







**Table 1** Patients' characteristics at last available update (31 December 2018)

Variables	Overall n=4139 (%)	Treatment-experienced n=3658 (%)	Naive n=481 (%)	P values
Male, n (%)	2979 (72.5)	2609 (71.7)	370 (78.7)	0.001
Age (years), median (IQR)	50.4 (42.2–55.6)	51.0 (43.8–56.0)	41.3 (33.2–50.4)	<0.001
Risk factor, n (%)				<0.001
MSM	1540 (37.9)	1310 (36.4)	230 (50.1)	
Eterosexual	1572 (38.7)	1416 (39.3)	156 (34.0)	
IDU	753 (18.5)	712 (19.8)	41 (9.0)	
Other/Unknown	196 (4.9)	164 (4.6)	32 (6.9)	
HCV <sup>c</sup> Ab positive, n (%)	833 (21.2)	804 (22.8)	29 (7.3)	<0.001
HBsAg positive, n (%)	107 (2.7)	96 (2.7)	11 (2.7)	ns
CDC stage C, n (%)	837 (26.9)	774 (28.0)	63 (17.8)	<0.001
Years from HIV diagnosis, median (IQR)		14.0 (5.4–23.1)	/	/
Zenith HIV-RNA (log <sub>10</sub> copies/mL), median (IQR)	4.82 (4.29–5.37)	4.82 (4.29–5.36)	5.05 (4.57–5.56)	<0.001
Nadir CD4+ (cells/mm <sup>3</sup> ), median (IQR)	194.0 (61.0–324.0)	191.0 (58.0–312.0)	272.0 (94.5–488.5)	<0.001
BL CD4+ (cell/mm <sup>3</sup> ), median (IQR)	583 (365–810)	601 (400–823)	330 (110–560)	<0.001
Years on cART, median (IQR)		10.6 (4.0–18.5)	/	/
Time on virological suppression (months), median (IQR)		43.9 (8.4–97.0)	/	/
Virologically suppressed patients at baseline, n (%)		2222 (80.4)	/	/
Previous virological failure, n (%)		1183 (44.9)	/	/
Therapies before switch, n (%)				/
2NRTI+PI		944 (25.9)		
2NRTI+INI		835 (22.9)		
2NRTI+NNRTI		702 (19.2)	/	
Mono/Dual		763 (20.9)		
Others		405 (11.1)		
Reasons for previous treatment discontinuation, n (%)				/
Virological failure		209 (5.7)		
Treatment Intensification		106 (2.9)		
Dyslipidaemia		247 (6.8)	/	
Proactive switch/Simplification		1773 (48.5)		
GI toxicity		170 (4.6)		
Renal toxicity		113 (3.1)		
Neurological toxicity		34 (0.9)		
Osteopenia/Osteoporosis		61 (1.7)		
Other toxicity		44 (1.2)		
Hypersensitivity		20 (0.5)		
Drug–drug interactions		155 (4.2)		
Other/Unknown		723 (19.8)		

GI, gastrointestinal; INI, integrase inhibitor; NNRTI, non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor ; NRTI, nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor ; PI, protease inhibitor.



**Table 2** ARV regimens in the cohort

ARV regimen	Overall	Treatment-experienced patients	Naïve patients
DTG+ABC/3TC	1718 (41.5)	1529 (41.8)	189 (39.3)
DTG+FTC/Tenofovir (either TDF or TAF)	863 (20.9)	618 (16.9)	245 (50.9)
DTG+3TC	616 (14.9)	608 (16.6)	8 (1.7)
DTG+RPV	263 (6.4)	259 (7.1)	4 (0.8)
DTG+PI (boosted or unboosted)	380 (9.2)	370 (10.1)	10 (2.1)
DTG monotherapy	8 (0.2)	8 (0.2)	0
Other DTG-based dual regimen	22 (0.5)	19 (0.5)	3 (0.6)
Other DTG-based regimen (three or more drugs)	269 (6.5)	247 (6.8)	22 (4.6)

ARV, antiretroviral; DTG, dolutegravir; PI, protease inhibitor; RPV, rilpivirine; TAF, tenofovir alafenamide; 3TC, lamivudine; TDF, tenofovir disoproxil fumarate.

### Findings to date

In recent years, various works by the ODOACRE cohort have been produced and published in full paper articles. The cohort's production has been mainly focused on the study of the effectiveness and tolerability of DTG-based ARV regimens. In 2017, we published a work on the safety of a switch strategy with DTG plus a dual-NRTI backbone,<sup>26</sup> following reports of high rates of discontinuations of DTG-based regimens due to neuropsychiatric symptoms. In our work, we observed no virological failures during 1090 patient-months of follow-up and a 9.2% rate of TD, with a median time to TD of 81 days.

