1

Hepatitis B virus resistance to tenofovir: fact or fiction?

A synthesis of the evidence to date

Jolynne Mokaya[1], Anna L McNaughton[1], Phillip A Bester[2], Dominique Goedhals[2],

Eleanor Barnes [1,3,4], Brian D Marsden[5,6], Philippa C Matthews[1,4,7*]

[1] Nuffield Department of Medicine, Medawar Building, South Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3SY,

UK

[2] Division of Virology, National Health Laboratory Service/University of the Free State,

Bloemfontein, South Africa

[3] Department of Hepatology, Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, John

Radcliffe Hospital, Headley Way, Oxford OX3 9DU, UK

[4] National Institutes of Health Research Health Informatics Collaborative, NIHR Oxford

Biomedical Research Centre, The Joint Research Office, Second Floor, OUH Cowley,

Unipart House Business Centre, Garsington Road Oxford OX4 2PG

[5] Structural Genomics Consortium, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

[6] Kennedy Institute of Rheumatology, Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology

and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of Oxford, Roosevelt Drive, Headington,

Oxford, UK

[7] Department of Microbiology and Infectious Diseases, Oxford University Hospitals NHS

Foundation Trust, John Radcliffe Hospital, Headley Way, Oxford OX3 9DU, UK

*Corresponding author: philippa.matthews@ndm.ox.ac.uk; **Phone:** 01865 271973

SHORT RUNNING TITLE: Evidence of hepatitis B virus resistance to tenofovir

ABBREVIATIONS

- 3TC - lamivudine

- ADV – Adefovir

- ART – antiretroviral therapy

- cccDNA – covalently closed circular DNA

- CHB – chronic hepatitis B virus infection

- ETV – entecavir (ETV)

- HBsAg – Hepatitis B surface antigen

- HBV – Hepatitis b virus

- HIV – human immunodeficiency virus

- LdT – telbivudine

- NA – Nucleos(t)ide analogue

- RAM – Resistance Associated Mutation

- RT – reverse transcriptase

- TAF – tenofovir alafenamide

- TDF – tenofovir disoproxil fumarate

- TFV – tenofovir (the active component of both TAF and TDF)

- YMDD – tyrosine methionine aspartate aspartate motif in HBV RT

ABSTRACT

Background: Tenofovir (TFV) is a widely used antiviral treatment for chronic hepatitis B virus

(HBV) infection. There is a high genetic barrier to the selection of TFV resistance-associated

mutations (RAMs), but the distribution and clinical significance of TFV RAMs are not well

understood, and the topic remains contentious. We here present assimilated evidence for

putative TFV RAMs with the aims of cataloguing and characterising mutations that have been

reported, and starting to develop insights into the mechanisms of resistance and potential

clinical significance.

Methods: We carried out a systematic literature search in PubMed to identify clinical, *in vitro*

and *in silico* evidence of TFV resistance. The structure of HBV reverse transcriptase (RT) has

not been solved; we therefore compared HBV RT to the crystal structure for HIV RT to map

the likely sites of RAMs.

Results: We identified a 'long-list' of 37 putative TFV RAMs in HBV RT, occurring within and

outside sites of enzyme activity, some of which can be mapped onto a homologous HIV RT

structure. Based on quality and quantity of supporting data, we generated a 'short-list' of nine

sites that are supported by the most robust evidence. Most resistance arises as a result of

suites of multiple RAMs. Other factors including adherence, viral load, HBeAg status, HIV

coinfection and NA dosage may also influence viraemic suppression.

Conclusion: There is emerging evidence for polymorphisms that may reduce susceptibility to

TVF. A better understanding of HBV drug resistance is imperative to optimise approaches to

public health elimination targets.

INTRODUCTION

Nucleot(s)ide analogues (NA) are the most widely used antiviral treatments for chronic HBV (CHB) infection (1), with tenofovir (TFV) being safe, cheap, and widely available agent. NA agents inhibit the action of HBV reverse transcriptase (RT), acting as DNA chain terminators. NA therapy can be effective in suppressing HBV viraemia, thus reducing the risks of inflammation, fibrosis and hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) as well as lowering the risk of transmission (1). However, NAs are not curative due to the persistent intracellular hepatic reservoir of HBV covalently closed circular DNA (cccDNA). Long-term administration is therefore typically required (2), with a potential risk of selection of resistance associated mutations (RAMs) in the virus (3,4). RAMs are mostly likely to arise in the context of high viral replication, arising as a result of the error prone RT enzyme (1).

Lamivudine (3TC), telbivudine (LdT) and adefovir (ADV) have been phased out of use in HBV management, mainly due to the predictable selection of RAMs over time (1). The best recognised 3TC RAM arises at RT-M204, representing the second position of the tyrosine-methionine-aspartate-aspartate ('YMDD') motif in viral RT (1,4). Resistance to TFV, formulated either as tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF) or tenofovir alafenamide (TAF) (**Suppl Fig 1)**, remains controversial. Unlike other NAs, TFV has a high genetic barrier to resistance (1), corroborated by studies that report no resistance after many years of treatment (5). An on-line tool, 'geno2pheno hbv', lists only one position (RT N236T) in association with reduced TFV susceptibility, while other reports also include A181T/V (6). However, there are emerging reports of a wider range of amino acid substitutions that are associated with reduced TFV sensitivity, described in both treatment-experienced and treatment-naïve individuals with CHB (7,8).

There is some degree of homology between the sequence, structure and function of HIV and HBV RT enzymes, explaining why certain NAs are active against both viruses (9). Although no crystal structure has been resolved for HBV RT, some studies have modelled this enzyme

based on the HIV crystal structure (9–11), suggesting that insights into HBV drug resistance

mechanisms might be inferred from what is known about HIV.

A better understanding of the role of NA therapy in driving HBV elimination at a population

level is crucial to underpin efforts to move towards international targets for elimination by the

year 2030 (3,12). For populations in which HIV and HBV are both endemic, as exemplified by

many settings in sub-Saharan Africa, there are particular concerns about drug resistance in

HBV, given the widespread population exposure to TDF as a component of first-line

antiretroviral therapy (ART) for HIV (3). In order to progress towards these targets, many more

people will need to be treated in the decade ahead.

