## Lopinavir/ritonavir (Kaletra®)

## A Review of Pertinent Drug Information for SARS-CoV-2

Krutika N. Mediwala, PharmD, BCPS, BCIDP MUSC Health

kmediwala@gmail.com

SOCIETY OF INFECTIOU DISEASES PHARMACIST

🥑 @krutu8



## Mechanism of Action – LPV/r







400mg /100mg PO twice daily No renal adjustments

Caution: hepatic impairment Crushing: may need increased doses



Best BM, et al. J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2011 Dec 1; 58(4): 3-5-391. https://doi.org/10.1097/QAI.0b013e318232b057

## Available Data – in vitro data in SARS-CoV-1

Molecular dynamics simulations: LPV/r may inhibit key enzyme EC<sub>50</sub> value 17.1-50µN ritonavir

*in vitro* activity for LPV at 4µg/mL after 48h

Cytopathic inhibition seen at 1µg/mL when combined with ritonavir

EC<sub>50</sub> values for LPV: 17.1-50µM; no activity with ritonavir

Binding site analysis: 1/2 of LPV left outside catalytic site --> poor efficacy

LPV/r may not have effect on replication of SARS-CoV



CIETY OF INFECTIOUS EASES PHARMACISTS

> 1. Yao TT, et al. J Med Virol. 2020; 1-8. <u>https://doi.org/10.1002/jm.20729</u> 2. De wilde AH, et al. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2014:58(8):4875-4884. https://doi.org10.1128/AAC.03011-14

## Available Data – in vitro data in MERS-CoV

Cytopathic inhibition seen Initial cytopathic effect with an  $EC_{50}$  of  $8.0\mu$ M (SI = 3.1) when combined with ritonavir

89% inhibition observed at 12µM

 $EC_{50}$  values for LPV: 11.6µM (SI > 4.3); no significant enhancement with ritonavir



EC<sub>50</sub>: 50% effective inhibitory concentration; SI: selectivity index

1. Yao TT, et al. J Med Virol. 2020; 1-8. <u>https://doi:10.1002/2022529</u> 2. De wilde AH, et al. Antimicrob Agents Chemother. 2014:58(8):4875-4884. https://doi.org10.1128/AAC.0301-14 3. Chan JF, et al. J Infect. 2013;67(6):606-616. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinf.2013.09.029

# Available Data – Animal Data in MERS-CoV

### Untreated

- Increased respiratory rate, reduced movement
- Loss of appetite, hypothermia
- Higher mean clinical scores
- <u>Extensive, multilobar</u> <u>hemorrhagic lung</u> <u>lesions and infiltrates</u>

### Mycophenalate Mofetil

- Increased respiratory rate
- Reduced movement
- Loss of appetite
- Hypothermia
- Higher mean clinical scores
- Extensive, multilobar hemorrhagic lung lesions and infiltrates
- Highest mean viral loads in lung

### LPV/r

- No severe sx
- Less weight reduction
- Improved mean clinical scores
- Less pulmonary infiltrates
- <u>Lowest mean viral</u> loads in lung

### Interferon-β1b

- No severe sx
- Less weight reduction
- Improved mean clinical scores
- Less pulmonary infiltrates
- Lower mean viral loads in lung



## Available Data – Animal Data in MERS-CoV



Sheahan TP, et al. Nat Commun.2020;11:222. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-13940-6 | www.nature.com/naturecommunications

## Available Data – Human Data in SARS-CoV-1



## Available Data – Initial vs. Rescue Therapy

### Author Conclusions:

Early use but not rescue use of LPV/r was beneficial in reducing use of pulse corticosteroid therapy, intubation rates, and death. No significant increases in ADEs.

\*synergism in rescue therapy not established by this study. Table 3. Comparison of outcomes for the group given LPV/r as initial treatment and a matched cohort\*

	LPV/r as initial treatment, n=44 Crude rate or mean (95% CI)	Matched cohort, n=634 Standardised rate or mean <sup>+</sup> (95% CI)	P value
Death rate (%)	2.3 (0-6.8)	15.6 (9.8-22.8)	< 0.05
Intubation rate (%)	0	11.0 (7.7-15.3)	< 0.05
Desaturation rate (SaO2≤95%) [%]	68.2 (52.3-81.8)	84.5 (74.4-95.2)	NS <sup>†</sup>
Proportion requiring pulse	27.3 (11.4-40.9)	55.4 (47.6-63.9)	< 0.05
methylprednisolone rescue (%)			
Mean pulse methylprednisolone dose (g)	1.6 (1.1-2.0)	3.0 (2.8-3.2)	<0.05

