Effectiveness and safety of dolutegravir two-drug regimens in virologically suppressed people living with HIV: a systematic literature review and meta-analysis of real-world evidence

Y S Punekar D¹ D Parks,² M Joshi,³ S Kaur,⁴ L Evitt,¹ V Chounta,¹ M Radford,¹ D Jha,³ S Ferrante,² S Sharma,⁴ J Van Wyk¹ and A de Ruiter^{1,5}

¹ViiV Healthcare, Brentford, UK, ²GlaxoSmithKline, Collegeville, PA, USA, ³GlaxoSmithKline Knowledge Centre, Gurgaon, India, ⁴Parexel India, Chandigarh, India and ⁵Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

Objectives

Dolutegravir (DTG) is widely recommended within three-drug regimens. However, similar efficacy and tolerability have also been achieved with DTG within two-drug regimens in clinical trials. This study evaluated the real-world effectiveness and discontinuations in people living with HIV-1 (PLHIV) switching to DTG with lamivudine (3TC) or rilpivirine (RPV).

Methods

This was a one-arm meta-analysis utilizing data from a systematic literature review. Data from real-world evidence studies of DTG + RPV and DTG + 3TC were extracted, pooled and analysed. The primary outcome was the proportion of patients with viral failure (VF; \geq 50 copies/mL in two consecutive measurements and/or \geq 1000 copies/mL in a single measurement) at week 48 (W48) and week 96 (W96). Other outcomes included virological suppression (VS; < 50 copies/mL) and discontinuations (W48 and W96). Estimates were calculated for VF, VS as per snapshot (VSS) and on treatment analysis (VSOT), and discontinuations.

Results

Pooled mean estimates of VF for DTG + 3TC and DTG + RPV were 0.8% [95% confidence interval (CI): 0.4–1.3] and 0.6% (95% CI: 0.0–1.6), respectively, at W48. VSS rate at W48 was 85.0% (95% CI: 82.3–87.5) for DTG + 3TC regimen and 92.4% (95% CI: 85.0–97.7) in the DTG + RPV regimen. The DTG + 3TC and DTG + RPV regimens led to discontinuations in 13.6% (95% CI: 11.1–16.2) and 7.2% (95% CI: 2.1–14.4) of patients, respectively, at W48. Similar results were observed at W96.

Conclusions

Treatment with DTG + 3TC or DTG + RPV in clinical practice provides a low rate of VF and a high rate of VS when initiated in virologically suppressed PLHIV with diverse backgrounds.

Keywords: antiretroviral therapy, dolutegravir, lamivudine, meta-analysis, real-world clinical trials, rilpivirine, two-drug regimen

Accepted 1 December 2020

Introduction

Current guidelines recommend a three-drug combined antiretroviral therapy (ART) regimen consisting of an

integrase strand inhibitor (INSTI) and two nucleoside/ nucleotide reverse transcriptase inhibitors for treatmentnaïve and virologically suppressed people living with HIV-1 (PLHIV) [1–4]. However, the European Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) Clinical Society (EACS) and US Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS) guidelines now also recommend the use of twodrug regimens in switch patients due to their efficacy [1,4]. Furthermore, two-drug regimens are of interest as several ART agents are associated with the risk of wellestablished, long-term toxicities, including reduced bone

Correspondence: Yogesh Punekar, ViiV Healthcare, GSK House, 980 Great West Rd, Brentford, Middlesex TW8 9GS, UK. Tel: +44 7881269021; fax: +44 7881269021; e-mail: Yogesh.q.punekar@gsk.com

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

mineral density, renal failure or chronic kidney disease, cardiovascular disease and diabetes [5–11]. In addition, the high prevalence of co-morbidities associated with HIV leads to polypharmacy, thus increasing the risk of drug–drug interactions and serious adverse drug events [12,13].

Considering the lifetime requirements for PLHIV, risks associated with long-term drug exposure [14] may be mitigated, at least partly, by reducing exposure to ART agents where possible. INSTIs have been shown to be the most efficacious core agents [15,16] and are the preferred agent according to EACS and DHHS guidelines, with dolutegravir (DTG) being the preferred INSTI according to the World Health Organization (WHO) for both first- and second-line therapy [1-4]. DTG is a once-daily INSTI approved for the treatment of adults with HIV-1 (who do not have documented or suspected resistance to INSTIs) in combination with other ART agents [16,17]. DTG is considered to be among the most effective INSTIs and, therefore, is the core agent for the majority of triple ART regimens [15,16,18]. In addition to the clinical value of DTG forming part of three-drug regimens, several clinical trials and meta-analyses have shown that DTG-containing two-drug ART regimens, particularly the combinations of DTG with lamivudine (3TC) or rilpivirine (RPV), have similar efficacy in achieving and maintaining virological suppression (VS) in PLHIV. This is achieved whilst reducing the number of ART agents and potential risk of drug-drug interactions owing to the simplified regimen compared with triple ART regimens [14,19-24].

Two multicentre, double-blind, randomized, phase III trials demonstrated non-inferiority of DTG + 3TC vs. DTG + tenofovir disoproxil fumarate (TDF)/emtricitabine (FTC) for achieving VS in treatment-naïve PLHIV (GEMINI-1 and GEMINI-2) [20,21]. In these 48-week studies, the tolerability profiles were considered similar between the two regimens [20]. The combination of DTG and RPV was non-inferior compared with the triple ART regimen in the maintenance of VS over 48 weeks in patients who switched to the two-drug ART regimen from their current triple ART regimen in the open-label, parallel-group, multicentre, phase III, randomized, non-inferiority studies, SWORD-1 and SWORD-2 [25]. In addition, a recent randomized phase III study evaluated the efficacy and safety of switching to DTG + 3TC from a tenofovir alafenamide (TAF)-based regimen (TANGO study). Results showed that switching to DTG + 3TC was not inferior to continuing a TAF-containing regimen at week 48 {W48; snapshot virological failure: < 1% vs. < 1%; adjusted difference= -0.6% [95% confidence interval (CI): -1.3-0.2]}. The safety profile of the DTG + 3TC regimen was similar to that seen with the TAF-based regimen [26,27].

These clinical trials are encouraging the use of these two-drug ART regimens in clinical practice, and the EACS and DHHS now recommend the use of DTG + 3TC for naïve patients and DTG with 3TC or RPV in virologically suppressed switch patients. Furthermore, a plethora of real-world evidence using cohort, case–control, claimsdatabase studies, and case series have been conducted to investigate DTG two-drug regimens in routine clinical practice. Here we present the results of a one-arm metaanalysis with the objective of providing an estimate of the real-world effectiveness and tolerability (as measured by discontinuation rate) of DTG when used as part of a two-drug regimen with either 3TC or RPV in treatmentexperienced PLHIV.

