

Optimizing the antiretroviral treatment focusing on long-term effectiveness and a person-centred approach. Consensus Guidance Using a Delphi Process.

Franco Maggiolo¹, Sergio Lo Caputo², Stefano Bonora³, Marco Borderi⁴, Antonella Cingolani⁵, Gabriella D’Ettorre⁶, Antonio Di Biagio⁷, Simona Di Giambenedetto⁵, Cristina Gervasoni⁸, Giovanni Guaraldi⁹, Paolo Maggi¹⁰, Lucia Taramasso¹¹.

¹ ASST Papa Giovanni XXIII, Bergamo, Italy

² Università di Foggia - A.O.U. Ospedali Riuniti Foggia, Italy

³ Ospedale Amedeo di Savoia, Università degli Studi di Torino, Italy

⁴ Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria Policlinico Sant'Orsola Malpighi, Bologna, Italy

⁵ Fondazione Policlinico Universitario Agostino Gemelli IRCCS, Roma, Italy

⁶ Azienda Policlinico Umberto I, Roma, Italy

⁷ Ospedale Policlinico San Martino, Università degli Studi di Genova, Italy

⁸ ASST Fatebenefratelli Sacco, Ospedale Luigi Sacco, Milano, Italy

⁹ Università degli Studi di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Italy

¹⁰ Università degli Studi della Campania “Luigi Vanvitelli”, Napoli, Italy

¹¹ Infectious Disease Clinic, IRCCS Ospedale Policlinico San Martino, Genova, Italy

Keywords. HIV; comorbidities; inflammation; immune activation; quality of life; durability; antiretrovirals.

Running title: Delphi Consensus for ART optimization

Corresponding author:

Dr. Lucia Taramasso

Infectious Diseases Clinic

Policlinic IRCCS San Martino Hospital

Largo R Benzi n 10

16132 Genova, Italy

E-mail: taramasso.lucia@gmail.com

Alternate corresponding author:

Dr. Franco Maggiolo

Division of Infectious Diseases

ASST Papa Giovanni XXIII

Piazza OMS n 1

24127 Bergamo, Italy

E-mail: fmaggiolo@asst-pg23.it

Key points (40-word summary)

A panel of experts in the care of HIV infection expressed their consensus on which could be the best strategy to achieve and maintain long-term effectiveness in course of antiretroviral therapy, using Delphi methodology.

ABSTRACT

Background. Modern antiretroviral therapy (ART) offers several treatment options characterized by high efficacy and tolerability, and new strategies with new drugs are now available for the treatment of HIV infection. As definitive data on the long-term success of these new strategies are lacking, a panel of infectious diseases specialists was convened to develop a consensus on how to tailor and follow in time a person-centered ART approach.

Methods. Panelists used a Delphi technique to develop a list of statements describing preferred management approaches for ART and patient monitoring and quality of life evaluation. Panelists provided level of agreement and feedback on consensus statements generated and refined them from the first round through 2 subsequent rounds of voting.

Results. Ninety infectious diseases specialists from different Infectious Diseases Centres in Italy participated in the consensus process. A consensus was reached on virological and immunological parameters to use to monitor long term efficacy of antiretroviral treatment, while there was no consensus on the use of specific inflammation and immune-activation markers in clinical routine. The panel agreed on the need of an antiretroviral treatment with the lowest impact on bone, kidney and cardiovascular toxicity and on the utility of quality of life monitoring during the standard follow up of people living with HIV.

Conclusions. The consensus statements developed by a panel of infectious diseases specialists may provide guidance to practitioners for a person-centered approach aimed at obtaining long-term virological and clinical success for people living with HIV.

Background

Modern antiretroviral therapy (ART) is characterized by several treatment options with high efficacy and tolerability, available for both ART-naïve and -experienced people living with HIV (PLWH)[1,2]. Moreover, new ART strategies with new drugs have been recently introduced in clinical practice and are becoming widely used worldwide [3–8], outlining a scenario where therapies can be increasingly tailored to combine efficacy and tolerability with long-term durability [1,2,9]. The new drug class of integrase inhibitors (INSTIs) has allowed to expand strategies for initiating and simplifying antiretroviral therapy (ART) [3,4,8], but literature data, mainly derived from the clinical practice, highlight how INSTIs cannot yet be considered therapies for every patient [10–14]. Indeed, clinical and virological characteristics of each single subject should be considered before choosing drugs either for ART-naïve or -experienced PLWH. In particular, late presentation, tolerability to previous drugs, patient's lifestyle, drug-drug interactions, viral subtype, history of previous virological failures or transmitted resistance and even residual viremia can play a role in the maintenance of the long-term efficacy of ART [15,16]. In addition, definitive data on the long-term success of the newest therapeutic strategies are still lacking due to their recent introduction in clinical practice, and the best way to study them throughout time, is still object of debate and research. For instance, it is still to define the role of very low-level HIV viremia, the utility of studying viral reservoirs or markers of immune-activation or subclinical inflammation other than CD4-T and CD8-T cell count in clinical practice for long-term monitoring of ART, and which differences, if any, exist among different ART strategies.

At the same time, the question remains on which treatment could be more adequate in challenging scenarios such as the advanced naïve or AIDS presenter patients, as well as the non-adherent or heavily treatment experienced patients.

New drugs, with lower rates of adverse events and better long-term tolerability compared to past, together with their lower potential for drug-drug interactions or altered metabolism [17] may allow easier management also in the most challenging scenarios, and better ease of intake for PLWH, who consequently may experience an additional benefit in terms of quality of life. Also, the opportunity for single tablet regimens seems to satisfy patient preferences and improve adherence [18–24].

Indeed, considering the patient's preferences is another key point for the development of tailored person-centered ART strategies, and for the success of long-term therapy. Patient reported outcomes measures (PROMs) allow assessing important aspects of health, beyond immunovirological results, by accessing people's subjective perceptions of their health-related experiences, which may differ from those perceived by service providers and physicians [25]. Thus, their routine use might be considered to optimize the follow up of PLWH, but also the resource allocation, by focusing on the true perceived needs of people who access services and therapies.

As conclusive data are still not available on which could be the best treatment monitoring strategy during ART, we identified four thematic areas to be submitted to a panel of experts in the care of HIV infection. We used the Delphi methodology to reach a consensus on how to monitor I) clinical efficacy of ART, II) immunology and pharmacology issues, III) long-term safety of ART and IV) how to use quality of life measures and patients reported outcomes in the clinical context.

Methods

Study Design

We employed a Delphi technique to develop a list of statements describing optimal management approaches antiretroviral therapy prescription and therapeutic success monitoring. The Delphi technique

is a structured process to develop consensus on a topic with gaps in data-driven guidance [26]. Delphi poll was submitted to a restricted panel of expert clinicians working primarily as infectious diseases specialists in the care of HIV infection and its complications in different infectious disease centers in Italy.

