

Assessment of the impact of the new blister packaging of Biktarvy® (B/F/TAF) on treatment satisfaction of people living with HIV

Authors

Cruz JP^{1,2}, Santos O^{3,4}, Rodrigues M¹, Morais R¹, Borralho T¹, Ferreira F¹, Ferreira A⁵, Albuquerque J^{5,6}, Nogueira P³, Silva MP⁷, and Antunes F³

1. Serviços Farmacêuticos da Unidade de Saúde Local Santa Maria, Lisboa, Portugal
2. iMed.Ulisboa – Institute for Medicine Research, Faculdade de Farmácia, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
3. Instituto de Saúde Ambiental, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
4. Unbreakable Idea Research, Painho, Portugal
5. BlueClinical – Investigação e Desenvolvimento em Saúde, Lda, Porto, Portugal
6. Centro de Estatística e Aplicações, Faculdade de Ciências, Universidade de Lisboa, Portugal
7. Gilead Sciences, Lda, Lisboa, Portugal

1 Abstract

2 **Background:** Antiretroviral therapy (ART) is highly effective in people living with HIV
3 (PLHIV), but its success depends on treatment satisfaction and adherence. A determinant of
4 satisfaction regards how the medication is delivered to the patient, namely how it is
5 contained (e.g., bottles, blisters, etc). A new packaging of Biktarvy® has been introduced as
6 a monthly blister, aiming to improve satisfaction, facilitate traceability of daily medication,
7 portability, and discretion (reducing stigma associated with ART), and, ultimately, enhance
8 adherence.

9 **Goals:** The study's objective was to assess the impact of changing the packaging of
10 Biktarvy® (B/F/TAF) from a standard pill bottle to a monthly blister with a weekly calendar
11 on therapy satisfaction. Additionally, the association between treatment satisfaction and
12 selected patients' characteristics (e.g., ART duration) was evaluated. A secondary goal was
13 to characterize the association between the change of packaging on patient's adherence.

14 **Methods:** This is an observational longitudinal (retrospective and prospective) study with
15 patients following ART for at least six months (ambulatory clinical management) recruited
16 according to a non-probabilistic sequential sampling. Satisfaction was measured at two
17 different moments: at baseline, HIVTSQs were used to assess satisfaction within the
18 previous six months' use of medication containers (bottles). Six months later, patients filled
19 in the HIVTSQc to assess their perception of satisfaction change with the new packaging
20 (blister). Adherence was assessed by pharmacy medication dispensing at the hospital.

21 **Results:** The study enrolled 105 patients in two selected centers (102 patients completed
22 the study). Patients were significantly more satisfied (HIVTSQc scores) with ART when
23 using the new Biktarvy® blister pack package. Importantly, gains of ART satisfaction were
24 higher among those less satisfied with the bottle packaging. No significant associations
25 were found between HIVTSQc scores and sociodemographic or ART-related variables.

26 **Keywords:** PLHIV; Antiretroviral therapy; Patient satisfaction; Adherence

28 Introduction

29 In the last decade, antiretroviral therapy (ART) has demonstrated high efficacy, resulting in
30 higher than 90% viral suppression rates. Therapeutic guidelines identify several regimens
31 that allow adequate long-term suppression of viral load in people living with HIV infection.

32 (PLHIV), including single tablet coformulations¹.
33 The success of ART depends on treatment satisfaction and adherence, which are impacted by
34 several factors, including medication usage facility, patient perception of results, and side
35 effects. These factors must be considered when making treatment decisions in the clinical
36 management of PLHIV². For all these reasons, satisfaction has been considered relevant in
37 the assessment and differentiation between therapeutic regimens, aiming to improve clinical
38 outcomes, the well-being of PLHIV, and maximizing improvement of health status^{3,4}.
39 Medication packaging in blister packs, with a weekly calendar, has the potential to
40 contribute to improving adherence to ART and optimizing outcomes in the treatment of
41 PLHIV. In the scope of treatment of hypertension, patients with medication in blisters with
42 weekly calendars renewed their prescription more frequently, had higher Medication
43 Possession Ratio (MPR) and better control of blood pressure at 12 months⁵. Additionally, a
44 meta-analysis of 52 studies (n = 22 858) involving patients with different diseases showed
45 an increase in adherence from 63% to 71%, related to the change in the packaging of the
46 medication to blisters with calendars, which demonstrates a practical improvement in
47 treatment adherence because of this tablet package modification⁶.
48 Biktarvy® is indicated for the treatment of adults infected with human immunodeficiency
49 virus type 1 (HIV-1) without present or past evidence of viral resistance to the integrase
50 inhibitor class, emtricitabine or tenofovir. Currently, Biktarvy® new package contains the
51 same number of units (30 tablets), but packaged in four blisters of seven tablets, with a
52 weekly calendar, and one blister of two tablets. This new packaging has the potential for
53 the patient to improve the adherence to therapy, facilitating the traceability of daily
54 medication dosage, its portability and greater medication discretion, reducing the risk of
55 stigma associated with ART. In Portugal, there was a complete replacement of units of
56 Biktarvy® in bottles by Biktarvy® in blisters, until May 2022⁷.
57 This project aimed to estimate the impact of the new Biktarvy® packaging containing the
58 same number of units (30 tablets), but packed in four blisters of seven tablets, with a weekly
59 calendar, and one blister of two tablets, on patient's satisfaction (main outcome) and
60 adherence (secondary outcome) with ART.

