Lopinavir/Ritonavir (LPV/r, Kaletra)

Updated: April 11, 2023
Reviewed: April 11, 2023

Formulations

Oral Solution

- [Kaletra] Lopinavir 80 mg/mL and ritonavir 20 mg/mL (contains 42.4% alcohol by volume and 15.3% propylene glycol by weight/volume)

Film-Coated Tablets

- [Kaletra] Lopinavir 100 mg/ritonavir 25 mg
- [Kaletra] Lopinavir 200 mg/ritonavir 50 mg

When using fixed-dose combination (FDC) tablets, refer to other sections of the Drug Appendix for information about the individual components of the FDC. See also Appendix A, Table 2. Antiretroviral Fixed-Dose Combination Tablets: Minimum Body Weights and Considerations for Use in Children and Adolescents.

For additional information, see Drugs@FDA or DailyMed.

Dosing Recommendations

Neonate (Aged <14 Days) Dose

- Lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/r) is not approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for use in neonates before a postmenstrual age of 42 weeks and a postnatal age of at least 14 days.

Dosing for Individuals Who Are Not Receiving Concomitant Nevirapine, Efavirenz, Fosamprenavir, or Nelfinavir

Infant (Aged 14 Days to 12 Months) Dose

- Once-daily dosing **is not recommended.**
- LPV/r 300 mg/75 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily. This approximates LPV/r 16 mg/4 mg (both per kg body weight) twice daily. Use of this dose in infants aged <12 months is associated with lower LPV trough levels than those found in adults; LPV dosing should be adjusted for growth at frequent intervals (see Pharmacokinetics and Dosing below).

Child and Adolescent (Aged >12 Months to 18 Years) Dose

- Once-daily dosing **is not recommended.**
- LPV/r 300 mg/75 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily (maximum dose LPV/r 400 mg/100 mg twice daily, except as noted below). For patients weighing <15 kg, this dose approximates LPV/r 13 mg/3.25 mg (both per kg body weight)

Selected Adverse Events

- Gastrointestinal (GI) intolerance, nausea, vomiting, diarrhea, alteration of taste
- Hyperlipidemia, especially hypertriglyceridemia
- Elevated transaminases
- Hyperglycemia
- PR interval prolongation
- QT interval prolongation and Torsades de Pointes
- Risk of toxicity—including life-threatening cardiotoxicity—is increased in premature infants (see Major Toxicities below)

Special Instructions

- LPV/r tablets can be administered without regard to food; administration with or after meals may enhance GI tolerability.
- LPV/r tablets must be swallowed whole. **Do not crush or split tablets.**
- LPV/r oral solution should be administered with food because a high-fat meal increases absorption.

twice daily. For patients weighing ≥15 kg to 45 kg, this dose approximates LPV/r 11 mg/2.75 mg (both per kg body weight) twice daily. This dose is routinely used by many clinicians and is the preferred dose for antiretroviral therapy (ART)-experienced patients who could harbor virus with decreased LPV susceptibility (see Pharmacokinetics and Dosing).

- LPV/r 230 mg/57.5 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily can be used in antiretroviral (ARV)-naive patients aged >1 year. For patients weighing <15 kg, this dose approximates LPV/r 12 mg/3 mg per kg body weight given twice daily. For patients weighing ≥15 kg to 40 kg, this dose approximates LPV/r 10 mg/2.5 mg per kg body weight given twice daily. This lower dose **should not be used** in treatment-experienced patients who could harbor virus with decreased LPV susceptibility.

Weight-Band Dosing for Lopinavir 100-mg/Ritonavir 25-mg Pediatric Tablets in Children and Adolescents

Recommended Number of LPV/r 100-mg/25-mg Tablets Given Twice Daily		
Dosing target	300 mg/m^2 per dose given twice daily	230 mg/m^2 per dose given twice daily
Body Weight		
15 kg to 20 kg	2	2
>20 kg to 25 kg	3	2
>25 kg to 30 kg	3	3
>30 kg to 35 kg	4[a]	3
>35 kg to 45 kg	4[a]	4[a]
>45 kg	4[a] or 5[b]	4[a]

[a] Two tablets that each contain LPV/r 200 mg/50 mg can be substituted for the four LPV/r 100-mg/25-mg tablets in children who are capable of swallowing a larger tablet.

[b] In patients who weigh >45 kg and who are receiving concomitant nevirapine (NVP), efavirenz (EFV), fosamprenavir (FPV), or nelfinavir (NFV), the FDA-approved adult dose is LPV/r 500 mg/125 mg twice daily, given as a combination of two tablets of LPV/r 200 mg/50 mg and one tablet of LPV/r 100 mg/25 mg. Alternatively, three tablets of LPV/r 200 mg/50 mg can be used for ease of dosing.

Adult (Aged >18 Years) Dose

- LPV/r 800 mg/200 mg once daily; *or*
- LPV/r 400 mg/100 mg twice daily
- **Do not use** once-daily dosing in children; adolescents; in patients receiving concomitant therapy with NVP, EFV, FPV, or NFV; or in patients with three or more LPV-associated mutations (see Special Instructions for a list of mutations).