Baldin *et al*<sup>27</sup> compared a switch regimen with FTC/TDF plus DTG with a single tablet regimen with EVG and found that the 48-week estimated probability of continuing treatment was 74.5% for patients in the DTG group and 84.7% for those in the EVG group, and the difference was not statistically significant. Most recent works, meanwhile, mainly focus on the efficacy and safety of less drug regimens as switch strategies in virologically suppressed HIV-1-positive patients, since clinician's attention has shifted towards the analysis of risk/benefit ratio of dual therapies. Capetti *et al*<sup>28</sup> have described the effectiveness and tolerability of a dual therapy with RPV and DTG, with a median follow-up time of 101 weeks; in this study, the probability of maintaining virological suppression was 96.3% at week 96 while also observing a significant reduction of the low-density lipoprotein cholesterol/high-density lipoprotein cholesterol ratio. Similarly, a work by Borghetti *et al*<sup>29</sup> showed the results of our experience with a switch regimen of 3TC plus DTG in clinical practice; in this study, over 216.5 PYFU, we observed five virological failures with a probability of maintaining suppression of 95.1% at week 96. Finally, a comparison between the switch regimens of RPV+DTG and 3TC+DTG was published in 2018<sup>30</sup>; in this work, we observed no differences in the rate of virological failure between the two groups with no mutations to INI and with just one patient who developed a resistance mutation to NNRTIs at failure in the RPV group.

### Rescue regimen in highly treatment-experienced patients

Our experience with highly treatment-experienced patients was well described in a work by Capetti *et al*,<sup>31</sup> showing the results of a rescue regimen of boosted darunavir plus DTG on 130 patients; about 90% of them had documented resistance to one to five ARV classes. After 48 weeks of follow-up, we observed a decrease in the proportion of patients harbouring active HIV replication from 40% at baseline to 6.1%. Patients starting boosted DRV+DTG with HIV-RNA over 50 copies/mL presented a success rate of 88.5%; meanwhile, 97.4% of those who started this regimen with HIV-RNA below 50 copies/mL maintained virological suppression.

### DTG in naïve patient

Following the results from the GEMINI trials,<sup>23</sup> the use of a dual therapy with 3TC plus DTG in treatment-naïve patients will become more common in clinical practice and we expect to describe the feasibility of this strategy in our centres in the short future. With these data obviously still months away, our experience in naïve patients is represented by two recent studies: Rossetti *et al*<sup>32</sup> described the efficacy of DTG-based regimens (vs non-DTG-containing regimens) in achieving virological suppression in advanced HIV-infected naïve patients. Thirty-six per cent of patients in the DTG group achieved HIV-RNA below 50 copies/mL after 1 month of therapy (vs 17% of the non-DTG group) and 91% of them achieving suppression at 24 months (vs 89%), while the frequency of IRIS was similar between groups. Another study by Lagi *et al*<sup>33</sup> compared the tolerability and viroimmunologic efficacy of DTG-based regimens versus other regimens in naïve patients with acute HIV infection, with both groups showing significant increase in CD4+ cell count and CD4+/CD8+ ratio at 3, 6, 12, 24 and 36 months without significant differences between them.

### Further study plans

Given the large data set available, the ODOACRE cohort aims at continuing its observational activity on DTG-based regimens, highlighting rates and reasons of DTG



discontinuation for both standard three-drug regimen and dual regimen, with a focus also on ARV-naïve patients. The already published data, confirming the favourable metabolic profile of DTG, will be implemented with the assessment of inflammation and immunological status. Moreover, given the expanding interest in weight gain during INI-based regimens,<sup>16 34</sup> the cohort will attempt to thoroughly study this matter in its large population. The collaboration with other cohorts, mainly collecting data on HIV genotypic test, will lead to investigate the role of RAMs on the virological outcome of DTG-containing regimens, also considering not only HIV-RNA but also HIV-DNA. Additional assessments will also be conducted on the adverse events reported during therapy with DTG in order to examine possible predictors of these events (ie, neuropsychiatric events).

### Strengths and limitations

The main strength of the ODOACRE cohort is that it enrolls all the patients starting a DTG-based regimen in each of the participating centres, with a grand total of 4139 patients as of December 2018, providing a real clinical practice scenario of the use of DTG in Italy. Another strength is the cumulative length of follow-up (6937 PYFU), which, along with the clinical, laboratory and demographic data of such a large number of patients, allows us to thoroughly define the safety and tolerability of the regimens. Our observational data on the dual therapy with RPV and DTG have anticipated the results of the SWORD trials; similarly, while the TANGO trials on the efficacy and tolerability of 3TC+DTG are still under way,<sup>35</sup> our group has already described in multiple works the real-life feasibility of the said regimen.

A predominant feature of our cohort is that it is prevalently composed of highly treatment-experienced patients, with an overall median time from HIV diagnosis of 15.6 years (IQR 7.2–23.9), a median time on ARV of 11.4 years (IQR 5.0–18.7) and a median time of virological suppression of 3.9 years (IQR 0.8–8.2). Moreover, 44.9% of the patients experienced at least one virological failure in their clinical history and 21.2% of them switched to DTG coming from a dual/mono regimen.