Methods

Study identification

A systematic search of Embase, MEDLINE, MEDLINE In-Process and Cochrane databases was performed to identify real-world studies evaluating the effectiveness and/or safety of DTG in virologically suppressed PLHIV switching to DTG with 3TC or RPV (published in any language between 1 January 2013 and 4 April 2020, inclusive). Abstracts published in major HIV/AIDS conference proceedings between and including 1 January 2013 and 4 April 2020 were hand-searched to supplement the literature searches. Full details of the search strategy (including search terms and strings) are presented in Table S1. Conferences included in these searches are presented in Table S2.

Following the identification and removal of duplicate publications, a two-step screening process was undertaken to identify suitable studies: step 1 - the titles and abstracts of all publications identified by the literature searches were reviewed for eligibility; step 2 - full-text copies of all relevant publications identified during step 1 were obtained and reviewed against the same eligibility criteria. Eligible populations included adult PLHIV (studies including only children were excluded); no limits were applied based on gender or race. Eligible studies included observational cohort studies (both retrospective and prospective), case-control studies, claims-database studies and case series. Eligible interventions included DTG-based drug regimens. Case reports detailing information for only one patient and case series providing evidence for four patients or less were excluded.

Linked publications were identified based on population, sites and study period. Alongside linking publications, studies were also reviewed by the team to assess whether there was potential duplication in cohorts and populations for which results were being reported. Where duplication of cohort/population was suspected, only the publication reporting the highest number of people receiving DTG + 3TC or DTG + RPV, the overarching study, was included in the analysis.

The Downs and Black assessment tool was used to assess the methodological quality of the included studies [28].

Data were extracted from selected publications by two independent reviewers, with any discrepancies resolved by a third reviewer. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) data extraction and reporting guidelines were observed [29– 31].

Outcomes

Outcomes included in the meta-analysis were the proportion of patients with viral failure (VF), VS using a snapshot algorithm (VSS), VS on treatment (VSOT), and the proportion of patients discontinuing treatment at weeks 48 and 96. VSS was calculated as follows: intent-to-treat (ITT) population - (VF + discontinuations). This analysis was conducted to supplement the results reported in the identified publications, aiming to overcome potential biases of overestimating the proportion of virally suppressed population, as many of the studies did not account for participants who were lost to follow-up or discontinued. The VF was defined as plasma viral load \geq 50 copies/mL obtained in two consecutive measurements and/or > 1000 copies/mL obtained in a single measurement. The VSOT was defined as the proportion of patients achieving a specific reduction in HIV RNA copies/mL (usually < 50 copies/mL in accordance with FDA guidance [32]), over the number patients who remain on DTG + 3TC or RPV group at weeks 48 and 96.

Data analysis and quality assessments

Extracted data (including VS) were analysed using a fixed-effects model assuming asymptotically normally distributed variance and a random-effects model using restricted maximum likelihood or Bayesian methods to estimate variance. Root mean square error (RMSE) criteria were used to determine the best-fit model and guided the choice of the model used for the estimates. Statistical heterogeneity between studies was assessed using the following equation: $I^2 = (Q - df/Q) \times 100\%$, where *I* is the level of inconsistency, *Q* is the χ^2 statistic and df the degrees of freedom. Publication bias for each outcome was analysed using a funnel plot (sample size *vs.* estimated effect size) and effect modification (i.e. between-

study variations in treatment duration, dosage) analysed using meta-regression. Data are presented as the proportion of patients (percentage), standard error (SE; for study data), 95% CI (for meta-analysis data), weighting (for fixed and random effects), funnel plot asymmetry (Pvalue) and heterogeneity (I^2).

Results

Studies included

In total, the systematic literature review identified 394 studies from 530 publications that investigated DTG in PLHIV (Fig. 1). Of these, a total of 118 studies assessed DTG as a dual therapy (with 3TC or RPV) and reported data for effectiveness and/or discontinuations. Of the 118 studies, 82 studies were excluded as they included treatments other than DTG + 3TC and DTG + RPV, reported data at time points other than 48 or 96 weeks, or investigated treatment-naïve patients. Only two studies were identified investigating dual therapy in treatment-naïve patients; therefore, this analysis focused on treatment-experienced patients. Of the 36 studies in treatment-experienced suppressed patients, only seven studies reported effectiveness and/or discontinuation data for DTG + 3TC and 11 studies for DTG + RPV in cohorts believed to be unique and distinct from each other. Outcomes of interest (meta-analysis inputs) for studies providing W48 data are presented in Table 1 and those for studies providing W96 data are presented in Table S3. Results from a quality evaluation using the Downs and Black assessment tool can be found in Table S4.

Dual therapy with DTG + 3TC

Study and patient characteristics for the selected six studies with 48-week data are presented in Table 1. Males comprised 68.4–77.4% of the PLHIV. The mean age of PLHIV ranged from 48.5 to 59 years and all PLHIV were treatment-experienced suppressed. Most PLHIV switched from triple therapy [33–35]. Some populations also had PLHIV with resistance mutations including the M184I/V mutation for 3TC resistance [33–36]. PLHIV in Reynes *et al.* [36] were considered heavily pre-treated, whereas Hidalgo-Tenorio *et al.* [35] and Gagliardini *et al.* [37] included a population with no history of VF.

Outcomes

Five publications reported VF and VS data at W48; three publications reported data that enabled the calculation of VSS at W48 (Table 1). Overall, the meta-analysis showed that treatment of virologically suppressed patients with



Fig. 1 PRISMA flow chart showing studies published from 2013 to 2019 investigating the use of dolutegravir (DTG) + lamivudine (3TC) and DTG + rilpivirine (RPV) in people living with HIV-1 (PLHIV). *One study evaluated both DTG + 3TC and DTG + RPV. ART, antiretroviral therapy; SGA, subgroup available; SLR, systematic literature review.

DTG + 3TC resulted in VF in 1.0% (95% CI: 0.3–2.0) of patients at W48 (Fig. 2a), with similar results reported at W96 (1.0%; 95% CI: 0.2–2.2; Fig. S1a). The VSS value was 85.0% (95% CI: 82.3–87.5) and 87.9% (95% CI: 76.6–96.0) at W48 (Fig. 2b) and W96 (Fig. S1b), respectively. The VSOT was 98.8% (95% CI: 97.7–99.7) at W48 (Fig. 2c), and 98.4% (95% CI: 96.4–99.7) at W96

(Fig. S1c). Heterogeneity between studies was assessed and found to be not significant enough to affect the analysis. Funnel plot analyses indicated that no publication bias was present in VF, VSOT and VSS data (P = 0.340, 0.228 and 0.706, respectively, at W48). Three publications reported data for discontinuations at W48. Overall, the meta-analysis showed that treatment with

