

Antiretroviral prophylaxis for HIV prevention reaches a key milestone

On May 10, 2012, a US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) advisory committee voted in support of the use of tenofovir-emtricitabine for HIV prevention.¹ If the FDA, which is scheduled to make its decision by June 15, adopts the committee's recommendations, tenofovir-emtricitabine will become the first antiretroviral drug to be approved as pre-exposure prophylaxis (PrEP) for the prevention of HIV, paving the way for implementation.

PrEP has a unique advantage in young women in southern Africa, who bear a disproportionate burden of the HIV epidemic. In much of this region, young women are often unable to convince their male partners to use condoms, remain faithful, or have an HIV test. To rely on her HIV-positive discordant male partner to come forward to test, to agree to take antiretroviral therapy (ART), and to take his ART with high adherence, all for her protection, puts a woman's risk of acquiring HIV back in the hands of men, thereby disempowering women and undermining their efforts to control their risk of HIV.

However, there are several criticisms and concerns about PrEP. First, that data on the effectiveness of PrEP, especially in women, are inconsistent. This concern is based on the results of two PrEP studies—the FEM-PrEP² and VOICE^{3,4} trials—which were stopped, at least partly, earlier than planned when they did not show efficacy. To some extent, this concern has been allayed by recent data from the FEM-PrEP trial⁵ which show that adherence to daily tenofovir-emtricitabine in the trial was too low allow assessment of efficacy. Data to explain the VOICE

trial, which still has an ongoing tenofovir-emtricitabine group, are not expected until 2013.

Second, some suggest that antiretroviral drugs should be provided to HIV-negative people only when all eligible HIV-positive patients are receiving ART. Although it is a legitimate concern that eligible HIV-positive patients should be prioritised for ART for their own health and to save their lives, it is spurious to trade off treatment and prevention as if these drugs are being taken away from sick and dying patients to be given to healthy people. Treatment and prevention strategies are a continuum in their use of antiretroviral drugs—both are needed in conjunction with each other to ensure ART provision is sustainable in the long term and to realise the quest to end the HIV epidemic.

Third, there is a fear that PrEP will lead to worsening of the HIV epidemic, since PrEP users might reduce their use of higher-efficacy HIV prevention strategies such as condoms. Behavioural disinhibition, which was not noted in either the CAPRISA 004⁶ or iPrEx trials,⁷ is a potential concern when implementing any new suboptimum HIV prevention strategy, and is not specific to PrEP. This challenge can be mitigated through the counselling of people being started on PrEP. Indeed, PrEP is most appropriate for the target populations where condom use is low or non-existent.

Fourth, could PrEP undermine future AIDS treatment by causing drug resistance? The risk of drug resistance from PrEP is very different from that noted when, for example, nevirapine is given to HIV-positive pregnant women, since those taking PrEP generally do not have circulating virus which can become drug-resistant. However, the possibility of resistance is present in instances where PrEP is taken for several weeks inadvertently by those with

unidentified HIV infection. The main issue in resistance is whether this will compromise their antiretroviral treatment options in several years' time when they might require ART. At present, there are no data to answer this question.

Finally, some claim that PrEP is unaffordable. Concern about the high cost of PrEP in the developing world (and, to some extent, even in the developed world) remains a legitimate one, given the lack of capacity in developing country health services. However, costs are not static and the new PrEP indication might lead to a lower cost for tenofovir-emtricitabine owing to economies of scale. Similar cost and affordability arguments were made about a decade ago when the provision of ART was being considered in the developing world. Health systems, even those under duress, evolve. Innovative ways are being found to deal with the need to reduce costs—eg, task shifting in ART services.

Many of the concerns being raised will need additional research to obviate them or to reduce their effect. Research is needed to identify additional drugs (beyond nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors), additional formulations (eg, rings, gels, injectables), and alternative dosing strategies (coital, intermittent, once a month) for PrEP to have an even bigger effect with greater safety, less risk of resistance, higher adherence, and greater efficacy. Once PrEP becomes part of the HIV armamentarium, research will probably see this prevention technique advance rapidly with new formulations, and improved efficacy and safety. The strongest impetus for further research and rapid innovation in PrEP would be demand from patients and field implementation experience.

Despite its limitations, PrEP has, in conjunction with ART for prevention, created new-found optimism in HIV prevention. PrEP increases options



Giuseppe Pinazzi/Panos

Published Online
May 18, 2012
DOI:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)60786-7

Submissions should be made via our electronic submission system at <http://ees.elsevier.com/thelancet/>

for HIV prevention, especially for specific high-risk populations. Mathematical models have illustrated PrEP's potential effect on the epidemic trajectory. PrEP has been found to be cost-effective⁸ in a South African setting. By enhancing HIV prevention, PrEP affects the long-term sustainability of AIDS treatment programmes. Can we afford not to implement it?

We were the co-principal investigators of the CAPRISA 004 trial of tenofovir gel. QAK is co-principal investigator of the HIV Prevention Trials Network, which is undertaking the HPTN 052 trial of treatment for prevention. SSAK is an executive committee member of the Microbicide Trials Network, which is undertaking the VOICE trial of oral and topical PrEP.