The main weakness of our study is that it only collects routine clinical data and therefore some data could be missing in the analysis. The observational nature of the study is prone to bias due to unmeasured confounders that may impact on the study endpoints. Inaccurate or incomplete reporting on non-AIDS-related events, concomitant medications and reasons for DTG discontinuation cannot be excluded. Furthermore, as in several other observational studies, patients who refused to give their consent to data collection may differ systematically on some of the baseline characteristics from patients who participated.

Moreover, although a yearly update is planned, a delay exists between local data collection and availability of an updated central database.

### COLLABORATION

Data can be obtained on reasonable request. We encourage other clinical centres, even from other countries, to collaborate with our cohort. In particular, we aim to further investigate DTG-based regimens in several clinical contexts and we would like to evaluate these regimens in comparison with other INIs and other ARV drugs in order to try to answer the many questions that still come from clinical practice.

#### Author affiliations

- <sup>1</sup>Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Facoltà di Medicina e Chirurgia, Roma, Italy
- <sup>2</sup>Università degli Studi di Milano Dipartimento di Scienze Cliniche Luigi Sacco, Milano, Lombardia, Italy
- <sup>3</sup>Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia Facoltà di Medicina e Chirurgia, Modena, Emilia-Romagna, Italy
- <sup>4</sup>Division of Tropical and Infectious Diseases, Azienda Ospedaliera Careggi, Firenze, Italy
- <sup>5</sup>Infectious Dermatology and Allergology Unit, IFO, Roma, Lazio, Italy
- <sup>6</sup>Department of Clinical, Surgical and Experimental Sciences, Sassari University Hospital, Sassari, Sardegna, Italy
- <sup>7</sup>Department of Public Health and Infectious Diseases, Università degli Studi di Roma La Sapienza, Roma, Lazio, Italy
- <sup>8</sup>Infectious Disease Clinic– Department of Medicine and Science of Aging, School of Medicine, “G. d’Annunzio” University, Chieti, Italy
- <sup>9</sup>Università degli Studi di Siena Facoltà di Medicina e Chirurgia, Siena, Toscana, Italy
- <sup>10</sup>Università Politecnica delle Marche Facoltà di Medicina e Chirurgia, Ancona, Marche, Italy
- <sup>11</sup>UOC Malattie Infettive, Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli IRCCS, Roma, Italy

**Twitter** Maria Vittoria Cossu @maria.cossu

**Acknowledgements** First at all, the authors would like to thank all patients enrolled in the cohort. We also thank all clinical centres that participated in the ODOACRE cohort and in particular A. Emiliozzi, D. Moschese, C. Picarelli, F. Lombardi, S. Belmonti, S. Lamonica, V. Delle Donne, D. Farinacci, G. d’Ettorre, C. M. Mastroianni (Rome), T. Formenti (Milan), A. De Vito (Sassari), J. Vecchiet (Chieti) and A. Giacometti (Ancona).

**Contributors** ACic, GB, LC, FV, BR, AD, MVC, SRes, WG, FL, AG, MC, LB and AB managed patients and collected data. ACic and GB collaborated with the other clinical centers and wrote the manuscript. ACap, VB, GS, AL, GM, CM and SRus critically revised the manuscript. SDG conceived the work and revised the manuscript. All authors approved the submitted version of this manuscript.

**Funding** The cohort was supported by ViiV Healthcare Europe, which provided an unrestricted grant to the Infectious Disease Unit of the University of Siena.

**Map disclaimer** The depiction of boundaries on this map does not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of BMJ (or any member of its group) concerning the legal status of any country, territory, jurisdiction or area or of its authorities. This map is provided without any warranty of any kind, either express or implied.

**Competing interests** GB received travel grant from Gilead. ACa has received a personal grant from AB, Gilead and ViiV. GS has received funds for speaking by Gilead, Merck, Janssen, Abbvie, ViiV. AL received personal fees from BMS, Gilead, Merck, ViiV, AbbVie and Janssen and grants from BMS, Gilead, ViiV and Janssen. GM is in an ongoing relation as board member for ViiV Healthcare, Gilead Sciences and Janssen. BR received travel grants from Janssen, ViiV, Gilead MSD and received grants for consultancy from Abbvie, MSD, ViiV. AG received speaker fees from Mylan. AB has received non-financial support from Bristol-Myers Squibb and ViiV Healthcare, and personal fees from Gilead Sciences. CM has participated in advisory boards, received study grants and/or speaker honoraria from Abbvie, Gilead, ViiV, Janssen, Angelini, BMS and MSD. SR received research grants to his Institution from ViiV Healthcare, Gilead Sciences and Janssen, outside the submitted work; he was also a paid consultant for ViiV Healthcare, Gilead Sciences, Merck Sharp and Dohme, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Janssen and Mylan. SDG was a paid consultant or member of advisory boards for Gilead, ViiV Healthcare, Janssen-Cilag, Merck Sharp & Dohme and Bristol-Myers Squibb.