- The poor palatability of LPV/r oral solution is difficult to mask with flavorings or foods (see Formulations below).
- LPV/r oral solution can be kept at room temperature (up to 77 ºF or 25 ºC) if used within 2 months. If kept refrigerated (36 ºF to 46 ºF or 2 ºC to 8 ºC), LPV/r oral solution remains stable until the expiration date printed on the label.
- Children aged <18 years who receive once-daily dosing of LPV/r have shown considerable variability in plasma concentrations and have a higher incidence of diarrhea. Therefore, once-daily dosing **is not recommended** for this age group.
- Use of LPV/r once daily is **contraindicated** if three or more of the following LPV resistance–associated substitutions are present: L10F/I/R/V, K20M/N/R, L24I, L33F, M36I, I47V, G48V, I54L/T/V, V82A/C/F/S/T, and I84V. This is because higher LPV trough concentrations may be required to suppress resistant virus.

Metabolism/Elimination

- Cytochrome P450 3A4 substrate and inhibitor.

Lopinavir/Ritonavir Dosing in Patients With Hepatic Impairment

- LPV/r is eliminated primarily by hepatic metabolism. Use caution when administering LPV to patients with hepatic impairment. No dosing information is currently available for children or adults with hepatic insufficiency.
- In the coformulation of LPV/r, ritonavir acts as a pharmacokinetic enhancer, not as an ARV agent. Ritonavir inhibits the metabolism of LPV and increases LPV plasma concentrations.

Dosing for Individuals With Three or More Lopinavir-Associated Mutations (See Special Instructions for List) • LPV/r 400 mg/100 mg twice daily Dosing for Individuals Receiving Concomitant Nevirapine or Efavirenz • These drugs induce LPV metabolism and reduce LPV plasma levels. Increased LPV/r dosing is required with concomitant administration of these drugs. Once-daily dosing should not be used in these patients. *Child and Adolescent (Aged >12 Months to 18 Years) Dose* • LPV/r 300 mg/75 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily. See the table above for weight-band dosing when using tablets. *Adult (Aged >18 Years) Dose* • The FDA-approved dose is LPV/r 500 mg/125 mg twice daily, given as a combination of two tablets of LPV/r 200 mg/50 mg and one tablet of LPV/r 100 mg/25 mg. Alternatively, three tablets of LPV/r 200 mg/50 mg can be used for ease of dosing. Once-daily dosing should not be used. Lopinavir/Ritonavir Used in Combination With Maraviroc • Maraviroc doses may need modification (see the Maraviroc section).	

Drug Interactions

Additional information about drug interactions is available in the Adult and Adolescent Antiretroviral Guidelines and the HIV Drug Interaction Checker.

- *Metabolism:* Lopinavir/ritonavir (LPV/r) is a cytochrome P450 (CYP) 3A4 substrate and inhibitor with the potential for multiple drug interactions. Coadministering LPV/r with drugs that induce CYP3A4 may decrease LPV plasma concentrations, whereas coadministering LPV/r with other CYP3A4 inhibitors may increase LPV plasma concentrations. Coadministering LPV/r with other CYP3A4 substrates may require dose adjustments and additional monitoring.

Before initiating therapy with LPV/r, a patient's medication profile should be carefully reviewed for potential drug interactions. In patients treated with LPV/r, fluticasone (a commonly used inhaled and intranasal steroid) should be avoided, and an alternative steroid should be used. Drug interactions with antituberculous drugs are common. Coadministration of LPV/r with the antituberculosis drug rifampin—a strong CYP3A4 inducer—may lead to suboptimal LPV levels.[1-3] Patients who are receiving both LPV/r and antituberculous drugs may need a dose adjustment for LPV/r, or they may need to switch to an antiretroviral (ARV) regimen that does not include LPV/r.

Major Toxicities

- *More common:* Diarrhea, headache, asthenia, nausea and vomiting, rash, insulin resistance.[4] Hyperlipidemia, especially hypercholesterolemia and hypertriglyceridemia,[5-7] which may be more pronounced in girls than in boys.[8] LPV requires a higher dose of ritonavir than some other protease inhibitors (PIs); this higher dose may exacerbate these adverse events (AEs).
- *Rare:* New-onset diabetes mellitus, hyperglycemia, ketoacidosis, exacerbation of preexisting diabetes mellitus, hemolytic anemia, spontaneous and/or increased bleeding in hemophiliacs, pancreatitis, elevation in serum transaminases, hepatitis (which has been life-threatening in rare cases). PR interval prolongation, QT interval prolongation, and Torsades de Pointes may occur.
- *Special populations—neonates:* An increased risk of toxicity in premature infants has been reported, including cases of transient symptomatic adrenal insufficiency,[9,10] life-threatening bradyarrhythmias and cardiac dysfunction (including complete atrioventricular block, bradycardia, and cardiomyopathy),[11-13] lactic acidosis, acute renal failure, central nervous system depression, and respiratory depression. These toxicities may be caused by the drug itself and/or by the inactive ingredients in the oral solution,[13] which include propylene glycol (15.3%) and ethanol (42.4%). Transient asymptomatic elevation in 17-hydroxyprogesterone levels also has been reported[9] in term newborns treated at birth with LPV/r. The pharmacokinetics (PKs) and safety of LPV/r were studied in IMPAACT P1106, an opportunistic, multi-arm, Phase 4 prospective study in newborns who received ARV and anti-tuberculosis medicines in clinical care. A total of 25 neonates with HIV were enrolled, with a median birth weight of 2,130 g (interquartile range [IQR] 1,775–2,630 g) and a median gestational age of 35 weeks (IQR 32–37 weeks). Neonates received LPV/r solution at a dose of 300 mg/75 mg per m^2 twice daily, which was well tolerated and not associated with any treatment-related AEs, even in 13 newborns who initiated therapy prior to 42 weeks postmenstrual age at a mean postnatal age of 37 days (range 13–61 days).[14]

Resistance

The International Antiviral Society–USA maintains a list of HIV drug resistance mutations, and the Stanford University HIV Drug Resistance Database offers a discussion of each mutation.