Study participants

Panelists were identified based on a combination of clinical experience with managing HIV infection, relevant peer-reviewed publications, and active engagement in professional society meetings. The research team discussed the possibility of joint participation of doctors and PLWH in the implementation of the consensus, but after a discussion on the specificity of some of the issues addressed, the risk of methodological bias by including the assessment of PLWH for only some (and not all) of the elements, and the need for uniformity of expertise to validate the Delphi methodology, the research team decided to carry out the voting only by including doctors specialised in infectious diseases and in the treatment of HIV infection. The reason why other specialists and general practitioners were not included in the panel is that, in Italy, starting in 1990, Law 135/90 [27] introduced a plan of care objectives, implementation of interventions and training to deal with the AIDS emergency, which shifted HIV care from the community to outpatient clinics run by infectious disease specialists. As a result, currently, the management of chronic HIV infection is almost totally hospital-centered with limited involvement of health care professionals other than infectious diseases specialists.

Participation in the study was proposed to 111 physicians from 17 Italian regions; 90 specialists agreed to participate and expressed their level of consent to the submitted statements. Expert panelists were surveyed for their clinical opinions based on their previous experiences and interpretation of the available literature by deploying several rounds of questionnaires. The statements proposed in the questionnaire were formulated by a research team to address clinical, laboratory and therapeutic issues for which data from the literature are still scarce. As the aim of the survey was to find a consensus targeted on modern ART strategies, the focus was on INSTI-based two-drug regimens (2DR) and tenofovir alafenamide (TAF)-based triple therapies, leaving out of this consensus the issues related to other and older dual therapies or 3-drug ART combinations with other backbones. The research team did not participate in the Delphi process and was aware of the identity of the participants but was blinded to the identity of their responses.

Delphi Round 1

In round 1, levels of aggregation of the consensus were assessed on 20 items selected by the re-search group with the aim of managing the long-term effectiveness of ART with a person-centered approach. Statement 1-5 were focused on treatment monitoring during ART, statement 6-10 on immunology and pharmacology issues, statement 11-14 on long-term safety of ART and statement 15-20 on quality of life and outcomes reported by PLWH. The panelists were asked to express whether they disagreed, partially agreed, agreed or strongly agreed with the proposed statements. For each item, the consensus was considered to have been reached if at least 75% of the voters stated that they agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The same threshold of 75% was also required for disagreement (disagree or partial agree) to define the consensus against one given statement. All panelists had the possibility of leaving feedback for each statement, that was reviewed blindly by the research team of the study after each round of voting. For all the statements which did not reach the consent, the research team reformulated the statement after revision of the literature on the topic and of the feedback given by the panelists after the first round of voting.

Delphi Round 2

In round 2, the research team resubmitted the statements which did not reach a sufficient consent in round 1 to the panelists, after rephrasing and content revision. Also in round 2, at least 75% of panelists who declared they agree or strongly agree to the statements, was required to define the consensus was reached. The panelists had the possibility of leaving feedback for each statement. Statements who did not reach the consent were modified again by the investigators based on the feedback.

Delphi Round 3

In the third and final round, the statements that did not reach consent in rounds 1 and 2 were presented again to the panelists after further revision by the research team, based on the feedback given by the panelists in the previous rounds. At the conclusion of the third round, the investigators considered the consensus was reached in case $\geq 75\%$ of panelists agreed (strongly agree, agree) to the statement. Otherwise, the research team declared that a consensus was not reached for the given item.

Results

Characteristics of Panel Members

One hundred and eleven potential panelists were contacted, of which 90 agreed to participate and expressed their grade of consent to the statements identified by the research team.

Among 90 panelists, eight choose to remain anonymous during voting and revision of the statements; among the remaining 82, 27 (33%) were female. Fourteen non-anonymous panelists (17%) were under 40 years old, 34 (41.5%) were between 40 and 55 and 34 (41.5%) were older than 55 years old. All were infectious diseases physicians specialized in HIV care.

All 90 panelists participated to the first round of voting, 76 to the second round, and 64 to the third round.

During the three rounds, panelists developed a consensus on treatment monitoring strategy during ART, how to manage immunology and pharmacology issues, long-term safety of ART and use of quality of life measures in the clinical context.

Clinical efficacy: ART-monitoring strategy

The panelist agreed at first round voting that the aim of ART is to achieve virological success, obtaining not only an HIV-RNA <50 copies/mL during treatment but also, hopefully, an undetectable value of HIV viral load (target not detected, TND). This goal is, at present, achievable and can be maintained in all patients independently from baseline HIV-RNA with the use of triple ART with recognized efficacy and high genetic barrier. The panelists also agreed that an HIV-RNA of at least <200 copies/mL is crucial to bring virus transmission to zero.

Modern therapies, due to their better tolerability and improved drug-drug interaction profile, make the need for therapeutic changes less frequent than in the past. A consensus about clinical monitoring of viral reservoirs such as HIV-DNA and residual viremia was reached after two rounds of voting. In the final statement, it was clarified that the study of viral reservoirs should not be done routinely, but can, in particular clinical situations, be useful in patient's management [28–31] (Supplementary materials). The panel did not reach an agreement about the utility of using inflammation or immune-activation markers in daily clinical practice. In fact, the study of such markers has been proposed by some panelists to further

refine decision-making algorithms, with the aim of defining safer and more tailored therapies [32–38]. However, the clinical relevance of these markers is currently unproven, leading most respondents to express disagreement with their use in clinical practice. On the third and final round of voting, the majority (67%) of voters expressed disagreement (disagree or partial agree). Then, a 75% consent was not reached about this specific item, suggesting that further studies will be needed to clarify the issue (Supplementary materials).

The final statements are reported in Figure 1.

Immunology and Pharmacology

The CD4+ T-lymphocyte (CD4) count remains the most validated immunological prognostic marker according to almost all the study participants, being considered the strongest predictor of clinical progression to AIDS and non-AIDS-related events. Then, the panelists agreed on the utility of its monitoring along time, in conjunction with the assessment of CD4 percentage, which can be less influenced by total white blood cell variability than the absolute CD4 count, and with CD4/CD8 ratio, which can be interpreted as a useful marker of immune-senescence, immune-activation and inflammation, that complements the overall risk assessment of even non-AIDS-defining events [11, 39-41].

