Drug Resistance and Virological Failure among HIV-Infected Patients after a Decade of Antiretroviral Treatment Expansion in Eight Provinces of China
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Abstract

Background

China’s National Free Antiretroviral Treatment Program (NFATP) has substantially increased the survival rate since 2002. However, the emergence of HIV drug resistance (HIVDR) limits the durability and effectiveness of antiretroviral treatment (ART) in at risk patients.

Method

A cross-sectional survey was conducted among patients having received a median of 13.9 months of ART in eight provinces in China. Demographic and clinical information was collected, and venous blood was sampled for CD4 cell counts, measurement of the HIV viral load (VL), and HIV drug resistance (HIVDR) genotyping. Possible risk factors for HIVDR were analyzed by the logistic regression model.

Results

The study included 765 patients. Among them, 65 patients (8.5%) had virological failure (VLF) defined as ≥1,000 copies/ml. Among the individuals with VLF, 64 were successful genotyped, and of these, 33 had one or more HIVDR mutations. The prevalence of HIVDR mutations among patients receiving first-line ART was 4.3% (33/765). All of the patients with HIVDR mutations were resistant to non-nucleoside transcriptase inhibitors, 81.8% were resistant to nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors, and only 3% had mutations that caused resistance to protease inhibitors. Having lower ratios of drug intake in the past...
month and dwelling in two southwestern provinces were factors independently associated with the emergence of HIVDR.

Conclusion

Most patients receiving first-line ART treatment achieved sound virological and immunological outcomes. However, poor adherence is still a key problem, which has led to the high rate of HIVDR. It was notable that the proportion of drug resistance widely varied among the provinces. More studies are needed to focus on adherence.

Introduction

Since its development in 1996, combination antiretroviral therapy (cART) has significantly improved the quality of life of HIV-infected persons and dramatically lowered their morbidity and mortality [1–5]. It has become widely available in most resource-limited or developing countries since the WHO launched the “3 by 5” initiative in 2003. It was reported at the world AIDS day 2015 that 16 million people were receiving antiretroviral treatment and 7.8 million HIV-related deaths had been averted between 2000 and 2015.

In China, the National Free Antiretroviral Treatment Program (NFATP) was begun in 2002, after a pilot study [6]. As a public health approached ART program, NFATP has proved to have efficiently reduced mortality among HIV-infected Chinese patients [7–12]. The development of NFATP was in three phases. The first phase was from 2002 to 2005, the second phase, also called as the first scale-up phase, was between 2005 and 2007, and the third phase which was the further scale-up and standardization phase was from 2008 onwards [13]. Significant policy changes in the third phase included scale-up HIV testing among key populations and immediate initiation of ART in China. By the end of 2014, more than 363,000 patients in China had received ART [14]. However, concerns for the emergence of drug resistance grew during the rapid ART expansion in China. In this study, we conducted a survey of acquired HIVDR based on the WHO HIVDR surveillance protocol in order to assess the level of virological suppression and drug resistance during these years in China. Our findings would provide valuable implications for good practice of planning treatments for all people living with HIV.

Methods

Study design and study population

We conducted a cross-sectional survey in eight provinces or cities of China: Beijing, Jilin, Hunan, Guangxi, Sichuan, Guizhou, Yunnan and Xinjiang Province. The survey protocol was taken from the WHO recommended cross-sectional survey on acquired HIVDR in adult patients receiving ART. Patients included were 18 years or older, had begun free ART treatment in 2013, and had received first-line ART for 9–18 months at enrollment. Eligible patients were enrolled at routine clinic visits in 2014. All participants provided written informed consent.

Ethics approval

Institutional review board approval was granted by National Center for AIDS/STD Control and Prevention (NCAIDS), Chinese Center for Disease Control and Prevention (China CDC).
Data collection
An interview-administered questionnaire (S1 File) was used for data collection. The questionnaire was administered face to face by trained local health staff in a private room. Data on demographic characteristics, ART treatment, and medicine adherence were collected during the interview.

Laboratory tests
Blood specimens were collected after the interview. CD4+ T cells were quantified using flow cytometry at local CDCs within 12 hours. Plasma was isolated and sent under cold chain to the laboratory at NCAIDS, China CDC where the HIV viral load was measured. Viral suppression was defined as an HIV RNA level <1000 copies/ml. In samples with a viral load ≥1000 copies/ml, HIV drug resistance genotyping was performed at the NCAIDS laboratory by using an in-house method [15, 16]. A drug resistance mutation was identified and interpreted by using the algorithm of the Stanford HIV Drug Resistance Database (http://hivdb.stanford.edu/pages/algs/sierra_sequence.html). HIV drug resistance mutations were defined as those conferring low-, intermediate, or high- level resistance [17, 18].

Statistical analysis
All questionnaire data were double-entered using Epidata 3.1 (The Epidata Association Odense, Denmark). Statistical Analyses (S1 Table) were performed using SAS V9.4 (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, North Carolina, USA). Univariate logistic regression models were constructed to explore factors associated with drug resistance. A stepwise multivariate logistic regression model was constructed to select the variables that were independently associated with drug resistance. A P value <0.05 was considered statistically significant, and all tests were two-sided.

