# Differences in HCV prevalence, treatment uptake, and liver related events in urban vs. rural HIV/HCV co-infected residents of British Columbia

#### Sylvain A Lother<sup>1</sup>, Oghenowede Eyawo<sup>2</sup>, Anthony Wu<sup>2</sup>, Monica Ye<sup>2</sup>, Paul Sereda<sup>2</sup>, Viviane Dias Lima<sup>2</sup>, Kate Salters<sup>2</sup>, Robert S Hogg<sup>2,3</sup>, Julio SG Montaner<sup>2</sup>, Mark Hull<sup>1,2\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Section of Infectious Disease, Department of Internal Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada <sup>2</sup>British Columbia Centre for Excellence in HIV/AIDS, Vancouver, BC, Canada <sup>3</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, BC, Canada

Background

- Direct acting antivirals (DAA) are simple, safe, and effective treatments for hepatitis C virus (HCV)
- Individuals in rural and remote areas may have limited accessibility to treatments
- These factors should be considered in the provincial scale up of DAA treatment throughout British Columbia
- We compared the prevalence of HCV, pre-DAA treatment uptake, and outcomes of patients with HIV/HCV in rural vs. urban areas

### **Results**

- Characteristics from 17,596 identified individuals with HCV are summarized in Table 1
- Individuals with HIV/HCV co-infection (24.3%) were more likely to live in urban centers than those with HCV alone (Table 1)
- HCV treatment uptake was higher in mono-infected vs. co-infected individuals in both urban (25.9 vs. 10.3%, p< 0.0001) and rural (25.1 vs. 9.7%, p<0.001) settings
- Treatment uptake was low among HIV/HCV individuals in both

\*Contact: mhull@cfenet.ubc.ca

All inferences, opinions, and conclusions drawn in this poster are those of the authors, and do not reflect the opinions or policies of the Data Steward(s)

## **Methods**

Table 1

- Retrospective study using population based data from the British lacksquareColumbia Comparative Outcomes and Service Utilization Trends (COAST)
- All individuals with HCV from 1996 2013 were included ullet
- HCV status was determined by serology in HIV/HCV infected ulletindividuals, and by serology, ICD-9/10 codes, and physician report for HCV mono-infected individuals
- Rurality (vs. urban or suburban dwelling) was determined by postal  $\bullet$ code of residence or CMA code
- Prescriptions for interferon and ribavirin were identified from  $\bullet$ **Provincial PharmaNet**
- Liver related events were defined using ICD-9/10 diagnostic codes ulletfrom Medical Service billing and hospitalization records
- Medians and Q1-Q3 were calculated for explanatory variables,  $\bullet$ while univariable and multivariable logistic regression were used to fit the models

urban and rural settings, and no geographic differences were observed in liver related outcomes (Table 2)

- Rurality, female sex, and PWID were factors associated with less treatment uptake, while history of mood disorder and HCV monoinfection were associated with higher treatment uptake (Table 3)
- In HIV/HCV co-infected individuals, female sex, AIDS defining illness (ADI), and viral load (VL)  $\geq$  40 copies/mL were associated with less treatment uptake. No differences were observed with urban vs. rural dwelling, HIV treatment adherence, or PWID (data not shown)

#### Table 2

**Pre-DAA treatment uptake and outcomes in HIV/HCV co-infected** individuals by rural vs. urban setting

Variable	Urban (n=3,700)	Rural (n=248)	p-value
Treatment uptake (%)	10.3	9.7	0.7655
End stage liver disease (%)	8.9	8.9	0.9911
Liver related mortality (%)	1.8	2.8	0.2715

## Table 3

#### Multivariable logistic regression examining factors associated with pre-DAA treatment uptake in HCV mono-infected, and HIV/ **HCV co-infected individuals**

#### **Characteristics of study participants**

Outcome	Total cohort	HCV mono-infection	<b>HIV/HCV</b> co-infection		
	(n=17,596)	(n=13,313)	(n=4,283)		
Demographics					
Age at baseline (median, Q1-	48.5 (39.8 – 55.7)	50.9 (43.4 – 57.3)	40.1 (33.3 – 46.6)		
Q3)					
Sex (%)					
Male	65.5	63.0	73.1		
Female	34.5	37.0	26.9		
PWID (%)	49.4	38.5	83.1		
History of mood disorder (%)	63.0	63.1	63.0		
Place of residence (%)					
Urban	62.1	54,2	86.4		
Sub-urban	24.1	29.4	7.8		
Rural	13.8	16.4	5.8		
HCV treatment					
HCV treatment uptake ever (%)	21.5	25.2	9.9		
HCV treatment completion (%)					
24 weeks	41.1	41.0	42.2		
48 weeks	4.2	4.3	3.3		
Liver-related outcomes					
End stage liver disease (%)	15.4	17.6	8.6		
Liver related mortality (%)	7.1	8.8	1.9		
HIV related factors		·			
Adherence to ART >95% (%)	-	-	35.4		
Viral load (%)					
< 40 copies/mL	-	-	61.3		
≥ 40 copies/mL	-	-	20.8		
Unknown	-	-	18.0		
History of ADI (%)	-	-	23.4		
CD4 nadir (cells/mm <sup>3</sup> ) (median,	-	-	110 (30 – 200)		
Q1-Q3)					

Variable	Adjusted odds ratio	95% Confidence interval
HCV mono-infection vs. HIV/ HCV co-infection	2.53	2.24 - 2.85
Sub-urban vs. urban Rural vs. urban	0.88 0.89	0.80 - 0.96 0.80 - 0.99
PWID ever vs. never	0.44	0.40 - 0.48
Mood disorder ever vs. never	1.46	1.34 - 1.58
Female vs. male	0.17	0.11 - 0.26

# Conclusions

- Approximately 1/10 individuals with HIV/HCV were treated for HCV (pre-DAA) in this population based cohort
- Treatment uptake in rural settings is almost 3x higher in HCV mono-infection than HIV/HCV co-infection
- Barriers to treatment uptake including rurality, female sex, PWID,  $\bullet$ and others should be considered in HCV treatment scale up with DAAs

