

Re:

BMJ-2019-049143

"Unmasking the vulnerabilities of children exposed to HIV and/or antiretroviral drugs"

Dear Dr. Ramokolo,

Many thanks for submitting the above paper to BMJ as part of an intended collection focussing on PMTCT (VT). I am working with my colleague Paul Simpson on the collection. My apologies that this paper took longer to peer-review than we'd planned.

The paper has now been sent out for external peer review to four reviewers, and I have discussed the decision with Paul. In light of the reviews, we aren't able to make an offer of publication at this stage but would like to invite you to revise and resubmit, having responded to the reviewer and editors' comments. Ideally, we would like to ask if you can submit the revision within around three weeks (ie by 24th April), but if there are likely problems with this, do let me know.

The reviewers' and editors' comments are at the end of this letter, and I hope you find them constructive.

When submitting your revised manuscript please provide a point by point response to our comments and those of any reviewers. We also ask that you keep the revised manuscript within the word count of 1800-2000 words.

Please note that resubmitting your manuscript does not guarantee eventual acceptance, and that your revision may be sent again for review.

Once you have revised your manuscript, go to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bmj> and login to your Author Center. Click on "Manuscripts with Decisions," and then click on "Create a Revision" located next to the manuscript number. Then, follow the steps for resubmitting your manuscript.

You may also click the below link to submit the revised files. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.

If accepted, your article will be published online at bmj.com, the canonical form of the journal. Please note that only a proportion of accepted analysis articles will also be published in print.

I hope you will find the comments useful. Please don't hesitate to contact me if you wish to discuss this further.

Yours sincerely, Emma

Emma Veitch, PhD
Associate Editor, The BMJ

BMJ, BMA House,
Tavistock Square,
London, WC1H 9JR

E: eveitch@bmj.com
W: bmj.com/company

In your response please provide point by point replies to our editors' and reviewers' comments, explaining how you have dealt with them in the article.

EDITORS' COMMENTS TO AUTHOR:

*Regarding terminology (raised on other articles in the collection). Across the collection, we are recommending to use "VT" rather than PMTCT, and would guide the authors to do this. This would entail defining VT early on, and here the authors can state the equivalence with MTCT.

*Around the time of preparation of this piece, we noted some recent articles on HEU that may be relevant for the authors to consider (one is a commentary written by two of the present authors). I am not saying the authors definitely need to cite these, but it's just to give you the chance to make sure all data are as up to date as possible:

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanchi/article/PIIS2352-4642\(19\)30007-0](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanchi/article/PIIS2352-4642(19)30007-0)

[/fulltexthttps://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanchi/article/PIIS2352-4642\(19\)30023-9/fulltext#%20](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanchi/article/PIIS2352-4642(19)30023-9/fulltext#%20)

[https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanhiv/article/PIIS2352-3018\(18\)30361-8/fulltext](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lanhiv/article/PIIS2352-3018(18)30361-8/fulltext)

*On the editors' first read of the paper, we felt that the article does not quite present the clear argument or analytical thread that we hope for in an Analysis piece, however the topic is very important and there would be great value in having an article with this focus within the Collection in BMJ. We found (as also noted by a reviewer) the definitions presented are very useful, and there is an argument made regarding the value of monitoring, and outstanding dilemmas regarding this. However, the argument for monitoring is not made as clearly as it could be, since it's not clear to the reader how this might resolve the issue that many questions around mechanisms of risk for HEU children are unresolved - and that presumably routine data will be of poorer quality than research (trials/cohort) data, so may not be geared up to answer these (one of the reviewers highlights this too). So more clarity is needed to understand the purpose of monitoring data, what value this will bring distinct from specifically-designed research studies, etc. A clearer narrative thread is needed.

*The authors might consider hiving off the "definitions" part into a box, for example which presents the various acronyms and definitions, and this would save space for more room in the text to develop the various arguments.

*The editors are happy to discuss options for taking the piece forward anytime the authors would like in order to develop it further along the lines of what we aim for in the Analysis section - perhaps when the authors have had a look over the reviewer comments and considered how to proceed.

INFORMATION FOR SUBMITTING A REVISION

Please submit your revised manuscript by the deadline if you can, or contact us if you are likely to be late.

Once you have revised your manuscript, go to <https://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/bmj> and login to your Author Center. Click on "Manuscripts with Decisions," and then click on "Create a Resubmission" located next to the manuscript number. Then, follow the steps for resubmitting your manuscript.

You may also click the below link to start the resubmission process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.

REVIEWERS' COMMENTS:

Reviewer: 1

Comments:

This is a well-written article which clearly outlines the issues regarding health and development of HEU children and how we should both investigate and manage these. I have a couple of small comments which need to be addressed and a few ideas for the authors to consider.