Results
Demographic characteristics
This survey included 765 patients having received ART for 9–18 months (Table 1). The mean age was 44.7 years. The majority of the subjects were male (71.4%), of Han ethnicity (79.3%), and had received Junior high school or lower education (70.7%). 42.5% were married and 35.3% were farmers. About two-thirds of the patients were infected by heterosexual transmission, followed by homosexual contact (19.2%), and intravenous drug use (8.5%). Most patients started ART with first-line regimens that included AZT+3TC+EFV/NVP (56.0%), D4T+3TC+EFV/NVP (7.6%), or TDF+3TC+EFV/NVP (29.9%). 8.2% of the patients initiated ART with PI (LPV/r)-based second-line regimens. At the time of the survey, the median duration of ART was 13.9 months (interquartile range [IQR] 12.6–15.0).

Immunological and virological outcomes
Among the patients, the proportion of a CD4 count of 0–199, 200–349, and ≥350 cells/ul before ART were 45.4%, 37.4%, and 17.2%, respectively. After 13.9 months of treatment, the proportion of a CD4 count of ≥350 cells/ul was increased to 37.4%. The median CD4 count before ART increased from 222 (IQR, 215) cells/ul to 303 (IQR, 258) cells/ul at the time of the survey. The great majority of patients (700/765, 91.5%) had a plasma HIV viral load <1000 copies/ml. Among the individuals with VLF, 64 were successful genotyped, and of these, 33 had one or more HIVDR mutations. However, the proportion of viral load failure among
Table 1. Characteristics of HIV patients receiving ART in China.

| Characteristics                                   | Number | Percentage (%) |
|---------------------------------------------------|--------|----------------|
| Total                                             | 765    |                |
| Age (mean ± SD, years)                            | 44.7±13.4 |               |
| Sex                                               |        |                |
| Male                                              | 546    | 71.4           |
| Female                                            | 219    | 28.6           |
| Ethnicity                                         |        |                |
| Han                                               | 607    | 79.3           |
| Minorities                                        | 158    | 20.7           |
| Education                                         |        |                |
| Illiterate                                        | 32     | 4.2            |
| Primary school                                    | 189    | 24.7           |
| Junior high school                                | 320    | 41.8           |
| High school                                       | 121    | 15.8           |
| Junior college or higher                          | 103    | 13.5           |
| Married                                           |        |                |
| Yes                                               | 325    | 42.5           |
| No                                                | 440    | 57.5           |
| Occupation                                        |        |                |
| Farmer                                            | 270    | 35.3           |
| Other                                             | 495    | 64.7           |
| HIV transmission route                             |        |                |
| Heterosexual intercourse                          | 517    | 67.6           |
| Homosexual intercourse                            | 147    | 19.2           |
| Drug injection                                    | 65     | 8.5            |
| Other                                             | 36     | 4.7            |
| CD4 count before ART                              |        |                |
| 0–199                                             | 347    | 45.4           |
| 200–349                                           | 286    | 37.4           |
| 349 or above                                      | 132    | 17.2           |
| CD4 count at survey                               |        |                |
| 0–199                                             | 277    | 36.2           |
| 200–349                                           | 202    | 26.4           |
| 349 or above                                      | 286    | 37.4           |
| Duration of ART (months) median, IQR              | 13.9, 12.6–15.0 |     |
| Missed dose in the past month                     |        |                |
| Yes                                               | 45     | 5.9            |
| No                                                | 720    | 94.1           |
| Ratio of drug intake in the past month            |        |                |
| ≥90%                                              | 742    | 97.0           |
| <90%                                              | 23     | 3.0            |
| Initial ART regimen                               |        |                |
| AZT/3TC/EFV or NVP                                | 428    | 56.0           |
| D4T/3TC/EFV or NVP                                | 58     | 7.6            |
| TDF/3TC/EFV or NVP                                | 229    | 29.9           |
| Second-line regimens                             | 50     | 6.5            |
| ART regimen at survey                             |        |                |
| AZT/3TC/EFV or NVP                                | 383    | 50.1           |
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patients from Sichuan and Guizhou were 27% and 24%, respectively, which was higher than patients from other provinces.

HIV drug resistance and subtype

Among the 33 patients identified with HIVDR mutations, all patients harbored HIV-1 strains resistant to non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs) (Table 2). 81.8% of these patients were also resistant to nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs), but only 3% were resistant to both NNRTIs and PIs. The most common NNRTIs mutations were K103N (54.5%), G190A/S/R (27.3%), and Y181C (24.2%) in the reverse transcriptase (RT) region. NRTIs mutations were most frequently seen as M184I/V (66.7%) and K65R (39.4%) in the RT region, while PI mutations were only found to be M46L in the protease (PR) region. Among 65 patients with VLF, 56.9% (37/65) patients were subtypes of 01AE, 21.5% (14/65) were 07BC, and the rest were other subtypes. There was no corrections between the drug resistance and the subtype (P>0.05).