61 **Materials and methods**

62

63 **Research strategies**

64 The study followed an observational retrospective/prospective design with PLHIV being
65 followed in two Portuguese hospitals. Data collected referred to a period of ART of at least
66 six months before the change of packaging (bottle; retrospective data) and six months of
67 experience with the new packaging (blister; prospective data).

68 The study was conducted in accordance with the clinical study protocol (CSP), the
69 International Council for Harmonization, Good Clinical Practices, and the Declaration of
70 Helsinki, as well as the applicable European and Portuguese laws and regulations approved
71 by the Ethics Committee of the Centro Académico de Medicina de Lisboa (reference
72 number 226/22).

73 All patients signed a written informed consent form before entering the study. Each
74 participant received a full explanation of the project goals, procedures, and implied tasks
75 (and burden) from patients. Subjects were informed that their participation was voluntary
76 and assured that they could abandon the study at any time without any prejudice. They also
77 received a copy of the subject's information and, after being fully clarified, signed the
78 informed consent form.

79

80 **Sampling: inclusion and exclusion criteria**

81 The sample size was planned to enroll 100 PLHIV (including at least 20 women) on
82 treatment with Biktarvy®, being over 18 years old, under ambulatory clinical management
83 in two Portuguese hospitals for at least six months and accepting to participate voluntarily
84 in the study.

85 Patients coming to the hospital pharmacy were included sequentially (non-probabilistic
86 sampling), and the sample size was determined to allow an estimate of the patients with
87 timely prescription delivery in the hospital pharmacy (before the time of prescription
88 collection), with the precision of 7% to 10%. The first patient visit occurred in August 2022,
89 and the last patient visit occurred in December 2023.

90

91 **Data collection and instruments**

92 Subjects' data was directly collected on paper-based clinical reports forms (CRFs).
93 Subsequently, data were transcribed into the study database by a data entry operator. Each
94 patient was given a study reference number, which was archived in the clinical file.

95 Data collected included demographic information (age, gender, nationality, level of
96 education), clinical and laboratory data (duration of ART, viral load, and CD4 T
97 lymphocytes count). For assessing satisfaction with ART, two instruments have been used:
98 the Portuguese version of the HIV Treatment Satisfaction Questionnaires version "s"
99 (HIVTSQs), at baseline (retrospective assessment related to the previous six months), and
100 the Portuguese version for the HIV Treatment Satisfaction Questionnaires version "c"
101 (HIVTSQc), six months after starting the use of Biktarvy® monthly blisters. HIVTSQs and
102 HIVTSQc have been developed by Woodcock & Bradley, with evidence of sound

103 psychometric properties^{8,9}. The HIVTSQs is composed of 10 items being answered in a
104 seven-points Likert-type scale (varying from 0 = “very dissatisfied” to 6 = “very satisfied”).
105 The HIVTSQs provides a global score of satisfaction as well as scores for two
106 subdimensions: the HIVTSQs General Satisfaction/Clinical subscale and the HIVTSQs
107 Lifestyle/Ease subscale; the HIVTSQc also includes a subscale: the HIVTSQc General
108 Satisfaction/Clinical subscale.