Regarding the discussion of pharmacology issues, the panel questioned if in some clinical situations it might be more appropriate to maintain a regimen with a backbone of two nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTI) than choosing a 2DR. To reach a consensus on this item, the panel requested a revision of the statement after discussion on which are the most challenging clinical scenarios in which the statement can be true, identifying the setting of low adherence and known archived resistances, or lack of complete clinical and virological history in a PLWH needing an antiretroviral switch, or first-line ART in naïve patients with low CD4 or high HIV-RNA load as the possible situations in which to prefer a 2NRTI backbone combined with a third drug, over other strategic combinations [5–7,18,19,42]. Moreover, in patients with suboptimal adherence or who have discontinued therapy one or more times, exploiting the forgiveness of triple therapy may be advantageous in limiting the risk of virological failure and drug resistance mutations [43]. Therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) could be used as an additional tool to optimize the antiretroviral treatment in complex or special patient populations [44-47].

The final statements are reported in Figure 2.

Long-term safety

Preventing long-term side effects of antiretrovirals remains a key issue for the success and durability of an ART regimen, also in the light of ageing of PLWH and consequent possible increase of comorbidities. The panel identified three main domains in the field of ART related toxicities to manage: bone, kidney and cardiovascular disease (CVD). These toxicities were mainly linked to the use of older antiretrovirals and thus the possible impact of new therapies was discussed. The discussion also addressed the differences between TAF and tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF) in terms of tolerability and safety.

A consensus was reached among voters, that in the physiological, steady, loss of bone mineral density (BMD) that happens with ageing, a TAF-based triple ART showed no BMD reduction after the first year of therapy. TAF-based triple therapy should also be considered kidney friendly, while special attention and monitoring should be reserved for patients with previous or current renal damage or concurrent use of nephrotoxic drugs.

Regarding CVD, the panel discussed two items: how to evaluate the risk in PLWH who experience change in lipid levels during ART and how to deal with the weight gain that has been observed during treatment with new drugs such as INSTIs and TAF. The consensus was reached about the indication to assess CVD risk in PLWH on TAF-based ART using up-to-date risk scores (e.g. Framingham, ASCVD, D:A:D:) and not only on the basis of change in plasma lipids. On the other side, the panelists required three rounds of voting and statement revision to specify that the weight gain observed with modern drug regimens did not show correlation with increased CVD risk in people with a body mass index (BMI) <30 kg/m² and in absence of metabolic syndrome and other risk factors, but they also required to include in the statement that a longer follow-up is needed in order to provide more precise indications, also considering the multiple concomitant factors that might influence weight gain in course of ART (Supplementary materials). The final statements are reported in Figure 3.

Quality of life

According to the panelist judgements, health related Quality of Life (HRQoL) should be assessed routinely in the clinical management of PLWH. Improving the HRQoL of PLWH has the potential to improve several clinical outcomes, including medication adherence, retention in care and well-being. HRQoL should be measured with PROMs validated in PLWH, with the aim of achieving a person-centered approach, but also of using resources efficiently, facilitating discussion of sensitive issues with PLWH, encouraging a greater engagement with services, and promoting adherence to treatment.

The study participants agreed that HRQoL in PLWH does not depend only on ART, but also on multifactorial causes both related to health status (such as multimorbidity, frailty, symptom burden, disability) and to the social context (such as social isolation, financial insecurity, HIV-related stigma and discrimination), indicating the need for people-based health care models. There are no conclusive data demonstrating a significant impact of different ART regimens on HRQoL, but individual domains describing HRQoL may be differently affected by specific antiretroviral drug-related toxicities. Moreover, the consensus was reached that HRQoL reported by PLWH is better in single tablet regimens (STR) than in multi-tablet regimens and that HRQoL monitoring over time assesses the experience of drug burden (number of tablets, food restrictions, ease of intake) and symptoms associated with treatment regimes. The complexity of the pharmacological burden, identifiable in the definition of polypharmacy, entails consequences for care, but also ethical, social and economic, while the concepts of deprescribing and therapeutic optimization might allow the reduction of potentially inappropriate drugs and drug-drug interactions, with the ultimate aim of improving the patient's quality of life [48-51].

The final statements are reported in Figure 4.

Discussion:

In this study, a panel of 90 experts in the care of HIV infection expressed their consensus on which could be the best strategy to achieve and maintain long-term effectiveness of antiretroviral therapy. The agreement was reached on virological and immunological parameters to be used to monitor antiretroviral therapy, pointing out how, beyond the assessment of HIV-RNA, the monitoring of CD4 count and percentage, remains crucial to assess the risk of AIDS and non-AIDS related events [52-57]. The evaluation of CD4/CD8 ratio was felt remarkably relevant as well, as a marker of immune-senescence, immune-activation and inflammation [11, 39-41], while the direct study of pro-inflammatory cytokines or other markers of immune-activation and inflammation was generally considered by the panelists an object of research rather than a tool in clinical practice.

The panelists agreed that modern therapies allow to bring together high genetic barrier, low potential for drug-drug interactions or altered pharmacokinetics, and good tolerability, with different drug combinations being available in single tablet regimens (STRs), too [5–7,18,19,42]. In this context, the forgiveness of an ART, namely its the ability of achieving and sustaining viral suppression, despite suboptimal adherence [58–60], was considered as an additional feature which can further improve possibility of long-term success. Few data are available comparing two-drug (2DR) and triple-drug regimens, however, experimental models in vitro showed higher forgiveness of TAF-based triple therapy compared to 2DR, and consistent protection against emergence of drug resistance during simulations of short lapses in adherence [43], supporting the choice of this strategy in patients with suboptimal compliance. In such situations, the panelists also considered the contribution of TDM to be important. In PLWH, TDM can be used to monitor adherence, but, importantly, also to optimize drug exposure in cases in which the knowledge of the pharmacokinetics of antiretroviral drugs is incomplete, such as in cases of insufficient excretory organs, dialysis procedures, or possible altered absorption or distribution of the ART, such as in gastro-resected PLWH, those undergoing polypharmacy or obese patients or pregnant women [44–47]. Then, the panel concluded that TDM might be key to optimize antiretroviral treatment in complex or special patient populations, although unfortunately, until today, it is not widely accessible in routine clinical practice in many infectious diseases centres.

Another point considered key for the long-term success of ART is the prevention of long-term side effects [61], in consideration also of ageing and co-morbidities of PLWH [62,63].

The panelist agreed that, in recent years, the introduction of new drug classes and regimens has radically improved the long-term tolerability, having no effects on plasma lipid increases, and no interference with renal, bone and cardiovascular outcomes, as compared to the older antiretrovirals [1,64–67]. These characteristics have even greater relevance considering that PLWH have already an increased risk of bone [68–70], renal [71], or cardiovascular problems with ageing [72,73], regardless of therapy. Finally, in the most recent years, the new issue of weight gain has emerged. Indeed, studies mostly conducted in Africa, have shown that PLWH who began antiretroviral therapy, especially if ART-naïve, in more advanced stage of HIV disease, with lower baseline body mass index (BMI), and treated with TAF or INSTIs, experienced a significant increase in body weight [74–78]. It remains to be established to what extent this weight gain is attributable to a ‘return to health’ phenomenon and how much to an underlying pathological mechanism, and whether weight gain may increase the CVD risk of PLWH [79]. However, both TAF and INSTIs are lipid-neutral drugs and the panelists therefore considered them suitable treatment options in PLWH at CVD risk [1,2,80–82]. On the other side, a possible and independent increase in CVD risk in parallel with weight gain during these same treatments has no supporting data, nor have switching strategies to other (and potentially less tolerated) regimens, which are not, at present, supported by guidelines or other research data. Longer follow-up and the results of ongoing studies will provide more precise guidance on this issue. The last factor that was discussed in the Delphi consensus was the evaluation of quality of life in PLWH. In 2015, UNAIDS promoted the 95-95-95 agenda to end AIDS as a public health threat by 2030. The ‘fourth 95’ goal was added as the ultimate objective of HIV care: to ensure that 95% of PLWH with suppressed viral load achieve a good health-related quality of life (HRQoL). The relevance of HRQoL as a measure of well-being among PLWH is a well-established concept [83] and can be assessed by PROMs. PLWH report lower HRQoL than the general population and compared to people with other chronic health conditions [84–86]. Lower HRQoL scores were found to be closely related to worse clinical outcomes such as low CD4 counts, hospitalization and the occurrence of AIDS-defining events, [87–91] while high HRQoL scores correlate with positive outcomes, such as treatment adherence and retention in care [92]. While comorbidity, disability and pain compromise HRQoL, successful HIV treatment has a positive impact on it [93]. The panel recognized the evaluation of PROMs as an important tool in the care of PLWH and considered it key in therapeutic strategy studies, where they feel that HRQoL domain should contribute the global evaluation of the effectiveness of a treatment [3,94,95]. HRQoL monitoring into clinical and

community services can provide a direct feedback on the person-centred perspective on the effectiveness of interventions, has the potential to identify PLWH who would benefit from specific services and to address modifiable factors that negatively impact on HRQoL [96].

The results of this Delphi consensus have some limitations to consider. Due to the nature of the Delphi process, the panel addressed issues for which data from the literature are very scarce, and therefore it should be noted that the final statements that were presented reflect the opinion of a group of experts in the field, rather than evidence-based guidance. Furthermore, the panelists were limited to infectious disease specialists involved in HIV care, but as also emerged in this consensus, modern ART management cannot be done without including patients' opinions in the decision-making process. Consequently, due to the many technical aspects covered in the statements, it was decided to carry on the work only among infectious disease specialists.

Even with the limitations mentioned above, this consensus addressed many challenges of modern ART, concluding that the newer regimens do offer significant advantages over older treatment options and that new monitoring strategies including TDM and PROMs evaluations may bring closer to the goal of personalised therapies. The consensus statements developed in this study can provide guidance to practitioners in building a person-centred approach aimed at achieving long-term virological and clinical success for PLWH.

Funding: This work was unconditionally supported by Gilead Sciences.

Conflict of Interest: The authors reported no conflict of interest relevant for the present study.

Data Availability Statement: All data on the rate of agreement with the statements proposed in the Delphi consensus are provided in the text and supplementary materials.

Patient Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Acknowledgments:

Delphi reviewer committee: Massimo Andreoni, Università degli Studi di Roma "Tor Vergata", Roma; Andrea Antinori, INMI "Lazzaro Spallanzani" I.R.C.C.S., Roma; Giovanni Di Perri, Ospedale Amedeo di Savoia, Università degli Studi di Torino; Andrea Gori, Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milano; Cristina Mussini, Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria Policlinico di Modena; Giuliano Rizzardini, ASST Fatebenefratelli Sacco - Ospedale Luigi Sacco, Milano; Antonella d'Arminio Monforte, ASST Santi Paolo e Carlo - Polo Universitario, Milano; Antonella Castagna, IRCCS Ospedale San Raffaele Università Vita-Salute, Milano.

Study group: M. Allegrini, G. Angioni, L. Attala, F. Bai, A. Bandera, O. Bargiacchi, A. Beltrame, B. Borch, M. Brizzi, A. Calcagno, M. Camici, M. Campus, D. Canetti, S. Casari, A. Cascio, B.M. Celesia, A. Celotti, G. Cenderello, L. Chessa, S. Cicalini, R. Cinelli, M. Colafigli, P. Colletti, N. Coppola, A. Costantini, L. Cristiano, G. Cuomo, M. De Gennaro, P. De Leo, F.G. De Rosa, F. Del Puente, G. Di Giuli, E.M. Erne, V. Esposito, M. Fabbiani, D. Farinacci, S.M. Ferrara, E. Foca', D. Francisci, A. Franco, F.M. Fusco, I. Gentile, A. Giacometti, N. Gianotti, G. Guadagnino, M. Guerra, A. Ialungo, F. Lagi, M. Lanzafame, G. Lapadula, A. Lazzaro, A. Longo, G. Madeddu, E. Manzillo, A. Masiello, M. Menozzi, B. Menzaghi, L. Meroni, P. Milini, M.C. Moioli, A. Muscatello, G. Orofino, F. Ortu, S. Ottou, G. Pantò, A. Parisini, G. Parruti, A. Patacca, T.S. Prestileo, D. Ripamonti, S. Rusconi, R. Scaggiante, P. Scerbo, M.P. Sciotti, M. Scuderi, L. Sighinolfi, L. Taramasso, E. Teti, C. Torti, M. Trezzi, J. Vecchiet, D. Vitullo.

