

1 **TITLE: Viraemia and HIV drug resistance among people receiving dolutegravir versus**
2 **efavirenz-based first-line antiretroviral therapy**

3
4 **Authors:** Jienchi Dorward^{1,2}, Yuktेशwar Sookrajh³, Richard Lessells^{2,4}, Elliot Bulo³, Nicola
5 Bodley², Lavanya Singh⁴, Pravikrishnen Moodley⁵, Natasha Samsunder², Paul K. Drain^{6,7,8}, Gail
6 Hayward¹, Christopher C Butler¹, Nigel Garrett^{2,9}

7
8 **Affiliations:**

- 9 1. Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
10 2. Centre for the AIDS Programme of Research in South Africa (CAPRISA), University of
11 KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa.
12 3. eThekweni Municipality Health Unit, Durban, South Africa
13 4. KwaZulu-Natal Research and Innovation Sequencing Platform (KRISP), University of
14 KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa
15 5. Department of Virology, University of KwaZulu-Natal and National Health Laboratory
16 Service, Inkosi Albert Luthuli Central Hospital, KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa
17 6. Department of Global Health, Schools of Medicine and Public Health, University of
18 Washington, Seattle, USA.
19 7. Department of Medicine, School of Medicine, University of Washington, Seattle, USA.
20 8. Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Washington, Seattle,
21 USA.
22 9. Discipline of Public Health Medicine, School of Nursing and Public Health, University of
23 KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, South Africa

24
25 **Corresponding Author:**

26 Jienchi Dorward
27 Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford,
28 Radcliffe Primary Care Building, Radcliffe Observatory Quarter, Woodstock Road, Oxford, OX2
29 6GG; Email: jienchi.dorward@phc.ox.ac.uk

30
31 **Word count: 1488/1500**

32
33 **Keywords:** HIV, viral failure, viraemia, drug resistance, dolutegravir, efavirenz.
34
35

36 **SUMMARY**

37 Limited data exists to inform management of viraemia among people receiving dolutegravir-
38 based first-line ART in low- and middle-income countries. Among South-Africans with viraemia
39 ≥ 1000 copies/mL receiving dolutegravir (n=43) and efavirenz (n=37), we found no dolutegravir
40 resistance, but high efavirenz resistance (66.7%). 12-week resuppression was higher with
41 dolutegravir (85%) versus efavirenz (38%).

42

43

44

45 INTRODUCTION

46 Dolutegravir, an integrase strand transfer inhibitor (INSTI), is currently being rolled out across
47 low and middle income countries (LMICs).^{1 2} It has shown better effectiveness, tolerability, and
48 has a higher genetic barrier to drug resistance compared to previous non-nucleoside reverse
49 transcriptase (NNRTI)-based regimens such as efavirenz.³ People with viraemia receiving
50 dolutegravir may be more likely to have inconsistent adherence, than HIV drug resistance.
51 However, the absence of widespread HIV drug resistance testing in LMICs,⁴ makes it difficult for
52 clinicians to determine the cause of viraemia and manage it appropriately.

53 Among people receiving NNRTIs with viral failure (two consecutive viral loads [VLs] ≥ 1000
54 copies/mL, ≥ 3 months apart), approximately 70% have drug resistance, and therefore current
55 World Health Organization (WHO) guidelines recommend switching to second-line ART^{5 6}.
56 Current WHO guidelines for managing viraemia on first-line dolutegravir are less clear, because
57 there is little data from LMICs regarding dolutegravir drug resistance and subsequent VL
58 outcomes.

59 Therefore, among people with viraemia on dolutegravir and efavirenz-based first-line ART, we
60 aimed to compare subsequent VL trajectories and drug resistance profiles.

61 METHODS AND ANALYSIS

62 We used data from the POwER study, a randomised study of point-of-care VL testing among
63 people with HIV viraemia receiving first-line ART. The protocol and results have been previously
64 published^{7 8}.