Table 4. Comparison of outcomes of the group given LPV/r as rescue treatment and a matched cohort\*

	LPV/r as rescue, n=31 Crude rate or mean (95% Cl)	Matched cohort, n=343 Standardised rate or mean <sup>†</sup> (95% CI)	P value
Death rate (%)	12.9 (0-25.8)	14.0 (5.2-26.3)	NS <sup>‡</sup>
Intubation rate (%)	9.7 (0-22.6)	18.1 (9.0-29.7)	NS
Desaturation rate (SaO2≤95%) [%]	93.5 (80.6-100)	92.1 (75.9-100)	NS
Mean pulse methylprednisolone dose (g)	3.8 (3.5-4.2)	3.0 (2.9-3.2)	<0.05



Chan KS, et al. Hong Kong Med J. 2003;9(6):399-406

## Available Data – Human Data in SARS





Chu CM et al. Thorax. 2004;59:252-256. https://doi.org/10.1136/thorax.2003.012658

## Change in viral load



Author Conclusions: When combined with ribavirin, lopinavir appears considerably more effective

\* SIDP

SOCIETY OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES PHARMACISTS

### Chu CM et al. Thorax. 2004;59:252-256. https://doi.org /10.1136/thorax.2003.012658

Retrospective, matched cohort PEP in HCWs (n=43)	Ribavirin 2g PO LD, 1.2g PO q8h X 4d, then 600mg PO q8h X 6-8d	PLUS Lopi	navir/ritonavir 4( q12h X 11-13d (n=2	00mg/100mg 22)
	Non-PEP (n=21)			
uthor Conclusions: P therapy was associated with	Non-PEP (n=21) Outcome	PEP (n=22)	Non-PEP (n=21)	P-value
uthor Conclusions: <u>P therapy</u> was associated with <u>40% decrease</u> in the risk of	Non-PEP (n=21)         Outcome         Subsequent MERS-CoV infection	PEP (n=22) 0 (0%)	Non-PEP (n=21) 6 (28.6%)	P-value P=0.009
uthor Conclusions: <u>P therapy</u> was associated with <u>40% decrease</u> in the risk of fection. There were <u>no severe</u> <b>Iverse events</b> during PEP	Non-PEP (n=21)         Outcome         Subsequent MERS-CoV infection         Safety – ADEs (N/V/D)	PEP (n=22) 0 (0%) 21(95.5%)	Non-PEP (n=21) 6 (28.6%) 0(0%)	P-value P=0.009

PEP: post-exposure prophylaxis; HCW: healthcare workers

Park SY et al. J Hosp Infect. 2019; 01(1):42-46. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhin.2018.09.005

#### Available Data – COVID-19 in China Open-label, individually Standard Care: Supplemental O<sub>2</sub>, Standard care PLUS randomized noninvasive and invasive ventilation, abx, LPV/r (400mg/100mg) PO q12h X14d (n=99) vasopressor support, renal-replacement SARS-CoV-2 therapy, and extracorporeal membrane PCR(+) oxygenation (ECMO) (n=199) Standard Care (n=100) 1° Outcome LPV/r (n=99) Standard Care (n=100) Difference Time from illness onset to randomization, median days 13(11-17)13 (10–16) (IQR) 16.0 (13.0 to 17.0) 16.0 (15.0 to 18.0) 1.31 (0.95 to 1.80) Time to clinical improvement, median days (IQR) -5.8 (-17.3 to 5.7) ITT 28d mortality, n (%) 19 (19.2) 25 (25.0) -8.3 (-19.6 to 3.0) mITT 28d mortality, n (%) 16 (16.7) 25 (25.0) 12 (10 to 16) 14 (11 to 16) 1 (0 to 3) Time from randomization to d/c, median days (IQR) 15.5 (2.2 to 28 30 (30.0) Pts w/ clinical improvement at 14d, n (%) 45 (45.5)

Cao B, et al. NEJM, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2001282

## Available Data – COVID-19 in China

### Author Conclusions:

LPV/r treatment added to standard txt was not associated w/ clinical improvements or mortality in seriously ill patients with COVID-19 vs. standard care alone. Decrease in viral loads over time <u>did not differ</u> between the two groups

\*high overall mortality, numerical benefits in early txt group and post-hoc groups

(log<sub>10</sub> copies/ml) Viral Load Lopinavir-ritonavir Control 10 14 28 Day

Figure 3. Mean Change from Baseline in SARS-CoV-2 Viral RNA Load by oPCR on Throat Swabs.

