AIDS Conference (AIDS 2018); 2018; Amsterdam.

18. Zash R, Makhema J, Shapiro RL. Neural-Tube Defects with Dolutegravir Treatment from the Time of Conception. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(10):979-981. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30037297.

19. Zash R, Holmes L, Diseko M, et al. Neural-tube defects and antiretroviral treatment regimens in Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):827-840. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31329379.

20. Raesima MM, Ogbuabo CM, Thomas V, et al. Dolutegravir use at conception - additional surveillance data from Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):885-887. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31329378.

21. Rudy BJ, Murphy DA, Harris DR, Muenz L, Ellen J, Adolescent Trials Network for HIVAI. Prevalence and interactions of patient-related risks for nonadherence to antiretroviral therapy among perinatally infected youth in the United States. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2010;24(2):97-104. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20059354.

22. Rudy BJ, Murphy DA, Harris DR, Muenz L, Ellen J, Adolescent Trials Network for HIVAI. Patient-related risks for nonadherence to antiretroviral therapy among HIV-infected youth in the United States: a study of prevalence and interactions. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2009;23(3):185-194. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19866536.

23. MacDonell K, Naar-King S, Huszti H, Belzer M. Barriers to medication adherence in behaviorally and perinatally infected youth living with HIV. *AIDS Behav.* 2013;17(1):86-93. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23142855.

24. Ryscavage P, Anderson EJ, Sutton SH, Reddy S, Taiwo B. Clinical outcomes of adolescents and young adults in adult HIV care. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2011;58(2):193-197. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21826014.

25. Lyon ME, Trexler C, Akpan-Townsend C, et al. A family group approach to increasing adherence to therapy in HIV-infected youths: results of a pilot project. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2003;17(6):299-308. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12880493.

26. Belzer ME, Kolmodin MacDonell K, Clark LF, et al. Acceptability and Feasibility of a Cell Phone Support Intervention for Youth Living with HIV with Nonadherence to Antiretroviral Therapy. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2015;29(6):338-345. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25928772.

27. Brooks-Gunn J, Graber JA. Puberty as a biological and social event: implications for research on pharmacology. *J Adolesc Health.* 1994;15(8):663-671. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7696287.

28. Kyngas H, Hentinen M, Barlow JH. Adolescents' perceptions of physicians, nurses, parents and friends: help or hindrance in compliance with diabetes self-care? *J Adv Nurs.* 1998;27(4):760-769. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9578206.

29. La Greca AM. Peer influences in pediatric chronic illness: an update. *J Pediatr Psychol*. 1992;17(6):775-784. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1484338.

30. Murphy DA, Wilson CM, Durako SJ, Muenz LR, Belzer M. Antiretroviral medication adherence among the REACH HIV-infected adolescent cohort in the USA. *AIDS Care.* 2001;13(1):27-40. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11177463.

31. Stenzel MS, McKenzie M, Mitty JA, Flanigan TP. Enhancing adherence to HAART: a pilot program of modified directly observed therapy. *AIDS Read.* 2001;11(6):317-319, 324-318. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11449925.

32. Purdy JB, Freeman AF, Martin SC, et al. Virologic response using directly observed therapy in adolescents with HIV: an adherence tool. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care.* 2008;19(2):158-165. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18328966.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

33. Garvie PA, Lawford J, Flynn PM, et al. Development of a directly observed therapy adherence intervention for adolescents with human immunodeficiency virus-1: application of focus group methodology to inform design, feasibility, and acceptability. *J Adolesc Health.* 2009;44(2):124-132. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19167660.

34. Gaur AH, Belzer M, Britto P, et al. Directly observed therapy (DOT) for nonadherent HIV-infected youth: lessons learned, challenges ahead. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2010;26(9):947-953. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20707731.

35. Vermund SH, Wilson CM, Rogers AS, Partlow C, Moscicki AB. Sexually transmitted infections among HIV infected and HIV uninfected high-risk youth in the REACH study. Reaching for Excellence in Adolescent Care and Health. *J Adolesc Health.* 2001;29(3 Suppl):49-56. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11530303.

36. Workowski KA, Berman S. Sexually transmitted diseases treatment guidelines, 2010. *MMWR Recomm Rep*. 2010;59(RR-12):1-110. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21160459.

37. Valenzuela JM, Buchanan CL, Radcliffe J, et al. Transition to adult services among behaviorally infected adolescents with HIV--a qualitative study. *J Pediatr Psychol*. 2011;36(2):134-140. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19542198.

38. Committee On Pediatric AIDS. Transitioning HIV-infected youth into adult health care. *Pediatrics*. 2013;132(1):192-197. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23796739.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

HIV-2 Infection (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Key Considerations and Recommendations
• The clinical course of HIV-2 infection is generally characterized by a longer asymptomatic stage, lower plasma viral loads, and lower mortality rate than HIV-1 infection. However, progression to AIDS and death will occur in the majority of individuals without treatment. • No randomized controlled trials have addressed when a person with HIV-2 should start antiretroviral therapy (ART) or which regimens are most effective for initial or second-line ART when treating HIV-2; thus, the optimal treatment strategy is not well defined. • Existing data on the treatment of HIV-2, and extrapolation from data on the treatment of HIV-1, suggest that ART should be started at or soon after HIV-2 diagnosis to prevent disease progression and transmission of HIV-2 to others **(AIII)**. • Quantitative plasma HIV-2 RNA viral load testing for clinical care is available and should be performed before initiation of ART **(AIII)**. • HIV-2 is intrinsically resistant to non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors and to enfuvirtide; therefore, these drugs **should not be included** in ART regimens for HIV-2 infection **(AII)**. • Patients with hepatitis B virus (HBV)/HIV-2 coinfection should be prescribed ART regimens that contain drugs with activity against both HIV-2 and HBV **(AIII)**. • Initial ART regimens for ART-naive patients who have HIV-2 mono-infection or HIV-1/HIV-2 coinfection should include an integrase strand transfer inhibitor (INSTI) plus two nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) **(AII)**. An alternative regimen is a boosted protease inhibitor (PI) that is active against HIV-2 (darunavir or lopinavir) plus two NRTIs **(BII)**. • HIV-2 RNA, CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell counts, and clinical status should be used to assess treatment response **(AIII)**. Unlike persons with HIV-1, persons with HIV-2 should continue to undergo periodic CD4 count testing even if their viral loads are persistently suppressed, because disease progression can occur despite an undetectable viral load. • Resistance-associated viral mutations to INSTIs, PIs, or NRTIs may develop in persons with HIV-2 while they are on ART. However, no validated HIV-2 genotypic or phenotypic antiretroviral resistance assays are approved for clinical use. • In the event of virologic, immunologic, or clinical failure, a new ART regimen should be constructed in consultation with an expert in HIV-2 management.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional* ***Rating of Evidence:*** *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

Overview

HIV-2 infection is endemic in West Africa, with certain countries experiencing a population prevalence of >1%. The possibility of HIV-2 infection should be considered when treating persons of West African origin, persons who have had sexual contact with or who have shared needles with persons of West African origin, and persons who reside in countries with strong socioeconomic ties to West Africa (e.g., France, Spain, Portugal, and former Portuguese colonies such as Brazil, Angola, Mozambique, and parts of India). Globally, it has been estimated that one million to two million individuals have HIV-2, a number that includes people with HIV-1/HIV-2 dual infection. However, current and accurate prevalence data are scarce, and neither the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV and AIDS nor the World Health Organization have formal surveillance systems for HIV-2.[1]

Clinical Course of HIV-2 Infection

The clinical course of HIV-2 infection is generally characterized by a longer asymptomatic stage, lower plasma viral loads, and a lower mortality rate than HIV-1 infection.[2,3] However, without effective antiretroviral therapy (ART), HIV-2 infection will progress to AIDS and death in the majority of individuals.[4] Concomitant HIV-1 and HIV-2 infection may occur, and the possibility of this coinfection should be considered when treating persons from areas with a high prevalence of HIV-2.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Diagnostic and Monitoring Assays for HIV-2 Infection

In the appropriate epidemiologic setting, HIV-2 infection should be suspected in persons who have clinical conditions that suggest HIV infection but who have atypical serologic results (e.g., a positive screening assay with an indeterminate HIV-1 Western blot).[5] The possibility of HIV-2 infection should also be considered in the appropriate epidemiologic setting in persons who have serologically confirmed HIV infection but who have low or undetectable HIV-1 RNA levels, or in those who have declining CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell counts despite apparent virologic suppression on ART.

The 2014 Centers for Disease Control and Prevention guidelines for HIV diagnostic testing[6] recommend using an HIV-1/HIV-2 antigen/antibody combination immunoassay for initial testing and using an HIV-1/HIV-2 antibody differentiation immunoassay for subsequent testing. The Geenius HIV 1/2 Supplemental Assay (Bio-Rad Laboratories) is approved by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to differentiate HIV-1 infection from HIV-2 infection. The Multispot HIV-1/HIV-2 Rapid Test is no longer available. Commercially available HIV-1 RNA assays do not reliably detect or quantify HIV-2 RNA.[7] Quantitative HIV-2 RNA testing is available at the University of Washington (UW)[8] and the New York State Department of Health (NYSDOH).[9] HIV-2 nucleic acid amplification test-based (total DNA/RNA) diagnostic testing is available for clinical care at UW.[10] However, it is important to note that up to one-third of persons with untreated HIV-2 will have HIV-2 RNA levels below the limits of detection (10 copies/mL for UW testing and 7 IU/mL for NYSDOH testing); some of these persons will have clinical progression and CD4 count decline. No validated HIV-2 genotypic or phenotypic antiretroviral (ARV) resistance assays are approved by the FDA for clinical use. HIV-2 genotypic ARV resistance assays are available at UW for research use only.

Treatment of HIV-2 Infection

To date, no randomized controlled trials that address when to start ART or the choice of initial or subsequent ART regimens for HIV-2 have been completed;[11] thus, the optimal treatment strategy has not been defined. Existing data on the treatment of HIV-2 and extrapolation from data on the treatment of HIV-1 suggest that ART should be started at or soon after HIV-2 diagnosis in order to prevent disease progression and transmission of HIV-2 to others **(AIII)**. However, CD4 cell recovery in persons with HIV-2 who are on ART is generally poorer than that observed in persons with HIV-1.[12,13]

Data from *in vitro* studies suggest that HIV-2 is sensitive to the currently available nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs); however, HIV-2 is more likely to develop resistance to NRTIs than HIV-1.[14] HIV-2 is intrinsically resistant to non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs);[15] thus, NNRTI-based regimens **are not recommended** for treatment of HIV-2 **(AII)**. Several small studies in individuals with HIV-2 have reported poor responses to dual-NRTI regimens[16,17] or regimens that contain an NNRTI plus two NRTIs.[18,19] Clinical data on the effectiveness of triple-NRTI regimens are conflicting.[20,21]

Integrase strand transfer inhibitor (INSTI)-based regimens or protease inhibitor (PI)-based regimens are treatment options for persons with HIV-2. As discussed below, two single-arm clinical trials showed favorable outcomes in patients who received INSTI-based regimens; data regarding the efficacy of PI-based regimens primarily come from observational reports. A randomized controlled trial comparing raltegravir (RAL) plus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine (TDF/FTC) to lopinavir/ritonavir plus TDF/FTC is currently underway (FIT-2; NCT02150993).

Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor-Based Regimens

All FDA-approved INSTIs—RAL, elvitegravir (EVG), dolutegravir (DTG), and bictegravir—have potent activity against HIV-2 *in vitro*.[22-26] INSTI-based regimens have shown favorable treatment responses in observational studies.[27-29] Two single-arm, open-label clinical trials have assessed the effectiveness of INSTI-based regimens in ART-naive individuals with HIV-2. One study evaluated RAL plus TDF/FTC, and the other evaluated EVG/cobicistat/TDF/FTC. Both studies demonstrated favorable clinical and immuno-virologic results at 48 weeks, providing the best evidence to date for HIV-2 treatment recommendations.[30,31]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Protease Inhibitor-Based Regimens

In general, regimens that contain boosted PIs that are active against HIV-2 (and that also include two NRTIs) have resulted in more favorable virologic and immunologic responses than regimens that consist of only two or three NRTIs.[12,13,21,32] Darunavir (DRV), lopinavir, and saquinavir are more active against HIV-2 than other approved PIs.[33-35] Older, unboosted PI-based regimens, including nelfinavir or indinavir plus zidovudine and lamivudine, and atazanavir-based regimens have shown poor clinical success rates.[11,16,17,36,37]

Amongst the entry inhibitors, HIV-2 is intrinsically resistant to enfuvirtide.[38] The CCR5 antagonist maraviroc appears to be active against some HIV-2 isolates;[39] however, there are no FDA-approved assays that can determine HIV-2 co-receptor tropism, and HIV-2 is known to use many other minor co-receptors in addition to CCR5 and CXCR4.[40] There are no data yet on the activity of ibalizumab against HIV-2.

Some national and international guidelines have recommended specific preferred and alternative drug regimens for initial and second-line ART for HIV-2 infection;[41-44] however, there are currently no comparative randomized controlled clinical trial data that support the effectiveness of a specific recommended regimen.

Until there are more definitive data on outcomes, the Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents recommends the following regimens for individuals with HIV-2 mono-infection or HIV-1/HIV-2 dual infection:

- A regimen that contains one INSTI plus two NRTIs is the recommended initial ART regimen for most individuals with HIV-2 **(AII)**. Data from an observational study in Botswana suggest that there is an increased risk of neural tube defects in infants born to those who were receiving DTG at the time of conception; however, the risk of these defects is still low. Before initiating an INSTI-based regimen in a person of childbearing potential, clinicians should review Table 6b for information to consider when choosing an ART regimen.
- An alternative regimen is a boosted PI (DRV or LPV) that is active against HIV-2 plus two NRTIs **(BII)**.
- NNRTI-based regimens **are not recommended** for persons with HIV-2 **(AII)**.
- Patients with hepatitis B virus (HBV)/HIV-2 coinfection require ART regimens that contain drugs with activity against both HIV-2 and HBV **(AIII)**. See Hepatitis B Virus/HIV Coinfection for more information.
- HIV-2 plasma RNA levels, CD4 cell counts, and clinical status should be monitored to assess treatment response, as is recommended for HIV-1 **(AII)**.
- Persons who have HIV-2 RNA levels that are below the limits of detection before they initiate ART should still undergo routine HIV-2 plasma RNA monitoring in addition to CD4 cell count and clinical monitoring. Unlike HIV-1, persons with HIV-2 require continued CD4 cell count monitoring, as disease progression can occur in the setting of undetectable HIV-2 viral load **(AIII)**.

Persons with HIV-2 who are of childbearing potential require similar considerations when choosing a regimen as those with HIV-1 (see What to Start). There are no data on HIV-2 treatment as prevention; however, both data from studies of people with HIV-1 and data on the natural history of HIV-2 transmission suggest that effective ART likely provides a reduced risk of transmission to sexual partners.

Viral mutations that are associated with resistance to NRTIs, PIs, and/or INSTIs may develop in persons with HIV-2 while they are on ART.[35,45,46] Currently, transmitted drug resistance appears to be rare among people with HIV-2.[47,48] In several small studies, twice-daily dosing of DTG was found to have some residual activity as a second-line INSTI in some persons with HIV-2 who had extensive ART experience and RAL resistance.[49-52] Genotypic algorithms that are used to predict drug resistance in HIV-1 may not be applicable to HIV-2, because the pathways and mutational patterns that lead to resistance may differ between the HIV types (see the HIV2EU Algorithm and the Stanford University HIV Drug Resistance Database).[53] In the event of

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

virologic, immunologic, or clinical failure, a new ART regimen should be constructed in consultation with an expert in HIV-2 management.

References

1. Gottlieb GS, Raugi DN, Smith RA. 90-90-90 for HIV-2? Ending the HIV-2 epidemic by enhancing care and clinical management of patients infected with HIV-2. *Lancet HIV*. 2018;5(7):e390-e399. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30052509.

2. Matheron S, Pueyo S, Damond F, et al. Factors associated with clinical progression in HIV-2 infected-patients: the French ANRS cohort. *AIDS*. 2003;17(18):2593-2601. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14685053.

3. Marlink R, Kanki P, Thior I, et al. Reduced rate of disease development after HIV-2 infection as compared to HIV-1. *Science*. 1994;265(5178):1587-1590. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7915856.

4. Esbjornsson J, Mansson F, Kvist A, et al. Long-term follow-up of HIV-2-related AIDS and mortality in Guinea-Bissau: a prospective open cohort study. *Lancet HIV*. 2018. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30392769.

5. O'Brien TR, George JR, Epstein JS, Holmberg SD, Schochetman G. Testing for antibodies to human immunodeficiency virus type 2 in the United States. *MMWR Recomm Rep*. 1992;41(RR-12):1-9. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1324395.

6. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Association of Public Health Laboratories. Laboratory testing for the diagnosis of HIV infection : updated recommendations. 2014. Available at: https://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/23447.

7. Damond F, Benard A, Balotta C, et al. An international collaboration to standardize HIV-2 viral load assays: results from the 2009 ACHI(E)V(2E) quality control study. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2011;49(10):3491-3497. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21813718.

8. Chang M, Gottlieb GS, Dragavon JA, et al. Validation for clinical use of a novel HIV-2 plasma RNA viral load assay using the Abbott m2000 platform. *J Clin Virol*. 2012;55(2):128-133. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22832059.

9. Styer LM, Miller TT, Parker MM. Validation and clinical use of a sensitive HIV-2 viral load assay that uses a whole virus internal control. *J Clin Virol*. 2013;58 Suppl 1:e127-133. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24342472.

10. Chang M, Wong AJ, Raugi DN, et al. Clinical validation of a novel diagnostic HIV-2 total nucleic acid qualitative assay using the Abbott m2000 platform: Implications for complementary HIV-2 nucleic acid testing for the CDC 4th generation HIV diagnostic testing algorithm. *J Clin Virol*. 2017;86:56-61. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27951466.

11. Gottlieb GS, Eholie SP, Nkengasong JN, et al. A call for randomized controlled trials of antiretroviral therapy for HIV-2 infection in West Africa. *AIDS*. 2008;22(16):2069-2072; discussion 2073-2064. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18832869.

12. Drylewicz J, Eholie S, Maiga M, et al. First-year lymphocyte T CD4+ response to antiretroviral therapy according to the HIV type in the IeDEA West Africa collaboration. *AIDS*. 2010;24(7):1043-1050. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20397306.

13. Ekouevi DK, Balestre E, Coffie PA, et al. Characteristics of HIV-2 and HIV-1/HIV-2 dually seropositive adults in West Africa presenting for care and antiretroviral therapy: The IeDEA-West Africa HIV-2 Cohort Study. *PLoS One*. 2013;8(6):e66135. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23824279.

14. Smith RA, Anderson DJ, Pyrak CL, Preston BD, Gottlieb GS. Antiretroviral drug resistance in HIV-2: three amino acid changes are sufficient for classwide nucleoside analogue resistance. *J Infect Dis*. 2009;199(9):1323-1326. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19358668.

15. Tuaillon E, Gueudin M, Lemee V, et al. Phenotypic susceptibility to nonnucleoside inhibitors of virion-associated reverse transcriptase from different HIV types and groups. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2004;37(5):1543-1549. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15577405.

16. Jallow S, Kaye S, Alabi A, et al. Virological and immunological response to Combivir and emergence of drug resistance mutations in a cohort of HIV-2 patients in The Gambia. *AIDS*. 2006;20(10):1455-1458. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16791023.

17. Adje-Toure CA, Cheingsong R, Garcia-Lerma JG, et al. Antiretroviral therapy in HIV-2-infected patients: changes in

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

plasma viral load, CD4+ cell counts, and drug resistance profiles of patients treated in Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire. *AIDS*. 2003;17 Suppl 3:S49-54. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14565609.

18. Borget MY, Diallo K, Adje-Toure C, Chorba T, Nkengasong JN. Virologic and immunologic responses to antiretroviral therapy among HIV-1 and HIV-2 dually infected patients: case reports from Abidjan, Cote d'Ivoire. *J Clin Virol*. 2009;45(1):72-75. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19375979.

19. Sarfo FS, Bibby DF, Schwab U, et al. Inadvertent non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NNRTI)-based antiretroviral therapy in dual HIV-1/2 and HIV-2 seropositive West Africans: a retrospective study. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2009;64(3):667-669. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19549668.

20. Matheron S, Damond F, Benard A, et al. CD4 cell recovery in treated HIV-2-infected adults is lower than expected: results from the French ANRS CO5 HIV-2 cohort. *AIDS*. 2006;20(3):459-462. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16439883.

21. Ruelle J, Roman F, Vandenbroucke AT, et al. Transmitted drug resistance, selection of resistance mutations and moderate antiretroviral efficacy in HIV-2: analysis of the HIV-2 Belgium and Luxembourg database. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2008;8:21. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18304321.

22. Charpentier C, Larrouy L, Collin G, et al. *In-vitro* phenotypic susceptibility of HIV-2 clinical isolates to the integrase inhibitor S/GSK1349572. *AIDS*. 2010;24(17):2753-2755. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20827161.

23. Smith RA, Raugi DN, Pan C, et al. Three main mutational pathways in HIV-2 lead to high-level raltegravir and elvitegravir resistance: implications for emerging HIV-2 treatment regimens. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(9):e45372. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23028968.

24. Smith RA, Raugi DN, Pan C, et al. *In vitro* activity of dolutegravir against wild-type and integrase inhibitor-resistant HIV-2. *Retrovirology*. 2015;12:10. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25808007.

25. Le Hingrat Q, Collin G, Le M, et al. A new mechanism of resistance of HIV-2 to integrase inhibitors: a 5 amino-acids insertion in the integrase C-terminal domain. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2018. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30383215.

26. Smith RA, Raugi DN, Wu VH, et al. Comparison of the antiviral activity of bictegravir against HIV-1 and HIV-2 isolates and integrase inhibitor-resistant HIV-2 mutants. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2019;63(5). Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30803972.

27. Peterson K, Ruelle J, Vekemans M, Siegal FP, Deayton JR, Colebunders R. The role of raltegravir in the treatment of HIV-2 infections: evidence from a case series. *Antivir Ther*. 2012;17(6):1097-1100. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22892365.

28. Zheng Y, Lambert C, Arendt V, Seguin-Devaux C. Virological and immunological outcomes of elvitegravir-based regimen in a treatment-naive HIV-2-infected patient. *AIDS*. 2014;28(15):2329-2331. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25313590.

29. Requena S, Lozano AB, Caballero E, et al. Clinical experience with integrase inhibitors in HIV-2-infected individuals in Spain. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2019. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30753573.

30. Matheron S, Descamps D, Gallien S, et al. First-line raltegravir/emtricitabine/tenofovir combination in human immunodeficiency virus type 2 (HIV-2) infection: a phase 2, noncomparative trial (ANRS 159 HIV-2). *Clin Infect Dis*. 2018;67(8):1161-1167. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29590335.

31. Ba S, Raugi DN, Smith RA, et al. A trial of a single-tablet regimen of elvitegravir, cobicistat, emtricitabine, and tenofovir disoproxil fumarate for the initial treatment of human immunodeficiency virus type 2 infection in a resource-limited setting: 48-week results from Senegal, West Africa. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2018;67(10):1588-1594. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29672676.

32. Benard A, Damond F, Campa P, et al. Good response to lopinavir/ritonavir-containing antiretroviral regimens in antiretroviral-naive HIV-2-infected patients. *AIDS*. 2009;23(9):1171-1173. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19349850.

33. Desbois D, Roquebert B, Peytavin G, et al. *In vitro* phenotypic susceptibility of human immunodeficiency virus type 2 clinical isolates to protease inhibitors. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2008;52(4):1545-1548. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18227188.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

34. Brower ET, Bacha UM, Kawasaki Y, Freire E. Inhibition of HIV-2 protease by HIV-1 protease inhibitors in clinical use. *Chem Biol Drug Des*. 2008;71(4):298-305. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18312292.

35. Raugi DN, Smith RA, Ba S, et al. Complex patterns of protease inhibitor resistance among antiretroviral treatment-experienced HIV-2 patients from Senegal: implications for second-line therapy. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2013;57(6):2751-2760. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23571535.

36. Cavaco-Silva J, Aleixo MJ, Van Laethem K, et al. Mutations selected in HIV-2-infected patients failing a regimen including atazanavir. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2013;68(1):190-192. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22977160.

37. Gottlieb GS, Badiane NM, Hawes SE, et al. Emergence of multiclass drug-resistance in HIV-2 in antiretroviral-treated individuals in Senegal: implications for HIV-2 treatment in resouce-limited West Africa. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2009;48(4):476-483. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19143530.

38. Poveda E, Rodes B, Toro C, Soriano V. Are fusion inhibitors active against all HIV variants? *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2004;20(3):347-348. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15117459.

39. Visseaux B, Charpentier C, Hurtado-Nedelec M, et al. *In vitro* phenotypic susceptibility of HIV-2 clinical isolates to CCR5 inhibitors. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2012;56(1):137-139. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22064539.

40. Owen SM, Ellenberger D, Rayfield M, et al. Genetically divergent strains of human immunodeficiency virus type 2 use multiple coreceptors for viral entry. *J Virol*. 1998;72(7):5425-5432. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9620997.

41. New York State Department of Health AIDS Institute. Human Immunodeficiency Virus Type 2 (HIV-2). 2012. Available at: https://www.guidelinecentral.com/summaries/human-immunodeficiency-virus-type-2-hiv-2/#section-society.

42. World Health Organization. Consolidated guidelines on the use of antiretroviral drugs for treating and preventing HIV infection. 2013. Available at: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/85321/1/9789241505727_eng.pdf.

43. World Health Organization. What ARV regimen to start with in adults, adolescents, and pregnant women living with HIV-2? 2013. Available at: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/90772/1/WHO_HIV_2013.36_eng.pdf?ua=1.

44. Conseil national du sida et des hépatites virales. Prise en charge médicale des personnes vivant avec le VIH: Infection VIH-2 ; Diversité des VIH-1. 2016. Available at: https://cns.sante.fr/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/experts-vih_diversite.pdf.

45. Charpentier C, Eholie S, Anglaret X, et al. Genotypic resistance profiles of HIV-2-treated patients in West Africa. *AIDS*. 2014;28(8):1161-1169. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24583671.

46. Charpentier C, Camacho R, Ruelle J, et al. HIV-2EU: supporting standardized HIV-2 drug resistance interpretation in Europe. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;56(11):1654-1658. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23429380.

47. Duarte F, Miranda AC, Peres S, et al. Transmitted drug resistance in drug-naive HIV-2 infected patients. *AIDS*. 2016;30(10):1687-1688. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27243780.

48. Storto A, Visseaux B, Bertine M, et al. Minority resistant variants are also present in HIV-2-infected antiretroviral-naive patients. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2018;73(5):1173-1176. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29415189.

49. Descamps D, Peytavin G, Visseaux B, et al. Dolutegravir in HIV-2 infected patients with resistant virus to first-line integrase inhibitors from the French Named Patient Program. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25690598.

50. Trevino A, Cabezas T, Lozano AB, et al. Dolutegravir for the treatment of HIV-2 infection. *J Clin Virol*. 2015;64:12-15. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25728072.

51. Delory T, Papot E, Rioux C, et al. Foscarnet, zidovudine and dolutegravir combination efficacy and tolerability for late stage HIV salvage therapy: a case-series experience. *J Med Virol*. 2016;88(7):1204-1210. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26636432.

52. Requena S, Trevino A, Cabezas T, et al. Drug resistance mutations in HIV-2 patients failing raltegravir and influence on dolutegravir response. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2017;72(7):2083-2088. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28369593.

53. Charpentier C, Camacho R, Ruelle J, et al. HIV-2EU-supporting standardized HIV-2 drug-resistance interpretation in Europe: an update. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;61(8):1346-1347. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26187019.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

HIV and the Older Person (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Key Considerations When Caring for Older Persons With HIV
• Antiretroviral therapy (ART) is recommended for all people with HIV regardless of CD4 T lymphocyte cell count **(AI)**. ART is especially important for older individuals because they have a greater risk of serious non-AIDS complications and potentially a blunted immunologic response to ART.
• Given that the burden of aging-related diseases is significantly higher among persons with HIV than in the general population, additional medical and social services may be required to effectively manage both HIV and comorbid conditions.
• Adverse drug events from ART and concomitant drugs may occur more frequently in older persons with HIV than in younger individuals with HIV. Therefore, the bone, kidney, metabolic, cardiovascular, cognitive, and liver health of older individuals with HIV should be monitored closely.
• Polypharmacy is common in older persons with HIV; therefore, there is a greater risk of drug-drug interactions between antiretroviral drugs and concomitant medications. Potential for drug-drug interactions should be assessed regularly, especially when starting or switching ART and concomitant medications.
• The decline in neurocognitive function with aging is faster in people with HIV than in people without HIV. HIV-associated neurocognitive disorder (HAND) is associated with reduced adherence to therapy and poorer health outcomes including increased risk of death. For persons with progressively worsening symptoms of HAND, referral to a neurologist for evaluation and management or a neuropsychologist for formal neurocognitive testing may be warranted **(BIII)**.
• Mental health disorders are a growing concern in aging people with HIV. A heightened risk of mood disorders including anxiety and depression has been observed in this population. Screening for depression and management of mental health issues are critical in caring for persons with HIV.
• HIV experts, primary care providers, and other specialists should work together to optimize the medical care of older persons with HIV and complex comorbidities.
• Early diagnosis of HIV and counseling to prevent secondary transmission of HIV remains an important aspect of the care of older people with HIV
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional*
Rating of Evidence: *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

Introduction

Effective antiretroviral therapy (ART) has increased survival in individuals with HIV,[1,2] resulting in an increasing number of older individuals living with HIV. In the United States, from 2012 through 2017, the annual fraction of persons newly diagnosed with HIV aged ≥50 years was stably 17%.[3] Among persons with HIV at year-end 2016, 48% were aged ≥50 years, 8% were aged ≥65 years, and trends suggest that these proportions will increase steadily.[3] Care of people with HIV will increasingly involve adults aged ≥60 years, a population for which data from clinical trials or pharmacokinetic (PK) studies are very limited. The discussion in this section of the guidelines refers to individuals aged ≥50 years as older persons with HIV.

There are several distinct areas of concern regarding aging and HIV.[4] First, older persons with HIV may suffer from aging-related comorbid illnesses and require substantially more non-ART medications[5] than younger people, which may complicate HIV clinical care.[6] Second, HIV disease may affect the biology of aging, possibly resulting in early manifestations of clinical syndromes generally associated with more advanced age. Third, reduced mucosal and immunologic defenses (e.g., postmenopausal atrophic vaginitis) and changes in risk related-behaviors (e.g., decrease in condom use because of less concern about pregnancy or more high-risk sexual activity with increased use of erectile dysfunction drugs) in older adults may lead to increased risk of acquisition and transmission of HIV.[7,8] Finally, HIV screening among older adults remains low because they are generally perceived to be at low risk of acquiring HIV.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

HIV Screening and Diagnosis in the Older Person

Failure to consider a diagnosis of HIV has likely contributed to later initiation of ART in older persons with HIV.[9] The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that in 2016, 36% of adults aged ≥55 years met the case definition for AIDS at the time of HIV diagnosis. The comparable CDC estimates are 16% for adults aged 25 to 34 years and 27% for adults aged 35 to 44 years.[10] In one observational cohort, older people (defined as those aged ≥35 years) appeared to have lower CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell counts at seroconversion and steeper CD4 count decline over time,[11] and tended to present to care with significantly lower CD4 counts.[12] When individuals aged >50 years present with severe illnesses, HIV and AIDS-related opportunistic infections (OIs) need to be considered in the differential diagnosis of the illness.

Although many older individuals engage in risk behaviors associated with acquisition of HIV, they may see themselves or be perceived by providers as at low risk of infection and, as a result, they are less likely to be tested for HIV infection than younger persons.[13,14] Despite CDC guidelines recommending HIV testing at least once for individuals aged 13 to 64 years, and more frequently for those at risk,[15] HIV testing prevalence remains low (<5%) among adults aged 50 to 64 years, and decreases with increasing age.[16] Clinicians must be attuned to the possibility of HIV infection in older adults, including those aged ≥64 years, especially in those who may engage in high-risk behaviors. Sexual history taking and screening for other risk factors (e.g., injection drug use) that may place older adults at risk of HIV infection are therefore an important component of general health management for older adults. Risk-reduction counseling, and screening for HIV and sexually transmitted infections should be done, if indicated. Older adults who are at risk of acquiring HIV should be counseled on comprehensive HIV prevention strategies, including the option of HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP). Age alone should not exclude older adults from being evaluated for and offered PrEP (refer to CDC PrEP Guidelines for details).

Impact of Age on HIV Disease Progression

HIV infection in older persons presents unique challenges and these challenges may be compounded by ART:

- Chronic HIV infection is associated with elevated cellular and soluble markers of immune activation and inflammation. Although these levels decline with ART, they remain higher than normal, even with suppressive ART. Levels of these markers also increase with aging, and the rate of this age-related change was demonstrated to be faster in people with HIV with viremia than in those with virologic suppression on ART and in people without HIV.[17]
- HIV infection may induce immuno-phenotypic changes akin to accelerated aging, with senescent T cells which in older persons have been associated with negative outcomes including frailty and cardiovascular disease.[4,18-21] Some studies have shown that people with HIV may exhibit chromosomal and immunologic features similar to those induced by aging, such as the accumulation of highly differentiated $CD28^-/CD57^+$ $CD8^+$ T cells commonly used as markers of immunosenescence.[22-24] However, other studies show the immunologic changes in HIV to be distinct from age-related changes.[25] Cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection is very prevalent among people with HIV, and as they age, immune response to CMV—rather than HIV—may play a pivotal role in immunosenescence observed even in people with virologic suppression.[26]
- Although data on the increased incidence and prevalence of age-associated comorbidities in people with HIV are accumulating,[27,28] the age at diagnosis for myocardial infarction, stroke, and non-AIDS cancers in people with and without HIV is the same.[28,29]
- As the life expectancy of persons living with HIV increases with ART, more cisgender women with HIV are experiencing menopause. Although menopause may occur earlier in cisgender women with HIV than in cisgender women in the general population,[30] early menopause may also be a consequence of smoking, depression, substance use, and other psychosocial factors that are disproportionately present in cisgender women with HIV.[31]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

- Older persons with HIV have a greater incidence of health complications and comorbidities than adults of a similar age who do not have HIV, and may exhibit a frailty phenotype (defined clinically as a decrease in muscle mass, weight, physical strength, energy, and physical activity) earlier and in greater proportions than the general population.[32,33] Frailty in persons with HIV has been associated with adverse outcomes including incident cardiovascular disease, diabetes mellitus, recurrent falls and fractures, lower quality of life scores, cognitive impairment, hospitalization, and mortality.[34-43] Cisgender women have an increased risk of osteopenia, osteoporosis, and fractures, particularly after menopause, and this risk is exacerbated by HIV and ART.[34,44-46] Although the frailty phenotype is still incompletely characterized in people with HIV, its early recognition may lead to targeted interventions to improve the wellbeing of this population.[43]

Antiretroviral Therapy in the Older Person with HIV

Importance of Early Treatment Initiation

ART is recommended for all individuals with HIV (**AI**; see Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy). Early treatment may be particularly important in older adults in part because of decreased immune recovery and increased risk of serious non-AIDS events in this population.[47,48] In a modeling study based on data from an observational cohort, the beneficial effects of early ART were projected to be greatest in the oldest age group (people aged 45 to 65 years).[49] This was demonstrated in an analysis of HIV cohorts from Europe and the Americas showing a lower all-cause and non-AIDS mortality with immediate ART initiation in people aged 50 to 70 years.[50] It was also seen in a START substudy in which persons aged >50 years were among the groups that experienced the greatest risk reduction when ART was started when CD4 counts were >500 cells/mm^3.[51] All older persons with HIV should be informed that maintaining a plasma HIV RNA (viral load) at <200 copies/mL with ART improves overall health and prevents sexual transmission of HIV.

Choice of Antiretroviral Regimens in the Older Person with HIV

The choice of antiretroviral (ARV) regimen for an older person with HIV should be informed by a comprehensive review of the person's other medical conditions and medications. The What to Start section (Table 7) of these guidelines provides guidance on selecting an ARV regimen based on a person's characteristics and specific clinical conditions (e.g., kidney disease, elevated risk for cardiovascular disease, osteoporosis). In older persons with HIV and reduced renal function, dosage adjustment of nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) may be necessary (see Appendix B, Table 10). In addition, ARV regimen selection may be influenced by potential interactions between ARV medications and drugs used concomitantly to manage comorbidities (see Tables 21a-22b). Adults aged >50 years should be monitored for ART effectiveness and safety as similarly recommended for other populations with HIV (see Table 3); however, in older persons, special attention should be paid to the greater potential for adverse effects of ART on renal, liver, cardiovascular, central nervous system, metabolic, and bone health (see Table 17). ART regimens that contain tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF), boosted protease inhibitors (PIs), or both are associated with a significantly greater loss of bone mineral density than regimens containing other NRTIs and integrase strand transfer inhibitors (INSTIs).[52-55] Abacavir (ABC), NRTI-sparing regimens, and tenofovir alafenamide may be considered as alternatives to the use of TDF in older individuals who may be at risk of osteopenia or osteoporosis; however, with ABC, the benefit should be balanced with potentially increasing risk of cardiovascular disease.

Antiretroviral Efficacy and Safety Considerations in the Older Person with HIV

The efficacy, PKs, adverse effects, and drug interaction potentials of ART in the older adult have not been studied systematically. There is no evidence that the virologic response to ART differs in older and younger people. In an observational study, a higher rate of viral suppression was seen in people aged >55 years than in younger people.[56] However, ART-associated CD4 cell recovery in older adults is generally slower and

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

lower in magnitude than in younger people;[12,57-59] suggesting that starting ART at a younger age may result in better immunologic response and possibly clinical outcomes.

Hepatic metabolism and renal elimination are the major routes of drug clearance, including the clearance of ARV drugs. Both liver and kidney functions decrease with age and may result in impaired drug elimination and increased drug exposure.[60] Most clinical trials have included only a small proportion of participants aged >50 years, and current ARV dosing recommendations are based on PK and pharmacodynamic data derived from participants with normal organ function. Because it is unknown whether drug accumulation in the older person may lead to greater incidence and severity of adverse effects than seen in younger persons, therapy in older persons requires close monitoring and heightened awareness of drug-related adverse outcomes.

Impact of Comorbidities and Polypharmacy in Older Persons with HIV

People with HIV and aging-associated comorbidities may require additional pharmacologic interventions that can complicate therapeutic management.[5] In addition to taking medications to manage HIV infection and comorbid conditions, many older persons with HIV are also taking medications to relieve discomfort (e.g., pain medications, sedatives) or to manage adverse effects of medications (e.g., anti-emetics). Older individuals may also self-medicate with over-the-counter medicines or supplements.

Polypharmacy is more common in older persons with HIV than similarly aged persons in the general population.[5,61-63] In one large cohort of older patients with HIV in France, 62% of those whose HIV was diagnosed before 2000 had one or more comorbidities, and 70% were receiving at least one comedication.[64] Among persons living with HIV aged ≥65 years, the prevalence of comorbidities and polypharmacy rose with increasing age and duration of HIV infection.[65]

In older persons without HIV, polypharmacy is a major cause of iatrogenic complications.[66] Some of these complications may be caused by medication errors (by prescribers or patients), medication nonadherence, additive drug toxicities, and drug-drug interactions. Older persons with HIV are probably at an even greater risk of polypharmacy-related adverse consequences than younger or similarly aged people without HIV. When evaluating any new clinical complaint or laboratory abnormality in people with HIV, especially in older persons, clinicians should always consider the possible role of adverse drug reactions from both ARV drugs and other concomitantly administered medications.

Drug-Drug Interaction Concerns

Drug-drug interactions are common with ART and can be easily overlooked by prescribers.[67] Potential drug-drug interactions can occur between ARV and non-ARV medications, as well as between non-ARV medications.[63] The available drug interaction information on ARV agents is derived primarily from PK studies performed in small numbers of relatively young participants with normal organ function who do not have HIV (see Tables 21a-22b). Data from these studies provide clinicians with a basis to assess whether a significant interaction may exist. However, the magnitude of an interaction may be greater in older persons with HIV than in younger people with HIV; therefore, it is very important to remain vigilant to potential drug-drug interactions given the high prevalence of polypharmacy in older persons with HIV. In reviews of ARV and non-ARV medications prescribed for older persons with HIV, more than half of the medications had the potential for drug-drug interaction, including some severe interactions.[68,69] The risk is higher with PI-based ART than with INSTI-based ART.[68-70]

Adherence Concerns

Suboptimal adherence to ART is the most common cause of treatment failure. Complex dosing requirements, high pill burden, polypharmacy, inability to access medications because of cost or availability, limited health literacy (including misunderstanding of instructions), depression, and neurocognitive impairment are among the key reasons for nonadherence.[71] Although many of these factors associated with nonadherence

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

may be more prevalent in older persons with HIV, some studies have shown better adherence to ART among older persons than younger individuals.[72-74] Severe menopausal symptoms are also associated with reduced adherence to ART, which increases the risk of drug resistance and adverse HIV-related health outcomes in menopausal cisgender women.[75] Clinicians should regularly engage with older persons to identify any factors, such as neurocognitive deficits or hormonal changes, that may decrease adherence to ART. To facilitate medication adherence, it may be useful to discontinue unnecessary medications, simplify regimens, and recommend evidence-based behavioral approaches including the use of adherence aids such as pillboxes or daily calendars, and support from family members (see Adherence to the Continuum of Care).

Optimizing Antiretroviral Therapy in Older Persons with HIV

Given the greater incidence of comorbidities, non-AIDS complications, and frailty among older people with HIV, switching one or more ARVs in an HIV regimen may be necessary to minimize toxicities and drug-drug interactions. For example, expert guidance now recommends bone density monitoring in men aged ≥50 years and postmenopausal cisgender women, and suggests switching from TDF or boosted PIs to other ARVs in older persons at high risk for fragility fractures.[76] Given the high prevalence and faster progression of chronic kidney disease in aging persons with HIV, likely from a combination of HIV, ART, and non-HIV risk factors, development of the disease in an older person on ART must be monitored with great vigilance.[77,78] In persons with HIV at risk for or with declining renal function, consideration should be given to avoiding regimens containing TDF and atazanavir.[79]

Interrupting or Discontinuing Antiretroviral Therapy in Older Persons with HIV

Few data exist on the use of ART in severely debilitated people with chronic, severe, or non-AIDS-related terminal conditions.[80,81] Withdrawal of ART usually results in rebound viremia and a decline in CD4 count. In addition, an acute retroviral syndrome after abrupt discontinuation of ART has been reported. Even in severely debilitated adults, most clinicians would continue therapy if there are no significant adverse reactions to the ARV drugs. In cases where ART negatively affects quality of life, the decision to continue therapy should be made together with the patient and/or family members after a discussion of the risks and benefits of continuing or withdrawing treatment.

Non-AIDS HIV-Related Complications and Other Comorbidities in the Older Person with HIV

As AIDS-related morbidity and mortality have decreased among persons treated effectively with ART, non-AIDS conditions constitute an increasing proportion of serious illnesses among people with HIV.[82-84] The burden of age-related diseases is significantly higher among persons with HIV than in the general population, likely due to both traditional non-HIV-related and HIV-related factors.[85] Heart disease and cancer are the leading causes of death in older Americans.[86] Similarly, other non-AIDS events such as cognitive impairment, and liver disease have also emerged as major causes of morbidity and mortality in people with HIV receiving effective ART. Moreover, people with HIV are more likely to be current or former cigarette smokers than adults without HIV,[87] and model-based analyses have suggested that smoking cessation could improve life expectancy among older adults with HIV on ART.[88]

The prevalence of multimorbidity among persons with HIV has increased in the past decade,[89] with hypertension and hypercholesterolemia being the most common comorbidities. The presence of multiple non-AIDS comorbidities coupled with the immunologic effects of HIV infection may add to the disease burden of aging among adults with HIV.[90-92]

HIV-specific primary care guidelines have been developed and are available for clinicians caring for older persons with HIV.[93,94] Specific guidelines have also been developed for the evaluation and management of the following specific comorbidities in people with HIV: bone health,[76] kidney disease,[95] and cardiovascular disease.[96] In addition, the following guidelines recently developed for the general population can be applied

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

to the older persons with HIV: management of hyperglycemia[97] and hyperlipidemia.[98] However, it is important to note that the recommendations in these guidelines have not all been validated in the context of HIV disease. For instance, cardiovascular risk prediction functions developed for the general population likely underestimate the risk in persons with HIV.[99]

Neurocognitive Impairment and Mental Health Concerns in the Older Person with HIV

HIV-associated neurocognitive disorder (HAND), manifesting as difficulty with memory, attention, speed of information processing, and executive and motor functions, affects up to 30% of people with HIV on virally suppressive ART.[100] Though an accurate prevalence of neurocognitive impairment in older people with HIV is not yet available, the risk of HIV-associated brain injury and HAND appears to be higher with increasing age.[101-103] Neurocognitive function declines with increasing age in people with or without HIV, but the trajectory of the decline is steeper in individuals with HIV.[104] This accelerated decline is likely multifactorial, relating to injury associated with direct HIV effects in the brain, higher prevalence of comorbidities and coinfections, more severe vascular disease, mental health disorders, social isolation, and polypharmacy in this population.[105-107] Hormonal shifts that occur with aging may contribute to neurocognitive impairment, and these changes may manifest as unique differences in clinical manifestations by gender.[108] Finally, the risk of neurodegenerative disease rises with increasing age independent of HIV, and differentiating HAND from Alzheimer's disease or other forms of progressive dementia is now an important clinical concern.[109]

HAND carries potentially detrimental clinical consequences for aging people with HIV. In a prospective observational study, neurocognitive impairment was predictive of lower likelihood of retention in care among older persons.[110] HAND is also associated with reduced adherence to therapy[111] and poorer health outcomes including increased mortality.[112] Given the importance of cognitive health, screening for neurocognitive impairment is important, though optimal primary-care based screening methods are as yet unclear. Initial screening with questions regarding any symptoms of memory or concentration difficulties should be performed routinely, though individuals with substantial impairment may not have enough insight into their condition to answer the questions. No brief cognitive screening test has been clearly shown to be sensitive or specific for HAND; the frequently used Mini-Mental State Exam does not typically capture executive function impairment which is the main manifestation of subtle HAND.[113] The Montreal Cognitive Assessment may be more sensitive for HAND but is not specific. If a patient has persistent concerns over time, has symptoms corroborated by an acquaintance, or has progressively worsening symptoms, referral to a neurologist for evaluation and management or to a neuropsychologist for formal neuropsychological testing may be warranted **(BIII)**.

Mental health disorders are a growing concern in aging people with HIV, though little is known about their prevalence and consequences in this population specifically. In a study that compared a cohort of individuals aged >60 years with HIV to a historical control group of healthy older individuals, a heightened risk of mood disorders including anxiety and depression was noted among those with HIV.[114] Social isolation combined with depression is particularly common among older adults with HIV and, in addition to its direct effects on morbidity and mortality, may contribute to poor medication adherence and retention in care.[115,116] The risk of suicide remains greater in people with HIV than in the general population, though increasing age may not further heighten the risk.[117] Screening for depression and management of mental health issues are critical aspects of HIV primary care; guidelines for people with HIV, as well as for aging individuals without HIV, recommend behavioral approaches including individual psychotherapy, cognitive behavioral therapy, and group therapy, and often pharmacological treatment.[118,119] Integrated care models with routine screening by health care support staff, review by primary providers, and referral to on-site mental health specialists are likely to be the most effective approaches in vulnerable aging populations.

Health Care Utilization, Cost Sharing, and End-of-Life Issues

The significantly increased burden of age-related comorbidities, including cardiovascular disease, chronic kidney disease, neurocognitive disease, and fractures, leads to a considerable increase in healthcare

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

utilization and higher costs.[120] Out-of-pocket health care expenses (e.g., copayments, deductibles), loss of employment, and other financial-related factors can cause temporary interruptions in treatment, including ART, which should be avoided whenever possible. The increased life expectancy and higher prevalence of chronic complications in aging populations with HIV can place greater demands upon HIV services[121] and require a focused approach to prioritize modifiable health-related problems.[122] Facilitating continued access to insurance can minimize treatment interruptions and reduce the need for other services to manage concomitant chronic disorders. As with all aging people, it is important to discuss living wills, advance directives, and long-term care planning.

Conclusion

HIV infection can be overlooked in aging adults who tend to present with more advanced disease and experience accelerated CD4 loss. HIV induces immune-phenotypic changes that have been compared to accelerated aging. Effective ART has prolonged the life expectancy of people with HIV, increasing the number of adults aged >50 years living with HIV. However, unique challenges in this population include greater incidence of health complications and comorbidities, some of which may be exacerbated or accelerated by long-term use of some ARV drugs. Providing comprehensive multidisciplinary medical and psychosocial support to patients and their families (the "Medical Home" concept) is of paramount importance in the aging population. Continued involvement of HIV experts, geriatricians, and other specialists in the care of older persons with HIV is warranted.

References

1. Marcus JL, Chao CR, Leyden WA, et al. Narrowing the gap in life expectancy between HIV-infected and HIV-uninfected individuals with access to care. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;73(1):39-46. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27028501.
2. Legarth RA, Ahlstrom MG, Kronborg G, et al. Long-term mortality in HIV-infected individuals 50 years or older: a nationwide, population-based cohort study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;71(2):213-218. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26334734.
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. HIV surveillance report, 2017; vol. 29. 2018. Available at: http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/library/reports/hiv-surveillance.html.
4. Deeks SG, Phillips AN. HIV infection, antiretroviral treatment, ageing, and non-AIDS related morbidity. *BMJ*. 2009;338:a3172. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19171560.
5. Kong AM, Pozen A, Anastos K, Kelvin EA, Nash D. Non-HIV comorbid conditions and polypharmacy among people living with HIV age 65 or older compared with HIV-negative individuals age 65 or older in the United States: a retrospective claims-based analysis. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2019;33(3):93-103. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30844304.
6. Zhao H, Goetz MB. Complications of HIV infection in an aging population: challenges in managing older patients on long-term combination antiretroviral therapy. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2011;66(6):1210-1214. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21421583.
7. Levy JA, Ory MG, Crystal S. HIV/AIDS interventions for midlife and older adults: current status and challenges. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2003;33 Suppl 2:S59-67. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12853854.
8. Levy BR, Ding L, Lakra D, Kosteas J, Niccolai L. Older persons' exclusion from sexually transmitted disease risk-reduction clinical trials. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2007;34(8):541-544. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17297381.
9. Althoff KN, Gebo KA, Gange SJ, et al. CD4 count at presentation for HIV care in the United States and Canada: are those over 50 years more likely to have a delayed presentation? *AIDS Res Ther*. 2010;7:45. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21159161.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

10. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Monitoring selected national HIV prevention and care objectives by using HIV surveillance data—United States and 6 dependent areas. HIV Surveillance Supplemental Report. 2018. Available at: http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/library/reports/hiv-surveillance.html.

11. Lodi S, Phillips A, Touloumi G, et al. Time from human immunodeficiency virus seroconversion to reaching CD4+ cell count thresholds <200, <350, and <500 cells/mm^3: assessment of need following changes in treatment guidelines. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;53(8):817-825. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21921225.

12. Sabin CA, Smith CJ, d'Arminio Monforte A, et al. Response to combination antiretroviral therapy: variation by age. *AIDS*. 2008;22(12):1463-1473. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18614870.

13. Stone VE, Bounds BC, Muse VV, Ferry JA. Case records of the Massachusetts General Hospital. Case 29-2009. An 81-year-old man with weight loss, odynophagia, and failure to thrive. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;361(12):1189-1198. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19759382.

14. Ward EG, Disch WB, Schensul JJ, Levy JA. Understanding low-income, minority older adult self-perceptions of HIV risk. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care*. 2011;22(1):26-37. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20580270.

15. Branson BM, Handsfield HH, Lampe MA, et al. Revised recommendations for HIV testing of adults, adolescents, and pregnant women in health-care settings. *MMWR Recomm Rep*. 2006;55(RR-14):1-17. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16988643.

16. Ford CL, Godette DC, Mulatu MS, Gaines TL. Recent HIV testing prevalence, determinants, and disparities among U.S. older adult respondents to the behavioral risk factor surveillance system. *Sex Transm Dis*. 2015;42(8):405-410. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26165428.

17. Angelovich TA, Hearps AC, Maisa A, et al. Viremic and virologically suppressed HIV infection increases age-related changes to monocyte activation equivalent to 12 and 4 years of aging, respectively. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2015;69(1):11-17. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25647525.

18. Martin J, Volberding P. HIV and premature aging: A field still in its infancy. *Ann Intern Med*. 2010;153(7):477-479. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20921548.

19. Deeks SG, Verdin E, McCune JM. Immunosenescence and HIV. *Curr Opin Immunol*. 2012;24(4):501-506. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22658763.

20. Kaplan RC, Sinclair E, Landay AL, et al. T cell activation and senescence predict subclinical carotid artery disease in HIV-infected women. *J Infect Dis*. 2011;203(4):452-463. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21220772.

21. Spyridopoulos I, Martin-Ruiz C, Hilkens C, et al. CMV seropositivity and T-cell senescence predict increased cardiovascular mortality in octogenarians: results from the Newcastle 85+ study. *Aging Cell*. 2016;15(2):389-392. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26696322.

22. Papagno L, Spina CA, Marchant A, et al. Immune activation and CD8+ T-cell differentiation towards senescence in HIV-1 infection. *PLoS Biol*. 2004;2(2):E20. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14966528.

23. Liu JC, Leung JM, Ngan DA, et al. Absolute leukocyte telomere length in HIV-infected and uninfected individuals: evidence of accelerated cell senescence in HIV-associated chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(4):e0124426. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25885433.

24. Zanet DL, Thorne A, Singer J, et al. Association between short leukocyte telomere length and HIV infection in a cohort study: No evidence of a relationship with antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;58(9):1322-1332. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24457340.

25. Lee SA, Sinclair E, Hatano H, et al. Impact of HIV on CD8+ T cell CD57 expression is distinct from that of CMV and aging. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(2):e89444. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24586783.

26. Freeman ML, Mudd JC, Shive CL, et al. CD8 T-cell expansion and inflammation linked to CMV coinfection in ART-treated HIV infection. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;62(3):392-396. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26400999.

27. Schouten J, Wit FW, Stolte IG, et al. Cross-sectional comparison of the prevalence of age-associated comorbidities and their risk factors between HIV-infected and uninfected individuals: the AGEhIV cohort study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;59(12):1787-1797. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25182245.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

28. Althoff KN, McGinnis KA, Wyatt CM, et al. Comparison of risk and age at diagnosis of myocardial infarction, end-stage renal disease, and non-AIDS-defining cancer in HIV-infected versus uninfected adults. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;60(4):627-638. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25362204.

29. Rasmussen LD, May MT, Kronborg G, et al. Time trends for risk of severe age-related diseases in individuals with and without HIV infection in Denmark: a nationwide population-based cohort study. *Lancet HIV*. 2015;2(7):e288-298. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26423253.

30. Schoenbaum EE, Hartel D, Lo Y, et al. HIV infection, drug use, and onset of natural menopause. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;41(10):1517-1524. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16231267.

31. Imai K, Sutton MY, Mdodo R, Del Rio C. HIV and menopause: a systematic review of the effects of HIV infection on age at menopause and the effects of menopause on response to antiretroviral therapy. *Obstet Gynecol Int*. 2013;2013:340309. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24454386.

32. Althoff KN, Jacobson LP, Cranston RD, et al. Age, comorbidities, and AIDS predict a frailty phenotype in men who have sex with men. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2014;69(2):189-198. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24127428.

33. Retornaz F, Petit N, Darque A, et al. Frailty phenotype in older people living with HIV: concepts, prevention and issues. *Geriatr Psychol Neuropsychiatr Vieil*. 2019;17(2):123-128. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31010801.

34. Sharma A, Shi Q, Hoover DR, et al. Frailty predicts fractures among women with and at-risk for HIV. *AIDS*. 2019;33(3):455-463. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30702514.

35. Erlandson KM, Karris MY. HIV and aging: reconsidering the approach to management of comorbidities. *Infect Dis Clin North Am*. 2019;33(3):769-786. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31395144.

36. Kelly SG, Wu K, Tassiopoulos K, Erlandson KM, Koletar SL, Palella FJ. Frailty is an independent risk factor for mortality, cardiovascular disease, bone disease, and diabetes among aging adults with human immunodeficiency virus. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2019;69(8):1370-1376. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30590451.

37. Sharma A, Hoover DR, Shi Q, et al. Frailty as a predictor of falls in HIV-infected and uninfected women. *Antivir Ther*. 2019;24(1):51-61. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30604692.

38. Womack JA, Goulet JL, Gibert C, et al. Physiologic frailty and fragility fracture in HIV-infected male veterans. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;56(10):1498-1504. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23378285.

39. Tassiopoulos K, Abdo M, Wu K, et al. Frailty is strongly associated with increased risk of recurrent falls among older HIV-infected adults. *AIDS*. 2017;31(16):2287-2294. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28991026.

40. Blanco JR, Barrio I, Ramalle-Gomara E, et al. Gender differences for frailty in HIV-infected patients on stable antiretroviral therapy and with an undetectable viral load. *PLoS One*. 2019;14(5):e0215764. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31071105.

41. Brothers TD, Kirkland S, Theou O, et al. Predictors of transitions in frailty severity and mortality among people aging with HIV. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(10):e0185352. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28981535.

42. Akgun KM, Tate JP, Crothers K, et al. An adapted frailty-related phenotype and the VACS index as predictors of hospitalization and mortality in HIV-infected and uninfected individuals. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2014;67(4):397-404. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25202921.

43. Morgello S, Gensler G, Sherman S, et al. Frailty in medically complex individuals with chronic HIV. *AIDS*. 2019;33(10):1603-1611. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31305330.

44. Yin M, Dobkin J, Brudney K, et al. Bone mass and mineral metabolism in HIV+ postmenopausal women. *Osteoporos Int*. 2005;16(11):1345-1352. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15754081.

45. Brown TT, Qaqish RB. Response to Berg et al. Antiretroviral therapy and the prevalence of osteopenia and osteoporosis: a meta-analytic review. *AIDS*. 2007;21(13):1830-1831. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17690589.

46. Grant PM, Kitch D, McComsey GA, et al. Low baseline CD4+ count is associated with greater bone mineral density loss after antiretroviral therapy initiation. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;57(10):1483-1488. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

pubmed/23943825.

47. Stirrup OT, Copas AJ, Phillips AN, et al. Predictors of CD4 cell recovery following initiation of antiretroviral therapy among HIV-1 positive patients with well-estimated dates of seroconversion. *HIV Med*. 2018;19(3):184-194. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29230953.

48. Croxford S, Kitching A, Desai S, et al. Mortality and causes of death in people diagnosed with HIV in the era of highly active antiretroviral therapy compared with the general population: an analysis of a national observational cohort. *Lancet Public Health*. 2017;2(1):e35-e46. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29249478.

49. Edwards JK, Cole SR, Westreich D, et al. Age at entry into care, timing of antiretroviral therapy initiation, and 10-year mortality among HIV-seropositive adults in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;61(7):1189-1195. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26082505.

50. Lodi S, Costagliola D, Sabin C, et al. Effect of immediate initiation of antiretroviral treatment in HIV-positive individuals aged 50 years or older. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2017;76(3):311-318. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28746165.

51. Molina JM, Grund B, Gordin F, et al. Which HIV-infected adults with high CD4 T-cell counts benefit most from immediate initiation of antiretroviral therapy? A post-hoc subgroup analysis of the START trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2018;5(4):e172-e180. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29352723.

52. Stellbrink HJ, Orkin C, Arribas JR, et al. Comparison of changes in bone density and turnover with abacavir-lamivudine versus tenofovir-emtricitabine in HIV-infected adults: 48-week results from the ASSERT study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2010;51(8):963-972. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20828304.

53. Martin A, Bloch M, Amin J, et al. Simplification of antiretroviral therapy with tenofovir-emtricitabine or abacavir-lamivudine: a randomized, 96-week trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2009;49(10):1591-1601. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19842973.

54. Duvivier C, Kolta S, Assoumou L, et al. Greater decrease in bone mineral density with protease inhibitor regimens compared with nonnucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor regimens in HIV-1 infected naive patients. *AIDS*. 2009;23(7):817-824. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19363330.

55. Brown TT, Moser C, Currier JS, et al. Changes in bone mineral density after initiation of antiretroviral treatment with tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine plus atazanavir/ritonavir, darunavir/ritonavir, or raltegravir. *J Infect Dis*. 2015;212(8):1241-1249. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25948863.

56. Horberg MA, Hurley LB, Klein DB, et al. The HIV care cascade measured over time and by age, sex, and race in a large national integrated care system. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2015;29(11):582-590. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26505968.

57. Althoff KN, Justice AC, Gange SJ, et al. Virologic and immunologic response to HAART, by age and regimen class. *AIDS*. 2010;24(16):2469-2479. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20829678.

58. Bosch RJ, Bennett K, Collier AC, Zackin R, Benson CA. Pretreatment factors associated with 3-year (144-week) virologic and immunologic responses to potent antiretroviral therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2007;44(3):268-277. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17146370.

59. Nogueras M, Navarro G, Anton E, et al. Epidemiological and clinical features, response to HAART, and survival in HIV-infected patients diagnosed at the age of 50 or more. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2006;6:159. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17087819.

60. Sitar DS. Aging issues in drug disposition and efficacy. *Proc West Pharmacol Soc*. 2007;50:16-20. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18605223.

61. Gimeno-Gracia M, Crusells-Canales MJ, Armesto-Gomez FJ, Compaired-Turlan V, Rabanaque-Hernandez MJ. Polypharmacy in older adults with human immunodeficiency virus infection compared with the general population. *Clin Interv Aging*. 2016;11:1149-1157. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27616883.

62. Ware D, Palella FJ Jr, Chew KW, et al. Prevalence and trends of polypharmacy among HIV-positive and -negative men in the Multicenter AIDS Cohort Study from 2004 to 2016. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(9):e0203890. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30204807.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

63. Halloran MO, Boyle C, Kehoe B, et al. Polypharmacy and drug-drug interactions in older and younger people living with HIV: the POPPY study. *Antivir Ther*. 2019;24(3):193-201. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30700636.

64. Cuzin L, Katlama C, Cotte L, et al. Ageing with HIV: do comorbidities and polymedication drive treatment optimization? *HIV Med*. 2017;18(6):395-401. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28858437.

65. Guaraldi G, Malagoli A, Calcagno A, et al. The increasing burden and complexity of multi-morbidity and polypharmacy in geriatric HIV patients: a cross sectional study of people aged 65-74 years and more than 75 years. *BMC Geriatr*. 2018;18(1):99. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29678160.

66. Steinman MA, Hanlon JT. Managing medications in clinically complex elders: "There's got to be a happy medium". *JAMA*. 2010;304(14):1592-1601. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20940385.

67. Marzolini C, Back D, Weber R, et al. Ageing with HIV: medication use and risk for potential drug-drug interactions. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2011;66(9):2107-2111. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21680580.

68. Holtzman C, Armon C, Tedaldi E, et al. Polypharmacy and risk of antiretroviral drug interactions among the aging HIV-infected population. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2013;28(10):1302-1310. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23605401.

69. Bastida C, Grau A, Marquez M, et al. Polypharmacy and potential drug-drug interactions in an HIV-infected elderly population. *Farm Hosp*. 2017;41(5):618-624. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28847251.

70. Demessine L, Peyro-Saint-Paul L, Gardner EM, Ghosn J, Parienti JJ. Risk and cost associated with drug-drug interactions among aging HIV patients receiving combined antiretroviral therapy in France. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2019;6(3):ofz051. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30949521.

71. Gellad WF, Grenard JL, Marcum ZA. A systematic review of barriers to medication adherence in the elderly: looking beyond cost and regimen complexity. *Am J Geriatr Pharmacother*. 2011;9(1):11-23. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21459305.

72. Wellons MF, Sanders L, Edwards LJ, Bartlett JA, Heald AE, Schmader KE. HIV infection: treatment outcomes in older and younger adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. 2002;50(4):603-607. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11982658.

73. Wutoh AK, Elekwachi O, Clarke-Tasker V, Daftary M, Powell NJ, Campusano G. Assessment and predictors of antiretroviral adherence in older HIV-infected patients. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2003;33 Suppl 2:S106-114. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12853859.

74. Silverberg MJ, Leyden W, Horberg MA, DeLorenze GN, Klein D, Quesenberry CP Jr. Older age and the response to and tolerability of antiretroviral therapy. *Arch Intern Med*. 2007;167(7):684-691. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17420427.

75. Duff PK, Money DM, Ogilvie GS, et al. Severe menopausal symptoms associated with reduced adherence to antiretroviral therapy among perimenopausal and menopausal women living with HIV in Metro Vancouver. *Menopause*. 2018;25(5):531-537. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29206769.

76. Brown TT, Hoy J, Borderi M, et al. Recommendations for evaluation and management of bone disease in HIV. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;60(8):1242-1251. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25609682.

77. Kooij KW, Vogt L, Wit F, et al. Higher prevalence and faster progression of chronic kidney disease in human immunodeficiency virus-infected middle-aged individuals compared with human immunodeficiency virus-uninfected controls. *J Infect Dis*. 2017;216(6):622-631. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28934420.

78. Calza L, Sachs M, Colangeli V, et al. Prevalence of chronic kidney disease among HIV-1-infected patients receiving a combination antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Exp Nephrol*. 2019;23(11):1272-1279. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31327092.

79. Mocroft A, Lundgren JD, Ross M, et al. Cumulative and current exposure to potentially nephrotoxic antiretrovirals and development of chronic kidney disease in HIV-positive individuals with a normal baseline estimated glomerular filtration rate: a prospective international cohort study. *Lancet HIV*. 2016;3(1):e23-32. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26762990.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

80. Selwyn PA. Chapter 75: Palliative care in HIV/AIDS. In: Berger AM S, JL, Von Roenn JH, ed. *Principles and Practice of Palliative Care and Supportive Oncology*. 3rd ed. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2007:833-848.

81. Harding R, Simms V, Krakauer E, et al. Quality HIV care to the end of life. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;52(4):553-554; author reply 554. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21258107.

82. Justice AC. HIV and aging: time for a new paradigm. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2010;7(2):69-76. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20425560.

83. Palella FJ Jr, Baker RK, Moorman AC, et al. Mortality in the highly active antiretroviral therapy era: changing causes of death and disease in the HIV outpatient study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2006;43(1):27-34. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16878047.

84. Smit C, Geskus R, Walker S, et al. Effective therapy has altered the spectrum of cause-specific mortality following HIV seroconversion. *AIDS*. 2006;20(5):741-749. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16514305.

85. Althoff KN, Gebo KA, Moore RD, et al. Contributions of traditional and HIV-related risk factors on non-AIDS-defining cancer, myocardial infarction, and end-stage liver and renal diseases in adults with HIV in the USA and Canada: a collaboration of cohort studies. *Lancet HIV*. 2019;6(2):e93-e104. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30683625.

86. Kochanek KD, Xu J, Murphy SL, Minino AM, King HC. Deaths: preliminary data for 2009. *Natl Vital Stat Rep*. 2011;59(4):1-51. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr59/nvsr59_04.pdf.

87. Mdodo R, Frazier EL, Dube SR, et al. Cigarette smoking prevalence among adults with HIV compared with the general adult population in the United States: cross-sectional surveys. *Ann Intern Med*. 2015;162(5):335-344. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25732274.

88. Reddy KP, Parker RA, Losina E, et al. Impact of cigarette smoking and smoking cessation on life expectancy among people with HIV: a US-based modeling study. *J Infect Dis*. 2016;214(11):1672-1681. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27815384.

89. Wong C, Gange SJ, Moore RD, et al. Multimorbidity among persons living with human immunodeficiency virus in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2018;66(8):1230-1238. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29149237.

90. Guaraldi G, Orlando G, Zona S, et al. Premature age-related comorbidities among HIV-infected persons compared with the general population. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;53(11):1120-1126. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21998278.

91. Capeau J. Premature aging and premature age-related comorbidities in HIV-infected patients: facts and hypotheses. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;53(11):1127-1129. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21998279.

92. Hasse B, Ledergerber B, Furrer H, et al. Morbidity and aging in HIV-infected persons: the Swiss HIV cohort study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;53(11):1130-1139. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21998280.

93. American Academy of HIV Medicine. The HIV and Aging Consensus Project: Recommended treatment strategies for clinicians managing older patients with HIV. 2011. Available at: https://aahivm.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Aging-report-working-document-FINAL-12.1.pdf.

94. Aberg JA, Gallant JE, Ghanem KG, Emmanuel P, Zingman BS, Horberg MA. Primary care guidelines for the management of persons infected with HIV: 2013 update by the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;58(1):e1-34. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24235263.

95. Lucas GM, Ross MJ, Stock PG, et al. Clinical practice guideline for the management of chronic kidney disease in patients infected with HIV: 2014 update by the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;59(9):e96-138. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25234519.

96. Feinstein MJ, Hsue PY, Benjamin LA, et al. Characteristics, prevention, and management of cardiovascular disease in people living with HIV: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2019;140(2):e98-e124. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31154814.

97. Davies MJ, D'Alessio DA, Fradkin J, et al. Management of hyperglycemia in type 2 diabetes, 2018. A consensus report by the American Diabetes Association (ADA) and the European Association for the Study of Diabetes (EASD). *Diabetes Care*. 2018;41(12):2669-2701. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30291106.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

98. Grundy SM, Stone NJ, Bailey AL, et al. 2018 AHA/ACC/AACVPR/AAPA/ABC/ACPM/ADA/AGS/APhA/ASPC/NLA/PCNA guideline on the management of blood cholesterol: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018(18):39033-39038. Available at: http://www.onlinejacc.org/content/accj/early/2018/11/02/j.jacc.2018.11.003.full.pdf.

99. Triant VA, Perez J, Regan S, et al. Cardiovascular risk prediction functions underestimate risk in HIV infection. *Circulation*. 2018;137(21):2203-2214. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29444987.

100. Heaton RK, Clifford DB, Franklin DR Jr, et al. HIV-associated neurocognitive disorders persist in the era of potent antiretroviral therapy: CHARTER Study. *Neurology*. 2010;75(23):2087-2096. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21135382.

101. Saloner R, Heaton RK, Campbell LM, et al. Effects of comorbidity burden and age on brain integrity in HIV. *AIDS*. 2019;33(7):1175-1185. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30870195.

102. Canizares S, Cherner M, Ellis RJ. HIV and aging: effects on the central nervous system. *Semin Neurol*. 2014;34(1):27-34. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24715486.

103. Vance DE, Wadley VG, Crowe MG, Raper JL, Ball KK. Cognitive and everyday functioning in older and younger adults with and without HIV. *Clin Gerontol*. 2011;34(5):413-426. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22563140.

104. Goodkin K, Miller EN, Cox C, et al. Effect of ageing on neurocognitive function by stage of HIV infection: evidence from the Multicenter AIDS Cohort Study. *Lancet HIV*. 2017;4(9):e411-e422. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28716545.

105. Rubin LH, Springer G, Martin EM, et al. Elevated depressive symptoms are a stronger predictor of executive dysfunction in HIV-infected women than in men. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2019;81(3):274-283. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30893126.

106. Mukerji SS, Locascio JJ, Misra V, et al. Lipid profiles and APOE4 allele impact midlife cognitive decline in HIV-infected men on antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;63(8):1130-1139. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27448678.

107. Hellmuth J, Milanini B, Valcour V. Interactions between ageing and NeuroAIDS. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS*. 2014;9(6):527-532. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25203641.

108. Sundermann EE, Erlandson KM, Pope CN, et al. Current challenges and solutions in research and clinical care of older persons living with hiv: findings presented at the 9th International Workshop on HIV and Aging. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2019. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31373216.