65 Setting and participants

66 POwER was conducted at two public clinics in KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa, where dolutegravir
67 has been recommended for first- and second-line ART from December 2019.⁹ People with
68 viraemia ≥ 1000 copies/mL are recommended to receive enhanced adherence counselling, with
69 a repeat three month VL. If this remains high, those receiving efavirenz are recommended to
70 switch to second-line ART, while those receiving dolutegravir should continue enhanced
71 adherence counselling and repeat VL testing. Eligibility criteria for POwER were being ≥ 18
72 years old, non-pregnant, and receiving first-line dolutegravir or efavirenz-based ART, with
73 viraemia ≥ 1000 copies/mL in the past six weeks and yet to receive enhanced adherence
74 counselling. Dolutegravir recipients may have been initiated on dolutegravir, or previously
75 transitioned from efavirenz.

76 **Procedures**

77 Consenting participants were enrolled, received enhanced adherence counselling,¹⁰ and were
78 randomised to point-of-care or standard laboratory based VL testing after 12 weeks.
79 Management of these VL results and clinical care during the 24 weeks of follow-up was
80 provided by public sector healthcare workers. Plasma samples were stored at enrolment, 12
81 week VL and 24 week study exit visits, for retrospective VL and drug resistance testing, with
82 results not used for clinical management. All samples with VL ≥ 500 copies/mL were sequenced
83 using next-generation sequencing with the Illumina MiSeq platform (Illumina, San Diego, CA)
84 (see supplementary material). We identified drug resistance mutations (DRM) at $>20\%$
85 frequency in protease, integrase and reverse transcriptase regions using the Stanford HIVDR
86 database.

87 **Variables and analyses**

88 The main exposure was dolutegravir- or efavirenz-based ART at enrolment. We conducted
89 descriptive analyses and used Fisher's exact test to assess the proportions in each ART group
90 who had viraemia ≥ 1000 copies/mL at enrolment, 12 weeks and 24 weeks. We also assessed
91 the proportions with HIV drug resistance at each timepoint, and switched to second-line ART.

92 **Ethical approvals**

93 The University of KwaZulu-Natal Biomedical Research Ethics Committee (BREC
94 00000836/2019) and the University of Oxford Tropical Research Ethics Committee (OxTREC
95 66-19) approved the study.

96 **RESULTS**

97 **Participants**

98 We enrolled 80 eligible participants between August- March 2022. Median age was 38.5 years
99 (interquartile range [IQR] 33-45), 58.8% were female, and median time on ART was 3.2 years
100 (IQR 1.0-6.0) (Table S1).

101 At enrolment, 37 (46.3%) had been receiving efavirenz-based first-line regimens for a median of
102 3.2 years (1.1-5.0), and 43 (53.7%) had been receiving dolutegravir for a median of 0.7 years
103 (IQR 0.5-1.1). 15/43 (34.9%) had been initiated on dolutegravir, while the other 28/43 (65.1%)
104 had been initiated on an efavirenz-based regimen and were subsequently transitioned to first-
105 line dolutegravir. The dolutegravir group had less time on ART, slightly higher incomes and

106 higher CD4 counts, but otherwise were similar to the efavirenz group (Table S1). All participants
107 were receiving tenofovir disoproxil fumarate, apart from one dolutegravir participant receiving
108 abacavir.

109 **Viraemia and HIV drug resistance**

110 *Enrolment*

111 The median time since the pre-enrolment VL of ≥ 1000 copies/mL to enrolment was around two
112 weeks (Table 1). At enrolment, the numbers with viraemia ≥ 1000 copies/mL had fallen to 18/43
113 (41.9%) dolutegravir participants, compared to 27/37 (73.0%) efavirenz participants ($p=0.007$).
114 Of the 50 participants with VLs >500 copies/mL, HIVDR testing was successful in 48 for reverse
115 transcriptase and 47 for integrase. The proportion with DRMs against either of the nucleoside
116 reverse transcriptase inhibitor (NRTI) backbone drugs was lower in dolutegravir participants
117 (2/19, 10.5%, 95% CI 1.9, 32.9) compared to efavirenz participants (21/29, 72.4%, 54.0, 85.4,
118 $p<0.001$, Table 1). In efavirenz participants, 25/29 (86.2%, 68.7, 95.0) had DRMs against
119 efavirenz, while among dolutegravir participants there were no DRMs against dolutegravir.