## **Adverse Drug Reactions**



# SOCIETY OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES PHARMACISTS

Lexicomp<sup>®</sup> package insert. Lopinavir and Ritonavir. Accessed March 14, 2020.

# Drug-Drug & Drug-Food Interactions

# **Drug-Drug**

## <u>CYP3A4 inhibitor</u>

- Other HIV and HCV agents
- Antifungals
- Amiodarone
- Apixaban
- Tacrolimus
- Agents in psychiatric illness



# **Drug-Food**

- Oral solution
  - High-fat meal can **INCREASE** levels
- Tablets
  - With or without food

Lexicomp<sup>®</sup> package insert. Lopinavir and Ritonavir. Accessed March 14, 2020.

## **COVID-19?**

Current Evidence

- No current reported study in U.S
- NEJM 3/2020: no benefit in hospitalized adult pts
- Lancet 5/2020: triple therapy

Conflicting Evidence in non-COVID pts

- Improvement in symptoms
- Reduction in viral load

Treatment Guidelines: China

 LPV/r: recommended as antiviral regimen Special Populations

• Pregnancy

Safety profile -CONCERN

- Diarrhea
- Nausea
- Asthenia
- Anemia
- Hyperbilirubin emia
- Transaminitis

SOCIETY OF INFECTIOUS DISEASES PHARMACISTS



SARS-CoV-2 PCR(+) (n=127) 2, multicenter, open-label, randomized	Combination Therapy (LPV/r 400mg/100mg PO q12h, ribavirin 400mg q12h PO, and INF-1b SQ) X14d (n=86) Control (LPV/r 400mg/100mg PO q12h) X 14d (n=40)	<b>Standard Care</b> : Supplemental O <sub>2</sub> , noninvasive and invasive ventilation, abx, vasopressor support, renal- replacement therapy, and extracorporea membrane oxygenation (ECMO)		
Baseline Characteristics (select)	Combination (n = 86)	Control (n=40)		
Hypertension	23 (27%)	13 (32%)		
Hyperlipidemia	18 (21%)	11 (27%)		
Fever	70 (81%)	32 (78%)		
Cough	45 (52%)	23 (56%)		
Sputum	29 (34%)	12 (32%)		
Shortness of breath	7 (8%)	7 (17%)		
_ymphocytes (1.06–3.61 × 10º per L)	1.0 (0.8–1.5)	1.3 (0.9–1.6)		
LDH (143–280 U/L)	194.0 (159.8–249.0)	167.5 (142.0–200.0)		
CRP	3.0 (2.0–9.2)	3.0 (1.5–7.2)		
Abnormal CXR	64 (74%)	32 (78%)		

NEWS2 – National Early Warning Score, 2<sup>nd</sup> version

Outcomes	Combination (n = 86)	Control (n=40)	p-value
Time to negative RT-PCR in NP swab sample	7 (5-11)	12 (8-15)	0.0010
Time to NEWS2 of 0 sustained X 24h	4 (3-8)	8 (7-9)	<0.0001
Time to SOFA score of 0 sustained X 24h	3 (1-8)	8 (6.5-9.0)	0.041
Length of hospital stay	9 (7-13)	14.5 (9.3-16.0)	0.016
30-day mortality	0 (0)	0 (0)	1.00
Time to negative SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR in all samples	8 (6-12)	13 (8-15)	0.0010
Serious adverse events	0 (0)	1 (2%)	0.15
Concomitant abx	4 (51%)	25 (61%)	0.33
O2 therapy	12 (14%)	5 (12%)	0.72
Non-invasive vent support	3 (3%)	2 (5%)	0.75
Vent support	0	1 (2%)	0.15

