

Title: Oral Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) to prevent HIV: a systematic review and meta-analysis of clinical effectiveness, safety, adherence and risk compensation in all populations

Authors: Eamon O Murchu, MB BCh BAO, MPH;^{a, b} Liam Marshall, MSc; ^a Catherine Hayes, MD, MPH, MB;^b Patricia Harrington, PhD;^a Patrick Moran, PhD;^{a, b} Conor Teljeur, PhD;^a Máirín Ryan, PhD.^{a, c}

^aHealth Information and Quality Authority, George's Court, George's Lane, Dublin 7, Ireland

^bTrinity College Dublin, Institute of Population Health, Tallaght, Dublin 24, Ireland

^cTrinity College Dublin, Department of Pharmacology & Therapeutics, Trinity Health Sciences, Dublin 8, Ireland

Corresponding author: Eamon O Murchu. Trinity College Dublin, Institute of Population Health, Tallaght, Dublin 24, Ireland. E-mail: omurchea@tcd.ie. Tel: +353838818554.

Funding statement: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

Competing interests: None declared.

Data sharing: All data relevant to the study are included in the article or uploaded as supplementary information.

Word count: Abstract=300; Main text (excluding abstract, tables, figures, references): 4,698.

Figures=3; Tables=4; Supplementary Material=2 (S1 – search strategy, S2 – additional results, S3 – protocol); **PRISMA Checklist=1**

1

2

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Background

The objective of this study was to conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of the effectiveness and safety of oral Pre-Exposure Prophylaxis (PrEP) to prevent HIV.

Methods

Databases (PubMed, Embase and the Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials) were searched up to 5/7/2020. RCTs were included that compared oral tenofovir-containing PrEP to placebo, no treatment or alternative medication/dosing schedule. The primary outcome was the rate ratio (RR) of HIV infection using a modified intention-to-treat analysis. All analyses were stratified a priori by population: men who have sex with men (MSM), serodiscordant couples, heterosexuals and people who inject drugs (PWID).

The quality of individual studies was assessed using the Cochrane Risk-of-Bias tool and the certainty of evidence was assessed using GRADE.

Results

Of 2,803 unique records, 15 RCTs met our inclusion criteria. Over 25,000 participants were included, encompassing 38,289 person-years of follow-up data.

PrEP was found to be effective in MSM (Rate Ratio [RR] 0.25, 95% CI: 0.1-0.61; Absolute Rate Difference [ARD] -0.03, 95% CI: -0.01 to -0.05), serodiscordant couples (RR 0.25, 95% CI: 0.14-0.46; ARD -0.01, 95% CI: -0.01 to -0.02) and PWID (RR 0.51, 95% CI: 0.29-0.92; ARD -0.00, 95% CI: -0.00 to -0.01), but not in heterosexuals (RR 0.77, 95% CI: 0.46-1.29).

Efficacy was strongly associated with adherence ($p < 0.01$). PrEP was found to be safe, however unrecognised HIV at enrolment increased the risk of viral drug mutations. Evidence for risk compensation or an increase in STIs was not found.

Discussion

PrEP is safe and effective in MSM, serodiscordant couples and PWID. Additional research is needed prior to recommending PrEP in heterosexuals. Data were limited by poor adherence in several studies. No RCTs were identified for other high-risk groups, such as transgender women and sex workers.

PROSPERO ID: CRD42017065937

Keywords: 'PrEP', 'pre-exposure prophylaxis', 'HIV'

Article Summary

Strengths and limitations of this study

- A systematic review and meta-analysis of RCTs was conducted of the efficacy and safety of oral PrEP to prevent HIV following best practice guidelines (PRISMA guidelines and GRADE framework)
- Observational studies were excluded from this review, and as such, PrEP effectiveness may be lower in real-world settings
- Change in sexual behaviour, or 'risk compensation', is difficult to ascertain based on RCT evidence alone
- Due to substantial variation in adherence across studies, findings should be interpreted with caution.

Introduction

While the incidence of HIV has declined worldwide over the past decade, 1.5 million new HIV infections occurred in 2020,¹ highlighting the ongoing need for new and effective HIV prevention initiatives. Pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) is a novel biomedical form of HIV prevention method, whereby oral anti-retrovirals (most commonly a combination of tenofovir and emtricitabine) are taken by individuals at high risk of HIV acquisition to prevent infection. PrEP aims to complement the existing arsenal of HIV prevention strategies, such as the promotion of safer sex practices, treatment-as-prevention and post-exposure prophylaxis after sexual exposure.

In 2014, the WHO recommended offering PrEP to men who have sex with men (MSM),² based a 2010 trial that demonstrated the effectiveness in this group.³ Subsequently, in 2015, they broadened the recommendation to include anyone at substantial risk of HIV infection (defined as risk of 3 per 100 person-years in the absence of PrEP),⁴ based on further evidence of the acceptability and effectiveness in other populations. While the success of early PrEP studies in MSM was replicated in the years that followed (with high efficacy noted in IPERGAY⁵ and PROUD⁶ clinical trials), uncertainty still exists in other key populations. Many initial studies that failed to demonstrate effectiveness were plagued by poor adherence, such as those that enrolled heterosexual women.⁷ Also, of major concern to public health officials and policy-makers is the potential occurrence of ‘risk compensation’ in PrEP users (an increase in unsafe sexual practices due to the knowledge that PrEP is protective against HIV), which may lead to an increase in STIs, exacerbating the secular trend of rising STI rates in many countries.

Since the most recent WHO recommendation, a number of new trials in diverse populations have been conducted. We therefore conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to retrieve the most up-to-date evidence on the effectiveness and safety of oral PrEP compared with placebo, no treatment or alternative oral PrEP medication/dosing schedule in all populations, with a particular emphasis on adherence and risk compensation. This review aimed to inform the decision of the Irish government to implement a PrEP programme and to assist in the development of national clinical practice guidelines on PrEP for HIV prevention.

Methods

A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) was conducted, adhering to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines.⁸ The quality of evidence was assessed using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) framework.⁹ This framework is commonly used internationally to aid decisions by policy-makers, and ensured a systematic and transparent approach in the development of clinical practice recommendations. This study was registered with PROSPERO (ID: CRD42017065937).

Search strategy and selection criteria

Electronic searches were conducted in Medline (PubMed), Embase, the Cochrane Register of Controlled Trials, CRD DARE Database, Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report (CDC), and Eurosurveillance reports. Search terms that related to 'HIV' were combined with search terms that related to 'PrEP' or 'tenofovir', and filters for study design (RCTs) were applied (the full search strategy for PubMed is provided in Supplementary Material 1). Databases were searched on 5 July 2020. No restrictions were placed based on location of the intervention or date of publication. No language restrictions were used; articles in languages other than English were translated where necessary. Table 1 outlines the inclusion criteria for study selection. Animal studies, studies that did not report primary outcome data (HIV incidence), and abstracts from conference proceedings were excluded.

It was decided a priori that all analyses of effectiveness would be stratified by population.

The four populations were men who have sex with men (MSM), serodiscordant heterosexual couples (individuals whose partners are HIV positive and not virally suppressed

on antiretroviral medications), heterosexuals and people who inject drugs (PWIDs).

