

CROI 2011 Predictors of Virologic Response to etravirine-based cART Regimens in a Large European Cohort of HIV-infected Patients

A Cozzi-Lepri^{1,2}, R Paredes³, A Phillips¹, J Kjær⁴, A Lazzarin⁵, J van Lunzen⁶, A Karlsson⁷, M Johnson⁸, and J Lundgren^{4,9} for the EuroSIDA study group

¹Department of Infection & Population Health Division of Population Health Hampstead Campus, University College London, UK, ²Division of Biostatistics, University of Minnesota, USA, ³HIV Unit and irsiCaixa Retrovirology Lab, Hospital Universitari Germans Trias i Pujol, Barcelona, Spain, ⁴Copenhagen HIV Programme, University of Copenhagen, Panum Institute, Denmark, ⁵Istituto di Ricovero e Cura a Carattere Scientifico, San Raffaele Vita-Salute University, Milan, Italy, ⁶Infectious Diseases Unit/ Department of Medicine 1, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Germany, Department of Clinical Immunology, 7Swedish Institute for Infectious Disease Control, and Department of Infectious Diseases, Huddinge Hospital, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden ⁸Royal Free NHS Trust and RFUCMS, London UK, ⁹Centre for Viral Diseases/KMA, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen, Denmark

BACKGROUND

Etravirine is a non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NNRTI). Unlike other currently available agents in the class such as efavirenz and nevirapine, resistance to other NNRTIs seem to confer limited resistance to etravirine and the number of etravirine-associated mutations seems to be the major determinant of virological success on etravirine.

The understanding of the true potency of etravirine when used as part of a second-line regimen in patients who failed a first line regimen with NNRTI has implications both in the resource-rich and -in the future potentially- also in limited settings for patients who cannot afford or tolerate PI. Most of the expert-based interpretation systems (IS) are based on the etravirine-mutations identified in the DUET trials with little cross-validation of these rules in other settings. Therefore, which and how many NNRTI mutations are sufficient to substantially reduce the virological response to etravirine-cART regimens remains to be better established.

OBIECTIVE

The primary objective of this analysis was to estimate the prevalence of NNRTI-resistance accumulated up to the time of starting an etravirine-based regimen in EuroSIDA and to assess the long-term risk of virologic failure to etravirinebased ART regimens according to detected resistance and other factors.

METHODS

Study population

The EuroSIDA study is a prospective, observational, open cohort of 16,599 HIV-1 infected patients in 102 centres across 31 European countries, Israel and Argentina. The study is described in detail at www.cphiv.dk. EuroSIDA also requests plasma samples from patients to be collected prospectively every six months and stored in a central repository. Retrospective genotypic sequencing has been carried out on samples identified for specific projects. HIV-1 RNA is isolated from patient blood plasma using QIAamp kit (Qiagen, Barcelona, Spain) and sequence analysis of HIV-1 RT and PR reading frames is performed using the Trugene HIV-1 genotyping Kit and OpenGene DNA Sequencing System according to the manufacturer's recommendations (Bayer, Barcelona, Spain).

In this analysis, we included patients in EuroSIDA who started an etravirine-based cART regimen (containing at least 2 other antiretrovirals besides etravirine which was started as new) at any point in time after January 1, 2001. The date of starting etravirine as part of cART was defined as baseline. An additional inclusion criterion was an available measure of viral load before baseline (only n=3 patients were excluded because of this criterion).

Statistical analysis

The prevalence of etravirine-associated mutations and NNRTI-resistance based on all genotypic resistance tests (GRT) performed prior to the time of starting etravirine was described. Etravirine- and NNRTI-resistance mutations were defined according to the IAS-USA list of December 2009. Etravirine activity was estimated using current versions of the 3 most frequently used expert based interpretation systems (ANRS, Stanford and Rega) as well as two etravirinespecific scores: the Tibotec (TBT) weighted genotypic score and the Monogram (MGR) score. The activity of the background regimen (including all drugs received at the time of starting etravirine, besides etravirine) was estimated using the Rega system.

Time to virological failure was defined as the time of a single HIV-1 RNA >400 copies/mL after >6 months of starting the etravirine-containing regimen. If baseline viral load was ≤400 copies/mL, the definition was the same but there was no requirement for > 6 months to have elapsed to declare a rebound. Standard survival analysis by means of Kaplan-Meier curves and Cox proportional hazards regression model, stratified by year of starting etravirine, was employed. Statistical analyses were performed using SAS (Version 9.2). All reported p-values are two-sided.









RESULTS

Study population

We identified 320 patients who started etravirine as part of cART between May 2001 and October 2009 (median Feb 2008). Table 1 shows the main characteristics of the study population according to whether they started etravirine with a suppressed or unsuppressed viral load for the subset of 216 patients (68%) with at least one genotypic test prior to etravirine initiation. Table 2a/b compares the same two groups with respect to factors measuring antiretroviral treatment and HIV drug resistance.

NNRTI resistance at time of etravirine initiation and at time of failure

For 154 (71%) of the 216 with >=1 GRT, the date of the most recent test was after the estimated date of virological failure of \geq 1 drugs in the NNRTI class. Considering all 216, the median time between the test and the date of starting etravirine was 37 months (range:1-176) and 32 (1-141) months when restricting to the 154 tested after failure. The prevalence of patients with ≥1 IAS-USA NNRTI detected up to the most recent test before starting etravirine was 43% overall, 24% in patients never previously exposed to NNRTI (mainly due to detection of polymorphisms 90l, 98G and 101E), 48% in those exposed in the past but not receiving a NNRTI at the time of the last test and 46% in those last tested when receiving a NNRTI. The prevalence of etravirine specific mutations was 34% (95% CI:28-41) overall and 24% (12-39), 38% (29-47) and 35% (22-49) in the same subgroups. Figure 1a/b shows the distribution of specific IAS-USA NNRTIassociated mutations according to NNRTI exposure prior to last test. Thirty-seven patients (30% of those who showed no NNRTI-resistance up to the time of their last test) started nevirapine or efavirenz between the date of this test and the date of starting etravirine. Figure 2 shows the percentage of patients who at the time of their last GRT were estimated to have a virus which was susceptible to etravirine according to system used and predicted activity of the background regimen.