NEWS2 – National Early Warning Score, 2<sup>nd</sup> version

Outcomes	Combination (n = 86)	Control (n=40)	p-value
Time to negative RT-PCR in NP swab sample	7 (5-11)	12 (8-15)	0.0010
Time to NEWS2 of 0 sustained X 24h	4 (3-8)	8 (7-9)	<0.0001
Time to SOFA score of 0 sustained X 24h	3 (1-8)	8 (6.5-9.0)	0.041
Length of hospital stay	9 (7-13)	14.5 (9.3-16.0)	0.016
30-day mortality	0 (0)	0 (0)	1.00
Time to negative SARS-CoV-2 RT-PCR in all samples	8 (6-12)	13 (8-15)	0.0010
Serious adverse events	0 (0)	1 (2%)	0.15
Concomitant abx	4 (51%)	25 (61%)	0.33
O2 therapy	12 (14%)	5 (12%)	0.72
Non-invasive vent support	3 (3%)	2 (5%)	0.75
Vent support	0	1 (2%)	0.15

NEWS2 – National Early Warning Score, 2<sup>nd</sup> version







### Author Conclusions:

Early triple therapy w/ LPV/r, INF-1b, and ribavirin treatment <u>effectively suppressed viral load in all clinical</u> <u>specimens and IL-6</u>. Combination therapy was associated with <u>significantly shorter time to alleviation of symptom</u> <u>and shorter hospital stays</u>. Serious ADEs were <u>similar in</u> <u>both groups</u>, with minimal discontinuation. Baseline characteristics, SOFA and NEWS2 scores were not indicative of severe illness and may not have warranted admission (if not required). There was no statistically significant difference in 30-d mortality, O2 requirement, and need for ventilatory support.

\*ADEs and secondary abx were reported in almost half of pt population.

## (Update - 06/29/2020) RECOVERY Trial



- Patient randomized to either LPV/r, HCQ, Azithromycin, Convalescent plasma or Tocilizumab
- 4%: invasive mechanical ventilation when entering trial
- 70%: O2 alone
- 26%: no respiratory intervention.

### **Primary outcome: 28-d mortality**

- 22.1% lopinavir-ritonavir vs. 21.3% usual care; relative risk 1.04 [95% confidence interval 0.91- 1.18]; p=0.58
- No beneficial effects in 28-d mortality, risk of progression to mechanical ventilation or length of hospital stay.



Horby P, et al. https://www.recoverytrial.net/files/lopinavir-ritonavir-recovery-statement-29062020\_final.pd

## (Update – 12/06/2020) SOLIDARITY Trial



HCQ = hydroxychloroquine RDV = Remdesivir

### Figure 3. Rate Ratios for In-Hospital Death, Subdivided by Age and Respiratory Support at Trial Entry

Lopinavir						
Age at entry						
<50 yr	20/511 (3.6)	27/501 (4.9)	-3.0	11.7		0.77 (0.36-1.64)
50–69 yr	66/597 (9.8)	57/596 (9.1)	2.7	30.4		1.09 (0.68-1.74)
≥70 yr	62/291 (20.4)	62/275 (22.7)	0.0	30.2	<b>+</b>	1.00 (0.63-1.60)
Respiratory support at entry						
No mechanical ventilation	113/1287 (8.1)	111/1258 (8.7)	-1.6	55.6		0.97 (0.69-1.37)
Mechanical ventilation	35/112 (28.1)	35/114 (28.7)	1.3	16.7		<ul> <li>1.08 (0.57–2.03)</li> </ul>
Total	148/1399 (9.7)	146/1372 (10.3)	-0.4	72.3	$\diamond$	1.00 (0.79-1.25)
Heterogeneity around total: $\chi_3^2 = 1.2$						P=0.97



Pan H, et al. NEJM 2020. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2023184

## (Update – 12/06/2020) SOLIDARITY Trial

Death occurred in 148 of 1399 patients receiving lopinavir and in 146 of 1372 receiving its control (rate ratio,1.00; **95% CI, 0.79 to 1.25; P = 0.97**), These data show that LPV/r **did not reduce mortality, initiation of ventilation or hospitalization duration** of hospitalized COVID-19 patients when compared to standard of care. \*does not affect the possible evaluation in other studies of hydroxychloroquine or lopinavir/ritonavir in non-hospitalized patients or as pre- or post-exposure prophylaxis for COVID-19

**×**SIDP

### Figure 2. Effects of LPV/r on In-Hospital Mortality



Pan H, et al. NEJM 2020. https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2023184



## Lopinavir/ritonavir (Kaletra®)

## A Review of Pertinent Drug Information for SARS-CoV-2

Krutika N. Mediwala, PharmD, BCPS, BCIDP MUSC Health

kmediwala@gmail.com

SOCIETY OF INFECTIOU DISEASES PHARMACIST

🥑 @krutu8