*Salim S Abdool Karim,
Quarraisha Abdool Karim
karims1@ukzn.ac.za

Centre for the AIDS Programme of Research in South Africa (CAPRISA), University of KwaZulu-Natal, Durban, KwaZulu-Natal 4013, South Africa (SSAK); and Department of Epidemiology, Mailman School of Public Health, Columbia University, New York, NY, USA (QAK)

- Pettypiece S, Flinn R. Gilead's pill wins US panel backing to prevent HIV. <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/2012-05-10/gilead-s-pill-wins-u-s-panel-backing-to-prevent-hiv.html> (accessed May 15, 2012).
- FHI. FHI statement on the FEM-PrEP HIV prevention study. http://www.fhi360.org/en/aboutfhi/media/releases/fem-prep_statement041811.htm (accessed April 18, 2011).
- Microbicide Trials Network. MTN statement on decision to discontinue use of tenofovir gel in VOICE, a major HIV prevention study in women. <http://www.mtnstopshiv.org/node/3909> (accessed Nov 25, 2011).
- Microbicide Trials Network. Microbicide Trials Network statement on decision to discontinue use of oral tenofovir tablets in VOICE, a major HIV prevention study in women. <http://www.mtnstopshiv.org/node/3619> (accessed Nov 1, 2011).
- Van Damme L, Corneli A, Ahmed K, et al. The FEM-PrEP trial of emtricitabine/tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (Truvada) among African women. Presented at the 19th Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections; March 5-8, 2012; Seattle, WA, USA.
- Abdool Karim Q, Abdool Karim SS, Frohlich JA, et al. Effectiveness and safety of tenofovir gel, an antiretroviral microbicide, for the prevention of HIV infection in women. *Science* 2010; **329**: 1168-74.
- Grant RM, Lama JR, Anderson PL, et al. Preexposure chemoprophylaxis for HIV prevention in men who have sex with men. *N Engl J Med* 2010; **363**: 2587-99.
- Walensky RP, Park JE, Wood R, et al. The cost-effectiveness of pre-exposure prophylaxis for HIV infection in South African women. *Clin Infect Dis* 2012; **54**: 1504-13.

Trends in child maltreatment

Ruth Gilbert and colleagues' conclusion that there is no evidence of a decline in the prevalence of child maltreatment in England (Feb 26, p 758)¹ might be premature. Data from child protection plans or registrations and self-report surveys suggest a different conclusion for physical violence, contact sexual abuse, and verbal abuse.

Since 2007, after the tragic death of Peter Connolly, both professional experience and official data indicate that child protection activity has increased. The numbers of children in England subject to child protection plans at year end increased from 26 400 in 2006² to 39 100 in 2010.³ Meanwhile, the focus of activity on specific types of maltreatment seems to have changed. In England, registrations for physical abuse fell from 40% of all registrations in 1994⁴ to 15% in 2009,² and sexual abuse registrations declined from 26% to 6%. Registrations for neglect, however, increased from 27% to 45%.^{2,4}

Findings from nationally representative samples of young adults aged 18-24 years asked retrospectively about childhood experiences of maltreatment in 1998-99 and in 2009⁵ show decreases in reports of certain types of physical abuse (from 13.1% in 1998-99 to 9.8% in 2009), sexual abuse (6.8% to 5%), and verbal abuse (14.5% to 6%). No significant changes were found for neglect.⁵

Gilbert and colleagues suggest that their findings of no changes in trends in child maltreatment could alternatively indicate a decline in overall prevalence accompanied by an increase in recognition and recording. On the basis of the data presented here, we agree that increased awareness is indeed plausible and warrants further investigation in self-report time-

trends research with a cross-national comparative focus.

We declare that we have no conflicts of interest.

*Lorraine Radford, Susana Corral,
Christine Bradley, Helen Fisher
socialimpactresearchuk@gmail.com

Social Impact Research UK, Surrey, UK (LR); British Red Cross Society, London, UK (SC); University of Bristol, Bristol BS8 1TZ, UK (CB); and King's College London, Institute of Psychiatry, London, UK (HF)

- Gilbert R, Fluke J, O'Donnell M, et al. Child maltreatment: variation in trends and policies in six developed countries. *Lancet* 2012; **379**: 758-72.
- Department of Education. Referrals, assessments and children and young people who are subject to a child protection plan in England: year ending 31 March 2009. <http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/SFR/s000873/> (accessed May 9, 2012).
- Department of Education. Children in need in England, including their characteristics and further information on children who were the subject of a child protection plan 2009-2010. <http://www.education.gov.uk/rsgateway/DB/STR/d000970/index.shtml> (accessed May 9, 2012).
- Department of Education. Children on child protection registers 1998-99. <http://www.education.gov.uk/researchandstatistics/statistics/allstatistics/a00194516/children-on-child-protection-registers-1998-99> (accessed May 9, 2012).
- Radford L, Corral S, Bradley C, et al. Child abuse and neglect in the UK today. http://www.nspcc.org.uk/Inform/research/findings/child_abuse_neglect_research_wda84173.html (accessed May 9, 2012).

In their Review on trends in child maltreatment in six developed countries including the USA,¹ Ruth Gilbert and colleagues conclude: "Our results indicate relative stability or increases in child maltreatment indicators over time with little evidence of a decline." In our view this is not an accurate assessment of what the available indicators show in the USA.

The fourth National Incidence Study of Child Abuse and Neglect² found a 45% decline in sexual abuse and a 26% decline in physical abuse between 1993 and 2005. Similarly, data from child protection authorities show a 53% decline in sexual abuse and 45% decline in physical abuse over a similar period (1992-2006).³ Police reports of rape (about 50% of which involve minors) declined 27%