Table 1. Inclusion criteria

Criteria for study selection	
Population	Anyone at elevated risk of HIV acquisition. Populations defined a priori: men who have sex with men, serodiscordant heterosexual couples, heterosexuals, people who inject drugs
Intervention	Oral tenofovir-containing pre-exposure prophylaxis
Comparator	Placebo, no treatment or alternative oral PrEP medication/dosing schedule
Outcomes	Primary outcome: HIV incidence Secondary outcomes: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Adherence to PrEP2. Adverse events3. Incidence of other STIs and behaviour change associated with PrEP administration4. Viral drug mutations among those who contract HIV
Studies	RCTs

Legend: PrEP – pre-exposure prophylaxis, RCT – randomised controlled trial, STI – sexually transmitted infection.

Data collection and analysis

Results of the database search were exported to Endnote X7. Full text articles were obtained for all citations identified as potentially eligible. Two reviewers (EOM and LM) independently screened these according to the pre-specified inclusion criteria. Two reviewers (EOM and LM) independently performed data extraction and assessed the risk of bias according to the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool.¹⁰ An overall assessment of the quality of the evidence was assessed using the GRADE approach that included an assessment of other biases, such as publication bias.⁹

The primary outcome measure was the rate ratio (RR) of HIV infection for each population. The rate of HIV infection represented the number of HIV infections that occurred per person-years of follow up data, and the RR compares the rate of HIV infection in the PrEP group with control. The rate of HIV infection (per person-years) was favoured over risk of

HIV infection as rate incorporates both the number of participants *and* the duration of follow-up, allowing for comparisons across studies that may vary significantly in terms of study duration. The absolute rate difference (ARD) of HIV infection was also estimated for each population; in this case, the ARD represented the actual difference in the observed rate of HIV between PrEP and control groups per person-year of follow-up data. Meta-analyses of RRs and ARDs were performed in Review Manager 5.3 using Mantel-Haenszel random effects models.

A modified intention-to-treat analysis was employed (and not per-protocol analysis); therefore, effectiveness was a function of both efficacy of the drug itself and on adherence. A modified intention-to-treat analysis was selected instead of a standard intention-to-treat analysis to account for unrecognised HIV infection at enrolment. In the modified intention-to-treat analysis, all patients who were HIV negative at enrolment in the study were included in analyses, and individuals with an unrecognised HIV infection prior to enrolment were excluded.

Clinical heterogeneity was assessed by the reviewers based on the description of the interventions and comparators in the RCTs. Statistical heterogeneity was examined using the I^2 statistic (I^2 values above 75% represented considerable heterogeneity). If there was sufficient clinical homogeneity across studies, results were pooled using a random effects Mantel–Haenszel model.

In the estimation of PrEP effectiveness, subgroups of studies were defined by dosing schedule, comparator and adherence. Analyses were stratified by population and adherence. Adherence was dichotomised for subgroup analyses: if the proportion of participants who were adherent was $\geq 80\%$, the study was considered ‘high adherence’ and

<80% was considered 'low adherence'. Commonly used measures of adherence include self-report, pill counts, medication event monitoring systems (MEMS), structured interviews and plasma drug detection methods. Plasma drug monitoring is considered the gold standard for adherence assessment; plasma drug detection was favoured over self-report/pill count in the determination of adherence as it minimises recall bias. In studies that only measured plasma drug concentration in participants who reported taking study drug, the proportion of samples with study drug detected was multiplied by the self-reported adherence rate. In studies that measured adherence in a number of ways without undertaking plasma drug monitoring, taking a conservative approach, the lowest estimate of adherence was used for subgroup analysis.

To investigate the relationship between efficacy and adherence, a meta-regression analysis was conducted (meta-regression was considered the appropriate model as it accounts for trial size in analyses). In this analysis, adherence was a continuous variable, and only studies that confirmed adherence through plasma drug monitoring were included. Analyses were conducted in R version 3.6.2.

In the assessment of the safety of PrEP, the definitions for adverse events and serious adverse events followed the definitions used in the primary studies. Outcome measures were expressed as both RRs of safety events and RDs between groups. In the assessment of behaviour change, the effect of PrEP on condom use, number of sexual partners, recreational drug use and the rate of new STI diagnoses (as a proxy for condomless sex) were assessed. In the assessment of PrEP-related drug mutations, subgroups included patients with unrecognised acute HIV infection at the time of enrolment and patients who seroconverted during the course of the trial. Where there was a lack of data or agreed

definitions for these outcomes, a narrative review was performed.

In the case of pooling data for rare events, there can be issues with the inclusion of studies with zero events in one or both arms.¹¹ A common approach where there are zero events in one arm is to apply a continuity correction, whereby all cells in the two by two table for a given study have 0.5 added to avoid division by zero. This approach can lead to bias, particularly for small trials or those with imbalanced arms. Trials with zero events in both arms are typically excluded, leading to a loss of information. Approaches are available to include zero event trials with application of a continuity correction. For this study, if trials with zero events in one or both arms were identified, a sensitivity analysis using a random effects Poisson regression¹¹ and beta-binomial¹² models was applied to determine whether the results were sensitive to presence of trials with zero events in one or both arms. The main analysis excluded trials with zero events in both arms, as has been recommended when a treatment effect is considered likely.¹³

In the assessment of publication bias, funnel plots were used when there were more than 10 studies available for analysis. Standard approaches to funnel plots and tests for small study bias use the $\log(\text{OR})$ or $\log(\text{RR})$, which are not independent of their estimated standard error creating a bias. Those tests also have the limitation that they omit studies that have zero events in both arms. To overcome these issues, the arcsine test for publication bias was used.¹⁴

Patient and public involvement

No patients were involved.

Results

A total of 2,803 unique records were retrieved, resulting in 73 studies for full text review (Figure 1 provides the PRISMA diagram of study selection and the list of excluded studies, along with reasons, is provided in Supplementary Material 2.1). Fifteen RCTs met our inclusion criteria and were included in the assessment of effectiveness and safety. Seven RCTs were placebo-controlled trials that evaluated daily oral PrEP.^{3 7 15-19} Two studies randomised participants to receive either immediate or delayed PrEP.^{6 20} Three placebo-controlled trials investigated non-daily PrEP, including intermittent and ‘on-demand’ (also known as event-based) PrEP.^{5 21 22} Two RCTs did not contain a ‘no PrEP’ arm (placebo or no medication): one compared tenofovir with tenofovir/emtricitabine²³ and one compared three different PrEP dosing schedules.²⁴ One study contained three arms: PrEP, placebo and ‘no pill’.²⁵ Four distinct patient populations were assessed. Six RCTs enrolled MSM,^{3 5 6 20 21 25} five enrolled heterosexual participants,^{7 16 17 19 24} three enrolled serodiscordant couples^{18 22 23} and one enrolled PWIDs.¹⁵

Figure 1. PRISMA diagram of study selection

Figure 1 Legend: Diagram provides details on the selection process of studies for inclusion. Note that the exclusion of 2,703 citations at the ‘screening’ stage did not meet our study inclusion/exclusion criteria based on screening of title/abstract.

Included studies involved 25,051 participants encompassing 38,289 person-years of follow-up data. Of the 15,062 participants that received active drug in the intervention arms of trials, 55% received combination tenofovir/emtricitabine and 45% received single agent tenofovir. Follow-up periods ranged from 17 weeks to 6.9 years. Four trials were conducted in high-income countries (USA, England, France and Canada), 10 in low- or middle-income

countries (including nine trials in sub-Saharan Africa) and one was a multicenter trial conducted across four continents. All studies reported the results of a modified intention-to-treat analysis.

