



## **Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in HIV-1-Infected Adults and Adolescents**

Downloaded from <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines> on 6/16/2014

Visit the AIDSinfo website to access the most up-to-date guideline.

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

# Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in HIV-1-Infected Adults and Adolescents



Developed by the HHS 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 HIV-1-infected adults and adolescents. Department of Health and Human Services. Available at <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/ContentFiles/AdultandAdolescentGL.pdf>. Section 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 *AIDSinfo* website (<http://aidsinfo.nih.gov>).



Access *AIDSinfo*  
mobile site

## What's New in the Guidelines? (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

---

Revisions to the February 12, 2013, version of the guidelines include both a new section and key updates to existing sections. Significant updates are highlighted throughout the document.

### New Section

#### *Cost Considerations and Antiretroviral Therapy*

- In the past, this guideline has not formally discussed costs related to antiretroviral therapy (ART). This new section provides an overview of costs as they relate to adherence, including discussion of cost-sharing, prior authorizations, and use of generic drugs. This section also elaborates on potential strategies for cost containment that do not compromise treatment effectiveness.

### Key Updates to Existing Sections

The following are key updates to existing sections of the guidelines.

#### *Change in Recommendations on Frequency of CD4 Count Monitoring*

This change can be found in the “[Laboratory Testing: HIV-1 RNA \(Viral Load\) and CD4 Count Monitoring](#)” section.

- The Panel emphasizes that viral load is the most important measure of response to ART, and should be monitored during therapy to assure consistent viral suppression. CD4+ T-lymphocyte cell count (CD4 count) measurement is essential when a patient enters into care, both to determine the urgency for ART initiation and the need for prophylaxis against opportunistic infections (OIs). After ART initiation, CD4 count monitoring is most helpful in patients with advanced HIV infection to guide the timing of discontinuation of OI prophylaxis or treatment.
- Frequent monitoring of CD4 counts, especially in those with higher counts ( $>300$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) and consistently suppressed viral loads, is generally not required for patient management. Therefore, the Panel recommends the following frequency of CD4 monitoring in patients who have been on ART for at least 2 years with consistent viral suppression:
  - CD4 count between 300 and 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>: CD4 count monitoring every 12 months (**BII**).
  - CD4 count  $>500$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>: CD4 count monitoring is optional (**CIII**).
- The Panel recommends resumption of more frequent CD4 count monitoring in patients who experience virologic rebound; who develop new HIV-associated clinical symptoms; or who develop conditions or initiate therapy that may lead to reduction of CD4 cell count (**AIII**).
- The Panel also emphasizes that monitoring of lymphocyte subsets other than CD4 (e.g., CD8, CD19) is not clinically useful, is more expensive, and is not routinely recommended (**BIII**).
- A new table ([Table 4](#)) has been added to outline the Panel's recommendations on the frequency of viral load and CD4 count monitoring. In addition, [Table 3](#) has been updated to reflect these changes.

#### *Change in Classification of Recommendations for Initial Treatment From “Preferred Regimens” to “Recommended Regimens”*

This change can be found in the “[What to Start: Initial Combination Regimens for the Antiretroviral-Naive Patient](#)” section.

- In the past few years, the FDA has approved several new antiretroviral (ARV) agents and co-

formulations for treatment-naïve individuals. On the basis of data from long-term follow-up studies and experience in clinical practice, the Panel recognizes that options for initial therapy have expanded. Consequently, the Panel now refers to options for initial treatment as “Recommended” rather than “Preferred” regimens.

- Recommended regimens are further divided into two categories:
  - 1. Regimens for ART-naïve patients regardless of baseline viral load or CD4 cell count.** These regimens include those previously termed “Preferred,” namely tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine (TDF/FTC) with either efavirenz (EFV); ritonavir-boosted atazanavir (ATV/r) or darunavir (DRV/r); or raltegravir (RAL). In addition, 3 new regimens have been added to this category:
    - Dolutegravir (DTG) + abacavir/lamivudine (ABC/3TC): **only** for patients who are HLA-B\*5701 negative
    - DTG + TDF/FTC
    - Elvitegravir (EVG)/cobicistat (cobi)/TDF/FTC: **only** for patients with pre-ART creatinine clearance  $\geq 70$  mL/min
  - 2. Regimens that are also recommended, but only for patients with pre-ART plasma HIV RNA <100,000 copies/mL.** These regimens include the following:
    - EFV + ABC/3TC: **only** for patients who are HLA-B\*5701 negative
    - Rilpivirine (RPV)/TDF/FTC: **only** for patients with CD4 count  $>200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>
    - ATV/r + ABC/3TC: **only** for patients who are HLA-B\*5701 negative
- The Panel has revised its list of Alternative Regimens ([Table 6](#)). Those listed as Alternative Regimens are effective and tolerable but, when compared with Recommended options, have potential disadvantages or fewer data supporting their use.
- Given the large number of Recommended and Alternative options, a number of ARV drugs are no longer recommended for initial therapy; these drugs include zidovudine (ZDV), nevirapine (NVP), unboosted ATV, ritonavir-boosted fosamprenavir (FPV/r) or saquinavir (SQV/r), and maraviroc (MVC).
- A new subsection has been added summarizing clinical trial data on antiretroviral strategies for initial therapy when ABC or TDF cannot be used.

### ***Emphasis on Key Principles to Follow When Switching ARV Drugs in the Setting of Viral Suppression***

The “Regimen Simplification” section of the previous guideline has been updated with a new title—“Regimen Switching in the Setting of Viral Suppression”—and includes the following key revisions.

- The Panel emphasizes that the key principle of regimen switch in this setting is to maintain viral suppression without compromising future options and that a patient’s prior treatment history and responses to ART, resistance profiles, and drug tolerance should be considered when contemplating a regimen switch.
- A new subsection has been added to discuss data from clinical trials investigating switching from traditional to alternative regimens.

### ***Addition of a New Table That Provides Recommendations on ARV Drug Options When Switching ARV Drugs Because of Adverse Effects***

- This new table has been added to the “Adverse Effects of Antiretroviral Agents” section to guide clinicians when it is necessary to switch ARV drugs because of adverse effects.

- In the introduction to this table, the Panel also emphasizes that the key principle of ARV switch in this situation is to maintain viral suppression without compromising future treatment options and that a patient's prior treatment history and responses, resistance profiles, and drug tolerance should be considered when selecting a new ARV drug.

## **Additional Updates**

Minor revisions have also been made to the following sections:

- [Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy in Treatment-Naive Patients](#)
- [Virologic Failure and Suboptimal Immunologic Response](#)
- [Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy](#)
- [HIV-Infected Adolescents and Young Adults](#)
- [Drug Interactions](#) (and [Tables 17–19c](#))
- [Drug Characteristics Tables](#) ([Appendix B](#))

## Table of Contents

---

<b><i>What's New in the Guidelines</i></b> .....	i
<b><i>Panel Roster</i></b> .....	viii
<b><i>Financial Disclosure</i></b> .....	x
<b><i>Introduction</i></b> .....	A-1
<i>Table 1. Outline of the Guidelines Development Process</i> .....	A-2
<i>Table 2. Rating Scheme for Recommendations</i> .....	A-3
<b><i>Baseline Evaluation</i></b> .....	B-1
<b><i>Laboratory Testing</i></b> .....	C-1
Laboratory Testing for Initial Assessment and Monitoring While on Antiretroviral Therapy .....	C-1
<i>Table 3. Laboratory Monitoring Schedule for Patients Before and After Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy</i> .....	C-2
Plasma HIV-1 RNA (Viral Load) and CD4 Count Monitoring .....	C-5
<i>Table 4. Recommendations on the Indications and Frequency of Viral Load and CD4 Count Monitoring</i> .....	C-8
Drug-Resistance Testing .....	C-11
<i>Table 5. Recommendations for Using Drug-Resistance Assays</i> .....	C-15
Co-Receptor Tropism Assays .....	C-20
HLA-B*5701 Screening .....	C-23
<b><i>Treatment Goals</i></b> .....	D-1
<b><i>Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy in Treatment-Naïve Patients</i></b> .....	E-1
<b><i>What to Start</i></b> .....	F-1
<i>Table 6. Recommended and Alternative Antiretroviral Regimen Options for Treatment-Naïve Patients</i> .....	F-7
<i>Table 7. Advantages and Disadvantages of Antiretroviral Components Recommended as Initial Antiretroviral Therapy</i> .....	F-22
<i>Table 8. Antiretroviral Components or Regimens Not Recommended as Initial Therapy</i> .....	F-25
<b><i>What Not to Use</i></b> .....	G-1
<i>Table 9. Antiretroviral Regimens or Components That Should Not Be Offered At Any Time</i> .....	G-3
<b><i>Management of the Treatment-Experienced Patient</i></b> .....	H-1
Virologic Failure and Suboptimal Immunologic Response .....	H-1
Regimen Switching in the Setting of Virologic Suppression .....	H-13
Exposure-Response Relationship and Therapeutic Drug Monitoring (TDM) for Antiretroviral Agents ...	H-17
<i>Table 10a. Trough Concentrations of Antiretroviral Drugs for Patients Who Have Drug-Susceptible Virus</i> .....	H-19



<i>Table 10b. Trough Concentrations of Antiretroviral Drugs for Treatment-Experienced Patients with Virologic Failure</i> .....	H-20
Discontinuation or Interruption of Antiretroviral Therapy .....	H-21
<b>Considerations for Antiretroviral Use in Special Patient Populations</b> .....	I-1
Acute and Recent (Early) HIV Infection.....	I-1
<i>Table 11. Identifying, Diagnosing, and Managing Acute and Recent HIV-1 Infection</i> .....	I-5
HIV-Infected Adolescents and Young Adults.....	I-8
HIV and Illicit Drug Users .....	I-14
<i>Table 12. Drug Interactions between Antiretroviral Agents and Drugs Used to Treat Opioid Addiction</i> .....	I-17
HIV-Infected Women .....	I-20
HIV-2 Infection .....	I-27
HIV and the Older Patient.....	I-30
<b>Considerations for Antiretroviral Use in Patients with Coinfections</b> .....	J-1
Hepatitis B (HBV)/HIV Coinfection .....	J-1
Hepatitis C (HCV)/HIV Coinfection .....	J-5
<i>Mycobacterium Tuberculosis</i> Disease with HIV Coinfection.....	J-12
<b>Limitations to Treatment Safety and Efficacy</b> .....	K-1
Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy.....	K-1
<i>Table 13. Strategies to Improve Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy and Retention in Care</i> .....	K-4
Adverse Effects of Antiretroviral Agents .....	K-8
<i>Table 14. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects</i> .....	K-9
<i>Table 15. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Adverse Events That Can Be Managed with Substitution of Alternative Antiretroviral Agent</i> .....	K-17
Cost Considerations and Antiretroviral Therapy .....	K-21
<i>Table 16. Monthly Average Wholesale Price of Antiretroviral Drugs</i> .....	K-22
<b>Drug Interactions</b> .....	L-1
<i>Table 17. Drugs That Should Not Be Used With Antiretroviral Agents</i> .....	L-4
<i>Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs</i> .....	L-6
<i>Table 18b. Drug Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs</i> .....	L-18
<i>Table 18c. Drug Interactions between Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents)</i> .....	L-25
<i>Table 18d. Drug Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs</i> ..	L-27
<i>Table 18e. Drug Interactions between CCR5 Antagonist and Other Drugs</i> .....	L-35
<i>Table 19a. Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors, and Protease Inhibitors</i> .....	L-37
<i>Table 19b. Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors or Protease Inhibitors</i> .....	L-39

<b><i>Preventing Secondary Transmission of HIV</i></b> .....	M-1
<b><i>Conclusion</i></b> .....	N-1
<b><i>Appendix A: Key to Acronyms</i></b> .....	O-1
<b><i>Appendix B: Drug Characteristics Tables</i></b> .....	P-1
<i>Appendix B, Table 1. Characteristics of Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors</i> .....	P-1
<i>Appendix B, Table 2. Characteristics of Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors</i> .....	P-6
<i>Appendix B, Table 3. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitors</i> .....	P-8
<i>Appendix B, Table 4. Characteristics of Integrase Inhibitors</i> .....	P-13
<i>Appendix B, Table 5. Characteristics of Fusion Inhibitor</i> .....	P-14
<i>Appendix B, Table 6. Characteristics of CCR5 Antagonist</i> .....	P-14
<i>Appendix B, Table 7. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Patients with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency</i> .....	P-15

## ***List of Tables***

Table 1. Outline of the Guidelines Development Process .....	A-2
Table 2. Rating Scheme for Recommendations.....	A-3
Table 3. Laboratory Monitoring Schedule for Patients 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-8
Table 5. Recommendations for Using Drug-Resistance Assays.....	C-15
Table 6. Recommended and Alternative Antiretroviral Regimen Options for Treatment-Naïve Patients .....	F-7
Table 7. Advantages and Disadvantages of Antiretroviral Components Recommended as Initial Antiretroviral Therapy .....	F-22
Table 8. Antiretroviral Components or Regimens Not Recommended as Initial Therapy.....	F-25
Table 9. Antiretroviral Regimens or Components That Should Not Be Offered At Any Time .....	G-3
Table 10a. Trough Concentrations of Antiretroviral Drugs for Patients Who Have Drug-Susceptible Virus.....	H-19
Table 10b. Trough Concentrations of Antiretroviral Drugs for Treatment-Experienced Patients with Virologic Failure.....	H-20
Table 11. Identifying, Diagnosing, and Managing Acute and Recent HIV-1 Infection .....	I-5
Table 12. Drug Interactions between Antiretroviral Agents and Drugs Used to Treat Opioid Addiction .....	I-17
Table 13. Strategies to Improve Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy.....	K-4
Table 14. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects .....	K-9
Table 15. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Adverse Events That Can Be Managed with Substitution of Alternative Antiretroviral Agent .....	K-17
Table 16. Monthly Average Wholesale Price of Antiretroviral Drugs .....	K-22



Table 17. Drugs That Should Not Be Used With Antiretroviral Agents .....	L-4
Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors and Other Drugs .....	L-6
Table 18b. Drug Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs .....	L-18
Table 18c. Drug Interactions between Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) .....	L-25
Table 18d. Drug Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs .....	L-27
Table 18e. Drug Interactions between CCR5 Antagonist and Other Drugs .....	L-35
Table 19a. Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors, and Protease Inhibitors .....	L-37
Table 19b. Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors or Protease Inhibitors .....	L-39

# HHS Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents

## Panel Roster (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

---

*These Guidelines are developed by the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents (a Working Group of the Office of AIDS Research Advisory Council).*

### **Panel Co-Chairs**

John G. Bartlett	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD (term ended December 31, 2013)
Roy M. Gulick	Weill Medical College of Cornell University, New York, NY (term began January 1, 2014)
Martin S. Hirsch	Massachusetts General Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA (term began January 1, 2014)
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 of Mount Sinai University, New York, NY
Adaora Adimora	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC
John T. Brooks	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA
J. Kevin Carmichael	El Rio Specialty Immunology Associates, Tucson, AZ
Deborah L. Cohan	University of California–San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
Eric Daar	University of California–Los Angeles, Harbor-UCLA Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA
Steven G. Deeks	University of California–San Francisco, San Francisco, CA (term ended March 4, 2014)
Carlos del Rio	Emory University, Atlanta, GA (term ended March 4, 2014)
Gerald Friedland	Yale University School of Medicine, New Haven, CT
Joel E. Gallant	Southwest CARE Center, Santa Fe, NM (term ended March 4, 2014)
Rajesh T. Gandhi	Massachusetts General Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
Stephen J. Gange	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD
Thomas Giordano	Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX (term began March 4, 2014)
Richard Haubrich	University of California–San Diego, San Diego, CA (term began March 4, 2014)
W. Keith Henry	Hennepin County Medical Center & University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN (term ended March 4, 2014)
Michael D. Hughes	Harvard School of Public Health, Boston, MA
Peter Hunt	University of California–San Francisco, San Francisco, CA (term began March 4, 2014)
Bill G. Kapogiannis	National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD
Marla Keller	Albert Einstein College of Medicine, New York, NY (term began March 4, 2014)

Daniel R. Kuritzkes	Brigham and Women's Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
Jeffrey Lennox	Emory University, Atlanta, GA (term began March 4, 2014)
Richard W. Price	University of California–San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
James L. Raper	University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL
Bret J. Rudy	New York University, New York, NY
Michael Saag	University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL (term ended March 4, 2014)
Paul Sax	Brigham and Women's Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
Kimberly Scarsi	University of Nebraska, Omaha, NE
Mark Sulkowski	Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD
Pablo Tebas	University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA
Zelalem Temesgen	Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN
Phyllis Tien	University of California–San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
Rochelle Walensky	Massachusetts General Hospital & Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA
David A. Wohl	University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC

### ***Community Members***

Lei Chou	Treatment Action Group, New York, NY
Paul Dalton	San Francisco, CA (term ended March 4, 2014)
David Evans	Project Inform, San Francisco, CA
Danielle Houston	Houston, TX
Jeff Taylor	AIDS Treatment Activists Coalition, Palm Springs, CA
Nelson Vergel	Program for Wellness Restoration, Houston, TX

### ***Members Representing Department of Health and Human Services Agencies***

Victoria Cargill	National Institutes of Health, Rockville, MD
Laura Cheever	Health Resources and Services Administration, Rockville, MD
Jonathan Kaplan	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA
Kendall Marcus	Food and Drug Administration, Silver Spring, MD
Henry Masur	National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD
Lynne Mofenson	National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD
Kimberly Struble	Food and Drug Administration, Silver Spring, MD

### ***Acknowledgement***

The Panel would like to acknowledge Sarita D. Boyd and Monica Calderon (Food and Drug Administration) and Lori Gordon (National Institutes of Health) for their assistance in updating the drug interaction tables in the guidelines, and recognize Thomas Uldrick (National Cancer Institute) for his contributions to the discussion on malignancies in the “Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy in Treatment-Naive Patients” section of the guidelines.

# HHS Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents Financial Disclosure (Reporting Period: February 2013–February 2014) (page 1 of 4)

Panel Member	Status of Panel Member	Company	Relationship
Judith Aberg	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abbvie</li> <li>• Janssen</li> <li>• Merck</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advisory Board</li> <li>• Advisory Board</li> <li>• Advisory Board</li> </ul>
Adaora Adimora	M	None	N/A
John G. Bartlett <sup>1</sup>	C	None	N/A
John T. Brooks	M	None	N/A
Victoria Ann Cargill	M	None	N/A
Kevin Carmichael	M	None	N/A
Laura W. Cheever	M	None	N/A
Lei Chou	M	None	N/A
Deborah Cohan	M	None	N/A
Eric Daar	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abbvie</li> <li>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</li> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• Janssen Therapeutics</li> <li>• Merck</li> <li>• Teva</li> <li>• ViiV</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advisory Board</li> <li>• Consultant; Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board</li> <li>• Consultant; Research support</li> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Consultant; Research support</li> </ul>
Paul Dalton <sup>2</sup>	M	None	N/A
Steven G. Deeks <sup>2</sup>	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abbvie</li> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• Merck</li> <li>• Roche Molecular Sciences</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Honoraria; Travel support</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> </ul>
Carlos del Rio <sup>2</sup>	M	None	N/A
David Evans	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</li> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• ViiV</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advisory Board</li> <li>• Advisory Board</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Travel support</li> </ul>
Gerald H. Friedland	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</li> <li>• Gilead</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> </ul>
Joel E. Gallant <sup>2</sup>	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</li> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• Janssen Therapeutics</li> <li>• Merck</li> <li>• Sangamo Biosciences</li> <li>• Takara Bio Inc.</li> <li>• Vertex</li> <li>• ViiV Healthcare/GlaxoSmithKline</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• DSMB member</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> </ul>
Rajesh Gandhi	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Janssen</li> <li>• ViiV/Abbott</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Educational program support</li> <li>• Educational program support</li> </ul>
Stephen Gange	M	Merck	DSMB member

# HHS Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents Financial Disclosure (Reporting Period: February 2013–February 2014) (page 2 of 4)

Panel Member	Status of Panel Member	Company	Relationship
Thomas Giordano <sup>3</sup>	M	None	N/A
Roy Gulick <sup>4</sup>	C	None	N/A
Richard Haubrich <sup>3</sup>	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abbvie</li> <li>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</li> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• GlaxoSmithKline/Pfizer/ViiV</li> <li>• Janssen</li> <li>• Merck</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support; Speakers Bureau (ended 12/2013); Travel support</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Travel support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> </ul>
W. Keith Henry <sup>2</sup>	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• GlaxoSmithKline/ViiV</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> </ul>
Martin Hirsch <sup>4</sup>	C	None	N/A
Danielle Houston	M	Gilead	Honoraria
Michael D. Hughes	M	None	N/A
Peter W. Hunt <sup>3</sup>	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</li> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• GlaxoSmithKline</li> <li>• Merck</li> <li>• Salix</li> <li>• Tobira</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Honoraria; Consultant</li> <li>• Travel support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Consultant</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Consultant</li> </ul>
Jonathan E. Kaplan	M	None	N/A
Bill Kapogiannis	M	None	N/A
Marla Keller <sup>3</sup>	M	None	N/A
Daniel R. Kuritzkes	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</li> <li>• Celera</li> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• GlaxoSmithKline</li> <li>• InnoVirvax</li> <li>• Merck</li> <li>• Tobira</li> <li>• ViiV</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Consultant; Grant support</li> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Consultant; Speaking honorarium</li> </ul>
H. Clifford Lane	C	None	N/A
Jeffrey Lennox <sup>3</sup>	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</li> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• Merck</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Consultant</li> </ul>
Kendall Marcus	M	None	N/A
Henry Masur	M	None	N/A
Lynne Mofenson	M	None	N/A
Alice Pau	ES	None	N/A

# HHS Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents Financial Disclosure (Reporting Period: February 2013–February 2014) (page 3 of 4)

Name	Panel Status*	Company	Relationship
Richard W. Price	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abbvie</li> <li>• Merck</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Honoraria; Travel support</li> <li>• Consultant</li> </ul>
James Raper	M	None	N/A
Brett Rudy	M	None	N/A
Michael Saag <sup>2</sup>	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abbvie</li> <li>• Boehringer Ingelheim</li> <li>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</li> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• GlaxoSmithKline/ViiV</li> <li>• Janssen Therapeutics</li> <li>• Merck</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> </ul>
Paul E. Sax	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abbvie</li> <li>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</li> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• Janssen Therapeutics</li> <li>• Merck</li> <li>• ViiV</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Advisory Board</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> </ul>
Kimberly Scarsi	M	None	N/A
Kimberly Struble	M	None	N/A
Mark Sulkowski	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Abbvie</li> <li>• Bayer HealthCare</li> <li>• Boehringer Ingelheim</li> <li>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</li> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• Idenix</li> <li>• Janssen Therapeutics</li> <li>• Merck</li> <li>• Pfizer</li> <li>• Vertex</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; DSMB member; Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Steering committee</li> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> </ul>
Jeff Taylor	M	Bristol-Myers Squibb	Consultant
Pablo Tebas	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Astra Zeneca</li> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• GlaxoSmithKline</li> <li>• Merck</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Consultant</li> <li>• Adjudication committee member</li> <li>• Consultant</li> </ul>
Zelalem Temesgen	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• Janssen Therapeutics</li> <li>• Merck</li> <li>• Pfizer</li> <li>• ViiV</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education grant; Research support</li> <li>• Education grant</li> <li>• Education grant</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Education grant</li> </ul>
Phyllis Tien	M	Bristol-Myers Squibb	Advisory Board
Nelson R. Vergel	M	None	N/A



## HHS Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents Financial Disclosure (Reporting Period: February 2013–February 2014) (page 4 of 4)

---

Name	Panel Status*	Company	Relationship
Rochelle Walensky	M	None	N/A
David Alain Wohl	M	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Gilead</li> <li>• Janssen Therapeutics</li> <li>• Merck</li> <li>• ViiV</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Advisory Board; Research support</li> <li>• Advisory Board</li> <li>• Research support</li> <li>• Research support</li> </ul>

**Key to Abbreviations:** C = co-chair; DSMB = Data Safety Monitoring Board; ES = executive secretary; M = member; N/A = not applicable

<sup>1</sup> Term ended December 31, 2013

<sup>2</sup> Term ended March 4, 2014

<sup>3</sup> Term began March 4, 2014

<sup>4</sup> Term began January 1, 2014

## Introduction (Last updated February 12, 2013; last reviewed February 12, 2013)

---

Antiretroviral therapy (ART) for the treatment of HIV infection has improved steadily since the advent of potent combination therapy in 1996. New drugs that offer new mechanisms of action, improvements in potency and activity even against multidrug-resistant viruses, dosing convenience, and tolerability have been approved. ART has dramatically reduced HIV-associated morbidity and mortality and has transformed HIV disease into a chronic, manageable condition. In addition, effective treatment of HIV-infected individuals with ART is highly effective at preventing transmission to sexual partners.<sup>1</sup> However, less than one-third of HIV-infected individuals in the United States have suppressed viral loads,<sup>2</sup> which is mostly a result of undiagnosed HIV infection and failure to link or retain diagnosed patients in care. Despite remarkable improvements in HIV treatment and prevention, economic and social barriers that result in continued morbidity, mortality, and new HIV infections persist.

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 primary goal of the Panel is to provide HIV care practitioners with recommendations based on current knowledge of antiretroviral (ARV) drugs used to treat adults and adolescents with HIV infection in the United States. The Panel reviews new evidence and updates recommendations in these guidelines when needed. The Panel's primary areas of attention have included baseline assessment, treatment goals, indications for initiation of ART, choice of the initial regimen for ART-naïve patients, drugs or combinations to avoid, management of adverse effects and drug interactions, management of treatment failure, and special ART-related considerations in specific patient populations. For recommendations related to pre-exposure HIV prophylaxis (PrEP) for HIV-uninfected persons, please refer to recommendations from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).<sup>3,4</sup>

These guidelines generally represent the state of knowledge regarding the use of ARV agents. However, 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 be consistent with approved labeling for the particular products or indications in question, and the use of the terms “safe” and “effective” may not be synonymous with the Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-defined legal standards for product approval. The Panel frequently updates the guidelines (current and archived versions of the guidelines are available on the *AIDSinfo* website at <http://www.aidsinfo.nih.gov>). However, the guidelines cannot always be updated apace with the rapid evolution of new data in the field of HIV and cannot offer guidance on care for all patients. Clinicians should exercise clinical judgment in management decisions tailored 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. The Panel encourages both the development of protocols and patient participation in well-designed, Institutional Review Board (IRB)-approved clinical trials.

## Guidelines Development Process

**Table 1. Outline of the Guidelines Development Process**

Topic	Comment
<b>Goal of the guidelines</b>	Provide guidance to HIV care practitioners on the optimal use of antiretroviral (ARV) agents for the treatment of HIV infection in adults and adolescents in the United States.
<b>Panel members</b>	The Panel is composed of approximately 40 voting members who have expertise in HIV care and research. The Panel 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 Resource Services Administration (HRSA), and National Institutes of Health (NIH). Approximately two-thirds of the Panel members are non-governmental scientific members. The Panel also includes four to five community members with knowledge in HIV treatment and care. The U.S. government representatives are appointed by their respective agencies; other Panel members are selected after an open announcement to call for nominations. Each member serves on the Panel for a 4-year term with an option for reappointment for an additional term. A list of current members can be found in the <a href="#">Panel Roster</a> .
<b>Financial disclosure</b>	All members of the Panel submit financial disclosure in writing annually, reporting any association with manufacturers of ARV drugs or diagnostics used for management of HIV infections. A <a href="#">list of the latest disclosures</a> is available on the AIDSinfo website ( <a href="http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/AA_financialDisclosures.pdf">http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/AA_financialDisclosures.pdf</a> ).
<b>Users of the guidelines</b>	HIV treatment providers
<b>Developer</b>	Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents—a working group of the Office of AIDS Research Advisory Council (OARAC)
<b>Funding source</b>	Office of AIDS Research, NIH
<b>Evidence collection</b>	The recommendations in the guidelines are generally based on studies published in peer-reviewed journals. 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.
<b>Recommendation grading</b>	As described in <a href="#">Table 2</a>
<b>Method of synthesizing data</b>	Each section of the guidelines is assigned to a working group of Panel members with expertise in the area of interest. The working groups synthesize the 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 as official recommendations.
<b>Other guidelines</b>	These guidelines focus on treatment for HIV-infected adults and adolescents. Included is a brief discussion on the management of women of reproductive age and pregnant women. For more detailed and up-to-date discussion on the use of antiretroviral therapy (ART) for these women, as well as for children, and other special populations, please refer to guidelines specific to these groups. The guidelines are also available on the AIDSinfo website ( <a href="http://www.aidsinfo.nih.gov">http://www.aidsinfo.nih.gov</a> ).
<b>Update plan</b>	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 significant safety or efficacy data, or other information that may have a significant impact on the clinical care of patients. In the event of significant new data that may affect patient safety, the Panel may post a warning announcement with recommendations on the AIDSinfo website in the interim until the guidelines can be updated with the appropriate changes. Updated guidelines are available on the AIDSinfo website ( <a href="http://www.aidsinfo.nih.gov">http://www.aidsinfo.nih.gov</a> ).
<b>Public comments</b>	A 2-week public comment period follows release of the updated guidelines on the AIDSinfo website. The Panel reviews comments received to determine whether additional revisions to the guidelines are indicated. The public may also submit comments to the Panel at any time at <a href="mailto:contactus@aidsinfo.nih.gov">contactus@aidsinfo.nih.gov</a> .

## Basis for Recommendations

Recommendations in these guidelines are based upon scientific evidence and expert opinion. Each recommended statement includes a letter (A, B, or C) that represents the strength of the recommendation and with 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	Quality of Evidence for Recommendation
<b>A:</b> Strong recommendation for the statement	<b>I:</b> One or more randomized trials with clinical outcomes and/or validated laboratory endpoints
<b>B:</b> Moderate recommendation for the statement	<b>II:</b> One or more well-designed, non-randomized trials or observational cohort studies with long-term clinical outcomes
<b>C:</b> Optional recommendation for the statement	<b>III:</b> Expert opinion

## HIV Expertise in Clinical Care

Many studies have demonstrated that outcomes achieved in HIV-infected outpatients are better when care is delivered by a clinician with HIV expertise,<sup>5-10</sup> which reflects the complexity of HIV infection and its treatment. Thus, appropriate training and experience, as well as ongoing continuing education, are important components of optimal care. Primary care providers without HIV experience, such as those who provide service in rural or underserved areas, should identify experts in their regions who will be available for consultation when needed.

## References

1. 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 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21767103>.
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *HIV in the United States: The Stages of Care—CDC Fact Sheet*. 2012. Available at <http://www.cdc.gov/nchhstp/newsroom/docs/2012/Stages-of-CareFactSheet-508.pdf>. Accessed December 21, 2012.
3. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim guidance: Preexposure prophylaxis for the prevention of HIV infection in men who have sex with men. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2011;60(3):65-68. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21270743>.
4. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Interim guidance for clinicians considering the use of preexposure prophylaxis for the prevention of HIV infection in heterosexually active adults. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2012;61(31):586-589. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22874836>.
5. Kitahata MM, Koepsell TD, Deyo RA, Maxwell CL, Dodge WT, Wagner EH. Physicians' experience with the acquired immunodeficiency syndrome as a factor in patients' survival. *N Engl J Med*. 1996;334(11):701-706. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=8594430](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=8594430).
6. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10935685](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10935685).
7. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15911726](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15911726).
8. Laine C, Markson LE, McKee LJ, Hauck WW, Fanning TR, Turner BJ. The relationship of clinic experience with advanced HIV and survival of women with AIDS. *AIDS*. 1998;12(4):417-424. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=9520172](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9520172).

9. Kitahata MM, Van Rumpae 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12542583](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12542583).
10. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14640395](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=14640395).

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

Every HIV-infected patient 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<sup>1</sup> and guidelines for prevention and treatment of HIV-associated opportunistic infections.<sup>2</sup> The initial evaluation also should include introductory 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-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 at entry into care, regardless of whether ART will be initiated immediately **(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.<sup>1, 2</sup>

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 (see [Preventing Secondary Transmission of HIV](#)).

## 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 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 Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Available at [http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult\\_oi.pdf](http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult_oi.pdf). Accessed January 6, 2014.

## Laboratory Testing

---

### Laboratory Testing for Initial Assessment and Monitoring of HIV-Infected Patients on Antiretroviral Therapy (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

A number of laboratory tests are important for initial evaluation of HIV-infected patients upon entry into care; during follow-up if antiretroviral therapy (ART) is not initiated; and before and after initiation or modification of therapy 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 the Panel's recommendations on the frequency of testing. As noted in the table, some tests may be repeated more frequently if clinically indicated.

Two surrogate markers are used routinely to assess immune function and level of HIV viremia: CD4 T-cell count (CD4 count) and plasma HIV RNA (viral load), respectively. Resistance testing should be used to guide selection of an ARV regimen. 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). The rationale for and utility of these laboratory tests are discussed in the corresponding sections of the guidelines.

**Table 3. Laboratory Monitoring Schedule for HIV-Infected Patients Before and After Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy<sup>a</sup> (page 1 of 2)**

Laboratory Test	Timepoint/Frequency of Testing								
	Entry into Care	Follow Up Before Initiation of ART	ART Initiation or Modification <sup>b</sup>	Follow-Up 2 to 8 Weeks After ART Initiation or Modification	Every 3 to 6 Months	Every 6 Months	Every 12 Months	Treatment Failure	Clinically Indicated
<b>HIV Serology</b>	√ If HIV diagnosis has not been confirmed								
<b>CD4 Count</b>	√	√ Every 3–6 months	√		√ During first 2 years of ART or if viremia develops while patient on ART or CD4 count <300 cells/mm <sup>3</sup>		√ After 2 years on ART with consistently suppressed viral load: CD4 Count 300–500 cells/mm <sup>3</sup> : • Every 12 months  CD4 Count >500 cells/mm <sup>3</sup> : • CD4 monitoring is optional	√	√
<b>HIV Viral Load</b>	√	Repeat testing is optional	√	√ <sup>c</sup>	√ <sup>d</sup>	√ <sup>d</sup>		√	√
<b>Resistance Testing</b>	√		√ <sup>e</sup>					√	√
<b>HLA-B*5701 Testing</b>			√ If considering ABC						
<b>Tropism Testing</b>			√ If considering a CCR5 antagonist					√ If considering a CCR5 antagonist or for failure of CCR5 antagonist-based regimen	√

**Table 3. Laboratory Monitoring Schedule for HIV-Infected Patients Before and After Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy<sup>a</sup> (page 2 of 2)**

Laboratory Test	Timepoint/Frequency of Testing								
	Entry into Care	Follow Up Before Initiation of ART	ART Initiation or Modification <sup>b</sup>	Follow-Up 2 to 8 Weeks After ART Initiation or Modification	Every 3 to 6 Months	Every 6 Months	Every 12 Months	Treatment Failure	Clinically Indicated
Hepatitis B Serology <sup>f</sup>	√		√  May repeat if HBsAg (-) and HBsAb (-) at baseline						√
Hepatitis C Serology, with Confirmation of Positive Results	√								√
Basic Chemistry <sup>g,h</sup>	√	√  Every 6–12 months	√	√	√				√
ALT, AST, T. bilirubin	√	√  Every 6–12 months	√	√	√				√
CBC with Differential	√	√  Every 3–6 months	√	√  If on ZDV	√				√
Fasting Lipid Profile	√	√  If normal, annually	√	√  Consider 4–8 weeks after starting new ART regimen that affects lipids		√  If abnormal at last measurement	√  If normal at last measurement		√
Fasting Glucose or Hemoglobin A1C	√	√  If normal, annually	√		√  If abnormal at last measurement		√  If normal at last measurement		√
Urinalysis <sup>g</sup>	√		√			√  If on TDF <sup>i</sup>	√		√
Pregnancy Test			√  In women with child-bearing potential						√

<sup>a</sup>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.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>b</sup>ART may be modified because of treatment failure, adverse effects, or for regimen simplification.

<sup>c</sup>If HIV RNA is detectable at 2 to 8 weeks, repeat every 4 to 8 weeks until viral load is suppressed to <200 copies/mL, and thereafter, every 3 to 6 months.

<sup>d</sup>In patients on ART, viral load typically is measured every 3 to 4 months. 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.

<sup>e</sup>In ART-naïve patients, if resistance testing was performed at entry into care, repeat testing before initiation of ART is optional. The exception is pregnant women; repeat testing is recommended in this case. In virologically suppressed patients who are switching therapy because of toxicity or for convenience, viral amplification will not be possible; therefore, resistance testing should not be performed. Results from prior resistance testing can be helpful in constructing a new regimen.

<sup>f</sup>If HBsAg is positive at baseline or before initiation of ART, TDF plus either FTC or 3TC should be used as part of the ARV regimen to treat both HBV and HIV infections. If HBsAg, and HBsAb, and anti-HBc are negative at baseline, hepatitis B vaccine series should be administered. **Refer to HIV Primary Care guidelines for more detailed recommendations.**<sup>1</sup>

<sup>g</sup>Serum Na, K, HCO<sub>3</sub>, Cl, BUN, creatinine, glucose (preferably fasting). Some experts suggest monitoring the phosphorus levels of patients on TDF. Determination of renal function should include estimation of CrCl using the Cockcroft-Gault equation or estimation of glomerular filtration rate using the MDRD equation.

<sup>h</sup>For patients with renal disease, 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.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>i</sup>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).

**Key to Acronyms:** 3TC = lamivudine, ABC = abacavir, ALT = alanine aminotransferase, ART = antiretroviral therapy, AST = aspartate aminotransferase, CBC = complete blood count, CrCl = creatinine clearance, EFV = efavirenz, FTC = emtricitabine, HBsAb = hepatitis B surface antibody, HBsAg = hepatitis B surface antigen, HBV = hepatitis B virus, MDRD = modification of diet in renal disease (equation), TDF = tenofovir, 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. Gupta SK, Eustace JA, Winston JA, et al. 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. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;40(11):1559-1585. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15889353](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15889353).

## 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.<sup>1</sup> 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 an HIV-infected patient. 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 HIV-infected patients 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 HIV-infected patients regardless of their viral load or CD4 count. 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 HIV-infected patients 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 HIV-infected patients 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 co-infection 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.<sup>1-3</sup> Thus, viral load testing is an established surrogate marker for treatment response.<sup>4</sup> 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<sub>10</sub> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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.<sup>6-9</sup> 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<sup>10</sup> (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



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 Response](#) sections).

## CD4 Count Monitoring

The CD4 count is the most important laboratory indicator of immune function in HIV-infected patients. It is also the strongest predictor of subsequent disease progression and survival according to findings from clinical trials and cohort studies.<sup>11,12</sup> 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, is more expensive, and 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](#))<sup>13</sup> and the urgency to initiate ART **(AI)** (see the [Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy in Antiretroviral-Naive Patients](#) section of these guidelines). **Although most OIs occur in patients with CD4 counts <200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>, some OIs can occur in patients with higher CD4 counts.**<sup>14</sup>

### 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](#))<sup>13</sup>. 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<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>3</sup> per year until a steady state level is reached.<sup>15</sup> Patients who initiate therapy with a low CD4 count<sup>16</sup> or at an older age<sup>17</sup> may have a blunted increase in their counts despite virologic suppression.

## Frequency of CD4 Count Monitoring

ART is now recommended for all HIV-infected patients. 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.<sup>13</sup> 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<sup>3</sup> are rare in patients with viral suppression and CD4 counts  $>300$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>.<sup>18</sup> 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<sup>3</sup> after 48 weeks of therapy.<sup>19</sup> 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<sup>3</sup>.<sup>20</sup> 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.<sup>21</sup> 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.<sup>22</sup>

For the patient on a suppressive regimen whose CD4 count has consistently ranged between 300 and 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> 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<sup>3</sup> 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 anti-neoplastic 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](#) section).

## 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<sup>23,24</sup> or co-infection with human T-lymphotropic virus type I (HTLV-1)<sup>25</sup> may cause misleadingly elevated CD4 counts. Alpha-interferon may reduce the absolute CD4 count without changing the CD4 percentage.<sup>26</sup> In all these settings, CD4 percentage remains stable and may be a more appropriate parameter to assess a patient's immune function.

**Table 4. Recommendations on the Indications and Frequency of Viral Load and CD4 Count Monitoring<sup>a</sup>**

Clinical Scenario	Viral Load Monitoring	CD4 Count Monitoring
Before initiating ART	At entry into care <b>(AIII)</b>  If ART initiation is deferred, repeat before initiating ART <b>(AIII)</b> .  In patients not initiating ART, repeat testing is optional <b>(CIII)</b> .	At entry into care <b>(AI)</b>  If ART is deferred, every 3 to 6 months <b>(AIII)</b> . <sup>b</sup>
After initiating ART	Preferably within 2 to 4 weeks (and no later than 8 weeks) after initiation of ART <b>(AIII)</b> ; thereafter, every 4 to 8 weeks until viral load suppressed <b>(BIII)</b> .	3 months after initiation of ART <b>(AIII)</b>
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 <b>(AIII)</b> .	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 <b>(AIII)</b> ; thereafter, every 4 to 8 weeks until viral load suppressed <b>(BIII)</b> . If viral suppression is not possible, repeat viral load every 3 months or more frequently if indicated <b>(AIII)</b> .	Every 3 to 6 months <b>(AI)</b>
During the first 2 years of ART	Every 3 to 4 months <b>(AIII)</b>	Every 3 to 6 months <sup>a</sup> <b>(BII)</b>
After 2 years of ART (VL consistently suppressed, CD4 consistently 300-500 cells/mm <sup>3</sup> )	Can extend to every 6 months for patients with consistent viral suppression for ≥2 years <b>(AIII)</b> .	Every 12 months <b>(BII)</b>
After 2 years of ART (VL consistently suppressed, CD4 consistently >500 cells/mm <sup>3</sup> )		Optional <b>(CIII)</b>
While on ART with detectable viremia (VL repeatedly >200 copies/mL)	Every 3 months <b>(AIII)</b> or more frequently if clinically indicated. (See <a href="#">Virologic Failure and Suboptimal Immunologic Response</a> section)	Every 3 to 6 months <b>(AIII)</b>
Change in clinical status (e.g., new HIV clinical symptom or initiation of interferon, chronic systemic corticosteroids, or antineoplastic therapy)	Every 3 months <b>(AIII)</b>	Perform CD4 count and repeat as clinically indicated <sup>c</sup> <b>(AIII)</b>

<sup>a</sup> 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)**.

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

<sup>c</sup> 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

- 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10357378](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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.* 1998;177(1):40-47. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=9419168](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9419168).
3. Thiebaut R, Morlat P, Jacqmin-Gadda H, et al, with the Groupe d'Epidemiologie du SIDA en Aquitaine (GECSA). Clinical progression of HIV-1 infection according to the viral response during the first year of antiretroviral treatment. *AIDS.* 2000;14(8):971-978. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10853978](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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.* 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.* 2001;286(2):171-179. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11448280](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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.* 2007;45(10):3436-3438. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17715371](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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.* 2009;48(2):260-262. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19113986](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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.* 2010;54(4):442-444. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20611035](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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.* 2013;57(10):1489-1496. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23946221>.
10. Ribaudo H, Lennox J, Currier J, et al. 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. Paper presented at: 16th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infection; 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.* 1997;126(12):946-954. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=9182471](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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.* 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](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 Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Available at [http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult\\_oi.pdf](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  $\geq$  200 cells/ $\mu$ L in the post-combination antiretroviral therapy era. *Clin Infect Dis.* 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.* 2003;163(18):2187-2195. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14557216](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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.* 2007;44(3):441-446. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17205456](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17205456).

17. 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/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20829678](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20829678).
18. Gale HB, Gitterman SR, Hoffman HJ, et al. Is frequent CD4+ T-lymphocyte count monitoring necessary for persons with counts  $\geq 300$  cells/ $\mu$ L and HIV-1 suppression? *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;56(9):1340-1343. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23315315>.
19. 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*. 2013;27(17):2759-2763. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23842127>.
20. Costiniuk CT, Fergusson DA, Doucette S, Angel JB. Discontinuation of *Pneumocystis jirovecii* pneumonia prophylaxis with CD4 count  $< 200$  cells/ $\mu$ L and virologic suppression: a systematic review. *PLoS One*. 2011;6(12):e28570. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22194853>.
21. 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*. 2013;57(2):314-321. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23575194>.
22. 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>.
23. 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*. 1995;20(4):768-771. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=7795071](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=7795071).
24. 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*. 1998;1(5):338-345. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10195261](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10195261).
25. 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*. 2007;49(4):231-233. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17823752](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17823752).
26. 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*. 1991;163(4):710-715. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=1672701](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=1672701).



## Drug-Resistance Testing (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

Panel's Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>HIV drug-resistance testing is recommended in persons with HIV infection at entry into care regardless of whether antiretroviral therapy (ART) will be initiated immediately or deferred (<b>AII</b>). If therapy is deferred, repeat testing should be considered at the time of ART initiation (<b>CIII</b>).</li><li>Genotypic testing is recommended as the preferred resistance testing to guide therapy in antiretroviral (ARV)-naive patients (<b>AIII</b>).</li><li>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 may wish to supplement standard genotypic resistance testing with an INSTI genotype test (<b>CIII</b>).</li><li>HIV drug-resistance testing should be performed to assist in the selection of active drugs when changing ARV regimens in persons with virologic failure and HIV RNA levels &gt;1,000 copies/mL (<b>AI</b>). In persons with HIV RNA levels &gt;500 but &lt;1,000 copies/mL, testing may be unsuccessful but should still be considered (<b>BII</b>).</li><li>Drug-resistance testing should also be performed when managing suboptimal viral load reduction (<b>AII</b>).</li><li>In persons failing INSTI-based regimens, genotypic testing for INSTI resistance should be performed to determine whether to include a drug from this class in subsequent regimens (<b>AII</b>).</li><li>Drug-resistance testing in the setting of virologic failure should be performed while the person is taking prescribed ARV drugs or, if not possible, within 4 weeks after discontinuing therapy (<b>AII</b>). If greater than 4 weeks has lapsed since the ARVs were discontinued, resistance testing may still provide useful information to guide therapy, recognizing that previously selected resistance mutations can be missed (<b>CIII</b>).</li><li>Genotypic testing is recommended as the preferred resistance testing to guide therapy in patients with suboptimal virologic responses or virologic failure while on first or second regimens (<b>AII</b>).</li><li>The addition of phenotypic to genotypic testing is generally preferred for persons with known or suspected complex drug-resistance mutation patterns, particularly to protease inhibitors (PIs) (<b>BIII</b>).</li><li>Genotypic resistance testing is recommended for all pregnant women before initiation of ART (<b>AIII</b>) and for those entering pregnancy with detectable HIV RNA levels while on therapy (<b>AI</b>) (see the <a href="#">Perinatal Treatment Guidelines</a> for more detailed discussion).</li></ul>
<b>Rating of Recommendations:</b> A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional
<b>Rating of Evidence:</b> 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 inform selection of treatment strategies. Standard assays provide information on resistance to nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs), non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs), and protease inhibitors (PIs). Testing for integrase and fusion inhibitor resistance can also be ordered separately from several commercial laboratories. Co-receptor tropism assays should be performed whenever the use of a CCR5 antagonist is being considered. Phenotypic co-receptor tropism assays have been used in clinical practice. A genotypic assay to predict co-receptor use is now commercially available (see [Co-receptor Tropism Assays](#)).

### Genotypic Assays

Genotypic assays detect drug-resistance mutations present in relevant viral genes. Most genotypic assays involve sequencing of the RT and PR genes to detect mutations that are known to confer drug resistance. Genotypic assays that assess mutations in the integrase and gp41 (envelope) genes are also commercially available. Genotypic assays can be performed rapidly and results are available within 1 to 2 weeks of sample collection. Interpretation of 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, integrase, and envelope genes (see



[http://www.iasusa.org/resistance\\_mutations](http://www.iasusa.org/resistance_mutations)).<sup>1</sup> The Stanford University HIV Drug Resistance Database (<http://hivdb.stanford.edu>) also provides helpful guidance for interpreting genotypic resistance test results. Various tools to assist the provider in interpreting genotypic test results are now available.<sup>2-5</sup> Clinical trials have demonstrated that consultation with specialists in HIV drug resistance improves virologic outcomes.<sup>6</sup> Clinicians are thus encouraged to consult a specialist to facilitate interpretation of genotypic test results and design of an optimal new regimen.

### **Phenotypic Assays**

Phenotypic assays measure the ability of a virus to grow in different concentrations of ARV drugs. RT and PR gene sequences and, more recently, integrase and envelope 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<sub>50</sub>]) is calculated, and the ratio of the IC<sub>50</sub> of test and reference viruses is reported as the fold increase in IC<sub>50</sub> (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, interpretation of phenotypic assay results is complicated by incomplete information regarding the specific resistance level (i.e., fold increase in IC<sub>50</sub>) that is associated with drug failure, although clinically significant fold increase cutoffs are now available for some drugs.<sup>7-11</sup> Again, consultation with a specialist to interpret test results can be helpful.

Further 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. Despite being present, drug-resistant viruses that constitute less than 10% to 20% of the circulating virus population will probably not be detected by commercially available assays. This limitation is important because after drugs exerting selective pressure on drug-resistant populations are discontinued, a wild-type virus often re-emerges as the predominant population in the plasma. As a consequence, the proportion of virus with resistance mutations decreases to below the 10% to 20% threshold.<sup>12-14</sup> 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.<sup>15</sup> Therefore, resistance testing is of greatest value when performed before or within 4 weeks after drugs are discontinued (**AII**). Because resistant virus may persist in the plasma of some patients for longer periods of time, resistance testing done 4 to 6 weeks after discontinuation of drugs may still detect mutations. However, the absence of detectable resistance in such patients must be interpreted with caution when designing subsequent ARV regimens.

### ***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 antiretroviral therapy (ART).<sup>16-19</sup> The likelihood that a patient will acquire drug-resistant virus is related to the prevalence of drug resistance in HIV-infected persons engaging in high-risk behaviors in the community. In the United States and Europe, recent studies suggest that the risk that transmitted virus will be resistant to at least one ARV drug is in the range of 6% to 16%.<sup>20-25</sup> Up to 8%, but generally less than 5% of transmitted viruses will exhibit resistance to drugs from more than one class.<sup>24, 26-28</sup>

If the decision is made to initiate therapy in a person with early HIV infection, resistance testing at baseline

can guide regimen selection to optimize virologic response. Therefore, resistance testing in this situation is recommended **(AII)**. A genotypic assay is preferred for this purpose **(AIII)**. In this setting, treatment initiation should not be delayed pending resistance testing results. Once results are obtained, the treatment regimen can be modified if warranted (see [Acute and Recent HIV Infection](#)). In the absence of therapy, resistant viruses may decline over time to less than the detection limit of standard resistance tests, but when therapy is eventually initiated, resistant viruses even at a low level may still increase the risk of treatment failure.<sup>29-31</sup> Therefore, if therapy is deferred, resistance testing should still be done during acute HIV infection **(AIII)**. In this situation, the genotypic resistance test result may be kept on record until the patient is to be started on ART. Repeat resistance testing at the time treatment is started should be considered because it is possible for a patient to acquire drug-resistant virus (i.e., superinfection) between entry into care and initiation of ART **(CIII)**.

Performing drug-resistance testing before ART initiation in patients with chronic HIV infection 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.<sup>32-34</sup> No prospective trial has addressed whether drug-resistance testing before initiation of therapy confers benefit in this population. However, data from several, but not all, studies suggest that virologic responses in persons with baseline resistance mutations are suboptimal.<sup>16-19, 35-37</sup> In addition, a cost-effectiveness analysis of early genotypic resistance testing suggests that baseline testing in this population should be performed.<sup>38</sup> Therefore, resistance testing in chronically infected persons is recommended at the time of entry into HIV care **(AII)**. Although no definitive prospective data exist to support the choice of one type of resistance testing over another, genotypic testing is generally preferred in this situation because of lower cost, more rapid turnaround time, the assay's ability to detect mixtures of wild-type and resistant virus, and the relative ease of interpreting test results **(AIII)**. If therapy is deferred, repeat testing soon before initiation of ART should be considered because the patient may have acquired drug-resistant virus (i.e., superinfection) **(CIII)**.

Standard genotypic drug-resistance testing in ARV-naïve persons involves testing for mutations in the RT and PR genes. Although transmission of integrase strand transfer inhibitor (INSTI)-resistant virus has rarely been reported, as use of INSTIs increases, the potential for transmission of INSTI-resistant virus may also increase. Therefore, when INSTI resistance is suspected, providers may wish to supplement standard baseline genotypic resistance testing with genotypic testing for resistance to this class of drugs **(CIII)**.

### Use of Resistance Assays in the Event of Virologic Failure

Resistance assays are useful in guiding treatment decisions for patients who experience virologic failure while on ART. Several prospective studies assessed the utility of resistance testing to guide ARV drug selection in patients with virologic failure. These studies involved genotypic assays, phenotypic assays, or both.<sup>6, 39-45</sup> In general, these studies found that changes in therapy that were informed by resistance testing 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 performance of genotypic drug-resistance testing in ART-experienced patients with detectable plasma HIV RNA was independently associated with improved survival.<sup>46</sup> Thus, resistance testing is recommended as a tool in selecting active drugs when changing ARV regimens because of virologic failure in persons with HIV RNA >1,000 copies/mL **(AI)** (see [Virologic Failure and Suboptimal Immunologic Response](#)). In persons with HIV RNA >500 copies/mL but <1,000 copies/mL, testing may be unsuccessful but should still be considered **(BII)**. Drug-resistance testing in persons with a plasma viral load <500 copies/mL is not usually recommended because resistance assays cannot be consistently performed given low HIV RNA levels **(AIII)**.

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

In patients who are on a failing first or second ARV drug regimen and experiencing virologic failure or suboptimal viral load reduction, genotypic testing is generally preferred for resistance testing **(AII)**. This is based on the fact that, when compared with phenotypic testing, genotypic testing costs less to perform, has a faster turnaround time, and greater sensitivity for detecting mixtures of wild-type and resistant virus. In addition, observations show that the assays are comparable predictors of virologic response to subsequent ART regimens.<sup>50</sup>

Addition of phenotypic to genotypic testing is generally preferred for persons with known or suspected complex drug-resistance mutation patterns, particularly to PIs **(BIII)**.

In patients failing INSTI-based regimens, testing for INSTI resistance should be performed to determine whether to include drugs from this class in subsequent regimens **(AII)**; genotypic testing is preferred for this purpose.

When the use of a CCR5 antagonist is being considered, a co-receptor tropism assay should be performed **(AI)**. Phenotypic co-receptor tropism assays have been used in clinical practice. A genotypic assay to predict co-receptor use is now commercially available and is less expensive than phenotypic assays. Evaluation of genotypic assays is ongoing, but current data suggest that such testing should be considered as an alternative assay. The same principles regarding testing for co-receptor use also apply to testing when patients exhibit virologic failure on a CCR5 antagonist.<sup>51</sup> Resistance to CCR5 antagonists in the absence of detectable CXCR4-using virus has been reported, but such resistance is uncommon (see [Co-receptor Tropism Assays](#)).

### **Use of Resistance Assays in Pregnant Women**

In pregnant women, the goal of ART is to 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 women 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, particularly to PIs, may provide additional information **(BIII)**. Optimal prevention of perinatal transmission may require initiation of ART pending resistance testing results. Once the results are available, the ARV regimen can be changed as needed.

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

Clinical Setting/Recommendation	Rationale
<b>Drug-resistance assay recommended</b>	
<p><b>In acute HIV infection:</b> Drug-resistance testing is recommended regardless of whether antiretroviral therapy (ART) is initiated immediately or deferred (<b>AII</b>). A genotypic assay is generally preferred (<b>AIII</b>).</p> <p>If ART is deferred, repeat resistance testing should be considered at the time therapy is initiated (<b>CIII</b>). A genotypic assay generally is preferred (<b>AIII</b>).</p>	<p>If ART is initiated immediately, drug-resistance testing can determine whether drug-resistant virus was transmitted. Test results will help in the design of initial regimens or to modify or change regimens if results are obtained after treatment initiation.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>If ART is deferred, testing should still be performed because of the greater likelihood that transmitted resistance-associated mutations will be detected earlier in the course of HIV infection. Results of resistance testing may be important when treatment is initiated. Repeat testing at the time ART is initiated should be considered because the patient may have acquired a drug-resistant virus (i.e., superinfection).</p>
<p><b>In ART-naïve patients with chronic HIV infection:</b> Drug-resistance testing is recommended at entry into HIV care, regardless of whether therapy is initiated immediately or deferred (<b>AII</b>). A genotypic assay is generally preferred (<b>AIII</b>).</p> <p>If therapy is deferred, repeat resistance testing should be considered before initiation of ART (<b>CIII</b>). A genotypic assay is generally preferred (<b>AIII</b>).</p> <p>If an INSTI is considered for an ART-naïve patient and transmitted INSTI resistance is a concern, providers may supplement standard resistance testing with a specific INSTI genotypic resistance assay (<b>CIII</b>).</p> <p>If use of a CCR5 antagonist is being considered, a co-receptor tropism assay should be performed (<b>AI</b>) (see <a href="#">Co-receptor Tropism Assays</a>)</p>	<p>Transmitted HIV with baseline resistance to at least 1 drug is seen in 6% to 16% of patients, and suboptimal virologic responses may be seen in patients with baseline resistant mutations. Some drug-resistance mutations can remain detectable for years in untreated, chronically infected patients.</p> <p>Repeat testing before initiation of ART should be considered because the patient may have acquired a drug-resistant virus (i.e., a superinfection).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Standard genotypic drug-resistance assays test only for mutations in the RT and PR genes.</p> <p>(see <a href="#">Co-receptor Tropism Assays</a>)</p>
<p><b>In patients with virologic failure:</b> Drug-resistance testing is recommended in patients on combination ART with HIV RNA levels &gt;1,000 copies/mL (<b>AI</b>). In patients with HIV RNA levels &gt;500 copies/mL but &lt;1,000 copies/mL, testing may not be successful but should still be considered (<b>BII</b>).</p> <p>A standard genotypic resistance assay is generally preferred for patients experiencing virologic failure on their first or second regimens (<b>AII</b>).</p> <p>In patients failing INSTI-based regimens, genotypic testing for INSTI resistance should be performed to determine whether to include drugs from this class in subsequent regimens (<b>AII</b>).</p> <p>If use of a CCR5 antagonist is being considered, a co-receptor tropism assay should be performed (<b>AI</b>) (see <a href="#">Co-receptor Tropism Assays</a>).</p> <p>Addition of phenotypic assay to genotypic assay is generally preferred in patients with known or suspected complex drug-resistance patterns, particularly to protease inhibitors (PIs) (<b>BIII</b>).</p>	<p>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. Drug-resistance testing should be performed while the patient is taking prescribed ARV drugs or, if not possible, within 4 weeks after discontinuing therapy.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Standard genotypic drug-resistance assays test only for mutations in the RT and PR genes.</p> <p>Phenotypic testing can provide additional useful information in patients with complex drug-resistance mutation patterns, particularly to PIs.</p>

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

Clinical Setting/Recommendation	Rationale
<b>Drug-resistance assay recommended</b>	
<b>In patients with suboptimal suppression of viral load:</b> Drug-resistance testing is recommended in patients with suboptimal suppression of viral load after initiation of ART ( <b>AII</b> ).	Testing can help determine the role of resistance and thus assist the clinician in identifying the number of active drugs available for a new regimen.
<b>In HIV-infected pregnant women:</b> Genotypic resistance testing is recommended for all pregnant women before initiation of ART ( <b>AIII</b> ) and for those entering pregnancy with detectable HIV RNA levels while on therapy ( <b>AI</b> ).	The goal of ART in HIV-infected pregnant women is to achieve maximal viral suppression for treatment of maternal HIV infection and for prevention of perinatal transmission of HIV. Genotypic resistance testing will assist the clinician in selecting the optimal regimen for the patient.
<b>Drug-resistance assay not usually recommended</b>	
<b>After therapy is discontinued:</b> Drug-resistance testing is not usually recommended more than 4 weeks after discontinuation of ARV drugs ( <b>BIII</b> ).	Drug-resistance mutations may become minor species in the absence of selective drug pressure, and available assays may not detect minor drug-resistant species. If testing is performed in this setting, the detection of drug resistance may be of value; however, the absence of resistance does not rule out the presence of minor drug-resistant species.
<b>In patients with low HIV RNA levels:</b> Drug-resistance testing is not usually recommended in patients with a plasma viral load <500 copies/mL ( <b>AIII</b> ).	Resistance assays cannot be consistently performed given low HIV RNA levels.

## References

1. Hirsch MS, Gunthard HF, Schapiro JM, et al. Antiretroviral drug-resistance testing in adult HIV-1 infection: 2008 recommendations of an International AIDS Society-USA panel. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2008;47(2):266-285. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18549313](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18549313).
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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17053360](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16782210](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16619162](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15909273](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11807305](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15040535](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14976601](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17205478](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17205478).
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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17197808](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16549968](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16549968).
12. Verhofstede C, Wanzele 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10630523](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11153667](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10630517](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17041858](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12167680](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17725415](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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-naïve patients: virologic, immunologic, and morphologic changes—a 96-week analysis. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2006;43(5):535-540. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17057609](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17057609).
19. Kuritzkes DR, Lalama CM, Ribaud HJ, et al. Preexisting resistance to nonnucleoside reverse-transcriptase inhibitors predicts virologic failure of an efavirenz-based regimen in treatment-naïve HIV-1-infected subjects. *J Infect Dis.* 2008;197(6):867-870. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18269317](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18269317).
20. Weinstock HS, Zaidi I, Heneine W, et al. The epidemiology of antiretroviral drug resistance among drug-naïve HIV-1-infected persons in 10 U.S. cities. *J Infect Dis.* 2004;189(12):2174-2180. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15181563](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15181563).
21. Wensing AM, van de Vijver DA, Angarano G, et al. Prevalence of drug-resistant HIV-1 variants in untreated individuals in Europe: implications for clinical management. *J Infect Dis.* 2005;192(6):958-966. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16107947](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16107947).
22. Cane P, Chrystie I, Dunn D, et al. Time trends in primary resistance to HIV drugs in the United Kingdom: multicentre observational study. *BMJ.* 2005;331(7529):1368. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16299012](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16299012).
23. Bennett D, McCormick L, Kline R, et al. U.S. surveillance of HIV drug resistance at diagnosis using HIV diagnostic sera. Paper presented at: 12th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. 2005. Boston, MA.

24. Wheeler WH, Ziebell RA, Zabina H, et al. Prevalence of transmitted drug resistance associated mutations and HIV-1 subtypes in new HIV-1 diagnoses, U.S.-2006. *AIDS*. 2010;24(8):1203-1212. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20395786](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20395786).
25. Ross L, Lim ML, Liao Q, et al. Prevalence of antiretroviral drug resistance and resistance-associated mutations in antiretroviral therapy-naïve HIV-infected individuals from 40 United States cities. *HIV Clin Trials*. 2007;8(1):1-8. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17434843](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17434843).
26. 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>.
27. Agwu AL, Bethel J, Hightow-Weidman LB, et al. Substantial multiclass transmitted drug resistance and drug-relevant polymorphisms among treatment-naïve behaviorally HIV-infected youth. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2012;26(4):193-196. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22563607>.
28. 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>.
29. Johnson JA, Li JF, Wei X, et al. Minority HIV-1 drug resistance mutations are present in antiretroviral treatment-naïve populations and associate with reduced treatment efficacy. *PLoS Med*. 2008;5(7):e158. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18666824](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18666824).
30. Simen BB, Simons JF, Hullsiek KH, et al. Low-abundance drug-resistant viral variants in chronically HIV-infected, antiretroviral treatment-naïve patients significantly impact treatment outcomes. *J Infect Dis*. 2009;199(5):693-701. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19210162](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19210162).
31. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20102271](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20102271).
32. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17597449](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17597449).
33. Novak RM, Chen L, MacArthur RD, et al. Prevalence of antiretroviral drug resistance mutations in chronically HIV-infected, treatment-naïve patients: implications for routine resistance screening before initiation of antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;40(3):468-474. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15668873](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15668873).
34. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18353964](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18353964).
35. Saag MS, Cahn P, Raffi F, et al. Efficacy and safety of emtricitabine vs stavudine in combination therapy in antiretroviral-naïve patients: a randomized trial. *JAMA*. 2004;292(2):180-189. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15249567](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15249567).
36. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15247339](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15247339).
37. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16327315](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16327315).
38. Sax PE, Islam R, Walensky RP, et al. Should resistance testing be performed for treatment-naïve HIV-infected patients? A cost-effectiveness analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;41(9):1316-1323. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16206108](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11834948](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10392984](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10392984).
41. Baxter JD, Mayers DL, Wentworth DN, et al; for the CPCRA 046 Study Team for the Terry Beinr Community Programs for Clinical Research on AIDS. A randomized study of antiretroviral management based on plasma genotypic antiretroviral resistance testing in patients failing therapy. *AIDS*. 2000;14(9):F83-93. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list\\_uids=10894268&dopt=Abstract](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list_uids=10894268&dopt=Abstract).
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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11873001](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11964529](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14640390](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=14640390).
45. Wegner SA, Wallace MR, Aronson NE, et al. Long-term efficacy of routine access to antiretroviral-resistance testing in HIV type 1-infected patients: results of the clinical efficacy of resistance testing trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2004;38(5):723-730. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14986258](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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](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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10634339](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10634336](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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](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>.
51. Lewis M MJ, Simpson P, et al. Changes in V3 loop sequence associated with failure of maraviroc treatment in patients enrolled in the MOTIVATE 1 and 2 trials. Paper presented at: 15th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. 2008; Boston, MA.

## Co-Receptor Tropism Assays (Last updated February 12, 2013; last reviewed February 12, 2013)

### 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 also 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**).

**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 receptor followed by binding to either the CCR5 or CXCR4 molecules and fusion of the viral and cellular membranes.<sup>1</sup> CCR5 co-receptor antagonists prevent HIV entry into target cells by binding to the CCR5 receptors.<sup>2</sup> Phenotypic and, to a lesser degree, genotypic assays have been developed that can determine or predict the co-receptor tropism (i.e., CCR5, CXCR4, or both) 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, a genotypic assay to predict co-receptor usage is now 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. Viruses in many untreated patients eventually exhibit a shift in co-receptor tropism from CCR5 usage to either CXCR4 or both CCR5 and CXCR4 tropism (i.e., dual- or mixed-tropic; D/M-tropic). This shift is temporally associated with a more rapid decline in CD4 T-cell counts,<sup>3,4</sup> but whether this tropism shift is a cause or a consequence of progressive immunodeficiency remains undetermined.<sup>1</sup> Antiretroviral (ARV)-treated patients with extensive drug resistance are more likely to harbor X4- or D/M-tropic variants than untreated patients with comparable CD4 counts.<sup>5</sup> The prevalence of X4- or D/M-tropic variants increases to more than 50% in treated patients who have CD4 counts <100 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>.<sup>5,6</sup>

### 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.<sup>7,8</sup> 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  $\geq 1,000$  copies/mL.

The performance characteristics of these assays have evolved. Most, if not all, patients enrolled in pre-marketing clinical trials of MVC and other CCR5 antagonists were screened with an earlier, less sensitive version of the *Trofile* assay.<sup>8</sup> 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 CXCR4-utilizing virus at baseline that were below the assay limit of detection and exhibited rapid virologic failure after initiation of a CCR5 antagonist.<sup>9</sup> The assay has been revised and is now able to detect lower levels of CXCR4-utilizing 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.<sup>10</sup> Although this more sensitive assay has had limited use in prospective clinical trials, it is now the only one 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 plasma HIV-1 RNA below the limit of detection, co-receptor usage can be determined from proviral DNA obtained from peripheral blood mononuclear cells; however, the clinical utility of this assay remains to be determined.<sup>11</sup>

### **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. When compared to the phenotypic assay, genotypic methods show high specificity (~90%) but only modest sensitivity (~50%–70%) for the presence of a CXCR4-utilizing virus. Given these performance characteristics, these assays may not be sufficiently robust to completely rule out the presence of an X4 or D/M variant.<sup>12</sup>

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.<sup>13-15</sup> On the basis of these data, accessibility, and cost, European guidelines currently favor genotypic testing to determine co-receptor usage.<sup>16</sup> An important caveat to these results 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.

### **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**). 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 also may 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 usefulness. Therefore, a phenotypic test for co-receptor usage is generally preferred (**AI**). However, because phenotypic testing is more expensive and requires more time to perform, a genotypic test to predict HIV-1 co-receptor usage should be considered as an alternative test (**BII**).

A tropism assay may potentially be used in clinical practice for prognostic purposes or to assess tropism before starting ART if future use of a CCR5 antagonist is anticipated (e.g., a regimen change for toxicity). Currently, sufficient data do not exist to support these uses.

## **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](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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16205738).
3. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9034141).
4. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=8096374).

5. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16960780).
6. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17243065).
7. Troupin 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11119595).
8. 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.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17116663](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17116663).
9. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16641282).
10. 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
11. Toma J, Frantzell A, Cook J, et al. Phenotypic determination of HIV-1 coreceptor tropism using cell-associated DNA derived from blood samples. Paper presented at: 17th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2010; San Francisco, CA.
12. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20048714).
13. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20736814).
14. McGovern RA, Thielen A, Portsmouth S, et al. Population-based sequencing of the V3-loop can predict the virological response to maraviroc in treatment-naïve 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>.
15. 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>.
16. 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>.



## 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 ABC HSR is a multiorgan clinical syndrome typically seen within the initial 6 weeks of ABC treatment. This reaction has been reported in 5%–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.<sup>1</sup>

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.<sup>2–3</sup> 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.<sup>4</sup> 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.<sup>5</sup> 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 patients 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).<sup>6</sup> 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).<sup>7</sup>

On the basis of the results of these studies, the Panel recommends screening for HLA-B\*5701 before starting patients on an ABC-containing regimen **(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 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.

## Treatment Goals (Last updated March 27, 2012; last reviewed March 27, 2012)

---

Eradication of HIV infection cannot be achieved with available antiretroviral (ARV) regimens even when new, potent drugs are added to a regimen that is already suppressing plasma viral load below the limits of detection of commercially available assays.<sup>1</sup> This is chiefly because the pool of latently infected CD4 T cells is established during the earliest stages of acute HIV infection<sup>2</sup> and persists with a long half-life, despite prolonged suppression of plasma viremia.<sup>3-7</sup> Therefore the primary goals for initiating antiretroviral therapy (ART) are to:

- reduce HIV-associated morbidity and prolong the duration and quality of survival,
- restore and preserve immunologic function,
- maximally and durably suppress plasma HIV viral load (see [Plasma HIV RNA Testing](#)), and
- prevent HIV transmission.

ART has reduced HIV-related morbidity and mortality<sup>8-11</sup> and has reduced perinatal<sup>12</sup> and behavior-associated transmission of HIV.<sup>13-17</sup> 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 HIV-infected cohorts. (See [Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy](#).) Maximal and durable suppression of plasma viremia delays or prevents the selection of drug-resistance mutations, preserves CD4 T-cell numbers, and confers substantial clinical benefits, all of which are important treatment goals.<sup>18-19</sup>

Achieving viral suppression requires the use of ARV regimens with at least two, and preferably three, active drugs from two or more drug classes. Baseline resistance testing and patient characteristics should guide design of the specific regimen. (See [What to Start: Initial Combination Regimens for the Antiretroviral-Naive Patient](#).) When initial suppression is not achieved or is lost, rapidly changing to a new regimen with at least two active drugs is required. (See [Virologic Failure and Suboptimal Immunologic Response](#).) The increasing number of drugs and drug classes makes viral suppression below detection limits an appropriate goal in all patients.

Viral load reduction to below limits of assay detection in an ART-naive patient usually occurs within the first 12–24 weeks of therapy. Predictors of virologic success include:

- high potency of ARV regimen,
- excellent adherence to treatment regimen,<sup>20</sup>
- low baseline viremia,<sup>21</sup>
- higher baseline CD4 count (>200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>),<sup>22</sup> and
- rapid reduction of viremia in response to treatment.<sup>21,23</sup>

Successful outcomes are usually observed, although adherence difficulties may lower the success rate in clinical practice to below the 90% rate commonly seen in clinical trials.<sup>24</sup>

### Strategies to Achieve Treatment Goals

Achieving treatment goals requires a balance of sometimes competing considerations, outlined below. Providers and patients must work together to define individualized strategies to achieve treatment goals.

#### *Selection of Initial Combination Regimen*

Several preferred and alternative ARV regimens are recommended for use. (See [What to Start](#).) Many of these regimens have comparable efficacy but vary to some degree in dosing frequency and symmetry, pill



burden, drug interactions, and potential side effects. Regimens should be tailored for the individual patient to enhance adherence and thus improve long-term treatment success. Individual regimen choice is based on such considerations as expected side effects, convenience, comorbidities, interactions with concomitant medications, and results of pretreatment genotypic drug-resistance testing.

### ***Pretreatment Drug-Resistance Testing***

Current studies suggest a 6%–16% prevalence of HIV drug resistance in ART-naïve patients,<sup>25-29</sup> and some studies suggest that the presence of transmitted drug-resistant viruses may lead to suboptimal virologic responses.<sup>30</sup> Therefore, pretreatment genotypic resistance testing should be used to guide selection of the most optimal initial ARV regimen. (See [Drug-Resistance Testing](#).)

### ***Improving Adherence***

Suboptimal adherence may result in reduced treatment response. Incomplete adherence can result from complex medication regimens; patient factors, such as active substance abuse and depression; 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 Antiretroviral Therapy](#).)

## **References**

1. 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 U S A*. Jun 9 2009;106(23):9403-9408.
2. Chun TW, Engel D, Berrey MM, Shea T, Corey L, Fauci AS. Early establishment of a pool of latently infected, resting CD4(+) T cells during primary HIV-1 infection. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. Jul 21 1998;95(15):8869-8873.
3. Chun TW, Stuyver L, Mizell SB, et al. Presence of an inducible HIV-1 latent reservoir during highly active antiretroviral therapy. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. Nov 25 1997;94(24):13193-13197.
4. Finzi D, Hermankova M, Pierson T, et al. Identification of a reservoir for HIV-1 in patients on highly active antiretroviral therapy. *Science*. Nov 14 1997;278(5341):1295-1300.
5. Finzi D, Blankson J, Siliciano JD, et al. Latent infection of CD4+ T cells provides a mechanism for lifelong persistence of HIV-1, even in patients on effective combination therapy. *Nat Med*. May 1999;5(5):512-517.
6. Wong JK, Hezareh M, Gunthard HF, et al. Recovery of replication-competent HIV despite prolonged suppression of plasma viremia. *Science*. Nov 14 1997;278(5341):1291-1295.
7. Siliciano JD, Kajdas J, Finzi D, et al. Long-term follow-up studies confirm the stability of the latent reservoir for HIV-1 in resting CD4+ T cells. *Nat Med*. Jun 2003;9(6):727-728.
8. Mocroft A, Vella S, Benfield TL, et al. Changing patterns of mortality across Europe in patients infected with HIV-1. EuroSIDA Study Group. *Lancet*. Nov 28 1998;352(9142):1725-1730.
9. Palella FJ, Jr., Delaney KM, Moorman AC, et al. Declining morbidity and mortality among patients with advanced human immunodeficiency virus infection. HIV Outpatient Study Investigators. *N Engl J Med*. Mar 26 1998;338(13):853-860.
10. Vittinghoff E, Scheer S, O'Malley P, Colfax G, Holmberg SD, Buchbinder SP. Combination antiretroviral therapy and recent declines in AIDS incidence and mortality. *J Infect Dis*. Mar 1999;179(3):717-720.
11. ART CC AC. Life expectancy of individuals on combination antiretroviral therapy in high-income countries: a collaborative analysis of 14 cohort studies. *Lancet*. Jul 26 2008;372(9635):293-299.
12. 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.
13. 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.
14. 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*. Mar 30 2000;342(13):921-929.

15. Dieffenbach CW, Fauci AS. Universal voluntary testing and treatment for prevention of HIV transmission. *JAMA*. Jun 10 2009;301(22):2380-2382.
16. Montaner JS, Hogg R, Wood E, et al. The case for expanding access to highly active antiretroviral therapy to curb the growth of the HIV epidemic. *Lancet*. Aug 5 2006;368(9534):531-536.
17. 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.
18. 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.
19. 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.
20. Paterson DL, Swindells S, Mohr J, et al. Adherence to protease inhibitor therapy and outcomes in patients with HIV infection. *Ann Intern Med*. Jul 4 2000;133(1):21-30.
21. Powderly WG, Saag MS, Chapman S, Yu G, Quart B, Clendeninn NJ. Predictors of optimal virological response to potent antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. Oct 1 1999;13(14):1873-1880.
22. Yamashita TE, Phair JP, Munoz A, et al. Immunologic and virologic response to highly active antiretroviral therapy in the Multicenter AIDS Cohort Study. *AIDS*. Apr 13 2001;15(6):735-746.
23. Townsend D, Troya J, Maida I, et al. First HAART in HIV-infected patients with high viral load: value of HIV RNA levels at 12 weeks to predict virologic outcome. *J Int Assoc Physicians AIDS Care (Chic Ill)*. Sep-Oct 2009;8(5):314-317.
24. Moore RD, Keruly JC, Gebo KA, Lucas GM. An improvement in virologic response to highly active antiretroviral therapy in clinical practice from 1996 through 2002. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Jun 1 2005;39(2):195-198.
25. Weinstock HS, Zaidi I, Heneine W, et al. The epidemiology of antiretroviral drug resistance among drug-naïve HIV-1-infected persons in 10 US cities. *J Infect Dis*. Jun 15 2004;189(12):2174-2180.
26. Bennett D, McCormick L, Kline R, et al. US surveillance of HIV drug resistance at diagnosis using HIV diagnostic sera. Paper presented at: 12th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections (CROI); February 22-25, 2005; Boston, MA.
27. Wheeler W, Mahle K, Bodnar U, et al. Antiretroviral drug-resistance mutations and subtypes in drug-naïve persons newly diagnosed with HIV-1 infection, US, March 2003 to October 2006. Paper presented at: 14th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections (CROI); February 25-28, 2007; Los Angeles, CA.
28. Ross L, Lim ML, Liao Q, et al. Prevalence of antiretroviral drug resistance and resistance-associated mutations in antiretroviral therapy-naïve HIV-infected individuals from 40 United States cities. *HIV Clin Trials*. Jan-Feb 2007;8(1):1-8.
29. Vercauteren J, Wensing AM, van de Vijver DA, et al. Transmission of drug-resistant HIV-1 is stabilizing in Europe. *J Infect Dis*. Nov 15 2009;200(10):1503-1508.
30. 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*. Aug 2007;23(8):988-995.

# Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy in Treatment-Naive Patients (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

## Panel's Recommendations

- Antiretroviral therapy (ART) is recommended for all HIV-infected individuals to reduce the risk of disease progression.
  - The strength of and evidence for this recommendation vary by pretreatment CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell count: CD4 count <350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (AI); CD4 count 350 to 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (AII); CD4 count >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (BIII).
- ART is also recommended for HIV-infected individuals to prevent of transmission of HIV.
  - The strength of and evidence for this recommendation vary by transmission risks: perinatal transmission (AI); heterosexual transmission (AI); other transmission risk groups (AIII).
- Patients starting ART should be willing and able to commit to treatment and understand the benefits and risks of therapy and the importance of adherence (AIII). Patients may choose to postpone therapy, and providers, on a case-by-case basis, may elect to defer therapy on the basis of clinical and/or psychosocial factors.

**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

Without treatment, most HIV-infected individuals will eventually develop progressive immunosuppression, as evident by CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell depletion, leading to AIDS-defining illnesses and premature death. The primary goal of ART is to prevent HIV-associated morbidity and mortality. This goal is best accomplished by using effective ART to maximally inhibit HIV replication so that plasma HIV RNA (viral load) remains below levels detectable by 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 prolongs life.

Furthermore, high plasma HIV RNA is a major risk factor for HIV transmission, and effective antiretroviral therapy (ART) can reduce viremia and transmission of HIV to sexual partners by more than 96%.<sup>1,2</sup> Modelling studies suggest that expanded use of ART may result in lower incidence and, eventually, prevalence of HIV on a community or population level.<sup>3</sup> Thus, a secondary goal of ART is to reduce the risk of HIV transmission.

Historically, HIV-infected individuals have had low CD4 counts at presentation to care.<sup>4</sup> However, there have been concerted efforts to increase testing of at-risk patients and to link these patients to medical care before they have advanced HIV disease. Deferring ART until CD4 count declines put an individual at risk of AIDS-defining conditions has been associated with higher risk of morbidity and mortality (as discussed below). 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<sup>3</sup> never achieve counts >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> after up to 6 years on ART.<sup>5</sup>

The recommendation to initiate ART in individuals with high CD4 cell counts—whose short-term risk for death and development of AIDS-defining illness is low<sup>6,7</sup>—is based on growing evidence that untreated HIV infection or uncontrolled viremia is associated with development of non-AIDS-defining diseases, including cardiovascular disease (CVD), kidney disease, liver disease, neurologic complications, and malignancies. Furthermore, newer ART regimens are more effective, more convenient, and better tolerated than regimens used in the past.

Regardless of CD4 count, the decision to initiate ART should always include consideration of a patient's comorbid conditions, his or her willingness and readiness to initiate therapy, and available resources. In settings where there are insufficient resources to initiate ART in all patients, treatment should be prioritized for patients with the following clinical conditions: pregnancy; CD4 count  $<200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> or history of an AIDS-defining illness including HIV-associated dementia, HIV-associated nephropathy (HIVAN), or hepatitis B virus (HBV); and acute HIV infection.

Tempering the enthusiasm to treat all patients regardless of CD4 count is the absence of randomized trial data that demonstrate a definitive clinical benefit of ART in patients with higher CD4 counts (e.g.,  $>350$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) and mixed results from observational cohort studies as to the definitive benefits of early ART (i.e., when CD4 count  $>500$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>). For some asymptomatic patients, the potential risks of short- or long-term drug-related complications and non-adherence to long-term therapy may offset possible benefits of earlier initiation of therapy. An ongoing randomized controlled trial evaluating the role of immediate versus delayed ART in patients with CD4 counts  $>500$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (see Strategic Timing of Antiretroviral Treatment (START); ClinicalTrials.gov identifier NCT00867048) should help to further define the role of ART in this patient population.

The known and potential benefits and limitations of ART in general, and in different patient populations are discussed below.

## Benefits of Antiretroviral Therapy

### *Reduction in Mortality and/or AIDS-Related Morbidity According to Pretreatment CD4 Cell Count*

#### **Patients with a History of an AIDS-Defining Illness or CD4 Count $<350$ cells/mm<sup>3</sup>**

HIV-infected patients with CD4 counts  $<200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> are at higher risk of opportunistic diseases, non-AIDS morbidity, and death than HIV-infected patients with higher CD4 counts. Randomized controlled trials in patients with CD4 counts  $<200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> and/or a history of an AIDS-defining condition provide strong evidence that ART improves survival and delays disease progression in these patients.<sup>8-10</sup> Long-term data from multiple observational cohort studies comparing earlier ART (i.e., initiated at CD4 count  $>200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) with later treatment (i.e., initiated at CD4 count  $<200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) have also provided strong support for these findings.<sup>11-16</sup>

Few large, randomized controlled trials address when to start therapy in patients with CD4 counts  $>200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. CIPRA HT-001, a randomized clinical trial conducted in Haiti, enrolled 816 participants without AIDS. Participants were randomized to start ART with CD4 counts in the 200 to 350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> range or to defer treatment until their CD4 counts dropped to  $<200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> or they developed an AIDS-defining condition. The study was terminated when an interim analysis showed a survival benefit in the early treatment arm. When compared with participants who began ART with CD4 counts in the 200 to 350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> range, patients who deferred therapy had a higher mortality rate (23 versus 6 deaths; hazard ratio [HR] = 4.0; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.6–9.8) and a higher rate of incident tuberculosis (TB) (HR = 2.0; 95% CI, 1.2–3.6).<sup>17</sup>

Collectively, these studies support the Panel's recommendation that ART should be initiated in patients with a history of an AIDS-defining illness or with a CD4 count  $<350$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (**AI**).

#### **Patients with CD4 Counts Between 350 and 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>**

Data supporting initiation of ART in patients with CD4 counts ranging from 350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> to 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> are from large observational studies conducted in North America, Europe, and Australia and from secondary analysis of randomized controlled trials. Findings from the observational studies were analyzed using



advanced statistical methods that minimize the bias and confounding that arise when observational data are used to address the question of when to start ART. However, unmeasured confounders for which adjustment was not possible may have influenced the analysis.

Among the cohort studies analyzed, the ART Cohort Collaboration (ART-CC) included 45,691 patients from 18 cohort studies conducted primarily in North America and Europe. Data from ART-CC showed that the rate of progression to AIDS and/or death was higher in participants who delayed ART initiation until their CD4 counts fell to 251 to 350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> than in those who initiated ART at CD4 count level of 351 to 450 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (risk ratio: 1.28; 95% CI, 1.04–1.57).<sup>13</sup> When analysis of the data was restricted to mortality alone, the difference between the 2 strategies was weaker and not statistically significant (risk ratio: 1.13; 95% CI, 0.80–1.60).

The NA-ACCORD cohort evaluated patients regardless whether they had started therapy. The 6,278 patients who deferred therapy until their CD4 counts fell to <350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> had a greater risk of death than the 2,084 patients who initiated therapy with CD4 counts between 351 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> and 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (risk ratio: 1.69; 95% CI, 1.26–2.26) after adjustment for other factors that differed between these 2 groups.<sup>18</sup>

The HIV-CAUSAL cohort evaluated 8,392 ART-naïve patients with initial CD4 counts >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> that declined to <500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>.<sup>16</sup> The study estimated that delaying initiation of ART until CD4 count fell to <350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> was associated with a greater risk of AIDS-defining illness or death than initiating ART with CD4 count between 350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> and 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (HR: 1.38; 95% CI, 1.23–1.56). However, there was no difference in mortality between the 2 groups (HR: 1.01; 95% CI, 0.84–1.22).

The CASCADE cohort included 5,527 ART-naïve patients with CD4 counts in the 350 to 499 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> range. Compared with patients who deferred therapy until their CD4 counts fell to <350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>, patients who started ART immediately had a marginally lower risk of AIDS-defining illness or death (HR: 0.75; 95% CI, 0.49–1.14) and a lower risk of death (HR: 0.51; 95% CI, 0.33–0.80).<sup>19</sup>

Randomized data showing clinical evidence that supports ART for patients with higher CD4 cell counts came from two studies. In the SMART trial, HIV-infected participants with CD4 counts >350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> were randomized to continuous ART or to treatment interruption until their CD4 counts fell to <250 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. In the subgroup of 249 participants who were ART naïve at enrollment (median CD4 count: 437 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>), those who deferred ART until their CD4 counts dropped to <250 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> had a greater risk of serious AIDS- and non-AIDS-related events than those who initiated therapy immediately (7 vs. 2 events; HR: 4.6; 95% CI, 1.0–22.2).<sup>20</sup> HPTN 052 was a large multi-continent randomized trial that examined whether treatment of HIV-infected individuals reduces transmission to their uninfected sexual partners.<sup>2</sup> A secondary objective of the study was to determine whether ART reduces clinical events in the HIV-infected participants. This trial enrolled 1,763 HIV infected participants with CD4 counts between 350 and 550 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> and their HIV uninfected partners. The infected participants were randomized to initiate ART immediately or to delay initiation until they had 2 consecutive CD4 counts <250 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. At a median follow-up of 2.1 years, there were 57 primary events in the early therapy arm versus 77 events in the delayed therapy arm (HR: 0.73; 95% CI, 0.52–1.03). The most frequent event was tuberculosis (17 cases in the early therapy arm and 34 cases in the delayed therapy arm); deaths were relatively rare (11 cases in the early therapy arm and 15 cases in the delayed therapy arm).<sup>21,22</sup>

Collectively, these studies suggest that initiating ART in patients with CD4 counts between 350 and 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> reduces HIV-related disease progression; whether there is a corresponding reduction in mortality is unclear. This benefit supports the Panel's recommendation that ART should be initiated in patients with CD4 counts 350 to 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (**AII**). Recent evidence demonstrating the public health benefit of earlier initiation of ART in reducing HIV transmission further supports the strength of this recommendation (see [Prevention of Sexual Transmission](#)).

### Patients with CD4 Counts >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>

An analysis of the risks of HIV-associated disease progression in ART-naïve patients with CD4 cell counts >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> is difficult because only a small proportion of individuals present for clinical care with CD4 cell counts at this level.<sup>4,23</sup> However, studies have demonstrated a gradient of increased risk of AIDS and death when ART is initiated at lower CD4 cell count levels and have provided no evidence of a safe CD4 count level.<sup>6,24,25</sup>

To date, questions regarding the risks and benefits of starting ART in patients with CD4 cell counts >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> as compared to deferring initiation until CD4 cell counts are lower have not yet been answered in a definitive randomized clinical trial. Evidence supporting early initiation comes from an observational study. The NA-ACCORD study observed patients who started ART with CD4 counts >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> or after their CD4 counts dropped below this threshold. The adjusted mortality rates were significantly higher in the 6,935 patients who deferred therapy until their CD4 counts fell to <500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> than in the 2,200 patients who started therapy with CD4 counts >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (risk ratio: 1.94; 95% CI, 1.37–2.79).<sup>18</sup>

In contrast, in an analysis of the ART-CC cohort,<sup>13</sup> the rate of progression to AIDS/death associated with deferral of therapy until CD4 counts fell to the 351 to 450 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> range was similar to the rate with initiation of therapy with CD4 counts in the 451 to 550 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> range (HR: 0.99; 95% CI, 0.76–1.29). The analysis showed no significant difference in rate of death in the immediate and deferred therapy groups (HR: 0.93; 95% CI, 0.60–1.44). In the CASCADE Collaboration,<sup>19</sup> among the 5,162 patients with CD4 counts in the 500 to 799 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> range, compared with patients who deferred therapy, those who started ART immediately did not experience a significant reduction in the composite outcome of progression to AIDS/death (HR: 1.10; 95% CI, 0.67–1.79) or death (HR: 1.02; 95% CI, 0.49–2.12).

Although not a clinical endpoint study, a recent clinical trial (Setpoint Study) randomized patients within 6 months of HIV seroconversion to receive either immediate ART for 36 weeks or deferred treatment. More than 57% of the study participants had CD4 counts >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. The deferred treatment group had a statistically higher risk of meeting study defined ART initiation criteria than the immediate treatment group. The study was halted early, showing that the time from diagnosis of early infection and the need for initiation of ART was shorter than anticipated in the deferral therapy group. Fully half of the participants in the deferral group met the criteria for treatment initiation by week 72.<sup>26</sup>

Another recent study provides evidence that early treatment enhances recovery of CD4 counts to levels >900 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>.<sup>27</sup> Among individuals who were identified during primary infection, those who initiated ART within 4 months after the estimated date of infection were more likely to have CD4 cell recovery and had a faster rate of recovery than those initiating ART at 4 to 12 months or >12 months after the estimated date of infection. However, even among participants who started ART earlier, those who initiated ART with lower CD4 counts were less likely to have CD4 cell recovery and had a lower rate of recovery than those who initiated ART with higher CD4 counts.

With a better understanding of the pathogenesis of HIV infection, the growing awareness that untreated HIV infection increases the risk of many non-AIDS-defining diseases (as discussed below), and the benefit of ART in reducing transmission of HIV, the Panel recommends initiation of ART in patients with CD4 counts >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (**BIII**).

When discussing initiation of ART at high CD4 cell counts (>500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>), clinicians should inform patients that data on the clinical benefit of starting treatment at such levels are not conclusive, especially for patients with very high CD4 counts. Clinicians should also inform patients that viral suppression from effective ART can reduce the risk of sexual transmission. Lastly, patients should be informed that untreated HIV infection will eventually lead to immunological deterioration and increased risk of clinical disease and death. Therefore, if therapy is not initiated, continued monitoring and close follow-up are necessary.

Further ongoing research (both randomized clinical trials and cohort studies) to assess the short- and long-term clinical and public health benefits and cost effectiveness of starting therapy at higher CD4 counts is needed. Findings from such research will provide further evidence to help the Panel make future recommendations.

### ***Effects of Viral Replication on HIV-Related Morbidity***

Since the mid-1990s, it has been known that measures of viral replication predict HIV disease progression. Among untreated HIV-infected individuals, time to clinical progression and mortality is fastest in those with higher viral loads.<sup>28</sup> This finding is confirmed across the spectrum of HIV-infected patient populations, such as injection drug users (IDUs),<sup>29</sup> women,<sup>30</sup> and individuals with hemophilia.<sup>31</sup> Several studies have shown the prognostic value of pre-treatment viral load for predicting post-therapy response.<sup>32,33</sup> Once therapy has been initiated, failure to achieve viral suppression<sup>34-36</sup> and viral load at the time of treatment failure<sup>37</sup> are predictive of clinical disease progression.

More recent studies have examined the impact of ongoing viral replication for both longer durations and at higher CD4 cell counts. Using viremia copy-years, a novel metric for quantifying viral load over time, the Centers for AIDS Research Network of Integrated Clinical Systems (CNICS) cohort found that cumulative exposure to replicating virus is independently associated with mortality. Using viremia copy-years, the HR for mortality was 1.81 per log<sub>10</sub> copy-year/mL (95% CI, 1.51–2.18), which was the only viral load-related variable that retained statistical significance in the multivariable model (HR 1.44 per log<sub>10</sub> copy-year/mL; 95% CI, 1.07–1.94). These findings support the concept that unchecked viral replication, which occurs in the absence of effective ART, is a factor in disease progression and death independent of CD4 count.<sup>38</sup>

The EuroSIDA collaboration evaluated HIV-infected individuals with CD4 counts >350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> segregated by three viral load strata (<500 copies/mL, 500–9,999 copies/mL, and ≥10,000 copies/mL) to determine the impact of viral load on rates of fatal and nonfatal AIDS-related and non-AIDS-related events. The lower viral load stratum included more participants on ART (92%) than the middle (62%) and high (31%) viral load strata. After adjustment for age, region, and ART, the rates of non-AIDS events were 61% ( $P = 0.001$ ) and 66% ( $P = 0.004$ ) higher in participants with viral loads 500 to 9,999 copies/mL and >10,000 copies/mL, respectively, than in individuals with viral loads <500 copies/mL. These data further confirm that unchecked viral replication is associated with adverse clinical outcomes in individuals with CD4 counts >350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>.<sup>39</sup>

Collectively, these data show that the harm of ongoing viral replication affects both untreated patients and those who are on ART but remain viremic. The harm of ongoing viral replication in patients on ART is compounded by the risk of emergence of drug-resistant virus. Therefore, all patients on ART should be carefully monitored and counseled on the importance of adherence to therapy.

### ***Effects of Antiretroviral Therapy on HIV-Related Morbidity***

HIV-associated immune deficiency, the direct effects of HIV on end organs, and the indirect effects of HIV-associated inflammation on these organs all likely contribute to HIV-related morbidity and mortality. In general, the available data demonstrate the following:

- Untreated HIV infection (ongoing viral replication) may have negative effects at all stages of infection.
- Earlier treatment may prevent the damage associated with HIV replication during early stages of infection.
- ART is beneficial even when initiated later in infection; however, later therapy may not repair damage associated with viral replication during early stages of infection.
- Sustaining viral suppression and maintaining higher CD4 count levels, mostly as a result of effective



combination ART, may delay, prevent, or reverse some non-AIDS-defining complications, such as HIV-associated kidney disease, liver disease, CVD, neurologic complications, and malignancies, as discussed below.

### **HIV-Associated Nephropathy**

HIVAN is the most common cause of chronic kidney disease in HIV-infected individuals that may lead to end-stage kidney disease.<sup>40</sup> HIVAN is almost exclusively seen in black patients and can occur at any CD4 count. Ongoing viral replication appears to be directly involved in renal injury;<sup>41</sup> HIVAN is extremely uncommon in virologically suppressed patients.<sup>42</sup> ART in patients with HIVAN has been associated with both preserved renal function and prolonged survival.<sup>43-45</sup> Therefore, regardless of CD4 count, ART should be started in all patients with HIVAN at the earliest sign of renal dysfunction (**AII**).

### **Coinfection with Hepatitis B Virus and/or Hepatitis C Virus**

HIV infection is associated with more rapid progression of viral hepatitis-related liver disease, including cirrhosis, end-stage liver disease, hepatocellular carcinoma, and fatal hepatic failure.<sup>46-48</sup> The pathogenesis of accelerated liver disease in HIV-infected patients has not been fully elucidated, but HIV-related immunodeficiency and a direct interaction between HIV and hepatic stellate and Kupffer cells have been implicated.<sup>49-52</sup> In individuals co-infected with HBV and/or hepatitis C virus (HCV), ART may attenuate liver disease progression by preserving or restoring immune function and reducing HIV-related immune activation and inflammation.<sup>53-55</sup> Antiretroviral (ARV) drugs active against both HIV and HBV (such as tenofovir disoproxil fumarate [TDF], lamivudine [3TC], and emtricitabine [FTC]) also may prevent development of significant liver disease by directly suppressing HBV replication.<sup>56,57</sup> Although ARV drugs do not inhibit HCV replication directly, HCV treatment outcomes typically improve when HIV replication is controlled or CD4 counts increase.<sup>58</sup> In one prospective cohort, after controlling for liver and HIV disease stage, HCV co-infected patients receiving ART were approximately 66% less likely to experience end-stage liver disease, hepatocellular carcinoma, and fatal hepatic failure than patients not receiving ART.<sup>59</sup> While some studies have shown that chronic viral hepatitis increases the risk of ART-induced liver injury, the majority of coinfecting persons do not develop clinically significant liver injury<sup>60-62</sup> and the rate of hepatotoxicity may be greater in persons with more advanced HIV disease. Collectively, these data suggest that earlier treatment of HIV infection in persons coinfecting with HBV (and likely HCV) may reduce the risk of liver disease progression. ART is recommended for patients coinfecting with HBV, and the ART regimen should include drugs with activity against both HIV and HBV (**AII**) (also see [Hepatitis B Virus/HIV Coinfection](#)). ART is also recommended for most patients coinfecting with HCV (**BII**), including those with high CD4 counts and those with cirrhosis. This recommendation is based on findings from retrospective and prospective cohort studies that indicated that the receipt of ART is associated with slower progression of hepatic fibrosis and reduced risk of liver disease outcomes.<sup>59,63-65</sup> Combined treatment of HIV and HCV can be complicated by large pill burden, drug interactions, and overlapping toxicities; however, the complexity of treatment depends on the HCV regimen selected. ART should be considered for HIV/HCV-coinfecting patients regardless of CD4 cell count. However, for patients with CD4 counts >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> and also infected with HCV genotype 1, if treatment is to include an HCV protease inhibitor, some clinicians may choose to defer ART until HCV treatment is completed (also see [HIV/Hepatitis C Virus Co-Infection](#)).

### **Cardiovascular Disease**

In HIV-infected patients, CVD is a major cause of morbidity and mortality, accounting for one-third of serious non-AIDS conditions and at least 10% of deaths.<sup>66-68</sup> A number of studies have found that, over time, HIV-infected persons are at greater risk for CVD events than age-matched uninfected individuals.

Persons living with HIV infection have higher rates of established CVD risk factors, particularly smoking and dyslipidemia, than HIV-uninfected individuals. In the Data Collection on Adverse Events of Anti-HIV

Drugs (D:A:D) cohort study such factors, including age, male gender, obesity, smoking, family history of CVD, diabetes, and dyslipidemia, were each independently associated with risk of myocardial infarction (MI).<sup>69</sup> This study also found that the risk of CVD was greater with exposure to some ARV drugs, including certain PIs (ritonavir-boosted lopinavir and ritonavir-boosted fosamprenavir) and abacavir, than with exposure to other ARV drugs.<sup>69,70</sup>

In terms of preventing the progression to CVD events, it has not been determined whether delaying ART initiation is preferable to immediate treatment. In the meta-analysis mentioned above, the risk of CVD in HIV-infected individuals was 1.5 times higher in those treated with ART than in those not treated with ART.<sup>63</sup> These analyses were limited by concern that the treated individuals may have been infected for longer periods of time and had prior episodes of untreated HIV disease, as well as the fact that the untreated people were at higher risk for competing events, including death. Furthermore, there is evidence that untreated HIV infection may also be associated with an increased risk of CVD. In the SMART study, the risk of cardiovascular events was greater in participants randomized to CD4-guided treatment interruption than in participants who received continuous ART.<sup>71</sup> In other studies, ART resulted in marked improvement in parameters associated with CVD, including markers of inflammation (such as interleukin 6 [IL-6]), immune dysfunction (e.g., T cell activation, T cell senescence), monocyte activation (e.g., IL-6, soluble CD14 and CD163), hyper-coagulation (e.g., D-dimers) and, most importantly, endothelial dysfunction.<sup>72,73</sup> Low nadir and/or proximal on-therapy CD4 cell count has been linked to CVD (MI and/or stroke),<sup>74-76</sup> suggesting that low CD4 count might result in increased risk of CVD.

Collectively, the increased risk of cardiovascular events with treatment interruption, the effects of ART on markers of inflammation and endothelial dysfunction, and the association between CVD and CD4 cell depletion suggest that early control of HIV replication with ART can be used as a strategy to reduce risk of CVD, particularly if drugs with potential cardiovascular toxicity are avoided. However, no study has demonstrated that initiation of ART prevents CVD. Therefore, a role for early ART in preventing CVD remains to be established. For HIV-infected individuals with a significant risk of CVD, as assessed by medical history and estimated risk calculations, risk of CVD should be considered when selecting a specific ART regimen.

## **Malignancies**

HIV-infected individuals are at increased risk for developing several cancers and human papilloma virus (HPV)-related pre-malignant intraepithelial neoplasia.<sup>77,78</sup> Increased rates of Kaposi sarcoma and non-Hodgkin lymphoma in patients with advanced HIV infection have been noted since early in the AIDS epidemic, and, together with cervical cancer, both diseases have been defined as AIDS-defining malignancies (ADMs) for public health surveillance purposes. HIV infection and associated immunosuppression increase the risk of several cancers identified as non-AIDS-defining malignancies (NADMs). Importantly, the incidence of lung, anal, oropharyngeal, liver and skin cancers, Hodgkin lymphoma, and melanoma, is higher in HIV-infected individuals than in matched HIV-uninfected controls,<sup>79-81</sup> and the burden of these NADMs continued to increase in the United States between 1996 and 2007.<sup>82</sup>

Incidental cancers that occur in HIV-infected individuals are becoming more common, which is due to the aging of the HIV population rather than to HIV-associated risks of malignancies. These cancers are also sometimes considered NADMs. Most cancers with increased incidence are either virally related (i.e., Hodgkin lymphoma, anal cancer, liver cancer) or smoking related (lung cancer), although HIV remains an independent risk factor for the later.<sup>83</sup>

Large cohort studies enrolling mainly patients receiving ART have reported a consistent link between low CD4 counts (<350 to 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) and the risk of ADMs and/or NADMs.<sup>14,76,84-87</sup> The ANRS C04 Study demonstrated that, in contrast to patients with CD4 counts >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>, patients with CD4 counts <500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> had a statistically significant relative risk of all cancers evaluated (except for anal carcinoma). The

study also showed **an increased risk of anal cancer based on extent of time with CD4 counts <200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>**, and that, regardless of CD4 count, ART has a protective effect for HIV-associated malignancies.<sup>84</sup> This potential effect of HIV-associated immunodeficiency is striking particularly with regard to cancers and pre-malignant diseases associated with chronic viral infections such as HBV, HCV, HPV, Epstein-Barr virus, and human herpes virus-8.<sup>88,89</sup> For some cancers, risk is related to HIV viremia. Cumulative HIV viremia, independent of other factors, is associated with increased risk of non-Hodgkin lymphoma and other ADM.<sup>87,90</sup> In the SMART study,<sup>91</sup> patients randomized to the drug conservation arm (ART interruption with re-initiation if CD4 count fell to <250 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) had a higher incidence of ADM but not NADM, although increased NADM was noted in non-smokers in the drug-conservation arm.

From the early 1990s through 2000, incidence rates for many cancers occurring with advanced immunosuppression, including Kaposi sarcoma, diffuse large B-cell lymphoma, and primary central nervous system (CNS) lymphoma, declined markedly in HIV-infected individuals in the United States, with more gradual declines noted after 2000.<sup>92</sup> However, for other ADMs and NADMs, such as Burkitt lymphoma, Hodgkin lymphoma, cervical cancer, and anal cancer, similar reductions in incidence have not been observed.<sup>92,93</sup> Declines in competing causes of mortality (e.g., opportunistic infections [OIs]) and concurrent cancer risk factors such as smoking or aging of HIV-infected cohorts, may confound a full assessment of the relative impact of ART on cancer prevention for NADMs.<sup>82,94</sup>

**Additionally, data from the era of potent combination ART suggest that overall survival in HIV-infected patients who develop ADMs or NADMs also depends on immune status as measured by CD4 count.<sup>85,95,96</sup> For non-Hodgkin lymphoma, data from the Center for AIDS Research Network of Integrated Clinical Systems Cohort shows that across CD4 strata, the level of HIV viremia 6 months after the diagnosis of lymphoma (including Hodgkin lymphoma) is associated with an increased risk of death.<sup>95</sup>**

Together this evidence suggests that initiating ART to suppress HIV replication, maximize immune reconstitution, and maintain CD4 counts at levels >350 to 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> reduces the overall incidence of ADMs and may reduce the risk of some NADMs as well. The effect of ART on cancer incidence and mortality in patients with cancer<sup>95,97</sup> is likely to be heterogeneous across various cancer types.

## **Neurological Complications**

In the untreated HIV-infected patient, CNS involvement is a nearly universal facet of systemic HIV infection as evident by detection of HIV RNA in cerebrospinal fluid (CSF).<sup>98-101</sup> The CNS is an important target of ART, not only to treat neurologically symptomatic infection but also to prevent later development of virus-related brain injury, which can range from severe and debilitating encephalopathy to milder and more insidious cognitive and motor dysfunction.<sup>102-104</sup>

Like systemic infection, CNS virus populations and the character of CNS infection can evolve within individual patients. Characteristically during the earliest phases of systemic infection, CSF viral isolates are similar to those found in blood and likely reflect transfer of blood populations across CNS barriers in T lymphocytes.<sup>105</sup> Over time CSF isolates may exhibit increasing compartmentalization that reflect divergence from the predominant blood populations, a transformation most notable in patients with frank HIV encephalitis presenting with HIV-associated dementia (HAD).<sup>106</sup> Combination ART usually reduces CSF HIV RNA to below the level of detection,<sup>99,107</sup> largely preventing this development, and consequently, reducing the incidence of severe HIV-related brain disease in virologically suppressed patients.<sup>108-110</sup> Hence, prevention of HAD is among the arguments for early ART, although the CD4 threshold for treatment to prevent this disorder is not established. Additionally, treatment of patients presenting with HAD—usually seen in the context of late HIV presentation—can arrest and variably reverse neurological abnormalities;<sup>111</sup> therefore, the diagnosis of HAD is an indication for rapid initiation of ART (AI).

With the successful control of HAD with ART, attention has shifted to milder forms of neurocognitive

impairment in HIV infection, largely recognized by reduced neuropsychological test performance.<sup>104,112</sup> These milder forms of impairment are categorized in two groups: asymptomatic neurocognitive impairment and mild neurocognitive disorder. Although patients with either form exhibit the same degree of impairment on neuropsychological tests (<1 SD below normative performance in two neurocognitive domains), they differ as to the absence or presence of symptoms or mild functional impairment in everyday activities.<sup>103</sup> Even after exclusion of confounding conditions, the prevalence of these milder forms of neurocognitive impairment appears to be substantial, including in treated patients with plasma viral suppression.<sup>104,112</sup> Less certain is the extent to which these impairments are the consequence of earlier mild or subclinical brain injury sustained before ART initiation, or alternatively, reflect ongoing injury despite ART and plasma viral suppression. Association of these milder deficits with nadir CD4 count may favor the role of earlier injury,<sup>100,113-115</sup> providing further argument for early treatment.

Peripheral neuropathies are a second category of important HIV-associated neurological disease.<sup>116</sup> In the early decades of the discovery of HIV infection and the use of some nucleoside analogs, painful distal sensory neuropathy was particularly common and a difficult problem that did not respond to ART.<sup>117</sup> Although some reports suggest that the incidence of this HIV-associated neuropathy remains high, clinical experience suggests that the condition mainly affects patients with longer duration of HIV infection who initiated ART late in the course of the disease.<sup>118</sup> There appears to be a reduced incidence of neuropathies as more patients begin treatment at earlier stages of HIV infection.

Overall, effective ART may be beneficial in preventing and treating symptomatic and subclinical CNS HIV infection and the CNS and peripheral nervous system consequences of infection.

### **Age and Treatment-Related Immune Reconstitution**

Also see [HIV and the Older Patient](#).

The CD4 cell response to ART is an important predictor of short- and long-term morbidity and mortality. In most, but not all studies, treatment initiation at an older age has been associated with a less robust CD4 count response; starting therapy at a younger age may result in better immunologic and perhaps clinical outcomes.<sup>4,119-122</sup>

### **Persistent Inflammation and Immunodeficiency During Antiretroviral Therapy**

Untreated HIV infection is associated with chronic inflammation, as defined by the frequency of activated T cells and monocyte/macrophages and levels of a number of pro-inflammatory cytokines (e.g., IL-6, CRP, soluble CD14). Effective ART decreases levels of most of these inflammatory markers, but the effect is often incomplete, with levels in many of those on ART remaining higher than those observed in age-matched uninfected adults.<sup>123,124</sup> Chronic inflammation during both untreated and treated disease is strongly associated with risk of non-AIDS defining morbidity and all-cause mortality.<sup>125-128</sup> Because HIV replication contributes to this inflammatory state through both direct and indirect mechanisms, earlier use of ART to blunt this process may be beneficial. However, there are no data showing that ART-mediated changes in any inflammatory biomarker are associated with reduced morbidity and mortality.

Immune function as defined by the peripheral CD4 cell count is also an important determinant of health. Although effective ART results in a sustained and beneficial increase in CD4 cell counts, this effect is often incomplete. Patients who delay therapy to the point of advanced immunodeficiency may require several years of ART to normalize their peripheral CD4 cell counts,<sup>129</sup> and some patients may never achieve a normal level.<sup>130</sup> A lower CD4 count on therapy is associated with higher risk of developing cancer, liver disease, cardiovascular disease and death.<sup>14</sup> In some studies a history of low CD4 counts is associated with risk of morbidity and mortality during subsequent effective therapy.<sup>131,132</sup>

Collectively, these observations support earlier use of ART. Treatment decreases the level of inflammation,



which may be associated with reduced short-term risk of AIDS- and non-AIDS-related morbidity and mortality.<sup>125,133,134</sup> ART also prevents progressive loss of CD4 cells, thus reducing risk of immunodeficiency and its related complications. Some studies have shown that a patient's pre-therapy CD4 cell count nadir is predictive of the degree of residual inflammation and/or T-cell dysfunction during ART.<sup>123,135,136</sup> Thus, earlier ART may result in less residual immunological perturbations during treatment, which theoretically may result in reduced risk of disease during the decades that a patient requires ART (CIII).

## ***Antiretroviral Therapy for Prevention of HIV Transmission***

### **Prevention of Perinatal Transmission**

Effective ART reduces transmission of HIV. The most dramatic and well-established example of this effect is the use of ART in pregnant women to prevent perinatal transmission of HIV. Effective suppression of HIV replication, as reflected in plasma HIV RNA, is a key determinant in reducing perinatal transmission. In the setting of ART initiation before 28 weeks' gestation and an HIV RNA level <50 copies/mL near delivery, use of combination ART during pregnancy has reduced the rate of perinatal transmission of HIV from approximately 20% to 30% to 0.1% to 0.5%.<sup>137,138</sup> Thus, use of combination ART drug regimens is recommended for all HIV-infected pregnant women (AI). Following delivery, in the absence of breastfeeding, considerations regarding continuation of the ARV regimen for maternal therapeutic indications are the same as those regarding ART for other non-pregnant individuals. For detailed recommendations, see the [Perinatal Guidelines](#).<sup>139</sup>

### **Prevention of Sexual Transmission**

A number of investigations, including biological, ecological and epidemiological studies and one randomized clinical trial, provide strong support for the premise that treatment of the HIV-infected individual can significantly reduce sexual transmission of HIV. Lower plasma HIV RNA levels are associated with decreases in the concentration of the virus in genital secretions.<sup>140,141</sup> Studies of HIV-serodiscordant heterosexual couples have demonstrated a relationship between level of plasma viremia and risk of transmission of HIV—when plasma HIV RNA levels are lower, transmission events are less common.<sup>1,142-145</sup>

A study conducted in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, used geospatial techniques to assess the relationship between ART use and HIV incidence in an observational cohort of more than 16,000 study participants living in many different communities.<sup>146</sup> After adjustment for sexual behavior and prevalent HIV cases, each percentage point increase in ART coverage of HIV-infected persons lowered the HIV infection risk in a community by 1.7%.

Most significantly, the multi-continental HPTN 052 trial enrolled 1,763 HIV-serodiscordant couples in which the HIV-infected partner was ART naive with a CD4 count of 350 to 550 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> at enrollment to compare the effect of immediate ART versus delayed therapy (not started until CD4 count <250 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) on HIV transmission to the HIV-infected partner.<sup>2</sup> At study entry, 97% of the participants were in heterosexual monogamous relationships. All study participants were counseled on behavioral modification and condom use. Twenty-eight linked HIV transmission events were identified during the study period, but only 1 event occurred in the early therapy arm. This 96% reduction in transmission associated with early ART was statistically significant (HR 0.04; 95% CI, 0.01–0.27; *P* <0.001). These results show that early ART is more effective at preventing transmission of HIV than all other behavioral and biomedical prevention interventions studied. This study, as well as other observational studies and modeling analyses showing a decreased rate of HIV transmission among serodiscordant heterosexual couples following the introduction of ART, demonstrate that suppression of viremia in ART-adherent patients with no concomitant sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) substantially reduces the risk of transmission of HIV.<sup>3,144,145,147-149</sup> HPTN 052 was conducted in heterosexual couples and not in populations at risk of transmission via homosexual exposure or needle sharing. In addition, in this clinical trial, adherence to ART was well supported and near complete. However,

the prevention benefits of effective ART observed in HPTN 052 can reasonably be presumed to apply broadly. Therefore, the Panel recommends that ART be offered to patients who are at risk of transmitting HIV to sexual partners (the strength of this recommendation varies according to mode of sexual transmission: **AI** for heterosexual transmission and **AIII** for male-to-male and other modes of sexual transmission). Clinicians should discuss with patients the potential individual and public health benefits of therapy and the need for adherence to the prescribed regimen and counsel patients that ART is not a substitute for condom use and behavioral modification and that ART does not protect against other STDs (see [Preventing Secondary Transmission of HIV](#)).

## Concerns Regarding Earlier Initiation of Therapy

Despite increasing evidence showing the benefits of earlier initiation of ART, four areas of concern remain as reasons for deferral of HIV therapy.

### ARV Drug Toxicities Have an Adverse Effect on Quality of Life and Adherence

Earlier initiation of ART extends exposure to ARV agents by several years. The D:A:D study found an increased incidence of CVD associated with cumulative exposure to some drugs in the nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor and protease inhibitor (PI) drug classes.<sup>69,150</sup> Renal and bone health are also of concern. Aging coupled with long term use of tenofovir may increase risk of significant renal dysfunction.<sup>151-153</sup> In the SMART study, compared with interruption or deferral of therapy, continuous exposure to ART was associated with significantly greater loss of bone density.<sup>71</sup> There may be unknown complications related to cumulative use of ARV drugs for many decades. A list of known ARV-associated toxicities can be found in [Adverse Effects of Antiretroviral Agents](#).

ART frequently improves quality of life for symptomatic patients. However, some side effects of ART may impair quality of life for some patients, especially those who are asymptomatic at initiation of therapy and at low risk of AIDS events. For example, efavirenz can cause neurocognitive or psychiatric side effects and PIs have been associated with gastrointestinal side effects. As noted above, some therapies may increase the risk of CVD. Patients who find that the inconvenience of taking medication every day outweighs the overall benefit of early ART may choose to delay therapy.

### ARV Non-Adherence May Have an Impact on Virologic Response.

At any CD4 count, adherence to therapy is essential to achieve viral suppression and prevent emergence of drug-resistance mutations. Several clinical, behavioral, and social factors associated with poor adherence, such as untreated major psychiatric disorders, active substance abuse, unfavorable social circumstances, patient concerns about side effects, and poor adherence to clinic visits, have been identified. 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 Antiretroviral Therapy](#).

### Earlier Development of Resistance may Reduce Future Therapeutic Options.

Non-adherence and subsequent virologic failure may promote emergence of drug resistance mutations and limit subsequent treatment options. Despite concerns about the development of resistance to ARV drugs, the evidence thus far indicates that resistance occurs more frequently in individuals who initiate therapy later in the course of infection than in those who initiate ART earlier.<sup>154</sup> Furthermore, recent data have indicated a slight increase in the prevalence of 2-drug class resistance from 2000 to 2005.<sup>155</sup>

### Cost may be a Barrier to Early Initiation of Therapy.

In resource-rich countries, the cost of ART exceeds \$10,000 per year (see [Cost Considerations and Antiretroviral Therapy](#)). Several modeling studies support the cost effectiveness of HIV therapy initiated soon after diagnosis.<sup>156-158</sup> One study reported that the annual cost of care is 2.5 times higher for patients with



CD4 counts  $<50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> than for patients with CD4 counts  $>350$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>.<sup>159</sup> Much of the health care expenditure in patients with advanced infection is from non-ARV drugs and hospitalization. However, there are no comparisons of the cost of earlier ART initiation (i.e., CD4 count 350–500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) versus later initiation (i.e., CD4 count  $>500$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>). As generic formulations for more ARV drugs become available in the next several years, the cost of ART may decline. However, despite any significant cost savings, decisions regarding which ARVs to select for system-wide HIV programs must be based on rigorous cost-effectiveness assessments (see [Cost](#) section).<sup>160</sup>

### ***Conditions Favoring More Urgent Initiation of Therapy***

Several conditions increase the urgency for therapy, including:

- Pregnancy (**AI**). Clinicians should refer to the [Perinatal Guidelines](#) for more detailed recommendations on the management of HIV-infected pregnant women.<sup>139</sup>
- AIDS-defining conditions, including HAD (**AI**)
- Acute OIs (see discussion below)
- Lower CD4 counts (e.g.,  $<200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) (**AI**)
- HIVAN (**AII**)
- Acute/Early Infection (**BII**). See more discussion in the [Acute/Early Infection](#) section.
- HIV/HBV coinfection (**AII**)
- HIV/HCV coinfection (**BII**)
- Rapidly declining CD4 counts (e.g.,  $>100$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> decrease per year) (**AIII**)
- Higher viral loads (e.g.,  $>100,000$  copies/mL) (**BII**)

### ***Acute Opportunistic Infections***

In patients who have opportunistic diseases for which no effective therapy exists (e.g., cryptosporidiosis, microsporidiosis, progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy), but in whom ART may improve outcomes by improving immune responses, treatment should be started as soon as possible (**AIII**). For patients with mild to moderate cutaneous Kaposi's sarcoma (KS), prompt initiation of ART alone without chemotherapy has been associated with improvement of the KS lesions, even though initial transient progression of KS lesion as a manifestation of immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome (IRIS) can also occur.<sup>161</sup>

In the setting of some OIs, such as cryptococcal meningitis, for which immediate therapy may increase the risk of serious immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome (IRIS), a short delay before initiating ART may be warranted.<sup>162-164</sup> In the setting of other OIs, such as *Pneumocystis jirovecii* pneumonia, early initiation of ART is associated with increased survival;<sup>10</sup> therefore, therapy should not be delayed (**AI**).

In patients who have active TB, initiating ART during treatment for TB confers a significant survival advantage;<sup>165-169</sup> therefore, ART should be initiated as recommended in [Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Disease with HIV Coinfection](#).

Clinicians should refer to the [Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents](#)<sup>161</sup> for more detailed discussion on when to initiate ART in the setting of a specific OI.

### ***Conditions Where Deferral of Therapy May be Considered***

Some patients and their clinicians may decide to defer therapy on the basis of clinical or personal circumstances. Deferring therapy for the reasons discussed below may be reasonable in patients with high CD4 counts (e.g.,  $>500$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>), but deferring therapy in patients with much lower CD4 counts (e.g.,

<200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) should be considered only in rare situations and should be undertaken with close clinical follow-up. Briefly delaying therapy to allow a patient more time to prepare for lifelong treatment may be considered.

### **When There are Significant Barriers to Adherence**

Also see [Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy](#).

In patients with higher CD4 counts who are at risk of poor adherence, it may be prudent to defer treatment while addressing the barriers to adherence. However, in patients with conditions that require urgent initiation of ART (see above), therapy should be started while simultaneously addressing the barriers to adherence.

Several methods are available to assess adherence. When the most feasible measure of adherence is self-report, this assessment should be completed at each clinic visit using one of the available reliable and valid instruments.<sup>170,171</sup> If other objective measures (e.g., pharmacy refill data, pill count) are available, these methods should be used to assess adherence at each follow-up visit.<sup>172,174</sup> Continual assessment and counseling allow the clinician to intervene early to address barriers to adherence occurring at any point during treatment (see [Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy](#)).

### **Presence of Comorbidities that Complicate or Prohibit Antiretroviral Therapy**

Deferral of ART may be considered when either the treatment or manifestations of other medical conditions may complicate the treatment of HIV infection or vice versa. Examples include:

- Surgery that may result in an extended interruption of ART
- Treatment with medications that have clinically significant drug interactions with ART and for which alternative medications are not available

In each of these circumstances, the assumption is that the situation is temporary and that ART will be initiated after the conflicting condition has resolved.

There are some less common situations that preclude ART at any time while CD4 counts remain high. In particular, such situations include that of patients who have a poor prognosis because of a concomitant medical condition and are not expected to gain survival or quality-of-life benefits from ART. Examples include patients with incurable non-HIV-related malignancies or end-stage liver disease who are not being considered for liver transplantation. In this setting, deciding to forgo ART may be easier in patients with higher CD4 counts who are likely asymptomatic for HIV and in whom ART is unlikely to prolong survival. However, it should be noted that ART may improve outcomes, including survival, in patients with some HIV-associated malignancies (e.g., lymphoma, Kaposi sarcoma) and in patients with liver disease due to chronic HBV or HCV.

### **Long-term Non-Progressors and Elite HIV Controllers**

A small subset of HIV-infected individuals (~3% to 5%) can maintain normal CD4 counts for many years without treatment (long-term non-progressors), and an even smaller subset (~1%) can maintain low to undetectable HIV RNA levels for years (elite controllers).<sup>175,176</sup> Although there is significant overlap in these clinical phenotypes, many long-term non-progressors have detectable viremia and some controllers progress immunologically and clinically despite having no detectable viremia.

There are limited data on how to manage these individuals. Given potential harm associated with uncontrolled HIV replication, many of the preceding arguments for early therapy likely apply to non-progressors who have consistently detectable viremia (i.e., HIV RNA >200 to 1000 copies/mL). **Given that ongoing HIV replication occurs even in controllers, ART is also recommended for those rare controllers with evidence of disease progression, as defined by declining CD4 counts or development of HIV-related complications (AII).** The Panel has no recommendations on managing controllers with high CD4 counts,

although the fact that ART reduces the level of inflammation in this setting suggests that treatment may be beneficial.<sup>177</sup>

## The Need for Early Diagnosis of HIV

Fundamental to the earlier initiation of ART recommended in these guidelines is the assumption that patients will be diagnosed early in the course of HIV infection, making earlier initiation of therapy an option. Unfortunately, most HIV-infections are diagnosed at later stages of disease,<sup>178-181</sup> although in recent years, HIV is increasingly being detected earlier.<sup>4</sup> Despite the recommendations for routine, opt-out HIV screening in the health care setting regardless of perceptions about a patient's risk of infection,<sup>182</sup> the median CD4 count of newly diagnosed patients remains **below 350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>, although this number is increasing.**<sup>4</sup> Diagnosis of HIV infection is delayed more often in nonwhites, IDUs, and older patients than in other populations, and many individuals in these groups develop AIDS-defining illnesses within 1 year of diagnosis.<sup>178-181</sup> Therefore, to ensure that the current treatment guidelines have maximum impact, routine HIV screening per current CDC recommendations is essential. It is also critical that all newly diagnosed patients are educated about HIV disease and linked to care for full evaluation, follow-up, and management. Once patients are in care, focused effort is required to retain them in the health care system so that both the infected individuals and their sexual partners can fully benefit from early diagnosis and treatment.

## Conclusion

The current recommendations are based on growing evidence supporting earlier initiation of ART and the lack of demonstrable harm in starting therapy earlier. The strength of each recommendation varies according to the quality and availability of existing evidence supporting the recommendation. In addition to the benefit of earlier initiation of therapy for the health of the HIV-infected individual, the reduction in sexual transmission to HIV-uninfected individuals provides further reason for earlier initiation of ART. The Panel will continue to monitor and assess the results of ongoing and planned randomized clinical trials and observational studies, which will provide information to guide future Panel recommendations.

## 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10738050](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10738050).
2. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21767103](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21767103).
3. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19038438](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19038438).
4. 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/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20829678](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20829678).
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*. 2007;44(3):441-446. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17205456](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17205456).
6. Study Group on Death Rates at High CDCiANP, Lodwick RK, Sabin CA, et al. Death rates in HIV-positive antiretroviral-naïve patients with CD4 count greater than 350 cells per microL in Europe and North America: a pooled cohort observational study. *Lancet*. 2010;376(9738):340-345. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20638118>.
7. Mocroft A, Furrer HJ, Miro JM, et al. The incidence of AIDS-defining illnesses at a current CD4 count  $\geq$  200 cells/ $\mu$ L in the post-combination antiretroviral therapy era. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;57(7):1038-1047. Available at

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23921881>.

8. HIV Trialists' Collaborative Group. Zidovudine, didanosine, and zalcitabine in the treatment of HIV infection: meta-analyses of the randomised evidence. *Lancet*. 1999;353(9169):2014-2025. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10376616](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10376616).
9. Hammer SM, Squires KE, Hughes MD, et al. A controlled trial of two nucleoside analogues plus indinavir in persons with human immunodeficiency virus infection and CD4 cell counts of 200 per cubic millimeter or less. AIDS Clinical Trials Group 320 Study Team. *N Engl J Med*. 1997;337(11):725-733. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=9287227](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9287227).
10. Zolopa A, Andersen J, Powderly W, et al. Early antiretroviral therapy reduces AIDS progression/death in individuals with acute opportunistic infections: a multicenter randomized strategy trial. *PLoS One*. 2009;4(5):e5575. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19440326](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19440326).
11. Mocroft A, Vella S, Benfield TL, et al. Changing patterns of mortality across Europe in patients infected with HIV-1. EuroSIDA Study Group. *Lancet*. 1998;352(9142):1725-1730. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=9848347](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9848347).
12. Hogg RS, Yip B, Chan KJ, et al. Rates of disease progression by baseline CD4 cell count and viral load after initiating triple-drug therapy. *JAMA*. 2001;286(20):2568-2577. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11722271](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11722271).
13. Sterne JA, May M, Costagliola D, et al. Timing of initiation of antiretroviral therapy in AIDS-free HIV-1-infected patients: a collaborative analysis of 18 HIV cohort studies. *Lancet*. 2009;373(9672):1352-1363. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19361855](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19361855).
14. Baker JV, Peng G, Rapkin J, et al. CD4+ count and risk of non-AIDS diseases following initial treatment for HIV infection. *AIDS*. 2008;22(7):841-848. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18427202](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18427202).
15. Palella FJ, Jr., Deloria-Knoll M, Chmiel JS, et al. Survival benefit of initiating antiretroviral therapy in HIV-infected persons in different CD4+ cell strata. *Ann Intern Med*. 2003;138(8):620-626. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12693883](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12693883).
16. Cain LE, Logan R, Robins JM, et al. When to initiate combined antiretroviral therapy to reduce mortality and AIDS-defining illness in HIV-infected persons in developed countries: an observational study. *Ann Intern Med*. 2011;154(8):509-515. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21502648](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21502648).
17. Severe P, Juste MA, Ambroise A, et al. Early versus standard antiretroviral therapy for HIV-infected adults in Haiti. *N Engl J Med*. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20647201).
18. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19339714](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19339714).
19. Writing Committee for the CASCADE Collaboration. Timing of HAART initiation and clinical outcomes in human immunodeficiency virus type 1 seroconverters. *Arch Intern Med*. 2011;171(17):1560-1569. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21949165](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21949165).
20. Emery S, Neuhaus JA, Phillips AN, et al. Major clinical outcomes in antiretroviral therapy (ART)-naïve participants and in those not receiving ART at baseline in the SMART study. *J Infect Dis*. 2008;197(8):1133-1144. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18476292](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18476292).
21. Grinsztejn B HM, Swindells S, et al. Effect of early versus delayed initiation of antiretroviral therapy (ART) on clinical outcomes in the HPTN 052 randomized clinical trial. Abstract ThLBB05. Paper presented at: AIDS 2012 Conference; July 2012; Washington, DC.
22. Grinsztejn B, Hosseinipour MC, Ribaudo HJ, et al. Effects of early versus delayed initiation of antiretroviral treatment on clinical outcomes of HIV-1 infection: results from the phase 3 HPTN 052 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Infect Dis*. 2014;14(4):281-290. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24602844>.
23. Lesko CR, Cole SR, Zinski A, Poole C, Mugavero MJ. A systematic review and meta-regression of temporal trends in adult CD4(+) cell count at presentation to HIV care, 1992-2011. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;57(7):1027-1037. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23921882>.
24. Phillips AN, Gazzard B, Gilson R, et al. Rate of AIDS diseases or death in HIV-infected antiretroviral therapy-naïve



- individuals with high CD4 cell count. *AIDS*. 2007;21(13):1717-1721. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17690569>.
25. Grabar S, Selinger-Leneman H, Abgrall S, Pialoux G, Weiss L, Costagliola D. Prevalence and comparative characteristics of long-term nonprogressors and HIV controller patients in the French Hospital Database on HIV. *AIDS*. 2009;23(9):1163-1169. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19444075>.
26. Hogan CM, Degruittola 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. 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>.
28. Mellors JW, Rinaldo CR, Jr., Gupta P, White RM, Todd JA, Kingsley LA. Prognosis in HIV-1 infection predicted by the quantity of virus in plasma. *Science*. 1996;272(5265):1167-1170. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=8638160](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=8638160).
29. Vlahov D, Graham N, Hoover D, et al. Prognostic indicators for AIDS and infectious disease death in HIV-infected injection drug users: plasma viral load and CD4+ cell count. *JAMA*. 1998;279(1):35-40. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=9424041](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9424041).
30. Anastos K, Kalish LA, Hessol N, et al. The relative value of CD4 cell count and quantitative HIV-1 RNA in predicting survival in HIV-1-infected women: results of the women's interagency HIV study. *AIDS*. 1999;13(13):1717-1726. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10509574](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10509574).
31. O'Brien TR, Blattner WA, Waters D, et al. Serum HIV-1 RNA levels and time to development of AIDS in the Multicenter Hemophilia Cohort Study. *JAMA*. 1996;276(2):105-110. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=8656501](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=8656501).
32. 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*. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12126821).
33. Anastos K, Barron Y, Cohen MH, et al. The prognostic importance of changes in CD4+ cell count and HIV-1 RNA level in women after initiating highly active antiretroviral therapy. *Ann Intern Med*. 2004;140(4):256-264. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14970148](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=14970148).
34. 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*. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=8552144).
35. Hughes MD, Johnson VA, Hirsch MS, et al. Monitoring plasma HIV-1 RNA levels in addition to CD4+ lymphocyte count improves assessment of antiretroviral therapeutic response. ACTG 241 Protocol Virology Substudy Team. *Ann Intern Med*. 1997;126(12):929-938. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=9182469](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9182469).
36. Chene G, Sterne JA, May M, et al. Prognostic importance of initial response in HIV-1 infected patients starting potent antiretroviral therapy: analysis of prospective studies. *Lancet*. 2003;362(9385):679-686. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12957089](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12957089).
37. Deeks SG, Gange SJ, Kitahata MM, et al. Trends in multidrug treatment failure and subsequent mortality among antiretroviral therapy-experienced patients with HIV infection in North America. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2009;49(10):1582-1590. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19845473](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19845473).
38. Mugavero MJ, Napravnik S, Cole SR, et al. Viremia copy-years predicts mortality among treatment-naïve HIV-infected patients initiating antiretroviral therapy. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;53(9):927-935. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21890751](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21890751).
39. Reekie J, Gatell JM, Yust I, et al. Fatal and nonfatal AIDS and non-AIDS events in HIV-1-positive individuals with high CD4 cell counts according to viral load strata. *AIDS*. 2011;25(18):2259-2268. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21918422](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21918422).
40. Szczech LA, Gupta SK, Habash R, et al. The clinical epidemiology and course of the spectrum of renal diseases associated with HIV infection. *Kidney Int*. 2004;66(3):1145-1152. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15327410](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15327410).



41. Marras D, Bruggeman LA, Gao F, et al. Replication and compartmentalization of HIV-1 in kidney epithelium of patients with HIV-associated nephropathy. *Nat Med*. 2002;8(5):522-526. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11984599](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11984599).
42. Estrella M, Fine DM, Gallant JE, et al. HIV type 1 RNA level as a clinical indicator of renal pathology in HIV-infected patients. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2006;43(3):377-380. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16804855](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16804855).
43. Atta MG, Gallant JE, Rahman MH, et al. Antiretroviral therapy in the treatment of HIV-associated nephropathy. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2006;21(10):2809-2813. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16864598](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16864598).
44. Schwartz EJ, Szczech LA, Ross MJ, Klotman ME, Winston JA, Klotman PE. Highly active antiretroviral therapy and the epidemic of HIV+ end-stage renal disease. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2005;16(8):2412-2420. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15987747](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15987747).
45. Kalayjian RC, Franceschini N, Gupta SK, et al. Suppression of HIV-1 replication by antiretroviral therapy improves renal function in persons with low CD4 cell counts and chronic kidney disease. *AIDS*. 2008;22(4):481-487. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18301060](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18301060).
46. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18784461](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18784461).
47. 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*. 2002;360(9349):1921-1926. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12493258](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12493258).
48. Ly KN, Xing J, Klevens RM, Jiles RB, Ward JW, Holmberg SD. The increasing burden of mortality from viral hepatitis in the United States between 1999 and 2007. *Ann Intern Med*. 2012;156(4):271-278. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22351712>.
49. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16908797](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16908797).
50. Balagopal A, Philp FH, Astemborski J, et al. Human immunodeficiency virus-related microbial translocation and progression of hepatitis C. *Gastroenterology*. 2008;135(1):226-233. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18457674](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18457674).
51. Blackard JT, Kang M, St Clair JB, et al. Viral factors associated with cytokine expression during HCV/HIV co-infection. *J Interferon Cytokine Res*. 2007;27(4):263-269. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17477814](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17477814).
52. Hong F, Tuyama A, Lee TF, et al. Hepatic stellate cells express functional CXCR4: role in stromal cell-derived factor-1alpha-mediated stellate cell activation. *Hepatology*. 2009;49(6):2055-2067. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19434726](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19434726).
53. Macias J, Berenguer J, Japon MA, et al. Fast fibrosis progression between repeated liver biopsies in patients coinfecting with human immunodeficiency virus/hepatitis C virus. *Hepatology*. 2009;50(4):1056-1063. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19670415](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19670415).
54. Verma S, Goldin RD, Main J. Hepatic steatosis in patients with HIV-Hepatitis C Virus coinfection: is it associated with antiretroviral therapy and more advanced hepatic fibrosis? *BMC Res Notes*. 2008;1:46. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18710499](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18710499).
55. Ragni MV, Nalesnik MA, Schillo R, Dang Q. Highly active antiretroviral therapy improves ESLD-free survival in HIV-HCV co-infection. *Haemophilia*. 2009;15(2):552-558. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19347994](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19347994).
56. Matthews GV, Avihingsanon A, Lewin SR, et al. A randomized trial of combination hepatitis B therapy in HIV/HBV coinfecting antiretroviral naive individuals in Thailand. *Hepatology*. 2008;48(4):1062-1069. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18697216](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18697216).
57. 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*. 2006;44(5):1110-1116. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17058225](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17058225).
58. Avidan NU, Goldstein D, Rozenberg L, et al. Hepatitis C viral kinetics during treatment with peg IFN-alpha-2b in HIV/HCV

- coinfecting patients as a function of baseline CD4+ T-cell counts. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009;52(4):452-458. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19797971](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19797971).
59. Limketkai BN, Mehta SH, Sutcliffe CG, et al. Relationship of liver disease stage and antiviral therapy with liver-related events and death in adults coinfecting with HIV/HCV. *JAMA*. 2012;308(4):370-378. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22820790>.
  60. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17416261](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17416261).
  61. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18650512](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18650512).
  62. 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-naïve 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20032785](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20032785).
  63. Loko MA, Bani-Sadr F, Valantin MA, et al. Antiretroviral therapy and sustained virological response to HCV therapy are associated with slower liver fibrosis progression in HIV-HCV-coinfecting patients: study from the ANRS CO 13 HEPAVIH cohort. *Antivir Ther*. 2012;17(7):1335-1343. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23052829>.
  64. Brau N, Salvatore M, Rios-Bedoya CF, et al. Slower fibrosis progression in HIV/HCV-coinfecting patients with successful HIV suppression using antiretroviral therapy. *J Hepatol*. 2006;44(1):47-55. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16182404](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16182404).
  65. Thorpe J, Saeed S, Moodie EE, Klein MB, Canadian Co-infection Cohort S. Antiretroviral treatment interruption leads to progression of liver fibrosis in HIV-hepatitis C virus co-infection. *AIDS*. 2011;25(7):967-975. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21330904>.
  66. Smith C. Factors associated with specific causes of death amongst HIV-positive individuals in the D:A:D Study. *AIDS*. 2010;24(10):1537-1548. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20453631](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20453631).
  67. Mocroft A, Reiss P, Gasiorowski J, et al. Serious fatal and nonfatal non-AIDS-defining illnesses in Europe. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2010;55(2):262-270. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20700060](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20700060).
  68. Weber R SC, D:D:D Study Group. Trends over time in underlying causes of death in the D:A:D study from 1999 to 2011. Abstract THAB0304. Presented at: XIX International AIDS Conference; July 22–27, 2012; Washington, DC.
  69. Friis-Moller N, Reiss P, Sabin CA, et al. Class of antiretroviral drugs and the risk of myocardial infarction. *N Engl J Med*. 2007;356(17):1723-1735. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17460226](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17460226).
  70. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18387667](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18387667).
  71. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17135583).
  72. McComsey G, Smith K, Patel P, et al. Similar reductions in markers of inflammation and endothelial activation after initiation of abacavir/lamivudine or tenofovir/emtricitabine: The HEAT Study. Paper presented at: 16th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2009; Montreal, Canada.
  73. Torriani FJ, Komarow L, Parker RA, et al. Endothelial function in human immunodeficiency virus-infected antiretroviral-naïve subjects before and after starting potent antiretroviral therapy: The ACTG (AIDS Clinical Trials Group) Study 5152s. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2008;52(7):569-576. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18687253](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18687253).
  74. Phillips AN, Neaton J, Lundgren JD. The role of HIV in serious diseases other than AIDS. *AIDS*. 2008;22(18):2409-2418. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19005264](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19005264).

75. Baker JV, Duprez D, Rapkin J, et al. Untreated HIV infection and large and small artery elasticity. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009;52(1):25-31. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19731451](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19731451).
76. Marin B, Thiebaut R, Bucher HC, et al. Non-AIDS-defining deaths and immunodeficiency in the era of combination antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. 2009;23(13):1743-1753. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19571723](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19571723).
77. Wright TC, Jr., Ellerbrock TV, Chiasson MA, Van Devanter N, Sun XW. Cervical intraepithelial neoplasia in women infected with human immunodeficiency virus: prevalence, risk factors, and validity of Papanicolaou smears. New York Cervical Disease Study. *Obstet Gynecol*. 1994;84(4):591-597. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8090399>.
78. Palefsky JM, Holly EA, Gonzales J, Lamborn K, Hollander H. Natural history of anal cytologic abnormalities and papillomavirus infection among homosexual men with group IV HIV disease. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 1992;5(12):1258-1265. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/1333531>.
79. Bedimo RJ, McGinnis KA, Dunlap M, Rodriguez-Barradas MC, Justice AC. Incidence of non-AIDS-defining malignancies in HIV-infected versus noninfected patients in the HAART era: impact of immunosuppression. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19617846](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19617846).
80. Silverberg MJ, Chao C, Leyden WA, et al. HIV infection, immunodeficiency, viral replication, and the risk of cancer. Cancer epidemiology, biomarkers & prevention: a publication of the American Association for Cancer Research, cosponsored by the American Society of Preventive Oncology. 2011;20(12):2551-2559. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22109347>.
81. Silverberg MJ, Leyden W, Warton EM, Quesenberry CP, Jr., Engels EA, Asgari MM. HIV infection status, immunodeficiency, and the incidence of non-melanoma skin cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2013;105(5):350-360. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23291375>.
82. Shiels MS, Pfeiffer RM, Gail MH, et al. Cancer burden in the HIV-infected population in the United States. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2011;103(9):753-762. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21483021](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21483021).
83. Sigel K, Wisnivesky J, Gordon K, et al. HIV as an independent risk factor for incident lung cancer. *AIDS*. 2012;26(8):1017-1025. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22382152>.
84. Guiguet M, Boue F, Cadranel J, Lang JM, Rosenthal E, Costagliola D. Effect of immunodeficiency, HIV viral load, and antiretroviral therapy on the risk of individual malignancies (FHDH-ANRS CO4): a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Oncol*. 2009. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19818686](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19818686).
85. Monforte A, Abrams D, Pradier C, et al. HIV-induced immunodeficiency and mortality from AIDS-defining and non-AIDS-defining malignancies. *AIDS*. 2008;22(16):2143-2153. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18832878](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18832878).
86. Reekie J, Kosa C, Engsig F, et al. Relationship between current level of immunodeficiency and non-acquired immunodeficiency syndrome-defining malignancies. *Cancer*. 2010;116(22):5306-5315. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20661911](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20661911).
87. Bruyand M, Thiebaut R, Lawson-Ayayi S, et al. Role of uncontrolled HIV RNA level and immunodeficiency in the occurrence of malignancy in HIV-infected patients during the combination antiretroviral therapy era: Agence Nationale de Recherche sur le Sida (ANRS) CO3 Aquitaine Cohort. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2009;49(7):1109-1116. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19705973](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19705973).
88. Silverberg MJ, Chao C, Leyden WA, et al. HIV infection and the risk of cancers with and without a known infectious cause. *AIDS*. 2009;23(17):2337-2345. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19741479](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19741479).
89. Grulich AE, van Leeuwen MT, Falster MO, Vajdic CM. Incidence of cancers in people with HIV/AIDS compared with immunosuppressed transplant recipients: a meta-analysis. *Lancet*. 2007;370(9581):59-67. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17617273](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17617273).
90. Zoufaly A, Stellbrink HJ, Heiden MA, et al. Cumulative HIV viremia during highly active antiretroviral therapy is a strong predictor of AIDS-related lymphoma. *J Infect Dis*. 2009;200(1):79-87. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19476437](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19476437).
91. Silverberg MJ, Neuhaus J, Bower M, et al. Risk of cancers during interrupted antiretroviral therapy in the SMART study. *AIDS*. 2007;21(14):1957-1963. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17721103>.



92. Shiels MS, Pfeiffer RM, Hall HI, et al. Proportions of Kaposi sarcoma, selected non-Hodgkin lymphomas, and cervical cancer in the United States occurring in persons with AIDS, 1980-2007. *JAMA*. 2011;305(14):1450-1459. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21486978](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21486978).
93. Patel P, Hanson DL, Sullivan PS, et al. Incidence of types of cancer among HIV-infected persons compared with the general population in the United States, 1992-2003. *Ann Intern Med*. 2008;148(10):728-736. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18490686](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18490686).
94. Simard EP, Pfeiffer RM, Engels EA. Cumulative incidence of cancer among individuals with acquired immunodeficiency syndrome in the United States. *Cancer*. 2011;117(5):1089-1096. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20960504](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20960504).
95. Gopal S, Patel MR, Yanik EL, et al. Temporal trends in presentation and survival for HIV-associated lymphoma in the antiretroviral therapy era. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2013;105(16):1221-1229. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23892362>.
96. Worm SW, Bower M, Reiss P, et al. Non-AIDS defining cancers in the D:A:D Study—time trends and predictors of survival: a cohort study. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2013;13:471. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24106926>.
97. Riedel DJ, Mwangi EI, Fantry LE, et al. High cancer-related mortality in an urban, predominantly African-American, HIV-infected population. *AIDS*. 2013;27(7):1109-1117. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23262503>.
98. McArthur JC, McClellon DR, Cronin MF, et al. Relationship between human immunodeficiency virus-associated dementia and viral load in cerebrospinal fluid and brain. *Ann Neurol*. 1997;42(5):689-698. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=9392567](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9392567).
99. Spudich SS, Nilsson AC, Lollo ND, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid HIV infection and pleocytosis: relation to systemic infection and antiretroviral treatment. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2005;5:98. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16266436>.
100. Ellis RJ, Badiee J, Vaida F, et al. CD4 nadir is a predictor of HIV neurocognitive impairment in the era of combination antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. 2011;25(14):1747-1751. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21750419>.
101. Valcour V, Chalermchai T, Sailasuta N, et al. Central nervous system viral invasion and inflammation during acute HIV infection. *J Infect Dis*. 2012;206(2):275-282. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22551810>.
102. Navia BA, Jordan BD, Price RW. The AIDS dementia complex: I. Clinical features. *Ann Neurol*. 1986;19(6):517-524. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=3729308](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=3729308).
103. Antinori A, Arendt G, Becker JT, et al. Updated research nosology for HIV-associated neurocognitive disorders. *Neurology*. 2007;69(18):1789-1799. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17914061](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17914061).
104. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21135382](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21135382).
105. Schnell G, Price RW, Swanstrom R, Spudich S. Compartmentalization and clonal amplification of HIV-1 variants in the cerebrospinal fluid during primary infection. *J Virol*. 2010;84(5):2395-2407. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20015984>.
106. Schnell G, Joseph S, Spudich S, Price RW, Swanstrom R. HIV-1 replication in the central nervous system occurs in two distinct cell types. *PLoS Pathog*. 2011;7(10):e1002286. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22007152>.
107. Mellgren A, Antinori A, Cinque P, et al. Cerebrospinal fluid HIV-1 infection usually responds well to antiretroviral treatment. *Antivir Ther*. 2005;10(6):701-707. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16218168](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16218168).
108. d'Arminio Monforte A, Cinque P, Mocroft A, et al. Changing incidence of central nervous system diseases in the EuroSIDA cohort. *Ann Neurol*. 2004;55(3):320-328. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14991809](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=14991809).
109. Bhaskaran K, Mussini C, Antinori A, et al. Changes in the incidence and predictors of human immunodeficiency virus-associated dementia in the era of highly active antiretroviral therapy. *Ann Neurol*. 2008;63(2):213-221. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17894380](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17894380).
110. Lescure FX, Omland LH, Engsig FN, et al. Incidence and impact on mortality of severe neurocognitive disorders in persons with and without HIV infection: a Danish nationwide cohort study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2011;52(2):235-243. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21288850](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21288850).
111. Abdulle S, Mellgren A, Brew BJ, et al. CSF neurofilament protein (NFL) -- a marker of active HIV-related neurodegeneration. *J Neurol*. 2007;254(8):1026-1032. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17420923>.

112. Simioni S, Cavassini M, Annoni JM, et al. Cognitive dysfunction in HIV patients despite long-standing suppression of viremia. *AIDS*. 2010;24(9):1243-1250. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19996937](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19996937).
113. Munoz-Moreno JA, Fumaz CR, Ferrer MJ, et al. Nadir CD4 cell count predicts neurocognitive impairment in HIV-infected patients. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2008;24(10):1301-1307. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18844464](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18844464).
114. 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>.
115. Garvey L, Surendrakumar V, Winston A. Low rates of neurocognitive impairment are observed in neuro-asymptomatic HIV-infected subjects on effective antiretroviral therapy. *HIV Clin Trials*. 2011;12(6):333-338. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22189152>.
116. Robinson-Papp J, Simpson DM. Neuromuscular diseases associated with HIV-1 infection. *Muscle Nerve*. 2009;40(6):1043-1053. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19771594>.
117. Evans SR, Ellis RJ, Chen H, et al. Peripheral neuropathy in HIV: prevalence and risk factors. *AIDS*. 2011;25(7):919-928. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21330902](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21330902).
118. Ellis RJ, Rosario D, Clifford DB, et al. Continued high prevalence and adverse clinical impact of human immunodeficiency virus-associated sensory neuropathy in the era of combination antiretroviral therapy: the CHARTER Study. *Arch Neurol*. 2010;67(5):552-558. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20457954](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20457954).
119. The Collaboration of Observational HIV Epidemiological Research Europe (COHERE) study group. Response to combination antiretroviral therapy: variation by age. *AIDS*. 2008;22(12):1463-1473. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18614870](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18614870).
120. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17087819](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17087819).
121. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17146370](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17146370).
122. Wright ST, Petoumenos K, Boyd M, et al. Ageing and long-term CD4 cell count trends in HIV-positive patients with 5 years or more combination antiretroviral therapy experience. *HIV Med*. 2013;14(4):208-216. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23036045>.
123. 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*. 2003;187(10):1534-1543. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12721933](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12721933).
124. Neuhaus J, Jacobs DR, Jr., Baker JV, et al. Markers of inflammation, coagulation, and renal function are elevated in adults with HIV infection. *J Infect Dis*. 2010;201(12):1788-1795. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20446848](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20446848).
125. Kuller LH, Tracy R, Belloso W, et al. Inflammatory and coagulation biomarkers and mortality in patients with HIV infection. *PLoS Med*. 2008;5(10):e203. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18942885](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18942885).
126. Sandler NG, Wand H, Roque A, et al. Plasma levels of soluble CD14 independently predict mortality in HIV infection. *J Infect Dis*. 2011;203(6):780-790. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21252259>.
127. Duprez DA, Neuhaus J, Kuller LH, et al. Inflammation, coagulation and cardiovascular disease in HIV-infected individuals. *PLoS One*. 2012;7(9):e44454. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22970224>.
128. Borges AH, Silverberg MJ, Wentworth D, et al. Predicting risk of cancer during HIV infection: the role of inflammatory and coagulation biomarkers. *AIDS*. 2013;27(9):1433-1441. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23945504>.
129. Mocroft A, Phillips AN, Gatell J, et al. Normalisation of CD4 counts in patients with HIV-1 infection and maximum virological suppression who are taking combination antiretroviral therapy: an observational cohort study. *Lancet*. 2007;370(9585):407-413. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17659333>.
130. 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*. 2009;48(6):787-794. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19193107>.
131. 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*. 2010;51(4):435-447. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20597691](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20597691).
132. Freiberg MS, Chang CC, Kuller LH, et al. HIV infection and the risk of acute myocardial infarction. *JAMA Internal Medicine*. 2013;173(8):614-622. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23459863>.
133. Rodger AJ, Fox Z, Lundgren JD, et al. Activation and coagulation biomarkers are independent predictors of the development of opportunistic disease in patients with HIV infection. *J Infect Dis*. 2009;200(6):973-983. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19678756](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19678756).
134. Palella FJ, Jr., Gange SJ, Benning L, et al. Inflammatory biomarkers and abacavir use in the Women's Interagency HIV Study and the Multicenter AIDS Cohort Study. *AIDS*. 2010;24(11):1657-1665. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20588104](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20588104).
135. Lange CG, Lederman MM, Medvik K, et al. Nadir CD4+ T-cell count and numbers of CD28+ CD4+ T-cells predict functional responses to immunizations in chronic HIV-1 infection. *AIDS*. 2003;17(14):2015-2023. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14502004](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=14502004).
136. Robbins GK, Spritzler JG, Chan ES, et al. Incomplete reconstitution of T cell subsets on combination antiretroviral therapy in the AIDS Clinical Trials Group protocol 384. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2009;48(3):350-361. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19123865](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19123865).
137. 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>.
138. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18453857](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18453857).
139. 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 <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/PerinatalGL.pdf>.
140. Vernazza PL, Troiani L, Flepp MJ, et al. Potent antiretroviral treatment of HIV-infection results in suppression of the seminal shedding of HIV. The Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *AIDS*. 2000;14(2):117-121. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10708281](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10708281).
141. Coombs RW, Reichelderfer PS, Landay AL. Recent observations on HIV type-1 infection in the genital tract of men and women. *AIDS*. 2003;17(4):455-480. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12598766](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12598766).
142. Tovanabutra S, Robison V, Wongtrakul J, et al. Male viral load and heterosexual transmission of HIV-1 subtype E in northern Thailand. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2002;29(3):275-283. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11873077](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11873077).
143. Kayitenkore K, Bekan B, Rufagari J, et al. The impact of ART on HIV transmission among HIV serodiscordant couples. Paper presented at: XVI International AIDS Conference; 2009; Toronto, Canada.
144. Reynolds S, Makumbi F, Kagaayi J, et al. ART reduced the rate of sexual transmission of HIV among HIV-discordant couples in rural Rakai, Uganda. Paper presented at: 16th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2009; Montreal, Canada.
145. Sullivan P, Kayitenkore K, Chomba E, et al. Reduction of HIV transmission risk and high risk sex while prescribed ART: Results from discordant couples in Rwanda and Zambia. Paper presented at: 16th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2009; Montreal, Canada.
146. Tanser F, Barnighausen T, Grapsa E, Zaidi J, Newell ML. High coverage of ART associated with decline in risk of HIV acquisition in rural KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Science*. 2013;339(6122):966-971. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23430656>.
147. Bunnell R, Ekwaru JP, Solberg P, et al. Changes in sexual behavior and risk of HIV transmission after antiretroviral therapy and prevention interventions in rural Uganda. *AIDS*. 2006;20(1):85-92. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16327323](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16327323).

148. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16123689](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16123689).
149. Wilson DP, Law MG, Grulich AE, Cooper DA, Kaldor JM. Relation between HIV viral load and infectiousness: a model-based analysis. *Lancet*. 2008;372(9635):314-320. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18657710](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18657710).
150. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20039804](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20039804).
151. Horberg M, Tang B, Towner W, et al. Impact of tenofovir on renal function in HIV-infected, antiretroviral-naïve patients. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2010;53(1):62-69. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19838127>.
152. 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>.
153. Scherzer R, Estrella M, Li Y, et al. Association of tenofovir exposure with kidney disease risk in HIV infection. *AIDS*. 2012;26(7):867-875. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22313955>.
154. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19474757](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19474757).
155. Abraham AG, Lau B, Deeks S, et al. Missing data on the estimation of the prevalence of accumulated human immunodeficiency virus drug resistance in patients treated with antiretroviral drugs in north america. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2011;174(6):727-735. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21813792>.
156. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11248160](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11248160).
157. Schackman BR, Goldie SJ, Weinstein MC, Losina E, Zhang H, Freedberg KA. Cost-effectiveness of earlier initiation of antiretroviral therapy for uninsured HIV-infected adults. *Am J Public Health*. 2001;91(9):1456-1463. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11527782](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11527782).
158. Mauskopf J, Kitahata M, Kauf T, Richter A, Tolson J. HIV antiretroviral treatment: early versus later. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2005;39(5):562-569. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16044008](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16044008).
159. Chen RY, Accortt NA, Westfall AO, et al. Distribution of health care expenditures for HIV-infected patients. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2006;42(7):1003-1010. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16511767](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16511767).
160. 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>.
161. 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 Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Available at [http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult\\_oi.pdf](http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult_oi.pdf). Accessed January 6, 2014.
162. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19365271](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19365271).
163. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16231262](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16231262).
164. Boulware D MD, Muzoora C, et al. ART initiation within the first 2 weeks of cryptococcal meningitis is associated with higher mortality: a multisite randomized trial. Abstract 144. Paper presented at CROI; 2013.
165. 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

- [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19131895](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19131895).
166. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20181971](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20181971).
  167. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=22010915](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=22010915).
  168. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=22010913](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=22010913).
  169. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=22010914](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=22010914).
  170. Lu M, Safren SA, Skolnik PR, et al. Optimal recall period and response task for self-reported HIV medication adherence. *AIDS Behav*. 2008;12(1):86-94. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17577653](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17577653).
  171. 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*. 2006;10(3):227-245. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16783535](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16783535).
  172. Bisson GP, Gross R, Bellamy S, et al. Pharmacy refill adherence compared with CD4 count changes for monitoring HIV-infected adults on antiretroviral therapy. *PLoS Med*. 2008;5(5):e109. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18494555](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18494555).
  173. Kalichman SC, Amaral CM, Cherry C, et al. Monitoring medication adherence by unannounced pill counts conducted by telephone: reliability and criterion-related validity. *HIV Clin Trials*. 2008;9(5):298-308. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18977718](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18977718).
  174. Moss AR, Hahn JA, Perry S, et al. Adherence to highly active antiretroviral therapy in the homeless population in San Francisco: a prospective study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2004;39(8):1190-1198. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15486844](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15486844).
  175. Hunt PW, Brenchley J, Sinclair E, et al. Relationship between T cell activation and CD4+ T cell count in HIV-seropositive individuals with undetectable plasma HIV RNA levels in the absence of therapy. *J Infect Dis*. 2008;197(1):126-133. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18171295](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18171295).
  176. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17537849](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17537849).
  177. 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>.
  178. Egger M. Outcomes of ART in resource-limited and industrialized countries. Paper presented at: 14th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2007; Los Angeles, CA.
  179. Wolbers M, Bucher HC, Furrer H, et al. Delayed diagnosis of HIV infection and late initiation of antiretroviral therapy in the Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *HIV Med*. 2008;9(6):397-405. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18410354](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18410354).
  180. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Late HIV testing—34 states, 1996–2005. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2009;58(24):661-665. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19553901](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19553901).
  181. Grigoryan A, Hall HI, Durant T, Wei X. Late HIV diagnosis and determinants of progression to AIDS or death after HIV diagnosis among injection drug users, 33 US States, 1996-2004. *PLoS One*. 2009;4(2):e4445. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19214229](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19214229).
  182. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16988643](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16988643).

# What to Start: Initial Combination Regimens for the Antiretroviral-Naive Patient (Last updated May 20, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

Panel's Recommendations
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The optimal antiretroviral (ARV) regimen for a treatment-naive patient consists of two NRTIs in combination with a third active ARV drug from one of three drug classes: an NNRTI, a PI boosted with ritonavir, or an INSTI <b>(AI)</b>.</li> <li>The Panel recommends one of the following regimens for ART-naive patients regardless of baseline viral load or CD4 count: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>NNRTI-Based Regimen:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EFV/TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> <b>(AI)</b></li> </ul> </li> <li><u>PI-Based Regimens:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ATV/r plus TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> <b>(AI)</b></li> <li>DRV/r plus TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> <b>(AI)</b></li> </ul> </li> <li><u>INSTI-Based Regimens:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>DTG plus ABC/3TC<sup>a</sup> <b>(AI)</b>—<u>only</u> for patients who are HLA-B*5701 negative</li> <li>DTG plus TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> <b>(AI)</b></li> <li>EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC—<u>only</u> for patients with pre-ART CrCl &gt;70 mL/min <b>(AI)</b></li> <li>RAL plus TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> <b>(AI)</b></li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>In addition to the regimens listed above, the following regimens are also recommended, <b>but only for patients with pre-ART plasma HIV RNA &lt;100,000 copies/mL</b>: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><u>NNRTI-Based Regimens:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>EFV plus ABC/3TC<sup>a</sup> <b>(AI)</b>—<u>only</u> for patients who are HLA-B*5701 negative</li> <li>RPV/TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> <b>(AI)</b>—<u>only</u> for patients with CD4 count &gt;200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> </li> <li><u>PI-Based Regimen:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ATV/r plus ABC/3TC<sup>a</sup> <b>(AI)</b>—<u>only</u> for patients who are HLA-B*5701 negative</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>On the basis of individual patient characteristics and needs, an Alternative Regimen may in some instances be the optimal regimen for a patient. <a href="#">A list of Alternative Regimens can be found in Table 6.</a></li> <li>Selection of a regimen should be individualized on the basis of virologic efficacy, toxicity, pill burden, dosing frequency, drug-drug interaction potential, resistance testing results, comorbid conditions, and cost.</li> <li>To assist clinicians in selecting the best treatment for a patient, <a href="#">Table 7</a> highlights the advantages and disadvantages of different components in a regimen.</li> </ul> <p><sup>a</sup> 3TC may substitute for FTC or vice versa.</p> <p><b>Rating of Recommendations:</b> A = Strong; B = Moderate; C = Optional</p> <p><b>Rating of Evidence:</b> 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</p> <p><b>Key to Acronyms:</b> 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir; cobi = cobicistat; CrCl = creatinine clearance; DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir; <b>DTG = dolutegravir</b>; EFV = efavirenz; EVG = elvitegravir; FTC = emtricitabine; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; PI = protease inhibitor; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate</p>

## Introduction

More than 20 antiretroviral (ARV) drugs in 6 mechanistic classes are Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved for treatment of HIV infection. These six classes include the nucleoside/nucleotide reverse



transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs), non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs), protease inhibitors (PIs), fusion inhibitors (FIs), a CCR5 antagonist, and integrase strand transfer inhibitors (INSTIs).

The optimal initial ARV regimen for a treatment-naïve patient consists of two NRTIs in combination with a drug from one of three drug classes: an NNRTI, a PI boosted with ritonavir (RTV), or an INSTI. As shown in clinical trials and **by retrospective evaluation of cohorts of patients in clinical care**, this strategy has resulted in HIV RNA decreases and CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell increases in most patients.<sup>1,2</sup>

Since 2009, the Panel has listed four regimens as “Preferred” for initial therapy of HIV infection: the NRTI combination tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine (TDF/FTC) with one of the following: efavirenz (EFV), ritonavir-boosted atazanavir (ATV/r) or ritonavir-boosted darunavir (DRV/r), or raltegravir (RAL). Subsequently, the FDA has approved several new agents and co-formulated products for treatment-naïve individuals on the basis of data from randomized clinical trials that compared regimens containing the newer drugs to one of the four preferred regimens. On the basis of this data, as well as from long-term follow-up of these studies and experience in clinical practice, the Panel recognizes that options for initial therapy have expanded. Consequently, the Panel now refers to these options for initial treatment as “Recommended” rather than “Preferred” regimens.

The revised [Table 6](#) lists Recommended and Alternative initial options for HIV treatment. The table also lists additional regimens that may be recommended for patients with pre-treatment plasma viral load <100,000 copies/mL. Each of the options listed has demonstrated favorable antiviral efficacy, safety, and tolerability in comparative clinical trials. **The list of Alternative regimens has been shortened because with more Recommended options, clinicians should be able to choose a Recommended regimen for most treatment-naïve patients. The Alternative regimens listed are effective and tolerable but, when compared with Recommended options, have potential disadvantages or less data supporting their use.**

Previous versions of these Guidelines listed several options for initial therapy that included ARV agents that are less effective, less convenient, and/or more toxic than current options—specifically, zidovudine (ZDV), nevirapine (NVP), ritonavir-boosted saquinavir (SQV/r), ritonavir-boosted fosamprenavir (FPV/r), unboosted atazanavir (ATV), and maraviroc (MVC). Given that many better options are now available, the panel no longer considers the components listed as suitable agents for initial treatment.

Aside from the change in terminology from “Preferred” to “Recommended” regimens, the major additions to the list of options for initial treatment are the inclusion of the following INSTI-based options as Recommended regimens (regardless of pre-treatment HIV RNA):

- Dolutegravir (DTG) plus abacavir/lamivudine (ABC/3TC) or TDF/FTC **(AI)**
- Elvitegravir (EVG)/cobicistat (cobi)/TDF/FTC **(AI)**

Additionally, the following three regimens are now listed as Recommended regimens, but only for patients with pre-treatment HIV RNA level <100,000 copies/mL:

- EFV plus ABC/3TC **(AI)**
- Rilpivirine (RPV)/TDF/FTC (and if CD4 cell count >200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) **(AI)**
- ATV/r plus ABC/3TC **(AI)**

The change in classification of EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC and RPV/TDF/FTC regimens is based on additional efficacy and safety data. DTG, when given once daily in combination with two NRTIs (TDF/FTC or ABC/3TC), has demonstrated non-inferiority to RAL and superiority to both EFV and DRV/r. These newer options are reviewed in greater detail below.



## Data Used for Making Recommendations

The Panel's recommendations are primarily based on clinical trial data published in peer-reviewed journals and data prepared by manufacturers for FDA review. In select cases, the Panel considers data presented in abstract format at major scientific meetings. The first criterion for selection of evidence on which to base recommendations is published information from a randomized, prospective clinical trial with an adequate sample size that demonstrates that an ARV regimen has shown durable viral suppression, increased CD4 cell count, and has a favorable safety profile. 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.

The Panel reviewed data from randomized clinical trials and other reports to arrive at "Recommended" or "Alternative" regimens, as specified in [Table 6](#). "Recommended regimens" are those studied in randomized controlled trials and shown to have optimal and durable virologic efficacy, favorable tolerability and toxicity profiles, and ease of use. "Alternative regimens" are those that are effective but have potential disadvantages or fewer data than "Recommended regimens." In certain situations and depending on individual patient characteristics and needs, a regimen listed as an Alternative may actually be the optimal regimen for a specific patient.

## Considerations When Selecting A Regimen for Antiretroviral Therapy-Naive Patients

### *Factors to Consider When Selecting an Initial Regimen*

Regimen selection should be individualized on the basis of a variety of factors, including the following:

- Results of HIV genotypic drug resistance testing
- Pre-treatment HIV RNA level (viral load)
- The regimen's genetic barrier to resistance
- Potential adverse drug effects
- Known or potential drug interactions with other medications
- The patient's comorbid conditions (e.g., cardiovascular disease [CVD], chronic hepatitis B [HBV] or hepatitis C [HCV] infection, drug abuse or dependency, liver or renal disease, psychiatric illnesses, or tuberculosis [TB])
- Pregnancy or pregnancy potential. Clinicians should refer to the latest [Perinatal Guidelines](#) for more detailed recommendations on the safety and effectiveness of ARV drugs during pregnancy.
- HLA-B\*5701 testing if considering ABC
- Patient preferences and adherence potential
- Convenience (e.g., pill burden, dosing frequency, availability of fixed dose combination products, food requirements)
- Cost (see [Cost Consideration and Antiretroviral Therapy](#))

Each of the recommended initial regimens listed in [Table 6](#) has shown potent virologic efficacy as measured by the proportion of participants in comparative clinical trials able to achieve and maintain viral suppression. On the basis of study results, some of the regimens are recommended for patients regardless of pre-treatment HIV RNA level whereas others are recommended only for patients whose baseline HIV RNA is <100,000 copies/mL.

[Table 7](#) lists the potential advantages and disadvantages of the components used in Recommended and Alternative regimens. [Table 8](#) lists agents or regimens not recommended for initial treatment. [Appendix B, Tables 1–6](#) lists characteristics of individual ARV agents, such as formulations, dosing recommendations,

pharmacokinetics (PKs), and common adverse effects. [Appendix B, Table 7](#) provides ARV dosing recommendations for patients who have renal or hepatic insufficiency.

### ***Choosing Between Recommended Initial Regimens***

Recommended regimens for initial treatment include two NRTIs combined with a third agent: an NNRTI, a ritonavir-boosted PI, or an INSTI.

#### **Choosing a Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor Combination**

Recommended regimens include the NRTI combination of TDF/FTC or ABC/3TC; both are available as fixed-dose combination tablets and are dosed once daily. One consideration when choosing between these NRTI combinations is virologic efficacy. A large randomized trial comparing TDF/FTC and ABC/3TC—each combined with either ATV/r or EFV—found that TDF/FTC resulted in better virologic responses than ABC/3TC in participants with pre-treatment HIV RNA levels  $\geq 100,000$  copies/mL; this difference was not seen in patients with HIV RNA  $< 100,000$  copies/mL.<sup>3</sup> Another study comparing TDF/FTC and ABC/3TC, each combined with ritonavir-boosted lopinavir (LPV/r), did not find differences in virologic efficacy between the NRTI pairs.<sup>4</sup> In the SINGLE trial, in which DTG plus ABC/3TC was compared to EFV/TDF/FTC, there was no difference in virologic responses between TDF/FTC and ABC/3TC in patients with high HIV RNA levels.<sup>5</sup> Potential adverse events are another consideration when choosing between these NRTI combinations. TDF can cause nephrotoxicity, particularly in patients who have pre-existing renal disease or risk factors for kidney disease (e.g., use of other nephrotoxic drugs) or in those receiving PIs. Patients who start TDF-containing regimens have a greater initial decrease in bone mineral density than those who start ABC-containing therapy, although bone density levels subsequently stabilize.

Before starting ABC, a patient must be tested for the HLA B\*5701 allele, which predicts hypersensitivity to this drug. In the United States, approximately 8% of whites and 2.5% of African Americans are positive for this allele.<sup>6</sup> Some observational studies have linked ABC to increased rates of myocardial infarction,<sup>7-9</sup> but this finding has not been confirmed in all analyses of clinical trial data, including a meta-analysis conducted by the FDA.<sup>10</sup>

One final consideration in choosing an NRTI combination is hepatitis B coinfection. TDF/FTC is the preferred NRTI combination in patients who also have chronic hepatitis B because both agents have activity against HBV.

ZDV/3TC is no longer recommended for initial treatment of HIV infection in non-pregnant adults because it has more toxicities than TDF/FTC or ABC/3TC and requires twice daily dosing.

#### **Choosing between a Non- Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor, Protease Inhibitor, or Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor as the Third Drug in the Regimen**

Factors influencing the choice between an NNRTI, PI or INSTI as the third drug in a regimen include efficacy, adverse effects, convenience (e.g., dosing frequency, number of pills, food requirements), genetic barrier to resistance, co-morbidities, concomitant medications, and potential for drug-drug interactions. All of the Recommended NNRTI-, PI- and INSTI-based regimens are potent, demonstrating high rates of virologic suppression in clinical trials. However, because lower virologic efficacy has been seen in patients with high baseline HIV RNA levels who received RPV- based regimen, it is recommended only in patients with HIV RNA levels  $< 100,000$  copies/mL. Some adverse events are specific to particular drugs within each drug class (see [Table 7](#)) and are an important consideration when selecting an initial regimen. In terms of convenience, once-daily single-pill combinations that contain all components of a regimen are currently available for TDF/FTC plus an NNRTI (EFV or RPV) or an INSTI (EVG/cobi). Patients and clinicians often prefer these regimens because of their low pill burden and favorable dosing frequency.

In contrast, regimens that include PIs have a greater pill burden, typically 3 pills once a day. However, PIs have a high genetic barrier to resistance: multiple viral mutations are generally required to reduce the activity of agents in this class, and virologic failure rarely selects for PI-resistance. Consequently, some clinicians consider regimens that include PIs to be the initial regimens of choice for patients with suboptimal or unknown adherence and a higher risk for virologic failure. In addition, because transmitted drug resistance to PIs is relatively uncommon, drugs in the PI class are favored when a regimen is started before HIV resistance testing results are available (e.g., when treating acute HIV infection, including in those who became HIV infected while prescribed TDF/FTC for pre-exposure prophylaxis). However, PIs and cobi (a pharmacoenhancer that increases EVG levels) are potent inhibitors of the cytochrome p450 pathway; therefore, regimens containing these drugs have a greater potential for drug-drug interactions than other combinations, which may be a disadvantage in patients who are receiving other medications that are primarily metabolized through this pathway.

### **Choosing Among Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor Options**

Among the Recommended regimens, EFV in combination with TDF/FTC has been studied in the greatest number of clinical trials.<sup>11-16</sup> This regimen, which also has extensive use in clinical practice, is available in a single tablet, once-daily formulation. In a large randomized trial comparing ABC/3TC plus EFV and TDF/FTC/EFV, ABC/3TC plus EFV showed inferior virologic responses in patients with pre-treatment HIV-1 RNA levels  $\geq 100,000$  copies/mL.<sup>3</sup> On the basis of these results, TDF/FTC/EFV is a Recommended regimen regardless of HIV RNA level, whereas ABC/3TC plus EFV is a Recommended option only for patients with pretreatment HIV RNA levels  $< 100,000$  copies/mL. Disadvantages of EFV-containing regimens include central nervous system (CNS) side effects, which resolve or improve in some, but not all, patients; a higher incidence of rash (including severe skin reactions) than with other Recommended regimens; and dyslipidemia. Because of potential teratogenicity of EFV, regimens that do not include EFV should be considered in women who wish to conceive or are sexually active and not using contraception. A suppressive EFV-based regimen can be continued in pregnant women who present for antenatal care in the first trimester because the risk of neural tube defects is restricted to the first 5 to 6 weeks of pregnancy, before pregnancy is usually recognized. EFV induces the cytochrome p450 pathway; therefore, regimens containing EFV have a potential for drug-drug interactions, which may be a disadvantage in those patients who are receiving other medications.

Studies comparing RPV to EFV, each in combination with two NRTIs, found equal rates of virologic suppression for the drugs. However, in patients with pre-therapy HIV RNA  $> 100,000$  copies/mL or CD4 count  $< 200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>, the rate of virologic failure was higher in patients who were randomized to RPV than to EFV.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, RPV is a recommended option **only** when a patient's pre-treatment HIV RNA is  $< 100,000$  copies/mL and CD4 count  $> 200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. In these studies, RPV-containing regimens were better tolerated than EFV-containing combinations, and had fewer adverse lipid effects. RPV in combination with TDF/FTC is available as a single tablet, once daily formulation. RPV with ABC/3TC is not available in a single tablet formulation and has substantially less experience in clinical trials and practice than RPV/TDF/FTC. RPV must be taken with a meal. Because RPV requires stomach acid for absorption, it cannot be taken with proton pump inhibitors and should be used with caution (i.e., staggered dosing) in patients receiving H<sub>2</sub> blockers or antacids.

Nevirapine (NVP) is no longer a Recommended or Alternative NNRTI because of greater toxicity and the availability of better options.

### **Choosing Among Protease Inhibitor Options**

ATV/r is as effective as EFV, but causes fewer CNS side effects and less rash and has a more favorable lipid profile when used in combination with two NRTIs.<sup>13</sup> One study found that among women enrolled in the study, those randomized to ATV/r had a lower virologic response rate than those randomized to EFV.<sup>17</sup> ATV can cause reversible indirect hyperbilirubinemia, which may result in visible jaundice or scleral icterus in a small proportion of patients. ATV has also been associated with nephrolithiasis, nephrotoxicity, and

cholelithiasis. Optimal absorption of ATV depends on the presence of food and low gastric pH; if acid-reducing agents are needed, ATV should be co-administered according to dosing guidelines shown in [Table 18a](#). In the only randomized trial of ATV/r with either ABC/3TC or TDF/FTC, ABC/3TC showed an inferior response in patients with pre-treatment HIV RNA levels  $\geq 100,000$  copies/mL.<sup>3</sup> Therefore, ATV/r plus TDF/FTC is a Recommended regimen regardless of HIV RNA, whereas ATV/r plus ABC/3TC is a Recommended option only for patients with pretreatment HIV RNA levels  $< 100,000$  copies/mL.

DRV/r shares many of the characteristics of boosted ATV, but does not cause hyperbilirubinemia, nephrolithiasis, nephrotoxicity, or cholelithiasis, and can be given with acid-reducing agents. Patients initiating DRV/r may develop a skin rash, which is usually mild to moderate in severity and self-limited. Rarely, severe rash with fever or elevated transaminase levels may occur, which necessitates discontinuation of the drug. There is more experience in clinical trials and practice with DRV/r plus TDF/FTC than with DRV/r plus ABC/3TC; therefore, DRV/r plus TDF/FTC is a Recommended regimen whereas DRV/r plus ABC/3TC is an Alternative regimen.

ACTG A5257, a large randomized open-label trial comparing ATV/r, DRV/r, and RAL, each given with TDF/FTC, found that all 3 regimens had similar virologic efficacy at week 96. A significantly higher proportion of patients in the ATV/r arm discontinued randomized treatment because of adverse events, mostly because of elevated indirect bilirubin/jaundice or gastrointestinal toxicities. Lipid changes were similar in the ATV/r and DRV/r arms.<sup>18</sup>

### **Choosing Among Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor Options**

RAL plus TDF/FTC demonstrated comparable antiviral efficacy to EFV/TDF/FTC but with fewer drug-related adverse effects and a more favorable lipid profile.<sup>12,16</sup> RAL has fewer drug-drug interactions than boosted-PI, EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC, and EFV-based regimens, and is therefore easier to use in a patient who is receiving a complex medication regimen. One disadvantage of RAL is that it requires twice-daily dosing. There is more experience in clinical trials and practice with RAL plus TDF/FTC than with ABC/3TC; therefore, RAL plus TDF/FTC is a Recommended regimen whereas RAL plus ABC/3TC is an Alternative regimen.

EVG combined with cobi (a pharmacoenhancer that boosts EVG concentrations) and TDF/FTC is available as a single-pill combination that is dosed once daily. EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC has comparable virologic activity to EFV/TDF/FTC<sup>19</sup> or ATV/r plus TDF/FTC.<sup>20</sup> The combination is well tolerated, with lower rates of neuropsychiatric adverse effects and rash than EFV/TDF/FTC. Cobi inhibits the tubular secretion of creatinine; as a result, soon after starting EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC, patients may have an increase in serum creatinine levels (average increase approximately 0.14 mg/dL; increase in most patients  $< 0.4$  mg/dL); levels usually stabilize soon after starting the drug. This regimen should be used only in patients with estimated creatinine clearance  $\geq 70$  mL/min. Because cobi, like PIs, inhibits the cytochrome p450 pathway (CYP3A4), combinations including this drug have more drug interactions than other INSTI-based regimens.

DTG, the most recently approved INSTI, was non-inferior to RAL-containing regimens<sup>21</sup> and superior to DRV/r<sup>22</sup> and EFV-containing<sup>5</sup> regimens in clinical trials, largely because of more discontinuations because of adverse events or other reasons in the comparator arms. DTG is dosed once daily when used for initial therapy and has fewer drug interactions than NNRTIs, PIs/r, and EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC—a potential advantage in patients on other medications that may interact with these drugs. Overall, DTG was well-tolerated in clinical trials. DTG decreases tubular secretion of creatinine, which causes small increases in serum creatinine in some patients soon after the drug is initiated. In clinical trials, no treatment-emergent resistance has been observed in treatment-naïve patients who received DTG, suggesting that it may have a higher genetic barrier to resistance than RAL or EVG.



**Table 6. Recommended and Alternative Antiretroviral Regimen Options for Treatment-Naïve Patients**

An antiretroviral regimen generally consists of two NRTIs plus one active drug from one of the following classes: NNRTI, PI (boosted with RTV), or INSTI. Selection of a regimen should be individualized on the basis of virologic efficacy, potential adverse effects, pill burden, dosing frequency, drug-drug interaction potential, a patient's resistance test results and comorbid conditions, and cost. [Table 7](#) lists the advantages and disadvantages of the ARV components listed below. [Appendix B, Tables 1–6](#) provides dosing information. The regimens in each category are listed in alphabetical order. For more detailed recommendations on ARV choices and dosing in HIV-infected pregnant women, refer to the latest perinatal guidelines available at <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/guidelines>.

**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*

Recommended Initial ART Regimen Options for All Patients, Regardless of Pre-ART Viral Load or CD4 Cell Count
<p><b>NNRTI-Based Regimen:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EFV/TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> (AI)</li> </ul> <p><b>PI-Based Regimens:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATV/r plus TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> (AI)</li> <li>• DRV/r plus TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> (AI)</li> </ul> <p><b>INSTI-Based Regimens:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DTG plus ABC/3TC<sup>a</sup> (AI)—<b>only</b> for patients who are HLA-B*5701 negative</li> <li>• DTG plus TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> (AI)</li> <li>• EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC—<b>only</b> for patients with pre-treatment estimated CrCl ≥70 mL/min (AI)</li> <li>• RAL plus TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> (AI)</li> </ul>
<p><b>In addition to the regimens listed above, the following regimens are also recommended, but only for patients with pre-ART plasma HIV RNA &lt;100,000 copies/mL</b></p>
<p><b>NNRTI-Based Regimens:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EFV plus ABC/3TC<sup>a</sup> (AI)—<b>only</b> for patients who are HLA-B*5701 negative</li> <li>• RPV/TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> (AI)—<b>only</b> for patients with CD4 cell count &gt;200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup></li> </ul> <p><b>PI-Based Regimen:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATV/r plus ABC/3TC<sup>a</sup> (AI)—<b>only</b> for patients who are HLA-B*5701 negative</li> </ul>
Alternative Initial ART Regimen Options
<p>Regimens that are effective and tolerable, but that have potential disadvantages when compared with the recommended regimens listed above or have less data from randomized clinical trials. An alternative regimen may be the preferred regimen for some patients.</p>
<p><b>PI-Based Regimens:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRV/r plus ABC/3TC<sup>a</sup> (BII)—<b>only</b> for patients who are HLA-B*5701 negative</li> <li>• LPV/r (once<sup>b</sup> or twice daily) plus ABC/3TC<sup>a</sup> (BI)—<b>only</b> for patients who are HLA-B*5701 negative</li> <li>• LPV/r (once<sup>b</sup> or twice daily) plus TDF/FTC<sup>a</sup> (BI)</li> </ul> <p><b>INSTI-Based Regimen:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RAL plus ABC/3TC<sup>a</sup> (BII)—<b>only</b> for patients who are HLA-B*5701 negative</li> </ul>

<sup>a</sup> 3TC may be substituted for FTC or vice versa. The following combinations in the recommended list above are available as co-formulated fixed-dose combinations: ABC/3TC, EFV/TDF/FTC, EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC, LPV/r, RPV/TDF/FTC, and TDF/FTC.

<sup>b</sup> Once daily LPV/r is not recommended for pregnant patients.

**Key to Acronyms:** 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV/r = ritonavir-boosted atazanavir; cobi = cobicistat; CrCl = creatinine clearance; DRV/r = ritonavir-boosted darunavir; **DTG = dolutegravir**; EFV = efavirenz; EVG = elvitegravir; FTC = emtricitabine; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LPV/r = ritonavir-boosted lopinavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate



## DUAL-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor (2-NRTI) Options As Part of Initial Combination Therapy

### Summary

Several NRTIs, including **ZDV**, didanosine, and stavudine are no longer recommended as part of an initial ART regimen, primarily because of their toxicities. The Panel designates the fixed-dose combination of TDF/FTC as the Recommended NRTI backbone for most initial ART regimens. **For patients who are HLA B\*5701 negative, ABC/3TC is also Recommended when combined with DTG, regardless of pre-treatment HIV RNA level. It is also Recommended when combined with EFV or ATV/r, but only if the patient's pre-treatment HIV RNA level is <100,000 copies/mL.** (See [Table 6](#) for recommendations and ratings for individual regimens). These recommendations are based on the virologic potency and durability, short- and long-term toxicity, and dosing convenience of these drugs.

### Clinical Trials Comparing ABC/3TC to TDF/FTC

Several randomized controlled trials in ART-naive participants compared ABC/3TC to TDF/FTC, each with the same<sup>3,4,23</sup> or a different third ARV drug (**also see discussion in the DTG section**).<sup>5</sup> The virologic responses demonstrated in selected key studies are summarized below:

- The ACTG 5202 study, a randomized controlled trial in more than 1800 participants, evaluated the efficacy and safety of ABC/3TC and TDF/FTC when each used in combination with either EFV or ATV/r.
  - Treatment randomization was stratified on the basis of a screening HIV RNA level <100,000 copies/mL or ≥100,000 copies/mL. HLA B\*5701 testing was not required before study entry.
  - A Data Safety Monitoring Board recommended early termination of the ≥100,000 copies/mL stratification group because of a significantly shorter time to study-defined virologic failure in the ABC/3TC arm than in the TDF/FTC arm.<sup>3</sup>
  - This difference in time to virologic failure between arms was observed regardless of whether the third active drug was EFV or ATV/r.
  - There was no difference between ABC/3TC and TDF/FTC in time to virologic failure for participants who had plasma HIV RNA <100,000 copies/mL at screening.<sup>24</sup>
- The ASSERT study compared open label ABC/3TC with TDF/FTC in 385 HLA B5701-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.<sup>23</sup>
- In the HEAT study, 688 participants received ABC/3TC or TDF/FTC in combination with once-daily LPV/r. Virologic efficacy was similar in the two study arms. In a subgroup analysis of patients with baseline HIV RNA ≥100,000 copies/mL, the proportion of participants who achieved HIV RNA <50 copies/mL at 96 weeks did not differ between the two regimens.<sup>4</sup>

### Recommended Dual-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors

#### TDF/FTC

TDF, with either 3TC or FTC, has been studied in combination with EFV, RPV, several boosted PIs, EVG/cobi, RAL, and DTG in randomized clinical trials.<sup>12,15,21,25-31</sup>

#### Adverse Effects:

- New onset or worsening renal impairment has been associated with TDF use.<sup>32,33</sup> Risk factors may include advanced HIV disease; longer treatment history; **low body weight, especially in females**;<sup>34</sup> and

pre-existing renal impairment.<sup>35</sup>

- Concomitant use of boosted PIs or cobi can increase TDF concentrations; studies have suggested a greater risk of renal dysfunction when TDF is used in PI- or cobi-based regimens.<sup>33,36-40</sup>
- While initiation of all NRTI-containing regimens has been associated with a decrease in bone mineral density (BMD), the loss of BMD is greater with TDF-containing regimens. For example, in two randomized studies comparing TDF/FTC with ABC/3TC, participants receiving TDF/FTC experienced a significantly greater decline in bone mineral density than ABC/3TC-treated participants.<sup>41,42</sup>
- Cases of osteomalacia associated with proximal renal tubulopathy have been reported with the use of TDF.<sup>43</sup>

#### Other Factors and Considerations:

- TDF/FTC is available in fixed-drug combinations with EFV, EVG/cobi, and RPV, allowing the regimens to be administered as a single pill, given once daily.
- Renal function, serum phosphorus, urine glucose, and urine protein should be assessed before initiating treatment with TDF and periodically during treatment (see Laboratory Monitoring section). In patients who have pre-existing renal insufficiency (CrCl <50 mL/min), TDF should generally be avoided; if the drug is used, dosage adjustment is required (see [Appendix B, Table 7](#) for dosage recommendations).
- Both TDF and FTC are active against hepatitis B virus (HBV). In patients with HIV/HBV coinfection, TDF/FTC should be used as the NRTI backbone of the ART regimen because the drugs have activity against both viruses (Also see [HIV/HBV Coinfection](#) section).

#### Panel's Recommendation:

- 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 co-formulated products, the Panel considers TDF/FTC as a Recommended NRTI backbone for initial ART in treatment-naïve patients (**AI**).

### **ABC/3TC**

The dual nucleoside backbone of ABC and 3TC has been studied in combination with EFV, several PIs, and DTG in ART-naïve patients.<sup>5,44-46</sup>

#### Adverse Effects

##### *Hypersensitivity Reactions:*

- Clinically suspected hypersensitivity reactions (HSRs) have been 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.<sup>47,48</sup> HLA-B\*5701 testing should precede use of ABC. ABC should not be given to patients who test positive for HLA-B\*5701 and based on a positive test result, ABC hypersensitivity should be noted on a patient's allergy list. Patients who are HLA-B\*5701 negative are 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 re-challenged, 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 (within 6 months) or current use of ABC was associated with an increased risk of MI, particularly in participants with pre-existing cardiac risk factors.<sup>7,49</sup>

- Since the D:A:D report, several studies have explored this association. Some studies have found an association,<sup>8,9,50,51</sup> others, including an FDA meta-analysis of 26 randomized clinical trials that evaluated ABC, have found no association or a weak association.<sup>10,52-55</sup>
- 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 co-formulated tablet that can be given once daily with or without food.
- ABC and 3TC are available separately in generic tablet formulations.
- HLA-B\*5701 testing should be performed before use of ABC and the drug should not be prescribed if a patient is found to be HLA-B\*5701 positive.
- ABC does not cause renal dysfunction and is a good substitute for TDF in patients with underlying renal dysfunction or who are at risk for renal effects. No dosage adjustment is required in patients with renal dysfunction.

#### Panel's Recommendation:

- The Panel recommends ABC/3TC as a dual NRTI, regardless of baseline HIV RNA, if it is prescribed with DTG (AI). EFV plus ABC/3TC (AI) and ATV/r plus ABC/3TC (AI) are classified as Recommended regimens only for patients with pre-treatment HIV RNA <100,000 copies/mL. As noted above, ABC should only be prescribed for patients who are tested negative for the HLA B\*5701 allele (See [Table 6](#) for more detailed recommendations on ABC/3TC use with other drugs).

### ***Other Dual Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors***

#### **ZDV/3TC**

ZDV is associated with many adverse events, including bone marrow suppression, manifested by macrocytic anemia and/or neutropenia, GI toxicity, fatigue, and mitochondrial toxicity, including lactic acidosis/hepatic steatosis and lipodystrophy. ZDV/3TC is generally not recommended as a dual-NRTI option for ART-naïve patients because ZDV/3TC has greater toxicity than TDF/FTC or ABC/3TC and requires twice daily dosing.

## **Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor-Based Regimens**

### ***Summary***

Five NNRTIs (delavirdine [DLV], EFV, etravirine [ETR], NVP, and RPV) are currently FDA approved.

NNRTI-based regimens have demonstrated virologic potency and durability. The major disadvantages of currently available NNRTIs are the prevalence of NNRTI-resistant viral strains in ART-naïve patients<sup>56,57</sup> and the drugs' low genetic barrier for the development of resistance. Resistance testing should be performed to guide therapy selection for ART-naïve patients (see [Drug-Resistance Testing](#)). High level resistance to all NNRTIs (except ETR) may occur with a single mutation; cross resistance within the class is common. ETR has in vitro activity against some viral strains harboring mutations that confer resistance to DLV, EFV, and NVP.<sup>58</sup> In RPV-treated patients, the presence of RPV resistance mutations at virologic failure may confer cross resistance to other NNRTIs, including ETR.<sup>59,60</sup>

The Panel recommends EFV with TDF/FTC as a recommended regimen regardless of a patient's baseline HIV RNA and CD4 cell count (AI). RPV is also a Recommended NNRTI when used with TDF/FTC, but only for patients with pre-treatment HIV RNA <100,000 copies/mL and CD4 counts >200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (AI).

NVP is no longer recommended as initial therapy because of the drug's toxicities (serious and even fatal hepatic events and skin rash), especially in women and in patients with high CD4 counts, and also because of concerns about the drug's efficacy in some clinical trials. However, patients doing well on NVP may continue the therapy. ETR at a dose of 200 mg twice daily is approved for use in treatment-experienced patients with virologic failure.<sup>61</sup> In a small, randomized, double-blinded, placebo-controlled trial, ETR 400 mg once daily was compared with EFV 600 mg once daily (both in combination with 2 NRTIs) in treatment-naïve participants (79 and 78 participants in the ETR and EFV arms, respectively). Virologic responses were comparable at 48 weeks.<sup>62</sup> However, pending results from larger clinical trials, the Panel cannot recommend ETR as initial therapy.

## ***Recommended Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor-Based Regimens***

### **EFV**

EFV is an NNRTI approved for use in combination with 2-NRTIs for ART-naïve patients.

#### Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

Large randomized, controlled trials and cohort studies in ART-naïve patients have demonstrated potent and durable viral suppression in patients treated with EFV plus two NRTIs. In clinical trials, EFV-based regimens in ART-naïve patients have demonstrated superiority or non-inferiority to several comparator regimens.

- In ACTG 5142, EFV was superior to LPV/r, although drug resistance was more common after EFV failure than after LPV/r failure.<sup>63</sup>
- In the 2NN study, compared to EFV, NVP did not meet non-inferiority criteria.<sup>64</sup>
- In ACTG 5202, EFV was comparable to ATV/r when each given with either TDF/FTC or ABC/3TC.<sup>13</sup>
- In the ECHO and THRIVE studies, EFV was non-inferior to RPV, with less virologic failure but 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 was more frequent with RPV failure.<sup>14</sup>
- In the GS 102 study, EFV/TDF/FTC was non-inferior to EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC.<sup>19</sup>

More recently, some regimens have demonstrated superiority to EFV, based primarily on fewer discontinuations because of adverse events:

- In the SINGLE trial, a DTG-based regimen was superior to EFV at the primary endpoint of viral suppression at Week 48.<sup>5</sup>
- In the STARTMRK trial, RAL was non-inferior to EFV at 48 weeks.<sup>12</sup> RAL was superior to EFV at 4 and 5 years,<sup>16,31</sup> 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 virologic suppression on RPV than on EFV.<sup>65</sup>

A recent multinational randomized placebo-controlled trial compared 600 mg (standard dose) with 400mg daily dosing of EFV, combined with TDF/FTC. At 48 weeks, EFV 400 mg was non-inferior to EFV 600mg.<sup>66</sup> Study drug-related adverse events were less frequent in the EFV 400 mg group than in the 600 mg group. Although there were fewer self-reported CNS events in the 400 mg group, the two groups had similar rates of psychiatric events. Unlike the 600 mg dose of EFV, the 400 mg dose, is not approved for initial treatment and is not co-formulated into a single pill regimen.

### Adverse Effects:

- EFV can cause CNS side effects, such as abnormal dreams, dizziness, headache, and depression, which resolve over a period of days to weeks in most patients. However, more subtle, long-term neuropsychiatric effects can occur. A recent analysis of several 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.<sup>67</sup>
- EFV may cause elevation in LDL cholesterol and triglycerides.

### Other Factors and Considerations:

- EFV is formulated both as a single-drug tablet and in a fixed-dose combination tablet of EFV/TDF/FTC that allows for once daily dosing.
- EFV is a substrate of CYP3A4 and an inducer of CYP3A4 and 2D6 and therefore may potentially interact with other drugs using the same pathways.
- EFV has been associated with CNS birth defects in non-human primates, and cases of neural tube defects have been reported after first trimester exposure in humans.<sup>68</sup> Alternative regimens should be considered in women who are planning to become pregnant or who are sexually active and not using effective contraception. Because the risk of neural tube defects is restricted to the first 5 to 6 weeks of pregnancy, before pregnancy is usually recognized, a suppressive EFV-based regimen can be continued in pregnant women who present for antenatal care in the first trimester (see [Perinatal Guidelines](#)).

### Panel's Recommendation:

- On the basis of safety and efficacy data from numerous clinical trials and observational cohorts and long-term clinical experience with EFV, the Panel classifies EFV/TDF/FTC as a Recommended regimen for ART-naïve patients (**AI**). EFV with ABC/3TC is Recommended only for patients with a pre-ART viral load of <100,000 copies/mL (see discussion in ABC/3TC section) (**AI**).
- EFV at a reduced dose has not been studied in the United States. Until further data to support its use in the U.S. population is available; the Panel cannot recommend the use of reduced dose EFV.

## **RPV**

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

### Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

Two Phase 3 randomized, double-blinded clinical trials, ECHO and THRIVE, compared RPV and EFV, each combined with 2 NRTIs (80%, 15%, and 5% of participants received TDF/FTC, ZDV/3TC, and ABC/3TC respectively).<sup>14</sup> At 96 weeks, the following findings were reported:

- RPV was non-inferior to EFV overall.
- Among participants with a pre-ART viral load >100,000 copies/mL, more RPV-treated than EFV-treated participants experienced virologic failure. Moreover, in this subgroup of participants with virologic failure, NNRTI and NRTI resistance was more frequently identified in those treated with RPV.
- Among the RPV-treated participants, the rate of virologic failure was greater in those with pre-treatment CD4 counts <200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> than in those with CD4 counts ≥200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>.

STaR, a Phase 3b, open-label study, compared the fixed-dose combinations of RPV/TDF/FTC and EFV/TDF/FTC in 786 treatment-naïve patients. At 96 weeks, the following key findings were reported:<sup>65</sup>



- RPV was non-inferior to EFV overall.
- RPV was superior to EFV in patients with pre-ART viral loads  $\leq 100,000$  copies/mL and non-inferior in those with pre-ART viral loads  $> 100,000$  copies/mL. Virologic failure was more common in RPV-treated patients than in EFV-treated patients with pre-ART viral loads  $> 500,000$  copies/mL.
- At 48 weeks, NRTI and NNRTI resistance occurred in 2%, 8%, and 19% of RPV-treated patients with viral loads  $\leq 100,000$ , 100,000 to 500,000, and  $> 500,000$  copies/mL, respectively, versus 1%, 0%, and 4% of EFV-treated patients.<sup>69</sup>

#### Adverse Effects:

- RPV is generally well tolerated. In the ECHO, THRIVE, and STaR trials, fewer CNS adverse events (e.g., abnormal dreams, dizziness, psychiatric side effects), skin rash, and dyslipidemia were reported in the RPV arms than the EFV arms, and fewer patients in the RPV arms discontinued therapy due to adverse events.

#### Other Factors and Considerations:

- RPV is formulated both as an individual tablet and in a fixed-dose combination tablet with TDF/FTC. It is given as a once daily regimen, and must be administered with a meal (at least 400 kcal).
- 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, and should be used with caution in those receiving H<sub>2</sub> antagonists or antacids (see [Drug Interactions](#) section for dosing recommendations).
- RPV is primarily metabolized in the liver by CYP3A enzyme; its plasma concentration may be affected in the presence of CYP3A inhibitors or inducers (see [Drug Interactions](#) section).
- At higher than the approved dose of 25 mg, RPV may cause QTc interval prolongation. RPV should be used with caution when co-administered with a drug with known risk of Torsades de Pointes.

#### Panel's Recommendation:

- On the basis of clinical trial safety and efficacy data, the Panel considers RPV/TDF/FTC as a Recommended regimen, but **only** for ART-naïve patients with pre-treatment viral load  $< 100,000$  copies/mL and CD4 count  $> 200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (**AI**). Data on RPV with ABC/3TC are insufficient to consider the combination either a Recommended or Alternative regimen.

### ***Other Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors***

#### **NVP**

NVP is approved for use in combination with 2-NRTIs for ART-naïve patients. However, more serious toxicities, including severe and even fatal hepatic events, Stevens Johnson Syndrome, and toxic epidermal necrolysis, have been associated with NVP than with other NNRTIs. On the basis of the safety concerns and the availability of many other preferable options for initial therapy, the Panel no longer recommends initiation of NVP in ART-naïve patients. Patients who are currently tolerating a suppressive NVP-based regimen may remain on the drug.

### **Protease Inhibitor-Based Regimens**

#### ***Summary***

FDA-approved PIs include ATV, DRV, FPV, indinavir (IDV), LPV/r, nelfinavir (NFV), RTV, SQV, and tipranavir (TPV). PI-based regimens (particularly with RTV-boosting) have demonstrated virologic potency

and durability in treatment-naïve patients, and a high genetic barrier to resistance. Few or no PI mutations are detected when a patient's first PI-based regimen fails, which is not the case with NNRTI- and some INSTI-based regimens.<sup>70,71</sup> All RTV-boosted PIs inhibit the cytochrome (CYP) 450 3A isoenzyme, which may lead to significant drug-drug interactions (see [Drug Interaction](#) section). Each PI has specific characteristics in terms of its virologic potency, adverse effect profile, and PK properties. The characteristics of Recommended and Alternative PIs are listed in [Table 6](#) and [Appendix B, Table 3](#).

A number of 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 boosting agent. Two large observational cohort studies suggest that LPV/r, IDV, FPV, or RTV-boosted FPV (FPV/r) may be associated with increased rates of MI or stroke.<sup>49,53</sup> This association was not seen with ATV.<sup>72</sup> These studies had too few patients receiving DRV/r to be included in the analysis.

Recommended PIs for use in ART-naïve patients are those that have proven virologic efficacy, once daily dosing, a low pill count, good tolerability, and use a low dose of ritonavir (100 mg per day). On the basis of these criteria, the Panel considers once-daily ATV/r and DRV/r as Recommended PIs. LPV/r has a higher RTV dose and is associated with more metabolic complications and gastrointestinal side effects than ATV/r and DRV/r; for these reasons, it is considered an Alternative regimen. LPV/r remains as an Alternative PI/r because it is currently the only co-formulated boosted PI, it has extended experience in clinical trials and practice, and it has a role in treatment of HIV infection during pregnancy (see the [Perinatal Guidelines](#) for recommendations in pregnancy<sup>73</sup>). Compared to other PIs, FPV/r, unboosted ATV, and SQV/r have disadvantages such as greater pill burden, lower efficacy, or increased toxicity and thus are no longer included as Recommended or Alternative options.

### ***Recommended Protease Inhibitor-Based Regimens (In Alphabetical Order)***

#### **ATV/r**

##### Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

- The CASTLE study compared once-daily ATV/r (300/100 mg) with twice-daily LPV/r (400/100 mg), each in combination with TDF/FTC, in 883 ART-naïve participants. In this open-label, non-inferiority study, the 2 regimens showed similar virologic and CD4 responses at 48 weeks<sup>27</sup> and at 96 weeks.<sup>74</sup>
- 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.<sup>13</sup> In a separate analysis, women assigned to ATV/r were found to have a higher risk of virologic failure than women assigned to EFV or men assigned to ATV/r.<sup>17</sup>
- In a study comparing ATV/r plus TDF/FTC to EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC, virologic suppression rates through 144 weeks were similar in the two groups.<sup>20</sup>
- ACTG A5257, a large randomized open-label trial, compared ATV/r with DRV/r or RAL, each given with TDF/FTC. At week 96, all 3 regimens had similar virologic efficacy. However, 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. Bone mineral density decreased to a greater extent in participants in the ATV/r and DRV/r arms than in participants in the RAL arm.<sup>18</sup>

##### Adverse Effects:

- In the CASTLE study, the participants randomized to ATV/r had fewer gastrointestinal toxicities and better lipid profiles than those who received LPV/r.

- The main adverse effect associated with ATV/r is reversible indirect hyperbilirubinemia, with or without jaundice or scleral icterus, but without concomitant hepatic transaminase elevations.
- Nephrolithiasis,<sup>75-77</sup> **nephrotoxicity,**<sup>78</sup> and cholelithiasis<sup>79</sup> have also been reported in patients who received ATV, with or without RTV.

#### Other Factors and Considerations:

- ATV/r is 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 18a](#) provides recommendations for use of ATV/r with these agents.
- ATV/r is a potent CYP3A4 inhibitor and may have significant interactions with other medications metabolized through this same pathway (see [Drug Interactions](#) section).

#### Panel's Recommendation:

- On the basis of clinical trial safety and efficacy data, the Panel classifies ATV/r plus TDF/FTC as a Recommended regimen for ART-naïve participants regardless of pre-treatment HIV RNA (**AI**). **ATV/r plus ABC/3TC is classified as a Recommended regimen, but only for patients whose pre-ART HIV RNA is <100,000 copies/mL (**AI**).**

### **DRV/r**

#### Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

- The ARTEMIS study compared DRV/r (800/100 mg once daily) with LPV/r (800/200 mg once daily or 400/100 mg twice daily), both in combination with TDF/FTC, in a randomized, open-label, non-inferiority trial. The study enrolled 689 ART-naïve participants. DRV/r was non-inferior to LPV/r at week 48,<sup>28</sup> and superior at week 192.<sup>80</sup> 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 in combination with two NRTIs, in 488 ART-naïve participants. The rate of virologic suppression at week 48 was significantly greater among those who received DTG than in those who received DRV/r, largely because of more drug discontinuations in the DRV/r group.<sup>22</sup>
- A small retrospective study that followed participants for 48 weeks suggested that DRV/r plus ABC/3TC may be effective in treatment-naïve patients.<sup>81</sup>
- The ACTG A5257 study 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.<sup>18</sup>

#### Adverse Effects:

- In the ARTEMIS Study, grades 2 to 4 adverse events, primarily diarrhea, were seen less frequently in DRV/r recipients than in LPV/r recipients.
- Patients starting DRV/r may develop a skin rash, which is usually mild-to-moderately severe and self-limited. Treatment discontinuation is necessary on rare occasions when severe rash with fever or elevated transaminases occur.

#### Other Factors and Considerations:

- DRV/r is administered once daily with food in treatment-naïve 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 who did or did not have a history of sulfonamide allergy. Most patients with sulfonamide allergy are able to tolerate DRV.
- DRV/r is a potent CYP3A4 inhibitor, and may lead to significant interactions with other medications metabolized through this same pathway (see [Drug Interactions](#) section).

#### Panel's Recommendation:

- On the basis of efficacy and safety data from clinical trials and clinical experience, the Panel classifies DRV/r with TDF/FTC as a Recommended regimen (**AI**). DRV/r with ABC/3TC is considered an Alternative regimen because there is less efficacy data to support its use (**BII**).

### ***Alternative Protease Inhibitor-Based Regimens***

#### **LPV/r**

#### Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

- A 7-year follow-up study of LPV/r and 2 NRTIs showed sustained virologic suppression in patients who were maintained on the originally assigned regimen.<sup>82</sup>
- Results of clinical trials that compared LPV/r with ATV/r and DRV/r are discussed above.
- In the ACTG 5142 study, at 96 weeks, a smaller proportion of patients who received LPV/r plus 2 NRTIs achieved viral suppression (HIV RNA <50 copies/mL) than those who received EFV plus 2 NRTIs. However, the CD4 cell response was greater with LPV/r, and there was less drug resistance associated with virologic failure.<sup>63</sup>

#### Adverse Effects:

- In addition to diarrhea, major adverse effects of LPV/r include insulin resistance and hyperlipidemia, especially hypertriglyceridemia; these require pharmacologic management in some patients.
- In the D:A:D and French observational cohorts, cumulative use of LPV/r was associated with a slightly increased risk of MI.<sup>49,53</sup>
- In the D:A:D study, LPV/r use was also reported as an independent predictor of chronic renal impairment.<sup>78</sup>

#### Other Factors and Considerations:

- LPV/r must be boosted with 200 mg/day of RTV and is associated with higher rates of GI side effects and hyperlipidemia than the Recommended PIs, which are boosted with 100 mg/day of RTV.
- LPV/r can be given once or twice daily.
- Once-daily dosing should not be used in pregnant women, especially during the third trimester, when LPV levels are expected to decline (see [Perinatal Guidelines](#)).
- LPV/r is currently the only available co-formulated boosted PI. Co-formulation may lower a patient's out-of-pocket costs by reducing the number of drug co-payments (see [Cost Consideration](#) section) and also prevent the patient from inadvertently not taking the RTV or the active PI.

#### Panel's Recommendation:

- On the basis of greater potential for adverse events and higher RTV dose and pill burden than ATV/r and

DRV/r, the Panel recommends LPV/r plus TDF/FTC or LPV/r plus ABC/3TC as Alternative regimens (**BI**).

## Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor-Based Regimens

### Summary

Three INSTIs—DTG, EVG, and RAL—are currently approved for HIV-infected, ARV-naïve patients. EVG is currently available as a component of a one-tablet once-daily complete regimen. All three agents are now classified as Recommended for use in ART-naïve patients because regimens containing DTG, EVG, or RAL have proven virologic efficacy when compared to other Recommended regimens, and because the INSTIs are generally well tolerated.

### *Recommended Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitor-Based Regimens (in Alphabetical Order)*

#### DTG

DTG is approved for use in ART-naïve and ART-experienced patients.

#### Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

The efficacy of DTG in treatment-naïve patients has been evaluated in three fully powered clinical trials, including two randomized double-blind clinical trials and one randomized open-label clinical trial. In these three trials, DTG-based regimens demonstrated either non-inferiority or superiority to a comparator INSTI, NNRTI, or PI-based regimen. The primary efficacy endpoint in all these clinical trials was the proportion of participants with plasma viral load <50 copies/mL.

- The SPRING-2 trial compared DTG 50 mg once daily to RAL 400 mg twice daily, each in combination with investigator-selected NRTI of either ABC/3TC or TDF/FTC, in 822 participants. At week 96, DTG was non-inferior to RAL.<sup>21</sup>
- The SINGLE trial compared DTG 50 mg once daily plus ABC/3TC to EFV/TDF/FTC in 833 participants. At week 48, DTG was superior to EFV, primarily because the study treatment discontinuation rate was higher in the EFV arm than in the DTG arm.<sup>5</sup>
- The FLAMINGO study, a randomized open-label clinical trial, compared DTG 50 mg once daily to DRV/r 800/100 mg once daily, each in combination with investigator-selected ABC/3TC or TDF/FTC. At week 48, DTG was superior to DRV/r because of higher rate of discontinuation in the DRV/r arm.<sup>22</sup>

#### Adverse Effects:

- DTG is generally well-tolerated. The most common adverse reactions of moderate to severe intensity with an incidence of  $\geq 2\%$  in the clinical trials were insomnia and headache. Cases of hypersensitivity reactions were reported in <1% of trial participants.

#### Other Factors and Considerations:

- DTG is given once daily, with or without food, in treatment-naïve patients.
- DTG decreases tubular secretion of creatinine without affecting glomerular function, with increases in serum creatinine observed within the first 4 weeks of treatment (mean change in serum creatinine of 0.11 mg/dL after 48 weeks).
- DTG should be administered 2 hours before or 6 hours after taking medications containing polyvalent cations (i.e., certain antacids, calcium supplements or buffered medications).



#### Panel's Recommendation:

- On the basis of clinical trial data, the Panel categorizes DTG in combination with either ABC/3TC or TDF/FTC as a Recommended regimen in ART-naïve patients (**AI**).

#### **EVG**

EVG is available only as a component of a four-drug, fixed-dose combination product containing EVG, coBI, TDF, and FTC (EVG/coBI/TDF/FTC). EVG/coBI/TDF/FTC is indicated as a one tablet once daily complete regimen for ARV-naïve adult patients. coBI is a specific, 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.

#### Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

The efficacy of EVG/coBI/TDF/FTC in ARV-naïve participants has been evaluated in two randomized, double-blind active-controlled trials.

- At 144 weeks, EVG/coBI/TDF/FTC was non-inferior to fixed-dose EFV/TDF/FTC.<sup>19</sup>
- EVG/coBI/TDF/FTC was also found to be non-inferior to a combination containing ATV/r plus TDF/FTC.<sup>20</sup>

#### Adverse Effects:

- The most common adverse events reported with EVG/coBI/TDF/FTC were diarrhea, nausea, upper respiratory infection and headache.<sup>19,20</sup>

#### Other Factors and Considerations:

- EVG is metabolized primarily by CYP3A enzymes; as a result, CYP3A inducers or inhibitors may alter EVG concentrations.
- Because coBI inhibits CYP3A, it interacts with a number of medications that are metabolized by this enzyme (see [Drug-Drug Interactions](#) section).<sup>83</sup>
- EVG plasma concentrations are lower when it is administered simultaneously with aluminum- or magnesium-containing antacids. Separate EVG/coBI/TDF/FTC and antacid administration by at least 2 hours.
- CoBI inhibits active tubular secretion of creatinine, resulting in increases in serum creatinine and a reduction in estimated CrCl without reducing glomerular function.<sup>84</sup>
- Patients who experience a confirmed increase in serum creatinine of greater than 0.4 mg/dL from baseline while taking EVG/coBI/TDF/FTC should be closely monitored and evaluated for evidence of proximal renal tubulopathy.<sup>40</sup>
- EVG/coBI/TDF/FTC **is not recommended** for patients with pre-treatment estimated CrCl <70 mL/min.<sup>40</sup>
- At the time of virologic failure, INSTI-associated mutations were detected in some of the EVG/coBI/TDF/FTC-treated patients whose therapy failed.<sup>19,20</sup> These mutations conferred cross-resistance to RAL, with most retaining susceptibility to DTG.

#### Panel Recommendation:

On the basis of these factors, the Panel classifies EVG/coBI/FTC/TDF as a Recommended regimen in ART-naïve patients (**AI**).

#### **RAL**

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

### Efficacy in Clinical Trials:

The efficacy of RAL (with either TDF/FTC or ABC/3TC) has been evaluated in two randomized, double-blind active-controlled clinical trials enrolling ARV-naïve participants and a small single-arm pilot trial. The primary endpoint in the clinical trials was plasma viral load <50 copies/mL.

- STARTMRK compared RAL 400 mg twice daily to EFV 600 mg once daily, each in combination with the TDF/FTC. RAL was non-inferior to EFV at 48 weeks.<sup>12</sup> RAL was superior to EFV at 4 and 5 years,<sup>16,31</sup> in part because of more frequent discontinuations due to adverse events in the EFV group than in the RAL group.
- In a small single-arm pilot trial of 35 participants who received a regimen of RAL in combination with ABC/3TC, 91% of participants had plasma viral loads <50 copies/mL at week 48.<sup>85</sup>
- The SPRING-2 trial compared DTG 50 mg once daily to RAL 400 mg twice daily, each in combination with either investigator-selected ABC/3TC or TDF/FTC, in 822 participants. At week 96, DTG was non-inferior to RAL. In this trial, 164 participants (39 and 125 with baseline viral loads  $\geq 100,000$  copies/mL and <100,000 copies/mL, respectively) received RAL in combination with ABC/3TC. After 96 weeks, no difference in virologic response was apparent between the ABC/3TC or TDF/FTC groups when RAL was given as the third drug.<sup>21</sup>
- ACTG A5257, a large randomized open-label trial, compared ATV/r with DRV/r or RAL, each given with TDF/FTC. At week 96, all 3 regimens had similar virologic efficacy. 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. Bone mineral density decreased to a greater extent in participants in the ATV/r and DRV/r arms than in participants in the RAL arm.<sup>18</sup>

### Adverse Effects:

- RAL use has been associated with creatine kinase elevations. Myositis and rhabdomyolysis have been reported.
- Rare cases of severe skin reactions and systemic hypersensitivity reactions in patients who received RAL have been reported during post-marketing surveillance.<sup>86</sup>

### Other Factors and Considerations:

- RAL must be administered twice daily—a potential disadvantage when comparing RAL-based treatment with other Recommended regimens.
- Co-administration of RAL with aluminum and/or magnesium-containing antacids can reduce absorption of RAL and is not recommended. Raltegravir may be co-administered with calcium carbonate-containing antacids.
- RAL has a lower genetic barrier to resistance than RTV-boosted PIs.

### Panel Recommendations:

- On the basis of these data and the long-term clinical experience with RAL, the Panel considers RAL plus TDF/FTC as a Recommended regimen in ARV-naïve patients (**AI**).
- Given that few patients have received RAL plus ABC/3TC in clinical trials, and the availability of Recommended regimens with similar advantages, the Panel categorizes RAL plus ABC/3TC as an Alternative regimen (**BII**).

## Other Antiretroviral Strategies for Initial Therapy When Abacavir or Tenofovir Cannot Be Used

All currently Recommended and Alternative regimens consist of two NRTIs plus a third active drug. This strategy, however, may not be possible or optimal in all patients. In some situations it may be necessary to avoid both TDF and ABC, such as in the case of a patient with pre-existing renal disease who is HLA B\*5701 positive or at high risk of cardiovascular disease.

Based on these concerns, several clinical studies have evaluated strategies using initial regimens that avoid 2 NRTIs or the NRTI drug class altogether. Some of these studies were not fully powered to permit comparison with established regimens and one was a single-arm study using only a historical standard-of-care regimen as a control. At this point, the Panel does not recommend any of these strategies for initial therapy except in patients in whom both TDF and ABC are contraindicated. The major trials and their key results are summarized below.

### PI/r plus NNRTI:

- **LPV/r plus EFV:** In the ACTG 5142 trial, 757 ART-naïve patients were randomly assigned to one of three regimens: an NRTI-sparing regimen of LPV/r plus EFV, EFV plus 2-NRTIs, or LPV/r plus 2-NRTIs. Although virologic responses in the LPV/r plus EFV and EFV plus 2-NRTI arms were comparable, the rates of drug resistance at treatment failure and hyperlipidemia were both higher in the NRTI-sparing group. This regimen also had an unacceptably high pill burden.<sup>63</sup>

### PI/r (or Unboosted PI) plus INSTI:

- **DRV/r plus RAL:** Three trials examined the role of DRV/r plus RAL in ART-naïve patients.
  - NEAT/ANRS143 is a large randomized study (805 participants) comparing DRV/r plus RAL with DRV plus TDF/FTC in ARV-naïve patients. At week 96, DRV/r plus RAL was non-inferior to DRV/r plus TDF/FTC in terms of the proportion of patients in each arm with virologic or clinical failure. Among those with baseline CD4 cell count  $<200/\text{mm}^3$ , however, there were more failures in the RAL group. In patients with pre-treatment HIV RNA  $\geq 100,000$  copies/mL, there was a trend towards more failures in the RAL group.<sup>87</sup>
  - ACTG 5262 is a single-arm study in which 112 ART-naïve patients received DRV/r once daily plus twice-daily RAL. There was a high rate of virologic failure (26%) at 48 weeks. Among the participants with pre-treatment HIV RNA levels  $>100,000$  copies/mL, there was a higher rate of virologic failure and greater likelihood of emergence of INSTI-resistance at treatment failure.<sup>88</sup>
  - In the RADAR trial, 83 ART-naïve participants were randomized to DRV/r plus RAL or DRV/r plus TDF/FTC. At 48 weeks, the rate of virologic suppression was significantly lower in the RAL group. There were more treatment discontinuations and virologic failures in the NRTI-sparing arm than in the TDF/FTC arm.<sup>89</sup>
- **LPV/r plus RAL:** In the PROGRESS trial, 206 ART-naïve patients were randomized to receive either LPV/r plus RAL or LPV/r plus TDF/FTC. LPV/r and RAL were given twice daily. At week 48, virologic responses to the regimens were similar. Compared to participants receiving TDF/FTC, those taking LPV/r plus RAL had greater changes in peripheral fat (but not trunk fat) and lipids but no changes in bone density (vs. declines in those receiving TDF/FTC). Participants in the TDF/FTC arm had greater reduction in estimated glomerular filtration rate from baseline. However, the regimen's twice daily dosing requirement makes it less desirable for patients who prefer once daily therapy. In addition, the proportion of patients enrolled in this study with baseline HIV RNA  $>100,000$  copies/mL was small.<sup>90</sup>
- **Unboosted ATV plus RAL:** In the SPARTAN study, 94 ART-naïve patients were assigned 2:1 to receive

either an experimental regimen of twice daily RAL (400 mg BID) plus ATV (200 mg BID) or a standard TDF/FTC plus ATV/r treatment. While overall virologic responses were similar between arms, the twice daily ATV plus RAL arm had higher levels of virologic failure with resistance and jaundice than the TDF/FTC plus ATV/r group, prompting early termination of the study.<sup>91</sup>

#### PI/r plus CCR5 Antagonist:

- **DRV/r plus MVC:** The MODERN Study was a fully-powered non-inferiority trial that compared DRV/r plus MVC to DRV/r plus TDF/FTC in 791 ART-naïve patients with CCR5 tropic virus. At 48 weeks, significantly fewer patients in the MVC treatment group had HIV RNA <50 copies/mL, a difference that prompted the study's Data and Safety Monitoring Board to recommend stopping the study (see <http://clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT01345630>).

#### PI/r plus One NRTI:

- **LPV/r plus 3TC:** In the GARDEL study, 426 ART-naïve patients were randomized to receive twice-daily LPV/r plus either open-label 3TC (twice daily) or two NRTIs selected by the study investigators. At 48 weeks, a similar number of patients in each arm had HIV RNA <50 copies/mL, meeting the study's non-inferiority criteria. The 3TC arm tended to be better tolerated than the 2 NRTI arm; notably, ZDV/3TC was the dual NRTI combination most commonly used.<sup>92</sup>

In summary, the aggregate results from most of the studies with NRTI-sparing regimens—with the exception of the NEAT ANRS 143 study, which has not yet been published—demonstrate that these initial strategies either have lower efficacy or more side effects than their standard-of-care treatment comparators without affording the benefit of reduced pill burden or dosing frequency. An additional concern is that the two most favorable outcomes in studies thus far were seen with twice-daily LPV/r based regimens (in the PROGRESS and GARDEL trials); LPV/r is not considered a Recommended initial regimen because of its unfavorable lipid, tolerability and pill burden characteristics as compared to ATV/r and DRV/r. PI/r monotherapy has been studied as an NRTI-sparing strategy, but mainly in the setting of regimen simplification in patients who have achieved viral suppression on an initial combination ART regimen. The results of clinical trials evaluating these regimens are discussed in the [Regimen Switching](#) in the Setting of Virologic Suppression section. As stated earlier, at this point, the Panel does not recommend any of these strategies for initial therapy except in patients in whom both TDF and ABC are contraindicated.

**Table 7. Advantages and Disadvantages of Antiretroviral Components Recommended as Initial Antiretroviral Therapy (page 1 of 3)**

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

ARV Class	ARV Agent(s)	Advantages	Disadvantages
Dual-NRTI Pairs	ABC/3TC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once-daily dosing</li> <li>No food effect</li> <li>No nephrotoxicity</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inferior virologic responses in patients with baseline HIV RNA <math>\geq 100,000</math> copies/mL when given with EFV or ATV/r as compared with TDF/FTC in ACTG 5202 study. <b>This difference not seen when ABC/3TC was used in combination with DTG.</b></li> <li>Requires HLA-B*5701 testing before use</li> <li>Potential for ABC HSR in patients with HLA-B*5701 allele</li> <li>ABC use has been associated with cardiac events in some but not all observational studies.</li> </ul>
	TDF/FTC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Better virologic responses than with ABC/3TC in patients with baseline viral load <math>\geq 100,000</math> copies/mL when combined with ATV/r or EFV</li> <li>Active against HBV; recommended dual-NRTI for HIV/HBV co-infected patients</li> <li>Once-daily dosing</li> <li>No food effect</li> <li>Co-formulated in fixed-dose combinations that comprise an entire regimen in a single pill (EFV/TDF/FTC, EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC, and RPV/TDF/FTC)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential for renal impairment, including proximal tubulopathy and acute or chronic renal insufficiency</li> <li>Potential for decrease in BMD</li> </ul>
NNRTIs	EFV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Virologic responses non-inferior or superior to most comparators</li> <li>Virologic potency persists regardless of baseline HIV RNA</li> <li>Once-daily dosing</li> <li>Co-formulated with TDF/FTC</li> <li>Long-term clinical experience</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transmitted resistance more common than with PIs</li> <li>Short-and long-term neuropsychiatric side effects, including depression and suicidality</li> <li>Teratogenic in non-human primates; avoid use in women who are trying to conceive or who are sexually active and not using contraception</li> <li>Dyslipidemia</li> <li>Greater risk of resistance at the time of treatment failure than with PIs</li> <li>Skin rash</li> <li>Potential for CYP450 drug interactions (see <a href="#">Tables 17</a>, <a href="#">18b</a>, and <a href="#">19a</a>)</li> <li>Should be taken on an empty stomach (food increases drug absorption and CNS toxicities)</li> </ul>
	RPV	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once-daily dosing</li> <li>Co-formulated with TDF/FTC</li> <li>Smaller pill size than co-formulated EFV/TDF/FTC or EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC</li> <li>Compared with EFV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fewer discontinuations for CNS adverse effects</li> <li>Fewer lipid effects</li> <li>Fewer rashes</li> <li>Smaller pill size</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not recommended in patients with pre-ART HIV RNA <math>&gt; 100,000</math> copies/mL or CD4 count <math>&lt; 200</math> cells/mm<sup>3</sup> because of higher rate of virologic failure in these patients</li> <li>Transmitted resistance more common than with PIs</li> <li>More NNRTI-, TDF-, and 3TC-associated mutations at virological failure than with regimen containing EFV and two NRTIs</li> <li>Potential for CYP450 drug interactions (see <a href="#">Tables 17</a>, <a href="#">18b</a>, and <a href="#">19a</a>)</li> <li>Meal requirement</li> <li>Requires acid for adequate absorption</li> <li>Contraindicated with PPIs</li> <li>Use with H2 antagonists or antacids with caution (see <a href="#">Table 18a</a> for detailed dosing information).</li> <li>RPV-associated depression reported</li> <li>Use with caution when co-administered with a drug having a known risk of torsades de pointes.</li> </ul>



**Table 7. Advantages and Disadvantages of Antiretroviral Components Recommended as Initial Antiretroviral Therapy (page 2 of 3)**

ARV Class	ARV Agent(s)	Advantages	Disadvantages
PIs	ATV/r	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once-daily dosing</li> <li>Higher genetic barrier to resistance than NNRTIs, EVG, and RAL</li> <li>PI resistance at the time of treatment failure uncommon with RTV-boosted PIs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Commonly causes indirect hyperbilirubinemia, which may manifest as scleral icterus or jaundice.</li> <li>Food requirement</li> <li>Absorption depends on food and low gastric pH (see Table 18a for interactions with H2 antagonists, antacids, and PPIs).</li> <li>Nephrolithiasis, cholelithiasis, <b>nephrotoxicity</b></li> <li>GI adverse effects</li> <li>CYP3A4 inhibitors and substrates: potential for drug interactions (see <a href="#">Tables 17</a> and <a href="#">18a</a>)</li> </ul>
	DRV/r	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once-daily dosing</li> <li>Higher genetic barrier to resistance than NNRTIs, EVG, and RAL</li> <li>PI resistance at the time of treatment failure uncommon with RTV-boosted PIs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Skin rash</li> <li>Food requirement</li> <li>GI adverse effects</li> <li>CYP3A4 inhibitors and substrates: potential for drug interactions (see <a href="#">Tables 17</a> and <a href="#">18a</a>)</li> </ul>
	LPV/r	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Only PI co-formulated with RTV <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>May reduce the number of patient co-pays (out-of-pocket cost)</li> <li>Can prevent patient from inadvertently not taking RTV or the active PI</li> </ul> </li> <li>No food requirement</li> <li>Once or twice daily dosing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Requires 200 mg per day of RTV</li> <li>Once-daily dosing not recommended in pregnant women</li> <li>Possible higher risk of MI associated with cumulative use of LPV/r</li> <li>PR and QT interval prolongation have been reported. Use with caution in patients at risk of cardiac conduction abnormalities or receiving other drugs with similar effect.</li> <li><b>Possible nephrotoxicity</b></li> <li>CYP3A4 inhibitors and substrates: potential for drug interactions (see <a href="#">Tables 17</a> and <a href="#">18a</a>)</li> </ul>
INSTIs	DTG	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Once-daily dosing</li> <li>DTG-containing regimens have higher rates of virologic suppression than EFV- or DRV/r-containing regimens, largely because of fewer drug discontinuations.</li> <li>May have higher barrier to resistance than EVG or RAL</li> <li>Demonstrated virologic potency with both TDF/FTC and ABC/3TC regardless of pre-ART HIV RNA level</li> <li>Effective at double dose (50 mg twice daily) against some RAL- and EVG-resistant viruses</li> <li>No food requirement</li> <li>No CYP3A4 interactions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inhibits renal tubular secretion of creatinine and can increase serum creatinine, without affecting glomerular function</li> <li>Oral absorption can be reduced by simultaneous administration with products containing polyvalent cations (e.g., Al<sup>+++</sup>, Ca<sup>++</sup>, or Mg<sup>++</sup> containing antacids or supplements, or multivitamin tablets with minerals) (see dosing recommendations in <a href="#">Table 18d</a>).</li> <li>UGT substrate: potential for drug interactions (see <a href="#">Table 18d</a>)</li> </ul>

**Table 7. Advantages and Disadvantages of Antiretroviral Components Recommended as Initial Antiretroviral Therapy (page 3 of 3)**

ARV Class	ARV Agent(s)	Advantages	Disadvantages
INSTIs	<b>EVG</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Co-formulated with cobi/TDF/FTC</li> <li>• Once daily dosing</li> <li>• Non-inferior to EFV/TDF/FTC and ATV/r plus TDF/FTC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EVG is only recommended for patients with baseline CrCl <math>\geq 70</math> mL/min; therapy should be discontinued if CrCl decreases to <math>&lt; 50</math> mL/min.</li> <li>• Cobi is a potent CYP3A4 inhibitor, which can result in significant interactions with CYP3A substrates.</li> <li>• Oral absorption can be reduced by simultaneous administration with antacids containing polyvalent cations, such as <math>Al^{+++}</math> or <math>Mg^{++}</math> (see dosing recommendations in <a href="#">Table 18d</a>).</li> <li>• Cobi inhibits active tubular secretion of creatinine and can increase serum creatinine, without affecting renal glomerular function.</li> <li>• Has potential for new onset or worsening of renal impairment</li> <li>• May have lower genetic barrier to resistance than seen with boosted PI- or DTG-based regimens</li> <li>• Food requirement</li> </ul>
	<b>RAL</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Longest post marketing experience in comparison to other INSTIs</li> <li>• No food requirement</li> <li>• No CYP3A4 interactions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Twice-daily dosing</li> <li>• May have lower genetic barrier to resistance than seen with boosted PI- or DTG-based regimens</li> <li>• Increase in creatine kinase, myopathy, and rhabdomyolysis have been reported.</li> <li>• Rare cases of severe hypersensitivity reactions (including SJS and TEN) have been reported.</li> <li>• Metal-containing antacids can reduce the absorption of RAL. Co-administration of RAL with <math>Al^{+++}</math> and/or <math>Mg^{++}</math>-containing antacids is not recommended. RAL may be co-administered with <math>CaCO_3</math> containing antacids (see dosing recommendations in <a href="#">Table 18d</a>).</li> <li>• UGT substrate: potential for drug interactions (see <a href="#">Table 18d</a>)</li> </ul>

**Key to Acronyms:** 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy;  $Al^{+++}$  = aluminum; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/r = ritonavir-boosted atazanavir; BMD = bone mineral density;  $CaCO_3$  = Calcium carbonate; CNS = central nervous system; cobi = cobicistat; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CYP = cytochrome P; DRV/r = ritonavir-boosted darunavir; **DTG = dolutegravir**; EFV = efavirenz; EVG = elvitegravir; FTC = emtricitabine; GI = gastrointestinal; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LPV/r = ritonavir-boosted lopinavir;  $Mg^{++}$  = magnesium; MI = myocardial infarction; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; PI = protease inhibitor; PPI = proton pump inhibitor; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SJS = Stevens-Johnson syndrome; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TEN = toxic epidermal necrosis

**Table 8. Antiretroviral Components or Regimens Not Recommended as Initial Therapy (page 1 of 2)**

ARV Drugs or Components	Reasons for <u>Not</u> Recommending as Initial Therapy
<b>NRTIs</b>	
<b>ABC/3TC/ZDV (Co-Formulated)</b> As triple-NRTI combination regimen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inferior virologic efficacy</li> </ul>
<b>ABC plus 3TC plus ZDV plus TDF</b> As quadruple-NRTI combination regimen	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inferior virologic efficacy</li> </ul>
<b>d4T plus 3TC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Significant toxicities including lipoatrophy; peripheral neuropathy; and hyperlactatemia, including symptomatic and life-threatening lactic acidosis, hepatic steatosis, and pancreatitis</li> </ul>
<b>ddl plus 3TC (or FTC)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inferior virologic efficacy</li> <li>• Limited clinical trial experience in ART-naive patients</li> <li>• ddl toxicities such as pancreatitis, peripheral neuropathy</li> </ul>
<b>ddl plus TDF</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High rate of early virologic failure</li> <li>• Rapid selection of resistance mutations</li> <li>• Potential for immunologic nonresponse/CD4 cell decline</li> <li>• Increased ddl drug exposure and toxicities</li> </ul>
<b>ZDV/3TC</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ZDV/3TC is generally not recommended as initial therapy because greater toxicities (including bone marrow suppression; GI toxicities; and mitochondrial toxicities such as lipoatrophy, lactic acidosis, and hepatic steatosis; skeletal muscle myopathy, and cardiomyopathy) than Recommended NRTIs.</li> </ul>
<b>NNRTIs</b>	
<b>DLV</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inferior virologic efficacy</li> <li>• Inconvenient (three times daily) dosing</li> </ul>
<b>ETR</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insufficient data in ART-naive patients</li> </ul>
<b>NVP</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Associated with serious and potentially fatal toxicity (hepatic events, severe rash, including SJS and TEN)</li> <li>• When compared to EFV, NVP did not meet non-inferiority criteria</li> </ul>
<b>PIs</b>	
<b>ATV (Unboosted)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Less potent than boosted ATV</li> </ul>
<b>DRV (Unboosted)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use without RTV has not been studied</li> </ul>
<b>FPV (Unboosted)</b> or <b>FPV/r</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Virologic failure with unboosted FPV-based regimen may result in selection of mutations that confer resistance to DRV.</li> <li>• Less clinical trial data for FPV/r than for other PI/r</li> </ul>
<b>IDV (Unboosted)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inconvenient dosing (three times daily with meal restrictions)</li> <li>• Fluid requirement</li> <li>• IDV toxicities such as nephrolithiasis, crystalluria</li> </ul>
<b>IDV/r</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fluid requirement</li> <li>• IDV toxicities such as nephrolithiasis, crystalluria</li> </ul>
<b>NFV</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inferior virologic efficacy</li> <li>• Diarrhea</li> </ul>

**Table 8. Antiretroviral Components or Regimens Not Recommended as Initial Therapy (page 2 of 2)**

ARV Drugs or Components	Reasons for <u>Not</u> Recommending as Initial Therapy
<b>NRTIs</b>	
RTV as sole PI	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High pill burden</li> <li>• GI intolerance</li> <li>• Metabolic toxicity</li> </ul>
SQV (Unboosted)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inadequate bioavailability</li> <li>• Inferior virologic efficacy</li> </ul>
<b>SQV/r</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High pill burden</li> <li>• Can cause QT and PR prolongation; requires pre-treatment and follow-up ECG</li> </ul>
TPV/r	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inferior virologic efficacy</li> <li>• Higher rate of adverse events than other PI/r</li> <li>• Higher dose of RTV required for boosting than other PI/r</li> </ul>
<b>CCR5 Antagonist</b>	
<b>Maraviroc</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Requires testing for CCR5 tropism before initiation of therapy</li> <li>• No virologic benefit when compared with other recommended regimens</li> <li>• Requires twice-daily dosing</li> </ul>

**Key to Acronyms:** 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; **ATV = atazanavir**; d4T = stavudine; ddI = didanosine; DLV = delavirdine; DRV = darunavir; ETR = etravirine; FPV = fosamprenavir; **FPV/r = ritonavir-boosted fosamprenavir**; FTC = emtricitabine; GI = gastrointestinal; IDV = indinavir; MVC = maraviroc; NFV = nelfinavir; **NVP = nevirapine**; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; PI = protease inhibitor; RTV = ritonavir; SJS = Stevens Johnson Syndrome; SQV = saquinavir; **SQV/r = ritonavir-boosted saquinavir**; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TEN = toxic epidermal necrolysis; TPV = tipranavir; ZDV = zidovudine

## References

1. Hanna DB, Buchacz K, Gebo KA, et al. Trends and disparities in antiretroviral therapy initiation and virologic suppression among newly treatment-eligible HIV-infected individuals in North America, 2001-2009. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2013;56(8):1174-1182. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23315317>.
2. Nachega JB, Parienti JJ, Uthman OA, et al. Effect of once-daily dosing and lower pill burden antiretroviral regimens for HIV infection: a meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. Abstract PS4/5. Paper presented at: 14th European AIDS Conference; October 16–19, 2013; Brussels.
3. Sax P, Tierney C, Collier AC, et al. Abacavir-lamivudine versus tenofovir-emtricitabine for initial HIV-1 therapy. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;361. Available at
4. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19542866](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19542866).
5. 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>.
6. Phillips EJ. Genetic screening to prevent abacavir hypersensitivity reaction: are we there yet? *Clin Infect Dis*. 2006;43(1):103-105. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16758425>.
7. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18387667](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18387667).
8. 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

- [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19682101](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19682101).
9. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21516027](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21516027).
  10. 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>.
  11. Gallant JE, DeJesus E, Arribas JR, et al. Tenofovir DF, emtricitabine, and efavirenz vs. zidovudine, lamivudine, and efavirenz for HIV. *N Engl J Med*. 2006;354(3):251-260. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16421366](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16421366).
  12. Lennox JL, DeJesus E, Lazzarin A, et al. Safety and efficacy of raltegravir-based versus efavirenz-based combination therapy in treatment-naïve patients with HIV-1 infection: a multicentre, double-blind randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2009;374(9692):796-806. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19647866](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19647866).
  13. 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>.
  14. Cohen CJ, Molina JM, Cassetti I, et al. Week 96 efficacy and safety of rilpivirine in treatment-naïve, 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>.
  15. 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>.
  16. Rockstroh JK, DeJesus E, Lennox JL, et al. Durable efficacy and safety of raltegravir versus efavirenz when combined with tenofovir/emtricitabine in treatment-naïve 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>.
  17. 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>.
  18. Landovitz RJ RH, Ofotokun I, et al. Efficacy and tolerability of atazanavir, raltegravir or darunavir with FTC/tenofovir: ACTG 5257. Abstract 85. Paper presented at the 21st Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; March 3–6, 2014; Boston, MA.
  19. Zolopa A, Sax PE, DeJesus E, et al. A randomized double-blind comparison of coformulated elvitegravir/cobicistat/emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate versus efavirenz/emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection: analysis of week 96 results. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2013;63(1):96-100. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23392460>.
  20. Clumeck N, Molina J, 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 Synr*. 2014;65(3):e121-124. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2434664>.
  21. Raffi F, Jaeger H, Quiros-Roldan E, et al. Once-daily dolutegravir versus twice-daily raltegravir in antiretroviral-naïve 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>.
  22. Clotet B, Feinberg J, van Lunzen J, et al. Once-daily dolutegravir versus darunavir plus ritonavir in antiretroviral-naïve 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>.
  23. 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-naïve, HIV-1-infected adults: 48-week results from the ASSERT study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2010;55(1):49-57. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20431394](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20431394).
  24. Sax PE, Tierney C, Collier AC, et al. Abacavir/Lamivudine Versus Tenofovir DF/Emtricitabine as Part of Combination Regimens for Initial Treatment of HIV: Final Results. *J Infect Dis*. 2011;204(8):1191-1201. Available at



- [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21917892](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21917892).
25. Cassetti I, Madruga JV, Etzel A, et al. The safety and efficacy of tenofovir DF (TDF) in combination with lamivudine (3TC) and efavirenz (EFV) in antiretroviral-naïve patients through seven years. Paper presented at: 17th International AIDS Conference; 2008; Mexico City, Mexico.
  26. Molina JM, Podsadecski 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18160008](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18160008).
  27. 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-naïve HIV-1-infected patients: 48 week efficacy and safety results of the CASTLE study. *Lancet*. 2008;372(9639):646-655. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18722869](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18722869).
  28. Ortiz R, Dejesus E, Khanlou H, et al. Efficacy and safety of once-daily darunavir/ritonavir versus lopinavir/ritonavir in treatment-naïve HIV-1-infected patients at week 48. *AIDS*. 2008;22(12):1389-1397. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18614861](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18614861).
  29. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18373851](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18373851).
  30. 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>.
  31. DeJesus E, Rockstroh JK, Lennox JL, et al. Efficacy of raltegravir versus efavirenz when combined with tenofovir/emtricitabine in treatment-naïve 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>.
  32. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12684922](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12684922).
  33. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16355343](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16355343).
  34. 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>.
  35. Moore R, Keruly J, Gallant J. Tenofovir and renal dysfunction in clinical practice. Paper presented at: 14th Conference on Retrovirus and Opportunistic Infections; 2007; Los Angeles, CA.
  36. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17079992](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17079992).
  37. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18171292](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18171292).
  38. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17597712](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17597712).
  39. Gallant JE, Moore RD. Renal function with use of a tenofovir-containing initial antiretroviral regimen. *AIDS*. 2009;23(15):1971-1975. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19696652](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19696652).
  40. Stribild [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2013. Available at [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/label/2013/203100s009lbl.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2013/203100s009lbl.pdf). Accessed February 24, 2014.

41. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20828304](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20828304).
42. McComsey GA, Kitch D, Daar ES, et al. Bone mineral density and fractures in antiretroviral-naïve 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21606537](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21606537).
43. Perrot S, Aslangul E, Szwedebel T, Caillat-Vigneron N, Le Jeune 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>.
44. DeJesus E, Herrera G, Teofilo E, et al. Abacavir versus zidovudine combined with lamivudine and efavirenz, for the treatment of antiretroviral-naïve HIV-infected adults. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2004;39(7):1038-1046. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15472858](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15472858).
45. 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-naïve HIV-1-infected patients. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2004;35(1):22-32. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14707788](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=14707788).
46. Gathe JC, Jr., Ive P, Wood R, et al. SOLO: 48-week efficacy and safety comparison of once-daily fosamprenavir /ritonavir versus twice-daily nelfinavir in naïve HIV-1-infected patients. *AIDS*. 2004;18(11):1529-1537. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15238771](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15238771).
47. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18444831](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18444831).
48. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18256392](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18256392).
49. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20039804](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20039804).
50. The SMART/INSIGHT and the D:A:D Study Groups. Use of nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors and risk of myocardial infarction in HIV-infected patients. *AIDS*. 2008;22(14):F17-24. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18753925](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18753925).
51. Durand M, Sheehy O, Baril JG, Leloir 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21499115](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21499115).
52. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19282778](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19282778).
53. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20660842](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20660842).
54. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21653308](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21653308).
55. Ribaud 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

- [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21427402](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21427402).
56. Kim D, Wheeler W, Ziebell R, et al. Prevalence of transmitted antiretroviral drug resistance among newly-diagnosed HIV-1-infected persons, U.S., 2007. Paper presented at: 17th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2010; San Francisco, CA.
57. Kim D, Ziebell R, Saduvala N, et al. Trend in transmitted HIV-1 ARV drug resistance-associated mutations: 10 HIV surveillance areas, U.S., 2007–2010. Abstract 149. Paper presented at: 20th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections (CROI 2013); March 3–6, 2013; Atlanta; Georgia.
58. Andries K, Azijn H, Thielemans T, et al. TMC125, a novel next-generation nonnucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor active against nonnucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor-resistant human immunodeficiency virus type 1. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2004;48(12):4680-4686. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15561844](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15561844).
59. Cohen CJ, Molina JM, Cahn P, et al. Efficacy and safety of rilpivirine (TMC278) versus efavirenz at 48 weeks in treatment-naïve 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>.
60. Edurant [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2013. Available at [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/label/2013/202022s0051bl.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2013/202022s0051bl.pdf). Accessed February 24, 2014.
61. Intelence [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2013. Available at [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/label/2013/022187s011s012s0141bl.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2013/022187s011s012s0141bl.pdf). Accessed February 24, 2014.
62. Gazzard B, Duvivier C, Zagler C, et al. Phase 2 double-blind, randomised trial of etravirine versus efavirenz in treatment-naïve patients: 48 week results. *AIDS*. 2011. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21881478](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21881478).
63. Riddler SA, Haubrich R, DiRienzo AG, et al. Class-sparing regimens for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;358(20):2095-2106. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18480202](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18480202).
64. van Leth F, Phanuphak P, Ruxrungtham K, et al. Comparison of first-line antiretroviral therapy with regimens including nevirapine, efavirenz, or both drugs, plus stavudine and lamivudine: a randomised open-label trial, the 2NN Study. *Lancet*. 2004;363(9417):1253-1263. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15094269](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15094269).
65. Cohen C. STaR study: single tablet regimen rilpivirine/emtricitabine/tenofovir has non-inferior efficacy compared to efavirenz/emtricitabine/tenofovir DF and improves patient reported outcomes. Abstract TUPE284. Paper presented at: 7th IAS Conference on HIV Pathogenesis, Treatment and Prevention; Jun 30–Jul 3, 2013; Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.
66. Group ES. Efficacy of 400 mg efavirenz versus standard 600 mg dose in HIV-infected, antiretroviral-naïve adults (ENCORE1): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet*. 2014. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24522178>.
67. Mollan K, Tierney C, Smurzynski M, et al. Suicidality in patients randomly assigned to efavirenz for initial treatment of HIV-1. Paper presented at: ID Week; 2013, San Francisco, CA.
68. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11807320](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11807320).
69. Cohen C, Wohl D, Arribas J, et al. Week 48 results from a randomized clinical trial of rilpivirine/emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate vs. efavirenz/emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate in treatment-naïve HIV-1-infected adults. *AIDS*. 2014;28(7):989-987. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24508782>.
70. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21311113](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21311113).
71. Soriano V, Arasteh K, Migrone H, et al. Nevirapine versus atazanavir/ritonavir, each combined with tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine, in antiretroviral-naïve HIV-1 patients: the ARTEN Trial. *Antivir Ther*. 2011;16(3):339-348. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21555816](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21555816).
72. 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>.



73. 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 <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/PerinatalGL.pdf>.
74. 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-naïve 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20032785](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20032785).
75. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17502736](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17502736).
76. 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>.
77. 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>.
78. 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>.
79. 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>.
80. 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-naïve patients in the ARTEMIS trial. *HIV Med*. 2013;14(1):49-59. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23088336>.
81. Trottier B, Machouf N, Thomas R, et al. Abacavir/lamivudine fixed-dose combination with ritonavir-boosted darunavir: a safe and efficacious regimen for HIV therapy. *HIV Clin Trials*. 2012;13(6):335-342. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23195671>.
82. Murphy RL, da Silva BA, Hicks CB, et al. Seven-year efficacy of a lopinavir/ritonavir-based regimen in antiretroviral-naïve HIV-1-infected patients. *HIV Clin Trials*. 2008;9(1):1-10. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18215977](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18215977).
83. 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>.
84. 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>.
85. Young B, Vanig T, Dejesus E, et al. A pilot study of abacavir/lamivudine and raltegravir in antiretroviral-naïve HIV-1-infected patients: 48-week results of the SHIELD trial. *HIV Clin Trials*. 2010;11(5):260-269. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21126956](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21126956).
86. Isentress [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2013. Available at <http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/drugsatfda/index.cfm?fuseaction=Search.Overview&DrugName=ISENTRESS&CFID=23260658&CFTOKEN=7a9d32074acb2921-F7406A7E-96B4-5EF1-32E62C6D79A47CCF>. Accessed February 24, 2014.
87. Raffi F BA, Richert L, et al. First-Line RAL + DRV/r is non-inferior to TDF/FTC + DRV/r: The NEAT001/ANRS143 Randomised trial. Abstract 84LB. Paper presented at: the 21st Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; March 3–6, 2014; Boston, MA.
88. Taiwo B, Zheng L, Gallien S, et al. Efficacy of a nucleoside-sparing regimen of darunavir/ritonavir plus raltegravir in treatment-naïve HIV-1-infected patients (ACTG A5262). *AIDS*. 2011;25(17):2113-2122. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21857490>.
89. Bedimo R, Drechsler H, Cutrell J, Jain M, Tebas P, Maalouf N. RADAR study: week 48 safety and efficacy of raltegravir combined with boosted darunavir compared to tenofovir/emtricitabine combined with boosted darunavir in antiretroviral-naïve patients. Impact on bone health. Abstract WEPE512. Paper presented at: 7th IAS Conference on HIV Pathogenesis,

treatment and prevention. Jun 30–Jul 3, 2013; Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

90. Reynes J, Trinh R, Pulido F, et al. Lopinavir/ritonavir combined with raltegravir or tenofovir/emtricitabine in antiretroviral-naïve subjects: 96-week results of the PROGRESS study. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2013;29(2):256-265. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22730929>.
91. Kozal MJ, Lupo S, DeJesus E, et al. A nucleoside- and ritonavir-sparing regimen containing atazanavir plus raltegravir in antiretroviral treatment-naïve HIV-infected patients: SPARTAN study results. *HIV Clin Trials*. 2012;13(3):119-130. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22592092>.
92. Cahn P, with the GARDEL Study Group. Dual therapy with lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/r) and lamivudine (3TC) is non-inferior to standard triple drug therapy in naïve HIV-1 infected subjects: 48-week results of the GARDEL study. Abstract LBPS7/6. Paper presented at: 14th European AIDS Conference (EACS 2013); October 16–19, 2013; Brussels; Belgium.



## What Not to Use (Last updated March 27, 2012; last reviewed March 27, 2012)

---

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 Regimens Not Recommended

**Monotherapy with nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NRTI).** Single-NRTI therapy does not demonstrate potent and sustained antiviral activity and **should not be used (AII)**. For prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT), zidovudine (ZDV) monotherapy is not recommended but might be considered in certain unusual circumstances in women with HIV RNA <1,000 copies/mL, although the use of a potent combination regimen is preferred. (See [Perinatal Guidelines](#),<sup>1</sup> available at <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov>.)

Single-drug treatment regimens with a ritonavir (RTV)-boosted protease inhibitor (PI), either lopinavir (LPV),<sup>2</sup> atazanavir (ATV),<sup>3</sup> or darunavir (DRV)<sup>4-5</sup> are under investigation with mixed results, and **cannot be recommended** outside of a clinical trial at this time.

**Dual-NRTI regimens.** These regimens **are not recommended** because they have not demonstrated potent and sustained antiviral activity compared with triple-drug combination regimens (**AI**).<sup>6</sup>

**Triple-NRTI regimens.** In general, triple-NRTI regimens other than abacavir/lamivudine/zidovudine (ABC/3TC/ZDV) (**BI**) and possibly lamivudine/zidovudine + tenofovir (3TC/ZDV + TDF) (**BII**) **should not be used** because of suboptimal virologic activity<sup>7-9</sup> or lack of data (**AI**).

### Antiretroviral Components Not Recommended

**Atazanavir (ATV) + indinavir (IDV).** Both of these PIs can cause Grade 3 to 4 hyperbilirubinemia and jaundice. Additive adverse effects may be possible when these agents are used concomitantly. Therefore, these two PIs **are not recommended** for combined use (**AIII**).

**Didanosine (ddI) + stavudine (d4T).** The combined use of ddI and d4T as a dual-NRTI backbone can result in a high incidence of toxicities, particularly peripheral neuropathy, pancreatitis, and lactic acidosis.<sup>10-13</sup> This combination has been implicated in the deaths of several HIV-infected pregnant women secondary to severe lactic acidosis with or without hepatic steatosis and pancreatitis.<sup>14</sup> Therefore, the combined use of ddI and d4T **is not recommended (AII)**.

**Didanosine (ddI) + tenofovir (TDF).** Use of ddI + TDF may increase ddI concentrations<sup>15</sup> and serious ddI-associated toxicities including pancreatitis and lactic acidosis.<sup>16-17</sup> These toxicities may be lessened by ddI dose reduction. The use of this combination has also been associated with immunologic nonresponse or CD4 cell decline despite viral suppression,<sup>18-19</sup> high rates of early virologic failure,<sup>20-21</sup> and rapid selection of resistance mutations.<sup>20-22</sup> Because of these adverse outcomes, this dual-NRTI combination **is not generally recommended (AII)**. Clinicians caring for patients who are clinically stable on regimens containing ddI + TDF should consider altering the NRTIs to avoid this combination.

**Two-non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (2-NNRTI) combinations.** In the 2NN trial, ARV-naïve participants were randomized to receive once- or twice-daily nevirapine (NVP) versus efavirenz (EFV) versus EFV plus NVP, all combined with d4T and 3TC.<sup>23</sup> A higher frequency of clinical adverse events that led to treatment discontinuation was reported in participants randomized to the two-NNRTI arm. Both EFV and NVP may induce metabolism of etravirine (ETR), which leads to reduction in ETR drug exposure.<sup>24</sup> Based on these findings, the Panel **does not recommend using two NNRTIs in combination in any regimen (AI)**.

**Efavirenz (EFV) in first trimester of pregnancy and in women with significant childbearing potential.**

EFV use was associated with significant teratogenic effects in nonhuman primates at drug exposures similar to those representing human exposure. Several cases of congenital anomalies have been reported after early human gestational exposure to EFV.<sup>25-26</sup> EFV **should be avoided** in pregnancy, particularly during the first trimester, and in women of childbearing potential who are trying to conceive or who are not using effective and consistent contraception (**AIII**). If no other ARV options are available for the woman who is pregnant or at risk of becoming pregnant, the provider should consult with a clinician who has expertise in both HIV infection and pregnancy. (See [Perinatal Guidelines](#),<sup>1</sup> available at <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov>.)

**Emtricitabine (FTC) + lamivudine (3TC).** Both of these drugs have similar resistance profiles and have minimal additive antiviral activity. Inhibition of intracellular phosphorylation may occur *in vivo*, as seen with other dual-cytidine analog combinations.<sup>27</sup> These two agents **should not be used** as a dual-NRTI combination (**AIII**).

**Etravirine (ETR) + unboosted PI.** ETR may induce the metabolism and significantly reduce the drug exposure of unboosted PIs. Appropriate doses of the PIs have not been established<sup>24</sup> (**AII**).

**Etravirine (ETR) + ritonavir (RTV)-boosted atazanavir (ATV) or fosamprenavir (FPV).** ETR may alter the concentrations of these PIs. Appropriate doses of the PIs have not been established<sup>24</sup> (**AII**).

**Etravirine (ETR) + ritonavir (RTV)-boosted tipranavir (TPV).** RTV-boosted TPV significantly reduces ETR concentrations. These drugs **should not be co-administered**<sup>24</sup> (**AII**).

**Nevirapine (NVP) initiated in ARV-naïve women with CD4 counts >250 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> or in ARV-naïve men with CD4 counts >400 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>.** Greater risk of symptomatic hepatic events, including serious and life-threatening events, has been observed in these patient groups. NVP **should not be initiated** in these patients (**BI**) unless the benefit clearly outweighs the risk.<sup>28-30</sup> Patients who experience CD4 count increases to levels above these thresholds as a result of antiretroviral therapy (ART) can be safely switched to NVP.<sup>31</sup>

**Unboosted darunavir (DRV), saquinavir (SQV), or tipranavir (TPV).** The virologic benefit of these PIs has been demonstrated only when they were used with concomitant RTV. Therefore, use of these agents as part of a combination regimen **without RTV is not recommended** (**AII**).

**Stavudine (d4T) + zidovudine (ZDV).** These two NRTIs **should not be used** in combination because of antagonism demonstrated *in vitro*<sup>32</sup> and *in vivo*<sup>33</sup> (**AII**).

**Table 9. Antiretroviral Regimens or Components That Should Not Be Offered At Any Time (page 1 of 2)**

	Rationale	Exception
<b>Antiretroviral Regimens <u>Not</u> Recommended</b>		
<b>Monotherapy with NRTI (All)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rapid development of resistance</li> <li>• Inferior ARV activity when compared with combination of three or more ARV agents</li> </ul>	• No exception
<b>Dual-NRTI regimens (AI)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rapid development of resistance</li> <li>• Inferior ARV activity when compared with combination of three or more ARV agents</li> </ul>	• No exception
<b>Triple-NRTI regimens (AI) except for ABC/ZDV/3TC (BI) or possibly TDF + ZDV/3TC (BII)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High rate of early virologic nonresponse seen when triple-NRTI combinations, including ABC/TDF/3TC and TDF/ddI/3TC, were used as initial regimen in ART-naïve patients.</li> <li>• Other triple-NRTI regimens have not been evaluated.</li> </ul>	• ABC/ZDV/3TC (BI) and possibly TDF + ZDV/3TC (BII) in patients in whom other combinations are not desirable
<b>Antiretroviral Components <u>Not</u> Recommended as Part of an Antiretroviral Regimen</b>		
<b>ATV + IDV (AIII)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential additive hyperbilirubinemia</li> </ul>	• No exception
<b>ddI + d4T (All)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High incidence of toxicities: peripheral neuropathy, pancreatitis, and hyperlactatemia</li> <li>• Reports of serious, even fatal, cases of lactic acidosis with hepatic steatosis with or without pancreatitis in pregnant women</li> </ul>	• No exception
<b>ddI + TDF (All)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increased ddI concentrations and serious ddI-associated toxicities</li> <li>• Potential for immunologic nonresponse and/or CD4 cell count decline</li> <li>• High rate of early virologic failure</li> <li>• Rapid selection of resistance mutations at failure</li> </ul>	• Clinicians caring for patients who are clinically stable on regimens containing TDF + ddI should consider altering the NRTIs to avoid this combination.
<b>2-NNRTI combination (AI)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• When EFV combined with NVP, higher incidence of clinical adverse events seen when compared with either EFV- or NVP-based regimen.</li> <li>• Both EFV and NVP may induce metabolism and may lead to reductions in ETR exposure; thus, they should not be used in combination with ETR.</li> </ul>	• No exception
<b>EFV in first trimester of pregnancy or in women with significant childbearing potential (AIII)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Teratogenic in nonhuman primates</li> </ul>	• When no other ARV options are available and potential benefits outweigh the risks (BIII)
<b>FTC + 3TC (AIII)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Similar resistance profiles</li> <li>• No potential benefit</li> </ul>	• No exception
<b>ETR + unboosted PI (All)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ETR may induce metabolism of these PIs; appropriate doses not yet established</li> </ul>	• No exception
<b>ETR + RTV-boosted ATV or FPV (All)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ETR may alter the concentrations of these PIs; appropriate doses not yet established</li> </ul>	• No exception
<b>ETR + RTV-boosted TPV (All)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ETR concentration may be significantly reduced by RTV-boosted TPV</li> </ul>	• No exception

**Table 9. Antiretroviral Regimens or Components That Should Not Be Offered At Any Time (page 2 of 2)**

	Rationale	Exception
<b>NVP in ARV-naïve women with CD4 count &gt;250 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> or men with CD4 count &gt;400 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (BI)</b>	• High incidence of symptomatic hepatotoxicity	• If no other ARV option available; if used, patient should be closely monitored
<b>d4T + ZDV (All)</b>	• Antagonistic effect on HIV-1	• No exception
<b>Unboosted DRV, SQV, or TPV (All)</b>	• Inadequate bioavailability	• No exception

**Acronyms:** 3TC = lamivudine, ABC = abacavir, ATV = atazanavir, d4T = stavudine, ddI = didanosine, DRV = darunavir, EFV = efavirenz, ETR = etravirine, FPV = fosamprenavir, FTC = emtricitabine, IDV = indinavir, NVP = nevirapine, RTV = ritonavir, SQV = saquinavir, TDF = tenofovir, TPV = tipranavir, ZDV = zidovudine

## References

1. 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 <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/PerinatalGL.pdf>.
2. Delfraissy JF, Flandre P, Delaugerre C, et al. Lopinavir/ritonavir monotherapy or plus zidovudine and lamivudine in antiretroviral-naïve HIV-infected patients. *AIDS*. 2008;22(3):385-393.
3. Swindells S, DiRienzo AG, Wilkin T, et al. Regimen simplification to atazanavir-ritonavir alone as maintenance antiretroviral therapy after sustained virologic suppression. *JAMA*. 2006;296(7):806-814.
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*. 2010;24(2):223-230.
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*. 2010;24(15):2365-2374.
6. 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*. 1999;180(3):659-665.
7. Gallant JE, Rodriguez AE, Weinberg WG, et al. Early virologic nonresponse to tenofovir, abacavir, and lamivudine in HIV-infected antiretroviral-naïve subjects. *J Infect Dis*. 2005;192(11):1921-1930.
8. 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*. 2006;43(3):284-292.
9. Barnas D, Koontz D, Bazmi H, et al. Clonal resistance analyses of HIV type-1 after failure of therapy with didanosine, lamivudine and tenofovir. *Antivir Ther*. 2010;15(3):437-441.
10. Moore RD, Wong WM, Keruly JC, et al. Incidence of neuropathy in HIV-infected patients on monotherapy versus those on combination therapy with didanosine, stavudine and hydroxyurea. *AIDS*. 2000;14(3):273-278.
11. Robbins GK, De Gruttola V, Shafer RW, et al. Comparison of sequential three-drug regimens as initial therapy for HIV-1 infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;349(24):2293-2303.
12. Boubaker K, Flepp M, Sudre P, et al. Hyperlactatemia and antiretroviral therapy: the Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2001;33(11):1931-1937.
13. Coghlan ME, Sommadossi JP, Jhala NC, et al. Symptomatic lactic acidosis in hospitalized antiretroviral-treated patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection: a report of 12 cases. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2001;33(11):1914-1921.

14. FDA FaDA. Caution issued for HIV combination therapy with Zerit and Videx in pregnant women. *HIV Clin.* 2001;13(2):6.
15. Kearney BP, Sayre JR, Flaherty JF, et al. Drug-drug and drug-food interactions between tenofovir disoproxil fumarate and didanosine. *J Clin Pharmacol.* 2005;45(12):1360-1367.
16. 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.* 2003;36(8):1082-1085.
17. 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.* 2004;364(9428):65-67.
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.* 2005;19(6):569-575.
19. Negredo E, Bonjoch A, Paredes R, et al. Compromised immunologic recovery in treatment-experienced patients with HIV infection receiving both tenofovir disoproxil fumarate and didanosine in the TORO studies. *Clin Infect Dis.* 2005;41(6):901-905.
20. Leon A, Martinez E, Mallolas J, et al. Early virological failure in treatment-naïve HIV-infected adults receiving didanosine and tenofovir plus efavirenz or nevirapine. *AIDS.* 2005;19(2):213-215.
21. 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.* 2005;19(11):1183-1188.
22. Podzamczar 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.
23. van Leth F, Phanuphak P, Ruxrungtham K, et al. Comparison of first-line antiretroviral therapy with regimens including nevirapine, efavirenz, or both drugs, plus stavudine and lamivudine: a randomised open-label trial, the 2NN Study. *Lancet.* 2004;363(9417):1253-1263.
24. Tibotec, Inc. Intelence (package insert) 2009.
25. Fundaro C, Genovese O, Rendeli C, et al. Myelomeningocele in a child with intrauterine exposure to efavirenz. *AIDS.* 2002;16(2):299-300.
26. Antiretroviral Pregnancy Registry Steering Committee. Antiretroviral Pregnancy Registry international interim report for 1 Jan 1989 - 31 January 2007. 2007; <http://www.APRegistry.com>.
27. Bethell R, Adams J, DeMuys J, et al. Pharmacological evaluation of a dual deoxycytidine analogue combination: 3TC and SPD754. Paper presented at: 11th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; February 8-11, 2004; San Francisco, California. Abstract 138.
28. Baylor MS, Johann-Liang R. Hepatotoxicity associated with nevirapine use. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2004;35(5):538-539.
29. Sanne I, Mommeja-Marin H, Hinkle J, et al. Severe hepatotoxicity associated with nevirapine use in HIV-infected subjects. *J Infect Dis.* 2005;191(6):825-829.
30. Boehringer Ingelheim. Dear Health Care Professional Letter. *Clarification of risk factors for severe, life-threatening and fatal hepatotoxicity with VIRAMUNE® (nevirapine)* 2004.
31. Kesselring AM, Wit FW, Sabin CA, et al. Risk factors for treatment-limiting toxicities in patients starting nevirapine-containing antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS.* 2009;23(13):1689-1699.
32. Hoggard PG, Kewn S, Barry MG, et al. Effects of drugs on 2',3'-dideoxy-2',3'-didehydrothymidine phosphorylation *in vitro*. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 1997;41(6):1231-1236.
33. Havlir DV, Tierney C, Friedland GH, et al. *In vivo* antagonism with zidovudine plus stavudine combination therapy. *J Infect Dis.* 2000;182(1):321-325.



# Management of the Treatment-Experienced Patient

## Virologic Failure and Suboptimal Immunologic Response (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

### Panel's Recommendations

- Assessing and managing an antiretroviral (ARV)-experienced patient experiencing antiretroviral therapy (ART) failure is complex. Expert advice is critical and should be sought.
- Evaluation of virologic failure should include an assessment of adherence, drug-drug or drug-food interactions, drug tolerability, HIV RNA and CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) cell count trends over time, treatment history, and prior and current drug-resistance testing results.
  - Drug-resistance testing should be performed while the patient is taking the failing ARV regimen **(AI)** or within 4 weeks of treatment discontinuation **(AII)**. Even if more than 4 weeks have elapsed since the ARVs were discontinued, resistance testing can still provide useful information to guide therapy, though it may not detect previously selected resistance mutations **(CIII)**.
- The goal of treatment for ARV-experienced patients with drug resistance who are experiencing virologic failure is to establish virologic suppression (i.e., HIV RNA below the lower limits of detection of currently used assays) **(AI)**.
- A new regimen should include at least two, preferably three, fully active agents **(AI)**. A fully active agent is one that is expected to have ARV activity on the basis of the patient's treatment history and drug-resistance testing results and/or the drug's novel mechanism of action.
- In general, adding a single fully active ARV agent to a virologically failing regimen is **not** recommended because of the risk of development of resistance to all drugs in the regimen **(BII)**.
- For some highly ARV-experienced patients, maximal virologic suppression is not possible. In this case, ART should be continued **(AI)** with regimens designed to minimize toxicity, preserve CD4 cell counts, and at least delay clinical progression.
- When no viable suppressive regimen can be constructed for a patient with multi-drug resistant HIV, the clinician should consider enrolling the patient in a clinical trial of investigational agents or contacting pharmaceutical sponsors that may have investigational agents available.
- Discontinuing or briefly interrupting therapy may lead to a rapid increase in HIV RNA and a decrease in CD4 cell count and increases the risk of clinical progression. Therefore, this strategy is **not** recommended **(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

With use of antiretroviral therapy (ART) regimens currently recommended for initial therapy, HIV-infected patients have a high likelihood of achieving and maintaining plasma HIV RNA levels below the lower limits of detection (LLOD) of currently used assays (see [What to Start](#)). Patients on ART who do not achieve this treatment goal or who experience virologic rebound often develop resistance mutations to one or more components of their regimens, depending upon the regimen initiated. It is estimated that nearly 25% of those receiving ART are not virologically suppressed.<sup>1,2</sup> Many patients with detectable viral loads are non-adherent to treatment. Depending on their treatment histories, some of these patients may have minimal or no drug resistance; 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 these individuals.

### Virologic Definitions

**Virologic Suppression:** A confirmed HIV RNA level below the LLOD of available assay.

**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  $\geq 200$  copies/mL after 24 weeks on an ARV regimen. Baseline HIV RNA may affect the time course of response; some regimens will take longer than others to suppress HIV RNA levels.

**Virologic Rebound:** Confirmed HIV RNA  $\geq 200$  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.

### ***Goal of ART Treatment and Virologic Responses***

The goal of ART is to suppress HIV replication to a level below which drug-resistance mutations do not emerge. Although the evidence is not conclusive, it is generally believed that selection of drug resistance mutations does not occur in patients with HIV RNA levels persistently suppressed to below the LLOD of current assays.<sup>3</sup>

There is controversy regarding the clinical implications of HIV RNA levels between the LLOD and <200 copies/mL in patients on ART. In addition, viremia at this threshold appears to occur more frequently because newer real-time PCR assays are more sensitive than PCR-based viral load platforms used in the past.<sup>4-6</sup> Findings from a large retrospective analysis showed that an HIV RNA threshold for virologic failure of <200 copies/mL had the same predictive value for virologic rebound to >200 copies/mL as a threshold of <50 copies/mL.<sup>7</sup>

However, some studies have suggested that viremia at this low level (i.e., <200 copies/mL) can be predictive of progressive viral rebound<sup>8,9</sup> and can be associated with the evolution of drug resistance.<sup>10</sup> In contrast to individuals with higher levels of HIV RNA, a substantial amount of circulating virus in those with low level of HIV RNA (<50 copies/mL) is believed to result from the release of HIV from long-lived latently infected cells and does not signify ongoing viral replication with the potential emergence of drug-resistant virus.<sup>11</sup>

Persistent HIV RNA levels  $\geq 200$  copies/mL are often associated with evidence of viral evolution and accumulation of drug-resistance mutation.<sup>12</sup> This association is particularly common when HIV RNA levels are >500 copies/mL.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, persistent plasma HIV RNA levels  $\geq 200$  copies/mL should be considered virologic failure.

Viremia blips (e.g., viral suppression followed by a detectable HIV RNA level and subsequent return to undetectable levels) are not usually associated with subsequent virologic failure.<sup>14</sup>

### ***Causes of Virologic Failure***

Virologic failure can occur in a patient for many reasons. Data from patient cohorts in the earlier era of combination ART suggested that suboptimal adherence and drug intolerance/toxicity accounted for 28% to 40% of virologic failure and regimen discontinuations.<sup>15,16</sup> More recent data suggest that most virologic failure on first-line regimens occurs because of either pre-existing (transmitted) drug resistance or suboptimal adherence.<sup>17</sup> Virologic failure is associated with both patient- and regimen-related factors.

#### **Patient-Related Factors:**

- Higher pretreatment or baseline HIV RNA level (depending on the specific regimen used)
- Lower pretreatment or nadir CD4 T-cell count (depending on the specific regimen used)
- Comorbidities (e.g., active substance abuse, psychiatric disease, neurocognitive deficits)
- Presence of drug-resistant virus, either transmitted or acquired
- Prior treatment failure
- Incomplete medication adherence and missed clinic appointments

- Interruption of or intermittent access to ART

#### ARV Regimen-Related Factors:

- Drug adverse effects and toxicities
- Suboptimal pharmacokinetics (variable absorption, metabolism, or, theoretically, penetration into reservoirs)
- Suboptimal virologic potency
- Prior exposure to suboptimal regimens (e.g., functional monotherapy)
- Food requirements
- High pill burden and/or dosing frequency
- Adverse drug-drug interactions with concomitant medications
- Prescription errors

### ***Management of Patients with Virologic Failure***

#### **Assessment of Virologic Failure**

If virologic failure is suspected or confirmed, a thorough work-up that includes consideration of the factors listed in the Causes of Virologic Failure section above is indicated. In many cases, the cause(s) of virologic failure can be identified. In some cases, however, no obvious cause(s) may be found. It is important to distinguish among the causes for virologic failure because the approaches to subsequent therapy differ. The following potential causes of virologic failure should be explored in depth.

- **Incomplete Adherence.** Assess the patient's adherence to the regimen. Identify and address the underlying cause(s) for incomplete adherence (e.g., drug intolerance, difficulty accessing medications, depression, active substance abuse) and, if possible, simplify the regimen (e.g., decrease pill count or dosing frequency) (see [Adherence](#)).
- **Medication Intolerance.** Assess 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. Management strategies to address intolerance in the absence of drug resistance may include:
  - Using symptomatic treatment (e.g., antiemetics, antidiarrheals)
  - Changing one ARV in a regimen to another agent in the same drug class (see [Adverse Effects](#) section)
  - Changing from one drug class to another class (e.g., from a Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitor [NNRTI] to a protease inhibitor [PI] or an integrase strand transfer inhibitor [INSTI]) if necessary (see [Adverse Effects](#) section).
- **Pharmacokinetic Issues.**
  - Review food requirement for each medication, and assess whether the patient adheres to the requirement.
  - Review recent history of gastrointestinal symptoms such as vomiting or diarrhea that may result in short-term malabsorption.
  - Review concomitant medications and dietary supplements for possible adverse drug-drug interactions (consult [Drug Interactions](#) section and tables for common interactions) and make appropriate substitutions for ARV agents and/or concomitant medications, if possible.
  - Consider therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) if pharmacokinetic drug-drug interactions or impaired drug absorption leading to decreased ARV exposure is suspected (see also [Exposure-Response Relationship and Therapeutic Drug Monitoring](#)).

- **Suspected Drug Resistance.** Perform resistance testing while the patient is still taking the failing regimen or within 4 weeks after the regimen is discontinued if the patient's plasma HIV RNA level is >1000 copies/mL (**AI**), and possibly even if between 500 to 1000 copies/mL (**BII**) (see [Drug-Resistance Testing](#)). In some patients, resistance testing should be considered even after treatment interruptions of more than 4 weeks—recognizing 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**). Evaluate the extent of drug resistance, taking into account the patient's past treatment history and prior resistance test results. Drug resistance is cumulative; thus, all prior treatment history and resistance test results should be considered when evaluating resistance. Routine genotypic or phenotypic testing provides information relevant for selecting nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs), NNRTIs, and PIs. Additional drug-resistance tests for patients experiencing failure on INSTIs and/or a fusion inhibitor (**AII**), and viral tropism tests for patients experiencing failure on a CCR5 antagonist (**BIII**) are also available. Typically, these tests must be ordered separately from tests for resistance to NRTIs, NNRTIs, and PIs. (See [Drug-Resistance Testing](#).)

### Managing Virologic Failure

Once virologic failure is confirmed, every effort should be made to assess if poor adherence and drug-drug or drug-food interactions may be contributing to the inadequate virologic response to ART. In general, if virologic failure persists after these issues have been adequately addressed, the regimen should be changed as soon as possible to avoid progressive accumulation of resistance mutations.<sup>18</sup> In addition, several studies have shown that virologic responses to new regimens are greater in individuals with lower HIV RNA levels<sup>8,19</sup> and/or higher CD4 cell counts at the time of regimen changes.<sup>8,19</sup> Discontinuing or briefly interrupting therapy in a patient with viremia may lead to a rapid increase in HIV RNA and a decrease in CD4 cell count and increases the risk of clinical progression.<sup>20,21</sup> Therefore, this strategy is **not** recommended (**AI**) (see [Discontinuation or Interruption of Antiretroviral Therapy](#)).

Ideally, a new ARV regimen should contain at least two, and preferably three, fully active drugs whose expected activity is based on the patient's drug treatment history, resistance testing, or the mechanistic action of a new drug class (**AI**).<sup>8,22-31</sup> Despite drug resistance, some ARV drugs (e.g., NRTIs) may contribute partial ARV activity to a regimen<sup>21</sup>, but other agents (e.g., enfuvirtide [T-20], NNRTIs, raltegravir [RAL]) likely will not.<sup>32-34</sup> Using a "new" drug that a patient has not previously taken does not ensure that the drug will be fully active; there is still the potential for drug-class cross-resistance that reduces drug activity. In addition, 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. This illustrates the importance of considering both treatment history and prior and current drug-resistance test results when designing a new regimen. Drug potency and viral susceptibility are more important factors to consider than the number of component drugs.

In general, patients who receive at least three active drugs selected on the basis of past and present drug resistance test results and treatment history, experience better and more sustained virologic responses than those receiving regimens with fewer active drugs. However, in select cases, adding a fully active ritonavir-boosted [RTV] PI (PI/r) to a single active drug may result in a regimen that is as effective as a regimen that includes more active agents.<sup>23,24,26,27,35,36</sup> Active ARV drugs are those with activity against drug-resistant viral strains. These include newer members of existing drug classes that are active against HIV that are resistant to older drugs in the same classes (e.g., ETR, DRV and tipranavir [TPV], and **dolutegravir [DTG]**)<sup>8,31</sup> and drugs with unique mechanisms of action (e.g., the fusion inhibitor T-20, the CCR5 antagonist maraviroc [MVC] in patients with no detectable CXCR4-using virus). In the presence of certain drug resistance mutations, the recommended doses of select ARVs, such as DRV/r and DTG need to be given twice daily instead of once daily to achieve higher drug concentrations.<sup>37,38</sup> Drug-resistance tests for patients experiencing failure on a FI and/or INSTIs, and viral tropism tests for patients experiencing failure on a CCR5 antagonist are also available, although these assays must be performed independent of routine drug resistance testing (see [Drug-Resistance Testing](#)).



## Clinical Scenarios of Virologic Failure

- **HIV RNA above the LLOD and <200 copies/mL.** Confirm that levels remain above the LLOD and assess adherence and drug-drug interactions (including those with over the counter products and supplements) and drug-food interactions. Patients with HIV RNA typically below the LLOD with transient increases in HIV RNA (i.e., blips) do not require a change in treatment (**AII**).<sup>5</sup> Although there is no consensus on how to manage patients with persistent HIV RNA levels above the LLOD and <200 copies/mL, the risk of emerging resistance is believed to be relatively low. Therefore, these patients should be followed on their current regimens with HIV RNA levels monitored at least every 3 months to assess the need for changes in ART in the future (**AIII**).
- **HIV RNA ≥200 and <1000 copies/mL.** Confirm that levels remain in this range, assess adherence, drug-drug interactions (including those with over the counter products and supplements), and drug-food interactions. In contrast to patients with HIV RNA levels persistently <200 copies/mL, those with persistent HIV RNA levels ≥200 copies/mL often develop drug resistance, particularly when their HIV RNA levels are >500 copies/mL. Persistent plasma HIV RNA levels in the 200 to 1,000 copies/mL range should be considered as virologic failure and resistance testing should be attempted if the HIV RNA level is >500 copies/mL. For individuals with sufficient therapeutic options, consider treatment change (**BIII**).
- **HIV RNA >1000 copies/mL and NO drug resistance identified.** This scenario is almost always associated with non-adherence. Conduct a thorough assessment to determine the level of adherence and identify any drug-drug and drug-food interactions. Consider the timing of the drug-resistance test (e.g., Was the patient off ART for more than 4 weeks and/or nonadherent with the regimen at the time testing was performed?). Consider resuming the same regimen or starting a new regimen. Two to four weeks after treatment is resumed repeat viral load testing and—if viral load remains >500 copies/mL—perform genotypic testing to determine whether a resistant viral strain emerges (**CIII**).
- **HIV RNA >1000 copies/mL and drug resistance identified.** The goals in this situation are to suppress HIV RNA levels maximally (i.e., to below the LLOD) and to prevent further selection of resistance mutations. With the availability of several newer ARVs, including some with new mechanisms of action, it is now possible to achieve these goals in many patients, including in those with extensive treatment experience and drug resistance. In the case of virologic failure, consider changing the treatment regimen sooner, rather than later, to minimize continued selection of resistance mutations. In a patient with ongoing viremia and evidence of resistance, some drugs in a regimen (e.g., NNRTIs, T-20, or INSTIs) should be discontinued promptly to decrease the risk of selection of additional drug-resistance mutations and to preserve the activity of these drug classes in future regimens. A new regimen should include at least two, and preferably three, fully active agents (**AII**). If only two active drugs can be identified, whenever possible, an active ritonavir-boosted PI (PI/r) should be prescribed as part of the regimen because of its higher genetic barrier for resistance. In a new regimen, it is the number of active agents and not necessarily the drug class that is most important. This principle was demonstrated in the OPTIONS study; virologic outcomes in those taking at least 2 fully active drugs were equal, whether or not the regimen was supplemented with NRTIs.<sup>39</sup>

Patients who fail a first-line, NNRTI-based regimen often have resistance to the NNRTI, as well as the cytosine analog components of the regimen (e.g., lamivudine [3TC] and emtricitabine [FTC]). The optimal management strategy for these patients is not known, but a number of studies have now demonstrated the activity of a fully active ritonavir-boosted PI (PI/r) alone<sup>40</sup> or with another fully active drug or even with an agent that has only partial activity. Three of these trials were head-to-head comparisons in this patient population.<sup>41-43</sup> Despite evidence of NRTI resistance in many of these patients, two of the studies found that regimens consisting of a PI/r combined with NRTIs were as active as the PI/r combined with RAL,<sup>41,43</sup> two other studies showed that the PI/r plus NRTIs combination was more active than the PI/r alone.<sup>42,43</sup> Resistance testing should be used to



guide therapy; however, on the basis of these studies, even those with NRTI resistance can be treated with a PI/r plus 2 to 3 NRTIs or RAL (AI). Although data are limited, the second generation NNRTI ETR or the new INSTI DTG combined with a PI/r may also be an option in this situation.

- **Highly drug resistant HIV.** In recent years, use of currently available ARV drugs has resulted in a dramatic decline in the number of patients who have few treatment options because of multi-class drug resistance.<sup>44</sup> Despite this decline, there remains a subset of patients who have experienced toxicity and/or developed resistance to all or most currently available drugs such that design of a regimen with two or three fully active drugs is not possible. These patients may have started therapy before newer, more potent ARVs were available; thus, they developed resistance but had no options for salvage therapy. Standard genotypic testing for RT and PR mutations may be inadequate to identify fully active drugs to add to a new regimen. Additional testing for INSTI resistance, as well as genotypic and phenotypic testing for PR and RT mutations, may be necessary. A tropism assay can also help to determine whether MVC can be added to the new regimen.

If maximal virologic suppression cannot be achieved, the goals of ART are to preserve immunologic function and to prevent clinical progression, even in those with ongoing viremia. There is no consensus on the optimal management of these patients. It is reasonable to observe a patient on the same regimen, rather than changing the regimen, depending on the stage of HIV disease (**BII**). Even partial virologic suppression of HIV RNA to  $>0.5 \log_{10}$  copies/mL from baseline correlates with clinical benefits.<sup>45</sup> 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.<sup>46</sup> Other cohort studies suggest continued immunologic and clinical benefits if the HIV RNA level is maintained at  $<10,000$  to  $20,000$  copies/mL.<sup>47,48</sup> However, these potential benefits all must be balanced with the ongoing risk of accumulating additional resistance mutations. The management of these patients always requires expert advice. In general, adding a single fully active ARV to the regimen is **not** recommended because of the risk of rapid development of resistance (**BII**). However, in patients with a high likelihood of clinical progression (e.g., those with CD4 cell count  $<100$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) and limited drug options, adding a single drug to a regimen may reduce the risk of immediate clinical progression because even transient decreases in HIV RNA and/or transient increases in CD4 cell counts have been associated with clinical benefits (**CI**). Weighing the risks (e.g., selection of drug resistance) and benefits (e.g., ARV activity) of adding a single active drug to the regimen of a heavily ART-experienced patient is complicated and consultation with an expert is advised.

Patients with ongoing viremia who lack sufficient treatment options to construct a fully suppressive regimen may be candidates for research studies or expanded access programs or may qualify for single-patient access of an investigational new drug(s) (IND) as specified in Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations: <http://www.fda.gov/AboutFDA/CentersOffices/OfficeofMedicalProductsandTobacco/CDER/ucm163982.htm>. Information about these programs may also be available from the sponsoring pharmaceutical manufacturer.

- **Previously treated patient with suspected drug resistance and in need of care but with limited information (i.e., incomplete or no self-reported history, medical records, or resistance data).** Every effort should be made to obtain the patient's medical records and prior drug-resistance testing 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 selection of the next regimen. Another strategy is to start two or three drugs known to be active on the basis of the patient's treatment history (e.g., MVC if the patient has no detectable X4 virus and an INSTI if there is no prior history of treatment with drugs in this class).

In summary, the management of treatment-experienced patients with virologic failure often requires expert advice to achieve the goal of constructing virologically suppressive regimens. It is critical to carefully evaluate the cause of virologic failure including assessment of adherence, drug and food interactions, tolerability, HIV RNA and CD4 cell count changes over time, treatment history, and drug-resistance test

results before switching regimens. If HIV RNA suppression with use of currently approved agents is not possible, consider use of investigational agents that are available through 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 cell counts to delay clinical progression.

### ***Suboptimal Immunologic Response Despite Viral Suppression***

After ART initiation, most patients experience improved immune function and maintain viral suppression; however, there remains a subset of patients who have suboptimal immunologic responses—defined as the failure to achieve and maintain an adequate CD4 response despite virologic suppression. In ARV-naïve patients on initial ARV regimens, during the first year of ART, CD4 counts usually increase by approximately 150 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>.<sup>49</sup> A CD4 count plateau may occur after 4 to 6 years of treatment with suppressed viremia.<sup>50-54</sup>

Although there is not an accepted specific definition for **suboptimal immunologic response**, some studies have focused on a failure to increase CD4 counts above a specific threshold (e.g., >350 or 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) over a specific period of time (e.g., 4 to 7 years). Others have focused on an inability to increase CD4 counts above pretherapy levels by a certain threshold (e.g., >50 or 100 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) over a given time period. The former criterion may be preferable because of data linking these thresholds with the risk of non-AIDS clinical events.<sup>55</sup>

The proportion of patients experiencing **suboptimal immunologic response** depends on how **suboptimal response** is defined, the observation period, and the CD4 count when treatment was started. In the longest study conducted to date, the percentage of patients with suppressed viremia who reached a CD4 count >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> through 6 years of treatment was 42% in those starting treatment with a CD4 count <200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>, 66% in those starting with a CD4 count 200 to 350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>, and 85% in those starting with a CD4 count >350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>.<sup>56</sup>

A persistently low CD4 count while on suppressive ART is associated with a small, but appreciable, risk of AIDS- and non-AIDS-related morbidity and mortality.<sup>57,58</sup> For example, in the FIRST study,<sup>59</sup> a low CD4 count on therapy was associated with an increased risk of AIDS-related complications (adjusted hazard ratio of 0.56 per 100 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> higher CD4 count). Similarly, a low CD4 count was associated with an increased risk of non-AIDS events, including cardiovascular, hepatic, and renal disease and cancer. Other studies support these associations.<sup>60-63</sup>

The following are some factors that have been associated with poor CD4 cell response:

- CD4 count <200/mm<sup>3</sup> at initiation of ART
- Older age
- Coinfection (e.g., hepatitis C virus [HCV], HIV-2, human T-cell leukemia virus type 1 [HTLV-1], HTLV-2)
- ARVs (e.g., zidovudine [ZDV],<sup>64</sup> tenofovir disoproxil fumarate [TDF] + didanosine [ddI]<sup>65-67</sup>) and other medications
- Persistent immune activation
- Loss of regenerative potential of the immune system
- Concomitant medical conditions

### **Assessment of Patients with **Suboptimal Immunologic Responses****

CD4 count should be confirmed by repeat testing. Concomitant medications should be reviewed carefully, with a focus on those known to decrease white blood cells or, specifically, CD4 T-cells (e.g., cancer chemotherapy, interferon, prednisone, ZDV; combination of TDF and ddI), and consideration should be given to substituting or discontinuing these drugs, if possible. Untreated coinfections (e.g., HIV-2, HTLV-1,

HTLV-2) and serious medical conditions (e.g., malignancy) also should be considered. In many cases, no obvious cause for immunologic failure can be identified.

### Management of Patients with Suboptimal Immunologic Response

There is no consensus with regards to when or how to manage patients with suboptimal immunologic response. Given the risk of clinical events, it is reasonable to focus on patients with CD4 counts <200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> because patients with higher CD4 counts have a lower risk of clinical events. It is not clear that suboptimal immunologic response in the setting of virologic suppression should prompt a change in the ARV regimen. Because ongoing immune activation occurs in some patients with suppressed HIV RNA levels, some have suggested adding a drug to an existing regimen. However, this strategy does not result in clear virologic or immunologic benefit. Others suggest changing the regimen to another regimen (e.g., from NNRTI-based to PI-based, INSTI-based, or CCR5 antagonist-based regimens), but this strategy has not shown clear benefit.

In two large randomized studies, an immune-based therapy, interleukin-2, demonstrated CD4 count increases but no clinical benefit<sup>68</sup> and therefore is not recommended (AI). Other immune-based therapies (e.g., gene therapies, growth hormone, cyclosporine, interleukin-7) are under investigation. Currently, immune-based therapies should not be used outside the context of a clinical trial (AIII).

## 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*. 2011;52(6):793-800. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21367734>.
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Vital signs: HIV prevention through care and treatment—United States. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. 2011;60(47):1618-1623. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22129997>.
3. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15073683](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15073683).
4. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19247185](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19247185).
5. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19113986](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19113986).
6. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20611035](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20611035).
7. Ribaud H, Lennox J, Currier J, et al. 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. Paper presented at: 16th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2009; Montreal, Canada.
8. 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. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23664333>.
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*. 2013;57(10):1489-1496. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23946221>.
10. Taiwo B, Gallien S, Aga S, al e. HIV drug resistance evolution during persistent near-target viral suppression. *Antiviral Therapy* 2010;15:A38.

11. Siliciano JD, Kajdas J, Finzi D, et al. Long-term follow-up studies confirm the stability of the latent reservoir for HIV-1 in resting CD4+ T cells. *Nat Med*. 2003;9(6):727-728. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12754504](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12754504).
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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11953470](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15096800](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15096800).
14. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15713771](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15713771).
15. d'Arminio Monforte A, Lepri AC, Rezza G, et al, with the ICONA Study Group and Italian Cohort of Antiretroviral-Naive Patients. Insights into the reasons for discontinuation of the first highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART) regimen in a cohort of antiretroviral naive patients. *AIDS*. 2000;14(5):499-507. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10780712](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10780712).
16. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11216926](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11216926).
17. Paredes R, Lalama CM, Ribaud 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20102271](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20102271).
18. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19417582](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19417582).
19. 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>.
20. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12944569](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12944569).
21. 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. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11172188](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11172188).
22. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18650513](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18650513).
23. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12773645](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12773645).
24. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12637625](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12637625).
25. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17711378](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17711378).
26. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17416261](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17416261).



27. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18650512](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18650512).
28. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19710593](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19710593).
29. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18832244](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18832244).
30. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18832245](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18832245).
31. Cahn P, Pozniak AL, Mingrone H, et al. Dolutegravir versus raltegravir in antiretroviral-experienced, integrase-inhibitor-naïve 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>.
32. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16206068](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16206068).
33. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17205477](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17205477).
34. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19717396](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19717396).
35. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16890833](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16890833).
36. 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>.
37. Prezista [package insert. Food and Drug Administration. 2013. Available at [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/label/2013/021976s033\\_202895s0101bl.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2013/021976s033_202895s0101bl.pdf). Accessed February 11, 2014.
38. Tivicay [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2013. Available at [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/label/2013/2047901bl.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2013/2047901bl.pdf). Accessed February 11, 2014.
39. Tashima K, Smeaton L, Andrade A. Omitting NRTI from ARV regimens is not inferior to adding NRTI in treatment-experienced HIV+ subjects failing a protease inhibitor regimen: The ACTG OPTIONS Study. Abstract 153LB. Paper presented at: 20th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2013; Atlanta GA.
40. Bartlett JA, Ribaudo HJ, Wallis CL, et al. Lopinavir/ritonavir monotherapy after virologic failure of first-line antiretroviral therapy in resource-limited settings. *AIDS*. 2012;26(11):1345-1354. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22441252>.
41. Group S-LS, 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. 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>.



43. Paton NI, Kityo C, Hoppe A. A pragmatic randomised controlled strategy trial of three second-line treatment options for use in public health rollout programme settings: the Europe-Africa Research Network for Evaluation of Second-line Therapy (EARNEST) Trial. Abstract WELBB02.2013. Paper presented at: 7th International AIDS Society Conference on HIV Pathogenesis, Treatment and Prevention (IAS 2013); 2013; Kuala Lumpur.
44. 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>.
45. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10357378](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10357378).
46. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11153667](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11153667).
47. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15234856](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15234856).
48. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15319674](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15319674).
49. Bartlett JA, DeMasi R, Quinn J, Moxham C, Rousseau F. Overview of the effectiveness of triple combination therapy in antiretroviral-naïve HIV-1 infected adults. *AIDS*. 2001;15(11):1369-1377. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11504958](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11504958).
50. Tarwater PM, Margolick JB, Jin J, et al. Increase and plateau of CD4 T-cell counts in the 3(1/2) years after initiation of potent antiretroviral therapy. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2001;27(2):168-175. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11404539](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11404539).
51. 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*. 2003;163(18):2187-2195. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14557216](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=14557216).
52. 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*. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15167289).
53. Mocroft A, Phillips AN, Ledergerber B, et al. Relationship between antiretrovirals used as part of a cART regimen and CD4 cell count increases in patients with suppressed viremia. *AIDS*. 2006;20(8):1141-1150. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16691065](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16691065).
54. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17205456](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17205456).
55. Lau B, Gange SJ, Moore RD. Risk of non-AIDS-related mortality may exceed risk of AIDS-related mortality among individuals enrolling into care with CD4+ counts greater than 200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2007;44(2):179-187. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17075385](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17075385).
56. Moore R, Keruly J, Gallant J. Tenofovir and renal dysfunction in clinical practice. Paper presented at: 14th Conference on Retrovirus and Opportunistic Infections; 2007; Los Angeles, CA.
57. Loutfy MR, Walmsley SL, Mullin CM, Perez G, Neaton JD. CD4(+) cell count increase predicts clinical benefits in patients with advanced HIV disease and persistent viremia after 1 year of combination antiretroviral therapy. *J Infect Dis*. 2005;192(8):1407-1411. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16170758](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16170758).
58. Moore DM, Hogg RS, Chan K, Tyndall M, Yip B, Montaner JS. Disease progression in patients with virological suppression in response to HAART is associated with the degree of immunological response. *AIDS*. 2006;20(3):371-377. Available at

- [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16439870](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16439870).
59. Baker JV, Peng G, Rapkin J, et al. CD4+ count and risk of non-AIDS diseases following initial treatment for HIV infection. *AIDS*. 2008;22(7):841-848. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18427202](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18427202).
  60. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17135583).
  61. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16908797](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16908797).
  62. Monforte A, Abrams D, Pradier C, et al. HIV-induced immunodeficiency and mortality from AIDS-defining and non-AIDS-defining malignancies. *AIDS*. 2008;22(16):2143-2153. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18832878](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18832878).
  63. 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*. 2010;51(4):435-447. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20597691](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20597691).
  64. 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*. 2007;21(8):939-946. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17457087](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17457087).
  65. 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*. 2005;19(6):569-575. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15802975](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15802975).
  66. Lacombe K, Pacanowski J, Meynard JL, Trylesinski A, Girard PM. Risk factors for CD4 lymphopenia in patients treated with a tenofovir/didanosine high dose-containing highly active antiretroviral therapy regimen. *AIDS*. 2005;19(10):1107-1108. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15958845](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15958845).
  67. 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*. 2005;41(6):901-905. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16107993](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16107993).
  68. Abrams D, Levy Y, Losso MH, et al. Interleukin-2 therapy in patients with HIV infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;361(16):1548-1559. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19828532](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19828532).

## Regimen Switching In the Setting of Virologic Suppression (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

With use of currently available antiretroviral therapy (ART), most HIV-infected patients are able to achieve sustained HIV viral suppression. Furthermore, advances in treatment and better understanding about drug resistance make it possible to consider switching an effective regimen to an alternative regimen in some situations (see below). When contemplating such a switch, clinicians must consider several key principles to maintain viral suppression while addressing concerns with the current treatment.

### Reasons to Consider Regimen Switching in the Setting of Viral Suppression:

- To simplify the regimen by reducing pill burden and dosing frequency to improve adherence
- To enhance tolerability and decrease short- or long-term toxicity (see [Adverse Effects](#) section)
- To change food or fluid requirements
- To avoid parenteral administration
- To minimize or address drug interaction concerns (see [Drug Interactions](#) section)
- To allow for optimal use of ART during pregnancy or should pregnancy occur (see [Perinatal Guidelines](#))<sup>1</sup>
- To reduce costs (see [Cost](#) section)

### ***Principles and Strategies of Regimen Switching***

The cardinal principle of regimen switching is to maintain viral suppression without jeopardizing future treatment options. If a regimen switch results in virologic failure with emergence of new resistance mutations, the patient may require more complex, difficult to follow, or expensive regimens. Principles for successful regimen switching are highlighted below:

- It is critical to review a patient's full antiretroviral (ARV) history (including virologic responses, resistance test results, and past adverse events) before any treatment switch.
- Once a particular resistance mutation has been selected, it is generally archived in the HIV reservoir and is likely to reappear under the appropriate selective drug pressure, even if not detected in the most recent resistance test. If resistance data are unavailable, resistance may often be inferred from a patient's treatment history. For example, a clinician should assume that patients who have failed a cytosine analogue (e.g., a lamivudine (3TC)- or emtricitabine (FTC)-containing regimen), likely have the M184V substitution, even if the substitution is not documented. The same assumption of resistance may also apply to patients with documented failure to a non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NNRTI)- or an integrase strand transfer inhibitors (INSTI)-based regimen because these drugs generally have a lower barrier to resistance. 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 as active against resistant virus as the suppressive regimen.
- Consultation with an HIV specialist is recommended when considering a regimen switch for a patient with a history of resistance to one or more drug classes.
- Switching from a ritonavir (RTV)-boosted protease inhibitor (PI) regimen to a regimen composed of drugs with a lower barrier to resistance generally maintains viral suppression provided there is no resistance to the other components of the regimen. However, such switches should be avoided if there is any doubt about the activity of the other agents in the regimen.
- Within-class switches prompted by adverse events usually maintain viral suppression provided that there is no drug resistance to the other ARV agents in the same drug class.

- In the absence of any likely drug resistance, switching from complex regimens, parenteral drug (i.e., enfuvirtide), or drugs known now to be more toxic (e.g., zidovudine, stavudine, or didanosine) or with higher pill burden or dosing frequency to simpler regimens (e.g., from a regimen including ritonavir-boosted saquinavir [SQV/r] to one including ritonavir-boosted darunavir [DRV/r]) or to ARVs in a new drug class (e.g., an INSTI) generally results in similar or improved adherence, continued viral suppression and possibly improved quality of life.
- More intensive monitoring of tolerability, viral suppression, adherence, and laboratory changes is recommended during the first 3 months after a regimen switch.

## ***Alternative Switch Strategies for Patients with Virologic Suppression***

### **RTV-Boosted PI Monotherapy**

The strategy of switching virologically suppressed patients without PI resistance from one ART regimen to RTV-boosted PI monotherapy has been studied. The rationale for this strategy is to avoid nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NRTI) toxicities and decrease costs, while taking advantage of the high barrier to resistance of RTV-boosted PIs. RTV-boosted PI monotherapy maintains virologic suppression in most patients, but at slightly lower rates than standard therapy that includes 2 NRTIs.<sup>2,3</sup> Low-level viremia, generally without the emergence of PI resistance, appears to be more common with monotherapy. In most studies, resumption of NRTIs in patients experiencing low level viral rebound has led to re-suppression.

No clinical trials comparing available RTV-boosted PI monotherapy regimens have been conducted. Findings from an observational study suggest that the rate of treatment failure is higher in patients on RTV-boosted atazanavir (ATV/r) than in those on RTV-boosted lopinavir (LPV/r) or DRV/r.<sup>4</sup> Another pilot study reported early viral rebound with use of ATV/r monotherapy.<sup>5</sup> There are rare reports of central nervous system virologic escape, sometimes with clinical symptoms, in patients on RTV-boosted PI monotherapy.<sup>6,7</sup>

On the basis of the results from these studies, RTV-boosted PI monotherapy should generally be avoided. Other strategies to avoid use of NRTIs (i.e., use of a RTV-boosted PI plus a NNRTI, an INSTI, or maraviroc [MVC]) are also being studied, but data on these strategies are limited.

### **Switching from a Ritonavir-Boosted Protease Inhibitor to Unboosted Atazanavir**

Several clinical studies have evaluated switching a RTV-boosted PI to unboosted atazanavir (ATV) in virologically suppressed patients without NRTI resistance. Two comparative clinical trials reported that ATV/r and ATV, both in combination with 2 NRTIs (mostly ABC/3TC), demonstrated comparable levels of virologic suppression and a similar lack of treatment-emergent resistance. The benefits of the unboosted ATV regimen included a slightly improved lipid profile and a lower incidence of hyperbilirubinemia.<sup>8,9</sup> An additional study of 296 patients with virologic suppression on tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF)/FTC plus ATV/r showed that patients switched to ABC/3TC plus ATV maintained viral suppression and showed improvements in certain bone and renal biomarkers.<sup>10</sup> The results of these and other non-comparative studies suggest that a regimen of ABC/3TC plus ATV can be considered in virologically suppressed patients, especially in those who have adverse effects from TDF or RTV.

### **Switching to Maraviroc**

Co-receptor usage in virologically suppressed patients can be determined from proviral DNA obtained from peripheral blood mononuclear cells. Individuals found to have R5-tropic virus by this technique could potentially have a component of their regimens switched to MVC.<sup>11,12</sup> However, although the use of MVC after DNA tropism testing has potential, this strategy cannot be recommended until more data from larger clinical studies are available (see [Tropism Testing](#) section).



## De-intensification

De-intensification of a standard RTV-boosted PI regimen from three to two active drugs (e.g., to a boosted PI plus one NRTI,<sup>13</sup> a boosted PI plus an INSTI,<sup>14,15</sup> or an NNRTI such as etravirine<sup>15</sup> or the CCR5 antagonist MVC<sup>12</sup>) may be more effective virologically than RTV-boosted PI monotherapy, but, thus far, comparative data on this approach are limited. In general, switching a regimen—even in a patient without known drug resistance—from an effective three-drug regimen to a two-drug regimen has not been validated and is not recommended.

## Monitoring After Treatment Changes

Patients should be evaluated more closely for several months after a treatment switch (i.e., 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). The goal of the intensive monitoring is to assess medication tolerance and conduct targeted laboratory testing if the patient had pre-existing laboratory abnormalities or there are potential concerns with the new regimen. For example, if lipid abnormalities were present and/or were a reason for the ARV change or are a concern with the new regimen, fasting cholesterol subsets and triglycerides should be assessed within 3 months after the change in therapy. Absent any specific 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](#) section).

## References

1. 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 <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/PerinatalGL.pdf>.
2. 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>.
3. Arribas JR, Clumeck N, Nelson M, Hill A, van Delft Y, Moocklinghoff 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>.
4. 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>.
5. 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>.
6. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20802297](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20802297).
7. 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>.
8. 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>.
9. 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>.
10. Wohl D. Simplification to abacavir/lamivudine (ABC/3TC) + atazanavir (ATV) from tenofovir/emtricitabine (TDF/FTC) + ATV/Ritonavir (RTV, /r) maintains viral suppression and improves bone biomarkers. Abstract H-556c. Paper presented at: Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy; 2012.



11. 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>.
12. 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>.
13. Di Giambenedetto S, Fabbiani M, Colafigli M, et al. Safety and feasibility of treatment simplification to atazanavir/ritonavir + lamivudine in HIV-infected patients on stable treatment with two nucleos(t)ide reverse transcriptase inhibitors + atazanavir/ritonavir with virological suppression (Atazanavir and Lamivudine for treatment Simplification, AtLaS pilot study). *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2013;68(6):1364-1372. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23372058>.
14. Ofotokun I, Sheth AN, Sanford SE, et al. A switch in therapy to a reverse transcriptase inhibitor sparing combination of lopinavir/ritonavir and raltegravir in virologically suppressed HIV-infected patients: a pilot randomized trial to assess efficacy and safety profile: the KITE study. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2012;28(10):1196-1206. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22364141>.
15. Burgos J, Crespo M, Falco V, et al. Simplification to dual antiretroviral therapy including a ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor in treatment-experienced HIV-1-infected patients. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2012;67(10):2479-2486. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22729925>.

## Exposure-Response Relationship and Therapeutic Drug Monitoring (TDM) for Antiretroviral Agents (Last updated January 10, 2011; last reviewed January 10, 2011)

### Panel's Recommendations

- Therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) for antiretroviral (ARV) agents is not recommended for routine use in the management of the HIV-infected adult (CIII).
- TDM may be considered in selected clinical scenarios, as discussed in the text below.

**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

Knowledge of the relationship between systemic exposure (or concentration) and drug responses (beneficial and/or adverse) is key in selecting the dose of a drug, in understanding the variability in the response of patients to a drug, and in designing strategies to optimize response and tolerability.

TDM is a strategy applied to certain antiarrhythmics, anticonvulsants, antineoplastics, and antibiotics that utilizes measured drug concentrations to design dosing regimens to improve the likelihood of the desired therapeutic and safety outcomes. The key characteristic of a drug that is a candidate for TDM is knowledge of the 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.

Several ARV agents meet most of the characteristics of agents that can be considered candidates for a TDM strategy.<sup>1</sup> The rationale for TDM in managing antiretroviral therapy (ART) derives from the following:

- data showing that considerable interpatient variability in drug concentrations exists among patients who take the same dose;
- data indicating that relationships exist between the concentration of drug in the body and anti-HIV effect and, in some cases, toxicities; and
- data from small prospective studies demonstrating that TDM improved virologic response and/or decreased the incidence of concentration-related drug toxicities.<sup>2-3</sup>

***TDM for ARV agents, however, is not recommended for routine use in the management of the HIV-infected adult (CIII).***

Multiple factors limit the routine use of TDM in HIV-infected adults.<sup>4-5</sup> These factors include:

- lack of large prospective studies demonstrating that TDM improves clinical and virologic outcomes. (This is the most important limiting factor for the implementation of TDM at present.);
- lack of established therapeutic range of concentrations for all ARV drugs that is associated with achieving the desired therapeutic response and/or reducing the frequency of drug-associated adverse reactions;
- inpatient variability in ARV drug concentrations;
- lack of widespread availability of clinical laboratories that perform quantitation of ARV concentrations under rigorous quality assurance/quality control standards; and
- shortage of experts to assist with interpretation of ARV concentration data and application of such data to revise patients' dosing regimens.

## ***Exposure-Response Relationships and TDM with Different ARV Classes***

*Protease Inhibitors (PIs), Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NNRTIs), and Integrase Inhibitors.* Relationships between the systemic exposure to PIs and NNRTIs and treatment response have been reviewed in various publications.<sup>4-7</sup> Although there are limitations and unanswered questions, the consensus among clinical pharmacologists from the United States and Europe is that the data provide a framework for the potential implementation of TDM for PIs and NNRTIs. However, information on relationships between concentrations and drug-associated toxicities are sparse. Clinicians who use TDM as a strategy to manage either ARV response or toxicities should consult the most current data on the proposed therapeutic concentration range. Exposure-response data for darunavir (DRV), etravirine (ETR), and raltegravir (RAL) are accumulating but are not sufficient to recommend minimum trough concentrations. The median trough concentrations for these agents in HIV-infected persons receiving the recommended dose are included in [Table 10b](#).

*CCR5 Antagonists.* Trough maraviroc (MVC) concentrations have been shown to be an important predictor of virologic success in studies conducted in ART-experienced persons.<sup>8-9</sup> Clinical experience in the use of TDM for MVC, however, is very limited. Nonetheless, as with PIs and NNRTIs, the exposure-response data provide a framework for TDM, and that information is presented in these guidelines ([Table 10b](#)).

*Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NRTIs).* Relationships between plasma concentrations of NRTIs and their intracellular pharmacologically active moieties have not yet been established. Therefore, monitoring of plasma or intracellular NRTI concentrations for an individual patient largely remains a research tool. Measurement of plasma concentrations, however, is routinely used for studies of drug-drug interactions.

*Scenarios for Use of TDM.* Multiple scenarios exist in which both ARV concentration data and expert opinion may be useful in patient management. Consultation with a clinical pharmacologist or a clinical pharmacist with HIV expertise may be advisable in these cases. These scenarios include the following:

- Suspect clinically significant drug-drug or drug-food interactions that may result in reduced efficacy or increased dose-related toxicities;
- Changes in pathophysiologic states that may impair gastrointestinal, hepatic, or renal function, thereby potentially altering drug absorption, distribution, metabolism, or elimination;
- Pregnant women who may be at risk of virologic failure as a result of changes in their pharmacokinetic parameters during the later stage of pregnancy, which may result in plasma concentrations lower than those achieved in the earlier stages of pregnancy and in the nonpregnant patient;
- Heavily pretreated patients experiencing virologic failure and who may have viral isolates with reduced susceptibility to ARVs;
- Use of alternative dosing regimens and ARV combinations for which safety and efficacy have not been established in clinical trials;
- Concentration-dependent, drug-associated toxicities; and
- Lack of expected virologic response in medication-adherent persons.

### ***TDM***

- **For patients who have drug-susceptible virus.** [Table 10a](#) includes a synthesis of recommendations<sup>2-7</sup> for minimum target trough PI and NNRTI concentrations in persons with drug-susceptible virus.
- **For ART-experienced patients with virologic failure** (see [Table 10b](#)). Fewer data are available to formulate suggestions for minimum target trough concentrations in ART-experienced patients who have viral isolates with reduced susceptibility to ARV agents. Concentration recommendations for tipranavir

(TPV) and MVC were derived only from studies in ART-experienced persons. It is likely that use of PIs and NNRTIs in the setting of reduced viral susceptibility may require higher trough concentrations than those needed for wild-type virus. The inhibitory quotient (IQ), which is the ratio of ARV drug concentration to a measure of susceptibility (genotype or phenotype) of the patient's strain of HIV to that drug, may additionally improve prediction of virologic response—as has been shown, for example, with DRV in ART-experienced persons.<sup>10-11</sup> Exposure-response data for DRV, ETR, and RAL are accumulating but are not sufficient to recommend minimum trough concentrations. The median trough concentrations for these agents in HIV-infected persons receiving the recommended dose are included in [Table 10b](#).

*Using Drug Concentrations to Guide Therapy.* There are several challenges and considerations for implementation of TDM in the clinical setting. Use of TDM to monitor ARV concentrations in a patient requires multiple steps:

- quantification of the concentration of the drug, usually in plasma or serum;
- determination of the patient's pharmacokinetic characteristics;
- integration of information on patient adherence;
- interpretation of the concentrations; and
- adjustment of the drug dose to achieve concentrations within the therapeutic range, if necessary.

Guidelines for the collection of blood samples and other practical suggestions can be found in a position paper by the Adult AIDS Clinical Trials Group Pharmacology Committee.<sup>4</sup>

A final caveat to the use of measured drug concentrations in patient management is a general one—drug concentration information cannot be used alone; it must be integrated with other clinical information. In addition, as knowledge of associations between ARV concentrations and virologic response continues to accumulate, clinicians who employ a TDM strategy for patient management should consult the most current literature.

**Table 10a. Trough Concentrations of Antiretroviral Drugs for Patients Who Have Drug-Susceptible Virus**

Drug	Concentration (ng/mL)
<b>Suggested minimum target trough concentrations in patients with HIV-1 susceptible to the ARV drugs<sup>2-9</sup></b>	
Fosamprenavir (FPV)	400 (measured as amprenavir concentration)
Atazanavir (ATV)	150
Indinavir (IDV)	100
Lopinavir (LPV)	1000
Nelfinavir <sup>a</sup> (NFV)	800
Saquinavir (SQV)	100–250
Efavirenz (EFV)	1000
Nevirapine (NVP)	3000

<sup>a</sup> Measurable active (M8) metabolite

**Table 10b. Trough Concentrations of Antiretroviral Drugs for Treatment-Experienced Patients with Virologic Failure**

Drug	Concentration (ng/mL)
<b>Suggested minimum target trough concentrations for ART-experienced patients who have resistant HIV-1 strains</b>	
Maraviroc (MVC)	>50
Tipranavir (TPV)	20,500
<b>Median (Range) Trough Concentrations from Clinical Trials<sup>12-14</sup></b>	
Darunavir (DRV) (600 mg twice daily)	3300 (1255–7368)
Etravirine (ETR)	275 (81–2980)
Raltegravir (RAL)	72 (29–118)

## References

1. Spector R, Park GD, Johnson GF, et al. Therapeutic drug monitoring. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 1988;43(4):345-353.
2. Fletcher CV, Anderson PL, Kakuda TN, et al. Concentration-controlled compared with conventional antiretroviral therapy for HIV infection. *AIDS.* 2002;16(4):551-560.
3. Fabbiani M, Di Giambenedetto S, Bracciale L, et al. Pharmacokinetic variability of antiretroviral drugs and correlation with virological outcome: 2 years of experience in routine clinical practice. *J Antimicrob Chemother.* 2009;64(1):109-117.
4. Acosta EP, Gerber JG. Position paper on therapeutic drug monitoring of antiretroviral agents. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses.* 2002;18(12):825-834.
5. van Luin M, Kuks PF, Burger DM. Use of therapeutic drug monitoring in HIV disease. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS.* 2008;3(3):266-271.
6. Boffito M, Acosta E, Burger D, et al. Current status and future prospects of therapeutic drug monitoring and applied clinical pharmacology in antiretroviral therapy. *Antivir Ther.* 2005;10(3):375-392.
7. LaPorte CJL, Back BJ, Blaschke T, et al. Updated guidelines to perform therapeutic drug monitoring for antiretroviral agents. *Rev Antivir Ther.* 2006;3:4-14.
8. Pfizer Inc. Selzentry (maraviroc) tablets prescribing information NY. 2007.
9. McFayden L, Jacqmin P, Wade J, et al. Maraviroc exposure response analysis: phase 3 antiviral efficacy in treatment-experienced HIV+ patients. Paper presented at: 16th Population Approach Group in Europe Meeting; June 2007, 2007; Kobenhavn, Denmark. Abstract P4-13.
10. Molto J, Santos JR, Perez-Alvarez N, et al. Darunavir inhibitory quotient predicts the 48-week virological response to darunavir-based salvage therapy in human immunodeficiency virus-infected protease inhibitor-experienced patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother.* 2008;52(11):3928-3932.
11. Sekar V, DeMeyer S, Vangeneugden T, et al. Pharmacokinetic/pharmacodynamic (PK/PD) analyses of TMC114 in the POWER 1 and POWER 2 trials in treatment-experienced HIV-infected patients. Paper presented at: 13th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; February 5, 2006, 2006; Denver, CO. Abstract J-121.
12. Markowitz M, Morales-Ramirez JO, Nguyen BY, et al. Antiretroviral activity, pharmacokinetics, and tolerability of MK-0518, a novel inhibitor of HIV-1 integrase, dosed as monotherapy for 10 days in treatment-naïve HIV-1-infected individuals. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* 2006;43(5):509-515.
13. Kakuda TN, Wade JR, Snoeck E, et al. Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of the non-nucleoside reverse-transcriptase inhibitor etravirine in treatment-experienced HIV-1-infected patients. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2010;88(5):695-703.
14. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Prezista (package insert). 2010.  
[http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/label/2010/021976s016lbl.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2010/021976s016lbl.pdf).



## Discontinuation or Interruption of Antiretroviral Therapy (Last updated January 10, 2011; last reviewed January 10, 2011)

Discontinuation of antiretroviral therapy (ART) may result in viral rebound, immune decompensation, and clinical progression. Unplanned interruption of ART may become necessary because of severe drug toxicity, intervening illness, surgery that precludes oral therapy, or unavailability of antiretroviral (ARV) medication. Some investigators have studied planned treatment discontinuation strategies in situations or for reasons that include: in patients who achieve viral suppression and wish to enhance adherence; to reduce inconvenience, long-term toxicities, and costs for patients; or in extensively treated patients who experience treatment failure due to resistant HIV, to allow reversion to wild-type virus. Potential risks and benefits of interruption vary according to a number of factors, including the clinical and immunologic status of the patient, the reason for the interruption, the type and duration of the interruption, and the presence or absence of resistant HIV at the time of interruption. Below are brief discussions on what is currently known about the risks and benefits of treatment interruption in some of these circumstances.

### *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 unavailability of drugs. Stopping ARV drugs for a short time (i.e., <1 to 2 days) due to medical/surgical procedures can usually be done by holding all drugs in the regimen. Recommendations for some other scenarios are listed below:

#### *Unanticipated Need for Short-Term 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 Interruption (> 2–3 days)*

- **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 sustained period of 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 ARV regimen contains drugs with differing 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]). Options in this circumstance are discussed below. (See [Discontinuation of efavirenz, etravirine, or nevirapine.](#))

### *Interruption of Therapy after Pregnancy*

ARV drugs for prevention of perinatal transmission of HIV are recommended for all pregnant women, regardless of whether they have indications for ART for their own health. Following delivery, considerations regarding continuation of the ARV regimen for maternal therapeutic indications are the same as for other nonpregnant individuals. The decision of whether to continue therapy after delivery should take into account current recommendations for initiation of ART, current and nadir CD4 T-cell counts and trajectory, HIV RNA levels, adherence issues, and patient preference.

## ***Planned Long-Term Therapy Interruptions***

Planned therapy interruptions have been contemplated in various scenarios, listed below. Research is ongoing in several of the scenarios. Therapy interruptions ***cannot be recommended*** at this time outside of controlled clinical trials (**AI**).

- **In patients who initiated therapy during acute HIV infection and achieved virologic suppression**—the optimal duration of treatment and the consequences of treatment interruption are not known at this time. (See [Acute HIV Infection](#).)
- **In patients who have had exposure to multiple ARV agents, have experienced ARV treatment failure, and have few treatment options available because of extensive resistance mutations**—interruption is ***not recommended*** unless done in a clinical trial setting (**AI**). Several clinical trials, largely yielding negative results, but some with conflicting results, have been conducted to better understand the role of treatment interruption in these patients.<sup>1-4</sup> The largest of these studies showed negative clinical impact of treatment interruption in these patients.<sup>1</sup> The Panel notes that partial virologic suppression from combination therapy has been associated with clinical benefit;<sup>5</sup> therefore, interruption of therapy is not recommended.
- **In patients on ART who have maintained a CD4 count above the level currently recommended for treatment initiation and irrespective of whether their baseline CD4 counts were either above or below that recommended threshold**—interruption is also ***not recommended*** unless done in a clinical trial setting (**BI**). (See discussion below highlighting potential adverse outcomes seen in some treatment interruption trials.)

Temporary treatment interruption to reduce inconvenience, potential long-term toxicity, and/or overall treatment cost has been considered as a strategy for patients on ART who have maintained CD4 counts above those currently recommended for initiating therapy. Several clinical trials have been designed to determine the safety of such interruptions, in which reinitiation is triggered by predetermined CD4 count thresholds. In these trials, various CD4 count levels have been set to guide both treatment interruption and reinitiation. In the SMART study, the largest of such trials with more than 5,000 subjects, interrupting treatment with CD4 counts  $>350$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> and reinitiating when  $<250$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> was associated with an increased risk of disease progression and all cause mortality compared with the trial arm of continuous ART.<sup>6</sup> In the TRIVACAN study, the same CD4 count thresholds were used for stopping and restarting treatment.<sup>7</sup> This study also showed that interruption was an inferior strategy; the interventions in both trials were stopped early because of these findings. Data from the DART trial reported a twofold increase in rates of World Health Organization (WHO) Stage 4 events/deaths in the 12-week ART cycling group among African patients achieving a CD4 count  $>300$ /mm<sup>3</sup> compared with the continuous ART group.<sup>8</sup> Observational data from the EuroSIDA cohort noted a twofold increase in risk of death after a treatment interruption of  $>3$  months. Factors linked to increased risk of death or progression included lower CD4 counts, higher viral loads, and a prior history of AIDS.<sup>9</sup> Other studies have reported no major safety concerns,<sup>10-12</sup> but these studies had smaller sample sizes. Results have been reported from several small observational studies evaluating treatment interruption in patients doing well with nadir CD4 counts  $>350$ /mm<sup>3</sup>, but further studies are needed to determine the safety of treatment interruption in this population.<sup>13-14</sup> There is concern that CD4 counts  $<500$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> are associated with a range of non-AIDS clinical events (e.g., cancer and heart, liver, and kidney disease).<sup>6, 15-16</sup>

Planned long-term therapy interruption strategies ***cannot be recommended*** at this time outside of controlled clinical trials (**BI**) based on available data and a range of ongoing concerns.

If therapy has to be discontinued, patients should be counseled about the need for close clinical and laboratory monitoring. They should also be aware of the risks of viral rebound, acute retroviral syndrome,

increased risk of HIV transmission, decline of CD4 count, HIV disease progression or death, development of minor HIV-associated manifestations such as oral thrush, development of serious non-AIDS complications, development of drug resistance, and the need for chemoprophylaxis against opportunistic infections depending on the CD4 count. Treatment interruptions often result in rapid reductions in CD4 counts.

Prior to any planned treatment interruption, a number of ARV-specific issues should be taken into consideration. These include:

- **Discontinuation of efavirenz (EFV), etravirine (ETR), or nevirapine (NVP).** The optimal interval between stopping EFV, ETR, or NVP and other ARV drugs is not known. The duration of detectable levels of EFV or NVP after discontinuation ranges from less than 1 week to more than 3 weeks.<sup>17-18</sup> Simultaneously stopping all drugs in a regimen containing these agents may result in functional monotherapy with the NNRTIs because NNRTIs have much longer half-lives than other agents. This may increase the risk of selection of NNRTI-resistant mutations. It is further complicated by evidence that certain host genetic polymorphisms may result in slower rates of clearance. Such polymorphisms may be more common among specific ethnic groups, such as African Americans and Hispanics.<sup>18-19</sup> Some experts recommend stopping the NNRTI but continuing the other ARV drugs for a period of time. The optimal time sequence for staggered component discontinuation has not been determined. A study in South Africa demonstrated that giving 4 or 7 days of zidovudine (ZDV) + lamivudine (3TC) after a single dose of NVP reduced the risk of postnatal NVP resistance from 60% to 10%–12%.<sup>20</sup> Use of nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) with a longer half-life such as tenofovir (TDF) plus emtricitabine (FTC) has also been shown to decrease NVP resistance after single-dose treatment.<sup>21</sup> The findings may, however, differ in patients on chronic NVP treatment. An alternative strategy is to substitute a protease inhibitor (PI) for the NNRTI and to continue the PI with dual NRTIs for a period of time. In a post-study analysis of the patients who interrupted therapy in the SMART trial, patients who were switched from an NNRTI- to a PI-based regimen prior to interruption had a lower rate of NNRTI-resistant mutation after interruption and a greater chance of resuppression of HIV RNA after restarting therapy than those who stopped all the drugs simultaneously or stopped the NNRTI before the 2-NRTI.<sup>22</sup> The optimal duration needed to continue the PI-based regimen after stopping the NNRTI is not known. Given the potential of prolonged detectable NNRTI concentrations for more than 3 weeks, some suggest that the PI-based regimen may need to be continued for up to 4 weeks. Further research to determine the best approach to discontinuing NNRTIs is needed. Clinical data on ETR and treatment interruption is lacking but its long half-life of approximately 40 hours suggests that stopping ETR needs to be done carefully using the same suggestions for NVP and EFV for the time being.
- **Discontinuation and reintroduction of NVP.** Because NVP is an inducer of the drug-metabolizing hepatic enzymes, administration of full therapeutic doses of NVP without a 2-week, low-dose escalation phase will result in excess plasma drug levels and potentially increase the risk of toxicity. Therefore, in a patient who has interrupted treatment with NVP for more than 2 weeks, NVP should be reintroduced with a dose escalation period of 200 mg once daily for 14 days and then a 200 mg twice-daily regimen (**AII**).
- **Discontinuation of FTC, 3TC, or TDF in patients with hepatitis B virus (HBV) coinfection.** Patients with HBV coinfection (hepatitis B surface antigen [HbsAg] or hepatitis B e antigen [HBeAg] positive) and receiving one or a combination of these NRTIs may experience an exacerbation of hepatitis upon drug discontinuation.<sup>23-24</sup> (See [Hepatitis B \(HBV\)/HIV Coinfection](#).)

## References

1. 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.
2. Ruiz L, Ribera E, Bonjoch A, et al. Role of structured treatment interruption before a 5-drug salvage antiretroviral

regimen: the Retrogene Study. *J Infect Dis*. 2003;188(7):977-985.

3. Ghosn J, Wirten M, Ktorza N, et al. No benefit of a structured treatment interruption based on genotypic resistance in heavily pretreated HIV-infected patients. *AIDS*. 2005;19(15):1643-1647.
4. Jaafar A, Massip P, Sandres-Saune K, et al. HIV therapy after treatment interruption in patients with multiple failure and more than 200 CD4+ T lymphocyte count. *J Med Virol*. 2004;74(1):8-15.
5. 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.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. 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.
9. 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.
10. Maggiolo F, Ripamonti D, Gregis G, et al. Effect of prolonged discontinuation of successful antiretroviral therapy on CD4 T cells: a controlled, prospective trial. *AIDS*. 2004;18(3):439-446.
11. Cardillo PG, Hassink E, Ananworanich J, et al. A prospective, randomized trial of structured treatment interruption for patients with chronic HIV type 1 infection. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2005;40(4):594-600.
12. Ananworanich J, Siangphoe U, Hill A, et al. Highly active antiretroviral therapy (HAART) retreatment in patients on CD4-guided therapy achieved similar virologic suppression compared with patients on continuous HAART: the HIV Netherlands Australia Thailand Research Collaboration 001.4 study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2005;39(5):523-529.
13. 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/mm<sup>3</sup>: 48-week Treatment Interruption in Early Starters Netherlands Study (TRISTAN). *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2007;44(4):395-400.
14. Skiest DJ, Su Z, Havlir DV, et al. Interruption of antiretroviral treatment in HIV-infected patients with preserved immune function is associated with a low rate of clinical progression: a prospective study by AIDS Clinical Trials Group 5170. *J Infect Dis*. 2007;195(10):1426-1436.
15. Monforte A, Abrams D, Pradier C, et al. HIV-induced immunodeficiency and mortality from AIDS-defining and non-AIDS-defining malignancies. *AIDS*. 2008;22(16):2143-2153.
16. Phillips AN, Neaton J, Lundgren JD. The role of HIV in serious diseases other than AIDS. *AIDS*. 2008;22(18):2409-2418.
17. Cressey TR, Jourdain G, Lallemant MJ, et al. Persistence of nevirapine exposure during the postpartum period after intrapartum single-dose nevirapine in addition to zidovudine prophylaxis for the prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV-1. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2005;38(3):283-288.
18. Ribaud HJ, Haas DW, Tierney C, et al. Pharmacogenetics of plasma efavirenz exposure after treatment discontinuation: an Adult AIDS Clinical Trials Group Study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2006;42(3):401-407.
19. Haas DW, Ribaud HJ, Kim RB, et al. Pharmacogenetics of efavirenz and central nervous system side effects: an Adult AIDS Clinical Trials Group study. *AIDS*. 2004;18(18):2391-2400.
20. McIntyre JA, Hopley M, Moodley D, et al. Efficacy of short-course AZT plus 3TC to reduce nevirapine resistance in the prevention of mother-to-child HIV transmission: a randomized clinical trial. *PLoS Med*. 2009;6(10):e1000172.
21. Chi BH, Sinkala M, Mbewe F, et al. Single-dose tenofovir and emtricitabine for reduction of viral resistance to non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor drugs in women given intrapartum nevirapine for perinatal HIV prevention: an open-label randomised trial. *Lancet*. 2007;370(9600):1698-1705.

22. Fox Z, Phillips A, Cohen C, et al. Viral resuppression and detection of drug resistance following interruption of a suppressive non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor-based regimen. *AIDS*. 2008;22(17):2279-2289.
23. Bessesen M, Ives D, Condeay L, et al. Chronic active hepatitis B exacerbations in human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients following development of resistance to or withdrawal of lamivudine. *Clin Infect Dis*. 1999;28(5):1032-1035.
24. Sellier P, Clevenbergh P, Mazon MC, et al. Fatal interruption of a 3TC-containing regimen in a HIV-infected patient due to re-activation of chronic hepatitis B virus infection. *Scand J Infect Dis*. 2004;36(6-7):533-535.



# Considerations for Antiretroviral Use in Special Patient Populations

## Acute and Recent (Early\*) HIV Infection (Last updated February 12, 2013; last reviewed February 12, 2013)

### Panel's Recommendations

- Antiretroviral therapy (ART) is recommended for all persons with HIV infection and should be offered to those with early\* HIV infection (**BII**), although definitive data are lacking as to whether this approach will result in long-term virologic, immunologic, or clinical benefits.
- All pregnant women with early HIV infection should start ART as soon as possible to prevent perinatal transmission of HIV (**AI**).
- If treatment is initiated in a patient with early HIV infection, the goal is to suppress plasma HIV RNA to below detectable levels (**AIII**).
- For patients with early HIV infection in whom therapy is initiated, testing for plasma HIV RNA levels, CD4 count, and toxicity monitoring should be performed as described for patients with chronic HIV infection (**AII**).
- Genotypic drug-resistance testing should be performed before initiation of ART to guide the selection of the regimen (**AII**). If therapy is deferred, genotypic resistance testing should still be performed because the results will be useful in selecting a regimen with the greatest potential for achieving optimal virologic response when therapy is ultimately initiated (**AII**).
- For patients without transmitted drug resistant virus, therapy should be initiated with a regimen that is recommended for patients with chronic HIV infection (see [What to Start](#)) (**AIII**).
- ART can be initiated before drug resistance test results are available. Since resistance to ritonavir (RTV)-boosted protease inhibitors (PIs) emerges slowly and since clinically significant transmitted resistance to PIs is uncommon, these drugs combined with nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) should be used in this setting (**AIII**).
- Patients starting ART should be willing and able to commit to treatment and should understand the possible benefits and risks of therapy and the importance of adherence (**AIII**). Patients may choose to postpone therapy, and providers, on a case-by-case basis, may elect to defer therapy because of clinical and/or psychosocial factors.

\* Early infection represents either acute or recent infection as defined in the first paragraph below.

**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

**Definitions:** Acute HIV infection is the phase of HIV disease immediately after infection during which the initial burst of viremia in newly infected patients occurs; anti-HIV antibodies are undetectable at this time while HIV RNA or p24 antigen are present. Recent infection generally is considered the phase up to 6 months after infection during which anti-HIV antibodies are detectable. Throughout this section, the term “early HIV infection” is used to refer to either acute or recent HIV infection.

An estimated 40% to 90% of patients with acute HIV infection will experience symptoms of acute retroviral syndrome, characterized by fever, lymphadenopathy, pharyngitis, skin rash, myalgias/arthralgias, and other symptoms.<sup>1-6</sup> Primary care clinicians, however, often do not recognize acute HIV infection because the self-limiting symptoms are similar to those of many other viral infections, such as influenza and infectious mononucleosis. Acute infection can also be asymptomatic. [Table 11](#) provides practitioners with guidance to recognize, diagnose, and manage acute HIV infection.

### Diagnosis of Acute HIV Infection

Health care providers should maintain a high level of suspicion of acute HIV infection in patients who have a compatible clinical syndrome—especially in those who report recent high-risk behavior ([Table 11](#)).<sup>7</sup> Patients

may not always disclose or admit to high-risk behaviors or they may not perceive that their behaviors put them at risk for HIV acquisition. Thus, signs and symptoms consistent with acute retroviral syndrome should motivate consideration of a diagnosis of acute HIV infection even in the absence of reported high-risk behaviors.

Acute HIV infection is usually defined as detectable HIV RNA or p24 antigen, the latter often used in currently available HIV antigen/antibody (Ag/Ab) combination assays, in serum or plasma in the setting of a negative or indeterminate HIV antibody test.<sup>7, 8</sup> When the acute retroviral syndrome is suspected in a patient with a negative or indeterminate HIV antibody test result, a test for HIV RNA should be performed to diagnose acute infection (**AI**). A low-positive HIV RNA level (<10,000 copies/mL) may represent a false-positive test result because values in acute infection are generally very high (>100,000 copies/mL).<sup>5, 6</sup> A presumptive diagnosis of acute HIV infection can be made on the basis of a negative or indeterminate HIV antibody test result and a positive HIV RNA test result. However, if the results of an HIV RNA test are low-positive, the test should be repeated using a different specimen from the same patient. It is highly unlikely that a second test will reproduce a false-positive result.<sup>6</sup> Interest in routine screening for acute infection has led select centers to use the HIV Ag/Ab test as the primary HIV screening assay or to test all HIV antibody negative samples for HIV RNA.<sup>9</sup> Combination HIV Ag/Ab tests (ARCHITECT HIV Ag/Ab Combo and GS HIV Combo Ag/Ab) now are approved by the Food and Drug Administration; however, the currently available tests do not differentiate between a positive antibody test result and a positive antigen result. Thus HIV Ag/Ab-reactive specimens should be tested with an antibody assay, and if the test results are negative or indeterminate and if acute HIV infection is suspected, be further tested for HIV RNA.<sup>10, 11</sup> Because HIV RNA or Ag/Ab combination assays are not yet used routinely for HIV screening in all settings, clinicians should not assume that a laboratory report of a negative HIV test result indicates that screening for acute HIV infection has been conducted. Patients also should know that home HIV testing only detects HIV antibodies and therefore will not detect very early acute HIV infection. Persons diagnosed presumptively with acute HIV infection should have serologic testing repeated over the next 3 to 6 months to document seroconversion (**AI**) (see [Table 11](#)).

### ***Treatment for Early HIV Infection***

Clinical trial data regarding the treatment of early HIV infection is limited. Many patients who enrolled in studies to assess the role of antiretroviral therapy (ART) in early HIV infection, as outlined below, were identified as trial participants because they presented with signs or symptoms of acute infection. With the introduction of HIV screening tests that include assays for HIV RNA or p24 antigen and wider HIV screening in healthcare systems, the number of asymptomatic patients identified with early infection may be increasing. The natural history of HIV disease in these patients may differ from that in persons with symptomatic infections, thus further studies on the impact of ART on the natural history of asymptomatic acute HIV infection are needed. The initial burst of high level viremia in infected adults usually declines shortly after acute infection (e.g., within 2 months); however, a rationale for treatment during recent infection (e.g., 2–6 months after infection) remains because the immune system may not yet have maximally contained viral replication in the lymphoid tissue during this time.<sup>12</sup> Several trials have addressed the question of the long-term benefit of potent treatment regimens initiated during early HIV infection. The potential benefits and risks of treating HIV during this stage of disease are discussed below:

- **Potential Benefits of Treatment During Early HIV Infection.** Preliminary data indicate that treatment of early HIV infection with combination ART improves laboratory markers of disease progression.<sup>13-17</sup> The data, though limited, indicate that treatment of early HIV infection may also decrease the severity of acute disease; lower the viral set point,<sup>18-20</sup> which can affect disease progression rates in the event therapy is stopped; reduce the size of the viral reservoir;<sup>21</sup> and decrease the rate of viral mutation by suppressing viral replication and preserving immune function.<sup>22</sup> Because early HIV infection often is associated with high viral loads and increased infectiousness,<sup>23</sup> and ART use by HIV-infected individuals reduces

transmission to serodiscordant sexual partners,<sup>24</sup> treatment during this stage of infection is expected to substantially reduce the risk of HIV transmission. In addition, although data are limited and the clinical relevance unclear, the profound loss of gastrointestinal lymphoid tissue that occurs during the first weeks of infection may be mitigated by initiating ART during early HIV infection.<sup>25, 26</sup> Many of the potential benefits described above may be more likely to occur with treatment of acute infection, but they also may occur if treatment is initiated during recent HIV infection.

- **Potential Risks of Treatment During Early HIV Infection.** The potential disadvantages of initiating therapy during early HIV infection include more prolonged exposure to ART without a known long-term clinical benefit. This could result in drug toxicities, development of drug resistance, and adverse effects on an individual's quality of life due to earlier initiation of lifelong therapy that requires strict adherence.

Several randomized controlled trials have studied the effect of ART during acute and recent infection to assess whether initiating early therapy would allow patients to stop treatment and maintain lower viral loads and higher CD4 counts while off ART for prolonged periods of time. This objective was of interest when these studies were initiated but is less relevant in an era in which treatment is recommended for virtually all HIV-infected patients and treatment interruptions are not recommended (see [Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy in Treatment-Naive Patients](#)).

The Setpoint Study (ACTG A5217 Study) randomized patients with recent but not acute HIV infection to either defer therapy or immediately initiate ART for 36 weeks and then stop.<sup>18</sup> The primary study end point was a composite of meeting criteria for ART or re-initiation of ART and viral load results at week 72 in both groups and at week 36 in the deferred treatment group. The study was stopped prematurely by the Data and Safety Monitoring Board because of an apparent benefit associated with early therapy that was driven mostly by greater proportion of participants meeting criteria for ART initiation in the deferred treatment group (50%) than in the immediate treatment group (10%). Nearly half of the patients in the deferred treatment group needed to start therapy during the first year of study enrollment.

The Randomized Primo-SHM Trial randomized patients with acute (~70%) or recent (~30%) infection to either defer ART or to undergo treatment for 24 or 60 weeks and then stop.<sup>19</sup> Significantly lower viral loads were observed 36 weeks after treatment interruption in the patients who had been treated early. These patients also experienced a longer time before the need to initiate therapy, primarily on the basis of reaching a CD4 count of <350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. The median time to starting treatment was 0.7 years for the deferred therapy group and 3.0 and 1.8 years for the 24- and 60-week treatment arms, respectively. The time to reaching a CD4 count of <500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> was only 0.5 years in the deferred group.

Finally, the SPARTAC Trial included patients with acute and recent infection randomized to either defer therapy or to undergo treatment for 12 or 48 weeks and then stop.<sup>20</sup> In this case, the time to CD4 <350 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> or initiation of therapy was significantly longer in the group treated for 48 weeks than in the deferred treatment group or the group treated for 12 weeks. However, no difference was observed comparing persons who received 12 weeks of ART with those who deferred treatment during early infection.

The strategies tested in these studies are of limited relevance in the current treatment era in which treatment interruption is not recommended. The study results may not fully reflect the natural history of HIV disease in persons with asymptomatic acute infection because most patients in these trials were enrolled on the basis of identified early symptomatic HIV infections. Nevertheless, the results do demonstrate that some immunologic and virologic benefits may be associated with the treatment of early HIV infection. Moreover, all the findings suggest, at least in the population recruited for these studies, that the time to initiating ART after identification of early infection is quite short when the threshold for ART initiation is 350 CD4 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>, and nonexistent when therapy is advised for all individuals regardless of CD4 cell count as currently recommended in these guidelines. These observations must be balanced with the risks of early treatment, risks that are largely the same as those of therapy initiated in chronically infected asymptomatic patients with high CD4 counts.

Consequently, the health care provider and the patient should be fully aware that the rationale for initiating therapy during early HIV infection is based on theoretical benefits and the extrapolation of data from the strategy trials outlined above. These potential benefits must be weighed against the risks. For these reasons, and because ART is currently recommended for all HIV-infected patients (see [Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy in Treatment-Naïve Patients](#)), ART should be offered to all patients with early HIV infection (**BII**). However, patients must be willing and able to commit to treatment and providers, on a case-by-case basis, may elect to defer therapy for clinical and/or psychosocial reasons. Providers also should consider enrolling patients with early HIV infection in clinical studies to further evaluate the natural history of this stage of HIV infection and to further define the role of ART in this setting. Providers can obtain information regarding such trials at [www.clinicaltrials.gov](http://www.clinicaltrials.gov) or from local HIV treatment experts.

### ***Treatment for Early HIV Infection During Pregnancy***

Because early HIV infection is associated with a high risk of perinatal transmission, all HIV-infected pregnant women should start combination ART as soon as possible to prevent perinatal transmission of HIV (**AI**).<sup>27</sup>

### ***Treatment Regimen for Early HIV Infection***

Data from the United States and Europe demonstrate that transmitted virus may be resistant to at least 1 antiretroviral in 6% to 16% of patients.<sup>28-30</sup> Up to 21% of isolates from contemporary patients with acute HIV infection demonstrated resistance to at least 1 drug.<sup>31</sup> Therefore, before initiation of ART in a person with early HIV infection, genotypic antiretroviral drug-resistance testing should be performed to guide the selection of a regimen (**AII**). If the decision to initiate therapy during early infection is made, especially in the setting of acute infection, treatment initiation should not be delayed pending resistance testing results. Once results are available, the treatment regimen can be modified if warranted. If therapy is deferred, resistance testing still should be performed because the results will help guide selection of a regimen to optimize virologic response once therapy is initiated (**AII**).

The goal of therapy during early HIV infection is to suppress plasma HIV RNA to undetectable levels (**AIII**). Because data to draw firm conclusions regarding specific drug combinations to use in this stage of HIV infection are insufficient, ART should be initiated with one of the combination regimens recommended for patients with chronic infection (**AIII**) (see [What to Start](#)). If therapy is started before the results of drug-resistance testing are available, because resistance to RTV-boosted protease inhibitors (PIs) emerge slowly and clinically significant transmitted resistance to PIs is uncommon (**AIII**). If available, the results of ARV drug-resistance testing or the ARV resistance pattern of the source person's virus should be used to guide the selection of the ARV regimen. Given the recent approval of daily tenofovir DF/emtricitabine (TDF/FTC) for pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP),<sup>32-34</sup> early infection may be diagnosed in some patients while they are taking TDF/FTC as PrEP. In this setting, resistance testing should be performed; however, because PI resistance is unlikely, use of a RTV-boosted PI with TDF/FTC remains a reasonable option pending resistance testing results (see [What to Start](#)).

### ***Patient Follow-up***

Testing for plasma HIV RNA levels, CD4 cell counts, and toxicity monitoring should be performed as described in [Laboratory Testing for Initial Assessment and Monitoring While on Antiretroviral Therapy](#) (i.e., HIV RNA at initiation of therapy, after 2 to 8 weeks, then every 4 to 8 weeks until viral suppression, and thereafter, every 3 to 4 months) (**AII**).

### ***Duration of Therapy for Early HIV Infection***

The optimal duration of therapy for patients with early HIV infection is unknown. Recent studies of early HIV infection have evaluated the potential for starting and then stopping treatment.<sup>18-20</sup> Although these studies showed some benefits associated with this strategy, a large randomized controlled trial of patients



with chronic HIV infection found that treatment interruption was harmful in terms of increased risk of AIDS and non-AIDS events,<sup>35</sup> and that the strategy was associated with increased markers of inflammation, immune activation and coagulation.<sup>36</sup> For these reasons and because of the potential benefit of ART in reducing the risk of HIV transmission, the Panel recommends against discontinuation of ART in patients treated for early HIV infection (**AIII**).

**Table 11. Identifying, Diagnosing, and Managing Acute and Recent HIV-1 Infection**

- **Suspecting acute HIV infection:** Signs or symptoms of acute HIV infection with recent (within 2 to 6 weeks) high risk of exposure to HIV<sup>a</sup>
  - Signs/symptoms/laboratory findings 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, transaminase elevation.
  - High-risk exposures include sexual contact with an HIV-infected person or a person at risk of HIV infection, sharing injection drug use paraphernalia, or contact of mucous membranes or breaks in skin with potentially infectious fluids.
- **Differential diagnosis:** Includes but is not limited to viral illnesses such as Epstein-Barr virus (EBV)- and non-EBV (e.g., cytomegalovirus) infectious mononucleosis syndromes, influenza, viral hepatitis, streptococcal infection, or syphilis.
- **Evaluation/diagnosis of acute HIV infection:**
  - Acute infection is defined as detectable HIV RNA or p24 antigen (the antigen used in currently available HIV antigen/antibody [Ag/Ab] combination assays), in serum or plasma in the setting of a negative or indeterminate HIV antibody test result
    - A reactive HIV antibody test or Ag/Ab test must be followed by supplemental confirmatory testing.
    - A negative or indeterminate HIV antibody test in a person with a positive Ag/Ab test or in whom acute HIV infection is suspected requires assessment of plasma HIV RNA<sup>b</sup> to assess for acute HIV infection.
    - A positive plasma HIV RNA test in the setting of a negative or indeterminate antibody result is consistent with acute HIV infection.
  - Patients presumptively diagnosed with acute HIV infection should have serologic testing repeated over the next 3 to 6 months to document seroconversion.
- **Considerations for antiretroviral therapy (ART) during early HIV infection:**
  - All pregnant women with early HIV infection should begin taking combination ART as soon as possible because of the high risk of perinatal HIV transmission (**AI**).
  - Treatment for early HIV infection should be offered to all non-pregnant persons (**BII**).
  - The risks of ART during early HIV infection are largely the same as those for ART initiated in chronically infected asymptomatic patients with high CD4 counts.
  - If therapy is initiated, the goal should be sustained plasma virologic suppression (**AIII**).
  - Providers should consider enrolling patients with early HIV infection in clinical studies.

<sup>a</sup> In some settings, behaviors conducive to acquisition of HIV infection might not be ascertained or might not be perceived as high risk by the health care provider or the patient or both. Thus, symptoms and signs consistent with acute retroviral syndrome should motivate consideration of this diagnosis even in the absence of reported high-risk behaviors.

<sup>b</sup> Plasma HIV RNA can be measured by a variety of quantitative assays, including branched DNA (bDNA) and reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR)-based assays as well as by a qualitative transcription-mediated amplification assay (APTIMA, GenProbe).

## References

1. Tindall B, Cooper DA. Primary HIV infection: host responses and intervention strategies. *AIDS*. 1991;5(1):1-14. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=1812848](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=1812848).
2. Niu MT, Stein DS, Schnittman SM. Primary human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection: review of pathogenesis and early treatment intervention in humans and animal retrovirus infections. *J Infect Dis*. 1993;168(6):1490-1501. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=8245534](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=8245534).



3. Kinloch-de Loes S, de Saussure P, Saurat JH, Stalder H, Hirschel B, Perrin LH. Symptomatic primary infection due to human immunodeficiency virus type 1: review of 31 cases. *Clin Infect Dis*. 1993;17(1):59-65. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=8353247](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=8353247).
4. Schacker T, Collier AC, Hughes J, Shea T, Corey L. Clinical and epidemiologic features of primary HIV infection. *Ann Intern Med*. 1996;125(4):257-264. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=8678387](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=8678387).
5. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11187417](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11187417).
6. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12004270](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12004270).
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; quiz CE11-14. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16988643>.
8. Pilcher CD, Christopoulos KA, Golden M. Public health rationale for rapid nucleic acid or p24 antigen tests for HIV. *J Infect Dis*. 2010;201(1):S7-15. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20225950>.
9. Pilcher CD, Fiscus SA, Nguyen TQ, et al. Detection of acute infections during HIV testing in North Carolina. *N Engl J Med*. 2005;352(18):1873-1883. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15872202](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15872202).
10. Branson BM. The future of HIV testing. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Dec 2010;55 Suppl 2:S102-105. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21406978>.
11. Branson BM, Stekler JD. Detection of acute HIV infection: we can't close the window. *J Infect Dis*. Feb 15 2012;205(4):521-524. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22207652>.
12. Pantaleo G, Cohen OJ, Schacker T, et al. Evolutionary pattern of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) replication and distribution in lymph nodes following primary infection: implications for antiviral therapy. *Nat Med*. 1998;4(3):341-345. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=9500610](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9500610).
13. Hoen B, Dumon B, Harzic M, et al. Highly active antiretroviral treatment initiated early in the course of symptomatic primary HIV-1 infection: results of the ANRS 053 trial. *J Infect Dis*. 1999;180(4):1342-1346. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10479169](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10479169).
14. Lafeuillade A, Poggi C, Tamalet C, Profizi N, Tourres C, Costes O. Effects of a combination of zidovudine, didanosine, and lamivudine on primary human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection. *J Infect Dis*. 1997;175(5):1051-1055. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=9129065](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9129065).
15. Lillo FB, Ciuffreda D, Veglia F, et al. Viral load and burden modification following early antiretroviral therapy of primary HIV-1 infection. *AIDS*. 1999;13(7):791-796. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10357377](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10357377).
16. Malhotra U, Berrey MM, Huang Y, et al. Effect of combination antiretroviral therapy on T-cell immunity in acute human immunodeficiency virus type 1 infection. *J Infect Dis*. 2000;181(1):121-131. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10608758](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10608758).
17. Smith DE, Walker BD, Cooper DA, Rosenberg ES, Kaldor JM. Is antiretroviral treatment of primary HIV infection clinically justified on the basis of current evidence? *AIDS*. 2004;18(5):709-718. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15075505](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15075505).
18. Hogan CM, Degruittola 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>.
19. Grijnsen 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>.
20. The SPARTAC Trial Investigators. 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>.

21. 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>.
22. Rosenberg ES, Altfeld M, Poon SH, et al. Immune control of HIV-1 after early treatment of acute infection. *Nature.* S2000;407(6803):523-526. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11029005>.
23. 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>.
24. 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 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21767103>.
25. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15365095](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15365095).
26. 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 Virol.* 2003;77(21):11708-11717. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14557656](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=14557656).
27. 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 <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/PerinatalGL.pdf>.
28. Wheeler WH, Ziebell RA, Zabina H, et al. Prevalence of transmitted drug resistance associated mutations and HIV-1 subtypes in new HIV-1 diagnoses, U.S.-2006. *AIDS.* 2010;24(8):1203-1212. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20395786](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20395786).
29. Kim D, Wheeler W, Ziebell R, et al. Prevalence of transmitted antiretroviral drug resistance among newly-diagnosed HIV-1-infected persons, US, 2007. Paper presented at: 17th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; 2010; San Francisco, CA.
30. Wensing AM, van de Vijver DA, Angarano G, et al. Prevalence of drug-resistant HIV-1 variants in untreated individuals in Europe: implications for clinical management. *J Infect Dis.* 2005;192(6):958-966. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16107947](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16107947).
31. 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>.
32. 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>.
33. 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>.
34. 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>.
35. Strategies for Management of Antiretroviral Therapy Study G, El-Sadr WM, Lundgren J, 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/pubmed/17135583>.
36. Kuller LH, Tracy R, Belloso W, et al. Inflammatory and coagulation biomarkers and mortality in patients with HIV infection. *PLoS Med.* 2008;5(10):e203. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18942885>.

## HIV-Infected Adolescents and Young Adults (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

Older children and adolescents now make up the largest percentage of HIV-infected children cared for at pediatric HIV clinics in the United States. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) estimates that 26% of the approximately 50,000 new HIV infections diagnosed in 2010 were among youth 13 to 24 years of age. In this age group, 57% of the infections were among young black/African Americans and 75% among young men who have sex with men (MSM).<sup>1</sup> Among youth living with HIV infection in 2010, CDC estimates that almost 60% had undiagnosed infections and were unaware they were HIV-infected.<sup>2</sup> Recent trends in HIV/AIDS prevalence reveal that the disproportionate burden of AIDS among racial minorities is even greater among minority youth 13 to 24 years of age (64% to 66% of cases) than among those older than 24 years (48% of cases).<sup>3</sup> Furthermore, trends for all HIV diagnoses among adolescents and young adults in 46 states and 5 U.S. dependent areas from 2007 to 2010 decreased or remained stable for all transmission categories except among young MSM. HIV-infected adolescents represent a heterogeneous group in terms of sociodemographics, mode of HIV infection, 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 are infected through sexual risk behaviors. Many of them are recently infected and unaware of their HIV infection status. Thus, many are in an early stage of HIV infection, which makes them ideal candidates for early interventions, such as prevention counseling and linkage to and engagement in care.<sup>4</sup> High grade viremia was reported among a cohort of youth identified as HIV-infected 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.<sup>5</sup> A study among HIV-infected adolescents and young adults presenting for care identified primary genotypic resistance mutations to ARV medications in up to 18% of the evaluable sample of recently infected youth, as determined by the detuned antibody testing assay strategy that defined recent infection as occurring within 180 days of testing.<sup>6</sup> Recently, substantial multiclass resistance was noted in a cohort of behaviorally-infected, treatment-naïve youth who were screened for an ARV treatment trial.<sup>7</sup> As these youth were naïve to all ART, this reflects transmission of resistant virus. This transmission dynamic reflects that a substantial proportion of youth's sexual partners are likely older and may be more ART experienced; thus, awareness of the importance of baseline resistance testing among recently infected youth naïve to ART is imperative.

A limited but increasing number of HIV-infected adolescents are long-term survivors of HIV infection acquired perinatally or in infancy through blood products. Such adolescents are usually heavily ART experienced and may have a unique clinical course that differs from that of adolescents infected later in life.<sup>8</sup> Those adolescents infected perinatally or in infancy were often started on ART early in life with mono or dual therapy regimens resulting in incomplete viral suppression and emergence of resistance. If these heavily ART-experienced adolescents harbor resistant virus, optimal ARV regimens should be selected on the basis of the same guiding principles used for heavily ART-experienced adults (see [Virologic Failure and Suboptimal Immunologic Response](#)).

Adolescents are developmentally at a difficult crossroad. Their needs for autonomy and independence and their evolving decisional capacity intersect and 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 attract and 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 maintain adolescents in care so they can improve and maintain their health for the long term. Adolescents may seek care in several settings including pediatric-focused HIV clinics, adolescent/young adult clinics, and adult-focused clinics.<sup>9</sup> Regardless of the setting, expertise in caring for adolescents is critical to creating a

### ***Antiretroviral Therapy Considerations in Adolescents***

Adult guidelines for ART are usually appropriate for postpubertal adolescents because the clinical course of HIV infection in adolescents who were infected 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 were perinatally infected. These patients 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.

Dosage of medications for HIV infection and opportunistic infections should be prescribed according to Tanner staging of puberty and not solely on the basis of age.<sup>11,12</sup> Adolescents in early puberty (i.e., Tanner Stages I and II) should be administered doses on pediatric schedules, whereas those in late puberty (i.e., Tanner Stage V) should follow adult dosing schedules. However, Tanner stage and age are not necessarily directly predictive of drug pharmacokinetics. Because puberty may be delayed in children who were infected with HIV perinatally,<sup>13</sup> continued use of pediatric doses in puberty-delayed adolescents can result in medication doses that are higher than the usual adult doses. Because data are not available to predict optimal medication doses for each ARV medication for this group of children, issues such as toxicity, pill or liquid volume burden, adherence, and virologic and immunologic parameters should be considered in determining when to transition from pediatric to adult doses. Youth who are in their growth spurt period (i.e., Tanner Stage III in females and Tanner Stage IV in males) and 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 each of these selected circumstances to help guide therapy decisions. Pharmacokinetic studies of drugs in youth are needed to better define appropriate dosing. For a more detailed discussion, see [Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in Pediatric HIV Infection](#).<sup>14</sup>

### ***Adherence Concerns in Adolescents***

HIV-infected adolescents are especially vulnerable to specific adherence problems on the basis of their psychosocial and cognitive developmental trajectory. Comprehensive systems of care are required to serve both the medical and psychosocial needs of HIV-infected adolescents, who are frequently inexperienced with health care systems and who lack health insurance. Recent studies in adolescents infected through risk behaviors and in adolescents infected through perinatal transmission demonstrate that many adolescents in both groups face numerous barriers to adherence.<sup>15-17</sup> Compared with adults, these youth have lower rates of viral suppression and higher rates of virologic rebound and loss to follow up.<sup>18</sup> Many HIV-infected adolescents face challenges in adhering to medical regimens for reasons that include:

- Denial and fear of their HIV infection;
- Misinformation;
- Distrust of the medical establishment;
- Fear and lack of belief in the effectiveness of medications;
- Low self-esteem;
- Unstructured and chaotic lifestyles;
- Mood disorders and other mental illness;
- Lack of familial and social support;
- Absence of or inconsistent access to care or health insurance; and
- Risk of inadvertent parental disclosure of the youth's HIV infection status if parental health insurance is used.



In selecting treatment regimens for adolescents, clinicians must balance the goal of prescribing a maximally potent ART regimen with realistic assessment of existing and potential support systems to facilitate adherence. Adolescents benefit from reminder systems (e.g., beepers, timers, and pill boxes) that are stylish and/or inconspicuous.<sup>19</sup> In a recent randomized controlled study among non-adherent youth 15 to 24 years of age, youth who received cell phone medication reminders demonstrated significantly higher adherence and lower viral loads than youth who did not receive the reminder calls.<sup>20</sup> It is important to make medication adherence as user friendly and the least stigmatizing possible for the older child or adolescent. The concrete thought processes of adolescents make it difficult for them to take medications when they are asymptomatic, particularly if 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.<sup>21-23</sup> Directly observed therapy may be considered for selected HIV-infected adolescents such as those with mental illness.<sup>24-28</sup>

### ***Difficult Adherence Problems***

Because adolescence is characterized by rapid changes in physical maturation, cognitive processes, and life style, predicting long-term adherence in an adolescent can be very challenging. The ability of youth to adhere to therapy needs to be considered as part of therapeutic decision making concerning the risks and benefits of starting treatment. Erratic adherence may result in the loss of future regimens because of the development of resistance mutations. Clinicians who care for HIV-infected adolescents frequently manage youth who, while needing therapy, pose significant concerns regarding their ability to adhere to therapy. In these cases, alternative considerations to initiation of therapy can be the following:

1. A short-term deferral of treatment until adherence is more likely or while adherence-related problems are aggressively addressed;
2. An adherence testing period in which a placebo (e.g., vitamin pill) is administered; and
3. The avoidance of any regimens with low genetic resistance barriers.

Such decisions are ideally individualized to each patient and should be made carefully in context with the individual's clinical status. For a more detailed discussion on specific therapy and adherence issues for HIV-infected adolescents, see [Guidelines for Use of Antiretroviral Agents in Pediatric HIV Infection](#).<sup>14</sup>

### ***Special Considerations in Adolescents***

Sexually transmitted infections (STIs), in particular human papilloma virus (HPV), should also be addressed in all adolescents. 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.<sup>29</sup> For a more detailed discussion on STIs, see the most recent CDC guidelines<sup>30</sup> and the adult and pediatric opportunistic infection treatment guidelines on HPV among HIV-infected adolescents.<sup>31,32</sup> Family planning counseling, including a discussion of the risks of perinatal transmission of HIV and methods to reduce risks, should be provided to all youth. Providing gynecologic care for HIV-infected female adolescents is especially important. Contraception, including the interaction of specific ARV drugs with hormonal contraceptives, and the potential for pregnancy also may alter choices of ART. As an example, efavirenz (EFV) should be used with caution in females of childbearing age and should only be prescribed after intensive counseling and education about the potential effects on the fetus, the need for close monitoring—including periodic pregnancy testing—and a commitment on the part of the teen to use effective contraception. For a more detailed discussion, see [HIV-Infected Women](#) and the [Perinatal Guidelines](#).<sup>33</sup>

### ***Transitioning Care***

Given lifelong infection with HIV and the need for treatment through several stages of growth and development, HIV care programs and providers need flexibility to appropriately transition care for HIV-infected children, adolescents, and young adults. A successful transition requires an awareness of some



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 referral of the patient to separate subspecialty care settings, such as gynecology. Transitioning the care of an emerging young adult includes considerations of areas such as 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, HIV-infected adolescents belong to two epidemiologically distinct subgroups:

1. Those perinatally infected—who would likely have more disease burden history, complications, and chronicity; less functional autonomy; greater need for ART; and higher mortality risk—and
2. Those more recently infected because of high-risk behaviors.

Thus, these subgroups have unique biomedical and psychosocial considerations and needs.

To maximize the likelihood of a successful transition, interventions to facilitate transition are best implemented early on.<sup>34</sup> These 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 and adult clinics;
- Identifying adult care providers willing to care for adolescents and young adults;
- Addressing patient/family resistance caused by lack of information, stigma or disclosure concerns, and differences in practice styles;
- Preparing youth for life skills development, including counseling them on the appropriate use of a primary care provider and appointment management, the importance of prompt symptom recognition and reporting, and the importance of self-efficacy in managing medications, insurance, and entitlements;
- Identifying an optimal clinic model for a given setting (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 model;
- Engaging in regular multidisciplinary case conferences between adult and adolescent care providers;
- Implementing interventions that may be associated with improved outcomes, such as support groups and mental health consultation;
- Incorporating a family planning component into clinical care; and
- Educating HIV care teams and staff about transitioning.

Discussions regarding transition should begin **early and** before the actual transition process.<sup>35</sup> Attention to these key areas will likely improve adherence to appointments and avert the potential for a youth to fall through the cracks, as it is commonly referred to in adolescent medicine. For a more detailed discussion on specific topics on transitioning care for adolescents and young adults, see <http://www.hivguidelines.org/clinical-guidelines/adolescents/transitioning-hiv-infected-adolescents-into-adult-care/>.

## References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Monitoring selected national HIV prevention and care objectives by using HIV surveillance data—United States and 6 U.S. dependent areas—2010. HIV Surveillance Supplemental Report 2012;17(No. 3, part A)*. Table 5a. June 2012. Available at <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/surveillance/resources/reports/>. Accessed January 6, 2013.

2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Vital signs: HIV infection, testing, and risk behaviors among youths—United States. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Nov 30 2012;61(47):971-976. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23190571>.
3. 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](http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/pdf/statistics_surveillance_Adolescents.pdf). Accessed January 2, 2014.
4. 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*. Jan 2014;26(1):12-19. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23777542>.
5. Kapogiannis BF, Ellen J, Xu J, Willard N, DuVal A, Pace J, Loeb J, Bethel J, Wilson C, and the ATN 093 Team, and the Adolescent Trials Network for HIV/AIDS Interventions. The Strategic Multisite Initiative for the Identification, Linkage and Engagement to Care of HIV-Infected Youth (SMILE): Can Treatment As Prevention Work for American Minority Youth? Poster presented at: International AIDS Society Conference; Washington, DC; July 22–27, 2012.
6. 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*. Dec 1 2006;194(11):1505-1509. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17083034](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17083034).
7. Agwu AL, Bethel J, Hightow-Weidman LB, et al. Substantial multiclass transmitted drug resistance and drug-relevant polymorphisms among treatment-naïve behaviorally HIV-infected youth. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. Apr 2012;26(4):193-196. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22563607>.
8. 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*. Jun 1 2011;57(2):165-173. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21407086>.
9. Tanner AE, Philbin MM, Duval A, et al. "Youth friendly" clinics: Considerations for linking and engaging HIV-infected adolescents into care. *AIDS Care*. Feb 2014;26(2):199-205. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23782040>.
10. New York State Department of Health AIDS Institute. *Ambulatory Care of HIV-Infected Adolescents*. 2012. Available at <http://hivguidelines.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/ambulatory-care-of-hiv-infected-adolescents-11-19-2012.pdf>. Accessed April 2, 2014.
11. Rogers A (ed). Pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics in adolescents. *J Adolesc Health*. 1994;15:605-678.
12. El-Sadar W, Oleske JM, Agins BD, et al. Evaluation and management of early HIV infection. Clinical Practice Guideline No. 7 (AHCPR Publication No. 94-0572). Agency for Health Care Policy and Research, Public Health Service, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. Rockville, MD; 1994.
13. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?db=pubmed&cmd=Retrieve&dopt=AbstractPlus&list\\_uids=12792356&query\\_hl=17&itool=pubmed\\_docsum](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?db=pubmed&cmd=Retrieve&dopt=AbstractPlus&list_uids=12792356&query_hl=17&itool=pubmed_docsum).
14. Panel on Antiretroviral Therapy and Medical Management of HIV-Infected Children. Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in Pediatric HIV Infection. Available at <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/pediatricguidelines.pdf>. Accessed January 6, 2014.
15. 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*. Feb 2010;24(2):97-104. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20059354>.
16. 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*. Mar 2009;23(3):185-194. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19866536>.
17. MacDonell K, Naar-King S, Huszti H, Belzer M. Barriers to medication adherence in behaviorally and perinatally infected youth living with HIV. *AIDS Behav*. Jan 2013;17(1):86-93. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23142855>.
18. 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*. Oct 1 2011;58(2):193-197. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21826014>.
19. 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*. Jun 2003;17(6):299-308. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=12880493](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=12880493).

20. Belzar M, Naar-King S, Olson J, Clark, Sarr M, and the Adolescent Trials Network for HIV/AIDS Interventions. A pilot study using cell phone interactions to improve HIV medication adherence in adolescents who have previously failed antiretroviral therapy. Paper presented at: 2013 Society for Adolescent Health and Medicine Annual Meeting; Atlanta, GA; March 13–16, 2013.
21. Brooks-Gunn J, Graber JA. Puberty as a biological and social event: implications for research on pharmacology. *J Adolesc Health*. Dec 1994;15(8):663-671. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=7696287](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=7696287).
22. 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*. Apr 1998;27(4):760-769. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=9578206](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9578206).
23. La Greca AM. Peer influences in pediatric chronic illness: an update. *J Pediatr Psychol*. Dec 1992;17(6):775-784. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=1484338](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=1484338).
24. 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*. Feb 2001;13(1):27-40. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11177463](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11177463).
25. Stenzel MS, McKenzie M, Mitty JA, Flanigan TP. Enhancing adherence to HAART: a pilot program of modified directly observed therapy. *AIDS Read*. Jun 2001;11(6):317-319. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11449925](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11449925).
26. 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*. Mar-Apr 2008;19(2):158-165. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18328966](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18328966).
27. 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*. Feb 2009;44(2):124-132. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19167660](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19167660).
28. Gaur A, Belzer M, Britto P, et al. Directly observed therapy for non-adherent HIV-infected adolescents - lessons learned, challenges ahead. Paper presented at: 15th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. 2008; Boston, MA.
29. 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*. Sep 2001;29(3 Suppl):49-56. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11530303>.
30. Workowski KA, Berman S. Sexually transmitted diseases treatment guidelines, 2010. *MMWR Recomm Rep*. Dec 17 2010;59(RR-12):1-110. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21160459](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21160459).
31. 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 Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Available at [http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult\\_oi.pdf](http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult_oi.pdf). Accessed January 6, 2014.
32. Panel on Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Exposed and HIV-Infected Children. Guidelines for the Prevention and Treatment of Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Exposed and HIV-Infected Children. Department of Health and Human Services. Available at [http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/oi\\_guidelines\\_pediatrics.pdf](http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/oi_guidelines_pediatrics.pdf). Accessed January 8, 2014.
33. 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 <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/PerinatalGL.pdf>. Accessed April 2, 2014
34. Valenzuela JM, Buchanan CL, Radcliffe J, et al. Transition to adult services among behaviorally infected adolescents with HIV—a qualitative study. *J Pediatr Psychol*. Mar 2011;36(2):134-140. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19542198>.
35. Committee On Pediatric AIDS. Transitioning HIV-infected youth into adult health care. *Pediatrics*. Jul 2013;132(1):192-197. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23796739>.

## **HIV and Illicit Drug Users (Last updated March 27, 2012; last reviewed March 27, 2012)**

### ***Treatment Challenges of HIV-Infected Illicit Drug Users***

Injection drug use is the second most common mode of HIV transmission in the United States. In addition, noninjection illicit drug use may facilitate sexual transmission of HIV. Injection and noninjection illicit drugs include the following: heroin, cocaine, marijuana, and club drugs (i.e., methamphetamine, ketamine, gamma-hydroxybutyrate [GHB], and amyl nitrate [i.e., poppers]). The most commonly used illicit drugs associated with HIV infection are heroin and stimulants (e.g., cocaine and amphetamines); however, the use of club drugs has increased substantially in the past several years and is common among individuals who have HIV infection or who are at risk of HIV infection. The association between club drugs and high-risk sexual behavior in men who have sex with men (MSM) is strongest for methamphetamine and amyl nitrate; this association is less consistent with the other club drugs.<sup>1</sup>

Illicit drug use has been associated with depression and anxiety, either as part of the withdrawal process or as a consequence of repeated use. This is particularly relevant in the treatment of HIV infection because depression is one of the strongest predictors of poor adherence and poor treatment outcomes.<sup>2</sup> Treatment of HIV disease in illicit drug users can be successful but HIV-infected illicit drug users present special treatment challenges. These challenges may include the following: (1) an array of complicating comorbid medical and mental health conditions; (2) limited access to HIV care; (3) inadequate adherence to therapy; (4) medication side effects and toxicities; (5) the need for substance abuse treatment; and (6) drug interactions that can complicate HIV treatment.<sup>3</sup>

Underlying health problems in injection and noninjection drug users result in increased morbidity and mortality, either independent of or accentuated by HIV disease. Many of these problems are the consequence of prior exposures to infectious pathogens from nonsterile needle and syringe use. Such problems can include hepatitis B or C virus infection, tuberculosis (TB), skin and soft tissue infections, recurrent bacterial pneumonia, and endocarditis. Other morbidities such as alteration in levels of consciousness and neurologic and renal disease are not uncommon. Furthermore, these comorbidities are associated with a higher risk of drug overdoses in illicit drug users with HIV disease than in HIV-uninfected illicit drug users, due in part to respiratory, hepatic, and neurological impairments associated with HIV infection.<sup>4</sup> Successful HIV therapy for illicit drug users often depends on clinicians becoming familiar with and managing these comorbid conditions and providing overdose prevention support.

Illicit drug users have less access to HIV care and are less likely to receive antiretroviral therapy (ART) than other populations.<sup>5-6</sup> Factors associated with low rates of ART use among illicit drug users include active drug use, younger age, female gender, suboptimal health care, recent incarceration, lack of access to rehabilitation programs, and health care providers' lack of expertise in HIV treatment.<sup>5-6</sup> The typically unstable, chaotic life patterns of many illicit drug users; the powerful pull of addictive substances; and common misperceptions about the dangers, impact, and benefits of ART all contribute to decreased adherence.<sup>7</sup> The chronic and relapsing nature of substance abuse as a biologic and medical disease, compounded by the high rate of mental illness that antedates and/or is exacerbated by illicit substance use, additionally complicate the relationship between health care workers and illicit drug users.<sup>8-9</sup> The first step in provision of care and treatment for these individuals is to recognize the existence of a substance abuse problem. It is often obvious that the problem exists, but some patients may hide these problem behaviors from clinicians. Assessment of a patient for substance abuse should be part of routine medical history taking and should be done in a professional, straightforward, and nonjudgmental manner.

### ***Treatment Efficacy in HIV-Infected Illicit Drug Use Populations***

Although illicit drug users are underrepresented in HIV therapy clinical trials, available data indicate that efficacy of ART in illicit drug users—when they are not actively using drugs—is similar to that seen in other



populations.<sup>10</sup> Furthermore, therapeutic failure in this population generally correlates with the degree that drug use disrupts daily activities rather than with drug use per se.<sup>11</sup> Providers need to remain attentive to the possible impact of disruptions caused by drug use on the patient both before and while receiving ART. Although many illicit drug users can sufficiently control their drug use for long enough time to benefit from care, substance abuse treatment is often necessary for successful HIV management.

Close collaboration with substance abuse treatment programs and proper support and attention to this population's special multidisciplinary needs are critical components of successful HIV treatment. Essential to this end are accommodating, flexible, community-based HIV care sites that are characterized by familiarity with and nonjudgmental expertise in management of drug users' wide array of needs and in development of effective strategies to promote medication adherence.<sup>9</sup> These strategies should include, if available, the use of adherence support mechanisms such as modified directly observed therapy (mDOT), which has shown promise in this population.<sup>12</sup>

### ***Antiretroviral Agents and Opioid Substitution Therapy***

Compared with noninjection drug users receiving ART, injection drug users (IDUs) receiving ART are more likely to experience an increased frequency of side effects and toxicities of ART. Although not systematically studied, this is likely because underlying hepatic, renal, neurologic, psychiatric, gastrointestinal (GI), and hematologic disorders are highly prevalent among IDUs. These comorbid conditions should be considered when selecting antiretroviral (ARV) agents in this population. Opioid substitution therapies such as methadone and buprenorphine/naloxone and extended-release naltrexone are commonly used for management of opioid dependence in HIV-infected patients.

**Methadone and Antiretroviral Therapy.** Methadone, an orally administered, long-acting opioid agonist, is the most common pharmacologic treatment for opioid addiction. Its use is associated with decreased heroin use, decreased needle sharing, and improved quality of life. Because of its opioid-induced effects on gastric emptying and the metabolism of cytochrome P (CYP) 450 isoenzymes 2B6, 3A4, and 2D6, pharmacologic effects and interactions with ARV agents may commonly occur.<sup>13</sup> These may diminish the effectiveness of either or both therapies by causing opioid withdrawal or overdose, increased methadone toxicity, and/or decreased ARV efficacy. Efavirenz (EFV), nevirapine (NVP), and lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/r) have been associated with significant decreases in methadone levels. Patients and substance abuse treatment facilities should be informed of the likelihood of this interaction. The clinical effect is usually seen after 7 days of co-administration and may be managed by increasing the methadone dosage, usually in 5-mg to 10-mg increments daily until the desired effect is achieved.

**Buprenorphine and Antiretroviral Therapy.** Buprenorphine, a partial  $\mu$ -opioid agonist, is administered sublingually and is often coformulated with naloxone. It is increasingly used for opioid dependence treatment. Compared with methadone, buprenorphine has a lower risk of respiratory depression and overdose. This allows physicians in primary care to prescribe buprenorphine for the treatment of opioid dependency. The flexibility of the primary care setting can be of significant value to opioid-addicted HIV-infected patients who require ART because it enables one physician or program to provide both medical and substance abuse services. Limited information is currently available about interactions between buprenorphine and ARV agents.<sup>13-14</sup> Findings from available studies show that the drug interaction profile of buprenorphine is more favorable than that of methadone.

**Naltrexone and Antiretroviral Therapy.** A once-monthly extended-release intramuscular formulation of naltrexone was recently approved for prevention of relapse in patients who have undergone an opioid detoxification program. Naltrexone is also indicated for treatment of alcohol dependency. Naltrexone is not metabolized via the CYP450 enzyme system and is not expected to interact with protease inhibitors (PIs) or non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs).<sup>15</sup>



[Table 12](#) provides the currently available pharmacokinetic (PK) interaction data that clinicians can use as a guide for managing patients receiving ART and methadone or buprenorphine. Particular attention is needed concerning communication between HIV care providers and drug treatment programs regarding additive drug toxicities and drug interactions resulting in opiate withdrawal or excess.

Methylenedioxymethamphetamine (MDMA), GHB, ketamine, and methamphetamine all have the potential to interact with ARV agents because all are metabolized, at least in part, by the CYP450 system. Overdoses secondary to interactions between the party drugs (i.e., MDMA or GHB) and PI-based ART have been reported.<sup>16</sup>

## ***Summary***

It is usually possible over time to support most active drug users such that acceptable adherence levels with ARV agents can be achieved.<sup>17-18</sup> Providers must work to combine all available resources to stabilize an active drug user in preparation for ART. This should include identification of concurrent medical and psychiatric illnesses, drug treatment and needle and syringe exchange programs, strategies to reduce high-risk sexual behavior, and harm-reduction strategies. A history of drug use alone is insufficient reason to withhold ART because individuals with a history of prior drug use have adherence rates similar to those who do not abuse drugs.

Important considerations in the selection of successful regimens and the provision of appropriate patient monitoring in this population include need for supportive clinical sites; linkage to substance abuse treatment; and awareness of the interactions between illicit drugs and ARV agents, including the increased risk of side effects and toxicities. Simple regimens should be considered to enhance medication adherence. Preference should be given to ARV agents that have a lower risk of hepatic and neuropsychiatric side effects, simple dosing schedules, and minimal interaction with methadone.

**Table 12. Drug Interactions between Antiretroviral Agents and Drugs Used to Treat Opioid Addiction**  
(page 1 of 2)

Concomitant Drug	Antiretroviral Drug	Pharmacokinetic Interactions Clinical Comments/Recommendations
Buprenorphine	EFV	buprenorphine AUC ↓ 50%; norbuprenorphine <sup>a</sup> AUC ↓ 71% No withdrawal symptoms reported. No dosage adjustment recommended; however, monitor for withdrawal symptoms.
	ETR	buprenorphine AUC ↓ 25% No dosage adjustment necessary.
	ATV	buprenorphine AUC ↑ 93%; norbuprenorphine AUC ↑ 76%; ↓ ATV levels possible Do not co-administer buprenorphine with unboosted ATV.
	ATV/r	buprenorphine AUC ↑ 66%; norbuprenorphine AUC ↑ 105% Monitor for sedation. Buprenorphine dose reduction may be necessary.
	DRV/r	buprenorphine: no significant effect; norbuprenorphine AUC ↑ 46% and C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 71% No dose adjustment necessary.
	FPV/r	buprenorphine: no significant effect; norbuprenorphine AUC ↓ 15% No dosage adjustment necessary.
	TPV/r	buprenorphine: no significant effect; norbuprenorphine AUC, C <sub>max</sub> , and C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 80%; TPV C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 19%–40% Consider monitoring TPV level.
	3TC, ddI, TDF, ZDV, NVP, LPV/r, NFV	No significant effect No dosage adjustment necessary.
	ABC, d4T, FTC, ETR, IDV +/- RTV, SQV/r, RAL, MVC, T20	No data
Methadone	ABC	methadone clearance ↑ 22% No dosage adjustment necessary.
	d4T	d4T AUC ↓ 23% and C <sub>max</sub> ↓ 44% No dosage adjustment necessary.
	ZDV	ZDV AUC ↑ 29%–43% Monitor for ZDV-related adverse effects.
	EFV	methadone AUC ↓ 52% Opioid withdrawal common; increased methadone dose often necessary.

**Table 12. Drug Interactions between Antiretroviral Agents and Drugs Used to Treat Opioid Addiction (page 2 of 2)**

<b>Methadone, cont'd</b>	NVP	methadone AUC ↓ 41% NVP: no significant effect Opioid withdrawal common; increased methadone dose often necessary.
	ATV/r, DRV/r, FPV/r, IDV/r, LPV/r, SQV/r, TPV/r	With ATV/r, DRV/r, FPV/r: R-methadone <sup>b</sup> AUC ↓ 16%–18%; With LPV/r: methadone AUC ↓ 26%–53%; With SQV/r 1000/100 mg BID: R-methadone AUC ↓ 19%; With TPV/r: R-methadone AUC ↓ 48%  Opioid withdrawal unlikely but may occur. Adjustment of methadone dose usually not required; however, monitor for opioid withdrawal and increase methadone dose as clinically indicated.
	FPV	No data with FPV (unboosted) With APV: R-methadone C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 21%, no significant change in AUC  Monitor and titrate methadone as clinically indicated. The interaction with FPV is presumed to be similar.
	NFV	methadone AUC ↓ 40%  Opioid withdrawal rarely occurs. Monitor and titrate dose as clinically indicated. May require increased methadone dose.
	ddl (EC capsule), 3TC, TDF, ETR, RTV, ATV, IDV, RAL	No significant effect No dosage adjustment necessary.
	FTC, MVC, T20	No data

<sup>a</sup> Norbuprenorphine is an active metabolite of buprenorphine.

<sup>b</sup> R-methadone is the active form of methadone.

**Key to Abbreviations:** 3TC = lamivudine, ABC = abacavir, APV = amprenavir, ATV = atazanavir, ATV/r = atazanavir/ritonavir, AUC = area under the curve, BID = twice daily, C<sub>max</sub> = maximum plasma concentration, C<sub>min</sub> = minimum plasma concentration, d4T = stavudine, ddl = didanosine, DRV/r = darunavir/ritonavir, EC = enteric coated, EFV = efavirenz, ETR = etravirine, FPV = fosamprenavir, FPV/r = fosamprenavir/ritonavir, FTC = emtricitabine, IDV = indinavir, IDV/r = indinavir/ritonavir, LPV/r = lopinavir/ritonavir, MVC = maraviroc, NFV = nelfinavir, NVP = nevirapine, RAL = raltegravir, RTV = ritonavir, SQV/r = saquinavir/ritonavir, T20 = enfuvirtide, TDF = tenofovir, TPV = tipranavir, TPV/r = tipranavir/ritonavir, ZDV = zidovudine

## References

- Colfax G, Guzman R. Club drugs and HIV infection: a review. *Clin Infect Dis*. May 15 2006;42(10):1463-1469.
- Tucker JS, Burnam MA, Sherbourne CD, Kung FY, Gifford AL. Substance use and mental health correlates of nonadherence to antiretroviral medications in a sample of patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection. *Am J Med*. May 2003;114(7):573-580.
- Bruce RD, Altice FL, Gourevitch MN, Friedland GH. Pharmacokinetic drug interactions between opioid agonist therapy and antiretroviral medications: implications and management for clinical practice. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Apr 15 2006;41(5):563-572.
- Wang C, Vlahov D, Galai N, et al. The effect of HIV infection on overdose mortality. *AIDS*. Jun 10 2005;19(9):935-942.
- Strathdee SA, Palepu A, Cornelisse PG, et al. Barriers to use of free antiretroviral therapy in injection drug users. *JAMA*. Aug 12 1998;280(6):547-549.
- Celentano DD, Vlahov D, Cohn S, Shadle VM, Obasanjo O, Moore RD. Self-reported antiretroviral therapy in injection drug users. *JAMA*. Aug 12 1998;280(6):544-546.
- Altice FL, Mostashari F, Friedland GH. Trust and the acceptance of and adherence to antiretroviral therapy. *J Acquir*

*Immune Defic Syndr.* Sep 1 2001;28(1):47-58.

8. Altice FL, Kamarulzaman A, Soriano VV, Schechter M, Friedland GH. Treatment of medical, psychiatric, and substance-use comorbidities in people infected with HIV who use drugs. *Lancet.* Jul 31 2010;376(9738):367-387.
9. Bruce RD, Altice FL, Friedland GH, Volberding P. HIV Disease Among Substance Misusers: Treatment Issues. *Global AIDS/HIV Medicine.* San Diego, CA: Elsevier Inc; 2007:513-526.
10. Morris JD, Golub ET, Mehta SH, Jacobson LP, Gange SJ. Injection drug use and patterns of highly active antiretroviral therapy use: an analysis of ALIVE, WIHS, and MACS cohorts. *AIDS Res Ther.* 2007;4:12.
11. Bouhnik AD, Chesney M, Carrieri P, et al. Nonadherence among HIV-infected injecting drug users: the impact of social instability. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.* Dec 15 2002;31(Suppl 3):S149-153.
12. 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.
13. Gruber VA, McCance-Katz EF. Methadone, buprenorphine, and street drug interactions with antiretroviral medications. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep.* Aug 2010;7(3):152-160.
14. Bruce RD, McCance-Katz E, Kharasch ED, Moody DE, Morse GD. Pharmacokinetic interactions between buprenorphine and antiretroviral medications. *Clin Infect Dis.* Dec 15 2006;43(Suppl 4):S216-223.
15. Food and Drug Administration (FDA). Vivitrol (package insert). October 2010.  
[http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/label/2010/021897s0151bl.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2010/021897s0151bl.pdf).
16. Bruce RD, Altice FL, Gourevitch MN, Friedland GH. A review of pharmacokinetic drug interactions between drugs of abuse and antiretroviral medications: Implications and management for clinical practice. *Exp Rev of Clin Pharmacol.* 2008;1(1):115-127.
17. Hicks PL, Mulvey KP, Chander G, et al. The impact of illicit drug use and substance abuse treatment on adherence to HAART. *AIDS Care.* Oct 2007;19(9):1134-1140.
18. Cofrancesco J, Jr., Scherzer R, Tien PC, et al. Illicit drug use and HIV treatment outcomes in a US cohort. *AIDS.* Jan 30 2008;22(3):357-365.

## HIV-Infected Women (Last updated February 12, 2013; last reviewed February 12, 2013)

### Panel's Recommendations

- The indications for initiation of antiretroviral therapy (ART) and the goals of treatment are the same for HIV-infected women as for other HIV-infected adults and adolescents (**AI**).
- Women taking antiretroviral (ARV) drugs that have significant pharmacokinetic interactions with oral contraceptives should use an additional or alternative contraceptive method to prevent unintended pregnancy (**AIII**).
- In pregnant women, an additional goal of therapy is prevention of perinatal transmission of HIV, with a goal of maximal viral suppression to reduce the risk of transmission of HIV to the fetus and newborn (**AI**).
- When selecting an ARV combination regimen for a pregnant woman, clinicians should consider the known safety, efficacy, and pharmacokinetic data on use during pregnancy for each agent (**AIII**).
- Women of childbearing potential should undergo pregnancy testing before initiation of efavirenz (EFV) and receive counseling about the potential risk to the fetus and desirability of avoiding pregnancy while on EFV-based regimens (**AIII**).
- Alternative regimens that do not include EFV should be strongly considered in women who are planning to become pregnant or sexually active and not using effective contraception, assuming these alternative regimens are acceptable to the provider and are not thought to compromise the woman's health (**BIII**).
- Because the risk of neural tube defects is restricted to the first 5 to 6 weeks of pregnancy and pregnancy is rarely recognized before 4 to 6 weeks of pregnancy, EFV can be continued in pregnant women receiving an EFV-based regimen who present for antenatal care in the first trimester, provided the regimen produces virologic suppression (**CIII**).
- When designing a regimen for a pregnant woman, clinicians should consult the most current Health and Human Services (HHS) Perinatal Guidelines (**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 provides discussion of some basic principles and unique considerations to follow when caring for HIV-infected women, including during pregnancy. Clinicians who provide care for pregnant women should consult the current [Perinatal Guidelines](#)<sup>1</sup> for more in-depth discussion and management assistance. Additional guidance on the management of HIV-infected women can be found at <http://hab.hrsa.gov/deliverhivaidsare/clinicalguide11>.

### Gender Considerations in Antiretroviral Therapy

In general, studies to date have not shown gender differences in virologic responses to antiretroviral therapy (ART),<sup>2-4</sup> but a number of studies have suggested that gender may influence the frequency, presentation, and severity of selected antiretroviral (ARV)-related adverse events.<sup>5</sup> Although data are limited, evidence also exists that pharmacokinetics for some ARV drugs may differ between men and women, possibly because of variations between men and women in factors such as body weight, plasma volume, gastric emptying time, plasma protein levels, cytochrome P (CYP) 450 activity, drug transporter function, and excretion activity.<sup>6-8</sup>

#### Adverse Effects:

- **Nevirapine (NVP)-associated hepatotoxicity:** NVP has been associated with an increased risk of symptomatic, potentially fatal, and often rash-associated liver toxicity in ARV-naïve individuals; women with higher CD4 counts ( $>250$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) or elevated baseline transaminase levels appear to be at greatest risk.<sup>9-12</sup> It is generally recommended that NVP not be prescribed to ARV-naïve women who have CD4 counts  $>250$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> unless there is no other alternative and the benefit from NVP outweighs the risk of hepatotoxicity (**AI**).



- **Lactic acidosis:** There is a female predominance in the increased incidence of symptomatic and even fatal lactic acidosis associated with prolonged exposure to nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs). Lactic acidosis is most common with stavudine (d4T), didanosine (ddI), and zidovudine (ZDV) but it can occur with other NRTIs.<sup>13</sup>
- **Metabolic complications:** A few studies have compared women and men in terms of metabolic complications associated with ARV use. Compared with HIV-infected men, HIV-infected women are more likely to experience increases in central fat with ART and are less likely to have triglyceride elevations on treatment.<sup>14, 15</sup> Women have an increased risk of osteopenia/osteoporosis, particularly after menopause, and this risk is exacerbated by HIV and ART.<sup>16, 17</sup> At the present time, none of these differences requires women-specific recommendations regarding treatment or monitoring.

## ***Women of Childbearing Potential***

All women of childbearing potential should be offered pre-conception counseling and care as a component of routine primary medical care. Counseling should include discussion of special considerations pertaining to ARV use when trying to conceive and during pregnancy (see [Perinatal Guidelines](#)<sup>1</sup>). Safe sexual practices, reproductive desires and options for conception, HIV status of sexual partner(s), and use of effective contraception to prevent unintended pregnancy should be discussed. An HIV-infected woman who wishes to conceive with an HIV-uninfected male partner should be informed of options to prevent sexual transmission of HIV while attempting conception. Interventions include initiation of maximally suppressive ART, which significantly decreases the risk of sexual transmission (see [Preventing Secondary Transmission of HIV](#)), and artificial insemination, including the option to self-inseminate with the partner's sperm during the periovulatory period<sup>18</sup> (for more extensive discussion on this topic, see the Reproductive Options for HIV-Concordant and Serodiscordant Couples section of the [Perinatal Guidelines](#).<sup>1</sup>

Efavirenz (EFV) is teratogenic in non-human primates. Women of childbearing potential should undergo pregnancy testing before initiation of EFV and receive counseling about the potential risk to the fetus and desirability of avoiding pregnancy while on EFV-based regimens (**AIII**). Alternative regimens that do not include EFV should be strongly considered in women who are planning to become pregnant or who are sexually active and not using effective contraception, assuming these alternative regimens are acceptable to the provider and are not thought to compromise the woman's health (**BIII**). The most vulnerable period in fetal organogenesis is early in gestation, before pregnancy is recognized.

## ***Hormonal Contraception***

Safe and effective reproductive health and family planning services to reduce unintended pregnancy and perinatal transmission of HIV are an essential component of care for HIV-infected women of childbearing age. Counseling about reproductive issues should be provided on an ongoing basis.

Providers should be aware of potential interactions between ARV drugs and hormonal contraceptives that could lower contraceptive efficacy. Several protease inhibitors (PIs) and non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs) have drug interactions with combined oral contraceptives (COCs). Interactions include either a decrease or an increase in blood levels of ethinyl estradiol, norethindrone, or norgestimate (see [Tables 18a and 18b](#)), which potentially decreases contraceptive efficacy or increases estrogen- or progestin-related adverse effects (e.g., thromboembolism). Small studies of HIV-infected women receiving injectable depot-medroxyprogesterone acetate (DMPA) while on ART showed no significant interactions between DMPA and EFV, NVP, nelfinavir (NFV), or NRTI drugs.<sup>19-21</sup> Contraceptive failure of the etonogestrel implant in two patients on EFV-based therapy has been reported and a study has shown EFV may decrease plasma progestin concentrations of COCs containing ethinyl estradiol and norgestimate.<sup>22, 23</sup> Several RTV-boosted PIs decrease oral contraceptive estradiol levels.<sup>24, 25</sup> A small study from Malawi showed that NVP use did not significantly affect estradiol or progestin levels in HIV-infected women.<sup>26</sup> Overall, data are

relatively limited and the clinical implications of these findings are unclear. The magnitudes of change in drug levels that may reduce contraceptive efficacy or increase adverse effects are unknown. Concerns about pharmacokinetic interactions between oral and implant hormonal contraceptives and ARVs should not prevent clinicians from prescribing hormonal contraceptives for women on ART if that is their preferred contraceptive method. However, when women wish to use hormonal contraceptives and drug interactions with ARVs are known, additional or alternative contraceptive methods may be recommended (see drug interaction [Tables 18a, 18b, and 18d](#) and [Perinatal Guidelines](#)<sup>1</sup>). Consistent use of male or female condoms to prevent transmission of HIV and protect against other sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) is recommended for all HIV-infected women and their partners, regardless of contraceptive use.

The data on the association between hormonal contraception and the risk of acquisition of HIV are conflicting.<sup>27</sup> A retrospective secondary analysis of two studies of serodiscordant couples in Africa in which the HIV-infected partner was not receiving ART found that women using hormonal contraception (the vast majority using injectable DMPA) had a twofold increased risk of acquiring HIV (for HIV-infected male/HIV-uninfected female couples) or transmitting HIV (HIV-infected female/HIV-uninfected male couples). HIV-infected women using hormonal contraception had higher genital HIV RNA concentrations than did women not using hormonal contraceptives.<sup>28</sup> Oral contraceptive use was not significantly associated with transmission of HIV; however, the number of women using oral contraceptives in this study was insufficient to adequately assess risk. It is important to note that not all studies have supported a link between hormonal contraception and transmission or acquisition of HIV and that the individuals in this study were not receiving ART. Further research is needed to definitively determine if hormonal contraceptive use is an independent risk factor for acquisition and transmission of HIV, particularly in the setting of ART.<sup>27, 29</sup>

Intrauterine devices (IUDs) appear to be a safe and effective contraceptive option for HIV-infected women.<sup>30-33</sup> Although studies have focused primarily on non-hormone-containing IUDs (e.g., copper IUD), several small studies have also found levonorgestrel-releasing IUDs to be safe and not associated with increased genital tract shedding of HIV.<sup>31, 34, 35</sup>

## ***Pregnant Women***

Clinicians should review the [Perinatal Guidelines](#)<sup>1</sup> for a detailed discussion of the management of HIV-infected pregnant women. The use of combination ARV regimens is recommended for all HIV-infected pregnant women, regardless of virologic, immunologic, or clinical parameters (**AI**). Pregnant HIV-infected women should be counseled regarding the known benefits and risks of ARV use during pregnancy to the woman, fetus, and newborn. A woman's decision regarding ARV use should be respected. Coercive and punitive approaches undermine provider-patient trust and could discourage women from seeking prenatal care and adopting health care behaviors that optimize maternal, fetal, and neonatal well-being.

**Prevention of Perinatal Transmission of HIV.** The use of ARVs and the resultant reduction of HIV RNA levels decrease perinatal transmission of HIV.<sup>36-38</sup> The goal of ARV use is to achieve maximal and sustained suppression of HIV RNA levels during pregnancy.

As in non-pregnant individuals, genotypic resistance testing is recommended for all pregnant women before ARV initiation (**AIII**) and for pregnant women with detectable HIV RNA levels while on therapy (**AI**). Optimal prevention of perinatal transmission may require initiation of ARV drugs before results of resistance testing are available. If results demonstrate the presence of significant mutation(s) that may confer resistance to the prescribed ARV regimen, the regimen should be modified.

Long-term follow-up is recommended for all infants born to women who have received ARVs during pregnancy, regardless of the infant's HIV status (see the [Perinatal Guidelines](#)<sup>1</sup>).

**Regimen Considerations.** Pregnancy should not preclude the use of optimal drug regimens. Because recommendations on ARVs to use for treatment of HIV-infected pregnant women are subject to unique

considerations, recommendations specific to the timing of therapy initiation and the choice of ARVs for pregnant women may differ from those for non-pregnant individuals. These considerations include the following:

- Potential changes in pharmacokinetics and, thus, dosing requirements, which result from physiologic changes associated with pregnancy;
- potential ARV-associated adverse effects in pregnant women and the woman's ability to adhere to a particular regimen during pregnancy; and
- potential short- and long-term effects of the ARV on the fetus and newborn, which are unknown for many drugs.

Combination drug regimens are considered the standard of care in pregnancy, both for the treatment of HIV infection and for the prevention of perinatal transmission of HIV. Because the risk of neural tube defects is restricted to the first 5 to 6 weeks of pregnancy and pregnancy is rarely recognized before 4 to 6 weeks of pregnancy, and unnecessary changes in ARV drugs during pregnancy may be associated with loss of viral control and increased risk of perinatal transmission, EFV can be continued in pregnant women receiving an EFV-based regimen who present for antenatal care in the first trimester, provided the regimen produces virologic suppression (**CIII**). Detailed recommendations on ARV choice in pregnancy are discussed in detail in the Perinatal Guidelines (see [Perinatal Guidelines](#)<sup>1</sup>).

Intravenous (IV) zidovudine (ZDV) infusion to the mother during labor is recommended if maternal HIV RNA is  $\geq 400$  copies/mL (or with unknown HIV RNA levels) near delivery, regardless of antepartum regimen or mode of delivery (**AI**). Consideration can be given to omitting IV ZDV infusion during labor for HIV-infected women receiving combination ART regimens who have HIV RNA  $< 400$  copies/mL near delivery (**BII**); however, the combination ART should continue to be administered during labor.

Clinicians who are treating HIV-infected pregnant women are strongly encouraged to report cases of prenatal exposure to ARVs (either administered alone or in combinations) to the Antiretroviral Pregnancy Registry (<http://www.apregistry.com>). The registry collects observational data regarding exposure to Food and Drug Administration-approved ARV drugs during pregnancy for the purpose of assessing potential teratogenicity. For more information regarding selection and use of ART during pregnancy, refer to the [Perinatal Guidelines](#).<sup>1</sup>

## Postpartum Management

Following delivery, clinical, immunologic, and virologic follow-up should continue as recommended for non-pregnant adults and adolescents. Because maternal ART reduces but does not eliminate the risk of transmission of HIV in breast milk and postnatal transmission can occur despite maternal ART, women should also be counseled to avoid breastfeeding.<sup>1</sup> HIV-infected women should avoid pre-mastication of food fed to their infants because the practice has been associated with transmission of HIV from mother to child.<sup>39</sup> Considerations regarding continuation of ART for maternal therapeutic indications are the same as those for ART use in other non-pregnant individuals. For more information regarding postpartum discontinuation of ART, refer to the [Perinatal Guidelines](#).<sup>1</sup>

Several studies have demonstrated that adherence to ART may worsen in the postpartum period.<sup>40-44</sup> Clinicians caring for women postpartum who are receiving ART should specifically address adherence, including an evaluation of specific facilitators and barriers to adherence. Clinicians may consider an intervention to improve adherence (see [Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy](#)).

## References

1. 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 <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/PerinatalGL.pdf>.

2. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17415038](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17415038).
3. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17105511](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17105511).
4. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20855799](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20855799).
5. Clark RA, Squires KE. Gender-specific considerations in the antiretroviral management of HIV-infected women. *Expert Rev Anti Infect Ther*. 2005;3(2):213-227. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15918779](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15918779).
6. Gandhi M, Aweeka F, Greenblatt RM, Blaschke TF. Sex differences in pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol*. 2004;44:499-523. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14744256](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=14744256).
7. Floridia M, Giuliano M, Palmisano L, Vella S. Gender differences in the treatment of HIV infection. *Pharmacol Res*. 2008;58(3-4):173-182. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18708144](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18708144).
8. Ofofokun I, Chuck SK, Hitti JE. Antiretroviral pharmacokinetic profile: a review of sex differences. *Gend Med*. 2007;4(2):106-119. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17707845](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17707845).
9. Baylor MS, Johann-Liang R. Hepatotoxicity associated with nevirapine use. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2004;35(5):538-539. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15021321](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15021321).
10. Wit FW, Kesselring AM, Gras L, et al; for the ATHENA cohort study. Discontinuation of nevirapine because of hypersensitivity reactions in patients with prior treatment experience, compared with treatment-naïve patients. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2008;46(6):933-940. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18271750](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18271750).
11. Dieterich DT, Robinson PA, Love J, Stern JO. Drug-induced liver injury associated with the use of nonnucleoside reverse-transcriptase inhibitors. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2004;38 Suppl 2:S80-89. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14986279](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=14986279).
12. Leith J, Piliero P, Storfer S, Mayers D, Hinzmann R. Appropriate use of nevirapine for long-term therapy. *J Infect Dis*. 2005;192(3):545-546; author reply 546. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15995971](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15995971).
13. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18025882](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18025882).
14. Thiebaut R, Dequae-Merchadou L, Ekouevi DK, et al. Incidence and risk factors of severe hypertriglyceridaemia in the era of highly active antiretroviral therapy: the Aquitaine Cohort, France, 1996-99. *HIV Med*. 2001;2(2):84-88. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11737383](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11737383).
15. Galli M, Veglia F, Angarano G, et al. Gender differences in antiretroviral drug-related adipose tissue alterations. Women are at higher risk than men and develop particular lipodystrophy patterns. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2003;34(1):58-61. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=14501794](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=14501794).
16. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15754081](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15754081).
17. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17690589](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17690589).



18. 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>.
19. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17192768](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17192768).
20. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17880953](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17880953).
21. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=18226670](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=18226670).
22. Leticee N, Viard JP, Yamgnane A, Karmochkine M, Benachi A. Contraceptive failure of etonogestrel implant in patients treated with antiretrovirals including efavirenz. *Contraception*. 2011. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22036046>.
23. 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>.
24. 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>.
25. 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>.
26. 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>.
27. 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>.
28. 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>.
29. Blish CA, Baeten JM. Hormonal contraception and HIV-1 transmission. *Am J Reprod Immunol*. 2011;65(3):302-307. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21087338>.
30. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17689627](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17689627).
31. 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>.
32. 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)(1):S55-67. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20081389](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20081389).
33. U.S. Medical Eligibility Criteria for Contraceptive Use. Recommendations and Reports June 18, 2010 / 59(RR04);1-6; Prepared by Division of Reproductive Health, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion. 2010. Available at [http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/rr5904a1.htm?s\\_cid=rr5904a1\\_e](http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/rr5904a1.htm?s_cid=rr5904a1_e).
34. Heikinheimo O, Lahteenmaki P. Contraception and HIV infection in women. *Hum Reprod Update*. 2009;15(2):165-176. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18978360>.
35. 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>.



36. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11170978](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11170978).
37. Mofenson LM, Lambert JS, Stiehler ER, et al; for Pediatric AIDS Clinical Trials Group Study 185 Team. Risk factors for perinatal transmission of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 in women treated with zidovudine. *N Engl J Med*. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10432323).
38. Garcia PM, Kalish LA, Pitt J, et al; for the Women and Infants Transmission Study Group. Maternal levels of plasma human immunodeficiency virus type 1 RNA and the risk of perinatal transmission. *N Engl J Med*. 1999;341(6):394-402. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=10432324](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=10432324).
39. 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/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=21482608](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=21482608).
40. Ickovics JR, Wilson TE, Royce RA, et al. Prenatal and postpartum zidovudine adherence among pregnant women with HIV: results of a MEMS substudy from the Perinatal Guidelines Evaluation Project. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2002;30(3):311-315. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12131568>.
41. Bardegeur 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>.
42. 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>.
43. Turner BJ, Newschaffer CJ, Zhang D, Cosler L, Hauck WW. Antiretroviral use and pharmacy-based measurement of adherence in postpartum HIV-infected women. *Med Care*. 2000;38(9):911-925. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10982113>.
44. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=20831428](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=20831428).

## HIV-2 Infection (Last updated January 10, 2011; last reviewed January 10, 2011)

HIV-2 infection is endemic in West Africa. Although HIV-2 has had only limited spread outside this area, it should be considered in persons of West African origin or those who have had sexual contact or shared needles with persons of West African origin. The prevalence of HIV-2 infection is also disproportionately high 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 near Goa).

The clinical course of HIV-2 infection is generally characterized by a longer asymptomatic stage, lower plasma HIV-2 viral loads, and lower mortality rates compared with HIV-1 infection.<sup>1-2</sup> However, HIV-2 infection can progress to AIDS, and thus antiretroviral therapy (ART) may become necessary during the course of infection. Concomitant HIV-1 and HIV-2 infection may occur and should be considered in patients from an area with high prevalence of HIV-2. In the appropriate epidemiologic setting, HIV-2 infection should be suspected in patients with clinical conditions suggestive of HIV infection but with atypical serologic results (e.g., a positive screening assay with an indeterminate HIV-1 Western blot).<sup>3</sup> The possibility of HIV-2 infection should also be considered in the appropriate epidemiologic setting in patients with serologically confirmed HIV infection but low or undetectable viral loads or in those with declining CD4 counts despite apparent virologic suppression on ART.

The Multispot HIV-1/HIV-2 Rapid Test (Bio-Rad Laboratories) is Food and Drug Administration (FDA) approved for differentiating HIV-1 from HIV-2 infection. Commercially available HIV-1 viral load assays do not reliably detect or quantify HIV-2, and no HIV-2 commercial viral load assays are currently available.<sup>4-5</sup> Most studies reporting HIV-2 viral loads use “in-house” assays that are not widely available, making it difficult to monitor virologic response in the clinical setting. In addition, no validated HIV-2 genotypic or phenotypic antiretroviral (ARV) resistance assays are available.

To date, there have been no randomized trials addressing the question of when to start ART or the choice of initial or second-line therapy for HIV-2 infection;<sup>6</sup> thus, the optimal treatment strategy has not been defined. HIV-2 appears intrinsically resistant to non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs)<sup>7</sup> and to enfuvirtide.<sup>8</sup> *In vitro* data suggest HIV-2 is sensitive to the currently available nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs), although with a lower barrier to resistance than HIV-1.<sup>9-10</sup> Variable sensitivity among protease inhibitors (PIs) has been reported; lopinavir (LPV), saquinavir (SQV), and darunavir (DRV) are more active against HIV-2 than other approved PIs.<sup>11-14</sup> The integrase inhibitor, raltegravir (RAL),<sup>15</sup> and the CCR5 antagonist, maraviroc (MVC), appear active against some HIV-2 isolates, although no approved assays to determine HIV-2 coreceptor tropism exist and HIV-2 is known to utilize multiple minor coreceptors in addition to CCR5 and CXCR4.<sup>16</sup> Several small studies suggest poor responses among HIV-2 infected individuals treated with some ARV regimens, including dual-NRTI regimens, regimens containing two NRTIs + NNRTI, and some unboosted PI-based regimens including nelfinavir (NFV) or indinavir (IDV) plus zidovudine (ZDV) and lamivudine (3TC).<sup>6, 17-19</sup> Clinical data on the utility of triple-NRTI regimens are conflicting.<sup>20-21</sup> In general, boosted PI-containing regimens have resulted in more favorable virologic and immunologic responses.<sup>21</sup> One small study suggested satisfactory responses to lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/r)-containing regimens in 17 of 29 (59%) of ARV-naïve subjects.<sup>22</sup>

Resistance-associated mutations develop commonly in HIV-2 patients on therapy.<sup>17, 21, 23</sup> Genotypic algorithms used to predict drug resistance in HIV-1 may not be applicable to HIV-2, because pathways and mutational patterns leading to resistance may differ.<sup>10, 21, 24</sup> CD4 cell recovery on therapy may be poor,<sup>25</sup> suggesting that more reliable methods for monitoring disease progression and treatment efficacy in HIV-2 infection are needed.

Some groups have recommended specific preferred and alternative regimens for initial therapy of HIV-2 infection,<sup>24</sup> though as yet there are no controlled trial data to reliably predict their success. Until more definitive data are available in an ART-naïve patient with HIV-2 mono-infection or with HIV-1/HIV-2 dual

infection who requires treatment, clinicians should initiate a regimen containing two NRTIs and a boosted PI. Monitoring of virologic response in such patients is problematic because of the lack of a commercially available HIV-2 viral load assay; however, clinical and CD4 count improvement can be used to assess treatment response.

## References

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. O'Brien TR, George JR, Epstein JS, et al. Testing for antibodies to human immunodeficiency virus type 2 in the United States. *MMWR Recomm Rep*. 1992;41(RR-12):1-9.
4. Chan PA, Wakeman SE, Flanigan T, et al. HIV-2 diagnosis and quantification in high-risk patients. *AIDS Res Ther*. 2008;5:18.
5. Damond F, Benard A, Ruelle J, et al. Quality control assessment of human immunodeficiency virus type 2 (HIV-2) viral load quantification assays: results from an international collaboration on HIV-2 infection in 2006. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2008;46(6):2088-2091.
6. 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.
7. 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.
8. Poveda E, Rodes B, Toro C, et al. Are fusion inhibitors active against all HIV variants? *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2004;20(3):347-348.
9. Boyer PL, Sarafianos SG, Clark PK, et al. Why do HIV-1 and HIV-2 use different pathways to develop AZT resistance? *PLoS Pathog*. 2006;2(2):e10.
10. Smith RA, Anderson DJ, Pyrak CL, et al. 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.
11. Parkin NT, Schapiro JM. Antiretroviral drug resistance in non-subtype B HIV-1, HIV-2 and SIV. *Antivir Ther*. 2004;9(1):3-12.
12. 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.
13. Brower ET, Bacha UM, Kawasaki Y, et al. Inhibition of HIV-2 protease by HIV-1 protease inhibitors in clinical use. *Chem Biol Drug Des*. 2008;71(4):298-305.
14. Rodes B, Sheldon J, Toro C, et al. Susceptibility to protease inhibitors in HIV-2 primary isolates from patients failing antiretroviral therapy. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2006;57(4):709-713.
15. Roquebert B, Damond F, Collin G, et al. HIV-2 integrase gene polymorphism and phenotypic susceptibility of HIV-2 clinical isolates to the integrase inhibitors raltegravir and elvitegravir in vitro. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2008;62(5):914-920.
16. 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.
17. 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 resource-limited West Africa. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2009;48(4):476-483.
18. 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.

19. Adje-Toure CA, Cheingsong R, Garcia-Lerma JG, et al. Antiretroviral therapy in HIV-2-infected patients: changes in 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.
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.
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.
22. Benard A, Damond F, Campa P, et al. Good response to lopinavir/ritonavir-containing antiretroviral regimens in antiretroviral-naïve HIV-2-infected patients. *AIDS*. 2009;23(9):1171-1173.
23. Damond F, Matheron S, Peytavin G, et al. Selection of K65R mutation in HIV-2-infected patients receiving tenofovir-containing regimen. *Antivir Ther*. 2004;9(4):635-636.
24. Gilleece Y, Chadwick DR, Breuer J, et al. British HIV Association guidelines for antiretroviral treatment of HIV-2-positive individuals 2010. *HIV Med*. 2010;11(10):611-619.
25. Drylewicz J, Matheron S, Lazaro E, et al. Comparison of viro-immunological marker changes between HIV-1 and HIV-2-infected patients in France. *AIDS*. 2008;22(4):457-468.

## HIV and the Older Patient (Last updated March 27, 2012; last reviewed March 27, 2012)

### Key Considerations When Caring for Older HIV-Infected Patients

- Antiretroviral therapy (ART) is recommended in patients >50 years of age, regardless of CD4 cell count (**BIII**), because the risk of non-AIDS related complications may increase and the immunologic response to ART may be reduced in older HIV-infected patients.
- ART-associated adverse events may occur more frequently in older HIV-infected adults than in younger HIV-infected individuals. Therefore, the bone, kidney, metabolic, cardiovascular, and liver health of older HIV-infected adults should be monitored closely.
- The increased risk of drug-drug interactions between antiretroviral (ARV) drugs and other medications commonly used in older HIV-infected patients should be assessed regularly, especially when starting or switching ART and concomitant medications.
- HIV experts and primary care providers should work together to optimize the medical care of older HIV-infected patients with complex comorbidities.
- Counseling to prevent secondary transmission of HIV remains an important aspect of the care of the older HIV-infected patient.

**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

Effective antiretroviral therapy (ART) has increased survival in HIV-infected individuals, resulting in an increasing number of older individuals living with HIV infection. In the United States, approximately 30% of people currently living with HIV/AIDS are age 50 years or older and trends suggest that the proportion of older persons living with HIV/AIDS will increase steadily.<sup>1</sup> Care of HIV-infected patients increasingly will involve adults 60 to 80 years of age, a population for which data from clinical trials or pharmacokinetic studies are very limited.

There are several distinct areas of concern regarding the association between age and HIV disease.<sup>2</sup> First, older HIV-infected patients may suffer from aging-related comorbid illnesses that can complicate the management of HIV infection, as outlined in detail below. Second, HIV disease may affect the biology of aging, possibly resulting in early manifestations of many clinical syndromes generally associated with advanced age. Third, reduced mucosal and immunologic defenses (such as post-menopausal atrophic vaginitis) and changes in risk behaviors (for example, decrease in condom use because of less concern about pregnancy and increased use of erectile dysfunction drugs) in older adults could lead to increased risk of acquisition and transmission of HIV.<sup>3-4</sup> Finally, because older adults generally are perceived to be at low risk of HIV infection, screening for HIV in this population remains low. For these reasons, HIV infection in many older adults may not be diagnosed until late in the disease process. This section focuses on HIV diagnosis and treatment considerations in the older HIV-infected patient.

### HIV Diagnosis and Prevention

Even though many older individuals are engaged in risk behaviors associated with acquisition of HIV, they may be perceived to be at low risk of infection and, as a result, they are less likely to be tested for HIV than younger persons.<sup>5</sup> According to one U.S. survey, 71% of men and 51% of women age 60 years and older continue to be sexually active,<sup>6</sup> with less concern about the possibility of pregnancy contributing to less condom use. Another national survey reported that among individuals age 50 years or older, condoms were not used during most recent intercourse with 91% of casual partners or 70% of new partners.<sup>7</sup> In addition, results from a CDC survey<sup>8</sup> show that in 2008 only 35% of adults age 45 to 64 years had ever been tested for HIV infection despite the 2006 CDC recommendation that individuals age 13 to 64 years be tested at least once and more often if sexually active.<sup>9</sup> Clinicians must be attuned to the possibility of HIV infection in older patients, including those older than 64 years of age who, based on CDC recommendations, would not



be screened for HIV. Furthermore, sexual history taking, risk-reduction counseling, and screening for sexually transmitted diseases (STDs) (if indicated), are important components of general health care for HIV-infected and -uninfected older patients.

Failure to consider a diagnosis of HIV in older persons likely contributes to later disease presentation and initiation of ART.<sup>10</sup> One surveillance report showed that the proportion of patients who progressed to AIDS within 1 year of diagnosis was greater among patients >60 years of age (52%) than among patients younger than 25 years (16%).<sup>1</sup> When individuals >50 years of age present with severe illnesses, AIDS-related opportunistic infections (OIs) need to be considered in the differential diagnosis of the illness.

## Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy

Concerns about decreased immune recovery and increased risk of serious non-AIDS events are factors that favor initiating ART in patients >50 years of age regardless of CD4 cell count (**BIII**). (See [Initiating Antiretroviral Therapy in Treatment-Naïve Patients](#).) Data that would favor use of any one of the Panel's recommended initial ART regimens (see [What to Start](#)) on the basis of age are not available. The choice of regimen should be informed by a comprehensive review of the patient's other medical conditions and medications. A noteworthy limitation of currently available information is lack of data on the long-term safety of specific antiretroviral (ARV) drugs in older patients, such as use of tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF) in older patients with declining renal function. The recommendations on how frequently to monitor parameters of ART effectiveness and safety for adults age >50 years are similar to those for the general HIV-infected population; however, the recommendations for older adults focus particularly on the adverse events of ART pertaining to renal, liver, cardiovascular, metabolic, and bone health (see [Table 14](#)).

## HIV, Aging, and Antiretroviral Therapy

The efficacy, pharmacokinetics, 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 is different in older patients than in younger patients. However, CD4 T-cell recovery after starting ART generally is less robust in older patients than in younger patients.<sup>11-14</sup> This observation suggests that starting ART at a younger age will result in better immunologic 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 function may decrease with age, which may result in impaired drug elimination and drug accumulation.<sup>15</sup> Current ARV drug doses are based on pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic data derived from studies conducted in subjects with normal organ function. Most clinical trials include only a small proportion of study participants >50 years of age. Whether drug accumulation in the older patient may lead to greater incidence and severity of adverse effects than seen in younger patients is unknown.

HIV-infected patients with aging-associated comorbidities may require additional pharmacologic intervention, making therapeutic management increasingly complex. In addition to taking medications to manage HIV infection and comorbid conditions, many older HIV-infected patients also are taking medications to ameliorate discomfort (e.g., pain medications, sedatives) or to manage adverse effects of medications (e.g., anti-emetics). They also may self-medicate with over-the-counter medicines or supplements. In the HIV-negative population, polypharmacy is a major cause of iatrogenic problems in geriatric patients.<sup>16</sup> This may be the result of medication errors (by prescribers or patients), nonadherence, additive drug toxicities, and drug-drug interactions. Older HIV-infected patients probably are at an even greater risk of polypharmacy and its attendant adverse consequences than younger HIV-infected or similarly aged HIV-uninfected patients.

Drug-drug interactions are common with ART and easily can be overlooked by prescribers.<sup>17</sup> The available drug interaction information on ARV agents is derived primarily from pharmacokinetic studies performed in a small number of relatively young, HIV-uninfected subjects with normal organ function (see [Tables 17-19b](#)). Data from these studies provide clinicians with a basis to assess whether a significant interaction may exist. However, the magnitude of the interaction may be different in older HIV-infected patients than in younger HIV-infected patients.

Nonadherence is the most common cause of treatment failure. Complex dosing requirements, high pill burden, inability to access medications because of cost or availability, limited health literacy including lack of numeracy skills, misunderstanding of instructions, depression, and neurocognitive impairment are among the key reasons for nonadherence.<sup>18</sup> Although many of these factors likely will be more prevalent in an aging HIV-infected population, some data suggest that older HIV-infected patients may be more adherent to ART than younger HIV-infected patients.<sup>19-21</sup> Clinicians should assess adherence regularly to identify any factors, such as neurocognitive deficits, that may make adherence a challenge. One or more interventions such as discontinuation of unnecessary medications; regimen simplification; or use of adherence tools, including pillboxes, daily calendars, and evidence-based behavioral approaches may be necessary to facilitate medication adherence (see [Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy](#)).

## Non-AIDS HIV-Related Complications and other Comorbidities

With the reduction in AIDS-related morbidity and mortality observed with effective use of ART, non-AIDS conditions constitute an increasing proportion of serious illnesses in ART-treated HIV-infected populations.<sup>22-24</sup> Heart disease and cancer are the leading causes of death in older Americans.<sup>25</sup> Similarly, for HIV-infected patients on ART, non-AIDS events such as heart disease, liver disease, and cancer have emerged as major causes of morbidity and mortality. Neurocognitive impairment, already a major health problem in aging patients, may be exacerbated by the effect of HIV infection on the brain.<sup>26</sup> That the presence of multiple non-AIDS comorbidities coupled with the immunologic effects of HIV infection could add to the disease burden of an aging HIV-infected person is a concern.<sup>27-29</sup> At present, primary care recommendations are the same for HIV-infected and HIV-uninfected adults and focus on identifying and managing risks of conditions such as heart, liver, and renal disease; cancer; and bone demineralization.<sup>30-32</sup>

## Discontinuing Antiretroviral Therapy in Older Patients

Important issues to discuss with aging HIV-infected patients are living wills, advance directives, and long-term care planning including financial concerns. Health care cost sharing (e.g., co-pays, out-of-pocket costs), loss of employment, and other financial-related factors can cause interruptions in treatment. Clinic systems can minimize loss of treatment by helping patients maintain access to insurance.

For the severely debilitated or terminally ill HIV-infected patient, adding palliative care medications, while perhaps beneficial, further increases the complexity and risk of negative drug interactions. For such patients, a balanced consideration of both the expected benefits of ART and the toxicities and negative quality-of-life effects of ART is needed.

Few data exist on the use of ART in severely debilitated patients with chronic, severe, or non-AIDS terminal conditions.<sup>33-34</sup> Withdrawal of ART usually results in rebound viremia and a decline in CD4 cell count. Acute retroviral syndrome after abrupt discontinuation of ART has been reported. In very debilitated patients, if there are no significant adverse reactions to ART, most clinicians would continue therapy. 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 on the risks and benefits of continuing or withdrawing ART.

## Conclusion

HIV infection may increase the risk of many major health conditions experienced by aging adults and possibly accelerate the aging process.<sup>35</sup> As HIV-infected adults age, their health problems become increasingly complex, placing additional demands on the health care system. This adds to the concern that outpatient clinics providing HIV care in the United States share the same financial problems as other chronic disease and primary care clinics and that reimbursement for care is not sufficient to maintain care at a sustainable level.<sup>36</sup> Continued involvement of HIV experts in the care of older HIV-infected patients is warranted. However, given that the current shortage of primary care providers and geriatricians is projected to continue, current HIV providers will need to adapt to the shifting need for expertise in geriatrics through continuing education and ongoing assessment of the evolving health needs of aging HIV-infected patients.<sup>37</sup> The aging of the HIV-infected population also signals a need for more information on long-term safety and efficacy of ARV drugs in older patients.

## References

1. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. HIV Surveillance Report <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/surveillance/resources/reports/>. Published February 2011. Accessed December 7, 2011.
2. Deeks SG, Phillips AN. HIV infection, antiretroviral treatment, ageing, and non-AIDS related morbidity. *BMJ*. 2009;338:a3172.
3. Levy JA, Ory MG, Crystal S. HIV/AIDS interventions for midlife and older adults: current status and challenges. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Jun 1 2003;33(Suppl 2):S59-67.
4. Levy BR, Ding L, Lakra D, Kostas J, Niccolai L. Older persons' exclusion from sexually transmitted disease risk-reduction clinical trials. *Sex Transm Dis*. Aug 2007;34(8):541-544.
5. 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*. Sep 17 2009;361(12):1189-1198.
6. Zablotsky D, Kennedy M. Risk factors and HIV transmission to midlife and older women: knowledge, options, and the initiation of safer sexual practices. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Jun 1 2003;33(Suppl 2):S122-130.
7. Schick V, Herbenick D, Reece M, et al. Sexual behaviors, condom use, and sexual health of Americans over 50: implications for sexual health promotion for older adults. *J Sex Med*. Oct 2010;7(Suppl 5):315-329.
8. Vital signs: HIV testing and diagnosis among adults—United States, 2001-2009. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Dec 3 2010;59(47):1550-1555.
9. 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*. Sep 22 2006;55(RR-14):1-17.
10. 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.
11. Sabin CA, Smith CJ, d'Arminio Monforte A, et al. Response to combination antiretroviral therapy: variation by age. *AIDS*. Jul 31 2008;22(12):1463-1473.
12. 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.
13. 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*. Mar 1 2007;44(3):268-277.
14. 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.
15. Sitar DS. Aging issues in drug disposition and efficacy. *Proc West Pharmacol Soc*. 2007;50:16-20.
16. Steinman MA, Hanlon JT. Managing medications in clinically complex elders: "There's got to be a happy medium." *JAMA*. Oct 13 2010;304(14):1592-1601.
17. Marzolini C, Back D, Weber R, et al. Ageing with HIV: medication use and risk for potential drug-drug interactions. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. Sep 2011;66(9):2107-2111.

18. 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*. Feb 2011;9(1):11-23.
19. Wellons MF, Sanders L, Edwards LJ, Bartlett JA, Heald AE, Schmadher KE. HIV infection: treatment outcomes in older and younger adults. *J Am Geriatr Soc*. Apr 2002;50(4):603-607.
20. 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*. Jun 1 2003;33(Suppl 2):S106-114.
21. 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*. Apr 9 2007;167(7):684-691.
22. Justice AC. HIV and aging: time for a new paradigm. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. May 2010;7(2):69-76.
23. 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*. Sep 2006;43(1):27-34.
24. Smit C, Gekus R, Walker S, et al. Effective therapy has altered the spectrum of cause-specific mortality following HIV seroconversion. *AIDS*. Mar 21 2006;20(5):741-749.
25. Kochanek KD, Xu J, Murphy SL, Minino AM, King HC. Deaths: Preliminary data for 2009. *National Vital Statistics Reports*. 2011;59(4):1-54.
26. Vance DE, Wadley VG, Crowe MG, Raper JL, Ball KK. Cognitive and everyday functioning in older and younger adults with and without HIV. *Clinical Gerontologists* 2011;34(5):413-426.
27. Guaraldi G, Orlando G, Zona S, et al. Premature age-related comorbidities among HIV-infected persons compared with the general population. *Clin Infect Dis*. Dec 2011;53(11):1120-1126.
28. Capeau J. Premature Aging and Premature Age-Related Comorbidities in HIV-Infected Patients: Facts and Hypotheses. *Clin Infect Dis*. Dec 2011;53(11):1127-1129.
29. Hasse B, Ledergerber B, Furrer H, et al. Morbidity and aging in HIV-infected persons: the Swiss HIV cohort study. *Clin Infect Dis*. Dec 2011;53(11):1130-1139.
30. 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 medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *Clin Infect Dis*. Sep 1 2009;49(5):651-681.
31. Henry K. Internal medicine/primary care reminder: what are the standards of care for HIV-positive patients aged 50 years and older? *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. Aug 2009;6(3):153-161.
32. American Academy of HIV Medicine. The HIV and Aging Consensus Project: Recommended treatment strategies for clinicians managing older patients with HIV. [http://www.aahivm.org/Upload\\_Module/upload/HIV and Aging/Aging report working document FINAL.pdf](http://www.aahivm.org/Upload_Module/upload/HIV%20and%20Aging/Aging%20report%20working%20document%20FINAL.pdf). 2011.
33. Selwyn PA. Chapter 75. In: Berger AM S, JL, Von Roenn JH, ed. Palliative care in HIV/AIDS. In *Principles and Practice of Palliative Care and Supportive Oncology* 3rd Edition. Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott Williams and Wilkins; 2007:833-848.
34. Harding R, Simms V, Krakauer E, et al. Quality HIV Care to the End of life. *Clin Infect Dis*. Feb 15 2011;52(4):553-554; author reply 554.
35. Martin J, Volberding P. HIV and premature aging: A field still in its infancy. *Ann Intern Med*. Oct 5 2010;153(7):477-479.
36. Chen RY, Accortt NA, Westfall AO, et al. Distribution of health care expenditures for HIV-infected patients. *Clin Infect Dis*. Apr 1 2006;42(7):1003-1010.
37. Martin CP, Fain MJ, Klotz SA. The older HIV-positive adult: a critical review of the medical literature. *Am J Med*. Dec 2008;121(12):1032-1037.



## Considerations for Antiretroviral Use in Patients with Coinfections

### HIV/Hepatitis B Virus (HBV) Coinfection (Last updated January 10, 2011; last reviewed January 10, 2011)

#### Panel's Recommendations

- Prior to 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), and tenofovir (TDF) have activity against both HIV and HBV, if HBV or HIV treatment is needed, ART should be initiated with the combination of TDF + FTC or TDF + 3TC as the nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NRTI) backbone of a fully suppressive antiretroviral (ARV) regimen (**A**).
- If HBV treatment is needed and TDF cannot safely be used, the alternative recommended HBV therapy is entecavir in addition to a fully suppressive ARV regimen (**BI**). Other HBV treatment regimens include peginterferon alfa monotherapy or adefovir in combination with 3TC or FTC or telbivudine in addition to a fully suppressive ARV regimen (**BII**).
- 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 used in HIV/HBV-coinfected patients (**AII**).
- Discontinuation of agents with anti-HBV activity may cause serious hepatocellular damage resulting from reactivation of HBV; patients should be advised against self-discontinuation and 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**).

**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%–10% of HIV-infected persons also have chronic HBV infection, defined as testing positive for HBsAg for more than 6 months.<sup>1</sup> The progression of chronic HBV to cirrhosis, end-stage liver disease, and/or hepatocellular carcinoma is more rapid in HIV-infected persons than in persons with chronic HBV alone.<sup>2</sup> Conversely, chronic HBV does not substantially alter the progression of HIV infection and does not influence HIV suppression or CD4 cell responses following ART initiation.<sup>3–4</sup> However, several liver-associated complications that are ascribed to flares in HBV activity, discontinuation of dually active ARVs, or toxicity of ARVs can affect the treatment of HIV in patients with HBV coinfection.<sup>5–7</sup> These include the following:

- FTC, 3TC, and TDF are approved ARVs that also have antiviral activity against HBV. Discontinuation of these drugs may potentially cause serious hepatocellular damage resulting from reactivation of HBV.<sup>8</sup>
- 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 used in HIV/HBV-coinfected patients (**AII**).<sup>9</sup>
- 3TC-resistant HBV is observed in approximately 40% of patients after 2 years on 3TC for chronic HBV and in approximately 90% of patients after 4 years when 3TC is used as the only active drug for HBV in coinfecting patients. Therefore, 3TC or FTC should be used in combination with other anti-HBV drugs (**AII**).<sup>10</sup>



- Immune reconstitution after initiation of treatment for HIV and/or HBV can be associated with elevation in transaminases, possibly because HBV is primarily an immune-mediated disease.<sup>11</sup>
- Some ARV agents can cause increases in transaminase levels. The rate and magnitude of these increases are higher with HBV coinfection.<sup>12-13</sup> The etiology and consequences of these changes in liver function tests are unclear because continuation of ART may be accompanied by resolution of the changes. Nevertheless, some experts suspend the implicated agent(s) when the serum alanine transferase (ALT) level is increased to 5–10 times the upper limit of normal. However, in HIV/HBV-coinfected persons, increases in transaminase levels can herald hepatitis B e antigen (HBeAg) seroconversion due to immune reconstitution, so the cause of the elevations should be investigated prior to the decision to discontinue 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 HBV/HIV-Coinfected Patients***

- All patients with chronic HBV should be advised to abstain from alcohol, assessed for immunity to hepatitis A virus (HAV) infection (anti-HAV antibody total) and vaccinated if nonimmune, advised on methods to prevent HBV transmission (methods that do not differ from those to prevent HIV transmission), and evaluated for the severity of HBV infection as outlined in the [Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents](#).<sup>14</sup>
- Prior to initiation of ART, all persons who test positive for HBsAg should be tested for HBV DNA using a quantitative assay to determine the level of HBV replication (**AIII**). Persons with chronic HBV infection already receiving ART active against HBV should undergo quantitative HBV DNA testing every 6–12 months to determine the effectiveness of therapy in suppressing HBV replication. The goal of HBV therapy with NRTIs is to prevent liver disease complications by sustained suppression of HBV replication to the lowest achievable level.
- **If not yet on therapy and HBV or HIV treatment is needed:** In persons without HIV infection, the recommended anti-HBV drugs for the treatment of persons naive to HBV therapy are TDF and entecavir.<sup>15-16</sup> In HIV-infected patients, however, only TDF 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, only TDF is fully active for the treatment of persons with known or suspected 3TC-resistant HBV infection. To avoid selection of HBV-resistant variants, when possible, these agents should not be used as the only agent with anti-HBV activity in an ARV regimen (**AIII**).

**Preferred regimen.** The combination of TDF + FTC or TDF + 3TC should be used as the NRTI backbone of a fully suppressive ARV regimen and for the treatment of HBV infection (**AII**).<sup>17-19</sup>

**Alternative regimens.** If TDF cannot safely be used, entecavir should be used in addition to a fully suppressive ARV regimen (**AII**); importantly, entecavir should not be considered to be a part of the ARV regimen<sup>20</sup> (**BII**). Due to a partially overlapping HBV-resistance pathway, it is not known if the combination of entecavir + 3TC or FTC will provide additional virologic or clinical benefit compared with 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 (~ every 3 months) of the HBV DNA level to detect viral breakthrough. Other HBV treatment regimens include peginterferon alfa monotherapy or adefovir in combination with 3TC or FTC or telbivudine in addition to a fully suppressive ARV regimen;<sup>17, 21-22</sup> however, data on these regimens in persons with HIV/HBV coinfection are limited (**BII**). Due to safety concerns, peginterferon alfa should not be used in HIV/HBV-coinfected persons with cirrhosis.

- **Need to discontinue medications active against HBV:** The patient's clinical course should be monitored with frequent liver function tests. The use of adefovir dipivoxil, entecavir, or telbivudine to prevent flares, especially in patients with marginal hepatic reserve such as persons with compensated or decompensated cirrhosis, can be considered.<sup>8</sup> 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 suitable ARV agents to achieve HIV suppression (AIII).

## References

1. Spradling PR, Richardson JT, Buchacz K, et al. Prevalence of chronic hepatitis B virus infection among patients in the HIV Outpatient Study, 1996-2007. *J Viral Hepat.* 2010.
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.* 2002;360(9349):1921-1926.
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.* 2005;19(6):593-601.
4. Hoffmann CJ, Seaberg EC, Young S, et al. Hepatitis B and long-term HIV outcomes in coinfecting HAART recipients. *AIDS.* 2009;23(14):1881-1889.
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.* 2009;10(1):12-18.
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.* 2003;17(15):2191-2199.
7. Wit FW, Weverling GJ, Weel J, et al. Incidence of and risk factors for severe hepatotoxicity associated with antiretroviral combination therapy. *J Infect Dis.* 2002;186(1):23-31.
8. Dore GJ, Soriano V, Rockstroh J, et al. Frequent hepatitis B virus rebound among HIV-hepatitis B virus-coinfecting patients following antiretroviral therapy interruption. *AIDS.* 2010;24(6):857-865.
9. McMahon MA, Jilek BL, Brennan TP, et al. The HBV drug entecavir - effects on HIV-1 replication and resistance. *N Engl J Med.* 2007;356(25):2614-2621.
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.* 1999;30(5):1302-1306.
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.* 2001;32(1):144-148.
12. Sulkowski MS, Thomas DL, Chaisson RE, et al. 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.
13. 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.
14. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Guidelines for prevention and treatment of opportunistic infections in HIV-infected adults and adolescents: recommendations from CDC, the National Institutes of Health, and the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *MMWR Recomm Rep.* 2009;58(RR-4):1-207.
15. Lok AS, McMahon BJ. Chronic hepatitis B: update 2009. *Hepatology.* 2009;50(3):661-662.
16. Woo G, Tomlinson G, Nishikawa Y, et al. Tenofovir and entecavir are the most effective antiviral agents for chronic hepatitis B: a systematic review and Bayesian meta-analyses. *Gastroenterology.* 2010;139(4):1218-1229.
17. 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.* 2006;44(5):1110-1116.

18. 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 coinfecting individuals. *AIDS*. 2009;23(13):1707-1715.
19. 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*. 2010.
20. Pessoa MG, Gazzard B, Huang AK, et al. Efficacy and safety of entecavir for chronic HBV in HIV/HBV coinfecting patients receiving lamivudine as part of antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. 2008;22(14):1779-1787.
21. 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*. 2001;358(9283):718-723.
22. 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.

## HIV/Hepatitis C Virus (HCV) Coinfection (Last updated March 27, 2012; last reviewed March 27, 2012)

### Key Considerations When Managing Patients Coinfected with HIV and Hepatitis C Virus

- All HIV-infected patients should be screened for hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection, preferably before starting antiretroviral therapy (ART).
- ART may slow the progression of liver disease by preserving or restoring immune function and reducing HIV-related immune activation and inflammation. For most HIV/HCV-coinfected patients, including those with cirrhosis, the benefits of ART outweigh concerns regarding drug-induced liver injury (DILI). Therefore, ART should be considered for HIV/HCV-coinfected patients, regardless of CD4 count (**BII**).
- Initial ART combination regimens for most HIV/HCV-coinfected patients are the same as those for individuals without HCV infection. However, when treatment for both HIV and HCV is indicated, consideration of potential drug-drug interactions and overlapping toxicities should guide ART regimen selection or modification (see discussion in the text).
- Combined treatment of HIV and HCV can be complicated by large pill burden, drug interactions, and overlapping toxicities. Although ART should be initiated for most HIV/HCV-coinfected patients regardless of CD4 cell count, in ART-naïve patients with CD4 counts  $>500$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> some clinicians may choose to defer ART until completion of HCV treatment.
- In patients with lower CD4 counts (e.g.,  $<200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>), it may be preferable to initiate ART and delay HCV therapy until CD4 counts increase as a result of ART.

**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 one-third of patients with chronic hepatitis C virus (HCV) infection progress to cirrhosis at a median time of less than 20 years.<sup>1, 2</sup> The rate of progression increases with older age, alcoholism, male sex, and HIV infection.<sup>3-6</sup> In a meta-analysis, individuals coinfectd with HIV/HCV were found to have three times greater risk of progression to cirrhosis or decompensated liver disease than were HCV-monoinfected patients.<sup>5</sup> This accelerated rate is magnified in HIV/HCV-coinfected patients with low CD4 counts. Although ART appears to slow the rate of HCV disease progression in HIV/HCV-coinfected patients, several studies have demonstrated that the rate continues to exceed that observed in those without HIV infection.<sup>7, 8</sup> Whether HCV infection accelerates HIV progression, as measured by AIDS-related opportunistic infections (OIs) or death,<sup>9</sup> is unclear. If such an increased risk of HIV progression exists, it may reflect the impact of injection drug use, which is strongly linked to HCV infection.<sup>10, 11</sup> The increased frequency of antiretroviral (ARV)-associated hepatotoxicity with chronic HCV infection also complicates HIV treatment.<sup>12, 13</sup>

A combination regimen of peginterferon and ribavirin (PegIFN/RBV) has been the mainstay of treatment for HCV infection. In HCV genotype 1-infected patients without HIV, addition of an HCV NS3/4A protease inhibitor (PI) boceprevir or telaprevir to PegIFN/RBV significantly improves the rate of sustained virologic response (SVR).<sup>14, 15</sup> Clinical trials of these HCV PIs in combination with PegIFN/RBV for the treatment of HCV genotype 1 infection in HIV-infected patients are currently under way. Both boceprevir and telaprevir are substrates and inhibitors of cytochrome P (CYP) 3A4/5 and p-glycoprotein (p-gp); boceprevir is also metabolized by aldo-keto reductase. These drugs have significant interactions with certain ARV drugs that are metabolized by the same pathways. As such, the presence of HCV infection and the treatment of HCV may influence HIV treatment as discussed below.

### Assessment of HIV/Hepatitis C Virus Coinfection Before Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy

- All HIV-infected patients should be screened for HCV infection using sensitive immunoassays licensed for detection of antibody to HCV in blood.<sup>16</sup> HCV-seronegative patients at risk for the acquisition of HCV infection should undergo repeat testing annually. HCV-seropositive patients should be tested for HCV

RNA using a qualitative or quantitative assay to confirm the presence of active infection.<sup>17</sup>

- Patients with HIV/HCV coinfection should be counseled to avoid consuming alcohol and to use appropriate precautions to prevent transmission of HIV and/or HCV to others. HIV/HCV-coinfected patients who are susceptible to hepatitis A virus (HAV) or hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection should be vaccinated against these viruses.
- All patients with HIV/HCV coinfection should be evaluated for HCV therapy. HCV treatment is recommended according to standard guidelines.<sup>18, 19</sup> Strong preference should be given to commence HCV treatment in patients with higher CD4 counts. For patients with lower CD4 counts (e.g., <200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>), it may be preferable to initiate ART and delay HCV therapy until CD4 counts increase as a result of HIV treatment.<sup>17, 20-22</sup>

### ***Antiretroviral Therapy in HIV/Hepatitis C Virus Coinfection***

- When to start antiretroviral therapy: The rate of liver disease (liver fibrosis) progression is accelerated in HIV/HCV-coinfected patients, particularly in individuals with low CD4 counts ( $\leq 350$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>). Data largely from retrospective cohort studies are inconsistent regarding the effect of ART on the natural history of HCV disease.<sup>6, 23, 24</sup> However, ART may slow the progression of liver disease by preserving or restoring immune function and reducing HIV-related immune activation and inflammation.<sup>25-27</sup> Thus, for most coinfecting patients, including those with high CD4 counts and those with cirrhosis, the benefits of ART outweigh concerns regarding DILI. Therefore, ART should be initiated for most HIV/HCV-coinfecting patients, regardless of CD4 count (**BII**). However, in HIV treatment-naïve patients with CD4 counts >500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>, some clinicians may choose to defer ART until completion of HCV treatment.
- What antiretroviral to start and what antiretroviral not to use: Initial ARV combination regimens for most HIV treatment-naïve patients with HCV are the same as those for patients without HCV infection. Special considerations for ARV selection in HIV/HCV-coinfecting patients include:
  - When both HIV and HCV treatments are indicated, the choice of ARV regimen should be guided by the HCV treatment regimen selected with careful consideration of potential drug-drug interactions and overlapping toxicities (as discussed below).
  - Cirrhotic patients should be carefully assessed for signs of liver decompensation according to the Child-Turcotte-Pugh classification system because hepatically metabolized ARV drugs may require dose modification or avoidance in patients with Child-Pugh class B and C disease. (See [Appendix B, Table 7.](#))
- Hepatotoxicity: DILI following initiation of ART is more common in HIV/HCV-coinfecting patients than in those with HIV monoinfection. The greatest risk of DILI may be observed in coinfecting individuals with advanced liver disease (e.g., cirrhosis or end-stage liver disease).<sup>28</sup> Eradication of HCV infection with treatment may decrease the likelihood of ARV-associated DILI.<sup>29</sup>
  - Given the substantial heterogeneity in patient populations and drug regimens, comparison of DILI incidence rates for individual ARV agents across clinical trials is difficult. In such studies, the highest incidence rates of significant elevations in liver enzyme levels (>5 times the upper limit of the laboratory reference range) have been observed during therapy with ARV drugs that are no longer commonly used in clinical practice, including stavudine (d4T) (with or without didanosine [ddI]), nevirapine (NVP), or full-dose ritonavir (RTV) (600 mg twice daily).<sup>30</sup> Additionally, certain ARV agents should be avoided if possible because they have been associated with higher incidence of serious liver-associated adverse effects, such as fatty liver disease with nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) such as d4T, ddI, or zidovudine (ZDV);<sup>31</sup> noncirrhotic portal hypertension associated with ddI;<sup>32</sup> and hepatotoxicity associated with RTV-boosted tipranavir.<sup>33</sup>



- Alanine aminotransferase (ALT) and aspartate aminotransferase (AST) levels should be monitored at 1 month after initiation of ART and then every 3 to 6 months. Mild to moderate fluctuations in ALT and/or AST are typical in individuals with chronic HCV infection. In the absence of signs and/or symptoms of liver disease these fluctuations do not require interruption of ART. Significant ALT and/or AST elevation should prompt careful evaluation 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); short-term interruption of the ART regimen or of the specific drug suspected to be responsible for the DILI may be required.<sup>34</sup>

### ***Treating Both HIV and Hepatitis C Virus Infection***

Concurrent treatment of HIV and HCV is feasible but may be complicated by high pill burden, drug interactions, and overlapping drug toxicities. In this context, the decision to treat chronic HCV should also include consideration of the medical need for such treatment on the basis of an assessment of HCV disease stage. Some clinicians may choose to defer HCV therapy in HIV/HCV-coinfected patients with no or minimal liver fibrosis. If treatment with PegIFN/RBV alone or in combination with one of the HCV NS3/4A PIs (boceprevir or telaprevir) is initiated, the ART regimen may need to be modified to reduce the potential for drug interactions and/or toxicities that may develop during the period of concurrent HIV and HCV treatment.

### ***Considerations for using certain nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors and hepatitis C virus treatments:***

- ddI **should not be given** with RBV because of the potential for drug-drug interactions leading to life-threatening ddI-associated mitochondrial toxicity including hepatomegaly/steatosis, pancreatitis, and lactic acidosis (AII).<sup>35</sup>
- Combined use of ZDV and RBV is associated with increased rates of anemia, making RBV dose reduction necessary. Therefore, this combination should be avoided when possible.<sup>36</sup> Because the risk of anemia may further increase when boceprevir or telaprevir is combined with PegIFN/RBV, ZDV **should not be given** with this combination (AIII).
- Abacavir (ABC) has been associated with decreased response to PegIFN/RBV in some, but not all, retrospective studies; current evidence is insufficient to recommend avoiding this combination.<sup>37-39</sup>

### ***Considerations for the use of HCV NS3/4A protease inhibitors (boceprevir or telaprevir) and antiretroviral therapy:***

- Boceprevir is approved for the treatment of HCV genotype 1 infection in patients without HIV infection. After 4 weeks of PegIFN/RBV therapy, boceprevir is added to the regimen for 24, 32, or 44 additional weeks of HCV therapy. Data on the use of an HCV regimen containing boceprevir together with ART in HIV/HCV-coinfected individuals are limited. In 1 small study of coinfecting patients, higher HCV response was observed with boceprevir plus PegIFN/RBV (64 patients) than with PegIFN/RBV alone (34 patients). In this study, patients received ART that included HIV-1 ritonavir-boosted atazanavir (ATV/r), darunavir (DRV/r), or lopinavir (LPV/r) or raltegravir (RAL) plus dual NRTIs.<sup>40</sup>

Boceprevir is primarily metabolized by aldo-keto reductase, but because the drug is also a substrate and inhibitor of CYP3A4/5 and p-gp enzymes, it may interact with ARVs metabolized by these pathways. Based on drug interaction studies in healthy volunteers, boceprevir can be co-administered with RAL.<sup>41</sup> However, co-administration of boceprevir with ATV/r, DRV/r, LPV/r, or efavirenz (EFV) is not recommended because of bidirectional drug interactions (see [Table 18a and 18b](#)).<sup>42, 43</sup> Importantly, the pharmacokinetic (PK) interactions of HIV PIs with boceprevir were not identified before the approval of boceprevir and before participant enrollment in the HIV/HCV-coinfection trial; consequently, some

coinfected patients have received HIV PIs and boceprevir during HCV treatment. Patients who are currently receiving these drug combinations should be advised not to stop any medication until contacting their health care providers. If therapy with HIV PIs and boceprevir is continued, patients should be closely monitored for HIV and HCV responses and consideration should be given to switching the HIV PI or EFV to RAL during boceprevir therapy. Additional clinical trial data are needed to determine if other ARVs may be co-administered with boceprevir.

- Telaprevir is approved for the treatment of HCV genotype 1 infection in patients without HIV infection. Telaprevir is administered in combination with PegIFN/RBV for the initial 12 weeks of HCV therapy followed by 12 or 36 weeks of additional treatment with PegIFN/RBV. Data on the use of this regimen in HIV/HCV-coinfected individuals are limited. In 1 small study of coinfecting patients, higher HCV response was observed with telaprevir plus PegIFN/RBV (38 patients) than with PegIFN/RBV alone (22 patients). In this study, patients received ART containing EFV or ATV/r plus tenofovir/emtricitabine (TDF/FTC) or no ART during the HCV therapy.<sup>44</sup>

Because telaprevir is a substrate and an inhibitor of CYP3A4 and p-gp enzymes, the drug may interact with ARVs metabolized by these pathways. On the basis of drug interaction studies in healthy volunteers and data on responses in coinfecting patients enrolled in the small clinical trial noted above, telaprevir can be co-administered with ATV/r<sup>45</sup> and RAL<sup>46</sup> at the standard recommended dose of telaprevir (750 mg every 7–9 hours) and with EFV at an increased dose of telaprevir (1125 mg every 7–9 hours) (see [Table 18b](#)); however, co-administration of telaprevir with DRV/r, fosamprenavir/ritonavir (FPV/r), or LPV/r is not recommended because of bidirectional drug interactions.<sup>45</sup> Data on PK interactions of telaprevir with other ARVs including non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs) other than EFV and with maraviroc (MVC) are not available; therefore, co-administration of telaprevir with other ARVs cannot be recommended.

**Following are preliminary recommendations for the use of boceprevir or telaprevir in HIV patients coinfecting with HCV genotype 1 based on current ART use. These recommendations may be modified as new drug interaction and clinical trial information become available.**

Patients not on ART:	Use either boceprevir or telaprevir
Patients receiving RAL + 2-NRTI:	Use either boceprevir or telaprevir
Patients receiving ATV/r + 2-NRTI:	Use telaprevir at standard dose. Do not use boceprevir.
Patients receiving EFV + 2-NRTI:	Use telaprevir at increased dose of 1125 mg every 7–9 hours. Do not use boceprevir.