Pediatric Use

Approval

LPV/r is approved by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for use in children, including neonates who have attained a postmenstrual age of 42 weeks and a postnatal age of at least 14 days. The potential benefit of using LPV/r in premature infants who have not met these age thresholds must be carefully balanced with the risk of metabolic and cardiac toxicity. In pediatric patients receiving LPV/r at a dose of 300 mg/75 mg per m^2 twice daily, lower LPV exposure has been observed in infants aged <6 weeks relative to older children.[15]

Efficacy

Clinical trials involving antiretroviral therapy (ART)-naive adults have shown that regimens that contain LPV/r plus two nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NRTIs) are comparable to a

variety of other regimens, including regimens that contain atazanavir, darunavir (DRV), fosamprenavir (FPV), saquinavir/ritonavir, or efavirenz (EFV). Studies also have shown that regimens that contain LPV/r plus two NRTIs are superior to regimens that contain nelfinavir (NFV) and inferior to regimens that contain DRV.[16-24]

LPV/r has been studied in both ART-naive and ART-experienced children and has demonstrated durable virologic activity and acceptable toxicity.[25-33]

Pharmacokinetics

General Considerations

Children have lower LPV/r exposure than adults when treated with doses that are directly scaled for body surface area. The directly scaled dose approximation of the adult dose in children is calculated by dividing the adult dose by the typical adult body surface area of 1.73 m^2. For the adult dose of LPV/r 400 mg/100 mg, the scaled pediatric dose would be approximately LPV/r 230 mg/57.5 mg per m^2 of body surface area. However, younger children have higher LPV clearance and need higher doses to achieve LPV exposures that are similar to those seen in adults treated with standard doses. To achieve a trough concentration (C_{trough}) similar to that observed in adults, the pediatric dose needs to be increased 30% greater than the dose that is directly scaled for body surface area. LPV exposures in infants[15,27,32] are compared to those in older children[25] and adults[34] in Table A below.

Table A. Pharmacokinetics of Lopinavir/Ritonavir by Age

PK Parameters	Adults (n = 19)[34]	Children (n = 12)[25]	Children (n = 15)[25]	Infants[a] at 12 Months (n = 20)[32]	Infants at 6 Weeks to 6 Months (n = 18)[27]	Infants at 14 Days to <6 Weeks (n = 9)[15]
LPV Dose	400 mg	230 mg/m^2	300 mg/m^2	300 mg/m^2	300 mg/m^2	300 mg/m^2
AUC_{0-12} (mcg·hr/mL)	92.6	72.6	116.0	101.0	74.5	43.4
C_{max} (mcg/mL)	9.8	8.2	12.5	12.1	9.4	5.2
C_{trough} (mcg/mL)	7.1	4.7	7.9	4.9	2.7	2.5
C_{min} (mcg/mL)	5.5	3.4	6.5	3.8	2.0	1.4

[a] This column contains unreported data that were originally generated for a published study. The data were provided by Edmund Capparelli, Pharm.D., in a personal communication (April 18, 2012).

Note: Values are means, and PK parameters refer to the LPV component; all data come from studies wherein none of the participants received non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors as part of their antiretroviral therapy.

Key: AUC = area under the curve; C_{max} = maximum concentration; C_{min} = minimum concentration; C_{trough} = trough concentration; LPV = lopinavir; mcg = microgram; mg = milligram; mL = milliliter; PK = pharmacokinetic

Models suggest that diet, body weight, and postnatal age are important factors in LPV PKs, with higher bioavailability as dietary fat increases during the first year of life[35] and clearance slowing by age 2.3 years.[36] A study from the United Kingdom and Ireland compared outcomes of LPV/r treatment with either 230 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose or 300 mg per m^2 of body surface

area per dose in children aged 5.6 to 12.8 years at the time of LPV/r initiation. The findings suggested that the higher dose was associated with improved long-term viral load suppression.[37]

Pharmacokinetics and Dosing

14 Days to 12 Months (Without Concurrent Nevirapine, Efavirenz, Fosamprenavir, or Nelfinavir)

The PKs of the oral solution at approximately LPV/r 300 mg/75 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily were evaluated in infants aged <6 weeks[15] and infants aged 6 weeks to 6 months.[27] Even at this higher dose, C_{trough} levels were highly variable, but they were lower in infants than in children aged >6 months. C_{trough} levels were lower in infants aged ≤6 weeks than in infants aged 6 weeks to 6 months. By age 12 months, LPV area under the curve (AUC) was similar to that found in older children.[32] Because infants grow rapidly in the first months of life, it is important to optimize LPV dosing by adjusting the dose at frequent intervals. Given the safety of doses as high as 400 mg per m^2 of body surface area in older children and adolescents,[28] some practitioners anticipate rapid infant growth and prescribe doses somewhat higher than the 300 mg per m^2 of body surface area dose to allow for projected growth between clinic appointments.