Patient characteristics associated with HIV drug resistance

The risk factors for HIVDR that were significant in the univariate logistic analysis were included in the multivariate logistic regression (Table 3). According to the univariate logistic regression model, five potential factors correlated with HIV drug resistance. In the multivariate model, the following two factors were independently correlated with HIVDR: the rate of HIVDR among patients with <90% of drug intake in the past month were 6.0 folds higher than in patients with ≥90% of drug intake (95%CI: 1.7–20.7; P = 0.005), and Sichuan and Guizhou Provinces were 7.3 times higher than the other provinces (95%CI: 3.6–15.2; P<0.0001).

Discussion

In this study, we analyzed HIVDR data in order to evaluate the prevalence and risk factors among 765 patients who were undergoing treatment. Our findings showed that 91.5% (700/765) achieved virological suppression (VL<1000 copies/ml) after 13.9 months of ART, which is better than the outcomes of previous surveillance studies in China [19–21]. 33 patients (4.3%) had verified HIVDR which is slightly lower than other countries where national free ART is available. The prevalence of HIVDR in Cameroon and Namibia were 5.3% and 5%.
Table 2. HIV drug resistance mutations among HIV patients with drug resistance.

| Antiretroviral drug                     | N(%) | HIV drug resistance mutations, N (%) |
|----------------------------------------|------|-------------------------------------|
| Total                                  | 33 (100) |                                       |
| Non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs, any) | 33 (100) |                                       |
| Efavirenz (EFV)                        | 33 (100) | K103N/KN,18 (54.5)                  |
| Nevirapine (NVP)                       | 33 (100) | G190A/S/R/GS/RS/AG,9 (27.3)         |
| Etravirine (ETR)                       | 21 (63.6) | Y181C/CY,8 (24.2)                   |
| Rilpivirine (RPV)                      | 24 (72.7) | V179D/T/E,7 (21.2)                  |
|                                        |       | K101E/N/EK,5 (15.2)                 |
|                                        |       | V90I/IV,5 (15.2)                    |
|                                        |       | V106M/V,5 (15.2)                    |
|                                        |       | V108I/IV,3 (9.1)                    |
|                                        |       | E138A/EG/EK,3 (9.1)                 |
|                                        |       | M230L,3 (9.1)                       |
|                                        |       | L100I,3 (9.1)                       |
|                                        |       | K238N/KT,2 (6.1)                    |
|                                        |       | A98G/AG,2 (6.1)                     |
|                                        |       | Y188FHLYL,2 (6.1)                   |
|                                        |       | P225HP/H,2 (6.1)                    |
|                                        |       | H221HY,1 (3.0)                      |
|                                        |       | F227FL,1 (3.0)                      |
| Nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs, any) | 27 (81.8) |                                       |
| Emtricitabine (FTC)                    | 25 (75.8) | M184I/V/M,22 (66.7)                |
| Lamivudine (3TC)                       | 25 (75.8) | K65R/KR,13 (39.4)                  |
| Abacavir (ABC)                         | 26 (78.8) | D67N/G/DN,6 (18.2)                 |
| Didanosine (DDI)                       | 22 (66.7) | Y115F,5 (15.2)                      |
| Stavudine (D4T)                        | 19 (57.6) | K70E/R,3 (9.1)                      |
| Tenofovir (TDF)                        | 18 (54.6) | T215FIST/F,3 (9.1)                  |
| Azidothymidine (AZT)                   | 4 (12.1)  | A62V/AV,2 (6.1)                     |
|                                        |       | L74I/IL,2 (6.1)                     |
|                                        |       | V75M/IV,2 (6.1)                     |
|                                        |       | T69N,1 (3.0)                        |
|                                        |       | M41LM,1 (3.0)                       |
|                                        |       | K219E,1 (3.0)                       |
| Protease inhibitors (PIs, any)         | 1 (3.0)  | M46L,1 (3.0)                        |
| Tipranavir (TPV)                       |       |                                    |
| Fosamprenavir (FPV)                    |       |                                    |
| Lopinavir (LPV)                        |       |                                    |
| Nelfinavir (NFV)                       | 1 (3.0)  |                                    |
| Atazanavir (ATV)                       |       |                                    |
| Darunavir (DRV)                        |       |                                    |
| Indinavir (IDV)                        |       |                                    |
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respectively [22, 23] but significantly higher than Malawi [24] of 3.4%. Our results suggest that China’s free ART program is providing high quality care to HIV/AIDS patients. There are several reasons to explain the low virological failure and drug resistance among HIV-infected patients receiving first-line ART. First, medical care is accessible at many levels of the health systems including provincial, prefecture, and county hospitals. Most care is provided at the community level and through outreach, with telephone calls or home visitation. Second, all doctors and health staff involved in providing ART and care management receive additional training [25].