We have therefore undertaken a systematic approach to assimilate the current evidence for

the development of clinical or virological HBV breakthrough during TFV therapy. The evidence

on this topic is not currently sufficiently advanced to underpin definitive conclusions regarding

specific genetic signatures that underpin TVF resistance, or the extent to which these are

significant in clinical practice. However, we add to the field by providing a comprehensive

summary of relevant publications, together with a quality appraisal of the evidence. We used

this process to assimilata a 'long-list' (all putative TFV RAMs) and a 'short-list' (a refined

catalogue containing only the polymorphisms most robustly supported by existing data). We

highlight gaps in the existing data and the urgent need for more research.

METHODS

Search strategy and quality appraisal

We undertook a systematic search of PubMed and Scopus in February 2019, using PRISMA

criteria (**Suppl Fig 2**). We used the search terms ("*Hepatitis B virus" [Mesh] OR "hepatitis b"*

OR HBV) AND (*Tenofovir OR TDF* OR *TAF* OR *"Tenofovir alafenamide"* OR "*Tenofovir*

Disoproxil Fumarate") *AND* (*resista* OR drug muta* OR DRMs OR RAMs OR viremia OR*

replica*). We reviewed the titles and abstracts matching the search terms and included those

reporting virological HBV breakthrough after exposure to TFV, only including studies that

presented original data and had undergone peer review. We used the Joanna Briggs Institute

Critical Appraisal tool checklist to assess for quality of case reports (13). For assessment of

quantitative studies, we used the BMJ adapted Quality Assessment Tool for Quantitative

Studies (14).

Appraisal of putative sites of drug resistance

Recognising that there is sparse and varied evidence to support TDF RAMs, we divided our

data into two categories. First, we generated a 'long list' of all polymorphisms that have been

reported in association with TFV resistance, to summarise all the available data in the most

inclusive way. We then refined this into a 'short list' including just those sites supported by the

most robust evidence, based on reporting in ≥2 studies, and a combination of *in vivo* and *in*

vitro evidence.

Sequence analysis

To assess similarity between HIV and HBV RT, we downloaded HIV and HBV reference

sequences from a publicly available repositories: HIV sequence database (15) and Hepatitis

B Virus Database (16). We aligned amino acid RT sequences using MAFFT version 7 (17).

The alignment illustrates regions of similarity and differences between HIV and HBV RT. We

obtained RAMs associated with HIV resistance to TFV from Stanford University HIV drug

resistance database (18).

Structural analysis

The crystal structure for HBV RT has not been solved, However, the enzyme is homologous

to HIV RT. In order to further assess the relevance of sites included in a 'long list' of all

polymorphisms, we therefore considered evidence for a mechanistic influence by mapping

HBV RAMs onto a previously solved crystal structure of HIV RT (PDB code 3dlk) (19) using

ICM [http://www.molsoft.com/icm_pro.html].

RESULTS

Nature and quality of the evidence identified

We identified 15 studies that met our search criteria. Although some studies used hybrid methods, we classified them broadly as seven studies arising from clinical case reports (7,8,20–24), (one of these also presented in vitro evidence for drug resistance (8)), four from *in vitro* studies (25–27) and four from longitudinal studies of CHB (with or without HIV coinfection) (28–31). Studies were from Asia (7,8,20,22,27), Australia (31), Europe (21,24,26,28–30) and USA (23,25,32). Despite the high prevalence of HBV infection in Africa, and the widespread use of TFV for HIV across this continent, it is striking that no African data have been published to date. Eight studies reported HBV genotypes, representing genotypes A-G (8,20,23–25,28–30,32). Metadata for individual studies are provided in **Suppl Table 1**.

A detailed quality assessment of each individual reference is included in **Suppl Table 2.** Among the case reports, three were of high quality as they clearly described patients' characteristics, clinical details, diagnosis, treatment and follow-up, and concluded with take away lessons (20–22). Three further case reports did not describe diagnostic or assessment methods (7,23,24), and one study did not describe post-intervention follow-up (8). The overall quality rating for four cohort studies was strong because participants selected represented the target population, characteristics of participants were clearly described, there was a clear hypothesis for the study, and inclusion/exclusion criteria were specified (28–31). Two studies had a weak rating because there was no description of the characteristics of participants and it was not clear to what extent participants were representative of the target population (25,32). Two natural experimental studies were not rated because the quality assessment questions were not applicable (26,27).

Approach to defining resistance

Resistance was studied based on exposure to TDF in 13 studies and TAF in two studies; we

therefore refer to TFV throughout the results section. TFV resistance was determined using a

range of strategies, which can be summarised as follows:

i.   A sequencing approach to identifying possible RAMs in HBV sequence isolated from

individuals in whom viraemia was not suppressed by TFV therapy, undertaken in

seven studies (7,20,22–24,28,31);

ii.   *In vitro* assays to measure the effect of TFV on viral replication in cell lines, reported

by three studies (25,26,32);

iii. Approaches (i) and (ii) in combination, applied in four studies (8,21,29,30);

iv.   Approach (ii) combined with an animal model, described by one study (27).

In 12/15 studies, HBV mutations were reported in association with TFV resistance or reduced

TFV susceptibility (8,20,21,24–30,32). In the remaining three studies, persistent viraemia was

reported among individuals with chronic HBV infection while on TFV but either no RAMs were

identified (23,31) or viral sequencing was not performed due to low viral load (22).

Location and number of RAMs associated with TFV resistance

We generated a 'long-list' of 37 different sites of polymorphism, arising both within (n=15) and

outside (n=22) enzymatically active sites in RT (Fig 1; **Suppl Table 3**). HBV mutations outside

active sites of the enzyme occurred in combination with RAMs located within active sites, with

the exception of A194T. Only two studies reported TFV resistance arising from the selection

of a single mutation, S78T and A194T (21,26). S78T was defined by sequencing HBV from

two individuals in whom viraemia was not suppressed by TDF, combined with *in vitro* assays

(21), while A194T was only defined *in vitro* (26). In all other studies, ≥2 RAMs were required

to confer TFV resistance (2 RAMs in four studies (25,27,28,32), 3 RAMs in one study (30), 5

RAMs in one study (8), and ≥8 RAMs in a further four studies (7,20,24,29)). This pattern

supports the high genetic barrier to selection of TFV resistance.