1. p5, line 53 to p 6, line 5: The authors mention the disadvantage of the large Zimbabwean study in that it was conducted when ARVs were hardly available so it can provide no data relevant to today's ARV-exposed cohorts. However, it also be mentioned that it provides an important, and now vanishingly rare, study of the effects of HIV exposure alone, without the complication of varying ARV regimens.
2. In their discussion towards the end on the Way Forward, the authors discuss the practical and ethical issues of routine monitoring of HEU children. However, I think the way forward needs to start by getting more good quality research data in order to determine which groups, including HUA and EHE, have any excess risks at all, what these are, and what cost-effective interventions are available to mitigate risks. If there is no problem or no solution, then implementing a surveillance programme is not a priority.
3. The 2nd and 3rd key messages are quite similar and could be combined.

Small points:

4. Page 4. line 55: It is not clear what is meant by 'efficiency' of ARVs.
5. Page 10: Reference #9 seems to have got messed up.

Additional Questions:

Please enter your name: Suzanne Filteau

Job Title: Professor of International Nutrition

Institution: London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine

Reimbursement for attending a symposium?: No

A fee for speaking?: No

A fee for organising education?: No

Funds for research?: No

Funds for a member of staff?: No

Fees for consulting?: No

Have you in the past five years been employed by an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?: No

Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?: No

If you have any competing interests <A
HREF='http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-policies-and-checklists/declaration-co
mpeting-interests'target='_new'> (please see BMJ policy) please declare them here: No

Reviewer: 2

Comments:

This is an analysis paper regarding the importance of understanding and monitoring of children born to mothers infected with HIV. This is an incredibly important topic, and the authors' have extensive international expertise and leadership in this area. This is a strong paper that brings up some critical points to consider regarding the vulnerabilities of this population. Having a clear message about this topic helps stakeholders and clinicians understand the current state of HEU children and is tremendously valuable. I strongly recommend that this paper be published, however, in order to maximize its impact and clarity, I have a few suggestions to consider.

Of note, I commend the authors for highlighting the HUA and EHE groups. I don't think I've seen them as clearly defined as they are here. This paper can be an origin point, of sorts, for the use of these terms to describe their respective populations.

Suggested revisions:

Introduction- It would be valuable to clearly indicate what specific areas appear to be affected within the research on morbidity and mortality of HEUs. The paper generally speaks of health and development early on, and only later notes its association with worse language, growth, and immunity. Being clear/specific early on regarding the evidence would be of great benefit to those less familiar with this topic and can strengthen the case for why more comprehensive monitoring should take place.

Page 4, "Definition of Exposure Status"- Line 35- the authors listed, "indirect/environmental HIV exposure through an HIV-affected household," which is a valid exposure that many clinicians may not consider (making it even more important to highlight). However, there isn't a lot a clarity about what this means. In the following sentences discussing the heterogeneity of the HEU group, it is unclear if Lines 44-47 are referring to the indirect/environmental HIV exposure through an HIV-affected household or just the general heterogeneity. Additionally, it is unclear how this exposure is the same/different/related to the EHE population, which is mentioned at the end of this section (page 5, lines 33-47). This section would be much stronger if this specific area is made clearer.

I was enthusiastic when reading the ideas laid forward by the authors regarding routine monitoring and how data platforms could help collect information about this population and brings up the need for unique identifiers that can follow a child to adulthood. This would be incredibly valuable and a way to benefit children in ways beyond HIV exposure as well. However, I was a little confused when the discussion switched to disclosure of status. I completely agree that the child should be aware of his/her HIV or exposure status. However, the authors also highlighted that long-term monitoring needs to consider disclosure to those who monitor outcomes or provide interventions. Who are "those" groups? (Page 7, Line 37-39)

Page 7, Lines 39-42- the author's note that documented HIV status for healthcare purposes would disclose a mother's status, and that presents an ethical dilemma. I'm not sure if I follow this. Are the author's talking about medical records? And if so, are they concerned that the data documented within these records are not secure or that people are not willing to share their status or be tested within the healthcare system, making this issue ethically challenging? I may be naïve in this area, but I didn't realize that any of those points might be issues. However, if disclosure is a challenge within healthcare, it would be important to expand on why this is the case.

During Page 7 lines 46-51, who are the authors referring to when they're discussing disclosure of a breastfeeding mothers' status? Health care settings, studies, surveillance, or interventions all may request information regarding HIV exposure or infection status. I wasn't under the impression that many individuals refuse to provide this information if it were otherwise kept confidential, perhaps I'm wrong. Further clarification (see above) would be appreciated.

Page 7, lines 53-54, Which article within the International Convention on the Rights of the Child are the authors referring to with their statement that specific health care providers need access to their HIV and or ARV exposure status throughout their lives? Could providers just directly ask their patients about it, like other exposures that can negatively affect one's long-term health (ACEs, tobacco or alcohol consumption, etc)? Or if more specific data regarding in utero exposure is needed, could there just be a push for individual patient identifiers that are linked to a parent from birth to resolve this issue?

Again, overall, I think this is a fantastic paper that discusses an important topic, and I'm grateful the authors put this together. It will be valuable to the scientific community and I recommend it for publication, with consideration of the suggested revisions.

Minor editorial revisions:

Please check the citation style within the text.