Study (first author, year)	Mean age (years)	Male gender (%)	I∏* (n)	VSOT [% (95% CI)]	VF [% (95% CI)]	VSS [% (95% CI)]	Discontinuations [% (95% CI)]
DTG + 3TC							
Galizzi, 2020 [34]	52.5	68.4	307	97.7 (95.4–99.1)	2.3 (0.9–4.6)	_	_
Hidalgo-Tenorio, 2019 [35]	48.5	77.4	177	96.6 (92.8–98.7)	2.8 (0.9-6.5)	82.5 (76.1–87.8)	14.7 (9.8–20.8)
Balidin, 2019 [33]	51.0	68.8	556	98.7 (97.4–99.5)	1.3 (0.5–2.6)	84.7 (81.4-87.6)	13.8 (11.1–17.0)
Gagliardini, 2020 (no previous VF) [37]	50.0	75.5	772	99.6 (98.9–99.9)	0.4 (0.1–1.1)	_	_
Gagliardini, 2020 (previous VF) [37]	53.0	69.6	194	98.5 (95.5–99.7)	1.0 (0.1–3.7)	_	_
Reynes, 2016/2017 [36,48]	59	74	27	100.0 (87.2–100.0)	0 (0–1.3)	88.9 (70.8–97.6)	11.1 (2.4–29.2)
DTG + RPV							
Casado, 2019 [39]	54	72	102	96.1 (90.3–98.9)	1.0 (0.0–5.3)	93.1 (86.4–97.2)	5.9 (2.2–12.4)
Galizzi, 2020 [34]	53.5	80.6	67	98.5 (92.0-100)	_	_	_
Deschanvres, 2020 [49]	54.5	69.1	799	97.2 (95.9–98.3)	_	_	_
Bonijoly, 2017[50]	55	67	268	_	1.5 (0.4–3.8)	75.0 (69.4–80.1)	23.5 (18.6–29.0)
Diaz, 2016 [38]	53	66	38	100 (90.7–100.0)	0 (0–9.3)	92.1 (78.6–98.3)	7.9 (1.7–21.4)
Saling, 2016 [41]	-	50	14	100 (76.8–100.0)	-	100 (76.8–100.0)	0 (0–23.2)
Revuelta-Hererro, 2018 [40]	49	63	35	97.1 (85.1–99.9)	2.9 (0.1–14.9)	91.4(76.9–98.2)	5.7 (0.7–19.2)
Togami, 2016 [51]	57	96	25	100 (87.2–100.0)	0 (0–12.8)	96.3 (81.0–99.9)	7.4 (0.9–24.3)
Ciccullo, 2019 [52]	52	72	187	98.4 (95.4–99.7)	1.6 (0.3-4.6)	95.2 (91.1–97.8)	3.7 (1.5–7.6)
Grabmeier-Pfistershammer, 2016 [53]	54	81	43	100 (91.8–100.0)	0 (0–8.2)	93.0 (3.9)	7.0 (1.5–19.1)

Table 1 Summary of outcomes and patient characteristics for studies investigating dolutegravir (DTG) + lamivudine (3TC) or DTG + rilpivirine (RPV) in people living with HIV-1 (PLHIV) at week 48

ITT, intent to treat; SE, standard error; VF, viral failure; VSOT, viral suppression on treatment; VSS, viral suppression using snapshot algorithm. *ITT population receiving DTG dual therapy.

DTG + 3TC in virologically suppressed PLHIV led to discontinuations in 13.6% (95% CI: 11.1–16.2) of patients at W48 (Fig. 2d). The proportion of discontinuations at W96 was 11.6% (95% CI: 4.50; 21.1); Fig. S1d). At W48, heterogeneity was 0% and funnel plot analyses indicated no publication bias (P = 0.877).

Dual therapy with DTG + RPV

Study and patient characteristics for the selected 10 studies included in the W48 analyses are presented in Table 1. In general, males accounted for 50–96% of the participants. The mean age of participants ranged from 49 to 57 years and all PLHIV were treatment-experienced and suppressed on current therapy. Some of the studies reported patient populations that could be considered heavily pre-treated (Diaz *et al.* [38] median 4.3 ARTs; Casado *et al.*: mean 6.1 prior regimens; and Revuelta-Hererro *et al.*: median 5 prior regimens (median 4 prior ARTs). In Diaz *et al.* [38], patients had a long history of ART (median 19.4 years). Some studies reported populations that contained patients with known resistance mutations [34,38–41].

Outcomes

Of DTG + RPV studies, eight publications reported VF and VSS data, and nine publications reported VSOT at W48 (Table 1). Overall, the meta-analysis showed that treatment with DTG + RPV in virologically suppressed PLHIV resulted in VF in 0.6% (95% CI: 0.0-1.6) of patients at W48 (Fig. 3a), with similar results reported at W96 (1.4%; 95% CI: 0.4-2.7%; Fig. S2a). The VSS values were 92.4% (95% CI: 85.0-97.7) and 92.8% (95% CI: 90.1-95.1) at weeks 48 (Fig. 3b) and 96 (Fig. S2b), respectively. The VSOT values were 98.5% (95% CI: 97.6-99.2) at W48 (Fig. 3c) and 97.3% (95% CI: 94.7-99.1) at W96 (Figure S2c). At W48, heterogeneity values for VF, VSS and VSOT were 0%, 86.6%, and 0%, respectively, at W48. Funnel plot analyses indicated that no publication bias was present in VF, VSOT and VSS data (P = 0.591, 0.214, and 0.190, respectively), at W48. Eight publications reported data for discontinuations at W48. Overall, the meta-analysis showed that treatment with DTG + RPV in virologically suppressed PLHIV led to discontinuations in 7.2% (95% CI: 2.1-14.4) of PLHIV at W48 (Fig. 3d). Slightly lower results were reported at W96 (5.7%; 95% CI: 3.7-8.2; Fig. S2d). Heterogeneity was 86.5% and funnel plot analyses indicated no publication bias (P = 0.265).

Discussion

The results of this real-world evidence meta-analysis support the use of DTG + 3TC or DTG + RPV as an effective maintenance therapy alternative to three-drug regimens in virologically suppressed treatment-experienced PLHIV. These results are consistent with a recent randomized phase III study evaluating the efficacy and safety of

