

FIGURE 362-1 Relative potency of antiviral drugs for hepatitis B, as reflected by median log_{10} HBV DNA reduction in HBeAg-positive chronic hepatitis B. These data are from individual reports of large, randomized controlled registration trials that were the basis for approval of the drugs. In most instances, these data do not represent direct comparisons among the drugs, because study populations were different, baseline patient variables were not always uniform, and the sensitivity and dynamic range of the HBV DNA assays used in the trials varied. ADV, adefovir dipivoxil; ETV, entecavir; LAM, lamivudine; PEG IFN, pegylated interferon α2a; TBV, telbivudine; TDF, tenofovir disoproxil fumarate.

with either drug alone (and is much less likely to be associated with lamivudine resistance), this combination used for a year is no better than a year of PEG IFN in achieving sustained responses. To date, combinations of oral nucleoside/nucleotide agents have not achieved an enhancement in virologic, serologic, or biochemical efficacy over that achieved by the more potent of the combined drugs given individually. In a 2-year trial of combination entecavir and tenofovir versus entecavir monotherapy, for a small subgroup of patients with very high HBV DNA levels ($\geq 10^8$ IU/mL), a reduction in HBV DNA to <50 IU/mL was higher in the combination group (79% versus 62%); however, no differences in HBeAg responses or any other endpoint were observed between the combination-therapy and monotherapy groups, even in the high-HBV DNA subgroup. On the other hand, combining agents that are not cross-resistant (e.g., lamivudine and adefovir or tenofovir) has the potential to reduce the risk or perhaps even to preempt entirely the emergence of drug resistance. In the future, the treatment paradigm may shift from the current approach of sequential monotherapy to preemptive combination therapy, perhaps not for all patients but for subsets (e.g., patients with very high levels of HBV DNA, immunosuppressed patients); however, designing and executing clinical trials that demonstrate superior efficacy and resistance profile of combination therapy over monotherapy with entecavir or tenofovir will remain challenging.

NOVEL ANTIVIRALS AND STRATEGIES

In addition to the seven approved antiviral drugs for hepatitis B, emtricitabine, a fluorinated cytosine analogue very similar to lamivudine in structure, efficacy, and resistance profile, offers no advantage over lamivudine. A combination of emtricitabine and tenofovir is approved for the treatment of HIV infection and is an appealing combination therapy for hepatitis B, especially for lamivudine-resistant disease; however, neither emtricitabine nor the combination is approved yet for hepatitis B. Several initially promising antiviral agents have been abandoned because of toxicity (e.g., clevudine, which was linked to myopathy during its clinical development). Because direct-acting antivirals have been so successful in the management of chronic hepatitis B, more unconventional approaches—e.g., immunologic (e.g., toll receptor agonists) or genetic manipulation (e.g., RNA interference—gene silencing—to reduce HBV DNA transcription)—are not likely to be competitive, unless they can be shown to go beyond current antivirals in achieving recovery (HBsAg seroconversion) from HBV infection. Finally, initial emphasis in the development of antiviral therapy for hepatitis B was placed on monotherapy; whether combination regimens will yield additive or synergistic efficacy remains to be determined.

TREATMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

Several learned societies and groups of expert physicians have issued treatment recommendations for patients with chronic hepatitis B; the most authoritative and updated (and free of financial support by pharmaceutical companies) are those of the American Association for the Study of Liver Diseases (AASLD) and of the European Association for the Study of the Liver (EASL). Although the recommendations differ slightly, a consensus has emerged on most of the important points **(Table 362-4)**. No treatment is recommended or available for inactive "nonreplicative" hepatitis B carriers (undetectable HBeAg with normal ALT and HBV DNA $\leq 10^3$ IU/mL documented serially over time). In patients with detectable HBeAg and HBV DNA levels $>2 \times 10^4$ IU/mL, treatment is recommended by the AASLD for those with ALT levels above 2 × the upper limit of normal. (The EASL recommends treatment in HBeAg-positive patients for HBV DNA levels $>2 \times 10^3$ IU/mL and ALT above the upper limit of normal.) For HBeAg-positive patients with ALT ≤2 × the upper limit of normal, in whom sustained responses are not likely and who would require multiyear therapy, antiviral therapy is not recommended currently. This pattern is common during the early decades of life among Asian patients infected at birth; even in this group, therapy would be considered for those >40 years of age, ALT persistently at the high end of the twofold range, and/or with a family history of HCC, especially if the liver biopsy shows moderate to severe necroinflammatory activity or fibrosis. In this group, when, eventually, ALT becomes elevated later in life, antiviral therapy should be instituted. For patients with HBeAg-negative chronic hepatitis B, ALT >2 × the upper limit of normal (above the upper limit of normal according to EASL), and HBV DNA $>2 \times 10^3$ IU/mL, antiviral therapy is recommended. If HBV DNA is $>2 \times 10^3$ IU/mL and ALT is 1 to >2 × the upper limit of normal, liver biopsy should be considered to help in arriving at a decision to treat if substantial liver injury is present (treatment in this subset would be recommended according to EASL guidelines, because ALT is elevated).

For patients with compensated cirrhosis, because antiviral therapy has been shown to retard clinical progression, treatment is recommended regardless of HBeAg status and ALT as long as HBV DNA is detectable at $>2 \times 10^3$ IU/mL (detectable at any level according to the EASL); monitoring without therapy is recommended for those with HBV DNA $<2 \times 10^3$ IU/mL, unless ALT is elevated. For patients with decompensated cirrhosis, treatment is recommended regardless of serologic and biochemical status, as long as HBV DNA is detectable. Patients with decompensated cirrhosis should be evaluated as candidates for liver transplantation.

Among the seven available drugs for hepatitis B, PEG IFN has supplanted standard IFN, entecavir has supplanted lamivudine, and tenofovir has supplanted adefovir. PEG IFN, entecavir, or tenofovir is recommended as first-line therapy (Table 362-3). PEG IFN requires finite-duration therapy, achieves the highest rate of HBeAg responses after a year of therapy, and does not support viral mutations, but it requires subcutaneous injections and is associated with inconvenience, more intensive clinical and laboratory monitoring, and intolerability. Oral nucleoside analogues require long-term therapy in most patients, and when used alone, lamivudine and telbivudine foster the emergence of viral mutations, adefovir somewhat less so, and entecavir (except in lamivudine-experienced patients) and tenofovir rarely at all. Oral agents do not require injections or cumbersome laboratory monitoring, are very well tolerated, lead to improved histology in 50–90% of patients, suppress HBV DNA more profoundly than PEG IFN, and are effective even in patients who fail to respond to IFN-based therapy. Although oral agents are less likely to result in HBeAg responses during the first year of therapy, as compared to PEG IFN, treatment with oral agents tends to be extended beyond the first year and, by the end of the second year,