Page 6, line 15- Please consider revising the phrase: "well thought through long-term prospective cohort study designs." Having 7 adjectives before "designs" is difficult to follow, even within such an important statement.

Page 6, line 29- ART was used instead of ARV for the first time- likely unintentional.

Additional Questions:

Please enter your name: Megan S. McHenry

Job Title: Assistant Professor of Pediatrics

Institution: Indiana University School of Medicine

Reimbursement for attending a symposium?: No

A fee for speaking?: No

A fee for organising education?: No

Funds for research?: Yes

Funds for a member of staff?: No

Fees for consulting?: No

Have you in the past five years been employed by an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?: No

Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?: No

If you have any competing interests <A
HREF='http://www.bmj.com/about-bmj/resources-authors/forms-policies-and-checklists/declaration-co
mpeting-interests'target='_new'> (please see BMJ policy) please declare them here: I have a
K23MH116808 career development award focused on HIV-infected and HIV-exposed children.

Reviewer: 3

Comments:

This is a timely and important topic. The number of HEU children is rapidly rising and is becoming one of the largest HIV affected populations. The authors present a nice and balanced discussion of the need to invest in the long-term follow up of these children. Interesting discussion is also presented for HIV unexposed but ARV exposed children born to mothers using PrEP during pregnancy, and HIV and ARV unexposed children living in households affected by HIV. The paper presents the need for defining exposures, encourages prospective cohort studies of HEUs and routine follow up of HEU with a trigger based approach, and discusses the issue of maternal HIV disclosure and HIV stigma in having the HIV/ARV exposure status linked to a child's health record.

I have a few minor comments:

In the second Key Message which start with "This" – I am not sure what "This" refers to. I suggest editing to increase clarity.

In the Standfirst it is stated "...that short and long-term monitoring of HIV and/or antiretroviral (ARV) exposure in children is critical to identifying ways of improving individual clinical care...". This statement is not quite clear as it is not HIV and ARV exposure that is monitored in the children but rather the health of the HEU children. I suggest editing the statement.

In the Definition of exposure status: I recommend revising the first sentence to increase clarity. The first half of the sentence seems to refer to a general definition of exposures, while in the second half of the sentence the authors mention ARV drug regimens. Splitting into two sentences would be helpful. Plus, I am not sure what "variation in how exposures are constructed" means.

In the same section, second paragraph the authors mention that high levels of maternal HIV viremia and systemic inflammation could result in immune dysfunction. This is true, but not the only adverse outcomes. Inflammation has been linked to other developmental issues including higher risk of autism spectrum disorder.

There is a period missing in the sentence ending with reference 9

Additional Questions:

Please enter your name: Lena Serghides

Job Title: Scientist

Institution: University Health Network

Reimbursement for attending a symposium?: Yes

A fee for speaking?: Yes

A fee for organising education?: No

Funds for research?: Yes

Funds for a member of staff?: Yes

Fees for consulting?: No

Have you in the past five years been employed by an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?: No

Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?: No

If you have any competing interests (please see BMJ policy) please declare them here:

Reviewer: 4

Comments:

In this manuscript, the authors explain clearly the multiple ways HIV in the parents or caregivers may affect the health of exposed children, and the importance of understanding association between these exposures and health outcomes.

This necessitates a new way to monitor these children, as compared to what is currently done, with two major challenges which are (1) the resources given by low and middle income countries to this problem, which may not be considered everywhere as a priority, and (2) the problem of HEU status "disclosure".

I have 3 minor remarks :

1) P5 lines 23-24 : the authors underline that conceiving while on ARV is expanding because of PreP access, however, this is confusing to me.

The vast majority of women conceiving while on ART are HIV-infected women, women on PreP are a small number, that will probably increase in years to come. Please clarify by adding

- in the HEU paragraph (for example p4, after lines 55) that because of Option B+ a very large number of HIV-infected women will conceive while on ARV;

- and distinctly say later that a new population of children (the HUA) for now a very small number, but maybe in the near future a more important population, may be exposed to ARV at conception.

2) Paragraph "routine monitoring of children"

One of the major obstacles to long-term follow-up of HEU children, is that most of them are not aware of the HIV status of their parents, and therefore do not know their own "HEU" status.

This is developed in length later by the authors in the paragraph "the way forward" but should be explained earlier in the text, as it is the major limitation to information collection on these children, even in high income countries.

3) P7, lines 26 : the unique identifiers, in order to tackle this problem of "HEU disclosure" would need to link the mother to the child also.

Additional Questions:

Please enter your name: Jeanne Sibiude

Job Title: Assistant Professor in Obstetrics and Gynecology

Institution: Assistance-Publique-Hopitaux de Paris

Reimbursement for attending a symposium?: No

A fee for speaking?: No

A fee for organising education?: No

Funds for research?: No

Funds for a member of staff?: No

Fees for consulting?: No

Have you in the past five years been employed by an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?: No

Do you hold any stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of this paper?: No

If you have any competing interests (please see BMJ policy) please declare them here: