

COMPARATIVE NEUROPSYCHIATRIC TOXICITY PROFILE OF DOLUTEGRAVIR VERSUS EFAVIRENZ VERSUS OTHER **ANTIRETROVIRAL THIRD DRUGS USED EITHER IN FIRST-LINE OR SWITCH ANTIRETROVIRAL THERAPIES (ART):** DATA FROM ICONA FOUNDATION STUDY COHORT

1.HIV/AIDS Department, National Institute for Infectious Diseases "Lazzaro Spallanzani" IRCCS, Rome, Italy; 2. Centre for Clinical Research, Epidemiology, Modelling and Evaluation (CREME), Institute for Global Health, UCL, London, UK; 3. Infectious Diseases Unit, Catholic University of Sacred Heart, Rome, Italy; 4. Icona Foundation, Milan, Italy. 5. Infectious Diseases Department, ASST Grande Ospedale Metropolitano Niguarda, Milano, Italy; 6. Clinic of Infectious Diseases, Dept. of Biomedical Sciences and Public Health, Polytechnic University of Marche, Ancona, Italy; 7. Infectious Diseases Clinic, Department of Medicine University of Udine and Azienda Sanitaria Universitaria Integrata di Udine, Udine, Italy; 8. Clinic of Infectious and Tropical Diseases, Department of Health Sciences, ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo, University of Milan, Italy; 9. Department of Infectious Diseases, San Raffaele Hospital, Vita-Salute University, Milan, Italy

BACKGROUND

PE 32/10

- Concerns about an increased risk of neuropsychiatric adverse events (NPAEs) during exposure to Dolutegravir (DTG) have been recently raised in observational studies^[1-5].
- Historically, Efavirenz (EFV) was largely associated to a higher risk of NPAEs with an increased rate of discontinuations for toxicity compared with other antiretrovirals^[6].
- Despite this common toxicity profile, comparisons of NPAEs' risk between DTG and EFV-based regimens are limited. A large comparative randomized trial showed a lower rate of NPAEs with fewer discontinuations in ART-naïve patients starting DTG compared to those starting EFV^[7,8]. However, direct comparisons in real-life setting are lacking.

AIMS

The aim of this study was to evaluate and compare the risk of discontinuation due to NPAEs among DTG-based, EFV-based and other different antiretroviral regimens currently used as either first-line or switch ART.

STUDY DESIGN AND METHODS

STUDY DESIGN AND POPULATION

- Prospective, observational, multicentric study analyzing data from Icona Foundation Study Cohort.
- All consecutive ART-naïve and virologically-suppressed treatment-experienced (TE) HIV-positive patients, enrolled in the Icona cohort, who started or switched for the first time to a regimen including DTG or EFV or other currently used third drugs from January 2006 to December 2018, were included in the analysis and divided into three groups, according to the third drug started:
- ✓ DTG-group
- ✓ EFV-group
- **V** Other-group (including patients starting boosted darunavir, atazanavir, rilpivirine or other integrase strand transfer inhibitors [INSTIs] as third drug).

OUTCOME DEFINITION:

Treatment discontinuation due to NPAEs (NP-TD): discontinuation of the third drug, ignoring changes in the backbone, due to NPAEs as reported by the treating physician.

STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

- The probability of NP-TD was estimated and compared among the three treatment groups by Kaplan Meier analysis.
- Cox multivariable analysis were fitted to evaluate the independent risk of NP-TD for the three treatment groups after adjusting for main confounding factors.
- Two sensitivity cox-regression analysis were performed to assess the independent risk of NP-TD: 1) restricting the group "other" only to patients starting a non-DTG INSTIbased regimen in ART-naïve and TE populations 2) restricting the analysis to patients starting ART from 2011 (first year in which DTG was available in Icona database) in ARTnaïve population.
- NPAEs leading to discontinuation were characterized and compared among the groups in ART-naïve population.

Table 1 – Baseline characteristics according to treatment history and third-drug started

	ART-NAIVE (N=7,854)				TREATMENT-EXPERIENCED (N=3,300)			
	DTG GROUP (N=1,322)	EFV group (N=1,542)	OTHER GROUP (N=4,990)	P-VALUE	DTG GROUP (N=1,014)	EFV group (N=515)	OTHER GROUP (N=1,771)	P-VALUE
Female gender*	223 (16.9)	230 (14.9)	1016 (20.4)	<0.001	228 (22.5)	126 (24.5)	437 (24.7)	0.411
Age, years**	40 (31-49)	39 (32-46)	39 (31-47)	0.051	48 (39-56)	41 (35-47)	45 (38-52)	<0.001
Non-Italian born*	556 (42.1)	289 (18.7)	1351 (27.1)	<0.001	124 (12.2)	46 (8.9)	225 (12.7)	0.065
RISK FACTOR FOR HIV*				<0.001				<0.001
-MSM	703 (53.7)	701 (45.9)	2293 (46.4)		421 (41.6)	165 (32.1)	610 (34.6)	
-HETEROSEXUAL	442 (33.4)	599 (38.8)	1948.(39.0)		412 (40.6)	212 (41.2)	746 (42.1)	
-IDU	62 (4.7)	121 (7.9)	381. (7.7)		122 (12.1)	114 (22.2)	307 (17.4)	
-Other/Unknown	102 (7.8)	107 (7.0)	322 (6.5)		56 (5.5)	23 (4.5)	102 (5.8)	
AIDS DIAGNOSIS*	163 (12.3)	136 (8.8)	486 (9.7)	0.005	164 (16.2)	105 (20.4)	276 (15.6)	0.033
HCV-AB POSITIVE*	69 (5.2)	151 (9.8)	416 (8.3)	<0.001	151 (14.9)	139 (27.0)	366 (20.7)	<0.001
CD4 COUNT NADIR, CELLS/MM ^{3**}	333 (129-526)	307 (213-399)	337 (191-480)	<0.001	271 (141-384)	236 (109-334)	258 (132-361)	<0.001
BL CALENDAR YEAR**	2016 (2016-2017)	2011 (2009-2012)	2014 (2012-2016)	<0.001	2016 (2016-2017)	2007 (2003-2011)	2014 (2010-2016) <0.001
Months from HIV diagnosis to ART**	1 (1-3)	11 (2-39)	3 (1-24)	<0.001	71 (32, 171)	61 (28, 124)	92 (42, 172)	<0.001
BL CD4 COUNT, CELL/MM ^{3**}	349 (139-562)	324 (226-420)	351 (199-503)	<0.001	658 (463-882)	500 (355-720)	616 (442-821)	<0.001
BL HIV-RNA, LOG ₁₀ COPIES/ML**	4.62 (4.10-5.24)	4.75 (4.23-5.14)	4.57 (4.00-5.04)	<0.001	-	-	-	-
THIRD DRUG NON-EFV NON-DTG*				-				-
- RPV	-	-	1230 (24.7)		-	-	640 (36.1)	
- ATV/r	-	-	1131 (22.6)		-	-	533 (30.1)	
- DRV/R	-	-	1271 (25.5)		-	-	182 (10.3)	
- RAL	-	-	469 (9.4)		-	-	221 (12.5)	
- EVG/c			889 (17.8)				195 (11.0)	
Follow-up, months**	11 (4-19)	8 (3-27)	21 (9-38)	<0.001	19 (11-29)	28 (9-60)	45 (23-75)	<0.001

Figure 1- Probability of discontinuing third drug due to NPAEs according to treatment history and third drug started

1a) ART-NAÏVE POPULATION



Acknowledgments – Icona Foundation Study Group

BOARD OF DIRECTORS: A d'Arminio Monforte (President), A Antinori (Vice-President), M Andreoni, A Castagna, F Castelli, R Cauda, G Di Perri, M Galli, R Iardino, G Ippolito, A Lazzarin, GC Marchetti, G Rezza, F von Schloesser, P Viale. SCIENTIFIC SECRETARY: A d'Arminio Monforte, A Antinori, A Castagna, F Castelli, R Cauda, G Di Perri, M Galli, R Iardino, G Ippolito, A Lazzarin, GC Marchetti, G Rezza, F von Schloesser, P Viale. Ceccherini-Silberstein, A Cozzi-Lepri, E Girardi, S Lo Caputo, C Mussini, M Puoti, CF Perno. STEERING COMMITTEE: A Antinori, F Bai, C Balotta, A Bandera, S Bonora, M Borderi, A Calcagno, A Capetti, MR Capobianchi, A Castagna, F Ceccherini-Silberstein, S Cicalini, A Cingolani, P Cinque, A Cozzi-Lepri, A d'Arminio Monforte, A Di Biagio, E Girardi, N Gianotti, A Gori, G Guaraldi, G Lapadula, M Lichtner, S Lo Caputo, G Madeddu, F Maggiolo, G Marchetti, L Monno, C Mussini, S Nozza, CF Perno, C Pinnetti, M Puoti, E Quiros Roldan, R Rossotti, S Rusconi, MM Santoro, A Saracino, L Sarmati. STATISTICAL AND MONITORING TEAM: A Cozzi-Lepri, I Fanti, L Galli, P Lorenzini, A Rodano', M Macchia, A Tavelli. BIOLOGICAL BANK INMI: F Carletti, S Carrara, A Di Caro, S Graziano, F Petroni, G Prota, S Truffa. PARTICIPATING PHYSICIANS AND CENTERS: Italy A Giacometti, A Costantini, V Barocci (Ancona); G Angarano, L Monno, E Milano (Bari); F Maggiolo, C Suardi (Bergamo); P Viale, V Donati, G Verucchi (Bologna); F Castelnuovo, C Minardi, E Quiros Roldan (Brescia); B Menzaghi, C Abeli (Busto Arsizio); B Cacopardo, B Celesia (Catania); J Vecchiet, K Falasca (Chieti); A Pan, S Lorenzotti (Cremona); L Sighinolfi, D Segala (Ferrara); P Blanc, F Vichi (Firenze); G Cassola, C Viscoli, A Alessandrini, N Bobbio, G Mazzarello (Genova); M Lichtner, L Fondaco, (Latina); P Bonfanti, C Molteni (Lecco); A Chiodera, P Milini (Macerata); G Nunnari, G Pellicanò (Messina); A d'Arminio Monforte, M Galli, A Lazzarin, G Rizzardini, M Puoti, A Castagna, ES Cannizzo, MC Moioli, R Piolini, D Bernacchia, S Salpietro, C Tincati, (Milano); C Mussini, C Puzzolante (Modena); C Migliorino, G Lapadula (Monza); V Sangiovanni, G Borgia, V Esposito, G Di Flumeri, I Gentile, V Rizzo (Napoli); AM Cattelan, S Marinello (Padova); A Cascio, M Trizzino (Palermo); D Francisci, E Schiaroli (Perugia); G Parruti, F Sozio (Pescara); G Magnani, MA Ursitti (Reggio Emilia); M Andreoni, A Antinori, R Cauda, A Cristaudo, V Vullo, R Acinapura, D Moschese, M Capozzi, A Mondi, A Cingolani, M Rivano Capparuccia, G Iaiani, A Latini, R Gagliardini, MM Plazzi, G De Girolamo, A Vergori (Roma); M Cecchetto, F Viviani (Rovigo); G Madeddu, A De Vito(Sassari); B Rossetti, F Montagnani (Siena); A Franco, R Fontana Del Vecchio (Siracusa); C Di Giuli (Terni); P Caramello, G Di Perri, S Bonora, GC Orofino, M Sciandra (Torino); M Bassetti, A Londero (Udine); V Manfrin, G Battagin (Vicenza); G Starnini, A Ialungo (Viterbo).

A. Mondi¹, A. Cozzi-Lepri², A. Cingolani³, A. Tavelli⁴, M. Puoti⁵, V. Barocci⁶, A. Londero⁷, F. Bai⁸, C. Pinnetti¹, P. Cinque⁹, A. d'Arminio Monforte⁸, A. Antinori¹ on behalf

of the Icona Foundation Study Group

R	ES	U	L	-8

• Overall, 7,854 ART-naïve patients (starting ART bas	ed
patients (switching to regimens based on DTG in	319
characteristics are shown in Table 1.	

- **DTG-based or other ART both in ART-naïve (p<.001) and in TE (p<.001) population** [Fig.1a,1b]

Table 2-Relative hazards (RH) of discontinuing third drug due to NPAEs from fitting Cox regression models