Virological response to the etravirine-based cART and its predictors

Over a total of 399 person years of follow-up we observed 42 cases of virological failure (incidence rate=10.5 per 100 person years, 95% CI:7.7-14.0), of which only one was a rebound from a patient who started etravirine with a viral load suppressed ≤400 copies/mL. Virological failure was declared a median of 9 months from starting etravirine in those who experienced failure. Table 3 shows the associations between predicted etravirine activity (based on all tests performed an average 37 months before start etravirine), specific etravirine mutations and virological response from fitting a Cox proportional hazards regression model. The ANRS score was the only IS showing a significant association with the risk of virological failure for increased levels of resistance. In addition, an increased risk of virological failure was seen in patients carrying mutations 101E. Interestingly, detection of mutation 103N was independently associated with a significantly reduced risk of subsequent virological failure. Results were similar when we performed sensitivity analyses: i) after restricting to tests performed within 1 year of starting ETR - RH=13.2 for ANRS intermediate vs. ANRS sensitive, p=0.04; 373.5 for ANRS resistance vs. ANRS sensitive, p=0.008 and RH=0.01 for patients in which K103N was detected (p=0.05) and ii) after excluding patients who started a NNRTI between the date of the last test and the date of commencing etravirine - RH=8.5 for ANRS intermediate vs. ANRS sensitive, p=0.01; 44.3 for ANRS resistance vs. ANRS sensitive, p=0.001 and RH=0.15 for patients in which K103N was detected (p=0.002). Calendar year of starting ETR (RH=0.66 per more recent year, p=0.001) was the only other independent predictor of virological failure (Table 4 - analysis performed also on all 320 patients, not just those with >=1 GRT). Results were similar when we used two consecutive viral loads>400 copies/mL to define virological failure (34 events, data not shown).

CONCLUSIONS

Uncertainty regarding predictions of antiviral activity for etravirine in NNRTI-treated patients in clinical practice remains high. Analysis of this database after the accumulation of additional patients starting etravirine as well as analyses of other datasets are needed to further investigate the role of 103N in determining etravirine hypersensitivity.

Alessandro Cozzi-Lepr University College Londo Tel +1. 612.626.8615 Fax +1. 612.624.2819 a.cozzi-lepri@ucl.ac.ul



Factors"	Crude RH (95% CI)	p-value	Adjusted" RH (95% CI)	p-valu
Predicted etryirine activity				
Rega				
Intermediate	1.47 (0.74, 2.92)	0.268 0.252	1.18(0.50, 2.78) 1.64(0.42, 6.43)	0.708
HVDS				
ANRS				
Resistant	4.50 (1.07, 18.90)	0.040	8.72 (1.55, 48.77)	0.01
TBT score				
Resistant	3.35 (1.65, 6.82)	1.001	3.08 (1.08, 8.75)	0.07
MGR score				
Resistant	1.89(1.02, 3.50)	0.043	1.45 (0.61, 3.44)	0.39
IAS-USA NNRTI mutations				

All patierts (N=320) Factors"	Crude and adjusted relative hazards of virological failure						
	Crude RH (95% CI)	p value	Adjusted** RH (95% CI) All patients (n=320)	p-value	Adjusted" RH (95% CI) Patients with genotype (n=216)	p-valı	
Prior exposure to NNRTI, n(%)							
No			1.00		1.00		
Efavirenz		0.425	0.81(0.40, 1.67)	0.573	0.75(0.29, 1.93)	0.548	
Nevirapine	0.97 (0.52, 1.80)	0.916	0.84 (0.38, 1.84)	0.657	0.85(0.31, 2.32)	0.750	
No. of total drugs previously failed per one additional	1.05 (0.98, 1.12)	0.135	1.01 (0.93, 1.10)	0.831	1.06 (0.95, 1.18)	0.32	
No. of new drugs started per one additional	1.16 (0.96, 1.39)	0.115	1.01 (0.82, 1.25)	0.890	1.16 (0.92, 1.47)	0.218	
No. of active drugs in background regimen- Rega nor one additional		0.808			1.18 (0.89, 1.56)	0.24	
Duration of previous exposure to failing efaviren 2, months	1.01 (0.77, 1.33)	0.938	1.08(0.77, 1.51)	0.663	1.24 (0.82, 1.85)	0.301	
per year longer							
Duration of previous exposure to failing nevirapine, months		0.660	1.10 (0.84, 1.43)	0.492	0.93 (0.64, 1.34)	0.68;	
per year longer							
Time from last use of NNRTI, months per year longer	0.99 (0.90, 1.08)	0.759	1.04 (0.92, 1.18)	0.546	1.02 (0.87, 1.21)	0.780	
Viral load at baseline per log** higher	1.35 (1.10, 1.65)	0.004	1.25 (0.96, 1.62)	0.093	1.20 (0.87, 1.65)	0.258	
Calendaryear of baseline	0.75 (0.65, 0.87)	C001	0.79(0.65, 0.97)	0.021	0.66(0.51, 0.85)	0.00	

Download poster at: www.cphiv.dk