12 Months to 12 Years (Without Concurrent Nevirapine, Efavirenz, Fosamprenavir, or Nelfinavir)

Lower C_{trough} values have been observed in children receiving LPV/r 230 mg/57.5 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily than in children receiving LPV/r 300 mg/75 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily (see Table A above).[24] Therefore, some clinicians choose to initiate therapy in children aged 12 months to 12 years using LPV/r 300 mg/75 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily (when LPV/r is given without nevirapine [NVP], EFV, FPV, or NFV), rather than the FDA-approved dose of LPV/r 230 mg/57.5 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily.

For infants receiving LPV/r 300 mg/75 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily, immediate dose reduction at age 12 months **is not recommended;** many practitioners would allow patients to "grow into" the dose of LPV/r 230 mg/57.5 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily as they gain weight over time. Some practitioners would continue the infant dose (LPV/r 300 mg/75 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily) while using the LPV/r liquid formulation.

Pharmacokinetics and Dosing With Concurrent Nevirapine, Efavirenz, Fosamprenavir, or Nelfinavir

In both children and adults, the LPV C_{trough} is reduced by concurrent treatment with non-nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors (NNRTIs) or concomitant FPV or NFV. Higher doses of LPV are recommended when the drug is given in combination with NVP, EFV, FPV, or NFV. In 14 children who were treated with LPV/r 230 mg/57.5 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily plus NVP,[25] the mean LPV C_{trough} was 3.77 ± 3.57 mcg/mL. Not only are these trough plasma concentrations lower than those found in adults treated with standard doses of LPV/r, but the variability in concentration is much higher in children than in adults.[25,38] In a study of 15 children with HIV aged 5.7 to 16.3 years who were treated with LPV/r 300 mg/75 mg per m^2 of body surface

area per dose twice daily plus EFV 14 mg/kg body weight per dose once daily, there was a 34-fold interindividual variation in LPV C_{trough} values. Five of 15 children (33%) had LPV 12-hour C_{trough} values that were <1.0 mcg/mL, the plasma concentration needed to inhibit wild-type HIV.[39] A PK study in 20 children aged 10 to 16 years who were treated with LPV/r 300 mg/75 mg per m^2 of body surface area twice daily plus EFV 350 mg per m^2 of body surface area once daily reported only one patient (6.6%) with subtherapeutic LPV C_{trough} values,[40] perhaps because the trial used an EFV dose that was approximately 11 mg/kg body weight[40] instead of the 14 mg/kg body weight dose used in the trial discussed above.[39]

Dosing

Once Daily

A single daily dose of LPV/r 800 mg/200 mg is approved by the FDA for treatment of HIV in treatment-naive adults aged >18 years. However, once-daily administration **cannot be recommended for use in children in the absence of therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM);** once-daily administration may be successful in select, closely monitored children.[41] There is high interindividual variability in drug exposure for LPV/r, and trough plasma concentrations may fall below the therapeutic range for wild-type virus, as demonstrated in studies of ARV-naive children and adolescents.[42-45] The currently available tablet formulation of LPV/r has lower variability in trough levels than the previously used soft-gel formulation.[45,46] An international, randomized, open-label trial attempted to demonstrate that once-daily LPV/r dosing was noninferior to twice-daily LPV/r dosing in children and adolescents with HIV. This trial was unsuccessful, because a greater number of children and adolescents who received once-daily doses had viral loads ≥50 copies/mL within 48 weeks.[47]

Dosing and Its Relation to Efficacy

LPV/r is effective in treatment-experienced patients with severe immune suppression,[48,49] although heavily pretreated patients may be slower to reach undetectable viral loads[49,50] and may have less-robust CD4 T lymphocyte (CD4) percentage responses.[51]

The relationship between LPV exposure and the susceptibility of the HIV-1 isolate is a key component of successful treatment. The ratio of C_{trough} to half maximal effective concentration (EC_{50}) is called the inhibitory quotient (IQ), and in both adults and children treated with LPV/r, viral load reduction is more closely associated with IQ than with either C_{trough} or EC_{50} alone.[52-54] One study investigated the use of the IQ as a guide for therapy by administering higher doses of LPV/r to children and adolescents until a target IQ of 15 was reached. This study showed that doses of LPV/r 400 mg/100 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily (without FPV, NFV, NVP, or EFV) and LPV/r 480 mg/120 mg per m^2 of body surface area per dose twice daily (with NVP or EFV) were safe and tolerable.[28] Results of a modeling study suggest that standard doses of LPV/r may be inadequate for treatment-experienced children and indicate the potential utility of TDM when LPV/r is used in children who were previously treated with PIs.[55] An LPV plasma concentration of ≥1 mcg/mL is cited as a minimum target C_{trough},[56-58] but this C_{trough} may not adequately control viremia in patients with multiple LPV resistance mutations.[59,60]

