



BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email [info.bmjopen@bmj.com](mailto:info.bmjopen@bmj.com)

# BMJ Open

## HIV-1 disease is not made worse by breastfeeding in non-immuno-compromised HIV-1 infected mothers participating in the ANRS12174 clinical trial

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-019239
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	24-Aug-2017
Complete List of Authors:	<p>SOME, Eric; Institut de Recherche en Sciences de la Santé (IRSS), Département biomédical et santé publique; Universitetet i Bergen Institutt for indremedisin, Centre for International Health</p> <p>Engbreetsen, Ingunn; Universitetet i Bergen Institutt for indremedisin, Centre for International Health</p> <p>Nagot, Nicolas; INSERM UMR 1058, Pathogenesis and control of chronic infections; Université de Montpellier</p> <p>MEDA, Nicolas; University of Ouagadougou, Faculty of Health Sciences; Centre MURAZ</p> <p>Vallo, Roselyne; INSERM UMR 1058, Pathogenesis and control of chronic infections</p> <p>Kankasa, Chipepo; University of Zambia School of Medicine, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health</p> <p>Tumwine, James; Makerere University, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health</p> <p>Singata-Madliki, Mandisa; East London Hospital Complex, Effective Care Research Unit (ECRU)</p> <p>Harper, Kim; University of Fort Hare, Effective Care Research Unit</p> <p>Hofmeyr, G Justus ; University of Fort Hare, Effective Care Research Unit</p> <p>Van de Perre, Philippe; INSERM UMR 1058, Pathogenesis and control of chronic infections; Université de Montpellier</p> <p>Tylleskär, Thorkild; Universitetet i Bergen Institutt for indremedisin</p>
Keywords:	HIV & AIDS < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Tropical medicine < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, NUTRITION & DIETETICS

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**HIV-1 disease is not made worse by breastfeeding in non-immuno-compromised HIV-1 infected mothers participating in the ANRS12174 clinical trial**

Eric N. Somé<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Ingunn M. S. Engebretsen<sup>1</sup>, Nicolas Nagot<sup>3,4,5</sup>, Nicolas Meda<sup>6</sup>, Roselyne Vallo<sup>3,4</sup>, Chipepo Kankasa<sup>7</sup>, James K. Tumwine<sup>8</sup>, Mandisa Singata<sup>9</sup>, G. Justus Hofmeyr<sup>9</sup>, Philippe Van de Perre<sup>3,4,5</sup>, Thorkild Tylleskär<sup>1</sup> for the ANRS 12174 Trial Group^

- <sup>1</sup>Centre for International Health, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway
- <sup>2</sup>National Health Research Institute, Centre National pour la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso
- <sup>3</sup>INSERM UMR 1058, Pathogenesis and control of chronic infections, Montpellier, France
- <sup>4</sup>Université de Montpellier, Montpellier, France
- <sup>5</sup>Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Montpellier, France
- <sup>6</sup>University of Ouagadougou, Faculty of Health Sciences, Centre de Recherche International en Santé (CRIS) Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso
- <sup>7</sup>University of Zambia, School of Medicine, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health, University Teaching Hospital, Lusaka, Zambia
- <sup>8</sup>Makerere University, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health, School of Medicine, College of Health Sciences, Kampala, Uganda
- <sup>9</sup>University of Fort Hare, Effective Care Research Unit, Eastern Cape, South Africa

**\*Corresponding author:**

E-mail: [eric.nsome@gmail.com](mailto:eric.nsome@gmail.com) (ENS)

10 BP 250 Ouagadougou 10 Burkina Faso

Tel : +226 78 84 95 74

^Membership of the ANRS 12174 Trial Group (PROMISE PEP Consortium) is provided in the Acknowledgments

Words count: 3097

## Abstract

### Objective

We have assessed disease progression of mothers in relation to exclusive or any breastfeeding duration among breastfeeding HIV1-positive women participating in the ANRS12174 trial (clinical trial no NCT0064026).

### Methods

The analysis was carried out on 203, 212, 272 and 529 HIV-1 negative infants born to HIV-1-positive women with CD4 count >350 cell/ $\mu$ l from Burkina Faso, South Africa, Uganda and Zambia, respectively. The trial compared Lamivudine and Lopinavir/Ritonavir as a peri-exposure prophylaxis. A multiple logistic regression model was also run with the HIV-1 disease progression as the dependent composite end-point combining the mothers' weight, CD4 count and HIV-1 clinical stage as per WHO classification. Exclusive or predominant breastfeeding (EPBF) duration and duration of any breastfeeding were the key explanatory variables.

### Results

In the adjusted model, the associations between EPBF duration and weight change, CD4 cell count and the HIV-1 viral load were consistently insignificant. The CD4 cell count was associated with a significantly higher mothers' body mass index (BMI; a mean increase of 4.9 (95% CI: 2.1; 7.7) CD4 cells/ $\mu$ l per each extra kilogram per square meter of BMI) and hemoglobin concentration (19.4 (95% CI: 11.4; 27.4) CD4 cells/ $\mu$ l per each extra gram per decilitre of hemoglobin concentration).

There was no significant association between EPBF duration and HIV-1 disease progression. However, randomization to the lopinavir/ritonavir arm was related to a significant acceleration of HIV-1 disease progression (adjusted odd ratio of 1.3 (95% CI: 1.0; 1.6;  $p=0.04$ ) at the multivariate mode).

### Conclusion

Breastfeeding was not a risk factor for the HIV-1 infected mother's weight, CD4 cell count and HIV-1 viral load change or HIV-1 disease progression in this cohort that had a baseline CD4 cell count of >350 cells/ $\mu$ l.

**Keywords:** HIV-1 infection; breastfeeding; Sub Saharan Africa

**Strengths and limitations of this study**

- Our study has been implemented in 4 Countries in Africa, namely Burkina Faso (West), South Africa and Zambia (South), and Uganda (East), which made our sample typically representative of the wider Sub-Sahara African population.
- The data were collected in the context of a rigorous clinical trial, which minimized the lost to follow-up, the missing data as well as other data collection errors, and therefore improved the quality of our data.
- However, the selection associated with the environment of a clinical trial, usually quite different from a routine environment, may have slightly biased our findings.
- Nonetheless, our end-points (mother’s weight, CD4 cell count and HIV-1 viral load) were sufficiently robust and had a high validity.