(a)						
Study	Events	Total	Mean difference	Viral failure (%) (95% Cl)	Wt. % (fixed)	Wt. % (random)
				(,		
Hidalgo 2019	5	177		0.028 (0.009–0.065)	8.7	14.3
Baldin 2019	7	556		0.013 (0.005–0.026)	27.3	23.2
Galizzi 2020	7	307		0.023 (0.009–0.046)	15.1	18.8
Gagliardini 2020_1	3	772		0.004 (0.001–0.011)	37.9	25.2
Gagliardini 2020_2	2	194		0.010 (0.001–0.037)	9.6	15.0
Reynes 2016/2017 (DOLULAM)	0	27	e	0.000 (0.000–0.128)	1.4	3.5
Fixed-effects model		2033	*	0.008 (0.004-0.013)	100.0	
Random-effects model			•	0.010 (0.003–0.020)		100.0
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 57\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0011$, $P =$	= 0.04		0 0.02 0.06 0.1 0.12			
(b)						
Study	Events	Total	Mean difference	VSS (%) (95% CI)	Wt, % (fixed)	Wt, % (random)
Hidalgo 2019	146	177	_	0.825 (0.761–0.878)	23.3	23.3
Baldin 2019	472	556		0.849 (0.816-0.878)	73.1	73.1
Reynes 2016/2017 (DOLULAM)	25	27		0.926 (0.757-0.991)	3.6	3.6
			!			
Fixed-effects model		760		0.850 (0.823–0.875)	100.0	
Random-effects model			<u> </u>	0.850 (0.823–0.875)		100.0
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $P = 0.40$			0.7 0.75 0.8 0.85 0.9 0.95 1			
(c)						
Study	Events	Total	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI)	Wt, % (fixed)	Wt, % (random)
Galizzi 2020	300	307		0.977 (0.954-0.991)	15.1	18.9
Hidalgo 2019	171	177		0.966 (0.928-0.987)	8.7	14.9
Baldin 2019	549	556		0.987 (0.974-0.995)	27.3	22.5
Gagliardini 2020_1	769	772		0.996 (0.989-0.999)	37.9	24.1
Gagliardini 2020_2	191	194		0.985 (0.955-0.997)	9.6	15.6
Reynes 2016/2017 (DOLULAM)	27	27		1.000 (0.872–1.000)	1.4	4.0
Fixed-effects model		2033	÷	0.992 (0.986-0.996)	100.0	
Random-effects model			.	0.988 (0.977-0.997)		100.0
Heterogeneity: I^2 = 63%, τ^2 = 0.0014, P	= 0.02		0.86 0.9 0.92 0.96 1			
(d)						
Study	Events	Total	Mean difference	Discontinuations (%) (95% CI)	Wt, % (fixed)	Wt, % (random)
				(,		,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
Hidalgo 2019	26	177		0.147 (0.098-0.208)	23.3	23.3
Baldin 2019	77	556		0.138 (0.111–0.170)	73.1	73.1
Reynes 2016/2017 (DOLULAM)	3	27	a	0.111 (0.024–0.292)	3.6	3.6
Fixed-effects model		760		0 136 (0 111_0 162)	100.0	
Random-effects model		100	—	0.136 (0.111-0.162)		100.0
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $P = 0.92$						
			0 0.05 0.1 0.15 0.2 0.25 0.3			

Fig. 2 Summary of week 48 meta-analysis data for dolutegravir (DTG) + lamivudine (3TC) treatment in people living with HIV-1 (PLHIV): (a) viral failure (VF); (b) viral suppression using snapshot algorithm (VSS); (c) viral suppression on treatment (VSOT); and (d) discontinuations. CI, confidence interval; Wt, weight.

switching to DTG + 3TC from a TAF-based regimen (TANGO study) and the randomized pilot clinical trial (ASPIRE), which investigated the efficacy of switching from triple therapy to DTG + 3TC. At W48, VF was 0% and VSS was 93% in TANGO while VF was 2% and VSS 91% in ASPIRE, which are comparable to the estimates determined in this meta-analysis. In addition, for DTG + RPV, the results from this meta-analysis are comparable to those reported in the SWORD-1 and SWORD-2 studies (VSS was 95% at W48) [25]. The SWORD-1 and SWORD-2 studies demonstrated non-inferiority of the

dual regimen *vs*. current triple regimens and a similar safety profile in patients who had VS for the 6 months before screening. Moreover, our results for VF are comparable to real-world VF reported for DTG-based triple therapy (0.5–2.8%) [44–46].

The results of this analysis also support those of previous meta-analyses evaluating both randomized controlled trials and real-world evidence studies, which report a high virological efficacy with DTG-based dual maintenance therapy and a low potential for drug–drug interactions and toxicity [14,19]. Interestingly, in the