109. Milanini B, Valcour V. Differentiating HIV-associated neurocognitive disorders from Alzheimer's disease: an emerging issue in geriatric NeuroHIV. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2017;14(4):123-132. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28779301.

110. Jacks A, Wainwright DA, Salazar L, et al. Neurocognitive deficits increase risk of poor retention in care among older adults with newly diagnosed HIV infection. *AIDS*. 2015;29(13):1711-1714. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26372282.

111. Kamal S, Locatelli I, Wandeler G, et al. The presence of human immunodeficiency virus-associated neurocognitive disorders is associated with a lower adherence to combined antiretroviral treatment. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. 2017;4(2):ofx070. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28584853.

112. Patel S, Parikh NU, Aalinkeel R, et al. United States national trends in mortality, length of stay (LOS) and associated costs of cognitive impairment in HIV population from 2005 to 2014. *AIDS Behav*. 2018;22(10):3198-3208. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29705930.

113. Valcour V, Paul R, Chiao S, Wendelken LA, Miller B. Screening for cognitive impairment in human immunodeficiency virus. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;53(8):836-842. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21921226.

114. Milanini B, Catella S, Perkovich B, et al. Psychiatric symptom burden in older people living with HIV with and without cognitive impairment: the UCSF HIV over 60 cohort study. *AIDS Care*. 2017;29(9):1178-1185. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28127989.

115. Grov C, Golub SA, Parsons JT, Brennan M, Karpiak SE. Loneliness and HIV-related stigma explain depression

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

among older HIV-positive adults. *AIDS Care*. 2010;22(5):630-639. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20401765.

116. Kalichman SC, Heckman T, Kochman A, Sikkema K, Bergholte J. Depression and thoughts of suicide among middle-aged and older persons living with HIV-AIDS. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2000;51(7):903-907. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10875956.

117. Ruffieux Y, Lemsalu L, Aebi-Popp K, et al. Mortality from suicide among people living with HIV and the general Swiss population: 1988-2017. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2019;22(8):e25339. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31423727.

118. Nanni MG, Caruso R, Mitchell AJ, Meggiolaro E, Grassi L. Depression in HIV infected patients: a review. *Curr Psychiatry Rep*. 2015;17(1):530. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25413636.

119. Alexopoulos GS. Depression in the elderly. *Lancet*. 2005;365(9475):1961-1970. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15936426.

120. Gallant J, Hsue P, Budd D, Meyer N. Healthcare utilization and direct costs of non-infectious comorbidities in HIV-infected patients in the USA. *Curr Med Res Opin*. 2018;34(1):13-23. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28933204.

121. Brennan A, Morley D, O'Leary AC, Bergin CJ, Horgan M. Determinants of HIV outpatient service utilization: a systematic review. *AIDS Behav*. 2015;19(1):104-119. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24907780.

122. Erlandson KM, Perez J, Abdo M, et al. Frailty, neurocognitive impairment, or both in predicting poor health outcomes among adults living with human immunodeficiency virus. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2019;68(1):131-138. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29788039.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Substance Use Disorders and HIV (Last updated July 10, 2019; last reviewed July 10, 2019)

Key Considerations and Recommendations
• Substance use disorders (SUDs) are prevalent among people with HIV and contribute to poor health outcomes; therefore, screening for SUDs should be a routine part of clinical care **(AII)**. • The most commonly used substances among people with HIV include alcohol, benzodiazepines, cannabinoids, club drugs, opioids, stimulants (cocaine and methamphetamines), and tobacco. • Health care providers should be nonjudgmental when addressing substance use with their patients **(AIII)**. • Persons with HIV and SUDs should be screened for additional mental health disorders **(AII)**. • Persons with HIV and SUDs should be offered evidenced-based pharmacotherapy (e.g., opioid agonist therapy, tobacco cessation treatment, alcohol use disorder treatment; see Table 13) as part of comprehensive HIV care in HIV clinical settings **(AI)**. • Ongoing substance use is not a contraindication to antiretroviral therapy (ART) **(AI)**. Persons who use substances can achieve and maintain viral suppression with ART. • Substance use may increase the likelihood of risk-taking behaviors (e.g., risky sexual behaviors), the potential for drug-drug interactions, and the risk or severity of substance-associated toxicities (e.g., increased hepatotoxicity or an increased risk of overdose). • Selection of ART regimens for individuals who practice unhealthy substance and alcohol use should take potential adherence barriers, comorbidities which could impact care (e.g., advanced liver disease from alcohol or hepatitis viruses), potential drug-drug interactions, and possible adverse events associated with the medications into account **(AII)**. • ART regimens with once-daily dosing of single-tablet regimens, high barriers to resistance, low hepatotoxicity, and low potential for drug-drug interactions are preferred **(AIII)**.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional* ***Rating of Evidence:*** *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

Background on Substance Use Disorders among People with HIV

Ending the HIV epidemic requires addressing substance use among people with HIV, which poses a barrier to optimal engagement in the HIV care continuum. Ongoing substance use may prevent an individual from being tested for HIV, initiating antiretroviral therapy (ART), or adhering to ART, and it may increase the frequency of behaviors that put a person at risk for HIV transmission. Substance use may increase the likelihood of risk-taking behaviors (e.g., risky sexual behaviors, needle sharing, and injection of substances), the potential for drug-drug interactions, and the risk or severity of substance-related toxicities (e.g., increased hepatotoxicity and increased risk of overdose). In the United States, the death toll for drug overdose (70,237 deaths in 2017)[1] now far exceeds the death toll for HIV (15,807 deaths in 2016).[2] As the drug overdose epidemic continues to expand, health care providers need to have a basic understanding of how to screen for and treat substance use disorders in persons with HIV in clinical settings.[3]

Substance use exists on a continuum from episodic use to a substance use disorder (SUD) with its concomitant negative consequences. Research on alcohol consumption has defined a threshold at which consumption does not reach a diagnosis of a SUD, but where the level of consumption is nonetheless hazardous to the person. This level of consumption has been defined as "hazardous drinking." A comparable category does not exist for other substances. The prevalence of substance use and SUDs is higher among people with HIV than among the general public,[4] and polysubstance use is common. This section will focus on the most commonly used substances among people with HIV: alcohol, benzodiazepines, cannabinoids, club drugs,[5] opioids, stimulants (cocaine and methamphetamines), and tobacco.

Persons with HIV may use more than one substance and may not be ready to consider reducing the use of substances or seeking treatment for SUDs. Polysubstance use occurs for multiple reasons, including to

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

improve the euphoria associated with use (e.g., use of cocaine and heroin mixtures called "speedballs") and to reduce the adverse effects of a particular substance (e.g., the use of alcohol or benzodiazepines to reduce the anxiety caused by cocaine use).

Substance Use and Sexual Risk Taking

There is a growing body of literature describing the intersection of substance use and sexual risk taking ("chemsex"). While a precise definition of "chemsex" is lacking, and the various studies have investigated the use of many different substances, this research highlights the impact of substance use on sexual risk behaviors. In these settings, substances may be used to enhance sexual pleasure, decrease inhibitions related to particular sexual acts, and combat low self-esteem. In a retrospective study in a London sexual health clinic, individuals who disclosed substance use (463 of 1,734 patients) had higher odds of acquiring new HIV infection, bacterial sexually transmitted infections (STIs), and/or hepatitis C virus (HCV).[6] A much larger analysis using the European Men Who Have Sex with Men (MSM) Internet Survey, which collected data from 16,065 United Kingdom-based respondents, found that MSM who reported using methamphetamines or gamma-hydroxybutyrate (GHB) during the previous year were more likely to have gonorrhea infection than MSM who did not use these drugs, with odds ratios of 1.92 and 2.23, respectively.[7] These data emphasize the need to screen patients for substance use and STIs in clinical settings.

Screening for Substance Use Disorders

Screening for SUDs should be incorporated into the routine clinical care of all persons with HIV. The following questions can be used to screen for drug or alcohol use: "How many times in the past year have you used an illegal drug or used a prescription medication for nonmedical reasons?" and "How many times in the past year have you had X or more drinks in a day?" (X is five for men and four for women).[8] Data are lacking on the appropriate threshold for alcohol use among transgender individuals, so until data clarifies the risks, providers should use the more conservative threshold of four drinks. Individuals with liver disease, including active HCV infection, should not consume alcohol. A positive response of at least one time on either screen should prompt additional screening with other short, yet effective screening tools (see the Screening and Assessment Tools Chart from the National Institute on Drug Abuse). These tools can identify substance use and guide decisions on appropriate treatment interventions. There is currently not enough data to determine how often patients should be screened for SUDs; however, given the potential negative impact that SUDs may have on persons with HIV, it is advisable to ask these questions during every clinical visit.

Health care providers should be nonjudgmental when discussing substance use with their patients. Patients who experience stigma or who feel judged may not trust the health care provider's recommendations, may avoid returning to see that provider again, and may consequently have poorer health outcomes.[9] Language is one way in which stigma is communicated, and words such as "addict" and "dirty urine" convey a negative connotation. The Office of National Drug Control Policy (ONDCP), the American Medical Association, the American Society of Addiction Medicine, the International Society of Addiction Journal Editors, and others have recommended the adoption of clinical, non-stigmatizing language for substance use as described in the "Changing the Language of Addiction" report from ONDCP.

Co-Occurring Mental Illness

Many people who use substances have co-occurring mental health disorders, including a history of trauma that may drive and/or exacerbate their substance use. Conversely, ongoing use of substances can place individuals at risk of trauma, such as sexual assault and sexual exploitation, which may further exacerbate their substance use.[6,10] People with SUDs should undergo evaluation and treatment for concurrent mental health disorders using standardized screening instruments (e.g., the Patient Health Questionnaire-2 [PHQ-2] for depression).[11] Where applicable, clinicians should use available behavioral and pharmacological interventions to address mental health concerns, because recommending that patients stop their substance use without providing treatment for underlying mental health conditions has very limited efficacy.[11]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Several behavioral interventions have shown promise in randomized trials. Motivational interviewing, cognitive behavioral therapy, or a combination of the two have led to decreases in stimulant use, decreases in risky sexual behaviors, and improved adherence to ART.[12] Contingency management, a behavioral intervention that provides rewards for abstinence, has been shown to be effective in decreasing stimulant use among persons with HIV, but the sustained effects of this intervention are less clear.[13]

Selecting and Initiating an Antiretroviral Therapy Regimen

Ongoing substance use is not a contraindication to prescribing ART. Indeed, ART reduces the risk of HIV transmission to sexual and drug-using partners. These clinical, community, and individual benefits should encourage health care providers to initiate ART in people with HIV who use substances, and for those with SUDs.

When selecting ART regimens for individuals who use substances, clinicians should consider potential barriers to adherence (see Adherence to the Continuum of Care), co-morbidities that could impact care (e.g., advanced liver disease from alcohol or HCV), potential drug-drug interactions, and possible adverse events that are associated with the medications. Providers should discuss adherence with their patients during multiple, nonjudgmental evaluations. In general, the use of simplified ART regimens should be considered to aid ART adherence. Regimens for people with SUDs should be easy to take, such as a once-daily, single-tablet regimen,[14] and have a high barrier to resistance or a low risk of hepatotoxicity. Adherence counseling should highlight the benefits of ART use, irrespective of concurrent substance use. Additionally, a reduction in substance use may improve adherence to ART.[15]

Commonly Used Substances and Their Impact on HIV and Antiretroviral Therapy

Health care providers should have a basic understanding of evidence-based treatments for SUDs, including alcohol, benzodiazepines, cannabinoids, club drugs, opioids, stimulants (cocaine and methamphetamines), and tobacco. The sections below discuss the impact of these substances on persons with HIV and how these substances affect ART use.

Alcohol

Epidemiology

Alcohol consumption is common among persons with HIV. Recent estimates indicate that >50% of persons with HIV in the United States consume any amount of alcohol (with a range of 54% to 67%).[16,17] Among a sample of persons with HIV across seven university-based HIV clinics in the United States, 27% of people screened positive for unhealthy alcohol use as determined by the Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test-Consumption (AUDIT-C).[17] Unhealthy alcohol use includes a spectrum of consumption, including risky or hazardous use, heavy episodic use (binge drinking), and alcohol use disorder (AUD).[18]

Risk-Taking Behaviors, the HIV Care Continuum, and Comorbidities

Unhealthy alcohol use has been linked to HIV acquisition, as unhealthy alcohol use can increase the frequency of behaviors that put a person at risk for sexual transmission of HIV.[19-21] In a meta-analysis of 27 studies, any alcohol use, unhealthy alcohol use, and alcohol use in sexual contexts were all associated with condomless sex among persons with HIV.[20]

In addition, unhealthy alcohol use has been associated with interruptions in all steps of the HIV care continuum, including lower adherence to ART.[22,23] Studies have demonstrated both temporal and dose-related relationships between alcohol use and adherence, where ART is more likely to be missed on a given drinking day and the day after drinking, with a stronger association on heavy (binge) drinking days.[24-26] The negative impact of unhealthy alcohol use on ART adherence is likely multifactorial and driven by the effects of intoxication, ART regimen complexity, and patient perceptions of adverse interactions between alcohol and ART drugs.[27-29] Studies have also demonstrated an association between unhealthy alcohol use

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

and the loss of durable viral suppression,[30,31] greater time spent with a viral load >1,500 copies/mL after ART initiation,[32] increased risk of viral rebound, lower retention in care,[33,34] and increased mortality.[35-37] Unhealthy alcohol use alone (hazardous or AUD) and in combination with other common comorbidities, including viral hepatitis coinfection, can hasten liver fibrosis progression in persons with HIV.[38,39] Finally, in general medical populations, unhealthy alcohol use complicates the management of diabetes mellitus, hypertension, mental health disorders, other substance use, and other chronic diseases and increases the risk for pneumonia, osteoporosis, a number of cancers (e.g., liver, head and neck, and breast cancers), and tuberculosis.

Management of Unhealthy Alcohol Use

On-going alcohol use is not a contraindication for a person to receive ART. However, treatment for unhealthy alcohol use may further improve HIV treatment outcomes. Behavioral treatments for unhealthy alcohol use among persons with HIV demonstrate a small but significant reduction in alcohol use[40] (see additional resources for alcohol management from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism and the American Public Health Association). Pharmacotherapy can also reduce alcohol use among persons with HIV. There are three Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved pharmacotherapies for AUD: naltrexone, disulfiram, and acamprosate (see Table 13).

Clinical trials have demonstrated the efficacy of naltrexone in reducing the number of heavy drinking days among those with HIV and among the general population. Naltrexone appears to be safe to use in persons with HIV,[41,42] and it is not associated with significant drug-drug interactions or irreversible hepatotoxicity. However, it is not recommended for individuals with decompensated liver disease and should be used with caution in individuals with elevated transaminase levels. Use of naltrexone in persons with HIV and AUD can improve HIV treatment outcomes. In a randomized placebo-controlled trial of 100 prisoners with HIV who met the criteria for AUD, individuals who were provided depot naltrexone upon release from prison were more likely to achieve viral suppression at 6 months than the placebo group (56.7% vs. 30.3%).[42]

Data on the use of disulfiram and acamprosate among persons with HIV are lacking. Notably, integrating treatment for AUD with treatment for HIV has been shown to increase the number of patients who receive alcohol treatment medication, counselling, and formal outpatient alcohol treatment services. Integrating these treatments may also improve the likelihood that a patient will achieve viral suppression on ART. A randomized controlled trial of 128 individuals with HIV and AUD compared an integrated stepped-care model of alcohol treatment in Veteran's Administration HIV clinics to treatment as usual. At end of treatment (24 weeks), integrated stepped care resulted in more participants receiving pharmacotherapy for AUD and participating in counseling. Though differences in alcohol use and viral suppression were not seen at 24 weeks, at 52 weeks integrated stepped care was significantly associated with an increased number of alcohol abstinent days, a decrease in the number of drinks per drinking day, and a decreased number of heavy drinking episodes. In addition, the patients in the stepped care group had increased odds of achieving viral suppression (odds ratio [OR] 5.58; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.11–27.99).[43]

Liver cirrhosis, whether related to chronic heavy alcohol use, viral hepatitis, or nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, can result in altered metabolism of antiretroviral (ARV) drugs. For those who have hepatic impairment due to alcohol-related liver disease, ART dosing should follow the recommendations in Appendix B, Table 10, which are based on Child-Pugh classifications.

Benzodiazepines

Epidemiology

While specific epidemiologic data on the prevalence of benzodiazepine use among persons with HIV are limited, the use of benzodiazepines can impact both morbidity and mortality. Benzodiazepines cause anterograde amnesia, defined as difficulty recalling events after taking the medication. Individuals do not develop tolerance to this neurocognitive effect, and long-term use of benzodiazepines may result in impairment of neurocognitive functioning.[44]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Risk-Taking Behaviors and the HIV Care Continuum

People who inject drugs and who also use benzodiazepines engage in riskier behaviors than the people who inject drugs but who do not use benzodiazepines; these behaviors may include paying for sex, sharing injection equipment with more people, and performing more frequent injections.[45] A cohort of 2,802 people who injected drugs was followed from 1996 to 2013. During that time, benzodiazepines were the substances with the greatest association with mortality.[46] The long-term neurocognitive impact of benzodiazepines on ART adherence among persons with HIV is unclear, but prescribing a memory-impairing medication to persons with HIV who are prone to neurocognitive impairments from other causes increases the risk of poor ART adherence.[47] Benzodiazepines are also used illicitly to counteract the negative side effects of stimulants such as cocaine and methamphetamine.[48]

Management of Benzodiazepine Use

Repeated use of benzodiazepines can result in physiologic dependence and life-threatening withdrawal in some patients. When feasible, individuals who chronically take benzodiazepines should be slowly tapered off the benzodiazepines under the supervision of an experienced clinician. Different benzodiazepines have different potencies (e.g., alprazolam is more potent than diazepam) and therefore require different tapers in terms of length and graduated decrease in dosage.

Benzodiazepine and Antiretroviral Drug Interactions

Several pharmacological interactions with ARV drugs have also been described. For example, some benzodiazepines are cytochrome P (CYP) 3A4 substrates; thus, when these benzodiazepines are used with a ritonavir-boosted or cobicistat-boosted ARV drug, their half-lives and concentrations can increase significantly, leading to enhanced and prolonged sedating effects. See Drug-Drug Interactions for available data on benzodiazepine-related interactions.[49]

Cannabinoids

Epidemiology

Both medical and recreational cannabis (marijuana) use are prevalent among people with HIV.[50] Cannabis belongs to a class of compounds that activate cannabinoid receptors. This class, known as cannabinoids, also includes synthetic compounds such as K2. In recent years, cannabinoids have become more popular. In 2009, two cannabinoids were reported to the National Forensic Laboratory Information System. By 2015, 84 compounds had been reported.[51] These compounds most commonly cause tachycardia, agitation, and nausea, but they have a wide range of psychiatric effects, including psychosis and paranoia.[52]

Risk-Taking Behaviors and the HIV Care Continuum

Cannabis has not been shown to negatively impact adherence to ART or a patient's ability to achieve viral suppression. In one study, among 874 persons with HIV, daily cannabis use did not predict lower odds of ART use or achieving an undetectable HIV RNA level, except when combined with binge drinking.[53] Data from the Multicenter AIDS Cohort Study have supported the idea that marijuana use does not predict problems with adherence to ART or achieving viral suppression.[54] In some cases, however, cannabinoids have been listed as the cause of death in overdoses. While data are lacking among adults with HIV, the nationally representative 2015 Youth Risk Behavior Survey (which includes data from 15,624 adolescent students in grades 9 to 12) found that students who had ever used synthetic cannabinoids engaged in riskier activities, including sex, than students who only used marijuana.[55] While the available data suggest that the use of marijuana in not associated with decreased adherence to ART,[56] data are currently lacking on the impact of synthetic cannabinoids on ART adherence. Finally, with the growing use of synthetic cannabinoids, there is concern that fentanyl could be added to these products, which may increase the risk of opioid overdose.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Management of Cannabinoid Use

Due to the aforementioned concerns regarding cannabinoid use—particularly the variety of compounds and neuropsychiatric effects—persons with HIV should be discouraged from using cannabinoids until more data are available. There is no pharmacological treatment for cannabinoid use disorder; however, behavioral health treatment may be effective for some patients.[57-59]

Club Drugs

Epidemiology

Club drugs are recreational substances that have euphoric or hallucinogenic effects, or that are used to enhance sexual experiences.[5] The use of multiple club drugs or other drugs simultaneously is common. While these substances are used by many different persons with HIV, the majority of data comes from MSM with HIV. Use of club drugs in this population has been shown to negatively impact HIV treatment.[60] Club drugs include methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA), GHB, ketamine, benzodiazepines (see the benzodiazepine section above), and other drugs that are used to enhance the sexual experience (e.g., mephedrone, inhaled nitrates [poppers], and phosphodiesterase-5 inhibitors [PDE5] for erectile dysfunction). Survey data from users of club drugs have also revealed that efavirenz is purchased by people without HIV for its intoxicating effects.[61]

Risk-Taking Behaviors and the HIV Care Continuum

Club drugs have disinhibitory effects. Using club drugs increases the likelihood that a person will engage in high-risk sexual practices, which can increase the risk of HIV transmission. In addition, these disinhibitory effects can lead to poor ART adherence.[49,60,62]

Management of Club Drug Use

Treatment strategies for club drug use have not been well studied in controlled trials.[63] There are no recommended pharmacotherapies at this time, and the most common strategy for treating patients who use club drugs is to employ the behavioral interventions that are used for other drug use disorders.

Club Drug and Antiretroviral Drug Interactions

MDMA, GHB, ketamine, and methamphetamine all have the potential to interact with ARV drugs because they are metabolized, at least in part, by the CYP450 system.[49,62] Overdoses secondary to interactions between the club drugs (i.e., MDMA or GHB) and protease inhibitor-based ART have been reported.[49] For instance, using PDE5 or ketamine concurrently with potent CYP3A4 inhibitors such as ritonavir or cobicistat can lead to potentiation of the effects of these substances.[60]

Cocaine

See the discussion in the section on stimulants below.

Opioids

Epidemiology

Opioids remain a significant concern for persons with HIV, both for the acquisition of HIV (as recently demonstrated in Scott County, Indiana[64]) and as major contributors to morbidity and mortality. Overdose involving opioids is the leading cause of accidental death in the United States.[65] The appropriate use of opioids while caring for people with HIV and chronic pain is an important component of combating the opioid epidemic, but this subject is beyond the scope of this section. Please refer to additional resources, such as those from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) and the Infectious Diseases Society of America.[66] To combat the opioid overdose epidemic, health care providers should prescribe naloxone for opioid overdose prevention for all patients who are using opioids beyond the short-term treatment of acute pain.[3]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Risk-Taking Behaviors and the HIV Care Continuum

Many people who use opioids start by using opioid tablets (e.g., oxycodone) that are ingested orally or crushed and sniffed. Once tolerance develops, some individuals move from sniffing the crushed tablets to injecting heroin purchased on the streets. This transition from sniffing to injecting dramatically increases the risk of HIV and HCV infection.

Low-cost heroin is often a mix of heroin and higher potency synthetic opioids, such as fentanyl.[65] Methamphetamines and cocaine have also been combined with fentanyl, but at a lower rate than heroin.[67,68] With the growing use of synthetic cannabinoids, there is concern that fentanyl could be added to these as well. In all instances where fentanyl or other high-potency opioids are added to other drugs, the risk of overdose increases.

While treatment for an opioid use disorder can improve HIV treatment outcomes, it is not a prerequisite for treating HIV, as some patients are able to successfully adhere to ART despite ongoing opioid use. Although ART coverage among people with HIV who injected drugs increased from 58% to 71% between 2009 and 2015, additional work is needed to improve ART coverage in this population.[69] Data from the Johns Hopkins HIV Clinical Cohort (2001–2012) demonstrated that in the early years of the cohort, people who injected drugs were less likely to be retained in care; however, this gap in retention had closed by 2012, and people who injected drugs and noninjectors had similar probabilities of being on ART and having a suppressed viral load during the later years of the cohort.[70]

Management of Opioid Use

There are three FDA-approved medications for the treatment of opioid use disorder that can help decrease or eliminate opioid use, reduce the risks of morbidity and mortality that are associated with opioid use, and improve HIV treatment success. These medications, collectively termed medication-assisted treatment (MAT), include buprenorphine, methadone, and naltrexone (see Table 13). Buprenorphine and methadone are opioid agonists (the use of these drugs is termed opioid agonist therapy [OAT]), while naltrexone is an opioid-antagonist or "blocker." Both buprenorphine and naltrexone can be prescribed in the setting of routine HIV clinical care.[71] Prescribing buprenorphine requires specific training and licensure (known as an X-waiver; see the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA] website for more information). Methadone must be prescribed through a licensed opioid treatment program (OTP). An OTP directory can also be found on the SAMHSA website.

Use of buprenorphine or methadone can lead to reductions in risky behaviors associated with HIV transmission, psychosocial and medical morbidity related to opioid use disorder, and criminal behaviors. People who are receiving treatment for opioid use are already engaging with the health care system; therefore, they are more likely to initiate treatment for HIV and to be adherent to their ART regimens. Both buprenorphine and methadone are cost-effective interventions at the societal level.[72] Methadone has better retention in SUD treatment than either buprenorphine or naltrexone, and it should be considered for individuals who do not achieve successful outcomes with buprenorphine or naltrexone.[73] Buprenorphine has a lower risk of overdose than methadone. In addition, it can be prescribed in primary care offices. Patients who are taking buprenorphine have significantly better retention in treatment than those who are taking daily oral naltrexone.[74] While several randomized, controlled clinical trials have demonstrated efficacy for naltrexone when treating opioid use disorder, subsequent study results have been disappointing; one meta-analysis revealed that oral naltrexone was equivalent to placebo.[75] To address the adherence challenges with naltrexone, a depot formulation was created for monthly administration. This preparation has the potential to improve adherence; however, studies that compare opioid agonists such as buprenorphine and methadone to depot naltrexone as treatments for opioid use disorder have not been conducted. In a randomized, placebo-controlled trial in persons with both HIV and opioid use disorder, participants who received at least three doses of depot naltrexone prior to discharge from prison achieved longer periods of continuous abstinence

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

after transitioning from prison to the community than those who received either placebo or two or less doses of depot naltrexone.[42] On the basis of these data, methadone or buprenorphine are generally used as first-line agents for the treatment of opioid use disorder. Depot naltrexone is used as an alternative treatment for people who have recently been released from correctional facilities when other options are not available.

Important pharmacokinetic interactions between these medications (particularly methadone) and certain ARV drugs are listed in Drug-Drug Interactions.

Stimulants

Epidemiology

Cocaine and methamphetamine are powerful stimulants that have been associated with multiple detrimental effects to people with HIV, including accelerated disease progression, poor ART adherence, and lack of viral suppression. Cocaine powder is snorted or injected, while the free-base form (crack) is smoked. Methamphetamines can be taken orally or rectally, injected, or smoked. Cocaine and methamphetamine are commonly used with other substances, including alcohol. Individuals who use stimulants experience a sense of euphoria and may have heightened sexual desire and arousal. This can lead to disinhibited sexual behaviors, increasing the risk of HIV transmission.

The prevalence of stimulant use among people with HIV has been estimated to be 5% to 15% across multiple studies.[76-78] Methamphetamine use is more common among MSM,[79] and increased rates of cocaine use have been observed among ethnic and racial minorities and persons with a history of incarceration.[80]

Risk-Taking Behaviors and the HIV Care Continuum

There are multiple negative health consequences of stimulant use among persons with HIV, including rapid development of dependence and adverse effects on multiple organ systems, particularly the central nervous and cardiovascular systems. Stimulant use is associated with neurocognitive impairment,[81] delirium, seizures, hemorrhagic strokes, and mental health disturbances, including anxiety, psychosis, and paranoia.

Stimulant use may independently lead to HIV disease progression even among persons who are taking ART and who have achieved viral suppression. Research to identify the cellular mechanisms responsible for this is ongoing, but increased viral replication, direct effects on the immune system that lead to declines in CD4 T lymphocyte cell count, enhanced immune activation, and disruption of the blood brain barrier that facilitates HIV entry into the brain have been implicated.[82-85] Stimulant use has been associated with poor HIV continuum of care outcomes, including suboptimal rates of ART adherence, retention in care, and viral suppression. Lack of viral suppression, combined with the increased likelihood of risky sexual behaviors that occurs under the influence of stimulants, poses a threat to the HIV treatment as prevention paradigm.[86]

Non-opioid substances, including methamphetamines and cocaine, are sometimes combined with fentanyl, which increases the risk of overdose.[67,68]

Management of Stimulant Use

Several pharmacologic and behavioral interventions for stimulant dependence have been investigated, and some trials have included people with HIV. The results of pharmacologic interventions have generally been disappointing. There is no FDA-approved pharmacotherapy for cocaine use disorder at this time, despite research on multiple drug classes, including antidepressants, antipsychotics, anticonvulsants, and dopaminergic medications (e.g., disulfiram).[87,88] Among persons with HIV who use crack and opioids, MAT for opioid use disorder may improve ART adherence and viral suppression.[89,90] There is limited evidence that some pharmacologic interventions (e.g., methylphenidate, modafinil, bupropion, naltrexone)[91] can reduce methamphetamine use or cravings, yet there is no recommended pharmacotherapy to treat stimulant use disorder in persons with HIV.

Several behavioral interventions have shown promise in randomized trials. People with HIV who received

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

motivational interviewing sessions, cognitive behavioral therapy, or a combination of the two decreased their stimulant use and improved their adherence to ART, and they were less likely to engage in risky sexual behaviors.[12] Contingency management has been shown to be effective in decreasing stimulant use among persons with HIV, but the sustained effects on the reduction of stimulant use and improvements in ART adherence are less clear.[13,77,92] Technology-based interventions, such as text messaging, may have a role in supporting ART adherence and decreasing methamphetamine use among persons with HIV, but further research is needed.[93] Persons with HIV who use stimulants benefit most from multidimensional interventions that target substance use, ART adherence, and risky sexual behaviors.[12]

Despite the challenges discussed above, persons with HIV who use stimulants can achieve viral suppression with ART[94] and should be prescribed ART even if stimulant use is ongoing.

Tobacco

Epidemiology

The prevalence of tobacco smoking among persons with HIV in the United States is approximately twice that of the general population (33.6% vs. 16.8%). Prevalence is even higher among specific subgroups, including those who use alcohol and/or other drugs, those who have concurrent mental health disorders, and those of a lower socioeconomic status. While smoking rates are declining overall in the United States, persons with HIV are less likely to quit smoking than people in the general population.[95]

Associated Risks of Tobacco Use and HIV Infection

With respect to substance use and HIV, tobacco smoking is the biggest threat to health-related gains achieved through ART. Among individuals with viral suppression on ART, more years of life may be lost from continued smoking than from HIV infection itself.[96,97] Tobacco smoking among persons with HIV is associated with an increased risk of numerous health conditions, including lung cancer and other smoking-related cancers, cardiovascular disease, and pulmonary disease. In a sample of 17,995 persons with HIV on ART in Europe and North America, individuals who smoked had nearly twice the mortality of those who did not (mortality rate ratio 1.94; 95% CI, 1.56–2.41) with significant mortality attributed to cardiovascular disease and non-AIDS related malignancy.[96] Importantly, tobacco cessation reduces the incidence of cardiovascular disease and smoking-related cancers (though definitive data on lung cancer are not available) and improves quality of life.[98-100]

Managing Tobacco Use

To maximize the survival benefits of ART, clinicians should consider using evidence-based behavioral and pharmacological[101-103] cessation strategies when treating patients with HIV who smoke tobacco (see the tools and recommendations provided by the CDC and the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force). These include (but are not limited to) advising the patient to quit smoking, using the five A's, employing motivational interviewing, and referring the patient to a tobacco quitline. Pharmacotherapies for smoking cessation (nicotine replacement therapy, bupropion, and varenicline) have few clinically significant interactions with ARV drugs and can lead to enormous reductions in morbidity and mortality if the person is able to stop smoking. Nicotine replacement is efficacious;[104] however, bupropion doubles rates of smoking cessation compared with nicotine replacement therapy.[105] Varenicline is a partial nicotine receptor agonist. In comparative studies, varenicline was more effective than bupropion in smoking cessation.[105,106] Clinical trials among persons with HIV have found varenicline to be both effective and safe.[101,103] In a recent randomized controlled trial among 179 individuals with HIV who were randomized to receive 12 weeks of behavioral counseling and either varenicline or placebo, varenicline use led to an increase in the percentage of participants who achieved a 7-day abstinence period at 12 weeks (28.1% vs. 12.1%, OR 4.5; 95% CI, 1.83–11.2) and produced higher continuous abstinence between weeks 9 and 12 (23.6% vs. 10%, OR 4.65; 95% CI, 1.71–12.67) compared to placebo.[103] While significant between-group differences were not observed after 24 weeks, these data support the use of varenicline among persons with HIV. Varenicline should be used

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

in combination with relapse prevention strategies and other measures for long-term tobacco cessation.

Table 13. Medications for Treatment of Substance Use Disorders

Medication	Dose and Recommendations	Potential Interaction with ARV Drugs	Comments
Alcohol Use Disorder			
Acamprosate	666 mg PO three times a day *or* 333 mg PO three times a day for patients with CrCl 30–50 mL/min	No significant interaction with ARV drugs expected.	**Contraindicated** in patients with CrCl <30 mL/min.
Disulfiram	250 mg PO once daily	Use with caution when prescribing an ARV oral solution that contains ethanol and/or propylene glycol (e.g., FPV, LPV/r, RTV).	Counsel patients regarding disulfiram reaction when taken with alcohol; symptoms for the reaction may include flushing, tachycardia, nausea, vomiting, or hypotension.
Naltrexone	50–100 mg PO once daily Depot formulation is a fixed-dose monthly injection.	No significant interaction with ARV drugs expected.	Has the greatest efficacy of all FDA-approved medications for alcohol use disorder.
Opioid Use Disorder			
Buprenorphine	Individualize buprenorphine dosing based on a patient's opioid use. The dose range is 4–24 mg sublingually. Dosing is once daily or twice daily.	Potential interaction with ARV drugs that are CYP inhibitors or inducers. See Drug-Drug Interactions for further recommendations.	Buprenorphine has 90% first pass hepatic metabolism. Verify that the patient is using the appropriate technique for sublingual administration before adjusting the dose, as improper administration will result in poor absorption and low drug levels.
Methadone	Individualize dose. Patients who receive higher doses (>100 mg) are more likely to remain in treatment.	Potential interaction with ARV drugs that are CYP inhibitors or inducers. See Drug-Drug Interactions for further recommendations.	QTc prolongation is a concern at higher doses. Methadone can only be prescribed for OUD by a licensed OTP.
Naltrexone	50–100 mg PO once daily Depot formulation is a fixed-dose monthly injection.	No significant interaction with ARV drugs expected.	Longer time of continuous abstinence in those who received depot formulation naltrexone compared to placebo after transition from prison to community.
Nicotine Use Disorder			
Nicotine Replacement Therapy	There are a wide variety of FDA-approved nicotine replacement products. All formulations are effective.	No significant interaction with ARV drugs expected.	Work with the patient to identify the route of delivery that the patient will use and find most helpful.
Bupropion	Start at 150 mg PO daily for three days, then increase to either 150 mg twice daily or 300 mg once daily (only use formulations that are approved for once daily dosing).	Concentration may be reduced when used with ARV drugs that are CYP2D6 inducers. See Drug-Drug Interactions for further recommendations.	Tobacco quit date should ideally be 1 week after starting therapy.
Varenicline	Titrate dose based on tolerability until desired effect is achieved. The goal is to reach a dose of 1 mg PO twice daily. Requires dose adjustment in patients with CrCl <30 mL/min.	No significant interaction with ARV drugs expected.	Tobacco quit date should ideally be 1 week after starting therapy.

Key: ARV = antiretroviral; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CYP = cytochrome P; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FPV = fosamprenavir; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; OUD = opioid use disorder; OTP = opioid treatment program; PO = orally; RTV = ritonavir; SR = sustained release

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

References

1. HIV.gov. U.S. Statistics. 2019. Available at: https://www.hiv.gov/hiv-basics/overview/data-and-trends/statistics.
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Drug Overdose Deaths. 2018; https://www.cdc.gov/drugoverdose/data/statedeaths.html.
3. Bowman S, Eiserman J, Beletsky L, Stancliff S, Bruce RD. Reducing the health consequences of opioid addiction in primary care. *Am J Med*. 2013;126(7):565-571. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23664112.
4. Shiau S, Arpadi SM, Yin MT, Martins SS. Patterns of drug use and HIV infection among adults in a nationally representative sample. *Addict Behav.* 2017;68:39-44. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28088742.
5. National Institute on Drug Abuse. Club Drugs. https://www.drugabuse.gov/drugs-abuse/club-drugs. Accessed May 30, 2019.
6. Pakianathan M, Whittaker W, Lee MJ, et al. Chemsex and new HIV diagnosis in gay, bisexual and other men who have sex with men attending sexual health clinics. *HIV Med.* 2018. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29790254.
7. Kohli M, Hickson F, Free C, Reid D, Weatherburn P. Cross-sectional analysis of chemsex drug use and gonorrhoea diagnosis among men who have sex with men in the UK. *Sex Health.* 2019. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30760386.
8. Smith PC, Schmidt SM, Allensworth-Davies D, Saitz R. A single-question screening test for drug use in primary care. *Arch Intern Med.* 2010;170(13):1155-1160. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20625025.
9. Altice FL, Mostashari F, Friedland GH. Trust and the acceptance of and adherence to antiretroviral therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2001;28(1):47-58. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11579277.
10. Marinetti L, Montgomery MA. The Use of GHB to Facilitate Sexual Assault. *Forensic Sci Rev.* 2010;22(1):41-59. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26242455.
11. Basu S, Chwastiak LA, Bruce RD. Clinical management of depression and anxiety in HIV-infected adults. *AIDS.* 2005;19(18):2057-2067. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16284454.
12. Wechsberg WM, Golin C, El-Bassel N, Hopkins J, Zule W. Current interventions to reduce sexual risk behaviors and crack cocaine use among HIV-infected individuals. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2012;9(4):385-393. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22872433.
13. Carrico AW, Gomicronmez W, Jain J, et al. Randomized controlled trial of a positive affect intervention for methamphetamine users. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2018;192:8-15. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30195243.
14. Griffith DC, Farmer C, Gebo KA, et al. Uptake and virological outcomes of single- versus multi-tablet antiretroviral regimens among treatment-naive youth in the HIV Research Network. *HIV Med.* 2019;20(2):169-174. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30561888.
15. Feldman MB, Kepler KL, Irvine MK, Thomas JA. Associations between drug use patterns and viral load suppression among HIV-positive individuals who use support services in New York City. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2019;197:15-21. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30743195.
16. Williams EC, Joo YS, Lipira L, Glass JE. Psychosocial stressors and alcohol use, severity, and treatment receipt across human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) status in a nationally representative sample of US residents. *Subst Abus.* 2017;38(3):269-277. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27925867.
17. Crane HM, McCaul ME, Chander G, et al. Prevalence and Factors Associated with Hazardous Alcohol Use Among Persons Living with HIV Across the US in the Current Era of Antiretroviral Treatment. *AIDS Behav.* 2017;21(7):1914-1925. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28285434.
18. Saitz R. Clinical practice. Unhealthy alcohol use. *N Engl J Med.* 2005;352(6):596-607. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15703424.
19. Scott-Sheldon LA, Carey KB, Cunningham K, Johnson BT, Carey MP, Team MR. Alcohol Use Predicts Sexual

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Decision-Making: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of the Experimental Literature. *AIDS Behav.* 2016;20 Suppl 1:S19-39. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26080689.

20. Shuper PA, Joharchi N, Monti PM, Loutfy M, Rehm J. Acute Alcohol Consumption Directly Increases HIV Transmission Risk: A Randomized Controlled Experiment. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2017;76(5):493-500. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28930769.
21. Rehm J, Shield KD, Joharchi N, Shuper PA. Alcohol consumption and the intention to engage in unprotected sex: systematic review and meta-analysis of experimental studies. *Addiction.* 2012;107(1):51-59. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22151318.
22. Williams EC, McGinnis KA, Edelman EJ, et al. Level of Alcohol Use Associated with HIV Care Continuum Targets in a National U.S. Sample of Persons Living with HIV Receiving Healthcare. *AIDS Behav.* 2019;23(1):140-151. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29995206.
23. Vagenas P, Azar MM, Copenhaver MM, Springer SA, Molina PE, Altice FL. The Impact of Alcohol Use and Related Disorders on the HIV Continuum of Care: a Systematic Review : Alcohol and the HIV Continuum of Care. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2015;12(4):421-436. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26412084.
24. Braithwaite RS, McGinnis KA, Conigliaro J, et al. A temporal and dose-response association between alcohol consumption and medication adherence among veterans in care. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res.* 2005;29(7):1190-1197. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16046874.
25. Braithwaite RS, Bryant KJ. Influence of alcohol consumption on adherence to and toxicity of antiretroviral therapy and survival. *Alcohol Res Health.* 2010;33(3):280-287. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23584069.
26. Parsons JT, Rosof E, Mustanski B. Patient-related factors predicting HIV medication adherence among men and women with alcohol problems. *J Health Psychol.* 2007;12(2):357-370. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17284499.
27. Kalichman SC, Grebler T, Amaral CM, et al. Viral suppression and antiretroviral medication adherence among alcohol using HIV-positive adults. *Int J Behav Med.* 2014;21(5):811-820. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24085706.
28. Pellowski JA, Kalichman SC, Kalichman MO, Cherry C. Alcohol-antiretroviral therapy interactive toxicity beliefs and daily medication adherence and alcohol use among people living with HIV. *AIDS Care.* 2016;28(8):963-970. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26964014.
29. Williams EC, Hahn JA, Saitz R, Bryant K, Lira MC, Samet JH. Alcohol Use and Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) Infection: Current Knowledge, Implications, and Future Directions. *Alcohol Clin Exp Res*. 2016;40(10):2056-2072. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27696523.
30. Cook RL, Sereika SM, Hunt SC, Woodward WC, Erlen JA, Conigliaro J. Problem drinking and medication adherence among persons with HIV infection. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2001;16(2):83-88. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11251758.
31. Kelso NE, Sheps DS, Cook RL. The association between alcohol use and cardiovascular disease among people living with HIV: a systematic review. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse*. 2015;41(6):479-488. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26286352.
32. Lesko CR, Lau B, Chander G, Moore RD. Time Spent with HIV Viral Load > 1500 Copies/mL Among Persons Engaged in Continuity HIV Care in an Urban Clinic in the United States, 2010-2015. *AIDS Behav.* 2018;22(11):3443-3450. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29541913.
33. Monroe AK, Lau B, Mugavero MJ, et al. Heavy Alcohol Use Is Associated With Worse Retention in HIV Care. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;73(4):419-425. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27243904.
34. Ladak F, Socias E, Nolan S, et al. Substance use patterns and HIV-1 RNA viral load rebound among HIV-positive illicit drug users in a Canadian setting. *Antivir Ther.* 2019;24(1):19-25. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30230474.
35. DeLorenze GN, Weisner C, Tsai AL, Satre DD, Quesenberry CP, Jr. Excess mortality among HIV-infected patients diagnosed with substance use dependence or abuse receiving care in a fully integrated medical care program. *Alcohol*

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Clin Exp Res. 2011;35(2):203-210. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21058961.

36. Canan CE, Lau B, McCaul ME, Keruly J, Moore RD, Chander G. Effect of alcohol consumption on all-cause and liver-related mortality among HIV-infected individuals. *HIV Med.* 2017;18(5):332-341. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27679418.

37. Eyawo O, McGinnis KA, Justice AC, et al. Alcohol and Mortality: Combining Self-Reported (AUDIT-C) and Biomarker Detected (PEth) Alcohol Measures Among HIV Infected and Uninfected. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2018;77(2):135-143. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29112041.

38. Marcellin F, Roux P, Loko MA, et al. High levels of alcohol consumption increase the risk of advanced hepatic fibrosis in HIV/hepatitis C virus-coinfected patients: a sex-based analysis using transient elastography at enrollment in the HEPAVIH ANRS CO13 cohort. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2014;59(8):1190-1192. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25015913.

39. Lim JK, Tate JP, Fultz SL, et al. Relationship between alcohol use categories and noninvasive markers of advanced hepatic fibrosis in HIV-infected, chronic hepatitis C virus-infected, and uninfected patients. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2014;58(10):1449-1458. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24569533.

40. Scott-Sheldon LAJ, Carey KB, Johnson BT, Carey MP, Team MR. Behavioral Interventions Targeting Alcohol Use Among People Living with HIV/AIDS: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *AIDS Behav.* 2017;21(Suppl 2):126-143. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28831609.

41. Edelman EJ, Moore BA, Holt SR, et al. Efficacy of Extended-Release Naltrexone on HIV-Related and Drinking Outcomes Among HIV-Positive Patients: A Randomized-Controlled Trial. *AIDS Behav.* 2019;23(1):211-221. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30073637.

42. Springer SA, Di Paola A, Azar MM, et al. Extended-Release Naltrexone Improves Viral Suppression Among Incarcerated Persons Living With HIV With Opioid Use Disorders Transitioning to the Community: Results of a Double-Blind, Placebo-Controlled Randomized Trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2018;78(1):43-53. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29373393.

43. Edelman EJ, Maisto SA, Hansen NB, et al. Integrated stepped alcohol treatment for patients with HIV and alcohol use disorder: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2019. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31109915.

44. Barker MJ, Greenwood KM, Jackson M, Crowe SF. Cognitive effects of long-term benzodiazepine use: a meta-analysis. *CNS Drugs.* 2004;18(1):37-48. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14731058.

45. Darke S, Hall W, Ross M, Wodak A. Benzodiazepine use and HIV risk-taking behaviour among injecting drug users. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 1992;31(1):31-36. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1358587.

46. Walton GR, Hayashi K, Bach P, et al. The Impact of Benzodiazepine Use on Mortality Among Polysubstance Users in Vancouver, Canada. *Public Health Rep.* 2016;131(3):491-499. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27252569.

47. Newville H, Roley J, Sorensen JL. Prescription medication misuse among HIV-infected individuals taking antiretroviral therapy. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. 2015;48(1):56-61. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25245428.

48. Motta-Ochoa R, Bertrand K, Arruda N, Jutras-Aswad D, Roy E. "I love having benzos after my coke shot": The use of psychotropic medication among cocaine users in downtown Montreal. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2017;49:15-23. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28826127.

49. Bruce RD, Altice FL, Friedland GH. Pharmacokinetic drug interactions between drugs of abuse and antiretroviral medications: implications and management for clinical practice. *Expert Rev Clin Pharmacol*. 2008;1(1):115-127. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24410515.

50. Pacek LR, Towe SL, Hobkirk AL, Nash D, Goodwin RD. Frequency of Cannabis Use and Medical Cannabis Use Among Persons Living With HIV in the United States: Findings From a Nationally Representative Sample. *AIDS Educ Prev*. 2018;30(2):169-181. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29688777.

51. Drug Enforcement Administration Diversion Control Division. *Special Report: Synthetic Cannabinoids and Synthetic Cathinones Reported in NFLIS, 2013-2015*. 2016. Available at: https://www.nflis.deadiversion.usdoj.gov/DesktopModules/ReportDownloads/Reports/NFLIS-SR-SynthCannabinoidCathinone.pdf. Accessed: May 30, 2019.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

52. Tait RJ, Caldicott D, Mountain D, Hill SL, Lenton S. A systematic review of adverse events arising from the use of synthetic cannabinoids and their associated treatment. *Clin Toxicol (Phila)*. 2016;54(1):1-13. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26567470.

53. Lake S, Kerr T, Capler R, Shoveller J, Montaner J, Milloy MJ. High-intensity cannabis use and HIV clinical outcomes among HIV-positive people who use illicit drugs in Vancouver, Canada. *Int J Drug Policy*. 2017;42:63-70. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28336000.

54. Lorenz DR, Dutta A, Mukerji SS, Holman A, Uno H, Gabuzda D. Marijuana Use Impacts Midlife Cardiovascular Events in HIV-Infected Men. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2017;65(4):626-635. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28449059.

55. Clayton HB, Lowry R, Ashley C, Wolkin A, Grant AM. Health Risk Behaviors With Synthetic Cannabinoids Versus Marijuana. *Pediatrics.* 2017;139(4). Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28289138.

56. Sinha S, McCaul ME, Hutton HE, et al. Marijuana use and HIV treatment outcomes among PWH receiving care at an urban HIV clinic. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. 2017;82:102-106. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29021107.

57. Gates PJ, Sabioni P, Copeland J, Le Foll B, Gowing L. Psychosocial interventions for cannabis use disorder. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016(5):CD005336. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27149547.

58. Stephens RS, Roffman RA, Curtin L. Comparison of extended versus brief treatments for marijuana use. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2000;68(5):898-908. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11068976.

59. Copeland J, Swift W, Roffman R, Stephens R. A randomized controlled trial of brief cognitive-behavioral interventions for cannabis use disorder. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. 2001;21(2):55-64; discussion 65-56. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11551733.

60. Daskalopoulou M, Rodger A, Phillips AN, et al. Recreational drug use, polydrug use, and sexual behaviour in HIV-diagnosed men who have sex with men in the UK: results from the cross-sectional ASTRA study. *Lancet HIV*. 2014;1(1):e22-31. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26423813.

61. Inciardi JA, Surratt HL, Kurtz SP, Cicero TJ. Mechanisms of prescription drug diversion among drug-involved club- and street-based populations. *Pain Med.* 2007;8(2):171-183. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17305688.

62. Bracchi M, Stuart D, Castles R, Khoo S, Back D, Boffito M. Increasing use of 'party drugs' in people living with HIV on antiretrovirals: a concern for patient safety. *AIDS.* 2015;29(13):1585-1592. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26372268.

63. Colfax G, Guzman R. Club drugs and HIV infection: a review. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2006;42(10):1463-1469. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16619161.

64. Peters PJ, Pontones P, Hoover KW, et al. HIV Infection Linked to Injection Use of Oxymorphone in Indiana, 2014-2015. *N Engl J Med.* 2016;375(3):229-239. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27468059.

65. Scholl L, Seth P, Kariisa M, Wilson N, Baldwin G. Drug and Opioid-Involved Overdose Deaths - United States, 2013-2017. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2018;67(5152):1419-1427. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30605448.

66. Bruce RD, Merlin J, Lum PJ, et al. 2017 HIV Medicine Association of Infectious Diseases Society of America Clinical Practice Guideline for the Management of Chronic Pain in Patients Living With Human Immunodeficiency Virus. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2017;65(10):1601-1606. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29091230.

67. Khatri UG, Viner K, Perrone J. Lethal Fentanyl and Cocaine Intoxication. *N Engl J Med.* 2018;379(18):1782. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30380395.

68. LaRue L, Twillman RK, Dawson E, et al. Rate of Fentanyl Positivity Among Urine Drug Test Results Positive for Cocaine or Methamphetamine. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2019;2(4):e192851. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31026029.

69. Hoots BE, Finlayson TJ, Broz D, Paz-Bailey G, Group NS. Antiretroviral Therapy Use Among HIV-Infected People Who Inject Drugs-20 Cities, United States, 2009-2015. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2017;75 Suppl 3:S392-S396. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28604444.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

70. Lesko CR, Tong W, Moore RD, Lau B. Retention, Antiretroviral Therapy Use and Viral Suppression by History of Injection Drug Use Among HIV-Infected Patients in an Urban HIV Clinical Cohort. *AIDS Behav.* 2017;21(4):1016-1024. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27752872.

71. Altice FL, Bruce RD, Lucas GM, et al. HIV treatment outcomes among HIV-infected, opioid-dependent patients receiving buprenorphine/naloxone treatment within HIV clinical care settings: results from a multisite study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2011;56 Suppl 1:S22-32. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21317590.

72. Kresina TF, Bruce RD, McCance-Katz EF. Medication assisted treatment in the treatment of drug abuse and dependence in HIV/AIDS infected drug users. *Curr HIV Res*. 2009;7(4):354-364. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19601770.

73. Woody GE, Bruce D, Korthuis PT, et al. HIV risk reduction with buprenorphine-naloxone or methadone: findings from a randomized trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2014;66(3):288-293. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24751432.

74. Schottenfeld RS, Chawarski MC, Mazlan M. Maintenance treatment with buprenorphine and naltrexone for heroin dependence in Malaysia: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2008;371(9631):2192-2200. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18586174.

75. Kirchmayer U, Davoli M, Verster AD, Amato L, Ferri A, Perucci CA. A systematic review on the efficacy of naltrexone maintenance treatment in opioid dependence. *Addiction.* 2002;97(10):1241-1249. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12359026.

76. Hartzler B, Dombrowski JC, Crane HM, et al. Prevalence and Predictors of Substance Use Disorders Among HIV Care Enrollees in the United States. *AIDS Behav.* 2017;21(4):1138-1148. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27738780.

77. Mimiaga MJ, Reisner SL, Grasso C, et al. Substance use among HIV-infected patients engaged in primary care in the United States: findings from the Centers for AIDS Research Network of Integrated Clinical Systems cohort. *Am J Public Health*. 2013;103(8):1457-1467. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23763417.

78. Rosen MI, Black AC, Arnsten JH, et al. Association between use of specific drugs and antiretroviral adherence: findings from MACH 14. *AIDS Behav.* 2013;17(1):142-147. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22246513.

79. Vu NT, Maher L, Zablotska I. Amphetamine-type stimulants and HIV infection among men who have sex with men: implications on HIV research and prevention from a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2015;18:19273. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25609214.

80. Chitsaz E, Meyer JP, Krishnan A, et al. Contribution of substance use disorders on HIV treatment outcomes and antiretroviral medication adherence among HIV-infected persons entering jail. *AIDS Behav.* 2013;17 Suppl 2:S118-127. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23673792.

81. Mediouni S, Marcondes MC, Miller C, McLaughlin JP, Valente ST. The cross-talk of HIV-1 Tat and methamphetamine in HIV-associated neurocognitive disorders. *Front Microbiol*. 2015;6:1164. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26557111.

82. Tyagi M, Weber J, Bukrinsky M, Simon GL. The effects of cocaine on HIV transcription. *J Neurovirol*. 2016;22(3):261-274. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26572787.

83. Dash S, Balasubramaniam M, Villalta F, Dash C, Pandhare J. Impact of cocaine abuse on HIV pathogenesis. *Front Microbiol*. 2015;6:1111. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26539167.

84. Carrico AW, Flentje A, Kober K, et al. Recent stimulant use and leukocyte gene expression in methamphetamine users with treated HIV infection. *Brain Behav Immun*. 2018;71:108-115. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29679637.

85. Carrico AW, Cherenack EM, Roach ME, et al. Substance-associated elevations in monocyte activation among methamphetamine users with treated HIV infection. *AIDS.* 2018;32(6):767-771. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29369159.

86. Jin H, Ogunbajo A, Mimiaga MJ, et al. Over the influence: The HIV care continuum among methamphetamine-using men who have sex with men. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2018;192:125-128. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

pubmed/30248558.

87. Minozzi S, Cinquini M, Amato L, et al. Anticonvulsants for cocaine dependence. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015(4):CD006754. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25882271.

88. Minozzi S, Amato L, Pani PP, et al. Dopamine agonists for the treatment of cocaine dependence. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015(5):CD003352. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26014366.

89. Hayashi K, Wood E, Kerr T, et al. Factors associated with optimal pharmacy refill adherence for antiretroviral medications and plasma HIV RNA non-detectability among HIV-positive crack cocaine users: a prospective cohort study. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2016;16(1):455. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27568002.

90. Berg KM, Litwin A, Li X, Heo M, Arnsten JH. Directly observed antiretroviral therapy improves adherence and viral load in drug users attending methadone maintenance clinics: a randomized controlled trial. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2011;113(2-3):192-199. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20832196.

91. Bruce R. Addiction In: Gendelman E, Grant I, Everall I, et al., eds. *The Neurology of AIDS*. 3rd ed.: Oxford University Press; 2011.

92. Burch AE, Rash CJ, Petry NM. Cocaine-using substance abuse treatment patients with and without HIV respond well to contingency management treatment. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. 2017;77:21-25. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28476266.

93. Moore DJ, Pasipanodya EC, Umlauf A, et al. Individualized texting for adherence building (iTAB) for methamphetamine users living with HIV: A pilot randomized clinical trial. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2018;189:154-160. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29958127.

94. Carrico AW, Hunt PW, Neilands TB, et al. Stimulant Use and Viral Suppression in the Era of Universal Antiretroviral Therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2019;80(1):89-93. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30272634.

95. Frazier EL, Sutton MY, Brooks JT, Shouse RL, Weiser J. Trends in cigarette smoking among adults with HIV compared with the general adult population, United States - 2009-2014. *Prev Med*. 2018;111:231-234. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29550303.

96. Helleberg M, May MT, Ingle SM, et al. Smoking and life expectancy among HIV-infected individuals on antiretroviral therapy in Europe and North America. *AIDS.* 2015;29(2):221-229. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25426809.

97. Reddy KP, Parker RA, Losina E, et al. Impact of Cigarette Smoking and Smoking Cessation on Life Expectancy Among People With HIV: A US-Based Modeling Study. *J Infect Dis*. 2016;214(11):1672-1681. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27815384.

98. Petoumenos K, Worm S, Reiss P, et al. Rates of cardiovascular disease following smoking cessation in patients with HIV infection: results from the D:A:D study(*). *HIV Med.* 2011;12(7):412-421. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21251183.

99. Vidrine DJ, Arduino RC, Gritz ER. The effects of smoking abstinence on symptom burden and quality of life among persons living with HIV/AIDS. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2007;21(9):659-666. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17919093.

100. Shepherd L, Ryom L, Law M, et al. Cessation of Cigarette Smoking and the Impact on Cancer Incidence in Human Immunodeficiency Virus-infected Persons: The Data Collection on Adverse Events of Anti-HIV Drugs Study. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2019;68(4):650-657. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29912335.

101. Mercie P, Arsandaux J, Katlama C, et al. Efficacy and safety of varenicline for smoking cessation in people living with HIV in France (ANRS 144 Inter-ACTIV): a randomised controlled phase 3 clinical trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2018;5(3):e126-e135. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29329763.

102. Anthenelli RM, Benowitz NL, West R, et al. Neuropsychiatric safety and efficacy of varenicline, bupropion, and nicotine patch in smokers with and without psychiatric disorders (EAGLES): a double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled clinical trial. *Lancet*. 2016;387(10037):2507-2520. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27116918.

103. Ashare RL, Thompson M, Serrano K, et al. Placebo-controlled randomized clinical trial testing the efficacy and safety of

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

varenicline for smokers with HIV. *Drug Alcohol Depend.* 2019;200:26-33. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31082665.

104. Amodei N, Lamb RJ. The role of nicotine replacement therapy in early quitting success. *Nicotine Tob Res*. 2010;12(1):1-10. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19897526.

105. Gonzales D, Rennard SI, Nides M, et al. Varenicline, an alpha4beta2 nicotinic acetylcholine receptor partial agonist, vs sustained-release bupropion and placebo for smoking cessation: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 2006;296(1):47-55. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16820546.

106. West R, Baker CL, Cappelleri JC, Bushmakin AG. Effect of varenicline and bupropion SR on craving, nicotine withdrawal symptoms, and rewarding effects of smoking during a quit attempt. *Psychopharmacology (Berl)*. 2008;197(3):371-377. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18084743.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Transgender People with HIV (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Panel's Recommendations
• Antiretroviral therapy (ART) is recommended for all transgender people with HIV to improve their health and to reduce the risk of HIV transmission to sexual partners **(AI)**. • HIV care services should be provided within a gender-affirmative care model to reduce potential barriers to ART adherence and to maximize the likelihood of achieving sustained viral suppression **(AII)**. • Prior to ART initiation, a pregnancy test should be performed for transgender individuals of childbearing potential **(AIII)**. • Some antiretroviral drugs may have pharmacokinetic interactions with gender-affirming hormone therapy. Clinical effects and hormone levels should be routinely monitored with appropriate titrations of estradiol, testosterone, or androgen blockers, as needed **(AIII)**. • Gender-affirming hormone therapies are associated with hyperlipidemia, elevated cardiovascular risk, and osteopenia; therefore, clinicians should choose an ART regimen that will not increase the risk of these adverse effects **(AIII)**.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional* ***Rating of Evidence:*** *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

Introduction

Because transgender and nonbinary people bear a disproportionate burden of HIV, it is important for HIV care providers to be knowledgeable about the specific HIV care needs of these individuals.

Terminology

Transgender people are broadly defined as those whose gender identity differs from their assigned sex at birth.[1,2] The terminology used to define transgender identities continues to evolve over time and across geographical and cultural contexts.[3] The terms cisgender, cis-man, and cis-woman are used to describe persons who identify with their assigned sex at birth. The terms used to describe women who were assigned male at birth include transgender women, trans women, transfeminine individuals, and women of transgender experience. The terms for men who were assigned female at birth include transgender men, trans men, transmasculine individuals, and men of transgender experience. Some individuals identify outside the gender binary of man or woman, using words such as gender nonbinary, genderqueer, and gender nonconforming to describe themselves. Other individuals may not have a fixed sense of their gender and may move back and forth among different gender identities; these individuals are described as gender fluid. Agender persons do not identify with having any gender and can use other terms such as null-gender or neutrois.

Gender affirmation describes processes whereby a person receives social recognition, value, and support for their gender identity and expression.[4] Gender affirmation is often described across several dimensions, including social (e.g., social support and acceptance, use of pronouns, names, or clothing that align with their gender identity), medical (e.g., use of hormones or surgery), legal (e.g., legal name change or changing gender markers on identity documents), and psychological (e.g., the degree of self-acceptance and comfort with their gender identity).[5] Medical gender affirmation has been shown to improve mental health outcomes and measures of well-being in transgender individuals.[6,7]

Epidemiology

National surveys indicate that 1.4 million adults in the United States aged 18 years and older identify as transgender, representing 0.6% of the adult population.[8] It is estimated that almost 2% of high school students identify as transgender.[9,10] National, population-based estimates of the numbers of gender nonbinary people in the United States are not yet available; however, 31% of the 27,715 people who completed the 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey (USTS) identified as gender nonbinary.[11] Meta-regression modeling suggests that the number of people who are willing to report that they are transgender and/or gender nonbinary is likely to increase in the future.[12]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

The most recent estimate of HIV prevalence among transgender people is 14% among transgender women and 2% among transgender men.[13] The highest prevalence is among black (44%) and Hispanic/Latino (26%) transgender women.[13] Not enough data were available to estimate HIV prevalence by race/ethnicity among transgender men. Data on HIV prevalence among nonbinary individuals is scant. Of the nonbinary individuals who completed the 2015 USTS, 0.4% self-reported having HIV, including 1% of participants who were assigned male at birth and 0.2% of participants who were assigned female at birth.[11]

In the first national-level analysis of transgender people with HIV, the National HIV Surveillance system identified 2,351 transgender people with newly diagnosed HIV infection from 2009 to 2014. Eighty-four percent of these individuals were transgender women, 15% were transgender men, and 0.7% reported other gender identities.[14] More than one-half of both transgender women (51%) and men (58%) with newly diagnosed HIV were black/African American. Most of these individuals were aged 25 years to 34 years (35%) or 20 years to 24 years (26%). Almost one-half of transgender people with newly diagnosed HIV resided in the South (44%), and 18% had AIDS at the time of diagnosis.

In 2017, the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program provided services for 8,811 transgender people, representing 1.8% of Ryan White clients.[15] Of these transgender clients, 7,837 (89%) were transgender women, 853 (10%) were transgender men, and 121 (1%) were transgender with current gender unknown. The majority were black and/or African American (5,081 individuals [57.6%]) or Hispanic/Latino (2,619 individuals [29.7%]).

HIV Care Continuum

Some studies have reported that transgender women living with HIV are less likely than cisgender men to receive antiretroviral therapy (ART), be adherent to ART, and achieve viral suppression.[16-21] Transgender people may experience numerous barriers to successful engagement along the HIV care continuum.[11,22] For example, compared with Ryan White clients overall, transgender clients were significantly less likely to have stable housing (77% vs. 87%), live above the federal poverty level (24% vs. 37%), and be virally suppressed (81% vs. 86%).[15] Experiences of violence, discrimination, and other trauma[11] are common among transgender people and have been associated with ART failure.[23]

Barriers to HIV Care and Treatment

Transgender people may avoid the health care system due to stigma and past negative experiences (e.g., being called the wrong name or pronoun, being verbally harassed, asked invasive questions about being transgender, or having to educate their providers about transgender people).[11,13,14,24-26]

For many transgender people, gender-affirming therapy (e.g., feminizing hormones) is a greater priority than HIV treatment and care.[27,28]

Concerns about adverse interactions between antiretroviral (ARV) drugs and gender-affirming hormone therapy are common among transgender people.[27] One study found that 40% of transgender women with HIV did not take their ARV drugs as directed due to concerns about drug-drug interactions, yet less than half had discussed this concern with their providers.[29]

Facilitating HIV Care Engagement

Gender Affirmation

Individuals are more likely to engage in HIV care when gender affirmation needs are met.[4,25] A national study of transgender people with HIV found that participants who work with HIV care providers who affirm their gender (e.g., providers who use their chosen name and pronoun) were more likely to be virally suppressed.[28] Adherence to hormone therapy correlates with adherence to ART.[30,31] However, making access to hormone therapy contingent upon ART adherence is associated with lower likelihood of viral suppression.[28]

Integration of HIV Care with Gender Care

According to research with transgender youth[25] and adults,[27] integrating HIV care with gender care facilitates

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

treatment and is associated with higher rates of viral suppression. In addition to minimizing the number of provider visits and potentially stressful clinical interactions, care integration makes it easier to discuss concerns about drug-drug interactions between HIV treatment and gender-affirming medications. In instances where integrated care is not feasible, the ART prescriber should refer the patient to an appropriate hormone therapy prescriber. Collaboration between these two care providers may enhance the quality of care.

Peer Navigation

Peer navigation has been found to improve the likelihood of durable viral suppression among key populations, including among transgender women.[32] Research with youth and adults suggests that having visible transgender staff in the clinical environment also facilitates engagement in care.[25]

Gender-Affirming Clinical Settings

Providing HIV services within gender-affirming environments should be a priority. Concrete steps that clinicians can take include ensuring that registration forms and electronic medical records are inclusive of transgender and gender nonbinary identities, preferably using a two-step method that records both gender and sex assigned at birth.[33] Individuals should be asked for their chosen name and pronouns, and these should be used consistently when speaking to or about the person, regardless of legal name. Clinicians and staff should avail themselves of resource lists, brochures, and other materials that meet the specific needs of transgender people with HIV.

Integrating hormone therapy with HIV services is the recommended practice; this requires HIV providers to become knowledgeable about hormone therapy and other aspects of gender-affirming services. When integration of HIV and transgender services is not possible, patients should be referred to clinicians who are knowledgeable in the field of transgender medicine. Both the World Professional Association for Transgender Health (WPATH) and GLMA: Health Professionals Advancing LGBTQ Equality (previously known as the Gay & Lesbian Medical Association) have provider directories that list endocrinologists, primary care providers, and psychiatrists with expertise working with transgender populations.

Pharmacological Considerations

Hormone Therapy

Hormone therapy is an important aspect of gender-affirming care for many transgender individuals. Hormones facilitate the acquisition of the secondary sex characteristics that are associated with the affirmed gender. Several guidelines for hormonal treatment of transgender people have been published, including guidelines from the Endocrine Society[34] and WPATH.[35] Clinical outcomes, potential adverse effects, the patient's treatment goals, and the patient's current hormone levels should be taken into account when determining the appropriate doses of hormone and androgen blockers. A clinician should be aware of the typical doses and routes of administration for all of the hormones and androgen blockers that a patient is taking, whether these medications are prescribed or not. All additional interventions (such as gonadectomy) should be documented. These interventions could potentially increase the risk of ART-related adverse effects on cardiovascular and bone health.

Feminizing regimens that are used by transgender women and others who were assigned male at birth usually include estrogens and androgen blockers. Feminizing regimens result in breast growth, redistribution of body fat, softening of the skin, and a decrease in muscle mass.[32] These regimens do not reduce facial (beard) hair or change the voice. In the United States, oral, parenteral, or transdermal preparations of 17-beta estradiol, or, less often, conjugated estrogens, are the mainstay of gender-affirming medical care for transgender women. Spironolactone, a mineralocorticoid receptor antagonist with anti-androgen properties, is usually used for androgen blockade; alternatives include 5-alpha reductase inhibitors that decrease the production of dihydrotestosterone (e.g., finasteride or dutasteride) or gonadotropin-releasing hormone agonists (e.g., goserelin acetate and leuprolide acetate). Cyproterone acetate is a steroidal anti-androgen that is frequently used outside of the United States. Patients may request progesterone to assist with breast growth; however, this has not been proven to be effective.[33] When using feminizing regimens, the goal is to suppress the testosterone level to <50 ng/dL and reach a serum estradiol level in the physiologic cisgender female range of 100 pg/mL to 200 pg/mL.[34]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Masculinizing regimens for transgender men and others who were assigned female at birth involve parenteral or transdermal testosterone preparations. These regimens are designed to stimulate the growth of facial and body hair, increase muscle mass, and deepen the voice; use of these regimens also results in clitoral enlargement, vaginal atrophy, and amenorrhea.[34] When using masculinizing therapy, the testosterone levels should be kept in the usual cisgender male range of 400 ng/dL to 700 ng/dL.[34]

Hormones and Antiretroviral Therapy

Studies that have examined interactions between exogenous estrogens and ART have predominantly focused on combined oral contraceptive use in cisgender women.[36] The data from these studies have been used to make predictions about the direction and extent of drug-drug interactions (Table 14). However, there are known differences between the pharmacologic characteristics of ethinyl estradiol, which is used in contraceptives, and 17-beta estradiol, which is used for gender affirmation. These differences may influence the accuracy of the predictions about the interactions between feminizing hormonal regimens and ART.

Table 14. Potential Interactions Between the Drugs Used in Gender-Affirming Hormone Therapy and Antiretroviral Drugs

Potential Effect on GAHT Drugs	ARV Drugs	GAHT Drugs that may be Affected by ARV Drugs	Clinical Recommendations for GAHT
ARV Drugs with the Least Potential to Impact GAHT Drugs	All NRTIs **Entry Inhibitors:** • IBA • MVC • T-20 **Unboosted INSTIs:** • BIC • DTG • RAL **NNRTIs:** • RPV • DOR	None	No dose adjustments necessary. Titrate dose based on desired clinical effects and hormone concentrations.
ARV Drugs that may Increase Concentrations of Some GAHT Drugs	EVG/c All boosted PIs	Dutasteride Finasteride Testosterone	Monitor patient for associated adverse effects; decrease the doses of GAHT drugs as needed to achieve the desired clinical effects and hormone concentrations.
ARV Drugs that may Decrease Concentrations of GAHT Drugs	PI/r **NNRTIs:** • EFV • ETR • NVP	Estradiol	Increase the dose of estradiol as needed to achieve the desired clinical effects and hormone concentrations.
	NNRTIs: • EFV • ETR • NVP	Dutasteride Finasteride Testosterone	Increase the doses of GAHT drugs as needed to achieve the desired clinical effects and hormone concentrations.
ARV Drugs with an Unclear Effect on GAHT Drugs	EVG/c PI/c	Estradiol	There is the potential for increased or decreased estradiol concentrations. Adjust the dose of estradiol to achieve the desired clinical effects and hormone concentrations.

Note: See Tables 21a, 21b, 21c, 21d, and 21e for additional information regarding drug-drug interactions between ARV drugs and gender-affirming medications.