We narrowed the list of 37 sites down to compile a 'short-list' of TFV RAMs that have been

identified in ≥2 studies, regarding these sites as having the strongest evidence base (9 sites;

Table 1). The most frequently described RAMs were L180M (20,29,30), A181T/V

(25,28,29,32), M204I/V (8,20,29,30), and N236T (25,28,32), which were all identified through

sequencing and tested in *in vitro* assay to measure the effect of TDF on viral replication in cell

lines. Among these, the M204 mutation (within the 'YMDD' motif) is well established in

association with 3TC resistance, commonly arising in combination with substitutions at

positions V173, L180 and A181, while N236 substitutions appear to be more specifically

associated with reduced susceptibility to ADV and TFV (6). Mutations at sites 177, 194 and

249 may also be more specific to TFV resistance, having been less clearly reported in

association with resistance to other agents (3,33). Polymorphisms at positions 80, 173 and

184 have been described as compensatory changes to allow the virus to accommodate the

primary drug escape substitution (6). These mutations on their own may not be sufficient to

mediate TVF resistance but may be a necessary compensatory contribution to combinations

of mutations that underpin resistance.

Some reported polymorphisms associated with drug resistance represent wild type sequence

in some genotypes (Y9H, F122L, H126Y, R153W/Q, F221Y, S223A, C256S, D263E, V278IV

and A317S), and our assimilation shows more resistance in genotype D (**Suppl Table 4**). Most

of these polymorphisms are located outside the active site of the enzyme, with the exception

of position 256. The barrier to selection of TFV resistance may therefore be lower in certain

genotypes, (Fig 1, **Suppl Table 4**). The same phenomenon has been described for HCV

resistance, in which certain sub genotypes are predicted to be intrinsically resistant to certain

direct acting antiviral agents due to the presence of resistance associated polymorphisms in

the wild type sequence (34,35).

One study assessed the replication competence and susceptibility to TFV of mutated HBV

clones *in vitro* and *in vivo* using mice models. The introduction of P177G and F249A mutations

(substitutions in active sites of the RT enzyme) in HBV clones, resulted in a reduction in their
susceptibility to TFV (27).

RAMs occurring as minor quasispecies
There is limited evidence for the significance of TFV RAMs occurring as minor quasispecies.
One study that performed ultra-deep pyrosequencing enrolled HIV/HBV co-infected
individuals on (or about to start) TFV-containing ART, reporting minor variants present at
<20% with mutations (V173, L180M, A181T/V and M204V) in 2/50 TFV naïve samples and
1/14 sample obtained from a TDF-experienced individual (31). One other study performed
deep sequencing using Illumina on HBV clones (8), revealing that RAMs S106C, H126Y,
D134E, M204I/V & L269I were predominant. Only one study reported sequencing the whole
HBV genome, but this was undertaken following i*n vitro* introduction of RAMs into a clinically
isolated virus (32), so does not provide any evidence of the association between TFV RAMs
and other polymorphisms that might arise on the same viral haplotype.

Duration of therapy and treatment compliance prior to detection of tenofovir resistance
Five studies reported the duration in which individuals were on TFV prior to treatment failure,
with virological breakthrough occurring between 48 weeks and 48 months of therapy (48
weeks (20), 18 months (22), 20 months (29), 26 months (8), and 48 months (7,21)).
Compliance was assessed in six studies, among which virological breakthrough despite good
treatment compliance was reported in five (8,20,22,29,30), and one reported concerns with
compliance (24). Quantification of drug levels in plasma supported good compliance in two
studies (8,29).

Comparison between HIV and HBV RT
HBV RT has been classified into subdomains which are further divided into regions A – G (36),
which form the main catalytic core of the enzyme (Fig 1). Alignment of sequences of HBV and
HIV RT demonstrates 25-27% homology between HBV and the HXB2 HIV reference

sequence (Fig 2). Comparing sites that have been reported in association with drug resistance

in HBV vs HIV (Fig 3, **Suppl Table 5**), we found that among our long-list of 37 HBV RAMs,

two sites had identical substitutions in HIV RT (M204 and L229 in HBV (9,11), corresponding

to M184 and L210 in HIV, respectively [https://hivdb.stanford.edu/dr-summary/resistance-

notes/NRTI/], Fig 3). Other sites reporting an association with TVF resistance in HBV have

substitutions that overlap with HIV RAMs, but not all of these are associated with TFV

resistance, **Suppl Table 5**.

Six established TFV RAMs in HIV RT (M41L, K65R, K70E, Y115F, Q151M and T215F/Y) (18)

do not correspond to an equivalent mutation in HBV RT, although three of these HIV RAMs

have an HBV RAM within 3 amino acids up- or down-stream in the equivalent sequence,

suggesting there may be homology in the mechanism through which drug resistance is

mediated.

We mapped HBV RAMs onto the crystal structure of the likely structurally-related HIV RT (pdb

code 3dlk) in order to visualise their approximate 3D locations and infer possible functional

consequences (Fig 4) (**Suppl Table 6**). The RAMs are primarily located within the 'fingers',

'palm', 'thumb' and 'connection' subdomains of the p66 polymerase domain of HIV RT, with

the majority within the 'palm'. A number of RAMs (e.g. V207, M204, F249) are spatially

adjacent to the catalytically critical (and highly conserved) residues D110, D185 and D186 in

HIV RT (D83, D204 and D205 in HBV), suggesting that these RAMs are highly likely to

affected catalytic competency. Twenty-two HBV RAMs map to HIV RT residue positions

which, if mutated, are likely to cause polymerase structure destabilisation, suggesting that

many of these RAMs are likely to impact upon resistance.

DISCUSSION

Summary of key findings

TFV is a safe and effective treatment choice for CHB in the majority of cases, and large case

series have not raised significant concerns about clinically significant drug resistance.

However, it is important to consider the potential for the emergence of resistance,

demonstrated by persistent viraemia on therapy and/or reduced virologic suppression *in vitro*.

Based on existing evidence, TFV resistance seems likely to depend on the selection of suites

of mutations (most commonly including L180M, A181V/T, M204I/V and/or N236T),

overlapping with RAMs that allow escape from other NA drugs. There is also a suggestion

that, rarely, single mutations can confer TFV resistance, best demonstrated for S78T.

Notably, the literature to date is limited and heterogenous, and there remains a lack of

evidence about the frequency and likely impact of proposed TFV RAMs either within individual

patients or at population level. At present, we have tackled this uncertainty by dividing our

catalogue of polymorphisms into a 'long-list' (all reported RAMs) and a 'short-list' (RAMs with

the best evidence-base of support).