	-	
	ع ۱	
L	aı	
•	•	

(a)				Viral failure (%)		
Study	Events	Total	Mean difference	(95% CI)	Wt, % (fixed)	Wt, % (random)
,				(,	, ,. (,
Casado 2019	1	102	—	0.010 (0.000-0.053)	14.3	14.3
Díaz 2016	0	38	* <u></u>	0.000 (0.000-0.093)	5.4	5.4
Bonijoly 2017	4	268	— —	0.015(0.004-0.038)	37.4	37.4
Soling 2016		14			2.0	2.0
Saling 2010	0	14		0.000 (0.000-0.232)	2.0	2.0
Revuelta-Herrero 2018	1	35	+	0.029 (0.001–0.149)	4.9	4.9
Togami 2016	0	27	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.000 (0.000–0.128)	3.8	3.8
Ciccullo 2019	3	187	II -	0.016 (0.003-0.046)	26.1	26.1
Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016	0	43		0.000 (0.000–0.082)	6.1	6.1
Fixed-effects model		714	•	0.006 (0.000-0.016)	100.0	
Random-effects model			•	0.006 (0.000-0.016)		100.0
Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\% = 0.07$				0.000 (0.000 0.010)		100.0
$\frac{1}{10000000000000000000000000000000000$			0 0.05 0.1 0.15 0.2 0.25			
(b)						
Study	Evonte	Total	Moon difforence	VSS (%) (95% CI)	Mt % (fixed)	Wt % (random)
Study	Evenus	TOLAI	Mean unrerence	V33 (//) (93 // Cl)	wit, 76 (lixeu)	wi, % (ranuoni)
Casado 2019	95	102	_ <u>+</u>	0.931 (0.864-0.972)	14.3	14.2
Díaz 2016	35	38	i	0.921 (0.786-0.983)	5.4	12.0
Bonijoly 2017	201	268		0.750 (0.694 0.801)	37 /	15.1
	201	200	— ! :	0.750 (0.094-0.001)	0.0	10.1
Saiing 2016	14	14		1.000 (0.768–1.000)	2.0	8.6
Revuelta-Herrero 2018	32	35		0.914 (0.769–0.982)	4.9	11.8
Togami 2016	26	27	@	0.963 (0.810-0.999)	3.8	11.0
Ciccullo 2019	178	187	I ÷	0.952 (0.911-0.978)	26.1	14.9
Grahmeier-Pfistershammer 2016	40	43		0 930 (0 809_0 985)	6.1	12.4
Grabineler-Fristershammer 2010	40	45		0.330 (0.003-0.303)	0.1	12.4
Fixed-effects model		714		0.889 (0.863–0.912)	100.0	
Random-effects model				0.924 (0.850-0.977)		100.0
Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 87\%$, $\tau^2 = 0.0207$, P	< 0.01					
			0.05 0.7 0.75 0.8 0.05 0.9 0.95 1			
(c)						
\-/						
Study	Evente	Total	Maan difference	VCD (%) (05% CI)	Mt 0/ (fixed)	Wt % (random)
Study	Events	Total	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI)	Wt, % (fixed)	Wt, % (random)
Study	Events	Total	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI)	Wt, % (fixed)	Wt, % (random)
Study Casado 2019	Events	Total	Mean difference 	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989)	Wt, % (fixed)	Wt, % (random)
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020	Events 98 66	Total 102 67	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% Cl) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020	Events 98 66 777	Total 102 67 799	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016	Events 98 66 777 38	Total 102 67 799 38	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% Cl) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016 Saling 2016	Events 98 66 777 38 14	Total 102 67 799 38 14	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903-0.989) 0.985 (0.920-1.000) 0.972 (0.959-0.983) 1.000 (0.907-1.000) 1.000 (0.768-1.000) 0.971 (0.851-0.999) 1.000 (0.872-1.000) 0.984 (0.954-0.997) 1.000 (0.918-1.000)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 -	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $P = 0.79$	Events 98 66 7777 38 14 34 27 184 43	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 187 43 1312	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.964–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $P = 0.79$	Events 98 66 7777 38 14 34 27 184 43	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.964–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 -	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $P = 0.79$ (d)	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 - 100.0
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $P = 0.79$ (d) Study	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43 Events	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) VSS (%) (95% CI)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed)	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (random)
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43 Events	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) VSS (%) (95% CI)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed)	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 - 100.0 Wt, % (random)
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019	Events 98 66 777 38 14 27 184 43 8 Events	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) VSS (%) (95% CI) 0.059 (0.022–0.124)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed) 14.3	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (random) 14.2
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019 Diaz 2016	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43 Events 6 3	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102 38	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) VSS (%) (95% CI) 0.059 (0.022–0.124) 0.079 (0.017–0.214)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 - Wt, % (fixed) 14.3 5.4	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (random) 14.2 12.0
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019 Díaz 2016 Bonijoly 2017	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43 Events 6 3 63	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102 38 268	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) VSS (%) (95% CI) 0.059 (0.022–0.124) 0.079 (0.017–0.214) 0.235 (0.186–0.290)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed) 14.3 5.4 37.4	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (random) 14.2 12.0 15.2
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019 Díaz 2016 Bonijoly 2017 Saling 2016	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43 Events 6 3 6 3 0	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102 38 268 14	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.099) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) VSS (%) (95% CI) 0.059 (0.022–0.124) 0.059 (0.017–0.214) 0.235 (0.186–0.290) 0.000 (0.000–0.232)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed) 14.3 5.4 37.4 2.0	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 - 100.0 Wt, % (random) 14.2 12.0 15.2 8.6
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019 Diaz 2016 Bonijoly 2017 Saling 2016 Pavuelta-Herrero 2018	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43 Events 6 3 63 0 2	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102 38 268 14 35	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) VSS (%) (95% CI) 0.059 (0.022–0.124) 0.079 (0.017–0.214) 0.235 (0.186–0.290) 0.000 (0.000–0.222)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed) 14.3 5.4 37.4 2.0 4 9	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 - 100.0 Wt, % (random) 14.2 12.0 15.2 8.6 11 8
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019 Diaz 2016 Bonijoly 2017 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43 Events 6 3 63 0 2 2	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102 38 268 14 35 27 1312	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) VSS (%) (95% CI) 0.059 (0.022–0.124) 0.079 (0.017–0.214) 0.235 (0.186–0.290) 0.000 (0.000–0.232) 0.057 (0.007–0.192)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed) 14.3 5.4 37.4 2.0 4.9 2.2	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 - 100.0 Wt, % (random) 14.2 12.0 15.2 8.6 11.8 14.2
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019 Diaz 2016 Bonijoly 2017 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016	Events 98 66 777 38 14 27 184 43 Events 6 3 63 0 2 2 2	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102 38 268 14 35 27 14 35 27	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.099) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) VSS (%) (95% CI) 0.059 (0.022–0.124) 0.079 (0.017–0.214) 0.235 (0.186–0.290) 0.000 (0.000–0.232) 0.057 (0.007–0.192) 0.074 (0.009–0.243)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed) 14.3 5.4 37.4 2.0 4.9 3.8	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 - 100.0 Wt, % (random) 14.2 12.0 15.2 8.6 11.8 11.0
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%$, $\tau^2 = 0$, $P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019 Diaz 2016 Bonijoly 2017 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43 Events 6 3 6 3 0 2 2 7	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102 38 268 14 35 27 187 43 1312	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.057 (0.007–0.124) 0.057 (0.007–0.192) 0.057 (0.007–0.192) 0.074 (0.09–0.243) 0.037 (0.015–0.076)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed) 14.3 5.4 37.4 2.0 4.9 3.8 26.1	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (random) 14.2 12.0 15.2 8.6 11.8 11.0 14.9
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019 Díaz 2016 Bonijoly 2017 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016	Events 98 66 777 38 14 27 184 43 43 Events 6 3 63 0 2 2 7 3	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102 38 268 14 35 27 187 43 1312	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.192) 0.059 (0.022–0.124) 0.079 (0.017–0.214) 0.235 (0.186–0.290) 0.000 (0.000–0.232) 0.057 (0.007–0.192) 0.074 (0.009–0.243) 0.037 (0.015–0.076) 0.070 (0.015–0.76)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed) 14.3 5.4 37.4 2.0 4.9 3.8 26.1 6.1	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (random) 14.2 12.0 15.2 8.6 11.8 11.0 14.9 12.4
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $l^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019 Diaz 2016 Bonijoly 2017 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Eixed.effects model	Events 98 66 777 38 14 27 184 43 Events 6 3 63 0 2 2 7 3	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102 38 268 14 35 27 187 43 1312	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.168–0.290) 0.000 (0.000–0.232) 0.057 (0.007–0.192) 0.074 (0.009–0.243) 0.037 (0.015–0.076) 0.070 (0.015–0.191) 0.101 (0.070–0.125)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed) 14.3 5.4 37.4 2.0 4.9 3.8 26.1 6.1 100.0	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 - 100.0 Wt, % (random) 14.2 12.0 15.2 8.6 11.8 11.0 14.9 12.4
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Deschanvres 2020 Díaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019 Díaz 2016 Bonijoly 2017 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model	Events 98 66 777 38 14 34 27 184 43 Events 6 3 6 3 6 3 0 2 2 7 3 3	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102 388 268 14 35 27 187 43 714	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) VSS (%) (95% CI) 0.059 (0.022–0.124) 0.079 (0.017–0.214) 0.235 (0.186–0.290) 0.000 (0.000–0.232) 0.057 (0.007–0.192) 0.074 (0.009–0.243) 0.037 (0.015–0.076) 0.070 (0.015–0.191) 0.101 (0.079–0.126) 0.072 (0.021–0.144)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed) 14.3 5.4 37.4 2.0 4.9 3.8 26.1 6.1 100.0	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (random) 14.2 12.0 15.2 8.6 11.8 11.0 14.9 12.4
Study Casado 2019 Galizzi 2020 Descharvres 2020 Diaz 2016 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 0\%, \tau^2 = 0, P = 0.79$ (d) Study Casado 2019 Diaz 2016 Bonijoly 2017 Saling 2016 Revuelta-Herrero 2018 Togami 2016 Ciccullo 2019 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer 2016 Fixed-effects model Random-effects model Random-effects model Random-effects model	Events 98 66 777 38 14 43 27 184 43 Events 6 3 63 0 2 2 7 3 	Total 102 67 799 38 14 35 27 187 43 1312 Total 102 38 268 14 35 27 187 43 268 14 35 27 187 43 74 35 27 187 43 74 74 74 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75 75	Mean difference	VSP (%) (95% CI) 0.961 (0.903–0.989) 0.985 (0.920–1.000) 0.972 (0.959–0.983) 1.000 (0.907–1.000) 1.000 (0.768–1.000) 0.971 (0.851–0.999) 1.000 (0.872–1.000) 0.984 (0.954–0.997) 1.000 (0.918–1.000) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.985 (0.976–0.992) 0.935 (0.976–0.992) 0.935 (0.076–0.922) 0.057 (0.007–0.192) 0.057 (0.007–0.192) 0.070 (0.015–0.076) 0.070 (0.015–0.191) 0.101 (0.079–0.126) 0.072 (0.021–0.144)	Wt, % (fixed) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 100.0 Wt, % (fixed) 14.3 5.4 37.4 2.0 4.9 3.8 26.1 6.1 100.0	Wt, % (random) 7.8 5.1 60.7 2.9 1.1 2.7 2.1 14.2 3.3 - 100.0 Wt, % (random) 14.2 12.0 15.2 8.6 11.8 11.0 14.9 12.4 - 100.0