**INTRODUCTION**

In 2015, 36.7 [34.0-39.8] million people were infected with HIV. Among them 17.4 [16.1-20.0] million were women of childbearing age [1 2]. HIV-1 prevalence is estimated between 5.3 and 6.5% among pregnant women in Sub-Saharan Africa [3]. Because of the almost irreversible immune activation involved, HIV-1 infection creates a condition of metabolic stress that may result in wasting and immune depression [4-7]. Ten per cent weight loss and a CD4 count of <350 cells/µl in the context of HIV-1 infection have been recognized as major criteria of the diagnosis of AIDS [8-12]. This weight loss is also associated with a higher risk of mortality in HIV-1-infected patients [13]. Furthermore, HIV-1 is a major cause of maternal mortality in affected countries in Southern Africa. About 25% of pregnancy-related deaths in Sub-Saharan Africa are attributable to HIV [14], and 88% of deaths among pregnant and postpartum women with HIV infection are attributable to the virus [15].

In women, pregnancy is, though a physiological condition, a period of increased metabolic activities and synthesis requiring a supplement of energy and nutrients. After delivery, breastfeeding prolongs the increased metabolic demands. In spite of this, WHO still recommends HIV-1-infected women to breastfeed as the best choice for the infant and the mother [16] in contexts where replacement feeding is not safe.

There have been conflicting results on assessment of the impact of breastfeeding in HIV-1-infected mothers. Some studies found that breastfeeding was harmful to HIV-positive mothers by either accelerating HIV disease progression assessed by the mother’s weight loss, a decrease in CD4 cells count, or even an increased risk of maternal mortality, suggesting that metabolic, immunologic or hormonal changes associated with breastfeeding may accelerate HIV-1 disease progression in postpartum mothers [17-19]. Others found no

effect on the mothers' health assessed by death, development of a low CD4 cell count, anemia or excessive weight loss [20 21] . Some studies have found breastfeeding protective, allowing weight gain in HIV-1 infected breastfeeding mothers [19 22-26].

In the ANRS12174 trial, we assessed mothers' HIV-1 disease progression (measured by the change in weight, CD4 cells count and HIV-1 disease stage as per WHO classification) in relation to exclusive breastfeeding or duration of any breastfeeding during the infant first 6 months of life and until week 50 post-partum.

For peer review only

**METHODS**

**Study design**

The ANRS 12174 clinical trial in Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso), East London (South Africa), Mbale (Uganda) and Lusaka (Zambia) was conducted from 2009 to 2013. The protocol and the main outcome have been published [27 28]. Briefly, HIV-1 infected, pregnant women, at the time not eligible for highly active antiretroviral therapy because CD4 count was >350 cells/ $\mu$ l, aged 18 or above, planning to breastfeed were identified from ante-natal clinics between 28 and 40 weeks of amenorrhea. As part of the HIV post-test counselling session, they were informed on the different feeding options for their babies. Only women intending to breastfeed were referred to the research clinic for further assessment of the inclusion criteria during the antenatal period and again with their child within 6 days after birth, for an enrolment and randomisation at day 7 postpartum. From 28 weeks of pregnancy to day 7 after birth, programmatic mother to child transmission prophylaxis was implemented with antepartum zidovudine, intrapartum single dose nevirapine and zidovudine-lamivudine for mothers and nevirapine for infants for 7 days postpartum. Twins and triplets, infants with positive HIV-1 DNA PCR test result at day 7 (+/- 2 days) postpartum, low birth-weight or ill babies (ranked grade II or above of the ANRS classification for adverse events) were excluded [29]. The intervention provided an infant prophylaxis in the breastfeeding period plus one week from day 7 to 50 weeks of age with either lopinavir/ritonavir or lamivudine.

**Data management and analysis**

Data was collected on a paper case-report form or directly entered online using the Electronic Data capture system: OpenClinica™ ([www.openclinica.com](http://www.openclinica.com)). Twenty-four h and one week breastfeeding recalls were collected during the enrolment visit at day 7 $\pm$ 2 days after birth and the 13 monthly-scheduled follow-up visits that started at week 2. During these visits, mothers were asked in particular if they gave their infants other foods/liquids as well as breastmilk. Prelacteal feeding data - defined as any food item except mothers' milk given to infants before initial breastfeeding - were also collected at the enrolment visit.

The mothers at each visit were categorized into the following groups: 1) exclusive breastfeeding, EBF (only breastmilk being given to the infant without any other food or liquid, except medically prescribed drugs or vitamins); 2) predominant breastfeeding, PBF (breastmilk with some liquid-based food, such as juice, tea, sugar-water and salt-water, including glucose without any kind of formula, or animal milk); and 3) mixed feeding, MF

(breastmilk with other solid or liquid-based food, including other kinds of milk). We thereafter combined EBF and PBF into one group called “exclusive or predominant breastfeeding” (EPBF) ) as PBF presented few cases and was assessed as having much the same risk as EBF, at least with regard to postnatal HIV transmission [30].

During the follow-up visits, the mothers underwent a clinical assessment, including weight measurement and HIV-1 infection staging at the first screening visit, day 7 post-partum, weeks 26 and 50; CD4 cell count analysis at screening one, weeks 26 and 50; and HIV-1 viral load at screening one, day 7, weeks 6, 14, 26, 38 and 50. The dependant variables were mothers’ weight, CD4 cell count and HIV-1 viral load considered separately. We generated a new variable called “weight loss”, which was calculated as the mothers’ weight at W26 (mothers’ weights were not available for week 50) minus the baseline weight at day 7 postpartum, which was compared to the baseline weight to assess if the loss had reached 10%. Furthermore, we combined CD4 cell count, mothers’ weight loss and HIV disease stage as per WHO classification to create the composite endpoint called “HIV-1 disease progression”. HIV-1 disease progression was accelerated when CD4 cell count decreased to <350 Cells/ $\mu$ l, or the HIV-1 infection was assessed by the trial physician at stage 3 or above, or the mothers lost >10% of their weight; otherwise, HIV-1 disease progression was deemed absent or slow. Our main independent variable was EPBF (until week 26 post-partum) or any breastfeeding (until week 50 post-partum) duration.