The main characteristics of included studies are provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Study characteristics

Study	Location	Population	Intervention	Comparison	Number of participants	Follow-up (person years)	Adherence: high (≥80%) vs. low (<80%)*
MSM							
Hosek 2013 (Project PrEPare) ²⁵	United States	Young MSM. Median age: 19.97 years (range: 18–22)	Tenofovir/emtricitabine	Daily PrEP with placebo and ‘no pill’	58	27	Low: 62% by self-report
Grohskopf 2013 (CDC Safety Study) ²⁰	United States	MSM. Age range: 18–60 years	Tenofovir	Immediate/delayed PrEP with immediate/delayed placebo. 1:1:1:1 trial design: tenofovir, placebo, delayed tenofovir and delayed placebo groups	400	800	Low: 77% by pill count
iPrEx (Grant 2010) ³	Peru, Ecuador, South Africa, Brazil, Thailand, and United States	MSM and transgender women. Age range: 18–67 years. Sex: 100% male at birth; 1% female gender identity	Tenofovir/emtricitabine	Daily PrEP with placebo	2499	3324	Low: 51% by plasma drug detection
McCormack 2015 (PROUD) ⁶	England	MSM. Median age: 35 years Sex: 100% men	Tenofovir/emtricitabine	Immediate PrEP with delayed PrEP	544	504	High: sufficient study drug was prescribed for 88% of the total follow-up time, and study drug was detected in 100% of participants who reported taking PrEP

Study	Location	Population	Intervention	Comparison	Number of participants	Follow-up (person years)	Adherence: high (≥80%) vs. low (<80%)*
Molina 2015 (IPERGAY) ⁵	France and Canada	MSM. Median age 35 PrEP group, 34 placebo group; Sex: 100% men	Tenofovir/emtricitabine	Intermittent ('on demand') PrEP with placebo. Participants were instructed to take a loading dose of two pills of tenofovir-emtricitabine or placebo 2 to 24 hours before sex, followed by a third pill 24 hours after the first drug intake and a fourth pill 24 hours later**	400	431	High: 86% by plasma drug detection
Mutua 2012 (IAVI Kenya Study) ²¹	Kenya	Female sex workers and MSM. Mean age: 26 years (range: 18–49); Sex: 67 men; 5 women	Tenofovir/emtricitabine	Daily/intermittent PrEP to daily /intermittent placebo	72	24	High: 83% by medication event monitoring system
Serodiscordant heterosexual couples (when the HIV-positive partner is not on antiretroviral treatment)							
Kibengo 2013 (IAVI Uganda Study) ²²	Uganda	Serodiscordant couples. Mean age: 33 years (range: 20–48); Sex: 50% women; 50% men	Tenofovir/emtricitabine	Daily/intermittent PrEP with daily/intermittent placebo	72 couples	24	High: 98% by medication event monitoring system
Baeten 2012 (Partners PrEP Study) ¹⁸	Kenya and Uganda	Serodiscordant couples. Age range: 18–45 years; Sex: seronegative partner was male in 61–64% of couples (depending on group assignment)	Tenofovir/emtricitabine and tenofovir only (three arms: two active arms and one placebo arm)	Daily PrEP with placebo	4,747 couples	7,830	High: 82% by plasma drug detection
Baeten 2014 (Partners PrEP Study Continuation) ²³	Kenya and Uganda	Serodiscordant couples. Age range: 28–40 years; Sex: 62–64% men (depending on group assignment)	Tenofovir/emtricitabine and tenofovir (Two Active Arms)	Tenofovir/emtricitabine combination versus tenofovir	4,410 couples	8,791	Low: 78.5% by plasma drug detection

Study	Location	Population	Intervention	Comparison	Number of participants	Follow-up (person years)	Adherence: high (≥80%) vs. low (<80%)*
Heterosexuals							
Bekker 2018 (ADAPT Cape Town) ²⁴	South Africa	Women. Median age of women was 26 years (IQR 21–37; range 18–52)	Tenofovir/emtricitabine	Daily, time and event-driven PrEP [†]	191	99	Low: 53-75% by electronic drug monitoring
Marrazzo 2015 (VOICE) ¹⁹	South Africa, Uganda, and Zimbabwe	Women. Median age: 24 years (range: 18–40); Sex: 100% women	5 arms: tenofovir/emtricitabine, tenofovir only and 1% tenofovir vaginal gel (compared with placebo oral PrEP and placebo vaginal gel)	Daily PrEP with placebo	4,969	5,509	Low: 29% by plasma drug detection
Peterson 2007 (West African Safety Study)	Nigeria, Cameroon, and Ghana	Women. Age range: 18–34 years; Sex: 100% women (mostly sex workers)	Tenofovir	Daily PrEP with placebo	936	428	Low: 69% by pill count
Thigpen 2012 (TENOFVIR2) ¹⁶	Botswana	Heterosexual men and women. Age range: 18–39 years; Sex: 54.2% men; 45.8% women	Tenofovir/emtricitabine	Daily PrEP with placebo	1219	1,563	High: 84.1% by pill count
VanDamme 2012 (FEM-PrEP) ⁷	Tanzania, South Africa, and Kenya	Women. Median age: 24.2 years (range: 18–35); Sex: 100% women	Tenofovir/emtricitabine	Daily PrEP with placebo	2,120	1407	Low: 24% by plasma drug detection
PWIDs							

Study	Location	Population	Intervention	Comparison	Number of participants	Follow-up (person years)	Adherence: high (≥80%) vs. low (<80%)*
Choopanya 2013 (Bangkok Tenofovir Study) ¹⁵	Thailand (Bangkok)	PWID. Median age: 31 years (range: 20–59) 80% male	Tenofovir	Daily PrEP with placebo	2,413	9,665	Low: 67% by plasma drug detection

Table 2 Legend: MSM = men who have sex with men; PWID = people who inject drugs. Tenofovir = Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate.

In all cases, tenofovir dose was 300mg and emtricitabine dose was 200mg.

*Adherence refers to the proportion of participants in trials that adhered to study drug. In most studies, more than one method was used to measure adherence; taking a conservative approach, the lowest estimate of adherence was used. In trials that investigated daily and intermittent PrEP, adherence relates to daily PrEP. In studies that measured tenofovir and emtricitabine separately by plasma drug detection, adherence refers to tenofovir detection.

**In case of multiple consecutive episodes of sexual intercourse, participants were instructed to take one pill per day until the last sexual intercourse and then to take the two postexposure pills

All included individual RCTs were judged to have a low risk of bias by the Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool (risk of bias graph and summary provided in Supplementary Material 2.2). Across studies, while publication bias may have been present in earlier, industry-funded studies (with fewer participants), this form of bias was considered less likely in the more recent, larger, publicly-funded studies. To investigate publication bias, the arcsine test for funnel plot asymmetry was applied to all 13 trials (as there were too few trials in individual population groups). The p-values for the equivalent of the Begg, Egger and Thompson tests were 0.58, 0.14 and 0.13, respectively. As such, it was determined that there was no evidence of funnel plot asymmetry (Supplementary Material 2.3).

Effectiveness

The following sections present the effectiveness of PrEP to prevent HIV acquisition by study population and stratified by adherence, where appropriate. Tables 3 and 4 present the GRADE 'summary of findings' assessment of the effectiveness and safety of PrEP.

Table 3. GRADE summary of findings: PrEP effectiveness

Summary of findings table: Effectiveness of PrEP						
Patient or population: HIV prevention in participants at substantial risk						
Intervention: PrEP						
Comparison: no PrEP						
Outcomes	Anticipated absolute effects* (95% CI)		Relative effect, expressed as rate ratios (95% CI)	Person-years of follow up (studies)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Rate with no PrEP	Rate with PrEP				
HIV infection: MSM (all clinical trials)	40 per 1,000	10 per 1,000 (4 to 24)	RR 0.25 (0.10 to 0.61)	5,103 (6 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH ^{a, b}	PrEP is effective in preventing HIV acquisition in MSM with a rate reduction of 75%
HIV infection: MSM , trials with high (≥80%) adherence	66 per 1,000	9 per 1,000 (4 to 23)	RR 0.14 (0.06 to 0.35)	960 (3 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	PrEP is highly effective in preventing HIV acquisition in MSM in trials with high adherence (over 80%) with a rate reduction of 86%
HIV infection: MSM , trials with low (<80%) adherence**	32 per 1,000	18 per 1,000 (12 to 26)	RR 0.55 (0.37 to 0.81)	4143 (3 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	PrEP is effective in preventing HIV acquisition in MSM in trials with low adherence (under 80%) with a rate reduction of 45%
HIV infection: Serodiscordant couples*** (all clinical trials: two studies with high [≥80%] adherence)	20 per 1,000	5 per 1,000 (3 to 9)	RR 0.25 (0.14 to 0.46)	5,237 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	PrEP is effective in preventing HIV acquisition in serodiscordant couples with a rate reduction of 75%
HIV infection: Heterosexual transmission (all clinical trials)	41 per 1,000	32 per 1,000 (19 to 53)	RR 0.77 (0.46 to 1.29)	6,821 (4 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ LOW ^{a, c}	PrEP is not effective in preventing heterosexual HIV transmission (all trials)
HIV infection: Heterosexual transmission , trials with high (≥80%) adherence	31 per 1,000	12 per 1,000 (6 to 26)	RR 0.39 (0.18 to 0.83)	1524 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	PrEP is effective in preventing heterosexual HIV transmission in heterosexuals in one trial with high (over 80%) adherence. This trial enrolled males and females; note that efficacy was only reported for males.

HIV infection: Heterosexual transmission , trials with low (<80%) adherence	45 per 1,000	46 per 1,000 (34 to 64)	RR 1.03 (0.75 to 1.43)	5297 (3 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ ^c MODERATE ^c	PrEP is not effective in preventing heterosexual HIV transmission in trials with low adherence. Note that all three trials enrolled heterosexual women.
HIV infection: People who inject drugs (all clinical trials: one study with low [<80%] adherence)	7 per 1,000	3 per 1,000 (2 to 6)	RR 0.51 (0.29 to 0.92)	9,666 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ ^d MODERATE ^d	PrEP is effective in preventing HIV transmission in people who inject drugs with a rate reduction of 49%

Table 3 Legend:

Explanations

a. Downgraded one level for heterogeneity b. Upgraded one level for large effect (RR<0.5) c. Downgraded one level for imprecision d. Downgraded one level for indirectness

*The rate in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed rate in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

**Note that under alternative methods to account for zero events in one or both arms (beta-binomial), there is greater imprecision and the upper confidence bound crosses the line of no effect

***In studies that enrolled serodiscordant couples, the HIV-positive individual was not on antiretroviral therapy. All studies relate to serodiscordant heterosexual couples.

CI: Confidence interval; RR: Rate ratio

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

High certainty: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect

Moderate certainty: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different

Low certainty: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect

Very low certainty: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

Table 4. GRADE summary of findings: Safety of PrEP

Summary of findings table: Safety of PrEP						
Patient or population: HIV prevention in participants at substantial risk. Intervention: PrEP. Comparison: no PrEP.						
Outcomes	Anticipated absolute effects^a (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	Person-years of follow up (studies)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Rate with no PrEP	Rate with PrEP				
Safety outcome: Any adverse event	776 per 1,000	784 per 1,000 (768 to 799)	RR 1.01 (0.99 to 1.03)	17,358 (10 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	Adverse events do not occur more commonly in patients taking PrEP compared with placebo. Adverse events were common in trials (78% of patients reporting 'any' event).
Safety outcome: Serious adverse events	81 per 1,000	73 per 1,000 (60 to 91)	RR 0.91 (0.74 to 1.13)	17,778 (12 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	Serious adverse events do not occur more commonly in patients taking PrEP compared with placebo. Serious adverse events occurred in 7% of patients in trials but most were not drug related.
Safety outcome: Deaths	13 per 1,000	10 per 1,000 (8 to 15)	RR 0.83 (0.60 to 1.15)	12,720 (11 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊠ MODERATE ^a	Deaths did not occur more commonly in people taking PrEP compared with placebo in trials. No deaths were related to PrEP.
Safety outcome: Drug resistance mutations in patients with acute HIV at enrolment	53 per 1,000	186 per 1,000 (62 to 556)	RR 3.53 (1.18 to 10.56)	44 (5 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕⊠ MODERATE ^a	Patients randomised to receive PrEP who had acute HIV at enrolment were at increased risk of developing resistance mutations to the study drug. Most conferred resistance to emtricitabine.

Table 4 Legend:
Explanations
a. Imprecision was detected due to few observations.
Note that only a minority of studies tested for viral drug resistance mutations
*The rate in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed rate in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).
CI: Confidence interval; RR: Rate ratio

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High certainty: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect
Moderate certainty: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different
Low certainty: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect
Very low certainty: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

Effectiveness in MSM

Six studies enrolled MSM.^{3 5 6 20 21 25} A meta-analysis of all studies resulted in a RR of 0.25 (95% CI: 0.1 to 0.61), indicating a 75% reduction in the rate of HIV acquisition (Figure 2). The estimated absolute rate reduction (ARD) was -0.03 (95% CI: -0.01 to -0.05), indicating PrEP users had a 3% lower rate of HIV acquisition per person-year of follow-up.

When stratified by adherence, heterogeneity was eliminated (I^2 reduced from 52% to 0%). PrEP was most effective in studies with high adherence, as expected, where rate of HIV acquisition was reduced by 86% (RR 0.14, 95% CI: 0.06 to 0.35; ARD -0.06, 95% CI: -0.04 to -0.09; $I^2 = 0%$, n=3 studies).^{5 6 21} Of the three studies with high adherence, one study was small and reported non-significant findings due to few events (Mutua et al.²¹). Of the remaining two studies, one study investigated daily PrEP use (McCormack et al., PROUD trial⁶) and the other investigated 'on demand' PrEP (Molina et al., IPERGAY trial⁵). Both studies reported identical efficacy (PROUD: RR 0.14, 95% CI 0.04-0.47; IPERGAY: RR 0.14, 95% CI 0.03-0.6).

When adherence was under 80%, acquisition rate was reduced by 45% (RR 0.55, 95% CI: 0.37 to 0.81; ARD -0.01, 95% CI: -0.00 to -0.02; $I^2 = 0%$, n=3 studies).^{3 20 23 25}

Figure 2. Meta-analysis: HIV acquisition in MSM, all studies

Figure 2 Legend: Forest plot of the meta-analysis of HIV incidence in all MSM trials, PrEP versus placebo or no drug. Subgroups include high ($\geq 80%$) adherence and low ($< 80%$) adherence. 'Events' refers to new HIV infections and 'Total' refers to total person-years at risk during the study period.

Effectiveness in serodiscordant heterosexual couples

In all three studies that enrolled serodiscordant heterosexual couples, the HIV-infected partner was not on antiretroviral therapy (studies were conducted in Kenya and Uganda; HIV-infected participants did not meet criteria for ART initiation at the time of enrolment).¹⁸
^{22 23} Details on the CD4 count (a type of cell that HIV infects) or viral load of the HIV-infected partners were not reported.

Two studies investigated the effect of daily oral PrEP compared to placebo.^{18 22} A total of 4,819 couples were enrolled, and the seronegative individual was male in the majority (>60%) of cases. One trial enrolled few participants (n=24 in the daily PrEP arm), and the duration of the trial was very short (4 months); this study did not contribute to analyses as no seroconversions were reported in either arm of the trial.²² The trial by Baeten et al.¹⁸ consisted of three arms: tenofovir/emtricitabine (n=1,568 participants), tenofovir alone (n=1,572 participants) and placebo (n=1,568 participants). Tenofovir/emtricitabine resulted in a 75% rate reduction (RR 0.25, 95% CI: 0.14 to 0.46; ARD -0.01, 95% CI: -0.01 to -0.02) and tenofovir alone resulted in a 67% rate reduction (RR 0.33, 95% CI: 0.19 to 0.56; ARD -0.01, 95% CI: -0.01 to -0.02). A continuation of this trial (Baeten et al. 2014²³) compared tenofovir/emtricitabine with tenofovir alone: there was no significant difference between groups.

Effectiveness in heterosexuals

Of the five studies enrolling heterosexual participants, four were placebo-controlled^{7 16 17 19} and one compared different drug schedules.²⁴ Four studies enrolled only women^{7 17 19 24} and one study enrolled both men and women.¹⁶ All studies were conducted in a high HIV prevalence context (countries in Sub-Saharan Africa). A meta-analysis of all placebo-controlled studies did not demonstrate a statistically significant reduction in HIV acquisition

(RR 0.77, 95% CI: 0.46 to 1.29; $I^2 = 66\%$, Figure S4, Supplementary Material 2.7). In the only trial with high adherence (Thigpen et al.¹⁶), a rate reduction of 61% was noted (RR 0.39, 95% CI 0.18 to 0.83; ARD -0.02, 95% CI: -0.01 to -0.04). This was the only trial to enrol both men and women, and when the results were analysed separately by sex, efficacy was only noted in males, with a rate reduction of 80% (RR 0.2, 95% CI 0.04 to 0.91, Supplementary Material 2.5). As expected, in a meta-analysis of trials with low adherence, the result was non-significant (RR 1.03, 95% CI 0.75 to 1.43, $I^2 = 21\%$, Figure S5, Supplementary Material 2.7).

A final study compared different PrEP regimens (daily PrEP, 'time-driven' PrEP and 'event-driven' PrEP).²⁴ Fewer infections occurred in the daily PrEP arm; however, there were no significant differences in HIV acquisition comparing either event or time-driven PrEP with daily PrEP.

Effectiveness in PWID

Only one study enrolled PWID.¹⁵ Daily oral tenofovir was found to be effective, with a 49% reduction in HIV acquisition (RR 0.51, 95% CI: 0.29 to 0.92; ARD -0.00, 95% CI: -0.00 to -0.01). In this study, HIV transmission may have occurred sexually or parenterally.

Sensitivity analysis

A sensitivity analysis was applied to determine whether the use of continuity correction and the omission of studies with zero events in both arms impacted on the results. First, a meta-analysis of all trials was conducted. Both the Poisson regression and beta-binomial models produced similar results to the standard approach (Table 5), providing reassurance that the impact of excluding smaller studies with zero events was small. Second, a meta-analysis of studies in the MSM group was undertaken, stratified by adherence, as these analyses

included three studies with zero events in one or both arms (Table 5). Only the beta-binomial model converged on a stable result. The rate ratio and 95% confidence interval were very similar to the main analysis for the high adherence group. However, there was greater imprecision in the low adherence group, and the wider confidence bounds included the possibility of no effect.

Table 5 **Sensitivity analysis**

Group	Method of analysis	Rate ratio	95% CI
All studies (n=13)	Standard approach (Mantel-Haenszel)	0.41	0.26 to 0.67
	Poisson regression	0.375	0.225 to 0.625
	Beta-binomial	0.437	0.210 to 0.911
MSM group: high adherence (n=3 studies)	Standard approach (Mantel-Haenszel)	0.14	0.06 to 0.35
	Beta-binomial	0.134	0.063 to 0.284
MSM group: low adherence (n=3 studies)	Standard approach (Mantel-Haenszel)	0.55	0.37 to 0.81
	Beta-binomial	0.428	0.038 to 4.815

Relationship between efficacy and adherence

A meta-regression analysis was performed to investigate the relationship between efficacy and adherence, accounting for trial size (Figure 3). Studies that did not confirm adherence through plasma drug detection rates were excluded from analyses, due to biases associated with other methods such as self-report or pill count.

Efficacy (as RRs) and adherence (by proportion with plasma drug detectable) were strongly associated ($p < 0.001$). As the proportion adherent increases from 0.5 to 0.6, the RR decreases by 0.13. Therefore, on average, a 10% decrease in adherence decreases efficacy by 13%.

Figure 3. Fitted meta-regression line of the relationship between trial-level PrEP adherence and efficacy

Figure 3 Legend: Only trials that reported plasma drug concentration from a representative sample contributed to analysis, represented as circles (Baeten 2012 (Partners PrEP), Choopanya 2013 (Bangkok Tenofovir Study), Grant 2010 (iPrEx), Mazzarro 2015 (VOICE), McCormack 2015 (PROUD), Molina 2015 (Ipergay), VanDamme 2012 (FEM-PrEP). The solid line represents the fitted regression line and the shaded area the 95% Confidence Interval. The X-axis represents the trial-level adherence as a proportion and the Y-axis represents the efficacy as rate ratios.

Safety

Eleven studies reported data on ‘any’ adverse events, including ten that compared PrEP with placebo^{3 5 7 15-19 21 22} and two that compared tenofovir alone to tenofovir/emtricitabine.^{19 23} A meta-analysis of placebo-controlled trials demonstrated no significant difference between groups (RR 1.01; 95% CI 0.99 to 1.03; $I^2 = 42%$, Figure S7, Supplementary Material 2.7). Comparing tenofovir with tenofovir/emtricitabine, one study noted a small increase in adverse events in the tenofovir/emtricitabine group (RR 1.23; 95% CI 1.03 to 1.33, Figure S8, Supplementary Material 2.7)¹⁹ and another failed to show any difference.²³

Of note, several studies reported mild decreases in renal function among PrEP users that returned to normal following discontinuation of PrEP use, while a reduction in creatinine clearance (a measure of renal function) was not observed in others.^{15 18} Where renal function has been affected, PrEP was associated with mild, non-progressive and reversible reductions in creatinine clearance.^{3 5 6 15 18} Some trials also found slight decreases in bone mineral density.^{16 19}

All 15 studies reported data in relation to the risk of serious adverse events: 12 were placebo-controlled,^{3 5 7 15-22 25} one compared PrEP with no PrEP⁶, two compared tenofovir/emtricitabine with tenofovir^{19 23} and one compared different dosage schedules.²⁴ A meta-analysis of placebo-controlled trials did not find an increased risk (RR 0.91, 95% CI: 0.74 to 1.13; $I^2 = 67%$, Figure S9, Supplementary Material 2.7).

In the only trial that compared PrEP with no treatment, an increased rate of serious adverse events was noted in the treatment arm (RR 3.42; 95% CI 1.4 to 8.35).⁶ However, these adverse events were not considered study drug-related. Two studies compared tenofovir with tenofovir/emtricitabine: one found no significant difference between groups²³ and another found an increased rate in the tenofovir/emtricitabine group (RR 2.48; 95% CI: 1.42 to 4.33).¹⁹ Of note, not all studies defined what constituted adverse events (including serious adverse events).

No study found an increased mortality rate associated with PrEP use, and of the deaths that occurred, none were considered to be drug-related (Figure S10, Supplementary Material 2.7).

Viral drug resistance mutations

Five placebo-controlled trials provided data on HIV mutations among patients who had acute HIV infection at enrolment (unknown to study investigators).^{3 15 16 18 19} In total, there were 44 seroconversions at enrolment, 25 who received study drug and 19 who received placebo. There were nine mutations detected, eight among participants receiving study drug and one in a patient receiving placebo. The RR for any drug mutation was 3.53 (95% CI: 1.18 to 10.56; $I^2 = 0%$, Figure S11, Supplementary Material 2.7) which represents an ARD of

0.57 (95% CI: 0.21 to 0.94).

Of the nine resistance mutations at enrolment, seven were for emtricitabine. The RR for emtricitabine mutation was 3.72 (95% CI: 1.23 to 11.23; $I^2 = 0\%$) which represents an ARD of 0.6 (95% CI: 0.23 to 0.97) in those receiving tenofovir/emtricitabine (Figure S12, Supplementary Material 2.7).^{3 16 18 19}

Among participants who seroconverted postrandomisation, the development of resistant mutations was uncommon. Of 551 seroconverters, only seven resistance mutations were detected; one tenofovir mutation was noted in a tenofovir-only arm (k65n, a rare tenofovir resistance mutation) and six emtricitabine mutations were noted.

Risk compensation

Changes in sexual behaviour, or 'risk compensation', was measured in a number of ways, including condom use, number of sexual partners, changes in STI rates and recreational drug use. Due to the differences in how sexual behaviour was reported across trials, including differing definitions and at different time points, a meta-analysis was not possible.

Studies consistently showed no between-group difference in condom use or number of sexual partners. Studies showed either no overall change in condom use throughout the duration of the study (n=4 studies) or an increase in condom use (n=4 studies). Most studies showed no change in the number of sexual partners over time (n=6 studies), four studies showed a slight reduction in number of sexual partners and one showed an increase (investigators of this study noted the possibility of partner underreporting at baseline²¹). No study reported an increase in STIs or a between-group difference in STI diagnoses. In the only study to enroll intravenous drug users, a reduction in intravenous drug use, needle

sharing and number of sexual partners over the course of the study was noted.¹⁵

Supplementary Material 2.6 presents full details of behaviour change and STI rates in individual studies.

1

2

Discussion

Summary of findings

This systematic review and meta-analysis of 25,051 individuals encompassing 38,289 person-years of follow-up data confirms that oral tenofovir-containing PrEP is both effective and safe. PrEP is particularly effective in MSM, with a rate reduction of 75% across all trials, rising to 86% in trials with high adherence. Only one trial investigated the effectiveness of ‘on demand’ PrEP.⁵ This trial reported a rate reduction of 86%, identical to the only comparable trial among daily PrEP users⁶ (both trials enrolled a large sample of MSM and achieved high levels of adherence). PrEP is also effective in serodiscordant couples, and no significant difference exists between single-agent tenofovir and combination tenofovir/emtricitabine.

Questions remain regarding PrEP effectiveness in other populations. One study found that PrEP was effective in PWID.¹⁵ However, a limitation of this study is that investigators were not sure if transmission was parenteral or sexual. It is unclear if PrEP is effective in heterosexuals. PrEP was effective in preventing heterosexual HIV transmission in one trial where adherence was high (61% reduction),¹⁶ but only in male participants. The remaining three heterosexual trials, all conducted in sub-Saharan Africa, only enrolled females and adherence was noted to be very low.^{7 17 19}

Adherence varied greatly across studies, ranging from 25% to 88% by plasma drug monitoring. As expected, efficacy was found to be strongly associated with adherence ($p < 0.01$). On average, a 10% reduction in adherence reduced efficacy by 13%.

PrEP was found to be safe, and there was no difference in adverse event rates comparing single agent tenofovir with tenofovir/emtricitabine in combination. Some studies noted a

transient elevation of creatinine with resolution upon discontinuation of study drug.^{3 5 6 15 18}

While uncommon, viral drug resistance mutations may occur in the presence of an unrecognised HIV infection at enrolment.

Our findings of high effectiveness in MSM has been confirmed by two open-label extensions^{26 27} that followed the conclusion of four RCTs included in this review.^{3 5 20 25} One open-label extension found no seroconversions in participants that took a minimum of four pills per week.²⁶

Ongoing studies

Following the conclusion of this review, an additional search was conducted to identify recently published or ongoing RCTs after the date of our database search. PubMed was searched, using the same search strategy, up to 9 September 2021. No additional PrEP efficacy trials were identified, although two publications were identified that relate to an ongoing non-inferiority RCT that compared two different types of oral tenofovir-containing PrEP: tenofovir alafenamide plus emtricitabine versus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate plus emtricitabine^{28 29} (all studies in this systematic review relate to tenofovir disoproxil fumarate). Interim results found that the daily tenofovir alafenamide group showed non-inferior efficacy to the daily tenofovir disoproxil fumarate group for HIV prevention, and the number of adverse events for both regimens was low. Tenofovir alafenamide had more favourable effects on bone mineral density and biomarkers of renal safety than tenofovir disoproxil fumarate,²⁸ however there was more weight gain among participants who had received tenofovir alafenamide (median weight gain 1.7 kg vs 0.5 kg, $p < 0.0001$).²⁹

Strengths and limitations

This systematic review assessed the use of PrEP in all potentially eligible populations, and provided a GRADE assessment of important outcomes⁹⁹⁹, ensuring a systematic and transparent approach in the development of national clinical practice guidelines for the prevention of HIV. Based on the strength of the evidence, this study was used to develop national clinical guidelines on the management of patients on PrEP,³⁰ and informed the decision of the Irish government to implement a publicly funded PrEP programme nationally for MSM and serodiscordant couples at increased risk, and for other populations on a case-by-case basis as determined by the treating HIV specialist.³¹

Despite the strength of the evidence, however, the present study is subject to a number of limitations. First, there was a lack of data on a number of other high risk groups, such as transgender women (only one study included transgender women, which made up less than 1% of participants³) and sex workers (one study included sex workers, however disaggregated data were not reported¹⁷). Second, adherence was notably poor in most studies that enrolled heterosexual women, limiting conclusions in this group. Additionally, as observational studies were excluded from this review, PrEP effectiveness may be lower in real-world settings in all populations if adherence is suboptimal. Third, while PrEP is considered to have an excellent safety profile, the maximum follow-up period was 6.9 years in this review and, therefore, long-term safety was not assessed.