Formulations

Palatability

The poor palatability of the LPV/r oral solution can be a significant challenge to medication adherence for some children and families. Numbing the taste buds with ice chips before or after administering the solution, masking the taste of the solution by administering it with sweet or tangy foods (e.g., chocolate syrup, peanut butter), or having the pharmacist flavor the solution prior to dispensing it are examples of interventions that may improve tolerability. Alternative pediatric formulations are currently being developed.[61,62]

Do Not Use Crushed Tablets

LPV/r tablets must be swallowed whole. Crushed tablets are slowly and erratically absorbed and result in significantly reduced AUC, maximum concentration (C_{max}), and C_{trough} compared with swallowing the whole tablet. The variability of the reduced exposure with the crushed tablets (5–75% reduction in AUC) means that a dose modification cannot be relied on to overcome the reduced absorption. Crushed tablets cannot be recommended for use.[63] In a PK study that used a generic adult formulation of LPV/r manufactured in Thailand, 21 of 54 children were administered cut (not crushed) pills and had adequate LPV C_{trough} measurements.[46]

Toxicity

Children treated with LPV/r may have less-robust weight gain and smaller increases in CD4 percentage than children treated with NNRTI-based regimens.[30,64-68] However, one study did not observe this difference in the effect of LPV/r on CD4 count,[69] and another study found that the difference did not persist after a year of therapy.[33] Some studies found no differences between the weight gain of children treated with LPV/r and those treated with EFV.[67,70] Switching to an EFV-based regimen at or after age 3 years removed the risk of LPV-associated metabolic toxicity, with no loss of virologic control (see Table 16 in Modifying Antiretroviral Regimens in Children with Sustained Virologic Suppression on Antiretroviral Therapy).[67,68] Bone mineral density improved when children were treated with EFV-containing regimens instead of regimens that contained LPV/r.[71] Among 212 children randomized to either remain on an LPV/r-based regimen or switch to an EFV-containing regimen, osteocalcin—a biochemical marker of bone turnover—was higher in the LPV/r group than the EFV group at both 8 weeks and 2 years post-randomization. Levels of C-telopeptide of type 1 collagen (CTx) and procollagen type I N-terminal propeptide did not differ between the two groups.[72] In a separate study, among 220 children with HIV (mean age 6.38 years), lower bone mass was observed in children on LPV/r-based regimens than those with EFV-based regimens over 2 years of follow-up.[73]

References

1. Salerno SN, Capparelli EV, McIlleron H, et al. Leveraging physiologically based pharmacokinetic modeling to optimize dosing for lopinavir/ritonavir with rifampin in pediatric patients. *Pharmacotherapy*. 2022;10.1002/phar.2703. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/35607886.

2. Chishala Chabala, Anna Turkova, Kapasa M, et al. Suboptimal lopinavir exposure on 8-hourly LPV/R 4:1 in HIV/TB co-infected children. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections 2022. Virtual. Available at: https://www.croiconference.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/posters/2022/CROI2022_Poster_733.pdf.

3. T.G. Jacobs, V. Mumbiro, C. Moraleda, et al. Suboptimal lopinavir exposure in infants 1-12 months on rifampicin treatment receiving double-dosed or semi-superboosted lopinavir/ritonavir; results from the EMPIRICAL trial. Presented at: AIDS 2022; 2022. Montreal, Canada. Available at: https://programme.aids2022.org/Abstract/Abstract/?abstractid=12648.

4. Dejkhamron P, Unachak K, Aurpibul L, Sirisanthana V. Insulin resistance and lipid profiles in HIV-infected Thai children receiving lopinavir/ritonavir-based highly active antiretroviral therapy. *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab*. 2014;27(5-6):403-412. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24259240.

5. Arpadi S, Shiau S, Strehlau R, et al. Metabolic abnormalities and body composition of HIV-infected children on lopinavir or nevirapine-based antiretroviral therapy. *Arch Dis Child*. 2013;98(4):258-264. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23220209.

6. Ige OO, Yilgwan CS, Ebonyi AO, et al. Serum lipid and glucose profiles in HIV-positive Nigerian children. *J Virus Erad*. 2017;3(3):157-162. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28758024.

7. Patel K, Lindsey J, Angelidou K, Aldrovandi G, Palumbo P, Team IPS. Metabolic effects of initiating lopinavir/ritonavir-based regimens among young children. *AIDS*. 2018;32(16):2327-2336. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30102656.

8. Shiau S, Kuhn L, Strehlau R, et al. Sex differences in responses to antiretroviral treatment in South African HIV-infected children on ritonavir-boosted lopinavir- and nevirapine-based treatment. *BMC Pediatr*. 2014;14:39. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24521425.

9. Simon A, Warszawski J, Kariyawasam D, et al. Association of prenatal and postnatal exposure to lopinavir-ritonavir and adrenal dysfunction among uninfected infants of HIV-infected mothers. *JAMA*. 2011;306(1):70-78. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21730243.

10. Kariyawasam D, Peries M, Foissac F, et al. Lopinavir-ritonavir impairs adrenal function in infants. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2019;71(4):1030-1039. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/31633158.

11. Lopriore E, Rozendaal L, Gelinck LB, Bokenkamp R, Boelen CC, Walther FJ. Twins with cardiomyopathy and complete heart block born to an HIV-infected mother treated with HAART. *AIDS*. 2007;21(18):2564-2565. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18025905.