References:

1. DHHS Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents., A Working Group of the Office of AIDS Research, Advisory Council (OARAC). Guidelines for the Use of Antiretroviral Agents in Adults and Adolescents with HIV. Available at: <https://clinicalinfo.hiv.gov/sites/default/files/guidelines/documents/AdultandAdolescentGL.pdf>.
2. EACS European Aids Clinical Society. Guidelines. Version 11.0. October 2021. Available at: https://www.eacsociety.org/media/final2021eacsguidelinesv11.0_oct2021.pdf.
3. Cahn P, Madero JS, Arribas JR, et al. Durable Efficacy of Dolutegravir Plus Lamivudine in Antiretroviral Treatment-Naïve Adults With HIV-1 Infection: 96-Week Results From the GEMINI-1 and GEMINI-2 Randomized Clinical Trials. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2020; 83:310–318.
4. Aboud M, Orkin C, Podzamczar D, et al. Efficacy and safety of dolutegravir–rilpivirine for maintenance of virological suppression in adults with HIV-1: 100-week data from the randomised, open-label, phase 3 SWORD-1 and SWORD-2 studies. *The Lancet HIV* 2019; 6:e576–e587. Available at: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2352301819301493>. Accessed 4 January 2022.
5. Gallant J, Lazzarin A, Mills A, et al. Bictegravir, emtricitabine, and tenofovir alafenamide versus dolutegravir, abacavir, and lamivudine for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection (GS-US-380-1489): a double-blind, multicentre, phase 3, randomised controlled non-inferiority trial. *Lancet* 2017; 390:2063–2072.
6. Sax PE, Rockstroh JK, Luetkemeyer AF, et al. Switching to Bictegravir, Emtricitabine, and Tenofovir Alafenamide in Virologically Suppressed Adults With Human Immunodeficiency Virus. *Clin Infect Dis* 2021; 73:e485–e493.
7. D’Antoni ML, Andreatta K, Acosta RK, Chang S, Martin R, White KL. 633. Bictegravir/Emtricitabine/Tenofovir Alafenamide (B/F/TAF) Efficacy in Participants with Pre-Existing Primary Integrase Inhibitor Resistance Through 48 Weeks of Phase 3 Clinical Trials. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 2020; 7:S376–S377. Available at: https://academic.oup.com/ofid/article/7/Supplement_1/S376/6056891. Accessed 5 January 2022.
8. van Wyk J, Ajana F, Bisshop F, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Switching to Dolutegravir/Lamivudine Fixed-Dose 2-Drug Regimen vs Continuing a Tenofovir Alafenamide–Based 3- or 4-Drug Regimen for Maintenance of Virologic Suppression in Adults Living With Human Immunodeficiency Virus Type 1: Phase 3, Randomized, Noninferiority TANGO Study. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2020; 71:1920–1929. Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/cid/article/71/8/1920/5697294>. Accessed 28 January 2021.
9. Saag MS, Gandhi RT, Hoy JF, et al. Antiretroviral Drugs for Treatment and Prevention of HIV Infection in Adults: 2020 Recommendations of the International Antiviral Society-USA Panel. *JAMA* 2020; 324:1651–1669.
10. Teira R, Diaz-Cuervo H, Aragão F, et al. Real world effectiveness of standard of care triple therapy versus two-drug combinations for treatment of people living with HIV. *PLoS One* 2021; 16:e0249515.
11. Mussini C, Lorenzini P, Cozzi-Lepri A, et al. Switching to dual/monotherapy determines an increase in CD8+ in HIV-infected individuals: an observational cohort study. *BMC Med* 2018; 16:79.
12. van Welzen BJ, Oomen PGA, Hoepelman AIM. Dual Antiretroviral Therapy—All Quiet Beneath the Surface? *Front Immunol* 2021; 12:637910. Available at: <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fimmu.2021.637910/full>. Accessed 4 January 2022.
13. Boffito M, Waters L, Cahn P, et al. Perspectives on the Barrier to Resistance for Dolutegravir + Lamivudine, a Two-Drug Antiretroviral Therapy for HIV-1 Infection. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses* 2020; 36:13–18.
14. Baril J-G, Angel JB, Gill MJ, et al. Dual Therapy Treatment Strategies for the Management of Patients Infected with HIV: A Systematic Review of Current Evidence in ARV-Naïve or ARV-Experienced,

Virologically Suppressed Patients. PLoS ONE 2016; 11:e0148231. Available at: <https://dx.plos.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0148231>. Accessed 4 January 2022.

15. Borghetti A, Giacomelli A, Borghi V, et al. Nucleoside Reverse-Transcriptase Inhibitor Re-sistance Mutations Predict Virological Failure in Human Immunodeficiency Virus-Positive Patients During Lamivudine Plus Dolutegravir Maintenance Therapy in Clinical Practice. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2021; 8:ofab103.
16. Gagliardini R, Ciccullo A, Borghetti A, et al. Impact of the M184V Resistance Mutation on Virological Efficacy and Durability of Lamivudine-Based Dual Antiretroviral Regimens as Maintenance Therapy in Individuals With Suppressed HIV-1 RNA: A Cohort Study. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2018; 5:ofy113.
17. Cottura N, Kinvig H, Grañana-Castillo S, Wood A, Siccardi M. Drug-Drug Interactions in People Living with HIV at Risk of Hepatic and Renal Impairment: Current Status and Future Perspectives. *J Clin Pharmacol* 2022;
18. Airoidi M, Zaccarelli M, Bisi L, et al. One-pill once-a-day HAART: a simplification strategy that improves adherence and quality of life of HIV-infected subjects. *Patient Prefer Adherence* 2010; 4:115–125.
19. Sutton SS, Hardin JW, Bramley TJ, D’Souza AO, Bennett CL. Single- versus multiple-tablet HIV regimens: adherence and hospitalization risks. *Am J Manag Care* 2016; 22:242–248.
20. Palella FJ, Fisher M, Tebas P, et al. Simplification to rilpivirine/emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate from ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitor antiretroviral therapy in a randomized trial of HIV-1 RNA-suppressed participants. *AIDS* 2014; 28:335–344.
21. Buscher A, Hartman C, Kallen MA, Giordano TP. Impact of antiretroviral dosing frequency and pill burden on adherence among newly diagnosed, antiretroviral-naïve HIV patients. *Int J STD AIDS* 2012; 23:351–355.
22. Hanna DB, Hessel NA, Golub ET, et al. Increase in single-tablet regimen use and associated improvements in adherence-related outcomes in HIV-infected women. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2014; 65:587–596.
23. Sutton SS, Magagnoli J, H. Cummings T, Hardin JW. Adherence after treatment switch from a multiple tablet antiretroviral regimen to a single tablet antiretroviral regimen. *Therapies* 2021; 76:567–576. Available at: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0040595721000639>. Accessed 7 January 2022.
24. Scott Sutton S, Magagnoli J, Hardin JW. Impact of Pill Burden on Adherence, Risk of Hospitalization, and Viral Suppression in Patients with HIV Infection and AIDS Receiving Antiretroviral Therapy. *Pharmacotherapy* 2016; 36:385–401.
25. Kall M, Marcellin F, Harding R, Lazarus JV, Carrieri P. Patient-reported outcomes to enhance person-centred HIV care. *Lancet HIV* 2020; 7:e59–e68.
26. Diamond IR, Grant RC, Feldman BM, et al. Defining consensus: a systematic review recommends methodologic criteria for reporting of Delphi studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014; 67:401–409.
27. Gazzetta Ufficiale. law 135/90. Programma di interventi urgenti per la prevenzione e la lotta contro l’AIDS. Available at: <https://www.trovanorme.salute.gov.it/norme/dettaglioAtto?id=14925>.
28. Marras Francesco, Casabianca Anna, Bozzano Federica, et al. Control of the HIV-1 DNA reservoir is associated in vivo and in vitro with NKp46/NKp30 (CD335 CD337) inducibility and interferon gamma production by transcriptionally unique NK cells. *JOURNAL OF VIROLOGY* 2017; 91:e00647-17-e00647-37.
29. Rainwater-Lovett K, Luzuriaga K, Persaud D. Very early combination antiretroviral therapy in infants: prospects for cure. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS* 2015; 10:4–11.
30. Persaud D, Patel K, Karalius B, et al. Influence of age at virologic control on peripheral blood human immunodeficiency virus reservoir size and serostatus in perinatally infected adolescents. *JAMA Pediatr* 2014; 168:1138–1146.