109 Additionally, and for a better understanding of the factors of satisfaction with ART, patients
110 were asked about their level of agreement with four statements, both at baseline and at
111 follow-up: *The packaging of this medication allows me to easily check if I've taken my daily*
112 *pill, This medicine comes in a package that lets me take the pill easily and*

113 *without anyone noticing, This medicine's packaging reminds me that I need to refill my*
114 *prescription, and I don't like the way this medicine is packaged.* Finally, patients reported
115 their level of agreement with one more statement, at the follow-up moment: *I am more*
116 *satisfied with this type of medication packaging than with the previous one, which was a*
117 *plastic bottle.* Level of agreement was indicated through a 5-points Likert scale ranging
118 from 1 = *totally disagree* to 5 = *totally agree*.

119 To assess the impact of the new Biktarvy® packaging on adherence, pharmacy medication
120 dispensing was measured, more specifically, by registering the number of tablets supplied
121 in the last delivery per number of days elapsed since the last delivery. Pharmacy medication
122 dispensing data were collected by pharmacy records, and questionnaires were completed
123 while patients waited in the hospital pharmacy (a representation of the study design is
124 presented in Figure 1).

125

126 **Figure 1. Study design diagram**

127

128 **Data analysis**

129 The statistical analyses were conducted using R statistical software version 4.2.1.
130 Descriptive statistics were used to analyze results: percentages and absolute frequencies to
131 describe the categorical variables; minimum, maximum, interquartile range, means,
132 medians, and standard deviation for the quantitative variables.

133 All ten items from HIVTSQs were summed up to obtain a treatment satisfaction score (0 to
134 60), where higher scores represent greater satisfaction. The HIVTSQs General Satisfaction
135 / Clinical subscale includes the items 1, 2, 3, 9 and 10 (range: 0 to 30), and the HIVTSQs
136 Lifestyle/Ease subscale includes the remaining items, namely the items 4, 5, 6, 7 and 8
137 (range: 0 to 30).

138 For the HIVTSQc, the sum of all items results in a treatment satisfaction (change) score
139 (range: -30 to 30), where positive values are associated with improvement in satisfaction
140 with treatment, the 0 score represents no change, and negative values indicate a
141 deterioration in treatment satisfaction. For the HIVTSQc General Satisfaction / Clinical
142 subscale and HIVTSQc Lifestyle/Ease subscale, the same items as in HIVTSQs subscales
143 were included (range: -15 to 15). Cronbach alpha was used to assess internal consistency
144 for both HIVTSQs and HIVTSQc, and correlations were applied to assess the convergent
145 validity between these two scales.

146 To evaluate the effect of switching the medication from a standard pill bottle to a monthly
147 blister in patient satisfaction, a unilateral Wilcoxon signed rank test was applied (alternative

148 hypothesis: pseudomedian > 0) to the score in the HIVTSQc scale and its subscales.
 149 Differences between independent samples in the distribution of these scores was tested
 150 using the Wilcoxon rank sum test.
 151 Linear regression models have been performed to assess the predictive effect of baseline
 152 satisfaction on satisfaction change. The scores for HIVTSQc scale, HIVTSQc General
 153 Satisfaction subscale, HIVTSQs Clinical subscale, e HIVTSQc Lifestyle/Ease subscale
 154 were found as very skewed (left-skewed distribution). Therefore, their values were shifted
 155 and reversed for modeling purposes, as follows: *HIVTSQc scale* recoded = 61 + 1 -
 156 (*HIVTSQc scale* + 31); *HIVTSQc General Satisfaction / Clinical subscale* recoded = 31
 157 + 1 - (*HIVTSQc General Satisfaction / Clinical subscale* + 16); *HIVTSQc Lifestyle/Ease*
 158 *subscale* recoded = 31 + 1 - (*HIVTSQc Lifestyle/Ease subscale* + 16). Resulting scores were
 159 log-transformed and included in the linear regression models as dependent variables. The
 160 models included as predictors sex, age group, education, nationality, and antiretroviral
 161 therapy duration, adjusting for the treatment satisfaction score at baseline. When studying
 162 the predictive effect of treatment satisfaction at baseline (for HIVTSQs scale, HIVTSQs
 163 General Satisfaction / Clinical subscale, and HIVTSQs Lifestyle/Ease subscale) on
 164 HIVTSQc, HIVTSQc General Satisfaction / Clinical e HIVTSQc Lifestyle/Ease, simple
 165 models (no additional variables, in these equations) have been used. The predictors
 166 mentioned above were also included all-together in one model (M2). Estimates and 95%
 167 confidence intervals (CI), and p-values are presented.
 168
 169