Key: ARV = antiretroviral; BIC = bictegravir; DOR = doravirine; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; GAHT = gender-affirming hormone therapy; IBA = ibalizumab; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; MVC = maraviroc; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PI/c = protease inhibitor/cobicistat; PI/r = protease inhibitor/ritonavir; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; T-20 = enfuvirtide

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Other Hormonal Therapy Considerations

Bone Health

Bone metabolism is influenced by sex hormones. Current recommendations for osteoporosis screening are based on age and sex and have not been studied in transgender populations, which include people who have used hormone therapy and/or undergone removal of their gonads. Studies investigating bone mineral density changes in transgender women have shown inconsistent results, with the use of estrogens being associated with both elevations and declines in bone mineral density.[37-39] In one study, transgender women had high rates of osteopenia even before initiating hormones, possibly due to low levels of physical activity and low vitamin D levels.[37] Transgender men who are receiving testosterone appear to maintain adequate bone mineral density.[40] The risk for osteoporosis increases after gonadectomy for both transgender men and transgender women, especially if hormone regimens are stopped. Consequently, clinicians should consider early screening in this setting.

When using the FRAX® tool, which requires a sex designation, expert consensus is that assigned birth sex should be used, since transgender people who initiate hormones in early adulthood have generally already achieved peak bone mass.[41] Transgender people with HIV should be screened for osteoporosis using dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry by age 50, in accordance with current primary care recommendations.[42]

Since the use of tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF) has been associated with reductions in bone mineral density in people with HIV, TDF should be used with caution in transgender people with risk factors for osteoporosis or in those with established osteoporosis.

Interpretation of Laboratory Values

Interpretation of laboratory results requires special attention when reference ranges vary by sex. The sex listed on laboratory requisition forms typically corresponds with the gender listed on the patient's insurance forms and may not reflect the patient's current anatomical or hormonal configuration. Normal values have not been established for transgender individuals who are receiving gender-affirming hormonal or surgical interventions. Interpretation of laboratory results is dependent on the patient's physiology and the specific test being performed. Feldman et al.[43] recommend the following:

- For transgender people who are not taking hormones and have not had gonadectomy, use the sex assigned at birth.
- For transgender people who have undergone gonadectomy and have been stable on hormone therapy, use their affirmed gender.
- For transgender people who retain natal gonads and who may have been on hormone therapy for shorter periods of time, some laboratory tests may require the use of male reference ranges, while others may require the use of female reference ranges.
- Guidelines from the Center of Excellence for Transgender Health[1] recommend using the limits of normal described in the table below.

Limits of Normal When Interpreting Selected Laboratory Results in Transgender Adults

Laboratory Measures	Transgender Women on Gender-Affirming Hormones		Transgender Men on Gender-Affirming Hormones	
	Lower Limit	Upper Limit	Lower Limit	Upper Limit
Alkaline Phosphatase	Not defined	Male value	Not defined	Male value
Creatinine	Not defined	Male value	Not defined	Male value
Hemoglobin/Hematocrit	Female value	Male value	Male value[a]	Male value

[a] If the patient is menstruating regularly, consider using the female lower limit of normal.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Providers are encouraged to consult with their local laboratories to obtain hormone level reference ranges for both male and female norms, and then apply the correct range when interpreting results based on the current hormonal sex, rather than the sex on the laboratory form.[1] Reference intervals for transgender people have not been established; therefore, hormone status and clinical judgment must be used to assess abnormal laboratory values.[44]

Renal Concerns

Gender-affirming hormones can affect estimates of glomerular filtration rates (eGFR) that rely on serum creatinine due to changes in muscle mass. In one study, transgender men on testosterone had a mean increase in levels of serum creatinine from 0.73 ± 0.03 mg/dL to 0.87 ± 0.04 mg/dL after 3 months to 6 months of treatment. Transgender women on estrogen had a decrease in mean serum creatinine levels from 0.90 ± 0.03 mg/dL to 0.85 ± 0.03 mg/dL.[45] Creatinine-based eGFR calculations may therefore overestimate GFR in transgender women on hormones or underestimate GFR in transgender men on hormones. Therefore, using cystatin C-based eGFR calculations may be preferred for patients with marginal renal function.

Cardiovascular Disease Risk

Transgender individuals may have elevated cardiovascular disease (CVD) risk, due to both traditional risk factors and the risk factors associated with hormone use. Rates of tobacco use are higher among transgender people than in the general population,[46] and transgender women have a higher risk of venous thromboembolism and ischemic stroke, primarily associated with duration of estrogen use.[47] Transgender women on estrogens may show an increase in serum levels of triglycerides and high-density lipoproteins (HDL) and a decrease in levels of low-density lipoproteins (LDL).[48] Exogenous testosterone has been associated with increased levels of LDL and decreased levels of HDL among transgender men.[48] Providers should take CVD risk into consideration when selecting ART regimens and gender-affirming hormone therapy regimens.

Assessment of cardiac risk among transgender people with HIV can be complicated by hormone-induced changes in lipid levels as well as sex-specific variations in levels of homocysteine and high sensitivity C-reactive protein.[49] American Heart Association guidelines recommend using sex-specific calculators to determine cardiovascular risk and guide interventions,[50] and they provide no guidance for transgender people whose assigned sex at birth may differ from their hormonal and/or anatomical sex. The Center of Excellence for Transgender Health recommends that providers use the risk calculator for the sex at birth, affirmed gender, or an average of the two depending on the age at which the patient began using hormones and the total amount of time that a patient has been on hormone therapy.[1]

For transgender people with an elevated CVD risk or a history of CVD events, ARV drugs that are associated with CVD should be avoided whenever possible. See Table 17 for a list of ARV drugs that are associated with an increased risk of CVD. See Table 18 for alternative ARV agents to use in individuals with CVD. In transgender women who have an elevated risk for CVD or who have experienced a CVD event, transdermal estradiol may be the safest option for hormone therapy, as it carries a lower risk of thromboembolism than other routes of administration.[51]

Pregnancy Potential

Important information on contraception, drug-drug interactions between ARV drugs and hormone therapy drugs, and pregnancy is provided in Women with HIV. Much of this information also applies to transgender and nonbinary individuals. Below are specific ART considerations for transgender and nonbinary people of childbearing potential. Clinicians who care for pregnant patients should also consult the current Perinatal Guidelines for a more in-depth discussion and guidance on managing these patients.

Some transgender individuals use exogenous hormones and/or undergo gonadectomy for gender affirmation. Understanding exactly what interventions someone has undergone and the timeline for these interventions will clarify the patient's potential for pregnancy. Transgender individuals without a uterus (by birth or by

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

hysterectomy) do not have pregnancy potential. Ovulation may continue in the presence of hormone therapy in transgender people with a uterus and ovaries, and these individuals may retain their fertility.[1] Gender-affirming surgeries do not impair fertility unless the uterus, ovaries, and vagina are removed.[52,53]

All transgender people who have a uterus and ovaries and engage in sexual activity that could result in pregnancy should receive a pregnancy test prior to initiating ART **(AIII)**. Data from an observational study in Botswana suggest that there is an increased risk of neural tube defects in infants born to those who were receiving dolutegravir at the time of conception; however, the risk of these defects is still low. Before initiating an integrase strand transfer inhibitor-based regimen in a person of childbearing potential, clinicians should review Table 6b for information to consider when choosing an ART regimen. All ART-naive persons who are pregnant should be started on ART for their health and to prevent transmission of HIV to the fetus. They should be counseled about ARV drug use during pregnancy, and clinicians should consult the Perinatal Guidelines when designing a regimen **(AIII)**.

Testosterone Exposure in Transgender Persons with Ovaries
Testosterone alone is not a reliable form of contraception, and pregnancies have been reported in transgender men following prolonged testosterone treatment. Testosterone is a teratogen, and it is contraindicated in pregnancy. Clinicians should assess the reproductive desires and fertility potential of their transgender patients and provide accurate information on contraceptive and reproductive options.[54]

References

1. Deutsch M ed, Center of Excellence for Transgender Health. Guidelines for the primary and gender-affirming care of transgender and gender nonbinary people. 2016. Available at: http://www.transhealth.ucsf.edu/trans?page=guidelines-home.

2. Winter S, Diamond M, Green J, et al. Transgender people: health at the margins of society. *Lancet*. 2016;388(10042):390-400. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27323925.

3. Reisner SL, Radix A, Deutsch MB. Integrated and gender-affirming transgender clinical care and research. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2016;72 Suppl 3:S235-242. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27429189.

4. Sevelius JM. Gender affirmation: a framework for conceptualizing risk behavior among transgender women of color. *Sex Roles*. 2013;68(11-12):675-689. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23729971.

5. Glynn TR, Gamarel KE, Kahler CW, Iwamoto M, Operario D, Nemoto T. The role of gender affirmation in psychological well-being among transgender women. *Psychol Sex Orientat Gend Divers*. 2016;3(3):336-344. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27747257.

6. Bauer GR, Scheim AI, Pyne J, Travers R, Hammond R. Intervenable factors associated with suicide risk in transgender persons: a respondent driven sampling study in Ontario, Canada. *BMC Public Health*. 2015;15:525. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26032733.

7. Mahfouda S, Moore JK, Siafarikas A, et al. Gender-affirming hormones and surgery in transgender children and adolescents. *Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol*. 2019;7(6):484-498. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30528161.

8. Flores AR, Herman JL, Gates GJ, Brown TNT, The Williams Institute. How many adults identify as transgender in the United States? 2016. Available at: http://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/How-Many-Adults-Identify-as-Transgender-in-the-United-States.pdf.

9. Herman JL, Flores AR, Brown TNT, Wilson BDM, Conron KJ, The Williams Institute. Age of individuals who identify as transgender in the United States. 2017. Available at: https://williamsinstitute.law.ucla.edu/wp-content/uploads/TransAgeReport.pdf.

10. Johns MM, Lowry R, Andrzejewski J, et al. Transgender identity and experiences of violence victimization, substance use, suicide risk, and sexual risk behaviors among high school students-19 states and large urban school districts, 2017. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2019;68(3):67-71. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30677012.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

11. James SE, Herman JL, Rankin S, et al. The report of the 2015 U.S. Transgender Survey. 2016. Available at: https://transequality.org/sites/default/files/docs/usts/USTS-Full-Report-Dec17.pdf.

12. Meerwijk EL, Sevelius JM. Transgender population size in the United States: a meta-regression of population-based probability samples. *Am J Public Health*. 2017;107(2):e1-e8. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28075632.

13. Becasen JS, Denard CL, Mullins MM, Higa DH, Sipe TA. Estimating the prevalence of HIV and sexual behaviors among the US transgender population: a systematic review and meta-analysis, 2006-2017. *Am J Public Health*. 2018:e1-e8. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30496000.

14. Clark H, Babu AS, Wiewel EW, Opoku J, Crepaz N. Diagnosed HIV infection in transgender adults and adolescents: results from the National HIV Surveillance System, 2009-2014. *AIDS Behav*. 2017;21(9):2774-2783. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28035497.

15. Health Resources and Services Administration. Ryan White and Global HIV/AIDS Program annual client-level data report, 2017. 2018. Available at: http://hab.hrsa.gov/data/data-reports.

16. Beckwith CG, Kuo I, Fredericksen RJ, et al. Risk behaviors and HIV care continuum outcomes among criminal justice-involved HIV-infected transgender women and cisgender men: data from the Seek, Test, Treat, and Retain Harmonization Initiative. *PLoS One*. 2018;13(5):e0197730. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29787580.

17. Poteat T, Hanna DB, Rebeiro PF, et al. Characterizing the HIV care continuum among transgender women and cisgender women and men in clinical care: a retrospective time-series analysis. *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. 2019. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciz322.

18. Kalichman SC, Hernandez D, Finneran S, Price D, Driver R. Transgender women and HIV-related health disparities: falling off the HIV treatment cascade. *Sex Health*. 2017;14(5):469-476. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28870282.

19. Mizuno Y, Frazier EL, Huang P, Skarbinski J. Characteristics of transgender women living with HIV receiving medical care in the United States. *LGBT Health*. 2015;2(3):228-234. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26788671.

20. Santos GM, Wilson EC, Rapues J, Macias O, Packer T, Raymond HF. HIV treatment cascade among transgender women in a San Francisco respondent driven sampling study. *Sex Transm Infect*. 2014;90(5):430-433. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24714446.

21. Baguso GN, Gay CL, Lee KA. Medication adherence among transgender women living with HIV. *AIDS Care*. 2016;28(8):976-981. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26908228.

22. Mizuno Y, Beer L, Huang P, Frazier EL. Factors associated with antiretroviral therapy adherence among transgender women receiving HIV medical care in the United States. *LGBT Health*. 2017;4(3):181-187. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28498011.

23. Machtinger EL, Haberer JE, Wilson TC, Weiss DS. Recent trauma is associated with antiretroviral failure and HIV transmission risk behavior among HIV-positive women and female-identified transgenders. *AIDS Behav*. 2012;16(8):2160-2170. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22426597.

24. Poteat T, German D, Kerrigan D. Managing uncertainty: a grounded theory of stigma in transgender health care encounters. *Soc Sci Med*. 2013;84:22-29. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23517700.

25. Dowshen N, Lee S, Franklin J, Castillo M, Barg F. Access to medical and mental health services across the HIV care continuum among young transgender women: a qualitative study. *Transgend Health*. 2017;2(1):81-90. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28861551.

26. Sevelius JM, Carrico A, Johnson MO. Antiretroviral therapy adherence among transgender women living with HIV. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care*. 2010;21(3):256-264. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20347342.

27. Sevelius JM, Patouhas E, Keatley JG, Johnson MO. Barriers and facilitators to engagement and retention in care among transgender women living with human immunodeficiency virus. *Ann Behav Med*. 2014;47(1):5-16. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24317955.

28. Chung C, Kalra A, McBride B, Roebuck C, Sprague L, Center TL. Some Kind of Strength: Findings on Health Care and

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Economic Wellbeing from a National Needs Assessment of Transgender and Gender Non-conforming People Living with HIV. 2016. Available at: http://transgenderlawcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/TLC_REPORT_SOME_KIND_OF_FINAL_REV3.pdf.

29. Braun HM, Candelario J, Hanlon CL, et al. Transgender women living with HIV frequently take antiretroviral therapy and/or feminizing hormone therapy differently than prescribed due to drug-drug interaction concerns. *LGBT Health*. 2017;4(5):371-375. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28876170.

30. Crosby RA, Salazar LF, Hill BJ. Correlates of not using antiretroviral therapy among transwomen living with HIV: The unique role of personal competence. *Transgend Health*. 2018;3(1):141-146. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30094338.

31. Sevelius JM, Saberi P, Johnson MO. Correlates of antiretroviral adherence and viral load among transgender women living with HIV. *AIDS Care*. 2014;26(8):976-982. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24646419.

32. Cunningham WE, Weiss RE, Nakazono T, et al. Effectiveness of a peer navigation intervention to sustain viral suppression among HIV-positive men and transgender women released from jail: the LINK LA randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2018;178(4):542-553. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29532059.

33. Cahill S, Singal R, Grasso C, et al. Do ask, do tell: high levels of acceptability by patients of routine collection of sexual orientation and gender identity data in four diverse American community health centers. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(9):e107104. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25198577.

34. Hembree WC, Cohen-Kettenis PT, Gooren L, et al. Endocrine treatment of gender-dysphoric/gender-incongruent persons: An Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2017;102(11):3869-3903. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28945902.

35. Coleman E, Bockting W, Botzer M, et al. Standards of care for the health of transsexual, transgender, and gender-nonconforming people, version 7. *International Journal of Transgenderism*. 2011;13:165. Available at: http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/15532739.2011.700873.

36. Radix A, Sevelius J, Deutsch MB. Transgender women, hormonal therapy and HIV treatment: a comprehensive review of the literature and recommendations for best practices. *J Int AIDS Soc*. 2016;19(3 Suppl 2):20810. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27431475.

37. Wierckx K, Mueller S, Weyers S, et al. Long-term evaluation of cross-sex hormone treatment in transsexual persons. *J Sex Med*. 2012;9(10):2641-2651. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22906135.

38. Lapauw B, Taes Y, Simoens S, et al. Body composition, volumetric and areal bone parameters in male-to-female transsexual persons. *Bone*. 2008;43(6):1016-1021. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18835591.

39. van Kesteren PJ, Asscheman H, Megens JA, Gooren LJ. Mortality and morbidity in transsexual subjects treated with cross-sex hormones. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)*. 1997;47(3):337-342. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9373456.

40. Van Caenegem E, Wierckx K, Taes Y, et al. Bone mass, bone geometry, and body composition in female-to-male transsexual persons after long-term cross-sex hormonal therapy. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2012;97(7):2503-2511. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22564669.

41. Radix A, Deutsch M, Center of Excellence for Transgender Health. Bone health and osteoporosis. In: *Guidelines for the Primary and Gender-Affirming Care of Transgender and Gender Nonbinary People*. 2016. Available at: http://www.transhealth.ucsf.edu/trans?page=guidelines-bone-health.

42. Aberg JA, Gallant JE, Ghanem KG, Emmanuel P, Zingman BS, Horberg MA. Primary care guidelines for the management of persons infected with HIV: 2013 update by the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014;58(1):e1-34. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24235263.

43. Feldman JL, Goldberg JM. Transgender primary medical care. *International Journal of Transgenderism*. 2006;9(3-4):3-34. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1300/J485v09n03_02.

44. Goldstein Z, Corneil T, Greene D. When gender identity doesn't equal sex recorded at birth: the role of the laboratory in providing effective healthcare to the transgender community. *Clin Chem*. 2017;63(8):1342-1352. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28679645.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

45. Fernandez JD, Tannock LR. Metabolic effects of hormone therapy in transgender patients. *Endocr Pract*. 2016;22(4):383-388. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26574790.

46. Buchting FO, Emory KT, Scout, et al. Transgender use of cigarettes, cigars, and e-cigarettes in a national study. *Am J Prev Med*. 2017;53(1):e1-e7. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28094133.

47. Getahun D, Nash R, Flanders WD, et al. Cross-sex hormones and acute cardiovascular events in transgender persons: a cohort study. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018;169(4):205-213. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29987313.

48. Maraka S, Singh Ospina N, Rodriguez-Gutierrez R, et al. Sex steroids and cardiovascular outcomes in transgender individuals: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2017;102(11):3914-3923. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28945852.

49. Arnold JD, Sarkodie EP, Coleman ME, Goldstein DA. Incidence of venous thromboembolism in transgender women receiving oral estradiol. *J Sex Med*. 2016. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27671969.

50. Grundy SM, Stone NJ, Bailey AL, et al. 2018 AHA/ ACC/ AACVPR/ AAPA/ ABC/ ACPM/ ADA/ AGS/ APhA/ ASPC/ NLA/ PCNA Guideline on the management of blood cholesterol: a report of the American College of Cardiology/ American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2018(18):39033-39038. Available at: http://www.onlinejacc.org/content/accj/early/2018/11/02/j.jacc.2018.11.003.full.pdf.

51. Streed CG Jr, Harfouch O, Marvel F, Blumenthal RS, Martin SS, Mukherjee M. Cardiovascular disease among transgender adults receiving hormone therapy: a narrative review. *Ann Intern Med*. 2017;167(4):256-267. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28738421.

52. Hoffkling A, Obedin-Maliver J, Sevelius J. From erasure to opportunity: a qualitative study of the experiences of transgender men around pregnancy and recommendations for providers. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2017;17(Suppl 2):332. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29143629.

53. MacDonald T, Noel-Weiss J, West D, et al. Transmasculine individuals' experiences with lactation, chestfeeding, and gender identity: a qualitative study. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. 2016;16:106. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27183978.

54. Light A, Wang LF, Zeymo A, Gomez-Lobo V. Family planning and contraception use in transgender men. *Contraception*. 2018;98(4):266-269. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29944875.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Women with HIV (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Key Considerations and Recommendations
• Antiretroviral therapy (ART) is recommended for all persons living with HIV to improve their health and to reduce the risk of HIV transmission to sexual partners without HIV **(AI)**.
• When prescribing antiretroviral (ARV) drugs, clinicians should take into account that some ARV drugs have significant pharmacokinetic (PK) interactions with hormonal contraceptives; an alternative or additional effective contraceptive method is recommended to prevent unplanned pregnancy **(AIII)**. Switching to an ARV drug that does not have interactions with hormonal contraceptives may also be considered **(BIII)**.
• A pregnancy test should be performed for those of childbearing potential prior to initiation of ART **(AIII)**.
• Preliminary data suggest there may be an increased risk of neural tube defects (NTDs) (0.9%) in infants born to women who were receiving dolutegravir (DTG) at the time of conception. Updated results have shown that the prevalence of NTDs in infants who were exposed to DTG at the time of conception is lower (0.3%) than reported in the preliminary data, but still higher than in infants born to women who received ART that did not include DTG (0.1%).
• Providers should discuss the potential risks and benefits of using DTG with individuals of childbearing potential and provide appropriate counseling so that individuals can make informed decisions.
• Before initiating an integrase strand transfer inhibitor-based regimen in a person of childbearing potential, clinicians should review Table 6b for information to consider when choosing an ART regimen.
• In a patient with multidrug-resistant HIV who has no alternatives to DTG, the decision of whether to use DTG should be made after carefully considering the risk of NTDs in the infant if pregnancy occurs while a patient is taking DTG, and the risks of persistent viremia in the patient and potential HIV transmission to the fetus if pregnancy occurs while the patient is not on effective ART.
• During pregnancy, an additional goal of ART is to maintain a viral load below the limit of detection throughout pregnancy to reduce the risk of transmission to the fetus and newborn **(AI)**.
• When selecting an ARV combination regimen for a pregnant woman, clinicians should consider the available safety, efficacy, and PK data on use during pregnancy for each agent. The risks and benefits of ARV use during pregnancy should be discussed with all individuals of childbearing potential **(AIII)** and clinicians should consult the most current Perinatal Guidelines when designing a regimen **(AIII)**.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional*
Rating of Evidence: *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

This section focuses on some unique clinical and therapeutic issues to consider and basic principles to follow when caring for cisgender women living with HIV. Cisgender women are defined as women who were assigned female at birth and who identify themselves as women. Some topics discussed in this section, such as contraception, drug-drug interactions between antiretroviral (ARV) drugs and hormonal therapy, and pregnancy, also apply to transgender men (men assigned female at birth), and individuals assigned female at birth who identify as nonbinary (gender identities that are not exclusively feminine or masculine) or gender fluid (gender identity is not fixed). See Transgender People with HIV for more information on the specific HIV care needs of these individuals. Clinicians who care for pregnant patients should consult the current Perinatal Guidelines for a more in-depth discussion on treating pregnant patients and guidance on managing these patients.

Sex Difference Considerations in Antiretroviral Therapy

In general, studies to date have not shown sex differences in virologic responses to antiretroviral therapy (ART).[1-4] However, there are limited data showing that pharmacokinetics (PKs) for some ARV drugs may differ between men and women, possibly because of variations in factors such as body weight, plasma volume, gastric emptying time, plasma protein levels, cytochrome P 450 activity, drug transporter function, and excretion activity.[5-7]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Adverse Effects

Several studies with older ARV drugs have suggested that sex may influence the frequency, presentation, and severity of some ARV-related adverse events. Most notably, women are more likely to develop severe symptomatic hepatotoxicity with nevirapine (NVP) use[8,9] and are more likely to develop symptomatic lactic acidosis with prolonged use of older nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) such as zidovudine (ZDV), stavudine, and didanosine.[10] These agents are no longer recommended for use in people with HIV in the United States; although ZDV is still administered intravenously (IV) to some patients during delivery, it is not generally recommended for long-term use.

Some studies have investigated how metabolic complications that are associated with the use of ARV drugs differ between women and men. At 96 weeks after initiation of ART, women with HIV were less likely to have decreases in limb fat but more likely to have decreases in bone mineral density (BMD) than men with HIV.[11,12] Women have an increased risk of osteopenia, osteoporosis, and fractures, particularly after menopause, and this risk is exacerbated by HIV and ART.[13-16] ART regimens that contain tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF), ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitors (PI/r), or both are associated with a significantly greater loss of BMD than regimens that contain other NRTIs and raltegravir (RAL).[17-20] Abacavir (ABC), NRTI-sparing regimens, and tenofovir alafenamide may be considered as alternatives to TDF for patients who are at risk of osteopenia or osteoporosis. Recommendations for the management of bone disease in people with HIV have been published.[21]

Adults and Adolescents with HIV Who Are of Childbearing Potential

All adults and adolescents with HIV who are of childbearing potential should be offered comprehensive reproductive and sexual health counseling and care as part of routine primary medical care. Topics for discussion should include safe sex practices, reproductive desires and options for conception, the HIV status of sexual partner(s), and the use of effective contraception to prevent unplanned pregnancy. Counseling should also include discussion of special considerations pertaining to ARV use when using hormonal contraceptives, when trying to conceive, and during pregnancy (see the Perinatal Guidelines).

Antiretroviral Regimen Considerations for Individuals Who Are Trying to Conceive or Who Cannot Use Effective Contraception

Efavirenz (EFV) is teratogenic in nonhuman primates. However, a meta-analysis that included data from 23 studies found no evidence for an increased risk of birth defects in infants born to women who received EFV during the first trimester compared with infants born to women who received other ARV drugs during the first trimester.[22] EFV can be used in individuals of childbearing potential who are not using effective contraception or who are contemplating pregnancy. Individuals who become pregnant on EFV-containing regimens should continue their current regimens.

Preliminary data from a study in Botswana suggested that there is an increased risk of neural tube defects (NTDs) (0.9%) in infants born to women who were receiving dolutegravir (DTG) at the time of conception.[23,24] Updated results have shown that the prevalence of NTDs in infants who were exposed to DTG at the time of conception is lower (0.3%) than reported in the preliminary data, but still higher than in infants who were exposed to ART that did not contain DTG (0.1%).[25,26] Providers should discuss with individuals of childbearing potential the potential risks and benefits of taking DTG and provide appropriate counseling so that individuals can make informed decisions.

Before initiating an integrase strand transfer inhibitor (INSTI)-based regimen in a person of childbearing potential, clinicians should review Table 6b for information to consider when choosing an ART regimen. The key recommendations are listed below:

- **For individuals who are trying to conceive**, the Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents recommends initiating one of the following regimens, which are designated as *Preferred*

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

regimens during pregnancy in the Perinatal Guidelines: RAL, atazanavir/ritonavir, or darunavir/ritonavir plus TDF/emtricitabine, TDF/lamivudine (3TC), or ABC/3TC. DTG would be an *Alternative*, rather than a *Preferred*, option **(BII)**.

- **For individuals who are not planning to conceive but who are sexually active and not using contraception**, consider a regimen's effectiveness and tolerability, the available data on potential teratogenicity, and the person's preferences (e.g., pill burden) when choosing between regimens that are recommended for initial therapy (see Table 6a). In this situation, DTG would be an *Alternative*, rather than *Preferred*, option **(BII)**. If the person becomes pregnant, changes to the ARV regimen may be warranted. Clinicians should refer to the Perinatal Guidelines for recommendations.
- **For individuals who are using effective contraception**, a DTG-based regimen is one of the recommended options; however, clinicians should discuss the risks and benefits of using DTG with patients to allow them to make informed decisions **(AIII)**.
- An approach similar to that outlined for DTG should be considered for bictegravir-containing ART **(AIII)**.

In a person with multidrug-resistant HIV who has no alternatives to DTG, the decision of whether to initiate or continue DTG should be made after carefully considering the risk of NTDs in the infant if pregnancy occurs while a patient is taking DTG, the risks of persistent viremia in the patient, and potential HIV transmission to the fetus if pregnancy occurs while the patient is not on effective ART.

Reproductive Options for Serodiscordant Couples

An individual who wishes to conceive with a serodiscordant partner should be informed of options to prevent sexual transmission of HIV while attempting conception. Interventions include screening and treating both partners for sexually transmitted infections (STIs), the use of ART to maximally suppress and maintain the viral load of the partner with HIV, the use of pre-exposure prophylaxis by the partner without HIV,[27-29] male circumcision, and/or self-insemination with the sperm of the partner without HIV during the periovulatory period of the individual with HIV.[30]

Hormonal Contraception

Safe and effective reproductive health and family planning services to prevent unplanned pregnancies and perinatal transmission of HIV are an essential component of care for individuals with HIV of childbearing age. These individuals should receive ongoing counseling on reproductive issues. Regardless of hormonal contraceptive use, individuals with HIV should be advised to consistently use condoms (male or female) during sex and to adhere to an HIV regimen that effectively maintains viral suppression. Both strategies are crucial to prevent transmission of HIV to partners without HIV and to protect against infection with other STIs. The following sections describe some factors to consider when hormonal contraceptives are used.

Drug-Drug Interactions

PK interactions between ARV drugs and hormonal contraceptives may reduce contraceptive efficacy. However, there are limited clinical data regarding interactions between ARV drugs and hormonal contraceptives, and the clinical implications of these interactions are unclear. The magnitudes of changes in drug concentrations that may reduce contraceptive efficacy or increase the risk of adverse effects are not known for all forms of contraceptives.

- **Combined Oral Contraceptives (COCs):** Several PIs, EFV, and elvitegravir/cobicistat (EVG/c)-based regimens have drug interactions with COCs. Interactions include either a decrease or an increase in blood levels of ethinyl estradiol, norethindrone, or norgestimate (see Tables 21a, 21b, and 21d), which potentially decreases contraceptive efficacy or increases the risk of estrogen- or progestin-related adverse effects (e.g., thromboembolism). EFV can decrease etonogestrel bioavailability and plasma progestin concentrations of COCs that contain ethinyl estradiol and norgestimate.[31] Several regimens that include

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

a cobicistat-boosted PI, PI/r, or EVG/c decrease oral contraceptive estradiol levels.[32-35] One PK study showed that DTG did not affect ethinyl estradiol or norgestimate levels.[36] Several studies have shown that the use of etravirine, rilpivirine, and NVP did not significantly affect estradiol or progestin levels in individuals with HIV who were using COCs.[37-39]

- **Injectable Contraceptives:** Small studies of women with HIV who were receiving injectable depot-medroxyprogesterone acetate (DMPA) while on ART showed no significant interactions between DMPA and EFV, lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/r), NVP, nelfinavir, or NRTI drugs.[40-43]
- **Contraceptive Implants:** Contraceptive failure of the etonogestrel implant in women on EFV-based therapy has been reported.[44,45] Studies of women with levonorgestrel- and etonogestrel-releasing implants reported that participants who received EFV-based ART had decreased bioavailability of levonorgestrel and etonogestrel.[46-48] These studies did not identify any change in hormone concentrations when the implants were used in those taking NVP[46,48] or LPV/r.[47] Similarly, two retrospective cohort evaluations that were conducted in Swaziland and Kenya showed an increased risk of contraceptive failure in women using contraceptive implants and receiving EFV.[49,50]

Concerns about PK interactions between oral or implantable hormonal contraceptives and ARV drugs should not prevent clinicians from prescribing hormonal contraceptives for individuals on ART who prefer this contraceptive method. However, an alternative or additional effective contraceptive method is recommended when there are significant drug interactions between hormonal contraceptives and ARV drugs (see Tables 21a, 21b, and 21d and the Perinatal Guidelines).

Risk of HIV Acquisition and Transmission

Studies have produced conflicting data on the association between hormonal contraception and the risk of acquisition of HIV.[51] Most of the retrospective studies involved couples in which the partners with HIV were not taking ART. A retrospective secondary analysis of two studies of serodiscordant couples in Africa in which the partner with HIV was not receiving ART found that, compared to women who did not use hormonal contraception, those using hormonal contraception (the majority of study participants were using injectable DMPA) had a two-fold increased risk of acquiring or transmitting HIV. Higher genital HIV RNA concentrations have been found in women with HIV who were using hormonal contraception than in those who were not using hormonal contraceptives.[52] Oral contraceptive use was not significantly associated with transmission of HIV; however, the number of women who were using oral contraceptives in this study was insufficient to adequately assess risk.

A World Health Organization expert group reviewed all available evidence regarding hormonal contraception use and HIV transmission to a partner without HIV and recommended that individuals with HIV can continue to use all existing hormonal contraceptive methods without restriction.[53] Further research is needed to definitively determine whether hormonal contraceptive use is an independent risk factor for acquisition and transmission of HIV, particularly in the setting of ART. Regardless, the potential association between hormonal contraception use and HIV transmission in the absence of ART underscores the importance of ART-induced viral suppression to reduce transmission risk.

Intrauterine devices (IUDs) appear to be a safe and effective contraceptive option for individuals with HIV.[54-56] Although studies have focused primarily on IUDs that do not contain hormones (e.g., copper IUDs), several small studies have found that levonorgestrel-releasing IUDs are also safe and are not associated with increased genital tract shedding of HIV.[57-59]

Pregnancy

Clinicians who are caring for pregnant adults and adolescents with HIV should review the Perinatal Guidelines. The use of combination ARV regimens is recommended for all pregnant persons with HIV,

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

regardless of virologic, immunologic, or clinical parameters, for their own health and to prevent HIV transmission to the fetus **(AI)**. Pregnant individuals with HIV should be counseled regarding the known benefits and risks of using ARV drugs during pregnancy to the woman, fetus, and newborn. They should be strongly encouraged to receive ART for their own health and their infants' health. Open, nonjudgmental, and supportive discussion should be used to encourage them to adhere to care.

Prevention of Perinatal HIV Transmission

The use of ART and the resultant reduction of HIV RNA levels decrease the risk of perinatal HIV transmission.[60-62] The goal of ART is to achieve maximal and sustained viral suppression throughout pregnancy. Long-term follow-up is recommended for all infants who were exposed to ART *in utero*, regardless of the infant's HIV status (see the Perinatal Guidelines).

Antiretroviral Regimen Considerations

Pregnancy should not preclude the use of optimal ARV regimens. As in nonpregnant individuals, genotypic resistance testing is recommended for all pregnant persons before initiating ARV drugs **(AIII)** and for those with detectable HIV RNA while on ART **(AI)**. However, ART initiation should not be delayed pending genotypic resistance test results. The ARV regimen can be modified, if necessary, once the resistance test results are available **(BIII)**. Unique considerations that influence recommendations on the ARV drugs to use during pregnancy include the following:

- Physiologic changes that are associated with pregnancy and that potentially change the PKs of ARV drugs, which may affect ARV dosing at different stages of pregnancy;
- Potential ARV-associated adverse effects in pregnancy;
- Potential for nonadherence to a particular regimen during pregnancy; *and*
- Potential short-term and long-term effects of an ARV drug on the fetus and newborn, which are unknown for many drugs.

ART is considered the standard of care for pregnant individuals with HIV, both to treat HIV infection and prevent perinatal transmission of HIV. Clinicians should review the Perinatal Guidelines for ARV drug recommendations, including recommendations on the use of DTG and other INSTIs, for individuals who have recently received an HIV diagnosis or those who become pregnant while on ART.

If maternal HIV RNA is ≥1,000 copies/mL (or unknown) near delivery, IV infusion of ZDV during labor is recommended regardless of the mother's antepartum regimen and resistance profile and the mode of infant delivery **(AI)**. Administration of combination ART should continue during labor and before a cesarean delivery (oral medications can be administered with sips of water during this time).

Clinicians who are treating pregnant individuals with HIV are strongly encouraged to report cases of prenatal exposure to ARV drugs (either administered alone or in combination) to the Antiretroviral Pregnancy Registry. The registry collects observational data regarding exposure to Food and Drug Administration-approved ARV drugs during pregnancy to assess potential teratogenicity.

Postpartum Management

Following delivery, clinical, immunologic, and virologic follow-up should continue as recommended for nonpregnant adults and adolescents. Individuals with HIV should be counseled to avoid breastfeeding; maternal ART reduces, but does not eliminate, the risk of HIV transmission of HIV in breast milk, and postnatal transmission can occur despite maternal ART.[63] Persons with HIV should not premasticate food and feed it to their infants, because the practice has been associated with transmission of HIV.[64] ART is currently recommended for all individuals with HIV **(AI)**; therefore, maternal ART should be continued after delivery. For more information regarding postpartum management of HIV, refer to the Perinatal Guidelines.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Several studies have demonstrated that adherence to ART may decline during the postpartum period.[65-67] Clinicians should address ART adherence at each postpartum clinic visit, including an evaluation of specific factors that facilitate adherence or that present a barrier to adherence. Clinicians may recommend an intervention to improve adherence (see Adherence to the Continuum of Care).

References

1. Collazos J, Asensi V, Carton JA. Sex differences in the clinical, immunological and virological parameters of HIV-infected patients treated with HAART. *AIDS*. 2007;21(7):835-843. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17415038.
2. Fardet L, Mary-Krause M, Heard I, Partisani M, Costagliola D. Influence of gender and HIV transmission group on initial highly active antiretroviral therapy prescription and treatment response. *HIV Med*. 2006;7(8):520-529. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17105511.
3. Currier J, Averitt Bridge D, Hagins D, et al. Sex-based outcomes of darunavir-ritonavir therapy: a single-group trial. *Ann Intern Med*. 2010;153(6):349-357. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20855799.
4. Rosin C, Elzi L, Thurnheer C, et al. Gender inequalities in the response to combination antiretroviral therapy over time: the Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *HIV Med*. 2015;16(5):319-325. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25329751.
5. Gandhi M, Aweeka F, Greenblatt RM, Blaschke TF. Sex differences in pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol*. 2004;44:499-523. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14744256.
6. Ofotokun I, Chuck SK, Hitti JE. Antiretroviral pharmacokinetic profile: a review of sex differences. *Gend Med*. 2007;4(2):106-119. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17707845.
7. Venuto CS, Mollan K, Ma Q, et al. Sex differences in atazanavir pharmacokinetics and associations with time to clinical events: AIDS Clinical Trials Group Study A5202. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2014;69(12):3300-3310. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25159623.
8. Baylor MS, Johann-Liang R. Hepatotoxicity associated with nevirapine use. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2004;35(5):538-539. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15021321.
9. Wit FW, Kesselring AM, Gras L, et al. Discontinuation of nevirapine because of hypersensitivity reactions in patients with prior treatment experience, compared with treatment-naive patients: the ATHENA cohort study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2008;46(6):933-940. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18271750.
10. Lactic Acidosis International Study Group LAISG. Risk factors for lactic acidosis and severe hyperlactataemia in HIV-1-infected adults exposed to antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. 2007;21(18):2455-2464. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18025882.
11. McComsey GA, Kitch D, Sax PE, et al. Peripheral and central fat changes in subjects randomized to abacavir-lamivudine or tenofovir-emtricitabine with atazanavir-ritonavir or efavirenz: ACTG Study A5224s. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;53(2):185-196. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21690627.
12. McComsey GA, Kitch D, Daar ES, et al. Bone mineral density and fractures in antiretroviral-naive persons randomized to receive abacavir-lamivudine or tenofovir disoproxil fumarate-emtricitabine along with efavirenz or atazanavir-ritonavir: AIDS Clinical Trials Group A5224s, a substudy of ACTG A5202. *J Infect Dis*. 2011;203(12):1791-1801. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21606537.
13. Yin M, Dobkin J, Brudney K, et al. Bone mass and mineral metabolism in HIV+ postmenopausal women. *Osteoporos Int*. 2005;16(11):1345-1352. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15754081.
14. Brown TT, Qaqish RB. Response to Berg et al. 'Antiretroviral therapy and the prevalence of osteopenia and osteoporosis: a meta-analytic review'. *AIDS*. 2007;21(13):1830-1831. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17690589.
15. Sharma A, Shi Q, Hoover DR, et al. Increased fracture incidence in middle-aged HIV-infected and HIV-uninfected women: updated results from the Women's Interagency HIV study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2015;70(1):54-61. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26322667.
16. Grant PM, Kitch D, McComsey GA, et al. Low baseline CD4+ count is associated with greater bone mineral density loss after antiretroviral therapy initiation. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;57(10):1483-1488. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23943825.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

17. Stellbrink HJ, Orkin C, Arribas JR, et al. Comparison of changes in bone density and turnover with abacavir-lamivudine versus tenofovir-emtricitabine in HIV-infected adults: 48-week results from the ASSERT study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2010;51(8):963-972. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20828304.

18. Martin A, Bloch M, Amin J, et al. Simplification of antiretroviral therapy with tenofovir-emtricitabine or abacavir-lamivudine: a randomized, 96-week trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2009;49(10):1591-1601. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19842973.

19. Duvivier C, Kolta S, Assoumou L, et al. Greater decrease in bone mineral density with protease inhibitor regimens compared with nonnucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor regimens in HIV-1 infected naive patients. *AIDS*. 2009;23(7):817-824. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19363330.

20. Brown TT, Moser C, Currier JS, et al. Changes in bone mineral density after initiation of antiretroviral treatment with tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine plus atazanavir/ritonavir, darunavir/ritonavir, or raltegravir. *J Infect Dis*. 2015;212(8):1241-1249. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25948863.

21. Brown TT, Hoy J, Borderi M, et al. Recommendations for evaluation and management of bone disease in HIV. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;60(8):1242-1251. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25609682.

22. Ford N, Mofenson L, Shubber Z, et al. Safety of efavirenz in the first trimester of pregnancy: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis. *AIDS*. 2014;28 Suppl 2:S123-131. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24849471.

23. Zash R, Holmes L, Makhema J, et al. Surveillance for neural tube defects following antiretroviral exposure from conception. Presented at: 22nd International AIDS Conference (AIDS 2018); 2018; Amsterdam.

24. Zash R, Makhema J, Shapiro RL. Neural-Tube Defects with Dolutegravir Treatment from the Time of Conception. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(10):979-981. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30037297.

25. Zash R, Holmes L, Diseko M, et al. Neural-tube defects and antiretroviral treatment regimens in Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):827-840. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31329379.

26. Raesima MM, Ogbuabo CM, Thomas V, et al. Dolutegravir use at conception - additional surveillance data from Botswana. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(9):885-887. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31329378.

27. Heffron R, Pintye J, Matthews LT, Weber S, Mugo N. PrEP as peri-conception HIV prevention for women and men. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. 2016. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26993627.

28. Vernazza PL, Graf I, Sonnenberg-Schwan U, Geit M, Meurer A. Preexposure prophylaxis and timed intercourse for HIV-discordant couples willing to conceive a child. *AIDS*. 2011;25(16):2005-2008. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21716070.

29. Whetham J, Taylor S, Charlwood L, et al. Pre-exposure prophylaxis for conception (PrEP-C) as a risk reduction strategy in HIV-positive men and HIV-negative women in the UK. *AIDS Care*. 2014;26(3):332-336. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23876052.

30. Lampe MA, Smith DK, Anderson GJ, Edwards AE, Nesheim SR. Achieving safe conception in HIV-discordant couples: the potential role of oral preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP) in the United States. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2011;204(6):488 e481-488. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21457911.

31. Sevinsky H, Eley T, Persson A, et al. The effect of efavirenz on the pharmacokinetics of an oral contraceptive containing ethinyl estradiol and norgestimate in healthy HIV-negative women. *Antivir Ther*. 2011;16(2):149-156. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21447863.

32. Vogler MA, Patterson K, Kamemoto L, et al. Contraceptive efficacy of oral and transdermal hormones when co-administered with protease inhibitors in HIV-1-infected women: pharmacokinetic results of ACTG trial A5188. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2010;55(4):473-482. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20842042.

33. Zhang J, Chung E, Yones C, et al. The effect of atazanavir/ritonavir on the pharmacokinetics of an oral contraceptive containing ethinyl estradiol and norgestimate in healthy women. *Antivir Ther*. 2011;16(2):157-164. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21447864.

34. Stribild package insert [package insert]. Gilead. 2017. Available at: http://www.gilead.com/~/media/Files/pdfs/medicines/hiv/stribild/stribild_pi.pdf.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

35. Genvoya package insert [package insert]. Gilead. 2017. Available at: http://www.gilead.com/~/media/files/pdfs/medicines/hiv/genvoya/genvoya_pi.pdf.

36. Song IH, Borland J, Chen S, Wajima T, Peppercorn AF, Piscitelli SC. Dolutegravir Has No Effect on the Pharmacokinetics of Oral Contraceptives With Norgestimate and Ethinyl Estradiol. *Ann Pharmacother*. 2015;49(7):784-789. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25862012.

37. Scholler-Gyure M, Kakuda TN, Woodfall B, et al. Effect of steady-state etravirine on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of ethinylestradiol and norethindrone. *Contraception*. 2009;80(1):44-52. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19501215.

38. Crauwels HM, van Heeswijk RP, Buelens A, Stevens M, Hoetelmans RM. Lack of an effect of rilpivirine on the pharmacokinetics of ethinylestradiol and norethindrone in healthy volunteers. *Int J Clin Pharmacol Ther*. 2014;52(2):118-128. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24161160.

39. Stuart GS, Moses A, Corbett A, et al. Combined oral contraceptives and antiretroviral PK/PD in Malawian women: pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of a combined oral contraceptive and a generic combined formulation antiretroviral in Malawi. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2011;58(2):e40-43. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21921726.

40. Cohn SE, Park JG, Watts DH, et al. Depo-medroxyprogesterone in women on antiretroviral therapy: effective contraception and lack of clinically significant interactions. *Clin Pharmacol Ther*. 2007;81(2):222-227. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17192768.

41. Nanda K, Amaral E, Hays M, Viscola MA, Mehta N, Bahamondes L. Pharmacokinetic interactions between depot medroxyprogesterone acetate and combination antiretroviral therapy. *Fertil Steril*. 2008;90(4):965-971. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17880953.

42. Watts DH, Park JG, Cohn SE, et al. Safety and tolerability of depot medroxyprogesterone acetate among HIV-infected women on antiretroviral therapy: ACTG A5093. *Contraception*. 2008;77(2):84-90. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18226670.

43. Luque AE, Cohn SE, Park JG, et al. Depot medroxyprogesterone acetate in combination with a twice-daily lopinavir-ritonavir-based regimen in HIV-infected women showed effective contraception and a lack of clinically significant interactions, with good safety and tolerability: results of the ACTG 5283 study. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2015;59(4):2094-2101. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25624326.

44. Leticee N, Viard JP, Yamgnane A, Karmochkine M, Benachi A. Contraceptive failure of etonogestrel implant in patients treated with antiretrovirals including efavirenz. *Contraception*. 2012;85(4):425-427. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22036046.

45. McCarty EJ, Keane H, Quinn K, Quah S. Implanon(R) failure in an HIV-positive woman on antiretroviral therapy resulting in two ectopic pregnancies. *Int J STD AIDS*. 2011;22(7):413-414. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21729965.

46. Scarsi KK, Darin KM, Nakalema S, et al. Unintended Pregnancies Observed With Combined Use of the Levonorgestrel Contraceptive Implant and Efavirenz-based Antiretroviral Therapy: A Three-Arm Pharmacokinetic Evaluation Over 48 Weeks. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;62(6):675-682. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26646680.

47. Vieira CS, Bahamondes MV, de Souza RM, et al. Effect of antiretroviral therapy including lopinavir/ritonavir or efavirenz on etonogestrel-releasing implant pharmacokinetics in HIV-positive women. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2014;66(4):378-385. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24798768.

48. Chappell CA, Lamorde M, Nakalema S, et al. Efavirenz decreases etonogestrel exposure: a pharmacokinetic evaluation of implantable contraception with antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. 2017;31(14):1965-1972. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28692531.

49. Patel RC, Onono M, Gandhi M, et al. Pregnancy rates in HIV-positive women using contraceptives and efavirenz-based or nevirapine-based antiretroviral therapy in Kenya: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet HIV*. 2015;2(11):e474-482. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26520927.

50. Perry SH, Swamy P, Preidis GA, Mwanyumba A, Motsa N, Sarero HN. Implementing the Jadelle implant for women living with HIV in a resource-limited setting: concerns for drug interactions leading to unintended pregnancies. *AIDS*. 2014;28(5):791-793. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24401645.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

51. Morrison CS, Nanda K. Hormonal contraception and HIV: an unanswered question. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2012;12(1):2-3. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21975268.

52. Heffron R, Donnell D, Rees H, et al. Use of hormonal contraceptives and risk of HIV-1 transmission: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2012;12(1):19-26. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21975269.

53. World Health Organization. *Hormonal contraceptive methods for women at high risk of HIV and living with HIV: 2014 guidance statement*. Geneva, Switzerland 2014. Available at: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/128537/1/WHO_RHR_14.24_eng.pdf?ua=1.

54. Stringer EM, Kaseba C, Levy J, et al. A randomized trial of the intrauterine contraceptive device vs hormonal contraception in women who are infected with the human immunodeficiency virus. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2007;197(2):144 e141-148. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17689627.

55. Curtis KM, Nanda K, Kapp N. Safety of hormonal and intrauterine methods of contraception for women with HIV/AIDS: a systematic review. *AIDS*. 2009;23 Suppl 1:S55-67. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20081389.

56. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, U.S. Medical Eligibility Criteria for Contraceptive Use. U.S. Medical Eligibility Criteria for Contraceptive Use, 2010: Adapted from the World Health Organization Medical Eligibility Criteria for Contraceptive Use, 4th edition. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2010;59(RR04):1-6. Available at: https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/rr5904a1.htm?s_cid=rr5904a1_e.

57. Heikinheimo O, Lehtovirta P, Aho I, Ristola M, Paavonen J. The levonorgestrel-releasing intrauterine system in human immunodeficiency virus-infected women: a 5-year follow-up study. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2011;204(2):126 e121-124. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21035781.

58. Lehtovirta P, Paavonen J, Heikinheimo O. Experience with the levonorgestrel-releasing intrauterine system among HIV-infected women. *Contraception*. 2007;75(1):37-39. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17161122.

59. Coleman JS, Mwachari C, Balkus J, et al. Effect of the levonorgestrel intrauterine device on genital HIV-1 RNA shedding among HIV-1-infected women not taking antiretroviral therapy in Nairobi, Kenya. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2013;63(2):245-248. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23446496.

60. Ioannidis JP, Abrams EJ, Ammann A, et al. Perinatal transmission of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 by pregnant women with RNA virus loads <1000 copies/ml. *J Infect Dis*. 2001;183(4):539-545. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11170978.

61. Mofenson LM, Lambert JS, Stiehm ER, et al. Risk factors for perinatal transmission of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 in women treated with zidovudine. Pediatric AIDS Clinical Trials Group Study 185 Team. *N Engl J Med*. 1999;341(6):385-393. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10432323.

62. Garcia PM, Kalish LA, Pitt J, et al. Maternal levels of plasma human immunodeficiency virus type 1 RNA and the risk of perinatal transmission. Women and Infants Transmission Study Group. *N Engl J Med*. 1999;341(6):394-402. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10432324.

63. Panel on Treatment of HIV-Infected Pregnant Women and Prevention of Perinatal Transmission. Recommendations for Use of Antiretroviral Drugs in Pregnant HIV-1-Infected Women for Maternal Health and Interventions to Reduce Perinatal HIV Transmission in the United States. Available at: https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines/html/3/perinatal-guidelines/0.

64. Gaur AH, Freimanis-Hance L, Dominguez K, et al. Knowledge and practice of prechewing/prewarming food by HIV-infected women. *Pediatrics*. 2011;127(5):e1206-1211. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21482608.

65. Bardeguez AD, Lindsey JC, Shannon M, et al. Adherence to antiretrovirals among US women during and after pregnancy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2008;48(4):408-417. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18614923.

66. Mellins CA, Chu C, Malee K, et al. Adherence to antiretroviral treatment among pregnant and postpartum HIV-infected women. *AIDS Care*. 2008;20(8):958-968. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18608073.

67. Rana AI, Gillani FS, Flanigan TP, Nash BT, Beckwith CG. Follow-up care among HIV-infected pregnant women in Mississippi. *J Womens Health (Larchmt)*. 2010;19(10):1863-1867. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20831428.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Considerations for Antiretroviral Use in Patients with Coinfections

Hepatitis B/HIV Virus Coinfection (Last updated October 17, 2017; last reviewed October 17, 2017)

Panel's Recommendations
• Before initiation of antiretroviral therapy (ART), all patients who test positive for hepatitis B surface antigen (HBsAg) should be tested for hepatitis B virus (HBV) DNA using a quantitative assay to determine the level of HBV replication **(AIII)**. • Because emtricitabine (FTC), lamivudine (3TC), tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF), and tenofovir alafenamide (TAF) have activity against both HIV and HBV, an ART regimen for patients with both HIV and HBV should be include (TAF or TDF) plus (3TC or FTC) as the nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NRTI) backbone of a fully suppressive antiretroviral (ARV) regimen **(AI)**. • If TDF or TAF cannot safely be used, the alternative recommended HBV therapy is entecavir in addition to a fully suppressive ARV regimen **(BI)**. Entecavir has activity against HIV; its use for HBV treatment without ART in patients with dual infection may result in the selection of the M184V mutation that confers HIV resistance to 3TC and FTC. Therefore, entecavir must be used in addition to a fully suppressive ARV regimen when given to patients with HBV/HIV-coinfection **(AII)**. Peginterferon alfa monotherapy may also be considered in certain patients **(CII)**. • Other HBV treatment regimens, including adefovir alone or in combination with 3TC or FTC and telbivudine, **are not recommended** for patients with HBV/HIV coinfection **(CII)**. • Discontinuation of agents with anti-HBV activity may cause serious hepatocellular damage resulting from reactivation of HBV; patients should be advised against stopping these medications and be carefully monitored during interruptions in HBV treatment **(AII)**. • If ART needs to be modified due to HIV virologic failure and the patient has adequate HBV suppression, the ARV drugs active against HBV should be continued for HBV treatment in combination with other suitable ARV agents to achieve HIV suppression **(AIII)**. • HBV reactivation has been observed in persons with HBV infection during interferon-free HCV treatment. For that reason, all patients initiating HCV therapy should be tested for HBV. Persons with HCV/HIV coinfection and active HBV infection (determined by a positive HBsAg test) should receive ART that includes two agents with anti-HBV activity prior to initiating HCV therapy **(AIII)**.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional* ***Rating of Evidence:*** *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

Approximately 5% to 10% of people with HIV in the United States also have chronic hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection.[1] The progression of chronic HBV to cirrhosis, end-stage liver disease, or hepatocellular carcinoma is more rapid in persons with HBV/HIV coinfection than in persons with chronic HBV monoinfection.[2] Conversely, chronic HBV does not substantially alter the progression of HIV infection and does not influence HIV suppression or CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell responses following initiation of antiretroviral therapy (ART).[3,4] However, antiretroviral (ARV) drug toxicities or several liver-associated complications attributed to flares in HBV activity after initiation or discontinuation of dually active ARV drugs can affect the treatment of HIV in patients with HBV/HIV coinfection.[5-7] These complications include the following:

- Emtricitabine (FTC), lamivudine (3TC), tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF), and tenofovir alafenamide (TAF) are ARVs approved to treat HIV that are also active against HBV. Discontinuation of these drugs may potentially cause serious hepatocellular damage resulting from reactivation of HBV.[8]
- The anti-HBV drug entecavir has activity against HIV. However, when entecavir is used to treat HBV in patients with HBV/HIV coinfection who are not on ART, the drug may select for the M184V

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

mutation that confers HIV resistance to 3TC and FTC. Therefore, when used in patients with HBV/HIV coinfection, entecavir must be used in addition to a fully suppressive ARV regimen **(AII)**.[9]

- When 3TC is the only active drug used to treat chronic HBV in patients with HBV/HIV coinfection, 3TC-resistant HBV emerges in approximately 40% and 90% of patients after 2 and 4 years on 3TC, respectively. Therefore, 3TC or FTC, which is similar to 3TC, should be used in combination with other anti-HBV drugs **(AII)**.[10]
- In patients with HBV/HIV coinfection, immune reconstitution following initiation of treatment for HIV, HBV, or both can be associated with elevated transaminase levels, possibly because HBV-induced liver damage is primarily an immune-mediated disease.[11]
- Some ARV agents can increase transaminase levels. The rate and magnitude of these increases are higher with HBV/HIV coinfection than with HIV monoinfection.[12-14] The etiology and consequences of these changes in liver function tests are unclear because the changes may resolve with continued ART. Nevertheless, some experts suspend the suspected agent(s) when the serum alanine transferase (ALT) level increases to 5 to 10 times the upper limit of normal or at a lower threshold if the patient has symptoms of hepatitis. However, increased transaminase levels in persons with HBV/HIV coinfection may indicate hepatitis B e antigen (HBeAg) seroconversion due to immune reconstitution; thus, the cause of the elevations should be investigated before discontinuing medications. In persons with transaminase increases, HBeAg seroconversion should be evaluated by testing for HBeAg and anti-HBe, as well as HBV DNA levels.

Recommendations for Patients with HBV/HIV Coinfection

- All patients with chronic HBV should be evaluated to assess the severity of HBV infection (see Hepatitis B Virus Infection in the Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents). Patients with chronic HBV should also be tested for immunity to hepatitis A virus (HAV) infection (anti-HAV antibody total) and, if nonimmune, receive the HAV vaccination. In addition, patients with chronic HBV should be advised to abstain from alcohol and counseled on prevention methods that protect against both HBV and HIV transmission.[15]
- Before ART is initiated, all persons who test positive for hepatitis B surface antigen (HBsAg) should be tested for HBV DNA by using a quantitative assay to determine the level of HBV replication **(AIII)**, and the test should be repeated every 3 to 6 months to ensure effective HBV suppression. The goal of HBV therapy with nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) is to prevent liver disease complications by sustained suppression of HBV replication.
- Since HBV reactivation has been observed in persons with HBV infection during interferon-free HCV treatment,[16,17] persons with HCV/HIV coinfection and active HBV infection (determined by a positive HBsAg test) should receive ART that includes agents with anti-HBV activity (such as [TDF or TAF] plus [FTC or 3TC]) prior to initiating HCV therapy **(AIII)**. The diagnosis of HBV reactivation should be considered in persons with current HBV infection who experience elevated liver enzymes during or immediately after HCV therapy.

Antiretroviral Drugs with Dual Activities against HBV and HIV

Among the ARV drugs, 3TC, FTC, TAF, and TDF all have activity against HBV. Entecavir is an HBV nucleoside analog which also has weak HIV activity. TAF is a tenofovir prodrug with HBV activity and potentially less renal and bone toxicities than TDF.

The efficacy of TDF versus TAF in patients with HBV monoinfection was evaluated in a randomized controlled trial of HBV treatment-naive and treatment-experienced HBeAg-negative patients. In this study,

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

TAF was noninferior to TDF based on the percentage of patients with HBV DNA levels <29 IU/mL at 48 weeks of therapy (94% for TAF vs. 93% for TDF; $P = .47$).[18] TAF was also noninferior to TDF in HBeAg-positive patients with chronic HBV monoinfection with a similar percentage of patients achieving HBV DNA levels <29 IU/mL at 48 weeks of therapy (64% for TAF vs. 67% for TDF; $P = .25$).[19] In both studies, patients on TAF experienced significantly smaller mean percentage decreases from baseline in hip and spine bone mineral density at 48 weeks than patients receiving TDF. The median change in estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) from baseline to 48 weeks also favored TAF.[18,19]

In patients with HBV/HIV coinfection, (TAF or TDF) plus (3TC or FTC) can be considered part of the ARV regimen; entecavir has weak anti-HIV activity and must not be considered part of an ARV regimen. In addition, TDF is fully active for the treatment of persons with known or suspected 3TC-resistant HBV infection, whereas 3TC resistance compromises the activity of entecavir against HBV.

Recommended Therapy

The combination of (TAF or TDF) plus (3TC or FTC) should be used as the NRTI backbone of an ARV regimen and for the treatment of both HIV and HBV infection **(AII)**.[20-22] The decision whether to use a TAF- or TDF-containing regimen should be based on an assessment of risk for nephrotoxicity and for acceleration of bone loss. In a switch study in patients with HBV/HIV coinfection, study participants who switched from a primarily TDF-based ART regimen to the fixed-dose combination elvitegravir/cobicistat/tenofovir alafenamide/emtricitabine (EVG/c/TAF/FTC) maintained or achieved HBV suppression, with improved eGFR and bone turnover markers.[23] TAF/FTC-containing regimens currently approved for the treatment of HIV infection are not recommended for use in patients with creatinine clearance (CrCl) <30 mL/min. While data on switching from a TDF-based to a TAF-based ART regimen are limited, the data from the EVG/c/TAF/FTC switch study suggest that patients with HBV/HIV coinfection can switch to TAF/FTC-containing regimens with a potential reduction in renal and bone toxicity while maintaining HBV suppression.

Alternative Therapy

If TDF or TAF cannot safely be used, entecavir should be used in addition to a fully suppressive ARV regimen **(AII)**; however, entecavir should not be considered as part of the ARV regimen (BII).[24] Because entecavir and 3TC share a partially overlapping pathway to HBV resistance, it is unknown whether the combination of entecavir plus 3TC or FTC will provide greater virologic or clinical benefit than entecavir alone. In persons with known or suspected 3TC-resistant HBV infection, the entecavir dose should be increased from 0.5 mg/day to 1 mg/day. However, entecavir resistance may emerge rapidly in patients with 3TC-resistant HBV infection. Therefore, entecavir should be used with caution in such patients with frequent monitoring (approximately every 3 months) of the HBV DNA level to detect viral breakthrough.

Peginterferon alfa monotherapy for up to 48 weeks may also be considered in some patients with HBV/HIV coinfection. However, data on the use of this therapy in persons with HBV/HIV coinfection are limited and, given safety concerns, peginterferon alfa should not be used in persons with HBV/HIV coinfection who have decompensated cirrhosis.

HBV Drugs Not Recommended

Other HBV treatment regimens include telbivudine used in addition to a fully suppressive ARV regimen, or adefovir used in combination with 3TC or FTC and a fully suppressive ARV regimen.[20,25,26] However, data on these regimens in persons with HBV/HIV coinfection are limited. In addition, these regimens are associated with higher rates of HBV treatment failure and a higher incidence of toxicity when compared to regimens containing TDF, TAF, or entecavir. These toxicities include increased risk of renal disease with adefovir-containing regimens and increased risk of myopathy and neuropathy with telbivudine-containing regimens. Therefore, the Panel on Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents **does not currently recommend** adefovir or telbivudine for patients with HBV/HIV coinfection.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Changing Antiretroviral Therapy

- **Need to discontinue ARV medications active against HBV:** The patient's clinical course should be monitored with frequent liver function tests. The use of entecavir to prevent flares can be considered, especially in patients with marginal hepatic reserve such as those with compensated or decompensated cirrhosis.[8] These alternative HBV regimens should only be used in addition to a fully suppressive ARV regimen.
- **Need to change ART because of HIV resistance:** If the patient has adequate HBV suppression, the ARV drugs active against HBV should be continued for HBV treatment in combination with other ARV agents that effectively suppress HIV **(AIII)**.

References

1. Spradling PR, Richardson JT, Buchacz K, Moorman AC, Brooks JT. Prevalence of chronic hepatitis B virus infection among patients in the HIV Outpatient Study, 1996-2007. *J Viral Hepat*. Feb 11 2010. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20158604.
2. Thio CL, Seaberg EC, Skolasky R Jr, et al. HIV-1, hepatitis B virus, and risk of liver-related mortality in the Multicenter Cohort Study (MACS). *Lancet*. Dec 14 2002;360(9349):1921-1926. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12493258.
3. Konopnicki D, Mocroft A, de Wit S, et al. Hepatitis B and HIV: prevalence, AIDS progression, response to highly active antiretroviral therapy and increased mortality in the EuroSIDA cohort. *AIDS*. Mar 24 2005;19(6):593-601. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15802978.
4. Hoffmann CJ, Seaberg EC, Young S, et al. Hepatitis B and long-term HIV outcomes in coinfected HAART recipients. *AIDS*. Sep 10 2009;23(14):1881-1889. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19550291.
5. Bellini C, Keiser O, Chave JP, et al. Liver enzyme elevation after lamivudine withdrawal in HIV-hepatitis B virus co-infected patients: the Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *HIV Med*. Jan 2009;10(1):12-18. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18795964.
6. Law WP, Dore GJ, Duncombe CJ, et al. Risk of severe hepatotoxicity associated with antiretroviral therapy in the HIV-NAT Cohort, Thailand, 1996-2001. *AIDS*. Oct 17 2003;17(15):2191-2199. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14523276.
7. Wit FW, Weverling GJ, Weel J, Jurriaans S, Lange JM. Incidence of and risk factors for severe hepatotoxicity associated with antiretroviral combination therapy. *J Infect Dis*. Jul 1 2002;186(1):23-31. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12089658.
8. Dore GJ, Soriano V, Rockstroh J, et al. Frequent hepatitis B virus rebound among HIV-hepatitis B virus-coinfected patients following antiretroviral therapy interruption. *AIDS*. Mar 27 2010;24(6):857-865. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20216301.
9. McMahon MA, Jilek BL, Brennan TP, et al. The HBV drug entecavir - effects on HIV-1 replication and resistance. *N Engl J Med*. Jun 21 2007;356(25):2614-2621. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17582071.
10. Benhamou Y, Bochet M, Thibault V, et al. Long-term incidence of hepatitis B virus resistance to lamivudine in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients. *Hepatology*. Nov 1999;30(5):1302-1306. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10534354.
11. Manegold C, Hannoun C, Wywiol A, et al. Reactivation of hepatitis B virus replication accompanied by acute hepatitis in patients receiving highly active antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Infect Dis*. Jan 2001;32(1):144-148. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11118394.
12. Sulkowski MS, Thomas DL, Chaisson RE, Moore RD. Hepatotoxicity associated with antiretroviral therapy in adults infected with human immunodeficiency virus and the role of hepatitis C or B virus infection. *JAMA*. Jan 5 2000;283(1):74-80. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10632283.
13. den Brinker M, Wit FW, Wertheim-van Dillen PM, et al. Hepatitis B and C virus coinfection and the risk for

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

hepatotoxicity of highly active antiretroviral therapy in HIV-1 infection. *AIDS*. Dec 22 2000;14(18):2895-2902. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11153671.

14. Neukam K, Mira JA, Collado A, et al. Liver toxicity of current antiretroviral regimens in HIV-infected patients with chronic viral hepatitis in a real-life setting: The HEPAVIR SEG-HEP Cohort. *PLoS One*. 2016;11(2):e0148104. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26848975.
15. Panel on Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents. Guidelines for the prevention and treatment of opportunistic infections in HIV-infected adults and adolescents: recommendations from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, and the *HIV Med*icine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2016. Available at http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult_oi.pdf.
16. Bersoff-Matcha SJ, Cao K, Jason M, et al. Hepatitis B virus reactivation associated with direct-acting antiviral therapy for chronic hepatitis C virus: a review of cases reported to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration Adverse Event Reporting System. *Ann Intern Med*. Jun 06 2017;166(11):792-798. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28437794.
17. Wang C, Ji D, Chen J, et al. Hepatitis due to reactivation of hepatitis B virus in endemic areas among patients with hepatitis C treated with direct-acting antiviral agents. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*. Jan 2017;15(1):132-136. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27392759.
18. Buti M, Gane E, Seto WK, et al. A Phase 3 study of tenofovir alafenamide compared with tenofovir disoproxil fumarate in patients with HBeAg-negative, chronic hepatitis B: Week 48 efficacy and safety results. Presented at: EASL International Liver Conference. 2016. Barcelona, Spain.
19. Chan HLY, Fung S, Seto WK. A Phase 3 study of tenofovir alafenamide compared with tenofovir disoproxil fumarate in patients with HBeAg-positive, chronic hepatitis B: Week 48 efficacy and safety results. Presented at: EASL International Liver Conference. 2016. Barcelona, Spain.
20. Peters MG, Andersen J, Lynch P, et al. Randomized controlled study of tenofovir and adefovir in chronic hepatitis B virus and HIV infection: ACTG A5127. *Hepatology*. Nov 2006;44(5):1110-1116. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17058225.
21. Matthews GV, Seaberg E, Dore GJ, et al. Combination HBV therapy is linked to greater HBV DNA suppression in a cohort of lamivudine-experienced HIV/HBV coinfected individuals. *AIDS*. Aug 24 2009;23(13):1707-1715. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19584701.
22. de Vries-Sluijs TE, Reijnders JG, Hansen BE, et al. Long-term therapy with tenofovir is effective for patients co-infected with HIV and HBV. *Gastroenterology*. Aug 26 2010. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20801123.
23. Gallant J, Brunetta J, Crofoot G, et al. Efficacy and safety of switching to a single-tablet regimen of elvitegravir/cobicistat/emtricitabine/tenofovir alafenamide (E/C/F/TAF) in HIV-1/hepatitis B coinfected adults. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. May 11 2016. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27171740.
24. Pessoa MG, Gazzard B, Huang AK, et al. Efficacy and safety of entecavir for chronic HBV in HIV/HBV coinfected patients receiving lamivudine as part of antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. Sep 12 2008;22(14):1779-1787. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18753861.
25. Benhamou Y, Bochet M, Thibault V, et al. Safety and efficacy of adefovir dipivoxil in patients co-infected with HIV-1 and lamivudine-resistant hepatitis B virus: an open-label pilot study. *Lancet*. Sep 1 2001;358(9283):718-723. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11551579.
26. Ingiliz P, Valantin MA, Thibault V, et al. Efficacy and safety of adefovir dipivoxil plus pegylated interferon-alpha2a for the treatment of lamivudine-resistant hepatitis B virus infection in HIV-infected patients. *Antivir Ther*. 2008;13(7):895-900. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19043923.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Hepatitis C Virus/HIV Coinfection (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Panel's Recommendations
• All people with HIV should be screened for hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection **(AIII)**. Patients at high risk of HCV infection should be screened annually and whenever incident HCV infection is suspected **(AIII)**. • Antiretroviral therapy (ART) may slow the progression of liver disease by preserving or restoring immune function and reducing HIV-related immune activation and inflammation. For most persons with HCV/HIV coinfection, including those with cirrhosis, the benefits of ART outweigh concerns regarding drug-induced liver injury. Therefore, ART should be initiated in all patients with HCV/HIV coinfection, regardless of CD4 T lymphocyte cell count **(AI)**. • Initial ART regimens that are recommended for most patients with HCV/HIV coinfection are the same as those recommended for individuals without HCV infection. However, when treatment for both HIV and HCV is indicated, the ART and HCV treatment regimens should be selected with special consideration for potential drug-drug interactions and overlapping toxicities **(AIII)** (see discussion in the text below and in Table 15). • All patients with HCV/HIV coinfection should be evaluated for HCV therapy, which includes assessing their liver fibrosis stage to guide the duration of therapy and predict subsequent risk of hepatocellular carcinoma and liver disease complications **(AIII)**. • Persons with chronic HCV/HIV coinfection should be screened for active and prior hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection by testing for the presence of hepatitis B surface antigen (HBsAg) and antibodies to hepatitis B surface (HBsAb) and core (HBcAb; total or Immunoglobulin G). Persons who are not immune to HBV infection (HBsAb negative) should receive anti-HBV vaccination **(AIII)**. • HBV reactivation has been observed in persons with HBV infection during HCV treatment with direct-acting antivirals (DAAs). Accordingly, before initiating HCV therapy, persons with HCV/HIV coinfection and active HBV infection (HBsAg positive) should receive ART that includes two agents with anti-HBV activity **(AIII)**.
Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional* ***Rating of Evidence:*** *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

The treatment of hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection is rapidly evolving. Patients with HCV/HIV coinfection treated with all-oral, direct-acting antiviral (DAA) HCV regimens can achieve sustained virologic response (HCV cure) at rates comparable to those in patients with HCV mono-infection.[1-3] This section of the guidelines focuses on hepatic safety and drug-drug interaction issues related to HCV/HIV coinfection and the concomitant use of antiretroviral (ARV) agents and HCV drugs. For specific guidance on HCV treatment, clinicians should refer to the HCV Guidance from the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases and the Infectious Diseases Society of America.

Approximately one-third of patients with chronic HCV infection progress to cirrhosis, at a median time of <20 years.[4,5] The rate of progression increases with older age, alcoholism, male sex, and HIV infection.[6-9] A meta-analysis found that patients with HCV/HIV coinfection had a three-fold greater risk of progression to cirrhosis or decompensated liver disease than patients with HCV mono-infection.[8] The risk of progression is even greater in patients with HCV/HIV coinfection who have low CD4 T lymphocyte cell counts. Although antiretroviral therapy (ART) appears to slow the rate of HCV disease progression in patients with HCV/HIV coinfection, several studies have demonstrated that the rate of disease progression continues to exceed that observed in patients without HIV infection.[10,11] Whether HCV infection accelerates HIV progression, as measured by the occurrence of AIDS-related opportunistic infections (OIs) or death,[12] is unclear. With older ARV drugs, persons with HIV and HCV coinfection experienced higher rates of hepatotoxicity than those seen in persons with HIV but not HCV.[13,14] These higher rates have not been observed with the newer ARV agents that are currently in use.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Assessment of HCV/HIV Coinfection

- All patients with HIV should be screened for HCV infection using sensitive immunoassays licensed for the detection of antibodies to HCV in blood.[15] At-risk HCV-seronegative patients should undergo repeat testing annually or as clinically indicated. HCV-seropositive patients should be tested for HCV RNA using a sensitive quantitative assay to confirm the presence of active infection. Patients who test HCV RNA positive should undergo HCV genotyping and liver disease staging as recommended by the HCV Guidance.
- Persons with HCV/HIV coinfection should be counseled to avoid consuming alcohol.
- Persons with HCV/HIV coinfection should be also be counseled about appropriate precautions to prevent transmission of HIV and/or HCV to others.
- People with chronic HCV/HIV coinfection should be screened for active and prior hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection by testing for the presence of hepatitis B surface antigen (HBsAg) and antibodies to hepatitis B surface (HBsAb) and core (HBcAb; total or Immunoglobulin G).
  - Persons with evidence of active HBV infection (HBsAg positive) should be further evaluated and treated with ART that includes agents with anti-HIV and anti-HBV activities **(AIII)**.
  - Those who are not immune to HBV infection (HBsAb negative) should receive anti-HBV vaccination.
- Patients with HCV/HIV coinfection who are susceptible to hepatitis A virus (HAV) should be vaccinated against HAV.
- All patients with HCV/HIV coinfection are candidates for curative HCV treatment.

Antiretroviral Therapy in HCV/HIV Coinfection

When to Start Antiretroviral Therapy

Initiation of ART for persons with HCV/HIV coinfection should follow the recommendations for all persons with HIV infection, considering the need for concurrent HCV treatment with oral DAA regimens, the potential for drug-drug interactions, and the individual's HBV status.

Considerations When Starting Antiretroviral Therapy

The same regimens that are recommended for initial treatment of HIV in most ART-naive persons are also recommended for persons with HCV/HIV coinfection. Special considerations for ARV selection in persons with HCV/HIV coinfection include the following:

- When both HIV and HCV treatments are indicated, the ARV regimen should be selected with careful consideration of potential drug-drug interactions with the HCV treatment regimen (see Table 15).
- In persons with HCV/HBV coinfection, HBV reactivation has been observed during HCV treatment with DAAs.[16,17] Therefore, before initiating HCV therapy, persons with HCV/HIV coinfection and active HBV infection (HBsAg positive) should receive ART that includes agents with anti-HBV activity (such as tenofovir disoproxil fumarate [TDF] or tenofovir alafenamide plus emtricitabine or lamivudine) **(AIII)**.
- Patients with cirrhosis should be evaluated for signs of liver decompensation according to the Child-Turcotte-Pugh classification system. All patients with Child-Pugh class B or C disease should be evaluated by an expert in advanced liver disease and considered for liver transplantation. Furthermore, hepatically metabolized ARV and HCV DAA drugs may be contraindicated or require dose modification in patients with Child-Pugh class B and C disease (see Appendix B, Table 10).

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Hepatotoxicity

Drug-induced liver injury (DILI) following the initiation of ART is more common in patients with HCV/HIV coinfection than in those with HIV mono-infection. Individuals with HCV/HIV coinfection who have advanced liver disease (e.g., cirrhosis, end-stage liver disease) are at greatest risk for DILI.[18] Eradicating HCV infection with treatment may decrease the likelihood of ARV-associated DILI.[19] Alanine aminotransferase (ALT) and aspartate aminotransferase (AST) levels should be monitored 4 to 8 weeks after initiation of ART and at least every 6 to 12 months thereafter, and more often if clinically indicated. Mild to moderate fluctuations in ALT and/or AST levels (<5 times upper limit of normal [ULN]) are typical in individuals with chronic HCV infection. In the absence of signs and/or symptoms of liver disease or increases in bilirubin, these fluctuations do not warrant interruption of ART, but do warrant monitoring to ensure a return to baseline. Patients with significant elevations in ALT and/or AST levels (>5 times ULN), concomitant increase in total bilirubin, and/or concomitant symptoms (weakness, nausea, vomiting) should be carefully evaluated for signs and symptoms of liver insufficiency and for alternative causes of liver injury (e.g., acute HAV or HBV infection, hepatobiliary disease, or alcoholic hepatitis). If these signs and symptoms do not resolve, ART should be discontinued.

Concurrent Treatment of HIV and HCV Infections

Guidance on the treatment and management of HCV in adults with and without HIV can be found in the HCV Guidance. Several ARV drugs and HCV DAAs have the potential for clinically significant pharmacokinetic drug-drug interactions when used in combination. Before starting HCV therapy, the ART regimen may need to be modified to reduce the drug-drug interaction potential. Table 15 below provides recommendations on the concomitant use of selected drugs for the treatment of HCV and HIV infection. In patients receiving ART that has been modified to accommodate HCV treatment, HIV RNA should be measured within 2 to 8 weeks after changing HIV therapy to confirm the effectiveness of the new regimen. After ART modification, initiation of an HCV DAA regimen should be delayed for ≥2 weeks. Resumption of the original ART regimen should also be delayed until ≥2 weeks after the HCV DAA regimen is completed. The prolonged half-life of some HIV and HCV drugs poses a potential risk of drug-drug interactions if a regimen is resumed soon after ART modification or HCV treatment completion.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 15. Concomitant Use of Selected Antiretroviral Drugs and Hepatitis C Virus Direct-Acting Antiviral Drugs for Treatment of Hepatitis C Virus in Adults with HIV (page 1 of 4)

The recommendations in this table for concomitant use of select HIV drugs with FDA-approved HCV DAA drugs are based on available PK interaction data or are predictions based on the known metabolic pathways of the agents. (Instances where PK interaction data are limited or not available are indicated in the table.) Whenever HIV and HCV drugs are used concomitantly, patients should be closely monitored for HIV and HCV virologic efficacy and potential toxicities. As the field of HCV therapy is rapidly evolving, readers should also refer to the latest drug product labels and the HCV Guidance for updated information.

Note: Interactions with FPV, IDV, NFV, and SQV are **not** included in this table. Please refer to the FDA product labels for information regarding drug interactions with these HIV PIs.

Selected HIV Drugs	HCV Direct-Acting Antiviral Agents							
	NS5A Inhibitor	NS5B Inhibitor	Coformulated					
					SHOULD NOT BE USED IN THOSE WITH MODERATE TO SEVERE HEPATIC IMPAIRMENT (Cirrhosis classified as Child-Pugh class B or C)			
			NS5A/NS5B Inhibitor	NS5A/NS5B Inhibitor	NS5A/NS5B Inhibitor/NS3/4A PI	NS5A Inhibitor/ NS3/4A PI	NS5A Inhibitor/ NS3A/4A PI	NS5A Inhibitor/NS3A/4A PI plus NS5B Inhibitor
	Daclatasvir	Sofosbuvir	Ledipasvir/ Sofosbuvir	Sofosbuvir/ Velpatasvir	Sofosbuvir/ Velpatasvir/ Voxilaprevir	Glecaprevir/ Pibrentasvir	Elbasvir/ Grazoprevir	Ombitasvir/Paritaprevir/RTV plus Dasabuvir[a]
NRTIs								
3TC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
ABC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
FTC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
TDF	✓	✓	✓ Monitor for TDF-associated adverse events.	✓ Monitor for TDF-associated adverse events.	✓ Monitor for TDF-associated adverse events.	✓	✓	✓
TAF	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
PIs								
Unboosted ATV	✓	✓	✓	✓	×	×	×	✓[b]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 15. Concomitant Use of Selected Antiretroviral Drugs and Hepatitis C Virus Direct-Acting Antiviral Drugs for Treatment of Hepatitis C Virus in Adults with HIV (page 2 of 4)

Selected HIV Drugs	HCV Direct-Acting Antiviral Agents							
	NS5A Inhibitor	NS5B Inhibitor	Coformulated					
					SHOULD NOT BE USED IN THOSE WITH MODERATE TO SEVERE HEPATIC IMPAIRMENT (Cirrhosis classified as Child-Pugh class B or C)			
			NS5A/NS5B Inhibitor	NS5A/NS5B Inhibitor	NS5A/NS5B Inhibitor/NS3/4A PI	NS5A Inhibitor/ NS3/4A PI	NS5A Inhibitor/ NS3A/4A PI	NS5A Inhibitor/NS3A/4A PI plus NS5B Inhibitor
	Daclatasvir	Sofosbuvir	Ledipasvir/ Sofosbuvir	Sofosbuvir/ Velpatasvir	Sofosbuvir/ Velpatasvir/ Voxilaprevir	Glecaprevir/ Pibrentasvir	Elbasvir/ Grazoprevir	Ombitasvir/Paritaprevir/RTV plus Dasabuvir[a]
PIs, continued								
ATV/r or ATV/c	✓ ↓ daclatasvir dose to 30 mg/day	✓	✓ If a PI/r or PI/c is used with TDF, ↑ TDF concentrations are expected. If coadministration is necessary, monitor for TDF-associated adverse events.[d]	✓ If a PI/r or PI/c is used with TDF, ↑ TDF concentrations are expected. If coadministration is necessary, monitor for TDF-associated adverse events.[d]	×	×	×	✓[c]
DRV/r or DRV/c	✓	✓			✓ If a PI/r is used with TDF, ↑ TDF concentrations are expected. Monitor for TDF-associated adverse events.[d] Consider monitoring for hepatotoxicity.[e]	×	×	×
LPV/r	✓	✓			×	×	×	×
TPV/r	?	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
NNRTIs								
DOR	✓	✓	✓ If used with TDF, monitor for TDF-associated adverse events.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
EFV	✓ ↑ daclatasvir dose to 90 mg/day	✓		×	×	×	×	×
ETR	✓ ↑ daclatasvir dose to 90 mg/day	✓		×	×	×	×	×
NVP	✓ ↑ daclatasvir dose to 90 mg/day	✓		×	×	✓[f]	×	×

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 15. Concomitant Use of Selected Antiretroviral Drugs and Hepatitis C Virus Direct-Acting Antiviral Drugs for Treatment of Hepatitis C Virus in Adults with HIV (page 3 of 4)

Selected HIV Drugs	HCV Direct-Acting Antiviral Agents							
	NS5A Inhibitor	NS5B Inhibitor	Coformulated					
					SHOULD NOT BE USED IN THOSE WITH MODERATE TO SEVERE HEPATIC IMPAIRMENT (Cirrhosis classified as Child-Pugh class B or C)			
			NS5A/NS5B Inhibitor	NS5A/NS5B Inhibitor	NS5A/NS5B Inhibitor/NS3/4A PI	NS5A Inhibitor/ NS3/4A PI	NS5A Inhibitor/ NS3A/4A PI	NS5A Inhibitor/NS3A/4A PI plus NS5B Inhibitor
	Daclatasvir	Sofosbuvir	Ledipasvir/ Sofosbuvir	Sofosbuvir/ Velpatasvir	Sofosbuvir/ Velpatasvir/ Voxilaprevir	Glecaprevir/ Pibrentasvir	Elbasvir/ Grazoprevir	Ombitasvir/Paritaprevir/RTV plus Dasabuvir[a]
NNRTIs, continued								
RPV	✓	✓	✓ If used with TDF, monitor for TDF-associated adverse events.	✓	✓	✓	✓	×
INSTIs								
BIC/TAF/FTC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
DTG	✓	✓	✓ If used with TDF, monitor for TDF-associated adverse events.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
EVG/c/TDF/ FTC	✓ ↓ daclatasvir dose to 30 mg/day	✓	×	✓ If used with TDF, monitor for TDF-associated adverse events.	✓ If used with TDF, monitor for TDF-associated adverse events. Consider monitoring for hepatotoxicity.[e]	✓ If used with TDF, monitor for TDF-associated adverse events. Consider monitoring for hepatotoxicity.[g]	×	×
EVG/c/TAF/ FTC	✓ ↓ daclatasvir dose to 30 mg/day	✓	✓	✓	✓ Consider monitoring for hepatotoxicity.[e]	✓ Consider monitoring for hepatotoxicity.[g]	×	×
RAL	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
CCR5 Antagonist								
MVC	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	×

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 15. Concomitant Use of Selected Antiretroviral Drugs and Hepatitis C Virus Direct-Acting Antiviral Drugs for Treatment of Hepatitis C Virus in Adults with HIV (page 4 of 4)

[a] Dasabuvir must be prescribed with ombitasvir/paritaprevir/RTV.

[b] Reduce ATV dose to 300 mg and instruct the patient to take it in the morning at the same time as ombitasvir/paritaprevir/RTV plus dasabuvir. If RTV cannot be used, choose an alternative HCV regimen.

[c] This HCV regimen contains RTV. If ATV is part of the ARV regimen, prescribe ATV 300 mg without COBI or RTV. The modified ARV regimen should be taken in the morning at the same time as ombitasvir/paritaprevir/RTV plus dasabuvir. Resume RTV or COBI regimen when HCV therapy is completed.

[d] Consider using an alternative HCV treatment or ARV regimen to avoid increases in TDF exposure. If coadministration is necessary, monitor patient for TDF-associated adverse events.

[e] Voxilaprevir exposures can increase when it is coadministered with pharmacologically boosted DRV or EVG. Until more safety data in clinical settings becomes available, patients who are receiving voxilaprevir and pharmacologically boosted DRV or EVG should be monitored for hepatotoxicity.

[f] Consider alternative ARV or HCV regimen. If used together, monitor for HCV efficacy.

[g] Glecaprevir exposures can increase when it is coadministered with EVG/c. Until more safety data in clinical settings becomes available, patients who are receiving glecaprevir and EVG/c should be monitored for hepatotoxicity.

Key to Symbols:

✓ = ARV agents that can be used concomitantly

× = ARV agents not recommended

? = Data on PK interactions with ARV drug are limited or not available

↑ = Increase

↓ = Decrease

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; BIC = bictegravir; COBI = cobicistat; DAA = direct-acting antiviral agents; DOR = doravirine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; DTG = dolutegravir; DSV = dasabuvir; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FPV = fosamprenavir; FTC = emtricitabine; HCV = hepatitis C virus; IDV = indinavir; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; MVC = maraviroc; NFV = nelfinavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PI/c = protease inhibitor/cobicistat; PI/r = protease inhibitor/ritonavir; PK = pharmacokinetic; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SQV = saquinavir; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TPV/r = tipranavir/ritonavir

References

1. Naggie S, Cooper C, Saag M, et al. Ledipasvir and sofosbuvir for HCV in patients coinfected with HIV-1. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;373(8):705-713. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26196665.
2. Rockstroh JK, Nelson M, Katlama C, et al. Efficacy and safety of grazoprevir (MK-5172) and elbasvir (MK-8742) in patients with hepatitis C virus and HIV coinfection (C-EDGE COINFECTION): a non-randomised, open-label trial. *Lancet HIV*. 2015;2(8):e319-327. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26423374.
3. Sogni P, Gilbert C, Lacombe K, et al. All-oral direct-acting antiviral regimens in HIV/hepatitis C virus-coinfected patients with cirrhosis are efficient and safe: real-life results from the prospective ANRS CO13-HEPAVIH cohort. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;63(6):763-770. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27317796.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

4. Alter MJ, Margolis HS, Krawczynski K, et al. The natural history of community-acquired hepatitis C in the United States. *N Engl J Med*. 1992;327(27):1899-1905. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1280771.

5. Thomas DL, Astemborski J, Rai RM, et al. The natural history of hepatitis C virus infection: host, viral, and environmental factors. *JAMA*. 2000;284(4):450-456. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10904508.

6. Poynard T, Bedossa P, Opolon P. Natural history of liver fibrosis progression in patients with chronic hepatitis C. The OBSVIRC, METAVIR, CLINIVIR, and DOSVIRC groups. *Lancet*. 1997;349(9055):825-832. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9121257.

7. Wiley TE, McCarthy M, Breidi L, Layden TJ. Impact of alcohol on the histological and clinical progression of hepatitis C infection. *Hepatology*. 1998;28(3):805-809. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9731576.

8. Graham CS, Baden LR, Yu E, et al. Influence of human immunodeficiency virus infection on the course of hepatitis C virus infection: a meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2001;33(4):562-569. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11462196.

9. Thein HH, Yi Q, Dore GJ, Krahn MD. Natural history of hepatitis C virus infection in HIV-infected individuals and the impact of HIV in the era of highly active antiretroviral therapy: a meta-analysis. *AIDS*. 2008;22(15):1979-1991. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18784461.

10. Weber R, Sabin CA, Friis-Moller N, et al. Liver-related deaths in persons infected with the human immunodeficiency virus: the D:A:D study. *Arch Intern Med*. 2006;166(15):1632-1641. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16908797.

11. Kitahata MM, Gange SJ, Abraham AG, et al. Effect of early versus deferred antiretroviral therapy for HIV on survival. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;360(18):1815-1826. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19339714.

12. Greub G, Ledergerber B, Battegay M, et al. Clinical progression, survival, and immune recovery during antiretroviral therapy in patients with HIV-1 and hepatitis C virus coinfection: the Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *Lancet*. 2000;356(9244):1800-1805. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11117912.

13. Sulkowski MS, Thomas DL, Chaisson RE, Moore RD. Hepatotoxicity associated with antiretroviral therapy in adults infected with human immunodeficiency virus and the role of hepatitis C or B virus infection. *JAMA*. 2000;283(1):74-80. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10632283.

14. Sulkowski MS, Thomas DL, Mehta SH, et al. Hepatotoxicity associated with nevirapine or efavirenz-containing antiretroviral therapy: role of hepatitis C and B infections. *Hepatology*. 2002;35(1):182-189. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11786975.

15. Panel on Opportunistic Infections in Adults and Adolescents with HIV. Guidelines for the prevention and treatment of opportunistic infections in adults and adolescents with HIV: recommendations from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, the National Institutes of Health, and the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2018. Available at: http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult_oi.pdf.

16. Bersoff-Matcha SJ, Cao K, Jason M, et al. Hepatitis B virus reactivation associated with direct-acting antiviral therapy for chronic hepatitis C virus: a review of cases reported to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration adverse event reporting system. *Ann Intern Med*. 2017;166(11):792-798. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28437794.

17. Wang C, Ji D, Chen J, et al. Hepatitis due to reactivation of hepatitis B virus in endemic areas among patients with hepatitis C treated with direct-acting antiviral agents. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol*. 2017;15(1):132-136. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27392759.

18. Aranzabal L, Casado JL, Moya J, et al. Influence of liver fibrosis on highly active antiretroviral therapy-associated hepatotoxicity in patients with HIV and hepatitis C virus coinfection. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;40(4):588-593. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15712082.

19. Labarga P, Soriano V, Vispo ME, et al. Hepatotoxicity of antiretroviral drugs is reduced after successful treatment of chronic hepatitis C in HIV-infected patients. *J Infect Dis*. 2007;196(5):670-676. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17674307.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Tuberculosis/HIV Coinfection (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Key Considerations and Recommendations

• Selection of tuberculosis (TB)-preventive treatment for individuals with HIV and latent tuberculosis infection (LTBI) should be based on the individual's antiretroviral therapy (ART) regimen as noted below:
  • Any ART regimen can be used when isoniazid alone is used for LTBI treatment **(AIII)**.
  • Efavirenz 600 mg once daily- or raltegravir 400 mg twice daily-based regimens (in combination with either abacavir/lamivudine or tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine) can be used without dose adjustment with once-weekly isoniazid plus rifapentine **(AII)**.
  • If rifampin or rifapentine is used to treat LTBI, clinicians should review Tables 21a through 21e to assess the potential for drug-drug interactions among different antiretroviral (ARV) drugs and the rifamycins **(AIII)**.
• All patients with HIV and active TB who are not on ART should be started on ART as described below:
  • **CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell counts <50 cells/mm^3:** Initiate ART as soon as possible, but within 2 weeks of starting TB treatment **(AI)**.
  • **CD4 counts ≥50 cells/mm^3:** Initiate ART within 8 weeks of starting TB treatment **(AI)**.
  • **During pregnancy, regardless of CD4 count:** Initiate ART as early as feasible, for treatment of the person with HIV and to prevent HIV transmission to the infant **(AIII)**.
  • **With tuberculous meningitis:** When initiating ART early, patients should be closely monitored as high rates of adverse events and deaths have been reported in a randomized trial **(AI)**.
• For patients with active TB who are receiving ART, the ARV regimen should be assessed with particular attention to potential drug-drug interactions between ARVs and TB drugs. The ARV regimen may need to be modified to permit use of the optimal TB treatment regimen (see Tables 21a through 21e for dosing recommendations).
• Rifamycin antibiotics (rifabutin, rifampin, and rifapentine), are critical components of TB treatment regimens and should be included in regimens for patients with both HIV and active TB, unless precluded because of TB resistance or toxicity. However, rifamycin antibiotics have a considerable potential for drug-drug interactions. Clinicians should review Tables 21a through 21e to assess the potential for interactions among different ARV drugs and the rifamycins **(AIII)**.

Rating of Recommendations: *A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional* ***Rating of Evidence:*** *I = Data from randomized controlled trials; II = Data from well-designed nonrandomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes; III = Expert opinion*

Managing Latent Tuberculosis Infection in Persons with HIV

Approximately 23% of the world's population has tuberculosis (TB), with a 5% to 10% lifetime risk of progressing to active disease.[1] Among individuals with TB infection, the risk of developing active TB is much higher among those who also have HIV, and this risk increases as immune deficiency worsens.[2]

Tuberculosis Preventive Treatment

Randomized controlled clinical trials have demonstrated that treatment for latent tuberculosis infection (LTBI) in people with HIV reduces risk of active TB, especially in those with a positive tuberculin skin test.[3] After active TB disease has been excluded, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) recommends one of the following regimens for LTBI treatment (see Treatment Regimens for Latent TB Infection (LTBI), Adult and Adolescent Opportunistic Infection Guidelines):

- Isoniazid daily or twice weekly for 6 or 9 months
- Isoniazid plus rifapentine once weekly for 12 weeks
- Rifampin daily for 4 months.

For more than 30 years, isoniazid has been the cornerstone of treatment for LTBI to prevent active TB. It can be coadminstered with any antiretroviral (ARV) regimen. The combination of isoniazid and rifapentine administered once a week for 12 weeks as directly observed therapy (DOT) was as safe and effective as 9 months of isoniazid alone in preventing TB in patients with HIV who were not on ART in the PREVENT

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

TB study.[4] Another study randomized 1,148 South African adults with HIV to one of four treatment groups: rifapentine plus isoniazid weekly for 12 weeks, rifampin plus isoniazid twice weekly for 12 weeks, isoniazid daily for 6 months, or continuous isoniazid therapy. TB incidence did not differ among the groups.[5] Similarly, in 3,000 people with HIV infection in the BRIEF TB study, there was no difference in TB incidence between those who received rifapentine plus isoniazid daily for 1 month and those who received 9 months of daily isoniazid.[6] There were fewer adverse events and a higher treatment completion rate with the 1-month regimen than with 9 months of isoniazid alone. However, this short-course regimen has not yet been endorsed by the World Health Organization or CDC.

Although rifapentine induces cytochrome P (CYP) 450 isoenzymes and can potentially cause significant drug-drug interactions, there are pharmacokinetic (PK) data supporting its use, daily or once weekly with efavirenz (EFV) 600 mg daily,[7,8] and once weekly with raltegravir (RAL) 400 mg twice daily **(AII)**.[9] A healthy volunteer study of dolutegravir (DTG) and weekly rifapentine with isoniazid was stopped early following the development of an influenza-like syndrome and elevated aminotransferase levels in two of the first four participants after the third rifapentine-isoniazid dose.[10] However, in a Phase 1/2 study of 60 adults with HIV on DTG-based ART and weekly rifapentine with isoniazid, coadministration of the regimens was well tolerated.[11] Although the rifapentine-isoniazid regimen decreased DTG trough concentrations by 50% to 60%, all but one remained above the DTG IC_{90} and all HIV viral loads remained suppressed. Until more clinical data are available on the safety and efficacy of DTG use with rifapentine, the Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents (the Panel) does not recommend DTG use with once weekly rifapentine-isoniazid **(AIII)**. Rifampin for 4 months may also be considered for TB preventive treatment, but clinicians should pay careful attention to potential drug-drug interactions with specific ARV drugs (see Tables 21a through 21e).

A randomized trial of isoniazid preventive therapy (IPT) that compared isoniazid initiated during pregnancy (immediate IPT) to delayed until 12 weeks postpartum (deferred IPT) in 956 women with HIV on ART. This study demonstrated a greater number of adverse pregnancy outcomes in women on immediate IPT. Treatment-related maternal adverse events were higher than expected in both arms, suggesting that IPT should be delayed until after delivery.[12] IPT is still recommended, however, for pregnant women with HIV whose close household contacts include a person with TB disease (Adult and Adolescent Opportunistic Infection Guidelines).

If a patient with HIV is a contact of an individual with drug-resistant TB, the options for LTBI treatment should be modified. In this setting, consultation with a TB expert is advised.

Impact of Antiretroviral Therapy in Preventing Active Tuberculosis

Accumulating evidence suggests that ART can prevent active TB. The TEMPRANO study conducted in Côte d'Ivoire randomized 2,056 participants with HIV to one of four study arms: deferred ART, deferred ART plus IPT, early ART, or early ART plus IPT. The initial results demonstrated that IPT and early ART each independently reduced the risk of a serious HIV-related event, many of which were tuberculosis, and that IPT with early ART provided the best protection from disease.[13] Data from longer follow-up (median 4.9 years) showed that 6 months of IPT given early in the course of HIV infection provided a durable survival benefit, with a 37% reduction in the risk of death that was independent of ART.[14] In the START study, 4,685 participants with CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell counts >500 cells/mm^3 were randomized to receive immediate ART or ART deferred until their CD4 count dropped to 350 cells/mm^3 or until they developed a clinical condition that required ART. TB was one of the three most common clinical events, occurring in 14% of participants in the immediate ART group and 20% of participants in the deferred ART group.[15] Collectively, these two large randomized studies showed that early initiation of ART (with or without IPT) reduced active TB, particularly in countries with high prevalence of TB/ HIV coinfection.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Antiretroviral Therapy for Patients with HIV and Active Tuberculosis

Active pulmonary or extrapulmonary TB disease requires prompt initiation of TB treatment. The treatment of active TB disease in patients with HIV should follow the general principles guiding treatment for patients without HIV. The Adult and Adolescent Opportunistic Infection Guidelines include a more complete discussion of the diagnosis and treatment of TB disease in patients with HIV.

All patients with HIV/TB disease should be treated with ART **(AI)** though the timing of initiation of ART may vary as discussed below. Important considerations related to the use of ART in patients with active TB disease include:

- When to start ART;
- Significant PK drug-drug interactions between anti-TB and ARV agents;
- The additive toxicities associated with concomitant ARV and anti-TB drug use; *and*
- The development of TB-associated immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome (IRIS) after ART initiation.

Tuberculosis Diagnosed While a Patient is Receiving Antiretroviral Therapy

ART should be continued when TB is diagnosed in a patient receiving ART, but the ARV regimen should be assessed with particular attention to potential drug interactions between ARVs and TB drugs (discussed below). The patient's ARV regimen may need to be modified to permit use of the optimal TB treatment regimen (see Tables 18a through 18e for dosing recommendations).

Tuberculosis Diagnosed in a Patient Not Yet Receiving Antiretroviral Therapy

ART should not be delayed until TB treatment is completed, as this strategy was associated with higher mortality rates in the SAPiT-1 study.[16] The timing of ART in specific patient populations is discussed below.

Patients with CD4 Counts <50 cells/mm^3: Three large randomized clinical trials in patients with HIV/TB disease, conducted in Africa and Asia, all convincingly showed that early ART in those with CD4 counts <50 cell/mm^3 significantly reduced AIDS events or deaths.[17-19] In these studies, early ART was defined as starting ART within 2 weeks of and no later than 4 weeks after initiation of TB therapy. In all three studies, IRIS was more common in patients initiating ART earlier than in patients starting ART later, but the syndrome was infrequently associated with mortality. Collectively these three trials support initiation of ART within the first 2 weeks of TB treatment in patients with CD4 counts <50 cells/mm^3 **(AI)**.

Patients with CD4 Counts ≥50 cells/mm^3: In the three studies mentioned above,[17-19] there was no survival benefit for patients with CD4 counts ≥50 cells/mm^3 who initiated ART at <2 weeks versus later (8 to 12 weeks) after beginning TB treatment. Importantly, none of the studies demonstrated harm from earlier ART initiation, and there are many well-documented benefits from ART in people with HIV regardless of TB coinfection. It is unlikely that more trials will be conducted to specifically inform the decision on when to start ART in patients with TB and CD4 counts >50 cells/mm^3. However, given the growing body of evidence supporting early ART in general and lack of data showing any harm in patients with TB coinfection, the Panel recommends ART initiation within 8 weeks of starting TB treatment for patients with CD4 counts ≥50 cells/mm^3 **(AI)**.

Patients with Drug-Resistant TB: Mortality rates in patients with multidrug-resistant or extensively drug-resistant TB and HIV are very high.[20] Retrospective case control studies and case series provide growing evidence of better outcomes associated with receipt of ART in such patients,[21,22] but the optimal timing for initiation of ART is unknown. Management of patients with HIV and drug-resistant TB is complex, and expert consultation is encouraged **(BIII)**.

Patients with TB Meningitis: TB meningitis is often associated with severe complications and a high

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

mortality rate. In a study conducted in Vietnam, patients with HIV-associated TB meningitis were randomized to immediate ART or to ART deferred until 2 months after initiation of TB treatment. A significantly higher rate of severe (Grade 4) adverse events was seen in patients who received immediate ART than in those who received deferred ART (80.3% vs. 69.1% for immediate and deferred ART, respectively; $P = 0.04$).[23] Despite these study results, many experts would recommend initiating ART within 2 to 8 weeks of starting anti-TB treatment, opting for 2 weeks in individuals with CD4 counts <50 cells/mm^3 in settings in which close monitoring of drug-related toxicities and central nervous system adverse events is feasible (see Adult and Adolescent Opportunistic Infection Guidelines) **(BIII)**. Managing patients with HIV and TB meningitis is complex, and expert consultation is encouraged **(BIII)**.

Pregnant Patients: All pregnant individuals with HIV and active TB should be started on ART as early as feasible, both for treatment of the person with HIV and to prevent HIV transmission to the infant **(AIII)**. The choice of ART should be based on efficacy and safety in pregnancy and should take into account potential drug-drug interactions between ARVs and rifamycins (see Perinatal Guidelines for more detailed discussions).

Drug Interaction Considerations

Rifamycin antibiotics (rifabutin, rifampin, and rifapentine), are a crucial component of TB treatment regimens. However, they are associated with a considerable potential for drug interactions. Rifampin is a potent inducer of the hepatic CYP450 (mostly 3A and 2C subfamilies), P-glycoprotein (P-gp), and uridine diphosphate glucuronosyltransferase 1A1 enzymes. Rifabutin and rifapentine are CYP3A4 substrates and inducers. As potent enzyme inducers, the rifamycin antibiotics can accelerate drug metabolism, resulting in significant reduction in ARV drug exposure. The ARV drugs most affected include all protease inhibitors (PIs), non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs), the integrase strand transfer inhibitors (INSTIs), and the CCR5 antagonist maraviroc (MVC). Most nucleos(t)ide reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs), the fusion inhibitor enfuvirtide, and the CD4 post attachment inhibitor ibalizumab are not expected to have significant drug interactions with the rifamycins. Tables 21a through 21e outline the magnitude of these interactions and provide dosing recommendations when rifamycin antibiotics and selected ARV drugs are used concomitantly.

Because tenofovir alafenamide (TAF) is a P-gp substrate, its plasma concentrations may be reduced by rifamycin antibiotics. Current labeling does not recommend concomitant administration of TAF and any rifamycin antibiotic.[24] However, in a healthy volunteer study, following administration of TAF/emtricitabine with rifampin, intracellular tenofovir-DP concentrations were still 4.2-fold higher than those achieved by tenofovir disoproxil fumarate.[25] A clinical trial in persons with HIV and TB with concomitant use of TAF and rifampin is ongoing.

Several ARV drugs are not recommended for use with rifampin; clinicians should refer to Tables 21a through 21e before prescribing these drugs in combination. When DTG, RAL, or MVC are used with rifampin for TB treatment, the ARV doses must be increased. The Phase 3 REFLATE TB2 trial compared ARV regimens including standard dose RAL 400 mg twice daily or EFV 600 mg once daily for the treatment of HIV/TB coinfection. At week 48, the standard dose RAL 400 mg twice daily regimen did not demonstrate noninferiority to EFV 600 mg once daily.[26] In contrast to its effect on other ARV drugs, rifampin only leads to modest reduction in EFV concentrations.[27,28] Even though the current EFV label recommends increasing the EFV dose from 600 mg once daily to 800 mg once daily in patients weighing >50 kg,[29] this dosage increase is generally not necessary. A reduced dose of EFV 400 mg once daily is now approved for HIV treatment. Coadministration of EFV 400 mg with rifampin and isoniazid led to only limited changes in EFV AUC (<25%) in a study with 26 participants with HIV infection, and plasma concentrations were considered adequate to maintain virologic suppression.[30] Until more clinical trial data are available regarding the safety and efficacy of EFV 400 mg, the Panel continues to recommend EFV 600 mg for individuals receiving

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

rifampin therapy.

Rifabutin, a weaker CYP3A4 enzyme inducer, is an alternative to rifampin, especially in patients receiving PI- or INSTI-based ARV regimens. Because rifabutin is a substrate of the CYP450 enzyme system, its metabolism may be affected by NNRTIs or PIs. Therefore, rifabutin dosage adjustment is generally recommended (see Tables 21a through 21e for dosing recommendations).

Rifapentine is a long-acting rifamycin which, when given daily, is a more potent inducer than rifampin.[31] Once-daily rifapentine did not affect the oral clearance of EFV in individuals with HIV in the BRIEF TB study,[32] and once weekly rifapentine has minimal impact on EFV exposure.[7] Once-weekly rifapentine led to an increase rather than a decrease in RAL drug exposure in healthy volunteers.[9] Once-weekly isoniazid plus rifapentine for LTBI treatment should only be given to patients receiving either an EFV 600 mg-, or RAL-based regimen **(AII)**.

After selecting the ARV drugs and rifamycin to use, clinicians should determine the appropriate dose of each, and should closely monitor the patients to assure good control of both TB (when treating active TB) and HIV infections. Suboptimal HIV suppression or suboptimal response to TB treatment should prompt assessment of drug adherence, adequacy of drug exposure, or presence of acquired HIV or TB drug resistance.

Tuberculosis-Associated IRIS

IRIS is a clinical condition caused by ART-induced restoration of pathogen-specific immune responses to opportunistic infections such as TB, resulting in either the deterioration of a treated infection (paradoxical IRIS) or a new presentation of a previously subclinical infection (unmasking IRIS). TB-associated IRIS (TB-IRIS) has been reported in 8% to >40% of patients starting ART after TB is diagnosed, although the incidence depends on the definition of IRIS and the intensity of monitoring.[33,34] Predictors of IRIS include a baseline CD4 count <50 cells/mm^3; higher on-ART CD4 counts; high pre-ART and lower on-ART HIV viral loads; severity of TB disease, especially high pathogen burden; and <30-day interval between initiation of TB and HIV treatments.[35] Most IRIS in HIV/TB disease occurs ≤3 months of the start of ART.

Manifestations of unmasking TB-IRIS are characterized by their marked inflammatory nature, such as high fever, respiratory distress, lymphadenitis, abscesses, and sepsis syndrome. Manifestations of paradoxical TB-IRIS include fevers, new or worsening lymphadenopathy, new or worsening pulmonary infiltrates, enlarging pleural effusions, and new or enlarging tuberculomas.

In general, the Panel recommends continuing ART without interruption during IRIS **(AIII)**.

References

1. Houben RM, Dodd PJ. The Global Burden of Latent Tuberculosis Infection: A Re-estimation Using Mathematical Modelling. *PLoS Med*. 2016;13(10):e1002152. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27780211.
2. Lawn SD, Harries AD, Williams BG, et al. Antiretroviral therapy and the control of HIV-associated tuberculosis. Will ART do it? *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis*. 2011;15(5):571-581. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21756508.
3. Akolo C, Adetifa I, Shepperd S, Volmink J. Treatment of latent tuberculosis infection in HIV infected persons. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2010(1):CD000171. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20091503.
4. Sterling TR, Scott NA, Miro JM, et al. Three months of weekly rifapentine plus isoniazid for treatment of M. tuberculosis infection in HIV co-infected persons. *AIDS*. 2016. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26990624.
5. Martinson NA, Barnes GL, Moulton LH, et al. New regimens to prevent tuberculosis in adults with HIV infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365(1):11-20. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21732833.
6. Swindells S, Ramchandani R, Gupta A, et al. One month of rifapentine plus isoniazid to prevent HIV-related tuberculosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;380(11):1001-1011. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30865794.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

7. Farenc C, Doroumian S, Cantalloube C, et al. Rifapentine once-weekly dosing effect on efavirenz emtricitabine and tenofovir PKs. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2014; Boston, MA. Available at: http://www.croiconference.org/sessions/rifapentine-once-weekly-dosing-effect-efavirenz-emtricitabine-and-tenofovir-pks.

8. Podany A, Sizemore E, Chen M, et al. Efavirenz pharmacokinetics in HIV/TB coinfected persons receiving rifapentine. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2018; Boston, Massachusetts.

9. Weiner M, Egelund EF, Engle M, et al. Pharmacokinetic interaction of rifapentine and raltegravir in healthy volunteers. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2014;69(4):1079-1085. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24343893.

10. Brooks KM, George JM, Pau AK, et al. Cytokine-mediated systemic adverse drug reactions in a drug-drug interaction study of dolutegravir with once-weekly isoniazid and rifapentine. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2018;67(2):193-201. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29415190.

11. Dooley KE, Churchyard G, Savic RM, et al. Safety & PK of weekly rifapentine/isoniazid (3HP) in adults with HIV on dolutegravir. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2019; Seattle, Washington.

12. Gupta A, Montepiedra G, Aaron L, et al. Isoniazid Preventive Therapy in HIV-Infected Pregnant and Postpartum Women. *N Engl J Med*. 2019;381(14):1333-1346. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31577875.

13. TEMPRANO ANRS Study Group, Danel C, Moh R, et al. A trial of early antiretrovirals and isoniazid preventive therapy in Africa. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;373(9):808-822. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26193126.

14. Badje A, Moh R, Gabillard D, et al. Effect of isoniazid preventive therapy on risk of death in west African, HIV-infected adults with high CD4 cell counts: long-term follow-up of the Temprano ANRS 12136 trial. *Lancet Glob Health*. 2017;5(11):e1080-e1089. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29025631.

15. INSIGHT START Study Group, Lundgren JD, Babiker AG, et al. Initiation of antiretroviral therapy in early asymptomatic HIV infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2015;373(9):795-807. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26192873.

16. Abdool Karim SS, Naidoo K, Grobler A, et al. Timing of initiation of antiretroviral drugs during tuberculosis therapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362(8):697-706. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20181971.

17. Abdool Karim SS, Naidoo K, Grobler A, et al. Integration of antiretroviral therapy with tuberculosis treatment. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365(16):1492-1501. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22010915.

18. Blanc FX, Sok T, Laureillard D, et al. Earlier versus later start of antiretroviral therapy in HIV-infected adults with tuberculosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365(16):1471-1481. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22010913.

19. Havlir DV, Kendall MA, Ive P, et al. Timing of antiretroviral therapy for HIV-1 infection and tuberculosis. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365(16):1482-1491. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22010914.

20. Gandhi NR, Shah NS, Andrews JR, et al. HIV coinfection in multidrug- and extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis results in high early mortality. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2010;181(1):80-86. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19833824.

21. Dheda K, Shean K, Zumla A, et al. Early treatment outcomes and HIV status of patients with extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis in South Africa: a retrospective cohort study. *Lancet.* 2010;375(9728):1798-1807. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20488525.

22. Pietersen E, Ignatius E, Streicher EM, et al. Long-term outcomes of patients with extensively drug-resistant tuberculosis in South Africa: a cohort study. *Lancet.* 2014;383(9924):1230-1239. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24439237.

23. Torok ME, Yen NT, Chau TT, et al. Timing of initiation of antiretroviral therapy in human immunodeficiency virus (HIV)--associated tuberculous meningitis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;52(11):1374-1383. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21596680.

24. Descovy package insert [package insert]. Gilead. 2016. Available at: http://www.gilead.com/~/media/files/pdfs/medicines/hiv/descovy/descovy_pi.pdf?la=en.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

25. Cerrone M, Alfarisi O, Neary M, et al. Rifampicin effect on intracellular and plasma pharmacokinetics of tenofovir alafenamide. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2019;74(6):1670-1678. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30815689.

26. De Castro N, Marcy O, Chazallon C, et al. Virologic efficacy of raltegravir vs. efavirenz based antiretroviral treatment in HIV1-infected adults with tuberculosis W48 results of the ANRS 12300 Reflate TB2 trial. Presented at: 10th IAS Conference on HIV Science; 2019; Mexico City, Mexico. Available at: http://www.natap.org/2019/IAS/MOAB0101_july22_decastro.pdf.

27. Lopez-Cortes LF, Ruiz-Valderas R, Viciana P, et al. Pharmacokinetic interactions between efavirenz and rifampicin in HIV-infected patients with tuberculosis. *Clin Pharmacokinet*. 2002;41(9):681-690. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12126459.

28. Luetkemeyer AF, Rosenkranz SL, Lu D, et al. Relationship between weight, efavirenz exposure, and virologic suppression in HIV-infected patients on rifampin-based tuberculosis treatment in the AIDS Clinical Trials Group A5221 STRIDE Study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;57(4):586-593. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23592830.

29. Sustiva package insert [package insert]. Bristol-Myers Squibb. 2016. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2016/020972s049-021360s038lbl.pdf.

30. Cerrone M, Wang X, Neary M, et al. Pharmacokinetics of efavirenz 400 mg once daily coadministered with isoniazid and rifampicin in human immunodeficiency virus-infected individuals. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2019;68(3):446-452. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30084943.

31. Dooley KE, Bliven-Sizemore EE, Weiner M, et al. Safety and pharmacokinetics of escalating daily doses of the antituberculosis drug rifapentine in healthy volunteers. *Clin Pharmacol Ther*. 2012;91(5):881-888. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22472995.

32. Podany AT, Bao Y, Swindells S, et al. Efavirenz Pharmacokinetics and Pharmacodynamics in HIV-Infected Persons Receiving Rifapentine and Isoniazid for Tuberculosis Prevention. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2015;61(8):1322-1327. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26082504.

33. Meintjes G, Lawn SD, Scano F, et al. Tuberculosis-associated immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome: case definitions for use in resource-limited settings. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2008;8(8):516-523. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18652998.

34. Haddow LJ, Moosa MY, Easterbrook PJ. Validation of a published case definition for tuberculosis-associated immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome. *AIDS*. 2010;24(1):103-108. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19926965.

35. Haddow LJ, Moosa MY, Mosam A, Moodley P, Parboosing R, Easterbrook PJ. Incidence, clinical spectrum, risk factors and impact of HIV-associated immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome in South Africa. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(11):e40623. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23152745.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Limitations to Treatment Safety and Efficacy

Adherence to the Continuum of Care (Last reviewed October 17, 2017)

Key Summary of Adherence to the Continuum of Care

• Linkage-to-care and adherence to both antiretroviral therapy (ART) and clinic appointments should be regularly assessed.
• An individual's barriers to adherence to ART and appointments should be assessed before initiation of ART and regularly thereafter.
• Patients with ART adherence problems should be placed on regimens with high genetic barriers to resistance, such as dolutegravir (DTG) or boosted darunavir (DRV). Side effects, out-of-pocket costs, convenience, and patient preferences also need to be considered.
• Patients having difficulties with adherence to appointments or ART should be approached in a constructive, collaborative, nonjudgmental, and problem-solving manner.
• The approach to improved adherence should be tailored to each person's needs (or barriers to care). Approaches could include, but are not limited to:
  • Changing ART to simplify dosing or reduce side effects
  • Finding resources to assist with treatment costs to maintain uninterrupted access to both ART and appointments
  • Allowing flexible appointment scheduling
  • Assisting with transportation, or
  • Linking patients to counseling to overcome stigma, substance use, or depression.
• Multidisciplinary approaches to find solutions to ART and appointment adherence problems are often necessary, including collaboration with social work and case management (to the extent available). The clinician's role is to help the patient understand the importance of adherence to the continuum of care and reveal barriers to adherence, and link the patient to resources to overcome those barriers.
• A summary of best practice interventions to improve linkage, retention, and adherence can be found at a Centers for Disease Control and Prevention compendium (https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/research/interventionresearch/compendium/index.html).

Introduction

Treatment adherence includes initiating care with an HIV provider (linkage to care), regularly attending appointments (retention in care), and adherence to antiretroviral therapy (ART). The concept of a "continuum of care" has been used to describe the process of HIV testing, linkage to HIV care, initiation of ART, adherence to treatment, retention in care, and virologic suppression.[1-3] The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that HIV has not yet been diagnosed in about 13% of the people living with HIV in the United States. After receiving an HIV diagnosis, about 75% of individuals are linked to care within 30 days. However, only 57% of persons who receive an HIV diagnosis are retained in HIV care. It is estimated that only approximately 55% of persons with diagnosed HIV are virally suppressed because of poor linkage to care and retention in care.[4] The data for adolescents and young adults are even more sobering: only 51% of youth living with HIV receive a diagnosis, 68% are linked to care within 1 month, and 55% are retained in care. As a result, adolescents and young adults had the lowest rate of viral suppression among all age groups, at only 44%.[5] Outcomes along the continuum also vary by geographic region and other population characteristics, such as sex, race/ethnicity, and HIV risk factors.[4] To achieve optimal clinical outcomes and to realize the potential public health benefit of treatment as prevention, adherence to each step in the continuum of care is critical.[6] It is also important to realize that retention and adherence are not static states. Life events, changes in insurance status, comorbid conditions and health system changes can cause people to shift back and forth on the continuum. Knowledgeable providers and high-quality system processes are vital in promoting rapid linkage and sustained retention in care and adherence to ART.

This section provides guidance on linking patients to care, assessing and improving retention in care, and assessing and improving adherence to ART. The CDC maintains a compendium of evidence-based

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

and evidence-informed interventions to improve linkage, retention, and adherence (https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/research/interventionresearch/compendium/index.html). In addition, a number of other groups and organizations have provided guidance for improving adherence to the steps in the care continuum.[6,7]

Linkage to Care

Receiving a diagnosis of HIV infection can be traumatic and linkage to care efforts must be delivered with sensitivity and persistence. The time from diagnosis to linkage to care can be affected by many factors, including insufficient socioeconomic resources, active substance use, mental health problems, stigma, and disease severity (symptomatic HIV is associated with more successful linkage).[8-12] In the United States, youth, people who use injection drugs, and black/African American persons have lower rates of linkage to care.[4] Some health system-associated factors have also been associated with linkage success or failure. Co-location of testing and treatment services[11] and active linkage services (e.g., assisting the patient in setting up appointments, maintaining an active relationship with the patient until linkage is completed, and providing linkage case management services)[13-15] bolster linkage to care. Conversely, passive linkage (e.g., only providing names and contact information for treatment centers) is associated with lower linkage to care.

Monitoring Linkage to Care

Linking to HIV care after a new diagnosis of HIV infection is defined as completing an outpatient appointment with a clinical provider who has the skills and ability to treat HIV infection, including prescribing ART. Patients should be linked to care as soon as possible after diagnosis with HIV, preferably within 30 days. Monitoring linkage is a critical responsibility so that interventions can effectively reach persons who are not linked to care. If the facilities that diagnose and treat an individual are the same or share the same electronic medical record system, it is relatively straightforward to monitor linkage to care. Monitoring linkage for persons whose HIV is diagnosed outside the treatment provider's healthcare system is difficult and generally is the responsibility of the diagnosing provider/entity and the public health authority. However, once a patient makes contact with the treating clinical system, he or she should be engaged in linkage efforts and monitored for successful linkage to and retention in HIV care.

Improving Linkage to Care

Strategies to improve linkage to care are summarized in Table 16. Linkage efforts should include immediate referral to care at diagnosis, appointment reminders, and outreach efforts if needed.[13] The only intervention shown to increase linkage to care in a randomized trial conducted in the United States is the Anti-Retroviral Treatment and Access to Services (ARTAS) intervention.[14] ARTAS is a strength-based intervention which aims to facilitate linkage to and retention in care for persons with recently diagnosed HIV. The ARTAS intervention was tested in four cities and enrolled a diverse group of persons. The participants in the ARTAS intervention trial were randomized to either an intervention arm or a control arm. Participants randomized to the control arm received information about HIV and care resources and a referral to a local HIV Medical provider. Each participant in the intervention arm worked with an ARTAS interventionist for five sessions, 90 days, or until linkage—whichever came first. The interventionist helped the participant to identify and use his or her strengths, abilities, and skills to link to HIV care, and linked the participant to community resources. Linkage to care, defined as completing at least one visit with an HIV clinician within the first 6 months, was greater among the ARTAS participants than the control participants (78% vs. 60%, adjusted RR = 1.36, $P < 0.001$). Furthermore, a greater percentage of ARTAS participants were retained in care, defined as visiting an HIV clinician at least once in each of the first two 6-month blocks after enrollment (64% vs. 49% for ARTAS and control participants, respectively; adjusted RR = 1.41, $P = 0.006$). ARTAS has been replicated in a community-based study.[15] CDC supports free training in the ARTAS intervention (https://effectiveinterventions.cdc.gov/en/HighImpactPrevention/PublicHealthStrategies/ARTAS.aspx). Other studies support the importance of post-test counseling to educate, motivate, and present positive messages about

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

living with HIV,[16] peer support,[17] and engaging with the patient at the clinic in advance of the visit with the provider.[18] Financial incentives did not increase linkage to care within 90 days in a large randomized trial.[19]

Retention in Care

Poor retention in HIV care is associated with greater risk of death.[20,21] Poor retention is more common in persons who are substance users, have serious mental health problems, have unmet socioeconomic needs (e.g., housing, food, or transportation), lack financial resources or health insurance, have schedules that complicate adherence, have been recently incarcerated, or face stigma.[22-25] At the provider and health system level, low trust in providers and a poor patient-provider relationship have been associated with lower retention, as has lower satisfaction with the clinic experience.[26-28] Availability of appointments and timeliness of appointments (i.e., long delay from the request for an appointment to the appointment's date) and scheduling convenience are also factors.

Monitoring Retention in Care

Retention in care should be routinely monitored.[6] There are various ways to measure retention, including measures based on attended visits over a defined period of time (constancy measures), and measures based on missed visits.[29] Both approaches are valid and independently predict survival.[30] Missed visits and a prolonged time since last visit are relatively easy to measure and should trigger efforts to retain or re-engage a person in care. Constancy measures (e.g., at least two visits that are at least 90 days apart over 1 year, or at least one visit every 6 months over the last 2 years), can be used as clinic quality assurance measures.

Improving Retention in Care

Strategies to improve retention in care are summarized in Table 16. The Retention through Enhanced Personal Contact (REPC) intervention was tested in a randomized trial in six clinics in the United States. The intervention relied on personal contact by an interventionist with at-risk patients. It included a brief face-to-face meeting upon returning to care and at each clinic visit and three types of phone calls: to check on patients between visits, as appointment reminders just before visits, and to attempt to reschedule missed visits. REPC resulted in small but significant improvements in retention in care, including in racial/ethnic minority populations and persons with detectable plasma HIV RNA.[31] In-clinic opioid replacement therapy helps opioid users remain in care.[32] An intervention using the electronic medical record to alert providers when patients had suboptimal follow-up or high viral loads also improved retention in care.[33] On the other hand, in two randomized trials involving out-of-care, hospitalized patients with HIV, peer counselors and patient navigators did not improve relinkage to care after hospital discharge.[34,35] Data from nonrandomized studies support:

- Clinic-wide marketing (e.g., posters, brochures, and customer service training of patient-facing staff) to promote attending scheduled visits and provide patients a welcoming and courteous experience,[36]
- Stepped case management and social and outreach services,[37] and
- "Data to Care" approaches which use clinic and public health data to reach out-of-care persons and re-engage them into care (see https://effectiveinterventions.cdc.gov/en/highimpactprevention/publichealthstrategies/DatatoCare.aspx).[38-40] However, the effectiveness of "data to care" interventions is variable and privacy concerns must be adequately addressed.

Overall, these data support the concept that all clinic personnel, from the facilities staff to nurses to providers, play important roles in supporting retention in care by providing the optimal patient care experience, constructively affirming attendance rather than criticizing non-attendance, and collaboratively problem solving with patients to overcome barriers to care.[27,31,36] Flexible appointment schedules, expanded clinic hours, and copay and other financial or insurance assistance such as that provided by the Ryan White program will also provide patients with uninterrupted access to clinical care. Guidelines regarding linkage

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

and retention have been published.[6,7] CDC maintains a compendium of evidence-based and evidence-informed interventions (https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/research/interventionresearch/compendium/index.html).

The use of financial incentives or rewards to promote retention in care has been studied. A large study randomized clinic sites to financial incentives or standard-of-care. At baseline, 45% of the patients were retained in care in these clinics. The relative increase in the proportion of participants retained in care was 9% higher in clinics offering incentives than in standard-of-care clinics. Viral suppression also improved 4% at financial incentive clinics, from a baseline of 62%.[19] In another large, randomized study of persons out-of-care and hospitalized, financial incentives plus patient navigation did not lead to sustained improvement in retention or viral load suppression over that achieved with standard care.[34] The use of financial incentives therefore remains experimental and cannot be recommended for routine care at this time.

Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy

Adherence to ART can be influenced by a number of factors, including the patient's social situation and clinical condition, the prescribed regimen, and the patient-provider relationship.[41] Poor adherence is often a consequence of one or more behavioral, structural, and psychosocial barriers (e.g., depression and other mental illnesses, neurocognitive impairment, low health literacy, low levels of social support, stressful life events, busy or unstructured daily routines, active substance use, homelessness, poverty, nondisclosure of HIV serostatus, denial, stigma, and inconsistent access to medications due to financial and insurance status).[42-44]

Characteristics of one or more components of the prescribed regimen can affect adherence. Once-daily regimens,[45] including those with low pill burden (even if not one pill once daily), without a food requirement, and few side effects or toxicities, are associated with higher levels of adherence.[46,47] Single-tablet regimens (STR) that include all antiretrovirals in one pill taken once daily are easier for people to use. However, data to support or refute the superiority of a STR versus a once-daily multi-tablet regimen (MTR), as might be required for the use of some soon-to-be-available generic-based antiretroviral (ARV) regimens, are limited. There are demonstrated beneficial effects on virologic suppression in switch studies, in which persons on MTR are randomized to stay on MTR or switch to STR.[48] Whether an STR is beneficial in treatment-naive patients is not known, with at least one large observational cohort study showing benefit of once-daily STR versus once-daily MTR, but only when switches for simplification of MTR were considered failures.[47,49] Comparisons of these regimens are hampered since not all drugs and classes are available as STR.

Characteristics of the clinical setting can also have important structural influences on the success or failure of medication adherence. Settings that provide comprehensive multidisciplinary care (e.g., by case managers, pharmacists, social workers, and mental health and substance abuse providers) support patients' complex needs, including their medication adherence-related needs. Drug abuse treatment programs are often best suited to address substance use and may offer services that promote adherence, such as directly observed therapy (DOT).

Monitoring Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy

Adherence to ART should be assessed and addressed in a constructive and nonjudgmental manner at every visit. Given the potency of contemporary ART, a detectable viral load identified during chronic care for a patient with stable access to ART is most likely the result of poor adherence. Patient self-report, the most frequently used method for evaluating medication adherence, remains a useful tool. Carefully assessed patient self-report of high-level adherence to ART has been associated with favorable viral load responses.[50,51] Patient admission of suboptimal adherence is highly correlated with poor therapeutic response. The reliability of self-report often depends on how the clinician elicits the information. It is most reliable when ascertained in a simple, nonjudgmental, routine, and structured format that normalizes less-than-perfect adherence and minimizes socially desirable responses. To allow patients to disclose lapses in adherence, some experts suggest inquiring about the number of missed doses during a defined time period. For example, for a patient with a

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

detectable viral load, a provider might state, "I know it is difficult to take medicine every day. Most people miss doses at least sometimes. Thinking about the last 2 weeks, how many times have you missed doses? Please give me a rough estimate so I can help you take the best care of yourself." Other research supports simply asking patients to rate their adherence during the last 4 weeks on a 5- or 6-point Likert scale.[52,53]

Other measures of adherence include pharmacy records and pill counts. Pharmacy records can be valuable when medications are obtained exclusively from a single source. Because pill counts can be altered by patients, are labor intensive, and can be perceived as confrontational, they are generally not used in routine care. Other methods of assessing adherence include the use of therapeutic drug monitoring and electronic measurement devices (e.g., Medication Event Monitoring System [MEMS] bottle caps and dispensing systems). However, these methods are costly and are generally reserved for research settings.

Improving Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy

Strategies to improve adherence to ART are summarized in Table 16. Just as they support retention in care, all health care team members play integral roles in successful ART adherence programs.[51,54-56] An increasing number of interventions have proven effective in improving adherence to ART (for descriptions of the interventions, see http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/research/interventionresearch/compendium/ma/index.html). The many options can be customized to suit a range of needs and settings.

It is important that each new patient receives and understands basic information about HIV infection, including the goals of therapy (achieving and maintaining viral suppression, which will decrease HIV-associated complications and prevent transmission), the prescribed regimen (including dosing schedule and potential side effects), the importance of adherence to ART, and the potential for the development of drug resistance as a consequence of suboptimal adherence. Patients must also be positively motivated to initiate therapy, which can be assessed by simply asking patients if they want to start treatment for HIV infection. Clinicians should assist patients in identifying facilitating factors and potential barriers to adherence, and develop multidisciplinary plans to attempt to overcome those barriers. Processes for obtaining medications and refills should be clearly described. Transportation to pharmacy and to clinic visits should be assessed with linkage to appropriate services as needed. Plans to ensure uninterrupted access to ART via insurance, copay assistance, pharmaceutical company assistance programs, or AIDS Drug Assistance Programs (ADAP), for example, should be made and reviewed with the patient. Much of this effort to inform, motivate, and reduce barriers can be achieved by support staff, and can be accomplished concomitant with, or even after, starting therapy.[57-60] While delaying the initiation of ART is rarely indicated, some patients may not be comfortable starting treatment. Patients expressing reluctance to initiate ART should be engaged in counseling to understand and overcome barriers to ART initiation. Although homelessness, substance use, and mental health problems are associated with poorer adherence, they are not predictive enough at the individual level to warrant withholding or delaying therapy given the simplicity, potency, and tolerability of contemporary ART. Rapid ART initiation at the time of HIV diagnosis has been pursued as a strategy to increase viral load suppression and retention in care, but safety data, data on intermediate or long-term outcomes, and data from randomized controlled trials conducted in high-resource settings are currently lacking.[57-60] For more details, see Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy.

The first principle of successful treatment is to design a plan to which the patient can commit.[61,62] It is important to consider the patient's daily schedule; tolerance of pill number, size, and frequency; and any issues affecting absorption (e.g., use of acid-reducing therapy and food requirements). With the patient's input, a medication choice and administration schedule should be tailored to his or her daily activities. Clinicians should explain to patients that their first regimen is usually the best option for a simple regimen that affords long-term treatment success. Establishing a trusting patient-provider relationship and maintaining good communication will help to improve adherence and long-term outcomes. Medication taking can also be enhanced using medication reminder aids. There is strongest evidence for text messaging, but pill box monitors, pill boxes, and alarms may also improve adherence.[63-67]

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Positive reinforcement can greatly help patients maintain high levels of adherence. This technique to foster adherence includes informing patients of their low or suppressed viral load and increases in CD4 T lymphocyte cell counts. Motivational interviewing has also been used with some success.[68-70] Other effective interventions include nurse home visits, a five-session group intervention, and couples- or family-based interventions. Interventions involving several approaches are generally more successful than single-strategy interventions, and interventions based on cognitive behavioral therapy and supporter interventions have been shown to improve viral suppression.[71] Problem-solving approaches that vary in intensity and culturally tailored approaches also are promising.[70,72,73] To maintain high levels of adherence in some patients, it is important to provide substance abuse therapy and to strengthen social support. DOT has been effective in providing ART to active drug users[74] but not to patients in a general clinic population[75] or in home-based settings with partners responsible for DOT.[76] The use of incentives or rewards to promote adherence has been studied, and they have been shown to improve adherence in one study.[19] However, the durability and feasibility of financial incentives are not known at this time, hence rewards for adherence are not generally recommended.[34,77,78]

Conclusion

Even armed with accurate information about a patient's adherence and barriers to ART and appointment adherence, clinicians often fail to engage patients in a productive conversation and instead simply tell patients to be adherent and offer warnings about what might ensue with continued poor adherence. This approach fails to acknowledge a patient's barriers to adherence, fails to provide the patient with actionable information, erodes rather than builds the patient-provider relationship, and has been demonstrated to not improve adherence.[79,80] At the same time, however, many of the interventions shown to improve adherence are difficult to implement in routine care. Nonetheless, effective lessons from this body of research can be applied to routine care to improve linkage to care, adherence to ART, and adherence to appointments. These lessons include the following:

- Regularly assess adherence to ART and appointments.
- Engage a patient who is struggling with adherence at any step on the care continuum with a constructive, collaborative, nonjudgmental, and problem-solving approach rather than reprimanding them or lecturing them on the importance of adherence.
- Elicit an individual's barriers to adherence, which may include personal barriers (e.g., substance use, housing instability, stigma, lack of transportation), clinic barriers (e.g., limited clinic hours, processes that make it more difficult to obtain prescriptions or schedule appointments), and system barriers (e.g., copays, prior approvals, processes that complicate maintaining pharmacy benefits or obtaining refills).
- Tailor approaches to improve adherence to an individual's needs and barriers, for example, by changing ART to simplify dosing or reduce side effects, finding resources to assist with copays or other out-of-pocket costs (see Table 16) to maintain an uninterrupted supply of ART and access to clinicians, or linking patients to counseling to overcome stigma, substance use, or depression.
- Place patients with apparent ART adherence problems on regimens with high genetic barriers to resistance, such as dolutegravir or boosted-darunavir regimens. When selecting the regimen, consider possible side effects, out-of-pocket costs, convenience, and patient preferences since the only regimen that will work is the one the patient can obtain and is willing and able to take.
- Understand that multidisciplinary approaches and time to understand and address barriers are needed in many situations, and that the clinician's role is to help the patient to understand the importance of adherence to the continuum of care and reveal any barriers to adherence, and link the patient to resources to overcome those barriers.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 16. Strategies to Improve Linkage to Care, Retention in Care, Adherence to Appointments, and Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy (page 1 of 2)

Strategies	Examples
Provide an accessible, trustworthy, nonjudgmental multidisciplinary health care team.	• Care providers, nurses, social workers, case managers, pharmacists, and medication managers.
Strengthen early linkage to care and retention in care.	• Encourage health care team participation in linkage to and retention in care. • Use ARTAS training (if available).
Evaluate patient's knowledge about HIV infection, prevention, and treatment and, based on this assessment, provide HIV-related information.	• Keeping the patient's current knowledge base in mind, provide information about HIV, including the natural history of the disease, HIV viral load and CD4 count and expected clinical outcomes according to these parameters, therapeutic and prevention consequences of poor adherence, and importance of staying in HIV care.
Identify facilitators, potential barriers to adherence, and necessary medication management skills both before starting ART and on an ongoing basis.	• Assess patient's cognitive competence and impairment. • Assess behavioral and psychosocial challenges, including depression, mental illnesses, levels of social support, levels of alcohol consumption and current substance use, nondisclosure of HIV serostatus, and stigma. • Identify and address language and literacy barriers. • Assess beliefs, perceptions, and expectations about taking ART (e.g., impact on health, side effects, disclosure issues, consequences of poor adherence). • Ask about medication-taking skills and foreseeable challenges with adherence (e.g., past difficulty keeping appointments, adverse effects from previous medications, issues managing other chronic medications, need for medication reminders and organizers). • Assess structural issues, including unstable housing, lack of income, unpredictable daily schedule, lack of prescription drug coverage, lack of continuous access to medications, transportation problems.
Provide needed resources.	• Provide or refer for mental health and/or substance abuse treatment. • Provide resources to obtain prescription drug coverage (e.g., Common Patient Assistance Program Application (CPAPA): http://bit.ly/CommonPAPForm; Pharmaceutical Company HIV Patient Assistance Programs and Cost-Sharing Assistance Programs: http://bit.ly/1XIahvN • Provide resources about stable housing, social support, transportation assistance, and income and food security.
Involve the patient in ARV regimen selection.	• Review potential side effects, dosing frequency, pill burden, storage requirements, food requirements, and consequences of poor adherence. • Assess daily activities and tailor regimen to predictable and routine daily events. • Consider preferential use of PI/r-based or DTG-based ART if poor adherence is anticipated. • Consider use of STR formulations. • Assess if cost/copayment for drugs will affect adherence and access to medications.
Assess adherence at every clinic visit.	• Monitor viral load as a strong biologic measure of adherence. • Use a simple behavioral rating scale or self-reported assessment. • Employ a structured format that normalizes or assumes less-than-perfect adherence and minimizes socially desirable or "white-coat adherence" responses. • Ensure that other members of the health care team also assess and support adherence.
Use positive reinforcement to foster adherence success.	• Inform patients of low or nondetectable levels of HIV viral load and increases in CD4 cell counts. • Thank patients for attending their appointments.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 16. Strategies to Improve Linkage to Care, Retention in Care, Adherence to Appointments, and Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy (page 2 of 2)

Strategies	Examples
Identify the type of and reasons for poor adherence and target ways to improve adherence.	• Failure to understand dosing instructions. • Complexity of regimen (e.g., pill burden, size, dosing schedule, food requirements, polypharmacy). • Pill aversion or pill fatigue. • Adverse effects. • Inadequate understanding of drug resistance and its relationship to adherence. • Patient is unaware of appointments or appointments are not scheduled with proper patient input. • Cost-related issues (copays for medications or visits, missed work time). • Depression, drug and alcohol use, homelessness, poverty. • Stigma of taking pills or attending HIV-related appointments. • Nondisclosure of status leading to missed doses, refills, or appointments.
Select from among available effective adherence and retention interventions.	• See https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/research/interventionresearch/compendium/index.html for a summary of best practice interventions to improve linkage, retention, and adherence. • Use adherence-related tools to complement education and counseling interventions (e.g., text messaging, pill box monitors, pill boxes, alarms). • Use community resources to support adherence (e.g., visiting nurses, community workers, family, peer advocates, transportation assistance). • Use patient prescription assistance programs (see above, under "Provide needed resources"). • Use motivational interviews. • Provide outreach for patients who drop out of care • Use peer or paraprofessional treatment navigators. • Recognize positive clinical outcomes resulting from better adherence. • Arrange for DOT in persons in substance use treatment (if feasible). • Enhance clinic support and structures to promote linkage and retention (reminder calls, flexible scheduling, open access, active referrals, and improved patient satisfaction).
Systematically monitor retention in care.	• Record and follow up on missed visits.

Key to Acronyms: ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARTAS = Anti-Retroviral Treatment and Access to Services; ARV = antiretroviral; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; DOT = directly observed therapy; DTG = dolutegravir; PI/r = ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor; STR = single tablet regimen

References

1. Gardner EM, McLees MP, Steiner JF, Del Rio C, Burman WJ. The spectrum of engagement in HIV care and its relevance to test-and-treat strategies for prevention of HIV infection. *Clin Infect Dis*. Mar 15 2011;52(6):793-800. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21367734.

2. Greenberg AE, Hader SL, Masur H, Young AT, Skillicorn J, Dieffenbach CW. Fighting HIV/AIDS in Washington, D.C. *Health Aff*. Nov-Dec 2009;28(6):1677-1687. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19887408.

3. Giordano TP, Suarez-Almazor ME, Grimes RM. The population effectiveness of highly active antiretroviral therapy: are good drugs good enough? *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. Nov 2005;2(4):177-183. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16343375.

4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Monitoring selected national HIV prevention and care objectives by using HIV surveillance data—United States and 6 dependent areas, 2014. *HIV Surveillance Supplemental Report*. 2016;21(No. 4). Available at https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/library/reports/surveillance/cdc-hiv-surveillance-supplemental-report-

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

vol-21-4.pdf.

5. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *HIV Among Youth*. Division of HIV/AIDS Prevention; April 2017. Available at https://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/group/age/youth/cdc-hiv-youth.pdf. Accessed August 15, 2017.

6. Thompson MA, Mugavero MJ, Amico KR, et al. Guidelines for improving entry into and retention in care and antiretroviral adherence for persons with HIV: evidence-based recommendations from an International Association of Physicians in AIDS Care panel. *Ann Intern Med*. Jun 5 2012;156(11):817-833, W-284, W-285, W-286, W-287, W-288, W-289, W-290, W-291, W-292, W-293, W-294. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22393036.

7. International Advisory Panel on HIV Care Continuum Optimization. IAPAC guidelines for optimizing the HIV care continuum for adults and adolescents. *J Int Assoc Provid AIDS Care*. Nov-Dec 2015;14(Suppl 1):S3-S34. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26527218.

8. Rosen S, Fox MP. Retention in HIV care between testing and treatment in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review. *PLoS Med*. Jul 2011;8(7):e1001056. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21811403.

9. Govindasamy D, Ford N, Kranzer K. Risk factors, barriers and facilitators for linkage to antiretroviral therapy care: a systematic review. *AIDS*. Oct 23 2012;26(16):2059-2067. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22781227.

10. Gardner LI, Marks G, Strathdee SA, et al. Faster entry into HIV care among HIV-infected drug users who had been in drug-use treatment programs. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. Aug 01 2016;165:15-21. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27296978.

11. Torian LV, Wiewel EW, Liu KL, Sackoff JE, Frieden TR. Risk factors for delayed initiation of medical care after diagnosis of human immunodeficiency virus. *Arch Intern Med*. Jun 09 2008;168(11):1181-1187. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18541826.

12. Giordano TP, Visnegarwala F, White AC Jr, et al. Patients referred to an urban HIV clinic frequently fail to establish care: factors predicting failure. *AIDS Care*. Aug 2005;17(6):773-783. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16036264.

13. Hightow-Weidman LB, Jones K, Wohl AR, et al. Early linkage and retention in care: findings from the outreach, linkage, and retention in care initiative among young men of color who have sex with men. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. Aug 2011;25 Suppl 1:S31-38. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21711141.

14. Gardner LI, Metsch LR, Anderson-Mahoney P, et al. Efficacy of a brief case management intervention to link recently diagnosed HIV-infected persons to care. *AIDS*. Mar 04 2005;19(4):423-431. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15750396.

15. Craw JA, Gardner LI, Marks G, et al. Brief strengths-based case management promotes entry into *HIV Med*ical care: results of the antiretroviral treatment access study-II. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Apr 15 2008;47(5):597-606. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18285714.

16. Muhamadi L, Tumwesigye NM, Kadobera D, et al. A single-blind randomized controlled trial to evaluate the effect of extended counseling on uptake of pre-antiretroviral care in Eastern Uganda. *Trials*. Jul 27 2011;12:184. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21794162.

17. Chang LW, Nakigozi G, Billioux VG, et al. Effectiveness of peer support on care engagement and preventive care intervention utilization among pre-antiretroviral therapy, HIV-infected adults in Rakai, Uganda: a randomized trial. *AIDS Behav*. Oct 2015;19(10):1742-1751. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26271815.

18. Mugavero MJ. Improving engagement in HIV care: what can we do? *Top HIV Med*. Dec 2008;16(5):156-161. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19106431.

19. El-Sadr WM, Donnell D, Beauchamp G, et al. Financial incentives for linkage to care and viral suppression among HIV-positive patients: a randomized clinical trial (HPTN 065). *JAMA Intern Med*. Aug 01 2017;177(8):1083-1092. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28628702.

20. Giordano TP, Gifford AL, White AC, Jr., et al. Retention in care: a challenge to survival with HIV infection. *Clin Infect Dis*. Jun 01 2007;44(11):1493-1499. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17479948.

21. Mugavero MJ, Lin HY, Willig JH, et al. Missed visits and mortality among patients establishing initial outpatient HIV treatment. *Clin Infect Dis*. Jan 15 2009;48(2):248-256. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19072715.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

22. Giordano TP, Hartman C, Gifford AL, Backus LI, Morgan RO. Predictors of retention in HIV care among a national cohort of US veterans. *HIV Clin Trials*. Sep-Oct 2009;10(5):299-305. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19906622.

23. Yehia BR, Stewart L, Momplaisir F, et al. Barriers and facilitators to patient retention in HIV care. *BMC Infect Dis*. Jun 28 2015;15:246. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26123158.

24. Bulsara SM, Wainberg ML, Newton-John TR. Predictors of adult retention in HIV care: a systematic review. *AIDS Behav*. Dec 19 2016. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27990582.

25. Doshi RK, Milberg J, Isenberg D, et al. High rates of retention and viral suppression in the US HIV safety net system: HIV care continuum in the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program, 2011. *Clin Infect Dis*. Jan 01 2015;60(1):117-125. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25225233.

26. Flickinger TE, Saha S, Moore RD, Beach MC. Higher quality communication and relationships are associated with improved patient engagement in HIV care. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Jul 01 2013;63(3):362-366. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23591637.

27. Dang BN, Westbrook RA, Hartman CM, Giordano TP. Retaining HIV patients in care: the role of initial patient care experiences. *AIDS Behav*. Oct 2016;20(10):2477-2487. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26910339.

28. Magnus M, Herwehe J, Murtaza-Rossini M, et al. Linking and retaining HIV patients in care: the importance of provider attitudes and behaviors. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. May 2013;27(5):297-303. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23651107.

29. Mugavero MJ, Davila JA, Nevin CR, Giordano TP. From access to engagement: measuring retention in outpatient HIV clinical care. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. Oct 2010;24(10):607-613. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20858055.

30. Mugavero MJ, Westfall AO, Zinski A, et al. Measuring retention in HIV care: the elusive gold standard. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Dec 15 2012;61(5):574-580. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23011397.

31. Gardner LI, Giordano TP, Marks G, et al. Enhanced personal contact with HIV patients improves retention in primary care: a randomized trial in 6 US HIV clinics. *Clin Infect Dis*. Sep 01 2014;59(5):725-734. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24837481.

32. Lucas GM, Chaudhry A, Hsu J, et al. Clinic-based treatment of opioid-dependent HIV-infected patients versus referral to an opioid treatment program: A randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med*. Jun 01 2010;152(11):704-711. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20513828.

33. Robbins GK, Lester W, Johnson KL, et al. Efficacy of a clinical decision-support system in an HIV practice: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med*. Dec 04 2012;157(11):757-766. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23208165.

34. Metsch LR, Feaster DJ, Gooden L, et al. Effect of patient navigation with or without financial incentives on viral suppression among hospitalized patients with HIV infection and substance use: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. Jul 12 2016;316(2):156-170. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27404184.

35. Giordano TP, Cully J, Amico KR, et al. A randomized trial to test a peer mentor intervention to improve outcomes in persons hospitalized with HIV infection. *Clin Infect Dis*. Sep 01 2016;63(5):678-686. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27217266.

36. Gardner LI, Marks G, Craw JA, et al. A low-effort, clinic-wide intervention improves attendance for HIV primary care. *Clin Infect Dis*. Oct 2012;55(8):1124-1134. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22828593.

37. Irvine MK, Chamberlin SA, Robbins RS, et al. Improvements in HIV care engagement and viral load suppression following enrollment in a comprehensive HIV care coordination program. *Clin Infect Dis*. Jan 15 2015;60(2):298-310. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25301208.

38. Bove JM, Golden MR, Dhanireddy S, Harrington RD, Dombrowski JC. Outcomes of a clinic-based surveillance-informed intervention to relink patients to HIV care. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Nov 01 2015;70(3):262-268. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26068720.

39. Sena AC, Donovan J, Swygard H, et al. The North Carolina HIV Bridge Counselor Program: outcomes from a statewide

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

level intervention to link and reengage HIV-infected persons in care in the South. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Sep 01 2017;76(1):e7-e14. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28394820.

40. Udeagu CC, Webster TR, Bocour A, Michel P, Shepard CW. Lost or just not following up: public health effort to re-engage HIV-infected persons lost to follow-up into *HIV Med*ical care. *AIDS*. Sep 10 2013;27(14):2271-2279. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23669157.

41. Schneider J, Kaplan SH, Greenfield S, Li W, Wilson IB. Better physician-patient relationships are associated with higher reported adherence to antiretroviral therapy in patients with HIV infection. *J Gen Intern Med*. Nov 2004;19(11):1096-1103. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15566438.

42. Halkitis PN, Shrem MT, Zade DD, Wilton L. The physical, emotional and interpersonal impact of HAART: exploring the realities of HIV seropositive individuals on combination therapy. *J Health Psychol*. May 2005;10(3):345-358. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15857867.

43. Stirratt MJ, Remien RH, Smith A, et al. The role of HIV serostatus disclosure in antiretroviral medication adherence. *AIDS Behav*. Sep 2006;10(5):483-493. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16721505.

44. Carr RL, Gramling LF. Stigma: a health barrier for women with HIV/AIDS. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care*. Sep-Oct 2004;15(5):30-39. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15358923.

45. Parienti JJ, Bangsberg DR, Verdon R, Gardner EM. Better adherence with once-daily antiretroviral regimens: a meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. Feb 15 2009;48(4):484-488. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19140758.

46. Raboud J, Li M, Walmsley S, et al. Once daily dosing improves adherence to antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS Behav*. Oct 2011;15(7):1397-1409. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20878227.

47. Nachega JB, Parienti JJ, Uthman OA, et al. Lower pill burden and once-daily antiretroviral treatment regimens for HIV infection: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin Infect Dis*. May 2014;58(9):1297-1307. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24457345.

48. Clay PG, Nag S, Graham CM, Narayanan S. Meta-analysis of studies comparing single and multi-tablet fixed dose combination HIV treatment regimens. *Medicine*. Oct 2015;94(42):e1677. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26496277.

49. Cotte L, Ferry T, Pugliese P, et al. Effectiveness and tolerance of single tablet versus once daily multiple tablet regimens as first-line antiretroviral therapy – Results from a large French multicenter cohort study. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(2):e0170661. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28152047.

50. Simoni JM, Kurth AE, Pearson CR, Pantalone DW, Merrill JO, Frick PA. Self-report measures of antiretroviral therapy adherence: A review with recommendations for HIV research and clinical management. *AIDS Behav*. May 2006;10(3):227-245. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16783535.

51. Mannheimer SB, Morse E, Matts JP, et al. Sustained benefit from a long-term antiretroviral adherence intervention. Results of a large randomized clinical trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Dec 1 2006;43 Suppl 1:S41-47. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17091022.

52. Feldman BJ, Fredericksen RJ, Crane PK, et al. Evaluation of the single-item self-rating adherence scale for use in routine clinical care of people living with HIV. *AIDS Behav*. Jan 2013;17(1):307-318. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23108721.

53. Lu M, Safren SA, Skolnik PR, et al. Optimal recall period and response task for self-reported *HIV Med*ication adherence. *AIDS Behav*. Jan 2008;12(1):86-94. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17577653.

54. McPherson-Baker S, Malow RM, Penedo F, Jones DL, Schneiderman N, Klimas NG. Enhancing adherence to combination antiretroviral therapy in non-adherent HIV-positive men. *AIDS Care*. Aug 2000;12(4):399-404. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11091772.

55. Kalichman SC, Cherry J, Cain D. Nurse-delivered antiretroviral treatment adherence intervention for people with low literacy skills and living with HIV/AIDS. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care*. Sep-Oct 2005;16(5):3-15. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16433105.

56. Remien RH, Stirratt MJ, Dognin J, Day E, El-Bassel N, Warne P. Moving from theory to research to practice. Implementing an effective dyadic intervention to improve antiretroviral adherence for clinic patients. *J Acquir Immune*

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Defic Syndr. Dec 1 2006;43 Suppl 1:S69-78. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17133206.

57. Amanyire G, Semitala FC, Namusobya J, et al. Effects of a multicomponent intervention to streamline initiation of antiretroviral therapy in Africa: a stepped-wedge cluster-randomised trial. *Lancet HIV*. Nov 2016;3(11):e539-e548. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27658873.

58. Rosen S, Maskew M, Fox MP, et al. Initiating antiretroviral therapy for HIV at a patient's first clinic visit: The RapIT randomized controlled trial. *PLoS Med*. May 2016;13(5):e1002015. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27163694.

59. Koenig S, Dorvil N, Severe P, et al. Same-day HIV testing and antiretroviral therapy initiation results in higher rates of treatment initiation and retention in care. *AIDS*; 2016; Durban, South Africa.

60. Pilcher CD, Ospina-Norvell C, Dasgupta A, et al. The effect of same-day observed initiation of antiretroviral therapy on HIV viral load and treatment outcomes in a US public health setting. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Jan 01 2017;74(1):44-51. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27434707.

61. Williams A, Friedland G. Adherence, compliance, and HAART. *AIDS Clin Care*. 1997;9(7):51-54, 58. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11364415.

62. Vermeire E, Hearnshaw H, Van Royen P, Denekens J. Patient adherence to treatment: three decades of research. A comprehensive review. *J Clin Pharm Ther*. Oct 2001;26(5):331-342. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11679023.

63. Pop-Eleches C, Thirumurthy H, Habyarimana JP, et al. Mobile phone technologies improve adherence to antiretroviral treatment in a resource-limited setting: a randomized controlled trial of text message reminders. *AIDS*. Mar 27 2011;25(6):825-834. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21252632.

64. Lester RT, Ritvo P, Mills EJ, et al. Effects of a mobile phone short message service on antiretroviral treatment adherence in Kenya (WelTel Kenya1): a randomised trial. *Lancet*. Nov 27 2010;376(9755):1838-1845. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21071074.

65. Shet A, De Costa A, Kumarasamy N, et al. Effect of mobile telephone reminders on treatment outcome in HIV: evidence from a randomised controlled trial in India. *BMJ*. Oct 24 2014;349:g5978. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25742320.

66. Sabin LL, Bachman DeSilva M, Gill CJ, et al. Improving Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy With Triggered Real-time Text Message Reminders: The China Adherence Through Technology Study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Aug 15 2015;69(5):551-559. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25886927.

67. Petersen ML, Wang Y, van der Laan MJ, Guzman D, Riley E, Bangsberg DR. Pillbox organizers are associated with improved adherence to HIV antiretroviral therapy and viral suppression: a marginal structural model analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. Oct 01 2007;45(7):908-915. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17806060.

68. Parsons JT, Golub SA, Rosof E, Holder C. Motivational interviewing and cognitive-behavioral intervention to improve *HIV Med*ication adherence among hazardous drinkers: a randomized controlled trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Dec 01 2007;46(4):443-450. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18077833.

69. Gwadz M, Cleland CM, Applegate E, et al. Behavioral intervention improves treatment outcomes among HIV-infected individuals who have delayed, declined, or discontinued antiretroviral therapy: a randomized controlled trial of a novel intervention. *AIDS Behav*. Oct 2015;19(10):1801-1817. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25835462.

70. Bogart LM, Mutchler MG, McDavitt B, et al. A randomized controlled trial of rise, a community-based culturally congruent adherence intervention for black Americans living with HIV. *Ann Behav Med*. Apr 21 2017. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28432578.

71. Kanters S, Park JJ, Chan K, et al. Interventions to improve adherence to antiretroviral therapy: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Lancet HIV*. Jan 2017;4(1):e31-e40. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27863996.

72. Gross R, Bellamy SL, Chapman J, et al. Managed problem solving for antiretroviral therapy adherence: a randomized trial. *JAMA Intern Med*. Feb 25 2013;173(4):300-306. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23358784.

73. de Bruin M, Oberje EJM, Viechtbauer W, et al. Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of a nurse-delivered intervention to

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

improve adherence to treatment for HIV: a pragmatic, multicentre, open-label, randomised clinical trial. *Lancet Infect Dis*. Jun 2017;17(6):595-604. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28262598.

74. Altice FL, Maru DS, Bruce RD, Springer SA, Friedland GH. Superiority of directly administered antiretroviral therapy over self-administered therapy among HIV-infected drug users: a prospective, randomized, controlled trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. Sep 15 2007;45(6):770-778. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17712763.

75. Berg KM, Litwin AH, Li X, Heo M, Arnsten JH. Lack of sustained improvement in adherence or viral load following a directly observed antiretroviral therapy intervention. *Clin Infect Dis*. Nov 2011;53(9):936-943. Available at http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21890753.

76. Gross R, Zheng L, La Rosa A, et al. Partner-based adherence intervention for second-line antiretroviral therapy (ACTG A5234): a multinational randomised trial. *Lancet HIV*. Jan 2015;2(1):e12-19. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26424232.

77. Galarraga O, Genberg BL, Martin RA, Barton Laws M, Wilson IB. Conditional economic incentives to improve HIV treatment adherence: literature review and theoretical considerations. *AIDS Behav*. Sep 2013;17(7):2283-2292. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23370833.

78. Bassett IV, Wilson D, Taaffe J, Freedberg KA. Financial incentives to improve progression through the HIV treatment cascade. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS*. Nov 2015;10(6):451-463. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26371461.

79. Wilson IB, Laws MB, Safren SA, et al. Provider-focused intervention increases adherence-related dialogue but does not improve antiretroviral therapy adherence in persons with HIV. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Mar 2010;53(3):338-347. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20048680.

80. Laws MB, Beach MC, Lee Y, et al. Provider-patient adherence dialogue in HIV care: results of a multisite study. *AIDS Behav*. Jan 2013;17(1):148-159. Available at https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22290609.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Adverse Effects of Antiretroviral Agents (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Adverse effects have been reported with all antiretroviral (ARV) drugs and, in the earlier era of combination antiretroviral therapy (ART), adverse effects were among the most common reasons for switching or discontinuing therapy and for medication nonadherence.[1] Fortunately, newer ARV regimens are associated with fewer serious and intolerable adverse effects than regimens used in the past. Generally, <10% of ART-naive patients enrolled in randomized trials experience treatment-limiting adverse events. However, the long-term complications of ART can be underestimated because most clinical trials use highly specific inclusion criteria which exclude individuals with certain underlying medical conditions, and the duration of participant follow-up is relatively short. As ART is now recommended for all patients regardless of CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell count, and because therapy must be continued indefinitely, the focus of patient management has evolved from identifying and managing early ARV-related toxicities to individualizing therapy to avoid long-term adverse effects, including diabetes and other metabolic complications, atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease, kidney dysfunction, bone loss, and weight gain. To achieve and sustain viral suppression over a lifetime, both long-term and short-term ART toxicities must be anticipated and managed. When selecting an ARV regimen, clinicians must consider potential adverse effects, as well as the individual's comorbidities, concomitant medications, and prior history of drug intolerances.

Several factors may predispose individuals to adverse effects of ARV medications, such as:

- Concomitant use of medications with overlapping and additive toxicities.
- Comorbid conditions that increase the risk of adverse effects. For example, underlying liver disease from alcohol use, coinfection with viral hepatitis, and/or liver steatosis[2,3] may increase the risk of hepatotoxicity when efavirenz (EFV) or protease inhibitors are used; and borderline or mild renal dysfunction increases the risk of nephrotoxicity from tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF).
- Certain ARVs may exacerbate pre-existing conditions, for example, psychiatric disorders may be exacerbated by EFV, rilpivirine, and, infrequently, by integrase strand transfer inhibitors.[4,5]
- Drug-drug interactions that may increase toxicities of ARV drugs or concomitant medications, for example, when pharmacokinetic boosters such as ritonavir or cobicistat are used, or when isoniazid is used with EFV.[6]
- Genetic factors that predispose patients to abacavir (ABC) hypersensitivity reaction,[7,8] EFV neuropsychiatric toxicity[6,9] and QTc prolongation,[10,11] and atazanavir (ATV)-associated hyperbilirubinemia.[12]

Information on the adverse effects of ARVs is outlined in several tables in the guidelines. Table 17 provides clinicians with a list of the most common and/or severe ARV-associated adverse events for each drug class. The most common adverse effects of individual ARV agents are summarized in Appendix B, Tables 3–9.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 17. Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects Associated with Antiretroviral Therapy (page 1 of 5)

Adverse effects for ARV drugs that are no longer commonly used in clinical practice (ddI, d4T, FPV/r, IDV, NFV, SQV/r, and TPV/r) have been removed from this table, with the exception of lipodystrophy and peripheral neuropathy associated with ddI and d4T. Because these effects may persist long after discontinuation of ddI or d4T, and patients may still present with these long-lasting toxicities, the drugs remain listed among the ARVs associated with these two effects. Refer to the product labels or to the July 10, 2019, version of the guidelines (found in the archived guidelines section of AIDS*info*) for information regarding the adverse effects associated with these older ARVs.

This table focuses on ARV-associated adverse effects that a patient may experience as a result of taking an ARV regimen. For information regarding potential adverse effects of ARVs on fetuses and newborns when certain ARVs are taken around the time of conception or during pregnancy, refer to Table 6b and to the Perinatal Guidelines.

In this table, N/A indicates either that there are no reported cases for that particular side effect or that data for that specific ARV drug class are not available. See Appendix B, Tables 3-9 for additional information listed by drug.

Adverse Effect	Drug Class				
	NRTIs	NNRTIs	PIs	INSTIs	EIs
Bone Density Effects	**TDF:** Associated with greater loss of BMD than other NRTIs, especially when given with a PK booster. Osteomalacia may be associated with renal tubulopathy and urine phosphate wasting. **TAF:** Associated with smaller declines in BMD than those seen with TDF.	Decreases in BMD observed after the initiation of any ART regimen.			N/A
Bone Marrow Suppression	**ZDV:** Anemia, neutropenia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Cardiac Conduction Effects	N/A	**RPV, EFV:** QTc prolongation	**ATV/r and LPV/r:** PR prolongation. Risk factors include pre-existing heart disease and concomitant use of medications that may cause PR prolongation.	N/A	N/A
Cardiovascular Disease	**ABC:** Associated with an increased risk of MI in some cohort studies. Absolute risk greatest in patients with traditional CVD risk factors.	N/A	**Boosted DRV and LPV/r:** Associated with cardiovascular events in some cohorts	N/A	N/A

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 17. Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects Associated with Antiretroviral Therapy (page 2 of 5)

Adverse Effect	Drug Class				
	NRTIs	NNRTIs	PIs	INSTIs	EIs
Cholelithiasis	N/A	N/A	**ATV:** Cholelithiasis and kidney stones may present concurrently. Median onset is 42 months after ARV initiation.	N/A	N/A
Diabetes Mellitus and Insulin Resistance	ZDV	N/A	LPV/r, but not with boosted ATV or DRV	N/A	N/A
Dyslipidemia	**ZDV > ABC:** ↑ TG and ↑ LDL **TAF:** ↑ TG, ↑ LDL, and ↑ HDL (no change in TC:HDL ratio) TDF has been associated with lower lipid levels than ABC or TAF.	**EFV:** ↑ TG, ↑ LDL, ↑ HDL	**All RTV- or COBI-Boosted PIs:** ↑ TG, ↑ LDL, ↑ HDL **LPV/r > DRV/r and ATV/r:** ↑ TG	**EVG/c:** ↑ TG, ↑ LDL, ↑ HDL	N/A
Gastrointestinal Effects	**ZDV > Other NRTIs:** Nausea and vomiting	N/A	GI intolerance (e.g., diarrhea, nausea, vomiting) **LPV/r > DRV/r and ATV/r:** Diarrhea	**EVG/c:** Nausea and diarrhea	**IBA:** In a study of 40 people, 8% of patients reported diarrhea.
Hepatic Effects	**When TAF, TDF, 3TC, and FTC are withdrawn in Patients with HBV/HIV Coinfection or when HBV Resistance Develops:** Patients with HBV/HIV coinfection may develop severe hepatic flares. **ZDV:** Steatosis	**EFV:** Most cases relate to an increase in transaminases. Fulminant hepatitis leading to death or hepatic failure requiring transplantation have been reported. **NVP:** Severe hepatotoxicity associated with skin rash or hypersensitivity. A 2-week NVP dose escalation may reduce risk. Risk is greater for women with pre-NVP CD4 counts >250 cells/mm^3 and men with pre-NVP CD4 counts >400 cells/mm^3. NVP should **never** be used for post-exposure prophylaxis. EFV and NVP **are not recommended** in patients with hepatic insufficiency (Child-Pugh class B or C).	**All PIs**: Drug-induced hepatitis and hepatic decompensation have been reported. **ATV:** Jaundice due to indirect hyperbilirubinemia	**DTG:** Persons with HBV or HCV coinfection may be at higher risk of DTG-associated hepatotoxicity.	**MVC:** Hepatotoxicity with or without rash or HSRs reported.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 17. Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects Associated with Antiretroviral Therapy (page 3 of 5)

Adverse Effect	Drug Class				
	NRTIs	NNRTIs	PIs	INSTIs	EIs
Hypersensitivity Reaction Excluding rash alone or Stevens-Johnson syndrome	**ABC: Contraindicated** if patient is HLA-B*5701 positive. Median onset for HSR is 9 days after treatment initiation; 90% of reactions occur within 6 weeks. **HSR Symptoms (in Order of Descending Frequency):** Fever, rash, malaise, nausea, headache, myalgia, chills, diarrhea, vomiting, abdominal pain, dyspnea, arthralgia, and respiratory symptoms Symptoms worsen with continuation of ABC. Patients should not be rechallenged with ABC if HSR is suspected, regardless of their HLA-B*5701 status.	**NVP:** Hypersensitivity syndrome of hepatotoxicity and rash that may be accompanied by fever, general malaise, fatigue, myalgias, arthralgias, blisters, oral lesions, conjunctivitis, facial edema, eosinophilia, renal dysfunction, granulocytopenia, or lymphadenopathy. Risk is greater for ARV-naive women with pre-NVP CD4 counts >250 cells/mm^3 and men with pre-NVP CD4 counts >400 cells/mm^3. Overall, risk is higher for women than men. A 2-week dose escalation of NVP reduces risk.	N/A	**RAL:** HSR reported when RAL is given with other drugs also known to cause HSRs. All ARVs should be stopped if HSR occurs. **DTG:** Reported in <1% of patients in clinical development program	**MVC:** HSR reported as part of a syndrome related to hepatotoxicity.
Lactic Acidosis	**Reported with Older NRTIs, d4T, ZDV, and ddI**, but not with ABC, 3TC, FTC, TAF, or TDF.	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Lipodystrophy	**Lipoatrophy:** Associated with history of exposure to d4T or ZDV (d4T > ZDV). Not reported with ABC, 3TC or FTC, TAF or TDF.	**Lipohypertrophy:** Trunk fat increase observed with EFV-, PI-, and RAL-containing regimens; however, causal relationship has not been established.			N/A
Myopathy/ Elevated Creatine Phosphokinase	**ZDV:** Myopathy	N/A	N/A	**RAL and DTG:** ↑ CPK, rhabdomyolysis, and myopathy or myositis have been reported.	N/A

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 17. Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects Associated with Antiretroviral Therapy (page 4 of 5)

Adverse Effect	Drug Class				
	NRTIs	NNRTIs	PIs	INSTIs	EIs
Nervous System/ Psychiatric Effects	**History of Exposure to ddI, ddC, or d4T:** Peripheral neuropathy (can be irreversible)	**Neuropsychiatric Events:** EFV > RPV, DOR, ETR **EFV:** Somnolence, insomnia, abnormal dreams, dizziness, impaired concentration, depression, psychosis, suicidal ideation, ataxia, encephalopathy. Some symptoms may subside or diminish after 2–4 weeks. Bedtime dosing and taking without food may reduce symptoms. Risk factors include psychiatric illness, concomitant use of agents with neuropsychiatric effects, and genetic factors. **RPV:** Depression, suicidality, sleep disturbances **DOR:** Sleep disorders and disturbances, dizziness, altered sensorium; depression and suicidality and self-harm	N/A	**All INSTIs:** Insomnia, depression, and suicidality have been reported with INSTI use, primarily in patients with pre-existing psychiatric conditions.	N/A
Rash	**FTC:** Hyperpigmentation	All NNRTIs	ATV, DRV, and LPV/r	All INSTIs	MVC, IBA
Renal Effects/ Urolithiasis	**TDF:** ↑ SCr, proteinuria, hypophosphatemia, urinary phosphate wasting, glycosuria, hypokalemia, and non-anion gap metabolic acidosis. Concurrent use of TDF with COBI- or RTV-containing regimens appears to increase risk. **TAF:** Less impact on renal biomarkers and lower rates of proteinuria than TDF.	**RPV:** Inhibits Cr secretion without reducing renal glomerular function.	**ATV and LPV/r:** Associated with increased risk of chronic kidney disease in a large cohort study. **ATV:** Stone or crystal formation. Adequate hydration may reduce risk. **COBI (as a Boosting Agent for DRV or ATV):** Inhibits Cr secretion without reducing renal glomerular function.	**DTG, COBI (as a Boosting Agent for EVG), and BIC:** Inhibits Cr secretion without reducing renal glomerular function	**IBA:** SCr abnormalities ≥Grade 3 reported in 10% of trial participants.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 17. Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects Associated with Antiretroviral Therapy (page 5 of 5)

Adverse Effect	Drug Class				
	NRTIs	NNRTIs	PIs	INSTIs	EIs
Stevens-Johnson Syndrome/ Toxic Epidermal Necrosis	N/A	NVP > EFV, ETR, RPV	Some reported cases for DRV, LPV/r, and ATV	RAL	N/A
Weight Gain	Weight gain has been associated with initiation of ART and subsequent viral suppression. The increase appears to be greater with INSTIs than with other drug classes. Greater weight increase has also been reported with TAF than with TDF, and greater with DOR than EFV.			INSTI > other ARV drug classes	N/A

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART= antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; BIC = bictegravir; BMD = bone mineral density; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; CNS = central nervous system; COBI = cobicistat; CPK = creatine phosphokinase; Cr = creatinine; CVD = cardiovascular disease; d4T = stavudine; ddC = zalcitabine; ddI = didanosine; DLV = delavirdine; DOR = doravirine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; DTG = dolutegravir; ECG = electrocardiogram; EFV = efavirenz; EI = entry inhibitor; ETR = etravirine; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FPV = fosamprenavir; FPV/r = fosamprenavir/ritonavir; FTC = emtricitabine; GI = gastrointestinal; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HDL = high-density lipoprotein; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; IBA = ibalizumab; IDV = indinavir; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LDL = low-density lipoprotein; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; MI = myocardial infarction; MVC = maraviroc; NFV = nelfinavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SCr = serum creatinine; SQV = saquinavir; SQV/r = saquinavir/ritonavir; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TC = total cholesterol; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TG = triglycerides; TPV = tipranavir; TPV/r = tipranavir/ritonavir; ZDV = zidovudine

Switching Antiretroviral Drugs Due to Adverse Effects

Some patients experience treatment-limiting toxicities associated with ART. In these cases, ART must be modified. ART-associated adverse events can range from acute and potentially life-threatening to chronic and insidious. Serious life-threatening events (e.g., hypersensitivity reaction due to ABC, symptomatic hepatotoxicity, or severe cutaneous reactions) require the immediate discontinuation of all ARV drugs and re-initiation of an alternative regimen without overlapping toxicity. Toxicities that are not life-threatening (e.g., urolithiasis with ATV or renal tubulopathy with TDF) can usually be managed by substituting another ARV agent for the presumed causative agent without interrupting ART. Other chronic, non–life-threatening adverse events (e.g., dyslipidemia) can be addressed either by switching the potentially causative agent for another agent or by managing the adverse event with pharmacological or nonpharmacological interventions. Management strategies must be individualized for each patient.

Switching a patient from an effective ARV agent or regimen to a new agent or regimen must be done carefully and only when the potential benefits of the change outweigh the potential risks of altering treatment. The fundamental principle of regimen switching is to maintain viral suppression. When selecting a new agent or regimen, providers should be aware that drug resistant viruses previously acquired or selected, even those not detected by past genotypic resistance testing, are archived in HIV reservoirs. The resistant virus, even if absent from subsequent resistance test results, may reappear under selective drug pressure. See Optimizing Antiretroviral Therapy section for further discussion. It is critical that providers review the following information before implementing any treatment switch:

- The patient's medical and complete ARV history, including prior virologic responses to ART,

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

- All previous drug resistance test results,
- Viral tropism (if maraviroc [MVC] is being considered),
- HLA-B*5701 status (if ABC is being considered),
- Comorbidities,
- The patient's pregnancy status, ability to use effective contraceptives, and desire for pregnancy
- Hepatitis B virus (HBV) status. Patients with evidence of chronic HBV infection should not discontinue ARVs active against HBV (e.g., TDF, tenofovir alafenamide, lamivudine, emtricitabine). If discontinuation is necessary due to adverse effects, consult the HBV/HIV Coinfection section for guidance,
- Adherence history,
- Prior intolerances to any ARVs, and
- Concomitant medications and supplements, considering any potential drug interactions with ARVs.

A patient's willingness to accept new food requirements or dosing schedule must also be assessed. In some cases, medication costs may also be a factor to consider before switching treatment. Signs and symptoms of comorbidities, adverse effects of concomitant medications, or HIV itself may mimic adverse effects caused by ART. Therefore, clinicians should investigate all potential causes for an adverse event. In the case of a severe adverse event, it may be necessary to discontinue or switch ARVs pending the outcome of such an investigation. For the first few months after an ART switch, the patient should be closely monitored for any new adverse events. The patient's HIV viral load should also be monitored to assure continued viral suppression.

Table 18 lists several major ART-associated adverse events and the options for appropriate switches between agents in an ARV regimen. The table focuses on the ARVs most commonly used in the United States and lists substitutions that are supported by ARV switch studies, the findings of comparative ARV trials and observational cohort studies, or expert opinion. Switching agents in an effective ARV regimen should be done carefully and only when the potential benefits of the change outweigh the potential risks of altering treatment.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 18. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Adverse Effects That Can Be Managed with Substitution of Alternative Antiretroviral Agents (page 1 of 3)

This table focuses on ARV-associated adverse effects that patients may experience as a result of a current ARV regimen. For information regarding ARV choices to use in individuals of childbearing potential and during pregnancy to avoid potential ARV adverse effects on fetuses and newborns refer to Table 6b and to the Perinatal Guidelines.

Adverse Event	ARV Agent(s) or Drug Class		Comments
	Switch from	Switch to	
Bone Density Effects	TDF[a]	TAF or ABC[b] NRTI-sparing regimens or regimens using only 3TC or FTC as the NRTI may be considered, if appropriate.	Declines in BMD have been observed upon initiation of most ART regimens. Switching from TDF to alternative ARV agents has been shown to increase bone density, but the clinical significance of this increase remains uncertain. TAF is associated with smaller declines in BMD than TDF, and patients show improvement in BMD upon switching to TAF. The long-term impact of TAF on patients with osteopenia or osteoporosis is unknown; close clinical monitoring is recommended in this setting.
Bone Marrow Suppression	ZDV	Regimen not including ZDV	ZDV has been associated with neutropenia and macrocytic anemia.
Calculi Nephrolithiasis and cholelithiasis	ATV, ATV/c, ATV/r	DRV/c, DRV/r, INSTI, or NNRTI	This switch should be made if ATV is the presumed cause of the calculi.
Cardiac QTc Interval Prolongation	EFV, RPV	Boosted ATV or DRV, DOR, or INSTI-based regimen	High EFV and RPV exposures may cause QT prolongation. Consider switching from EFV- or RPV-based regimens if patient is taking other medications with known risk of Torsades de Pointes, or in patients at higher risk of Torsades de Pointes.
Cardiovascular Events Myocardial infarction, ischemic stroke	ABC	TDF or TAF	ABC use has been associated with CV disease and cardiac events in some, but not all, observational studies. TDF has been associated with lower lipid levels than TAF.
	RTV- or COBI-boosted PI regimens, EFV	RAL, DTG, BIC, RPV, or DOR	If lipids are a concern, see Dyslipidemia below. Large observation cohorts have found an association between some PIs (DRV, FPV, IDV, LPV/r) and an increased risk of CV events. However, this association has not been seen with ATV. Further study is needed.
Dyslipidemia Hypertriglyceridemia (with or without elevated LDL level)	RTV- or COBI-boosted EFV-based regimens	BIC, DTG, RAL, DOR, or RPV	Elevated TG and LDL levels are more common with LPV/r and FPV/r than with other RTV-boosted PIs. Improvements in TG and LDL levels have been observed with switch from LPV/r to ATV or ATV/r.[c]
Gastrointestinal Effects Nausea, diarrhea	LPV/r	Boosted ATV or DRV, INSTI, NNRTI	GI intolerance is common with boosted PIs and is linked to the total dose of RTV. More GI toxicity is seen with LPV/r than with ATV/r or DRV/r. GI effects are often transient and do not warrant ARV substitution unless they are persistent and intolerable.
	Other RTV- or COBI-boosted regimens	BIC, DTG, RAL, or NNRTI	In a trial of treatment-naive patients, rates of diarrhea and nausea were similar for EVG/c/TDF/FTC and ATV/r plus TDF/FTC.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 18. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Adverse Effects That Can Be Managed with Substitution of Alternative Antiretroviral Agents (page 2 of 3)

Adverse Event	ARV Agent(s) or Drug Class		Comments
	Switch from	Switch to	
Hypersensitivity Reaction	ABC	Any appropriate ABC-sparing regimen	Never rechallenge with ABC following a suspected HSR, regardless of the patient's HLA-B*5701 status.
	EFV, ETR, NVP, RPV	Non-NNRTI ART	Risk of HSR with NVP is higher for women and those with high CD4 counts.
	DTG, RAL	Non-INSTI ART	Reactions to NVP, ETR, RAL, DTG, and MVC may be accompanied by elevated liver transaminases.
	MVC	Suitable alternative ART	
Insulin Resistance	LPV/r	INSTI, NNRTI	Results of switch studies have been inconsistent. Studies in HIV-negative patients suggest a direct causal effect of LPV/r on insulin resistance. However, traditional risk factors for insulin resistance may be stronger risk factors than the use of any PI.
Jaundice and Icterus	ATV, ATV/c, ATV/r	DRV/c, DRV/r, INSTI, or NNRTI	Increases in unconjugated bilirubin are common with ATV and generally do not require modification of therapy unless resultant symptoms are distressing to the patient.
Lipoatrophy	Peripheral lipoatrophy (loss of subcutaneous fat of the limbs, face, and buttocks) is associated with prior thymidine analog (d4T and ZDV) use. Despite switching from these ARVs, fat recovery remains slow (may take years) and incomplete.		
Lipohypertrophy	Accumulation of visceral, truncal, dorsocervical, and breast fat has been observed during ART, particularly during use of older PI-based regimens (e.g., IDV), but whether ART directly causes fat accumulation remains unclear. There is no clinical evidence that switching to another first line regimen will reverse lipohypertrophy.		
Neuropsychiatric Side Effects Dizziness, suicidal ideation, abnormal dreams, depression, ataxia, encephalopathy	EFV, RPV	DOR, ETR, PI/c, or PI/r INSTIs may be used, but monitoring is recommended (see Comments column).	In most patients, EFV-related CNS effects subside within 4 weeks after initiation of the drug, but in some patients, ataxia or encephalopathy may appear months to years after EFV-initiation. Persistent or intolerable effects should prompt substitution of EFV. INSTIs are associated with insomnia. Depression and suicidality have been infrequently reported with INSTI use, primarily in patients with pre-existing psychiatric conditions.
Rash	NNRTIs (especially NVP and EFV)	PI- or INSTI-based regimen	Mild rashes that develop after initiation of NNRTIs other than NVP rarely require treatment switch. When serious rash develops due to any NNRTI, switch to another drug class.
	DRV/c, DRV/r	ATV/c, ATV/r, or another drug class (e.g., INSTI)	Mild rashes following DRV/r use may resolve without modification of therapy. For more severe reactions, change to an alternative boosted PI or an agent from another drug class.
Renal Effects Including proximal renal tubulopathy and elevated creatinine	TDF[a]	ABC,[b] TAF (for patients with CrCl >30 mL/min, unless on chronic hemodialysis), NRTI-sparing regimens, or regimens using only 3TC or FTC as the NRTI may be considered if appropriate.	TDF may cause tubulopathy. Switching from TDF to TAF is associated with improvement in proteinuria and renal biomarkers. The long-term impact of TAF on patients with pre-existing renal disease, including overt proximal tubulopathy, is unknown, and close clinical monitoring is recommended in this setting.
	ATV/c, ATV/r, LPV/r	BIC, DTG, EVG/c/TAF/FTC, RAL, boosted DRV, or NNRTI	COBI, DTG, BIC, and, to a lesser extent, RPV, can increase SCr through inhibition of creatinine secretion. This effect does not affect glomerular filtration. However, assess patient for renal dysfunction if SCr increases by >0.4 mg/dL.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 18. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Adverse Events That Can Be Managed with Substitution of Alternative Antiretroviral Agents (page 3 of 3)

[a] In patients with chronic active HBV infection, another agent that is active against HBV should be substituted for TDF.

[b] ABC should be used only in patients known to be HLA-B*5701 negative.

[c] TDF reduces ATV levels; therefore, unboosted ATV should not be coadministered with TDF.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; BIC = bictegravir; BMD = bone mineral density; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; CNS = central nervous system; COBI = cobicistat; CrCl = creatine clearance; CV = cardiovascular; d4T = stavudine; DOR = doravirine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FPV = fosamprenavir; FPV/r = fosamprenavir/ritonavir; FTC = emtricitabine; GI = gastrointestinal; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; IDV = indinavir; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LDL = low-density lipoprotein; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; MVC = maraviroc; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PI/c = protease inhibitor/cobicistat; PI/r = protease inhibitor/ritonavir; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SCr = serum creatinine; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TC = total cholesterol; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TG = triglycerides; ZDV = zidovudine

References

1. O'Brien ME, Clark RA, Besch CL, et al. Patterns and correlates of discontinuation of the initial HAART regimen in an urban outpatient cohort. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2003;34(4):407-414. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14615659.
2. den Brinker M, Wit FW, Wertheim-van Dillen PM, et al. Hepatitis B and C virus co-infection and the risk for hepatotoxicity of highly active antiretroviral therapy in HIV-1 infection. *AIDS*. 2000;14(18):2895-2902. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11153671.
3. Saves M, Raffi F, Clevenbergh P, et al. Hepatitis B or hepatitis C virus infection is a risk factor for severe hepatic cytolysis after initiation of a protease inhibitor-containing antiretroviral regimen in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients. The APROCO Study Group. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2000;44(12):3451-3455. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11083658.
4. Harris M, Larsen G, Montaner JS. Exacerbation of depression associated with starting raltegravir: a report of four cases. *AIDS*. 2008;22(14):1890-1892. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18753871.
5. Kheloufi F, Allemand J, Mokhtari S, Default A. Psychiatric disorders after starting dolutegravir: report of four cases. *AIDS*. 2015;29(13):1723-1725. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26372287.
6. Cross HM, Chetty S, Asukile MT, Hussey HS, Lee Pan EB, Tucker LM. A proposed management algorithm for late-onset efavirenz neurotoxicity. *S Afr Med J*. 2018;108(4):271-274. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29629676.
7. Mallal S, Phillips E, Carosi G, et al. HLA-B*5701 screening for hypersensitivity to abacavir. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;358(6):568-579. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18256392.
8. Saag M, Balu R, Phillips E, et al. High sensitivity of human leukocyte antigen-b*5701 as a marker for immunologically confirmed abacavir hypersensitivity in white and black patients. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2008;46(7):1111-1118. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18444831.
9. Variava E, Sigauke FR, Norman J, et al. Brief Report: Late efavirenz-induced ataxia and encephalopathy: a case series. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2017;75(5):577-579. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28520619.
10. Gounden V, van Niekerk C, Snyman T, George JA. Presence of the CYP2B6 516G> T polymorphism, increased plasma efavirenz concentrations and early neuropsychiatric side effects in South African HIV-infected patients. *AIDS Res Ther*. 2010;7:32. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20723261.
11. Abdelhady AM, Shugg T, Thong N, et al. Efavirenz inhibits the human ether-a-go-go related current (hERG) and induces QT interval prolongation in CYP2B6*6*6 allele carriers. *J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol*. 2016;27(10):1206-1213. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27333947.
12. Rodriguez-Novoa S, Martin-Carbonero L, Barreiro P, et al. Genetic factors influencing atazanavir plasma concentrations and the risk of severe hyperbilirubinemia. *AIDS*. 2007;21(1):41-46. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17148966.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Cost Considerations and Antiretroviral Therapy (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

The clinical benefits, public health impact, and cost-effectiveness of HIV treatment are well established since the advent of combination antiretroviral therapy (ART); as a result, expanded use of ART is one of the four pillars of the "Ending the HIV Epidemic: A Plan for America" initiative.[1-6] HIV treatment with ART is costly. A 2015 study using 2012 health care expenditure data estimated that the discounted lifetime medical costs for an individual who acquires HIV at age 35 years is $326,500 ($597,300, undiscounted), with 60% of the costs attributable to ART.[7] The estimated total direct expenditures for HIV/AIDS care and treatment between 2002 and 2011 was $10.7 billion, which is 800% to 900% higher than similar expenditures for other chronic conditions.[8] Total annual undiscounted spending on antiretroviral (ARV) drugs has more than doubled since 2010, reaching $22.5 billion in 2018.[9,10] Consequently, ART was among the top five therapeutic classes in non-discounted spending on medicine in 2018, after medications for diabetes and autoimmune diseases, cancer drugs, and respiratory agents.[10]

These guidelines first included an ARV cost table in 2012.[11] Since that time, the overall cost of brand-name, first-line ART regimens has increased more than 30%. The cost of ART, especially costs to the patient, should be one of the many considerations in regimen selection because such expenditures may directly impact adherence. Overall costs to the health care system, to insurers, and to society are also important, especially given the increasing number of people who require lifelong ART and rising drug costs.

Cost Sharing in the United States

Prescription drug pricing in the United States involves complex systems with varying requirements for mandatory and voluntary discounts, rebates, and reimbursement rates, and much of the pricing information is confidential. Prices can vary depending on the state, purchaser, the type of public or private insurance coverage in use, and the number of generic competitors to branded drugs (see Table 19b). Therefore, providers may find it difficult to navigate payer cost-containment practices, including formulary restrictions, prior authorization requirements, and patient cost-sharing arrangements, such as copayments (a fixed dollar amount per prescription), co-insurance (a fixed percentage of the prescription cost), and insurance deductible payments.

Out-of-pocket costs for patients can be prohibitive, creating a barrier to the initiation and continuation of ART. Cost sharing results in higher rates of patients not initiating ART and prescription abandonment at the pharmacy, decreased adherence, more frequent drug discontinuation, and increased use of the medical system among patients with chronic diseases.[12-17] Conversely, reducing patient out-of-pocket costs (e.g., through manufacturer copayment-assistance programs or by prescribing generic drugs instead of more costly brand-name products) has been associated with improved adherence.[18] Given the clear association between out-of-pocket costs and the ability to pay for and adhere to medications, clinicians should minimize patients' out-of-pocket drug-related expenses whenever possible. However, many of the cost-sharing arrangements that determine out-of-pocket costs are not transparent to clinicians or patients at the time decisions on ART are made.

Maximum allowable copayments on prescription drugs covered by Medicaid can vary by family income but are usually nominal. For commercial insurers, cost sharing is generally subject to maximum payment rules under the Affordable Care Act. Manufacturer cost-sharing assistance programs are available for most brand-name ARV products but may be restricted by pharmacy and by state. Manufacturer copay assistance may also be subject to copay accumulator programs implemented by insurers' pharmacy benefit managers, whereby manufacturer payments do not count toward a patient's deductible or out-of-pocket maximum.

Medicare Part D plan cost sharing can include deductibles and copayments or coinsurance, including out-of-pocket payments of up to 25% on prescription drugs during the annual coverage gap phase ("donut hole") and up to 5% during the annual catastrophic coverage phase.[19] Low-income beneficiaries may qualify for subsidies to defray cost-sharing payments. Manufacturer copay assistance programs may not be applied toward Medicare plan cost sharing, but assistance from independent foundations (e.g., Patient Access

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Network Foundation, Patient Advocate Foundation) may provide cost-sharing support if financial eligibility criteria are met.

AIDS Drug Assistance Programs (ADAPs), through the Ryan White HIV/AIDS Program, make ARVs and other prescription drugs accessible to people with HIV who are underinsured and have limited financial resources. Further, many ADAPs provide premium and cost-sharing assistance to eligible clients covered by Medicaid, commercial insurance plans, or Medicare Part D plans.

Generic Antiretrovirals and Multi-Tablet Regimens

In 2017, savings to the U.S. health care system generated by the use of generic drugs and biosimilar products totaled $265 billion, including $40.6 billion and $82.7 billion in savings to Medicaid and Medicare, respectively.[20]

With substantial improvements in the long-term safety and effectiveness of contemporary ART, a number of regimens and regimen components in Table 6a remain listed beyond their patent protection date and are or will be available as lower-cost generic options. In one study, the savings associated with a transition to a hypothetical lower-cost generic ART could potentially help cover the 20-year, $480 billion projected costs to reach national treatment targets.[5]

Some research informs the cost impact of use of specific generic ARV regimens or regimen components. In a cost-effectiveness analysis conducted before the availability of integrase strand transfer inhibitors (INSTIs), the use of generic efavirenz (EFV) had an estimated saving of nearly $1 billion, and a regimen with generic EFV was very cost-effective.[2] A more recent study describes a 25% reduction in both the wholesale acquisition cost and federal supply schedule cost associated with switching from branded coformulated dolutegravir/abacavir/lamivudine (DTG/ABC/3TC) to branded DTG plus generic ABC and generic 3TC.[2,21]

A number of generic options of ARV regimen components included in Table 6a are commercially available. Generic tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF), generic 3TC, or a lower-cost brand-name coformulation of TDF and 3TC may be combined with DTG or raltegravir. Generic versions of ABC, 3TC, and ABC/3TC are also available for use with DTG. Generic versions of EFV, atazanavir, and ritonavir are available for use, along with lower-cost brand-name coformulations of EFV (either 600 mg or 400 mg) with TDF and 3TC. TDF and 3TC have also been coformulated with doravirine, with a list price that is moderately lower than other single-tablet regimens containing only proprietary ARVs (Table 19b).

There is keen interest in assessing the economic value of using newer, more expensive drugs that have only incremental clinical benefits when compared with older, less expensive drugs. One study investigated the cost-effectiveness of TDF- versus TAF-based regimens.[22] The study demonstrated that the similar efficacy—but slightly improved toxicity profile—of the TAF-based regimens would justify a $1,000 higher annual premium for the TAF-based regimens. The study further highlighted that once generic TDF becomes available at much lower costs, TAF-based regimens will only remain cost-effective if their annual cost is no more than $1,000 above that of generically available TDF-based regimen. (Generic TDF was approved in 2018.)

The use of DTG plus generic 3TC for initial therapy has been evaluated in a cost-containment analysis. One study projected that if just 50% of patients with newly diagnosed HIV initiated a two-pill regimen consisting of branded DTG plus generic 3TC, the cost savings would reach $550 to $800 million over a 5-year period.[23] If 25% of patients with sustained viral suppression switched to branded DTG plus generic 3TC maintenance therapy, cost savings were projected to exceed $3 billion in just 5 years.[23]

Because all commercially available single-tablet regimens (STRs) (including those containing ARV components that are no longer patent protected) are branded products, use of generics in the United States may necessitate modest increases in pill burden, but without changes in drug frequency. One study of Medicare Part D spending, which included expenditures for one ARV fixed-dose combination tablet (ABC/3TC), demonstrated that splitting up brand-name coformulated products into their generic components could have saved Medicare an

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

estimated $2.7 billion from 2011 through 2016, and highlighted this approach as a critical cost-containment measure.[24] However, to the extent that pill burden, rather than drug frequency, results in reduced adherence, generic ART could lead to decreased costs but at the potential expense of worsening virologic suppression rates and poorer clinical outcomes.[14,15] Additionally, a benefit of STRs is that there is no risk that one drug in the regimen will be temporarily or permanently discontinued due to prescribing error, unsynchronized refill schedules, or prohibitive out-of-pocket costs. Data to support or refute the superiority of once-daily STRs versus once-daily multi-tablet regimens, particularly based on virologic outcomes and especially following viral suppression, remain limited. One large observational cohort study demonstrated a small but statistically significant virologic efficacy benefit associated with STRs.[25] In this study, the time to treatment discontinuation was shorter for non-STRs than for STR once-daily regimens; however, this difference disappeared when modifications for regimen simplification were included in the analysis.

Importantly, when the costs of brand-name drug products and generic ARV drugs are compared, savings associated with generic ARV drugs may vary when branded drugs are subject to discounts or rebates across public and private payer systems. Although generic drug products may be associated with societal cost savings and, specifically, savings for public payers, commercial insurers, and people with HIV with significant out-of-pocket pharmacy expenses, manufacturer copay assistance is generally not available to commercially insured individuals. In cases where manufacturer copay assistance may be available for a brand-name ARV product but not for an equivalent generic ARV product, the generic drug prescription paradoxically may result in higher out-of-pocket costs.

Laboratory Services

In the context of lifelong ART, the amount of money to be saved by performing infrequent or one-time only tests (e.g. genotypes or serologies), even expensive tests, is modest. Even so, judicious use of laboratory testing, without compromising patient care, can still be an important way to reduce costs. For patients with deductibles for laboratory tests, decreasing the use of tests with limited clinical value could reduce patient costs and improve adherence to a care plan. Several studies have examined the value of laboratory services in HIV care. One cost analysis study suggested that there may be no clinical benefit to continuing CD4 monitoring in patients with suppressed viral loads and CD4 counts >200 cells/mm^3 after 48 weeks of therapy.[16] In the United States, reducing biannual CD4 monitoring to annual monitoring could save approximately $10 million per year.[26] Another study examined more than 250 patients with HIV who were hospitalized over 500 times in a 6-month period. The inpatient chart review demonstrated that 45% of ordered laboratory tests were not indicated—including hepatitis serologies, other serologies, and cytomegalovirus polymerase chain reaction. During this 6-month period at this single site, the estimated cost of excess and inappropriate laboratory testing totaled $14,000 to $92,000.[27]

Cost-effectiveness analyses from 2001 and 2005 demonstrated the value of genotype resistance testing in ART-experienced and ART-naive patients and supported the guidelines' recommendation for performing resistance testing before ART initiation and at time of virologic failure.[28,29] More recent cost-effectiveness analyses have revisited the value of baseline, pre-treatment genotype testing in the setting of INSTI plus two-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) regimens. One modeling study suggested that INSTI-specific genotype testing before initiation of a DTG plus two NRTIs regimen was not cost-effective and may lead to underutilization of INSTIs; the results highlighted that some patients with INSTI-resistance would still become virologically suppressed on a DTG-based regimen.[30] A second modeling study found that standard (NRTI, non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor, protease inhibitor) genotype testing before ART initiation was also not cost-effective because it may have little impact on outcomes given the use of an INSTI plus 2 NRTIs in first-line treatment.[31] Both of these modeling studies only assessed the use of genotype testing for decision making for initial ART, and presumed such testing would be available for use at the time of first-line failure. The results of these modeling studies suggest that additional clinical research is needed to define the role of genotypic resistance testing before initiation of an INSTI plus 2-NRTI regimen.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Importantly, these modelling data do not apply to two-drug ARV regimens, which are increasingly being prescribed in clinical practice. It should be noted that the Panel continues to recommend baseline testing for clinically relevant protease and reverse transcriptase mutations (see Drug-Resistance Testing section).

Conclusion

Ideally, costs should not drive clinical care, yet they are a factor in contemporary health care. Because regimen costs may impact patients' ability to afford and adhere to therapy, understanding ART-related costs in the United States is increasingly important. Providers play a key role in ensuring optimal care while working to both: 1) minimize costs for ARV drugs and avoid or minimize unnecessary laboratory monitoring and 2) retain excellent clinical outcomes in an environment of cost-containment strategies, including formulary restrictions, utilization management (e.g., prior authorization), and cost sharing. Providers should therefore remain informed of current insurance and payment structures, ART costs (see Table 19b below for estimates of drugs' average prices), out-of-pocket expenditure requirements, and available generic ARV options. Providers should work with patients and their pharmacists, social workers, case managers, and/or peer navigators to understand their patients' medication benefits and any potential financial barriers to prescription fulfillment. This information will help providers identify treatment options that are safe, effective, and affordable. Engaging with patients about any cost constraints during the process of regimen selection will likely facilitate adherence. Additionally, providers should familiarize themselves with ARV affordability resources (such as ADAP and pharmaceutical company assistance programs for patients who qualify) and refer patients to such assistance if needed.

Table 19a. Insurance and Health Program Prescription Drug Pricing and Access (page 1 of 2)

Insurance/Health Program	Prescription Drug Pricing and Access
Medicaid	Drug manufacturers must participate in MDRP for their drugs to be covered by Medicaid and under Medicare Part B. Manufacturers are required to pay Medicaid programs a rebate of at least 23.1% of the average price paid to manufacturers by wholesalers (AMP) for most brand-name drugs sold to retail pharmacies (13% for generics). Manufacturers pay additional rebates if this confidential AMP increases faster than the CPI-U rate of inflation. States are permitted to require "nominal" cost-sharing for medical and pharmacy benefits for some beneficiaries though many elect not to do so. States can obtain a waiver to allow them to apply higher cost-sharing.
Medicare	ARVs are one of six "protected drug classes" under Medicare Part D. Part D plans must provide access to all, or substantially all, FDA-approved ARVs. Part D plan sponsors, or PBMs on their behalf, negotiate rebates on outpatient drugs with manufacturers; the extent of rebating is unclear. Most physician-administered drugs and biologics are covered under Medicare Part B at a set cost: ASP plus 6%. This pricing mechanism controls spending by narrowing the spread between what is actually paid for the drug and what is actually billed to Medicare. Premiums and cost-sharing payments may be significant for both services and prescription drugs; there is no cap on out-of-pocket spending under Part A (hospital care) and Part B. Some subsidies and supplemental coverage are offered for low-income beneficiaries. Manufacturer copay assistance programs cannot be applied to Part B or Part D cost sharing; cost sharing support is available from ADAPs, foundations, and other sources, based on financial eligibility criteria.
Commercial Insurance	Private insurance plans, or PBMs on their behalf, negotiate rebates on inpatient and outpatient drugs with manufacturers; the extent of rebating is unclear. Formulary restrictions and utilization management (prior authorization, step therapy, higher cost sharing) are possible as cost-containment measures. Cost sharing can be highly variable. Manufacturer copay assistance programs can be applied in most cases but may not count toward annual Affordable Care Act cost sharing limits; cost sharing support is also available from ADAPs, foundations, and other sources based on financial eligibility criteria.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 19a. Insurance and Health Program Prescription Drug Pricing and Access (page 2 of 2)

Insurance/Health Program	Prescription Drug Pricing and Access
ADAPs	Significant discounting on most ARVs negotiated by the ADAP Crisis Task Force is allowed under the 340B Drug Pricing Program. There is usually no cost sharing for ADAP clients who are uninsured. ADAP can assist with commercial or public insurance out-of-pocket costs.
Veterans Affairs	The FCP is the maximum price manufacturers may charge the four largest federal purchasers of pharmaceuticals (the "Big Four"): The Department of Veterans Affairs, the Department of Defense, the Public Health Service (including the Indian Health Service), and the Coast Guard. The FCP of a drug includes a 24% discount on a drug's average price paid by non-federal purchasers. Additional discounts may be applied if non-federal purchase prices increase faster than the CPI-U inflation rate. Big Four prices may be 40% to 50% below list prices. VA may negotiate further price reductions. Prescription drug cost sharing is generally nominal; medications are not withheld from those who cannot afford cost sharing expenses.
Community Health Centers	Many community health centers are enrolled in the 340B Drug Pricing Program, which allows for discounted drug purchasing using the MDRP formula. Discounts start at 23.1% off AMP, with additional discounts if the AMP increases faster than the CPI-U rate of inflation. Cost-sharing in community health centers is first driven by payer source. For clients who are uninsured, cost-sharing, if required, is typically based on a sliding fee scale.

Key: ADAP = AIDS Drug Assistance Programs; AMP = average manufacturer price; ARV = antiretroviral; ASP = average sales price; CPI-U = consumer price index-urban; FCP = Federal Ceiling Price; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; MDRP = Medicaid Drug Rebate Program; PBM = pharmacy benefits manager; VA = Veterans Affairs

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 19b. Monthly Average Prices of Commonly Used Antiretroviral Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 5)

Table 19b includes three benchmark prices, rounded to the nearest dollar, for commonly used ARV drugs[a] as a general reference for health care providers when considering the cost of HIV treatment. Health care providers should contact patients' pharmacies or payers regarding actual prices, comparative cost savings, formulary restrictions, and patient cost-sharing requirements.

Wholesale acquisition cost (WAC) is the list price published by manufacturers for prescription drugs or biologics sold to wholesalers. The WAC price approximates what retail pharmacies pay wholesalers for single-source (e.g., brand-name) drugs. There is a range of WAC prices for generic ARV drugs, as these are multiple-source products with variable list prices. With increasing competition, actual transactional prices of generic drugs among wholesalers and pharmacies decrease substantially. **Average wholesale price (AWP)** has historically been used as the basis for setting public (e.g., Medicaid) and private (e.g., commercial insurer) reimbursement rates for pharmacies. Neither WAC nor AWP include variable price concessions along supply and payment chains, including discounts and rebates to wholesalers, pharmacies, federal purchasers (e.g., the Veterans' Administration), pharmacy benefit managers (PBMs), commercial insurers, Medicaid, 340B pharmacies, and AIDS Drug Assistance Programs. The availability of these discounts and rebates depends on product demand, market competition, and WAC price increases set by manufacturers. Maximum prices are assigned to generic products with three or more therapeutically and pharmaceutically equivalent products, as determined by the Food and Drug Administration. This federally established price is the **federal upper limit (FUL)**. Federal Medicaid will reimburse state Medicaid programs up to this limit for multiple-source drugs (plus the dispensing fee); commercial insurers set their own reimbursement upper limits with pharmacies. Whereas WACs and AWPs are generally set annually, FULs are adjusted on a monthly basis, particularly for multiple-source drugs with fluctuating pharmacy acquisition costs. In the table below, the FUL for a drug is described as "pending" if a generic drug currently lacks the competition required to trigger a FUL.

ARV Drug (Generic and Brand Names)	Strength, Formulation	Tablets, Capsules, or mLs per Month	WAC (Monthly)[b]	AWP (Monthly)[b]	FUL (As of Oct. 31, 2019)[c]
NRTIs					
Abacavir					
• Generic	300 mg tablet	60 tablets	$150 to $482	$502 to $603	$43
• Ziagen	300 mg tablet	60 tablets	$559	$670	
Emtricitabine					
• Emtriva	200 mg capsule	30 capsules	$537	$644	N/A
Lamivudine					
• Generic	300 mg tablet	30 tablets	$75 to $343	$324 to $430	$51
• Epivir	300 mg tablet	30 tablets	$416	$499	
Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate					
• Generic	300 mg tablet	30 tablets	$27 to $163	$110 to $1,216	$203
• Viread	300 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,196	$1,435	

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 19. Monthly Average Prices of Commonly Used Antiretroviral Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 5)

ARV Drug (Generic and Brand Names)	Strength, Formulation	Tablets, Capsules, or mLs per Month	WAC (Monthly)[b]	AWP (Monthly)[b]	FUL (As of Oct. 31, 2019)[c]
NRTIs, continued					
Zidovudine					
• Generic	300 mg tablet	60 tablets	$36 to $54	$54 to $365	$13
NRTI Combination Products					
Abacavir/Lamivudine					
• Generic	600 mg/300 mg tablet	30 tablets	$185 to $1,116	$1,393 to $1,550	$182
• Epzicom	600 mg/300 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,292	$1,550	
Tenofovir Alafenamide/Emtricitabine					
• Descovy	25 mg/200 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,758	$2,109	N/A
Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Emtricitabine					
• Truvada	300 mg/200 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,676	$2,011	N/A
Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Lamivudine					
• Cimduo	300 mg/300 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,005	$1,207	N/A
• Temixys	300 mg/300 mg tablet	30 tablets	$850	$1,020	N/A
Zidovudine/Lamivudine					
• Generic	300 mg/150 mg tablet	60 tablets	$134 to $578	$878 to $932	$123
• Combivir	300 mg/150 mg tablet	60 tablets	$901	$1,082	
Abacavir Sulfate/Zidovudine/Lamivudine					
• Generic	300 mg/300 mg/150 mg tablet	60 tablets	$1,391	$1,738	Pending
• Trizivir	300 mg/300 mg/150 mg tablet	60 tablets	$1,610	$1,932	
NNRTIs					
Efavirenz					
• Generic	600 mg tablet	30 tablets	$894 to $980	$1,073 to $1,117	$768
• Sustiva	600 mg tablet	30 tablets	$981	$1,177	
Doravirine					
• Pifeltro	100 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,380	$1,656	N/A
Etravirine					
• Intelence	200 mg tablet	60 tablets	$1,366	$1,628	N/A

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 19. Monthly Average Prices of Commonly Used Antiretroviral Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 3 of 5)

ARV Drug (Generic and Brand Names)	Strength, Formulation	Tablets, Capsules, or mLs per Month	WAC (Monthly)[b]	AWP (Monthly)[b]	FUL (As of Oct. 31, 2019)[c]
NNRTIs, continued					
Nevirapine					
• Generic	200 mg tablet	60 tablets	$10 to $45	$648 to $651	$65
• Viramune	200 mg tablet	60 tablets	$906	$1,087	
• Generic XR	400 mg tablet	30 tablets	$135 to $565	$595 to $706	$392
• Viramune XR	400 mg tablet	30 tablets	$840	$1,008	
Rilpivirine					
• Edurant	25 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,115	$1,338	N/A
PIs					
Atazanavir					
• Generic	200 mg capsule	60 capsules	$445 to $1,264	$1,517 to $1,668	$1,405
• Reyataz	200 mg capsule	60 capsules	$1,463	$1,756	
• Generic	300 mg capsule	30 capsules	$445 to $1,252	$1,502 to $1,652	$1,032
• Reyataz	300 mg capsule	30 capsules	$1,449	$1,739	
Atazanavir/Cobicistat					
• Evotaz	300/150 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,605	$1,927	N/A
Darunavir					
• Prezista	600 mg tablet	60 tablets	$1,690	$2,028	N/A
• Prezista	800 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,690	$2,028	N/A
• Prezista	100 mg/mL suspension	200 mL	$939	$1,126	N/A
Darunavir/Cobicistat					
• Prezcobix	800 mg/150 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,931	$2,317	N/A
Lopinavir/Ritonavir					
• Kaletra	200 mg/50 mg tablet	120 tablets	$1,024	$1,229	N/A
Tipranavir					
• Aptivus	250 mg capsule	120 capsules	$1,673	$2,008	N/A
INSTIs					
Dolutegravir					
• Tivicay	50 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,740	$2,089	N/A

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 19. Monthly Average Prices of Commonly Used Antiretroviral Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 4 of 5)

ARV Drug (Generic and Brand Names)	Strength, Formulation	Tablets, Capsules, or mLs per Month	WAC (Monthly)[b]	AWP (Monthly)[b]	FUL (As of Oct. 31, 2019)[c]
INSTIs, continued					
• Tivicay	50 mg tablet	60 tablets	$3,480	$4,178	N/A
Raltegravir					
• Isentress	400 mg tablet	60 tablets	$1,574	$1,889	N/A
• Isentress HD	600 mg tablet	60 tablets	$1,574	$1,889	N/A
Fusion Inhibitor					
Enfuvirtide					
• Fuzeon	90 mg injection kit	60 doses (1 kit)	$3,586	$4,303	N/A
CCR5 Antagonist					
Maraviroc					
• Selzentry	150 mg tablet	60 tablets	$1,556	$1,867	N/A
• Selzentry	300 mg tablet	60 tablets	$1,556	$1,867	N/A
• Selzentry	300 mg tablet	120 tablets	$3,112	$3,734	N/A
CD4-Directed Post-Attachment Inhibitor					
Ibalizumab-uiyk					
• Trogarzo	200 mg vial	8 vials	$9,080	$10,896	N/A
Coformulated Combination Products as Single-Tablet Regimens					
Bictegravir/Tenofovir Alafenamide/Emtricitabine					
• Biktarvy	50 mg/25 mg/200 mg tablet	30 tablets	$3,089	$3,707	N/A
Darunavir/Cobicistat/Tenofovir Alafenamide/Emtricitabine					
• Symtuza	800 mg/150 mg/10 mg/200 mg tablet	30 tablets	$3,722	$4,466	N/A
Dolutegravir/Abacavir/Lamivudine					
• Triumeq	50 mg/600 mg/300 mg tablet	30 tablets	$2,889	$3,467	N/A
Dolutegravir/Lamivudine					
• Dovato	50 mg/300 mg tablet	30 tablets	$2,295	$2,754	N/A
Dolutegravir/Rilpivirine					
• Juluca	50 mg/25 mg tablet	30 tablets	$2,707	$3,249	N/A
Doravirine/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Lamivudine					
• Delstrigo	100 mg/300 mg/300 mg tablet	30 tablets	$2,100	$2,520	N/A

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 19. Monthly Average Prices of Commonly Used Antiretroviral Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 5 of 5)

ARV Drug (Generic and Brand Names)	Strength, Formulation	Tablets, Capsules, or mLs per Month	WAC (Monthly)[b]	AWP (Monthly)[b]	FUL (As of Oct. 31, 2019)[c]
Coformulated Combination Products as Single-Tablet Regimens, continued					
Efavirenz/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Emtricitabine					
• Atripla	600 mg/300 mg/200 mg tablet	30 tablets	$2,858	$3,429	N/A
Efavirenz/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Lamivudine					
• Symfi	600 mg/300 mg/150 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,634	$1,961	N/A
• Symfi Lo	400 mg/300 mg/150 mg tablet	30 tablets	$1,634	$1,961	N/A
Elvitegravir/Cobicistat/Tenofovir Alafenamide/Emtricitabine					
• Genvoya	150 mg/150 mg/10 mg/200 mg tablet	30 tablets	$3,090	$3,708	N/A
Elvitegravir/Cobicistat/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Emtricitabine					
• Stribild	150 mg/150 mg/300 mg/200 mg tablet	30 tablets	$3,241	$3,889	N/A
Rilpivirine/Tenofovir Alafenamide/Emtricitabine					
• Odefsey	25 mg/25 mg/200 mg tablet	30 tablets	$2,812	$3,375	N/A
Rilpivirine/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Emtricitabine					
• Complera	25 mg/300 mg/200 mg tablet	30 tablets	$2,812	$3,375	N/A
PK Enhancers (Boosters)					
Cobicistat					
• Tybost	150 mg tablet	30 tablets	$230	$277	N/A
Ritonavir					
• Generic	100 mg tablet	30 tablets	$80 to $222	$278	$78
• Norvir	100 mg tablet	30 tablets	$257	$309	

[a] The following less commonly used ARV drugs are not included in this table: DLV, ddI, FPV, IDV, NFV, SQV, and d4T.

[b] Source: Micromedex Red Book [database]. IBM Watson Health. 2019. Available at: https://www.micromedexsolutions.com

[c] Source: Federal Upper Limits–October 2019 [database]. Medicare & Medicaid Services. 2019. Available at: https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/prescription-drugs/pharmacy-pricing/index.html.

Key: ARV = antiretroviral; AWP = average wholesale price; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; d4t = stavudine; ddI = didanosine; DLV = delavirdine; FPV = fosamprenavir; FUL = federal upper limit; HD = high dose; IDV = indinavir; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; N/A = not applicable; NFV = nelfinavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; SQV = saquinavir; WAC = wholesale acquisition cost; XR = extended release

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

References

1. Freedberg KA, Losina E, Weinstein MC, et al. The cost effectiveness of combination antiretroviral therapy for HIV disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2001;344(11):824-831. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11248160.

2. Walensky RP, Sax PE, Nakamura YM, et al. Economic savings versus health losses: the cost-effectiveness of generic antiretroviral therapy in the United States. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013;158(2):84-92. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23318310.

3. Bayoumi AM, Barnett PG, Joyce VR, et al. Cost-effectiveness of newer antiretroviral drugs in treatment-experienced patients with multidrug-resistant HIV disease. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2013;64(4):382-391. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24129369.

4. Holmes C, Hallett T, Walensky R, Barnighausen T, Pillay Y, Cohen M. Effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of treatment as prevention for HIV. In: Holmes K, Bertozzi S, Bloom B, Jha P, eds. *Major Infectious Diseases*. 3 ed. Washington (DC): The World Bank; 2017.

5. Borre ED, Hyle EP, Paltiel AD, et al. The clinical and economic impact of attaining national HIV/AIDS strategy treatment targets in the United States. *J Infect Dis*. 2017;216(7):798-807. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29029344.

6. Walensky RP, Ross EL, Kumarasamy N, et al. Cost-effectiveness of HIV treatment as prevention in serodiscordant couples. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;369(18):1715-1725. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24171517.

7. Schackman BR, Fleishman JA, Su AE, et al. The lifetime medical cost savings from preventing HIV in the United States. *Med Care.* 2015;53(4):293-301. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25710311.

8. Ritchwood TD, Bishu KG, Egede LE. Trends in healthcare expenditure among people living with HIV/AIDS in the United States: evidence from 10 Years of nationally representative data. *Int J Equity Health*. 2017;16(1):188. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29078785.

9. Aitken M, Kleinrock M, Lyle J, Nass D, Caskey L. Medicines use and spending shifts: a review of the use of medicines in the U.S. in 2014. IMS Institute for Healthcare Informatics. 2015. Available at: https://www.iqvia.com/-/media/iqvia/pdfs/institute-reports/medicines-use-and-spending-shifts-in-the-us-in-2014.pdf?la=en&hash=34E4E2AD15D82812DD3FAA229854A0E9.

10. IQVIA Institute for Human Data Science. Medicine use and spending in the U.S.: a review of 2018 and outlook to 2023. 2019. Available at: https://www.iqvia.com/insights/the-iqvia-institute/reports/medicine-use-and-spending-in-the-us-a-review-of-2018-and-outlook-to-2023.

11. AIDS*info*. Archived adult and adolescent guidelines. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Available at: https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines/archive/adult-and-adolescent-guidelines.

12. Zamani-Hank Y. The Affordable Care Act and the burden of high cost sharing and utilization management restrictions on access to HIV medications for people living with HIV/AIDS. *Popul Health Manag*. 2016;19(4):272-278. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26565514.

13. Goldman DP, Joyce GF, Zheng Y. Prescription drug cost sharing: associations with medication and medical utilization and spending and health. *JAMA*. 2007;298(1):61-69. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17609491.

14. Doshi JA, Li P, Ladage VP, Pettit AR, Taylor EA. Impact of cost sharing on specialty drug utilization and outcomes: a review of the evidence and future directions. *Am J Manag Care*. 2016;22(3):188-197. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27023024.

15. Kolasa K, Kowalczyk M. Does cost sharing do more harm or more good? - a systematic literature review. *BMC Public Health*. 2016;16:992. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27633253.

16. Campbell DJ, Soril LJ, Clement F. Impact of cost-sharing mechanisms on patient-borne medication costs. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2016;176(11):1703-1704. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27618359.

17. Remler DK, Greene J. Cost-sharing: a blunt instrument. *Annu Rev Public Health*. 2009;30:293-311. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18976141.

18. Maciejewski ML, Farley JF, Parker J, Wansink D. Copayment reductions generate greater medication adherence in

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

targeted patients. *Health Aff*. 2010;29(11):2002-2008. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21041739.

19. Kaiser Family Foundation. An overview of the Medicare Part D prescription drug benefit. 2018. Available at: https://www.kff.org/medicare/fact-sheet/an-overview-of-the-medicare-part-d-prescription-drug-benefit/.

20. Association for Accessible Medicines. The case for competition: 2019 generic drug & biosimilars access & savings in the U.S. report. 2019. Available at: https://accessiblemeds.org/sites/default/files/2019-09/AAM-2019-Generic-Biosimilars-Access-and-Savings-US-Report-WEB.pdf.

21. Martin EG, Schackman BR. Treating and preventing HIV with generic drugs–barriers in the United States. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;378(4):316-319. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29365306.

22. Walensky RP, Horn TH, Paltiel AD. The epi-TAF for tenofovir disoproxil fumarate? *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;62(7):915-918. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26658300.

23. Girouard MP, Sax PE, Parker RA, et al. The cost-effectiveness and budget impact of 2-drug dolutegravir-lamivudine regimens for the treatment of HIV infection in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;62(6):784-791. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26658053.

24. Sacks CA, Lee CC, Kesselheim AS, Avorn J. Medicare spending on brand-name combination medications vs their generic constituents. *JAMA*. 2018;320(7):650-656. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30140875.

25. Cotte L, Ferry T, Pugliese P, et al. Effectiveness and tolerance of single tablet versus once daily multiple tablet regimens as first-line antiretroviral therapy—results from a large french multicenter cohort study. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(2):e0170661. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28152047.

26. Hyle EP, Sax PE, Walensky RP. Potential savings by reduced CD4 monitoring in stable patients with HIV receiving antiretroviral therapy. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2013;173(18):1746-1748. Available at: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23978894.

27. Bolles K, Woc-Colburn L, Hamill RJ, Hemmige V. Ordering patterns and costs of specialized laboratory testing by hospitalists and house staff in hospitalized patients with HIV at a county hospital: an opportunity for diagnostic stewardship. *Open Forum Infect Di*s. 2019;6(6):ofz158. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31205970.

28. Weinstein MC, Goldie SJ, Losina E, et al. Use of genotypic resistance testing to guide HIV therapy: clinical impact and cost-effectiveness. *Ann Intern Med*. 2001;134(6):440-450. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11255519.

29. Sax PE, Islam R, Walensky RP, et al. Should resistance testing be performed for treatment-naive HIV-infected patients? A cost-effectiveness analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;41(9):1316-1323. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16206108.

30. Koullias Y, Sax PE, Fields NF, Walensky RP, Hyle EP. Should we be testing for baseline integrase resistance in patients newly diagnosed with human immunodeficiency virus? *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017;65(8):1274-1281. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28605418.

31. Hyle EP, Scott JA, Sax PE, et al. Clinical impact and cost-effectiveness of genotype testing at HIV diagnosis in the United States. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2019. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31055599.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Drug-Drug Interactions (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Pharmacokinetic (PK) drug-drug interactions between antiretroviral (ARV) drugs and concomitant medications are common and may lead to increased or decreased drug exposure. In some instances, changes in drug exposure may increase the frequency and/or severity of toxicities or affect therapeutic responses. When prescribing or switching one or more drugs in an ARV regimen, clinicians must consider the potential for drug-drug interactions—both those affecting ARVs and those affecting concomitant drugs. A thorough review of concomitant medications in consultation with an expert in ARV pharmacology can help in designing a regimen that minimizes undesirable interactions. Recommendations for managing a specific drug interaction may differ depending on whether a new ARV is being initiated in a patient on a stable concomitant medication or a new concomitant medication is being initiated in a patient on a stable ARV regimen. The magnitude and significance of interactions are difficult to predict when several drugs with competing metabolic pathways are prescribed concomitantly. When it is necessary to prescribe interacting drugs, clinicians should be vigilant in monitoring for therapeutic efficacy and/or concentration-related toxicities. Tables 21a through 22b provide information on known or suspected drug interactions between ARV agents and commonly prescribed medications based on published PK data or information from product labels. The tables provide general guidance on drugs that should not be coadministered and recommendations for dose modification of ARVs or concomitant medicines or for alternative therapy.

Mechanisms of Pharmacokinetic Interactions

PK interactions may occur during absorption, metabolism, or elimination of the ARV and/or the interacting drugs. The most common drug interaction mechanisms are described below and listed for individual ARV drugs in Table 20.

Pharmacokinetic Interactions Affecting Drug Absorption

The extent of oral absorption of drugs can be affected by the following mechanisms:

- Acid-reducing agents, such as proton pump inhibitors, H2 antagonists, or antacids, can reduce the absorption of ARV drugs that require gastric acidity for optimal absorption (i.e., atazanavir and rilpivirine).
- Products that contain polyvalent cations, such as supplements, iron products, or antacids that contain aluminum, calcium, or magnesium, can bind to integrase strand transfer inhibitors (INSTIs) and reduce absorption of these ARV agents.
- Drugs that induce or inhibit the enzyme cytochrome P450 (CYP) 3A4 or efflux transporter P-glycoprotein in the intestines may reduce or promote the absorption of other drugs.

Pharmacokinetic Interactions Affecting Hepatic Metabolism

Two major enzyme systems are most frequently responsible for clinically significant drug interactions:

- The CYP450 enzyme system is responsible for the metabolism of many drugs, including the non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs), protease inhibitors (PIs), the CCR5 antagonist maraviroc, and the INSTI elvitegravir. CYP3A4 is the most common enzyme responsible for drug metabolism, though multiple enzymes may be involved in the metabolism of a drug. ARV drugs and concomitant medications may be inducers, inhibitors, and/or substrates of these enzymes.
- The uridine diphosphate glucuronosyltransferase (UGT) 1A1 enzyme is the primary enzyme responsible for the metabolism of the INSTI raltegravir. Drugs that induce or inhibit the UGT enzyme can affect the PKs of these INSTIs.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

- The INSTIs bictegravir and dolutegravir have mixed metabolic pathways, including both CYP3A4 and UGT1A1. Drugs that induce or inhibit these enzymes may have variable impact on the PKs of these INSTIs.

Pharmacokinetic Enhancers (Boosters)

PK enhancing is a strategy used to increase exposure of an ARV by concomitantly administering a drug that inhibits the enzymes that metabolize the ARV. Currently, two agents are used as PK enhancers: ritonavir (RTV) and cobicistat (COBI). Both drugs are potent inhibitors of the CYP3A4 enzyme, and thus, when coadministered with ARVs metabolized by the CYP3A4 pathway, the resultant systemic exposure of the ARVs is higher. Importantly, RTV and COBI have different effects on other CYP- or UGT-metabolizing enzymes and drug transporters. Complex or unknown mechanisms of PK-based interactions preclude extrapolation of RTV drug interactions to certain COBI interactions, such as interactions with warfarin, phenytoin, voriconazole, oral contraceptives, and certain HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors (or statins).

Other Mechanisms of Pharmacokinetic Interactions

Knowledge of drug transporters is evolving, elucidating additional drug interaction mechanisms. For example, DTG decreases the renal clearance of metformin by inhibiting organic cation transporters in renal tubular cells. Similar transporters aid hepatic, renal, and biliary clearance of drugs and may be susceptible to drug interactions. ARVs and concomitant medications may be inducers, inhibitors, and/or substrates of these drug transporters. The influence of drug transporters on drug-drug interactions is complex, and the clinical significance of these interactions is unclear but is under investigation. Further understanding of these pathways, and the clinical significance of this drug interaction mechanism is needed.

Role of Therapeutic Drug Monitoring in Managing Drug-Drug Interactions

Therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) can guide the dosing of certain medications by using measured drug concentrations to improve the likelihood of desired therapeutic and safety outcomes. Drugs suitable for TDM are characterized by a known exposure-response relationship and a therapeutic range of concentrations. The therapeutic range is a range of concentrations established through clinical investigations that are associated with a greater likelihood of achieving the desired therapeutic response and/or reducing the frequency of drug-associated adverse reactions.

When concomitant use of an ARV drug and another medication is likely to result in a clinically important drug-drug interaction, the first step is to assess whether other, equally effective treatment options can be used to avoid the interaction. If that is not possible, TDM may be useful in assessing whether a dose adjustment is needed.

Drug concentration assays for some ARV drugs are commercially available; however, results reporting may take 1 week or longer. When interpreting assay results, clinicians should consider the patient's medication adherence, the timing of last ARV dose and blood draw, and the time elapsed since coadministration of the interacting drug combination. If needed, a specialist in ARV clinical pharmacology should be consulted when interpreting the results and deciding what actions to take. If a dose adjustment is needed, TDM must be repeated after the dose-adjusted drug reaches steady state to assure appropriate dosing.

TDM information should not be used alone; it must be considered in conjunction with other clinical information, including virologic response and signs and symptoms of drug toxicities, to assure safe and effective therapy.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 20. Mechanisms of Antiretroviral-Associated Drug Interactions (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 2)

PK interactions may occur during absorption, metabolism, or elimination of the ARV drug and/or the interacting drug. This table does not include a comprehensive list of all possible mechanisms of interactions for individual ARV drugs (e.g., transporters); however, the table lists the most common mechanisms of known interactions and focuses on absorption and CYP- and UGT1A1-mediated interactions.

Note: N/A indicates that there are no clinically relevant interactions by the mechanism. Identified mechanisms are specific to the ARV drugs described in the row and may not be reflective of complete ARV regimens. The older PIs FPV, IDV, NFV, and SQV are not commonly used in clinical practice and are **not** included in this table. Please refer to the FDA product labels for FPV, IDV, NFV, and SQV for information regarding drug interactions with these PIs.

ARV Drugs by Drug Class	Mechanisms That May Affect Oral Absorption of ARV Drugs			Enzymes That Metabolize or are Induced or Inhibited by ARV Drugs			
	Increasing Gastric pH	Cationic Chelation	P-gp	CYP Substrate	CYP Inhibitor	CYP Inducer	UGT1A1
INSTIs							
BIC	N/A	Concentration decreased by products that contain polyvalent cations (e.g., Ca, Mg, Al, Fe, Zn)	Substrate	3A4	N/A	N/A	Substrate
DTG	N/A		Substrate	3A4 (minor)	N/A	N/A	Substrate
EVG/c	N/A		Inhibitor	3A4	3A4, 2D6	2C9	Substrate
RAL	N/A		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Substrate
PIs							
ATV	Concentration decreased	N/A	Substrate, Inducer, Inhibitor	3A4	3A4, 2C8	N/A	Inhibitor
ATV/c	Concentration decreased	N/A	Substrate, Inhibitor	3A4	3A4, 2D6, 2C8	N/A	Inhibitor
ATV/r	Concentration decreased	N/A	Substrate, Inhibitor	3A4, 2D6	3A4, 2D6, 2C8	1A2, 2B6, 2C8, 2C9, 2C19	**ATV:** Inhibitor **RTV:** Inducer
DRV/c	N/A	N/A	Substrate, effect on P-gp unknown	3A4	3A4, 2D6	N/A	No data
DRV/r	N/A	N/A	Substrate, effect on P-gp unknown	3A4, 2D6	3A4, 2D6	1A2, 2B6, 2C8, 2C9, 2C19	Inducer
LPV/r	N/A	N/A	Substrate	3A4, 2D6	3A4	1A2, 2B6, 2C8, 2C9, 2C19	Inducer
TPV/r	N/A	N/A	Substrate, Inducer	3A4, 2D6	3A4, 2D6	No data	Inducer
NNRTIs							
DOR	N/A	N/A	N/A	3A4, 3A5	N/A	N/A	N/A
EFV	N/A	N/A	N/A	2B6 (primary), 2A6, 3A4	3A4	3A4, 2B6, 2C19	N/A
ETR	N/A	N/A	N/A	3A4, 2C9, 2C19	2C9, 2C19	3A4	N/A

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 20. Mechanisms of Antiretroviral-Associated Drug Interactions (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 2)

ARV Drugs by Drug Class	Mechanisms That May Affect Oral Absorption of ARV Drugs			Enzymes That Metabolize or are Induced or Inhibited by ARV Drugs			
	Increasing Gastric pH	Cationic Chelation	P-gp	CYP Substrate	CYP Inhibitor	CYP Inducer	UGT1A1
NNRTIs, continued							
NVP	N/A	N/A	N/A	3A4, 2B6	N/A	3A4, 2B6	N/A
RPV	Concentration decreased	N/A	N/A	3A4	N/A	N/A	N/A
NRTIs							
ABC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Substrate
FTC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
3TC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TAF	N/A	N/A	Substrate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
TDF	N/A	N/A	Substrate	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
ZDV	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
CCR5 Antagonist							
MVC	N/A	N/A	Substrate	3A4	N/A	N/A	N/A
Fusion Inhibitor							
T-20	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Post-Attachment Inhibitor							
IBA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; Al = aluminum; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; BIC = bictegravir; Ca = calcium; COBI = cobicistat; CYP = cytochrome P; DOR = doravirine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; Fe = iron; FPV = fosamprenavir; FTC = emtricitabine; IBA = ibalizumab; IDV = indinavir; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; Mg = magnesium; MVC = maraviroc; NFV = nelfinavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors; NVP = nevirapine; P-gp = P-glycoprotein; PK = pharmacokinetic; PI = protease inhibitor; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SQV = saquinavir; T-20 = enfuvirtide; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TPV/r = tipranavir/ritonavir; UGT = uridine diphosphate glucuronosyltransferase; ZDV = zidovudine; Zn = zinc

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 19)

This table provides information on the known or predicted interactions between PIs and non-ARV drugs. When information is available, interactions for boosted ATV (with either RTV or COBI) and unboosted ATV are listed separately. The term "All PIs" refers to both unboosted ATV and PIs boosted with either RTV or COBI, except for FPV, IDV, NFV, and SQV. For information regarding interactions between PIs and other ARV drugs, including dosing recommendations, refer to Tables 21c, 22a, and 22b.

Recommendations for managing a particular drug interaction may differ depending on whether a new ARV drug is being initiated in a patient on a stable concomitant medication or whether a new concomitant medication is being initiated in a patient on a stable ARV regimen. The magnitude and significance of drug interactions are difficult to predict when several drugs with competing metabolic pathways are prescribed concomitantly. In cases where an interacting drug needs to be replaced with an alternative, providers should exercise their clinical judgement to select the most appropriate alternative medication to use.

Note: FPV, IDV, NFV, and SQV are no longer commonly used in clinical practice and are **not** included in this table. Please refer to the FDA product labels for FPV, IDV, NFV, and SQV for information regarding drug interactions between these PIs and concomitant medications.

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Acid Reducers			
Antacids	ATV, ATV/c, ATV/r	**When Given Simultaneously:** • ↓ ATV expected	Administer ATV at least 2 hours before or 1–2 hours after antacids or buffered medications.
	TPV/r	TPV AUC ↓ 27%	Administer TPV at least 2 hours before or 1 hour after antacids.
H2 Receptor Antagonists	ATV (unboosted)	**When Given Simultaneously with Famotidine:** • ATV AUC ↓ 41% **When Given 2 Hours Before and ≥10 Hours After H2RA:** • ↔ ATV	A single dose of H2RA should not exceed a dose equivalent to famotidine 20 mg, and the total daily dose should not exceed a dose equivalent to famotidine 20 mg twice daily in PI-naive patients. Give ATV at least 2 hours before and at least 10 hours after the H2RA. **Do not coadminister** unboosted ATV plus H2RA in PI-experienced patients.
	ATV/c, ATV/r	↓ ATV expected	H2RA dose should not exceed a dose equivalent to famotidine 40 mg twice daily in ART-naive patients or famotidine 20 mg twice daily in ART-experienced patients. Give ATV 300 mg (plus COBI 150 mg **or** RTV 100 mg) simultaneously with and/or ≥10 hours after the dose of H2RA. If using TDF and H2RA in ART-experienced patients, use ATV 400 mg (plus COBI 150 mg **or** RTV 100 mg).
	DRV/c, DRV/r, LPV/r, TPV/r	**With Ranitidine:** • ↔ DRV/r ↔ PI expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Proton Pump Inhibitors	ATV (unboosted)	**With Omeprazole 40 mg:** • ATV AUC ↓ 94%	**Do not coadminister**.
	ATV/c, ATV/r	**With Omeprazole 40 mg:** • ATV AUC ↓ 76% **When Omeprazole 20 mg is Given 12 Hours before ATV/c or ATV/r:** • ATV AUC ↓ 42%	PPI dose should not exceed a dose equivalent to omeprazole 20 mg daily in PI-naive patients. PPIs should be administered at least 12 hours before ATV/c or ATV/r. **Do not coadminister in PI-experienced patients.**

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Acid Reducers, continued			
Proton Pump Inhibitors	DRV/c, LPV/r	↔ PI expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	DRV/r	↔ DRV/r Omeprazole AUC ↓ 42%	Consider alternative ARV or acid reducer. If coadministered, monitor for omeprazole efficacy. If patient does not experience symptomatic relief, increase dose to no more than omeprazole 40 mg daily.
	TPV/r	↔ TPV/r Omeprazole AUC ↓ 70%	**Do not coadminister**.
Alpha-Adrenergic Antagonists for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia			
Alfuzosin	All PIs	↑ alfuzosin expected	**Contraindicated.**
Doxazosin	All PIs	↑ doxazosin possible	Initiate doxazosin at lowest dose and titrate while monitoring for clinical response/adverse events. Dose reduction may be necessary.
Tamsulosin	All PIs	↑ tamsulosin expected	**Do not coadminister, unless benefits outweigh risks.** If coadministered, monitor for tamsulosin toxicities.
Terazosin	All PIs	↔ or ↑ terazosin possible	Initiate terazosin at lowest dose and titrate while monitoring for clinical response/adverse events. Dose reduction may be necessary.
Silodosin	All PIs	↑ silodosin expected	**Contraindicated.**
Antibacterials			
Antimycobacterials			
Bedaquiline	All PIs	**With LPV/r:** • Bedaquiline AUC ↑ 1.9-fold **With other PI/r, ATV/c, or DRV/c:** • ↑ bedaquiline possible	**Do not coadminister, unless benefits outweigh risks.** Monitor liver function and ECG for QTc prolongation.
Rifabutin	ATV (unboosted)	↑ rifabutin AUC expected	Recommended dose is rifabutin 150 mg once daily. Monitor for antimycobacterial activity and consider therapeutic drug monitoring. PK data in this table are results from healthy volunteer studies. Lower rifabutin exposure has been reported in patients with HIV than in healthy study participants.
	ATV/r	**Compared with Rifabutin (300 mg Once Daily) Alone, Rifabutin (150 mg Once Daily) plus ATV/r:** • Rifabutin AUC ↑ 110% and metabolite AUC ↑ 2,101%	
	DRV/r	**Compared with Rifabutin (300 mg Once Daily) Alone, Rifabutin (150 mg Every Other Day) plus DRV/r:** • ↔ rifabutin AUC and metabolite AUC ↑ 881%	
	LPV/r	**Compared with Rifabutin (300 mg Daily) Alone, Rifabutin (150 mg Once Daily) plus LPV/r:** • Rifabutin AUC ↑ 203% and metabolite AUC ↑ 375%	
	TPV/r	Rifabutin AUC ↑ 190% and metabolite AUC ↑ 1,971%	
	PI/c	↑ rifabutin expected ↓ COBI expected	**Do not coadminister.**

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 3 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antibacterials, continued			
Antimycobacterials, continued			
Rifampin	All PIs	↓ PI concentration by >75%	**Contraindicated.** Increasing the dose of RTV does not overcome this interaction and may increase hepatotoxicity. Increasing the COBI dose is not recommended. Consider rifabutin if a rifamycin is indicated.
Rifapentine	All PIs	↓ PI expected	**Do not coadminister**.
Macrolides			
Azithromycin	ATV (unboosted), ATV/c, ATV/r	↑ azithromycin possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	DRV/c, DRV/r, TPV/r	↔ azithromycin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Clarithromycin	ATV (unboosted)	Clarithromycin AUC ↑ 94%	Reduce clarithromycin dose by 50% or consider alternative ARV or azithromycin. Monitor for clarithromycin-related adverse events, including QTc prolongation.
	PI/c, PI/r	DRV/r ↑ clarithromycin AUC 57% LPV/r ↑ clarithromycin expected RTV 500 mg twice daily ↑ clarithromycin 77% TPV/r ↑ clarithromycin 19% Clarithromycin ↑ TPV 66%	Consider alternative ARV or azithromycin. Monitor for clarithromycin-related adverse events, including QTc prolongation. If use of clarithromycin is necessary in a patient with impaired renal function, reduce clarithromycin dose by 50% in patients with CrCl 30 to 60 mL/min. In patients with CrCl <30 mL/min, reduce clarithromycin dose by 75%.
Erythromycin	All PIs	↑ erythromycin expected ↑ PIs expected	Consider alternative ARV or use azithromycin.
Anticoagulants			
Apixaban	ATV (unboosted)	No data	No data available for dose recommendation. Consider alternative ARV or anticoagulant.
	PI/c, PI/r	↑ apixaban expected	**Do not coadminister** in patients who require apixaban 2.5 mg twice daily. **In Patients Requiring Apixaban 5 mg or 10 mg Twice Daily:** • Reduce apixaban dose by 50%.
Betrixaban	ATV (unboosted)	No data	No data available for dose recommendation. Consider alternative ARV or anticoagulant.
	ATV/c, ATV/r, LPV/r	↑ betrixaban expected	Administer an initial single dose of betrixaban 80 mg followed by betrixaban 40 mg once daily.
	DRV/c, DRV/r, TPV/r	No data	No data available for dose recommendation. Consider alternative ARV or anticoagulant.
Dabigatran	ATV (unboosted)	No data	No data available for dose recommendation. Consider alternative ARV or anticoagulant.
	ATV/c, ATV/r, LPV/r	↑ dabigatran expected **With COBI 150 mg Alone:** • Dabigatran AUC ↑ 110% to 127%	Dabigatran dosing recommendation depends on indication and renal function. Refer to dabigatran prescribing information for dosing instructions when using dabigatran concomitantly with P-glycoprotein inhibitors.
	DRV/c, DRV/r, TPV/r	No data	No data available for dose recommendation. Consider alternative ARV or anticoagulant.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 4 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Anticoagulants, continued			
Edoxaban	ATV (unboosted)	No data	No data available for dose recommendation. Consider alternative ARV or anticoagulant.
	ATV/c, ATV/r, LPV/r	↑ edoxaban expected	**Stroke Prevention in Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation Indication:** • No dose adjustment needed. **Deep Venous Thrombosis and Pulmonary Embolism Indication:** • Administer edoxaban 30 mg once daily.
	DRV/c, DRV/r, TPV/r	No data	No data available for dose recommendation. Consider alternative ARV or anticoagulant.
Rivaroxaban	ATV (unboosted)	No data	No data available for dose recommendation. Consider alternative ARV or anticoagulant.
	PI/c, PI/r	↑ rivaroxaban expected	**Do not coadminister**.
Warfarin	PI/c	No data	Monitor INR closely when stopping or starting PI/c or PI/r and adjust warfarin dose accordingly. If switching between RTV and COBI, the effect of COBI on warfarin is not expected to be equivalent to RTV's effect on warfarin.
	PI/r	↓ warfarin possible	
Anticonvulsants			
Carbamazepine	ATV (unboosted)	May ↓ PI concentrations substantially	**Do not coadminister**.
	ATV/r, LPV/r, TPV/r	↑ carbamazepine possible TPV/r ↑ carbamazepine AUC 26% May ↓ PI concentrations substantially	Consider alternative ARV or anticonvulsant. If coadministration is necessary, consider monitoring concentrations of both drugs and assess virologic response. **Do not coadminister with LPV/r once daily.**
	DRV/r	Carbamazepine AUC ↑ 45% ↔ DRV	Monitor anticonvulsant concentration and adjust dose accordingly.
	PI/c	↑ carbamazepine possible ↓ cobicistat expected ↓ PI expected	**Contraindicated.**
Eslicarbazepine	All PIs	↓ PI possible	Consider alternative ARV or anticonvulsant. If coadministration is necessary, monitor for virologic response. Consider monitoring anticonvulsant and PI concentrations.
Ethosuximide	All PIs	↑ ethosuximide possible	Monitor for ethosuximide-related adverse events.
Lamotrigine	ATV (unboosted)	↔ lamotrigine	No dose adjustment needed.
	ATV/r	Lamotrigine AUC ↓ 32%	A dose increase of lamotrigine may be needed; monitor lamotrigine concentration or consider alternative ARV or anticonvulsant.
	LPV/r	Lamotrigine AUC ↓ 50% ↔ LPV	
	DRV/r, TPV/r	↓ lamotrigine possible	
	PI/c	No data	Monitor anticonvulsant concentration and adjust dose accordingly.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 5 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Anticonvulsants, continued			
Oxcarbazepine	All PIs	↓ PI possible	Consider alternative ARV or anticonvulsant. If coadministration is necessary, monitor for virologic response. Consider monitoring anticonvulsant and PI concentrations.
Phenobarbital	ATV (unboosted)	↓ ATV expected	**Do not coadminister**.
	ATV/r, DRV/r, TPV/r	↓ phenytoin possible ↓ PI possible	Consider alternative anticonvulsant. If coadministration is necessary, consider monitoring concentrations of both drugs and assessing virologic response.
	LPV/r	↓ phenytoin possible ↓ LPV/r possible	**Do not coadminister with LPV/r once daily.** Consider alternative anticonvulsant. If coadministration is necessary, consider monitoring concentrations of both drugs and assessing virologic response.
	PI/c	↓ cobicistat expected ↓ PI expected	**Contraindicated.**
Phenytoin	ATV (unboosted)	↓ ATV expected	**Do not coadminister**.
	ATV/r, DRV/r, TPV/r	↓ phenytoin possible ↓ PI possible	Consider alternative anticonvulsant. If coadministration is necessary, consider monitoring concentrations of both drugs and assessing virologic response.
	LPV/r	Phenytoin AUC ↓ 31% LPV/r AUC ↓ 33%	**Do not coadminister with LPV/r once daily.** Consider alternative anticonvulsant or monitor concentrations of both drugs and assess virologic response.
	PI/c	↓ cobicistat expected ↓ PI expected	**Contraindicated.**
Valproic Acid	All PIs	↓ or ↔ VPA possible LPV AUC ↑ 38% No data for other PIs	Monitor VPA concentrations and monitor for PI tolerability.
Antidepressants, Anxiolytics, and Antipsychotics Also see Sedative/Hypnotics section below			
Bupropion	ATV/r, DRV/r	↓ bupropion possible	Titrate bupropion dose based on clinical response.
	TPV/r	Bupropion AUC ↓ 46%	
	LPV/r	Bupropion AUC ↓ 57%	
	PI/c	↔ bupropion expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Buspirone	All PIs	↑ buspirone expected	Administer lowest dose of buspirone with caution and titrate buspirone dose based on clinical response.
Nefazodone	All PIs	↑ nefazodone expected ↑ PI possible	Monitor for nefazodone-related adverse events and PI tolerability.
Trazodone	All PIs	RTV 200 mg twice daily (for 2 days) ↑ trazodone AUC 240%	Administer lowest dose of trazodone and monitor for CNS and CV adverse events.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 6 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antidepressants, Anxiolytics, and Antipsychotics, continued Also see Sedative/Hypnotics section below			
Tricyclic Antidepressants Amitriptyline, amoxapine, clomipramine, desipramine, doxepin, imipramine, maprotiline, nortriptyline, protriptyline, trimipramine	All PIs	↑ TCA expected	Administer lowest possible TCA dose and titrate based on clinical assessment and/or drug concentrations.
Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors (e.g., citalopram, escitalopram, fluoxetine, fluvoxamine, paroxetine, sertraline)	DRV/r	Paroxetine AUC ↓ 39% Sertraline AUC ↓ 49%	Titrate SSRI dose based on clinical response.
	All PIs except DRV/r	No data	Titrate SSRI dose using the lowest available initial or maintenance dose.
Antipsychotics			
Aripiprazole	PI/c, PI/r	↑ aripiprazole expected	Administer 25% of the usual aripiprazole dose. Titrate dose based on clinical monitoring for efficacy/adverse events. Refer to aripiprazole label for doses to use in patients who have major depressive disorder or who are known to be CYP2D6 poor metabolizers.
	ATV (unboosted)	↑ aripiprazole expected	Administer 50% of the usual aripiprazole dose. Titrate dose based on clinical monitoring for efficacy/adverse events. Refer to aripiprazole label for doses to use in patients who have major depressive disorder or who are known to be CYP2D6 poor metabolizers.
Brexpiprazole	PI/c, PI/r	↑ brexpiprazole expected	Administer 25% of the usual brexpiprazole dose. Titrate dose based on clinical monitoring for efficacy/adverse events. Refer to brexpiprazole label for doses to use in patients who have major depressive disorder or who are known to be CYP2D6 poor metabolizers.
	ATV (unboosted)	↑ brexpiprazole expected	Administer 50% of the usual brexpiprazole dose. Titrate dose based on clinical monitoring for efficacy/adverse events. Refer to brexpiprazole label for doses to use in patients who have major depressive disorder or who are known to be CYP2D6 poor metabolizers.
Cariprazine	All PIs	↑ cariprazine expected	**Starting Cariprazine in a Patient Who Is Already Receiving a PI:** • Administer cariprazine 1.5 mg on Day 1 and Day 3, with no dose given on Day 2. From Day 4 onward, administer cariprazine 1.5 mg daily. Dose can be increased to a maximum dose of cariprazine 3 mg daily. If the PI is withdrawn, cariprazine dose may need to be increased. **Starting a PI in a Patient Who Is Already Receiving Cariprazine:** • For patients receiving cariprazine 3 mg or cariprazine 6 mg daily, reduce dose by half. For patients taking cariprazine 4.5 mg daily, the dose should be reduced to cariprazine 1.5 mg or cariprazine 3 mg daily. For patients taking cariprazine 1.5 mg daily, change to cariprazine 1.5 mg every other day. If PI is withdrawn, cariprazine dose may need to be increased.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 7 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antidepressants, Anxiolytics, and Antipsychotics, continued Also see Sedative/Hypnotics section below			
Antipsychotics, continued			
Iloperidone	All PIs	↑ iloperidone expected	Decrease iloperidone dose by 50%.
Lurasidone	ATV (unboosted)	↑ lurasidone expected	Consider alternative ARV or antipsychotic. If coadministration is necessary, reduce lurasidone dose by 50%.
	PI/c, PI/r	↑ lurasidone expected	**Contraindicated.**
Other Antipsychotics CYP3A4 and/or CYP2D6 substrates (e.g., clozapine, perphenazine, risperidone, thioridazine)	PI/c, PI/r	↑ antipsychotic possible	Titrate antipsychotic dose using the lowest initial dose or adjust maintenance dose accordingly. Monitor for adverse events, including QTc prolongation.
Pimavanserin	ATV (unboosted)	No data	No data available for dose recommendation. Consider alternative ARV or antipsychotic.
	LPV/r	↑ pimavanserin expected	**Do not coadminister**, due to risk for QTc prolongation.
	All other PIs	↑ pimavanserin expected	Reduce pimavanserin dose to 10 mg once daily.
Pimozide	All PIs	↑ pimozide expected	**Contraindicated.**
Quetiapine	All PIs	↑ quetiapine expected	**Starting Quetiapine in a Patient Receiving a PI:** • Initiate quetiapine at the lowest dose and titrate up as needed. Monitor for quetiapine effectiveness and adverse events. **Starting a PI in a Patient Receiving a Stable Dose of Quetiapine:** • Reduce quetiapine dose to 1/6 of the current dose. Closely monitor for quetiapine effectiveness and adverse events.
Ziprasidone	LPV/r	↑ ziprasidone expected	**Do not coadminister,** due to risk for QTc prolongation.
	All PIs except LPV/r	↑ ziprasidone expected	Monitor for ziprasidone-related adverse events.
Antifungals			
Fluconazole	TPV/r	TPV AUC ↑ 50%	Fluconazole doses >200 mg daily **are not recommended**. If high-dose fluconazole is indicated, consider alternative ARV.
	All PIs except TPV/r	↔ PI expected ↔ fluconazole expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Isavuconazole	LPV/r	Isavuconazole AUC ↑ 96% LPV AUC ↓ 27% RTV AUC ↓ 31%	If coadministered, monitor isavuconazole concentrations and adverse events. Monitor for virologic response.
	All PIs except LPV/r	↑ isavuconazole possible ↑ or ↓ PI possible	If coadministered, monitor isavuconazole concentrations and monitor for isavuconazole-related adverse events. Monitor for PI tolerability and virologic response.
Itraconazole	All PIs	↑ itraconazole possible ↑ PI possible	Itraconazole doses >200 mg/day **are not recommended** with PI/r, ATV/c, or DRV/c unless dosing is guided by itraconazole concentrations.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 8 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antifungals, continued			
Posaconazole	ATV	ATV AUC ↑ 268% ↑ posaconazole possible	If coadministered, monitor posaconazole concentrations and monitor for posaconazole-related or PI-related adverse events.
	ATV/r	ATV AUC ↑ 146% ↑ posaconazole possible	
	All other PIs	↑ PI possible ↑ posaconazole possible	
Voriconazole	ATV (unboosted)	↑ PI possible ↑ voriconazole possible	If coadministered, monitor voriconazole concentrations and monitor for voriconazole-related or PI-related adverse events.
	PI/c	No data	**Do not coadminister** voriconazole and RTV or COBI unless benefits outweigh risks. If coadministered, monitor voriconazole concentration and adjust dose accordingly.
	PI/r	RTV 100 mg twice daily ↓ voriconazole AUC 39%	
Antimalarials			
Artemether/ Lumefantrine	ATV (unboosted), PI/c	↑ lumefantrine expected No data for artemether	Clinical significance unknown. If coadministered, monitor closely for antimalarial efficacy and lumefantrine toxicity, including QTc prolongation.
	DRV/r	Artemether AUC ↓ 16% DHA[a] AUC ↓ 18% Lumefantrine AUC ↑ 175% ↔ DRV	
	LPV/r	Artemether AUC ↓ 40% DHA AUC ↓ 45% Lumefantrine AUC ↑ 4.8-fold ↔ LPV	
	TPV/r	↑ lumefantrine expected	**Do not coadminister**, due to risk for QTc prolongation.
Atovaquone/Proguanil	ATV/r, LPV/r	**With ATV/r:** • Atovaquone AUC ↓ 46% • Proguanil AUC ↓ 41% **With LPV/r:** • Atovaquone AUC ↓ 74% • Proguanil AUC ↓ 38%	Clinical significance unknown. Consider alternative ARV or malaria prophylaxis.
Mefloquine	All PIs	**With RTV 200 mg Twice Daily:** • RTV AUC ↓ 31% and C_{min} ↓ 43% • ↔ mefloquine **With ATV (unboosted), PI/c, or PI/r:** • No data • ↑ mefloquine possible	Clinical significance unknown. Consider alternative ARV or antimalarial drug. If coadministered, monitor for mefloquine-related adverse events, including psychiatric symptoms and QTc prolongation. Monitor virologic response.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 9 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antiplatelets			
Clopidogrel	All PIs	Clopidogrel active metabolite AUC ↓ 320% with impaired platelet inhibition	**Do not coadminister.**
Prasugrel	All PIs	Prasugrel active metabolite AUC ↓ 210% with adequate platelet inhibition	Insufficient data to make a recommendation.
Ticagrelor	All PIs	↑ ticagrelor expected	**Do not coadminister**.
Vorapaxar	All PIs	↑ vorapaxar expected	**Do not coadminister**.
Antipneumocystis and Antitoxoplasmosis Drug			
Atovaquone	ATV/r	↔ atovaquone	No dose adjustment needed.
Oral suspension	All other PIs	↔ atovaquone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Beta-Agonists, Long-Acting Inhaled			
Arformoterol, Formoterol	ATV (unboosted), ATV/c, ATV/r	↑ arformoterol possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	DRV/c, DRV/r, LPV/r, TPV/r	↔ arformoterol expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Indacaterol	All PIs	**With RTV 300 mg Twice Daily:** • Indacaterol AUC ↑ 1.7-fold	No dose adjustment needed in patients receiving indacaterol 75 mcg daily.
Olodaterol	All PIs	↑ olodaterol expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Salmeterol	All PIs	↑ salmeterol possible	**Do not coadminister**, due to potential increased risk of salmeterol-associated CV events.
Cardiac Medications			
Amiodarone	TPV/r	↑ amiodarone possible ↑ PI possible	**Contraindicated.**
	All other PIs	↑ amiodarone possible ↑ PI possible	**Do not coadminister** unless benefits outweigh risks. If coadministered, monitor for amiodarone-related adverse events and consider monitoring ECG and amiodarone drug concentration.
Antiarrhythmics (e.g., disopyramide, dofetilide, lidocaine, mexiletine, propafenone)	ATV (unboosted)	↑ antiarrhythmic possible	Consider alternative ARV or antiarrhythmics. If coadministered, monitor for antiarrhythmic toxicities.
	PI/c, PI/r	↑ antiarrhythmic possible	**Do not coadminister**.
Dronedarone	ATV (unboosted)	↑ dronedarone possible	**Do not coadminister**.
	PI/c, PI/r	↑ dronedarone expected	**Contraindicated.**
Flecainide	All PIs except TPV/r	↑ flecainide possible	**Do not coadminister**.
	TPV/r	↑ flecainide expected	**Contraindicated.**
Propafenone	All PIs except TPV/r	↑ propafenone possible	**Do not coadminister**.
	TPV/r	↑ propafenone expected	**Contraindicated.**
Quinidine	All PIs except TPV/r	↑ quinidine possible	**Do not coadminister**.
	TPV/r	↑ quinidine expected	**Contraindicated.**

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 10 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Cardiac Medications, continued			
Beta-Blockers (e.g., carvedilol, metoprolol, timolol)	All PIs	↑ beta-blockers possible	May need to decrease beta-blocker dose; adjust dose based on clinical response. Consider using beta-blockers that are not metabolized by CYP450 enzymes (e.g., atenolol, labetalol, nadolol, sotalol).
Bosentan	All PIs	**With LPV/r:** • ↑ bosentan 48-fold (Day 4) and ↑ 5-fold (Day 10) ↓ ATV expected	**Do not coadminister bosentan and unboosted ATV.** **In Patients on a PI (Other than Unboosted ATV) >10 Days:** • Start bosentan at 62.5 mg once daily or every other day. **In Patients on Bosentan who Require a PI (Other than Unboosted ATV):** • Stop bosentan ≥36 hours before PI initiation and restart bosentan 10 days after PI initiation at 62.5 mg once daily or every other day. **When Switching Between COBI and RTV:** • Maintain same bosentan dose.
Calcium Channel Blockers, Except Diltiazem	All PIs	↑ dihydropyridine possible ↑ verapamil possible	Titrate CCB dose and monitor closely. ECG monitoring is recommended when CCB is used with ATV.
Digoxin	PI/c, PI/r	RTV 200 mg twice daily ↑ digoxin AUC 29% and ↑ half-life 43% DRV/r ↑ digoxin AUC 36% COBI ↑ digoxin C_{max} 41% and ↔ AUC	Monitor digoxin concentrations. Digoxin dose may need to be decreased. Titrate initial digoxin dose.
Diltiazem	ATV (unboosted), ATV/c, ATV/r	Unboosted ATV ↑ diltiazem AUC 125% Greater ↑ likely with ATV/c or ATV/r	Decrease diltiazem dose by 50%. ECG monitoring is recommended.
	DRV/c, DRV/r, LPV/r, TPV/r	↑ diltiazem possible	Titrate diltiazem dose according to clinical response and toxicities.
Eplerenone	PI/c, PI/r	↑ eplerenone expected	**Contraindicated.**
Ranolazine	ATV (unboosted)	↑ ranolazine possible	**Do not coadminister**.
	PI/c, PI/r	↑ ranolazine expected	**Contraindicated.**
Ivabradine	All PIs	↑ ivabradine expected	**Contraindicated.**
Corticosteroids			
Beclomethasone Inhaled or intranasal	DRV/r	↔ 17-BMP (active metabolite) AUC RTV 100 mg twice daily ↑ 17-BMP AUC 2-fold	No dose adjustment needed.
	All PIs except DRV/r	↔ 17-BMP expected	No dose adjustment needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 11 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Corticosteroids, continued			
Budesonide, Ciclesonide, Fluticasone, Mometasone Inhaled or intranasal	All PIs	↑ glucocorticoids possible RTV 100 mg twice daily ↑ fluticasone AUC 350-fold	**Do not coadminister** unless potential benefits of inhaled or intranasal corticosteroid outweigh the risks of adverse events associated with corticosteroids. Coadministration can result in adrenal insufficiency and Cushing's syndrome. Consider alternative inhaled/intranasal corticosteroid (e.g., beclomethasone).
Betamethasone, Budesonide Systemic	All PIs	↑ glucocorticoids possible ↓ PI possible	**Do not coadminister** unless potential benefits of systemic corticosteroid outweigh the risks of adverse events associated with systemic corticosteroids. Coadministration can result in adrenal insufficiency and Cushing's syndrome.
Dexamethasone Systemic	All PIs	↑ glucocorticoids possible ↓ PI possible	Consider alternative corticosteroid for long-term use. If coadministration is necessary, monitor virologic response to ART.
Prednisone, Prednisolone Systemic	LPV/r	↑ prednisolone AUC 31%	Coadministration may be considered if the potential benefits outweigh the risks of adverse events associated with systemic corticosteroids. If coadministered, monitor for adrenal insufficiency, Cushing's syndrome, and other corticosteroid-associated toxicities.
	All PIs	↑ prednisolone possible	
Betamethasone, Methylprednisolone, Triamcinolone Local injections, including intra-articular, epidural, or intra-orbital	All PIs	↑ glucocorticoids expected	**Do not coadminister**. Coadministration can result in adrenal insufficiency and Cushing's syndrome.
Glucose-Lowering Medications			
Canagliflozin	ATV (unboosted), PI/c	↔ canagliflozin	No dose adjustment needed.
	PI/r	↓ canagliflozin expected	If a patient is already tolerating canagliflozin 100 mg daily, increase canagliflozin dose to 200 mg daily. If a patient is already tolerating canagliflozin 200 mg daily and requires additional glycemic control, management strategy is based on renal function. **In Patients with eGFR ≥60 mL/min/1.73 m^2:** • Canagliflozin dose may be increased to 300 mg daily. **In Patients with eGFR <60 mL/min/1.73 m^2:** • Consider adding another antihyperglycemic agent.
Saxagliptin	All PIs	↑ saxagliptin expected	Limit saxagliptin dose to 2.5 mg once daily.
Dapagliflozin/Saxagliptin	All PIs	↑ saxagliptin expected	**Do not coadminister.** Dapagliflozin is only available as a coformulated drug that contains 5 mg of saxagliptin. When coadministered with EVG/c, the dose of saxagliptin should not exceed 2.5 mg once daily; thus, this combination **is not recommended**.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 12 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Hepatitis C Direct-Acting Antiviral Agents			
Daclatasvir	ATV/c, ATV/r	↑ daclatasvir	Decrease daclatasvir dose to 30 mg once daily.
	ATV (unboosted), DRV/c, DRV/r, LPV/r	↔ daclatasvir	No dose adjustment needed.
	TPV/r	No data	No data available for dose recommendation.
Dasabuvir plus Paritaprevir/Ombitasvir/RTV	ATV (unboosted)	↔ ATV	ATV 300 mg alone, **without COBI or additional RTV**, should be given in the morning with dasabuvir plus paritaprevir/ombitasvir/RTV.
	ATV/c, ATV/r	No data	This HCV regimen contains RTV. If ATV is part of the ARV regimen, prescribe ATV 300 mg daily without COBI or RTV. ATV should be administered in the morning, at the same time as ombitasvir/paritaprevir/RTV plus dasabuvir. Resume RTV or COBI regimen when HCV therapy is completed.
	DRV	DRV C_{min} ↓ 43% to 48%	**Do not coadminister**.
	LPV/r	Paritaprevir AUC ↑ 117%	**Do not coadminister**.
	DRV/c, TPV/r	No data	**Do not coadminister**.
Elbasvir/Grazoprevir	ATV/r	Elbasvir AUC ↑ 4.8-fold Grazoprevir AUC ↑ 10.6-fold Elbasvir ↔ ATV Grazoprevir ↑ ATV AUC 43%	**Contraindicated.** May increase the risk of ALT elevations due to a significant increase in grazoprevir plasma concentrations caused by OATP1B1/3 inhibition.
	DRV/r	Elbasvir AUC ↑ 66% Grazoprevir AUC ↑ 7.5-fold ↔ DRV	
	LPV/r	Elbasvir AUC ↑ 3.7-fold Grazoprevir AUC ↑ 12.9-fold ↔ LPV	
	ATV (unboosted), ATV/c, DRV/c, TPV/r	↑ grazoprevir expected	

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 13 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Hepatitis C Direct-Acting Antiviral Agents, continued			
Glecaprevir/Pibrentasvir	ATV (unboosted), ATV/c, ATV/r	**With (ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Once Daily:** • Glecaprevir AUC ↑ 6.5-fold • Pibrentasvir AUC ↑ 64%	**Contraindicated.**
	DRV/c, DRV/r	**With (DRV 800 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Once Daily:** • Glecaprevir AUC ↑ 5-fold • ↔ pibrentasvir	**Do not coadminister**.
	LPV/r	Glecaprevir AUC ↑ 4-fold Pibrentasvir ↑ 2.5-fold	**Do not coadminister**.
	TPV/r	↑ glecaprevir and pibrentasvir expected	**Do not coadminister**.
Ledipasvir/Sofosbuvir	ATV/r	ATV AUC ↑ 33% Ledipasvir AUC ↑ 113% ↔ sofosbuvir	No dose adjustment needed. Coadministration of ledipasvir/sofosbuvir with TDF and a PI/r results in increased exposure to TDF. The safety of the increased TDF exposure has not been established. Consider alternative HCV or ARV drugs to avoid increased risk of TDF toxicities. If coadministration is necessary, monitor for TDF-associated adverse reactions.
	ATV (unboosted), ATV/c, DRV/c, DRV/r, LPV/r	↔ PI expected ↔ ledipasvir and sofosbuvir	
	TPV/r	↓ ledipasvir and sofosbuvir expected	**Do not coadminister**.
Sofosbuvir	TPV/r	↓ sofosbuvir expected	**Do not coadminister**.
Sofosbuvir/Velpatasvir	ATV/r	↔ ATV/r ↔ sofosbuvir Velpatasvir AUC ↑ 2.4-fold	No dose adjustment needed.
	DRV/r	↔ DRV/r Sofosbuvir AUC ↓ 28% ↔ velpatasvir	No dose adjustment needed.
	ATV (unboosted), ATV/c, DRV/c, LPV/r	↔ sofosbuvir and velpatasvir expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	TPV/r	↓ sofosbuvir expected ↓ velpatasvir expected	**Do not coadminister**.
Sofosbuvir/Velpatasvir/ Voxilaprevir	ATV (unboosted), ATV/c, ATV/r	**With ATV/r:** • Voxilaprevir AUC ↑ 4.3-fold • Velpatasvir AUC ↑ 93% • Sofosbuvir AUC ↑ 40%	**Do not coadminister**.
	LPV/r	↑ voxilaprevir expected	**Do not coadminister**.
	DRV/c, DRV/r	**With DRV/r:** • Voxilaprevir AUC ↑ 2.4-fold • ↔ DRV/r, velpatasvir, and sofosbuvir	No dose adjustment needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 14 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Hepatitis C Direct-Acting Antiviral Agents, continued			
Sofosbuvir/Velpatasvir/ Voxilaprevir, continued	TPV/r	↓ sofosbuvir expected ↓ velpatasvir expected Effect on voxilaprevir is unknown.	**Do not coadminister**.
Herbal Products			
St. John's Wort	All PIs	↓ PI expected	**Contraindicated.**
Hormonal Therapies			
Contraceptives – Injectable Depot MPA	LPV/r	MPA AUC ↑ 46% and ↔ C_{min}	No dose adjustment needed.
	All other PIs	No data	No dose adjustment needed.
Contraceptives – Oral	ATV (unboosted)	Ethinyl estradiol AUC ↑ 48% Norethindrone AUC ↑ 110%	Prescribe oral contraceptive that contains no more than 30 mcg of ethinyl estradiol[b] or use alternative ARV or contraceptive methods. Oral contraceptives that contain less than 25 mcg of ethinyl estradiol or progestins other than norethindrone or norgestimate have not been studied.
	ATV/c	Drospirenone AUC ↑ 2.3-fold Ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 22%	**Contraindicated with drospirenone-containing hormonal contraceptive due to potential for hyperkalemia.** Use alternative ARV or contraceptive methods.
		↔ ethinyl estradiol AUC and C_{min} ↓ 25% ↔ levonorgestrel	No dose adjustment needed.
	ATV/r	Ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 19% and C_{min} ↓ 37% Norgestimate AUC ↑ 85% Norethindrone AUC ↑ 51% and C_{min} ↑ 67%	Oral contraceptive should contain at least 35 mcg of ethinyl estradiol.[c] Oral contraceptives that contain progestins other than norethindrone or norgestimate have not been studied.
	DRV/c	Drospirenone AUC ↑ 1.6-fold Ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 30%	Clinical monitoring is recommended due to the potential for hyperkalemia. Use alternative ARV or contraceptive methods.
	DRV/r, LPV/r, TPV/r	Ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 37% to 55% Norethindrone AUC ↓ 14% to 34% **With TPV/r:** • ↔ norethindrone AUC	**When Used for Contraception:** • Use alternative ARV or contraceptive methods. **When Used for Other Clinical Indications (e.g., Acne, Menstrual Cycle Regulation):** • Monitor for clinical effectiveness of hormonal therapy.
Contraceptives – Subdermal Implant Etonogestrel	LPV/r	Etonogestrel AUC ↑ 52% and C_{min} ↑ 34%	No dose adjustment needed.
	All other PIs	No data	
Contraceptives – Transdermal Ethinyl Estradiol/ Norelgestromin	LPV/r	↔ LPV Ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 45% Norelgestromin AUC ↑ 83%	No dose adjustment needed.
	All other PIs	No data	
Contraceptives – Vaginal Ring Etonogestrel/Ethinyl Estradiol	ATV/r	Ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 26% Etonogestrel AUC ↑ 79%	No dose adjustment needed.
	All other PIs	No data	

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 15 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Hormonal Therapies, continued			
Contraceptives – Vaginal Ring Segesterone/Ethinyl Estradiol	All PIs	No data	Use alternative ARV or contraceptive methods.
Gender-Affirming Therapy	PI/c	↓ or ↑ estradiol possible	Adjust estradiol dose as needed based on clinical effects and endogenous hormone concentrations.
	PI/r	↓ estradiol possible	
	All PIs	↔ goserelin, leuprolide acetate, and spironolactone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	All PIs	↑ dutasteride possible ↑ finasteride possible	Adjust dutasteride dose as needed based on clinical effects and endogenous hormone concentrations. No dose adjustment needed for finasteride.
	All PIs	↓ testosterone possible	Adjust testosterone dose as needed based on clinical effects and endogenous hormone concentrations.
Menopausal Replacement Therapy	All PIs	↓ or ↑ estrogen possible with estradiol or conjugated estrogen (equine and synthetic)	Adjust estrogen dose as needed based on clinical effects.
	All PIs	↑ drospirenone possible ↑ medroxyprogesterone ↑ micronized progesterone See Hormonal Contraceptives for other progestin-PI interactions	Adjust progestin/progesterone dose as needed based on clinical effects. Because drospirenone is prescribed at a lower dose for menopausal HRT than the products used for hormonal contraceptives, it is not contraindicated with ATV/c products.
Immunosuppressants			
Cyclosporine, Everolimus, Sirolimus, Tacrolimus	All PIs	↑ immunosuppressant expected	Initiate with an adjusted dose of immunosuppressant to account for potential increased concentrations of the immunosuppressant and monitor for immunosuppressant-related adverse events. Therapeutic drug monitoring of immunosuppressant is recommended. Consult with specialist as necessary.
Lipid-Modifying Agents			
Atorvastatin	ATV (unboosted), ATV/r	↑ atorvastatin possible	Titrate atorvastatin dose carefully and administer the lowest effective dose while monitoring for toxicities.
	ATV/c	Atorvastatin AUC ↑ 9.2-fold and C_{max} ↑ 18.9-fold	**Do not coadminister**.
	DRV/c	Atorvastatin AUC ↑ 3.9-fold and C_{max} ↑ 4.2-fold	Titrate atorvastatin dose carefully and administer the lowest effective dose while monitoring for toxicities. Do not exceed 20 mg atorvastatin daily.
	DRV/r	DRV/r plus atorvastatin 10 mg similar to atorvastatin 40 mg administered alone	Titrate atorvastatin dose carefully and administer the lowest effective dose while monitoring for toxicities. Do not exceed 20 mg atorvastatin daily.
	LPV/r	Atorvastatin AUC ↑ 5.9-fold and C_{max} ↑ 4.7-fold	Titrate atorvastatin dose carefully and administer the lowest effective dose while monitoring for toxicities. Do not exceed 20 mg atorvastatin daily.
	TPV/r	Atorvastatin AUC ↑ 9.4-fold and C_{max} ↑ 8.6-fold	**Do not coadminister**.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 16 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Lipid-Modifying Agents, continued			
Lomitapide	All PIs except TPV/r	↑ lomitapide expected	**Contraindicated.**
	TPV/r	↑ lomitapide expected	Titrate lomitapide dose based on clinical response. Do not exceed lomitapide 30 mg daily.
Lovastatin	All PIs	Significant ↑ lovastatin expected	**Contraindicated.**
Pitavastatin	All PIs	ATV ↑ pitavastatin AUC 31% and C_{max} ↑ 60% ↔ ATV DRV/r ↓ pitavastatin AUC 26% ↔ DRV/r LPV/r ↓ pitavastatin AUC 20% ↔ LPV	No dose adjustment needed.
Pravastatin	ATV/c, ATV/r	No data	Titrate pravastatin dose carefully while monitoring for pravastatin-related adverse events.
	DRV/c, DRV/r	**With DRV/r:** • Pravastatin AUC ↑ 81% following single dose of pravastatin Pravastatin AUC ↑ 23% at steady state	Titrate pravastatin dose carefully while monitoring for pravastatin-related adverse events.
	LPV/r	Pravastatin AUC ↑ 33%	No dose adjustment needed.
Rosuvatatin	ATV/r	Rosuvastatin AUC ↑ 3-fold and C_{max} ↑ 7-fold	Titrate rosuvastatin dose carefully and administer lowest effective dose while monitoring for rosuvastatin-related adverse events. Do not exceed rosuvastatin 10 mg daily.
	ATV/c	Rosuvastatin AUC ↑ 3.4-fold and C_{max} ↑ 10.6-fold	
	DRV/c	Rosuvastatin AUC ↑ 1.9-fold and C_{max} ↑ 3.8-fold	Titrate rosuvastatin dose carefully and administer lowest effective dose while monitoring for rosuvastatin-related adverse events. Do not exceed rosuvastatin 20 mg daily.
	DRV/r	Rosuvastatin AUC ↑ 48% and C_{max} ↑ 2.4-fold	Titrate rosuvastatin dose carefully and administer the lowest effective dose while monitoring for rosuvastatin-related adverse events.
	LPV/r	Rosuvastatin AUC ↑ 2.1-fold and C_{max} ↑ 4.7-fold	Titrate rosuvastatin dose carefully and administer the lowest effective dose. Do not exceed rosuvastatin 10 mg daily.
	TPV/r	Rosuvastatin AUC ↑ 26% and C_{max} ↑ 2.2-fold	No dose adjustment needed.
Simvastatin	All PIs	Significant ↑ simvastatin expected	**Contraindicated.**
Narcotics and Treatment for Opioid Dependence			
Buprenorphine Sublingual, buccal, or implant	ATV (unboosted)	Buprenorphine AUC ↑ 93% Norbuprenorphine (active metabolite) AUC ↑ 76% ↓ ATV possible	**Do not coadminister**.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 17 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Narcotics and Treatment for Opioid Dependence, continued			
Buprenorphine Sublingual, buccal, or implant, continued	ATV/r	Buprenorphine AUC ↑ 66% Norbuprenorphine (active metabolite) AUC ↑ 105%	Monitor for sedation and other signs or symptoms of over-medication. Buprenorphine dose reduction may be necessary. It may be necessary to remove implant and treat with a formulation that permits dose adjustments.
	DRV/r	↔ buprenorphine Norbuprenorphine (active metabolite) AUC ↑ 46% and C_{min} ↑ 71%	No dose adjustment needed. Monitor for buprenorphine-related adverse events. When transferring buprenorphine from transmucosal delivery to implantation, monitor to ensure buprenorphine effect is adequate and not excessive.
	LPV/r	↔ LPV/r	
	TPV/r	↔ buprenorphine Norbuprenorphine (active metabolite) AUC, C_{max}, and C_{min} ↓ 80% TPV C_{min} ↓ 19% to 40%	Consider monitoring TPV concentration. When transferring buprenorphine from transmucosal delivery to implantation, monitor to ensure buprenorphine effect is adequate and not excessive.
	PI/c	No data	Titrate buprenorphine dose using the lowest initial dose. Dose adjustment of buprenorphine may be needed. It may be necessary to remove implant and treat with a formulation that permits dose adjustments. Monitor for buprenorphine-related adverse events.
Fentanyl	All PIs	↑ fentanyl possible	Monitor for fentanyl-related adverse events, including potentially fatal respiratory depression.
Lofexidine	ATV (unboosted)	↔ lofexidine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	PI/c, PI/r	↑ lofexidine possible	Monitor for lofexidine-related adverse events, including symptoms of orthostasis and bradycardia.
Methadone	ATV (unboosted)	↔ ATV	No dose adjustment needed.
	PI/c	No data	Titrate methadone dose using the lowest feasible initial dose. Dose adjustment of methadone may be needed. Monitor for methadone-related adverse events.
	All PI/r	ATV/r and DRV/r ↓ R-methadone[d] AUC 16% to 18% LPV/r ↓ methadone AUC 26% to 53% TPV/r ↓ R-methadone[d] AUC 48%	Opioid withdrawal is unlikely but may occur. Monitor for opioid withdrawal and increase methadone dose as clinically indicated.
Oxycodone	All PIs	LPV/r ↑ oxycodone AUC 2.6-fold Other PIs: ↑ oxycodone expected	Monitor for opioid-related adverse events. Oxycodone dose reduction may be necessary.
Tramadol	All PIs	↑ tramadol expected ↓ M1 (active metabolite) possible	Tramadol dose adjustments may be necessary. Monitor for clinical response and tramadol-related adverse events.
PDE5 Inhibitors			
Avanafil	ATV (unboosted)	No data	Avanafil dose should not exceed 50 mg once every 24 hours.
	PI/c, PI/r	RTV 600 mg twice daily (for 5 days) ↑ avanafil AUC 13-fold and ↑ C_{max} 2.4-fold	**Do not coadminister**.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 18 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
PDE5 Inhibitors, continued			
Sildenafil	All PIs	DRV/r plus sildenafil 25 mg similar to sildenafil 100 mg alone RTV 500 mg twice daily ↑ sildenafil AUC 1,000%	**For Treatment of Erectile Dysfunction:** • Start with sildenafil 25 mg every 48 hours and monitor for adverse events of sildenafil. **Contraindicated** for treatment of PAH.
Tadalafil	All PIs	RTV 200 mg twice daily ↑ tadalafil AUC 124% TPV/r (first dose) ↑ tadalafil AUC 133%	**For Treatment of Erectile Dysfunction:** • Start with tadalafil 5 mg and do not exceed a single dose of tadalafil 10 mg every 72 hours. Monitor for adverse events of tadalafil. **For Treatment of PAH** *In Patients on a PI >7 Days:* • Start with tadalafil 20 mg once daily and increase to tadalafil 40 mg once daily based on tolerability. *In Patients on Tadalafil who Require a PI:* • Stop tadalafil ≥24 hours before PI initiation. Seven days after PI initiation, restart tadalafil at 20 mg once daily and increase to tadalafil 40 mg once daily based on tolerability. *In Patients Switching between COBI and RTV:* • Maintain tadalafil dose. **For Treatment of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia:** • Maximum recommended daily dose is tadalafil 2.5 mg per day.
Vardenafil	All PIs	RTV 600 mg twice daily ↑ vardenafil AUC 49-fold	Start with vardenafil 2.5 mg every 72 hours and monitor for adverse events of vardenafil.
Sedative/Hypnotics			
Alprazolam, Clonazepam, Diazepam	All PIs	↑ benzodiazepine possible RTV 200 mg twice daily (for 2 days) ↑ alprazolam half-life 222% and ↑ AUC 248%	Consider alternative benzodiazepines, such as lorazepam, oxazepam, or temazepam.
Lorazepam, Oxazepam, Temazepam	All PIs	No data	These benzodiazepines are metabolized via non-CYP450 pathways; thus, there is less interaction potential than with other benzodiazepines.
Midazolam	All PIs	↑ midazolam expected	**Oral midazolam is contraindicated with PIs.** Parenteral midazolam can be used with caution when given as a single dose in a monitored situation for procedural sedation.
Suvorexant	All PIs	↑ suvorexant expected	**Do not coadminister**.
Triazolam	All PIs	↑ triazolam expected RTV 200 mg twice daily ↑ triazolam half-life 1,200% and ↑ AUC 2,000%	**Contraindicated.**
Zolpidem	PI/c, PI/r	↑ zolpidem possible	Initiate zolpidem at a low dose. Dose reduction may be necessary.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21a. Drug Interactions Between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 19 of 19)

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Miscellaneous Drugs			
Calcifediol	All PIs	↑ calcifediol possible	Dose adjustment of calcifediol may be required, and serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D, intact PTH, and serum calcium concentrations should be closely monitored.
Cisapride	All PIs	↑ cisapride expected	**Contraindicated.**
Colchicine	All PIs	RTV 100 mg twice daily ↑ colchicine AUC 296% and C_{max} ↑ 184% Significant ↑ colchicine expected with all PIs, with or without COBI or RTV	**For Treatment of Gout Flares:** • Administer a single dose of colchicine 0.6 mg, followed by colchicine 0.3 mg 1 hour later. Do not repeat dose for at least 3 days. **For Prophylaxis of Gout Flares:** • If original dose was colchicine 0.6 mg twice daily, decrease to colchicine 0.3 mg once daily. If dose was 0.6 mg once daily, decrease to 0.3 mg every other day. **For Treatment of Familial Mediterranean Fever:** • Do not exceed colchicine 0.6 mg once daily or colchicine 0.3 mg twice daily. **Do not coadminister in patients with hepatic or renal impairment.**
Dronabinol	All PIs	↑ dronabinol possible	Monitor for dronabinol-related adverse events.
Eluxadoline	All PIs	↑ eluxadoline expected	Administer eluxadoline at a dose of 75 mg twice daily and monitor for eluxadoline-related adverse events.
Ergot Derivatives	All PIs	↑ dihydroergotamine, ergotamine, and methylergonovine expected	**Contraindicated.**
Flibanserin	All PIs	↑ flibanserin expected	**Contraindicated.**

[a] DHA is an active metabolite of artemether.

[b] The following products contain no more than 30 mcg of ethinyl estradiol combined with norethindrone or norgestimate: Lo Minastrin Fe; Lo Loestrin Fe; Loestrin 1/20, 1.5/30; Loestrin Fe 1/20, 1.5/30; Loestrin 24 Fe; Minastrin 24 Fe; Ortho Tri-Cyclen Lo. Generic formulations may also be available.

[c] The following products contain at least 35 mcg of ethinyl estradiol combined with norethindrone or norgestimate: Brevicon; Femcon Fe; Modicon; Norinyl 1/35; Ortho-Cyclen; Ortho-Novum 1/35, 7/7/7; Ortho Tri-Cyclen; Ovcon 35; Tri-Norinyl. Generic formulations may also be available.

[d] R-methadone is the active form of methadone.

Key to Symbols:

↑ = increase

↓ = decrease

↔ = no change

Key: 17-BMP = beclomethasone 17-monopropionate; ALT = alanine aminotransferase; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; AUC = area under the curve; CCB = calcium channel blocker; C_{max} = maximum plasma concentration; C_{min} = minimum plasma concentration; CNS = central nervous system; COBI = cobicistat; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CV = cardiovascular; CYP = cytochrome P; DHA = dihydroartemisinin; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; ECG = electrocardiogram; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FPV = fosamprenavir; H2RA = H2 receptor antagonist; HCV = hepatitis C virus; HRT = hormone replacement therapy; IDV = indinavir; INR = international normalized ratio; LPV = lopinavir; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; MPA = medroxyprogesterone acetate; NFV = nelfinavir; OATP = organic anion-transporting polypeptide; PAH = pulmonary arterial hypertension; PDE5 = Phosphodiesterase Type 5; PI = protease inhibitor; PI/c = protease inhibitor/cobicistat; PI/r = protease inhibitor/ritonavir; PK = pharmacokinetic; PPI = proton pump inhibitor; PTH = parathyroid hormone; QTc = QT corrected for heart rate; RTV = ritonavir; SQV = saquinavir; SSRI = selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor; TCA = tricyclic antidepressant; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TPV = tipranavir; TPV/r = tipranavir/ritonavir; VPA = valproic acid

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21b. Drug Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 12)

This table provides information on the known or predicted interactions between NNRTIs and non-ARV drugs. For information regarding interactions between NNRTIs and other ARV drugs, including dosing recommendations, refer to Tables 21c, 22a, and 22b. Recommendations for managing a particular drug interaction may differ depending on whether a new ARV drug is being initiated in a patient on a stable concomitant medication or if a new concomitant medication is being initiated in a patient on a stable ARV regimen. The magnitude and significance of drug interactions are difficult to predict when several drugs with competing metabolic pathways are prescribed concomitantly. In cases where an interacting drug needs to be replaced with an alternative, providers should exercise their clinical judgement to select the most appropriate alternative medication to use.

Note: DLV is **not** included in this table. Please refer to the FDA product label for information regarding drug interactions between DLV and other concomitant drugs. The term "All NNRTIs" in this table refers to all NNRTIs **except for** DLV.

Concomitant Drug	NNRTI	Effect on NNRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Acid Reducers			
Antacids	DOR, EFV, NVP	↔ NNRTI AUC	No dose adjustment needed.
	ETR	↔ ETR expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	RPV	↓ RPV expected when given simultaneously	Give antacids at least 2 hours before or at least 4 hours after RPV.
H2 Receptor Antagonists	DOR, ETR, NVP	↔ NNRTI expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	↔ EFV AUC	No dose adjustment needed.
	RPV	RPV AUC ↓ 76% when famotidine 40 mg is taken 2 hours prior	Give H2 receptor antagonists at least 12 hours before or at least 4 hours after RPV.
PPIs	DOR	DOR AUC ↓ 17% and C_{min} ↓ 16%	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, NVP	↔ EFV and NVP expected	
	ETR	↔ ETR AUC	
	RPV	**With Omeprazole 20 mg Daily:** • RPV AUC ↓ 40% and C_{min} ↓ 33%	**Contraindicated.**
Alpha-Adrenergic Antagonists for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia			
Alfuzosin, Doxazosin, Silodosin	DOR, RPV	↔ alpha-adrenergic antagonists expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ alpha-adrenergic antagonists expected	Consider alternative ARV or alpha antagonist therapy. If coadministration is necessary, monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of alpha antagonist.
Tamsulosin	DOR, RPV	↔ tamsulosin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ tamsulosin expected	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of tamsulosin after 2–4 weeks. May need to increase dose to tamsulosin 0.8 mg once daily for patients who fail to respond to the 0.4 mg dose.
Antibacterials			
Antimycobacterials			
Bedaquiline	DOR, RPV	↔ bedaquiline expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR	↓ bedaquiline possible	**Do not coadminister.**
	NVP	↔ bedaquiline AUC	No dose adjustment needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21b. Drug Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 12)

Concomitant Drug	NNRTI	Effect on NNRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antibacterials, continued			
Antimycobacterials, continued			
Rifabutin	DOR	DOR AUC ↓ 50%	Increase DOR dose to 100 mg twice daily. No dose adjustment needed for rifabutin.
	EFV	Rifabutin ↓ 38%	The recommended dosing range is rifabutin 450–600 mg per day.
	ETR	↔ rifabutin and metabolite AUC ETR AUC ↓ 37%	**Do not coadminister ETR plus PI/r with rifabutin.** Use rifabutin 300 mg once daily if ETR is administered without PI/r.
	NVP	Rifabutin AUC ↑ 17% and metabolite AUC ↑ 24% NVP C_{min} ↓ 16%	No dose adjustment needed.
	RPV	**Rifabutin plus RPV 50 mg Once Daily Compared to RPV 25 mg Once Daily Alone:** • ↔ RPV AUC and C_{min}	Increase RPV dose to 50 mg once daily. No dose adjustment for rifabutin needed.
Rifampin	DOR	DOR AUC ↓ 88%	**Contraindicated.**
	EFV	EFV AUC ↓ 26%	**Do not use EFV 400 mg with rifampin.** Maintain EFV dose at 600 mg once daily and monitor for virologic response.
	ETR	Significant ↓ ETR possible	**Do not coadminister.**
	NVP	NVP ↓ 20% to 58%	**Do not coadminister.**
	RPV	RPV AUC ↓ 80%	**Contraindicated.**
Rifapentine	DOR, RPV	↓ NNRTI expected	**Contraindicated.**
	EFV	↔ EFV concentrations	No dose adjustment needed.
	ETR, NVP	↓ NNRTI possible	**Do not coadminister.**
Macrolides			
Azithromycin	All NNRTIs	↔ azithromycin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Clarithromycin	DOR, RPV	↔ clarithromycin expected ↑ DOR and RPV possible	Consider alternative macrolide (e.g., azithromycin) for MAC prophylaxis and treatment.
	EFV	Clarithromycin AUC ↓ 39%	Monitor for effectiveness or consider alternative agent (e.g., azithromycin) for MAC prophylaxis and treatment.
	ETR	Clarithromycin AUC ↓ 39% ETR AUC ↑ 42%	Consider alternative macrolide (e.g., azithromycin) for MAC prophylaxis and treatment.
	NVP	Clarithromycin AUC ↓ 31% NVP AUC ↑ 26%	Monitor for effectiveness or consider alternative macrolide (e.g., azithromycin) for MAC prophylaxis and treatment.
Erythromycin	DOR, RPV	↑ DOR and RPV possible	Monitor for ARV tolerability if used in combination.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↑ EFV, ETR, and NVP possible ↓ erythromycin possible	Monitor for antibiotic efficacy if used in combination.
Anticoagulants			
Apixaban	DOR, RPV	↔ apixaban expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ apixaban possible	Consider alternative ARV or anticoagulant therapy.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21b. Drug Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 3 of 12)

Concomitant Drug	NNRTI	Effect on NNRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Anticoagulants, continued			
Betrixaban	All NNRTIs	↔ betrixaban expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Dabigatran	All NNRTIs	↔ dabigatran expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Edoxaban	All NNRTIs	↔ edoxaban expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Rivaroxaban	DOR, RPV	↔ rivaroxaban expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ rivaroxaban possible	Consider alternative ARV or anticoagulant therapy.
Warfarin	DOR, RPV	↔ warfarin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↑ or ↓ warfarin possible	Monitor INR and adjust warfarin dose accordingly.
Anticonvulsants			
Carbamazepine, Phenobarbital, Phenytoin	DOR, RPV	↓ NNRTI possible	**Contraindicated.**
	EFV	**Carbamazepine plus EFV:** • Carbamazepine AUC ↓ 27% • EFV AUC ↓ 36% **Phenytoin plus EFV:** • ↓ EFV • ↑ or ↓ phenytoin possible	Consider alternative ARV or anticonvulsant. If coadministration is necessary, monitor anticonvulsant and EFV concentrations.
	ETR	↓ anticonvulsant and ETR possible	**Do not coadminister.**
	NVP	↓ anticonvulsant and NVP possible	Consider alternative ARV or anticonvulsant. If coadministration is necessary, monitor anticonvulsant and NVP concentrations and virologic response.
Eslicarbazepine	All NNRTIs	↓ NNRTI possible	Consider alternative ARV or anticonvulsant. If coadministration is necessary, monitor virologic response and consider monitoring plasma concentrations of ARVs.
Oxcarbazepine	DOR, RPV	↓ NNRTI possible	**Contraindicated.**
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ NNRTI possible	Consider alternative ARV or anticonvulsant. If coadministration is necessary, monitor virologic response and consider monitoring plasma concentrations of ARVs.
Ethosuximide, Lacosamide, Tiagabine, Zonisamide	DOR, RPV	↔ anticonvulsant expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ anticonvulsant possible	Monitor seizure control and consider anticonvulsant therapeutic drug monitoring.
Lamotrigine	DOR, ETR, NVP, RPV	↔ lamotrigine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	↓ lamotrigine possible	Monitor seizure control and plasma concentrations of lamotrigine.
Antidepressants, Anxiolytics, and Antipsychotics			
Antidepressants			
Bupropion	DOR, ETR, RPV	↔ bupropion expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Bupropion AUC ↓ 55%	Titrate bupropion dose based on clinical response.
	NVP	↓ bupropion possible	

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21b. Drug Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 4 of 12)

Concomitant Drug	NNRTI	Effect on NNRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antidepressants, Anxiolytics, and Antipsychotics, continued			
Antidepressants, continued			
Citalopram, Escitalopram	DOR, RPV	↔ antidepressant expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ antidepressant possible	Titrate antidepressant dose based on clinical response.
Fluoxetine, Fluvoxamine	All NNRTIs	↔ antidepressant expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Paroxetine	DOR,NVP, RPV	↔ paroxetine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR	↔ paroxetine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Nefazodone	DOR, RPV	↑ NNRTI possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ nefazodone expected ↑ NNRTI possible	Monitor antidepressant effect and titrate dose as necessary based on clinical response.
Sertraline	DOR, RPV	↔ sertraline expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Sertraline AUC ↓ 39%	Monitor the antidepressant effect and titrate dose as necessary based on clinical response.
	ETR, NVP	↓ sertraline possible	
Trazodone	DOR, RPV	↔ trazodone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ trazodone possible	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of trazodone and titrate dose as necessary.
Anxiolytics (Benzodiazepines)			
Alprazolam, Triazolam	DOR, RPV	↔ benzodiazepine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ benzodiazepine possible	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of benzodiazepine.
Diazepam	DOR, RPV	↔ diazepam expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, NVP	↓ diazepam possible	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of diazepam.
	ETR	↑ diazepam possible	Decreased dose of diazepam may be necessary. Monitor for diazepam toxicity.
Lorazepam	DOR, ETR, NVP, RPV	↔ lorazepam expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	↔ lorazepam AUC	No dose adjustment needed.
Midazolam	DOR, RPV	↔ midazolam expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	↑ or ↓ midazolam possible	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness and toxicity of midazolam.
	ETR	Midazolam AUC ↓ 31% Midazolam active metabolite C_{max} ↑ 57%	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of midazolam.
	NVP	↓ midazolam possible	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of midazolam.
Antipsychotics			
Aripiprazole	DOR, RPV	↔ aripiprazole expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ aripiprazole expected	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of antipsychotic. Consider doubling usual dose of aripiprazole over 1–2 weeks. Refer to aripiprazole prescribing information for dose recommendations.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21b. Drug Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 5 of 12)

Concomitant Drug	NNRTI	Effect on NNRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antipsychotics, continued			
Brexpiprazole	DOR, RPV	↔ brexpiprazole expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ brexpiprazole expected	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of antipsychotic. Consider doubling the usual dose of brexpiprazole and making further adjustments based on clinical response. Refer to brexpiprazole prescribing information.
Cariprazine	DOR, RPV	↔ cariprazine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ cariprazine and ↑ or ↓ active metabolite possible	**Do not coadminister.**
Lurasidone	DOR, RPV	↔ antipsychotic expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ antipsychotic possible	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of antipsychotic.
Olanzapine	DOR, ETR, NVP, RPV	↔ olanzapine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	↓ olanzapine possible	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of olanzapine.
Pimavanserin	DOR, RPV	↔ pimavanserin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ pimavanserin expected	**Do not coadminister.**
Pimozide	DOR, RPV	↔ pimozide expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ pimozide possible	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of pimozide.
Quetiapine	DOR, RPV	↔ antipsychotic expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ antipsychotic possible	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of antipsychotic.
Antifungals			
Fluconazole	DOR, RPV	↑ NNRTI possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	↔ fluconazole expected ↔ EFV AUC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	ETR	ETR AUC ↑ 86%	No dose adjustment needed.
	NVP	NVP AUC ↑ 110%	Consider alternative ARV or antifungal agent. Increased risk of hepatotoxicity possible with this combination.
Isavuconazole	DOR, RPV	↑ NNRTI possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ isavuconazole possible	Monitor isavuconazole concentration and antifungal response. Dose adjustments for isavuconazole may be necessary.
Itraconazole	DOR, RPV	↑ NNRTI possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Itraconazole and OH-itraconazole AUC, C_{max}, and C_{min} ↓ 35% to 44%	**Do not coadminister, unless potential benefits outweigh the risks.** Failure to achieve therapeutic itraconazole concentrations has been reported. If coadministration is necessary, closely monitor itraconazole concentration and adjust dose accordingly.
	ETR	↓ itraconazole possible ↑ ETR possible	Dose adjustments for itraconazole may be necessary. Monitor itraconazole concentration and antifungal response.
	NVP	Itraconazole AUC ↓ 61% ↑ NVP possible	**Do not coadminister, unless potential benefits outweigh the risks.** If coadministration is necessary, monitor itraconazole concentration and adjust dose accordingly.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21b. Drug Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 6 of 12)

Concomitant Drug	NNRTI	Effect on NNRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antifungals, continued			
Posaconazole	DOR, ETR, NVP, RPV	↑ NNRTI possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Posaconazole AUC ↓ 50% ↔ EFV AUC	**Do not coadminister, unless potential benefits outweigh the risks.** If coadministration is necessary, monitor posaconazole concentration and adjust dose accordingly.
Voriconazole	DOR, RPV	↑ NNRTI possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Voriconazole AUC ↓ 77% EFV AUC ↑ 44%	**Contraindicated at standard doses.** Adjust dose to voriconazole 400 mg twice daily plus EFV 300 mg daily.
	ETR	↔ voriconazole AUC ETR AUC ↑ 36%	No dose adjustment needed.
	NVP	↓ voriconazole possible ↑ NVP possible	Consider alternative ARV or antifungal agent. If coadministration is necessary, monitor antiretroviral tolerability and antifungal response and/or voriconazole concentration.
Antimalarials			
Artemether/ Lumefantrine	DOR, RPV	↔ antimalarial expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Artemether AUC ↓ 79% DHA AUC ↓ 75% Lumefantrine AUC ↓ 56%	Consider alternative ARV or antimalarial drug. If used in combination, monitor closely for antimalarial efficacy.
	ETR	Artemether AUC ↓ 38% ↔ DHA AUC ↔ lumefantrine AUC ↔ ETR AUC	Clinical significance of the reduced antimalarial drug concentrations unknown. If used in combination with ETR, monitor for antimalarial efficacy.
	NVP	Artemether AUC ↓ 67% to 72% **DHA:** • Study results are conflicting. DHA AUC ↓ 37% in one study, no difference in another. **Lumefantrine:** • Study results are conflicting. Lumefantrine AUC ↓ 25% to 58% in two studies but ↑ 56% in another.	Clinical significance unknown. If used in combination, monitor closely for antimalarial efficacy and lumefantrine toxicity.
Atovaquone/ Proguanil	DOR, ETR, NVP, RPV	No data	Monitor for antimalarial efficacy.
	EFV	Atovaquone AUC ↓ 75% Proguanil AUC ↓ 43%	No dose recommendation. Consider alternative drug for malaria prophylaxis, if possible.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21b. Drug Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 7 of 12)

Concomitant Drug	NNRTI	Effect on NNRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antiplatelets			
Clopidogrel	DOR, NVP, RPV	↔ clopidogrel expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR	↓ activation of clopidogrel possible	Consider alternative ARV or antiplatelet. ETR may prevent metabolism of clopidogrel to its active metabolite.
Prasugrel	All NNRTIs	↔ prasugrel expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Ticagrelor	DOR, RPV	↔ ticagrelor expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ ticagrelor expected	Consider alternative ARV or anticoagulant therapy.
Vorapaxar	DOR, NVP, RPV	↔ vorapaxar expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR	↓ vorapaxar expected	Insufficient data to make a dose recommendation.
Antipneumocystis and Anti-Toxoplasmosis Drugs			
Atovaquone (oral solution)	DOR, ETR, RPV, NVP	No data	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of atovaquone.
	EFV	Atovaquone AUC ↓ 44% to 47%	Consider alternative ARV or agent for PCP or toxoplasmosis treatment or prophylaxis. If coadministration is necessary, monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of atovaquone.
Cardiac Medications			
Dihydropyridine CCBs	DOR, RPV	↔ CCBs expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ CCBs possible	Titrate CCB dose based on clinical response.
Diltiazem, Verapamil	DOR, RPV	↔ CCBs expected ↑ NNRTI possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Diltiazem AUC ↓ 69% ↓ verapamil possible	Titrate diltiazem or verapamil dose based on clinical response.
	ETR, NVP	↓ diltiazem or verapamil possible	
Corticosteroids			
Dexamethasone	DOR, EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ NNRTI possible	Consider alternative corticosteroid for long-term use. If dexamethasone is used with NNRTI, monitor virologic response.
	RPV	Significant ↓ RPV possible	**Contraindicated with more than a single dose of dexamethasone.**
Glucose-Lowering Agents			
Canagliflozin, Dapagliflozin, Empagliflozin, Sitagliptin	All NNRTIs	↔ antihyperglycemic expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Linagliptin, Saxagliptin	DOR, RPV	↔ antihyperglycemic expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ antihyperglycemic possible	Monitor glycemic control.
Metformin	DOR	↔ metformin AUC DOR AUC ↓ 26% and C_{max} ↓ 24%	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP, RPV	↔ metformin expected	No dose adjustment needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21b. Drug Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 8 of 12)

Concomitant Drug	NNRTI	Effect on NNRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Hepatitis C Direct-Acting Antiviral Agents			
Daclatasvir	DOR, RPV	No data	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	**Daclatasvir 120 mg Once Daily plus EFV 600 mg Daily Compared with Daclatasvir 60 mg Alone:** • Daclatasvir C_{min} ↓ 17% and AUC ↑ 37%	The recommended dose is daclatasvir 90 mg once daily.
Dasabuvir plus Paritaprevir/ Ombitasvir/RTV	DOR	↑ DOR possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	No data	**Contraindicated.**
	ETR, NVP	↓ DAAs possible	**Do not coadminister.**
	RPV	RPV AUC ↑ 150% to 225%	**Do not coadminister,** due to potential for QT interval prolongation with higher concentrations of RPV.
Elbasvir/ Grazoprevir	DOR	↔ elbasvir and grazoprevir DOR AUC ↑ 56% and C_{min} ↑ 41%	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Elbasvir AUC ↓ 54% Grazoprevir AUC ↓ 83% ↔ EFV	**Contraindicated.**
	ETR, NVP	↓ elbasvir and grazoprevir expected	**Do not coadminister.**
	RPV	↔ elbasvir and grazoprevir ↔ RPV AUC and C_{min}	No dose adjustment needed.
Glecaprevir/ Pibrentasvir	DOR	↑ DOR expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	↓ glecaprevir and pibrentasvir expected	**Do not coadminister.**
	ETR	↓ glecaprevir and pibrentasvir possible	
	NVP	↓ glecaprevir and pibrentasvir possible	Consider alternative ARV or HCV regimen. If coadministration is necessary, monitor for HCV treatment efficacy.
	RPV	↔ glecaprevir and pibrentasvir RPV AUC ↑ 84%	No dose adjustment needed.
Ledipasvir/ Sofosbuvir	DOR, RPV	↔ ledipasvir and sofosbuvir ↔ DOR ↔ RPV	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Ledipasvir AUC, C_{min}, and C_{max} ↓ 34% ↔ sofosbuvir	
	ETR, NVP	No significant effect expected	
Sofosbuvir/ Velpatasvir	DOR, RPV	No significant effect expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Velpatasvir AUC ↓ 43% , C_{max} ↓ 37%, and C_{min} ↓ 47%	**Do not coadminister.**
	ETR, NVP	↓ velpatasvir expected	**Do not coadminister.**
Sofosbuvir/ Velpatasvir/ Voxilaprevir	DOR, RPV	No significant effect expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Velpatasvir AUC ↓ 43% , C_{max} ↓ 37%, and C_{min} ↓47% ↓ voxilaprevir expected	**Do not coadminister.**
	ETR, NVP	↓ voxilaprevir expected ↓ velpatasvir expected	**Do not coadminister.**

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21b. Drug Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 9 of 12)

Concomitant Drug	NNRTI	Effect on NNRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Herbal Products			
St. John's Wort	DOR, RPV	↓ NNRTI expected	**Contraindicated.**
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ EFV, ETR, and NVP expected	**Do not coadminister.**
Hormonal Therapies			
Contraceptives –Injectable Depot MPA	DOR, ETR, RPV	↔ MPA expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, NVP	↔ MPA	No dose adjustment needed.
Contraceptives – Oral	DOR	↔ ethinyl estradiol ↔ levonorgestrel	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	↔ ethinyl estradiol Etonogestrel (metabolite of oral desogestrel) C_{min} ↓ 61% Levonorgestrel (metabolite of oral norgestimate) AUC ↓ 83% Norelgestromin (metabolite of oral norgestimate) AUC ↓ 64%	**When Used for Contraception:** • Use alternative ARV or contraceptive methods. **When Used for Other Clinical Indications (e.g., Acne, Menstrual Cycle Regulation):** • Monitor for clinical effectiveness of hormonal therapy.
	ETR	Ethinyl estradiol AUC ↑ 22% ↔ norethindrone	No dose adjustment needed.
	NVP	Ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 29% and C_{min} ↓ 58% Norethindrone AUC ↓ 18% Etonogestrel (metabolite of oral desogestrel) C_{min} ↓ 22%	No dose adjustment needed based on clinical data that demonstrated no change in effectiveness
	RPV	↔ ethinyl estradiol ↔ norethindrone	No dose adjustment needed.
Contraceptives – Subdermal Implant Etonogestrel	DOR, RPV	↔ etonogestrel expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Etonogestrel AUC ↓ 63% to 82%	Use alternative ARV or contraceptive methods.
	ETR	↓ etonogestrel possible	No data available to make dose recommendation.
	NVP	↔ etonogestrel	No dose adjustment needed.
Contraceptives –Subdermal Implant Levonorestrel	DOR, RPV	↔ levonorgestrel expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Levonorgestrel AUC ↓ 47%	Use alternative ARV or contraceptive methods. Unintended pregnancies were observed in women who used EFV and levonorgestrel implant concomitantly.
	ETR	↓ levonorgestrel possible	No data available to make dose recommendation.
	NVP	Levonorgestrel AUC ↑ 35%	No dose adjustment needed.
Contraceptives – Vaginal Ring Etonogestrel/ Ethinyl Estradiol	DOR, RPV	↔ etonogestrel and ethinyl estradiol expected	No dose adjustment needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21b. Drug Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 10 of 12)

Concomitant Drug	NNRTI	Effect on NNRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Hormonal Therapies, continued			
Contraceptives – Vaginal Ring Etonogestrel/ Ethinyl Estradiol	EFV	Ethinyl estradiol (intravaginal ring) AUC ↓ 56% Etonogestrel (intravaginal ring) AUC ↓ 81%	Consider alternative ARV or contraceptive method.
	ETR, NVP	↓ etonogestrel and ethinyl estradiol possible	No data available to make dose recommendation.
Contraceptives – Vaginal Ring Segesterone/ Ethinyl Estradiol	DOR, RPV	↔ segesterone and ethinyl estradiol expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ segesterone and ethinyl estradiol possible	Consider alternative ARV or contraceptive method.
Emergency Contraceptives Levonorgestrel (oral)	DOR, RPV	↔ levonorgestrel expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Levonorgestrel AUC ↓ 58%	Effectiveness of emergency postcoital contraception may be diminished.
	NVP, ETR	↓ levonorgestrel possible	No data available to make dose recommendation.
Gender-Affirming Therapy	DOR, RPV	↔ hormonal concentrations expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ estradiol possible ↔ goserelin, leuprolide acetate, and spironolactone expected ↓ dutasteride and finasteride possible	Monitor feminizing effects of estrogen and antiandrogen therapy and titrate dose as necessary to achieve therapeutic goals.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ testosterone possible	Monitor masculinizing effects of testosterone and titrate testosterone dose as necessary to achieve therapeutic goals.
Menopausal Replacement Therapy	DOR, RPV	↔ hormonal concentrations expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ estrogen possible with estradiol or conjugated estrogen (equine and synthetic) ↓ medroxyprogesterone possible ↓ micronized progesterone possible ↓ drospirenone possible See Contraceptives – Oral for other progestin-NNRTI interactions	Monitor menopausal symptoms. Titrate to the dose of hormonal therapy that achieves menopausal symptom relief.
Immunosuppressants			
Cyclosporine	DOR, RPV	↔ cyclosporine expected ↑ NNRTI possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ cyclosporine possible	Increase in immunosuppressant dose may be necessary. Therapeutic drug monitoring of immunosuppressant is recommended. Consult with specialist as necessary.
Everolimus, Sirolimus, Tacrolimus	DOR, RPV	↔ immunosuppressant expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ immunosuppressant possible	Increase in immunosuppressant dose may be necessary. Therapeutic drug monitoring of immunosuppressant is recommended. Consult with specialist as necessary.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21b. Drug Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 11 of 12)

Concomitant Drug	NNRTI	Effect on NNRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Lipid-Modifying Agents			
Atorvastatin	DOR, RPV	↔ atorvastatin AUC	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR	Atorvastatin AUC ↓ 32% to 43%	Adjust atorvastatin dose according to lipid response, but do not exceed the maximum recommended dose.
	NVP	↓ atorvastatin possible	Adjust atorvastatin dose according to lipid response, but do not exceed the maximum recommended dose.
Fluvastatin	DOR, NVP, RPV	↔ fluvastatin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR	↑ fluvastatin possible	Dose adjustments for fluvastatin may be necessary. Monitor for fluvastatin toxicity.
Lovastatin, Simvastatin	DOR, RPV	↔ lovastatin and simvastatin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Simvastatin AUC ↓ 68% Simvastatin active metabolite AUC ↓ 60%	Adjust simvastatin dose according to lipid response, but do not exceed the maximum recommended dose.
	ETR, NVP	↓ lovastatin possible ↓ simvastatin possible	Adjust lovastatin or simvastatin dose according to lipid response, but do not exceed the maximum recommended dose.
Pitavastatin	DOR, ETR, NVP, RPV	↔ pitavastatin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	↔ pitavastatin AUC	No dose adjustment needed.
Pravastatin	DOR, NVP, RPV	↔ pravastatin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Pravastatin AUC ↓ 44%	Adjust statin dose according to lipid responses, but do not exceed the maximum recommended dose.
	ETR	↓ pravastatin possible	
Rosuvastatin	DOR, EFV, ETR, NVP, RPV	↔ rosuvastatin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Narcotics/Treatments for Opioid Dependence			
Buprenorphine Sublingual or buccal	DOR, RPV	↔ buprenorphine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Buprenorphine AUC ↓ 50% Norbuprenorphine (active metabolite) AUC ↓ 71%	No dose adjustment needed; monitor for withdrawal symptoms.
	ETR	Buprenorphine AUC ↓ 25%	No dose adjustment needed.
	NVP	No significant effect	No dose adjustment needed.
Buprenorphine Implant	DOR, RPV	↔ buprenorphine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	No data	Clinical monitoring is recommended when NNRTI is initiated after insertion of buprenorphine implant.
Lofexidine	DOR, EFV, ETR, NVP, RPV	↔ lofexidine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Methadone	DOR, ETR	No significant effect	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV	Methadone AUC ↓ 52%	Opioid withdrawal common; monitor and increase methadone dose as necessary.
	NVP	Methadone AUC ↓ 37% to 51% ↔ NVP	Opioid withdrawal common; monitor and increase methadone dose as necessary.
	RPV	R-methadone[a] AUC ↓ 16%	No dose adjustment needed, but monitor for withdrawal symptoms.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21b. Drug Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 12 of 12)

Concomitant Drug	NNRTI	Effect on NNRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
PDE5 Inhibitors			
Sildenafil	DOR	↔ sildenafil expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, NVP	↓ sildenafil possible	May need to titrate sildenafil dose based on clinical effect.
	ETR	Sildenafil AUC ↓ 57%	May need to titrate sildenafil dose based on clinical effect.
	RPV	↔ sildenafil AUC and C_{max}	No dose adjustment needed.
Tadalafil	DOR, RPV	↔ tadalafil expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ tadalafil possible	May need to titrate tadalafil dose based on clinical effect.
Avanafil, Vardenafil	DOR, RPV	↔ avanafil or vardenafil expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ avanafil or vardenafil possible	May need to increase PDE5 inhibitor dose based on clinical effect.

[a] R-methadone is the active form of methadone.

Key to Symbols:

↑ = increase

↓ = decrease

↔ = no change

Key: ARV = antiretroviral; AUC = area under the curve; CCB = calcium channel blocker; C_{max} = maximum plasma concentration; C_{min} = minimum plasma concentration; DAA = direct-acting antiviral; DHA = dihydroartemisinin; DLV = delavirdine; DOR = doravirine; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; HCV = hepatitis C virus; INR = international normalized ratio; MAC = *Mycobacterium avium* complex; MPA = medroxyprogesterone acetate; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; OH-itraconazole = active metabolite of itraconazole; PCP = *Pneumocystis jirovecii* pneumonia; PDE5 = phosphodiesterase type 5; PI/c = protease inhibitor/cobicistat; PI/r = protease inhibitor/ritonavir; PK = pharmacokinetic; PPI = proton pump inhibitor; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21c. Drug Interactions Between Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 3)

This table provides information on the known or predicted interactions between NRTIs and non-ARV drugs. Recommendations for managing a particular drug interaction may differ depending on whether a new ARV drug is being initiated in a patient on a stable concomitant medication or whether a new concomitant medication is being initiated in a patient on a stable ARV regimen. The magnitude and significance of drug interactions are difficult to predict when several drugs with competing metabolic pathways are prescribed concomitantly. In cases where an interacting drug needs to be replaced with an alternative, providers should exercise their clinical judgement to select the most appropriate alternative medication to use.

Note: Interactions associated with ddI and d4T are **not** included in this table. Please refer to the FDA product labels for ddI and d4T for information regarding drug interactions between these NRTIs and other drugs.

Concomitant Drug	NRTI	Effect on NRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Cytomegalovirus and Hepatitis B Antivirals			
Adefovir	TAF, TDF	No data	**Do not coadminister.** Serum concentrations of TDF and/or other renally eliminated drugs may increase.
Ganciclovir, Valganciclovir	TAF, TDF	No data	Serum concentrations of ganciclovir and/or TFV may increase. Monitor for dose-related toxicities.
	ZDV	↔ ZDV expected ↔ ganciclovir expected	If coadministered, closely monitor for hematologic toxicities.
Hepatitis C Antiviral Agents			
Glecaprevir/ Pibrentasvir	TAF	↔ TFV AUC	No dose adjustment needed.
	TDF	TFV AUC ↑ 29%	No dose adjustment needed.
Ledipasvir/ Sofosbuvir	TAF	TFV AUC ↑ 27%	No dose adjustment needed.
	TDF	Ledipasvir ↑ TFV AUC 40% to 98% when TDF is given with RPV and EFV Ledipasvir ↑ TFV C_{min} 55% to 80% when TDF is given with various PIs, NNRTIs, or INSTIs Further ↑ TFV AUC and C_{max} possible when TDF is given with PIs	**Do not coadminister** with EVG/c/TDF/FTC. If TDF is used in these patients, monitor for TDF toxicities. Consider using TAF in patients at risk of TDF-associated adverse events. Consider using TAF or alternative HCV therapy in patients on TDF plus a PI/r or PI/c. The safety of increased TFV exposure with this combination has not been established.
Ribavirin	TDF	**Ribavirin With Sofosbuvir 400 mg:** • ↔ TFV AUC	No dose adjustment needed.
	ZDV	Ribavirin inhibits phosphorylation of ZDV	Consider alternative. If coadministered, closely monitor HIV virologic response and monitor for possible hematologic toxicities.
Sofosbuvir/ Velpatasvir	TAF	↔ TAF expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	TDF	TFV C_{max} and AUC ↑ 39% to 81% when coadministered with various ARV combinations	If TDF is used in these patients, monitor for TDF-related toxicities. Consider using TAF in patients at risk of TDF-related adverse events.
Sofosbuvir/ Velpatasvir/ Voxilaprevir	TAF	↔ TAF expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	TDF	TFV C_{max} and AUC ↑ 35% to 55% when coadministered with various ARV combinations	If TDF is used in these patients, monitor for TDF-related toxicities. Consider using TAF in patients at risk of TDF-related adverse events.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21c. Drug Interactions Between Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 3)

Concomitant Drug	NRTI	Effect on NRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
INSTIs			
DTG	TAF	↔ TAF AUC	No dose adjustment needed.
	TDF	↔ TDF AUC ↔ DTG AUC	No dose adjustment needed.
RAL	TDF	RAL AUC ↑ 49%	No dose adjustment needed.
Narcotics and Treatment for Opioid Dependence			
Buprenorphine	3TC, TDF, ZDV	↔ 3TC, TDF, ZDV, and buprenorphine	No dose adjustment needed.
	TAF	↔ TAF expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Methadone	ABC	Methadone clearance ↑ 22%	No dose adjustment needed.
	ZDV	ZDV AUC ↑ 29% to 43%	Monitor for ZDV-related adverse effects.
Other			
Anticonvulsants Carbamazepine, oxcarbazepine, phenobarbital, phenytoin	TAF	**With Carbamazepine:** • TAF AUC ↓ 55% ↓ TAF possible with other anticonvulsants	**Do not coadminister.**
Antimycobacterial Rifampin	TAF	**TAF with Rifampin Compared with TDF Alone:** • TFV-DP AUC ↑ 4.2-fold **TAF with Rifampin Compared with TAF Alone:** • TAF AUC ↓ 55% • TFV-DP AUC ↓ 36% **TAF 25 mg Twice Daily with Rifampin Compared with TAF Once Daily Alone:** • TAF AUC ↓ 14% • TFV-DP AUC ↓ 24%	**Do not coadminister, unless benefits outweigh risks.** Intracellular TFV-DP levels are higher when TAF is coadministered with rifampin compared to TDF administered alone, but clinical outcomes have not been studied. If coadministered, monitor virologic response.
	TDF	↔ AUC TFV	No dose adjustment needed.
Atovaquone	ZDV	ZDV AUC ↑ 31%	Monitor for ZDV-related adverse effects.
Rifabutin, Rifapentine	TAF	↓ TAF possible	**Do not coadminister.**
St. John's Wort	TAF	↓ TAF possible	**Do not coadminister.**
PIs for Treatment of HIV			
ATV (Unboosted), ATV/c, ATV/r	TAF	**TAF 10 mg with ATV/r:** • TAF AUC ↑ 91% **TAF 10 mg with ATV/c:** • TAF AUC ↑ 75%	No dose adjustment needed (use TAF 25 mg).

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21c. Drug Interactions Between Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 3 of 3)

Concomitant Drug	NRTI	Effect on NRTI and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
ATV (Unboosted), ATV/c, ATV/r	TDF	**With ATV (Unboosted):** • ATV AUC ↓ 25% and C_{min} ↓ 23% to 40% (higher C_{min} with RTV than without RTV) TFV AUC ↑ 24% to 37%	**Do not coadminister unboosted ATV with TDF.** Use ATV 300 mg daily plus (RTV 100 mg or COBI 150 mg) daily when coadministering TDF 300 mg daily. If using TDF and an H2 receptor antagonist in an ART-experienced patient, use ATV 400 mg daily plus (RTV 100 mg or COBI 150 mg) daily. Monitor for TDF-associated toxicities.
	ZDV	**With ATV (Unboosted):** • ZDV C_{min} ↓ 30% and ↔ ZDV AUC	Clinical significance unknown. If coadministered, monitor virologic response.
DRV/c	TAF	**TAF 25 mg with DRV/c:** • ↔ TAF	No dose adjustment needed.
	TDF	↑ TFV possible	Monitor for TDF-associated toxicities.
DRV/r	TAF	**TAF 10 mg with DRV/r:** • ↔ TAF AUC	No dose adjustment needed.
	TDF	TFV AUC ↑ 22% and C_{min} ↑ 37%	Clinical significance unknown. If coadministered, monitor for TDF-associated toxicities.
LPV/r	TAF	**TAF 10 mg with DRV/r:** • TAF AUC ↑ 47%	No dose adjustment needed.
	TDF	↔ LPV/r AUC TFV AUC ↑ 32%	Clinical significance unknown. If coadministered, monitor for TDF-associated toxicities.
TPV/r	ABC	ABC AUC ↓ 35% to 44%	Clinical significance unknown. If coadministered, monitor virologic response.
	TAF	↓ TAF expected	**Do not coadminister, unless benefits outweigh risks.**
	TDF	↔ TDF AUC TPV AUC ↓ 9% to 18% and C_{min} ↓ 12% to 21%	No dose adjustment needed.
	ZDV	ZDV AUC ↓ 31% to 42% ↔ TPV AUC	Clinical significance unknown. If coadministered, monitor virologic response.

Key to Symbols:

↑ = increase

↓ = decrease

↔ = no change

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; AUC = area under the curve; C_{min} = minimum plasma concentration; COBI = cobicistat; d4T = stavudine; ddI = didanosine; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FTC = emtricitabine; HCV = hepatitis C virus; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; PI = protease inhibitor; PI/c = protease inhibitor/cobicistat; PI/r = protease inhibitor/ritonavir; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TFV = tenofovir; TFV-DP = tenofovir diphosphate; TPV/r = tipranavir/ritonavir; ZDV = zidovudine

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 17)

This table provides information on the known or predicted interactions between INSTIs (BIC, DTG, EVG, or RAL) and non-ARV drugs. EVG is always coadministered with COBI. For information regarding interactions between INSTIs and other ARV drugs, including dosing recommendations, refer to Tables 21c, 22a, and 22b.

Recommendations for managing a particular drug interaction may differ depending on whether a new ARV drug is being initiated in a patient on a stable concomitant medication or whether a new concomitant medication is being initiated in a patient on a stable ARV regimen. The magnitude and significance of drug interactions are difficult to predict when several drugs with competing metabolic pathways are prescribed concomitantly. In cases where an interacting drug needs to be replaced with an alternative, providers should exercise their clinical judgement to select the most appropriate alternative medication to use.

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Acid Reducers			
Al, Mg, +/- Ca-Containing Antacids Please refer to the Miscellaneous Drugs section of this table for recommendations on use with other polyvalent cation products (e.g., Fe and Ca supplements, multivitamins).	BIC	**Al/Mg Hydroxide Antacid:** • ↔ BIC AUC if antacid is administered 2 hours after BIC and under fasting conditions • BIC AUC ↓ 52% if antacid is administered 2 hours before BIC • BIC AUC ↓ 47% to 79% if administered simultaneously with antacid **$CaCO_3$ Antacid:** • ↔ BIC AUC if administered with food • BIC AUC ↓ 33% if administered under fasting conditions	**With Antacids That Contain Al/Mg:** • Administer antacids that contain Al/Mg at least 2 hours after or 6 hours before BIC. **With Antacids That Contain Ca:** • Administer BIC and antacids that contain Ca together with food. • **Do not coadminister BIC simultaneously with antacids that contain Ca on an empty stomach.**
	DTG	DTG AUC ↓ 74% if administered simultaneously with antacid DTG AUC ↓ 26% if administered 2 hours before antacid	Administer DTG at least 2 hours before or at least 6 hours after antacids that contain polyvalent cations.
	EVG/c	EVG AUC ↓ 40% to 50% if administered simultaneously with antacid EVG AUC ↓ 15% to 20% if administered 2 hours before or after antacid; ↔ with 4-hour interval	Separate EVG/c and antacid administration by more than 2 hours.
	RAL	**Al/Mg Hydroxide Antacid:** • RAL C_{min} ↓ 49% to 63% **$CaCO_3$ Antacid:** • RAL 400 mg twice daily: C_{min} ↓ 32% • RAL 1,200 mg once daily: C_{min} ↓ 48% to 57%	**Do not coadminister RAL and Al/Mg hydroxide antacids.** Use alternative acid-reducing agent. **With $CaCO_3$ Antacids:** • RAL 1,200 mg once daily: **Do not coadminister.** • RAL 400 mg twice daily: No dose adjustment or separation needed.
H2-Receptor Antagonists	BIC, DTG, EVG/c	↔ INSTI	No dose adjustment needed.
	RAL	RAL AUC ↑ 44% and C_{max} ↑ 60%	No dose adjustment needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Acid Reducers, continued			
Proton Pump Inhibitors	BIC, DTG, EVG/c	↔ INSTI	No dose adjustment needed.
	RAL	RAL AUC ↑ 37% and C_{min} ↑ 24%	No dose adjustment needed.
Alpha-Adrenergic Antagonists for Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia			
Alfuzosin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ alfuzosin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ alfuzosin expected	**Contraindicated.**
Doxazosin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ doxazosin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ doxazosin possible	Initiate doxazosin at lowest dose and titrate based on doxazosin efficacy and adverse events. Doxazosin dose reduction may be needed.
Tamsulosin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ tamsulosin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ tamsulosin expected	**Do not coadminister, unless benefits outweigh risks.** If coadministered, monitor for tamsulosin-related adverse events.
Terazosin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ terazosin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ terazosin possible	Initiate terazosin at lowest dose and titrate based on terazosin efficacy and adverse events. Terazosin dose reduction may be necessary.
Silodosin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ silodosin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ silodosin expected	**Contraindicated.**
Antibacterials			
Antimycobacterials			
Rifabutin	BIC	**Rifabutin 300 mg Once Daily:** • BIC AUC ↓ 38% and C_{min} ↓ 56%	**Do not coadminister.**
	DTG	**Rifabutin 300 mg Once Daily:** • ↔ DTG AUC and C_{min} ↓ 30%	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	**Rifabutin 150 mg Every Other Day with EVG/c Once Daily Compared to Rifabutin 300 mg Once Daily Alone:** • ↔ rifabutin AUC • 25-O-desacetyl-rifabutin AUC ↑ 625% • EVG AUC ↓ 21% and C_{min} ↓ 67%	**Do not coadminister.**
	RAL	RAL AUC ↑ 19% and C_{min} ↓ 20%	No dose adjustment needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 3 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antimycobacterials, continued			
Rifampin	BIC	BIC AUC ↓ 75%	**Contraindicated.**
	DTG	**Rifampin with DTG 50 mg Twice Daily Compared to DTG 50 mg Twice Daily Alone:** • DTG AUC ↓ 54% and C_{min} ↓ 72% **Rifampin with DTG 50 mg Twice Daily Compared to DTG 50 mg Once Daily Alone:** • DTG AUC ↑ 33% and C_{min} ↑ 22%	Use DTG 50 mg twice daily (instead of DTG 50 mg once daily) in patients without suspected or documented INSTI-associated resistance mutations. Consider an alternative to rifampin, such as rifabutin, in patients with certain suspected or documented INSTI-associated resistance mutations.
	EVG/c	Significant ↓ EVG and COBI expected	**Contraindicated.**
	RAL	**RAL 400 mg:** • RAL AUC ↓ 40% and C_{min} ↓ 61% **Rifampin with RAL 800 mg Twice Daily Compared to RAL 400 mg Twice Daily Alone:** • RAL AUC ↑ 27% and C_{min} ↓ 53%	Use RAL 800 mg twice daily instead of 400 mg twice daily. **Do not coadminister RAL 1,200 mg once daily with rifampin.** Monitor closely for virologic response, or consider using rifabutin as an alternative rifamycin.
Rifapentine	BIC, DTG, EVG/c	Significant ↓ BIC, DTG, EVG, and COBI expected	**Do not coadminister.**
	RAL	**Rifapentine 900 mg Once Weekly:** • RAL AUC ↑ 71% and C_{min} ↓ 12% **Rifapentine 600 mg Once Daily:** • RAL C_{min} ↓ 41%	For once-weekly rifapentine and RAL 400 mg twice daily, no dose adjustment needed. **Do not coadminister with once-daily rifapentine.**
Macrolides			
Azithromycin	All INSTIs	↔ azithromycin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Clarithromycin	BIC	↑ BIC possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	DTG, RAL	↔ clarithromycin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ clarithromycin expected ↑ COBI possible	Reduce clarithromycin dose by 50% in patients with CrCl 50 to 60 mL/min. **Do not coadminister in patients with CrCl <50 mL/min.** Consider alternative ARV or use azithromycin.
Erythromycin	BIC	↑ BIC possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	DTG, RAL	↔ INSTI expected ↔ erythromycin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ erythromycin expected ↑ COBI possible	No data available for dose recommendation. Consider alternative ARV or use azithromycin.
Anticoagulants			
Apixaban	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ apixaban expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ apixaban expected	**Do not coadminister** in patients who require apixaban 2.5 mg twice daily. Reduce apixaban dose by 50% in patients who require apixaban 5 mg or 10 mg twice daily.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 4 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Anticoagulants, continued			
Betrixaban	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ betrixaban expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ betrixaban expected	Administer initial single dose of betrixaban 80 mg, followed by betrixaban 40 mg once daily.
Dabigatran	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ dabigatran expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ dabigatran expected **With COBI 150 mg Alone:** • Dabigatran AUC ↑ 110% to 127%	Dabigatran dosing recommendation depends on indication and renal function. Refer to dabigatran prescribing information for dosing instructions when using dabigatran concomitantly with P-glycoprotein inhibitors.
Edoxaban	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ edoxaban expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↔ or ↑ edoxaban expected	**Stroke Prevention in Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation:** • No dose adjustment needed. **Deep Venous Thrombosis and Pulmonary Embolism:** • Administer edoxaban 30 mg once daily.
Rivaroxaban	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ rivaroxaban expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ rivaroxaban expected	**Do not coadminister.**
Warfarin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ warfarin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ or ↓ warfarin possible	Monitor INR and adjust warfarin dose accordingly.
Anticonvulsants			
Carbamazepine	BIC	↓ BIC possible	**Do not coadminister.**
	DTG	DTG AUC ↓ 49%	Increase DTG dose to 50 mg twice daily in ART-naive or ART-experienced, INSTI-naive patients. **Do not coadminister in INSTI-experienced patients with known or suspected INSTI resistance.**
	EVG/c	Carbamazepine AUC ↑ 43% EVG AUC ↓ 69% and C_{min} ↓ >99% ↓ COBI expected	**Contraindicated.**
	RAL	↓ or ↔ RAL possible	**Do not coadminister.**
Eslicarbazepine	All INSTIs	↓ INSTI possible ↓ COBI possible	Consider alternative ARV or anticonvulsant.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 5 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Anticonvulsants, continued			
Ethosuximide	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ ethosuximide expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ ethosuximide possible	Monitor for ethosuximide-related adverse events.
Lamotrigine	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ lamotrigine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	No data	Monitor anticonvulsant concentrations and adjust dose accordingly.
Oxcarbazepine	BIC, DTG	↓ BIC and DTG possible	**Do not coadminister.**
	EVG/c, RAL	↓ EVG/c and RAL possible	Consider alternative ARV or anticonvulsant.
Phenobarbital Phenytoin	BIC	↓ BIC possible	**Do not coadminister.**
	DTG	↓ DTG possible	**Do not coadminister.**
	EVG/c	↓ EVG/c expected	**Contraindicated.**
	RAL	↓ or ↔ RAL possible	**Do not coadminister.**
Valproic Acid	All INSTIs	No data	Monitor valproic acid concentration and virologic response.
Antidepressants, Anxiolytics, Antipsychotics Also see Sedative/Hypnotics section below			
Aripiprazole	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ aripiprazole expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ aripiprazole expected	Administer 25% of the usual aripiprazole dose. Titrate based on aripiprazole efficacy and adverse events. Refer to aripiprazole label for dosing recommendations in patients who are known to be CYP2D6 poor metabolizers or who have major depressive disorder.
Brexpiprazole	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ brexpiprazole expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ brexpiprazole expected	Administer 25% of the usual brexpiprazole dose. Titrate based on brexpiprazole efficacy and adverse events. Refer to brexpiprazole label for dosing recommendations in patients who are known to be CYP2D6 poor metabolizers or who have major depressive disorder.
Bupropion	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ bupropion expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ bupropion possible	Titrate bupropion dose based on clinical response.
Buspirone	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ buspirone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ buspirone possible	Initiate buspirone at a low dose. Buspirone dose reduction may be needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 6 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antidepressants, Anxiolytics, Antipsychotics, continued Also see Sedative/Hypnotics section below			
Cariprazine	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ cariprazine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ cariprazine expected	**Starting Cariprazine in a Patient Who Is Already Receiving EVG/c:** • Administer cariprazine 1.5 mg on Day 1 and Day 3, with no dose given on Day 2. From Day 4 onward, administer cariprazine 1.5 mg daily. Dose can be increased to a maximum dose of 3 mg daily. If EVG/c is withdrawn, cariprazine dose may need to be increased. **Starting EVG/c in a Patient Who is Already Receiving Cariprazine:** • For patients receiving cariprazine 3 mg or 6 mg daily, reduce cariprazine dose by half. For patients taking cariprazine 4.5 mg daily, the dose should be reduced to 1.5 mg or 3 mg daily. For patients taking cariprazine 1.5 mg daily, change to 1.5 mg every other day. If EVG/c is withdrawn, cariprazine dose may need to be increased.
Iloperidone	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ iloperidone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ iloperidone expected	Decrease iloperidone dose by 50%.
Lurasidone	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ lurasidone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ lurasidone expected	**Contraindicated.**
Nefazodone	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ nefazodone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ nefazodone expected	Consider alternative ARV or antidepressant.
Pimavanserin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ pimavanserin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ pimavanserin expected	Reduce pimavanserin dose to 10 mg.
Pimozide	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ pimozide expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ pimozide expected	**Contraindicated.**
Quetiapine	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ quetiapine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ quetiapine AUC expected	**Starting Quetiapine in a Patient Receiving EVG/c:** • Start quetiapine at the lowest dose and titrate up as needed. Monitor for quetiapine efficacy and adverse events. **Starting EVG/c in a Patient Receiving a Stable Dose of Quetiapine:** • Reduce quetiapine dose to 1/6 of the current dose, and closely monitor for quetiapine efficacy and adverse events.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 7 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antidepressants, Anxiolytics, Antipsychotics, continued Also see Sedative/Hypnotics section below			
Selective Serotonin Reuptake Inhibitors Citalopram, escitalopram, fluoxetine, fluvoxamine, paroxetine, sertraline	EVG/c	↔ EVG ↔ sertraline	No dose adjustment needed.
		↑ other SSRIs possible	Initiate with lowest dose of SSRI and titrate dose carefully based on antidepressant response.
	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ BIC, DTG and RAL expected ↔ SSRI expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Tricyclic Antidepressants Amitriptyline, desipramine, doxepin, imipramine, nortriptyline	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ TCA expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	Desipramine AUC ↑ 65%	Initiate with lowest dose of TCA and titrate dose carefully.
		↑ TCA expected	Initiate with lowest dose of TCA and titrate dose carefully based on antidepressant response and/or drug concentrations.
Trazodone	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ trazodone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ trazodone possible	Initiate with lowest dose of trazodone and titrate dose carefully.
Ziprasidone	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ ziprasidone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ ziprasidone possible	Monitor for ziprasidone-related adverse events.
Other Antipsychotics CYP3A4 and/or CYP2D6 substrates (e.g., perphenazine, risperidone, thioridazine)	EVG/c	↑ antipsychotic possible	Initiate antipsychotic at a low dose. Antipsychotic dose reduction may be needed.
Antifungals			
Isavuconazole	BIC	↑ BIC possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ isavuconazole expected ↑ or ↓ EVG and COBI possible	If coadministered, consider monitoring isavuconazole concentrations and assessing virologic response.
Itraconazole	BIC	↑ BIC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	DTG, RAL	↔ INSTI expected ↔ itraconazole expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ itraconazole expected ↑ EVG and COBI possible	Consider monitoring itraconazole concentrations to guide dose adjustments. **Do not coadminister with high itraconazole doses (>200 mg/day) unless guided by itraconazole concentrations.**

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 8 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antifungals, continued			
Posaconazole	BIC	↑ BIC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	DTG, RAL	↔ INSTI expected ↔ posaconazole expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ EVG and COBI possible ↑ posaconazole possible	If coadministered, monitor posaconazole concentrations.
Voriconazole	BIC	↑ BIC possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	DTG, RAL	↔ INSTI expected ↔ voriconazole expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ voriconazole expected ↑ EVG and COBI possible	**Do not coadminister voriconazole and COBI unless benefit outweighs risk.** If coadministered, consider monitoring voriconazole concentrations and adjust dose accordingly.
Antihyperglycemics			
Metformin	BIC	Metformin AUC ↑ 39%	Monitor for adverse events of metformin.
	DTG	**DTG 50 mg Once Daily plus Metformin 500 mg Twice Daily:** • Metformin AUC ↑ 79% and C_{max} ↑ 66% **DTG 50 mg Twice Daily plus Metformin 500 mg Twice Daily:** • Metformin AUC ↑ 2.4-fold and C_{max} ↑ 2-fold	Start metformin at lowest dose and titrate based on glycemic control. Monitor for adverse events of metformin. When starting/stopping DTG in patients on metformin, dose adjustment of metformin may be necessary to maintain optimal glycemic control and/or minimize adverse events of metformin.
	RAL	↔ metformin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Saxagliptin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ saxagliptin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ saxagliptin expected	Limit saxagliptin dose to 2.5 mg once daily.
Dapagliflozin/Saxagliptin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ dapagliflozin or saxagliptin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ saxagliptin expected	**Do not coadminister.** Dapagliflozin is only available as a coformulated drug that contains 5 mg of saxagliptin. When coadministered with EVG/c, the dose of saxagliptin should not exceed 2.5 mg once daily; thus, this combination **is not recommended**.
Antiplatelets			
Clopidogrel	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ clopidogrel expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↓ clopidogrel active metabolite, with impaired platelet inhibition expected	**Do not coadminister.**
Prasugrel	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ prasugrel expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↓ prasugrel active metabolite, with no impairment of platelet inhibition expected	Insufficient data to make a dose recommendation.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 9 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antiplatelets, continued			
Ticagrelor	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ ticagrelor expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ ticagrelor expected	**Do not coadminister.**
Vorapaxar	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ vorapaxar expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ vorapaxar expected	**Do not coadminister.**
Beta-Agonists, Long-Acting Inhaled			
Arformoterol, Formoterol	All INSTIs	↔ arformoterol or formoterol expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Indacaterol	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ indacaterol expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ indacaterol expected	
Olodaterol	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ olodaterol expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ olodaterol expected	
Salmeterol	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ salmeterol expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ salmeterol possible	**Do not coadminister** because of potential increased risk of salmeterol-associated cardiovascular events.
Cardiac Medications			
Amiodarone	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ INSTI expected ↔ amiodarone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ INSTI possible ↑ amiodarone possible	**Do not coadminister, unless benefits outweigh risks.** If coadministration is necessary, monitor for amiodarone-related adverse events and consider monitoring ECG and amiodarone concentrations.
Bepridil, Digoxin, Disopyramide, Dronedarone, Flecainide, Systemic Lidocaine, Mexilitine, Propafenone, Quinidine	BIC, DTG	↔ expected for the listed antiarrhythmics, except for disopyramide ↑ disopyramide possible	No dose adjustment needed. Monitor for disopyramide-related adverse events.
	RAL	↔ expected for the listed antiarrhythmics	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ antiarrhythmics possible Digoxin C_{max} ↑ 41% and ↔ AUC	Therapeutic drug monitoring for antiarrhythmics, if available, is recommended.
Beta-Blockers (e.g., metoprolol, timolol)	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ beta-blocker expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ beta-blocker possible	Beta-blocker dose may need to be decreased; adjust dose based on clinical response. Consider using an alternative ARV, or a beta-blocker that is not metabolized by CYP450 enzymes (e.g., atenolol, labetalol, nadolol, sotalol).

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 10 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Cardiac Medications, continued			
Bosentan	BIC, DTG	↓ BIC and DTG possible	No dose adjustment needed.
	RAL	↔ bosentan expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ bosentan possible	**In Patients on EVG/c ≥10 Days:** • Start bosentan at 62.5 mg once daily or every other day based on individual tolerability. **In Patients on Bosentan Who Require EVG/c:** • Stop bosentan ≥36 hours before EVG/c initiation. At least 10 days after initiation of EVG/c, resume bosentan at 62.5 mg once daily or every other day based on individual tolerability.
Calcium Channel Blockers	BIC	↑ BIC possible with diltiazem ↔ expected for all other CCBs	No dose adjustment needed.
	DTG, RAL	↔ INSTI expected ↔ CCB expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ CCB possible	Titrate CCB dose and monitor for CCB efficacy and adverse events.
Dofetilide	BIC, DTG	↑ dofetilide expected	**Contraindicated.**
	RAL	↔ dofetilide expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ dofetilide possible	**Do not coadminister.**
Eplerenone	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ eplerenone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ eplerenone expected	**Contraindicated.**
Ivabradine	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ ivabradine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ ivabradine expected	**Contraindicated.**
Ranolazine	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ ranolazine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ ranolazine expected	**Contraindicated.**
Corticosteroids			
Beclomethasone Inhaled or intranasal	BIC, DTG, EVG/c, RAL	↔ glucocorticoid expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Budesonide, Ciclesonide, Fluticasone, Mometasone Inhaled or intranasal	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ glucocorticoid expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ glucocorticoid possible	**Do not coadminister unless potential benefits of inhaled or intranasal corticosteroid outweigh the risks of systemic corticosteroid adverse effects.** Coadministration can result in adrenal insufficiency and Cushing's syndrome. Consider using an alternative corticosteroid (e.g., beclomethasone).

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 11 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Corticosteroids, continued			
Betamethasone, Budesonide Systemic	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ INSTI expected ↔ glucocorticoid expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ glucocorticoids possible ↓ EVG possible	**Do not coadminister unless potential benefits of systemic budesonide outweigh the risks of systemic corticosteroid adverse effects.** Coadministration can result in adrenal insufficiency and Cushing's syndrome.
Dexamethasone Systemic	BIC	↓ BIC possible	Consider alternative corticosteroid for long-term use or alternative ARV. If coadministration is necessary, monitor virologic response to ART.
	DTG, RAL	↔ INSTI expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↓ EVG and COBI possible	Consider alternative corticosteroid for long-term use or alternative ARV. If coadministration is necessary, monitor virologic response to ART.
Prednisone, Prednisolone Systemic	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ glucocorticoid expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ prednisolone possible	Coadministration may be considered if the potential benefits outweigh the risks of systemic corticosteroid adverse effects. If coadministration is necessary, monitor for adrenal insufficiency and Cushing's syndrome.
Betamethasone, Methylprednisolone, Prednisolone, Triamcinolone Local injections, including intra-articular, epidural, or intra-orbital	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ glucocorticoid expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ glucocorticoid expected	**Do not coadminister.** Coadministration may result in adrenal insufficiency and Cushing's syndrome.
Hepatitis C Direct-Acting Antiviral Agents			
Daclatasvir	BIC, RAL	No data	No dose adjustment needed.
	DTG	↔ daclatasvir	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ daclatasvir	Decrease daclatasvir dose to 30 mg once daily.
Dasabuvir plus Ombitasvir/Paritaprevir/RTV	BIC, DTG	No data	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	No data	**Do not coadminister.**
	RAL	RAL AUC ↑ 134%	No dose adjustment needed.
Elbasvir/Grazoprevir	BIC	↔ BIC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	DTG	↔ elbasvir ↔ grazoprevir ↔ DTG	No dose adjustment needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 12 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Hepatitis C Direct-Acting Antiviral Agents, continued			
Elbasvir/Grazoprevir	EVG/c	↑ elbasvir expected ↑ grazoprevir expected	**Do not coadminister.**
	RAL	↔ elbasvir ↔ grazoprevir ↔ RAL with elbasvir RAL AUC ↑ 43% with grazoprevir	No dose adjustment needed.
Glecaprevir/Pibrentasvir	BIC	↔ BIC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	DTG, RAL	No significant effect	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	Glecaprevir AUC ↑ 3-fold Pibrentasvir AUC ↑ 57% EVG AUC ↑ 47%	No dose adjustment needed. If coadministered with TDF, monitor for TDF-related adverse events. Consider monitoring for hepatotoxicity if coadministered with TDF or TAF.
Ledipasvir/Sofosbuvir	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ DTG and RAL	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c/ TDF/FTC	↑ TDF expected ↑ ledipasvir expected	**Do not coadminister.**
	EVG/c/ TAF/FTC	↔ EVG/c/TAF/FTC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Sofosbuvir	All INSTIs	↔ INSTI expected ↔ sofosbuvir expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Sofosbuvir/Velpatasvir	All INSTIs	↔ INSTI expected ↔ sofosbuvir and velpatasvir expected	No dose adjustment needed. If coadministered with TDF, monitor for TDF-related adverse events.
Sofosbuvir/Velpatasvir/ Voxilaprevir	EVG/c	**When Administered with Sofosbuvir/ Velpatasvir/Voxilaprevir (400 mg/100 mg/100 mg) plus Voxilaprevir 100 mg:** • Sofosbuvir AUC ↑ 22% • ↔ velpatasvir • Voxilaprevir AUC ↑ 2-fold	No dose adjustment needed. If coadministered with TDF, monitor for TDF-related adverse events. Consider monitoring for hepatotoxicity if coadministered with TDF or TAF.
	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ INSTI expected ↔ sofosbuvir, velpatasvir, and voxilaprevir expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Herbal Products			
St. John's Wort	BIC, DTG	↓ BIC and DTG possible	**Do not coadminister.**
	EVG/c	↓ EVG and COBI expected	**Contraindicated.**
Hormonal Therapies			
Contraceptives: Non-Oral	All INSTIs	No data	No drug-drug interaction studies have been conducted with INSTIs and non-oral routes of hormone administration. It is unclear whether drug-drug interaction data for oral drugs can be used to predict interactions for non-oral drugs.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 13 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Hormonal Therapies, continued			
Contraceptives – Oral	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ ethinyl estradiol and norgestimate ↔ INSTI	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	Norgestimate AUC, C_{max}, and C_{min} ↑ >2-fold Ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 25% and C_{min} ↓ 44%	The effects of increases in progestin (norgestimate) are not fully known and may include insulin resistance, dyslipidemia, acne, and venous thrombosis. Weigh the risks and benefits of using the drug and consider using an alternative ARV or contraceptive method.
		↑ drospirenone possible	Clinical monitoring is recommended, due to the potential for hyperkalemia. Consider using alternative ARV or contraceptive method.
Gender-Affirming Therapy	BIC, DTG, EVG/c, RAL	↔ goserelin, leuprolide acetate, and spironolactone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ estrogen expected	No dose adjustment needed.
		↔ testosterone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↓ or ↑ estradiol possible ↑ dutasteride and finasteride possible	Adjust dutasteride dose as needed based on clinical effects and endogenous hormone concentrations.
		↑ testosterone possible	Monitor masculinizing effects of testosterone and monitor for adverse effects. Adjust testosterone dose as necessary.
Menopausal Replacement Therapy	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ estrogen expected with estradiol or conjugated estrogen (equine and synthetic) ↔ drospirenone, medroxyprogesterone, and micronized progesterone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↓ or ↑ estrogen possible ↑ drospirenone possible ↑ oral medroxyprogesterone possible ↑ oral micronized progesterone possible	Adjust estrogen and progestin dose as needed based on clinical effects.
Immunosuppressants			
Cyclosporine, Everolimus, Sirolimus, Tacrolimus	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ immunosuppressant expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ immunosuppressant possible	Initiate with an adjusted dose of immunosuppressant to account for potential increased concentrations of the immunosuppressant and monitor for immunosuppressant-related adverse events. Therapeutic drug monitoring of immunosuppressant is recommended. Consult with a specialist as necessary.
Lipid-Modifying Agents			
Atorvastatin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ atorvastatin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	Atorvastatin AUC ↑ 2.6-fold and C_{max} ↑ 2.3-fold	Titrate statin dose carefully and administer the lowest effective dose while monitoring for adverse events. Do not exceed 20 mg atorvastatin daily.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 14 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Lipid-Modifying Agents, continued			
Lomitapide	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ lomitapide expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ lomitapide expected	**Contraindicated.**
Lovastatin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ lovastatin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	Significant ↑ lovastatin expected	**Contraindicated.**
Pitavastatin, Pravastatin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ statin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	No data	No data available for dose recommendation.
Rosuvastatin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ rosuvastatin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	Rosuvastatin AUC ↑ 38% and C_{max} ↑ 89%	Titrate statin dose carefully and use the lowest effective dose while monitoring for adverse events.
Simvastatin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ simvastatin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	Significant ↑ simvastatin expected	**Contraindicated.**
Narcotics and Treatment for Opioid Dependence			
Buprenorphine Sublingual, buccal, or implant	BIC, DTG	↔ buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine (active metabolite) expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	Buprenorphine AUC ↑ 35% and C_{min} ↑ 66% Norbuprenorphine (active metabolite) AUC ↑ 42% and C_{min} ↑ 57%	No dose adjustment needed. Monitor for adverse events of buprenorphine. When transferring buprenorphine from transmucosal administration to implantation, monitor to ensure buprenorphine effect is adequate and not excessive.
	RAL	↔ buprenorphine and norbuprenorphine (active metabolite) (sublingual) ↔ buprenorphine or norbuprenorphine (active metabolite) expected (implant)	No dose adjustment needed.
Fentanyl	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ fentanyl expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ fentanyl	Monitor for fentanyl efficacy and adverse events, including potentially fatal respiratory depression.
Lofexidine	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ lofexidine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ lofexidine possible	Monitor for lofexidine-related adverse events, including symptoms of orthostasis and bradycardia.
Methadone	All INSTIs	↔ methadone	No dose adjustment needed.
Tramadol	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ tramadol and M1 (active metabolite) expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ tramadol expected ↓ M1 (active metabolite) possible	Tramadol dose adjustments may be necessary. Monitor for clinical response and tramadol-related adverse events.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 15 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
PDE5 Inhibitors			
Avanafil	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ avanafil expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	No data	**Do not coadminister.**
Sildenafil	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ sildenafil expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ sildenafil expected	**For Treatment of Erectile Dysfunction:** • Start with sildenafil 25 mg every 48 hours and monitor for adverse effects of sildenafil. **Contraindicated** for treatment of PAH.
Tadalafil	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ tadalafil expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ tadalafil expected	**For Treatment of Erectile Dysfunction:** • Start with tadalafil 5 mg and do not exceed a single dose of tadalafil 10 mg every 72 hours. Monitor for adverse effects of tadalafil. **For Treatment of PAH** *In Patients on EVG/c >7 Days:* • Start with tadalafil 20 mg once daily and increase to tadalafil 40 mg once daily based on tolerability. *In Patients on Tadalafil who Require EVG/c:* • Stop tadalafil ≥24 hours before EVG/c initiation. Seven days after EVG/c initiation, restart tadalafil at 20 mg once daily, and increase to tadalafil 40 mg once daily based on tolerability.
Vardenafil	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ vardenafil expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ vardenafil expected	Start with vardenafil 2.5 mg every 72 hours and monitor for adverse effects of vardenafil.
Sedative/Hypnotics			
Buspirone	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ buspirone expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ buspirone expected	Initiate buspirone at a low dose. Dose reduction may be needed.
Clonazepam, Clorazepate, Diazepam, Estazolam, Flurazepam	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ benzodiazepine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ benzodiazepine possible	Dose reduction of benzodiazepine may be necessary. Initiate with a low dose and monitor for benzodiazepine-related adverse events. Consider using an alternative benzodiazepine, such as lorazepam, oxazepam, or temazepam.
Midazolam, Triazolam	BIC, RAL	↔ benzodiazepine expected	No dose adjustment needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 16 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Sedative/Hypnotics, continued			
Midazolam, Triazolam, continued	DTG	**With DTG 25 mg:** • ↔ midazolam AUC	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ midazolam expected ↑ triazolam expected	**Contraindicated. Do not coadminister triazolam or oral midazolam and EVG/c.** Parenteral midazolam can be administered in a closely monitored setting. Consider dose reduction, especially if >1 dose is administered.
Suvorexant	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ suvorexant expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ suvorexant expected	**Do not coadminister.**
Zolpidem	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ zolpidem expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ zolpidem expected	Initiate zolpidem at a low dose. Dose reduction of zolpidem may be necessary.
Miscellaneous Drugs			
Calcifediol	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ calcifediol expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ calcifediol possible	Dose adjustment of calcifediol may be required. Monitor serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D, intact PTH, and serum Ca concentrations.
Cisapride	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ cisapride expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ cisapride expected	**Contraindicated.**
Colchicine	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ colchicine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ colchicine expected	**Do not coadminister in patients with hepatic or renal impairment.** **For Treatment of Gout Flares:** • Administer a single dose of colchicine 0.6 mg, followed by colchicine 0.3 mg 1 hour later. Do not repeat dose for at least 3 days. **For Prophylaxis of Gout Flares:** • If original dose was colchicine 0.6 mg twice daily, decrease to colchicine 0.3 mg once daily. If dose was 0.6 mg once daily, decrease to 0.3 mg every other day. **For Treatment of Familial Mediterranean Fever:** • Do not exceed colchicine 0.6 mg once daily or 0.3 mg twice daily.
Dronabinol	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ dronabinol expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ dronabinol possible	Monitor for dronabinol-related adverse events.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21d. Drug Interactions Between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 17 of 17)

Concomitant Drug	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Miscellaneous Drugs, continued			
Eluxadoline	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ eluxadoline expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ eluxadoline possible	Monitor for eluxadoline-related adverse events.
Ergot Derivatives	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ dihydroergotamine, ergotamine, and methylergonovine expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ dihydroergotamine, ergotamine, and methylergonovine expected	**Contraindicated.**
Flibanserin	BIC, DTG, RAL	↔ flibanserin expected	No dose adjustment needed.
	EVG/c	↑ flibanserin expected	**Contraindicated.**
Polyvalent Cation Supplements Mg, Al, Fe, Ca, Zn, including multivitamins with minerals **Note:** Please refer to the Acid Reducers section in this table for recommendations on use with Al-, Mg-, and Ca-containing antacids.	BIC	↔ BIC AUC if administered simultaneously with Fe or Ca and food BIC AUC ↓ 33% if administered simultaneously with $CaCO_3$ under fasting conditions BIC AUC ↓ 63% if administered simultaneously with Fe under fasting conditions	**With Supplements That Contain Ca or Fe:** • Administer BIC and supplements that contain Ca or Fe together with food. **Do not coadminister BIC under fasting conditions simultaneously with, or 2 hours after, supplements that contain Ca or Fe.**
	DTG	DTG AUC ↓ 39% if administered simultaneously with $CaCO_3$ under fasting conditions DTG AUC ↓ 54% if administered simultaneously with Fe under fasting conditions ↔ DTG when administered with Ca or Fe supplement simultaneously with food	**With Supplements That Contain Ca or Fe:** • Administer DTG and supplements that contain Ca or Fe together with food, or administer DTG at least 2 hours before or at least 6 hours after supplement. **Do not coadminister DTG under fasting conditions simultaneously with, or 2 hours after, supplements that contain Ca or Fe.**
	EVG/c, RAL	↓ INSTI possible	If coadministration is necessary, administer INSTI at least 2 hours before or at least 6 hours after supplements that contain polyvalent cations, including but not limited to the following products: cation-containing laxatives; Fe, Ca, or Mg supplements; and sucralfate. Monitor for virologic response. Many oral multivitamins also contain varying amounts of polyvalent cations; the extent and significance of chelation is unknown.

Key to Symbols:

↑ = increase

↓ = decrease

↔ = no change

Key: Al = aluminum; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; AUC = area under the curve; BIC = bictegravir; Ca = calcium; $CaCO_3$ = calcium carbonate; CCB = calcium channel blocker; C_{max} = maximum plasma concentration; C_{min} = minimum plasma concentration; COBI = cobicistat; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CYP = cytochrome P; DAA = direct-acting antiviral; DTG = dolutegravir; ECG = electrocardiogram; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; Fe = iron; FTC = emtricitabine; HCV = hepatitis C virus; INR= international normalized ratio; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; Mg = magnesium; PAH = pulmonary arterial hypertension; PDE5 = Phosphodiesterase Type 5; PTH = parathyroid hormone; RAL = raltegravir; RTV = ritonavir; SSRI = selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TCA = tricyclic antidepressants; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; Zn = zinc

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21e. Drug Interactions between the CCR5 Antagonist Maraviroc and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 3)

In the table below, "No dose adjustment needed" indicates that the FDA-approved dose of MVC 300 mg twice daily should be used. Recommendations for managing a particular drug interaction may differ depending on whether a new ARV drug is being initiated in a patient on a stable concomitant medication or a new concomitant medication is being initiated in a patient on a stable ARV regimen. The magnitude and significance of drug interactions are difficult to predict when several drugs with competing metabolic pathways are prescribed concomitantly. In cases where an interacting drug needs to be replaced with an alternative, providers should exercise their clinical judgement to select the most appropriate alternative medication to use.

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	Effect on CCR5 Antagonist and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antibacterial Agents		
Antimycobacterials		
Rifabutin	↓ MVC possible	**If Used Without a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor:** • MVC 300 mg twice daily **If Used With a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor:** • MVC 150 mg twice daily
Rifampin	MVC AUC ↓ 63%	**If Used Without a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor:** • MVC 600 mg twice daily **If Used With a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor:** • Consider alternative ARV or antimycobacterial.
Rifapentine	↓ MVC expected	**Do not coadminister.**
Macrolides		
Azithromycin	↔ MVC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Clarithromycin	↑ MVC possible	MVC 150 mg twice daily
Erythromycin	↑ MVC possible	No dose adjustment needed.
Anticonvulsants		
Carbamazepine, Phenobarbital, Phenytoin	↓ MVC possible	**If Used Without a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor:** • MVC 600 mg twice daily **If Used With a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor:** • MVC 150 mg twice daily
Eslicarbazepine	↓ MVC possible	Consider alternative ARV or anticonvulsant.
Oxcarbazepine	↓ MVC possible	Consider alternative ARV or anticonvulsant.
Antifungals		
Fluconazole	↑ MVC possible	No dose adjustment needed.
Isavuconazole	↑ MVC possible	No dose adjustment needed.
Itraconazole	↑ MVC possible	MVC 150 mg twice daily
Posaconazole	↑ MVC possible	MVC 150 mg twice daily
Voriconazole	↑ MVC possible	MVC 150 mg twice daily
Hepatitis C Direct-Acting Antivirals		
Daclatasvir	↔ MVC expected ↔ daclatasvir expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Dasabuvir plus Ombitasvir/ Paritaprevir/RTV	↑ MVC expected	**Do not coadminister.**
Elbasvir/Grazoprevir	↔ MVC expected	No dose adjustment needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21e. Drug Interactions between the CCR5 Antagonist Maraviroc and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 3)

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	Effect on CCR5 Antagonist and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Hepatitis C Direct-Acting Antivirals, continued		
Glecaprevir/Pibrentasvir	↔ MVC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Ledipasvir/Sofosbuvir	↔ MVC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Simeprevir	↔ MVC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Sofosbuvir	↔ MVC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Sofosbuvir/Velpatasvir	↔ MVC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Sofosbuvir/Velpatasvir/Voxilaprevir	↔ MVC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Herbal Products		
St. John's Wort	↓ MVC expected	**Do not coadminister.**
Hormonal Therapies		
Hormonal Contraceptives	↔ ethinyl estradiol or levonorgestrel	No dose adjustment needed.
Menopausal Hormone Replacement Therapy	↔ MVC or hormone replacement therapies expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Gender-Affirming Hormone Therapies	↔ MVC or gender-affirming hormones expected	No dose adjustment needed.
Antiretroviral Drugs		
INSTIs		
BIC, DTG	↔ MVC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
EVG/c	↑ MVC possible	MVC 150 mg twice daily
RAL	MVC AUC ↓ 21% RAL AUC ↓ 37%	No dose adjustment needed.
NNRTIs		
DOR, RPV	↔ MVC expected	No dose adjustment needed.
EFV	MVC AUC ↓ 45%	**If Used Without a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor:** • MVC 600 mg twice daily **If Used With a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor:** • MVC 150 mg twice daily
ETR	MVC AUC ↓ 53%	**If Used Without a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor:** • MVC 600 mg twice daily **If Used With a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor:** • MVC 150 mg twice daily
NVP	↔ MVC AUC	**If Used Without a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor:** • MVC 300 mg twice daily **If Used With a Strong CYP3A Inhibitor:** • MVC 150 mg twice daily • With TPV/r, use MVC 300 mg twice daily
PIs		
ATV, ATV/c, ATV/r	**With Unboosted ATV:** • MVC AUC ↑ 257% **With (ATV/r 300 mg/100 mg) Once Daily:** • MVC AUC ↑ 388%	MVC 150 mg twice daily

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 21e. Drug Interactions between the CCR5 Antagonist Maraviroc and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 3 of 3)

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	Effect on CCR5 Antagonist and/or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
PIs, continued		
DRV/c, DRV/r	**With (DRV/r 600 mg/100 mg) Twice Daily:** • MVC AUC ↑ 305% **With (DRV/r 600 mg/100 mg) Twice Daily and ETR:** • MVC AUC ↑ 210%	MVC 150 mg twice daily
LPV/r	MVC AUC ↑ 295% **With LPV/r and EFV:** • MVC AUC ↑ 153%	MVC 150 mg twice daily
TPV/r	**With (TPV/r 500 mg/200 mg) Twice Daily:** • ↔ MVC AUC	No dose adjustment needed.

Key to Symbols:

↑ = increase

↓ = decrease

↔ = no change

Key: ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; AUC = area under the curve; BIC = bictegravir; CYP = cytochrome P; DOR = doravirine; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; MVC = maraviroc; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; TPV/r = tipranavir/ritonavir

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 22a. Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Protease Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 2)

Note: Interactions associated with DLV, FPV, IDV, NFV, and SQV are **not** included in this table. Please refer to the FDA product labels for information regarding interactions between these drugs and other concomitant drugs.