31. Sáez-Cirión A, Bacchus C, Hocqueloux L, et al. Post-treatment HIV-1 controllers with a long-term virological remission after the interruption of early initiated antiretroviral therapy ANRS VISCONTI Study. *PLoS Pathog* 2013; 9:e1003211.
32. Alteri C, Scutari R, Stingone C, et al. Quantification of HIV-DNA and residual viremia in patients starting ART by droplet digital PCR: Their dynamic decay and correlations with immuno-logical parameters and virological success. *Journal of Clinical Virology* 2019; 117:61–67. Available at: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S1386653219301428>. Accessed 4 January 2022.
33. Ryscavage P, Kelly S, Li JZ, Harrigan PR, Taiwo B. Significance and clinical management of persistent low-level viremia and very-low-level viremia in HIV-1-infected patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother* 2014; 58:3585–3598.
34. Chun T-W, Murray D, Justement JS, et al. Relationship between residual plasma viremia and the size of HIV proviral DNA reservoirs in infected individuals receiving effective antiretroviral therapy. *J Infect Dis* 2011; 204:135–138.
35. Khoury G, Fromentin R, Solomon A, et al. Human Immunodeficiency Virus Persistence and T-Cell Activation in Blood, Rectal, and Lymph Node Tissue in Human Immunodeficiency Virus-Infected Individuals Receiving Suppressive Antiretroviral Therapy. *J Infect Dis* 2017; 215:911–919.
36. Pino M, Pereira Ribeiro S, Pagliuzza A, et al. Increased homeostatic cytokines and stability of HIV-infected memory CD4 T-cells identify individuals with suboptimal CD4 T-cell recovery on-ART. *PLoS Pathog* 2021; 17:e1009825.
37. Knudsen TB, Ertner G, Petersen J, et al. Plasma Soluble CD163 Level Independently Predicts All-Cause Mortality in HIV-1-Infected Individuals. *J Infect Dis* 2016; 214:1198–1204.
38. Tenorio AR, Zheng Y, Bosch RJ, et al. Soluble markers of inflammation and coagulation but not T-cell activation predict non-AIDS-defining morbid events during suppressive antiretroviral treatment. *J Infect Dis* 2014; 210:1248–1259.
39. Mussini C, Lorenzini P, Cozzi-Lepri A, et al. CD4/CD8 ratio normalisation and non-AIDS-related events in individuals with HIV who achieve viral load suppression with antiretroviral therapy: an observational cohort study. *Lancet HIV* 2015; 2:e98-106.
40. Serrano-Villar S, Sainz T, Lee SA, et al. HIV-infected individuals with low CD4/CD8 ratio despite effective antiretroviral therapy exhibit altered T cell subsets, heightened CD8+ T cell activation, and increased risk of non-AIDS morbidity and mortality. *PLoS Pathog* 2014; 10:e1004078.
41. Serrano-Villar S, Martínez-Sanz J, Ron R, et al. Effects of first-line antiretroviral therapy on the CD4/CD8 ratio and CD8 cell counts in CoRIS: a prospective multicentre cohort study. *Lancet HIV* 2020; 7:e565–e573.
42. Sterrantino G, Santoro L, Bartolozzi D, Trotta M, Zaccarelli M. Self-reported adherence supports patient preference for the single tablet regimen (STR) in the current cART era. *Patient Preference Adherence* 2012; 6:427–433.
43. Mulato A, Acosta RK, Yant SR, Cihlar T, White KL. 1448. Forgiveness of BIC/FTC/TAF: In Vitro Simulations of Intermittent Poor Adherence Find Limited HIV-1 Breakthrough and High Barrier to Resistance. *Open Forum Infectious Diseases* 2020; 7:S726–S727. Available at: https://academic.oup.com/ofid/article/7/Supplement_1/S726/6057608. Accessed 5 January 2022.
44. O’Kelly B, Murtagh R, Lambert JS. Therapeutic Drug Monitoring of HIV Antiretroviral Drugs in Pregnancy: A Narrative Review. *Ther Drug Monit* 2020; 42:229–244.
45. Punyawudho B, Singkham N, Thammajaruk N, et al. Therapeutic drug monitoring of antiretroviral drugs in HIV-infected patients. *Expert Review of Clinical Pharmacology* 2016; 9:1583–1595. Available at: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17512433.2016.1235972>. Accessed 6 January 2022.
46. Courlet P, Alves Saldanha S, Cavassini M, et al. Development and validation of a multiplex UHPLC-MS/MS assay with stable isotopic internal standards for the monitoring of the plasma concentrations of

the antiretroviral drugs bictegravir, cabotegravir, doravirine, and rilpivirine in people living with HIV. *J Mass Spectrom* 2020; 55:e4506.