Although our study showed that China has met the WHO target for 90% of patients having their viral load suppressed, as HIV/AIDS patients live longer and are on ART for life, the number of patients with drug resistance is likely to increase. A combination of strategies is required to combat drug resistance. New medicines that can more robustly cope with drug resistance mutants are needed, especially for those with common mutations such as K103N and M184I/V [19, 26, 27]. M184I/V confers resistance to lamivudine, which is often the first mutation to develop in patients receiving partially suppressive triple combination therapy including lamivudine [28]. K103N is one of the most frequent mutations conferring resistance to most available NNRTIs [29].

Factors independently associated with the incidence of HIVDR were: the ratio of drug intake in the past month; and place of residence. The first factor reflected that adherence was a direct factor causing HIVDR, with 21(2.7%) patients having reported to have lower than 90% of drug intake in the past month. Similar findings had been reported in our previous studies in China [19, 27, 30], where poor adherence clearly leads to the occurrence of HIVDR. Good adherence can suppress plasma HIV RNA and utilize the optimum effectiveness of the ART therapy. Several studies have focused on strategies to improve adherence, including social support [31, 32], behavioral interventions [33], contingency management strategies [34], directly administered antiretroviral therapy (DAART) [35], and technological interventions [36]. The Chinese strategy focuses on education and counseling to improve the adherence of patients; but a comprehensive strategy using some of the other interventions is needed.

The reasons why patients from Sichuan and Guizhou had worse outcomes compared to patients from other provinces was unclear. We found, however, that the composition of patients from this population differed compared to patients from other provinces. Their differential risk for drug resistance may have been mediated through factors influencing adherence such as education, economic level, healthcare providers support, and adherence to ART. 78.2% of the Sichuan and Guizhou patients had received middle school education or lower compared with 69.5% in other provinces, 32.7% of patients in Sichuan and Guizhou were poor versus 22.3% in other provinces, 59.1% of patients in Sichuan and Guizhou get support from healthcare providers compared with 89.9% in other provinces, and 14.5% in Sichuan and Guizhou had a poor adherence to ART compared with 7.8% in other provinces. There may, however, have been unmeasured confounding variables that led to this observation. Observations about drug resistance found on the population level, may not apply to individual patients.

| Antiretroviral drug               | N(%)           | HIV drug resistance mutations, N (%) |
|----------------------------------|----------------|---------------------------------------|
| Saquinavir (SQV)                 |                |                                       |
| Multi-drug resistance to NNRTI and NRTI | 27             | (81.8)                                |

Table 2. (Continued)
| Variable                              | Number | Drug resistance, N (%) | Crude OR(95%CI) | P-value | Adjusted OR(95%CI) | P-value |
|---------------------------------------|--------|------------------------|-----------------|---------|--------------------|---------|
| **Total**                             | 765    | 33 (4.3)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| **Age (years)**                       |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| <45                                   | 416    | 22 (5.3)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| ≥45                                   | 349    | 11 (3.2)               | 0.6 (0.3–1.2)   | 0.15    |                    |         |
| **Sex**                               |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Male                                  | 546    | 26 (4.8)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Female                                | 219    | 7 (3.2)                | 0.7 (0.3–1.5)   | 0.34    |                    |         |
| **Ethnicity**                         |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Han                                    | 607    | 27 (4.4)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Minorities                            | 158    | 6 (3.8)                | 0.8 (0.3–2.1)   | 0.72    |                    |         |
| **Education**                         |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Junior high school or lower           | 541    | 27 (5.0)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| High school or higher                 | 224    | 6 (2.7)                | 0.5 (0.2–1.3)   | 0.16    |                    |         |
| **Married**                           |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Yes                                   | 408    | 19 (4.7)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| No                                    | 357    | 14 (3.9)               | 0.8 (0.4–1.7)   | 0.62    |                    |         |
| **Registered residence**              |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| City                                  | 421    | 19 (4.5)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Rural                                 | 344    | 14 (4.1)               | 0.9 (0.4–1.8)   | 0.76    |                    |         |
| **Occupation**                        |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Farmer                                | 270    | 10 (3.7)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Other                                 | 495    | 23 (4.6)               | 1.3 (0.6–2.7)   | 0.54    |                    |         |
| **Economics**                         |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Poor                                  | 182    | 11 (6.0)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| General or good                       | 583    | 22 (3.8)               | 0.6 (0.3–1.3)   | 0.19    |                    |         |
| **Medical insurance**                 |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Yes                                   | 665    | 32 (4.8)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| No                                    | 100    | 1 (1.0)                | 0.2 (0.03–1.5)  | 0.11    |                    |         |
| **Social support**                    |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| No                                    | 59     | 8 (13.8)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Yes                                   | 706    | 25 (3.5)               | 0.2 (0.1–0.5)   | 0.001   |                    |         |
| **Living condition**                  |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Satisfactory                          | 527    | 25 (4.7)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Not satisfactory                      | 238    | 8 (3.4)                | 0.7 (0.3–1.6)   | 0.39    |                    |         |
| **Alcohol in the past 6 months**      |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| No                                    | 473    | 22 (4.7)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Yes                                   | 292    | 11 (3.8)               | 0.8 (0.4–1.7)   | 0.56    |                    |         |
| **Smoking (cigarettes/day)**          |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| <10                                   | 613    | 25 (4.1)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| ≥10                                   | 152    | 8 (5.3)                | 1.3 (0.6–3.0)   | 0.52    |                    |         |
| **Went outside for work in the past three months (days)** | | | | | | |
| <30                                   | 595    | 26 (4.4)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| ≥30                                   | 170    | 7 (4.1)                | 0.9 (0.4–2.2)   | 0.89    |                    |         |
| **Weight**                            |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Increased                             | 224    | 7 (3.1)                |                 |         |                    |         |
| Decreased                             | 71     | 6 (8.5)                | 2.9 (0.9–8.8)   | 0.07    |                    |         |