170 Results

171 One hundred and five PLHIV were enrolled in the study. Two were discontinued due to a
 172 physician's decision to switch ART, and one had not completed six months of using
 173 Biktarvy® in blisters by the end of the data collection process (therefore, not considered for
 174 assessing satisfaction with the blister packaging). Table 1 summarizes the demographic and
 175 clinical characteristics of participants at baseline.
 176

177 **Table 1. Sociodemographic and clinical characteristics of the participants**

Sociodemographic variables		
	n	105
Sex, n (%)	Female, n (%)	22 (21.0)
	Male, n (%)	83 (79.1)
	n	105
Age	Mean	43.35
	SD	11.69
	Mediana [Q1, Q3]	42.00 (34.00, 53.00)
	Minimum	21
	Maximum	79
	n	105
Scholarship level, n (%)	No formal education	2 (1.9)
	Primary (basic) education	27 (25.7)
	Secondary education	37 (35.2)
	Superior education	39 (37.1)
	n	105
Nationality, n (%)	Portuguese	59 (56.20)

	Non-Portuguese	46 (43.8)
<hr/>		
Clinical variables		
	n	105
Antiretroviral therapy duration, n (%)	Less than 1 year	2 (1.9)
	1 - 5 years	53 (50.5)
	6 - 10 years	14 (13.3)
	More than 10 years	36 (34.3)
<hr/>		
HIV viral load, n (%)	n	105
	Not detectable	83 (79.0)
	20 - 200 copies/mL	21 (20.0)
	201 - 1000 copies/mL	1 (1.0)
<hr/>		
CD4 T lymphocytes count, n (%)	n	105
	< 350 cells/mm ³	6 (5.7)
	351 - 500 cells/mm ³	15 (14.3)
	> 500 cells/mm ³	84 (80.0)

178 n: number of subjects; HIV: human immunodeficiency virus

179

180 Out of the 105 participants, twenty-one (21.0%) were females. The mean age was 43.35
 181 years (s.d: 11.69; min 21, max 79 years old), 35.2% and 37.1% had secondary and superior
 182 education, respectively, and 43.8% were born outside Portugal. Only two participants had
 183 been following ART for less than one year. 79.0% had a non-detectable viral load, and
 184 80.0% had a CD4T lymphocyte count higher than 500 cells/mm³.

185 The scales used for assessing satisfaction performed well psychometrically: the internal
 186 reliability coefficients for HIVTSQs and HIVTSQc were found to be good (alpha = .76 for
 187 HIVTSQs; alpha = .88 for HIVTSQc). The correlation between HIVTSQs and HIVTSQc
 188 was also significant (rho=.327) (Figure 2).

189 **Figure 2. HIVTSQs (and subscales) and HIVTSQc total scores correlations**
 190 **(Spearman correlation)**

191

192 As Table 2 shows, the scores of HIVTSQs (at baseline) were not found to be associated
 193 with sociodemographic variables or the selected clinical indicators. When considering the 6-
 194 month assessment (with blister package usage) with HIVTSQc, a significant positive
 195 satisfaction evolution was observed (also for the HIVTSQc subscale).

Table 197. Satisfaction (HIVTSQs and HIVTSQc scores) by sex, age group, education, nationality, and antiretroviral therapy duration