TABLE 2A	Adjusted* RH (95% CI) of NF TD in ART-naïve population	P-VALUE	Adjusted* RH (95% CI) of NP- TD in ART-NAÏVE POPULATION [#]	P-VALUE	Adjusted* RH (95% CI) of NP TD IN TE POPULATION	P-VALUE
DTG-BASED REGIMENS	1.00		1.00		1.00	
EFV-BASED REGIMENS	7.02 (2.98-16.58)	<0.001	6.29 (2.28-17.34)	<0.001	5.09 (1.62, 15.98)	0.005
OTHER REGIMENS	0.10 (0.03-0.30)	<0.001	0.08 (0.02-0.27)	<0.001	0.24 (0.09-0.66)	0.006
TABLE 2B	TABLE 2B Adjusted* RH (95% CI) of NP-TD NAÏVE POPULATION		D IN ART- A P-VALUE	ADJUSTED* RH (95% CI) OF NP-TD IN TE POPULATION		P-VALUE
DTG-BASED REGIMENS	1	00			1.00	
EFV-BASED REGIMENS	6.98 (2.9	6.98 (2.95-16.51)		< 0.001 8.0		<0.001
OTHER INSTI-BASED REG	IMENS 0.08 (0.	01-0.68)	0.021	0.	72 (0.26-1.97)	0.519

* Adjusted for: gender, age, mode of HIV transmission, nationality, calendar year of starting ART, AIDS diagnosis, BMI (only for ART-naïve patients), STR (yes vs no), backbone, CD4 count nadir, highest level of education, employment and NPS symptoms at baseline. # sensitivity analysis on patients starting ART from 2011.

Figure 2- NPAEs leading to treatment discontinuation according to third drug in ART-naïve population SLEEP DISTURBANCES* # Regimens of patients in the group «other» who experienced NP-TD were based on: RPV DIZZINESS (6); ATV/r (3): EVG/C (3); RAL (2) **ANXIETY/MOOD DISORDERS** *Abnormal dreams were reported only in IMPAIRED CONCENTRATION/CONFUSIO EFV-group; DTG-group ** Other NPAEs includes: DEPRESSION EFV-group paraestnesia, anosmia, paranoid Other-group# SUICIDAL IDEATION ideation, hallucinations and headache OTHER ** (DTG group); hallucinations, acouphene (EFV-group) UNKWNOWN hands shacking and hallucinations (other-30 50 40 group). Number of patients with NPAEs leading to TD (more than one event for patient is possible)



- based ART.
- related NPAEs.

References

1.De Boer M et al, AIDS 2016; 2. Hoffmann C et al. HIV Med 2017: 3. Menard A et al AIDS 2017; ICONA Foundation is supported by unrestricted grants 4.Peñafiel J et al JAC 2017; 5. Elzi L et al AIDS 2017; 6.Ford N et al JAIDS 2015; 7. Walmsley S. et from BMS, Gilead Sciences, Janssen, MSD and ViiV al NEJM 2013: 8. Moreno S et al, 6th international Symposium of Neuropsychiatry and HIV. Healthcare

1b) TREATMENT-EXPERIENCED POPULATION



on DTG in 17%, EFV in 20% and non-EFV non-DTG in 63%) and **3,300 TE** %, EFV in 15% and non-EFV non-DTG in 54%) were included. Main BL

At survival analysis, patients on EFV-based ART were more likely to stop third drug due to NPAEs compared to patients on

• At multivariable analysis, after adjusting for main confounders, DTG was associated with a risk of NP-TD significantly lower than EFV but higher than non-DTG non-EFV drugs in both ART-naïve and TE patients [Table2A]. In ART-naïve population, these data were confirmed also restricting the analysis to patients starting ART after 2011 [Table2A] and including in the "other" group only people who started a elvitegravir- or raltegravir-based ART [Table2B]. Conversely, in TE patients, the risk of NP-TD did not significantly differ between patients treated with DTG versus other INSTI-based ART [Table2B].

 In ART-naïve patients, NPAEs leading to EFV discontinuation were mostly sleep disturbances (insomnia and abnormal dreams), dizziness and impaired concentration while those leading to DTG stop were mainly insomnia and mood disorders [Fig2].

CONCLUSIONS

In this large cohort, both ART-naïve and TE patients on DTG-based regimens showed a risk of experiencing treatmentlimiting NPAES significantly lower than patients on EFV-based regimens but higher than people on non-EFV non-DTG-

The slightly higher risk of discontinuation due to neuropsychiatric toxicity of DTG- versus non-EFV non-DTG-based regimens was confirmed, in ART-naïve population, also specifically comparing DTG- to other INSTI-based ART. Conversely, in TE patients, the risk of stopping treatment among different INSTI-based ART did not significantly differ. The neuropsychiatric toxicity profile of DTG and EFV, assessed in ART-naïve population, seems to be only partially comparable. However, this finding should be interpreted cautiously due to the lack of characterization of most EFV-

Funding