Fourth, while studies in this review did not detect risk compensation, evidence from placebo-controlled trials is often insufficient to determine its presence. It is not possible to reach conclusions on the impact of PrEP on behaviour when participants do not know if they are taking active PrEP or placebo. However, it is possible to evaluate the impact of the support provided to all participants over time (provision of condoms, counselling on safer

sex practices). Studies generally demonstrated no change or an improvement in safer sex practices. In the open-label PROUD study (where participants knew they were taking PrEP), there was no difference between the immediate and deferred PrEP groups in the total number of sexual partners in the three months prior to the 1-year questionnaire.⁶ However, a greater proportion of the immediate group reported receptive anal sex without a condom with 10 or more partners compared with the deferred group. Importantly, there was no difference in the frequency of bacterial STIs between groups, the most reliable proxy for changes in sexual behaviour (as it is not self-reported). Fifth, a number of studies in this review had zero events in one or both arms of the study. Standard meta-analytic approaches typically exclude these trials, resulting in a loss of data. A sensitivity analysis using alternative meta-analytic methods to account for these studies generally found similar findings, with the exception of the estimate of effectiveness in the 'low adherence' MSM group, which was no longer statistically significant.

Finally, the generalisability of studies to other clinical settings should be done with caution. All trials that enrolled heterosexuals were conducted in sub-Saharan Africa, a part of the world with a generalised HIV epidemic and suboptimal antiretroviral coverage. Additionally, the only trial that enrolled PWID was conducted in Bangkok, where needle exchange was unavailable to participants, and investigators could not differentiate sexually from parenterally acquired HIV.

Research in context and implications for practice

HIV infection is of significant public health importance. There were 523 diagnoses of HIV notified in 2018 in Ireland, representing a rate of 11 per 100,000 population, and over half (56%) of all diagnoses were in the MSM group.³² The rate of HIV in Ireland is high compared

with other countries in Western Europe, many of which have seen declines in their HIV rates in recent years.¹ This highlights the ongoing need for newer, more effective prevention strategies to halt the transmission of HIV.

Our finding of high PrEP effectiveness among MSM concurs with other recent systematic reviews that focussed solely on the MSM population.^{33 34} To our knowledge, this systematic review provides the first GRADE assessment of the totality of evidence across all populations that includes more recent trials with high adherence.^{5 6} Our GRADE assessment differs significantly from that of Okwundu et al., published in 2012.³⁵

Our quantification of the strength of the association between adherence and efficacy through meta-regression highlights the clinical importance of medication adherence support and counselling to prospective PrEP users. Additionally, our finding of emtricitabine resistance mutations occurring almost four times more often in those with acute HIV enrolment has implications for PrEP implementation going forward. Assessing if the patient could be in the 'window period' (the time between exposure to HIV and the point when HIV testing will give an accurate result) at enrolment is of critical importance, to ensure the patient is HIV negative prior to commencing PrEP. This highlights the need for PrEP delivery as part of a monitored programme that incorporates HIV testing and patient counselling on the risk and long-term consequences of resistance if poorly adherent to PrEP.

An additional finding of interest is the lack of significant difference in the effectiveness and safety of single agent tenofovir compared with combined tenofovir/emtricitabine. This may have implications for clinical practice, as tenofovir may be a suitable alternative for emtricitabine-allergic patients, and in resource-poor settings if cost or procurement of combination tenofovir/emtricitabine is an issue.

Conclusions

In conclusion, high-certainty evidence exists that PrEP is safe and, assuming adequate adherence, effectively prevents HIV in MSM and serodiscordant couples. One study found PrEP to be effective in PWID. The uncertainty regarding PrEP effectiveness in heterosexual individuals persists. Clinicians and policy-makers may decide to recommend PrEP to heterosexual individuals on a case-by-case basis, acknowledging adherence-related issues reported in trials. This review emphasises the importance of adherence support to ensure PrEP effectiveness is maintained, as well as the need for frequent HIV testing at enrolment and follow-up to avoid viral drug resistance mutations. Following the conclusion of this study, the Irish government implemented a publicly-funded PrEP programme for all individuals at increased risk of HIV acquisition, and developed national clinical practice guidelines for the provision of PrEP.

Author contributions: Dr. O Murchu: concept and design, acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting of the manuscript, critical revision of paper for important intellectual content, statistical analysis. Mr. Marshall: acquisition of data, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting of the manuscript, critical revision of paper for important intellectual content. Dr. Teljeur: concept and design, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting of the manuscript, critical revision of paper for important intellectual content, statistical analysis, supervision. Dr. Hayes: concept and design, drafting of the manuscript, supervision. Dr. Harrington: concept and design, critical revision of paper for important intellectual content, analysis and interpretation of data, drafting of the manuscript, supervision. Dr. Moran: concept and design, drafting of the manuscript, supervision. Dr.

Ryan: concept and design, critical revision of paper for important intellectual content, drafting of the manuscript, supervision.

Acknowledgements: The HSE's Sexual Health and Crisis Pregnancy Programme; the Gay Men's Health Centre Dublin; HIV Ireland; Act Up Dublin and the Gay Health Network.

References

1. UNAIDS. Global HIV & AIDS statistics — 2020 fact sheet. Available at: <https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/fact-sheet>. Accessed 11.9.2021. 2020 [
2. WHO. Consolidated guidelines on HIV prevention, diagnosis, treatment and care for key populations. Available at: <https://www.who.int/hiv/pub/guidelines/keypopulations/en/>. Accessed 22.7.2019. 2014
3. Grant RM, Lama JR, Anderson PL, et al. Preexposure chemoprophylaxis for HIV prevention in men who have sex with men. 2010; 363(27).
4. WHO. WHO Expands Recommendation On Oral Preexposure Prophylaxis Of Hiv Infection (Prep). Available at: https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/197906/WHO_HIV_2015.48_eng.pdf;jsessionid=7B04813AFDE92D7F5EE3D71C8E921BBA?sequence=1. Accessed 22.7.2019. 2015
5. Molina JM, Capitant C, Spire B, et al. On-Demand Preexposure Prophylaxis in Men at High Risk for HIV-1 Infection. *The New England journal of medicine* 2015;373(23):2237-46. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1506273 [published Online First: 2015/12/02]
6. McCormack S, Dunn DT, Desai M, et al. Pre-exposure prophylaxis to prevent the acquisition of HIV-1 infection (PROUD): effectiveness results from the pilot phase of a pragmatic open-label randomised trial. *Lancet (London, England)* 2016;387(10013):53-60. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(15)00056-2 [published Online First: 2015/09/14]
7. Van Damme L, Corneli A, Ahmed K, et al. Preexposure prophylaxis for HIV infection among African women. *The New England journal of medicine* 2012;367(5):411-22. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1202614 [published Online First: 2012/07/13]
8. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ* 2009;339 doi: 10.1136/bmj.b2700
9. GRADE. The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (short GRADE) working group. Available at: <http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/>.
10. Cochrane. The Cochrane Risk of Bias tool. Cochrane Handbook: Chapter 8. Available at: https://handbook-5-1.cochrane.org/chapter_8/8_assessing_risk_of_bias_in_included_studies.htm.
11. Beisemann M, Doebler P, Holling H. Comparison of random-effects meta-analysis models for the relative risk in the case of rare events: A simulation study. *Biom J* 2020;62(7):1597-630. doi: 10.1002/bimj.201900379 [published Online First: 2020/06/09]
12. Chen Y, Hong C, Ning Y, et al. Meta-analysis of studies with bivariate binary outcomes: a marginal beta-binomial model approach. *Stat Med* 2016;35(1):21-40. doi: 10.1002/sim.6620 [published Online First: 2015/08/26]
13. Cheng J, Pullenayegum E, Marshall JK, et al. Impact of including or excluding both-armed zero-event studies on using standard meta-analysis methods for rare event outcome: a simulation study. *BMJ Open* 2016;6(8):e010983. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010983
14. Rücker G, Schwarzer G, Carpenter J. Arcsine test for publication bias in meta-analyses with binary outcomes. *Stat Med* 2008;27(5):746-63. doi: 10.1002/sim.2971 [published Online First: 2007/06/27]
15. Choopanya K, Martin M, Suntharasamai P, et al. Antiretroviral prophylaxis for HIV infection in injecting drug users in Bangkok, Thailand (the Bangkok Tenofovir Study): a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet (London, England)* 2013;381(9883):2083-90. doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(13)61127-7 [published Online First: 2013/06/19]
16. Thigpen MC, Kebaabetswe PM, Paxton LA, et al. Antiretroviral preexposure prophylaxis for heterosexual HIV transmission in Botswana. *New England journal of medicine* 2012; 367(5).