We first ran linear mixed-effect models that considered separately the mothers’ weight, CD4 cell count and HIV-1 viral load changes as dependant variables, and EPBF or any breastfeeding as key independent variables. When the inter-country variability was not significant, a linear multivariate regression analysis was run. We ran a logistic regression regarding the composite endpoint. Adjustment covariates included the mother’s baseline BMI, education level, marital status, hemoglobin concentration, mode of delivery, breastfeeding initiation time and the baby’s gender, and the trial arm. These multivariate analyses were run taking all participants together and also as 2 strata comprising South African mothers (stratum 1) and Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia together (stratum 2) because South Africa presented important socio-economic, cultural and demographic differences compared with the other countries. STATA/SE 13.1 statistical software has been used for the analyses.

## Ethics

Prior to enrolment, the mothers signed a written informed consent and assent form for themselves and their children, respectively. The trial was conducted according to the sponsor (ANRS) ethic charter, Good Clinical Practices and the principles of the Helsinki declaration.



The protocol had obtained approval from the relevant ethical committees, including the Ethical Committee for Health Research in Burkina Faso, the Biomedical Research Ethics Committee in Zambia, the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology, the Stellenbosch University ethical committees and the Medicines Control Council in South Africa.

For peer review only

## RESULTS

In the ANRS 12174 trial, 1,273 mother-infant pairs were randomized and 6 were excluded due to protocol violations. Of the remaining 1,267 participants, 204 were from Ouagadougou, 222 from East London, 278 from Mbale and 563 from Lusaka. In all, 42 were excluded from analysis due to lack of breastfeeding data after inclusion, 7 due to inaccurate feeding duration data and 2 women had no data on weights. The analysis included 1,216 subjects. The mean baseline weight, the percentage of educated and employed women was highest, and the mean EPBF and any breastfeeding durations shortest in South Africa where the HIV-1 viral suppression was also most important (Table 1).

**Table 1:**

Table 1a: Baseline characteristics (continuous variables)

	<b>Burkina Faso</b>	<b>South Africa</b>	<b>Uganda</b>	<b>Zambia</b>	<b>All sites</b>
	N=203	N=212	N=272	N=529	N=1216
	Mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)
<b>Mean duration of AZT regimen post-delivery (days)</b>	6.6 (6.5; 6.8)	7 (7.0; 7.0)	6.8 (6.7; 6.9)	7.0 (6.9; 7.0)	6.9 (6.8; 7.0)
<b>Mean duration 3TC regimen post-delivery (days)</b>	6.6 (6.5; 6.8)	Data not available	6.7 (6.6; 6.8)	7.0 (6.9; 7.0)	6.8 (6.8; 6.9)
<b>Mean baseline CD4 count*10<sup>2</sup>cel/μl</b>	5.6 (5.4; 5.8)	5.5 (5.3;5.7)	5.6 (5.4; 5.8)	6.0 (5.8;6.2)	5.8 (5.7; 5.9)
<b>Mean baseline viral load*10<sup>3</sup> copies/μl</b>	23.0 (7.3; 38.7)	13.5 (7.5; 19.6)	34.9 (19.7; 50.0)	29.1 (21.5; 36.6)	26.4 (21.1; 31.8)
<b>Baseline mothers' weight (kg)</b>	62.9 (61.4; 64.5)	72.1 (70.0; 74.1)	58.1 (57.0; 59.2)	62.0 (61.0; 62.9)	63.0 (62.3; 63.7)
<b>Mean EPBF duration</b>	6.3 (6.2; 6.4)	4.8 (4.7; 4.9)	5.6 (5.5; 5.7)	6.0 (5.9; 6.1)	5.8 (5.7; 5.9)

(months)					
Mean breastfeeding duration (months)	10.5 (10.4; 10.6)	6.7 (6.6; 6.8)	8.4 (8.3; 8.5)	8.4 (8.3; 8.5)	8.4 (8.3; 8.5)

Table 1b: Baseline characteristics (categorical variables)

	Burkina Faso	South Africa	Uganda	Zambia	All sites
	N=203	N=212	N=272	N=529	N=1216
	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)
<b>Mother's age group</b>					
Below 25 years	26.2 (20.5; 32.6)	34.4 (28.3; 41.1)	39.3 (33.7; 45.3)	37.8 (33.8; 42.0)	35.6 (33.0; 38.3)
25 – 30 years	36.9 (30.6; 43.8)	31.2 (25.2; 37.7)	35.7 (30.2; 41.5)	33.1 (29.2; 37.2)	34.0 (31.3; 36.7)
30 and above	36.9 (30.6; 43.8)	34.4 (28.3; 41.1)	25.0 (20.2; 30.5)	29.1 (25.4; 33.1)	30.4 (27.9; 33.1)
<b>HIV stage 1</b>	93.1 (88.7; 95.9)	98.6 (95.7; 99.5)	92.3 (88.4; 94.9)	99.8 (98.7; 100.0)	96.8 (95.6; 97.6)
<b>Education</b>					
Uncomplete primary school	68.5 (61.7; 74.5)	8.5 (5.4; 13.1)	48.5 (42.6; 54.5)	28.2 (24.5; 32.2)	36.0 (33.4 ; 0.38.8)
Completed primary school	7.4 (4.5; 11.9)	0.5 (0.1; 3.3)	15.8 (11.9; 20.6)	18.5 (15.4; 22.1)	12.9 (11.1; 14.9)
Secondary school and more	24.1 (18.7; 30.5)	91.0 (86.4; 94.2)	35.7 (0.30.2; 41.5)	53.3 (49.0; 57.5)	51.1 (48.2; 53.9)
<b>Marital status (married)</b>	90.6 (85.8; 94.0)	39.1 (32.8; 45.9)	82.0 (76.9; 86.1)	88.7 (85.7; 91.1)	78.9 (76.5; 81.1)
<b>Occupation (employed)</b>	8.9 (5.6; 13.6)	41.5 (35.0; 48.3)	35.3 (29.8; 41.2)	17.0 (14.0; 20.5)	24.0 (21.7; 26.5)
<b>Primipara</b>	21.7 (16.5; 27.9)	33.5 (27.4; 40.1)	18.0 (13.9; 23.0)	20.6 (17.4; 24.3)	22.4 (20.2; 24.9)
<b>Vaginal delivery</b>	93.6 (89.3; 96.2)	65.1 (58.4; 71.2)	93.4 (89.7; 95.8)	96.2 (94.2; 97.5)	89.7 (87.9; 91.3)