Tools that have been designed to identify drug resistance may bias against detection of

relevant mutations if they do not scrutinise all relevant sites that contribute to reducing TFV

susceptibility. For example, 'TRUGENE' captures common HBV RAMs but does not include

positions 78, 177, or 249 which may be pertinent to TFV resistance (37) and 'geno2pheno

hbv' only lists one TFV mutation at position 236.

Overlap of TFV RAMs with RAMs to other NA agents

RAMs L180M, M204I/V and A181T/V have been associated with resistance to 3TC, LdT and

ETV (3,38–41); their reported association with TFV resistance is of concern in suggesting that

prior NA exposure can increase the likelihood of cross-resistance to TFV. A study of HIV/HBV

co-infected individuals demonstrated a decreased likelihood of HBV DNA suppression with

TDF among individuals exposed to prolonged 3TC treatment, possibly due to accumulation of

such mutations (42). A large study in China reported A181 and/or N236 substitutions in 11%

of the population (40), which may underpin reduced susceptibility to TFV. The structural

similarities between ADV and TFV, and similar interaction with HBV polymerase (1,2) explain

why the ADV RAMs A181T/V and N236T are also reported to confer resistance to TFV (1,43).

Although TFV has been considered effective in the context of resistance to other NAs (44),

the current evidence suggests that there may be common pathways to resistance (45). There

is some evidence showing co-location of RAMs conferring resistance to different antiviral

agents on the same viral haplotype (46). These findings suggesting cross-resistance are of

concern, especially for settings in which there has been widespread use of NA therapy as a

component of ART for HIV (3).

Sites of TFV RAMs in HBV RT

Resistance to TFV can be explained by RAMs both within and outside the active site of the

RT enzyme, some of which may have similar mechanisms to those described in HIV (9,36).

The mechanism of resistance in most of these polymorphisms remains unknown, but may

interfere with drug access to sites of activity through steric hindrance. Mutations within active

sites of the enzyme may be associated with a higher fitness cost to the virus than mutations

at other locations in the RT sequence, as they are more likely to interfere with the RT function.

Some polymorphisms listed as RAMs may in fact represent compensatory mutations, that are

co-selected in the presence of primary RAMs. For example, substitution at position 269 has

been previously described as a compensatory mutation that restores impairments to RT

function (47).

Currently, HBV genotyping is not routinely undertaken in clinical practice, so it is difficult to

amass data for any potential relationship between resistance and viral genotype. However,

there are some clues that genotype may be relevant. For example, C256S has been linked to

TFV resistance, but S256 is wild type in genotype C, **(Suppl Table 4)**, suggesting that the

genetic barrier to TFV resistance in genotype C might be lower than in other genotypes.

However, a study of >1000 individuals in China found no differences in drug resistance rates

between Geno-B vs Geno-C infection (40). The identification of Y9H as a TFV RAM should

be viewed with caution as H9 is frequently the wildtype residue, irrespective of genotype.

Other factors associated with persistent vireamia

In addition to RAMs, there are other explanations for incomplete suppression of HBV viraemia

on therapy (23,31), including a higher baseline HBV DNA level, positive baseline HBeAg

status, history of 3TC exposure, a lower nadir CD4+ T cell count in the context of HIV

coinfection, and high serum HBV RNA levels (42,48,49). Given that HBV DNA is inhibited in

a dose-dependent manner (2), it is also possible that insufficient drug delivery to the infected

hepatocyte could be the cause of persistent viraemia even in the absence of specific RAMs.

Incomplete adherence to therapy can also contribute to virological breakthrough (50). Two

studies included in our review assessed treatment compliance by measuring drug

concentration in plasma (8,29). Assessment of adherence in chronic HBV has been through

the use of questionnaires (51), but these are subject to self-reporting bias. Evidence of

potential TFV resistance may emerge when individuals with HIV/HBV coinfection are treated

with a TFV-containing regimen leading to suppression of HIV but with sustained HBV vireamia

(52).

It has been reported to take three years for 90% of HBV infected individuals to reach viraemic

suppression on therapy (53), in contrast to HIV, in which 88% of patients suppress the virus

within the first year of TDF-based treatment (54). In the studies we have reported in this

review, persistent HBV viraemia on therapy could be due to the prolonged timeline for viraemic

suppression; however, in most studies there was a reduction in viral load when TDF was

initiated, with subsequent virological breakthrough that is more in keeping with the selection

of resistance.

Implications for patient management

There are not currently sufficient data about TFV RAMs to underpin robust universal guidelines for clinical practice. However, the evidence that we have gathered here can underpin some practical recommendations:

  i.   There is an urgent need for more HBV sequencing data, together with contemporaneous viral load measurements and clinical metadata to advance understanding of the relationship between viral sequence and treatment outcomes. Sequence repositories, databases and tools for sequence analysis should regularly review the evidence for TDF RAMs in order to highlight all sites that may be significant in mediating resistance.

  ii.   In the context of failure of viraemic suppression in a patient prescribed therapy, assessing and supporting drug compliance is crucial, ideally together with viral sequencing.

  iii. Therapeutic failure of TFV – whether in the presence or absence of known RAMs – should lead to an expert clinical decision about switching therapy or combining agents. The presence of recognised RAMs, especially when in combination, may support a change of therapy, considering ETV or combination therapy, although guidance and options are currently limited.

  iv.   If there is an ongoing emergence of data to suggest TFV resistance, there will be a need for expert guidelines to include practical recommendations in order to unify clinical approaches. HIV guidelines should take an active stance on incorporating recommendations for those with HBV co-infection, particularly if dual therapy regimens are adopted.

  v.   Evidence of TFV resistance highlights the need for development of robust novel direct acting antivirals and immune therapies for HBV.

Caveats and limitations

There is sparse literature on HBV resistance to TFV, and studies are of varying quality. While

there is a high genetic barrier to selection of TFV resistance, it is likely that there is under-

reporting of cases of resistance, particularly in low/middle income settings in which routine

monitoring of HBV VL on treatment is not undertaken. It can be difficult to infer the impact of

common polymorphisms on drug resistance phenotype; for example, it is plausible that

M204I/V may be enriched among TFV resistant strains simply as a 'footprint' of prior exposure

to 3TC.