(Continued)
Future studies should explore health systems and individual level differences to better elucidate why resistance was greater in Sichuan and Guizhou provinces than other provinces.

We also found that regimens with or without TDF showed the same results in causing HIVDR, which needs further investigation. TDF is preferred to its predecessors AZT and d4T in the ART program because of its better safety profile [37] which has been recommended by WHO for HIV first-line treatment. Researchers found that patients on TDF-based first-line

| Variable                                    | Number | Drug resistance, N (%) | Crude OR(95%CI) | P-value | Adjusted OR(95%CI) | P-value |
|---------------------------------------------|--------|------------------------|-----------------|---------|--------------------|---------|
| No change                                   | 470    | 20 (4.3)               | 1.4 (0.6–3.3)   | 0.47    |                    |         |
| HIV transmission route                       |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Heterosexual intercourse                    | 517    | 25 (4.8)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Homosexual intercourse                      | 147    | 3 (2.0)                | 0.4 (0.1–1.4)   | 0.15    |                    |         |
| Drug injection                              | 65     | 3 (4.6)                | 1.0 (0.3–3.2)   | 0.94    |                    |         |
| Other                                       | 36     | 2 (5.6)                | 1.2 (0.3–5.1)   | 0.85    |                    |         |
| Traditional Chinese Medicine treatment      |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Yes                                         | 53     | 3 (5.7)                |                 |         |                    |         |
| No                                          | 712    | 30 (4.2)               | 0.7 (0.2–2.4)   | 0.6     |                    |         |
| Obtain medicine                             |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Myself                                      | 739    | 29 (3.9)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Others                                      | 26     | 4 (15.4)               | 4.5 (1.4–13.8)  | 0.01    |                    |         |
| Reminded of taking Antiretroviral drug       |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Telephone                                   | 434    | 14 (3.2)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Others                                      | 331    | 19 (5.7)               | 1.8 (0.9–3.7)   | 0.09    |                    |         |
| Taking medicine in the workplace            |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Convenient                                  | 274    | 10 (3.7)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Inconvenient                                | 136    | 7 (5.2)                | 1.4 (0.5–3.9)   | 0.48    |                    |         |
| Unemployed                                  | 355    | 16 (4.5)               | 1.2 (0.6–2.8)   | 0.59    |                    |         |
| Side reaction in the past month             |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Small side reaction                         | 743    | 31 (4.2)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Big side reaction                           | 22     | 2 (9.1)                | 2.3 (0.5–10.3)  | 0.28    |                    |         |
| Ratio of drug intake in the past month (%)  |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| \(\geq 90\%\)                               | 744    | 29 (3.9)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| \(<90\%\)                                   | 21     | 4 (19.0)               | 5.8 (1.8–18.3)  | 0.003   | 6.0(1.7–20.7)      | 0.005   |
| Ratio of on-time drug intake in the past month |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| \(\geq 90\%\)                               | 748    | 29 (3.9)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| \(<90\%\)                                   | 17     | 4 (23.5)               | 7.6 (2.3–24.8)  | 0.001   |                    |         |
| Missed doses in the past month              |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Yes                                         | 45     | 1 (2.2)                |                 |         |                    |         |
| No                                          | 720    | 32 (4.4)               | 2.0 (0.3–15.3)  | 0.49    |                    |         |
| Initial ART regimen                         |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Regimens without TDF                        | 497    | 21 (4.2)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Regimens with TDF                           | 268    | 12 (4.5)               | 1.1 (0.5–2.2)   | 0.87    |                    |         |
| ART regimen at survey                       |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Regimens without TDF                        | 410    | 14 (3.4)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Regimens with TDF                           | 355    | 19 (5.4)               | 1.6 (0.8–3.2)   | 0.19    |                    |         |
| Place of residence                          |        |                        |                 |         |                    |         |
| Others                                      | 655    | 16 (2.4)               |                 |         |                    |         |
| Sichuan and Guizhou                         | 110    | 17 (15.5)              | 7.3 (3.6–14.9)  | <0.001  | 7.4 (3.6–15.2)     | <0.0001 |

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0166661.t003

Future studies should explore health systems and individual level differences to better elucidate why resistance was greater in Sichuan and Guizhou provinces than other provinces.

