

**CPAG Summary Report for Clinical Panel – URN 1702  
bictegravir/emtricitabine/tenofovir alafenamide (B/F/TAF) for the  
treatment of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 (HIV-1) in adults**

No	Outcome measures	Summary from evidence review
1.	Survival	
2.	Progression free survival	
3.	Mobility	
4.	Self-care	
5.	Usual activities	
6.	Pain	
7.	Anxiety / Depression	<p>In Wohl et al. statistically significant differences in favour of B/F/TAF were found at 2 or more time points in the adjusted logistic regression model, as well as in the longitudinal models in the HIV symptom index domains for “sad/down/depressed” and “nervous/anxious” in treatment-experienced patients who had switched from dolutegravir, abacavir and lamivudine to B/F/TAF.</p> <p>See HIV Symptom Index outcome reported below.</p>
8.	Replacement of more toxic treatment	
9.	Dependency on care giver / supporting independence	
10.	Safety	<p><u>Drug-related adverse events</u></p> <p>Across all the studies included, fewer adverse events were reported in the bictegravir-emtricitabine-tenofovir alafenamide (B/F/TAF) group than in the comparator groups.</p> <p>In Gallant et al (2017), fewer drug-related adverse events were reported by the B/F/TAF group (26%) than in the dolutegravir, abacavir and lamivudine (DTG/ABC/3TC) group (40%). However, this was driven mainly by drug-related nausea which was 5% (n=17) in the B/F/TAF group and 17% (n=55) in the DTG/ABC/3TC group (p&lt;0.0001).</p>

		<p>Across all studies included, people did not appear to discontinue their treatment with B/F/TAF due to adverse reactions which was similar to the discontinuation rates seen in the comparator groups.</p> <p>Overall, the results suggest that B/F/TAF has a similar safety and tolerability profile to DTG/ABC/3TC, dolutegravir, emtricitabine and tenofovir alafenamide (DTG/F/TAF) and boosted protease inhibitor-based regimen (a therapy containing an additional drug which improves the ability of the medicine to kill the virus) .</p>
11.	Delivery of intervention	

No	Outcome measure	Summary from evidence review
1.	Proportion of patients with HIV-1 RNA less than 50 copies per ml of plasma	<p>This outcome is a measurement of how effective the treatment has been in reducing the number of HIV-1 RNA copies per ml (viral load) in the patient's blood plasma. Suppression of plasma HIV-1 RNA viral load to less than 50 copies per ml is the main goal of ART treatment as it is associated with durable clinical and immunological benefits. When the HIV virus is slowed down, so is HIV disease.</p> <p>Overall, the evidence suggests that receiving bicitegravir-emtricitabine-tenofovir alafenamide (B/F/TAF) is comparable to dolutegravir, abacavir and lamivudine (DTG/ABC/3TC), dolutegravir, emtricitabine and tenofovir alafenamide (DTG/F/TAF) or boosted protease inhibitor-based regimens in maintaining the level of detectable HIV-1 RNA in blood plasma (viral load) below 50 copies per ml at 48 weeks follow up or post treatment switching.</p> <p>In Gallant et al. (2017) there was no statistically significant difference between B/F/TAF and DTG/ABC/3TC (92.4% vs 93% [95% CI: -4.8 to 3.6, p=0.78]) at 48 weeks follow up for this outcome. Both studies by Sax et al. (2017a and b) also showed no statistically significant difference in people receiving B/F/TAF when compared with DTG/F/TAF.</p> <p>In Molina et al. (2018) there was also no statistically significant difference between B/F/TAF and DTG/ABC/3TC (93.6% vs 95% [95% CI: -5.5 to 2.6; p=0.59]) at 48 weeks post treatment switching for this outcome.</p> <p>Similarly, Daar et al. (2018) showed no statistically significant difference between B/F/TAF and a boosted protease inhibitor-based regimen (92.1% vs 88.9% [95% CI: -1.6 to 8.2; p=0.20]) at 48 weeks post treatment switching for this outcome.</p>
2.	Mean change in CD4 cell	This outcome is a marker of likely disease progression which is independent of viral load. A decline in the CD4 (lymphocyte helper

	count from baseline	<p>cells which help the immune system fight infection) cell count of an individual is caused by HIV-1 infection with an increase in cell count indicating that the HIV-1 viral load has been reduced. The lower the CD4 cell count, the greater the damage to the immune system and the greater the risk of illness.</p> <p>Overall, the evidence suggests that receiving bictegravir-emtricitabine-tenofovir alafenamide (B/F/TAF) is comparable to dolutegravir, abacavir and lamivudine (DTG/ABC/3TC), dolutegravir, emtricitabine and tenofovir alafenamide (DTG/F/TAF) or boosted protease inhibitor-based regimens at increasing the mean CD4 cell count from the start of treatment (baseline) to 48 weeks.</p> <p>In Gallant et al. (2017) there was no statistically significant difference between B/F/TAF and DTG/ABC/3TC at increasing the mean CD4 cell count from the start of treatment (baseline) to 48 weeks follow up (233 per <math>\mu\text{l}</math> [SD <math>\pm</math> 185.2] vs 229 per <math>\mu\text{l}</math> [SD <math>\pm</math> 188.8] respectively; <math>p=0.81</math>). Both studies by Sax et al. (2017a and b) showed no statistically significant difference between B/F/TAF and DTG/F/TAF at increasing the mean CD4 cell count from the start of treatment (baseline) to 48 weeks follow up.</p> <p>Molina et al. (2018) showed no statistically significant difference between B/F/TAF and DTG/ABC/3TC in increasing the mean CD4 cell count (difference: -21 cells per <math>\mu\text{l}</math> [95% CI: -51 to 9; <math>p=0.18</math>]) at 48 weeks post treatment switching. Similarly, Daar et al. (2018) showed no statistically significant difference between B/F/TAF and a boosted protease inhibitor-based regimen in increasing mean CD4 cell count (+25 per <math>\mu\text{l}</math> [SD <math>\pm</math> 151.2] vs +0 per <math>\mu\text{l}</math> [SD <math>\pm</math> 159.4], respectively; <math>p=0.068</math>) at 48 weeks post treatment switching:</p>
3	HIV symptom index	<p>The outcome is a HIV disease specific validated tool which uses patient elicitation to capture changes in 20 symptoms which are indicative of improvements in their condition.</p> <p>For the treatment naïve population, statistically significant differences in favour of B/F/TAF compared to dolutegravir, abacavir and lamivudine were found at 2 or more time points (<math>p&lt;0.05</math>) in the adjusted logistic regression model in the following domains of the HIV symptom index:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• fatigue/loss of energy;</li> <li>• dizziness/light headedness;</li> <li>• nausea/vomiting; and</li> <li>• difficulty sleeping.</li> </ul> <p>In the longitudinal models, there were statistically significant differences in the fatigue/loss of energy and nausea/vomiting domains with fewer reports in B/F/TAF group.</p> <p>For treatment-experienced patients switched from dolutegravir, abacavir and lamivudine to B/F/TAF, statistically significant differences in favour of B/F/TAF were found at 2 or more time points in the adjusted logistic regression model, as well as in the longitudinal models in the following domains:</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• nausea/vomiting;</li><li>• sad/down/depressed;</li><li>• nervous/anxious; and</li><li>• difficulty sleeping (as well as the poor sleep quality domain in the Pittsburgh Sleep Quality Index).</li></ul>
--	--	---

© NICE 2018. All rights reserved. Subject to [Notice of rights](#)