Fig. 3 Summary of week 48 meta-analysis data for dolutegravir (DTG) + rilpivirine (RPV) treatment in people living with HIV-1 (PLHIV): (a) viral failure (VF); (b) viral suppression using snapshot algorithm (VSS); (c) viral suppression on treatment (VSOT); and (d) discontinuations. CI, confidence interval; Wt, weight.

meta-analysis by Achhra et al. [14] no substantial difference in VF rate between dual ART and triple ART regimens was observed, although a higher rate was observed in treatment-naïve than in pre-treated suppressed patients. Unlike these previous meta-analyses, our study focused completely on real-world evidence, with broadly balanced patient populations across studies (i.e. results were not skewed by the population of a single study, e.g.

SWORD [19]), included published data up to March 2019 (published after approval of DTG + RPV), and specifically distinguished between DTG-containing dual ART regimens, thereby providing novel information to support clinicians with real-world treatment decisions.

Strengths of this meta-analysis include long-term evidence (up to 96 weeks) in a real-world setting, making it applicable to patients in clinical practice. Furthermore, there were no restrictions with regard to geographical region, and although most studies were conducted in Europe, this meta-analysis provides a more global picture of the use of DTG-containing, two-drug, ART regimens than previous studies of this kind [19]. It is also important to note that the lack of restrictions on inclusion criteria in real-word studies leads to substantial variations in patient populations, including multiple treatment backgrounds, different durations of treatment exposure, the presence of resistance mutations, experience of previous treatment failures and other characteristics that would normally exclude patients from randomized clinical trials, but may be more representative of real-world clinical settings. Some patients included in this analysis were heavily pre-treated (maximum reported median of nine prior regimens), had long treatment histories (maximum reported mean 19.4 years), had experienced prior VFs, or had detectable resistance mutations. Despite this variability in treated patients, our results were consistent with those observed in DTG + 3TC or DTG + RPV RCTs.

Despite the potential variability of real-world data, the effectiveness and tolerability outcomes for DTG + 3TC or DTG + RPV were generally consistent across studies included in this meta-analysis. These results should provide reassurance to clinicians that treatment of HIV with DTG + 3TC or DTG + RPV can be effective in diverse virologically suppressed, treatment-experienced patients outside of a clinical trial environment. Moreover, the endpoints reported in this meta-analysis are consistent with those used in randomized controlled trials and are widely used in clinical practice. This meta-analysis also included snapshot data, which considers the ITT population, including the proportion of discontinuations or those lost to follow-up in the analysis. This provides a more stringent view of treatment success than simply reporting proportions of VS among patients who remained in the study up to W48 and W96 and ignoring patients who have discontinued treatment for various reasons.

This study was a single-arm meta-analysis and was thus associated with limitations such as lack of a control group and publication bias. Additional limitations of this analysis include those inherent to real-world studies, such as non-randomization, no control for confounding factors, coding errors and determination of causality. As this meta-analysis focused on outcomes at W48 and W96, and the studies pertaining to data at these two time points varied, there is a potential for inconsistent results, with outcomes, such as VF, being higher at W48 than at W96. Furthermore, safety and tolerability data (adverse events, mortality), drug-drug interactions, and co-morbidities were not included in the meta-analysis as the information was not consistently reported across studies. Likewise, 96 weeks may not be a long enough follow-up to capture some comorbidities. Snapshot data were not consistently reported across real-world studies; however, this outcome could be calculated based on study data in many cases for the purpose of this meta-analysis [32]. Furthermore, while the two-drug regimens DTG + 3TC and DTG + RPV may provide a suitable treatment option for most patients, physicians should always evaluate the suitability of such regimens when considering a regimen switch in virologically suppressed patients including factors such as pre-existing resistance and hepatitis B virus coinfection.

Conclusions

Overall, the results of this one-arm meta-analysis show that treatment with a two-drug regimen of DTG + 3TC or DTG + RPV in clinical practice provides a low rate of VF and a high rate of viral suppression in pre-treated PLHIV who were suppressed at treatment initiation. Furthermore, viral suppression was shown to be maintained across patient populations and treatment histories of the individual studies included in this meta-analysis.

Acknowledgements

Editorial support (in the form of writing assistance, assembling figures, collating author comments, grammatical editing and referencing) was provided by Chrystelle Rasamison at Fishawack Indicia Ltd, UK, and was funded by ViiV Healthcare.

Conflict of interest: YP, DP, LE, VC, JvW, and AdR are employees of ViiV Healthcare. YP and LE hold shares in GSK. AdR holds shares in GSK and ViiV Healthcare. MJ, DJ and SF are employees of GSK. SK and SS are employees of Parexel, who was commissioned by ViiV Healthcare to conduct this study. MR is a former employee of ViiV Healthcare and holds stock in GSK and ViiV Healthcare.

Financial disclosure: This systematic literature review and meta-analysis was funded by ViiV Healthcare. ViiV Healthcare had a role in the design of the literature review, data analysis, data interpretation, and writing of the report.

Author contributions

The authors meet criteria for authorship as recommended by the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, take responsibility for the integrity of the work as a whole, contributed to the writing and reviewing of the manuscript, and have given final approval for the version to be published. All authors had full access to the data in this study and take complete responsibility for the integrity of the data and accuracy of the data analysis.

Ethics approval and informed consent

Ethics approval and patient consent were not required, because this was a meta-analysis based on previously published study data.