47. Stader F, Courlet P, Decosterd LA, Battegay M, Marzolini C. Physiologically-Based Pharmacokinetic Modeling Combined with Swiss HIV Cohort Study Data Supports No Dose Adjustment of Bictegravir in Elderly Individuals Living With HIV. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2021; 109:1025–1029.
48. Schafer JJ, Pandit NS, Cha A, et al. Incidence and Severity of Drug Interactions Before and After Switching Antiretroviral Therapy to Bictegravir/Emtricitabine/Tenofovir Alafenamide in Treatment-Experienced Patients. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2021; 8:ofaa625.
49. Lu C-H, Bednarczyk EM, Catanzaro LM, Shon A, Xu J-C, Ma Q. Pharmacokinetic drug interactions of integrase strand transfer inhibitors. *Curr Res Pharmacol Drug Discov* 2021; 2:100044.
50. Scott IA, Hilmer SN, Reeve E, et al. Reducing inappropriate polypharmacy: the process of deprescribing. *JAMA Intern Med* 2015; 175:827–834.
51. Guaraldi G, Milic J, Marcotullio S, Mussini C. A patient-centred approach to deprescribing antiretroviral therapy in people living with HIV. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2020; 75:3425–3432.
52. van Lelyveld SFL, Gras L, Kesselring A, et al. Long-term complications in patients with poor immunological recovery despite virological successful HAART in Dutch ATHENA cohort. *AIDS* 2012; 26:465–474.
53. Lapadula G, Cozzi-Lepri A, Marchetti G, et al. Risk of clinical progression among patients with immunological nonresponse despite virological suppression after combination antiretroviral treatment. *AIDS* 2013; 27:769–779.
54. May MT, Vehreschild J-J, Trickey A, et al. Mortality According to CD4 Count at Start of Combination Antiretroviral Therapy Among HIV-infected Patients Followed for up to 15 Years After Start of Treatment: Collaborative Cohort Study. *Clin Infect Dis* 2016; 62:1571–1577.
55. Tincati C, Merlini E, d'Arminio Monforte A, Marchetti G. Is weak CD4+ gain in the course of suppressive combination antiretroviral therapy for HIV infection a current clinical challenge? A case report and brief review of the literature. *BMC Infect Dis* 2018; 18:8.
56. Turk G, Ghiglione Y, Hormanstorfer M, et al. Biomarkers of Progression after HIV Acute/Early Infection: Nothing Compares to CD4+ T-cell Count? *Viruses* 2018; 10:E34.
57. Gebo KA, Gallant JE, Keruly JC, Moore RD. Absolute CD4 vs. CD4 percentage for predicting the risk of opportunistic illness in HIV infection. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2004; 36:1028–1033.
58. Shuter J. Forgiveness of non-adherence to HIV-1 antiretroviral therapy. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2008; 61:769–773.
59. Assawasuwannakit P, Braund R, Duffull S. Quantification of the Forgiveness of Drugs to Imperfect Adherence. *CPT Pharmacometrics Syst Pharmacol* 2015; 4:204–211. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/psp4.4>. Accessed 5 January 2022.
60. Morrison A, Stauffer ME, Kaufman AS. Relationship Between Adherence Rate Threshold and Drug 'Forgiveness'. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2017; 56:1435–1440. Available at: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s40262-017-0552-2>. Accessed 5 January 2022.
61. Shafran SD, Di Perri G, Esser S, Lelièvre J-D, Parczewski M. Planning HIV therapy to prevent future comorbidities: patient years for tenofovir alafenamide. *HIV Med* 2019; 20 Suppl 7:1–16.
62. Cuzin L, Katlama C, Cotte L, et al. Ageing with HIV: do comorbidities and polymedication drive treatment optimization? *HIV Med* 2017; 18:395–401. Available at: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/hiv.12441>. Accessed 5 January 2022.
63. Guaraldi G, Orlando G, Zona S, et al. Premature Age-Related Comorbidities Among HIV-Infected Persons Compared With the General Population. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2011; 53:1120–1126. Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/cid/article-lookup/doi/10.1093/cid/cir627>. Accessed 6 January 2022.

64. Sax PE, Zolopa A, Brar I, et al. Tenofovir alafenamide vs. tenofovir disoproxil fumarate in single tablet regimens for initial HIV-1 therapy: a randomized phase 2 study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2014; 67:52–58.
65. Antela A, Aguiar C, Compston J, et al. The role of tenofovir alafenamide in future HIV management. *HIV Med* 2016; 17 Suppl 2:4–16.
66. Dorjee K, Choden T, Baxi SM, Steinmaus C, Reingold AL. Risk of cardiovascular disease associated with exposure to abacavir among individuals with HIV: A systematic review and meta-analyses of results from 17 epidemiologic studies. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2018; 52:541–553.
67. Maggi P, Di Biagio A, Rusconi S, et al. Cardiovascular risk and dyslipidemia among persons living with HIV: a review. *BMC Infect Dis* 2017; 17:551.
68. Slama L, Reddy S, Phair J, Palella FJ, Brown TT, Multicenter AIDS Cohort Study group (MACS). Changes in bone turnover markers with HIV seroconversion and ART initiation. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2017; 72:1456–1461.
69. Grant PM, Kitch D, McComsey GA, et al. Long-term Bone Mineral Density Changes in Antiretroviral-Treated HIV-Infected Individuals. *J Infect Dis* 2016; 214:607–611.
70. Brown TT, Hoy J, Borderi M, et al. Recommendations for evaluation and management of bone disease in HIV. *Clin Infect Dis* 2015; 60:1242–1251.
71. Mocroft A, Lundgren JD, Ross M, et al. Cumulative and current exposure to potentially nephrotoxic antiretrovirals and development of chronic kidney disease in HIV-positive individuals with a normal baseline estimated glomerular filtration rate: a prospective international cohort study. *The Lancet HIV* 2016; 3:e23–e32. Available at: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2352301815002118>. Accessed 6 January 2022.
72. Triant VA, Perez J, Regan S, et al. Cardiovascular Risk Prediction Functions Underestimate Risk in HIV Infection. *Circulation* 2018; 137:2203–2214.
73. Triant VA. Cardiovascular disease and HIV infection. *Curr HIV/AIDS Rep* 2013; 10:199–206.
74. Venter WDF, Sokhela S, Simmons B, et al. Dolutegravir with emtricitabine and tenofovir alafenamide or tenofovir disoproxil fumarate versus efavirenz, emtricitabine, and tenofovir disoproxil fumarate for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection (ADVANCE): week 96 results from a randomised, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *The Lancet HIV* 2020; 7:e666–e676. Available at: <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2352301820302411>. Accessed 27 January 2021.
75. Sax PE, Erlandson KM, Lake JE, et al. Weight Gain Following Initiation of Antiretroviral Therapy: Risk Factors in Randomized Comparative Clinical Trials. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2019; :ciz999. Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciz999/5586728>. Accessed 21 October 2019.
76. Bourgi K, Rebeiro PF, Turner M, et al. Greater Weight Gain in Treatment-naïve Persons Starting Dolutegravir-based Antiretroviral Therapy. *Clinical Infectious Diseases* 2019; :ciz407. Available at: <https://academic.oup.com/cid/advance-article/doi/10.1093/cid/ciz407/5491263>. Accessed 25 August 2019.
77. Taramasso L, Berruti M, Briano F, Di Biagio A. The switch from tenofovir disoproxil fumarate to tenofovir alafenamide determines weight gain in patients on rilpivirine-based regimen. *AIDS* 2020; 34:877–881. Available at: <https://journals.lww.com/10.1097/QAD.0000000000002496>. Accessed 7 February 2021.
78. Taramasso L, Bonfanti P, Ricci E, et al. Factors Associated With Weight Gain in People Treated With Dolutegravir. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2020; 7:ofaa195.
79. Petoumenos K, Kuwanda L, Ryom L, et al. Effect of Changes in Body Mass Index on the Risk of Cardiovascular Disease and Diabetes Mellitus in HIV-Positive Individuals: Results From the D:A:D Study. *JAIDS Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes* 2021; 86:579–586. Available at: <https://journals.lww.com/10.1097/QAI.0000000000002603>. Accessed 29 April 2021.

