Implementing LA Cabotegravir (CAB) + Rilpivirine (RPV) therapy in six UK clinics & in the community - ILANA

00621

Chloe Orkin[1,2,3], Joanne Haviland[4], Yuk Lam Wong[4], Sara Paparini[2,4], Bakita Kasadha[5], Rosalie Hayes[2,4], Julie Fox[6,7], Ruth Byrne[8], Amanda Clarke[9], Emily Clarke[10], Tristan J. Barber[11,12], Vanessa Apea[2,3,4] for the ILANA study group [Nishat Halim, Sadna Ullah, James Hand, Chikondi Mwendera, Alexa Elias, Kyle Ring]

[1] Queen Mary University of London, Blizard Institute, London, UK, [2]SHARE Collaborative, London,UK, [3]Barts Health NHS Trust, London, UK, [4]Queen Mary University of London, Wolfson Institute of Population Health, London, UK, [5]University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, Oxford, UK, [6]Kings College London, Infectious Diseases, London, UK, [7]Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK, [8]Chelsea and Westminster Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK, [9] University Hospitals Sussex NHS Foundation Trust, Brighton, UK, [10]Liverpool University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Liverpool, UK, [11]Royal Free NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK, [12]University College London, Institute for Global Health, London, UK

BACKGROUND

The feasibility of implementing CAB+RPV LA ART in the community has not yet been described. In the first UK-based study, we purposefully recruited participants more representative of the global population of PLWH (at least 50% women, 50% racially minoritised and 30% over 50 years). We evaluated feasibility of implementation in 6 clinics (in & outside London) and in the community.

METHODS

- ILANA is a 1-year UK-based implementation study in PLWH who switched to CAB+RPV LA every 2 months.
- Participants received CAB+RPV in the clinic for 6 months with an option to receive the drug in the clinic or community (eg home or community organisation) from M6-M12.
- This prespecified M4 analysis evaluated PLWH perspectives on feasibility and acceptability of CAB+RPV LA and on potential community delivery through validated implementation questionnaires at baseline and 4 months:
  - Feasibility of Intervention Measure (FIM)
  - Acceptability of Intervention Measure (AIM)
  - Intervention Appropriateness Measure (IAM)
  - HIV Treatment Satisfaction Questionnaire (HIVTSQ-12)

RESULTS

- Between May-December 2022 we enrolled 114 virally suppressed PLWH [55% female, 51% Black, 30% White, 40% >50yrs, 68% heterosexual, 75% employed] (Table 1).
- Median time since diagnosis was 13 yrs (IQR 8, 19), time on ART was 11 yrs (IQR 7,16) with a mean of 3 prior regimens.
- 57% had received NNRTIs. 84% had co-morbidities, and 80% (91/114) were taking non-ART medications. 75% (68/91) were on >2 non-ART drugs.
- 99% of injections were given within the 7-day window. There were 5 discontinuations by M4 (2 injection-related, 3 participant choice).
- Regarding injectable treatment: FIM, IAM and HIVTSQ scores improved significantly (baseline to M4) (Table 2).
- FIM, IAM and AIM scores regarding perceptions of the future prospect of receiving ART in the community setting (at M6) did not improve from baseline.
- 96% preferred injectable to oral ART at M4.
- At M4, IAM mean scores were significantly less favourable in Black participants than in White participants with respect to the injection (4.44 vs. 4.67; p=0.029) and the community setting (3 vs 3.75; p=0.003)

By month 4, ILANA patient participants found injectable cabotegravir and rilpivirine **increasingly feasible and appropriate** and treatment satisfaction increased. In contrast, perceptions of receiving injections in the community in the future **did not change**. Black participants were **less likely** to find the injection and the community setting appropriate compared to White participants.

Table 1. Baseline demographics

Participant demographics	N=114 (%)
Age (years)	
≥ 50	46 (40.4)
Gender	
Cis-Woman	60 (52.6)
Cis-Man	52 (45.6)
Transgender woman	2 (1.8)
Sexual orientation	
Heterosexual	77 (67.6)
Ethnicity	
White	34 (29.8)
Asian / Asian British	6 (5.3)
Black African / Caribbean / British	58 (50.9)
Mixed / Other	16 (14.0)
Highest education level	
Higher Education Qualifications	61 (53.5)
Occupation	
Employed	92 (80.7)
Enough money to cover basic needs	
Most / all of the time	82 (71.9)
Disability	
No	101 (88.6)

Table 2. Change from baseline to 4 months for FIM, AIM, IAM outcomes in relation to injection and community setting

Mean difference* (SD) in scores	Black N=54	Non-Black N=52	Women (cis/trans) Woman N=60	Men N=46	Total N=106	p-value for change from baseline[1]
FIM change from baseline: injection	+0.21 (0.53)	+0.02 (0.51)	+0.16 (0.57)	+0.06 (0.45)	**+0.12 (0.52)**	**0.023**
FIM change from baseline: community-based location	-0.23 (1.24)	+0.04 (0.13)	-0.11 (1.08)	-0.08 (1.17)	-0.10 (1.12)	0.359
AIM change from baseline: injection	+0.11 (0.67)	+0.04 (0.45)	+0.01 (0.62)	+0.16 (0.49)	+0.08 (0.57)	0.175
AIM change from baseline: community-based location	-0.08 (1.35)	+0.13 (1.00)	-0.06 (1.21)	+0.13 (1.17)	+0.02 (1.19)	0.855
IAM change from baseline: injection	+0.20 (0.58)	+0.07 (0.50)	+0.17 (0.58)	+0.09 (0.50)	**+0.13 (0.55)**	**0.013**
IAM change from baseline: community-based location	-0.10 (0.17)	+0.17 (1.02)	-0.06 (1.09)	+0.16 (1.22)	+0.03 (1.15)	0.775
HIV-TSQ12 change from baseline	+5.43 (8.65)	+7.58 (11.85)	+5.32 (8.84)	+8.00 (11.97)	**+6.48 (10.35)**	**<0.001**

[1] p-value refers to change from baseline for total group only, not any sub-group.

CONCLUSIONS

Over four months, participants found injections increasingly feasible, appropriate and satisfactory, and preferred them to oral ART. Pre-specified sub-group analyses based on gender and race and ethnicity revealed significant differences around perception of delivering LA ART in the community in Black participants. These findings will be further evaluated in relation to treatment and psychosocial challenges.

CROI 2024 (March 3-6), Denver, Colorado, USA

Corresponding author: Chloe Orkin, c.m.orkin@qmul.ac.uk