References

- European AIDS Clinical Society (EACS). European aids clinical society guidelines, version 10.0. Available from: https://www.eacsociety.org/files/2019_guidelines-10.0_final. pdf (accessed 17 July 2020).
- 2 WHO. The use of antiretroviral drugs for treating and preventing HIV infection. Available from: http://apps.who. int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/208825/9789241549684_eng. pdf?sequence=1 (accessed December 5 2019).
- 3 WHO. Updated recommendations on first-line and secondline antiretroviral regimens and post-exposure prophylaxis and recommendations on early infant diagnosis of HIV. Available from: http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/ 10665/273632/WHO-CDS-HIV-18.18-eng.pdf?ua=1 (accessed December 5 2019).
- 4 Panel on Antiretroviral Guidelines for Adults and Adolescents. Guidelines for the use of antiretroviral agents in adults and adolescents living with HIV. Available from. https://aidsinfo.nih.gov/contentfiles/AdultandAdolesce ntGL003533.pdf (accessed December 5 2019).
- 5 Ahmad AN, Ahmad SN, Ahmad N. Hiv infection and bone abnormalities. *Open Orthop J* 2017; 11: 777–784.
- 6 Cooper RD, Wiebe N, Smith N, Keiser P, Naicker S, Tonelli M. Systematic review and meta-analysis: renal safety of tenofovir disoproxil fumarate in HIV-infected patients. *Clin Infect Dis* 2010; 51: 496–505.
- 7 Mocroft A, Kirk O, Reiss P *et al.* Estimated glomerular filtration rate, chronic kidney disease and antiretroviral drug use in HIV-positive patients. *AIDS* 2010; 24: 1667–1678.

- 8 Scherzer R, Estrella M, Li Y *et al.* Association of tenofovir exposure with kidney disease risk in HIV infection. *AIDS* 2012; **26**: 867–875.
- 9 Nduka CU, Stranges S, Kimani PK, Sarki AM, Uthman OA. Is there sufficient evidence for a causal association between antiretroviral therapy and diabetes in HIV-infected patients? A meta-analysis. *Diabetes Metab Res Rev* 2017; 33. https:// doi.org/10.1002/dmrr.2902
- 10 Lin SP, Wu CY, Wang CB, Li TC, Ko NY, Shi ZY. Risk of diabetes mellitus in hiv-infected patients receiving highly active antiretroviral therapy: A nationwide population-based study. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2018; 97: e12268.
- Pinto DSM, da Silva M. Cardiovascular disease in the setting of human immunodeficiency virus infection. *Curr Cardiol Rev* 2018; 14: 25–41.
- 12 Edelman EJ, Gordon KS, Glover J, McNicholl IR, Fiellin DA, Justice AC. The next therapeutic challenge in HIV: polypharmacy. *Drugs Aging* 2013; 30: 613–628.
- 13 Tseng A, Szadkowski L, Walmsley S, Salit I, Raboud J. Association of age with polypharmacy and risk of drug interactions with antiretroviral medications in HIV-positive patients. *Ann Pharmacother* 2013; **47**: 1429–1439.
- 14 Achhra AC, Mwasakifwa G, Amin J, Boyd MA. Efficacy and safety of contemporary dual-drug antiretroviral regimens as first-line treatment or as a simplification strategy: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet HIV* 2016; **3**: e351–e360.
- 15 Kanters S, Vitoria M, Doherty M *et al.* Comparative efficacy and safety of first-line antiretroviral therapy for the treatment of HIV infection: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Lancet HIV* 2016; 3: e510–e520.
- 16 Snedecor SJ, Radford M, Kratochvil D, Grove R, Punekar YS. Comparative efficacy and safety of dolutegravir relative to common core agents in treatment-naive patients infected with hiv-1: A systematic review and network meta-analysis. *BMC Infect Dis* 2019; **19**: 484.
- 17 Dolutegravir (tivicay) prescribing information. Available from: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/ 2018/204790s016s018lbl.pdf (accessed 29 October 2018).
- 18 Cruciani M, Parisi SG. Dolutegravir based antiretroviral therapy compared to other combined antiretroviral regimens for the treatment of hiv-infected naive patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2019; 14: e0222229.
- 19 Wandeler G, Buzzi M, Anderegg N *et al.* Virologic failure and HIV drug resistance on simplified, dolutegravir-based maintenance therapy: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *F1000Res* 2018; **7**: 1359.
- 20 Cahn P, Madero JS, Arribas JR *et al*. Dolutegravir plus lamivudine versus dolutegravir plus tenofovir disoproxil fumarate and emtricitabine in antiretroviral-naive adults with hiv-1 infection (gemini-1 and gemini-2): Week 48

results from two multicentre, double-blind, randomised, noninferiority, phase 3 trials. *Lancet* 2018; **393**: 143–155.

- 21 Cahn P, Rolon MJ, Figueroa MI, Gun A, Patterson P, Sued O. Dolutegravir-lamivudine as initial therapy in hiv-1 infected, arv-naive patients, 48-week results of the paddle (pilot antiretroviral design with dolutegravir lamivudine) study. J Int AIDS Soc 2017; 20: 21678.
- 22 Taiwo BO, Zheng L, Stefanescu A *et al.* Actg a5353: A pilot study of dolutegravir plus lamivudine for initial treatment of human immunodeficiency virus-1 (HIV-1)-infected participants with HIV-1 RNA <500000 copies/ml. *Clin Infect Dis* 2018; **66**: 1689–1697.
- 23 Corado KC, Caplan MR, Daar ES. Two-drug regimens for treatment of naive HIV-1 infection and as maintenance therapy. *Drug Des Devel Ther* 2018; 12: 3731–3740.
- 24 Rossetti B, Montagnani F, De Luca A. Current and emerging two-drug approaches for hiv-1 therapy in art-naive and artexperienced, virologically suppressed patients. *Expert Opin Pharmacother* 2018; **19**: 713–738.
- 25 Llibre JM, Hung CC, Brinson C *et al.* Efficacy, safety, and tolerability of dolutegravir-rilpivirine for the maintenance of virological suppression in adults with HIV-1: Phase 3, randomised, non-inferiority sword-1 and sword-2 studies. *Lancet* 2018; **391**: 839–849.
- 26 Van Wyk J, Ajana F, Bisshop F *et al.* Switching to DTG+3tc fixed dose combination (FDC) is non-inferior to continuing a TAF-based regimen (TBR) in maintaining virologic suppression through 24 weeks (TANGO study). 10th International AIDS Conference for HIV Science (IAS 2019). Mexico City, Mexico, 21–24 July 2019.
- 27 ViiV Healthcare. ViiV healthcare announces positive week 48 results in first study to evaluate treatment switch from TAF-containing regimen with three or more drugs to 2-drug regimen of dolutegravir/lamivudine for HIV-1 infection. Press Release, 2019.
- 28 Downs SH, Black N. The feasibility of creating a checklist for the assessment of the methodological quality both of randomised and non-randomised studies of health care interventions. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1998; 52: 377– 384.
- 29 Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J *et al*. The prisma statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. *PLoS Medicine* 2009; **6**: e1000100.
- 30 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and metaanalyses: the prisma statement. *PLoS Medicine* 2009; 6: e1000097.
- 31 Perez-Latorre L, Tejerina F, Teresa A*et al*.Efficacy of the combination dolutegravir and rilpivirine as simplification in patients with prior virological failure [abstract p-208]. VIII

Congreso Nacional de GeSIDA. San Sebastián, Spain, 29 November–2 December 2016.