Most studies to date have used Sanger sequencing, and it is possible that significant minority

variants may be under-represented, as suggested by one report in which phenotypic TFV

resistance was associated with RAMs in <20% of minor variants (31). Low HBV DNA viral

loads are a further barrier to sequencing, and bias existing data towards samples from

individuals with high viral loads, in which the full spectrum of relevant RAMs may not occur. It

is therefore important to invest in deep sequencing platforms that offer the opportunity to

explore the full landscape of HBV variants isolated from an infected individual, and to improve

sensitivity of sequencing methods including both Sanger and 'next-generation' approaches.

Some sequencing methods, such as Oxford Nanopore Technologies, can generate long reads

that allow reconstruction of complete viral haplotypes, providing improved certainty about

linkages between sites (55). To be able to undertake an appropriate haplotypes analysis would

require datasets with robustly phenotyped patients (displaying clinical evidence of drug

resistance) together with full length viral sequence data; such datasets have not been

generated to date but are an important long-term aim.

We recognise the limitations of drawing direct comparisons between HIV and HBV RT, given

the limited (<30%) sequence homology between the two enzymes, and the finding that only

2/37 sites associated with TVF resistance in HBV are homologous RAMs in HIV. This

highlights a need for future work to solve the crystal structure of HBV RT.

Conclusions

We have assimilated emerging evidence for HBV polymorphisms that reduce susceptibility to

TFV, also acknowledging the potential influences of other viral and host factors in cases of

persistent viraemia on therapy. While the genetic barrier to resistance is high, evidenced by

the large number of mutations that typically have to be selected to produce resistance, of

concern is the overlap with other NA resistance mutations, and the instances in which

individual amino acid polymorphisms may be sufficient to produce phenotypic resistance.

Enhanced studies representing larger numbers of patients, tracking longitudinal viral

sequence changes, and monitoring viral suppression over time are needed. In addition, the

evolution of better *in vitro* models will support experiments to investigate the effect of individual

and combined RAMs. In order to optimise the use of NA therapy as a tool in driving

advancements towards elimination at a population level, improved insights into drug

resistance are essential. If resistance emerges as a substantial clinical problem, there will be

a need for consideration of synergistic drug regimens, new agents that inhibit a target other

than viral RT, and for the development of new therapeutic strategies that can bring about cure.

FINANCIAL SUPPORT STATEMENT: This work was supported by the Leverhulme Mandela

Rhodes Scholarship to JM, Wellcome Trust (grant number 110110/Z/15/Z to PCM), the

Medical Research Council UK to EB, the Oxford NIHR Biomedical Research Centre to EB.

EB is an NIHR Senior Investigator. The views expressed in this article are those of the author

and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the Department of Health.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTIONS: JM and PCM conceived the study. JM performed literature

review. JM, PAB, BDM, PCM analysed the data. JM and PCM wrote the manuscript. All

authors revised and approved the final manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST STATEMENT: We have no conflicts of interest to declare.

TRANSPARENCY DECLARATION: Nothing to declare.

REFERENCES

1. Beloukas A, Geretti AM. Hepatitis B Virus Drug Resistance. In: Antimicrobial Drug Resistance. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2017. p. 1227–42.

2. Delaney WE, Ray AS, Yang H, et al. Intracellular metabolism and in vitro activity of tenofovir against hepatitis B virus. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2006;50(7):2471–7.

3. Mokaya J, McNaughton AL, Hadley MJ, et al. A systematic review of hepatitis B virus (HBV) drug and vaccine escape mutations in Africa: A call for urgent action. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2018;12(8):e0006629.

4. Warner N, Locarnini S. Mechanisms of hepatitis B virus resistance development. Intervirology. 2014;57(3–4):218–24.

5. Lee Y Bin, Lee J-H. Is tenofovir monotherapy a sufficient defense line against multi-drug resistant hepatitis B virus? Clin Mol Hepatol. 2017 Sep; 23(3): 219–221.

6. Zoulim F, Locarnini S. Hepatitis B Virus Resistance to Nucleos(t)ide Analogues. Gastroenterology. 2009;137(5):1593-1608.e2.

7. Cho WH, Lee HJ, Bang KB, et al. Development of tenofovir disoproxil fumarate resistance after complete viral suppression in a patient with treatment-naive chronic hepatitis B: A case report and review of the literature. World J Gastroenterol. 2018 May;24(17):1919–24.

8. Park E-S, Lee AR, Kim DH, et al. Identification of a quadruple mutation that confers tenofovir resistance in chronic hepatitis B patients. J Hepatol. 2019;70(6):1093-1102.

9. Das K, Xiong X, Yang H, et al. Molecular Modeling and Biochemical Characterization Reveal the Mechanism of Hepatitis B Virus Polymerase Resistance to Lamivudine (3TC) and Emtricitabine (FTC). J Virol. 2001;75(10):4771–9.

10. Ghany M, Liang TJ. Drug Targets and Molecular Mechanisms of Drug Resistance in Chronic Hepatitis B. Gastroenterology. 2007;132(4):1574-85.

11. Daga PR, Duan J, Doerksen RJ. Computational model of hepatitis B virus DNA

polymerase: molecular dynamics and docking to understand resistant mutations.

Protein Sci. 2010;19(4):796–807.

12. O'Hara GA, McNaughton AL, Maponga T, et al. Hepatitis B virus infection as a

neglected tropical disease. PLoS Negl Trop Dis. 2017 Oct 5;11(10):e0005842.

13. Critical Appraisal Tools - JBI: http://joannabriggs.org/research/critical-appraisal-

tools.html

14. Non-randomised EIG, Longitudinal OC. Appendix B The adapted Quality

Assessment Tool for Quantitative Studies (QATQS) Section A -Selection Bias (

paper level) Section B – Study Design (paper level) Section C – confounding

Section D – Blinding This section is incorporated in section B stu. :4–6.

15. HIV Databases. https://www.hiv.lanl.gov/content/index

16. Hayer J, Jadeau F, Deléage G, Kay A, Zoulim F, Combet C. HBVdb: A knowledge

database for Hepatitis B Virus. Nucleic Acids Res. 2013 Jan 1;41(D1).

17. Katoh K, Rozewicki J, Yamada KD. MAFFT online service: multiple sequence

alignment, interactive sequence choice and visualization. Brief Bioinform. 2017

18. Soo-Yon Rhee, Matthew J. Gonzales, Rami Kantor, Bradley J. Betts, Jaideep

Ravela, and Robert W. Shafer (2003) Human immunodeficiency virus reverse

transcriptase and protease sequence database. Nucleic Acids Res. 2003. 31(1), 298-

303.