<b>Breastfeeding initiation time (within one hour)</b>	6.9 (4.1; 11.3)	51.4 (44.7; 58.1)	55.9 (49.9; 61.7)	80.7 (77.1; 83.9)	57.7 (54.9; 60.5)
<b>Lamivudine arm</b>	49.7 (42.9; 56.6)	51.9 (45.1; 58.6)	49.6 (43.7; 55.6)	50.3 (46.0; 54.5)	50.3 (47.5; 53.1)
<b>Female baby</b>	41.9 (35.2; 48.8)	49.1 (42.4; 55.8)	52.9 (46.0; 58.8)	48.4 (44.1; 52.7)	48.4 (45.6; 51.2)

Overall in the adjusted model, the association between EPBF duration and weight change was negative and insignificant. Mothers who completed secondary school had a significant mean increase of 1.1 kg compared to those who did not complete primary school (Table 2). There was no weight change at univariate and multivariate analysis considering any breastfeeding duration (Table 3).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

**Table 2: Mother’s weight, CD4 cells count and HIV-1 viral load change and HIV disease progression according to EPBF duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa Vs the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
<b>Dependant variable=mother’s weight</b>						
<b>EPBF duration (months)</b>	0.1 (-0.7; 0.9)	-0.2 (-0.6; 0.1)	-0.1 (-0.5; 0.3)	0.1 (-0.0; 0.3)	-0.2 (-0.5; 0.2)	-0.1 (-0.2; 0.1)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup></b>	2.5 (2.4; 2.7)	2.4 (2.3; 2.6)	2.5 (2.4; 2.6)	2.4 (2.3; 2.5)	2.5 (2.4; 2.6)	2.4 (2.3; 2.5)
<b>Mother’s age</b>	0.8 (0.5; 1.2)	0.1 (0.0; 0.3)	0.5 (0.4; 0.6)	0.1 (0.1; 0.2)	0.5 (0.4; 0.7)	0.1 (0.1; 0.2)
<b>HIV disease stage</b>						
HIV stage 1						
HIV stage >1	12.4 (-4.5; 29.4)	6.7 (0.4; 13.1)	-2.8 (-6.4; 0.8)			
<b>Education</b>						
Not completed primary school			1	1	1	1
Completed primary school			3.9 (2.0; 5.9)	0.2 (-0.7; 1.1)	4.4 (2.2; 6.5)	0.6 (-0.3; 1.5)
Secondary school and more			2.7 (1.2; 4.1)	0.7 (0.1; 1.4)	3.1 (1.5; 4.6)	1.1 (0.4; 1.8)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting	1				1	

mothers						
Single mothers	-3.1 (-7.2; 0.9)				-1.2 (-3.0; 0.5)	
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery	1		1		1	1
C-section delivery	3.7 (-0.4; 7.9)		4.5 (1.5; 7.6)		4.4 (2.1; 6.7)	-1.1 (-2.1; -0.1)
<b>Parity</b>						
Primipara	1		1		1	-
Multipara	6.1 (1.9; 10.3)		3.1 (1.4; 4.7)		3.9 (2.3; 5.4)	-
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	2.0 (-2.0; 6.1)	0.8 (-0.7; 2.3)	-0.1 (-1.4; 1.3)	-0.3 (-0.9; 0.2)	0.3 (-1.0; 1.6)	-0.1 (-0.7; 0.4)
<b>Dependent variable=CD4 count</b>						
<b>EPBF duration (months)</b>	-1.0 (-8.9; 7.0)	-6.4 (-18.6; 5.8)	9.3 (2.3; 16.3)	7.9 (-4.2; 20.1)	5.4 (-0.1; 10.9)	4.5 (-6.2; 15.1)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup></b>			4.9 (2.4; 7.3)	5.9 (2.5; 9.2)	3.3 (1.3; 5.3)	4.9 (2.1; 7.7)
<b>Mother's age</b>	-3.1 (-7.5; 1.2)		-4.9 (-7.3; -2.5)	-6.2 (-8.6; -3.8)	-4.7 (-6.9; -2.6)	-6.2 (-8.4; -4.1)
<b>Hemoglobin concentration</b>	33.3 (12.7; 53.8)	34.8 (14.4; 55.1)	15.2 (7.8; 22.6)	12.9 (4.6; 21.2)	19.3 (12.3; 26.4)	19.4 (11.4; 27.4)
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time</b>						
Breastfeeding initiation within 1 h	1	1	1	1	1	-
Breastfeeding initiation	-56.2 (-94.9; -	-39.9 (-90.3; -	-40.5 (-60.1; -20.9)		-42.5 (-61.1; -	-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

after 1 h	17.4)	10.6)			23.9)	
<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies	1	1	1			
Female babies	-53.1 (-104.7; -1.6)	-52.9 (-103.0; -2.9)	21.8 (-3.9; 47.4)			
<b>HIV disease stage</b>						
HIV stage 1			1	1	1	1
HIV stage >1			-85.8 (-131.5; -40.2)	-86.5 (-147.1; -26.0)	-70.2 (-115.5; -25.0)	-83.7 (-144.1; -23.4)
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1		1	1
Completed primary school			29.2 (-8.6; 67.1)		25.1 (-12.6; 62.9)	24.4 (-12.9; 61.6)
Secondary school and more			1.0 (-26.8; 28.9)		-7.8 (-34.9; 19.3)	-9.3 (-36.8; 18.2)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers			1	1	1	1
Single mothers			-34.5 (-73.2; 4.2)	-44.6 (-83.1; -6.03)	-24.6 (-55.9; 6.6)	-29.7 (-61.0; 1.6)
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery			1	1		