We also found that regimens with or without TDF showed the same results in causing HIVDR, which needs further investigation. TDF is preferred to its predecessors AZT and d4T in the ART program because of its better safety profile [37] which has been recommended by WHO for HIV first-line treatment. Researchers found that patients on TDF-based first-line
regimens had fewer drug-resistant mutations [38]. With the scale-up of TDF, evidence on this issue tends to show different results concerning mortality, the CD4 cell count, and virological failure [38–40]. In our study, patients at the survey on regimens with and without TDF were 5.4% (19/355) and 3.4% (14/410), respectively (P = 0.19). Further studies are needed to clarify the effects of regimens with TDF in China.

This study has some limitations. First, this was a cross-sectional study and patients who terminated treatment (due to adverse reactions, loss to follow-up, or death) would not have been sampled, which may have led to overestimated treatment effectiveness. Second, adherence was assessed by self-reporting of having missed doses in the past month, which may not reflect the true adherence. Finally, we found the drug resistance difference between Guizhou, Sichuan, and other provinces. Explaining the differences focused on the socioeconomic status of the inhabitants, but in fact transmitted drug resistance and possible presence of transmission clusters with HIV drug resistant variants may differ in different provinces which we do not know.

In conclusion, a representative national sample of HIVDR surveillance across China demonstrated excellent virological and immunological outcomes at 9–18 months among patients receiving first-line ART treatment. However, poor adherence to treatment is still a key problem regardless of the efforts on the regimens, which has led to the high rate of HIVDR. Drug resistance widely varies among provinces. More research needs to focus on the adherence of patients and long-term studies monitoring drug resistance should be completed in some select cases.

Supporting Information

S1 File. Questionnaire of this research.
(DOC)

S1 Table. Relevant data underlying the findings described in manuscript.
(SAS7BDAT)

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the work of research assistants involved in completing patient interviews the staff of eight provincial CDCs. And Thanks to Dr. Edward C. Mignot, Shandong University, for linguistic advice.

Author Contributions

Conceptualization: LL YS YR HX.

Data curation: ZZ WK XL.

Investigation: SL XS JY.

Methodology: LL YS YR HX.

Writing – original draft: ZZ SB.

Writing – review & editing: ZZ.

References

1. May MT, Sterne JA, Costagliola D, Sabin CA, Phillips AN, Justice AC, et al. HIV treatment response and prognosis in Europe and North America in the first decade of highly active antiretroviral therapy: a collaborative analysis. Lancet (London, England). 2006; 368(9534):451–8. Epub 2006/08/08.
2. Lewden C, Drabo YJ, Zannou DM, Maiga MY, Minta DK, Sow PS, et al. Disease patterns and causes of death of hospitalized HIV-positive adults in West Africa: a multicountry survey in the antiretroviral treatment era. Journal of the International AIDS Society. 2014; 17:18797. Epub 2014/04/10. doi: 10.7448/IAS.17.1.18797 PMID: 24713375

3. Keiser O, Anastos K, Schechter M, Balestre E, Myer L, Boule A, et al. Antiretroviral therapy in resource-limited settings 1996 to 2006: patient characteristics, treatment regimens and monitoring in sub-Saharan Africa, Asia and Latin America. Tropical medicine & international health: TM & IH. 2008; (7):870–9. Epub 2008/04/01.

4. Lessells RJ, Mutevedzi PC, Iwuji CC, Newell ML. Reduction in early mortality on antiretroviral therapy for adults in rural South Africa since change in CD4+ cell count eligibility criteria. Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes (1999). 2014; 65(1):e17–24. Epub 2013/06/13.

5. Cornell M, Grimsrud A, Fairall L, Fox MP, van Cutsem G, Giddy J, et al. Temporal changes in programme outcomes among adult patients initiating antiretroviral therapy across South Africa, 2002–2007. AIDS (London, England). 2010; 24(14):2263–70. Epub 2010/08/05.

6. Ma Y, Zhang F, Zhao Y, Zang C, Zhao D, Dou Z, et al. Cohort profile: the Chinese national free antiretroviral treatment cohort. International journal of epidemiology. 2010; 39(4):973–9. Epub 2009/06/27. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyp233 PMID: 19556327

7. Zhang F, Dou Z, Yu L, Xu J, Jiao JH, Wang N, et al. The effect of highly active antiretroviral therapy on mortality among HIV-infected former plasma donors in China. Clin Infect Dis. 2008; 47(6):825–33. Epub 2008/08/12. doi: 10.1086/590945 PMID: 18690805

8. Zhu H, Napravnik S, Eron JJ, Cole SR, Ma Y, Wohl DA, et al. Decreasing excess mortality of HIV-infected patients initiating antiretroviral therapy: comparison with mortality in general population in China, 2003–2008. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2013; 63(5):e150–7. Epub 2013/04/11. doi: 10.1097/QAI.0b013e3182949b82 PMID: 23572014