- 32 Services USDoHaH. Guidance for industry: Human immunodeficiency virus-1 infection: Developing antiretroviral drugs for treatment. Available from: http:// www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegula toryInformation/Guidances/UCM355128.pdf (accessed 11 February 2019).
- Baldin G, Ciccullo A, Borghetti A, Di Giambenedetto S.
 Virological efficacy of dual therapy with lamivudine and dolutegravir in HIV-1-infected virologically suppressed patients: long-term data from clinical practice. *J Antimicrob Chemother* 2019; 74: 1461–1463.
- 34 Galizzi N, Poli A, Galli L *et al.* Retrospective study on the outcome of two-drug regimens based on dolutegravir plus one reverse transcriptase inhibitor in virologically-suppressed HIV-infected patients. *Int J Antimicrob Agents* 2020; 55: 105893.
- 35 Hidalgo-Tenorio C, Cortés LL, Gutiérrez A *et al.* Dolama study: Effectiveness, safety and pharmacoeconomic analysis of dual therapy with dolutegravir and lamivudine in virologically suppressed hiv-1 patients. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2019; **98**: e16813.
- 36 Reynes J, Meftah N, Tuaillon E, Charpentiers C, Montes B. Dual regimen with dolutegravir and lamivudine maintains virologic suppression even in heavily treatment experienced HIV-infected patients: 96 weeks results from maintenance dolulam study. [abstract] J Int AIDS Soc 2016; 19: 68–69.
- 37 Gagliardini R, Lorenzini P, Cozzi-Lepri Aet al. Effect of past virological failure on dolutegravir+lamivudine as maintenance regimen. https://www.croiconference.org/ab stract/effect-of-past-virological-failure-on-dolutegravirla mivudine-as-maintenance-regimen/, 2020.
- 38 Diaz A, Casado JL, Dronda Fet al. Dolutegravir plus rilpivirine in suppressed heavily pre-treated HIV-infected patients [abstract tupdb0 106]. 21st International AIDS Conference Durban, South Africa, 18–22 July 2016.
- 39 Casado JL, Monsalvo M, Fontecha M *et al*. Dolutegravir plus rilpivirine as dual regimen in virologically suppressed hiv-1 infected patients in a clinical setting. *HIV Res Clin Pract* 2019; **20**: 64–72.
- 40 Revuelta-Herrero JL, Chamorro-de-Vega E, Rodriguez-Gonzalez CG, Alonso R, Herranz-Alonso A, Sanjurjo-Saez M. Effectiveness, safety, and costs of a treatment switch to dolutegravir plus rilpivirine dual therapy in treatmentexperienced HIV patients. *Ann Pharmacother* 2018; **52**: 11– 18.
- 41 Saling C, Szabela ME, Brown M, Johnson T, Sison R, Slim J. Dolutegravir 50 mg + rilpivirine 25 mg (dtv + rpv) daily in treatment -experienced hiv-infected patients [abstract 1519]. Open Forum Infect Dis 2016; 3.

- 42 van Wyk J, Ajana F, Bisshop F *et al*. Efficacy and safety of switching to dolutegravir/lamivudine fixed-dose two-drug regimen versus continuing a tenofovir alafenamide-based three- or four-drug regimen for maintenance of virologic suppression in adults with HIV-1: Phase 3, randomized, non-inferiority tango study. *Clin Infect Dis* 2020; **71**: 1920– 1929.
- 43 Taiwo BO, Marconi VC, Berzins B *et al.* Dolutegravir plus lamivudine maintains human immunodeficiency virus-1 suppression through week 48 in a pilot randomized trial. *Clin Infect Dis* 2018; 66: 1794–1797.
- 44 Olearo F, Nguyen H, Bonnet F *et al.* Impact of the m184v/i mutation on the efficacy of abacavir/lamivudine/dolutegravir therapy in hiv treatment-experienced patients. *Open Forum Infect Dis* 2019; 6: ofz330.
- 45 Restelli S, Romeri F, Piscaglia M *et al.* Determinants and outcomes of the choice to switch to dolutegravir within different three- or two-drug regimens in a single-centre cohort: The dolutility study. International Congress of Drug Therapy in HIV Infection. Glasgow, UK, 2018.
- 46 Sangare M, Baril J, Pokomandy AD *et al*. Virological outcome after switching a suppressive haart to dolutegravir (dtg) with 2 nrtis among hiv-1 infected patients: Potential effects of previous suboptimal therapies or previous virologic failures. *J Int AIDS Soc* 2018; 21: e25187.
- 47 Cutrell J, Jodlowski T, Bedimo R. The management of treatment-experienced HIV patients (including virologic failure and switches). *Ther Adv Infect Dis* 2020; 7: 2049936120901395.
- 48 Reynes J, Meftah N, Tuaillon E, Charpentiers C, Montes B. Dual regimen with dolutegravir and lamivudine maintains virologic suppression even in heavily treatment experienced hiv-infected patients: 96 weeks results from maintenance Dolulam study. 9th International AIDS Society Conference on HIV Science (IAS 2017). Paris, France, 2017.
- 49 Deschanvres C, Raffi F, Reynes J *et al.* Virologic failure and resistance in dolutegravir-based maintenance dual regimens. https://www.croiconference.org/abstract/virologic-failure-and-resistance-in-dolutegravir-based-maintenance-dual-regimens/, 2020.

- 50 Bonijoly T, Cabie A, Cheret A *et al.* Week-48 efficacy and safety of dolutegravir + rilpivirine dual therapy as a switch strategy in a real-life cohort study. http:// resourcelibrary.eacs.cyim.com/mediatheque/ media.aspx?mediald=34526&channel=28172, 2017.
- 51 Togami H, Kato M, Fukushima N et al. Treatment outcome for nrti sparing regimen consisting of dolutegravir and rilpivirine [abstract]. *Reviews in Antiviral Therapy Infectious Diseases* 2016; 3: 42.
- 52 Ciccullo A, Baldin G, Capetti A *et al*. A comparison between two dolutegravir-based two-drug regimens as switch strategies in a multicentre cohort of hiv-1-infected patients. *Antivir Ther* 2019; 24: 63–67.
- 53 Grabmeier-Pfistershammer K. Maintenance therapy with dolutegravir/rilpivirine is efficient and well tolerated in a real-life setting [abstract #o_09]. 2nd European HIV Clinical Forum. Glasgow, UK, 2 October 2016, 2016.

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of the article.

Table S1 Search terms, strings and strategy for systematic literature review in (A) Embase and MEDLINE databases, (B) Cochrane database, and (C) PubMed platform.

 Table S2 Conference proceedings searched to supplement the literature review.

Table S3 Summary of outcomes and patient characteristics for studies investigation DTG + 3TC or DTG + RPV in PLWHIV at Week 96.

 Table S4 Results of the Downs and Black assessment tool (11)

Fig. S1 Summary of Week 96 meta-analysis data for DTG + 3TC treatment in PLWHIV: (A) viral failure, (B) VSS, (C) VSP, and (D) discontinuations.

Fig. S2 Summary of Week 96 meta-analysis data for DTG + RPV treatment in PLWHIV: (A) viral failure, (B) VSS, (C) VSP, and (D) discontinuations.