C-section delivery			71.6 (11.7; 131.4)	71.1 (11.1; 131.2)		
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	-33.4 (-69.2; 2.3)	-65.3 (-116.4; -14.1)	-12.8 (-31.6; 6.1)	-12.9 (-38.2; 12.4)	-15.8 (-32.6; 1.0)	-19.2 (-41.9; 3.6)
<b>Dependent variable=viral load (coefficient * 10<sup>3</sup>)</b>						
<b>EPBF duration (months)</b>	4.5 (-3.4; 12.4)	-3.6 (-11.5; 4.4)	5.4 (-7.1 18.0)	2.0(-11.3 15.4)	6.2 (-2.5; 14.9)	1.7 (-7.3; 10.8)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup></b>	-7.7 (-10.9; -4.6)	-14.5 (-17.9; -11.0)	-4.7 (-8.5; -1.0)	-5.7 (-9.8; -1.6)	-6.5 (-9.2; -3.8)	-8.0 (-11.0; -4.9)
<b>Mother's age</b>	-2.7 (-5.3; -0.1)	-2.7 (-5.5; 0.1)	-1.9 (-4.6; 0.8)	-4.5 (-7.7; -1.4)	-2.1 (-4.3; 0.1)	-4.5 (-7.0; -2.0)
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time</b>						
Breastfeeding initiation<1h	1	1				
Breastfeeding initiation>1h	70.5 (41.3; 99.7)	45.1 (13.5; 76.7)				
<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies	1	1	1	1	1	1
Female babies	-49.1 (-79.4-18.7)		-19.5 (-48.5; 9.4)	-36.5 (-66.0 -7.2)	-25.3 (-49.2; -1.4)	-35.2 (-59.2; -11.1)



Education						
Non completed primary school			1	1	1	1
Completed primary school			-10.2 (-53.9;33.5)	2.9 (-41.4; 47.2)	-5.0 (-45.1; 35.2)	13.4 (-26.9; 53.8)
Secondary school and more			-76.7 (-108.1; -45.3)	-73.4 (-105.9; -41.0)	-72.7 (-98.7; -46.7)	-62.0 (-89.7; -34.3)
Marital status						
Married/cohabiting mothers	1	1				
Single mothers	55.6 (21.6; 89.5)	127.9 (92.8 163.0)				
Delivery						
Vaginal delivery	1	1	1	1	1	1
C-section delivery	118.5 (86.4; 150.5)	143.2(108.8; 177.5)	72.6 (6.8; 138.4)	84.2 (17.6;150.7)	90.8 (49.8; 131.8)	105.5 (65.2; 145.7)
Parity						
Primipara	1	1	1	1	1	1
Multipara	66.5 (34.8; 98.2)	125.9 (90.5; 161.2)	47.7 (12.1; 83.2)	56.7 (15.1; 98.2)	54.8 (26.7; 83.0)	65.1 (32.8; 97.4)
Trial arm						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	-48.4 (-77.6; -	-37.6 (-67.5; -	39.9 (12.4; 67.4)	47.0 (17.9; -	22.6 (-0.0; 45.2)	31.1 (7.1; 55.0)

	19.2)	7.6)		76.1)		
Birthweight	0.0 (0.0 ; 0.1)	0.1 (0.0; 0.1)	0.0 (0.0; 0.1)	0.1 (0.0; 0.1)		
<b>HIV disease progression</b>						
	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
<b>EPBF duration (months)</b>	1.0 (0.9; 1.1)		1.1 (1.0 1.2)	1.0 (0.9;1.1)	1.1 (1.0; 1.1)	1.1 (1.0; 1.2)
<b>Mother's age</b>			1.0 (1.0; 1.1)	1.0 (1.0; 1.1)		1.0 ( 1.0; 1.0)
<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies			1		1	1
Female babies			0.8 (0.6; 1.0)		0.8 (0.6; 1.0)	0.8 (0.6; 1.0)
<b>HIV disease stage</b>						
HIV stage 1			1	1		
HIV stage >1			4.0 (2.5; 6.2)	4.2 (2.6; 6.5)		
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers			1	1	1	1
Single mothers			1.6 (1.1; 2.2)	1.8 (1.3; 2.6)	1.5 (1.2; 1.9)	1.6 (1.3; 2.1)
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm			1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm			1.3 (1.0; 1.6)	1.3 (1.0; 1.7)	1.3 (1.0; 1.6)	1.3 (1.0; 1.6)
Birthweight			0.9 (0.8; 1.0)			

1

2

3

4

5<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

6<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

7

8

9

10

11 **Table 3: Mother’s weight, CD4 cell count and HIV viral load change and HIV disease progression according to any breastfeeding**

12 **duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa Vs the other sites and pooled analysis**

13

	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted Odd Ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
	South Africa		The other 3 countries		Pooled analysis	
		Weight				
Any breastfeeding duration	0.3 (-0.2; 0.8)	-0.1 (-0.3; 0.0)	-0.0 (-0.3; 0.2)	0.1 (0.0; 0.3)	-0.0 (-0.3; 0.2)	-0.0 (-0.2; 0.1)
Baseline BMI <sup>b</sup>	2.5 (2.4; 2.7)	2.5 (2.3; 2.6)	2.5 (2.4; 2.6)	2.4 (2.3; 2.5)	2.5 (2.4; 2.6)	2.4 (2.3; 2.5)
Mothers’ age	0.8 (0.5; 1.2)	0.2 (0.0; 0.3)	0.5 (0.4; 0.6)	0.1 (0.1; 0.2)	0.5 (0.4 0.7)	0.1 (0.1; 0.2)
HIV disease stage						
HIV stage 1	1	1	1			
HIV stage>1	12.4 (-4.5; 29.4)	6.4 (0.0; 12.7)	-2.8 (-6.4; 0.8)			
Education						
Non completed primary school			1	1	1	1