9. Zhang F, Dou Z, Ma Y, Zhang Y, Zhao Y, Zhao D, et al. Effect of earlier initiation of antiretroviral treatment and increased treatment coverage on HIV-related mortality in China: a national observational cohort study. The Lancet Infectious Diseases. 2011; 11(7):516–24. Epub 2011/05/24. doi: 10.1016/S1473-3099(11)70097-4 PMID: 21600849

10. Zhang F, Dou Z, Ma Y, Zhao Y, Liu Z, Bulterys M, et al. Five-year outcomes of the China National Free Antiretroviral Treatment Program. Ann Intern Med. 2009; 151(4):241–51, W–52. Epub 2009/08/19. PMID: 19687491

11. Zhang Y, Dou Z, Sun K, Ma Y, Chen RY, Bulterys M, et al. Association between missed early visits and mortality among patients of China national free antiretroviral treatment cohort. Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes. 2012; 60(1):59–67. Epub 2012/04/21. doi: 10.1097/QAI.0b013e31824c3d9f PMID: 22517414

12. Liao L, Xing H, Su B, Wang Z, Ruan Y, Wang X, et al. Impact of HIV drug resistance on virologic and immunologic failure and mortality in a cohort of patients on antiretroviral therapy in China. AIDS (London, England). 2013; 27(11):1815–24. Epub 2013/06/28.

13. Zhao DC, Wen Y, Ma Y, Zhao Y, Zhang Y, Wu YS, et al. Expansion of China’s free antiretroviral treatment program. Chinese medical journal. 2012; 125(19):3514–21. Epub 2012/10/10. PMID: 23044316

14. NCAIDS N, and China CDC. Update on the AIDS/STD epidemic in China and main response in control and prevention in December, 2014. Chin J AIDS STD. 2015; 21:87.

15. Liao L, Xing H, Shang H, Li J, Zhong P, Kang L, et al. The prevalence of transmitted antiretroviral drug resistance in treatment-naive HIV-infected individuals in China. Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes (1999). 2010; 53 Suppl 1:S10–4. Epub 2010/02/06.

16. Xing H, Ruan Y, Hsi JH, Kan W, Liao L, Leng X, et al. Reductions in virological failure and drug resistance in Chinese antiretroviral-treated patients due to lamivudine-based regimens, 2003–12. J Antimicrob Chemother. 2015; 70(7):2097–103. Epub 2015/04/10. doi: 10.1093/jac/dkv076 PMID: 25855758

17. Liu TF, Shafer RW. Web resources for HIV type 1 genotypic-resistance test interpretation. Clinical infectious diseases: an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2006; 42(1):1808–18. Epub 2006/05/03.

18. Shafer RW, Rhee SY, Pillay D, Miller V, Sandstrom P, Schapiro JM, et al. HIV-1 protease and reverse transcriptase mutations for drug resistance surveillance. AIDS (London, England). 2007; 21(2):215–23. Epub 2007/01/02.

19. Wang J, He C, Hei JH, Xu X, Liu Y, He J, et al. Virological outcomes and drug resistance in Chinese patients after 12 months of 3TC-based first-line antiretroviral treatment. 2011–2012. PloS one. 2014; 9(2):e88305. Epub 2014/02/12. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0088305 PMID: 24516651

20. Wang X, Yang L, Li H, Zuo L, Liang S, Liu W, et al. Factors associated with HIV virologic failure among patients on HAART for one year as three sentinel surveillance sites in China. Current HIV research. 2011; 9(2):103–11. Epub 2011/03/03. PMID: 21361864
21. Liu H, Ma Y, Su Y, Smith MK, Liu Y, Jin Y, et al. Emerging trends of HIV drug resistance in Chinese HIV-infected patients receiving first-line highly active antiretroviral therapy: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Clinical infectious diseases: an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2014; 59(10):1495–502. Epub 2014/07/24.

22. Billong SC, Fokam J, Aghokeng AF, Milenge P, Kembou E, Abessouguie I, et al. Population-based monitoring of emerging HIV-1 drug resistance on antiretroviral therapy and associated factors in a sentinel site in Cameroon: low levels of resistance but poor programmatic performance. PloS one. 2013; 8(8):e72680. Epub 2013/08/31. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0072680 PMID: 23991142

23. Hong SY, Jonas A, DeKlerk M, Shiningavamwe A, Desta T, Badi A, et al. Population-based surveillance of HIV drug resistance emerging on treatment and associated factors at sentinel antiretroviral therapy sites in Namibia. Journal of acquired immune deficiency syndromes (1999). 2015; 68(4):463–71. Epub 2015/01/08.

24. Wadonda-Kabondo N, Hedd BL, van Oosterhout JJ, Moyo K, Limbambala B, Bello G, et al. A retrospective survey of HIV drug resistance among patients 1 year after initiation of antiretroviral therapy at 4 clinics in Malawi. Clinical infectious diseases: an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2012; 54 Suppl 4:S355–61. Epub 2012/05/11.