80. Taramasso L, Di Biagio A, Riccardi N, et al. Lipid profile changings after switching from rilpivirine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate/emtricitabine to rilpivirine/tenofovir alafenamide/emtricitabine: Different effects in patients with or without baseline hypercholesterolemia. *PLoS ONE* 2019; 14:e0223181.
81. Taramasso L, Tatarelli P, Ricci E, et al. Improvement of lipid profile after switching from efavirenz or ritonavir-boosted protease inhibitors to rilpivirine or once-daily integrase inhibitors: re-sults from a large observational cohort study (SCOLTA). *BMC Infect Dis* 2018; 18:357.
82. Taramasso L, Bonfanti P, Ricci E, et al. Metabolic syndrome and body weight in people liv-ing with HIV infection: analysis of differences observed in three different cohort studies over a decade. *HIV Med* 2021;
83. Drewes J, Gusy B, Rden U von. More than 20 years of research into the quality of life of people with HIV and AIDS--a descriptive review of study characteristics and methodological ap-proaches of published empirical studies. *J Int Assoc Provid AIDS Care* 2013; 12:18–22.
84. Engelhard EAN, Smit C, van Dijk PR, et al. Health-related quality of life of people with HIV: an assessment of patient related factors and comparison with other chronic diseases. *AIDS* 2018; 32:103–112.
85. Langebeek N, Kooij KW, Wit FW, et al. Impact of comorbidity and ageing on health-related quality of life in HIV-positive and HIV-negative individuals. *AIDS* 2017; 31:1471–1481.
86. Miners A, Phillips A, Kreif N, et al. Health-related quality-of-life of people with HIV in the era of combination antiretroviral treatment: a cross-sectional comparison with the general population. *Lancet HIV* 2014; 1:e32–40.
87. Aden B, Nosyk B, Wittenberg E, Schackman BR. Health-Related Quality of Life in HIV-Infected and At-Risk Women: The Impact of Illicit Drug Use and Hepatitis C on a Community Preference Weighted Measure. *Med Decis Making* 2014; 34:800–808.
88. Venturini A, Cenderello G, Di Biagio A, et al. Quality of life in an Italian cohort of people living with HIV in the era of combined antiretroviral therapy (Evidence from I.A.N.U.A. study-investigation on antiretroviral therapy). *AIDS Care* 2017; 29:1373–1377.
89. Prau M, Marcellin F, Carrieri MP, et al. Health-related quality of life in French people living with HIV in 2003: results from the national ANRS-EN12-VESPA Study. *AIDS* 2007; 21 Suppl 1:S19–27.
90. Anis AH, Nosyk B, Sun H, et al. Quality of life of patients with advanced HIV/AIDS: measuring the impact of both AIDS-defining events and non-AIDS serious adverse events. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2009; 51:631–639.
91. Mathews WC, May S. EuroQol (EQ-5D) measure of quality of life predicts mortality, emer-gency department utilization, and hospital discharge rates in HIV-infected adults under care. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2007; 5:5.
92. Degroote S, Vogelaers D, Vandijck DM. What determines health-related quality of life among people living with HIV: an updated review of the literature. *Arch Public Health* 2014; 72:40.
93. Pimentel GS, Ceccato M das GB, Costa J de O, Mendes JC, Bonolo P de F, Silveira MR. Quality of life in individuals initiating antiretroviral therapy: a cohort study. *Rev Saude Publica* 2020; 54:146.
94. Sculier D, Wandeler G, Yerly S, et al. Efficacy and safety of dolutegravir plus emtricitabine versus standard ART for the maintenance of HIV-1 suppression: 48-week results of the factorial, randomized, non-inferiority SIMPL’HIV trial. *PLoS Med* 2020; 17:e1003421.
95. Wohl D, Clarke A, Maggiolo F, et al. Patient-Reported Symptoms Over 48 Weeks Among Participants in Randomized, Double-Blind, Phase III Non-inferiority Trials of Adults with HIV on Co-formulated Bictegravir, Emtricitabine, and Tenofovir Alafenamide versus Co-formulated Ab-acavir, Dolutegravir, and Lamivudine. *Patient* 2018; 11:561–573. Available at: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/s40271-018-0322-8>. Accessed 7 January 2022.

96. O'Brien KK, Ibáñez-Carrasco F, Solomon P, et al. Research priorities for rehabilitation and aging with HIV: a framework from the Canada-International HIV and Rehabilitation Research Col-laborative (CIHRRRC). *AIDS Res Ther* 2020; 17:21.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Statements on monitoring long-term therapeutic efficacy.

* Agreement was reached for this statement after reformulation and two rounds of voting (Supplementary Figure 1).

** An agreement of at least 75% of the voters has not been reached for this statement, after reformulation and three rounds of voting (Supplementary Figure 2).

Figure 2. Statements on immunology and pharmacology.


* Agreement was reached for this statement after reformulation and two rounds of voting (Supplementary Figure 3).


Figure 3. Statements on long-term safety of antiretroviral therapy (ART).

* Agreement was reached for this statement after reformulation and three rounds of voting (Supplementary Figure 4).

Figure 4. Statements on quality of life assessment.

Figure 1. Statements on monitoring long-term therapeutic efficacy.







* Agreement was reached for this statement after reformulation and two rounds of voting (Supplementary Figure 1).

** An agreement of at least 75% of the voters has not been reached for this statement, after reformulation and three rounds of voting (Supplementary Figure 2).


Figure 2. Statements on immunology and pharmacology.






*Agreement was reached for this statement after reformulation and two rounds of voting (Supplementary Figure 3).


Figure 3. Statements on long-term safety of antiretroviral therapy (ART).






* Agreement was reached for this statement after reformulation and three rounds of voting (Supplementary Figure 4).

Figure 4. Statements on quality of life assessment.




Statement 17



Statement 18

There are no conclusive data demonstrating a significant impact of different ART regimens on HRQoL, but individual domains describing HRQoL may be differently affected by specific antiretroviral drug-related toxicities.


Statement 18



Statement 19

The HRQoL reported by PLWH is better in single tablet regimens (STR) than in multi-tablet regimens.

Statement 19



Statement 20

HRQoL monitoring over time, in PLWH on ART, assesses the experience of drug burden (number of tablets, food restrictions, ease of intake, etc.) and symptoms associated with treatment regimes.