19. Sarafianos SG, Marchand B, Das K, et al. Structure and Function of HIV-1 Reverse

Transcriptase: Molecular Mechanisms of Polymerization and Inhibition. J Mol Biol.

2009;385(3):693–713.

20. Lee HW, Chang HY, Yang SY, et al. Viral evolutionary changes during tenofovir

treatment in a chronic hepatitis B patient with sequential nucleos(t)ide therapy. J Clin

Virol. 2014;60(3):313–6.

21. Shirvani-Dastgerdi E, Winer BY, Celià-Terrassa T, et al. Selection of the highly

replicative and partially multidrug resistant rtS78T HBV polymerase mutation during

TDF-ETV combination therapy. J Hepatol. 2017;67(2):246–54.

22. Lu J-C, Liu L-G, Lin L, et al. Incident hepatocellular carcinoma developing during

tenofovir alafenamide treatment as a rescue therapy for multi-drug resistant hepatitis

B virus infection: A case report and review of the literature. World J Clin cases.

2018;6(13):671–4.

23. Schirmer P, Winters M, Holodniy M. HIV-HBV vaccine escape mutant infection with

loss of HBV surface antibody and persistent HBV viremia on tenofovir/emtricitabine

without antiviral resistance. J Clin Virol. 2011;52(3):261–4.

24. Mikulska M, Taramasso L, Giacobbe DR, et al. Case report: management and HBV

sequencing in a patient co-infected with HBV and HIV failing tenofovir. J Med Virol.

2012;84(9):1340–3.

25. Liu Y, Miller MD, Kitrinos KM. HBV clinical isolates expressing adefovir resistance

mutations show similar tenofovir susceptibilities across genotypes B, C and D. Liver

Int. 2014;34(7):1025–32.

26. Amini-Bavil-Olyaee S, Herbers U, Sheldon J, et al. The rtA194T polymerase mutation

impacts viral replication and susceptibility to tenofovir in hepatitis B e antigen-positive

and hepatitis B e antigen-negative hepatitis B virus strains. Hepatology.

2009;49(4):1158–65.

27. Qin B, Budeus B, Cao L, et al. The amino acid substitutions rtP177G and rtF249A in

the reverse transcriptase domain of hepatitis B virus polymerase reduce the

susceptibility to tenofovir. Antiviral Res. 2013;97(2):93–100.

28. van Bommel F, Trojan J, Deterding K, et al. Evolution of adefovir-resistant HBV

polymerase gene variants after switching to tenofovir disoproxil fumarate

monotherapy. Antivir Ther. 2012;17(6):1049–58.

29. Lada O, Gervais A, Branger M, et al. Quasispecies analysis and in vitro susceptibility

of HBV strains isolated from HIV-HBV-coinfected patients with delayed response to

tenofovir. Antivir Ther. 2012;17(1):61–70.

30. Sheldon J, Camino N, Rodés B, et al. Antiviral Therapy 10:727-734 Selection of

hepatitis B virus polymerase mutations in HIV-coinfected patients treated with

tenofovir. Antiviral Therapy. 2005;10:727–734.

31. Audsley J, Bent SJ, Littlejohn M, et al. Effects of long-term tenofovir-based

combination antiretroviral therapy in HIV-hepatitis B virus coinfection on persistent

hepatitis B virus viremia and the role of hepatitis B virus quasispecies diversity.

AIDS. 2016;30(10):1597–606.

32. Liu Y, Miller MD, Kitrinos KM. Tenofovir alafenamide demonstrates broad cross-

genotype activity against wild-type HBV clinical isolates and maintains susceptibility

to drug-resistant HBV isolates in vitro. Antiviral Res. 2017 Mar;139:25–31.

33. Kim HJ, Cho YK, Jeon WK, et al. Clinical characteristics of patients with chronic

hepatitis B who developed genotypic resistance to entecavir: Real-life experience.

Clin Mol Hepatol. 2017;23(4):323–30.

34. Fourati S, Rodriguez C, Hézode C, et al. Frequent Antiviral Treatment Failures in

Patients Infected With Hepatitis C Virus Genotype 4, Subtype 4r. Hepatology

[Internet]. 2019;69(2):513–23.

35. Davis C, Mgomella GS, da Silva Filipe A, et al. Highly Diverse Hepatitis C Strains

Detected in Sub-Saharan Africa Have Unknown Susceptibility to Direct-Acting

Antiviral Treatments. Hepatology. 2019;69(4):1426–41.

36. Clark DN, Hu J. Hepatitis B Virus Reverse Transcriptase – Target of Current Antiviral

Therapy and Future Drug Development. Antiviral Res. 2015;123:132-7.

37. Neumann-Fraune M, Beggel B, Kaiser R, et al. Hepatitis B Virus Drug Resistance

Tools: One Sequence, Two Predictions. Intervirology. 2014;57(3–4):232–6.

38. Yatsuji H, Noguchi C, Hiraga N, et al. Emergence of a novel lamivudine-resistant

hepatitis B virus variant with a substitution outside the YMDD motif. Antimicrob

Agents Chemother. 2006;50(11):3867–74.

39. Shaw T, Bartholomeusz A, Locarnini S. HBV drug resistance: Mechanisms, detection

and interpretation. AIDS.2016; 30(10)1597-1606.

40. Meng T, Shi X, Gong X, et al. Analysis of the prevalence of drug-resistant hepatitis B

virus in patients with antiviral therapy failure in a Chinese tertiary referral liver centre

(2010–2014). J Glob Antimicrob Resist. 2017;8:74–81.

41. Hermans LE, Svicher V, Pas SD, et al. Combined analysis of the prevalence of drug-

resistant Hepatitis B virus in antiviral therapy-experienced patients in Europe

(CAPRE). J Infect Dis. 2016;213(1):39–48.

42. Kim HN, Rodriguez C V, Van Rompaey S, Eron JJ, Thio CL, Crane HM, et al.

Factors associated with delayed hepatitis B viral suppression on tenofovir among

patients coinfected with HBV-HIV in the CNICS cohort. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr.

2014;66(1):96–101.

43. Nidhi G, Milky G, H. WC, et al. The Molecular and Structural Basis of HBV-resistance

to Nucleos(t)ide Analogs. J Clin Transl Hepatol. 2014;2(3):202–11.

44. Lim Y-S. Management of Antiviral Resistance in Chronic Hepatitis B. Gut Liver.

2017;11(2):189–95.