Completed primary school			3.9 (2.0; 5.9)	0.3 (-0.6; 1.1)	4.4 (2.2; 6.5)	0.6 (-0.3; 1.5)
Secondary school and further			2.7 (1.2; 4.1)	0.9 (0.2; 1.5)	3.1 (1.5; 4.6)	1.0 (0.4; 1.7)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers	1				1	
Single mothers	-3.1 (-7.2; 0.9)				-1.2 (-3.0; 0.5)	
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery			1		1	
C-section delivery	3.7 (-0.4; 7.9)	-1.6 (-3.2; 0.0)	4.5 (1.5; 7.6)		4.4 (2.1; 6.7)	-1.2 (-2.1; -0.2)
<b>Parity</b>						
Primipara	1	1	1	1	1	
Multipara	6.1 (1.9; 10.3)		3.1 (1.4; 4.7)		3.9 (2.3; 5.4)	
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	2.0 (-2.0; 6.1)	0.7 (-0.8; 2.2)	-0.1 (-1.4; 1.3)	-0.3 (-0.9; 0.3)	0.3 (-1.0; 1.6)	0.1 (-0.7; 0.4)
		<b>CD4 cells count</b>				
<b>Any breastfeeding duration</b>	0.4 (-6.8; 7.6)	-2.4 (-9.5; 4.7)	1.2 (-5.8; 8.3)	9.8 (-2.1; 21.8)	1.5 (-3.9; 7.0)	5.7 (0.4; 10.9)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>p</sup></b>			4.9 (2.4; 7.3)	5.7 (2.4; 9.1)	3.3 (1.3; 5.3)	4.2 (1.5; 6.9)
<b>Mother's age</b>	-3.1 (-7.5; 1.2)		-4.9 (-7.3; -2.5)	-6.5 (-8.9; -4.1)	-4.7 (-6.9; -2.6)	-6.2 (-8.4; -

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

						4.1)
Hemoglobin concentration	33.3 (12.7; 53.8)	33.9 (13.5; 54.3)	15.2 (7.8; 22.6)	15.7 (7.2; 24.3)	19.3 (12.3; 26.4)	16.7 (9.0; 24.4)
Breastfeeding initiation time						
Within 1 hour			1		1	
After 1 hour	-56.2 (-94.9; -17.4)		-40.5 (-60.1; -20.9)		-42.5 (-61.1; -23.9)	
Child's gender						
Male babies	1	1	1			
Female babies	-53.1 (-104.7; -1.6)	-54.1 (-104.3; -3.6)	21.7 (-3.9; 47.4)			
HIV stage						
HIV stage 1			1	1	1	1
HIV stage>1			-85.8 (-131.5; -40.2)	-91.5 (-152.9; -30.1)	-70.2 (-115.5; -25.0)	-88.8 (-148.3; -29.3)
Education						
Non completed primary school			1		1	1
Completed primary school			29.2 (-8.6; 67.1)		25.1 (-12.6; 62.9)	19.9 (-16.7; 56.5)
Secondary school and further			1.0 (-26.8; 28.9)		-7.8 (-34.9; 19.3)	-17.4 (-43.7; 9.5)

<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/ cohabiting mothers			1	1	1	1
Single mothers			-34.5 (-73.2; 4.2)	-43.1 (-81.5; -4.6)	-24.6 (-55.9; 6.6)	-43.3 (-72.8; -13.7)
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery			1	1		
C-section delivery			71.6 (11.7; 131.4)	71.8 (11.9; 131.7)		
<b>Parity</b>						
Primipara			1			
Multipara						
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	-33.4 (-69.; 2.3)	-58.7 (-109.6; -7.8)	-12.8 (-31.6; 6.1)	-13.4 (-38.6; 11.8)	-15.8 (-32.6; 1.0)	-19.2 (-41.9; 3.6)
		<b>HIV Viral load (coefficient*10<sup>3</sup>) copies/μl</b>				
<b>Any breastfeeding duration</b>	11.2 (6.8; 15.6)	7.7 (3.4; 12.1)	5.9 (-1.5; 13.2)	2.5 (-5.2; 10.2)	9.8 (4.9; 14.7)	6.1 (1.0; 11.2)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup></b>	-7.7 (-10.9; -4.6)	-14.0 (-17.4; -10.6)	-4.7 (-8.5; -1.0)	-5.7 (-9.8; -1.5)	-6.5 (-9.2; -3.8)	-7.6 (-10.7; -

						4.5)
Mother's age	-2.7 (-5.3; -0.1)	-3.4 (-6.2; -0.6)	-1.9 (-4.6; 0.8)	-4.6 (-7.8; -1.4)	-2.1 (-4.3; 0.1)	-4.8 (-7.3; -2.3)
Breastfeeding initiation time						
Within 1 hour	1	1				
After 1 hour	70.5 (41.3; 99.7)	34.2 (2.7; 65.7)				
Child's gender						
Male babies	1		1	1	1	1
Female babies	-49.1 (-79.4; -18.7)		-19.5 (-48.5; 9.4)	-37.2 (-66.6; -7.9)	-25.3 (-49.2; -1.4)	-36.2 (-60.2; -12.2)
Education						
Non completed primary school			1	1	1	1
Completed primary school			-10.2 (-53.9; 33.5)	4.7 (-39.8; 49.3)	-4.9 (-45.1; 35.2)	16.6 (-23.8; 57.0)
Secondary school and further			-76.7 (-108.1; -45.3)	-70.7 (-104.4; -37.1)	-72.7 (-98.7; -46.7)	-54.5 (-82.8; -26.1)
Marital status						
Married/ cohabiting mothers	1	1			1	
Single mothers	55.6 (21.6; 89.5)	124.9 (89.9; 160.0)				
Delivery						