120 *Follow-up*

121 By the time of the 12-week VL, participants in both the dolutegravir and efavirenz group had a
122 median of 1 (IQR 1, 1) enhanced adherence counselling sessions. Only 6/43 (15.0%) of
123 dolutegravir participants had a VL ≥ 1000 copies/mL and were classified as having viral failure,
124 compared to 23/37 (62.2%) efavirenz participants ($p<0.001$). Of the 27/32 with VL >500
125 copies/mL and successful HIVDR testing, none of the dolutegravir participants had dolutegravir
126 or NRTI DRMs, compared to 19/21 (90.5%, 69.6, 98.4) efavirenz participants who had
127 resistance against the NRTI backbone ($p<0.001$). 21/21 (100%, 81.4, 100) had resistance
128 against efavirenz. All 23 efavirenz participants with confirmed viral failure at 12 weeks, and one
129 other with a repeat VL of 937 copies/mL, were switched to second-line regimens (Tables 1 and
130 S2), at a median of 90 days (IQR 84, 99) weeks after enrolment. The commonest second line
131 regimen was zidovudine, lamivudine and dolutegravir.

132 At the 24-week exit visit, two participants in each group were lost to follow-up, and one
133 dolutegravir participant had no exit viral load taken. Of those with exit viral loads, viraemia was
134 detected in 6/40 (15.0%) of those who were receiving dolutegravir at enrolment, versus 2/35
135 (5.7%) of those who were receiving efavirenz at enrolment ($p=0.271$). Among the 8/10 with
136 successful NRTI HIVDR testing, 1/5 (20.0%, 2.5, 64.1) in the dolutegravir enrolment group had
137 resistance against the NRTI backbone versus 3/3 (100%, 40.0, 100) in the efavirenz enrolment

138 group. One participant who was receiving TLD from enrolment, and had only NNRTI DRMs at
139 enrolment, developed an emergent K65R mutation by week 24 (Table S2). There were no
140 dolutegravir DRMs detected from enrolment to study exit in any participants.

141 **DISCUSSION**

142 At enrolment and 12-week follow-up, people receiving efavirenz-based ART with viraemia had
143 high levels of DRMs against their first-line regimen, while people receiving dolutegravir had
144 minimal resistance. Consequently dolutegravir participants had higher levels of resuppression at
145 12-weeks compared to efavirenz. After switching to second-line ART, 24-week viral
146 resuppression in efavirenz participants became similar to dolutegravir, with few DRMs in both
147 groups.

148 Among participants receiving dolutegravir-based ART at baseline, there were no INSTI
149 mutations, meaning that viraemia was likely caused by poor adherence. Our study is one of the
150 first to report outcomes among people experiencing viraemia on first-line dolutegravir in LMICs,
151 with 85.0% achieving viral suppression <1000 copies/mL after 12 weeks. In contrast, a high
152 proportion of participants receiving efavirenz-based ART had baseline NRTI and NNRTI
153 resistance, meaning resistance was contributing to viraemia. After 12 weeks, 37.8% re-
154 suppressed to <1000 copies/mL, similar to the 46.4% among people receiving NNRTI-based
155 ART in a large systematic review.¹¹ The remaining participants only resuppressed after
156 switching to second-line ART. One other study compares resuppression among people with
157 viraemia receiving dolutegravir versus efavirenz in LMICs.¹² Among people with viraemia after
158 initiating ART in the ADVANCE trial, resuppression was more frequent in the dolutegravir group
159 (155/247, 62.8%) compared to efavirenz (44/138, 32%, $p < 0.001$). There was one case of
160 emergent resistance to dolutegravir.