	TOTAL ¹		Sex ²		Age group ²			Education ²			Nationality ²			Antiretroviral therapy duration ²			
	N = 105	p ¹	Female n = 22	Male n = 83	p ²	Less than 50 years n = 69	50 years or more n = 36	p ²	Secondary education or less n = 66	Superior education n = 39	p ²	Portuguese n = 59	Non- Portuguese n = 46	p ²	Up to 5 years n = 55	6 years or more n = 50	p ²
HIVTSQs scale																	
Mean (SD)	54.69 (5.52)		55.05 (6.37)	54.59 (5.31)		54.83 (5.82)	54.42 (4.96)		54.64 (6.10)	54.77 (4.46)		53.90 (5.70)	55.70 (5.18)		54.25 (4.99)	55.16 (6.07)	
Median [Q1, Q3]	57.00 (51.00, 59.00)	(a)	57.50 (53.50, 59.75)	57.00 (51.00, 59.00)	0.500	57.00 (51.00, 60.00)	56.00 (51.00, 58.00)	0.361	57.00 (50.25, 59.00)	56.00 (51.00, 59.00)	0.705	56.00 (50.00, 59.00)	57.00 (54.00, 60.00)	0.085	56.00 (50.00, 59.00)	57.00 (53.25, 60.00)	0.191
Minimum - Maximum	37.00 - 60.00		37.00 - 60.00	38.00 - 60.00		37.00 - 60.00	42.00 - 60.00		37.00 - 60.00	47.00 - 60.00		37.00 - 60.00	38.00 - 60.00		43.00 - 60.00	37.00 - 60.00	
HIVTSQs General Satisfaction / Clinical subscale																	
Mean (SD)	27.78 (2.61)		27.59 (2.84)	27.83 (2.56)		28.07 (2.48)	27.22 (2.78)		27.68 (2.81)	27.95 (2.25)		27.31 (2.81)	28.39 (2.20)		27.71 (2.38)	27.86 (2.86)	
Median [Q1, Q3]	29.00 (26.00, 30.00)	(a)	28.50 (24.75, 30.00)	29.00 (26.50, 30.00)	0.844	29.00 (27.00, 30.00)	28.00 (25.00, 30.00)	0.116	28.50 (27.00, 30.00)	29.00 (26.00, 30.00)	0.899	28.00 (25.00, 30.00)	29.00 (28.00, 30.00)	0.098	28.00 (27.00, 30.00)	29.50 (26.00, 30.00)	0.292
Minimum - Maximum	20.00 - 30.00		22.00 - 30.00	20.00 - 30.00		20.00 - 30.00	21.00 - 30.00		20.00 - 30.00	23.00 - 30.00		21.00 - 30.00	20.00 - 30.00		23.00 - 30.00	20.00 - 30.00	
HIVTSQs Lifestyle/Ease subscale																	
Mean (SD)	26.90 (3.52)		27.45 (4.07)	26.76 (3.37)		26.75 (3.76)	27.19 (3.03)		26.95 (3.86)	26.82 (2.88)		26.59 (3.37)	27.30 (3.69)		26.55 (3.33)	27.30 (3.70)	
Median [Q1, Q3]	28.00 (25.00, 30.00)	(a)	29.00 (28.00, 30.00)	28.00 (25.00, 30.00)	0.199	28.00 (25.00, 30.00)	28.00 (25.00, 30.00)	0.890	28.50 (25.00, 30.00)	27.00 (25.00, 30.00)	0.508	28.00 (25.00, 29.00)	29.00 (26.25, 30.00)	0.074	27.00 (25.00, 30.00)	28.50 (27.00, 30.00)	0.145
Minimum - Maximum	15.00 - 30.00		15.00 - 30.00	17.00 - 30.00		15.00 - 30.00	20.00 - 30.00		15.00 - 30.00	20.00 - 30.00		15.00 - 30.00	17.00 - 30.00		17.00 - 30.00	15.00 - 30.00	
HIVTSQc scale																	
Mean (SD)	22.21 (9.14)		22.05 (10.27)	22.24 (8.93)		23.07 (7.96)	20.54 (10.99)		21.59 (9.00)	23.21 (9.40)		21.19 (10.23)	23.49 (7.46)		22.85 (8.06)	21.45 (10.31)	
Median [Q1, Q3]	25.50 (18.25, 29.00)	< 0.001	26.00 (19.00, 28.50)	25.00 (18.50, 29.00)	0.853	26.00 (19.50, 28.50)	25.00 (18.00, 29.00)	0.474	25.00 (18.00, 28.00)	28.00 (22.00, 29.50)	0.133	25.00 (18.00, 28.00)	26.00 (19.00, 29.00)	0.368	26.00 (19.00, 29.00)	25.00 (18.50, 28.00)	0.615
Minimum - Maximum	-9 - 30		-6 - 30	-9 - 30		-6 - 30	-9 - 30		-6 - 30	-9 - 30		-9 - 30	0 - 30		0 - 30	-9 - 30	
(NA)	3		3	0		2	1		3	0		2	1		0	3	
HIVTSQc General Satisfaction / Clinical subscale																	
Mean (SD)	11.37 (4.74)		12.00 (5.11)	11.23 (4.67)		11.78 (4.21)	10.60 (5.60)		11.21 (4.65)	11.64 (4.93)		10.88 (5.10)	12.00 (4.20)		11.60 (3.99)	11.11 (5.52)	
Median [Q1, Q3]	13.00 (10.00, 15.00)	< 0.001	14.00 (12.00, 15.00)	13.00 (10.00, 15.00)	0.299	13.00 (10.50, 15.00)	12.00 (9.00, 15.00)	0.611	12.00 (10.00, 15.00)	14.00 (11.00, 15.00)	0.397	12.00 (9.00, 15.00)	14.00 (10.00, 15.00)	0.178	13.00 (10.50, 15.00)	14.00 (9.50, 15.00)	0.516
Minimum - Maximum	-3 - 15		-3 - 15	-3 - 15		-3 - 15	-3 - 15		-3 - 15	-3 - 15		-3 - 15	0 - 15		0 - 15	-3 - 15	
(NA)	3		3	0		2	1		3	0		2	1		0	3	
HIVTSQc Lifestyle/Ease subscale																	
Mean (SD)	10.83 (4.97)		10.05 (6.11)	11.01 (4.69)		11.30 (4.53)	9.94 (5.68)		10.38 (4.96)	11.56 (4.96)		10.32 (5.35)	11.49 (4.41)		11.25 (4.33)	10.34 (5.63)	
Median [Q1, Q3]	13.00 (9.00, 15.00)	< 0.001	13.00 (8.50, 14.00)	13.00 (9.00, 15.00)	0.621	13.00 (9.00, 15.00)	12.00 (8.50, 14.00)	0.262	12.00 (9.00, 14.00)	14.00 (9.50, 15.00)	0.094	12.00 (9.00, 15.00)	13.00 (9.00, 15.00)	0.375	13.00 (9.00, 15.00)	12.00 (9.00, 14.50)	0.501
Minimum - Maximum	-6 - 15		-3 - 15	-6 - 15		-3 - 15	-6 - 15		-3 - 15	-6 - 15		-6 - 15	-3 - 15		-2 - 15	-6 - 15	
(NA)	3		3	0		2	1		3	0		2	1		0	3	