45. Hemert FJ van, Berkhout B, Zaaijer HL. Differential Binding of Tenofovir and Adefovir

to Reverse Transcriptase of Hepatitis B Virus. PLoS One. 2014;9(9).

46. Yim HJ, Hussain M, Liu Y, et al. Evolution of multi-drug resistant hepatitis B virus

during sequential therapy. Hepatology. 2006;44(3):703–12.

47. Ahn SH, Kim DH, Lee AR, et al. Substitution at rt269 in Hepatitis B Virus Polymerase

Is a Compensatory Mutation Associated with Multi-Drug Resistance. PLoS One.

2015;10(8):e0136728.

48. Hu J, Liu K. Complete and Incomplete Hepatitis B Virus Particles: Formation,

Function, and Application. Viruses. 2017;9(3).

49. Matthews G V, Seaberg EC, Avihingsanon A, Bowden S, Dore GJ, Lewin SR, et al.

Patterns and causes of suboptimal response to tenofovir-based therapy in individuals

coinfected with HIV and hepatitis B virus. Clin Infect Dis. 2013 May;56(9):e87-94.

50. Boyd A, Gozlan J, Maylin S, et al. Persistent viremia in human immunodeficiency

virus/hepatitis B coinfected patients undergoing long-term tenofovir: Virological and

clinical implications. Hepatology. 2014;60(2):497–507.

51. Giang L, Selinger CP, Lee AU. Evaluation of adherence to oral antiviral hepatitis B

treatment using structured questionnaires. World J Hepatol. 2012;4(2):43.

52. Maponga TG, McNaughton AL, Schalkwyk M Van, et al. Treatment advantage in

HBV/HIV coinfection compared to HBV monoinfection in a South African cohort.

medRxiv. 2019;19007963.

53. Price H, Dunn D, Pillay D, et al. Suppression of HBV by tenofovir in HBV/HIV

coinfected patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PLoS One.

2013;8(7):e68152.

54. World Health Organisation. Dolutegravir (DTG) and the fixed dose combination

(FDC) of tenofovir/lamivudine/dolutegravir (TLD). 2018.

https://www.who.int/hiv/topics/treatment/dtg-tld-briefing-web/en/index5.html

55. McNaughton AL, Roberts HE, Bonsall D, et al. Illumina and Nanopore methods for

whole genome sequencing of hepatitis B virus (HBV). Sci Rep. 2019;9(1):7081.

TABLES

Table 1: Mutations most commonly reported in association with tenofovir resistance in

HBV, identified from a systematic literature review. This table reports a 'short-list' of

mutations identified in two or more different studies (7,8,20,24–26,28–30,32). The colour

indicates the method(s) used to determine drug resistance. All positions are in HBV RT, listed

in numerical order. The 'long-list' of 37 mutations identified in 15 included studies is reported

in Suppl Table 3.

Mutations	Park et al 2019	Cho et al 2018	Lee et al 2014	Mikulska et al 2012	Liu et al 2014	Amini-Bavil-Olyaee et al 2009	Van Bommel et al 2012	Lada et al 2012	Sheldon et al 2005	Liu et al 2017	Total number of studies	Associated with 3TC resistance	Associated with ETV resistance
S106C/G	(iii)	(i)									2	No	No
R153W/Q			(i)					(iii)			2	No	No
V173L				(i)				(iii)			2	Yes	Yes
L180M			(i)	(i)				(iii)	(iii)		4	Yes	Yes
A181T/V					(ii)		(i)	(iii)		(ii)	4	Yes	Yes
A194T						(ii)			(iii)		2	No	No
M204I/V	(iii)		(i)	(i)				(iii)			5	Yes	Yes
N236T					(ii)		(i)			(ii)	3	No	No
I269L	(iii)	(i)									2	No	Yes

KEY:	Method used to identify TFV resistance
(i)	Sequencing HBV sequence from individuals in whom viraemia was not suppressed by TDF
(ii)	In vitro assays to measure the effect of TDF on viral replication in cell lines
(iii)	Approaches (i) and (ii) in combination

FIGURES AND FIGURE LEGENDS

Fig 1: Mutations associated with tenofovir (TFV) resistance located within and outside

the active sites of the HBV RT enzyme. Polymerase numbering shown in the grey bars is

based on genotype A sequence (accession number X02763). Yellow bar represents RT; green

bars represent subdomains which are designated finger, palm and thumb; orange rectangles

represent active sites of the enzyme referred to as regions A-G. Mutations associated with

TFV resistance (n=37 sites) are listed according to their location within active sites of the

enzyme (orange table) or outside active sites (green table). The sites shown in bold represent

the nine mutations in our short-list with best literature support (evidence summarised in Table

1). Note that in most cases, individual mutations are unlikely to be sufficient to mediate

resistance, and a resistant phenotype arises only as a result of combinations of ≥2

polymorphisms.

Fig 2: Heatmap showing identity comparison matrix of reference sequence alignment of HBV RT and HIV RT. Chart shows a comparison based on sequences downloaded from HIV sequence database (https://www.hiv.lanl.gov/) and Hepatitis B Virus Database (https://hbvdb.ibcp.fr/HBVdb/) and aligned using MAFFT version 7. HIV reference sequence is HIV HXB2 (K03455). HBV reference sequences are Geno A – FJ692557, Geno B - GU815637, Geno C – GQ377617, Geno D - KC875277, Geno E - GQ161817.

HBV SEQUENCE POSITION	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212		213	214	215	216	217	218	219	220	221	222	223	224	225	226	227	228	229	230	231	232	233
HBV_Geno_A1	F	S	Y	M	D	D	V	V	L	G	A	K	-	S	V	Q	H	L	E	S	L	Y	T	A	V	T	N	F	L	L	S	L	G	I
HBV_Geno_B2	F	S	Y	M	D	D	V	V	L	G	A	K	-	S	V	Q	H	L	E	S	L	Y	A	A	V	T	N	F	L	L	S	L	G	I
HBV_Geno_C2	F	S	Y	M	D	D	V	V	L	G	A	K	-	S	V	Q	H	L	E	S	L	F	T	S	I	T	N	F	L	L	S	L	G	I
HBV_Geno_D1	F	S	Y	M	D	D	V	V	L	G	A	K	-	S	V	Q	H	L	E	S	L	F	T	A	V	T	N	F	L	L	S	L	G	I
HBV_Geno_E	F	S	Y	M	D	D	V	V	L	G	A	K	-	S	V	Q	H	L	E	S	L	Y	T	S	V	T	N	F	L	L	S	L	G	I
HBV TDF mutation hotspots				M204I/V			V207L											L217R				F221Y		S223A						L229V/W				
HIV SEQUENCE POSITION	181	182	183	184	185	186	187	188	189	190	191	192	193	194	195	196	197	198	199	200	201	202	203	204	205	206	207	208	209	210	211	212	213	214
HIV_Subtype_B	Y	Q	Y	M	D	D	L	Y	V	G	S	D	L	E	I	G	Q	H	R	T	K	I	E	E	L	R	Q	H	L	L	R	W	G	L
HIV TDF mutation hotspots				M184I/V																										L210W				
Sites with same AA when comparing HIV and HBV RT after alignment			*	*	*	*				*																			*	*			*	