161 Strengths of our study include the focus on people with viraemia while receiving dolutegravir,
162 successful HIVDR testing in a high proportion of those with viraemia, and frequent VL testing.
163 The small sample size meant we could not adjust for potential confounding factors that could
164 contribute the difference in outcomes between dolutegravir and efavirenz participants. For
165 example, people who were transitioned to dolutegravir may be better engaged in care or
166 motivated to adhere to treatment, and therefore also more likely to resuppress. Follow-up time
167 was short, and the median time on dolutegravir was less than a year.

168 Nevertheless, our findings, alongside those of the ADVANCE study, demonstrate that early in
169 the South African rollout, viraemia among people receiving dolutegravir is largely due to poor

170 adherence, rather than drug resistance. This supports the current South African and WHO
171 guidelines, which do not recommend early switching to second-line ART among people
172 receiving dolutegravir with viraemia. The high cost of HIV drug resistance testing, and low
173 prevalence of drug resistance, mean that South African Guidelines only recommend drug
174 resistance after two years of viraemia. Further evidence is needed to determine the extent and
175 impact of emergent DRMs with longer term viraemia on dolutegravir. In the meantime,
176 managing viraemia among people receiving dolutegravir should have a renewed focus on
177 interventions to support adherence, rather than managing HIVDR.

178 **LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

179 ART – antiretroviral therapy
180 PLHIV – people living with HIV
181 LMIC – low- and middle-income countries
182 UNAIDS - Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS
183 WHO – World Health Organization

184

185 **DECLARATIONS**

186 **Competing interests**

187 Cepheid provided point-of-care VL assays at no cost for use at the study site. The authors have
188 no other competing interests to declare.

189

190 **Funding**

191 This work is supported by grants from the Wellcome Trust PhD Programme for Primary Care
192 Clinicians (216421/Z/19/Z), the University of Oxford's Research England QR Global Challenges
193 Research Fund (0007365) and the Africa Oxford Initiative (AfiOx-119). HIV drug resistance
194 testing and drug concentration testing was funded by the National Institute for Health and Care
195 Research (NIHR) Community Healthcare MedTech and In Vitro Diagnostics Co-operative at
196 Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust (MIC-2016-018); GH, CCB & PJT also receive funding
197 from this award. The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of
198 the NHS, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care. For the purpose of open
199 access, the author has applied a CC BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted
200 Manuscript version arising from this submission. The University of Oxford is the study sponsor.
201 The funders and sponsor had no role in study design, manuscript submission, or collection,
202 management, analysis or interpretation of study data.

203

204 **Author contributions**

205 JD and NG conceived the study. YS, RL, EB, PM, NS, PKD, GH and CB contributed to study
206 design and implementation. JD analysed the data and wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All
207 authors critically reviewed and edited the manuscript and consented to final publication.

208 **Acknowledgements**

209 The authors would like to thank all participants in the study and acknowledge the work and
210 support of staff at the Prince Cyril Zulu Clinic, Mafakathini Clinic, eThekweni Municipality,
211 CAPRISA and the National Health Laboratory Services at Addington and Inkosi Albert Luthuli
212 Hospitals.

213

214 **Data sharing statement**

215 Bona fide researchers will be able to request access to anonymised trial data by contacting the
216 corresponding author.