Vaginal delivery	1	1	1	1	1	1
C-section delivery	118.5 (86.4; 150.5)	137.0 (102.7; 171.2)	72.6 (6.8; 138.4)	84.4 (18.0; 150.7)	90.8(49.8; 131.8)	104.7 (64.5; 144.9)
<b>Parity</b>						
Primipara	1	1	1	1	1	1
Multipara	66.5 (34.8; 98.3)	125.0 (89.8; 160.3)	47.7 (12.1; 83.2)	57.2 (15.6; 98.8)	54.8 (26.7; 83.0)	65.0 (32.7; 97.3)
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	-48.4 (-77.6; -19.2)	-35.0 (-64.8; -5.3)	39.9 (12.4; 67.4)	47.6 (18.6; 76.7)	22.6 (-60.2; 45.2)	31.9 (8.0; 55.8)
		<b>HIV disease progress</b>				
<b>Any breastfeeding duration</b>			1.1 (1.0; 1.2)	1.0 (0.9; 1.1)	1.0 (0.9; 1.0)	1.0 (0.9; 1.0)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup></b>			1.0 (1.0; 1.1)			
<b>Mother's age</b>				1.0 (1.0; 1.1)	1.0 (0.9; 1.0)	
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time</b>						
Within 1 h	1					
After 1 h						
<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies			1		1	
Female babies			0.8 (0.6; 1.0)		0.8 (0.6; 1.0)	



<b>HIV stage</b>						
HIV stage 1			1	1	1	1
HIV stage>1			4.0 (2.5; 6.2)	4.2 (2.6; 6.6)	4.4 (2.8; 6.7)	4.6 (2.9; 7.3)
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1			1
Completed primary school						1.4 (0.9; 2.0)
Secondary school and further						0.7 (0.5; 0.9)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers			1	1		
Single mothers			1.6 (1.1; 2.2)	1.8 (1.2; 2.6)	1.5 (1.2; 1.9)	
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm			1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm			1.3 (1.0; 1.6)	1.3 (1.0; 1.7)	1.3 (1.0; 1.6)	1.3 (1.0; 1.6)

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

The association between CD4 cell count and EPBF duration was insignificant (5.4 (95% CI:-0.1; 10.9) and 4.5 (95% CI:-6.2; 15.1) CD4 cells/ $\mu$ l increase per month of EPBF duration at univariate and multivariate analysis, respectively. The association was significantly positive between the mothers' baseline BMI, hemoglobin concentration and CD4 cell count yielding a mean increase of 4.9 (95% CI: 2.1; 7.7) CD4 cells/ $\mu$ l per BMI unit and 19.4 (95% CI:11.4; 27.4) CD4 cells/ $\mu$ l per each additional hemoglobin gram/dl throughout the EPBF period (Table 2). Regarding any breastfeeding, there was a significant mean increase of 5.7 (95% CI: 0.4; 10.9) CD4 cells/ $\mu$ l per month and a mean decrease of -43.3 (95% CI: -72.8; -13.7) CD4 cells/ $\mu$ l in single mothers compared to married ones (Table 3).

There was no significant association between HIV-1 viral load and EPBF duration. The heavier and older mothers, those who delivered female babies, and the best educated women group had a significantly lower mean viral load in the multivariate analysis. The mothers allocated to the lopinavir/ritonavir group had a significantly higher mean viral load than the ones in the Lamivudine arm (Table 2). Any breastfeeding duration was also associated with a significantly higher mean viral load (Table 3).

We found no significant association between EPBF duration and HIV-1 disease progression. However, randomization to the lopinavir/ritonavir arm or being single mother led to a significantly adjusted odd ratios (AOR) of 1.3 (95% CI: 1.0; 1.6;  $p=0.04$ ) and 1.6 (95% CI: 1.3; 2.1), respectively (Table 2). Analysis with any breastfeeding pattern showed exactly the same associations (Table 3).

In the stratified analysis, we found that EPBF duration had no influence on mothers' weight, their CD4 count, or their HIV viral load, whatever the stratum. HIV disease progression was not accelerated either by EPBF duration. In stratum 2, C-section delivery was associated with an increase in CD4 cell count, whereas delivering a female baby and being educated beyond secondary school were associated with a decrease in HIV-1 viral load.

In South Africa, initiating breastfeeding one h post-delivery and being a single mother were related to an increase in HIV-1 viral load. In both strata, C-section delivery and multiparity were related to this increase in HIV-1 viral load. In South Africa situation, randomisation to the lopinavir/ritonavir arm was associated with a decrease, whereas it was associated in stratum 2 to an increase in HIV-1 viral load. Nevertheless, in stratum 2 and with respect to the HIV-1 disease progression, being in the lopinavir/ritonavir group prompted a border-line significant hazard ratio of 1.3 (Table 2). There was no association between any breastfeeding and the mothers' weight, CD4 count and HIV-1 disease progression, whatever the stratum. However, any breastfeeding duration tended to increase the HIV-1 viral load in South African women.

**DISCUSSION**

Considered separately, there appeared to be no variations in the mothers' weight, CD4 cell count and HIV-1 viral load related to EPBF or any breastfeeding. The same conclusion applied to these outcomes combined in a composite endpoint representing HIV-1 disease progression. Unsurprisingly, mothers' baseline BMIs were consistently associated with an increase in the mothers' weight and CD4 cell count, and with a lower mean HIV-1 viral load for both EPBF and any breastfeeding groups. Associated also with the study outcomes, but in an opposite direction, was the allocation of the babies to the lopinavir/ritonavir arm, which appeared to be associated with an acceleration of the mother's HIV-1 disease progression and a higher HIV-1 viral load.

In a review of the literature on weight change in the postpartum period, there appeared to be no report of an association between breastfeeding, or generally between the mode of infant feeding, and postpartum weight loss, but a risk factor for postpartum weight loss seemed to be delivery by C-section [31], similar to our findings. However, while this review of the literature [31] found that less educated mothers (<12 years of schooling) were at risk of postpartum weight retention, we found that higher educated women (secondary school or further) were at risk of that weight retention. In a further review of literature on the effects of lactation on the mother's bodyweight, it is clear that the assumption that the postpartum weight loss is due to the high energy demand associated with lactation has been challenged by many studies [32]. Some reports conflict with our own findings, such as one in KwaZulu Natal, where HIV-1 infected mothers at between 8 and 24 weeks had a mean weight loss of 1.4 kg in contrast to a 0.4-kg weight gain in HIV-1 uninfected mothers (P=0.01) during breastfeeding [19].