Fig 3: A section of the reference sequence alignment of HBV RT and HIV RT. Sequences downloaded from HIV sequence database at https://www.hiv.lanl.gov/ and Hepatitis B Virus Database at https://hbvdb.ibcp.fr/HBVdb/. Sequences were aligned using MAFFT version 7. HIV subtype B reference sequence is shown in light green (accession number K03455). HBV reference sequences are shown in yellow (Geno-A: FJ692557; Geno-B: GU815637; Geno-C: GQ377617; Geno-D: KC875277; Geno-E: GQ161817). Sites of TFV resistance are highlighted in red, based on the data assimilated in this study. HIV tenofovir RAMs were obtained from the online Stanford Database https://hivdb.stanford.edu/dr-summary/resistance-notes/NRTI/. Sites marked * have the same amino acid in HIV and HBV RT after alignment, and those coloured blue also share TFV resistance mutations. This section is shown as it contains the only two homologous TFV RAMs that we have identified using this approach. Sequence alignments and RAMs throughout the whole RT protein is shown in Suppl Table 5. Note that in most cases, individual mutations are unlikely to be sufficient to mediate resistance, and a resistant phenotype arises only as a result of combinations of ≥2 polymorphisms.

Fig 4: Cartoon to show the sites of TFV drug resistance polymorphisms, using the

homologous crystal structure of HIV RT as a model. The sequence alignment of HBV was

extended with HIV RT's p66 domain and then projected onto a high-resolution HIV RT

structure (pdb code 3dlk). Sub-domains of the HIV RT are coloured and annotated. Positions

associated with resistance are scattered primarily throughout the finger and palm subdomains

of the p66 domain (purple space-filled representations, left whole-molecule view, purple stick

representation on the zoomed in view on the right). Three aspartate residues, D83, D205 and

D206 (indicated by grey space-filled representation) form the catalytic triad of the enzyme and

are shown as a point of reference. Of the 37 sites identified as potential TFV RAMs, 24

residues which are visible in the structure are labelled (using HBV numbering). This excludes

seven putative HBV mutations at sites which do not have a homologous site in the HIV

structure (sites 78, 80, 130, 134, 153, 163 and 256), and six sites which are beyond the end

of the sequence of the solved crystal HIV structure (267, 269, 278, 317, 333 and 337). Figure

produced using the ICM platform (http://www.molsoft.com/icm_browser.html). Note that in

most cases, individual mutations are unlikely to be sufficient to mediate resistance, and a

resistant phenotype arises only as a result of combinations of ≥2 polymorphisms.

 SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Supporting datafiles can be accessed on-line using the following link:

https://figshare.com/s/7dcfa78cc5ed14094d6f

On acceptance of the manuscript for publication, the following permanent DOI will be made

available: 10.6084/m9.figshare.8427746.

Suppl Fig 1: Pharmacokinetics of tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF), tenofovir

alafenamide (TAF) and adefovir dipivoxil (ADV). Orange rectangle represents the gut,

showing amount of drug absorbed in mg; yellow rectangle represents plasma, in which TDF

and ADV are converted to the active molecules, tenofovir and adefovir respectively. Green

rectangle represents hepatocytes where the active drug is incorporated into growing HBV

DNA to stop viral replication.

Suppl Fig 2: PRISMA flow diagram to illustrate the identification of studies for inclusion in a

systematic review of tenofovir resistance in HBV infection (provided in pdf format).

Suppl Table 1: Metadata for 15 studies reporting TDF resistance in HBV infection

identified from a systematic literature review.

Suppl Table 2: Quality assessment for 15 studies reporting TDF resistance in HBV

infection. Studies identified from a systematic literature review.

Suppl Table 3: List of 37 tenofovir RAMs in HBV Reverse Transcriptase (RT) reported

in 15 studies identified through a systematic literature review (provided in xls format).

Suppl Table 4: List of TFV RAMs in HBV, showing consensus residue at each position

according to HBV genotype, and genotype-specific resistance where this has been

reported. List of RAMs obtained from 12 studies included in the review. HBV reference

sequences used are the same as for Fig 1. Grey colour highlights the sites that differ from

majority consensus. Ticks represent RAMs situated in sites where there is a difference (at

consensus level) between genotype sequences. RAMs are listed with the wild-type amino acid

first, followed by the numbered position in RT sequence, and the amino acid substitution that

is associated with resistance. TFV = tenofovir, RAMs = resistance associated mutations, HBV

= hepatitis B virus.

Suppl Table 5: Reference sequence alignment of HBV RT and HIV RT. Sequences

downloaded from HIV sequence database online at https://www.hiv.lanl.gov/ and Hepatitis B

Virus Database online at https://hbvdb.ibcp.fr/HBVdb/. Alignment undertaken using MAFFT

version 7. HIV subtype B reference sequence is shown in light green (accession number

K03455). HBV reference sequences (Geno-A: FJ692557; Geno-B: GU815637; Geno-C:

GQ377617; Geno-D: KC875277; Geno-: GQ161817 shown in light yellow. TFV RAMs are

highlighted in red. HIV TFV RAMs were obtained from Stanford Database

(https://hivdb.stanford.edu/dr-summary/resistance-notes/NRTI/). HBV TFV RAMs were

obtained from 12 studies included in the review. Sites with the same amino acid at

homologous sites are indicated with asterisks (*); among these sites, those that are also

shared TVF RAMs are shaded in light blue.

Suppl Table 6: Mapping of RAMs to the HIV RT structure. RAMs were mapped onto the

high-resolution structure of HIV RT to infer their possible functional consequences in terms

of structure.