- <http://cochranelibrary-wiley.com/o/cochrane/clcentral/articles/265/CN-00840265/frame.html>.
17. Peterson L, Taylor D, Roddy R, et al. Tenofovir Disoproxil Fumarate for Prevention of HIV Infection in Women: A Phase 2, Double-Blind, Randomized, Placebo-Controlled Trial. *PLoS Clinical Trials* 2007;2(5):e27. doi: 10.1371/journal.pctr.0020027
 18. Baeten JM, Donnell D, Ndase P, et al. Antiretroviral prophylaxis for HIV prevention in heterosexual men and women. *New England journal of medicine* 2012; 367(5).
<http://cochranelibrary-wiley.com/o/cochrane/clcentral/articles/266/CN-00840266/frame.html>
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3770474/pdf/nihms493581.pdf>.
 19. Marrazzo JM, Ramjee G, Richardson BA, et al. Tenofovir-based preexposure prophylaxis for HIV infection among African women. *The New England journal of medicine* 2015;372(6):509-18. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1402269 [published Online First: 2015/02/05]
 20. Grohskopf LA, Chillag KL, Gvetadze R, et al. Randomized trial of clinical safety of daily oral tenofovir disoproxil fumarate among HIV-uninfected men who have sex with men in the United States. *Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes (1999)* 2013;64(1):79-86. doi: 10.1097/QAI.0b013e31828e33 [published Online First: 2013/03/08]
 21. Mutua G, Sanders E, Mugo P, et al. Safety and adherence to intermittent pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) for HIV-1 in African men who have sex with men and female sex workers. *Plos one* 2012; 7(4). <http://cochranelibrary-wiley.com/o/cochrane/clcentral/articles/614/CN-00848614/frame.html>
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3325227/pdf/pone.0033103.pdf>.
 22. Kibengo FM, Ruzagira E, Katende D, et al. Safety, adherence and acceptability of intermittent tenofovir/emtricitabine as HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) among HIV-uninfected Ugandan volunteers living in HIV-serodiscordant relationships: a randomized, clinical trial. *PLoS One* 2013;8(9):e74314. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0074314 [published Online First: 2013/10/03]
 23. Baeten JM, Donnell D, Mugo NR, et al. Single-agent tenofovir versus combination emtricitabine plus tenofovir for pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV-1 acquisition: an update of data from a randomised, double-blind, phase 3 trial. *The lancet Infectious diseases* 2014; 14(11).
<http://cochranelibrary-wiley.com/o/cochrane/clcentral/articles/639/CN-01053639/frame.html>
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4252589/pdf/nihms635147.pdf>.
 24. Bekker LG, Roux S, Sebastien E, et al. Daily and non-daily pre-exposure prophylaxis in African women (HPTN 067/ADAPT Cape Town Trial): a randomised, open-label, phase 2 trial. *The lancet HIV* 2018;5(2):e68-e78. doi: 10.1016/s2352-3018(17)30156-x [published Online First: 2017/10/08]
 25. Hosek SG, Siberry G, Bell M, et al. The acceptability and feasibility of an HIV preexposure prophylaxis (PrEP) trial with young men who have sex with men. *Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes (1999)* 2013;62(4):447-56. doi: 10.1097/QAI.0b013e3182801081 [published Online First: 2013/10/19]
 26. Grant RM, Anderson PL, McMahan V, et al. Uptake of pre-exposure prophylaxis, sexual practices, and HIV incidence in men and transgender women who have sex with men: a cohort study. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2014;14(9):820-9. doi: 10.1016/s1473-3099(14)70847-3 [published Online First: 2014/07/30]
 27. Molina JM, Spire B et al.,. Efficacy, safety, and effect on sexual behaviour of on-demand pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV in men who have sex with men: an observational cohort study. *Lancet HIV* 2017; 4: e402–e410. 2017
 28. Mayer KH, Molina JM, Thompson MA, et al. Emtricitabine and tenofovir alafenamide vs emtricitabine and tenofovir disoproxil fumarate for HIV pre-exposure prophylaxis (DISCOVER): primary results from a randomised, double-blind, multicentre, active-

- controlled, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet (London, England)* 2020;396(10246):239 - 54. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(20)31065-5
29. Ogbuagu O, Ruane PJ, Podzamczar D, et al. Long-term safety and efficacy of emtricitabine and tenofovir alafenamide vs emtricitabine and tenofovir disoproxil fumarate for HIV-1 pre-exposure prophylaxis: week 96 results from a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. *The Lancet HIV* 2021;8(7):e397-e407. doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3018\(21\)00071-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3018(21)00071-0)
 30. Health Service Executive (HSE). Clinical management guidance for individuals taking HIV PrEP within the context of a combination HIV (and STI) prevention approach in Ireland. PrEP clinical management guidance. Version 1.1. October 2019. Available at: <https://www.sexualwellbeing.ie/for-professionals/prep-information-for-service-providers/guidelines-for-the-management-of-prep-in-ireland.pdf>. Accessed 11.9.2021., 2019.
 31. Department of Health. Taoiseach and Ministers for Health announce HIV PrEP programme: Press release. Published on 10 October 2019. 2019 [11.9.2021]. Available from: <https://www.gov.ie/en/press-release/taoiseach-and-ministers-for-health-announce-hiv-prep-programme/>.
 32. Health Protection Surveillance Centre (HPSC). HIV in Ireland, 2018. Annual Epidemiological Report. Available at: https://www.hpsc.ie/a-z/hivandaids/hivdataandreports/HIV_2018_finalrev.pdf. Accessed 11.9.2021. 2019
 33. Huang X, Hou J, Song A, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Oral TDF-Based Pre-exposure Prophylaxis for Men Who Have Sex With Men: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Frontiers in pharmacology* 2018;9:799. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2018.00799 [published Online First: 2018/09/21]
 34. Freeborn K, Portillo CJ. Does pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV prevention in men who have sex with men change risk behaviour? A systematic review. *J Clin Nurs* 2018;27(17-18):3254-65. doi: 10.1111/jocn.13990
 35. Okwundu CI, Uthman OA, Okoromah CAN. Antiretroviral pre - exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) for preventing HIV in high - risk individuals. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2012(7) doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD007189.pub3

Figure 1. PRISMA diagram of study selection [CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) .