SD, Standard Deviation; Q1, Quartile 1; Q3, Quartile 3

¹ Wilcoxon signed rank test for one sample;

² Wilcoxon rank sum test for two independent samples

(a) Test was not performed for HIVTSQs and respective subscales

(NA) Number of patients for whom no data was available

203 Table 3 also shows that satisfaction with a blister (measured with HIVTSQc) is not
204 predicted by gender, age group, education level, nationality, or ART duration. On the other
205 hand, an increase in the baseline treatment satisfaction score was associated with a decrease
206 in the treatment satisfaction change score (six months after the switch to blister). For the
207 HIVTSQc scale model, a one-unit increase in the baseline treatment satisfaction score
208 (HIVTSQs) results in a decrease of 6% [$\exp(0.06)$] in the HIVTSQc overall score.
209

210 **Table 3. Satisfaction change (HIVTSQc scores): predictive effect of satisfaction at baseline (HIVTSQs), sociodemographic variables,**
 211 **and clinical variables (linear models)**

	HIVTSQc scale				HIVTSQc General Satisfaction / Clinical subscale				HIVTSQc Lifestyle/Ease subscale			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 1		Model 2		Model 1		Model 2	
	b (95% CI)	p	b (95% CI)	p	b (95% CI)	p	b (95% CI)	p	b (95% CI)	p	b (95% CI)	p
HIVTSQs*	-0.06 (-0.10; -0.02)	0.002	-0.06 (-0.10; -0.02)	0.003	-0.10 (-0.17; -0.03)	0.006	-0.09 (-0.17; -0.02)	0.016	-0.09 (-0.15; -0.04)	0.001	-0.10 (-0.15; -0.04)	<0.001
Sex												
Female	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Male	-0.03 (-0.56; 0.51)	0.926	0.08 (-0.47; 0.64)	0.769	0.27 (-0.20; 0.74)	0.252	0.29 (-0.20; 0.78)	0.240	-0.25 (-0.73; 0.23)	0.302	-0.14 (-0.64; 0.35)	0.559
Age group												
Less than 50 years	—		—		—		—		—		—	
50 years or more	0.12 (-0.32; 0.56)	0.591	0.03 (-0.44; 0.49)	0.913	0.02 (-0.37; 0.41)	0.918	0.02 (-0.39; 0.44)	0.914	0.26 (-0.12; 0.65)	0.178	0.17 (-0.23; 0.57)	0.409
Education												
Secondary education or less	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Superior education	-0.34 (-0.76; 0.08)	0.114	-0.31 (-0.76; 0.15)	0.183	-0.13 (-0.51; 0.25)	0.498	-0.17 (-0.57; 0.23)	0.390	-0.36 (-0.73; 0.01)	0.060	-0.27 (-0.67; 0.12)	0.174
Nationality												
Portuguese	—		—		—		—		—		—	
Non-Portuguese	-0.10 (-0.52; 0.33)	0.655	-0.07 (-0.50; 0.35)	0.735	-0.16 (-0.54; 0.21)	0.388	-0.16 (-0.54; 0.23)	0.420	-0.15 (-0.52; 0.23)	0.435	-0.11 (-0.49; 0.26)	0.549
Antiretroviral therapy duration												
Up to 5 years	—		—		—		—		—		—	
6 years or more	0.21 (-0.21; 0.62)	0.331	0.14 (-0.31; 0.59)	0.541	-0.08 (-0.45; 0.29)	0.670	-0.08 (-0.48; 0.32)	0.705	0.24 (-0.13; 0.61)	0.207	0.11 (-0.28; 0.51)	0.574