25. Liang S, Shen Z, Yan J, Liang F, Tang Z, Liu W, et al. Low Virologic Failure and Drug Resistance among HIV-Infected Patients Receiving Hospital-Based ART While Care and Outreach through Community in Guangxi, China. Frontiers in public health. 2015; 3:244. Epub 2015/11/19. doi: 10.3389/fpubh.2015.00244 PMID: 26579506

26. Xing H, Wang X, Liao L, Ma Y, Su B, Fu J, et al. Incidence and associated factors of HIV drug resistance in Chinese HIV-infected patients receiving antiretroviral treatment. PloS one. 2013; 8(4):e62408. Epub 2013/05/03. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0062408 PMID: 23638072

27. Leng X, Liang S, Ma Y, Dong Y, Kan W, Goan D, et al. HIV virological failure and drug resistance among injecting drug users receiving first-line ART in China. BMJ Open. 2014; 4(10):e005886. Epub 2014/10/17. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2014-005886 PMID: 25319999

28. Tisdale M, Kemp SD, Parry NR, Larder BA. Rapid in vitro selection of human immunodeficiency virus type 1 resistant to 3'-thiacytidine inhibitors due to a mutation in the YMDD region of reverse transcriptase. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 1993; 90(12):5653–6. Epub 1993/06/15. PMID: 7685907

29. Casado JL, Hertogs K, Ruiz L, Dronda F, Van Cauwenberge A, Arno A, et al. Non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitor resistance among patients failing a nevirapine plus protease inhibitor-containing regimen. AIDS (London, England). 2000; 14(2):F1–7. Epub 2000/03/09.

30. Xing H, Ruan Y, Li J, Shang H, Zhong P, Wang X, et al. HIV drug resistance and its impact on antiretroviral therapy: a randomized controlled trial (CCTG 578). AIDS. 2013; 27(18):2411–21. Epub 2013/09/27. doi: 10.1097/01.aids.0000442528.41057.15 PMID: 24031233

31. Simoni JM, Fishbein M, Boreman S, Lando H. A randomized controlled trial of a peer support intervention targeting antiretroviral medication adherence and depressive symptomatology in HIV-positive men and women. Health Psychol. 2007; 26(4):488–95. Epub 2007/07/04. doi: 10.1037/0278-6133.26.4.488 PMID: 17605569

32. Wagner GJ, Kanouse DE, Golinielli D, Miller LG, Daar ES, Witt MD, et al. Cognitive-behavioral intervention to enhance adherence to antiretroviral therapy: a randomized controlled trial (CCTG 578). AIDS (London, England). 2006; 20(9):1295–302. Epub 2006/07/04.

33. Sorensen JL, Haug NA, Delucchi KL, Gruber V, Kletter E, Batki SL, et al. Voucher reinforcement improves medication adherence in HIV-positive methadone patients: a randomized trial. Drug Alcohol Depend. 2007; 88(1):54–63. Epub 2006/10/24. doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2006.09.019 PMID: 17056206

34. Goggin K, Liston RJ, Mitty JA. Modified directly observed therapy for antiretroviral therapy: a primer from the field. Public Health Rep. 2007; 122(4):472–81. Epub 2007/02/21. PMID: 17639650

35. Andrade AS, McGrunder HF, Wu AW, Celano SA, Skolasky RL Jr., Selnes OA, et al. A programmable prompting device improves adherence to highly active antiretroviral therapy in HIV-infected subjects with memory impairment. Clinical infectious diseases: an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2005; 41(6):875–302. Epub 2005/07/04.

36. Velen K, Lewis JJ, Charalambous S, Grant AD, Churchyard GJ, Hoffmann CJ. Comparison of tenofovir, zidovudine, or stavudine as part of first-line antiretroviral therapy in a resource-limited-setting: a cohort study. PloS one. 2013; 8(5):e64459. Epub 2013/05/22. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0064459 PMID: 23691224
38. Etiebet MA, Shepherd J, Nowak RG, Charurat M, Chang H, Ajayi S, et al. Tenofovir-based regimens associated with less drug resistance in HIV-1-infected Nigerians failing first-line antiretroviral therapy. AIDS (London, England). 2013; 27(4):553–61. Epub 2012/10/20.

39. Scarsi KK, Eisen G, Darin KM, Meloni ST, Rawizza HE, Tchetgen Tchetgen EJ, et al. Superior effectiveness of zidovudine compared to tenofovir when combined with nevirapine-based antiretroviral therapy in a large Nigerian Cohort. Clinical infectious diseases: an official publication of the Infectious Diseases Society of America. 2015. Epub 2015/11/13.

40. Hemkens LG, Ewald H, Santini-Oliveira M, Buhler JE, Vuichard D, Schandelmaier S, et al. Comparative effectiveness of tenofovir in treatment-naive HIV-infected patients: systematic review and meta-analysis. HIV Clin Trials. 2015; 16(5):178–89. Epub 2015/09/24. doi: 10.1179/1945577115Y.0000000004 PMID: 26395328