217

218 **REFERENCES**

- 219 1. Dorward J, Lessells R, Drain PK, et al. Dolutegravir for first-line antiretroviral therapy in low-
220 income and middle-income countries: uncertainties and opportunities for implementation
221 and research. *Lancet HIV* 2018;5(7):e400-e04. doi: 10.1016/S2352-3018(18)30093-6
222 [published Online First: 2018/06/10]
- 223 2. Vitoria M, Hill A, Ford N, et al. The transition to dolutegravir and other new antiretrovirals in
224 low-income and middle-income countries: what are the issues? *AIDS* 2018;32(12):1551-
225 61. doi: 10.1097/QAD.0000000000001845 [published Online First: 2018/05/11]
- 226 3. Kanters S, Vitoria M, Zoratti M, et al. Comparative efficacy, tolerability and safety of
227 dolutegravir and efavirenz 400mg among antiretroviral therapies for first-line HIV
228 treatment: A systematic literature review and network meta-analysis. *EClinicalMedicine*
229 2020;28:100573. doi: 10.1016/j.eclinm.2020.100573 [published Online First: 2020/12/10]
- 230 4. Hamers RL, Rinke de Wit TF, Holmes CB. HIV drug resistance in low-income and middle-
231 income countries. *The Lancet HIV* 2018;5(10):e588-e96. doi: 10.1016/S2352-
232 3018(18)30173-5
- 233 5. Gregson J, Tang M, Ndembu N, et al. Global epidemiology of drug resistance after failure of
234 WHO recommended first-line regimens for adult HIV-1 infection: a multicentre
235 retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet Infectious Diseases* 2016;16(5):565-75. doi:
236 10.1016/S1473-3099(15)00536-8
- 237 6. Hunt GM, Dokubo EK, Takuva S, et al. Rates of virological suppression and drug resistance
238 in adult HIV-1-positive patients attending primary healthcare facilities in South Africa.
239 *Journal of Antimicrobial Chemotherapy* 2017;72:3141-48. doi: 10.1093/jac/dkx252
- 240 7. Dorward J, Sookrajh Y, Ngobese H, et al. Protocol for a randomised feasibility study of Point-
241 Of-care HIV viral load testing to Enhance Re-suppression in South Africa: the POWER
242 study. *BMJ Open* 2021;11(2):e045373. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2020-045373
- 243 8. Dorward J, Sookrajh Y, Lessells RJ, et al. Point-of-care viral load testing to manage HIV
244 viraemia during the rollout of dolutegravir-based ART in South Africa: a randomised
245 feasibility study (POwER) *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes* 2023
- 246 9. The South African National Department of H. 2019 ART Clinical Guidelines for the
247 management of HIV in Adults, Pregnancy, Adolescents, Children, Infants and Neonates.
248 Pretoria, South Africa, 2019.
- 249 10. South African National Department of Health. Adherence Guidelines for HIV, TB and NCDs:
250 Updated March 2020 Pretoria, South Africa2020 [Available from:
251 [https://www.knowledgehub.org.za/elibrary/adherence-guidelines-hiv-tb-and-ncds-](https://www.knowledgehub.org.za/elibrary/adherence-guidelines-hiv-tb-and-ncds-standard-operating-procedures-2020)
252 [standard-operating-procedures-2020](https://www.knowledgehub.org.za/elibrary/adherence-guidelines-hiv-tb-and-ncds-standard-operating-procedures-2020).
- 253 11. Ford N, Orrell C, Shubber Z, et al. HIV viral resuppression following an elevated viral load: a
254 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Journal of the International AIDS Society*
255 2019;22(11):1-6. doi: 10.1002/jia2.25415
- 256 12. Pepperrell T, Venter WDF, McCann K, et al. Participants on Dolutegravir Resuppress
257 Human Immunodeficiency Virus RNA After Virologic Failure: Updated Data from the
258 ADVANCE Trial. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021;73(4):e1008-e10. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciab086