Patients receiving other ARV regimens:

- If HCV disease is minimal (i.e., no or mild portal fibrosis), consider deferring HCV treatment given rapidly evolving HCV drug development.
- If good prognostic factors for HCV treatment response are present—IL28B CC genotype or low HCV RNA level (<400,000 International Unit [IU]/mL)—consider use of PegIFN/RBV without HCV NS3/4A PI.
- On the basis of ART history and HIV genotype testing results, if possible, consider switching to the ART regimens listed above to permit the use of boceprevir or telaprevir.
- For patients with complex ART history or resistance to multiple classes of ART, consultation with experts regarding the optimal strategy to minimize the risk of HIV breakthrough may be needed. In such patients, telaprevir may be the preferred HCV NS3/4A PI because its duration of use (12 weeks) is shorter than that of boceprevir (24 to 44 weeks).

### **Summary:**

In summary, HCV coinfection and use of PegIFN/RBV with or without HCV NS3/4A PIs (telaprevir or boceprevir) to treat HCV may impact the treatment of HIV because of increased pill burden, toxicities, and

drug-drug interactions. Because ART may slow the progression of HCV-related liver disease, ART should be considered for most HIV/HCV-coinfected patients, regardless of CD4 count. If treatment with PegIFN/RBV alone or in combination with one of the HCV NS3/4A PIs (telaprevir or boceprevir) is initiated, the ART regimen may need to be modified to reduce the potential for drug-drug interactions and/or drug toxicities that may develop during the period of concurrent HIV and HCV treatment. The science of HCV drug development is evolving rapidly. As new clinical trial data on the management of HIV/HCV-coinfected patients with newer HCV drugs become available, the Panel will modify its recommendations accordingly.

## References

1. Alter MJ, et al. The natural history of community-acquired hepatitis C in the United States. The Sentinel Counties Chronic non-A, non-B Hepatitis Study Team. *N Engl J Med*. 1992;327(27):1899-1905.
2. Thomas DL, et al. The natural history of hepatitis C virus infection: host, viral, and environmental factors. *JAMA*. 2000;284(4):450-456.
3. Poynard T, Bedossa B, 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.
4. Wiley TE, et al. Impact of alcohol on the histological and clinical progression of hepatitis C infection. *Hepatology*. 1998;28(3):805-809.
5. Graham CS, 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.
6. Thein HH, et al. 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.
7. Weber R, 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.
8. Kitahata MM, et al. Effect of early versus deferred antiretroviral therapy for HIV on survival. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;360(18):1815-1826.
9. Greub G, 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.
10. Vlahov D, et al. Prognostic indicators for AIDS and infectious disease death in HIV-infected injection drug users: plasma viral load and CD4+ cell count. *JAMA*. 1998; 279(1):35-40.
11. Celentano DD, et al. Self-reported antiretroviral therapy in injection drug users. *JAMA*. 1998;280(6):544-546.
12. Sulkowski MS, et al. 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.
13. 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.
14. Poordad F, et al. Boceprevir for untreated chronic HCV genotype 1 infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;364(13):1195-1206.
15. Jacobson IM, et al. Telaprevir for previously untreated chronic hepatitis C virus infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;364(25):2405-2416.
16. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Guidelines for prevention and treatment of opportunistic infections in HIV-infected adults and adolescents: recommendations from CDC, the National Institutes of Health, and the HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. *MMWR Recomm Rep*. 2009;58(RR-4):1-207.
17. Ghany MG, et al. Diagnosis, management, and treatment of hepatitis C: an update. *Hepatology*. 2009;49(4):1335-1374.
18. Ghany MG, et al. An update on treatment of genotype 1 chronic hepatitis C virus infection: 2011 practice guideline by the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases. *Hepatology*. 2011;54(4):1433-1444.
19. Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents. Guidelines for the prevention and treatment of opportunistic infections in adults and adolescents with HIV/AIDS. Department of Health and Human Services. (In Press).
20. Soriano V, et al. Care of patients coinfecting with HIV and hepatitis C virus: 2007 updated recommendations from the HCV-HIV International Panel. *AIDS*. 2007;21(9):1073-1089.

21. Tien PC. Management and treatment of hepatitis C virus infection in HIV-infected adults: recommendations from the Veterans Affairs Hepatitis C Resource Center Program and National Hepatitis C Program Office. *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2005;100(10):2338-2354.
22. Avidan NU, et al. Hepatitis C Viral Kinetics During Treatment With Peg IFN-alpha-2b in HIV/HCV Coinfected Patients as a Function of Baseline CD4+ T-Cell Counts. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2009;52(4):452-458.
23. Sulkowski MS, et al. Rapid fibrosis progression among HIV/hepatitis C virus-co-infected adults. *AIDS*. 2007;21(16):2209-2216.
24. Brau N, et al. Slower fibrosis progression in HIV/HCV-coinfected patients with successful HIV suppression using antiretroviral therapy. *J Hepatol*. 2006;44(1):47-55.
25. Macias J, et al. Fast fibrosis progression between repeated liver biopsies in patients coinfecting with human immunodeficiency virus/hepatitis C virus. *Hepatology*. 2009;50(4):1056-1063.
26. Verma S, Goldin RD, Main J. Hepatic steatosis in patients with HIV-Hepatitis C Virus coinfection: is it associated with antiretroviral therapy and more advanced hepatic fibrosis? *BMC Res Notes*. 2008;1:46.
27. Ragni MV, et al. Highly active antiretroviral therapy improves ESLD-free survival in HIV-HCV co-infection. *Haemophilia*. 2009;15(2):552-558.
28. Aranzabal L, 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.
29. Labarga P, 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.
30. Nunez M. Hepatotoxicity of antiretrovirals: incidence, mechanisms and management. *J Hepatol*. 2006;44(1 Suppl):S132-S139.
31. McGovern BH, et al. Hepatic steatosis is associated with fibrosis, nucleoside analogue use, and hepatitis C virus genotype 3 infection in HIV-seropositive patients. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2006;43(3):365-372.
32. Kovari H, et al. Association of noncirrhotic portal hypertension in HIV-infected persons and antiretroviral therapy with didanosine: a nested case-control study. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2009;49(4):626-635.
33. Food and Drug Administration. Aptivus (package insert). [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/label/2011/021814s011bl.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2011/021814s011bl.pdf). Accessed March 26, 2012.
34. Sulkowski MS, Thomas DL. Hepatitis C in the HIV-infected patient. *Clin Liver Dis*. 2003;7(1):179-194.
35. Fleischer R, Boxwell D, Sherman KE. Nucleoside analogues and mitochondrial toxicity. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2004;38(8):e79-e80.
36. Alvarez D, et al. Zidovudine use but not weight-based ribavirin dosing impacts anaemia during HCV treatment in HIV-infected persons. *J Viral Hepat*. 2006;13(10):683-689.
37. Vispo E, et al. Low response to pegylated interferon plus ribavirin in HIV-infected patients with chronic hepatitis C treated with abacavir. *Antivir Ther*. 2008;13(3):429-437.
38. Laufer N, et al. Abacavir does not influence the rate of virological response in HIV-HCV-coinfected patients treated with pegylated interferon and weight-adjusted ribavirin. *Antivir Ther*. 2008;13(7):953-957.
39. Mira JA, et al. Efficacy of pegylated interferon plus ribavirin treatment in HIV/hepatitis C virus co-infected patients receiving abacavir plus lamivudine or tenofovir plus either lamivudine or emtricitabine as nucleoside analogue backbone. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2008;62(6):1365-1373.
40. Sulkowski M, S. Pol, et al. (2012). Boceprevir + pegylated interferon + ribavirin for the treatment of HCV/HIV coinfecting patients: End of treatment (Week 48) interim results. 18th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. Seattle, WA, Abs 47.
41. de Kanter CB, Blonk M, Colbers A, Fillekes Q, Schouwenberg B, Burger D. The Influence of the HCV Protease Inhibitor Bocepravir on the Pharmacokinetics of the HIV Integrase Inhibitor Raltegravir. Paper presented at: 19th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections (CROI); March 5-8, 2012; Seattle, WA.
42. Hulskotte E, Feng H-P, Xuan F, van Zutven M, O'Mara E, Youngberg S, Wagner J, Butters J. Pharmacokinetic interaction between the HCV protease inhibitor bocepravir and ritonavir-boosted HIV-1 protease inhibitors atazanavir, lopinavir, and darunavir. Paper presented at: 19th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections (CROI); March 5-8, 2012; Seattle, WA.

43. Food and Drug Administration, Victrelis (package insert). [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/label/2011/202258lbl.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2011/202258lbl.pdf). Accessed March 23, 2012.
44. Dieterich D., V. Soriano, et al. (2012). Telaprevir in combination with peginterferon a-2a + ribavirin in HCV/HIV-coinfected patients: a 24-week treatment interim analysis. 18th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections. Seattle, WA, Abs 46.
45. Food and Drug Administration, INCIVEK (package insert). Accessed March 23, 2012.
46. van Heeswijk R, et al. The pharmacokinetic interaction between telaprevir and raltegravir in healthy volunteers. Paper presented at: 51st Interscience Conference on Antimicrobial Agents and Chemotherapy (ICAAC); September 17-20, 2011; Chicago, IL.



## Mycobacterium Tuberculosis Disease with HIV Coinfection (Last updated March 27, 2012; last reviewed March 27, 2012)

### Panel's Recommendations

- The principles for treatment of active tuberculosis (TB) disease in HIV-infected patients are the same as those for HIV-uninfected patients **(AI)**.
- All HIV-infected patients with diagnosed active TB should be started on TB treatment immediately **(AI)**.
- All HIV-infected patients with diagnosed active TB should be treated with antiretroviral therapy (ART) **(AI)**.
- In patients with CD4 counts  $<50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>, ART should be initiated within 2 weeks of starting TB treatment **(AI)**.
- In patients with CD4 counts  $\geq 50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> who present with clinical disease of major severity as indicated by clinical evaluation (including low Karnofsky score, low body mass index [BMI], low hemoglobin, low albumin, organ system dysfunction, or extent of disease), ART should be initiated within 2 to 4 weeks of starting TB treatment. The strength of this recommendation varies on the basis of CD4 cell count:
  - CD4 count 50 to 200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> **(BI)**
  - CD4 count  $>200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> **(BIII)**
- In patients with CD4 counts  $\geq 50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> who do not have severe clinical disease, ART can be delayed beyond 2 to 4 weeks of starting TB therapy but should be started within 8 to 12 weeks of TB therapy initiation. The strength of this recommendation also varies on the basis of CD4 cell count:
  - CD4 count 50 to 500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> **(AI)**
  - CD4 count  $>500$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> **(BIII)**
- In all HIV-infected pregnant women with active TB, ART should be started as early as feasible, both for maternal health and for prevention of mother-to-child transmission (PMTCT) of HIV **(AIII)**.
- In HIV-infected patients with documented multidrug-resistant (MDR) and extensively drug-resistant (XDR) TB, ART should be initiated within 2 to 4 weeks of confirmation of TB drug resistance and initiation of second-line TB therapy **(BIII)**.
- Despite pharmacokinetic drug interactions, a rifamycin (rifampin or rifabutin) should be included in TB regimens for patients receiving ART, with dosage adjustment if necessary **(AII)**.
- Rifabutin is the preferred rifamycin to use in HIV-infected patients with active TB disease on a protease inhibitor (PI)-based regimen because the risk of substantial drug interactions with PIs is lower with rifabutin than with rifampin **(AII)**.
- Co-administration of rifampin and PIs (with or without ritonavir [RTV] boosting) is not recommended **(AII)**.
- Rifapentine (RPT) is NOT recommended in HIV-infected patients receiving ART for treatment of latent TB infection (LTBI) or active TB, unless in the context of a clinical trial **(AIII)**.
- Immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome (IRIS) may occur after initiation of ART. Both ART and TB treatment should be continued while managing IRIS **(AIII)**.
- Treatment support, which can include directly observed therapy (DOT) of TB treatment, is strongly recommended for HIV-infected patients with active TB disease **(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

### Treatment of Active Tuberculosis in HIV-Infected Patients

HIV infection significantly increases the risk of progression from latent to active TB disease. The CD4 cell count influences both the frequency and severity of active TB disease.<sup>1-2</sup> Active TB also negatively affects HIV disease. It may be associated with a higher HIV viral load and more rapid progression of HIV disease.<sup>3</sup>

Active pulmonary or extrapulmonary TB disease requires prompt initiation of TB treatment. The treatment of active TB disease in HIV-infected patients should follow the general principles guiding treatment for

individuals without HIV (**AI**). Treatment of drug-susceptible TB disease should include a standard regimen that consists of isoniazid (INH) + a rifamycin (rifampin or rifabutin) + pyrazinamide + ethambutol given for 2 months, followed by INH + a rifamycin for 4 to 7 months.<sup>4</sup> The [Guidelines for Prevention and Treatment of Opportunistic Infections in HIV-Infected Adults and Adolescents](#)<sup>4</sup> include a more complete discussion of the diagnosis and treatment of TB disease in HIV-infected patients.

All patients with HIV/TB disease should be treated with ART (**AI**). Important issues related to the use of ART in patients with active TB disease include: (1) when to start ART, (2) significant pharmacokinetic drug-drug interactions between rifamycins and some antiretroviral (ARV) agents, (3) the additive toxicities associated with concomitant ARV and TB drug use, (4) the development of TB-associated IRIS after ART initiation, and (5) the need for treatment support including DOT and the integration of HIV and TB care and treatment.

## Antiretroviral Therapy in Patients with Active Tuberculosis

### *Patients Diagnosed with Tuberculosis While Receiving Antiretroviral Therapy*

When TB is diagnosed in a patient receiving ART, the patient's ARV regimen should be assessed with particular attention to potential pharmacokinetic interactions with rifamycins (discussed below). The patient's regimen may need to be modified to permit use of the optimal TB treatment regimen (see [Tables 17–19](#) for dosing recommendations).

### *Patients Not Yet Receiving Antiretroviral Therapy*

Until recently, when to start ART in patients with active TB has been a subject of debate. Survival is improved when ART is started early following initiation of TB therapy, but a delay in initiating ART often was favored because of the potential complications of high pill burden, additive toxicities, drug interactions, adherence, and the potential for development of IRIS. Recent studies primarily conducted in resource-limited settings, including three randomized controlled trials, have helped clarify the question of when to start ART in patients with active TB.<sup>5–8</sup>

The SAPiT study conducted in South Africa convincingly demonstrated that starting ART during rather than after concluding treatment for TB can significantly reduce mortality. In this study, ambulatory HIV-infected patients with smear-positive TB and CD4 counts  $<500$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> were randomized to one of three treatment arms: integrated therapy with ART initiated either during the first 4 weeks of TB therapy or after the first 8 weeks of TB treatment (i.e., during the continuation phase of TB therapy) or sequential therapy with ART initiated after the conclusion of standard TB therapy. The median CD4 cell count of participants at study entry was 150 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. The sequential therapy arm was stopped when an early analysis demonstrated that the mortality rate in the combined two integrated arms was 56% lower than the rate in the sequential therapy arm. Treatment was continued in the two integrated arms until study completion.<sup>5</sup>

With the completion of SAPiT and 2 other randomized controlled trials, CAMELIA and STRIDE, the question on the optimal time to initiate ART during TB therapy has been addressed. Findings from these trials now serve as the basis for the Panel's recommendations on when to start ART in patients with active TB.

In the final analysis of the SAPiT trial, there were no differences in rates of AIDS or death between the 2 integrated arms of the study (patients who started ART within 4 weeks after initiating TB treatment vs. those who started ART at 8–12 weeks [i.e., within 4 weeks after completing the intensive phase of TB treatment]). However, in patients with baseline CD4 counts  $<50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (17% of the study population), the rate of AIDS or death was lower in the earlier therapy group than in the later therapy group (8.5 vs. 26.3 cases per 100 person-years, a strong trend favoring the earlier treatment arm,  $P = 0.06$ ). For all patients, regardless of CD4

cell count, earlier therapy was associated with a higher incidence of IRIS and of adverse events that required a switch in ARV drugs than later therapy. Two deaths were attributed to IRIS.<sup>6</sup>

In the CAMELIA study, which was conducted in Cambodia<sup>7</sup>, patients who had CD4 counts  $<200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> were randomized to initiate ART at 2 weeks or 8 weeks after initiation of TB treatment. Study participants had advanced HIV disease, with a median entry CD4 count of 25 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>; low BMIs (median = 16.8 kg/m<sup>2</sup>), Karnofsky scores (87%  $<70$ ), and hemoglobin levels (median = 8.7 g/dl); and high rates of disseminated TB disease. Compared with therapy initiated at 8 weeks, ART initiated at 2 weeks resulted in a 38% reduction in mortality ( $P = 0.006$ ). A significant reduction in mortality was seen in patients with CD4 counts  $\leq 50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> and in patients with CD4 counts 51 to 200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. Overall, 6 deaths associated with TB-IRIS were reported.

The ACTG 5221 (STRIDE) trial, a multinational study conducted at 28 sites, randomized ART-naïve patients with confirmed or probable TB and CD4 counts  $<250$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> to earlier ( $<2$  weeks) or later (8–12 weeks) ART.<sup>8</sup> At study entry, the participants' median CD4 count was 77 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. The rates of mortality and AIDS diagnoses were not different between the earlier and later arms, although higher rates of IRIS were seen in the earlier arm. However, a significant reduction in AIDS or death was seen in the subset of patients with CD4 counts  $<50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> who were randomized to the earlier ART arm ( $P = 0.02$ ).

In each of these 3 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 3 trials demonstrate that in patients with active TB and with very low CD4 cell counts (i.e.,  $<50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>), early initiation of ART can reduce mortality and AIDS progression, albeit at the risk of increased IRIS. These findings strongly favor initiation of ART within the first 2 weeks of TB treatment in patients with CD4 cell counts  $<50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (**AI**).

The question of when to start ART in patients with CD4 counts  $\geq 50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> is also informed by these studies. The STRIDE and SAPIt studies—in which the patients with CD4 cell counts  $\geq 50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> were relatively healthy and with reasonable Karnofsky scores (note the SAPIt study excluded patients with Karnofsky scores  $<70$ ) and BMIs—demonstrated that ART initiation in these patients can be delayed until 8 to 12 weeks after initiation of TB therapy (**AI** for CD4 counts 51–500 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> and **BIII** for CD4 counts  $>500$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>).

However, the CAMELIA study, which included more patients who were severely ill than the STRIDE and SAPIt studies, showed that early initiation of ART improved survival both in patients with CD4 counts  $\leq 50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> and in patients with CD4 counts from 51 to 200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. In a multivariate analysis, age  $>40$  years, low BMI ( $<16$ ), low Karnofsky score ( $<40$ ), elevated aspartate aminotransferase (AST) level ( $>1.25$  x the upper limit of normal [ULN]), disseminated and MDR TB were independently associated with poor survival; whereas in a univariate analysis, hemoglobin  $<10$ g/dl also was associated with poor survival.

Thus, recently published results from the three clinical trials are complementary in defining the need for ART and use of CD4 count and clinical status to inform decisions on the optimal time to initiate ART in patients with HIV and TB disease. Earlier initiation of ART within 2 to 4 weeks of TB treatment should be strongly considered for patients with CD4 cell counts from 50 to 200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> who have evidence of clinical disease of major severity as indicated by clinical evaluation, low Karnofsky score, low BMI, low hemoglobin, low albumin, or organ system dysfunction (**BI**). Initiation of ART within 2 to 4 weeks also should be considered for patients with CD4 counts  $>200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> who present with evidence of severe disease (**BIII**).

Of additional importance, each of the above studies demonstrated excellent responses to ART, with 90% and  $>95\%$  of participants achieving suppressed viremia (HIV RNA  $<400$  copies/mL) at 12 months in the SAPIt and CAMELIA studies, respectively, and 74% of participants at 2 years in the STRIDE study.

Mortality rates in patients with MDR or XDR TB and HIV coinfection are very high.<sup>9</sup> Retrospective case control studies and case series provide growing evidence of better outcomes associated with receipt of ART in such coinfecting patients,<sup>10</sup> but the optimal timing for initiation of ART is unknown. However, given the high rates and rapid mortality, most experts recommend that ART be initiated within 2 to 4 weeks after confirmation of the diagnosis of drug resistance and initiation of second-line TB therapy (**BIII**).

All HIV-infected pregnant women with active TB should be started on ART as early as feasible, both for maternal health and to prevent perinatal transmission of HIV (**AIII**). The choice of ART should be based on efficacy and safety in pregnancy and take into account potential drug-drug interactions between ARVs and rifamycins (see [Perinatal Guidelines](#) for more detailed discussions).<sup>11</sup>

TB meningitis often is associated with severe complications and high mortality rate. In a randomized study conducted in Vietnam, patients were randomized to immediate ART or to therapy deferred until 2 months after initiation of TB treatment. A higher rate of severe (Grade 4) adverse events was seen in patients who received immediate ART than in those who deferred therapy (80.3% vs. 69.1%, respectively;  $P = 0.04$ ).<sup>12</sup> In this study 59.8% of the immediate ART patients and 55.5% of the delayed ART patients died within 9 months. However, in the United States, where patients may be more closely monitored and treated for severe adverse events such as central nervous system (CNS) IRIS, many experts feel that ART should be initiated as for other HIV/TB-coinfecting patients (**CIII**).

## Drug Interaction Considerations

A rifamycin is a crucial component in treatment of drug-sensitive TB. However, both rifampin and rifabutin are inducers of the hepatic cytochrome P (CYP) 450 and uridine diphosphate glucosyltransferase (UGT) 1A1 enzymes and are associated with significant interactions with most ARV agents including all PIs, non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs), maraviroc (MVC), and raltegravir (RAL). Rifampin is a potent enzyme inducer, leading to accelerated drug clearance and significant reduction in ARV drug exposure. Despite these interactions, some observational studies suggest that good virologic, immunologic, and clinical outcomes may be achieved with standard doses of efavirenz (EFV)<sup>13-14</sup> and, to a lesser extent, nevirapine (NVP)<sup>15-16</sup> when combined with rifampin. However, rifampin is not recommended in combination with all PIs and the NNRTIs etravirine (ETR) and rilpivirine (RPV). When rifampin is used with MVC or RAL, increased dosage of the ARV is generally recommended. Rifabutin, a weaker enzyme inducer, is an alternative to rifampin. Because rifabutin is a substrate of the CYP 450 enzyme system, its metabolism may be affected by the NNRTI or PI. [Tables 17, 18a, 18b, 18d, and 18e](#) outline the magnitude of these interactions and provide dosing recommendations when rifamycins and selected ARV drugs are used concomitantly. After determining the drugs and doses to use, clinicians should monitor patients closely to assure good control of both TB and HIV infections. Suboptimal HIV suppression or suboptimal response to TB treatment should prompt assessment of drug adherence, subtherapeutic drug levels (consider therapeutic drug monitoring [TDM]), and acquired drug resistance.

Rifapentine is a long-acting rifamycin that can be given once weekly with INH for the treatment of active or latent TB infection. Similar to rifampin and rifabutin, rifapentine is also a CYP3A4 inducer. No systematic study has been performed to assess the magnitude of the enzyme induction effect of rifapentine on the metabolism of ARV drugs and other concomitant drugs. Significant enzyme induction can result in reduced ARV drug exposure, which may compromise virologic efficacy. Rifapentine is **not recommended** for treatment of latent or active TB infection in patients receiving ART, unless given in the context of a clinical trial (**AIII**).



## Anti-Tuberculosis/Antiretroviral Drug Toxicities

ARV agents and TB drugs, particularly INH, rifamycin, and pyrazinamide, can cause drug-induced hepatitis. These first-line TB drugs should be used for treatment of active TB disease, even with co-administration of other potentially hepatotoxic drugs or when baseline liver disease is present (**AIII**). Patients receiving potentially hepatotoxic drugs should be monitored frequently for clinical symptoms and signs of hepatitis and have laboratory monitoring for hepatotoxicity. Peripheral neuropathy can occur with administration of INH, didanosine (ddI), or stavudine (d4T) or may be a manifestation of HIV infection. All patients receiving INH also should receive supplemental pyridoxine to reduce peripheral neuropathy. Patients should be monitored closely for signs of drug-related toxicities and receive alternative ARVs to ddI or d4T.

## Immune Reconstitution Inflammatory Syndrome with Tuberculosis and Antiretroviral Agents

IRIS occurs in two forms: unmasking and paradoxical. The mechanism of the syndrome is the same for both forms: restoration of immune competence by administration of ART, resulting in an exuberant host response to TB bacilli and/or antigens. Unmasking IRIS refers to the initial clinical manifestations of active TB that occurs soon after ART is started. Paradoxical IRIS refers to the worsening of TB clinical symptoms after ART is started in patients who are receiving TB treatment. Severity of IRIS ranges from mild to severe to life threatening. IRIS has been reported in 8% to more than 40% of patients starting ART after TB is diagnosed, although the incidence depends on the definition of IRIS and the intensity of monitoring.<sup>17-18</sup>

Predictors of IRIS include CD4 count  $<50$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>; higher on-ART CD4 counts; high pre-ART and lower on-ART HIV viral loads; severity of TB disease, especially high pathogen burden; and less than 30-day interval between initiation of TB and HIV treatments.<sup>19-22</sup> Most IRIS in HIV/TB disease occurs within 3 months of the start of TB treatment. Delaying initiation of ART for 2 to 8 weeks may reduce the incidence and severity of IRIS. However, this possible advantage of delayed ART must be weighed against the potential benefit of earlier ART in improving immune function and preventing progression of HIV disease and mortality.

Patients with mild or moderately severe IRIS can be managed symptomatically or treated with nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agents. Patients with more severe IRIS can be treated successfully with corticosteroids. A recent randomized, placebo-controlled trial demonstrated benefit of corticosteroids in the management of IRIS symptoms (as measured by decreasing days of hospitalization and Karnofsky performance score) without adverse consequences.<sup>23</sup> In the presence of IRIS, neither TB therapy nor ART should be stopped because both therapies are necessary for the long-term health of the patient (**AIII**).

## *Immune Reconstitution with Antiretroviral Therapy: Conversion to Positive Tuberculin Skin Test and Interferon-Gamma Release Assay*

Immune reconstitution with ART may result in unmasking LTBI (i.e., conversion of a previously negative tuberculin skin test [TST] to a positive TST or a positive interferon-gamma [IFN- $\gamma$ ] release assay [IGRA] for *Mycobacterium tuberculosis*-specific proteins). A positive IGRA, similar to a positive TST, is indicative of LTBI in the absence of evidence of active TB disease.<sup>24</sup> Because treatment for LTBI is indicated in the absence of evidence of active TB disease, clinicians should be aware of this phenomenon. Patients with a negative TST or IGRA and advanced HIV disease (i.e., CD4 count  $<200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) should have a repeat TST or IGRA after initiation of ART and CD4 count increase to  $>200$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> (**BII**).<sup>25</sup>



## Caring for Patients with HIV and Tuberculosis

Close collaboration among clinicians, health care institutions, and public health programs involved in the diagnosis and treatment of HIV-infected patients with active TB disease is necessary in order to integrate care and improve medication adherence and TB treatment completion rates, reduce drug toxicities, and maximize HIV outcomes. HIV-infected patients with active TB disease should receive treatment support, including adherence counseling and DOT, corresponding to their needs (**AII**). ART simplification or use of coformulated fixed-dose combinations also may help to improve drug adherence.

## References

1. Jones BE, Young SM, Antoniskis D, Davidson PT, Kramer F, Barnes PF. Relationship of the manifestations of tuberculosis to CD4 cell counts in patients with human immunodeficiency virus infection. *Am Rev Respir Dis*. Nov 1993;148(5):1292-1297.
2. Perlman DC, el-Sadr WM, Nelson ET, et al. Variation of chest radiographic patterns in pulmonary tuberculosis by degree of human immunodeficiency virus-related immunosuppression. The Terry Bein Community Programs for Clinical Research on AIDS (CPCRA). The AIDS Clinical Trials Group (ACTG). *Clin Infect Dis*. Aug 1997;25(2):242-246.
3. Whalen C, Horsburgh CR, Hom D, Lahart C, Simberkoff M, Ellner J. Accelerated course of human immunodeficiency virus infection after tuberculosis. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. Jan 1995;151(1):129-135.
4. 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 Medicine Association of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. Available at [http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult\\_o.pdf](http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/lvguidelines/adult_o.pdf). Accessed January 6, 2014.
5. Abdool Karim SS, Naidoo K, Grobler A, et al. Timing of initiation of antiretroviral drugs during tuberculosis therapy. *N Engl J Med*. Feb 25 2010;362(8):697-706.
6. Abdool Karim SS, Naidoo K, Grobler A, et al. Integration of antiretroviral therapy with tuberculosis treatment. *N Engl J Med*. Oct 20 2011;365(16):1492-1501.
7. 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*. Oct 20 2011;365(16):1471-1481.
8. Havlir DV, Kendall MA, Ive P, et al. Timing of antiretroviral therapy for HIV-1 infection and tuberculosis. *N Engl J Med*. Oct 20 2011;365(16):1482-1491.
9. 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*. Jan 1 2010;181(1):80-86.
10. 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*. May 22 2010;375(9728):1798-1807.
11. 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 <http://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/PerinatalGL.pdf>.
12. 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*. Jun 2011;52(11):1374-1383.
13. Friedland G, Khoo S, Jack C, Laloo U. Administration of efavirenz (600 mg/day) with rifampicin results in highly variable levels but excellent clinical outcomes in patients treated for tuberculosis and HIV. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. Dec 2006;58(6):1299-1302.
14. Manosuthi W, Kiertiburanakul S, Sungkanuparph S, et al. Efavirenz 600 mg/day versus efavirenz 800 mg/day in HIV-infected patients with tuberculosis receiving rifampicin: 48 weeks results. *AIDS*. Jan 2 2006;20(1):131-132.
15. Moses M, Zachariah R, Tayler-Smith K, et al. Outcomes and safety of concomitant nevirapine and rifampicin treatment under programme conditions in Malawi. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis*. Feb 2010;14(2):197-202.
16. Shipton LK, Wester CW, Stock S, et al. Safety and efficacy of nevirapine- and efavirenz-based antiretroviral treatment in adults treated for TB-HIV co-infection in Botswana. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis*. Mar 2009;13(3):360-366.
17. Haddow LJ, Moosa MY, Easterbrook PJ. Validation of a published case definition for tuberculosis-associated immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome. *AIDS*. Jan 2 2010;24(1):103-108.

18. 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*. Aug 2008;8(8):516-523.
19. Manosuthi W, Kiertiburanakul S, Phoorisri T, Sungkanuparph S. Immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome of tuberculosis among HIV-infected patients receiving antituberculous and antiretroviral therapy. *J Infect*. Dec 2006;53(6):357-363.
20. Colebunders R, John L, Huyst V, Kambugu A, Scano F, Lynen L. Tuberculosis immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome in countries with limited resources. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis*. Sep 2006;10(9):946-953.
21. Michailidis C, Pozniak AL, Mandalia S, Basnayake S, Nelson MR, Gazzard BG. Clinical characteristics of IRIS syndrome in patients with HIV and tuberculosis. *Antivir Ther*. 2005;10(3):417-422.
22. Lawn SD, Myer L, Bekker LG, Wood R. Tuberculosis-associated immune reconstitution disease: incidence, risk factors and impact in an antiretroviral treatment service in South Africa. *AIDS*. Jan 30 2007;21(3):335-341.
23. Meintjes G., R. J. Wilkinson, et al. (2010). Randomized placebo-controlled trial of prednisone for paradoxical tuberculosis-associated immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome. *AIDS* 24(15): 2381-2390.
24. Menzies D, Pai M, Comstock G. Meta-analysis: new tests for the diagnosis of latent tuberculosis infection: areas of uncertainty and recommendations for research. *Ann Intern Med*. Mar 6 2007;146(5):340-354.
25. Girardi E, Palmieri F, Zaccarelli M, et al. High incidence of tuberculin skin test conversion among HIV-infected individuals who have a favourable immunological response to highly active antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. Sep 27 2002;16(14):1976-1979.

## Limitations to Treatment Safety and Efficacy

### Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

Strict adherence to antiretroviral therapy (ART) is key to sustained HIV suppression, reduced risk of drug resistance, improved overall health, quality of life, and survival,<sup>1,2</sup> as well as decreased risk of HIV transmission.<sup>3</sup> Conversely, poor adherence is the major cause of therapeutic failure. Achieving adherence to ART is a critical determinant of long-term outcome in HIV infected patients. For many chronic diseases, such as diabetes or hypertension, drug regimens remain effective even after treatment is resumed following a period of interruption. In the case of HIV infection, however, loss of virologic control as a consequence of non-adherence to ART may lead to emergence of drug resistance and loss of future treatment options. Many patients initiating ART or already on therapy are able to maintain consistent levels of adherence with resultant viral suppression, CD4+ T-lymphocyte (CD4) count recovery, and improved clinical outcomes. Others, however, have poor adherence from the outset of ART and/or experience periodic lapses in adherence over the lifelong course of treatment. Identifying those with adherence-related challenges that require attention and implementing appropriate strategies to enhance adherence are essential roles for all members of the treatment team.

Recent data underscore the importance of conceptualizing treatment adherence broadly to include early engagement in care and sustained retention in care. The concept of an HIV “treatment cascade” has been used to describe the process of HIV testing, linkage to care, initiation of effective ART, adherence to treatment, and retention in care. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that only 36% of the people living with HIV in the United States are prescribed ART and that among these individuals, only 76% have suppressed viral loads.<sup>4</sup> Thus, to achieve optimal clinical outcomes and to realize the potential public health benefit of treatment as prevention, attention to each step in the treatment cascade is critical.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, provider skill and involvement to retain patients in care and help them achieve high levels of medication adherence are crucial.

This section provides updated guidance on assessing and monitoring adherence and outlines strategies to help patients maintain high levels of adherence.

### *Factors Associated with Adherence Success and Failure*

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.<sup>6</sup> It is critical that each patient receives and understands information about HIV disease including the goals of therapy (achieving and maintaining viral suppression, decreasing HIV-associated morbidity and mortality, and preventing sexual transmission of HIV), the prescribed regimen (including dosing schedule and potential side effects), the importance of strict adherence to ART, and the potential for the development of drug resistance as a consequence of suboptimal adherence. However, information alone is not sufficient to assure high levels of adherence; patients must also be positively motivated to initiate and maintain therapy.

From a patient perspective, nonadherence 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, high levels of alcohol consumption and active substance use, homelessness, poverty, nondisclosure of HIV serostatus, denial, stigma, and inconsistent access to medications).<sup>7-9</sup> Furthermore, patient age may affect adherence. For example, some adolescent and young adult HIV patients, in particular, have substantial challenges in achieving levels of adherence necessary for successful therapeutic outcomes (see [HIV-Infected Adolescents](#) section).<sup>10,11</sup> In addition, failure to adopt practices that facilitate adherence, such as linking medication taking to daily activities or using a medication reminder system or a pill organizer, is also associated with treatment failure.<sup>12</sup>

Characteristics of one or more components of the prescribed regimen can affect adherence. Simple, once-daily regimens,<sup>13</sup> including those with low pill burden, without a food requirement, and few side effects or toxicities, are associated with higher levels of adherence.<sup>14,15</sup> Many currently available ARV regimens are much easier to take and better tolerated than older regimens. Studies have shown that patients taking once-daily regimens have higher rates of adherence than those taking twice-daily dosing regimens.<sup>15</sup> However, data to support or refute the superiority of fixed-dose combination product of 1-pill versus 3-pills (of individual drug products), once-daily regimens—as might be required for the use of some soon-to-be-available generic-based ARV regimens—are limited.

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., with case managers, pharmacists, social workers, psychiatric care providers) are often more successful in supporting patients' complex needs, including their medication adherence-related needs. Further, specific settings, such as prisons and other institutional settings, may thwart or support medication adherence. Drug abuse treatment programs are often best suited to address substance use that may confound adherence and may offer services, such as directly observed therapy, that promote adherence.

Finally, a patient-provider relationship that enhances patient trust through non-judgmental and supportive care and use of motivational strategies can positively influence medication adherence.

### ***Routine Monitoring of Adherence and Retention in Care***

Although there is no gold standard for assessing adherence,<sup>1</sup> properly implemented validated tools and assessment strategies can prove valuable in most clinical settings. Viral load suppression is one of the most reliable indicators of adherence and can be used as positive reinforcement to encourage continuous adherence. When patients initiating ART fail to achieve viral suppression by 24 weeks of treatment, the possibility of suboptimal adherence and other factors must be assessed. Similarly, treatment failure as measured by detectable viral load during chronic care is most likely the result of non-adherence. Patient self-report, the most frequently used method for evaluating medication adherence, remains a useful tool for assessing adherence over time. However, self-reports must be properly and carefully assessed as patients may overestimate adherence. While carefully assessed patient self report of high-level adherence to ART has been associated with favorable viral load responses,<sup>16,17</sup> 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 or “white coat adherence” responses. Some patients may selectively adhere to components of a regimen believed to have the fewest side effects or the lowest dosing frequency or pill burden. To allow patients to more accurately disclose lapses in adherence, some experts suggest that providers inquire about the number of missed doses during a defined time period rather than directly asking “Are you taking your medicines?” Others advocate simply asking patients to rate their adherence during the last 4 weeks on a 5- or 6-point Likert scale.<sup>18,19</sup> Regardless of how obtained, patient self-report, in contrast to other measures of adherence, allows for immediate patient-provider discussion to identify reasons for missed doses and to explore corrective strategies.

Other measures of adherence include pharmacy records and pill counts. Pharmacy records can be valuable when medications are obtained exclusively from a single source so that refills can be traced. Pill counts are commonly used but can be altered by patients. Other methods of assessing adherence include the use of therapeutic drug monitoring and electronic measurement devices (e.g., MEMS bottle caps and dispensing systems). However, these methods are costly and are usually done primarily in research settings.

### ***Interventions to Improve Adherence and Retention in Care***

A continuum of ART adherence support services is necessary to meet individual patient needs. All health care

team members, including physicians, physician assistants, nurse practitioners, nurse midwives, nurses, pharmacists, medication managers, and social workers play integral roles in successful adherence programs.<sup>17,20-22</sup>

Effective adherence interventions vary in modality and duration, and by clinical setting, provider, and patient. There are many options that can be customized to suit a range of needs and settings (see [Table 13](#)). An increasing number of interventions have proven effective in improving adherence to ART. For descriptions of the interventions, see: <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/research/prs/ma-good-evidence-interventions.htm>.<sup>23</sup>

Clinicians should provide all patients with a basic level of adherence-related information and support. Before writing the first prescription(s) for patients initiating or reinitiating ART, clinicians should assess the patient's adherence readiness. Clinicians should evaluate patients' knowledge about HIV disease, treatment, and prevention and provide basic information about ART, viral load and CD4 count and the expected outcome of ART based on these parameters, the importance of strict adherence to ART, and the consequences of non-adherence. In addition, clinicians should assess patients' motivation to successfully adhere to ART and identify and support facilitating factors and address potential barriers to adherence. Finally, clinicians should be assured that patients have the necessary medication taking skills to follow the regimen as prescribed.

Given the wide array of treatment options, individualizing treatment with patient involvement in decision making is the cornerstone of treatment planning and therapeutic success. The first principle of successful treatment is to design an understandable plan to which the patient can commit.<sup>24,25</sup> It is important to consider the patient's daily schedule; patient 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/her routine daily activities. If necessary, soliciting help from family members may also improve adherence. Patients who are naive to ART should understand that their first regimen usually offers the best chance for taking a simple regimen that affords long-term treatment success and prevention of drug resistance. Establishing a trusting patient-provider relationship over time and maintaining good communication will help to improve adherence and long-term outcomes. Medication taking can also be enhanced by the use of pill organizers and medication reminder aids (e.g., alarm clock, pager, calendar).

Positive reinforcement can greatly help patients maintain high levels of adherence. This technique to foster adherence includes informing patients of their low or suppressed HIV viral load levels and increases in CD4 cell counts. Motivational interviewing has also been used with some successes. Recognizing high levels of adherence with incentives and rewards can facilitate treatment success in some patients. Adherence-contingent reward incentives such as meal tickets, grocery bags, lotto tickets, and cash have been used in the treatment of HIV and other chronic diseases. The effectiveness of using cash incentives to promote HIV testing, entry to care, and adherence to ART is currently being studied in the multi-site HPTN 065 trial. Other effective interventions include nurse home visits, a five-session group intervention, pager messaging, and couples or family-based interventions. To maintain high levels of adherence in some patients, it is critically important to provide substance abuse therapy and to strengthen social support. Directly observed therapy (DOT) has been effective in providing ART to active drug users<sup>26</sup> but not to patients in a general clinic population.<sup>27</sup>

To determine whether additional adherence or retention interventions are warranted, assessments should be done at each clinical encounter and should be the responsibility of the entire health care team. Routine monitoring of HIV viral load, pharmacy records, and indicators that measure retention in care are useful to determine if more intense efforts are needed to improve adherence. Patients with a history of non-adherence to ART are at risk for poor adherence when re-starting therapy with the same or new drugs. Special attention should be given to identify and address any reason for previous poor adherence. Preferential use of ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor-(PI/r)-based ART, which has a higher barrier to the development of resistance than



other treatment options, should be considered if poor adherence is predicted.

The critical elements of adherence go hand in hand with linkage-to-care and retention in care. A recently released guideline provides a number of strategies to improve entry and retention in care and adherence to therapy for HIV infected patients.<sup>5</sup> As with adherence monitoring, research advances offer many options for systematic monitoring of retention in care that may be used in accordance with local resources and standards. The options include surveillance of visit adherence, gaps in care, and the number of visits during a specified period of time.<sup>28</sup>

## Conclusion

Adherence to ART is central to therapeutic success. Given the many available assessment strategies and interventions, the challenge for the treatment team is to select the techniques that best fit each patient and patient population, and, according to available resources, the treatment setting. In addition to maintaining high levels of medication adherence, attention to effective linkage to care, engagement in care, and retention in care is critical for successful treatment outcomes. To foster treatment success, there are interventions to support each step in the cascade of care, as well as guidance on systematic monitoring of each step in the cascade.<sup>5</sup>

**Table 13. Strategies to Improve Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy and Retention in Care**  
(page 1 of 3)

Strategies	Examples
Use a multidisciplinary team approach. Provide an accessible, trustworthy health care team.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Nonjudgmental providers, nurses, social workers, pharmacists, and medication managers</li> </ul>
Strengthen early linkage to care and retention in care.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage healthcare team participation in linkage to and retention in care.</li> </ul>
Assess patient readiness to start ART.	
Evaluate patient's knowledge about HIV disease, prevention and treatment and, on the basis of the assessment, provide HIV-related information.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Considering the patient's current knowledge base, 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, and therapeutic and prevention consequences of non-adherence.</li> </ul>
Identify facilitators, potential barriers to adherence, and necessary medication management skills before starting ART medication.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assess patient's cognitive competence and impairment.</li> <li>Assess behavioral and psychosocial challenges including depression, mental illnesses, levels of social support, high levels of alcohol consumption and active substance use, non-disclosure of HIV serostatus and stigma.</li> <li>Identify and address language and literacy barriers.</li> <li>Assess beliefs, perceptions, and expectations about taking ART (e.g., impact on health, side effects, disclosure issues, consequences of non-adherence).</li> <li>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).</li> <li>Assess structural issues including unstable housing, lack of income, unpredictable daily schedule, lack of prescription drug coverage, lack of continuous access to medications.</li> </ul>
Provide needed resources.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide or refer for mental health and/or substance abuse treatment.</li> <li>Provide resources to obtain prescription drug coverage, stable housing, social support, and income and food security.</li> </ul>

**Table 13. Strategies to Improve Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy and Retention in Care**  
(page 2 of 3)

Strategies	Examples
Involve the patient in ARV regimen selection.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Review regimen potency, potential side effects, dosing frequency, pill burden, storage requirements, food requirements, and consequences of nonadherence.</li> <li>• Assess daily activities and tailor regimen to predictable and routine daily events.</li> <li>• Consider preferential use of PI/r-based ART if poor adherence is predicted.</li> <li>• Consider use of fixed-dose combination formulation.</li> <li>• Assess if cost/co-payment for drugs can affect access to medications and adherence.</li> </ul>
Assess adherence at every clinic visit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Monitor viral load as a strong biologic measure of adherence.</li> <li>• Use a simple behavioral rating scale.</li> <li>• Employ a structured format that normalizes or assumes less-than-perfect adherence and minimizes socially desirable or “white coat adherence” responses.</li> <li>• Ensure that other members of the health care team also assess adherence.</li> </ul>
Use positive reinforcement to foster adherence success.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inform patients of low or non-detectable levels of HIV viral load and increases in CD4 cell counts.</li> <li>• When needed, consider providing incentives and rewards for achieving high levels of adherence and treatment success.</li> </ul>
Identify the type of and reasons for nonadherence.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Failure to fill the prescription(s)</li> <li>• Failure to understand dosing instructions</li> <li>• Complexity of regimen (e.g., pill burden, size, dosing schedule, food requirements)</li> <li>• Pill aversion</li> <li>• Pill fatigue</li> <li>• Adverse effects</li> <li>• Inadequate understanding of drug resistance and its relationship to adherence</li> <li>• Cost-related issues</li> <li>• Depression, drug and alcohol use, homelessness, poverty</li> <li>• Stigma</li> <li>• Non-disclosure</li> <li>• Other potential barriers</li> </ul>
Select from among available effective treatment adherence interventions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• See <a href="http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/research/prs/ma-good-evidence-interventions.htm">http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/research/prs/ma-good-evidence-interventions.htm</a>.</li> <li>• Use adherence-related tools to complement education and counseling interventions (e.g., pill boxes, dose planners, reminder devices).</li> <li>• Use community resources to support adherence (e.g., visiting nurses, community workers, family, peer advocates).</li> <li>• Use patient prescription assistance programs.</li> <li>• Use motivational interviews.</li> </ul>

**Table 13. Strategies to Improve Adherence to Antiretroviral Therapy and Retention in Care**  
(page 3 of 3)

Strategies	Examples
Systematically monitor retention in care.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Record and follow up on missed visits.</li> </ul>
On the basis of any problems identified through systematic monitoring, consider options to enhance retention in care given resources available.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide outreach for those patients who drop out of care.</li> <li>Use peer or paraprofessional treatment navigators.</li> <li>Employ incentives to encourage clinic attendance or recognize positive clinical outcomes resulting from good adherence.</li> <li>Arrange for directly observed therapy (if feasible).</li> </ul>

**Key to Acronyms:** ART = antiretroviral therapy; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; PI = protease inhibitor; PI/r = ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor

## References

- Chesney MA. The elusive gold standard. Future perspectives for HIV adherence assessment and intervention. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2006;43 Suppl 1:S149-155. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17133199>.
- World Health Organization (WHO). Adherence to long term therapies—evidence for action. 2003. Available at [http://www.who.int/chp/knowledge/publications/adherence\\_full\\_report.pdf](http://www.who.int/chp/knowledge/publications/adherence_full_report.pdf).
- 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 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21767103>.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. *Linkage to and retention in HIV Medical Care*. 2012. Available at <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/prevention/programs/pwp/linkage.html>. Accessed on January 20, 2014.
- 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*. 2012;156(11):817-833. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22393036>.
- 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*. 2004;19(11):1096-1103. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15566438>.
- 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*. 2005;10(3):345-358. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15857867>.
- Stirratt MJ, Remien RH, Smith A, et al. The role of HIV serostatus disclosure in antiretroviral medication adherence. *AIDS Behav*. 2006;10(5):483-493. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16721505>.
- Carr RL, Gramling LF. Stigma: a health barrier for women with HIV/AIDS. *J Assoc Nurses AIDS Care*. 2004;15(5):30-39. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15358923>.
- 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>.
- 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>.
- Fisher JD, Fisher WA, Amico KR, Harman JJ. An information-motivation-behavioral skills model of adherence to antiretroviral therapy. *Health Psychol*. 2006;25(4):462-473. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16846321>.
- Parienti JJ, Bangsberg DR, Verdon R, Gardner EM. Better adherence with once-daily antiretroviral regimens: a meta-analysis. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2009;48(4):484-488. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19140758>.
- Raboud J, Li M, Walmsley S, et al. Once daily dosing improves adherence to antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS Behav*. 2011;15(7):1397-1409. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20878227>.
- Nachega JB, Parienti JJ, Uthman OA, et al. Lower Pill Burden and Once-daily Dosing Antiretroviral Treatment Regimens for HIV Infection: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014. Available at

- <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24457345>.
16. 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*. 2006;10(3):227-245. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=16783535](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=16783535).
  17. 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*. 2006;43 Suppl 1:S41-47. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17091022>.
  18. 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*. 2013;17(1):307-318. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23108721>.
  19. Lu M, Safren SA, Skolnik PR, et al. Optimal recall period and response task for self-reported HIV medication adherence. *AIDS Behav*. 2008;12(1):86-94. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17577653](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17577653).
  20. 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*. 2000;12(4):399-404. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11091772>.
  21. 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*. 2005;16(5):3-15. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16433105>.
  22. 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 Defic Syndr*. 2006;43 Suppl 1:S69-78. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17133206>.
  23. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Compendium of Evidence-Based HIV Behavioral Interventions: Medication Adherence Chapter. 2011. Available at <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/research/prs/ma-chapter.htm>.
  24. Williams A, Friedland G. Adherence, compliance, and HAART. *AIDS Clin Care*. 1997;9(7):51-54, 58. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list\\_uids=11364415&dopt=Abstract](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list_uids=11364415&dopt=Abstract).
  25. Vermeire E, Hearnshaw H, Van Royen P, Denekens J. Patient adherence to treatment: three decades of research. A comprehensive review. *J Clin Pharm Ther*. 2001;26(5):331-342. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11679023>.
  26. 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*. 2007;45(6):770-778. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17712763](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17712763).
  27. 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*. 2011;53(9):936-943. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21890753>.
  28. Mugavero MJ, Davila JA, Nevin CR, Giordano TP. From access to engagement: measuring retention in outpatient HIV clinical care. *AIDS Patient Care STDS*. 2010;24(10):607-613. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20858055>.

## Adverse Effects of Antiretroviral Agents (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

Adverse effects have been reported with the use of all antiretroviral (ARV) drugs and are among the most common reasons cited for switching or discontinuing therapy and for medication non-adherence.<sup>1</sup> However, with the use of newer ARV regimens, rates of treatment-limiting adverse events in antiretroviral therapy (ART)-naïve patients enrolled in randomized trials appear to be declining and are generally now occurring in less than 10% of study participants. However, because most clinical trials have a relatively short follow-up duration, the longer term complications of ART can be underestimated. In the Swiss Cohort study during 6 years of follow-up, the presence of laboratory adverse events was associated with higher rates of mortality, which highlights the importance of adverse events in overall patient management.<sup>2</sup>

Several factors may predispose individuals to adverse effects of ARV medications. For example, compared with men, women (especially ART-naïve women with CD4 counts >250 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>) seem to have a higher propensity to develop Stevens-Johnson syndrome, rashes, and hepatotoxicity from nevirapine (NVP)<sup>3-5</sup> and have higher rates of lactic acidosis due to nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors.<sup>6-8</sup> Other factors may also contribute to the development of adverse events:

- Concomitant use of medications with overlapping and additive toxicities;
- Comorbid conditions that may increase the risk of or exacerbate adverse effects (e.g., alcoholism<sup>9</sup> or coinfection with viral hepatitis<sup>10-12</sup> may increase the risk of hepatotoxicity);
- Drug-drug interactions that may lead to an increase in drug toxicities (e.g., interactions that result from concomitant use of statins with protease inhibitors); or
- Genetic factors that predispose patients to abacavir (ABC) hypersensitivity reaction.<sup>10,11</sup>

The therapeutic goals of ART include achieving and maintaining viral suppression and improving immune function, but an overarching goal of treatment should be to select a regimen that is not only effective but also safe. To accomplish this goal, the clinician must consider the toxicity potential of an ARV regimen, as well as the individual patient's underlying conditions, concomitant medications, and prior history of drug intolerances. In addition, it should be appreciated that, in general, the overall benefits of ART outweigh its risks and that some conditions (e.g., anemia, cardiovascular disease, renal impairment), may be more likely in the absence of ART.<sup>12,13</sup>

Information on the adverse events of ARVs is outlined in several tables in the guidelines. [Table 14](#) provides clinicians with a list of the most common and/or severe known ARV-associated adverse events by drug class. The most common adverse effects of individual ARV agents are summarized in [Appendix B, Tables 1–6](#).



**Table 14. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects (page 1 of 7)**

See [Appendix B](#) for additional information listed by drug. Empty cells in the table may mean that there are no reported cases for the particular side effect or that data for the specific ARV drug class are not available.

Adverse Effect	NRTIs	NNRTIs	PIs	INSTI	EI
<b>Bleeding Events</b>	N/A	N/A	PIs: Increased spontaneous bleeding, hematuria in patients with hemophilia reported with some PIs  TPV: Reports of intracranial hemorrhage. Risks include CNS lesions, trauma, surgery, hypertension, alcohol abuse, coagulopathy, and concomitant use of anti-coagulant or anti-platelet agents, including vitamin E	N/A	N/A
<b>Bone Density Effects</b>	TDF: Associated with greater loss of BMD than ZDV, d4T, and ABC.  Osteomalacia reported in association with proximal renal tubulopathy.	Decreases in BMD observed in studies of regimens containing different NRTIs combined with NNRTIs, PIs, or <b>INSTIs</b> .			N/A
<b>Bone Marrow Suppression</b>	ZDV: Anemia, neutropenia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>CVD</b>	ABC and ddI: Associated with an increased risk of MI in some, but not all, cohort studies. Absolute risk is greatest in patients with traditional CVD risk factors.	N/A	PIs: Associated with MI and stroke in some cohort studies. Data on newer PIs (ATV, DRV, and TPV) are limited.  SQV/r, ATV/r, and LPV/r: PR interval prolongation. Risks include structural heart disease, conduction system abnormalities, cardiomyopathy, ischemic heart disease, and co-administration with drugs that prolong PR interval.  SQV/r: QT interval prolongation in patients in a healthy volunteer study. Risks include underlying heart conditions, pre-existing prolonged QT or arrhythmia, or use with other QT-prolonging drugs. ECG is recommended before SQV initiation and should be considered during therapy.	N/A	N/A

**Table 14. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects (page 2 of 7)**

Adverse Effect	NRTIs	NNRTIs	PIs	INSTI	EI
<b>Cholelithiasis</b>	N/A	N/A	ATV: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• History of kidney stones increases risk.</li> <li>• Patients may present with cholelithiasis and kidney stones concurrently.</li> <li>• Typically presents as abdominal pain.</li> <li>• Reported complications include cholecystitis, pancreatitis, choledocholithiasis, and cholangitis.</li> <li>• Median time to onset is 42 months (range 1 to 90 months).</li> </ul>	N/A	N/A
<b>DM/Insulin Resistance</b>	ZDV, d4T, and ddI	N/A	Reported for some PIs (IDV, LPV/r), but not all PIs	N/A	N/A
<b>Dyslipidemia</b>	d4T > ZDV > ABC: ↑LDL and TG	EFV: ↑TG, ↑LDL, ↑HDL	↑LDL, ↑TG, ↑HDL: All RTV-boosted PIs ↑TG: LPV/r = FPV/r and LPV/r > DRV/r and ATV/r	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC: ↑TG, ↑LDL, ↑HDL	N/A
<b>GI Effects</b>	Nausea and vomiting: ddI and ZDV > other NRTIs Pancreatitis: ddI	N/A	GI intolerance (e.g., diarrhea, nausea, vomiting) Diarrhea: Common with NFV; also seen with LPV/r > DRV/r and ATV/r	Nausea and diarrhea: EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	N/A

**Table 14. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects (page 3 of 7)**

Adverse Effect	NRTIs	NNRTIs	PIs	INSTI	EI
<b>Hepatic Effects</b>	<p>Reported with most NRTIs</p> <p>ddl: Prolonged exposure has been linked to non-cirrhotic portal hypertension, including some cases with esophageal varices.</p> <p>Steatosis: Most commonly seen with ZDV, d4T, or ddl</p> <p>Flares: HIV/HBV-co-infected patients may develop severe hepatic flares when TDF, 3TC, and FTC are withdrawn or when HBV resistance develops.</p>	<p><u>NVP &gt; Other NNRTIs</u></p> <p><u>NVP:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Severe hepatotoxicity with NVP is often associated with skin rash or symptoms of hypersensitivity.</li> <li>• In ARV-naïve patients, risk is greater for women with pre-NVP CD4 count &gt;250 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> and men with pre-NVP CD4 count &gt;400 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. Overall risk is higher for women than men.</li> <li>• Risk is greatest in the first few months of treatment.</li> <li>• 2-week dose escalation of NVP reduces risk of rash and possibly hepatotoxicity if related to hypersensitivity.</li> <li>• NVP is contraindicated in patients with moderate to severe hepatic insufficiency (Child-Pugh classification B or C).</li> <li>• Liver failure observed in HIV-uninfected individuals receiving NVP for post-exposure prophylaxis. NVP should <b>never</b> be used for this indication.</li> </ul>	<p>All PIs: Drug-induced hepatitis and hepatic decompensation (and rare cases of fatalities) have been reported with all PIs. The frequency of hepatic events is higher with TPV/r than with other PIs.</p> <p>IDV, ATV: Jaundice due to indirect hyperbilirubinemia</p> <p>TPV/r: Contraindicated in patients with moderate to severe hepatic insufficiency (Child Pugh classification B or C)</p>	N/A	MVC: Hepatotoxicity with or without rash or HSRs reported

**Table 14. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects (page 4 of 7)**

Adverse Effect	NRTIs	NNRTIs	PIs	INSTI	EI
<b>HSR</b> Excluding rash alone or SJS	<u>ABC:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HLA-B*5701 screening should be performed before initiation of ABC. ABC should not be started if the HLA-B*5701 test result is positive.</li> <li>• Symptoms of HSR (in descending frequency): fever, skin rash, malaise, nausea, headache, myalgia, chills, diarrhea, vomiting, abdominal pain, dyspnea, arthralgia, and respiratory symptoms</li> <li>• Symptoms worsen with continuation of ABC.</li> <li>• Median onset of reactions is 9 days; approximately 90% of reactions occur within the first 6 weeks of treatment.</li> <li>• Patients, regardless of HLA-B*5701 status, should not be re-challenged with ABC if HSR is suspected.</li> </ul>	<u>NVP:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hypersensitivity syndrome of hepatic toxicity and rash that may be accompanied by fever, general malaise, fatigue, myalgias, arthralgias, blisters, oral lesions, conjunctivitis, facial edema, eosinophilia, granulocytopenia, lymphadenopathy, or renal dysfunction.</li> <li>• In ARV-naïve patients, risk is greater for women with pre-NVP CD4 count &gt;250 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> and men with pre-NVP CD4 count &gt;400 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. Overall, risk is higher for women than men.</li> <li>• 2-week dose escalation of NVP reduces risk.</li> </ul>	N/A	RAL: <b>HSR reported when RAL given in combination with other drugs known to cause HSR. All ARVs should be stopped if HSR occurs.</b>  DTG: Reported in <1% of patients in clinical development program	MVC: Reported as part of a syndrome related to hepatotoxicity

**Table 14. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects (page 5 of 7)**

Adverse Effect	NRTIs	NNRTIs	PIs	INSTI	EI
<b>Lactic Acidosis</b> <u>NRTIs, Especially d4T, ZDV, and ddI:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Insidious onset with GI prodrome, weight loss, and fatigue. May be rapidly progressive with tachycardia, tachypnea, jaundice, muscular weakness, mental status changes, respiratory distress, pancreatitis, and organ failure.</li> <li>• Mortality up to 50% in some case series, especially in patients with serum lactate &gt;10 mmol/L</li> <li>• Females and obese patients at increased risk</li> </ul> <u>Laboratory Findings:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ lactate (often &gt;5 mmol/L), anion gap, AST, ALT, PT, bilirubin</li> <li>• ↑ amylase and lipase in patients with pancreatitis</li> <li>• ↓ arterial pH, serum bicarbonate, serum albumin</li> </ul>		N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
<b>Lipodystrophy</b>	Lipoatrophy: Thymidine analogs (d4T > ZDV). May be more likely when NRTIs combined with EFV than with a RTV-boosted PI.	Lipohypertrophy: Trunk fat increase observed with EFV-, PI-, and RAL-containing regimens; however, causal relationship has not been established.			N/A
<b>Myopathy/ Elevated CPK</b>	ZDV: Myopathy	N/A	N/A	RAL: ↑ CPK  Muscle weakness and rhabdomyolysis	N/A



**Table 14. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects (page 6 of 7)**

Adverse Effect	NRTIs	NNRTIs	PIs	INSTI	EI
<b>Nervous System/ Psychiatric Effects</b>	Peripheral neuropathy (pain and/or paresthesia, lower extremities > upper extremities): d4T > ddI and ddC (can be irreversible)  d4T: Associated with rapidly progressive, ascending neuromuscular weakness resembling Guillain-Barré syndrome (rare)	EFV: Somnolence, insomnia, abnormal dreams, dizziness, impaired concentration, depression, psychosis, and suicidal ideation. Symptoms usually subside or diminish after 2–4 weeks. Bedtime dosing may reduce symptoms. Risks include history of psychiatric illness, concomitant use of agents with neuropsychiatric effects, and increased plasma EFV concentrations because of genetic factors or increased absorption with food. An association between EFV and suicidal ideation, suicide, and attempted suicide (especially among younger patients and those with history of mental illness or substance abuse) was found in one retrospective analysis of several comparative trials.	N/A	All INSTIs: insomnia  RAL: Depression and suicidal ideation (uncommon)	N/A
<b>Rash</b>	FTC: Hyperpigmentation	All NNRTIs	ATV, DRV, FPV, LPV/r, TPV	RAL, EVG/cobi/ TDF/FTC: Uncommon	MVC
<b>Renal Effects/ Urolithiasis</b>	TDF: ↑ SCr, proteinuria, hypophosphatemia, urinary phosphate wasting, glycosuria, hypokalemia, non-anion gap metabolic acidosis  Concurrent use with PI appears to increase risk.	N/A	ATV and LPV/r: Associated with increased risk of chronic kidney disease in a large cohort study.  IDV: ↑ SCr, pyuria; hydronephrosis or renal atrophy  IDV, ATV: Stone, crystal formation; adequate hydration may reduce risk.	cobi (a component of EVG/cobi/TDF/ FTC) and DTG: Can increase SCr by reducing tubular secretion of Cr without reducing renal glomerular function; however, assess for renal dysfunction, especially if SCr increase by >0.4 mg/dL.	N/A

**Table 14. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Common and/or Severe Adverse Effects (page 7 of 7)**

Adverse Effect	NRTIs	NNRTIs	PIs	INSTI	EI
<b>SJS/TEN</b>	ddl, ZDV: Reported cases	NVP > DLV, EFV, ETR, RPV	FPV, DRV, IDV, LPV/r, ATV: Reported cases	RAL	N/A

**Key to Abbreviations:** 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ALT = alanine aminotransferase; ARV = antiretroviral; AST = aspartate aminotransferase; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/r = ritonavir-boosted atazanavir; BMD = bone mineral density; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CNS = central nervous system; coBI = cobicistat; CPK = creatine phosphokinase; CVD = cardiovascular disease; d4T = stavudine; ddC = zalcitabine; ddl = didanosine; DLV = delavirdine; DM = diabetes mellitus; DRV = darunavir; DRV/r = ritonavir-boosted darunavir; **DTG = dolutegravir**; ECG = electrocardiogram; EFV = efavirenz; EI = entry inhibitor; ETR = etravirine; EVG = elvitegravir; FPV = fosamprenavir; FPV/r = ritonavir-boosted fosamprenavir; FTC = emtricitabine; GI = gastrointestinal; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HDL = high-density lipoprotein; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; IDV = indinavir; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LDL = low-density lipoprotein; LPV/r = ritonavir-boosted lopinavir; MI = myocardial infarction; MVC = maraviroc; NFV = nelfinavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PT = prothrombin time; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SCr. = serum creatinine; SJS = Stevens-Johnson syndrome; SQV = saquinavir; SQV/r = ritonavir-boosted saquinavir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TEN = toxic epidermal necrosis; TG = triglyceride; TPV = tipranavir; TPV/r = ritonavir-boosted tipranavir; ZDV = zidovudine

## Switching Antiretroviral Therapy Because of Adverse Effects

Most patients do not experience treatment-limiting ART-associated toxicities; however, some patients do, and in these cases, ART must be modified. ART-associated adverse events can range from acute and potentially life threatening to chronic and insidious. Acute life-threatening events (e.g., acute hypersensitivity reaction due to ABC, lactic acidosis due to stavudine [d4T] and didanosine [ddI], liver and/or severe cutaneous toxicities due to NVP) usually require the immediate discontinuation of all ARV drugs and re-initiation of an alternative regimen without overlapping toxicity. Non-life threatening toxicities (e.g., urolithiasis with atazanavir [ATV], renal tubulopathy with tenofovir [TDF]) can usually be handled by substituting another ARV agent for the presumed causative agent without interruption of ART. Other, more 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 additional pharmacological or non-pharmacological interventions. Management strategies must be individualized for each patient.

Switching from an effective ARV regimen to a new regimen must be done carefully and only when the potential benefits of the change outweigh the potential complications 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 resistance mutations selected for, regardless of whether previously or currently identified by genotypic resistance testing, are archived in HIV reservoirs and even if absent from subsequent resistance test results, may reappear under selective pressure. It is critical that providers review the following before implementing any treatment switch: the patient's medical and complete ARV history including prior virologic responses to ART; resistance test results; viral tropism (when maraviroc [MVC] is being considered); HLA B\*5701 status (when ABC is being considered); co-morbidities; adherence history; prior intolerances to any medications; and concomitant medications and supplements and their potential for drug interactions with ARVs. Patient acceptance of new food or dosing requirements must also be assessed. In some cases, medication costs may also be a factor to consider before switching treatment. Signs and symptoms of ART-associated adverse events may mimic those of comorbidities, other concomitant medications, or HIV infection itself. Therefore, concurrent with ascribing a particular clinical event to ART, alternative causes for the event should be investigated. In the case of a severe adverse event, it may be necessary to discontinue or switching ARVs pending the outcome of such an investigation. For the first few months after a switch in ART is made, the patient should be closely monitored for any new adverse events, and viral load should be monitored to assure continued viral suppression.

[Table 15](#) lists several major ART-associated adverse events and potential options to appropriately switch 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, findings of comparative ARV trials and observational cohort studies, or expert opinion.

**Table 15. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Adverse Events That Can Be Managed with Substitution of Alternative Antiretroviral Agent (page 1 of 3)**

Switching a successful ARV regimen should be done carefully and only when the potential benefits of the change outweigh the potential complications of altering treatment. The fundamental principle of regimen switching is to maintain viral suppression. Before any treatment switch is implemented, it is critical to review the patient's medical and full ARV history including the patient's prior virologic responses, resistance test results, viral tropism (when MVC is being considered), HLA B\*5701 status (when ABC is being considered), co-morbidities, adherence history, concomitant medications and supplements and their potential for drug interactions, and prior intolerances to any ARV drugs.

Adverse Event	ARV Agent(s)/Drug Class		Comments
	Switch from	Switch to	
<b>Bone Density Effects</b>	TDF <sup>a</sup>	ABC <sup>b</sup>	Declines in BMD have been observed with the start of most ART. Modification of ART because of reduced BMD should be predicated on the clinical significance of the decline. Switching from TDF to alternative ARV agents has been shown to increase bone density, but the clinical significance of this increase remains uncertain.
<b>Bone Marrow Suppression</b> Anemia, leukopenia	ZDV	TDF or ABC <sup>b</sup>	N/A
<b>CNS/Neuropsychiatric Side Effects</b> Dizziness, suicidal ideation, sleep disturbance, abnormal dreams, depression	EFV	Alternative NNRTI (RPV, ETR, NVP), a PI, or an INSTI	In most patients, EFV-related CNS effects subside within 4 weeks after initiation of the drug. Persistent or intolerable effects should prompt substitution of EFV with an alternate ARV agent.
<b>Dyslipidemia</b> Hypertriglyceridemia (with or without high low-density LDL level)	RTV- or coBI-boosted regimens or EFV	RAL, DTG, RPV, NVP, or unboosted ATV <sup>c</sup>	Elevated TG and LDL levels are more common with LPV/r and FPV/r than with other RTV-boosted PIs. Improved TG and LDL levels have been seen following a switch from LPV/r to RTV-boosted and -unboosted ATV. <sup>c</sup>
<b>GI Effects</b> Nausea, diarrhea	LPV/r	ATV/r, DRV/r, RAL, DTG, EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	GI intolerance is relatively 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 in nature, and do not warrant switching therapy. If GI adverse effects are persistent or intolerable, consider drug substitution.
	Other RTV-boosted regimens or EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	RAL, DTG, unboosted ATV, <sup>c</sup> NNRTIs	In a trial of treatment-naïve patients, rates of diarrhea and nausea were similar for boosted EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC and ATV/r plus TDF/FTC.

**Table 15. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Adverse Events That Can Be Managed with Substitution of Alternative Antiretroviral Agent** (page 2 of 3)

Adverse Event	ARV Agent(s)/Drug Class		Comments
	Switch from	Switch to	
<b>HSR</b>	ABC	TDF	Never re-challenge with ABC following a suspected HSR, regardless of the patient's HLA B*5701 status.
	NVP, EFV, ETR, RPV	Non-NNRTI ART	Risk of HSR with NVP is higher for women and those with high CD4 cell counts.
	DTG, RAL MVC	Non-INSTI ART Suitable alternative ART	Reactions to NVP, ETR, RAL, DTG and MVC may be accompanied by elevated liver transaminases.
<b>Insulin Resistance</b>	LPV/r, FPV/r	NNRTI (NVP or RPV), INSTI, unboosted ATV <sup>c</sup>	Results of switch studies have been inconsistent. Studies in HIV-negative patients given short courses of a PI suggest a direct causal effect of LPV/r (and IDV) on insulin resistance. However, traditional risk factors, such as obesity and family history of diabetes, may be stronger risk factors for insulin resistance than use of any PIs.
<b>Jaundice and Icterus</b>	ATV, ATV/r	DRV/r, INSTI, or NNRTI	Increases in unconjugated bilirubin are commonly seen with ATV and generally do not require modification of therapy unless jaundice/icterus is distressing to the patient.
<b>Lipoatrophy</b> Subcutaneous fat wasting of limbs, face, buttocks	d4T, ZDV	TDF or ABC <sup>b</sup>	Peripheral lipoatrophy is a legacy of prior thymidine analog (d4T and ZDV) use. Switching from these ARVs prevents worsening lipoatrophy, but fat recovery is typically slow, incomplete, and may take years.
<b>Lipohypertrophy</b> Accumulation of visceral abdominal, truncal, dorsocervical, and breast fat	Lipohypertrophy has been observed during ART, particularly during use of older PI-based regimens (e.g., IDV), but whether ART directly causes increases in fat depots remains unclear. There is no clinical evidence that switching to any currently recommended first line regimen will reverse weight or visceral fat gain.		
<b>Rash</b>	NNRTIs (especially NVP and EFV)	PI- or INSTI- based regimen	Rash can be seen with any NNRTI but occurs more frequently and is more severe with use of NVP, followed by EFV. Mild rashes developing after initiation of NNRTIs other than NVP rarely require treatment switch. When serious rash develops with use of any NNRTI, a switch to an agent from another ARV drug class is recommended.
	DRV/r	ATV/r or another class, such as INSTI	Mild rashes following DRV/r initiation do not necessarily require treatment switch. Close follow-up until the rash subsides is recommended. For more severe reactions, therapy can be changed to an alternative RTV-boosted PI or an agent from another drug class.



**Table 15. Antiretroviral Therapy-Associated Adverse Events That Can Be Managed with Substitution of Alternative Antiretroviral Agent (page 3 of 3)**

Adverse Event	ARV Agent(s)/Drug Class		Comments
	Switch from	Switch to	
<b>Renal Effects</b>  Including proximal renal tubulopathy, elevated creatinine	TDF <sup>a</sup>	ABC <sup>b</sup>	Phosphate wasting as a consequence of TDF nephrotoxicity may lead to osteomalacia.
	ATV/r, LPV/r	DTG, RAL, or NNRTI	cobi and DTG, and to a lesser extent RTV, RPV, and RAL, can increase SCr soon after treatment initiation because of inhibition of tubular secretion of creatinine. This effect does not affect glomerular filtration. However, assess for renal dysfunction, especially if SCr increases by >0.4 mg/dL.
<b>Stones</b>  Nephrolithiasis and cholelithiasis	ATV, ATV/r	DRV/r, INSTI, or NNRTI	Nephrolithiasis (a frequent complication of IDV) has been observed with ATV. Cholelithiasis is also reported with ATV.

<sup>a</sup> For patients with chronic active HBV infection, another agent active against HBV should be added to substitute for TDF.

<sup>b</sup> ABC should be used only in patients known to be HLA-B\*5701 negative.

<sup>c</sup> TDF reduces ATV levels; therefore, unboosted ATV should not be co-administered with TDF. Long term data for unboosted ATV are unavailable.

**Key to Abbreviations:** ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/r = ritonavir-boosted atazanavir; BMD = bone mineral density; CNS = central nervous system; cobi = cobicistat; d4T = stavudine; ddl = didanosine; DRV/r = ritonavir-boosted darunavir; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; EVG = elvitegravir; FPV/r = ritonavir-boosted fosamprenavir; FTC = emtricitabine; GI = gastrointestinal; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; IDV = indinavir; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LDL = low-density lipoprotein; LPV/r = ritonavir-boosted lopinavir; MVC = maraviroc; 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; 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list\\_uids=14615659](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list_uids=14615659).
2. Keiser O, Fellay J, Opravil M, et al. Adverse events to antiretrovirals in the Swiss HIV Cohort Study: effect on mortality and treatment modification. *Antivir Ther*. 2007;12(8):1157-1164. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list\\_uids=18240856](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list_uids=18240856).
3. Baylor MS, Johann-Liang R. Hepatotoxicity associated with nevirapine use. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2004;35(5):538-539. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list\\_uids=15021321](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list_uids=15021321).
4. Bersoff-Matcha SJ, Miller WC, Aberg JA, et al. Sex differences in nevirapine rash. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2001;32(1):124-129. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list\\_uids=11118391&dopt=Abstract](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list_uids=11118391&dopt=Abstract).
5. Fagot JP, Mockenhaupt M, Bouwes-Bavinck JN, for the EuroSCAR study group. Nevirapine and the risk of Stevens-Johnson syndrome or toxic epidermal necrolysis. *AIDS*. 2001;15(14):1843-1848. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list\\_uids=11579247&dopt=Abstract](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list_uids=11579247&dopt=Abstract).
6. Moyle GJ, Datta D, Mandalia S, et al. Hyperlactataemia and lactic acidosis during antiretroviral therapy: relevance, reproducibility and possible risk factors. *AIDS*. 2002;16(10):1341-1349. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list\\_uids=12131210&dopt=Abstract](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&list_uids=12131210&dopt=Abstract).
7. Bolhaar MG, Karstaedt AS. A high incidence of lactic acidosis and symptomatic hyperlactatemia in women receiving highly active antiretroviral therapy in Soweto, South Africa. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2007;45(2):254-260. Available at

- [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list\\_uids=17578788](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list_uids=17578788).
8. Geddes R, Knight S, Moosa MY, Reddi A, Uebel K, H S. A high incidence of nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NRTI)-induced lactic acidosis in HIV-infected patients in a South African context. *S Afr Med J*. 2006;96(8):722-724. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list\\_uids=17019496](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list_uids=17019496).
  9. Dieterich DT, Robinson PA, Love J, Stern JO. Drug-induced liver injury associated with the use of nonnucleoside reverse-transcriptase inhibitors. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2004;38(Suppl 2):S80-89. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list\\_uids=14986279](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list_uids=14986279).
  10. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list\\_uids=18256392](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list_uids=18256392).
  11. 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list\\_uids=18444831](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=pubmed&dopt=Abstract&list_uids=18444831).
  12. 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](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17135583).
  13. Lichtenstein KA, Armon C, Buchacz K, et al. Initiation of antiretroviral therapy at CD4 cell counts  $\geq 350$  cells/mm<sup>3</sup> does not increase incidence or risk of peripheral neuropathy, anemia, or renal insufficiency. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2008;47(1):27-35. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=17971714](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=17971714).

## **Cost Considerations and Antiretroviral Therapy (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)**

Although antiretroviral therapy (ART) is expensive (see Table 16 below), the cost-effectiveness of ART has been demonstrated in analyses of older<sup>1</sup> and newer regimens,<sup>2,3</sup> as well as for treatment-experienced patients with drug-resistant HIV.<sup>4</sup> Given the recommendations for immediate initiation of lifelong treatment and the increasing number of patients taking ART, the Panel now introduces cost-related issues pertaining to medication adherence and cost-containment strategies, as discussed below.

### ***Costs as They Relate to Adherence from a Patient Perspective***

**Cost sharing:** Cost sharing is where the patient is responsible for some of the medication cost burden (usually accomplished via co-payments, co-insurance, or deductibles); these costs are often higher for branded medications than for generic medications. In one comprehensive review, increased patient cost sharing resulted in decreased medical adherence and more frequent drug discontinuation; for patients with chronic diseases, increased cost sharing was also associated with increased use of the medical system.<sup>5</sup> Conversely, co-payment reductions, such as those that might be used to incentivize prescribing of generic drugs, have been associated with improved adherence in patients with chronic diseases.<sup>6</sup> Whereas cost-sharing disproportionately affects low income patients, resources (e.g., the Ryan White AIDS Drug Assistance Program [ADAP]) are available to assist eligible patients with co-pays and deductibles. Given the clear association between out-of-pocket costs for patients with chronic diseases and the ability of those patients to pay for and adhere to medications, clinicians should minimize patients' out-of-pocket drug-related expenses whenever possible.

**Prior authorizations:** As a cost-containment strategy, some programs require that clinicians obtain prior authorizations or permission before prescribing newer or more costly treatments rather than older or less expensive drugs. Although there are data demonstrating that prior authorizations do reduce spending, several studies have also shown that prior authorizations result in fewer prescriptions filled and increased non-adherence.<sup>7-9</sup> Prior authorizations in HIV care specifically have been reported to cost over \$40 each in provider personnel time (a hidden cost) and have substantially reduced timely access to medications.<sup>10</sup>

**Generic ART:** The impact of the availability of generic antiretroviral (ARV) drugs on selection of ART in the United States is unknown. Because U.S. patent laws currently limit the co-formulation of some generic alternatives to branded drugs, generic options may result in increased pill burden. 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.<sup>11,12</sup> Furthermore, prescribing the individual, less-expensive generic components of a branded co-formulated product rather than the branded product itself could, under some insurance plans, lead to higher copays—an out-of-pocket cost increase that may reduce medication adherence.

### ***Potential Cost Containment Strategies from a Societal Perspective***

Given resource constraints, it is important to maximize the use of resources without sacrificing clinical outcomes. Evidence-based revisions to these guidelines recommend tailored laboratory monitoring for patients with long-term virologic suppression on ART as one possible way to provide overall cost savings. Data suggest that continued CD4 monitoring yields no clinical benefit for patients whose viral loads are suppressed and CD4 counts exceed 200 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> after 48 weeks of therapy.<sup>13</sup> A reduction in laboratory use from biannual to annual CD4 monitoring could save ~\$10 million per year in the United States<sup>14</sup> (see the [Laboratory Monitoring](#) section). Although this is a small proportion of the overall costs associated with HIV care, such a strategy could reduce patients' personal expenses if they have deductibles for laboratory tests. The present and future availability of generic formulations of certain ARV drugs, despite the potential caveats of increased pill burden and reduced adherence, offers other money-saving possibilities on a much

greater scale. One analysis suggests the possibility of saving approximately \$900 million nationally in the first year of switching from a branded fixed-dose combination product to a three-pill regimen containing generic efavirenz.<sup>3</sup>

In summary, understanding HIV and ART-related costs in the United States is complicated because of the wide variability in medical coverage, accessibility, and expenses across regions, insurance plans, and pharmacies. In an effort to retain excellent clinical outcomes in an environment of cost-containment strategies, providers should remain informed of current insurance and payment structures, ART costs (see Table 16 below for estimates of drugs' average wholesale prices), discounts among preferred pharmacies, and available generic ART options. Providers should work with patients and their case managers and social workers to understand their patients' particular pharmacy benefit plans and potential financial barriers to filling their prescriptions. Additionally, providers should familiarize themselves with ARV affordability resources (such as ADAP and pharmaceutical company patient assistance programs for patients who qualify) and refer patients to such assistance if needed.

**Table 16: Monthly Average Wholesale Price<sup>a</sup> of Antiretroviral Drugs (Last updated January 2014; last reviewed January 2014) (page 1 of 4)**

ARV Drug (Generic and Brand Names)	Strength	Dosing	Tablets/Capsules/ mLs per Month	AWP <sup>a</sup> (Monthly)
<b>Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NRTIs)</b>				
<b>Abacavir</b>				
• Generic	300 mg tab	2 tabs daily	60 tabs	\$602.66
• Ziagen	300 mg tab	2 tabs daily	60 tabs	\$670.30
• Ziagen	20 mg/mL soln	30 mL daily	900 mL	\$660.86
<b>Didanosine Delayed-Release</b>				
• Generic	400 mg cap	1 cap daily	30 caps	\$368.72
• Videx EC	400 mg cap	1 cap daily	30 caps	\$515.84
<b>Emtricitabine</b>				
• Emtriva	200 mg cap	1 cap daily	30 tabs	\$602.27
• Emtriva	10 mg/mL soln	24 mL daily	680 mL (28-day supply)	\$568.88
<b>Lamivudine</b>				
• Generic	300 mg tab	1 tab daily	30 tabs	\$429.66
• Epivir	300 mg tab	1 tab daily	30 tabs	\$498.89
• Epivir	10 mg/mL soln	30 mL daily	900 mL	\$498.90
<b>Stavudine</b>				
• Generic	40 mg cap	1 cap twice daily	60 caps	\$410.70
• Zerit	40 mg cap	1 cap twice daily	60 caps	\$553.12
<b>Tenofovir</b>				
• Viread	300 mg tab	1 tab daily	30 tabs	\$1,047.73
<b>Zidovudine</b>				
• Generic	300 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$360.97
• Retrovir	300 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$476.70

**Table 16: Monthly Average Wholesale Price<sup>a</sup> of Antiretroviral Drugs (Last updated January 2014; last reviewed January 2014) (page 2 of 4)**

ARV Drug (Generic and Brand Names)	Strength	Dosing	Tablets/Capsules/ mLs per Month	AWP <sup>a</sup> (Monthly)
<b>NRTI Combination Products</b>				
<b>Abacavir/Lamivudine</b> • Epzicom	600/300 mg tab	1 tab daily	30 tabs	\$1,239.41
<b>Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/ Emtricitabine</b> • Truvada	300/150 mg tab	1 tab daily	30 tabs	\$1,539.90
<b>Zidovudine/Lamivudine</b> • Generic	300/150 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$931.61
• Combivir	300/150 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$1,081.70
<b>Abacavir Sulfate/Zidovudine/ Lamivudine</b> • Generic	300/300/150 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$1,738.46
• Trizivir	300/300/150 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$1,931.64
<b>Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NNRTIs)</b>				
<b>Efavirenz</b> • Sustiva	600 mg tab	1 tab daily	30 tabs	\$862.14
<b>Etravirine</b> • Intelence	200 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$1,123.52
<b>Nevirapine</b> • Generic	200 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$650.05
• Viramune	200 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$812.45
• Viramune XR (nevirapine extended release)	400 mg tab	1 tab daily	30 tabs	\$753.52
<b>Rilpivirine</b> • Endurant	25 mg tab	1 tab daily	30 tabs	\$923.47
<b>Protease Inhibitors (PIs)</b>				
<b>Atazanavir</b> • Reyataz	150 mg cap <sup>b</sup>	2 caps daily	60 caps	\$1,422.83
• Reyataz	200 mg cap	2 caps daily	60 caps	\$1,422.83
• Reyataz	300 mg cap <sup>b</sup>	1 cap daily	30 caps	\$1,409.39
<b>Darunavir</b> • Prezista	600 mg tab <sup>b</sup>	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$1,399.25
• Prezista	800 mg tab <sup>b</sup>	1 tab daily	30 tabs	\$1,399.25
• Prezista	100 mg/mL soln <sup>b</sup>	8 mL daily 6 mL twice daily	240 mL 360 mL	\$932.83 \$1,399.25
<b>Fosamprenavir</b> • Lexiva	700 mg tab	2 tabs twice daily	120 tabs	\$2,088.40
• Lexiva	700 mg tab	1 tab twice daily <sup>b</sup>	60 tabs	\$1,044.20
• Lexiva	700 mg tab	2 tabs once daily <sup>b</sup>	60 tabs	\$1,044.20



**Table 16: Monthly Average Wholesale Price<sup>a</sup> of Antiretroviral Drugs (Last updated January 2014; last reviewed January 2014) (page 3 of 4)**

ARV Drug (Generic and Brand Names)	Strength	Dosing	Tablets/Capsules/ mLs per Month	AWP <sup>a</sup> (Monthly)
<b>Protease Inhibitors (PIs), continued</b>				
<b>Lopinavir/Ritonavir</b> • Kaletra	200 mg/50 mg tab	2 tabs twice daily or 4 tabs once daily	120 tabs	\$977.22
• Kaletra	80 mg/20 mg per mL soln	5 mL twice daily	300 mL	\$916.13
<b>Ritonavir</b> Total Daily Dose Depends On Concomitant PI				
• Norvir	100 mg tab	1 tab once daily	30 tabs	\$308.60
• Norvir	100 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$617.20
• Norvir	100 mg tab	2 tabs twice daily	120 tabs	\$1,234.40
<b>Saquinavir</b> • Invirase	500 mg tab <sup>b</sup>	2 tabs twice daily	120 tabs	\$1,177.58
<b>Tipranavir</b> • Aptivus	250 mg cap <sup>b</sup>	2 caps twice daily	120 caps	\$1,500.17
<b>Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors (INSTIs)</b>				
Please refer to Co-formulated Combination Antiretroviral Drugs for cost of elvitegravir/cobicistat/tenofovir/emtricitabine (Stribild)				
<b>Dolutegravir</b> • Tivicay	50 mg tab	1 tab once daily	30 tabs	\$1,410.48
• Tivicay	50 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$2,820.96
<b>Raltegravir</b> • Isentress	400 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$1,352.05
<b>Fusion Inhibitor</b>				
<b>Enfuvirtide</b> • Fuzeon	90 mg injection kit	1 injection twice daily	60 doses (1 kit)	\$3,513.49
<b>CCR5 Antagonist</b>				
<b>Maraviroc</b> • Selzentry	150 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$1,297.62
• Selzentry	300 mg tab	1 tab twice daily	60 tabs	\$1,297.62
• Selzentry	300 mg tab	2 tabs twice daily	120 tabs	\$2,595.24
<b>Co-Formulated Combination Products as Complete Antiretroviral Regimens</b>				
<b>Efavirenz/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Emtricitabine</b> • Atripla	600/300/200 mg tab	1 tab daily	30 tabs	\$2,402.04
<b>Rilpivirine/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/Emtricitabine</b> • Complera	25/300/200 mg tab	1 tab daily	30 tabs	\$2,463.37
<b>Elvitegravir/Cobicistat/Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate/ Emtricitabine</b> • Stribild	150/150/300/200 mg tab	1 tab daily	30 tabs	\$2,948.70

**Table 16: Monthly Average Wholesale Price<sup>a</sup> of Antiretroviral Drugs (Last updated January 2014; last reviewed January 2014) (page 4 of 4)**

<sup>a</sup> AWP = Average Wholesale Price. Note that this price may not represent the pharmacy acquisition price or the price paid by consumers.

Source: Red Book Online. Available at <http://aapredbook.aappublications.org>. Accessed January 2014

<sup>b</sup> Should be used in combination with ritonavir. Please refer to [Appendix B, Table 3](#) for ritonavir doses.