212 CI, Confidence Interval

213 * These coefficients report to scores in HIVTSQs scale, HIVTSQs General Satisfaction / Clinical subscale and HIVTSQs Lifestyle/Ease subscale in models for HIVTSQc scale, HIVTSQc
 214 General Satisfaction / Clinical subscale and HIVTSQc Lifestyle/Ease subscale, respectively. For analysis, HIVTSQc scores were shifted, reversed and log transformed.

215 Model 1, Individual models adjusted for each variable presented, plus the HIVTSQs score

216 Model 2, Model adjusted for all the variables presented

218 This predictive value of baseline satisfaction (HIVTSQs) was also observed for the
219 HIVTSQc subscale (general satisfaction/clinical subscale).

220 Plots in Figure 2 provide some insight into the facets of blister packaging, as perceived by
221 patients (compared with bottles) that may support the observed positive evolution of
222 satisfaction. Although no significant difference was found in the proportion of patients
223 reporting appreciating positively the packaging (bottle and blister), three main facets of
224 usage were found to be better considered by patients: a significantly higher proportion of
225 them considered that the blister helps them to keep track of daily intake of pills; a higher
226 proportion indicate that blister packaging usage is more discrete than bottle usage; and a
227 higher proportion report that blister packaging helps them to recall the refill momentum.

228

229 **Figure 3. Frequencies of item response on the specifically developed questionnaire between**
230 **packaging methods**

231

232 Overall, and as seen in Figure 3, 68.6% of patients report being more satisfied with the
233 blister packaging than with bottle packaging.

234

235 **Figure 4. Response distribution on patients' satisfaction with blister packaging, when**
236 **compared with bottle packaging**

237

238 Regarding adherence, no significant differences were observed between the standard pill
239 bottle and monthly blister packaging: 89.7% and 91.3% of adherence, respectively.

240

241 **Discussion**

242 Main aim of this project was to assess if introducing a new packaging would affect
243 satisfaction and adherence with ART. The study was planned as a two-center, observational
244 retrospective and prospective study with 18+ years old PLHIV conducted in Portuguese
245 hospitals (non-random sampling). The bottle effect was assessed retrospectively for at least
246 six months, and the blister effect was prospectively evaluated for a period of at least six
247 months of usage. Overall, 105 PLHIV were enrolled and 102 completed the prospective
248 component of the study.

249 The main outcome of the study was satisfaction with ART treatment. Patients reported an
250 increase in satisfaction with the Biktarvy[®] blister packaging (compared with previous bottle
251 packaging). And this increase in satisfaction was independent of several main
252 sociodemographic and clinical characteristics. Importantly, the patients who became more
253 satisfied with ART treatment (when using blister packaging) were the least satisfied with
254 bottle packaging.

255 Another main finding regards the perception of utility from the blister packaging: after a
256 minimum of six month of experience, the blister (which includes a weekly calendar) was
257 considered by the majority (85%) of patients as an effective tool to keep track of their daily
258 intake of pills (significant higher percentage than the appreciation for bottle packaging),
259 and about two third of patients considered that it is helpful as a reminder of the adequate
260 moment of refilling.

261

262 **Conclusion**

263 To our knowledge this is the first study evaluating satisfaction with blister calendar package
264 usage of ART by PLHIV, and the same for medication packaging in blister packs with a
265 weekly calendar for the treatment of different diseases.

266 Overall, these findings support the advantages of the new packaging. Nevertheless,
267 adherence was not found to be significantly higher for blister than for bottle packaging
268 (though with a slight increase of proportion in adherence: 1.6 percentual points). This
269 issue calls for future research, also because the lapse of time after introducing the new
270 packaging was limited (about six months). Larger samples, including selected populations
271 with more extended periods of blister utilization, may provide sounder evidence about the
272 adherence potential of this Biktarvy® new packaging.

273

274 **Acknowledgments**

275 The authors thank the patients who accepted to participate in the study, Prof. Clare Bradley
276 and Health Psychology Research Limited (HPR) for the HIVTSQs and HIVTSQc, and Ana
277 Sequeira and Hugo Caldeira for technical assistance.

278

279 **Conflict of interests**

280 The authors declare no conflict of interest, except for Maria Pinto da Silva who is an
281 employee of Gilead Sciences, Lda., Lisboa, Portugal, and owns shares in Gilead.

282

283 **Supporting information captions**

284 Figure 1. Study design diagram

285 Table 1. Sociodemographic and clinical characteristics of the participants

286 Figure 2. HIVTSQs (and subscales) and HIVTSQc total scores correlations (Spearman
287 correlation)

288 Table 2. Satisfaction (HIVTSQs and HIVTSQc scores) by sex, age group, education,
289 nationality, and antiretroviral therapy duration

290 Table 3. Satisfaction change (HIVTSQc scores): predictive effect of satisfaction at baseline
291 (HIVTSQs), sociodemographic variables, and clinical variables (linear models)

292 Figure 3. Frequencies of item response on the specifically developed questionnaire between
293 packaging methods

294 Figure 4. Response distribution on patients' satisfaction with blister packaging, when
295 compared with bottle packaging

296

297 **References**

298

- 299 1. EACS Guidelines version 12.0, October 2023.
- 300 2. Paramesha AE, Chacko LK. Predictors of adherence to antiretroviral therapy among
301 PLHIV. *Indian J Public Health*. 2019;63(4):367-76.
- 302 3. Wohl D, Clarke A, Maggiolo F, Garner W, Laouri M, Martin H, Quirk E. Patient-
303 reported symptoms over 48 weeks among participants in randomized, double-blind,
304 phase III non-inferiority trials of adults with HIV on co-formulated bicitgravir,
305 emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide versus co-formulated abacavir,
306 dolutegravir, and lamivudine. *Patient*. 2018;11(5):561-73.
- 307 4. Curran A, Arends J, Buhk T, Cascio M, Teofilo E, van den Berk G, Guaraldi G.
308 "Moving Fourth": Introduction of a practical toolkit for shared decision-making to
309 facilitate healthy living beyond HIV viral suppression. *AIDS Rev*. 2021;23(4):204-
310 13.
- 311 5. Schneider PJ, Murphy JE, Pedersen CA. Impact of medication packaging on
312 adherence and treatment outcomes in older ambulatory patients. *J Am Pharm Assoc*
313 (2003). 2008;48(1):58-63.
- 314 6. Conn VS, Ruppap TM, Chan KC, Dunbar-Jacob J, Pepper GA, De Geest S.
315 Packaging interventions to increase medication adherence: systematic review and
316 meta-analysis. *Curr Med Res Opin*. 2015;31(1):145-60.

- 317 7. Biktarvy Summary of Product Characteristics, May 2021.
318 8. Woodcock A, Bradley C. Validation of the revised 10-item HIV Treatment
319 Satisfaction Questionnaire status version and new change version. *Value Health*.
320 2006;9(5): 320-33.
321 9. Serrão R, Mansinho K, Maltez F, Marques N, Carvalho A, Pazos R, et al. Real-
322 World characterization of the portuguese population living with HIV who initiated
323 raltegravir based-regimens: The REALITY Study. *Acta Med Port*. 2022;35(7-
324 8):558-65.




Figure 1






Figure 2


This packaging allows me to easily check if I've taken my daily pill



This packaging lets me take the pill easily and discreetly



This packaging reminds me that I need to refill my prescription



I don't like this packaging




Figure 3

I am more satisfied with this packaging than with the previous one




Figure 4