259

260

261 TABLES

262 Table 1: Outcomes among patients with viraemia on dolutegravir and efavirenz based
263 first-line ART

Variable	Levels	Dolutegravir, n = 43	Efavirenz, n = 37*	p
ENROLMENT				
Days since pre-enrolment viral load ≥ 1000 copies/mL	Median (IQR)	16.0 (13.5 to 20.0)	14.0 (13.0 to 21.0)	0.333
Enrolment viral load, copies/mL	<1000 copies/mL	25 (58.1)	10 (27.0)	0.007
	≥ 1000 copies/mL	18 (41.9)	27 (73.0)	
Predicted active NRTIs in current regimen [†]	0	1 (5.3)	12 (41.4)	<0.001
	1	1 (5.3)	9 (31.0)	
	2	17 (89.5)	8 (27.6)	
Predicted active dolutegravir or efavirenz in current regimen [†]	No	0 (0.0)	25 (86.2)	<0.001
	Yes	18 (100.0)	4 (13.8)	
WEEK 12 FOLLOW-UP				
Time to follow-up viral load, days	Median (IQR)	91.0 (84.0 to 98.0)	90.5 (84.0 to 98.0)	0.613
Follow-up viral load, copies/mL [‡]	<1000 copies/mL	34 (85.0)	14 (37.8)	<0.001
	≥ 1000 copies/mL	6 (15.0)	23 (62.2)	
Predicted active NRTIs in current regimen [§]	0	0 (0.0)	13 (61.9)	<0.001
	1	0 (0.0)	6 (28.6)	
	2	6 (100.0)	2 (9.5)	
Predicted active dolutegravir or efavirenz in current regimen [§]	No	0 (0.0)	21 (100.0)	
	Yes	6 (100.0)	0 (0.0)	
ART regimen change during follow-up?	No	43 (100.0)	6 (16.2)	<0.001
	Yes		31 (83.8)	
Reason for ART regimen change	ART policy change		7 (22.6)	1.000
	Virological failure		24 (77.4) [□]	
New ART regimen	AZT / 3TC / DTG		17 (54.8)	1.000
	AZT / 3TC / LPVr		2 (6.5)	
	TDF / 3TC / DTG		7 (22.6)	
	TDF / AZT / 3TC / DTG [¶]		4 (12.9)	
	TDF / FTC / LPVr		1 (3.2)	
WEEK 24 EXIT				
Exit viral load, copies/mL ^{**}	<1000 copies/mL	34 (85.0)	33 (94.3)	0.271
	≥ 1000 copies/mL	6 (15.0)	2 (5.7)	
Predicted active NRTIs in current regimen ^{††}	0	1 (20.0)	2 (66.7)	
	1	0 (0.0)	1 (33.3)	
	2	4 (80.0)	0 (0.0)	
Predicted active dolutegravir or efavirenz in current regimen ^{††}	No	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
	Yes	7 (100.0)	3 (100.0)	

264 * One participant had been transitioned from TDF / FTC / EFV to TDF / 3TC / DTG 15 days before enrolment, on the
265 same day of the pre-enrolment viral load. At the enrolment visit, they were changed back to TDF / FTC / EFV
266 because they should not have been transitioned while viraemic >1000 copies/mL. Their 12-week follow-up viral load
267 was 1222 copies/mL, and so they were switched from TDF/FTC/EFV to second-line AZT/3TC/LPVr

268 † 50 participants had viral load >500 copies/mL and HIVDR testing was successful in 48 for reverse transcriptase and
269 47 for integrase

270 ‡ Three participants in the dolutegravir group had no follow-up viral load

271 § 32 participants had viral load >500 copies/mL and HIVDR testing was successful in 27 for both reverse transcriptase
272 and integrase

273 □ One participant with repeat viral load of 937 copies/mL was deemed by the clinician to have virological failure and
274 switched to second line AZT/3TC/DTG

275 ¶ Remained on tenofovir due to Hepatitis B infection

276 ** Two participants in each group were lost to follow-up, and one dolutegravir participant had no exit viral load

277 †† 10 participants had viral load >500 copies/mL and HIVDR testing was successful in 8 for reverse transcriptase and
278 10 for integrase