12. McArthur MA, Kalu SU, Foulks AR, Aly AM, Jain SK, Patel JA. Twin preterm neonates with cardiac toxicity related to lopinavir/ritonavir therapy. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2009;28(12):1127-1129. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19820426.

13. Food and Drug Administration. Serious health problems seen in premature babies given keletra (lopinavir/ ritonavir) oral solution. 2011. Available at: https://www.fda.gov/Drugs/DrugSafety/ucm246002.htm.

14. Bekker A, Hanan N, Cababasay M, et al. Pharmacokinetics and safety of lopinavir/ritonavir solution in HIV-infected newborns. Abstract 841. Presented at: Conference on Retroviruses and Opportunistic Infections 2018. Boston, Massachusetts. Available at: https://www.croiconference.org/sessions/pharmacokinetics-and-safety-lopinavirritonavir-solution-hiv-infected-newborns.

15. Chadwick EG, Pinto J, Yogev R, et al. Early initiation of lopinavir/ritonavir in infants less than 6 weeks of age: pharmacokinetics and 24-week safety and efficacy. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2009;28(3):215-219. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19209098.

16. Walmsley S, Bernstein B, King M, et al. Lopinavir-ritonavir versus nelfinavir for the initial treatment of HIV infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2002;346(26):2039-2046. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12087139.

17. Eron J, Jr., Yeni P, Gathe J, Jr., et al. The KLEAN study of fosamprenavir-ritonavir versus lopinavir-ritonavir, each in combination with abacavir-lamivudine, for initial treatment of HIV infection over 48 weeks: a randomised non-inferiority trial. *Lancet*. 2006;368(9534):476-482. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16890834.

18. Molina JM, Andrade-Villanueva J, Echevarria J, et al. Once-daily atazanavir/ritonavir versus twice-daily lopinavir/ritonavir, each in combination with tenofovir and emtricitabine, for management of antiretroviral-naive HIV-1-infected patients: 48 week efficacy and safety results of the CASTLE study. *Lancet*. 2008;372(9639):646-655. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18722869.

19. Ortiz R, Dejesus E, Khanlou H, et al. Efficacy and safety of once-daily darunavir/ritonavir versus lopinavir/ritonavir in treatment-naive HIV-1-infected patients at week 48. *AIDS*. 2008;22(12):1389-1397. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18614861.

20. Riddler SA, Haubrich R, DiRienzo AG, et al. Class-sparing regimens for initial treatment of HIV-1 infection. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;358(20):2095-2106. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18480202.

21. Pulido F, Estrada V, Baril JG, et al. Long-term efficacy and safety of fosamprenavir plus ritonavir versus lopinavir/ritonavir in combination with abacavir/lamivudine over 144 weeks. *HIV Clin Trials*. 2009;10(2):76-87. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19487177.

22. Walmsley S, Baumgarten A, Berenguer J, et al. Dolutegravir plus abacavir/lamivudine for the treatment of HIV-1 infection in antiretroviral therapy-naive patients: week 96 and week 144 results from the SINGLE randomized clinical trial. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2015;70(5):515-519. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26262777.

23. Orkin C, DeJesus E, Khanlou H, et al. Final 192-week efficacy and safety of once-daily darunavir/ritonavir compared with lopinavir/ritonavir in HIV-1-infected treatment-naive patients in the ARTEMIS trial. *HIV Med*. 2013;14(1):49-59. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23088336.

24. Molina JM, Andrade-Villanueva J, Echevarria J, et al. Once-daily atazanavir/ritonavir compared with twice-daily lopinavir/ritonavir, each in combination with tenofovir and emtricitabine, for management of antiretroviral-naive HIV-1-infected patients: 96-week efficacy and safety results of the CASTLE study. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2010;53(3):323-332. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20032785.

25. Saez-Llorens X, Violari A, Deetz CO, et al. Forty-eight-week evaluation of lopinavir/ritonavir, a new protease inhibitor, in human immunodeficiency virus-infected children. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2003;22(3):216-224. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12634581.

26. De Luca M, Miccinesi G, Chiappini E, Zappa M, Galli L, De Martino M. Different kinetics of immunologic recovery using nelfinavir or lopinavir/ritonavir-based regimens in children with perinatal HIV-1 infection. *Int J Immunopathol Pharmacol*. 2005;18(4):729-735. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16388722.

27. Chadwick EG, Capparelli EV, Yogev R, et al. Pharmacokinetics, safety and efficacy of lopinavir/ritonavir in infants less than 6 months of age: 24 week results. *AIDS*. 2008;22(2):249-255. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18097227.

28. Robbins BL, Capparelli EV, Chadwick EG, et al. Pharmacokinetics of high-dose lopinavir-ritonavir with and without saquinavir or nonnucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors in human immunodeficiency virus-infected pediatric and adolescent patients previously treated with protease inhibitors. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2008;52(9):3276-3283. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18625762.

29. Violari A, Cotton MF, Gibb DM, et al. Early antiretroviral therapy and mortality among HIV-infected infants. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;359(21):2233-2244. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19020325.

30. Palumbo P, Lindsey JC, Hughes MD, et al. Antiretroviral treatment for children with peripartum nevirapine exposure. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;363(16):1510-1520. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20942667.

31. Reitz C, Coovadia A, Ko S, et al. Initial response to protease-inhibitor-based antiretroviral therapy among children less than 2 years of age in South Africa: effect of cotreatment for tuberculosis. *J Infect Dis*. 2010;201(8):1121-1131. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20214476.

32. Chadwick EG, Yogev R, Alvero CG, et al. Long-term outcomes for HIV-infected infants less than 6 months of age at initiation of lopinavir/ritonavir combination antiretroviral therapy. *AIDS*. 2011;25(5):643-649. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21297419.

33. Barlow-Mosha L, Angelidou K, Lindsey J, et al. Nevirapine- versus lopinavir/ritonavir-based antiretroviral therapy in HIV-infected infants and young children: long-term follow-up of the IMPAACT P1060 randomized trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2016;63(8):1113-1121. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27439527.

34. Kaletra (lopinavir/ritonavir) [package insert]. Food and Drug Administration. 2020. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/label/2020/021251s059,021906s054lbl.pdf.

35. Nikanjam M, Chadwick EG, Robbins B, et al. Assessment of lopinavir pharmacokinetics with respect to developmental changes in infants and the impact on weight band-based dosing. *Clin Pharmacol Ther*. 2012;91(2):243-249. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22190064.

36. Urien S, Firtion G, Anderson ST, et al. Lopinavir/ritonavir population pharmacokinetics in neonates and infants. *Br J Clin Pharmacol*. 2011;71(6):956-960. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21564164.

37. Donegan K, Doerholt K, Judd A, et al. Lopinavir dosing in HIV-infected children in the United Kingdom and Ireland. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2013;32(1):45-50. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23076384.

38. Verweel G, Burger DM, Sheehan NL, et al. Plasma concentrations of the HIV-protease inhibitor lopinavir are suboptimal in children aged 2 years and below. *Antivir Ther*. 2007;12(4):453-458. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17668553.

39. Bergshoeff AS, Fraaij PL, Ndagijimana J, et al. Increased dose of lopinavir/ritonavir compensates for efavirenz-induced drug-drug interaction in HIV-1-infected children.

J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr. 2005;39(1):63-68. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15851915.

40. King JR, Acosta EP, Yogev R, et al. Steady-state pharmacokinetics of lopinavir/ritonavir in combination with efavirenz in human immunodeficiency virus-infected pediatric patients. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2009;28(2):159-161. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19106779.

41. Gondrie IPE, Bastiaans DET, Fraaij PLA, et al. Sustained viral suppression in HIV-infected children on once-daily lopinavir/ritonavir in clinical practice. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2017;36(10):976-980. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28475554.

42. Rosso R, Di Biagio A, Dentone C, et al. Lopinavir/ritonavir exposure in treatment-naive HIV-infected children following twice or once daily administration. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2006;57(6):1168-1171. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16606636.

43. van der Lee M, Verweel G, de Groot R, Burger D. Pharmacokinetics of a once-daily regimen of lopinavir/ritonavir in HIV-1-infected children. *Antivir Ther*. 2006;11(4):439-445. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16856617.

44. la Porte C, van Heeswijk R, Mitchell CD, Zhang G, Parker J, Rongkavilit C. Pharmacokinetics and tolerability of once- versus twice-daily lopinavir/ritonavir treatment in HIV-1-infected children. *Antivir Ther*. 2009;14(4):603-606. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19578247.

45. van der Flier M, Verweel G, van der Knaap LC, et al. Pharmacokinetics of lopinavir in HIV type-1-infected children taking the new tablet formulation once daily. *Antivir Ther*. 2008;13(8):1087-1090. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19195335.

46. Puthanakit T, Chokephaibulkit K, Suntarattiwong P, et al. Therapeutic drug monitoring of lopinavir in human immunodeficiency virus-infected children receiving adult tablets. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2010;29(1):79-82. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19858772.

47. Paediatric European Network for Treatment of AIDS. Once vs. twice-daily lopinavir/ritonavir in HIV-1-infected children. *AIDS*. 2015;29(18):2447-2457. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26558544.

48. Resino S, Bellon JM, Ramos JT, et al. Salvage lopinavir-ritonavir therapy in human immunodeficiency virus-infected children. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2004;23(10):923-930. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15602192.

49. Resino S, Bellon JM, Munoz-Fernandez MA, Spanish Group of HIV Infection. Antiretroviral activity and safety of lopinavir/ritonavir in protease inhibitor-experienced HIV-infected children with severe-moderate immunodeficiency. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2006;57(3):579-582. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16446377.

50. Resino S, Galan I, Perez A, et al. Immunological changes after highly active antiretroviral therapy with lopinavir-ritonavir in heavily pretreated HIV-infected children. *AIDS Res Hum Retroviruses*. 2005;21(5):398-406. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15929702.

51. Larru B, Resino S, Bellon JM, et al. Long-term response to highly active antiretroviral therapy with lopinavir/ritonavir in pre-treated vertically HIV-infected children. *J Antimicrob Chemother*. 2008;61(1):183-190. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18025025.

52. Casado JL, Moreno A, Sabido R, et al. Individualizing salvage regimens: the inhibitory quotient (Ctrough/IC50) as predictor of virological response. *AIDS*. 2003;17(2):262-264. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12545089.

53. Delaugerre C, Teglas JP, Treluyer JM, et al. Predictive factors of virologic success in HIV-1-infected children treated with lopinavir/ritonavir. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2004;37(2):1269-1275. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15385734.

54. Hsu A, Isaacson J, Brun S, et al. Pharmacokinetic-pharmacodynamic analysis of lopinavir-ritonavir in combination with efavirenz and two nucleoside reverse transcriptase inhibitors in extensively pretreated human immunodeficiency virus-infected patients. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2003;47(1):350-359. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12499212.

55. Rakhmanina N, van den Anker J, Baghdassarian A, Soldin S, Williams K, Neely MN. Population pharmacokinetics of lopinavir predict suboptimal therapeutic concentrations in treatment-experienced human immunodeficiency virus-infected children. *Antimicrob Agents Chemother*. 2009;53(6):2532-2538. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19258274.

56. Moholisa RR, Schomaker M, Kuhn L, et al. Plasma lopinavir concentrations predict virological failure in a cohort of South African children initiating a protease-inhibitor-based regimen. *Antivir Ther*. 2014;19(4):399-406. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24518130.

57. Moholisa RR, Schomaker M, Kuhn L, et al. Effect of lopinavir and nevirapine concentrations on viral outcomes in protease inhibitor-experienced HIV-infected children. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2016;35(12):e378-e383. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27583591.

58. Aurpibul L, Teerananchai S, Prasitsuebsai W, et al. Therapeutic drug monitoring of lopinavir in HIV-infected children on second-line antiretroviral therapy in Asia. *Ther Drug Monit*. 2016;38(6):791-795. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27749514.

59. van Zyl GU, van Mens TE, McIlleron H, et al. Low lopinavir plasma or hair concentrations explain second-line protease inhibitor failures in a resource-limited

setting. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2011;56(4):333-339. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21239995.

60. Court R, Gordon M, Cohen K, et al. Random lopinavir concentrations predict resistance on lopinavir-based antiretroviral therapy. *Int J Antimicrob Agents*. 2016;48(2):158-162. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27345268.

61. Food and Drug Administration. NDA 205425 tentative approval 2015. 2015. Available at: https://www.accessdata.fda.gov/drugsatfda_docs/appletter/2015/205425Orig1s000TAltr.pdf

62. Kekitiinwa A, Musiime V, Thomason MJ, et al. Acceptability of lopinavir/r pellets (minitabs), tablets and syrups in HIV-infected children. *Antivir Ther*. 2016;21(7):579-585. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27128199.

63. Best BM, Capparelli EV, Diep H, et al. Pharmacokinetics of lopinavir/ritonavir crushed versus whole tablets in children. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr*. 2011;58(4):385-391. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21876444.

64. Coovadia A, Abrams EJ, Stehlau R, et al. Reuse of nevirapine in exposed HIV-infected children after protease inhibitor-based viral suppression: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 2010;304(10):1082-1090. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20823434.

65. Violari A, Lindsey JC, Hughes MD, et al. Nevirapine versus ritonavir-boosted lopinavir for HIV-infected children. *N Engl J Med*. 2012;366(25):2380-2389. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22716976.

66. Lindsey JC, Hughes MD, Violari A, et al. Predictors of virologic and clinical response to nevirapine versus lopinavir/ritonavir-based antiretroviral therapy in young children with and without prior nevirapine exposure for the prevention of mother-to-child HIV transmission. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2014;33(8):846-854. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25222305.

67. Murnane PM, Strehlau R, Shiau S, et al. Switching to efavirenz versus remaining on ritonavir-boosted lopinavir in HIV-infected children exposed to nevirapine: long-term outcomes of a randomized trial. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017;65(3):477-485. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28419200.

68. Coovadia A, Abrams EJ, Strehlau R, et al. Efavirenz-based antiretroviral therapy among nevirapine-exposed HIV-infected children in South Africa: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2015;314(17):1808-1817. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26529159.

69. Dahourou DL, Amorissani-Folquet M, Malateste K, et al. Efavirenz-based simplification after successful early lopinavir-boosted-ritonavir-based therapy in HIV-infected children in Burkina Faso and Cote d'Ivoire: the MONOD ANRS 12206 non-inferiority

randomised trial. *BMC Med*. 2017;15(1):85. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28434406.

70. Achan J, Kakuru A, Ikilezi G, et al. Growth recovery among HIV-infected children randomized to lopinavir/ritonavir or NNRTI-based antiretroviral therapy. *Pediatr Infect Dis J*. 2016;35(12):1329-1332. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27580060.

71. Arpadi SM, Shiau S, Strehlau R, et al. Efavirenz is associated with higher bone mass in South African children with HIV. *AIDS*. 2016;30(16):2459-2467. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/27427876.

72. Shiau S, Yin MT, Strehlau R, et al. Bone turnover markers in children living with HIV remaining on ritonavir-boosted lopinavir or switching to efavirenz. *Bone*. 2020;138:115500. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/32590137.

73. Shen Y, Shiau S, Strehlau R, et al. Persistently lower bone mass and bone turnover among South African children living with well-controlled HIV. *AIDS*. 2021;35(13):2137-2147. Available at: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/34127577.