**Key to Abbreviations:** cap = capsule; EC = enteric coated; soln = solution; AWP = average wholesale price; tab = tablet; XR = extended release

## 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 [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11248160](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11248160).
2. Mauskopf J, Brogan AJ, Talbird SE, Martin S. Cost-effectiveness of combination therapy with efavirenz in treatment-experienced adults with HIV-1 infection. *AIDS*. 2012;26(3):355-364. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22089378>.
3. 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>.
4. 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>.
5. 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>.
6. Maciejewski ML, Farley JF, Parker J, Wansink D. Copayment reductions generate greater medication adherence in targeted patients. *Health Affair*. 2010;29(11):2002-2008. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21041739>.
7. Abdelgawad T, Egbunu-Davis L. Preferred drug lists and Medicaid prescriptions. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2006;24 Suppl 3:55-63. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17266388>.
8. Ridley DB, Axelsen KJ. Impact of Medicaid preferred drug lists on therapeutic adherence. *PharmacoEconomics*. 2006;24 Suppl 3:65-78. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17266389>.
9. Wilson J, Axelsen K, Tang S. Medicaid prescription drug access restrictions: exploring the effect on patient persistence with hypertension medications. *Am J Manag Care*. 2005;11 Spec No:SP27-34. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15700907>.
10. Raper JL, Willig JH, Lin HY, et al. Uncompensated medical provider costs associated with prior authorization for prescription medications in an HIV clinic. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2010;51(6):718-724. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20695800>.
11. Hanna DB, Hessol NA, Golub ET, et al. Increase in Single-Tablet Regimen Use and Associated Improvements in Adherence-Related Outcomes in HIV-Infected Women. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2013. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24326606>.
12. Nachega JB, Parienti JJ, Uthman OA, et al. Lower Pill Burden and Once-daily Dosing Antiretroviral Treatment Regimens for HIV Infection: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2014. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24457345>.
13. 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? Analysis of the ARTEMIS trial. *AIDS*. 2013. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23842127>.
14. Hyle EP, Sax PE, Walensky RP. Potential Savings by Reduced CD4 Monitoring in Stable Patients With HIV Receiving Antiretroviral Therapy. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2013. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23978894>.

## Drug Interactions (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

Potential drug-drug and/or drug-food interactions should be taken into consideration when selecting an antiretroviral (ARV) regimen. A thorough review of concomitant medications can help in designing a regimen that minimizes undesirable interactions. In addition, the potential for drug interactions should be assessed when a new ARV is added to an existing ARV combination, as well as when any drug (including over-the-counter agents) is added to a patient's medication regimen. Most drug interactions with ARV drugs are mediated through inhibition or induction of hepatic drug metabolism.<sup>1</sup> The mechanisms of drug interactions with each ARV drug class are briefly summarized below. [Tables 17–19b](#) list significant drug interactions with different ARV agents and recommendations on contraindications, dose modifications, and alternative agents.

### Protease Inhibitors

All protease inhibitors (PIs) are metabolized in the liver by CYP3A isoenzymes; consequently their metabolic rates may be altered in the presence of CYP inducers or inhibitors. Co-administration of PIs with ritonavir (RTV), a potent CYP3A inhibitor, intentionally increases PI exposure (see [Pharmacokinetic Enhancing](#) below).

Co-administration of PIs with a potent CYP3A inducer may lead to suboptimal drug concentrations and reduced therapeutic effects of the PI. These drug combinations should be avoided if alternative agents can be used. If this is not possible, close monitoring of plasma HIV RNA, with or without ARV dosage adjustment, and therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM), may be warranted.

Some PIs may also induce or inhibit CYP isoenzymes, P-glycoprotein (P-gp), or other transporters in the gut and elsewhere. Tipranavir (TPV), for example, is a potent inducer of CYP3A4 and P-gp. However, the net effect of ritonavir-boosted TPV (TPV/r) on CYP3A in vivo appears to be enzyme inhibition. Thus, concentrations of drugs that are substrates for only CYP3A are most likely to be increased if the drugs are given with TPV/r. The net effect of TPV/r on a drug that is a substrate of both CYP3A and P-gp cannot be confidently predicted. Significant decreases in saquinavir (SQV), amprenavir (APV), and lopinavir (LPV) concentrations have been observed in vivo when the PIs were given with TPV/r.

The use of a CYP3A substrate that has a narrow margin of safety in the presence of a potent CYP3A inhibitor, such as the PIs, may lead to markedly prolonged elimination half-life ( $t_{1/2}$ ) and toxic drug accumulation. Avoidance of concomitant use or dose reduction of the affected drug, with close monitoring for dose-related toxicities or TDM if appropriate, may be warranted.

The list of drugs that may have significant interactions with PIs is extensive and is continuously expanding. Some examples of these drugs include lipid-lowering agents (e.g., statins), benzodiazepines, calcium channel blockers, immunosuppressants (e.g., cyclosporine, tacrolimus), anticonvulsants, rifamycins, erectile dysfunction agents (e.g., sildenafil), ergot derivatives, azole antifungals, macrolides, oral contraceptives, methadone, and HCV protease inhibitors. Herbal products, such as St. John's wort, can also cause interactions that increase the risk of adverse clinical effects. See [Table 18a](#) for dosage recommendations.

### Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors

All non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs) are metabolized in the liver by cytochrome P450 (CYP) 3A isoenzymes. In addition, efavirenz (EFV) and nevirapine (NVP) are substrates of CYP2B6 enzymes, and etravirine (ETR) is a substrate of CYP2C9 and 2C19 enzymes. Concomitantly administered drugs that induce or inhibit these enzymes can alter NNRTI drug concentrations, resulting in virologic failure or adverse effects. All NNRTIs, except rilpivirine (RPV), induce or inhibit CYP isoenzymes. EFV acts as a

mixed inducer and inhibitor, but similar to NVP, it primarily induces CYP3A and 2B6 enzymes. ETR also induces CYP3A but inhibits CYP2C9 and 2C19 enzymes. The inducing effects of NNRTIs can result in sub-therapeutic concentrations of concomitantly administered drugs that are metabolized by CYP enzymes. Examples of such interacting medications include azole antifungals, rifamycins (e.g., rifabutin), benzodiazepines, hepatitis C virus (HCV) protease inhibitors, HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors (statins), and methadone. See [Table 18b](#) for dosing recommendations.

## Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors

Raltegravir (RAL) is primarily eliminated by glucuronidation mediated by the uridine diphosphate (UDP)-glucuronosyltransferase (UGT) 1A1 enzymes. Strong inducers of UGT1A1 enzymes (e.g., rifampin) can significantly reduce the concentration of RAL.<sup>2</sup> Similar to RAL, dolutegravir (DTG) is also primarily metabolized by glucuronidation mediated by UGT1A1 and to a minor degree by CYP3A enzymes. DTG is also a substrate of UGT1A3, UGT1A9, and P-gp. Strong inducers of these proteins may reduce the concentration of DTG; alternatively, strong inhibitors of these proteins may increase the concentration of DTG. DTG does not appear to affect CYP or UGT enzymes or P-gp-mediated transport. *In vitro*, DTG has been shown to inhibit the renal organic cation transporter (OCT2), but does not appear to affect any additional transporter proteins.<sup>3</sup>

Elvitegravir (EVG) is metabolized largely by CYP3A enzymes but also undergoes glucuronidation by UGT 1A1/3 enzymes. It is available only as a fixed dose combination with cobicistat (cobi), tenofovir (TDF), and emtricitabine (FTC). Co-administration of EVG with cobin, a CYP3A inhibitor, increases EVG exposure (see [Pharmacokinetic Enhancing](#) below). Drugs that induce or inhibit CYP3A enzymes can alter concentrations of EVG. The co-formulation of EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC should not be co-administered with other ARVs because of potential drug interactions that may alter drug levels of EVG, cobin, or the concomitant drug.

[Table 18d](#) lists significant drug interactions and dosage recommendations when an INSTI is co-administered with other drugs.

## Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors

Unlike PIs, NNRTIs, EVG, and maraviroc (MVC), nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) do not undergo hepatic transformation through the CYP metabolic pathway. Significant pharmacodynamic interactions of NRTIs and other drugs, such as additive bone marrow suppressive effects of zidovudine (ZDV) and ganciclovir, have been reported. Pharmacokinetic (PK) interactions have also been reported; for example, atazanavir (ATV) concentration can be reduced when it is co-administered with TDF.<sup>4</sup> However, the mechanisms underlying some of these interactions are still unclear. [Table 18c](#) lists significant interactions with NRTIs.

## CCR5 Antagonist

MVC is a substrate of CYP3A enzymes and P-gp. As a consequence, the concentrations of MVC can be significantly increased in the presence of strong CYP3A inhibitors (such as RTV, cobin, and other PIs, except for TPV/r) and are reduced when MVC is used with CYP3A inducers (such as EFV or rifampin). Dose adjustment is necessary when MVC is used in combination with these agents (see [Table 18e](#) or [Appendix B, Table 6](#) for dosage recommendations). MVC is neither an inducer nor an inhibitor of the CYP3A system and does not alter the PKs of the drugs evaluated in interaction studies to date.

## Fusion Inhibitor

The fusion inhibitor enfuvirtide (T20) is a 36-amino-acid peptide that does not enter human cells. T20 is expected to undergo catabolism to its constituent amino acids with subsequent recycling of the amino acids in the body pool. No clinically significant drug-drug interaction with T20 has been identified to date.

## Pharmacokinetic Enhancing

Pharmacokinetic (PK) enhancing is a strategy used in ARV treatment to increase the exposure of an ARV by concomitantly administering a drug that inhibits the specific drug metabolizing enzymes for which the ARV is a substrate. Currently two agents are used in clinical practice as PK enhancers: RTV and cobi.

**RTV** is an HIV PI that is primarily used in clinical practice at a lower than approved dose (100 to 400 mg per day) as a PK enhancer for other PIs because of its inhibitory effects on CYP450, predominantly CYP3A4, and Pgp. RTV increases the trough concentrations ( $C_{min}$ ) and prolongs the half-life of the active PIs.<sup>5</sup> The higher  $C_{min}$  allows for a greater  $C_{min}$ : inhibitory concentration ratio, which reduces the risk that drug resistance will develop as a result of suboptimal drug exposure. The longer half-life of the PI allows for less frequent dosing, which may enhance medication adherence. Even though the primary role of RTV is as a potent inhibitor of 3A4, it may also, to a less extent, induce CYP2C9, which may result in complex drug-drug interactions when used with PIs, other ARVs or non ARV drugs. [Tables 18a](#) and [19a–b](#) list interactions between RTV-containing PI regimens and other medications, as well as comments on the clinical management of these interactions.

**cobi** is a specific, potent CYP3A inhibitor that has a weak to no effect on other CYP450 isoforms with no ARV activity. The high water solubility of cobi allows for its co-formulation with other agents.<sup>6</sup> Cobi is currently available only as part of a fixed dose combination of EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC. cobi is used to increase the plasma concentrations of EVG, an INSTI. Like RTV, cobi has a complex drug-drug interaction profile. It also is an inhibitor of P-gp-mediated transport, which appears to be the mechanism by which cobi increases the systemic exposure to TDF. [Table 18c](#) lists interactions with cobi identified in PK studies conducted to date, projected interactions, and drugs that should not be co-administered with cobi.

When using RTV- or cobi-containing regimens, clinicians should be vigilant in assessing the potential for adverse drug-drug interactions. This is especially important when prescribing CYP3A substrates for which no PK data are available.

## References

1. Piscitelli SC, Gallicano KD. Interactions among drugs for HIV and opportunistic infections. *N Engl J Med*. Mar 29 2001;344(13):984-996. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=11274626](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=11274626).
2. Wenning LA, Hanley WD, Brainard DM, et al. Effect of rifampin, a potent inducer of drug-metabolizing enzymes, on the pharmacokinetics of raltegravir. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. Jul 2009;53(7):2852-2856. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=19433563](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=19433563).
3. Tivicay [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2013. Available at [http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda\\_docs/label/2013/2047901bl.pdf](http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2013/2047901bl.pdf). Accessed October 28, 2013.
4. Taburet AM, Piketty C, Chazallon C, et al. Interactions between atazanavir-ritonavir and tenofovir in heavily pretreated human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. Jun 2004;48(6):2091-2096. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=15155205](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=15155205).
5. Kempf DJ, Marsh KC, Kumar G, et al. Pharmacokinetic enhancement of inhibitors of the human immunodeficiency virus protease by coadministration with ritonavir. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. Mar 1997;41(3):654-660. Available at [http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list\\_uids=9056009](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/entrez/query.fcgi?cmd=Retrieve&db=PubMed&dopt=Citation&list_uids=9056009).
6. Xu L, Desai MC. Pharmacokinetic enhancers for HIV drugs. *Curr Opin Investig Drugs*. Aug 2009;10(8):775-786. Available at <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19649922>.



**Table 17. Drugs That Should Not Be Used With Antiretroviral Agents (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 1 of 2)**

This table only lists drugs that should not be co-administered at any dose and regardless of RTV enhancing. See [Tables 18](#) and [19](#) for more detailed PK interaction data.

ARV Agents and Contraindicated Drugs by Drug Category										
ARV Agents <sup>a,b</sup>	Cardiac Agents	Lipid-Lowering Agents	Antimycobacterials	GI Drugs	Neuroleptics	Psychotropics	Ergot Derivatives (Vasoconstrictors)	Herbs	ARV Agents	Others
<b>ATV +/- RTV</b>	Amiodarone Dronedarone	Lovastatin Simvastatin	Rifampin Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	Cisapride <sup>e</sup>	Pimozide	Midazolam <sup>f</sup> Triazolam	Dihydroergotamine Ergonovine Ergotamine Methylexgonovine	St. John's wort	ETR NVP	Alfuzosin Irinotecan Salmeterol Sildenafil for PAH
<b>DRV/r</b>	Amiodarone Dronedarone	Lovastatin Simvastatin	Rifampin Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	Cisapride <sup>e</sup>	Pimozide	Midazolam <sup>f</sup> Triazolam	Dihydroergotamine Ergonovine Ergotamine Methylexgonovine	St. John's wort	None	Alfuzosin Salmeterol Sildenafil for PAH
<b>FPV +/- RTV</b>	Amiodarone Dronedarone Flecainide Propafenone	Lovastatin Simvastatin	Rifampin Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	Cisapride <sup>e</sup>	Pimozide	Midazolam <sup>f</sup> Triazolam	Dihydroergotamine Ergonovine Ergotamine Methylexgonovine	St. John's wort	ETR	Alfuzosin Salmeterol Sildenafil for PAH
<b>LPV/r</b>	Amiodarone Dronedarone	Lovastatin Simvastatin	Rifampin <sup>d</sup> Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	Cisapride <sup>e</sup>	Pimozide	Midazolam <sup>f</sup> Triazolam	Dihydroergotamine Ergonovine Ergotamine Methylexgonovine	St. John's wort	None	Alfuzosin Salmeterol Sildenafil for PAH
<b>SQV/r</b>	Amiodarone Dronedarone Dofetilide Flecainide Lidocaine Propafenone Quinidine	Lovastatin Simvastatin	Rifampin <sup>d</sup> Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	Cisapride <sup>e</sup>	Pimozide	Midazolam <sup>f</sup> Triazolam Trazodone	Dihydroergotamine Ergonovine Ergotamine Methylexgonovine	St. John's wort Garlic supplements	None	Alfuzosin Salmeterol Sildenafil for PAH
<b>TPV/r</b>	Amiodarone Dronedarone Flecainide Propafenone Quinidine	Lovastatin Simvastatin	Rifampin Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	Cisapride <sup>e</sup>	Pimozide	Midazolam <sup>f</sup> Triazolam	Dihydroergotamine Ergonovine Ergotamine Methylexgonovine	St. John's wort	ETR	Alfuzosin Salmeterol Sildenafil for PAH
<b>EFV</b>	None	None	Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	Cisapride <sup>e</sup>	Pimozide	Midazolam <sup>f</sup> Triazolam	Dihydroergotamine Ergonovine Ergotamine Methylexgonovine	St. John's wort	Other NNRTIs	None
<b>ETR</b>	None	None	Rifampin Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	None	None	None	None	St. John's wort	Unboosted PIs, ATV/r, FPV/r, or TPV/r  other NNRTIs	Carbamazepine Phenobarbital Phenytoin Clopidogrel
<b>NVP</b>	None	None	Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	None	None	None	None	St. John's wort	ATV +/- RTV <b>DTG</b> other NNRTIs	Ketoconazole

**Table 17. Drugs That Should Not Be Used With Antiretroviral Agents (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 2 of 2)**

ARV Agents and Contraindicated Drugs by Drug Category										
ARV Agents <sup>a,b</sup>	Cardiac Agents	Lipid-Lowering Agents	Antimycobacterials	GI Drugs	Neuroleptics	Psychotropics	Ergot Derivatives (Vasoconstrictors)	Herbs	ARV Agents	Others
<b>RPV</b>	None	None	Rifabutin Rifampin Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	Proton pump inhibitors	None	None	None	St. John's wort	Other NNRTIs	Carbamazepine Oxcarbazepine Phenobarbital Phenytoin
<b>MVC</b>	None	None	Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	None	None	None	None	St. John's wort	None	None
<b>EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC</b>	None	Lovastatin Simvastatin	Rifabutin Rifampin Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	Cisapride <sup>e</sup>	Pimozide	Midazolam <sup>f</sup> Triazolam	Dihydroergotamine Ergotamine Methylergonovine	St. John's wort	All other ARVs	Alfuzosin Salmeterol Sildenafil for PAH
<b>DTG</b>	Dofetilide	None	Rifapentine <sup>c</sup>	None	None	None	None	St. John's wort	NVP	Carbamazepine Oxcarbazepine Phenobarbital Phenytoin

<sup>a</sup> DLV, IDV, NFV, and RTV (as sole PI) are not included in this table. Refer to the appropriate FDA package insert for information regarding DLV-, IDV-, NFV-, and RTV (as sole PI)-related drug interactions.

<sup>b</sup> Certain listed drugs are contraindicated on the basis of theoretical considerations. Thus, drugs with narrow therapeutic indices and suspected metabolic involvement with CYP450 3A, 2D6, or unknown pathways are included in this table. Actual interactions may or may not occur in patients.

<sup>c</sup> HIV-infected patients who received rifapentine as part of a treatment regimen for TB had a higher rate of TB relapse and acquired rifamycin resistance than those treated with other rifamycin-based regimens. Therefore an alternative agent to rifapentine is recommended for TB treatment.

<sup>d</sup> A high rate of Grade 4 serum transaminase elevation was seen when a higher dose of RTV was added to LPV/r or SQV or when double-dose LPV/r was used with rifampin to compensate for rifampin's induction effect and therefore, these dosing strategies should not be used.

<sup>e</sup> The manufacturer of cisapride has a limited-access protocol for patients who meet specific clinical eligibility criteria.

<sup>f</sup> Use of oral midazolam is contraindicated. Parenteral midazolam can be used with caution as a single dose and can be given in a monitored situation for procedural sedation.

Suggested alternatives to:

- **Lovastatin, simvastatin:** Fluvastatin, pitavastatin, and pravastatin (except for pravastatin with DRV/r) have the least potential for drug-drug interactions (see [Table 18a](#)). Use atorvastatin and rosuvastatin with caution; start with the lowest possible dose and titrate based on tolerance and lipid-lowering efficacy.
- **Rifampin:** Rifabutin (with dosage adjustment, see [Tables 18a](#) and [18b](#))
- **Midazolam, triazolam:** temazepam, lorazepam, oxazepam

**Key to Acronyms:** ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/r = ritonavir-boosted atazanavir; coBI = cobicistat; CYP = cytochrome P; DLV = delavirdine; DRV/r = ritonavir-boosted darunavir; **DTG = dolutegravir**; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; EVG = elvitegravir; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FPV = fosamprenavir; FPV/r = ritonavir-boosted fosamprenavir; FTC = emtricitabine; IDV = indinavir; LPV/r = ritonavir-boosted lopinavir; MVC = maraviroc; NFV = nelfinavir; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; PAH = pulmonary arterial hypertension; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SQV = saquinavir; SQV/r = ritonavir-boosted saquinavir; TB = tuberculosis; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TPV/r = ritonavir-boosted tipranavir

**Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 1 of 12)**

This table provides information relating to PK interactions between PIs and non-ARV drugs. When information is available, interactions with boosted and unboosted PIs are listed separately. For interactions between ARV agents and for dosing recommendations, refer to Tables 18c, 19a, and 19b.

<sup>a</sup> NFV and IDV are **not** included in this table. Please refer to the FDA product labels for NFV and IDV for information regarding drug interactions with these PIs.

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Acid Reducers</b>			
<b>Antacids</b>	ATV, ATV/r	When given simultaneously, ↓ ATV expected	Give ATV at least 2 hours before or 1 hour after antacids or buffered medications.
	FPV	APV AUC ↓ 18%; no significant change in APV C <sub>min</sub>	Give FPV simultaneously with (or at least 2 hours before or 1 hour after) antacids.
	TPV/r	TPV AUC ↓ 27%	Give TPV at least 2 hours before or 1 hour after antacids.
<b>H2 Receptor Antagonists</b>	<b>RTV-Boosted PIs</b>		
	ATV/r	↓ ATV	H2 receptor antagonist dose should not exceed a dose equivalent to famotidine 40 mg BID in ART-naïve patients or 20 mg BID in ART-experienced patients.  Give ATV 300 mg + RTV 100 mg simultaneously with and/or ≥10 hours after the H2 receptor antagonist.  If using TDF and H2 receptor antagonist in ART-experienced patients, use ATV 400 mg + RTV 100 mg.
	DRV/r, LPV/r	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	<b>PIs without RTV</b>		
	ATV	↓ ATV	H2 receptor antagonist single dose should not exceed a dose equivalent of famotidine 20 mg or total daily dose equivalent of famotidine 20 mg BID in ART-naïve patients.  Give ATV at least 2 hours before and at least 10 hours after the H2 receptor antagonist.
	FPV	APV AUC ↓ 30%; no significant change in APV C <sub>min</sub>	If concomitant use is necessary, give FPV at least 2 hours before H2 receptor antagonist. Consider boosting FPV with RTV.
<b>PPIs</b>	ATV	↓ ATV	<b>PPIs are not recommended in patients receiving unboosted ATV.</b> In these patients, consider alternative acid-reducing agents, RTV boosting, or alternative PIs.
	ATV/r	↓ ATV	PPIs should not exceed a dose equivalent to omeprazole 20 mg daily in PI-naïve patients. PPIs should be administered at least 12 hours before ATV/r.  <b>PPIs are not recommended in PI-experienced patients.</b>
	DRV/r, TPV/r	↓ omeprazole PI: no significant effect	May need to increase omeprazole dose when using TPV/r.
	FPV, FPV/r, LPV/r	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	SQV/r	SQV AUC ↑ 82%	Monitor for SQV toxicities.

**Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 2 of 12)**

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Anticoagulants</b>			
Warfarin	All PIs	↑ or ↓ warfarin possible	Monitor INR closely when stopping or starting PI and adjust warfarin dose accordingly.
Rivaroxaban	All PIs	↑ rivaroxaban	Avoid concomitant use. Co-administration is expected to result in increased rivaroxaban exposure, which may lead to risk of increased bleeding.
<b>Anticonvulsants</b>			
Carbamazepine	<b>RTV-Boosted PIs</b>		
	ATV/r, FPV/r, LPV/r, SQV/r, TPV/r	↑ carbamazepine possible TPV/r ↑ carbamazepine AUC 26% May ↓ PI levels substantially	Consider alternative anticonvulsant or monitor levels of both drugs and assess virologic response. <b>Do not co-administer with LPV/r once daily.</b>
	DRV/r	carbamazepine AUC ↑ 45% DRV: no significant change	Monitor anticonvulsant level and adjust dose accordingly.
	<b>PIs without RTV</b>		
	ATV, FPV	May ↓ PI levels substantially	<b>Do not co-administer.</b> Consider alternative anticonvulsant or RTV boosting for ATV and FPV.
Lamotrigine	LPV/r	Lamotrigine AUC ↓ 50% LPV: no significant change	A dose increase of lamotrigine may be needed and therapeutic concentration monitoring for lamotrigine may be indicated, particularly during dosage adjustment. Alternatively, consider another anticonvulsant.  A similar interaction is possible with other RTV-boosted PIs.
Phenobarbital	All PIs	May ↓ PI levels substantially	Consider alternative anticonvulsant or monitor levels of both drugs and assess virologic response.  <b>Do not co-administer with LPV/r once daily, ATV without RTV, or FPV without RTV.</b>
Phenytoin	<b>RTV-Boosted PIs</b>		
	ATV/r, DRV/r, SQV/r, TPV/r	↓ phenytoin possible ↓ PI possible	Consider alternative anticonvulsant or monitor levels of both drugs and assess virologic response.
	FPV/r	phenytoin AUC ↓ 22% APV AUC ↑ 20%	Monitor phenytoin level and adjust dose accordingly. No change in FPV/r dose recommended.
	LPV/r	phenytoin AUC ↓ 31% LPV/r AUC ↓ 33%	Consider alternative anticonvulsant or monitor levels of both drugs and assess virologic response. <b>Do not co-administer with LPV/r once daily.</b>
	<b>PIs without RTV</b>		
	ATV, FPV	May ↓ PI levels substantially	<b>Do not co-administer.</b> Consider alternative anticonvulsant or RTV boosting for ATV and FPV.
Valproic Acid	LPV/r	↓ or ↔ VPA possible LPV AUC ↑ 75%	Monitor VPA levels and virologic response. Monitor for LPV-related toxicities.

**Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 3 of 12)**

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Antidepressants</b>			
<b>Bupropion</b>	LPV/r	bupropion AUC ↓ 57%	Titrate bupropion dose based on clinical response.
	TPV/r	bupropion AUC ↓ 46%	
<b>Paroxetine</b>	DRV/r	paroxetine AUC ↓ 39%	Titrate paroxetine dose based on clinical response.
	FPV/r	paroxetine AUC ↓ 55%	
<b>Sertraline</b>	DRV/r	sertraline AUC ↓ 49%	Titrate sertraline dose based on clinical response.
<b>Trazodone</b>	ATV/r, ATV, DRV/r, FPV/r, FPV, LPV/r, TPV/r	RTV 200 mg BID (for 2 days) ↑ trazodone AUC 240%	Use lowest dose of trazodone and monitor for CNS and cardiovascular adverse effects.
	SQV/r	↑ trazodone expected	<b>Contraindicated. Do not co-administer.</b>
<b>Tricyclic Antidepressants</b> Amitriptyline, Desipramine, Imipramine, Nortriptyline	All RTV-boosted PIs	↑ TCA expected	Use lowest possible TCA dose and titrate based on clinical assessment and/or drug levels.
<b>Antifungals</b>			
<b>Fluconazole</b>	<b>RTV-Boosted PIs</b>		
	ATV/r	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	SQV/r	No data with RTV boosting SQV (1200 mg TID) AUC ↑ 50%	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	TPV/r	TPV AUC ↑ 50%	Fluconazole >200 mg daily is not recommended. If high-dose fluconazole is indicated, consider alternative PI or another class of ARV drug.
<b>Itraconazole</b>	All PIs	↑ itraconazole possible ↑ PI possible	Consider monitoring itraconazole level to guide dosage adjustments. High doses (>200 mg/day) are not recommended with RTV-boosted PIs unless dose is guided by itraconazole levels.
<b>Posaconazole</b>	ATV/r	ATV AUC ↑ 146%	Monitor for adverse effects of ATV.
	ATV	ATV AUC ↑ 268%	Monitor for adverse effects of ATV.
	FPV	Compared with FPV/r (700 mg/100 mg), FPV (1400 mg BID) ↓ posaconazole AUC 23%, ↓ APV AUC 65%	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>



**Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 4 of 12)**

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Antifungals, continued</b>			
<b>Voriconazole</b>	<b>RTV-Boosted PIs</b>		
	All RTV-boosted PIs	RTV 400 mg BID ↓ voriconazole AUC 82% RTV 100 mg BID ↓ voriconazole AUC 39%	<b>Do not co-administer voriconazole and RTV unless benefit outweighs risk.</b> If administered, consider monitoring voriconazole level and adjust dose accordingly.
	<b>PIs without RTV</b>		
	ATV, FPV	↑ voriconazole possible ↑ PI possible	Monitor for toxicities.
<b>Antimalarials</b>			
<b>Artemether/ Lumefantrine</b>	DRV/r	artemether AUC ↓ 16%; DHA <sup>a</sup> AUC ↓ 18%; lumefantrine AUC ↑ 2.5-fold	Clinical significance unknown. If used, monitor closely for anti-malarial efficacy and lumefantrine toxicity.
	LPV/r	artemether AUC ↓ 40%; DHA AUC ↓ 17%; lumefantrine AUC ↑ 470%	Clinical significance unknown. If used, monitor closely for anti-malarial efficacy and lumefantrine toxicity.
<b>Atovaquone/ Proguanil</b>	ATV/r, LPV/r	ATV/r ↓ atovaquone AUC 46% and ↓ proguanil AUC 41%  LPV/r ↓ atovaquone AUC 74% and ↓ proguanil AUC 38%	No dosage recommendation. Consider alternative drug for malaria prophylaxis, if possible.
	RTV	With RTV 200 mg BID: RTV AUC ↓ 31%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 43%; ⇔ mefloquine	Use with caution. Effect on exposure of RTV-boosted PIs is unknown.
<b>Antimycobacterials</b>			
<b>Bedaquiline</b>	All RTV-boosted PIs	With LPV/r: bedaquiline AUC ↑ 22%; C <sub>max</sub> ⇔ With other PI/r: ↑ bedaquiline possible	Clinical significance unknown. Use with caution if benefit outweighs the risk and monitor for QTc prolongation and liver function tests.
<b>Clarithromycin</b>	ATV/r, ATV	clarithromycin AUC ↑ 94%	May cause QTc prolongation. Reduce clarithromycin dose by 50%. Consider alternative therapy (e.g., azithromycin).
	DRV/r, FPV/r, LPV/r, SQV/r, TPV/r	DRV/r ↑ clarithromycin AUC 57% FPV/r ↑ clarithromycin possible LPV/r ↑ clarithromycin expected RTV 500 mg BID ↑ clarithromycin 77% SQV unboosted ↑ clarithromycin 45% TPV/r ↑ clarithromycin 19% clarithromycin ↑ unboosted SQV 177% clarithromycin ↑ TPV 66%	Monitor for clarithromycin-related toxicities or consider alternative macrolide (e.g., azithromycin).  Reduce clarithromycin dose by 50% in patients with CrCl 30–60 mL/min.  Reduce clarithromycin dose by 75% in patients with CrCl <30 mL/min.
	FPV	APV AUC ↑ 18%	No dosage adjustment necessary.

**Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 5 of 12)**

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Antimycobacterials, continued			
Rifabutin	RTV-Boosted PIs		
	ATV/r	Compared with rifabutin (300 mg daily) administered alone, when rifabutin (150 mg once daily) is administered with ATV/r, rifabutin AUC ↑ 110% and metabolite AUC ↑ 2101%	Rifabutin 150 mg once daily or 300 mg three times a week. Monitor for antimycobacterial activity and consider therapeutic drug monitoring.  PK data reported in this table are results from healthy volunteer studies. Lower rifabutin exposure has been reported in HIV-infected patients than in the healthy study participants.
	DRV/r	Compared with rifabutin (300 mg once daily) administered alone, when rifabutin (150 mg every other day) is administered with DRV/r, rifabutin AUC not significantly changed and metabolite AUC ↑ 881%	
	FPV/r	Compared with rifabutin (300 mg once daily) administered alone, when rifabutin (150 mg every other day) is administered with FPV/r, rifabutin and metabolite AUC ↑ 64%.	
	LPV/r	Compared with rifabutin (300 mg daily) administered alone, when rifabutin (150 mg once daily) is administered with LPV/r, rifabutin and metabolite AUC ↑ 473%.	
	SQV/r	↑ rifabutin with unboosted SQV	
	TPV/r	rifabutin and metabolite AUC ↑ 333%	
	PIs without RTV		
	ATV, FPV	↑ rifabutin AUC expected	Rifabutin 150 mg daily or 300 mg three times a week
Rifampin	All PIs	↓ PI concentration by >75%	<b>Do not co-administer rifampin and PIs.</b> Additional RTV does not overcome this interaction and increases hepatotoxicity. Consider rifabutin if a rifamycin is indicated.
Rifapentine	All PIs	↓ PI expected	<b>Do not co-administer rifapentine and PIs.</b>
Benzodiazepines			
Alprazolam Diazepam	All PIs	↑ benzodiazepine possible  RTV (200 mg BID 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; there is less interaction potential than with other benzodiazepines.
Midazolam	All PIs	↑ midazolam expected  SQV/r ↑ midazolam (oral) AUC 1144% and C <sub>max</sub> 327%	<b>Do not co-administer oral midazolam and PIs.</b>  Parenteral midazolam can be used with caution when given as a single dose in a monitored situation for procedural sedation.
Triazolam	All PIs	↑ triazolam expected  RTV (200 mg BID) ↑ triazolam half-life 1200% and AUC 2000%	<b>Do not co-administer triazolam and PIs.</b>

**Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 6 of 12)**

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Cardiac Medications</b>			
<b>Bosentan</b>	All PIs	LPV/r ↑ bosentan 48-fold (day 4) and 5-fold (day 10) ↓ ATV expected	<b>Do not co-administer bosentan and ATV without RTV.</b> <u>In Patients on a PI (Other than Unboosted ATV) &gt;10 Days:</u> • Start bosentan at 62.5 mg once daily or every other day. <u>In Patients on Bosentan who Require a PI (Other than Unboosted ATV):</u> • Stop bosentan ≥36 hours before PI initiation and restart 10 days after PI initiation at 62.5 mg once daily or every other day.
<b>Digoxin</b>	RTV, SQV/r	RTV (200 mg BID) ↑ digoxin AUC 29% and ↑ half-life 43% SQV/r ↑ digoxin AUC 49%	Use with caution. Monitor digoxin levels. Digoxin dose may need to be decreased.
<b>Calcium Channel Blockers</b>	All PIs	↑ dihydropyridine possible	Use with caution. Titrate CCB dose and monitor closely. ECG monitoring is recommended when CCB used with ATV.
<b>Diltiazem</b>	ATV/r, ATV	diltiazem AUC ↑ 125%	Decrease diltiazem dose by 50%. ECG monitoring is recommended.
	DRV/r, FPV/r, FPV, LPV/r, SQV/r, TPV/r	↑ diltiazem possible	Use with caution. Adjust diltiazem according to clinical response and toxicities.
<b>Corticosteroids</b>			
<b>Beclomethasone Inhaled</b>	DRV/r	RTV 100 mg BID ↑ 17-BMP AUC 2-fold and ↑ C <sub>max</sub> 1.6-fold (DRV 600 mg plus RTV 100 mg) BID ↓ 17-BMP AUC 11% and ↓ C <sub>max</sub> 19%	No dosage adjustment necessary. Significant interaction between beclomethasone (inhaled or intranasal) and other RTV-boosted PIs is not expected.
<b>Budesonide Systemic</b>	All PIs	↓ PI levels possible ↑ glucocorticoids	Co-administration can result in adrenal insufficiency, including Cushing's syndrome. <b>Do not co-administer unless potential benefits of systemic budesonide outweigh the risks of systemic corticosteroid adverse effects.</b>
<b>Budesonide Inhaled or Intranasal</b>	All RTV-boosted PIs	↑ glucocorticoids	Co-administration can result in adrenal insufficiency, including Cushing's syndrome. <b>Do not co-administer unless potential benefits of inhaled or intranasal budesonide outweigh the risks of systemic corticosteroid adverse effects. Consider alternative therapy (e.g., beclomethasone).</b>
<b>Dexamethasone</b>	All PIs	↓ PI levels possible	Use systemic dexamethasone with caution or consider alternative corticosteroid for long-term use.

**Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 7 of 12)**

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Corticosteroids, continued</b>			
<b>Fluticasone</b> Inhaled or Intranasal	All RTV-boosted PIs	RTV 100 mg BID ↑ fluticasone AUC 350-fold and ↑ C <sub>max</sub> 25-fold	Co-administration can result in adrenal insufficiency, including Cushing's syndrome. <b>Do not co-administer unless potential benefits of inhaled or intranasal fluticasone outweigh the risks of systemic corticosteroid adverse effects. Consider alternative therapy (e.g., beclomethasone).</b>
<b>Prednisone</b>	LPV/r <b>All PIs</b>	↑ prednisolone AUC 31% ↑ prednisolone possible	Use with caution. Co-administration can result in adrenal insufficiency, including Cushing's syndrome. <b>Do not co-administer unless potential benefits of prednisone outweigh the risks of systemic corticosteroid adverse effects.</b>
<b>Methylprednisolone, Prednisolone, Triamcinolone</b> (local injections, including intra-articular, epidural, intra-orbital)	All RTV-boosted PIs	↑ glucocorticoids expected	Co-administration can result in adrenal insufficiency, including Cushing's syndrome. <b>Do not co-administer.</b> Consider alternative non-steroidal therapies. If intra-articular corticosteroid therapy required, change to alternative non-CYP3A-modulating ART (e.g., RAL, DTG).
<b>Hepatitis C NS3/4A Protease Inhibitors</b>			
<b>Boceprevir</b>	ATV/r	ATV AUC ↓ 35%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 49% RTV AUC ↓ 36% boceprevir AUC ↔	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
	DRV/r	DRV AUC ↓ 44%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 59% RTV AUC ↓ 26% boceprevir AUC ↓ 32%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 35%	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
	LPV/r	LPV AUC ↓ 34%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 43% RTV AUC ↓ 22% boceprevir AUC ↓ 45%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 57%	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
<b>Simeprevir</b>	All PIs	DRV/r 800/100 mg daily plus simeprevir 50 mg: simeprevir AUC ↑ 159% compared with simeprevir 150 mg alone RTV 100 mg BID ↑ simeprevir AUC 618%	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
<b>Telaprevir</b>	ATV/r	telaprevir AUC ↓ 20%	No dose adjustment necessary.
	DRV/r	telaprevir AUC ↓ 35% DRV AUC ↓ 40%	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
	FPV/r	telaprevir AUC ↓ 32% APV AUC ↓ 47%	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
	LPV/r	telaprevir AUC ↓ 54% LPV: no significant change	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>

**Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 8 of 12)**

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Herbal Products</b>			
St. John's Wort	All PIs	↓ PI expected	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
<b>Hormonal Contraceptives</b>			
<b>Hormonal Contraceptives</b>	<b>RTV-Boosted PIs</b>		
	ATV/r	ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 19% and C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 37% norgestimate ↑ 85%	Oral contraceptive should contain at least 35 mcg of ethinyl estradiol.  Oral contraceptives containing progestins other than norethindrone or norgestimate have not been studied. <sup>b</sup>
	DRV/r	ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 44% norethindrone AUC ↓ 14%	Recommend alternative or additional contraceptive method.
	FPV/r	ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 37% norethindrone AUC ↓ 34%	Recommend alternative or additional contraceptive method.
	LPV/r	ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 42% norethindrone AUC ↓ 17%	Recommend alternative or additional contraceptive method.
	SQV/r	↓ ethinyl estradiol	Recommend alternative or additional contraceptive method.
	TPV/r	ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 48% norethindrone: no significant change	Recommend alternative or additional contraceptive method.
	<b>PIs without RTV</b>		
	ATV	ethinyl estradiol AUC ↑ 48% norethindrone AUC ↑ 110%	Prescribe oral contraceptive that contains no more than 30 mcg of ethinyl estradiol or recommend alternative contraceptive method.  Oral contraceptives containing less than 25 mcg of ethinyl estradiol or progestins other than norethindrone or norgestimate have not been studied. <sup>c</sup>
	FPV	With APV: ↑ ethinyl estradiol and ↑ norethindrone C <sub>min</sub> ; APV C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 20%	Recommend alternative contraceptive method.
<b>HMG-CoA Reductase Inhibitors</b>			
<b>Atorvastatin</b>	ATV/r, ATV	↑ atorvastatin possible	Titrate atorvastatin dose carefully and use lowest dose necessary.
	DRV/r, FPV/r, FPV, SQV/r	DRV/r plus atorvastatin 10 mg similar to atorvastatin 40 mg administered alone; FPV +/- RTV ↑ atorvastatin AUC 130% to 153%; SQV/r ↑ atorvastatin AUC 79%	Titrate atorvastatin dose carefully and use the lowest necessary dose. Do not exceed 20 mg atorvastatin daily.
	LPV/r	LPV/r ↑ atorvastatin AUC 488%	Use with caution and use the lowest atorvastatin dose necessary.
	TPV/r	↑ atorvastatin AUC 836%	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
	All PIs	Significant ↑ lovastatin expected	<b>Contraindicated. Do not co-administer.</b>
<b>Lovastatin</b>	All PIs	Significant ↑ lovastatin expected	<b>Contraindicated. Do not co-administer.</b>



**Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 9 of 12)**

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>HMG-CoA Reductase Inhibitors, continued</b>			
<b>Pitavastatin</b>	All PIs	ATV ↑ pitavastatin AUC 31% and C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 60% ATV: no significant effect DRV/r: no significant effect LPV/r ↓ pitavastatin AUC 20% LPV: no significant effect	No dose adjustment necessary.
<b>Pravastatin</b>	DRV/r	pravastatin AUC • ↑ 81% following single dose of pravastatin • ↑ 23% at steady state	Use lowest possible starting dose of pravastatin with careful monitoring.
	LPV/r	pravastatin AUC ↑ 33%	No dose adjustment necessary.
	SQV/r	pravastatin AUC ↓ 47% to 50%	No dose adjustment necessary.
<b>Rosuvastatin</b>	ATV/r, LPV/r	ATV/r ↑ rosuvastatin AUC 3-fold and C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 7-fold LPV/r ↑ rosuvastatin AUC 108% and C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 366%	Titrate rosuvastatin dose carefully and use the lowest necessary dose. Do not exceed 10 mg rosuvastatin daily.
	DRV/r	rosuvastatin AUC ↑ 48% and C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 139%	Titrate rosuvastatin dose carefully and use the lowest necessary dose while monitoring for toxicities.
	FPV +/- RTV	No significant effect on rosuvastatin	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	SQV/r	No data available	Titrate rosuvastatin dose carefully and use the lowest necessary dose while monitoring for toxicities.
	TPV/r	rosuvastatin AUC ↑ 26% and C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 123%	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Simvastatin</b>	All PIs	Significant ↑ simvastatin level; SQV/r 400 mg/400 mg BID ↑ simvastatin AUC 3059%	<b>Contraindicated. Do not co-administer.</b>
<b>Immunosuppressants</b>			
<b>Cyclosporine</b> <b>Sirolimus</b> <b>Tacrolimus</b>	All PIs	↑ immunosuppressant expected	Initiate with an adjusted dose of immunosuppressant to account for potential increased concentrations of the immunosuppressant and monitor for toxicities. Therapeutic drug monitoring of immunosuppressant is recommended. Consult with specialist as necessary.
<b>Narcotics/Treatment for Opioid Dependence</b>			
<b>Buprenorphine</b>	ATV	buprenorphine AUC ↑ 93% norbuprenorphine <sup>d</sup> AUC ↑ 76% ↓ ATV possible	<b>Do not co-administer buprenorphine with unboosted ATV.</b>
	ATV/r	buprenorphine AUC ↑ 66% norbuprenorphine <sup>d</sup> AUC ↑ 105%	Monitor for sedation. Buprenorphine dose reduction may be necessary.
	DRV/r	buprenorphine: no significant effect norbuprenorphine <sup>d</sup> AUC ↑ 46% and C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 71%	No dosage adjustment necessary. Clinical monitoring is recommended.

**Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 10 of 12)**

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Narcotics/Treatment for Opioid Dependence, continued</b>			
<b>Buprenorphine, continued</b>	FPV/r	buprenorphine: no significant effect norbuprenorphine <sup>d</sup> AUC ↓ 15%	No dosage adjustment necessary. Clinical monitoring is recommended.
	LPV/r	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	TPV/r	buprenorphine: no significant effect norbuprenorphine <sup>d</sup> AUC, C <sub>max</sub> , and C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 80% TPV C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 19%–40%	Consider monitoring TPV level.
<b>Oxycodone</b>	LPV/r	oxycodone AUC ↑ 2.6-fold	Monitor for opioid-related adverse effects. Oxycodone dose reduction may be necessary.
<b>Methadone</b>	<b>RTV-Boosted PIs</b>		
	ATV/r, DRV/r, FPV/r, LPV/r, SQV/r, TPV/r	ATV/r, DRV/r, FPV/r: ↓ R-methadone <sup>e</sup> AUC 16% to 18%; LPV/r ↓ methadone AUC 26% to 53% SQV/r 1000/100 mg BID ↓ R-methadone <sup>e</sup> AUC 19% TPV/r ↓ R-methadone <sup>e</sup> AUC 48%	Opioid withdrawal unlikely but may occur. Dosage adjustment of methadone is not usually required, but monitor for opioid withdrawal and increase methadone dose as clinically indicated.
	<b>PIs without RTV</b>		
	ATV	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	FPV	No data with unboosted FPV APV ↓ R-methadone <sup>e</sup> C <sub>min</sub> 21%, AUC no significant change	Monitor and titrate methadone as clinically indicated. The interaction with FPV is presumed to be similar.
<b>Phosphodiesterase Type 5 (PDE5) Inhibitors</b>			
<b>Avanafil</b>	ATV, ATV/r, DRV/r, FPV/r, SQV/r, LPV/r	RTV (600 mg BID for 5 days) ↑ avanafil AUC 13-fold, C <sub>max</sub> 2.4-fold	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
	FPV	No data	Avanafil dose should not exceed 50 mg once every 24 hours.
<b>Sildenafil</b>	All PIs	DRV/r plus sildenafil 25 mg similar to sildenafil 100 mg alone; RTV 500 mg BID ↑ sildenafil AUC 1000% SQV unboosted ↑ sildenafil AUC 210%	<u>For Treatment of Erectile Dysfunction:</u> • Start with sildenafil 25 mg every 48 hours and monitor for adverse effects of sildenafil.  <u>For treatment of PAH:</u> • <b>Contraindicated</b>

**Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 11 of 12)**

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Phosphodiesterase Type 5 (PDE5) Inhibitors, continued</b>			
<b>Tadalafil</b>	All PIs	RTV 200 mg BID ↑ tadalafil AUC 124% TPV/r (1st dose) ↑ tadalafil AUC 133% TPV/r steady state: no significant effect	<p><u>For Treatment of Erectile Dysfunction:</u></p> <p>Start with tadalafil 5-mg dose and do not exceed a single dose of 10 mg every 72 hours. Monitor for adverse effects of tadalafil.</p> <p><u>For Treatment of PAH:</u></p> <p><i>In Patients on a PI &gt;7 Days:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Start with tadalafil 20 mg once daily and increase to 40 mg once daily based on tolerability.</li> </ul> <p><i>In Patients on Tadalafil who Require a PI:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stop tadalafil ≥24 hours before PI initiation, restart 7 days after PI initiation at 20 mg once daily, and increase to 40 mg once daily based on tolerability.</li> </ul> <p><u>For Treatment of Benign Prostatic Hyperplasia:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maximum recommended daily dose is 2.5 mg per day</li> </ul>
<b>Vardenafil</b>	All PIs	RTV 600 mg BID ↑ vardenafil AUC 49-fold	Start with vardenafil 2.5 mg every 72 hours and monitor for adverse effects of vardenafil.
<b>Miscellaneous Interactions</b>			
<b>Colchicine</b>	All PIs	RTV 100 mg BID ↑ colchicine AUC 296%, C <sub>max</sub> 184%  With all PIs: significant ↑ in colchicine AUC expected	<p><u>For Treatment of Gout Flares:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colchicine 0.6 mg x 1 dose, followed by 0.3 mg 1 hour later. Do not repeat dose for at least 3 days.</li> </ul> <p><i>With FPV without RTV:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1.2 mg x 1 dose and no repeat dose for at least 3 days</li> </ul> <p><u>For Prophylaxis of Gout Flares:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colchicine 0.3 mg once daily or every other day</li> </ul> <p><i>With FPV without RTV:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Colchicine 0.3 mg BID or 0.6 mg once daily or 0.3 mg once daily</li> </ul> <p><u>For Treatment of Familial Mediterranean Fever:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not exceed colchicine 0.6 mg once daily or 0.3 mg BID.</li> </ul> <p><i>With FPV without RTV:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Do not exceed 1.2 mg once daily or 0.6 mg BID.</li> </ul> <p><b>Do not co-administer in patients with hepatic or renal impairment.</b></p>

**Table 18a. Drug Interactions between Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 12 of 12)**

Concomitant Drug	PI	Effect on PI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Miscellaneous Interactions, continued</b>			
<b>Quetiapine</b>	All PIs	↑ quetiapine AUC expected	<p><u>Initiation of Quetiapine in a Patient Receiving a PI:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Start quetiapine at the lowest dose and titrate up as needed. Monitor for quetiapine effectiveness and adverse effects.</li> </ul> <p><u>Initiation of a PI in a Patient Receiving a Stable Dose of Quetiapine:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reduce quetiapine dose to 1/6 of the original dose. Closely monitor for quetiapine effectiveness and adverse effects.</li> </ul>
<b>Salmeterol</b>	All PIs	↑ salmeterol possible	<b>Do not co-administer</b> because of potential increased risk of salmeterol-associated cardiovascular events.

<sup>a</sup> DHA is an active metabolite of artemether.

<sup>b</sup> The following products contain at least 35 mcg of ethinyl estradiol combined with norethindrone or norgestimate (generic formulation may also be available): Ovcon 35, 50; Femcon Fe; Brevicon; Modicon; Ortho-Novum 1/35, 10/11, 7/7/7; Norinyl 1/35; Tri-Norinyl; Ortho-Cyclen; Ortho Tri-Cyclen.

<sup>c</sup> The following products contain no more than 30 mcg of ethinyl estradiol combined with norethindrone or norgestimate (generic formulation may also be available): Loestrin 1/20, 1.5/30; Loestrin Fe 1/20, 1.5/30; Loestrin 24 Fe; Ortho Tri-Cyclen Lo.

<sup>d</sup> Norbuprenorphine is an active metabolite of buprenorphine.

<sup>e</sup> R-methadone is the active form of methadone.

**Key to Acronyms:** 17-BMP = beclomethasone 17-monopropionate; APV = amprenavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/r = ritonavir-boosted atazanavir; AUC = area under the curve; BID = twice daily; C<sub>max</sub> = maximum plasma concentration; C<sub>min</sub> = minimum plasma concentration; CNS = central nervous system; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CYP = cytochrome P; DHA = dihydroartemisinin; DRV = darunavir; DRV/r = ritonavir-boosted darunavir; DTG = dolutegravir; ECG = electrocardiogram; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FPV = fosamprenavir; FPV/r = ritonavir-boosted fosamprenavir; IDV = indinavir; INR = international normalized ratio; LPV = lopinavir; LPV/r = ritonavir-boosted lopinavir; NFV = nelfinavir; PAH = pulmonary arterial hypertension; PDE5 = phosphodiesterase type 5; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; PPI = proton pump inhibitor; RAL = raltegravir; RTV = ritonavir; SQV = saquinavir; SQV/r = ritonavir-boosted saquinavir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TID = three times a day; TPV = tipranavir; TPV/r = ritonavir-boosted tipranavir

**Note:** FPV is a pro-drug of APV

**Table 18b. Drug Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 1 of 7)**

This table provides information relating to PK interactions between NNRTIs and non- ARV drugs. For interactions between ARV agents and for dosing recommendations, refer to Tables 18c, 19a, and 19b.

<sup>a</sup> DLV is **not** included in this table. Please refer to the DLV FDA package insert for information regarding drug interactions.

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	NNRTI <sup>a</sup>	Effect on NNRTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Acid Reducers</b>			
<b>Antacids</b>	RPV	↓ RPV expected when given simultaneously	Give antacids at least 2 hours before or at least 4 hours after RPV.
<b>H2 Receptor Antagonists</b>	RPV	↓ RPV	Give H2-receptor antagonists at least 12 hours before or at least 4 hours after RPV.
<b>PPIs</b>	RPV	With omeprazole 20 mg daily, ↓ RPV AUC 40%, C <sub>min</sub> 33%	<b>Contraindicated. Do not co-administer.</b>
<b>Anticoagulants/Antiplatelets</b>			
<b>Warfarin</b>	EFV, NVP	↑ or ↓ warfarin possible	Monitor INR and adjust warfarin dose accordingly.
	ETR	↑ warfarin possible	Monitor INR and adjust warfarin dose accordingly.
<b>Clopidogrel</b>	ETR	↓ activation of clopidogrel possible	ETR may prevent metabolism of clopidogrel (inactive) to its active metabolite. Avoid co-administration, if possible.
<b>Anticonvulsants</b>			
<b>Carbamazepine Phenobarbital Phenytoin</b>	EFV	<u>Carbamazepine plus EFV:</u> • Carbamazepine AUC ↓ 27%, and • EFV AUC ↓ 36%  <u>Phenytoin plus EFV:</u> • ↓ EFV, and • ↓ phenytoin possible	Monitor anticonvulsant and EFV levels or, if possible, use alternative anticonvulsant to those listed.
	ETR	↓ anticonvulsant and ETR possible	<b>Do not co-administer.</b> Consider alternative anticonvulsant.
	NVP	↓ anticonvulsant and NVP possible	Monitor anticonvulsant and NVP levels and virologic responses or consider alternative anticonvulsant.
	RPV	↓ RPV possible	<b>Contraindicated. Do not co-administer.</b> Consider alternative anticonvulsant.
<b>Antidepressants</b>			
<b>Bupropion</b>	EFV	bupropion AUC ↓ 55%	Titrate bupropion dose based on clinical response.
<b>Paroxetine</b>	EFV, ETR	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Sertraline</b>	EFV	sertraline AUC ↓ 39%	Titrate sertraline dose based on clinical response.



**Table 18b. Drug Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs** (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 2 of 7)

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	NNRTI <sup>a</sup>	Effect on NNRTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Antifungals</b>			
<b>Fluconazole</b>	EFV	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	ETR	ETR AUC ↑ 86%	No dosage adjustment necessary. Use with caution.
	NVP	NVP AUC ↑ 110%	Increased risk of hepatotoxicity possible with this combination. Monitor NVP toxicity or use alternative ARV agent.
	RPV	↑ RPV possible	No dosage adjustment necessary. Clinically monitor for breakthrough fungal infection (RPV 150 mg/day reduces ketoconazole exposure; no data on interaction with fluconazole).
<b>Itraconazole</b>	EFV	itraconazole and OH-itraconazole AUC, C <sub>max</sub> and C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 35%–44%	Failure to achieve therapeutic itraconazole concentrations has been reported. Avoid this combination if possible. If co-administered, closely monitor itraconazole concentration and adjust dose accordingly.
	ETR	↓ itraconazole possible ↑ ETR possible	Dose adjustments for itraconazole may be necessary. Monitor itraconazole level and antifungal response.
	NVP	↓ itraconazole possible ↑ NVP possible	Avoid combination if possible. If co-administered, monitor itraconazole concentration and adjust dose accordingly.
	RPV	↑ RPV possible	No dosage adjustment necessary. Clinically monitor for breakthrough fungal infection. (RPV 150 mg/day reduces ketoconazole exposure; no data on interaction with itraconazole.)
<b>Posaconazole</b>	EFV	posaconazole AUC ↓ 50% ↔ EFV	Avoid concomitant use unless the benefit outweighs the risk. If co-administered, monitor posaconazole concentration and adjust dose accordingly.
	ETR	↑ ETR possible	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	RPV	↑ RPV possible	No dosage adjustment necessary. Clinically monitor for breakthrough fungal infection (RPV 150 mg/day reduces ketoconazole exposure; no data on interaction with posaconazole).

**Table 18b. Drug Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 3 of 7)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	NNRTI <sup>a</sup>	Effect on NNRTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Antifungals, continued</b>			
<b>Voriconazole</b>	EFV	voriconazole AUC ↓ 77% EFV AUC ↑ 44%	<b>Contraindicated at standard doses.</b> Dose: voriconazole 400 mg BID, EFV 300 mg daily.
	ETR	voriconazole AUC ↑ 14% ETR AUC ↑ 36%	No dosage adjustment necessary; use with caution. Consider monitoring voriconazole level.
	NVP	↓ voriconazole possible ↑ NVP possible	Monitor for toxicity and antifungal response and/or voriconazole level.
	RPV	↑ RPV possible	No dosage adjustment necessary. Clinically monitor for breakthrough fungal infection (RPV 150 mg/day reduces ketoconazole exposure; no data on interaction with voriconazole).
<b>Antimalarials</b>			
<b>Artemether/ Lumefantrine</b>	EFV	artemether AUC ↓ 79% DHA AUC ↓ 75% lumefantrine AUC ↓ 56%	Clinical significance unknown. If used, monitor closely for anti-malarial efficacy
	ETR	artemether AUC ↓ 38% DHA AUC ↓ 15% lumefantrine AUC ↓ 13% ETR AUC ↑ 10%	Clinical significance unknown. If used, monitor closely for anti-malarial efficacy
	NVP	artemether AUC ↓ 72% DHA AUC ↓ 37% lumefantrine: no difference in one study, but AUC ↑ 55.6% in another study	Clinical significance unknown. If used, monitor closely for anti-malarial efficacy and lumefantrine toxicity.
<b>Atovaquone/ Proguanil</b>	EFV	↓ atovaquone AUC 75% ↓ proguanil AUC 43%	No dosage recommendation. Consider alternative drug for malaria prophylaxis, if possible.
<b>Antimycobacterials</b>			
<b>Bedaquiline</b>	EFV, NVP	↔ bedaquiline AUC	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Clarithromycin</b>	EFV	clarithromycin AUC ↓ 39%	Monitor for effectiveness or consider alternative agent, such as azithromycin, for MAC prophylaxis and treatment.
	ETR	clarithromycin AUC ↓ 39% ETR AUC ↑ 42%	Consider alternative agent, such as azithromycin, for MAC prophylaxis and treatment.
	NVP	clarithromycin AUC ↓ 31%	Monitor for effectiveness or use alternative agent, such as azithromycin, for MAC prophylaxis and treatment.
	RPV	↔ clarithromycin expected ↑ RPV possible	Consider alternative macrolide, such as azithromycin, for MAC prophylaxis and treatment.

**Table 18b. Drug Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 4 of 7)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	NNRTI <sup>a</sup>	Effect on NNRTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
Rifabutin	EFV	rifabutin ↓ 38%	Dose: rifabutin 450–600 mg once daily or 600 mg 3 times a week if EFV is not co-administered with a PI.
	ETR	rifabutin and metabolite AUC ↓ 17% ETR AUC ↓ 37%	<b>If ETR is used with an RTV-boosted PI, rifabutin should not be co-administered.</b>  Dose: rifabutin 300 mg once daily <b>if</b> ETR is not co-administered with an RTV-boosted PI.
	NVP	rifabutin AUC ↑ 17% and metabolite AUC ↑ 24% NVP C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 16%	No dosage adjustment necessary. Use with caution.
	RPV	RPV AUC ↓ 46%	<b>Contraindicated. Do not co-administer.</b>
Rifampin	EFV	EFV AUC ↓ 26%	Maintain EFV dose at 600 mg once daily and monitor for virologic response. Consider therapeutic drug monitoring.  Some clinicians suggest EFV 800 mg dose in patients who weigh more than 60 kg.
	ETR	Significant ↓ ETR possible	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
	NVP	NVP ↓ 20% to 58%	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
	RPV	RPV AUC ↓ 80%	<b>Contraindicated. Do not co-administer.</b>
Rifapentine	EFV, ETR, NVP, RPV	↓ NNRTI expected	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
Benzodiazepines			
Alprazolam	EFV, ETR, NVP, RPV	No data	Monitor for therapeutic effectiveness of alprazolam.
Diazepam	ETR	↑ diazepam possible	Decreased dose of diazepam may be necessary.
Lorazepam	EFV	lorazepam C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 16%, AUC ↔	No dosage adjustment necessary.
Midazolam	EFV	Significant ↑ midazolam expected	<b>Do not co-administer with oral midazolam.</b>  Parenteral midazolam can be used with caution as a single dose and can be given in a monitored situation for procedural sedation.
Triazolam	EFV	Significant ↑ triazolam expected	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
Cardiac Medications			
Dihydropyridine Calcium Channel Blockers	EFV, NVP	↓ CCBs possible	Titrate CCB dose based on clinical response.
Diltiazem Verapamil	EFV	diltiazem AUC ↓ 69% ↓ verapamil possible	Titrate diltiazem or verapamil dose based on clinical response.
	NVP	↓ diltiazem or verapamil possible	
Corticosteroids			
Dexamethasone	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ EFV, ETR, NVP possible	Consider alternative corticosteroid for long-term use. If dexamethasone is used with NNRTI, monitor virologic response.
	RPV	Significant ↓ RPV possible	<b>Contraindicated with more than a single dose of dexamethasone.</b>

**Table 18b. Drug Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs** (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 5 of 7)

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	NNRTI <sup>a</sup>	Effect on NNRTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Hepatitis C NS3/4A—PIs</b>			
<b>Boceprevir</b>	EFV	EFV AUC ↑ 20% boceprevir AUC ↓ 19%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 44%	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
	ETR	ETR AUC ↓ 23% boceprevir AUC, C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 10%	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Simeprevir</b>	EFV	Simeprevir AUC ↓ 71%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 91% EFV ↔	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
	ETR, NVP	↓ simeprevir expected	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
	RPV	Simeprevir ↔ and RPV ↔	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Telaprevir</b>	EFV	EFV AUC ↔ telaprevir AUC ↓ 26%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 47% <u>With TDE:</u> • EFV AUC ↓ 15% to 18% • Telaprevir AUC ↓ 18% to 20%	Increase telaprevir dose to 1125 mg q8h.
	ETR	ETR AUC ↔ telaprevir AUC ↓ 16%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 25%	No dosage recommendation.
<b>Herbal Products</b>			
<b>St. John's Wort</b>	EFV, ETR, NVP, RPV	↓ NNRTI	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
<b>Hormonal Contraceptives</b>			
<b>Hormonal Contraceptives</b>	EFV	ethinyl estradiol ↔ levonorgestrel AUC ↓ 83% norgestromin AUC ↓ 64% ↓ etonogestrel (implant) possible	Use alternative or additional contraceptive methods. Norgestromin and levonorgestrel are active metabolites of norgestimate.
	ETR	ethinyl estradiol AUC ↑ 22% norethindrone: no significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	NVP	ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 20% norethindrone AUC ↓ 19%	Use alternative or additional contraceptive methods.
		DMPA: no significant change	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	RPV	ethinyl estradiol AUC ↑ 14% norethindrone: no significant change	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Levonorgestrel</b> (for emergency contraception)	EFV	levonorgestrel AUC ↓ 58%	Effectiveness of emergency post-coital contraception may be diminished.

**Table 18b. Drug Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 6 of 7)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	NNRTI <sup>a</sup>	Effect on NNRTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>HMG-CoA Reductase Inhibitors</b>			
<b>Atorvastatin</b>	EFV, ETR	atorvastatin AUC ↓ 32% to 43%	Adjust atorvastatin according to lipid responses, not to exceed the maximum recommended dose.
	RPV	atorvastatin AUC ↔ atorvastatin metabolites ↑	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Fluvastatin</b>	ETR	↑ fluvastatin possible	Dose adjustments for fluvastatin may be necessary.
<b>Lovastatin Simvastatin</b>	EFV	simvastatin AUC ↓ 68%	Adjust simvastatin dose according to lipid responses, not to exceed the maximum recommended dose. If EFV used with RTV-boosted PI, simvastatin and lovastatin should be avoided.
	ETR, NVP	↓ lovastatin possible ↓ simvastatin possible	Adjust lovastatin or simvastatin dose according to lipid responses, not to exceed the maximum recommended dose. If ETR or NVP used with RTV-boosted PI, simvastatin and lovastatin should be avoided.
<b>Pitavastatin</b>	EFV	pitavastatin AUC ↓ 11%, C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 20%	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	ETR, NVP, RPV	No data	No significant effect expected. No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Pravastatin Rosuvastatin</b>	EFV	pravastatin AUC ↓ 44% rosuvastatin: no data	Adjust statin dose according to lipid responses, not to exceed the maximum recommended dose.
	ETR	No significant effect expected	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Immunosuppressants</b>			
<b>Cyclosporine Sirolimus Tacrolimus</b>	EFV, ETR, NVP	↓ immunosuppressant possible	Increase in immunosuppressant dose may be necessary. Therapeutic drug monitoring of immunosuppressant is recommended. Consult with specialist as necessary.
<b>Narcotics/Treatment for Opioid Dependence</b>			
<b>Buprenorphine</b>	EFV	buprenorphine AUC ↓ 50% norbuprenorphine <sup>b</sup> AUC ↓ 71%	No dosage adjustment recommended; monitor for withdrawal symptoms.
	ETR	buprenorphine AUC ↓ 25%	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	NVP	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Methadone</b>	EFV	methadone AUC ↓ 52%	Opioid withdrawal common; increased methadone dose often necessary.
	ETR	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	NVP	methadone AUC ↓ 37% to 51% NVP: no significant effect	Opioid withdrawal common; increased methadone dose often necessary.
	RPV	R-methadone <sup>c</sup> AUC ↓ 16%	No dosage adjustment necessary, but monitor for withdrawal symptoms.



**Table 18b. Drug Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 7 of 7)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	NNRTI <sup>a</sup>	Effect on NNRTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>PDE5 Inhibitors</b>			
<b>Avanafil</b>	EFV, ETR, NVP, RPV	No data	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
<b>Sildenafil</b>	ETR	sildenafil AUC ↓ 57%	May need to increase sildenafil dose based on clinical effect.
	RPV	sildenafil ↔	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Tadalafil</b>	ETR	↓ tadalafil possible	May need to increase tadalafil dose based on clinical effect.
<b>Vardenafil</b>	ETR	↓ vardenafil possible	May need to increase vardenafil dose based on clinical effect.

<sup>a</sup> Approved dose for RPV is 25 mg once daily. Most PK interaction studies were performed using 75 to 150 mg per dose.

<sup>b</sup> Norbuprenorphine is an active metabolite of buprenorphine.

<sup>c</sup> R-methadone is the active form of methadone.

**Key to Acronyms:** ARV = antiretroviral; AUC = area under the curve; BID = twice daily; C<sub>max</sub> = maximum plasma concentration; C<sub>min</sub> = minimum plasma concentration; **DHA = dihydroartemisinin**; DLV = delavirdine; DMPA = depot medroxyprogesterone acetate; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; INR = international normalized ratio; MAC = *Mycobacterium avium* complex; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; OH-clarithromycin = active metabolite of clarithromycin; PDE5 = phosphodiesterase type 5; PI = protease inhibitor; PPI = proton pump inhibitor; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate

**Table 18c. Drug Interactions between Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 1 of 2)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	NRTI	Effect on NRTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosage Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Non-ARV—Antivirals</b>			
<b>Adefovir</b>	TDF	No data	<b>Do not co-administer.</b> Serum concentrations of TDF and/or other renally eliminated drugs may be increased.
<b>Boceprevir</b>	TDF	No significant effect	No dose adjustment necessary.
<b>Ganciclovir</b>	TDF	No data	Serum concentrations of these drugs and/or TDF may be increased. Monitor for dose-related toxicities.
<b>Valganciclovir</b>	ZDV	No significant effect	Potential increase in hematologic toxicities
<b>Ribavirin</b>	ddl	↑ intracellular ddl	<b>Contraindicated. Do not co-administer.</b> Fatal hepatic failure and other ddl-related toxicities have been reported with co-administration.
	ZDV	Ribavirin inhibits phosphorylation of ZDV.	Avoid co-administration if possible, or closely monitor HIV virologic response and possible hematologic toxicities.
<b>Simeprevir</b>	TDF	No significant PK effects	No dose adjustment necessary.
<b>Telaprevir</b>	TDF	TDF AUC ↑ 30%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 6% to 41%	Monitor for TDF-associated toxicity.
<b>INSTIs</b>			
<b>DTG</b>	TDF	TDF AUC ↑ 12%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 19% DTG ↔	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>RAL</b>	TDF	RAL AUC ↑ 49%	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Narcotics/Treatment for Opioid Dependence</b>			
<b>Buprenorphine</b>	3TC, ddl, TDF, ZDV	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Methadone</b>	ABC	methadone clearance ↑ 22%	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	d4T	d4T AUC ↓ 23%	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	ZDV	ZDV AUC ↑ 29% to 43%	Monitor for ZDV-related adverse effects.
<b>NRTIs</b>			
<b>ddl</b>	d4T	No significant PK interaction	<b>Do not co-administer.</b> Additive toxicities of peripheral neuropathy, lactic acidosis, and pancreatitis seen with this combination.
	TDF	ddl-EC AUC and C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 48% to 60%	<b>Avoid co-administration.</b>
<b>Other</b>			
<b>Allopurinol</b>	ddl	ddl AUC ↑ 113% <u>In Patients with Renal Impairment:</u> • ddl AUC ↑ 312%	<b>Contraindicated.</b> Potential for increased ddl-associated toxicities.
<b>Atovaquone</b>	ZDV	ZDV AUC ↑ 31%	Monitor for ZDV-related adverse effects.

**Table 18c. Drug Interactions between Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 2 of 2)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	NRTI	Effect on NRTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosage Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>PIs</b>			
<b>ATV</b>	ddl	With ddl-EC Plus ATV (with Food): • ddl AUC ↓ 34% • ATV no change	Administer ATV with food 2 hours before or 1 hour after ddl.
	TDF	ATV AUC ↓ 25%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 23% to 40% (higher C <sub>min</sub> with RTV than without RTV) TDF AUC ↑ 24% to 37%	Dose: ATV/r 300/100 mg daily co-administered with TDF 300 mg daily. Avoid concomitant use without RTV. If using TDF and H2 receptor antagonist in ART-experienced patients, use ATV/r 400 mg/100 mg daily. Monitor for TDF-associated toxicity.
	ZDV	ZDV C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 30%, no change in AUC	Clinical significance unknown.
<b>DRV/r</b>	TDF	TDF AUC ↑ 22%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 37%	Clinical significance unknown. Monitor for TDF toxicity.
<b>LPV/r</b>	TDF	LPV/r AUC ↓ 15% TDF AUC ↑ 34%	Clinical significance unknown. Monitor for TDF toxicity.
<b>TPV/r</b>	ABC	ABC AUC ↓ 35% to 44%	Appropriate doses for this combination have not been established.
	ddl	ddl-EC AUC ↔ and C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 34% TPV/r ↔	Separate doses by at least 2 hours.
	TDF	TDF AUC ↔ TPV/r AUC ↓ 9%–18%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 12% to 21%	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	ZDV	ZDV AUC ↓ 35% TPV/r AUC ↓ 31% to 43%	Appropriate doses for this combination have not been established.

**Key to Acronyms:** 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ART = antiretroviral; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/r = ritonavir-boosted atazanavir; AUC = area under the curve; C<sub>max</sub> = maximum plasma concentration; C<sub>min</sub> = minimum plasma concentration; d4T = stavudine; ddl = didanosine; DRV/r = ritonavir-boosted darunavir; EC = enteric coated; LPV/r = ritonavir-boosted lopinavir; NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; RAL = raltegravir; RTV = ritonavir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TPV/r = ritonavir-boosted tipranavir; ZDV = zidovudine

**Table 18d. Drug Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 1 of 8)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Acid Reducers</b>			
<b>Aluminium, Magnesium +/- Calcium Containing Antacids</b>  Please refer to the Miscellaneous Interactions section below for recommendations on use with other polyvalent cation products (e.g., iron, calcium supplements, multivitamins).	DTG	DTG AUC ↓ 74% if given simultaneously; DTG AUC ↓ 26% if given 2 hours before antacid	Give DTG at least 2 hours before or at least 6 hours after medications containing polyvalent cations.
	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	EVG AUC ↓ 40% to 50% if given simultaneously, ↓ 15% to 20% if given 2 hours before or after antacid; ↔ with 4-hour interval	Separate EVG/cobi/FTC/TDF and antacid administration by more than 2 hours.
	RAL	<u>Al-Mg Hydroxide Antacid:</u> • RAL C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 54% to 63% if given simultaneously or 2 hours before or after antacid  <u>CaCO<sub>3</sub> Antacid:</u> • RAL AUC ↓ 54%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 32%	<b>Do not co-administer RAL and Al-Mg hydroxide antacids either simultaneously or within 2 hours.</b>  No dosing separation necessary when co-administering RAL and CaCO <sub>3</sub> antacids.
<b>H2-Receptor Antagonists</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Proton Pump Inhibitors</b>	DTG	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	RAL	RAL AUC ↑ 212%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 46%	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Anticoagulants</b>			
<b>Warfarin</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	No data, but warfarin levels may be affected	Monitor INR and adjust warfarin dose accordingly.
<b>Anticonvulsants</b>			
<b>Carbamazepine</b>	DTG	↓ DTG possible	Consider alternative anticonvulsant.
<b>Oxcarbazepine</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ carbamazepine possible	Consider alternative anticonvulsant.
<b>Phenobarbital</b>		↓ EVG possible	
<b>Phenytoin</b>		↓ cobi possible	
<b>Ethosuximide</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ ethosuximide possible	Clinically monitor for ethosuximide toxicities.
<b>Antidepressants</b>			
<b>SSRIs</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ SSRI possible	Initiate with lowest dose of SSRI and titrate dose carefully based on antidepressant response.
<b>TCAs</b> Amitriptyline Desipramine Imipramine Nortriptyline	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	Desipramine AUC ↑ 65%	Initiate with lowest dose and titrate dose of TCA carefully.
<b>Trazodone</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ trazodone possible	Initiate with lowest dose and titrate dose of trazodone carefully.

**Table 18d. Drug Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 2 of 8)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Antifungals</b>			
<b>Itraconazole</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ itraconazole expected ↑ EVG and cobi possible	Consider monitoring itraconazole level to guide dosage adjustments. High doses (>200 mg/day) are not recommended unless dose is guided by itraconazole levels.
<b>Posaconazole</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ EVG and cobi possible ↑ posaconazole possible	If co-administered, monitor posaconazole concentrations
<b>Voriconazole</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ voriconazole expected ↑ EVG and cobi possible	Risk/benefit ratio should be assessed to justify use of voriconazole. If administered, consider monitoring voriconazole level. Adjust dose accordingly.
<b>Antimycobacterials</b>			
<b>Clarithromycin</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ clarithromycin possible ↑ cobi possible	<u>CrCl ≥60 mL/min:</u> • No dose adjustment is necessary. <u>CrCl 50–60 mL/min:</u> • Reduce clarithromycin dose by 50%. <u>CrCl &lt;50 mL/min:</u> • EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC is not recommended.
<b>Rifabutin</b>	DTG	<b>Rifabutin (300 mg once daily):</b> • DTG AUC ↔, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 30%	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	Compared with rifabutin (300 mg daily) administered alone, when <b>rifabutin (150 mg every other day)</b> administered with EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC, no significant change in rifabutin AUC;  For 25-O-desacetyl-rifabutin, AUC ↑ 625%  EVG AUC ↓ 21%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 67%	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
	RAL	RAL AUC ↑ 19%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 20%	No dosage adjustment necessary.



**Table 18d. Drug Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 3 of 8)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Antimycobacterials, continued</b>			
<b>Rifampin</b>	DTG	<u>Rifampin with DTG 50 mg BID Compared with DTG 50 mg BID Alone:</u> • DTG AUC ↓ 54%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 72%  <u>Rifampin with DTG 50 mg BID Compared with DTG 50 mg Once Daily Alone:</u> • DTG AUC ↑ 33%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 22%	Dose: DTG 50 mg BID (instead of 50 mg once daily) for patients without suspected or documented INSTI mutation.  <b>Avoid concomitant use in patients with certain suspected or determined INSTI-associated resistance substitutions. Consider using rifabutin.</b>
	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	Significant ↓ EVG and cobi expected	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
	RAL	<u>RAL 400 mg:</u> • RAL AUC ↓ 40%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 61%  <u>Compared with RAL 400 mg BID Alone, Rifampin with RAL 800 mg BID:</u> • RAL AUC ↑ 27%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 53%	Dose: RAL 800 mg BID  Monitor closely for virologic response or consider using rifabutin as an alternative rifamycin.
<b>Rifapentine</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	Significant ↓ EVG and cobi expected	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
<b>Benzodiazepines</b>			
<b>Clonazepam</b> <b>Clorazepate</b> <b>Diazepam</b> <b>Estazolam</b> <b>Flurazepam</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ benzodiazepines possible	Dose reduction of benzodiazepine may be necessary. Initiate with low dose and clinically monitor.  Consider alternative benzodiazepines to diazepam, such as lorazepam, oxazepam, or temazepam.
<b>Midazolam</b> <b>Triazolam</b>	DTG	<u>DTG 25 mg:</u> • midazolam AUC ↔	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ midazolam expected ↑ triazolam expected	<b>Do not co-administer triazolam or oral midazolam and EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC.</b>  Parenteral midazolam can be used with caution in a closely monitored setting. Consider dose reduction, especially if more than one dose is administered.
<b>Cardiac Medications</b>			
<b>Anti-Arrhythmics</b>  Amiodarone, bepridil, digoxin, disopyramide, dronedarone, flecainide, systemic lidocaine, mexilitine, propafenone, quinidine	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ anti-arrhythmics possible  digoxin C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 41%, AUC no significant change	Use anti-arrhythmics with caution. Therapeutic drug monitoring, if available, is recommended for anti-arrhythmics.

**Table 18d. Drug Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 4 of 8)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Cardiac Medications, continued</b>			
<b>Bosentan</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ bosentan possible	<p><u>In Patients on EVG/cobi/FTC/TDF ≥10 Days:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Start bosentan at 62.5 mg once daily or every other day based on individual tolerability.</li> </ul> <p><u>In Patients on Bosentan who Require EVG/cobi/FTC/TDF:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Stop bosentan ≥36 hours before EVG/cobi/FTC/TDF initiation. After at least 10 days following initiation of EVG/cobi/FTC/TDF, resume bosentan at 62.5 mg once daily or every other day based on individual tolerability.</li> </ul>
<b>Beta-blockers</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ beta-blockers possible	<p>Adjust beta-blockers according to clinical response. Beta-blocker dose may need to be decreased.</p> <p>Some beta-blockers (e.g., metoprolol, timolol) are metabolized via CYP450 pathway. Consider using other beta-blockers (e.g., atenolol, labetalol, nadolol, sotalol) as these agents are not metabolized by CYP450 enzymes.</p>
<b>Dofetilide</b>	DTG	↑ dofetilide expected	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
<b>Dihydropyridine and Non-Dihydropyridine CCBs</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ CCBs possible	Co-administer with caution. Monitor for CCB efficacy and toxicities.
<b>Corticosteroids</b>			
<b>Dexamethasone</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↓ EVG and cobi possible	Co-administer with caution and monitor HIV virologic response.
<b>Fluticasone</b> Inhaled/Intranasal	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ fluticasone possible	Co-administration may result in adrenal insufficiency, including Cushing's syndrome. Consider alternative therapy (e.g., beclomethasone), particularly for long-term use.
<b>Methylprednisolone, Prednisolone, Triamcinolone</b> Local injections, including intra-articular, epidural, intra-orbital	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ glucocorticoids expected	<p>Co-administration may result in adrenal insufficiency, including Cushing's syndrome. <b>Do not co-administer.</b></p> <p>Consider alternative non-steroidal therapies. If intra-articular corticosteroid therapy required, change to alternative non-CYP3A-modulating ART (e.g., RAL, DTG).</p>
<b>Hepatitis C NS3/4A—PIs</b>			
<b>Boceprevir</b>	DTG	DTG AUC ↔	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	No data	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
	RAL	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.

**Table 18d. Drug Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 5 of 8)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Hepatitis C NS3/4A—PIs, continued</b>			
Simeprevir	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ simeprevir expected	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
	RAL	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
Telaprevir	DTG	DTG AUC ↑ 25%	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	EVG AUC ↓ 31%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 29% Telaprevir AUC ↔	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	RAL	RAL AUC ↑ 31% Telaprevir ↔	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Herbal Products</b>			
St. John's Wort	DTG	↓ DTG possible	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
<b>Hormonal Contraceptives</b>			
Hormonal Contraceptives	RAL	No clinically significant effect	Safe to use in combination
Norgestimate/ethinyl estradiol	DTG	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	Norgestimate AUC, C <sub>max</sub> , C <sub>min</sub> ↑ >2-fold Ethinyl estradiol AUC ↓ 25%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 44%	The effects of increases in progestin (norgestimate) are not fully known and can include insulin resistance, dyslipidemia, acne, and venous thrombosis. Weigh the risks and benefits of the drug, and consider alternative contraceptive method.
<b>HMG-CoA Reductase Inhibitors</b>			
Atorvastatin	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ atorvastatin possible	Titrate statin dose slowly and use the lowest dose possible.
Lovastatin	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	Significant ↑ lovastatin expected	<b>Contraindicated. Do not co-administer.</b>
Pitavastatin Pravastatin	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	No data	No dosage recommendation
Rosuvastatin	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	Rosuvastatin AUC ↑ 38%, C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 89%	Titrate statin dose slowly and use the lowest dose possible.
Simvastatin	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	Significant ↑ simvastatin expected	<b>Contraindicated. Do not co-administer.</b>
<b>Immunosuppressants</b>			
Cyclosporine Sirolimus Tacrolimus	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ immunosuppressant possible	Initiate with an adjusted immunosuppressant dose to account for potential increased concentration and monitor for toxicities. Therapeutic drug monitoring of immunosuppressant is recommended. Consult with specialist as necessary.

**Table 18d. Drug Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 6 of 8)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Narcotics/Treatment for Opioid Dependence</b>			
<b>Buprenorphine</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	Buprenorphine: AUC ↑ 35%, C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 12%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 66% Norbuprenorphine: AUC ↑ 42%, C <sub>max</sub> ↑ 24%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 57%	No dosage adjustment necessary. Clinical monitoring is recommended.
	RAL	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Methadone</b>	DTG	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
	RAL	No significant effect	No dosage adjustment necessary.
<b>Neuroleptics</b>			
<b>Perphenazine</b> <b>Risperidone</b> <b>Thioridazine</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ neuroleptic possible	Initiate neuroleptic at a low dose. Decrease in neuroleptic dose may be necessary.
<b>PDE5 Inhibitors</b>			
<b>Avanafil</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	No data	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
<b>Sildenafil</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ sildenafil expected	<u>For Treatment of Erectile Dysfunction:</u> • Start with sildenafil 25 mg every 48 hours and monitor for adverse effects of sildenafil.  <u>For treatment of PAH:</u> • <b>Contraindicated</b>
<b>Tadalafil</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ tadalafil expected	<u>For Treatment of Erectile Dysfunction:</u> • Start with tadalafil 5-mg dose and do not exceed a single dose of 10 mg every 72 hours. Monitor for adverse effects of tadalafil.  <u>For Treatment of PAH</u> <i>In Patients on EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC &gt;7 Days:</i> • Start with tadalafil 20 mg once daily and increase to 40 mg once daily based on tolerability.  <i>In Patients on Tadalafil who Require EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC:</i> • Stop tadalafil ≥24 hours before EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC initiation. Seven days after EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC initiation restart tadalafil at 20 mg once daily, and increase to 40 mg once daily based on tolerability.

**Table 18d. Drug Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 7 of 8)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>PDE5 Inhibitors, continued</b>			
<b>Vardenafil</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ vardenafil expected	Start with vardenafil 2.5 mg every 72 hours and monitor for adverse effects of vardenafil.
<b>Sedatives/Hypnotics</b>			
<b>Buspirone</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ buspirone possible	Initiate buspirone at a low dose. Dose reduction may be necessary.
<b>Zolpidem</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ zolpidem possible	Initiate zolpidem at a low dose. Dose reduction may be necessary.
<b>Miscellaneous Interactions</b>			
<b>Colchicine</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ colchicine expected	<p><b>Do not co-administer in patients with hepatic or renal impairment.</b></p> <p><u>For Treatment of Gout Flares:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Colchicine 0.6 mg for 1 dose, followed by 0.3 mg 1 hour later. Do not repeat dose for at least 3 days.</li> </ul> <p><u>For Prophylaxis of Gout Flares:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If original regimen was colchicine 0.6 mg BID, the regimen should be decreased to 0.3 mg once daily. If regimen was 0.6 mg once daily, the regimen should be decreased to 0.3 mg every other day.</li> </ul> <p><u>For Treatment of Familial Mediterranean Fever:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Do not exceed colchicine 0.6 mg once daily or 0.3 mg BID.</li> </ul>
<b>Metformin</b>	DTG	↑ metformin possible	Monitor clinically when starting or stopping DTG. Dose adjustment of metformin may be necessary.
<b>Polyvalent Cations</b> Mg, Al, Fe, Ca, Zn, including multivitamins with minerals	All INSTIs	↓ INSTI possible if co-administered with these products	<p>Give INSTI at least 2 hours before or at least 6 hours after medications containing polyvalent cations, including but not limited to the following products: cation-containing antacids or laxatives; iron, calcium, or magnesium supplements; and sucralfate.</p> <p>Many oral multivitamins also contain varying amounts of polyvalent cations.</p> <p>Exception: No dosing separation necessary when co-administering RAL and CaCO<sub>3</sub> antacids.</p>



**Table 18d. Drug Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Other Drugs (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 8 of 8)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	INSTI	Effect on INSTI or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Miscellaneous Interactions, continued</b>			
<b>Quetiapine</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ quetiapine AUC expected.	<p><u>Initiation of Quetiapine in a Patient Receiving EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Start quetiapine at the lowest dose and titrate up as needed. Monitor for quetiapine efficacy and adverse effects.</li> </ul> <p><u>Initiation of EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC in a Patient Receiving a Stable Dose of Quetiapine:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reduce quetiapine dose to 1/6 of the original dose, and closely monitor for quetiapine efficacy and adverse effects.</li> </ul>
<b>Salmeterol</b>	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	↑ salmeterol possible	<b>Do not co-administer</b> because of potential increased risk of salmeterol-associated cardiovascular events.

**Key to Acronyms:** **Al** = aluminum; ART = antiretroviral therapy; AUC = area under the curve; BID = twice daily; **Ca** = calcium; **CaCO<sub>3</sub>** = calcium carbonate; CCB = calcium channel blocker; C<sub>max</sub> = maximum plasma concentration; C<sub>min</sub> = minimum plasma concentration; cobi = cobicistat; **CrCl** = creatinine clearance; **DTG** = dolutegravir; EVG = elvitegravir; **Fe** = iron; FTC = emtricitabine; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; **Mg** = magnesium; PAH = pulmonary arterial hypertension; RAL = raltegravir; SSRI = selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor; TCA = tricyclic anti-depressants; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; **Zn** = zinc

**Table 18e. Drug Interactions between CCR5 Antagonist and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 1 of 2)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	CCR5 Antagonist	Effect on CCR5 Antagonist or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>Anticonvulsants</b>			
Carbamazepine Phenobarbital Phenytoin	MVC	↓ MVC possible	If used without a strong CYP3A inhibitor, use MVC 600 mg BID or an alternative antiepileptic agent.
<b>Antifungals</b>			
Itraconazole	MVC	↑ MVC possible	Dose: MVC 150 mg BID
Voriconazole	MVC	↑ MVC possible	Consider dose reduction to MVC 150 mg BID
<b>Antimycobacterials</b>			
Clarithromycin	MVC	↑ MVC possible	Dose: MVC 150 mg BID
Rifabutin	MVC	↓ MVC possible	If used without a strong CYP3A inducer or inhibitor, use MVC 300 mg BID.  If used with a strong CYP3A inhibitor, use MVC 150 mg BID.
Rifampin	MVC	MVC AUC ↓ 64%	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>  If co-administration is necessary, use MVC 600 mg BID.  If co-administered with a strong CYP3A inhibitor, use MVC 300 mg BID.
Rifapentine	MVC	↓ MVC expected	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
<b>Hepatitis C NS3/4A—PIs</b>			
Boceprevir	MVC	MVC AUC ↑ 202%	Dose: MVC 150 mg BID
Telaprevir	MVC	MVC AUC ↑ 850%	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
<b>Herbal Products</b>			
St. John's Wort	MVC	↓ MVC possible	<b>Co-administration is not recommended.</b>
<b>Hormonal Contraceptives</b>			
Hormonal Contraceptives	MVC	No significant effect on ethinyl estradiol or levonorgestrel	Safe to use in combination
<b>Antiretroviral Drugs</b>			
<b>INSTIs</b>			
EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	MVC	↑ MVC possible	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>
RAL	MVC	RAL AUC ↓ 37% MVC AUC ↓ 21%	Dose: standard
<b>NNRTIs</b>			
EFV	MVC	MVC AUC ↓ 45%	Dose: MVC 600 mg BID

**Table 18e. Drug Interactions between CCR5 Antagonist and Other Drugs (Including Antiretroviral Agents) (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 2 of 2)**

Concomitant Drug Class/Name	CCR5 Antagonist	Effect on CCR5 Antagonist or Concomitant Drug Concentrations	Dosing Recommendations and Clinical Comments
<b>NNRTIs, continued</b>			
<b>ETR</b>	MVC	MVC AUC ↓ 53%	Dose: MVC 600 mg BID in the absence of a potent CYP3A inhibitor
<b>NVP</b>	MVC	MVC AUC ↔	<u>Without HIV PI:</u> • MVC 300 mg BID  <u>With HIV PI (except TPV/r):</u> • MVC 150 mg BID
<b>PIs</b>			
<b>ATV +/- RTV</b>	MVC	<u>With Unboosted ATV:</u> • MVC AUC ↑ 257%  <u>With (ATV 300 mg and RTV 100 mg) Once Daily:</u> • MVC AUC ↑ 388%	Dose: MVC 150 mg BID
<b>DRV/r</b>	MVC	<u>With (DRV 600 mg and RTV 100 mg) BID:</u> • MVC AUC ↑ 305%  <u>With (DRV 600 mg and RTV 100 mg) BID and ETR:</u> • MVC AUC ↑ 210%	Dose: MVC 150 mg BID
<b>FPV +/- RTV</b>	MVC	<u>With (FPV 700 mg plus RTV 100 mg) BID plus MVC 300 mg BID:</u> • MVC AUC ↑ 149%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 374%  <u>With (FPV 1400 mg plus RTV 200 mg) Once Daily and MVC 300 mg Once Daily:</u> • MVC AUC ↑ 126%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 80%	Dose: MVC 150 mg BID
<b>LPV/r</b>	MVC	MVC AUC ↑ 295%  <u>With LPV/r and EFV:</u> • MVC AUC ↑ 153%	Dose: MVC 150 mg BID
<b>RTV</b>	MVC	<u>With RTV 100 mg BID:</u> • MVC AUC ↑ 161%	Dose: MVC 150 mg BID
<b>SQV/r</b>	MVC	<u>With SQV 1000 mg and RTV 100 mg BID:</u> • MVC: AUC ↑ 877%  <u>With SQV 1000 mg and RTV 100 mg BID plus EFV:</u> • MVC AUC ↑ 400%	Dose: MVC 150 mg BID
<b>TPV/r</b>	MVC	<u>With TPV 500 mg and RTV 200 mg) BID:</u> • MVC AUC ↔; • No data for TPV	Dose: MVC 300 mg BID

**Key to Acronyms:** ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; ATV/r = ritonavir-boosted atazanavir; AUC = area under the curve; BID = twice daily; coBI = cobicistat; CYP = cytochrome P; DRV/r = ritonavir-boosted darunavir; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; EVG = elvitegravir; FPV = fosamprenavir; FTC = emtricitabine; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; LPV/r = ritonavir-boosted lopinavir; MVC = maraviroc; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; RAL = raltegravir; RTV = ritonavir; SQV/r = ritonavir-boosted saquinavir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate

**Note:** FPV is a pro-drug of APV

**Table 19a. Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors, and Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> (Last updated March 27, 2012; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (Page 1 of 2)**

<sup>a</sup> DLV, IDV, and NFV are **not** included in this table. Refer to the DLV, IDV, and NFV Food and Drug Administration package inserts for information regarding drug interactions.

PIs		NNRTIs			
		EFV	ETR	NVP	RPV <sup>a</sup>
ATV +/- RTV	PK data	<u>With Unboosted ATV:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATV: AUC ↓ 74%</li> <li>• EFV: no significant change</li> </ul> <u>With ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg Once Daily with Food:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATV concentrations similar to those with unboosted ATV without EFV</li> </ul>	<u>With Unboosted ATV:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ETR: AUC ↑ 50%, C<sub>min</sub> ↑ 58%</li> <li>• ATV: AUC ↓ 17%, C<sub>min</sub> ↓ 47%</li> </ul> <u>With ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg Once Daily:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ETR: AUC and C<sub>min</sub> ↑ approximately 30%</li> <li>• ATV: AUC ↓ 14%, C<sub>min</sub> ↓ 38%</li> </ul>	<u>With ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg Once Daily:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATV: AUC ↓ 42%, C<sub>min</sub> ↓ 72%</li> <li>• NVP: AUC ↑ 25%</li> </ul>	<u>With Boosted and Unboosted ATV:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ RPV possible</li> </ul>
	Dose	<b>Do not co-administer with unboosted ATV.</b>  <u>In ART-Naive Patients:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (ATV 400 mg plus RTV 100 mg) once daily</li> </ul> <b>Do not co-administer in ART-experienced patients.</b>	<b>Do not co-administer with ATV +/- RTV.</b>	<b>Do not co-administer with ATV +/- RTV.</b>	Standard
DRV  Always use with RTV	PK data	<u>With DRV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg BID:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRV: AUC ↓ 13%, C<sub>min</sub> ↓ 31%</li> <li>• EFV: AUC ↑ 21%</li> </ul>	<u>ETR 100 mg BID with DRV 600 mg plus RTV 100 mg BID:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRV: no significant change</li> <li>• ETR: AUC ↓ 37%, C<sub>min</sub> ↓ 49%</li> </ul>	<u>With DRV 400 mg plus RTV 100 mg BID:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRV: AUC ↑ 24%<sup>b</sup></li> <li>• NVP: AUC ↑ 27%, C<sub>min</sub> ↑ 47%</li> </ul>	<u>RPV 150 mg Once Daily with DRV 800 mg plus RTV 100 mg Once Daily:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRV: no significant change</li> <li>• RPV: AUC ↑ 130%, C<sub>min</sub> ↑ 178%</li> </ul>
	Dose	Clinical significance unknown. Use standard doses and monitor patient closely. Consider monitoring drug levels.	Standard (ETR 200 mg BID)  Safety and efficacy of this combination, despite decreased ETR concentration, have been established in a clinical trial.	Standard	Standard
FPV	PK data	<u>With FPV 1400 mg plus RTV 200 mg Once Daily:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APV: C<sub>min</sub> ↓ 36%</li> </ul>	<u>With FPV 700 mg plus RTV 100 mg BID:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APV: AUC ↑ 69%, C<sub>min</sub> ↑ 77%</li> </ul>	<u>With Unboosted FPV 1400 mg BID:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• APV: AUC ↓ 33%</li> <li>• NVP: AUC ↑ 29%</li> </ul> <u>With FPV 700 mg plus RTV 100 mg BID:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NVP: C<sub>min</sub> ↑ 22%</li> </ul>	<u>With Boosted and Unboosted FPV:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ↑ RPV possible</li> </ul>
	Dose	FPV 1400 mg plus RTV 300 mg once daily or FPV 700 mg plus RTV 100 mg BID  EFV standard	<b>Do not co-administer with FPV +/- RTV.</b>	FPV 700 mg plus RTV 100 mg BID  NVP standard	Standard

**Table 19a. Interactions between Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors, and Protease Inhibitors<sup>a</sup> (Last updated March 27, 2012; **last reviewed May 1, 2014**) (Page 2 of 2)**

PIs		NNRTIs			
		EFV	ETR	NVP	RPV <sup>a</sup>
LPV/r	PK data	With LPV/r Tablets 500/125 mg BID <sup>c</sup> plus EFV 600 mg: • LPV levels similar to LPV/r 400/100 mg BID without EFV	With LPV/r Tablets: • ETR: AUC ↓ 35% (comparable to the decrease with DRV/r) • LPV: AUC ↓ 13%	With LPV/r Capsules: • LPV: AUC ↓ 27%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 51%	RPV 150 mg Once Daily with LPV/r Capsules: • LPV: no significant change • RPV: AUC ↑ 52%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 74%
	Dose	LPV/r tablets 500/125 mg <sup>c</sup> BID; LPV/r oral solution 533/133 mg BID  EFV standard	Standard	LPV/r tablets 500/125 mg <sup>c</sup> BID; LPV/r oral solution 533/133 mg BID  NVP standard	Standard
RTV	PK data	Refer to information for boosted PI.	Refer to information for boosted PI.	Refer to information for boosted PI.	Refer to information for boosted PI.
	Dose				
SQV Always use with RTV	PK data	With SQV 1200 mg TID: • SQV: AUC ↓ 62% • EFV: AUC ↓ 12%	With SQV 1000 mg plus RTV 100 mg BID: • SQV: AUC unchanged • ETR: AUC ↓ 33%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 29%  Reduced ETR levels similar to reduction with DRV/r	With 600 mg TID: • SQV: AUC ↓ 24%  • NVP: no significant change	↑ RPV possible
	Dose	SQV 1000 mg plus RTV 100 mg BID	SQV 1000 mg plus RTV 100 mg BID	Dose with SQV/r not established	Standard
TPV Always use with RTV	PK data	With TPV 500 mg plus RTV 100 mg BID: • TPV: AUC ↓ 31%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 42% • EFV: no significant change  With TPV 750 mg plus RTV 200 mg BID: • TPV: no significant change • EFV: no significant change	With TPV 500 mg plus RTV 200 mg BID: • ETR: AUC ↓ 76%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 82% • TPV: AUC ↑ 18%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 24%	With (TPV 250 mg plus RTV 200 mg) BID and with (TPV 750 mg plus RTV 100 mg) BID: • NVP: no significant change • TPV: no data	↑ RPV possible
	Dose	Standard	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	Standard	Standard

<sup>a</sup> Approved dose for RPV is 25 mg once daily. Most PK interaction studies were performed using 75 mg to 150 mg RPV per dose.

<sup>b</sup> Based on between-study comparison.

<sup>c</sup> 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 Acronyms:** APV = amprenavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ATV = atazanavir; AUC = area under the curve; BID = twice daily; C<sub>max</sub> = maximum plasma concentration; C<sub>min</sub> = minimum plasma concentration; CYP = cytochrome P; DLV = delavirdine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/r = ritonavir-boosted darunavir; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FPV = fosamprenavir; IDV = indinavir; LPV = lopinavir; LPV/r = ritonavir-boosted lopinavir; MVC = maraviroc; NFV = nelfinavir; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SQV = saquinavir; SQV/r = ritonavir-boosted saquinavir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TID = three times a day; TPV = tipranavir



**Table 19b. Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors or Protease Inhibitors** (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 1 of 3)

Drug Class/ARV		INSTI		
		DTG	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	RAL
NNRTIs				
EFV	PK Data	<p><u>With DTG 50 mg Once Daily:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DTG: AUC ↓ 57%, C<sub>min</sub> ↓ 75%</li> </ul>	↑ or ↓ EVG, cobi, EFV possible	EFV: AUC ↓ 36%
	Dose	<p>DTG 50 mg BID in patients without INSTI resistance</p> <p>Consider alternative combination in patients with certain INSTI-associated resistance<sup>a</sup> or clinically suspected INSTI resistance.</p>	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	Standard
ETR	PK Data	<p><u>With ETR 200 mg BID plus DTG 50 mg Once Daily:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DTG: AUC ↓ 71%, C<sub>min</sub> ↓ 88%</li> </ul> <p><u>With ETR 200 mg BID plus DRV/r 600/100 mg BID plus DTG 50 mg Once Daily:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DTG: AUC ↓ 25%, C<sub>min</sub> ↓ 37%</li> </ul> <p><u>With ETR 200 mg BID plus LPV/r 400 mg/100 mg BID plus DTG 50 mg Once Daily:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DTG: AUC ↑ 11%, C<sub>min</sub> ↑ 28%</li> </ul>	↑ or ↓ EVG, cobi, ETR possible	<p>ETR: C<sub>min</sub> ↓ 17%</p> <p>RAL: C<sub>min</sub> ↓ 34%</p>
	Dose	<p><b>Do not co-administer ETR and DTG without concurrently administering ATV/r, DRV/r, or LPV/r.</b></p> <p><u>In Patients without INSTI Resistance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DTG 50 mg daily with ETR (concurrently with ATV/r, DRV/r, or LPV/r)</li> </ul> <p><u>In Patients with Certain INSTI-Associated Resistance or Clinically Suspected INSTI Resistance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DTG 50mg BID with ETR (concurrently with ATV/r, DRV/r, or LPV/r)</li> </ul>	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	Standard

**Table 19b. Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors or Protease Inhibitors** (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 2 of 3)

Drug Class/ARV		INSTI		
		DTG	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	RAL
<b>NNRTIs</b>				
NVP	PK Data	↓ DTG possible	↑ or ↓ EVG, cobi, NVP possible	No data
	Dose	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	Standard
RPV	PK Data	With DTG 50 mg Daily: • DTG: AUC ↔, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 22% • RPV: AUC ↔, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 21%	↑ or ↓ EVG, cobi, RPV possible	No data
	Dose	Standard	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	No data
<b>PIs</b>				
ATV +/- RTV	PK Data	With Unboosted ATV plus DTG 30 mg Once Daily: • DTG: AUC ↑ 91%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 180%  With (ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg) Once Daily plus DTG 30 mg Once Daily: • DTG: AUC ↑ 62%, C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 121%	↑ or ↓ EVG, cobi, ATV possible	With unboosted ATV: • RAL: AUC ↑ 72%  With ATV 300 mg plus RTV 100 mg Once Daily: • RAL: AUC ↑ 41%
	Dose	Standard	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	Standard
DRV Always use with RTV	PK Data	With (DRV 600 mg plus RTV 100 mg) BID plus DTG 30 mg Once Daily: • DTG: AUC ↓ 22%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 38%	↑ or ↓ EVG, cobi, DRV possible	With DRV 600 mg plus RTV 100 mg BID: • RAL: AUC ↓ 29% and C <sub>min</sub> ↑ 38%
	Dose	Standard  Can use either once or twice daily dosing of DRV/r without dose adjustments.	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	Standard
FPV +/- RTV	PK Data	With (FPV 700 mg plus RTV 100 mg) BID plus DTG 50 mg Once Daily: • DTG: AUC ↓ 35%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 49%	↑ or ↓ EVG, cobi, FPV possible	FPV: No significant effect
	Dose	DTG 50 mg BID in patients without INSTI resistance  <b>Consider alternative combination</b> in patients with certain INSTI-associated resistance <sup>a</sup> or clinically suspected INSTI resistance.	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	Standard

**Table 19b. Interactions between Integrase Strand Transfer Inhibitors and Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors or Protease Inhibitors** (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 3 of 3)

Drug Class/ARV		INSTI		
		DTG	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC	RAL
PIs, continued				
LPV/r	PK Data	With LPV/r 400 mg/100 mg BID plus DTG 30 mg Once Daily: • DTG: no significant effect	↑ or ↓ EVG, cobi, LPV possible  RTV and cobi have similar effects on CYP3A.	↓ RAL  ↔ LPV/r
	Dose	Standard  Can use either once or twice daily dosing of LPV/r without dose adjustments.	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	Standard
RTV	PK Data	No data with RTV alone	↑ or ↓ EVG, cobi possible  RTV and cobi have similar effects on CYP3A.	With RTV 100 mg BID: • RAL: AUC ↓ 16%
	Dose	Refer to other PI/r for dosage recommendation.	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	Standard
SQV Always use with RTV	PK Data	No data	↑ or ↓ EVG, cobi, SQV possible  RTV and cobi have similar effects on CYP3A.	No data
	Dose	No dosage recommendation	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	Standard
TPV Always use with RTV	PK Data	With (TPV 500 mg plus RTV 200 mg) BID plus DTG 50 mg Once Daily: • DTG: AUC ↓ 59%, C <sub>min</sub> ↓ 76%	↑ or ↓ EVG, cobi, TPV possible  RTV and cobi have similar effects on CYP3A.	With TPV 500 mg plus RTV 200 mg BID: • RAL: AUC ↓ 24%
	Dose	DTG: 50 mg BID in patients without INSTI resistance  <b>Consider alternative combination</b> in patients with certain INSTI-associated resistance or clinically suspected INSTI-associated resistance substitutions. <sup>a</sup>	<b>Do not co-administer.</b>	Standard

<sup>a</sup> Refer to Tivicay product label for details.

**Key to Acronyms:** APV = amprenavir; ART = antiretroviral therapy; ATV = atazanavir; AUC = area under the curve; BID = twice daily; cobi = cobicistat; C<sub>max</sub> = maximum plasma concentration; C<sub>min</sub> = minimum plasma concentration; CYP = cytochrome P; DLV = delavirdine; DRV = darunavir; DRV/r = ritonavir-boosted darunavir; **DTG = dolutegravir**; EFV = efavirenz; EVG = elvitegravir; ETR = etravirine; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FPV = fosamprenavir; IDV = indinavir; **INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor**; LPV = lopinavir; LPV/r = ritonavir-boosted lopinavir; MVC = maraviroc; NFV = nelfinavir; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SQV = saquinavir; SQV/r = ritonavir-boosted saquinavir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TID = three times a day; TPV = tipranavir

## Preventing Secondary Transmission of HIV (Last updated March 27, 2012; last reviewed March 27, 2012)

---

Despite substantial advances in prevention and treatment of HIV infection in the United States, the rate of new infections has remained stable.<sup>1-2</sup> Although earlier prevention interventions mainly were behavioral, recent data demonstrate the strong impact of antiretroviral therapy (ART) on secondary HIV transmission. The most effective strategy to stem the spread of HIV will probably be a combination of behavioral, biological, and pharmacological interventions.<sup>3</sup>

### Prevention Counseling

Counseling and related behavioral interventions for those living with HIV infection can reduce behaviors associated with secondary transmission of HIV. Each patient encounter offers the clinician an opportunity to reinforce HIV prevention messages, but multiple studies show that prevention counseling is frequently neglected in clinical practice.<sup>4-5</sup> Although delivering effective prevention interventions in a busy practice setting may be challenging, clinicians should be aware that patients often look to their providers for messages about HIV prevention. Multiple approaches to prevention counseling are available, including formal guidance from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) for incorporating HIV prevention into medical care settings. Such interventions have been demonstrated to be effective in changing sexual risk behavior<sup>6-8</sup> and can reinforce self-directed behavior change early after diagnosis.<sup>9</sup>

CDC has identified several prevention interventions for individuals infected with HIV that meet stringent criteria for efficacy and scientific rigor (<http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/research/prs/index.htm>). The following three interventions have proven effective in treatment settings and can be delivered by providers as brief messages during clinic visits:

- Partnership for Health (<http://effectiveinterventions.org/en/Interventions/PfH.aspx>),
- Options (<http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/research/prs/resources/factsheets/options.htm>),
- Positive Choice (<http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/research/prs/resources/factsheets/positive-choice.htm>).

In addition, CDC's "Prevention Is Care" campaign (<http://www.actagainstaids.org/provider/pic/index.html>) helps providers (and members of a multidisciplinary care team) integrate simple methods to prevent transmission by HIV-infected individuals into routine care. These prevention interventions are designed to reduce the risk of secondary HIV transmission through sexual contact. The interventions are designed generally for implementation at the community or group level, but some can be adapted and administered in clinical settings by a multidisciplinary care team.

### Need for Screening for High-Risk Behaviors

The primary care visit provides an opportunity to screen patients for ongoing high-risk drug and sexual behaviors for transmitting HIV infection. Routine screening and symptom-directed testing for and treatment of sexually transmitted diseases (STDs), as recommended by CDC,<sup>10</sup> remain essential adjuncts to prevention counseling. Genital ulcers may facilitate HIV transmission and STDs may increase HIV viral load in plasma and genital secretions.<sup>7, 11-13</sup> They also provide objective evidence of unprotected sexual activity, which should prompt prevention counseling.

The contribution of substance and alcohol use to HIV risk behaviors and transmission has been well established in multiple populations;<sup>14-18</sup> therefore, effective counseling for injection and noninjection drug users is essential to prevent HIV transmission. Identifying the substance(s) of use is important because HIV

prevalence, transmission risk, risk behaviors, transmission rates, and potential for pharmacologic intervention all vary according to the type of substance used.<sup>19-21</sup> Risk-reduction strategies for injection drug users (IDUs), in addition to condom use, include needle exchange and instructions on cleaning drug paraphernalia. Evidence supporting the efficacy of interventions to reduce injection drug use risk behavior also exists. Interventions include both behavioral strategies<sup>14-15, 22</sup> and opiate substitution treatment with methadone or buprenorphine.<sup>23-24</sup> No successful pharmacologic interventions have been found for cocaine and methamphetamine users; cognitive and behavioral interventions demonstrate the greatest effect on reducing the risk behaviors of these users.<sup>25-27</sup> Given the significant impact of cocaine and methamphetamine on sexual risk behavior, reinforcement of sexual risk-reduction strategies is important.<sup>14-18, 28</sup>

## Antiretroviral Therapy as Prevention

ART can play an important role in preventing HIV transmission. Lower levels of plasma HIV RNA have been associated with decreases in the concentration of virus in genital secretions.<sup>29-32</sup> Observational studies have demonstrated the association between low serum or genital HIV RNA and a decreased rate of HIV transmission among serodiscordant heterosexual couples.<sup>29, 33-34</sup> Ecological studies of communities with relatively high concentrations of men who have sex with men (MSM) and IDUs suggest increased use of ART is associated with decreased community viral load and reduced rates of new HIV diagnoses.<sup>35-37</sup> These data suggest that the risk of HIV transmission is low when an individual's viral load is below 400 copies/mL,<sup>35, 38</sup> but the threshold below which transmission of the virus becomes impossible is unknown. Furthermore, to be effective at preventing transmission it is assumed that: (1) ART is capable of durably and continuously suppressing viremia; (2) adherence to an effective ARV regimen is high; and (3) there is an absence of a concomitant STD. Importantly, detection of HIV RNA in genital secretions has been documented in individuals with controlled plasma HIV RNA and data describing a differential in concentration of most ARV drugs in the blood and genital compartments exist.<sup>30, 39</sup> At least one case of HIV transmission from a patient with suppressed plasma viral load to a monogamous uninfected sexual partner has been reported.<sup>40</sup>

In the HPTN 052 trial in HIV-discordant couples, the HIV-infected partners who were ART naive and had CD4 counts between 350 and 550 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> were randomized to initiate or delay ART. In this study, those who initiated ART had a 96% reduction in HIV transmission to the uninfected partners.<sup>3</sup> Almost all of the participants were in heterosexual relationships, all participants received risk-reduction counseling, and the absolute number of transmission events was low: 1 among ART initiators and 27 among ART delayers. Over the course of the study virologic failure rates were less than 5%, a value much lower than generally seen in individuals taking ART for their own health. These low virologic failure rates suggest high levels of adherence to ART in the study, which may have been facilitated by the frequency of study follow-up (study visits were monthly) and by participants' sense of obligation to protect their uninfected partners. Therefore, caution is indicated when interpreting the extent to which ART for the HIV-infected partner protects seronegative partners in contexts where adherence and, thus, rates of continuous viral suppression, may be lower. Furthermore, for HIV-infected MSM and IDUs, biological and observational data suggest suppressive ART also should protect against transmission, but the actual extent of protection has not been established.

Rates of HIV risk behaviors can increase coincidentally with the availability of potent combination ART, in some cases almost doubling compared with rates in the era prior to highly effective therapy.<sup>9</sup> A meta-analysis demonstrated that the prevalence of unprotected sex acts was increased in HIV-infected individuals who believed that receiving ART or having a suppressed viral load protected against transmitting HIV.<sup>41</sup> Attitudinal shifts away from safer sexual practices since the availability of potent ART underscore the role of provider-initiated HIV prevention counseling. With wider recognition that effective treatment decreases the risk of HIV transmission, it is particularly important for providers to help patients understand that a sustained viral load below the limits of detection will dramatically reduce but does not absolutely assure the absence of



HIV in the genital and blood compartments and, hence, the inability to transmit HIV to others.<sup>41-42</sup>

Maximal suppression of viremia not only depends on the potency of the ARV regimen used but also on the patient's adherence to prescribed therapy. Suboptimal adherence can lead to viremia that not only harms the patient but also increases his/her risk of transmitting HIV (including drug-resistant strains) via sex or needle sharing. Screening for and treating behavioral conditions that can impact adherence, such as depression and alcohol and substance use, improve overall health and reduce the risk of secondary transmission.

## Summary

Consistent and effective use of ART resulting in a sustained reduction in viral load in conjunction with consistent condom usage, safer sex and drug use practices, and detection and treatment of STDs are essential tools for prevention of sexual and blood-borne transmission of HIV. Given these important considerations, medical visits provide a vital opportunity to reinforce HIV prevention messages, discuss sex- and drug-related risk behaviors, diagnose and treat intercurrent STDs, review the importance of medication adherence, and foster open communication between provider and patient.

## References

1. Prejean J, Song R, Hernandez A, et al. Estimated HIV incidence in the United States, 2006-2009. *PLoS One*. 2011;6(8):e17502.
2. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. HIV Surveillance Report <http://www.cdc.gov/hiv/topics/surveillance/resources/reports/>. 2009. Published February 2011. Accessed December 7, 2011.
3. 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.
4. Mayer KH, Safren SA, Gordon CM. HIV care providers and prevention: opportunities and challenges. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Oct 1 2004;37(Suppl 2):S130-132.
5. Morin SF, Koester KA, Steward WT, et al. Missed opportunities: prevention with HIV-infected patients in clinical care settings. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Aug 1 2004;36(4):960-966.
6. Metsch LR, McCoy CB, Miles CC, Wohler B. Prevention myths and HIV risk reduction by active drug users. *AIDS Educ Prev*. Apr 2004;16(2):150-159.
7. Johnson WD, Diaz RM, Flanders WD, et al. Behavioral interventions to reduce risk for sexual transmission of HIV among men who have sex with men. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2008(3):CD001230.
8. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Evolution of HIV/AIDS prevention programs—United States, 1981-2006. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep*. Jun 2 2006;55(21):597-603.
9. Gorbach PM, Drumright LN, Daar ES, Little SJ. Transmission behaviors of recently HIV-infected men who have sex with men. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. May 2006;42(1):80-85.
10. Workowski KA, Berman S. Sexually transmitted diseases treatment guidelines, 2010. *MMWR Recomm Rep*. Dec 17 2010;59(RR-12):1-110.
11. Tanton C, Weiss HA, Le Goff J, et al. Correlates of HIV-1 genital shedding in Tanzanian women. *PLoS One*. 2011;6(3):e17480.
12. Wright TC, Jr., Subbarao S, Ellerbrock TV, et al. Human immunodeficiency virus 1 expression in the female genital tract in association with cervical inflammation and ulceration. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Feb 2001;184(3):279-285.
13. Schacker T, Ryncarz AJ, Goddard J, Diem K, Shaughnessy M, Corey L. Frequent recovery of HIV-1 from genital herpes simplex virus lesions in HIV-1-infected men. *JAMA*. Jul 1 1998;280(1):61-66.

14. Celentano DD, Latimore AD, Mehta SH. Variations in sexual risks in drug users: emerging themes in a behavioral context. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep*. Nov 2008;5(4):212-218.
15. Mitchell MM, Latimer WW. Unprotected casual sex and perceived risk of contracting HIV among drug users in Baltimore, Maryland: evaluating the influence of non-injection versus injection drug user status. *AIDS Care*. Feb 2009;21(2):221-230.
16. Colfax G, Coates TJ, Husnik MJ, et al. Longitudinal patterns of methamphetamine, popper (amyl nitrite), and cocaine use and high-risk sexual behavior among a cohort of san francisco men who have sex with men. *J Urban Health*. Mar 2005;82(1 Suppl 1):i62-70.
17. Mimiaga MJ, Reisner SL, Fontaine YM, et al. Walking the line: stimulant use during sex and HIV risk behavior among Black urban MSM. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. Jul 1 2010;110(1-2):30-37.
18. Ostrow DG, Plankey MW, Cox C, et al. Specific sex drug combinations contribute to the majority of recent HIV seroconversions among MSM in the MACS. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Jul 1 2009;51(3):349-355.
19. Sterk CE, Theall KP, Elifson KW. Who's getting the message? Intervention response rates among women who inject drugs and/or smoke crack cocaine. *Prev Med*. Aug 2003;37(2):119-128.
20. Sterk CE, Theall KP, Elifson KW, Kidder D. HIV risk reduction among African-American women who inject drugs: a randomized controlled trial. *AIDS Behav*. Mar 2003;7(1):73-86.
21. Strathdee SA, Sherman SG. The role of sexual transmission of HIV infection among injection and non-injection drug users. *J Urban Health*. Dec 2003;80(4 Suppl 3):iii7-14.
22. Copenhaver MM, Johnson BT, Lee IC, Harman JJ, Carey MP. Behavioral HIV risk reduction among people who inject drugs: meta-analytic evidence of efficacy. *J Subst Abuse Treat*. Sep 2006;31(2):163-171.
23. Hartel DM, Schoenbaum EE. Methadone treatment protects against HIV infection: two decades of experience in the Bronx, New York City. *Public Health Rep*. Jun 1998;113(Suppl 1):107-115.
24. Metzger DS, Navaline H, Woody GE. Drug abuse treatment as AIDS prevention. *Public Health Rep*. Jun 1998;113(Suppl 1):97-106.
25. Crawford ND, Vlahov D. Progress in HIV reduction and prevention among injection and noninjection drug users. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. Dec 2010;55(Suppl 2):S84-87.
26. Shoptaw S, Heinzerling KG, Rotheram-Fuller E, et al. Randomized, placebo-controlled trial of bupropion for the treatment of methamphetamine dependence. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. Aug 1 2008;96(3):222-232.
27. Heinzerling KG, Swanson AN, Kim S, et al. Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of modafinil for the treatment of methamphetamine dependence. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. Jun 1 2010;109(1-3):20-29.
28. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. Methamphetamine Use and Risk for HIV/AIDS. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, US Dept. of Health and Human Services. Last Modified: May 3, 2007.
29. Baeten JM, Kahle E, Lingappa JR, et al. Genital HIV-1 RNA predicts risk of heterosexual HIV-1 transmission. *Sci Transl Med*. Apr 6 2011;3(77):77ra29.
30. Sheth PM, Kovacs C, Kemal KS, et al. Persistent HIV RNA shedding in semen despite effective antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. Sep 24 2009;23(15):2050-2054.
31. Graham SM, Holte SE, Peshu NM, et al. Initiation of antiretroviral therapy leads to a rapid decline in cervical and vaginal HIV-1 shedding. *AIDS*. Feb 19 2007;21(4):501-507.
32. Vernazza PL, Troiani L, Flepp MJ, et al. Potent antiretroviral treatment of HIV-infection results in suppression of the seminal shedding of HIV. The Swiss HIV Cohort Study. *AIDS*. Jan 28 2000;14(2):117-121.
33. Hughes JP, Baeten JM, Lingappa JR, et al. Determinants of Per-Coital-Act HIV-1 Infectivity Among African HIV-1-Serodiscordant Couples. *J Infect Dis*. Feb 2012;205(3):358-365.
34. 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*. Mar 30 2000;342(13):921-929.

35. 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.
36. Montaner JS, Lima VD, Barrios R, et al. Association of highly active antiretroviral therapy coverage, population viral load, and yearly new HIV diagnoses in British Columbia, Canada: a population-based study. *Lancet*. Aug 14 2010;376(9740):532-539.
37. Porco TC, Martin JN, Page-Shafer KA, et al. Decline in HIV infectivity following the introduction of highly active antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. Jan 2 2004;18(1):81-88.
38. 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*. Jul 17 2009;23(11):1397-1404.
39. Cu-Uvin S, DeLong AK, Venkatesh KK, et al. Genital tract HIV-1 RNA shedding among women with below detectable plasma viral load. *AIDS*. Oct 23 2010;24(16):2489-2497.
40. Sturmer M, Doerr HW, Berger A, Gute P. Is transmission of HIV-1 in non-viraemic serodiscordant couples possible? *Antivir Ther*. 2008;13(5):729-732.
41. Crepaz N, Hart TA, Marks G. Highly active antiretroviral therapy and sexual risk behavior: a meta-analytic review. *JAMA*. Jul 14 2004;292(2):224-236.
42. Rice E, Batterham P, Rotheram-Borus MJ. Unprotected sex among youth living with HIV before and after the advent of highly active antiretroviral therapy. *Perspect Sex Reprod Health*. Sep 2006;38(3):162-167.

## **Conclusion** (Last updated January 10, 2011; last reviewed January 10, 2011)

---

The Panel has carefully reviewed recent results from clinical trials in HIV therapy and considered how they inform appropriate care guidelines. The Panel appreciates that HIV care is highly complex and rapidly evolving. Guidelines are never fixed and must always be individualized. Where possible, the Panel has based recommendations on the best evidence from prospective trials with defined endpoints. When such evidence does not yet exist, the Panel attempted to reflect reasonable options in its conclusions.

HIV care requires, as always, partnerships and open communication. The provider can make recommendations most likely to lead to positive outcomes only if the patient's own point of view and social context are well known. Guidelines are only a starting point for medical decision making. They can identify some of the boundaries of high-quality care but cannot substitute for sound judgment.

As further research is conducted and reported, guidelines will be modified. The Panel anticipates continued progress in the simplicity of regimens, improved potency and barrier to resistance, and reduced toxicity. The Panel hopes the guidelines are useful and is committed to their continued adjustment and improvement.

## Appendix A: Key to Acronyms (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)

### *Drug Name Abbreviations*

Abbreviation	Full Name
3TC	lamivudine
ABC	abacavir
APV	amprenavir
ATV	atazanavir
ATV/r	ritonavir-boosted atazanavir
COBI	cobicistat
d4T	stavudine
ddC	zalcitabine
ddI	didanosine
DLV	delavirdine
DRV	darunavir
DRV/r	ritonavir- boosted darunavir
DTG	dolutegravir
EFV	efavirenz
ETR	etravirine
EVG	elvitegravir
FPV	fosamprenavir
FPV/r	ritonavir-boosted fosamprenavir
FTC	emtricitabine
GAZT	azidothymidine glucuronide
IDV	indinavir
LPV	lopinavir
LPV/r	ritonavir-boosted lopinavir
MVC	maraviroc
NFV	nelfinavir
NVP	nevirapine
RAL	raltegravir
RPV	rilpivirine
RTV	ritonavir
SQV	saquinavir
SQV/r	ritonavir-boosted saquinavir
T20	enfuvirtide
TDF	tenofovir disoproxil fumarate
TPV	tipranavir
TPV/r	ritonavir-boosted tipranavir
ZDV	zidovudine



## ***General Terms***

<b>Abbreviation</b>	<b>Full Name</b>
ACTG	AIDS Clinical Trials Group
AIDS	acquired immune deficiency syndrome
ALT	alanine aminotransferase
ART	antiretroviral therapy
ART-CC	ART Cohort Collaboration
ARV	antiretroviral
AST	aspartate aminotransferase
AUC	area under the curve
AV	atrioventricular
AWP	average wholesale price
bDNA	branched DNA
BID	twice daily
BMD	bone mineral density
BMI	body mass index
BUN	blood urea nitrogen
cap	capsule
CAPD	chronic ambulatory peritoneal dialysis
CBC	complete blood count
CCB	calcium channel blocker
CD4	CD4 T lymphocyte
CDC	Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
CI	confidence interval
CKD	chronic kidney disease
C <sub>max</sub>	maximum plasma concentration
CME	continuing medical education
C <sub>min</sub>	minimum plasma concentration
CMV	cytomegalovirus
CNICS	Centers for AIDS Research Network of Integrated Clinical Systems
CNS	central nervous system
COC	combined oral contraceptives
CPK	creatine phosphokinase
CrCl	creatinine clearance
CSF	cerebrospinal fluid
CVD	cardiovascular disease
CYP	cytochrome P
D/M	dual or mixed (tropic)
D:A:D	Data Collection on Adverse Events of Anti-HIV Drugs Study

DILI	drug-induced liver injury
DM	diabetes mellitus
DMPA	depot medroxyprogesterone acetate
DOT	directly observed therapy
DR	delayed release
DXA	dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry
EBV	Epstein-Barr virus
EC	enteric coated
ECG	electrocardiogram
EI	entry inhibitor
EIA	enzyme immunoassay
FDA	Food and Drug Administration
FI	fusion inhibitor
GHB	gamma-hydroxybutyrate
GI	gastrointestinal
HAD	HIV-associated dementia
HAV	hepatitis A virus
HBeAg	hepatitis B e antigen
HBsAg	hepatitis B surface antigen
HBV	hepatitis B virus
HCV	hepatitis C virus
HD	hemodialysis
HDL	high-density lipoprotein
HELLP	hemolysis, elevated liver enzymes, low platelet count (syndrome)
HHS	Department of Health and Human Services
HHV	human herpes virus
HHV-8	human herpes virus-8
HIV	human immunodeficiency virus
HIV-1	human immunodeficiency virus type 1
HIV-2	human immunodeficiency virus type 2
HIVAN	HIV-associated nephropathy
HLA	human leukocyte antigen
HPV	human papilloma virus
HR	hazard ratio
HRSA	Health Resource Services Administration
hsCRP	high-sensitivity C-reactive protein
HSR	hypersensitivity reaction
HTLV	human T-cell leukemia virus
HTLV-1	human T-cell leukemia virus type 1

HTLV-2	human T-cell leukemia virus type 2
IAS-USA	International Antiviral Society-USA
IC	inhibitory concentration
IDU	injection drug user
IFN- $\gamma$	interferon-gamma
IGRA	interferon-gamma release assay
IL-6	interleukin-6
IND	investigational new drug
INH	isoniazid
inj	injection
INR	international normalized ratio
INSTI	integrase strand transfer inhibitor
IQ	inhibitory quotient
IRB	Institutional Review Board
IRIS	immune reconstitution inflammatory syndrome
IUD	intrauterine device
IV	Intravenous
LDL	low-density lipoprotein
LTBI	latent tuberculosis infection
MAC	<i>Mycobacterium avium</i> complex
MDMA	methylenedioxymethamphetamine
mDOT	modified directly observed therapy
MDR	multidrug-resistant
MDRD	modification of diet in renal disease (equation)
MHC	major histocompatibility complex
MI	myocardial infarction
msec	milliseconds
MSM	men who have sex with men
MTB	<i>Mycobacterium tuberculosis</i>
NA-ACCORD	The North American AIDS Cohort Collaboration on Research and Design
NIH	National Institutes of Health
NNRTI	non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor
NRTI	nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor
OAR	Office of AIDS Research
OARAC	Office of AIDS Research Advisory Council
OI	opportunistic infection
PAH	pulmonary arterial hypertension
PCP	<i>Pneumocystis jiroveci</i> pneumonia
PDE5	phosphodiesterase type 5

PegIFN	peginterferon
p-gp	p-glycoprotein
PI	protease inhibitor
PI/r	ritonavir-boosted PI
PK	pharmacokinetic
PMTCT	prevention of mother-to-child transmission
PNS	peripheral nervous system
PO	orally
PPI	proton pump inhibitor
PR	protease (gene)
PrEP	pre-exposure HIV prophylaxis
PT	prothrombin time
q(n)d	every (n) days
q(n)h	every (n) hours
QTc	QT corrected for heart rate
RT	reverse transcriptase (gene)
RT-PCR	reverse transcriptase-polymerase chain reaction
SCr	Serum creatinine
SJS	Stevens-Johnson syndrome
soln	solution
SPT	skin patch test
STD	sexually transmitted disease
SVR	sustained virologic response
SWP	suggested wholesale price
$t_{1/2}$	half-life
tab	tablet
TAM	thymidine analogue mutation
TB	tuberculosis
TCA	tricyclic antidepressant
TDM	therapeutic drug monitoring
TEN	toxic epidermal necrosis
TG	triglyceride
the Panel	Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents
TID	three times daily
TST	tuberculin skin test
UDP	uridine diphosphate
UGT	uridine diphosphate glucosyltransferase
UGT1A1	uridine diphosphate glucuronosyltransferase 1A1
ULN	upper limit of normal

VPA	valproic acid
WBC	white blood cell
WHO	World Health Organization
WITS	Women and Infants Transmission Study
XDR	extensively drug-resistant
XR	extended release



**Appendix B, Table 1. Characteristics of Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NRTIs) (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 1 of 5)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination	Serum/ Intracellular Half-Lives	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Abacavir</b> (ABC) <i>Ziagen</i> <b>Note:</b> Generic available in tablet formulation <b>Also available as a component of fixed-dose combinations.</b>	<u>Ziagen:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 300 mg tablet</li> <li>• 20 mg/mL oral solution</li> </ul>	<u>Ziagen:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 300 mg BID, or</li> <li>• 600 mg once daily</li> <li>• Take without regard to meals.</li> </ul>	Metabolized by alcohol dehydrogenase and glucuronyl transferase Renal excretion of metabolites: 82% Dosage adjustment for ABC is recommended in patients with hepatic insufficiency (see <a href="#">Appendix B, Table 7</a> ).	1.5 hours/ 12–26 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HSRs: Patients who test positive for HLA-B*5701 are at highest risk. HLA screening should be done before initiation of ABC. Re-challenge is not recommended.</li> <li>• Symptoms of HSR may include fever, rash, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, abdominal pain, malaise, or fatigue or respiratory symptoms such as sore throat, cough, or shortness of breath.</li> <li>• Some cohort studies suggest increased risk of MI with recent or current use of ABC, but this risk is not substantiated in other studies.</li> </ul>
<i>Trizivir</i> ABC with ZDV + 3TC <b>Note:</b> Generic available	<u>Trizivir:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ABC 300 mg + ZDV 300 mg + 3TC 150 mg tablet</li> </ul>	<u>Trizivir:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 tablet BID</li> </ul>			
<i>Epzicom</i> ABC with 3TC	<u>Epzicom:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ABC 600 mg + 3TC 300 mg tablet</li> </ul>	<u>Epzicom:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 tablet once daily</li> </ul>			
<b>Didanosine</b> (ddl) <i>Videx EC</i> <b>Note:</b> Generic available; dose same as Videx EC	<u>Videx EC:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 125, 200, 250, and 400 mg capsules</li> </ul> <u>Videx:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 10 mg/mL oral solution</li> </ul>	<u>Body Weight ≥60 kg:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 400 mg once daily</li> </ul> <u>With TDF:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 250 mg once daily</li> </ul> <u>Body Weight &lt;60 kg:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 250 mg once daily</li> </ul> <u>With TDF:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 200 mg once daily</li> </ul> Take 1/2 hour before or 2 hours after a meal. <b>Note:</b> Preferred dosing with oral solution is BID (total daily dose divided into 2 doses)	Renal excretion: 50% Dosage adjustment in patients with renal insufficiency is recommended (see <a href="#">Appendix B, Table 7</a> ).	1.5 hours/ >20 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pancreatitis</li> <li>• Peripheral neuropathy</li> <li>• Retinal changes, optic neuritis</li> <li>• Lactic acidosis with hepatic steatosis +/- pancreatitis (rare but potentially life-threatening toxicity)</li> <li>• Nausea, vomiting</li> <li>• Potential association with non-cirrhotic portal hypertension; in some cases, patients presented with esophageal varices</li> <li>• One cohort study suggested increased risk of MI with recent or current use of ddl, but this risk is not substantiated in other studies.</li> <li>• Insulin resistance/diabetes mellitus</li> </ul>

**Appendix B, Table 1. Characteristics of Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NRTIs) (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 2 of 5)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination	Serum/ Intracellular Half-Lives	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Emtricitabine</b> (FTC) <i>Emtriva</i> <b>Also available as a component of fixed-dose combinations.</b>	<u>Emtriva:</u> • 200 mg hard gelatin capsule • 10 mg/mL oral solution	<u>Emtriva</u> <i>Capsule:</i> • 200 mg once daily <i>Oral Solution:</i> • 240 mg (24 mL) once daily Take without regard to meals.	Renal excretion: 86% Dosage adjustment in patients with renal insufficiency is recommended (see <a href="#">Appendix B, Table 7</a> ).	10 hours/ >20 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Minimal toxicity</li> <li>• Hyperpigmentation/skin discoloration</li> <li>• Severe acute exacerbation of hepatitis may occur in HBV-coinfected patients who discontinue FTC.</li> </ul>
<i>Atripla</i> FTC with EFV + TDF	<u>Atripla:</u> • FTC 200 mg + EFV 600 mg + TDF 300 mg tablet	<u>Atripla:</u> • 1 tablet at or before bedtime • Take on an empty stomach to reduce side effects.			
<i>Complera</i> FTC with RPV + TDF	<u>Complera:</u> • FTC 200 mg + RPV 25 mg + TDF 300 mg tablet	<u>Complera:</u> • 1 tablet once daily with a meal			
<i>Stribild</i> FTC with EVG + cobi + TDF	<u>Stribild:</u> • FTC 200 mg + EVG 150 mg + cobi 150 mg + TDF 300 mg tablet	<u>Stribild:</u> • 1 tablet once daily with food			
<i>Truvada</i> FTC with TDF	<u>Truvada:</u> • FTC 200 mg + TDF 300 mg tablet	<u>Truvada:</u> • 1 tablet once daily			

**Appendix B, Table 1. Characteristics of Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NRTIs) (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 3 of 5)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination	Serum/ Intracellular Half-Lives	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Lamivudine</b> (3TC) <i>Epivir</i>  <b>Note:</b> Generic available in tablet formulation  <b>Also available as a component of fixed-dose combinations.</b>	<u>Epivir:</u> • 150 and 300 mg tablets • 10 mg/mL oral solution	<u>Epivir:</u> • 150 mg BID, or • 300 mg once daily • Take without regard to meals.	Renal excretion: 70% Dosage adjustment in patients with renal insufficiency is recommended (see <a href="#">Appendix B, Table 7</a> ).	5–7 hours/ 18–22 hours	• Minimal toxicity • Severe acute exacerbation of hepatitis may occur in HBV-coinfected patients who discontinue 3TC.
<i>Combivir</i> 3TC with ZDV <b>Note:</b> Generic available	<u>Combivir:</u> • 3TC 150 mg + ZDV 300 mg tablet	<u>Combivir:</u> • 1 tablet BID			
<i>Epzicom</i> 3TC with ABC	<u>Epzicom:</u> • 3TC 300 mg + ABC 600 mg tablet	<u>Epzicom:</u> • 1 tablet once daily			
<i>Trizivir</i> 3TC with ZDV + ABC <b>Note:</b> Generic available	<u>Trizivir:</u> • 3TC 150 mg + ZDV 300 mg + ABC 300 mg tablet	<u>Trizivir:</u> • 1 tablet BID			
<b>Stavudine</b> (d4T) <i>Zerit</i>  <b>Note:</b> Generic available	<u>Zerit:</u> • 15, 20, 30, and 40 mg capsules • 1 mg/mL oral solution	<u>Body Weight ≥60 kg:</u> • 40 mg BID <u>Body Weight &lt;60 kg:</u> • 30 mg BID Take without regard to meals. <b>Note:</b> WHO recommends 30 mg BID dosing regardless of body weight.	Renal excretion: 50% Dosage adjustment in patients with renal insufficiency is recommended (see <a href="#">Appendix B, Table 7</a> ).	1 hour/ 7.5 hours	• Peripheral neuropathy • Lipoatrophy • Pancreatitis • Lactic acidosis/severe hepatomegaly with hepatic steatosis (rare but potentially life-threatening toxicity) • Hyperlipidemia • Insulin resistance/diabetes mellitus • Rapidly progressive ascending neuromuscular weakness (rare)

**Appendix B, Table 1. Characteristics of Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NRTIS) (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 4 of 5)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination	Serum/ Intracellular Half-Lives	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate (TDF)</b> <i>Viread</i> <b>Also available as a component of fixed-dose combinations.</b>	<u>Viread:</u> • 150, 200, 250, 300 mg tablets • 40 mg/g oral powder	<u>Viread:</u> • 300 mg once daily or • 7.5 level scoops once daily (dosing scoop dispensed with each prescription; one level scoop contains 1 g of oral powder). • Take without regard to meals. Mix oral powder with 2–4 ounces of a soft food that does not require chewing (e.g., applesauce, yogurt). <b>Do not mix oral powder with liquid.</b>	Renal excretion – primary route of elimination Dosage adjustment in patients with renal insufficiency is recommended (see <a href="#">Appendix B, Table 7</a> ).	17 hours/ >60 hours	• Renal insufficiency, Fanconi syndrome, proximal tubulopathy • Osteomalacia, decrease in bone mineral density • Potential decrease in bone mineral density • Severe acute exacerbation of hepatitis may occur in HBV-coinfected patients who discontinue TDF. • Asthenia, headache, diarrhea, nausea, vomiting, and flatulence
<i>Atripla</i> TDF with EFV + FTC	<u>Atripla:</u> • TDF 300 mg + EFV 600 mg + FTC 200 mg tablet	<u>Atripla:</u> • 1 tablet at or before bedtime • Take on an empty stomach to reduce side effects.			
<i>Complera</i> TDF with RPV + FTC	<u>Complera:</u> • TDF 300 mg + RPV 25 mg + FTC 200 mg tablet	<u>Complera:</u> • 1 tablet once daily • Take with a meal.			
<i>Stribild</i> TDF with EVG + cobin + FTC	<u>Stribild:</u> • TDF 300 mg + EVG 150 mg + cobin 150 mg + FTC 200 mg tablet	<u>Stribild:</u> • 1 tablet once daily • Take with food.			
<i>Truvada</i> TDF with FTC	<u>Truvada:</u> • TDF 300 mg + FTC 200 mg tablet	<u>Truvada:</u> • 1 tablet once daily • Take without regard to meals.			

**Appendix B, Table 1. Characteristics of Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NRTIS ) (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 5 of 5)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination	Serum/ Intracellular Half-Lives	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Zidovudine</b> (ZDV) <i>Retrovir</i> <b>Note:</b> Generic available <b>Also available as a component of fixed-dose combinations.</b>	<u>Retrovir:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 100 mg capsule</li> <li>• 300 mg tablet</li> <li>• 10 mg/mL intravenous solution</li> <li>• 10 mg/mL oral solution</li> </ul>	<u>Retrovir:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 300 mg BID, or</li> <li>• 200 mg TID</li> <li>• Take without regard to meals.</li> </ul>	Metabolized to GAZT Renal excretion of GAZT Dosage adjustment in patients with renal insufficiency is recommended (see <a href="#">Appendix B, Table 7</a> ).	1.1 hours/ 7 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bone marrow suppression: macrocytic anemia or neutropenia</li> <li>• Nausea, vomiting, headache, insomnia, asthenia</li> <li>• Nail pigmentation</li> <li>• Lactic acidosis/severe hepatomegaly with hepatic steatosis (rare but potentially life-threatening toxicity)</li> <li>• Hyperlipidemia</li> <li>• Insulin resistance/diabetes mellitus</li> <li>• Lipoatrophy</li> <li>• Myopathy</li> </ul>
<i>Combivir</i> ZDV with 3TC <b>Note:</b> Generic available	<u>Combivir:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ZDV 300 mg + 3TC 150 mg tablet</li> </ul>	<u>Combivir:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 tablet BID</li> <li>• Take without regard to meals.</li> </ul>			
<i>Trizivir</i> ZDV with 3TC + ABC <b>Note:</b> Generic available	<u>Trizivir:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ZDV 300 mg + 3TC 150 mg + ABC 300 mg tablet</li> </ul>	<u>Trizivir:</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 1 tablet BID</li> <li>• Take without regard to meals.</li> </ul>			

<sup>a</sup> For dosage adjustment in renal or hepatic insufficiency, see [Appendix B, Table 7](#).

<sup>b</sup> Also see [Table 14](#).

**Key to Acronyms:** 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; BID = twice daily; coBI = cobicistat; d4T = stavudine; ddI = didanosine; EC = enteric coated; EFV = efavirenz; EVG = elvitegravir; FTC = emtricitabine; GAZT = azidothymidine glucuronide; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HLA = human leukocyte antigen; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; MI = myocardial infarction; RPV = rilpivirine; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TID = three times a day; WHO = World Health Organization; ZDV = zidovudine



**Appendix B, Table 2. Characteristics of Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NNRTIs)**  
**(Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)** (page 1 of 2)

**Note:** Delavirdine (DLV) is not included in this table. Please refer to the DLV FDA package insert for related information.

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum/ Half-Life	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Efavirenz</b> (EFV) <i>Sustiva</i> <b>Also available as a component of a fixed-dose combination.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 and 200 mg capsules</li> <li>• 600 mg tablet</li> </ul>	600 mg once daily, at or before bedtime  Take on an empty stomach to reduce side effects.	Metabolized by CYPs 2B6 and 3A4  CYP3A4 mixed inducer/inhibitor (more an inducer than an inhibitor)	40–55 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rash<sup>c</sup></li> <li>• Neuropsychiatric symptoms<sup>d</sup></li> <li>• Increased transaminase levels</li> <li>• Hyperlipidemia</li> <li>• False-positive results with some cannabinoid and benzodiazepine screening assays reported.</li> <li>• Teratogenic in non-human primates and potentially teratogenic in humans</li> </ul>
<b>Atripla</b> EFV with TDF + FTC	<b>Atripla:</b> EFV 600 mg + FTC 200 mg + TDF 300 mg tablet	1 tablet once daily, at or before bedtime			
<b>Etravirine</b> (ETR) <i>Intelence</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 25, 100, and 200 mg tablets</li> </ul>	200 mg BID Take following a meal.	CYP3A4, 2C9, and 2C19 substrate  3A4 inducer; 2C9 and 2C19 inhibitor	41 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rash, including Stevens-Johnson syndrome<sup>c</sup></li> <li>• HSRs, characterized by rash, constitutional findings, and sometimes organ dysfunction, including hepatic failure, have been reported.</li> <li>• Nausea</li> </ul>
<b>Nevirapine</b> (NVP) <i>Viramune</i> or <i>Viramine XR</i> Generic available for 200 mg tablets	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 200 mg tablet</li> <li>• 400 mg XR tablet</li> <li>• 50 mg/5 mL oral suspension</li> </ul>	200 mg once daily for 14 days (lead-in period); thereafter, 200 mg BID, or 400 mg (Viramune XR tablet) once daily Take without regard to meals.  Repeat lead-in period if therapy is discontinued for more than 7 days.  In patients who develop mild-to-moderate rash without constitutional symptoms, continue lead-in period until rash resolves but not longer than 28 days total.	CYP450 substrate, inducer of 3A4 and 2B6; 80% excreted in urine (glucuronidated metabolites, <5% unchanged); 10% in feces	25–30 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rash, including Stevens-Johnson syndrome<sup>c</sup></li> <li>• Symptomatic hepatitis, including fatal hepatic necrosis, has been reported:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>◦ Rash reported in approximately 50% of cases.</li> <li>◦ Occurs at significantly higher frequency in ARV-naïve female patients with pre-NVP CD4 counts &gt;250 cells/mm<sup>3</sup> and in ARV-naïve male patients with pre-NVP CD4 counts &gt;400 cells/mm<sup>3</sup>. NVP should not be initiated in these patients unless the benefit clearly outweighs the risk.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

**Appendix B, Table 2. Characteristics of Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NNRTIs)**  
**(Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)** (page 2 of 2)

**Note:** Delavirdine (DLV) is not included in this table. Please refer to the DLV FDA package insert for related information.

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum/ Half-Life	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Rilpivirine</b> (RPV) <i>Edurant</i>  <b>Also available as a component of fixed-dose combination.</b>	• 25 mg tablet	25 mg once daily Take with a meal.	CYP3A4 substrate	50 hours	• Rash <sup>c</sup> • Depression, insomnia, headache • Hepatotoxicity
<i>Complera</i> RPV with TDF + FTC	<u>Complera:</u> • RPV 25 mg + TDF 300 mg + FTC 200 mg tablet	1 tablet once daily Take with a meal.			

<sup>a</sup> For dosage adjustment in renal or hepatic insufficiency, see [Appendix B, Table 7](#).

<sup>b</sup> Also see [Table 14](#).

<sup>c</sup> Rare cases of Stevens-Johnson syndrome have been reported with most NNRTIs; the highest incidence of rash was seen with NVP.

<sup>d</sup> Adverse events can include dizziness, somnolence, insomnia, abnormal dreams, depression, **suicidality**, confusion, abnormal thinking, impaired concentration, amnesia, agitation, depersonalization, hallucinations, and euphoria. Approximately 50% of patients receiving EFV may experience any of these symptoms. Symptoms usually subside spontaneously after 2 to 4 weeks but may necessitate discontinuation of EFV in a small percentage of patients.

**Key to Abbreviations:** ARV = antiretroviral; BID = twice daily; CD4 = CD4 T lymphocyte; CYP = cytochrome P; DLV = delavirdine; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; FDA = Food and Drug Administration; FTC = emtricitabine; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; NNRTI = non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor; NVP = nevirapine; RPV = rilpivirine; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; XR = extended release

**Appendix B, Table 3. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitors (PIs) (Last updated February 12, 2013; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 1 of 5)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum Half-Life	Storage	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Atazanavir</b> (ATV) <i>Reyataz</i>	100, 150, 200, and 300 mg capsules	<p><u>ARV-Naive Patients:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATV 300 mg + RTV 100 mg once daily; or</li> <li>• ATV 400 mg once daily</li> </ul> <p><u>With TDF or in ARV-Experienced Patients:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATV 300 mg + RTV 100 mg once daily</li> </ul> <p><u>With EFV in ARV-Naive Patients:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ATV 400 mg + RTV 100 mg once daily</li> </ul> <p>Take with food.</p> <p><b>For recommendations on dosing with H2 antagonists and PPIs, refer to Table 18a.</b></p>	CYP3A4 inhibitor and substrate  Dosage adjustment in patients with hepatic insufficiency is recommended (see <a href="#">Appendix B, Table 7</a> ).	7 hours	Room temperature (up to 25° C or 77° F)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Indirect hyperbilirubinemia</li> <li>• PR interval prolongation: First degree symptomatic AV block reported. Use with caution in patients with underlying conduction defects or on concomitant medications that can cause PR prolongation.</li> <li>• Hyperglycemia</li> <li>• Fat maldistribution</li> <li>• Cholelithiasis</li> <li>• Nephrolithiasis</li> <li>• Renal insufficiency</li> <li>• Serum transaminase elevations</li> <li>• Hyperlipidemia (especially with RTV boosting)</li> <li>• Skin rash</li> </ul>
<b>Darunavir</b> (DRV) <i>Prezista</i>	75, 150, 600, and 800 mg tablets  100 mg/mL oral suspension	<p><u>ARV-Naive Patients or ARV-Experienced Patients with no DRV Mutations:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• DRV 800 mg + RTV 100 mg once daily</li> </ul> <p><u>ARV-Experienced Patients with at Least 1 DRV Mutation:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• (DRV 600 mg + RTV 100 mg) BID</li> </ul> <p>Unboosted DRV is <b>not</b> recommended.</p> <p>Take with food.</p>	CYP3A4 inhibitor and substrate	15 hours (when combined with RTV)	Room temperature (up to 25° C or 77° F)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skin rash (10%): DRV has a sulfonamide moiety; Stevens-Johnson syndrome, toxic epidermal necrolysis, acute generalized exanthematous pustulosis, and erythema multiforme have been reported.</li> <li>• Hepatotoxicity</li> <li>• Diarrhea, nausea</li> <li>• Headache</li> <li>• Hyperlipidemia</li> <li>• Serum transaminase elevation</li> <li>• Hyperglycemia</li> <li>• Fat maldistribution</li> </ul>

**Appendix B, Table 3. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitors (PIs) (Last updated February 12, 2013; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 2 of 5)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum Half-Life	Storage	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Fosamprenavir</b> (FPV) <i>Lexiva</i> (a prodrug of amprenavir [APV])	700 mg tablet 50 mg/mL oral suspension	<p><u>ARV-Naive Patients:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FPV 1400 mg BID, or</li> <li>• FPV 1400 mg + RTV 100–200 mg once daily, or</li> <li>• FPV 700 mg + RTV 100 mg BID</li> </ul> <p><u>PI-Experienced Patients (Once-Daily Dosing <b>Not</b> Recommended):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FPV 700 mg + RTV 100 mg BID</li> </ul> <p><u>With EFV:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FPV 700 mg + RTV 100 mg BID, or</li> <li>• FPV 1400 mg + RTV 300 mg once daily</li> </ul> <p><u>Tablet:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Without RTV tablet: Take without regard to meals.</li> <li>• With RTV tablet: Take with meals.</li> </ul> <p><u>Oral Suspension:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take without food.</li> </ul>	<p>APV is a CYP3A4 substrate, inhibitor, and inducer.</p> <p>Dosage adjustment in patients with hepatic insufficiency is recommended (see <a href="#">Appendix B, Table 7</a>).</p>	7.7 hours (APV)	Room temperature (up to 25° C or 77° F)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Skin rash (12% to 19%): FPV has a sulfonamide moiety.</li> <li>• Diarrhea, nausea, vomiting</li> <li>• Headache</li> <li>• Hyperlipidemia</li> <li>• Serum transaminase elevation</li> <li>• Hyperglycemia</li> <li>• Fat maldistribution</li> <li>• Possible increased bleeding episodes in patients with hemophilia</li> <li>• Nephrolithiasis</li> </ul>
<b>Indinavir</b> (IDV) <i>Crixivan</i>	100, 200, and 400 mg capsules	<p>800 mg every 8 hours Take 1 hour before or 2 hours after meals; may take with skim milk or a low-fat meal.</p> <p><u>With RTV:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IDV 800 mg + RTV 100–200 mg BID</li> </ul> <p>Take without regard to meals.</p>	<p>CYP3A4 inhibitor and substrate</p> <p>Dosage adjustment in patients with hepatic insufficiency is recommended (see <a href="#">Appendix B, Table 7</a>).</p>	1.5–2 hours	<p>Room temperature (15° to 30° C/59° to 86° F)</p> <p>Protect from moisture.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nephrolithiasis</li> <li>• GI intolerance, nausea</li> <li>• Hepatitis</li> <li>• Indirect hyperbilirubinemia</li> <li>• Hyperlipidemia</li> <li>• Headache, asthenia, blurred vision, dizziness, rash, metallic taste, thrombocytopenia, alopecia, and hemolytic anemia</li> <li>• Hyperglycemia</li> <li>• Fat maldistribution</li> <li>• Possible increased bleeding episodes in patients with hemophilia</li> </ul>

**Appendix B, Table 3. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitors (PIs) (Last updated February 12, 2013; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 3 of 5)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum Half-Life	Storage	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Ritonavir- Boosted Lopinavir</b> (LPV/r) <i>Kaletra</i>	<p><u>Tablets:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LPV 200 mg + RTV 50 mg, or</li> <li>• LPV 100 mg + RTV 25 mg</li> </ul> <p><u>Oral Solution:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Each 5 mL contains (LPV 400 mg + RTV 100 mg)</li> <li>• Oral solution contains 42% alcohol.</li> </ul>	<p>LPV/r 400 mg/100 mg BID or LPV/r 800 mg/200 mg once daily</p> <p>Once-daily dosing is not recommended for patients with ≥3 LPV-associated mutations, pregnant women, or patients receiving EFV, NVP, FPV, NFV, carbamazepine, phenytoin, or phenobarbital.</p> <p><u>With EFV or NVP (PI-Naive or PI-Experienced Patients):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• LPV/r 500 mg/125 mg tablets BID (use a combination of 2 LPV/r 200 mg/50 mg tablets + 1 LPV/r 100 mg/25 mg tablet to make a total dose of LPV/r 500 mg/125 mg), or</li> <li>• LPV/r 533 mg/133 mg oral solution BID</li> </ul> <p><u>Tablet:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take without regard to meals.</li> </ul> <p><u>Oral Solution:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take with food.</li> </ul>	CYP3A4 inhibitor and substrate	5–6 hours	<p>Oral tablet is stable at room temperature.</p> <p>Oral solution is stable at 2° to 8° C (36° to 46° F) until date on label and is stable for up to 2 months when stored at room temperature (up to 25° C or 77° F).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GI intolerance, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea</li> <li>• Pancreatitis</li> <li>• Asthenia</li> <li>• Hyperlipidemia (especially hypertriglyceridemia)</li> <li>• Serum transaminase elevation</li> <li>• Hyperglycemia</li> <li>• Insulin resistance/diabetes mellitus</li> <li>• Fat maldistribution</li> <li>• Possible increased bleeding episodes in patients with hemophilia</li> <li>• PR interval prolongation</li> <li>• QT interval prolongation and torsades de pointes have been reported; however, causality could not be established.</li> </ul>
<b>Nelfinavir</b> (NFV) <i>Viracept</i>	<p>250 and 625 mg tablets</p> <p>50 mg/g oral powder</p>	<p>1250 mg BID or 750 mg TID</p> <p>Dissolve tablets in a small amount of water, mix admixture well, and consume immediately.</p> <p>Take with food.</p>	CYP2C19 and 3A4 substrate—metabolized to active M8 metabolite; CYP3A4 inhibitor	3.5–5 hours	Room temperature (15° to 30° C/59° to 86° F)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Diarrhea</li> <li>• Hyperlipidemia</li> <li>• Hyperglycemia</li> <li>• Fat maldistribution</li> <li>• Possible increased bleeding episodes in patients with hemophilia</li> <li>• Serum transaminase elevation</li> </ul>



**Appendix B, Table 3. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitors (PIs) (Last updated February 12, 2013; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 4 of 5)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum Half-Life	Storage	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Ritonavir</b> (RTV) <i>Norvir</i>	100 mg tablet 100 mg soft gel capsule 80 mg/mL oral solution Oral solution contains 43% alcohol.	<u>As PK Booster for Other PIs:</u> • 100–400 mg per day in 1 or 2 divided doses (refer to other PIs for specific dosing recommendations)  <u>Tablet:</u> • Take with food.  <u>Capsule and Oral Solution:</u> • To improve tolerability, take with food if possible.	CYP3A4 >2D6 substrate; potent 3A4, 2D6 inhibitor	3–5 hours	Tablets do not require refrigeration.  Refrigerate capsules.  Capsules can be left at room temperature (up to 25° C or 77° F) for up to 30 days.  Oral solution should <b>not</b> be refrigerated; store at room temperature (20° to 25° C/68° to 77° F).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GI intolerance, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea</li> <li>• Paresthesia (circumoral and extremities)</li> <li>• Hyperlipidemia (especially hypertriglyceridemia)</li> <li>• Hepatitis</li> <li>• Asthenia</li> <li>• Taste perversion</li> <li>• Hyperglycemia</li> <li>• Fat maldistribution</li> <li>• Possible increased bleeding episodes in patients with hemophilia</li> </ul>
<b>Saquinavir</b> (SQV) <i>Invirase</i>	500 mg tablet 200 mg capsule	SQV 1000 mg + RTV 100 mg BID  Unboosted SQV is <b>not</b> recommended.  Take with meals or within 2 hours after a meal.	CYP3A4 inhibitor and substrate	1–2 hours	Room temperature (15° to 30° C/59° to 86° F)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• GI intolerance, nausea, and diarrhea</li> <li>• Headache</li> <li>• Serum transaminase elevation</li> <li>• Hyperlipidemia</li> <li>• Hyperglycemia</li> <li>• Fat maldistribution</li> <li>• Possible increased bleeding episodes in patients with hemophilia</li> <li>• PR interval prolongation</li> <li>• QT interval prolongation, torsades de pointes have been reported. Patients with pre-SQV QT interval &gt;450 msec should not receive SQV.</li> </ul>

**Appendix B, Table 3. Characteristics of Protease Inhibitors (PIs) (Last updated February 12, 2013; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 5 of 5)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum Half-Life	Storage	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Tipranavir</b> (TPV) <i>Aptivus</i>	250 mg capsule 100 mg/mL oral solution	TPV 500 mg + RTV 200 mg BID  Unboosted TPV is <b>not</b> recommended.  <u>With RTV Tablets:</u> • Take with meals.  <u>With RTV Capsules or Solution:</u> • Take without regard to meals.	CYP P450 3A4 inducer and substrate  Net effect when combined with RTV (CYP3A4, 2D6 inhibitor)	6 hours after single dose of TPV/r	Refrigerate capsules.  Capsules can be stored at room temperature (25° C or 77° F) for up to 60 days.  Oral solution should <b>not</b> be refrigerated or frozen and should be used within 60 days after bottle is opened.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hepatotoxicity: Clinical hepatitis (including hepatic decompensation and hepatitis-associated fatalities) has been reported; monitor patients closely, especially those with underlying liver diseases.</li> <li>• Skin rash (3% to 21%): TPV has a sulfonamide moiety; use with caution in patients with known sulfonamide allergy.</li> <li>• Rare cases of fatal and nonfatal intracranial hemorrhages have been reported. Risks include brain lesion, head trauma, recent neurosurgery, coagulopathy, hypertension, alcoholism, use of anti-coagulant or anti-platelet agents (including vitamin E).</li> <li>• Hyperlipidemia</li> <li>• Hyperglycemia</li> <li>• Fat maldistribution</li> <li>• Possible increased bleeding episodes in patients with hemophilia</li> </ul>

<sup>a</sup> For dosage adjustment in hepatic insufficiency, see [Appendix B, Table 7](#).

<sup>b</sup> Also see [Table 14](#).

**Key to Acronyms:** APV = amprenavir; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; AV = atrioventricular; BID = twice daily; CYP = cytochrome P; DRV = darunavir; EFV = efavirenz; FPV = fosamprenavir; GI = gastrointestinal; IDV = indinavir; LPV = lopinavir; LPV/r = ritonavir-boosted lopinavir; msec = millisecond; NFV = nelfinavir; NVP = nevirapine; PI = protease inhibitor; PK = pharmacokinetic; PPI = proton pump inhibitor; RTV = ritonavir; SQV = saquinavir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TID = three times a day; TPV = tipranavir

**Appendix B, Table 4. Characteristics of Integrase Inhibitors (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulations	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Serum Half-Life	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Dolutegravir</b> (DTG) <i>Tivicay</i>	50 mg tablet	<p><u>ARV-Naive or ARV-Experienced, INSTI-Naive Patients:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 mg once daily</li> </ul> <p><u>ARV-Naive or ARV-Experienced, INSTI-Naive Patients when Co-Administered with EFV, FPV/r, TPV/r, or Rifampin:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 mg BID</li> </ul> <p><u>INSTI-Experienced Patients with Certain INSTI Mutations (See Product Label) or with Clinically Suspected INSTI Resistance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 50 mg BID</li> </ul> <p>Take without regard to meals</p>	UGT1A1 mediated glucuronidation  Minor contribution from CYP3A4	~14 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HSRs including rash, constitutional symptoms, and organ dysfunction (including liver injury) have been reported.</li> <li>• Insomnia</li> <li>• Headache</li> </ul>
<b>Elvitegravir</b> (EVG) <i>Stribild</i> (only available as a co-formulated product <b>with</b> coBI/TDF/FTC)	EVG 150 mg + coBI 150 mg + TDF 300 mg + FTC 200 mg tablet	<p>1 tablet once daily with food</p> <p><b>Not recommended</b> for patients with baseline CrCl &lt; 70 mL/min (see <a href="#">Appendix B Table 7</a> for the equation for calculating CrCl).</p> <p><b>Not recommended for use with other antiretroviral drugs.</b></p>	EVG: CYP3A, UGT1A1/3  coBI: CYP3A, CYP2D6 (minor)	~13 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Nausea</li> <li>• Diarrhea</li> <li>• New onset or worsening renal impairment</li> <li>• Potential decrease in bone mineral density</li> <li>• Severe acute exacerbation of hepatitis may occur in HBV-coinfected patients who discontinue FTC and TDF.</li> </ul>
<b>Raltegravir</b> (RAL) <i>Isentress</i>	400 mg tablet  25 and 100 mg chewable tablets  100 mg single-pack for oral suspension	<p>400 mg BID</p> <p><u>With Rifampin:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 800 mg BID</li> </ul> <p>Take without regard to meals.</p>	UGT1A1-mediated glucuronidation	~9 hours	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rash, including Stevens-Johnson syndrome, HSR, and toxic epidermal necrolysis</li> <li>• Nausea</li> <li>• Headache</li> <li>• Diarrhea</li> <li>• Pyrexia</li> <li>• CPK elevation, muscle weakness, and rhabdomyolysis</li> </ul>

<sup>a</sup> For dosage adjustment in hepatic insufficiency, see [Appendix B, Table 7](#).

<sup>b</sup> Also see [Table 14](#).

**Key to Abbreviations:** BID = twice daily; coBI = cobicistat; CPK = creatine phosphokinase; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CYP = cytochrome P; DTG = dolutegravir; EFV = efavirenz; EVG = elvitegravir; FTC = emtricitabine; FPV/r = ritonavir-boosted fosamprenavir; HBV = hepatitis B virus; HSR = hypersensitivity reaction; INSTI = integrase strand transfer inhibitor; RAL = raltegravir; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TPV/r = ritonavir-boosted tipranavir; UGT = uridine diphosphate glucosyltransferase

**Appendix B, Table 5. Characteristics of Fusion Inhibitor (Last updated January 29, 2008; last reviewed May 1, 2014)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Formulation	Dosing Recommendation	Serum Half- Life	Elimination	Storage	Adverse Events <sup>a</sup>
<b>Enfuvirtide</b> (T20) <i>Fuzeon</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Injectable; supplied as lyophilized powder</li> <li>Each vial contains 108 mg of T20; reconstitute with 1.1mL of sterile water for injection for delivery of approximately 90 mg/1 mL.</li> </ul>	90 mg (1 mL) subcutaneously BID	3.8 hours	Expected to undergo catabolism to its constituent amino acids, with subsequent recycling of the amino acids in the body pool	Store at room temperature (up to 25° C or 77° F). Re-constituted solution should be refrigerated at 2° to 8°C (36° to 46° F) and used within 24 hours.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local injection site reactions (e.g., pain, erythema, induration, nodules and cysts, pruritus, ecchymosis) in almost 100% of patients</li> <li>Increased incidence of bacterial pneumonia</li> <li>HSR (&lt;1% of patients): Symptoms may include rash, fever, nausea, vomiting, chills, rigors, hypotension, or elevated serum transaminases. Re-challenge is not recommended.</li> </ul>

<sup>a</sup> Also see [Table 14](#).

**Key to Abbreviations:** BID = twice daily, HSR = hypersensitivity reaction, T20 = enfuvirtide

**Appendix B, Table 6. Characteristics of CCR5 Antagonist (Last updated March 27, 2012; last reviewed May 1, 2014)**

Generic Name (Abbreviation)/ Trade Name	Formulation	Dosing Recommendations <sup>a</sup>	Serum Half-Life	Elimination/ Metabolic Pathway	Adverse Events <sup>b</sup>
<b>Maraviroc</b> (MVC) <i>Selzentry</i>	150 and 300 mg tablets	<p><b>150 mg BID</b> when given with drugs that are strong CYP3A inhibitors (with or without CYP3A inducers) including PIs (except TPV/r)</p> <p><b>300 mg BID</b> when given with NRTIs, T20, TPV/r, NVP, RAL, and other drugs that are not strong CYP3A inhibitors or inducers</p> <p><b>600 mg BID</b> when given with drugs that are CYP3A inducers, including EFV, ETR, etc. (without a CYP3A inhibitor)</p> <p>Take without regard to meals</p>	14–18 hours	CYP3A4 substrate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Abdominal pain</li> <li>Cough</li> <li>Dizziness</li> <li>Musculoskeletal symptoms</li> <li>Pyrexia</li> <li>Rash</li> <li>Upper respiratory tract infections</li> <li>Hepatotoxicity, which may be preceded by severe rash or other signs of systemic allergic reactions</li> <li>Orthostatic hypotension, especially in patients with severe renal insufficiency</li> </ul>

<sup>a</sup> (For dosage adjustment in hepatic insufficiency, see [Appendix B, Table 7](#).)

<sup>b</sup> Also see [Table 14](#).

**Key to Abbreviations:** BID = twice daily, CYP = cytochrome P, EFV = efavirenz, ETR = etravirine, MVC = maraviroc, NRTI = nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor, NVP = nevirapine, PI = protease inhibitor, RAL = raltegravir, T20 = enfuvirtide, TPV/r = ritonavir-boosted tipranavir

**Appendix B, Table 7. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Patients with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 1 of 6)**

See the reference section at the end of this table for creatinine clearance (CrCl) calculation formulas and criteria for Child-Pugh classification.

ARVs Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Usual Daily Dose (Refer to <a href="#">Appendix B, Tables 1–6</a> for additional dosing information.)	Dosing in Renal Insufficiency <sup>a</sup>	Dosing in Hepatic Impairment
<b>Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NRTIs)</b> Stribild should not be initiated in patients with CrCl <70 mL/min. Use of the following fixed-dose combinations is not recommended in patients with CrCl <50 mL/min: Atripla, Combivir, Complera, Stribild, Trizivir, or Epzicom. Use of Truvada is not recommended in patients with CrCl <30 mL/min.			
<b>Abacavir</b> (ABC) <i>Ziagen</i>	300 mg PO BID	No dosage adjustment necessary	<u>Child-Pugh Score 5–6:</u> • 200 mg PO BID (use oral solution) <u>Child-Pugh Score &gt;6:</u> • Contraindicated
<b>Didanosine EC</b> (ddl) <i>Videx EC</i>	<u>Body weight ≥60 kg:</u> • 400 mg PO once daily <u>Body weight &lt;60 kg:</u> • 250 mg PO once daily	<b>Dose (Once Daily)</b>	
		<b>CrCl (mL/min)</b>	<b>≥60 kg</b>
		30–59	200 mg
		10–29	125 mg
<b>Didanosine oral solution</b> (ddl) <i>Videx</i>	<u>Body weight ≥60 kg:</u> • 200 mg PO BID, or • 400 mg PO once daily <u>Body weight &lt;60 kg:</u> • 250 mg PO once daily, or • 125 mg PO BID	<b>Dose (Once Daily)</b>	
		<b>CrCl (mL/min)</b>	<b>≥60 kg</b>
		30–59	200 mg
		10–29	150 mg
<b>Emtricitabine</b> (FTC) <i>Emtriva</i>	200 mg oral capsule once daily or 240 mg (24 mL) oral solution once daily	<b>Dose</b>	
		<b>CrCl (mL/min)</b>	<b>Capsule</b>
		30–49	200 mg q48h
		15–29	200 mg q72h
<b>Lamivudine</b> (3TC) <i>Epivir</i>	300 mg PO once daily or 150 mg PO BID	<b>Dose</b>	
		<b>CrCl (mL/min)</b>	<b>Dose</b>
		30–49	150 mg q24h
		15–29	1 x 150 mg, then 100 mg q24h
		5–14	1 x 150 mg, then 50 mg q24h
		<5 or on HD*	1 x 50 mg, then 25 mg q24h
		* On dialysis days, take dose after HD session.	



**Appendix B, Table 7. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Patients with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency** (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 2 of 6)

ARVs Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Usual Daily Dose (Refer to <a href="#">Appendix B, Tables 1–6</a> for additional dosing information.)	Dosing in Renal Insufficiency <sup>a</sup>		Dosing in Hepatic Impairment	
NRTIs, continued					
Stavudine (d4T) Zerit	Body Weight ≥60 kg: • 40 mg PO BID  Body Weight <60 kg: • 30 mg PO BID	Dose		No dosage recommendation	
		CrCl (mL/min)	≥60 kg		<60 kg
		26–50	20 mg q12h		15 mg q12h
		10–25 or on HD*	20 mg q24h		15 mg q24h
		* On dialysis days, take dose after HD session.			
Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate (TDF) Viread	300 mg PO once daily	CrCl (mL/min)	Dose	No dosage adjustment necessary	
		30–49	300 mg q48h		
		10–29	300 mg twice weekly (every 72–96 hours)		
		<10 and not on HD	No recommendation		
		On HD*	300 mg q7d		
		*On dialysis days, take dose after HD session.			
Emtricitabine (FTC) + Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate (TDF) Truvada	1 tablet PO once daily	CrCl (mL/min)	Dose	No dosage recommendation	
		30–49	1 tablet q48h		
		<30 or on HD	Not recommended		
Zidovudine (AZT, ZDV) Retrovir	300 mg PO BID	CrCl (mL/min)	Dose	No dosage recommendation	
		<15 or on HD*	100 mg TID or 300 mg once daily		
		*On dialysis days, take dose after HD session.			
Non-Nucleoside Reverse Transcriptase Inhibitors (NNRTIs)					
Delavirdine (DLV) Rescriptor	400 mg PO TID	No dosage adjustment necessary		No dosage recommendation; use with caution in patients with hepatic impairment.	

**Appendix B, Table 7. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Patients with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency** (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 3 of 6)

ARVs Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Usual Daily Dose (Refer to <a href="#">Appendix B, Tables 1–6</a> for additional dosing information.)	Dosing in Renal Insufficiency <sup>a</sup>	Dosing in Hepatic Impairment
<b>NNRTIs, continued</b>			
<b>Efavirenz</b> (EFV) <i>Sustiva</i>	600 mg PO once daily, at or before bedtime	No dosage adjustment necessary	No dosage recommendation; use with caution in patients with hepatic impairment.
<b>Efavirenz</b> (EFV) + <b>Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate</b> (TDF) + <b>Emtricitabine</b> (FTC) <i>Atripla</i>	1 tablet PO once daily	Not recommended for use in patients with CrCl <50 mL/min. Instead use the individual drugs of the fixed-dose combination and adjust TDF and FTC doses according to CrCl level.	
<b>Etravirine</b> (ETR) <i>Intenceo</i>	200 mg PO BID	No dosage adjustment necessary	<u>Child-Pugh Class A or B:</u> • No dosage adjustment  <u>Child-Pugh Class C:</u> • No dosage recommendation
<b>Nevirapine</b> (NVP) <i>Viramune</i> or <i>Viramune XR</i>	200 mg PO BID or 400 mg PO once daily (using Viramune XR formulation)	<u>Patients on HD:</u> Limited data; no dosage recommendation	<u>Child-Pugh Class A:</u> • No dosage adjustment  <u>Child-Pugh Class B or C:</u> • Contraindicated
<b>Rilpivirine</b> (RPV) <i>Edurant</i>	25 mg PO once daily	No dosage adjustment necessary	<u>Child-Pugh Class A or B:</u> • No dosage adjustment  <u>Child-Pugh Class C:</u> • No dosage recommendation
<b>Rilpivirine</b> (RPV) + <b>Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate</b> (TDF) + <b>Emtricitabine</b> (FTC) <i>Complera</i>	1 tablet PO once daily	Not recommended for use in patients with CrCl <50 mL/min. Instead use the individual drugs of the fixed-dose combination and adjust TDF and FTC doses levels according to CrCl level.	<u>Child-Pugh Class A or B:</u> • No dosage adjustment  <u>Child-Pugh Class C:</u> • No dosage recommendation

**Appendix B, Table 7. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Patients with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 4 of 6)**

ARVs Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Usual Daily Dose (Refer to <a href="#">Appendix B, Tables 1–6</a> for additional dosing information.)	Dosing in Renal Insufficiency <sup>a</sup>	Dosing in Hepatic Impairment
<b>Protease Inhibitors (PIs)</b>			
<b>Atazanavir</b> (ATV) <i>Reyataz</i>	400 mg PO once daily or ATV 300 mg + RTV 100 mg PO once daily	No dosage adjustment for patients with renal dysfunction who do not require HD  <u>ARV-Naive Patients on HD:</u> • ATV 300 mg + RTV 100 mg once daily  <u>ARV-Experienced Patients on HD:</u> • ATV or ATV/r not recommended	<u>Child-Pugh Class B:</u> • 300 mg once daily  <u>Child-Pugh Class C:</u> • Not recommended  RTV boosting is <b>not</b> recommended in patients with hepatic impairment (Child-Pugh Class B or C).
<b>Darunavir</b> (DRV) <i>Prezista</i>	DRV 800 mg + RTV 100 mg PO once daily (ARV-naive patients only) otherwise DRV 600 mg + RTV 100 mg PO BID	No dosage adjustment necessary	<u>Mild-to-Moderate Hepatic Impairment:</u> • No dosage adjustment  <u>Severe Hepatic Impairment:</u> • Not recommended
<b>Fosamprenavir</b> (FPV) <i>Lexiva</i>	1400 mg PO BID or FPV 1400 mg + RTV 100–200 mg PO once daily or FPV 700 mg + RTV 100 mg PO BID	No dosage adjustment necessary	<u>PI-Naive Patients Only</u> <u>Child-Pugh Score 5–9:</u> • 700 mg BID  <u>Child-Pugh Score 10–15:</u> • 350 mg BID  <u>PI-Naive or PI-Experienced Patients:</u> <u>Child-Pugh Score 5–6:</u> • 700 mg BID + RTV 100 mg once daily  <u>Child-Pugh Score 7–9:</u> • 450 mg BID + RTV 100 mg once daily  <u>Child-Pugh Score 10–15:</u> • 300 mg BID + RTV 100 mg once daily
<b>Indinavir</b> (IDV) <i>Crixivan</i>	800 mg PO q8h	No dosage adjustment necessary	<u>Mild-to-Moderate Hepatic Insufficiency Because of Cirrhosis:</u> • 600 mg q8h
<b>Ritonavir-Boosted Lopinavir</b> (LPV/r) <i>Kaletra</i>	LPV/r 400/100 mg PO BID or LPV/r 800/200 mg PO once daily	Avoid once-daily dosing in patients on HD.	No dosage recommendation; use with caution in patients with hepatic impairment.

**Appendix B, Table 7. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Patients with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 5 of 6)**

ARVs Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Usual Daily Dose (Refer to <a href="#">Appendix B, Tables 1–6</a> for additional dosing information.)	Dosing in Renal Insufficiency <sup>a</sup>	Dosing in Hepatic Impairment
<b>PIs, continued</b>			
<b>Nelfinavir</b> (NFV) <i>Viracept</i>	1250 mg PO BID	No dosage adjustment necessary	<u>Mild hepatic impairment:</u> • No dosage adjustment  <u>Moderate-to-severe hepatic impairment:</u> • Do not use.
<b>Ritonavir</b> (RTV) <i>Norvir</i>	As a PI-Boosting Agent: • 100–400 mg per day	No dosage adjustment necessary	Refer to recommendations for the primary PI.
<b>Saquinavir</b> (SQV) <i>Invirase</i>	SQV 1000 mg + RTV 100 mg PO BID	No dosage adjustment necessary	<u>Mild-to-Moderate Hepatic Impairment:</u> • Use with caution.  <u>Severe Hepatic Impairment:</u> • Contraindicated
<b>Tipranavir</b> (TPV) <i>Aptivus</i>	TPV 500 mg + RTV 200 mg PO BID	No dosage adjustment necessary	<u>Child-Pugh Class A:</u> • Use with caution  <u>Child-Pugh Class B or C:</u> • Contraindicated
<b>Integrase Inhibitors (INSTIs)</b>			
<b>Dolutegravir</b> (DTG) <i>Tivicay</i>	50 mg once daily or 50 mg BID	No dosage adjustment necessary	<u>Child-Pugh Class A or B:</u> • No dosage adjustment  <u>Child-Pugh Class C:</u> • Not recommended
<b>Elvitegravir</b> (EVG) + <b>Cobicistat</b> (cobi) + <b>Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate</b> (TDF) + <b>Emtricitabine</b> (FTC) <i>Stribild</i> (only available as a co-formulated product)	1 tablet once daily	EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC <b>should not be initiated</b> in patients with CrCl <70 mL/min.  Discontinue EVG/cobi/TDF/FTC if CrCl declines to <50 mL/min while patient is on therapy.	<u>Mild-to-Moderate Hepatic Insufficiency:</u> • No dosage adjustment necessary  <u>Severe Hepatic Insufficiency:</u> • Not recommended
<b>Raltegravir</b> (RAL) <i>Isentress</i>	400 mg BID	No dosage adjustment necessary	<u>Mild-to-Moderate Hepatic Insufficiency:</u> • No dosage adjustment necessary  <u>Severe Hepatic Insufficiency:</u> • No recommendation

**Appendix B, Table 7. Antiretroviral Dosing Recommendations in Patients with Renal or Hepatic Insufficiency** (Last updated May 1, 2014; last reviewed May 1, 2014) (page 6 of 6)

ARVs Generic Name (Abbreviation) Trade Name	Usual Daily Dose (Refer to <a href="#">Appendix B, Tables 1–6</a> for additional dosing information.)	Dosing in Renal Insufficiency <sup>a</sup>	Dosing in Hepatic Impairment
<b>Fusion Inhibitor</b>			
<b>Enfuvirtide</b> (T20) <i>Fuzeon</i>	90 mg subcutaneous BID	No dosage adjustment necessary	No dosage adjustment necessary
<b>CCR5 Antagonist</b>			
<b>Maraviroc</b> (MVC) <i>Selzentry</i>	The recommended dose differs based on concomitant medications and potential for drug-drug interactions. See <a href="#">Appendix B, Table 6</a> for detailed dosing information.	<p><u>CrCl &lt;30 mL/min or on HD</u>  <i>Without Potent CYP3A Inhibitors or Inducers:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 300 mg BID; reduce to 150 mg BID if postural hypotension occurs</li> </ul> <p><i>With Potent CYP3A Inducers or Inhibitors:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not recommended</li> </ul>	No dosage recommendations. Concentrations will likely be increased in patients with hepatic impairment.

<sup>a</sup> Including with chronic ambulatory peritoneal dialysis and hemodialysis

**Key to Abbreviations:** 3TC = lamivudine; ABC = abacavir; ARV = antiretroviral; ATV = atazanavir; AZT = zidovudine; BID = twice daily; CAPD = chronic ambulatory peritoneal dialysis; coBI = cobicistat; CrCl = creatinine clearance; CYP = cytochrome P; d4T = stavudine; ddI = didanosine; DLV = delavirdine; DRV = darunavir; EC = enteric coated; **DTG = dolutegravir**; EFV = efavirenz; ETR = etravirine; EVG = elvitegravir; FPV = fosamprenavir; FTC = emtricitabine; HD = hemodialysis; IDV = indinavir; 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; q(n)d = every (n) days; q(n)h = every (n) hours; RAL = raltegravir; RPV = rilpivirine; RTV = ritonavir; SQV = saquinavir; T20 = enfuvirtide; TDF = tenofovir disoproxil fumarate; TID = three times daily; TPV = tipranavir; XR = extended release; ZVD = zidovudine



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 <sup>a</sup>	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 μmol/L to 50 μmol/L)	>3 mg/dL (>50 μmol/L)
Modified total bilirubin <sup>b</sup>	<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

<sup>a</sup> 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

<sup>b</sup> 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 <sup>c</sup>
Class A	5–6 points
Class B	7–9 points
Class C	>9 points

<sup>c</sup> Sum of points for each component