PIs		NNRTIs				
		DOR	EFV	ETR	NVP	RPV
ATV Unboosted	**PK Data**	↑ DOR expected ↔ ATV expected	↔ EFV ATV AUC ↓ 74%	ETR AUC ↑ 50% and C_{min} ↑ 58% ↔ ATV AUC and C_{min} ↓ 47%	↑ NVP possible ↓ ATV possible	↑ RPV possible ↔ ATV expected
	Dose	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not coadminister.**	**Do not coadminister.**	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.
ATV/c	**PK Data**	↑ DOR expected ↔ ATV expected	↔ EFV expected ↓ ATV possible ↓ COBI possible	↑ ETR possible ↓ ATV possible ↓ COBI possible	↑ NVP possible ↓ ATV possible ↓ COBI possible	↑ RPV possible ↔ ATV expected
	Dose	No dose adjustment needed.	**ATV/c in ART-Naive Patients:** • ATV 400 mg plus COBI 150 mg once daily • **Do not use coformulated ATV 300 mg/ COBI 150 mg.** **ATV/c in ART-Experienced Patients:** • **Do not coadminister.** No dose adjustment needed for EFV.	**Do not coadminister.**	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.
ATV/r	**PK Data**	↑ DOR expected ↔ ATV expected	↔ EFV expected **(ATV 400 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Once Daily:** • ATV concentrations similar to (ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg) without EFV	**(ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Once Daily:** • ETR AUC and C_{min} both ↑ ~30% • ↔ ATV AUC and C_{min}	**(ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Once Daily:** • ATV AUC ↓ 42% and C_{min} ↓ 72% • NVP AUC ↑ 25%	↑ RPV possible ↔ ATV expected
	Dose	No dose adjustment needed.	**ATV/r in ART-Naive Patients:** • (ATV 400 mg plus RTV 100 mg) once daily **ATV/r in ART-Experienced Patients:** • **Do not coadminister.** No dose adjustment needed for EFV.	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.
DRV/c	**PK Data**	↑ DOR expected ↔ DRV expected	↔ EFV expected ↓ DRV possible ↓ COBI possible	**ETR 400 mg Once Daily with (DRV 800 mg plus COBI 150 mg) Once Daily:** • ↔ ETR AUC and C_{min} • ↔ DRV AUC and C_{min} ↓ 56% • COBI AUC ↓ 30% and C_{min} ↓ 66%	↑ NVP possible ↓ DRV possible ↓ COBI possible	↔ DRV expected ↑ RPV possible
	Dose	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not coadminister.**	**Do not coadminister.**	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 22a. Interactions Between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Protease Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 2)

PIs		NNRTIs				
		DOR	EFV	ETR	NVP	RPV
DRV/r	**PK Data**	↑ DOR expected ↔ DRV expected	**With (DRV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Twice Daily:** • EFV AUC ↑ 21% • ↔ DRV AUC and C_{min} ↓ 31%	**ETR 100 mg Twice Daily with (DRV 600 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Twice Daily:** • ETR AUC ↓ 37% and C_{min} ↓ 49% • ↔ DRV	**With (DRV 400 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Twice Daily:** • NVP AUC ↑ 27% and C_{min} ↑ 47% • DRV AUC ↑ 24%[a]	**RPV 150 mg Once Daily with (DRV 800 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Once Daily:** • RPV AUC ↑ 130% and C_{min} ↑ 178% • ↔ DRV
	Dose	No dose adjustment needed.	Clinical significance unknown. Use standard doses and monitor patient closely. Consider monitoring drug levels.	No dose adjustment needed. Despite reduced ETR concentration, safety and efficacy of this combination have been established in a clinical trial.	No dose adjustment needed.	No dose adjustment needed.
LPV/r	**PK Data**	↑ DOR expected ↔ LPV expected	↔ EFV expected **With LPV/r 500 mg/125 mg[b] Twice Daily:** • LPV concentration similar to that of LPV/r 400 mg/100 mg twice daily without EFV	ETR AUC ↓ 35% (comparable to the decrease seen with DRV/r) ↔ LPV AUC	↑ NVP possible LPV AUC ↓ 27% and C_{min} ↓ 51%	**RPV 150 mg Once Daily with LPV/r:** • RPV AUC ↑ 52% and C_{min} ↑ 74% • ↔ LPV
	Dose	No dose adjustment needed.	LPV/r 500 mg/125 mg[b] twice daily LPV/r 533 mg/133 mg twice daily when using oral solution No dose adjustment needed for EFV.	No dose adjustment needed.	LPV/r 500 mg/125 mg[b] twice daily LPV/r 533 mg/133 mg twice daily when using oral solution No dose adjustment needed for NVP.	No dose adjustment needed.
TPV/r **Note:** Always use TPV with RTV	**PK Data**	↑ DOR expected ↔ TPV expected	**With (TPV 500 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Twice Daily:** • ↔ EFV • TPV AUC ↓ 31% and C_{min} ↓ 42% **With (TPV 750 mg plus RTV 200 mg) Twice Daily:** • ↔ EFV and TPV	**With (TPV 500 mg plus RTV 200 mg) Twice Daily:** • ETR AUC ↓ 76% and C_{min} ↓ 82% • ↔ TPV AUC and C_{min} ↑ 24%	**With (TPV 250 mg plus RTV 200 mg) Twice Daily *or* with (TPV 750 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Twice Daily:** • ↔ NVP • ↔ TPV expected	↑ RPV possible ↔ TPV expected
	Dose	No dose adjustment needed.	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.	No dose adjustment needed.

[a] DRV concentration was compared to a historic control.
[b] Use a combination of two LPV/r 200 mg/50 mg tablets plus one LPV/r 100 mg/25 mg tablet to make a total dose of LPV/r 500 mg/125 mg.

Key to Symbols: ↑ = increase ↓ = decrease ↔ = no change

Key: ART = antiretroviral therapy; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; AUC = area under the curve; C_{min} = minimum plasma concentration; COBI = cobicistat; DLV = delavirdine; DOR = doravirine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FPV = fosamprenavir; IDV = indinavir; LPV = lopinavir; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; NFV = nelfinavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SQV = saquinavir; TPV = tipranavir; TPV/r = tipranavir/ritonavir

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 22b. Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors or Protease Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 4)

Recommendations for managing a particular drug interaction may differ depending on whether a new ARV drug is being initiated in a patient on a stable concomitant medication or a new concomitant medication is being initiated in a patient on a stable ARV regimen. The magnitude and significance of drug interactions are difficult to predict when several drugs with competing metabolic pathways are prescribed concomitantly.

ARV Drugs by Drug Class		INSTIs			
		BIC	DTG	EVG/c	RAL
NNRTIs					
DOR	**PK Data**	↔ DOR and BIC expected	↔ DOR DTG AUC ↑ 36% and C_{min} ↑ 27%	↑ DOR expected ↔ EVG	↔ DOR and RAL expected
	Dose	No dose adjustment needed.	No dose adjustment needed.	No dose adjustment needed.	No dose adjustment needed.
EFV	**PK Data**	↓ BIC expected	**With DTG 50 mg Once Daily:** • DTG AUC ↓ 57% and C_{min} ↓ 75%	↑ or ↓ EVG, COBI, and EFV possible	**With RAL 400 mg Twice Daily:** • RAL AUC ↓ 36% and C_{min} ↓ 21% **With RAL 1,200 mg Once Daily:** • ↔ RAL AUC and C_{min}
	Dose	**Do not coadminister.**	**In Patients Without INSTI Resistance:** • DTG 50 mg twice daily **In Patients With Certain INSTI-Associated Resistance[a] or Clinically Suspected INSTI Resistance:** • Consider alternative combination.	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.
ETR	**PK Data**	↓ BIC expected	**ETR 200 mg Twice Daily plus DTG 50 mg Once Daily:** • DTG AUC ↓ 71% and C_{min} ↓ 88% **ETR 200 mg Twice Daily with (DRV 600 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Twice Daily and DTG 50 mg Once Daily:** • DTG AUC ↓ 25% and C_{min} ↓ 37% **ETR 200 mg Twice Daily with (LPV 400 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Twice Daily and DTG 50 mg Once Daily:** • DTG AUC ↑ 11% and C_{min} ↑ 28%	↑ or ↓ EVG, COBI, and ETR possible	**ETR 200 mg Twice Daily plus RAL 400 mg Twice Daily:** • ETR C_{min} ↑ 17% • RAL C_{min} ↓ 34%

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 22b. Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors or Protease Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 4)

ARV Drugs by Drug Class		INSTIs			
		BIC	DTG	EVG/c	RAL
NNRTIs, continued					
ETR	**Dose**	**Do not coadminister.**	**Do not coadminister ETR and DTG without concurrently administering ATV/r, DRV/r, or LPV/r.** **In Patients Without INSTI Resistance:** • DTG 50 mg once daily with ETR (concurrently with ATV/r, DRV/r, or LPV/r) **In Patients With Certain INSTI-Associated Resistance[a] or Clinically Suspected INSTI Resistance:** • DTG 50 mg twice daily with ETR (concurrently with ATV/r, DRV/r, or LPV/r)	**Do not coadminister.**	RAL 400 mg twice daily **Coadministration with RAL 1,200 mg once daily is not recommended.**
NVP	**PK Data**	↓ BIC expected	**With DTG 50 mg Once Daily:** • DTG AUC ↓ 19% and C_{min} ↓ 34%	↑ or ↓ EVG, COBI, and NVP possible	No data
	Dose	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.
RPV	**PK Data**	No data	**With DTG 50 mg Once Daily:** • ↔ DTG AUC and C_{min} ↑ 22% • ↔ RPV AUC and C_{min} ↑ 21%	↑ or ↓ EVG, COBI, and RPV possible	↔ RPV RAL C_{min} ↑ 27%
	Dose	No dose adjustment needed.	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.
PIs					
ATV	**PK Data**	**ATV 400 mg Once Daily plus BIC 75 mg Single Dose:** • BIC AUC ↑ 315%	**(ATV 400 mg plus DTG 30 mg) Once Daily:** • DTG AUC ↑ 91% and C_{min} ↑ 180%	↑ or ↓ EVG, COBI, and ATV possible	No data
	Dose	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.
ATV/c	**PK Data**	BIC AUC ↑ 306%	No data	Not applicable	No data
	Dose	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not coadminister two COBI-containing products.**	No dose adjustment needed.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 22b. Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors or Protease Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 3 of 4)

ARV Drugs by Drug Class		INSTIs			
		BIC	DTG	EVG/c	RAL
PIs, continued					
ATV/r	**PK Data**	↑ BIC expected	**(ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Once Daily plus DTG 30 mg Once Daily:** • DTG AUC ↑ 62% and C_{min} ↑ 121%	Not applicable	**With Unboosted ATV:** • RAL AUC ↑ 72% **With Unboosted ATV and RAL 1,200 mg:** • RAL AUC ↑ 67% **With (ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Once Daily:** • RAL AUC ↑ 41%
	Dose	**Do not coadminister.**	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not coadminister RTV and COBI.**	No dose adjustment needed.
DRV	**PK Data**	Not applicable	Not applicable	↔ DRV or EVG expected	Not applicable
	Dose	**Do not administer DRV without RTV or COBI.**	**Do not administer DRV without RTV or COBI.**	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not administer DRV without RTV or COBI.**
DRV/c	**PK Data**	BIC AUC ↑ 74%	**DRV/c plus DTG Once Daily:** • ↔ DTG, DRV, and COBI **DTG 50 mg Once Daily and DRV/r Once Daily Switched to DRV/c:** • DTG C_{min} ↑ 100%	Not applicable	No data
	Dose	No dose adjustment needed.	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not coadminister two COBI-containing products.**	No dose adjustment needed.
DRV/r	**PK Data**	No data	**(DRV 600 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Twice Daily with DTG 30 mg Once Daily:** • DTG AUC ↓ 22% and C_{min} ↓ 38%	Not applicable	**With (DRV 600 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Twice Daily:** • RAL AUC ↓ 29% and C_{min} ↑ 38%
	Dose	No dose adjustment needed.	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not coadminister RTV and COBI.**	No dose adjustment needed.
LPV/r	**PK Data**	No data	**With (LPV 400 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Twice Daily and DTG 30 mg Once Daily:** • ↔ DTG	Not applicable	↓ RAL ↔ LPV/r
	Dose	Consider alternative combination.	No dose adjustment needed.	**Do not coadminister RTV and COBI.**	No dose adjustment needed.
TPV/r	**PK Data**	↓ BIC possible	**With (TPV 500 mg plus RTV 200 mg) Twice Daily and DTG 50 mg Once Daily:** • DTG AUC ↓ 59% and C_{min} ↓ 76%	Not applicable	**With (TPV 500 mg plus RTV 200 mg) Twice Daily and RAL 400 mg Twice Daily:** • RAL AUC ↓ 24% and C_{min} ↓ 55%

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Table 22b. Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors or Protease Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 4 of 4)

ARV Drugs by Drug Class		INSTIs			
		BIC	DTG	EVG/c	RAL
PIs, continued					
TPV/r	**Dose**	**Do not coadminister.**	**In Patients Without INSTI Resistance:** • DTG 50 mg twice daily **In Patients With Certain INSTI-Associated Resistance[a] or Clinically Suspected INSTI Resistance:** • Consider alternative combination.	**Do not coadminister RTV and COBI.**	RAL 400 mg twice daily **Coadministration with RAL 1,200 mg once daily is not recommended.**

[a] Refer to DTG product label for details.

Key to Symbols:

↑ = increase

↓ = decrease

↔ = no change

Key: ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; AUC = area under the curve; BIC = bictegravir; C_{min} = minimum plasma concentration; COBI = cobicistat; CYP = cytochrome P; DOR = doravirine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LPV = lopinavir; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; TPV = tipranavir; TPV/r = tipranavir/ritonavir

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Conclusion (Last updated January 28, 2016; last reviewed January 28, 2016)

The Panel has carefully reviewed results from clinical HIV therapy trials and considered how they affect appropriate care guidelines. HIV care is complex and rapidly evolving. Where possible, the Panel has based recommendations on the best evidence from prospective trials with defined endpoints. Absent such evidence, the Panel has attempted to base recommendations on reasonable options for HIV care.

HIV care requires partnerships and open communication. Guidelines are only a starting point for medical decision making involving informed providers and patients. Although guidelines can identify some parameters of high-quality care, they cannot substitute for sound clinical judgment.

As further research is conducted and reported, these guidelines will be modified. The Panel anticipates continued progress in refining antiretroviral therapy regimens and strategies. The Panel hopes these guidelines are useful and is committed to their continued revision and improvement.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix A: Key to Acronyms (Last updated July 10, 2019; last reviewed July 10, 2019)

Drug Name Abbreviations

Abbreviation	Full Name
3TC	lamivudine
ABC	abacavir
APV	amprenavir
ATV	atazanavir
BIC	bictegravir
COBI or c	cobicistat
d4T	stavudine
ddI	didanosine
DLV	delavirdine
DOR	doravirine
DRV	darunavir
DTG	dolutegravir
EFV	efavirenz
ETR	etravirine
EVG	elvitegravir
FPV	fosamprenavir
FTC	emtricitabine
IBA	ibalizumab
IDV	indinavir
LPV	lopinavir
MVC	maraviroc
NFV	nelfinavir
NVP	nevirapine
RAL	raltegravir
RPV	rilpivirine
RTV or r	ritonavir
SQV	saquinavir
T-20	enfuvirtide
TAF	tenofovir alafenamide
TDF	tenofovir disoproxil fumarate
TPV	tipranavir
ZDV	zidovudine

General Terms

Abbreviation	Definition
17-BMP	beclomethasone 17-monopropionate
ADAP	AIDS drug assistance program

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Ag/Ab	antigen/antibody
Al	aluminum
ALT	alanine aminotransferase
aOR	adjusted odds ratio
ART	antiretroviral therapy
ARV	antiretroviral
AST	aspartate aminotransferase
AUC	area under the curve
AUD	alcohol use disorder
AV	atrioventricular
AWP	average wholesale price
BID	twice daily
BMD	bone mineral density
BUN	blood urea nitrogen
Ca	calcium
$CaCO_3$	calcium carbonate
CAPD	chronic ambulatory peritoneal dialysis
CBC	complete blood count
CCB	calcium channel blockers
CD4	CD4 T lymphocyte
CDC	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CI	confidence interval
CKD	chronic kidney disease
Cl	chloride
C_{max}	maximum plasma concentration
C_{min}	minimum plasma concentration
CNS	central nervous system
CPK	creatine phosphokinase
Cr	creatinine
CrCl	creatinine clearance
CSF	cerebrospinal fluid
CV	cardiovascular
CVD	cardiovascular disease
CYP	cytochrome P450
CYP3A4	cytochrome P450 3A4
DAA	direct-acting antiviral
DHA	dihydroartemisinin
DILI	drug-induced liver injury
DMPA	depot medroxyprogesterone acetate

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

DOT	directly observed therapy
EBV	Epstein-Barr virus
EC	enteric coated
ECG	electrocardiogram
eGFR	estimated glomerular filtration rate
FDA	Food and Drug Administration
FDC	fixed-dose combination
Fe	iron
FI	fusion inhibitor
FUL	federal upper limit
GAHT	gender-affirming hormone therapy
GAZT	azidothymidine glucuronide
GHB	gamma-hydroxybutyrate
GI	gastrointestinal
HAD	HIV-associated dementia
HAV	hepatitis A virus
HBcAb	hepatitis B core antibody
HBeAg	hepatitis B e antigen
HBsAb	hepatitis B surface antibody
HBsAg	hepatitis B surface antigen
HBV	hepatitis B virus
HCO_3	bicarbonate
HCV	hepatitis C virus
HD	hemodialysis
HDL	high-density lipoprotein
HIV	human immunodeficiency virus
HIV RNA	HIV viral load
HIV-1	human immunodeficiency virus type 1
HIV-2	human immunodeficiency virus type 2
HIVAN	HIV-associated nephropathy
HLA	human leukocyte antigen
HMG-CoA	hydroxy-methylglutaryl-coenzyme A
HRT	hormone replacement therapy
HSR	hypersensitivity reaction
HTLV-1	human T-lymphotropic virus-1
INR	international normalized ratio
INSTI	integrase strand transfer inhibitor
IRIS	immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome
K	potassium

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

KS	Kaposi's sarcoma
LDL	low-density lipoprotein
LLOD	lower limits of detection
MAC	*Mycobacterium avium* complex
MAT	medication-assisted treatment
MATE	multidrug and toxin extrusion transporter
MDMA	methylenedioxymethamphetamine
Mg	magnesium
MI	myocardial infarction
MPA	medroxyprogesterone acetate
MRI	magnetic resonance imaging
msec	millisecond
MSM	men who have sex with men
MTR	multi-tablet regimen
Na	sodium
NNRTI	non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor
NRTI	nucleoside/nucleotide reverse transcriptase inhibitor
OAT	opioid agonist therapy
OATP	organic anion-transporting polypeptide
OCT2	organic cation transporter 2
OH-itraconazole	active metabolite of itraconazole
OI	opportunistic infection
ONDCP	Office of National Drug Control Policy
OR	odds ratio
OTP	opioid treatment program
OUD	opioid use disorder
PAH	pulmonary arterial hypertension
PCP	*Pneumocystis jirovecii* pneumonia
PCR	polymerase chain reaction
PDE5	phosphodiesterase type 5
PI	protease inhibitor
PI/c	cobicistat-boosted protease inhibitor
PI/r	ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor
PK	pharmacokinetic
PO	orally
PPI	proton pump inhibitor
PR	protease
PrEP	pre-exposure prophylaxis
PTH	parathyroid hormone

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

q(n)d	every (n) days
q(n)h	every (n) hours
QTc	QT corrected for heart rate
RNA	ribonucleic acid
RR	relative risk
RT	reverse transcriptase
SAMHSA	Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration
SCr	serum creatinine
SJS	Stevens-Johnson syndrome
SSRI	selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor
STI	sexually transmitted infection
STR	single-tablet regimen
SUD	substance use disorder
TB	tuberculosis
TCA	tricyclic antidepressant
TDM	therapeutic drug monitoring
TEN	toxic epidermal necrosis
TG	triglyceride
TID	three times a day
UGT	uridine diphosphate glucuronosyltransferase
VPA	valproic acid
WAC	wholesale acquisition cost
WHO	World Health Organization
XR	extended release
Zn	zinc

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 1. Coformulated Single-Tablet Regimens (Last updated July 10, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

The following table includes dose recommendations for FDA-approved STR products. Please see the class-specific drug characteristics tables (Appendix B, Tables 3 to 6) for details about the individual drugs included in these STR products, including information on elimination and metabolic pathways, serum and intracellular half-lives, and adverse effects. The STR products in this table are listed by drug class and arranged **in alphabetical order** by trade name within each class.

Trade Name (Abbreviations)	ARV Drugs Included in the STR	Dosing Recommendation[a]
INSTI plus Two NRTIs		
Biktarvy (BIC/TAF/FTC)	Bictegravir 50 mg/tenofovir alafenamide 25 mg/emtricitabine 200 mg	One tablet once daily
Genvoya (EVG/c/TAF/FTC)	Elvitegravir 150 mg/cobicistat 150 mg/tenofovir alafenamide 10 mg/emtricitabine 200 mg	One tablet once daily with food
Stribild (EVG/c/TDF/FTC)	Elvitegravir 150 mg/cobicistat 150 mg/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate 300 mg/emtricitabine 200 mg	One tablet once daily with food
Triumeq (DTG/ABC/3TC)	Dolutegravir 50 mg/abacavir 600 mg/lamivudine 300 mg	One tablet once daily
INSTI plus One NRTI		
Dovato (DTG/3TC)	Dolutegravir 50 mg/lamivudine 300 mg	One tablet once daily
PI plus Two NRTIs		
Symtuza (DRV/c/TAF/FTC)	Darunavir 800 mg/cobicistat 150 mg/tenofovir alafenamide 10 mg/emtricitabine 200 mg	One tablet once daily with food
NNRTI plus Two NRTIs		
Atripla (EFV/TDF/FTC)	Efavirenz 600 mg/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate 300 mg/emtricitabine 200 mg	One tablet once daily on an empty stomach, preferably at bedtime
Complera (RPV/TDF/FTC)	Rilpivirine 25 mg/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate 300 mg/emtricitabine 200 mg	One tablet once daily with a meal
Delstrigo (DOR/TDF/3TC)	Doravirine 100 mg/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate 300 mg/lamivudine 300 mg	One tablet once daily
Odefsey (RPV/TAF/FTC)	Rilpivirine 25 mg/tenofovir alafenamide 25 mg/emtricitabine 200 mg	One tablet once daily with a meal
Symfi (EFV/TDF/3TC)	Efavirenz 600 mg/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate 300 mg/lamivudine 300 mg	One tablet once daily on an empty stomach, preferably at bedtime
Symfi Lo (EFV/TDF/3TC)	Efavirenz 400 mg/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate 300 mg/lamivudine 300 mg	One tablet once daily on an empty stomach, preferably at bedtime
INSTI plus One NNRTI		
Juluca (DTG/RPV)	Dolutegravir 50 mg/rilpivirine 25 mg	One tablet once daily with a meal

[a] For dose adjustments in patients with renal or hepatic insufficiency, see Appendix B, Table 10. When no food restriction is listed, the STR can be taken with or without food.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ARV = antiretroviral; BIC = bictegravir; DOR = doravirine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FTC = emtricitabine; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; PI = protease inhibitor; RPV = rilpivirine; STR = single-tablet regimen; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 2. Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor-Based, Fixed-Dose Combination Tablets for Use as Part of an Antiretroviral Regimen (Last updated July 10, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

The following table includes dose recommendations for FDA-approved, dual-NRTI FDC products. These FDC tablets **are not complete regimens** and must be administered in combination with other ARV drugs.

Please see the class-specific drug characteristics tables (Appendix B, Tables 3 to 6) for details about the individual drugs contained in these FDC products, including information on elimination and metabolic pathways, serum and intracellular half-lives, and adverse effects. The FDC tablets in this table are listed by trade name.

Trade Name (Abbreviations)	ARV Drugs Included in the FDC Tablet	Dosing Recommendation[a]
TAF or TDF plus an NRTI		
Descovy (TAF/FTC)	Tenofovir alafenamide 25 mg/emtricitabine 200 mg	One tablet once daily
Cimduo (TDF/3TC)	Tenofovir disoproxil fumarate 300 mg/lamivudine 300 mg	One tablet once daily
Temixys (TDF/3TC)	Tenofovir disoproxil fumarate 300 mg/lamivudine 300 mg	One tablet once daily
Truvada (TDF/FTC)	Tenofovir disoproxil fumarate 300 mg/emtricitabine 200 mg	One tablet once daily
Other NRTI-Based, FDC Tablets		
Epzicom (ABC/3TC) **Note:** Generic product is available.	Abacavir 600 mg/lamivudine 300 mg	One tablet once daily
Combivir (ZDV/3TC) **Note:** Generic product is available.	Zidovudine 300 mg/lamivudine 150 mg	One tablet twice daily

[a] For dose adjustments in patients with renal or hepatic insufficiency, see Appendix B, Table 10. All FDC tablets listed in this table can be taken without regard to food.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ARV = antiretroviral; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FDC = fixed-dose combination; FTC = emtricitabine; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; ZDV = zidovudine

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 3. Characteristics of Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 4)

The older NRTIs ddI and d4T are no longer commonly used in clinical practice and have been removed from this table. Please refer to the July 10, 2019, version of the guidelines (found in the archived guidelines section of AIDS*info*) or to the FDA product labels for ddI and d4T for information regarding these drugs.

Generic Name (Abbreviation) *Trade Name*	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations[a]	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum/ Intracellular Half-Lives	Adverse Events[b]
Abacavir (ABC) *Ziagen* **Note:** Generic tablet formulation is available.	**Ziagen:** • 300 mg tablet • 20 mg/mL oral solution **Generic:** • 300 mg tablet • Also available as FDC with 3TC and ZDV/3TC **FDC Tablets that Contain ABC:**[c] • Epzicom (ABC/3TC) • Trizivir (ABC/ZDV/3TC) **STRs that Contain ABC:**[d] • Triumeq (DTG/ABC/3TC)	**Ziagen**: • ABC 600 mg once daily, *or* • ABC 300 mg twice daily See Appendix B, Tables 1 and 2 for dosing information for FDC tablets that contain ABC.	Metabolized by alcohol dehydrogenase and glucuronyl transferase 82% of ABC dose is excreted renally as metabolites Dose adjustment is recommended in patients with hepatic insufficiency (see Appendix B, Table 10).	1.5 hours/12–26 hours	Patients who test positive for HLA-B*5701 are at the highest risk of experiencing HSRs. HLA screening should be done before initiating ABC. For patients with a history of HSRs, rechallenge **is not recommended**. Symptoms of HSRs may include fever, rash, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, abdominal pain, malaise, fatigue, or respiratory symptoms (e.g., sore throat, cough, or shortness of breath). Some cohort studies suggest an increased risk of MI with recent or current use of ABC, but this risk is not substantiated in other studies.
Emtricitabine (FTC) *Emtriva*	**Emtriva:** • 200 mg hard gelatin capsule • 10 mg/mL oral solution **FDC Tablets that Contain FTC:**[c] • Descovy (TAF/FTC) • Truvada (TDF/FTC) **STRs that Contain FTC:**[d] • Atripla (EFV/TDF/FTC) • Biktarvy (BIC/TAF/FTC) • Complera (RPV/TDF/FTC) • Genvoya (EVG/c/TAF/FTC) • Odefsey (RPV/TAF/FTC) • Stribild (EVG/c/TDF/FTC) • Symtuza (DRV/c/TAF/FTC)	**Emtriva** *Capsule:* • FTC 200 mg once daily *Oral Solution:* • FTC 240 mg (24 mL) once daily See Appendix B, Tables 1 and 2 for dosing information for FDC tablets that contain FTC.	86% of FTC dose is excreted renally See Appendix B, Table 10 for dosing recommendations in patients with renal insufficiency.	10 hours/>20 hours	Minimal toxicity Hyperpigmentation/skin discoloration Severe acute exacerbation of hepatitis may occur in patients with HBV/HIV coinfection who discontinue FTC.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 3. Characteristics of Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 4)

Generic Name (Abbreviation) *Trade Name*	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations[a]	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum/ Intracellular Half-Lives	Adverse Events[b]
Lamivudine (3TC) *Epivir* **Note:** Generic products are available.	**Epivir:** • 150 and 300 mg tablets • 10 mg/mL oral solution **Generic:** • 150 and 300 mg tablets • Also available as FDC with ABC and ZDV **FDC Tablets that Contain 3TC:**[c] • Cimduo (TDF/3TC) • Combivir (ZDV/3TC) • Epzicom (ABC/3TC) • Temixys (TDF/3TC) • Trizivir (ABC/ZDV/3TC) **STRs that Contain 3TC:**[d] • Delstrigo (DOR/TDF/3TC) • Dovato (DTG/3TC) • Symfi (EFV 600 mg/ TDF/3TC) • Symfi Lo (EFV 400 mg/ TDF/3TC) • Triumeq (DTG/ABC/3TC)	**Epivir:** • 3TC 300 mg once daily, *or* • 3TC 150 mg twice daily See Appendix B, Tables 1 and 2 for dosing information for FDC tablets that contain 3TC.	70% of 3TC dose is excreted renally See Appendix B, Table 10 for dose recommendations in patients with renal insufficiency.	5–7 hours/18–22 hours	Minimal toxicity Severe acute exacerbation of hepatitis may occur in patients with HBV/HIV coinfection who discontinue 3TC.
Tenofovir Alafenamide (TAF) *Vemlidy* **Note:** Vemlidy is available as a 25-mg tablet for the treatment of HBV.	**FDC Tablets that Contain TAF:**[c] • Descovy (TAF/FTC) **STRs that Contain TAF:**[d] • Biktarvy (BIC/TAF/FTC) • Genvoya (EVG/c/TAF/FTC) • Odefsey (RPV/TAF/FTC) • Symtuza (DRV/c/TAF/FTC)	See Appendix B, Tables 1 and 2 for dosing information for FDC tablets that contain TAF.	Metabolized by cathepsin A. See Appendix B, Table 10 for dosing recommendations in patients with renal insufficiency.	0.5 hours/150–180 hours	Renal insufficiency, Fanconi syndrome, and proximal renal tubulopathy are less likely to occur with TAF than with TDF. Osteomalacia and decreases in BMD are less likely to occur with TAF than with TDF. Severe acute exacerbation of hepatitis may occur in patients with HBV/HIV coinfection who discontinue TAF. Diarrhea, nausea, headache

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 3. Characteristics of Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 3 of 4)

Generic Name (Abbreviation) *Trade Name*	**Formulations**	**Dosing Recommendations**[a]	**Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway**	**Serum/ Intracellular Half-Lives**	**Adverse Events**[b]
Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate (TDF) *Viread* **Note:** Generic product is available.	**Viread:** • 150, 200, 250, and 300 mg tablets • 40 mg/g oral powder **Generic:** • 300 mg tablet **FDC Tablets that Contain TDF:**[c] • Cimduo (TDF/3TC) • Temixys (TDF/3TC) • Truvada (TDF/FTC) **STRs that Contain TDF:**[d] • Atripla (EFV/TDF/FTC) • Complera (RPV/TDF/FTC) • Delstrigo (DOR/TDF/3TC) • Stribild (EVG/c/TDF/FTC) • Symfi (EFV 600 mg/ TDF/3TC) • Symfi Lo (EFV 400 mg/ TDF/3TC)	**Viread:** • TDF 300 mg once daily, *or* • 7.5 level scoops of oral powder once daily (dosing scoop dispensed with each bottle; one level scoop contains 1 g of oral powder). Mix oral powder with 2–4 ounces of a soft food that does not require chewing (e.g., applesauce, yogurt). **Do not mix oral powder with liquid.** See Appendix B, Tables 1 and 2 for dosing information for FDC tablets that contain TDF.	Renal excretion is the primary route of elimination. See Appendix B, Table 10 for dose recommendations in patients with renal insufficiency.	17 hours/>60 hours	Renal insufficiency, Fanconi syndrome, proximal renal tubulopathy Osteomalacia, decrease in BMD Severe acute exacerbation of hepatitis may occur in patients with HBV/HIV coinfection who discontinue TDF. Asthenia, headache, diarrhea, nausea, vomiting, flatulence
Zidovudine (ZDV) *Retrovir* **Note:** Generic products are available.	**Retrovir:** • 100 mg capsule • 10 mg/mL IV solution • 10 mg/mL oral solution **Generic:** • 300 mg tablet • Also available as FDC with 3TC and 3TC/ABC **FDC Tablets that Contain ZDV:**[c] • Combivir (ZDV/3TC) • Trizivir (ABC/ZDV/3TC)	**Retrovir:** • ZDV 300 mg twice daily, *or* • ZDV 200 mg three times a day See Appendix B, Table 2 for dosing information for FDC tablets that contain ZDV.	Metabolized to GAZT Renal excretion of GAZT See Appendix B, Table 10 for dosing recommendations in patients with renal insufficiency.	1.1 hours/ 7 hours	Macrocytic anemia Neutropenia Nausea, vomiting, headache, insomnia, asthenia Nail pigmentation Lactic acidosis/severe hepatomegaly with hepatic steatosis (this is a rare, but potentially life-threatening, toxicity) Hyperlipidemia Insulin resistance/diabetes mellitus Lipoatrophy Myopathy

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 3. Characteristics of Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 4 of 4)

[a] For dose adjustments in patients with renal or hepatic insufficiency, see Appendix B, Table 10. When no food restriction is listed, the ARV drug can be taken with or without food.

[b] Also see Table 17.

[c] See Appendix B, Table 2 for information about these formulations.

[d] See Appendix B, Table 1 for information about these formulations.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; BIC = bictegravir; BMD = bone mineral density; CrCl = creatinine clearance; d4T = stavudine; ddI = didanosine; DOR = doravirine; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DTG = dolutegravir; EC = enteric coated; EFV = efavirenz; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FDC = fixed-dose combination; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FTC = emtricitabine; GAZT = azidothymidine glucuronide; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HLA = human leukocyte antigen; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; IV = intravenous; MI = myocardial infarction; RPV = rilpivirine; STR = single-tablet regimen; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; WHO = World Health Organization; ZDV = zidovudine

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 4. Characteristics of Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 2)

The older NNRTI DLV is no longer commonly used in clinical practice and is **not** listed this table. Please refer to the FDA product label for DLV for information regarding this drug.

Generic Name (Abbreviations) *Trade Name*	**Formulations**	**Dosing Recommendations**[a]	**Elimination/Metabolic Pathway**	**Serum Half-Life**	**Adverse Events**[b]
Doravirine (DOR) *Pifeltro*	**Pifeltro:** • 100 mg tablet Also available as part of the STR Delstrigo (DOR/TDF/3TC)[c]	**Pifeltro:** • One tablet once daily See Appendix B, Table 1 for dosing information for Delstrigo.	CYP3A4/5 substrate	15 hours	Nausea Dizziness Abnormal dreams
Efavirenz (EFV) *Sustiva* **Note:** Generic product is available.	**Sustiva:** • 50 and 200 mg capsules • 600 mg tablet **Generic:** • 600 mg tablet **STRs that Contain EFV:**[c] • Atripla (EFV/TDF/FTC) • Symfi (EFV 600 mg/TDF/3TC) • Symfi Lo (EFV 400 mg/TDF/3TC)	**Sustiva:** • EFV 600 mg once daily, at or before bedtime Take on an empty stomach to reduce side effects. See Appendix B, Table 1 for dosing information for STRs that contain EFV.	Metabolized by CYP2B6 (primary), 3A4, and 2A6 CYP3A4 mixed inducer/inhibitor (more an inducer than an inhibitor) CYP2B6 and 2C19 inducer	40–55 hours	Rash[d] Neuropsychiatric symptoms[e] Serum transaminase elevations Hyperlipidemia Use of EFV may lead to false-positive results with some cannabinoid and benzodiazepine screening assays. QT interval prolongation
Etravirine (ETR) *Intelence*	**Intelence:** • 25, 100, and 200 mg tablets	**Intelence:** • ETR 200 mg twice daily Take following a meal.	CYP3A4, 2C9, and 2C19 substrate CYP3A4 inducer CYP2C9 and 2C19 inhibitor	41 hours	Rash, including Stevens-Johnson syndrome[d] HSRs, characterized by rash, constitutional findings, and sometimes organ dysfunction (including hepatic failure), have been reported. Nausea

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 4. Characteristics of Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 2)

Generic Name (Abbreviations) *Trade Name*	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations[a]	Elimination/Metabolic Pathway	Serum Half-Life	Adverse Events[b]
Nevirapine (NVP) *Viramune or Viramune XR* **Note:** Generic products are available.	**Viramune:** • 200 mg tablet • 50 mg/5 mL oral suspension **Viramune XR:** • 400 mg tablet **Generic:** • 200 mg tablet • 400 mg extended release tablet • 50 mg/5 mL oral suspension	**Viramune:** • NVP 200 mg once daily for 14 days (lead-in period); thereafter, NVP 200 mg twice daily, *or* • NVP 400 mg (Viramune XR tablet) once daily Take without regard to meals. Repeat lead-in period if therapy is discontinued for >7 days. In patients who develop mild-to-moderate rash without constitutional symptoms, continue lead-in dose until rash resolves, but do not extend lead-in period beyond 28 days total.	CYP450 substrate CYP3A4 and 2B6 inducer **Contraindicated** in patients with moderate to severe hepatic impairment. Dose adjustment is recommended in patients on hemodialysis (see Appendix B, Table 10).	25–30 hours	Rash, including Stevens-Johnson syndrome[d] **Symptomatic Hepatitis:** • Symptomatic hepatitis, including fatal hepatic necrosis, has been reported. • Rash has been reported in approximately 50% of cases. • Symptomatic hepatitis occurs at a significantly higher frequency in ARV-naive female patients with pre-NVP CD4 counts >250 cells/mm^3 and in ARV-naive male patients with pre-NVP CD4 counts >400 cells/mm^3. • NVP should not be initiated in these patients unless the benefit clearly outweighs the risk.
Rilpivirine (RPV) *Edurant*	**Edurant:** • 25 mg tablet **STRs that Contain RPV:**[c] • Complera (RPV/TDF/FTC) • Juluca (DTG/RPV) • Odefsey (RPV/TAF/FTC)	**Edurant:** • RPV 25 mg once daily Take with a meal. See Appendix B, Table 1 for dosing information for STRs that contain RPV.	CYP3A4 substrate	50 hours	Rash[d] Depression, insomnia, headache Hepatotoxicity QT interval prolongation

[a] For dose adjustments in patients with renal or hepatic insufficiency, see Appendix B, Table 10. When no food restriction is listed, the ARV drug can be taken with or without food.

[b] Also see Table 17.

[c] See Appendix B, Table 1 for information about these formulations.

[d] Rare cases of Stevens-Johnson syndrome have been reported with the use of most NNRTIs; the highest incidence of rash was seen among patients who were receiving NVP.

[e] Adverse events can include dizziness, somnolence, insomnia, abnormal dreams, depression, suicidality (e.g., suicide, suicide attempt or ideation), confusion, abnormal thinking, impaired concentration, amnesia, agitation, depersonalization, hallucinations, and euphoria. Approximately 50% of patients who are receiving EFV may experience any of these symptoms. Symptoms usually subside spontaneously after 2–4 weeks, but discontinuation of EFV may be necessary in a small percentage of patients. Late-onset neurotoxicities, including ataxia and encephalopathy, have been reported.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ARV = antiretroviral; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; CYP = cytochrome P; DLV = delavirdine; DOR = doravirine; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; FDC = fixed-dose combination; FTC = emtricitabine; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; RPV = rilpivirine; STR = single-tablet regimen; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; XR = extended release

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 5. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 4)

The older PIs FPV, IDV, NFV, SQV, and TPV are no longer commonly used in clinical practice and have been removed from this table. Please refer to the July 10, 2019 version of the guidelines (found in the archived guidelines section of AIDS*info*) or to the FDA product labels for information regarding these drugs.

Generic Name (Abbreviations) *Trade Name*	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations[a]	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum Half-Life	Adverse Events[b]
Atazanavir (ATV) *Reyataz* (ATV/c) *Evotaz* **Note:** Generic products of ATV are available.	**Reyataz:** • 150, 200, and 300 mg capsules • 50 mg oral powder/packet **Generic:** • 100, 150, 200, and 300 mg capsules **Evotaz:** • ATV 300 mg/ COBI 150 mg tablet	**Reyataz** *In ARV-Naive Patients:* • (ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg) once daily; *or* • ATV 400 mg once daily • Take with food. *With TDF or in ARV-Experienced Patients:* • (ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg) once daily • Unboosted ATV **is not recommended**. • Take with food. *With EFV in ARV-Naive Patients:* • (ATV 400 mg plus RTV 100 mg) once daily • Take with food. **Evotaz**: • One tablet once daily • Take with food. • The use of ATV/c **is not recommended** for patients who are taking TDF and who have baseline CrCl <70 mL/min (see Appendix B, Table 10 for the equation for calculating CrCl). For dosing recommendations for patients who are also receiving H2 antagonists and PPIs, refer to Table 21a.	**ATV:** • CYP3A4 inhibitor and substrate • Weak CYP2C8 inhibitor • UGT1A1 inhibitor **COBI:** • CYP3A inhibitor and substrate • CYP2D6 inhibitor Dose adjustment is recommended in patients with hepatic insufficiency (see Appendix B, Table 10).	7 hours	Indirect hyperbilirubinemia PR interval prolongation. First degree symptomatic AV block has been reported. Use with caution in patients who have underlying conduction defects or who are on concomitant medications that can cause PR prolongation. Cholelithiasis Nephrolithiasis Renal insufficiency Serum transaminase elevations Hyperlipidemia (especially with RTV boosting) Skin rash Hyperglycemia Fat maldistribution An increase in serum creatinine may occur when ATV is administered with COBI.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 5. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 4)

Generic Name (Abbreviations) *Trade Name*	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations[a]	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum Half-Life	Adverse Events[b]
Darunavir (DRV) *Prezista* (DRV/c) *Prezcobix*	**Prezista**: • 75, 150, 600, and 800 mg tablets • 100 mg/mL oral suspension **Prezcobix**: • DRV 800 mg/ COBI 150 mg tablet Also available as part of the STR Symtuza (DRV/c/ TAF/FTC)	**Prezista** *In ARV-Naive Patients or ARV-Experienced Patients with No DRV Mutations:* • (DRV 800 mg plus RTV 100 mg) once daily • Take with food. *In ARV-Experienced Patients with One or More DRV Resistance Mutations:* • (DRV 600 mg plus RTV 100 mg) twice daily • Take with food. Unboosted DRV **is not recommended**. **Prezcobix:** • One tablet once daily • Take with food. • **Not recommended** for patients with one or more DRV resistance-associated mutations. • Coadministering Prezcobix and TDF **is not recommended** for patients with baseline CrCl <70 mL/min (see Appendix B, Table 10 for the equation for calculating CrCl). See Appendix B, Table 1 for dosing information for Symtuza.	**DRV:** • CYP3A4 inhibitor and substrate • CYP2C9 inducer **COBI:** • CYP3A inhibitor and substrate • CYP2D6 inhibitor	15 hours when combined with RTV 7 hours when combined with COBI	**Skin Rash:** DRV has a sulfonamide moiety, however incidence and severity of rash are similar in those with or without a sulfonamide allergy; Stevens-Johnson syndrome, toxic epidermal necrolysis, acute generalized exanthematous pustulosis, and erythema multiforme have been reported. Hepatotoxicity Diarrhea, nausea Headache Hyperlipidemia Serum transaminase elevation Hyperglycemia Fat maldistribution An increase in serum creatinine may occur when DRV is administered with COBI.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 5. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 3 of 4)

Generic Name (Abbreviations) *Trade Name*	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations[a]	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum Half-Life	Adverse Events[b]
Lopinavir/ Ritonavir (LPV/r) *Kaletra* **Note:** LPV is only available as a component of an FDC tablet that also contains RTV.	**Kaletra:** • LPV/r 200 mg/50 mg tablets • LPV/r 100 mg/25 mg tablets • LPV/r 400 mg/100 mg per 5 mL of oral solution. Oral solution contains 42% alcohol.	**Kaletra:** • LPV/r 400 mg/100 mg twice daily, *or* • LPV/r 800 mg/200 mg once daily. However, once-daily dosing **is not recommended** for patients with three or more LPV-associated mutations, pregnant women, or patients receiving EFV, NVP, carbamazepine, phenytoin, or phenobarbital. *With EFV or NVP in PI-Naive or PI Experienced Patients:* • LPV/r 500 mg/125 mg tablets twice daily (use a combination of two LPV/r 200 mg/50 mg tablets plus one LPV/r 100 mg/25 mg tablet to make a total dose of LPV/r 500 mg/125 mg), *or* • LPV/r 533 mg/133 mg oral solution twice daily **Food Restrictions** *Tablet:* • Take without regard to meals. *Oral Solution:* • Take with food.	CYP3A4 inhibitor and substrate	5–6 hours	GI intolerance, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea Pancreatitis Asthenia Hyperlipidemia (especially hypertriglyceridemia) Serum transaminase elevation Hyperglycemia Insulin resistance/ diabetes mellitus Fat maldistribution Possible increase in the frequency of bleeding episodes in patients with hemophilia PR interval prolongation QT interval prolongation and Torsades de Pointes have been reported; however, causality could not be established.
Ritonavir (RTV) Norvir **Note:** Generic is available. Although RTV was initially developed as a PI for HIV treatment, RTV is currently used at a lower dose of 100 mg to 200 mg once or twice daily as a PK enhancer to increase the concentrations of other PIs.	**Norvir:** • 100 mg tablet • 100 mg soft gel capsule • 80 mg/mL oral solution. Oral solution contains 43% alcohol. • 100 mg single packet oral powder Also available as part of the FDC tablet Kaletra (LPV/r)	**As a PK Booster (or Enhancer) for Other PIs:** • RTV 100–400 mg per day in one or two divided doses (refer to other PIs for specific dosing recommendations). **Food Restrictions** *Tablet:* • Take with food. *Capsule and Oral Solution:* • To improve tolerability, take with food if possible.	CYP3A4 > 2D6 substrate Potent CYP3A4 and 2D6 inhibitor Inducer of UGT1A1 and CYPs 1A2, 2C8, 2C9, and 2C19	3–5 hours	GI intolerance, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea Paresthesia (circumoral and extremities) Hyperlipidemia (especially hypertriglyceridemia) Hepatitis Asthenia Taste perversion Hyperglycemia Fat maldistribution Possible increase in the frequency of bleeding episodes in patients with hemophilia

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 5. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 4 of 4)

[a] For dose adjustments in patients with hepatic insufficiency, see Appendix B, Table 10.

[b] Also see Table 17.

Key: ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; AV = atrioventricular; COBI = cobicistat; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CYP = cytochrome P; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; EFV = efavirenz; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FDC = fixed-dose combination; FPV = fosamprenavir; FTC = emtricitabine; GI = gastrointestinal; IDV = indinavir; LPV = lopinavir; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; msec = millisecond; NFV = nelfinavir; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; PPI = proton pump inhibitor; RTV = ritonavir; SQV = saquinavir; STR = single-tablet regimen; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TPV = tipranavir; UGT = uridine diphosphate glucuronyl transferase

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 6. Characteristics of Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 2)

Generic Name (Abbreviation) *Trade Name*	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations[a]	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathways	Serum Half-Life	Adverse Events[b]
Bictegravir (BIC)	BIC is only available as a component of the STR Biktarvy (BIC/TAF/FTC).[c]	**Biktarvy:** • One tablet PO once daily	CYP3A4 substrate UGT1A1-mediated glucuronidation	~17 hours	Diarrhea Nausea Headache Weight gain
Dolutegravir (DTG) *Tivicay*	**Tivicay:** • 50 mg tablet **STRs that Contain DTG:**[c] • Dovato (DTG/3TC) • Juluca (DTG/RPV) • Triumeq (DTG/ABC/3TC)	**In ARV-Naive or ARV-Experienced, INSTI-Naive Patients:** • DTG 50 mg PO once daily **In ARV-Naive or ARV-Experienced, INSTI-Naive Patients when Coadministered with EFV, FPV/r, TPV/r, or Rifampin:** • DTG 50 PO mg twice daily **INSTI-Experienced Patients with Certain INSTI Mutations (See Product Label) or with Clinically Suspected INSTI Resistance:** • DTG 50 mg PO twice daily See Appendix B, Table 1 for dosing information for STRs that contain DTG.	UGT1A1-mediated glucuronidation Minor substrate of CYP3A4	~14 hours	Insomnia Headache Depression and suicidal ideation (rare; usually occurs in patients with pre-existing psychiatric conditions) Weight gain Hepatotoxicity There is a potential increased risk of NTDs in infants born to individuals who received DTG around the time of conception (see Table 6b for more information). HSRs, including rash, constitutional symptoms, and organ dysfunction (including liver injury), have been reported.
Elvitegravir (EVG)	EVG is only available as a component of an STR tablet that also contains COBI, FTC, and either TDF or TAF. **STRs that Contain EVG:**[c] • Genvoya (EVG/c/TAF/FTC) • Stribild (EVG/c/TDF/FTC)	**Genvoya:** • One tablet PO once daily with food • See Appendix B, Table 10 for recommendations on dosing in persons with renal insufficiency. **Stribild:** • One tablet PO once daily with food • **Not recommended** for patients with baseline CrCl <70 mL/min (see Appendix B, Table 10 for the CrCl calculation equation).	**EVG:** • CYP3A and UGT1A1/3 substrate **COBI:** • CYP3A inhibitor and substrate • CYP2D6 inhibitor	**EVG/c:** ~13 hours	Nausea Diarrhea Depression and suicidal ideation (rare; usually occurs in patients with pre-existing psychiatric conditions)

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 6. Characteristics of Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 2)

Generic Name (Abbreviation) *Trade Name*	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations[a]	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathways	Serum Half-Life	Adverse Events[b]
Raltegravir (RAL) *Isentress* *Isentress HD*	**Isentress:** • 400 mg tablet • 25 and 100 mg chewable tablets • 100 mg single-use packet for oral suspension **Isentress HD:** • 600 mg tablet	**Isentress** *In ARV-Naive Patients or ARV-Experienced Patients:* • 400 mg PO twice daily *With Rifampin:* • 800 mg twice daily **Isentress HD** *In ARV-Naive or ARV-Experienced Patients with Virologic Suppression on a Regimen containing RAL 400 mg Twice Daily:* • 1,200 mg (two 600-mg tablets) PO once daily *With Rifampin:* • **Not recommended**	UGT1A1-mediated glucuronidation	~9 hours	Rash, including Stevens-Johnson syndrome, HSR, and toxic epidermal necrolysis Nausea Headache Diarrhea Pyrexia CPK elevation, muscle weakness, and rhabdomyolysis Weight gain Insomnia Depression and suicidal ideation (rare; usually occurs in patients with pre-existing psychiatric conditions)

[a] For dose adjustments in patients with hepatic insufficiency, see Appendix B, Table 10. When no food restriction is listed, the ARV drug can be taken with or without food.

[b] Also see Table 17.

[c] See Appendix B, Table 1 for information about these formulations.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ARV = antiretroviral; BIC = bictegravir; COBI = cobicistat; CPK = creatine phosphokinase; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CYP = cytochrome P; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FDC = fixed-dose combination; FPV/r = fosamprenavir/ritonavir; FTC = emtricitabine; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; NTD = neural tube defect; PO = orally; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; STR = single-tablet regimen; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TPV/r = tipranavir/ritonavir; UGT = uridine diphosphate glucuronyl transferase

Appendix B, Table 7. Characteristics of the Fusion Inhibitor (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Generic Name (Abbreviation) *Trade Name*	Formulation	Dosing Recommendation	Serum Half-Life	Elimination	Adverse Events[a]
Enfuvirtide (T-20) *Fuzeon*	**Fuzeon:** • Injectable; supplied as lyophilized powder. • Each vial contains 108 mg of T-20; reconstitute with 1.1 mL of sterile water for injection for delivery of approximately 90 mg/1 mL. • Refer to prescribing information for storage instruction.	**Fuzeon:** • T-20 90 mg/1 mL SQ twice daily	3.8 hours	Expected to undergo catabolism to its constituent amino acids, with subsequent recycling of the amino acids in the body pool	Local injection site reactions (e.g., pain, erythema, induration, nodules and cysts, pruritus, ecchymosis) in almost 100% of patients Increased incidence of bacterial pneumonia HSR occurs in <1% of patients. Symptoms may include rash, fever, nausea, vomiting, chills, rigors, hypotension, or elevated serum transaminases. **Re-challenge is not recommended.**

[a] Also see Table 17.

Key: HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; SQ = subcutaneous; T-20 = enfuvirtide

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 8. Characteristics of the CCR5 Antagonist (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Generic Name (Abbreviation) *Trade Name*	Formulation	Dosing Recommendations[a]	Serum Half-Life	Elimination/Metabolic Pathway	Adverse Events[b]
Maraviroc (MVC) *Selzentry*	**Selzentry:** • 150 and 300 mg tablets	**Selzentry:** • MVC 150 mg PO twice daily when given with drugs that are strong CYP3A inhibitors (with or without CYP3A inducers), including PIs (except TPV/r) • MVC 300 mg PO twice daily when given with NRTIs, T-20, TPV/r, NVP, RAL, and other drugs that are not strong CYP3A inhibitors or inducers • MVC 600 mg PO twice daily when given with drugs that are CYP3A inducers, including EFV, ETR, etc. (without a CYP3A inhibitor) Take MVC without regard to meals.	14–18 hours	CYP3A4 substrate	Abdominal pain Cough Dizziness Musculoskeletal symptoms Pyrexia Rash Upper respiratory tract infections Hepatotoxicity, which may be preceded by severe rash or other signs of systemic allergic reactions Orthostatic hypotension, especially in patients with severe renal insufficiency

[a] For dose adjustments in patients with hepatic insufficiency, see Appendix B, Table 10.

[b] Also see Table 17.

Key: CYP = cytochrome P; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; MVC = maraviroc; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PO = orally; RAL = raltegravir; T-20 = enfuvirtide; TPV/r = tipranavir/ritonavir

Appendix B, Table 9. Characteristics of the CD4 Post-Attachment Inhibitor (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019)

Generic Name (Abbreviation) *Trade Name*	Formulation	Dosing Recommendations	Serum Half-Life	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Adverse Events
Ibalizumab (IBA) *Trogarzo*	**Trogarzo:** • Single-dose 2 mL vial containing 200 mg/1.33 mL (150 mg/mL) of ibalizumab	**Trogarzo:** • Administer a single loading dose of IBA 2,000 mg IV infusion over 30 minutes, followed by a maintenance dose of IBA 800 mg IV infusion over 15 minutes every 2 weeks. • See prescribing information for additional instructions for preparing, storing, and administering IBA, and for monitoring patients who are receiving IBA.	~64 hours	Not well defined	Diarrhea Dizziness Nausea Rash

Key: IBA = ibalizumab; IV = intravenous

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 10. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Persons with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 1 of 6)

The older ARV drugs ddI, d4T, FPV, IDV, NFV, SQV, and TPV are no longer commonly used in clinical practice and have been removed from this table. Please refer to the July 10, 2019, guidelines in the Guidelines Archive section of AIDS*info* or to the FDA product labels for these drugs for recommendations on dosing in persons with renal or hepatic insufficiency.

See the reference section at the end of this table for CrCl calculation formulas and criteria for Child-Pugh classification.

Generic Name (Abbreviations) *Trade Name*	Usual Daily Dose[a]	Dosing in Persons with Renal Insufficiency	Dosing in Persons with Hepatic Impairment
Some FDC products are not recommended in persons with different degrees of renal insufficiency. The recommendations for individual FDCs based on CrCl level are outlined below. • *CrCl <70 mL/min:* **Initiation of Stribild is not recommended.** • *CrCl <50 mL/min:* **FDCs not recommended:** Atripla, Combivir, Complera, Delstrigo, Dovato, Epzicom, Triumeq, or Trizivir. • *CrCl <30 mL/min:* **FDCs not recommended:** Biktarvy and Truvada. • *CrCl <30 mL/min* ***and*** *not on HD:* **FDCs not recommended:** Descovy, Genvoya, Odefsey, and Symtuza. The component drugs in some of the FDC products listed above may be prescribed as individual formulations with dose adjustment based on CrCl level as indicated below in this table.			
NRTIs			
Abacavir (ABC) *Ziagen*	ABC 300 mg PO twice daily *or* ABC 600 mg PO once daily	No dose adjustment necessary.	*Child-Pugh Class A:* ABC 200 mg PO twice daily (use oral solution) *Child-Pugh Class B or C:* **Contraindicated**
Emtricitabine (FTC) *Emtriva*	FTC 200 mg oral capsule once daily *or* FTC 240 mg (24 mL) oral solution once daily	**Dose by Formulation** **CrCl (mL/min) / Capsule / Solution** 30–49: 200 mg every 48 hours / 120 mg every 24 hours 15–29: 200 mg every 72 hours / 80 mg every 24 hours <15: 200 mg every 96 hours / 60 mg every 24 hours On HD[b]: 200 mg every 24 hours / 240 mg every 24 hours	No dose recommendation.
Lamivudine (3TC) *Epivir*	3TC 300 mg PO once daily *or* 3TC 150 mg PO twice daily	**CrCl (mL/min) / Dose** 30–49: 150 mg every 24 hours 15–29: 1 x 150 mg, then 100 mg every 24 hours 5–14: 1 x 150 mg, then 50 mg every 24 hours <5 or on HD[b]: 1 x 50 mg, then 25 mg every 24 hours	No dose adjustment necessary.
Tenofovir Alafenamide (TAF) *Vemlidy*	Vemlidy is available as a 25-mg tablet for the treatment of HBV.	**CrCl (mL/min) / Dose** <15 and not on HD: **Not recommended** On HD[b]: One tablet once daily.	*Child-Pugh Class B or C:* **Not recommended**

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 10. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Persons with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 2 of 6)

Generic Name (Abbreviations) *Trade Name*	Usual Daily Dose[a]	Dosing in Persons with Renal Insufficiency	Dosing in Persons with Hepatic Impairment
NRTIs, continued			
Tenofovir Alafenamide/ Emtricitabine (TAF/FTC) *Descovy*	TAF for HIV treatment is only available as a component of FDC tablets (i.e., in Descovy, Genvoya, Odefsey, Biktarvy, and Symtuza). TAF 10 mg PO daily with EVG/c (Genvoya) or DRV/c (Symtuza) TAF 25 mg PO daily in other FDC tablets	**CrCl (mL/min)** / **Dose** <30 and not on HD: **Not recommended** <30 and on HD[b]: One tablet once daily.	*Child-Pugh Class A or B:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class C:* No dose recommendation
Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate (TDF) *Viread*	TDF 300 mg PO once daily	**CrCl (mL/min)** / **Dose** 30–49: 300 mg every 48 hours 10–29: 300 mg twice weekly (every 72–96 hours) <10 and not on HD: No recommendation On HD[b]: 300 mg every 7 days	No dose adjustment necessary.
Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/ Emtricitabine (TDF/FTC) *Truvada*	One tablet PO once daily	**CrCl (mL/min)** / **Dose** 30–49: One tablet every 48 hours <30 or on HD: **Not recommended**	No dose recommendation.
Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Lamivudine (TDF/3TC) *Cimduo*	One tablet PO once daily	**CrCl (mL/min)** / **Dose** <50 or on HD: **Not recommended**	No dose recommendation.
Zidovudine (ZDV) *Retrovir*	ZDV 300 mg PO twice daily	**CrCl (mL/min)** / **Dose** <15 or on HD[b]: 100 mg three times a day or 300 mg once daily	No dose recommendation.
NNRTIs			
Doravirine (DOR) *Pifeltro*	One tablet PO once daily	No dose adjustment required in mild, moderate, or severe renal impairment. Has not been studied in individuals with ESRD or on HD.	*Child-Pugh Class A or B:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class C:* Not studied
Doravirine/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/ Lamivudine (DOR/TDF/3TC) *Delstrigo*	One tablet PO once daily	**Not recommended** if CrCl <50 mL/min.	*Child-Pugh Class A or B:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class C:* Not studied

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 10. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Persons with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 3 of 6)

Generic Name (Abbreviations) *Trade Name*	**Usual Daily Dose**[a]	**Dosing in Persons with Renal Insufficiency**	**Dosing in Persons with Hepatic Impairment**
NNRTIs, continued			
Efavirenz (EFV) *Sustiva*	EFV 600 mg PO once daily on an empty stomach, preferably at bedtime	No dose adjustment necessary.	No dose recommendation; use with caution in patients with hepatic impairment.
Efavirenz/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/ Emtricitabine (EFV/TDF/FTC) *Atripla*	One tablet PO once daily on an empty stomach, preferably at bedtime	**Not recommended** if CrCl <50 mL/min. Instead, use the individual component ARVs and adjust TDF and FTC doses according to CrCl level.	No dose recommendation; use with caution in patients with hepatic impairment.
Efavirenz 600 mg/ Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Lamivudine (EFV/TDF/3TC) *Symfi*	One tablet once daily on an empty stomach, preferably at bedtime	**Not recommended** if CrCl <50 mL/min or if patient is on HD. Instead, use the individual component ARVs and adjust TDF and 3TC doses according to CrCl level.	**Not recommended** for patients with moderate or severe hepatic impairment. Use with caution in patients with mild hepatic impairment.
Efavirenz 400 mg/ Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Lamivudine (EFV/TDF/3TC) *Symfi Lo*	One tablet once daily on an empty stomach, preferably at bedtime	**Not recommended** if CrCl <50 mL/min or if patient is on HD. Instead, use the individual component ARVs and adjust TDF and 3TC doses according to CrCl level.	**Not recommended** for patients with moderate or severe hepatic impairment. Use with caution in patients with mild hepatic impairment.
Etravirine (ETR) *Intelence*	ETR 200 mg PO twice daily	No dose adjustment necessary.	*Child-Pugh Class A or B:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class C:* No dose recommendation
Nevirapine (NVP) *Viramune* or *Viramune XR*	NVP 200 mg PO twice daily *or* NVP 400 mg PO once daily (using Viramune XR formulation)	No dose adjustment for patients with renal impairment. Patients on HD should receive an additional dose of NVP 200 mg following each dialysis treatment.	*Child-Pugh Class A:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class B or C:* **Contraindicated**
Rilpivirine (RPV) *Edurant*	RPV 25 mg PO once daily	No dose adjustment necessary.	*Child-Pugh Class A or B:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class C:* No dose recommendation
Rilpivirine/Tenofovir Alafenamide/ Emtricitabine (RPV/TAF/FTC) *Odefsey*	One tablet PO once daily	**In Patients on Chronic HD:** • One tablet once daily. On HD days, administer after dialysis. **Not recommended** in patients with CrCl <30 mL/min who are not receiving chronic HD.	*Child-Pugh Class A or B:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class C:* No dose recommendation
Rilpivirine/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/ Emtricitabine (RPV/TDF/FTC) *Complera*	One tablet PO once daily	**Not recommended** if CrCl <50 mL/min. Instead, use the individual component ARVs and adjust TDF and FTC doses according to CrCl level.	*Child-Pugh Class A or B:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class C:* No dose recommendation

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 10. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Persons with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 4 of 6)

Generic Name (Abbreviations) *Trade Name*	**Usual Daily Dose**[a]	**Dosing in Persons with Renal Insufficiency**	**Dosing in Persons with Hepatic Impairment**
NNRTIs, continued			
Rilpivirine/ Dolutegravir (RPV/DTG) *Juluca*	One tablet PO once daily with food	No dose adjustment necessary. In patients with CrCl <30 mL/min, monitor closely for adverse effects.	*Child-Pugh Class A or B:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class C:* No dose recommendation
PIs			
Atazanavir (ATV) *Reyataz*	ATV 400 mg PO once daily *or* (ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg) PO once daily	No dose adjustment for patients with renal dysfunction who do not require HD. **In ARV-Naive Patients on HD:** • (ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg) once daily **In ARV-Experienced Patients on HD:** • ATV and ATV/r **are not recommended**	*Child-Pugh Class A:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class B:* ATV 300 mg once daily (unboosted) for ARV-naive patients only *Child-Pugh Class C:* **Not recommended** RTV boosting **is not recommended** in patients with hepatic impairment.
Atazanavir/Cobicistat (ATV/c) *Evotaz*	One tablet PO once daily	**If Used with TDF:** • **Not recommended** if CrCl <70 mL/min	**Not recommended** in patients with hepatic impairment.
Darunavir (DRV) *Prezista*	**In ARV-Naive Patients and ARV-Experienced Patients with No DRV Resistance Mutations:** • (DRV 800 mg plus RTV 100 mg) PO once daily with food **In ARV-Experienced Patients with at Least One DRV Resistance Mutation:** • (DRV 600 mg plus RTV 100 mg) PO twice daily	No dose adjustment necessary.	*In Patients with Mild-to-Moderate Hepatic Impairment:* No dose adjustment *In Patients with Severe Hepatic Impairment:* **Not recommended**
Darunavir/Cobicistat (DRV/c) *Prezcobix*	One tablet PO once daily	**If Used with TDF:** • **Not recommended** if CrCl <70 mL/min	*Child-Pugh Class A or B:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class C:* **Not recommended**
Darunavir/ Cobicistat/Tenofovir Alafenamide/ Emtricitabine (DRV/c/TAF/FTC) *Symtuza*	One tablet PO once daily	**In Patients on Chronic HD:** • One tablet once daily. On HD days, administer after dialysis. **Not recommended** in patients with CrCl <30 mL/min who are not receiving chronic HD.	**Not recommended** for patients with severe hepatic impairment.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 10. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Persons with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 5 of 6)

Generic Name (Abbreviations) *Trade Name*	Usual Daily Dose[a]	Dosing in Persons with Renal Insufficiency	Dosing in Persons with Hepatic Impairment
PIs, continued			
Lopinavir/Ritonavir (LPV/r) *Kaletra*	(LPV/r 400 mg/100 mg) PO twice daily *or* (LPV/r 800 mg/200 mg) PO once daily	Avoid once-daily dosing in patients on HD.	No dose recommendation; use with caution in patients with hepatic impairment.
Ritonavir (RTV) *Norvir*	**As a PI-Boosting Agent:** • RTV 100–400 mg per day	No dose adjustment necessary.	Refer to recommendations for the primary (i.e., boosted) PI.
INSTIs			
Bictegravir/Tenofovir Alafenamide/ Emtricitabine (BIC/TAF/FTC) *Biktarvy*	One tablet once daily	**Not recommended** for use in patients with CrCl <30 mL/min.	*Child-Pugh Class A or B:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class C:* **Not recommended**
Dolutegravir (DTG) *Tivicay*	DTG 50 mg once daily *or* DTG 50 mg twice daily	No dose adjustment necessary.	*Child-Pugh Class A or B:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class C:* **Not recommended**
Dolutegravir/ Abacavir/Lamivudine (DTG/ABC/3TC) *Triumeq*	One tablet once daily	**Not recommended** if CrCl <50 mL/min. Instead, use the individual component drugs and adjust 3TC dose according to CrCl.	*Child-Pugh Class A:* Patients with mild hepatic impairment require a dose reduction of ABC. Use the individual drugs instead of the FDC tablet in these patients. *Child-Pugh Class B or C:* **Contraindicated** due to the ABC component
Dolutegravir/ Rilpivirine (DTG/RPV) *Juluca*	One tablet PO once daily with food	No dose adjustment necessary. In patients with CrCl <30 mL/min, monitor closely for adverse effects.	*Child-Pugh Class A or B:* No dose adjustment *Child-Pugh Class C:* No dose recommendation
Elvitegravir/ Cobicistat/Tenofovir Alafenamide/ Emtricitabine (EVG/c/TAF/FTC) *Genvoya*	One tablet once daily	**In Patients on Chronic HD:** • One tablet once daily. On HD days, administer after dialysis. **Not recommended** in patients with CrCl <30 mL/min who are not receiving chronic HD.	*In Patients with Mild-to-Moderate Hepatic Insufficiency:* No dose adjustment necessary *In Patients with Severe Hepatic Insufficiency:* **Not recommended**
Elvitegravir/ Cobicistat/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/ Emtricitabine (EVG/c/TDF/FTC) *Stribild*	One tablet once daily	EVG/c/TDF/FTC **should not be initiated** in patients with CrCl <70 mL/min. Discontinue EVG/c/TDF/FTC if CrCl declines to <50 mL/min while patient is on therapy.	*In Patients with Mild-to-Moderate Hepatic Insufficiency:* No dose adjustment necessary *In Patients with Severe Hepatic Insufficiency:* **Not recommended**

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Appendix B, Table 10. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Persons with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency (Last updated December 18, 2019; last reviewed December 18, 2019) (page 6 of 6)

Generic Name (Abbreviations) *Trade Name*	**Usual Daily Dose**[a]	**Dosing in Persons with Renal Insufficiency**	**Dosing in Persons with Hepatic Impairment**
INSTIs, continued			
Raltegravir (RAL) *Isentress* *Isentress HD*	RAL 400 mg twice daily (using Isentress formulation) *or* RAL 1,200 mg once daily (using Isentress HD formulation only)	No dose adjustment necessary.	*In Patients with Mild-to-Moderate Hepatic Insufficiency:* No dose adjustment necessary *In Patients with Severe Hepatic Insufficiency:* No recommendation
Fusion Inhibitor			
Enfuvirtide (T-20) *Fuzeon*	T-20 90 mg SQ twice daily	No dose adjustment necessary.	No dose adjustment necessary.
CCR5 Antagonist			
Maraviroc (MVC) *Selzentry*	The recommended dose differs based on concomitant medications and potential for drug-drug interactions. See Appendix B, Table 8 for detailed dosing information.	**In Patients with CrCl <30 mL/min or Patients Who Are on HD** *Without Potent CYP3A Inhibitors or Inducers:* • MVC 300 mg twice daily; if postural hypotension occurs, reduce to MVC 150 mg twice daily *With Potent CYP3A Inducers or Inhibitors:* • **Not recommended**	No dose recommendations. MVC concentrations will likely be increased in patients with hepatic impairment.
CD4 Post-Attachment Inhibitor			
Ibalizumab (IBA) *Trogarzo*	Loading dose: IBA 2,000 mg IV Maintenance dose: IBA 800 mg IV every 2 weeks	No dose adjustment recommended.	No recommendation.

[a] Refer to Appendix B, Tables 1–9 for additional dosing information.

[b] On dialysis days, the patient should take the dose after the HD session.

Key: 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/c = atazanavir/cobicistat; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; BIC = bictegravir; CAPD = chronic ambulatory peritoneal dialysis; COBI = cobicistat; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CYP = cytochrome P; d4T = stavudine; ddI = didanosine; DOR = doravirine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/c = darunavir/cobicistat; DTG = dolutegravir; EC = enteric coated; EFV = efavirenz; ESRD = end stage renal disease; ETR = etravirine; EVG = elvitegravir; EVG/c = elvitegravir/cobicistat; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FDC = fixed-dose combination; FPV = fosamprenavir; FTC = emtricitabine; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HD = hemodialysis; IBA = ibalizumab; IDV = indinavir; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; IV = intravenous; LPV = lopinavir; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; MVC = maraviroc; NFV = nelfinavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PO = orally; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SQ = subcutaneous; SQV = saquinavir; T-20 = enfuvirtide; TAF = tenofovir alafenamide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TPV = tipranavir; XR = extended release; ZDV = zidovudine

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020

Creatinine Clearance Calculation			
Male:	$\frac{(140 - \text{age in years}) \times (\text{weight in kg})}{72 \times (\text{serum creatinine})}$	Female:	$\frac{(140 - \text{age in years}) \times (\text{weight in kg}) \times (0.85)}{72 \times (\text{serum creatinine})}$

Child-Pugh Score			
Component	**Points Scored**		
	1	**2**	**3**
Encephalopathy[a]	None	Grade 1–2	Grade 3–4
Ascites	None	Mild or controlled by diuretics	Moderate or refractory despite diuretics
Albumin	>3.5 g/dL	2.8–3.5 g/dL	<2.8 g/dL
Total Bilirubin, *or*	<2 mg/dL (<34 µmol/L)	2–3 mg/dL (34–50 µmol/L)	>3 mg/dL (>50 µmol/L)
Modified Total Bilirubin[b]	<4 mg/dL	4–7 mg/dL	>7 mg/dL
Prothrombin Time (Seconds Prolonged), *or*	<4	4–6	>6
International Normalized Ratio (INR)	<1.7	1.7–2.3	>2.3

[a] **Encephalopathy Grades**

Grade 1: Mild confusion, anxiety, restlessness, fine tremor, slowed coordination

Grade 2: Drowsiness, disorientation, asterixis

Grade 3: Somnolent but rousable, marked confusion, incomprehensible speech, incontinence, hyperventilation

Grade 4: Coma, decerebrate posturing, flaccidity

[b] Modified total bilirubin used for patients who have Gilbert's syndrome or who are taking indinavir or atazanavir.

Child-Pugh Classification	Total Child-Pugh Score[a]
Class A	5–6 points
Class B	7–9 points
Class C	>9 points

[a] Sum of points for each component of the Child-Pugh Score.

Downloaded from https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines on 3/28/2020