Regarding the change in CD4 cell count, the South African data supports the conclusion that CD4 cell count did not differ significantly between women who breastfed and those who did not [33], which is contrary of the Kenyan Study that found that the rate of CD4 cell count decline was higher in breast-feeding mothers than in mothers who never breast-fed [17]. However, in that Kenyan study, HIV-1 RNA levels did not differ significantly between breast-feeding mothers and women feeding their babies with formula.

Regarding HIV-1 disease progression, in Durban, South Africa, one report found no deleterious effect of breastfeeding in HIV-1-infected mothers, in agreement with our own results. This study had as outcome variables the CD4 and CD8 cell count, the mothers' illness and mortality, and their hemoglobin levels [33]. Some reports from Malawi and South Africa reached the same conclusion that breastfeeding was not associated with higher risk of maternal morbidity or mortality [33 34]. In the South Africa study, the authors specifically

assessed the change in CD4 cell count and found no deleterious effect of breastfeeding. A study in Zambia concluded much the same, in that at 12 months after delivery, there was no difference in mortality between women who breastfed for a short duration (4 months) versus those who breastfed for a duration of their own choice [21]. An individual patient data meta-analysis on mortality among HIV-1 infected mothers according to children's feeding modality confirmed that the risk of dying within 18 months postpartum was not significantly affected by the infants' feeding modality (i.e. ever versus never breastfed) [35].

However, one report from Kenya found that HIV-1 infected breastfeeding mothers were more prone to death than HIV-1 infected non-breastfeeding mothers, with a relative risk of 3.2 (95% CI 1.3–8.1,  $p=0.01$ ) [18]. Along with the flaws noted in the design of the study, another explanation could be that, in the context of HIV infection, breastfeeding is more often the choice among poorer women.

### Strengths and limitations

Our study has been implemented in 4 Countries in Africa, including Burkina Faso (West), South Africa and Zambia (South) and Uganda (East), which we consider representative of much of the Sub-Saharan African population. The data were also collected in the rigorous context of a clinical trial, which minimized the lost to follow-up, the missing data as well as other data collection errors, and therefore improved the quality of our data.

However, the selection associated with the environment of a clinical trial - usually quite different from a routine environment - may have slightly biased our findings. Nonetheless, our endpoints (mother's weight, CD4 cell count and HIV-1 viral load) were sufficiently robust for us to vouch for their validity. Another point of note is the stratification of the participants into two strata, i.e. South Africa versus Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia. This stratification reduced the sample size in South Africa. Thus some of the modelling for South Africa could be less rigorous, and the findings regarding the risk factors here may not truly reflect the reality.

### CONCLUSION

Breastfeeding as far as this study can conclude was not a risk factor for the HIV-1 infected mothers weight, CD4 cell count, and HIV-1 viral load change, or HIV-1 disease progression, keeping in mind that all the participants had a baseline CD4 cell count  $>350$  cells/ul. The mothers' baseline high weight and high hemoglobin concentration were important factors in being consistently associated with an improvement of the outcome variables at stake. A higher education level was also a factor associated with a better HIV-1 infection status. Considering the benefits of breast milk for infants, and the consensus results from different

studies elsewhere that breastfeeding does not harm HIV-1-infected mothers, this study also supports the WHO 2016 guidelines on infant feeding, which indicates that mothers living with HIV should breastfeed for at least 12 months and up to 24 months, provided that the right treatment or prophylaxis for the infection is given where formula feeding is unsafe.

**Acknowledgments**

We would like to thank all the mothers who agreed to be part of the trial together with their children. Our acknowledgments also go to the different ANRS 12174 site staffs for their dedicated effort in this research. We are also very grateful to the University of Bergen and the Centre for International Health for providing the infrastructure, and the needed supervision and training. We also thank the UMR 1058, pathogenesis and control of chronic infections, Montpellier, France, from which we received invaluable support regarding data management. The final typescript has been improved through the help of BioMedES Ltd, UK ([www.biomedes.co.uk](http://www.biomedes.co.uk)).

**Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

**Funding:** This study used data collected in the context of the ANRS 12174 clinical trial funded by the French National Institute of Health and Medical Research - National Agency for Research on AIDS and Viral Hepatitis (Inserm-ANRS), the European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership (EDCTP; grant number CT.2006.33020.004), the Research Council of Norway (GlobVac grant number 183600), and the Total Foundation. NES benefited from a PhD grant from the Norwegian Quota Scheme. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

**Data Availability Statement:** The study sponsor (the French agency for research on HIV and viral hepatitis: ANRS) offers data sharing upon request. ANRS will be the contact organisation ([direction@anrs.fr](mailto:direction@anrs.fr)). The shared data will be those presented in the article.

**Contributorship statement:**

- Conceptualization: ENS, IMSE, NN, NM, PVP, TT.
- Data curation: ENS, RV.
- Formal analysis: ENS, IMSE, TT.
- Investigation: ENS, MS, NM, JKT, CK, JGH.
- Methodology: ENS, IMSE, TT.

Project administration: NN, PVP, TT, NM.

Resources: TT, IMSE.

Supervision: TT, IMSE, NM, NN.

Validation: TT, IMSE, NM, NN.

Writing the original draft: ENS, IMSE, TT.

Writing and review and editing: ENS, IMSE, NN, NM, TT, RV, CK, JKT, JGH, MS, KH

For peer review only

References

1. UNAIDS. Core epidemiology. UNAIDS July 2015;[http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2015/20150714\\_coreepidemiology\\_slides\\_ppt](http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2015/20150714_coreepidemiology_slides_ppt); Accessed 11 Nov 2015:12

2. UNAIDS. Global AIDS update 2016. UNAIDS [\[http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2016/Global-AIDS-update-2016\]](http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2016/Global-AIDS-update-2016) Accessed on 17th October 2016 2016:16

3. Eaton JW, Rehle TM, Jooste S, et al. Recent HIV prevalence trends among pregnant women and all women in sub-Saharan Africa: implications for HIV estimates. *AIDS* 2014;**28** [suppl 4]:8 doi: 10.1097/QAD.0000000000000412[published Online First: Epub Date]].

4. Younas M, Psomas C, Reynes J, et al. Immune activation in the course of HIV-1 infection: Causes, phenotypes and persistence under therapy. *HIV Medicine* 2016;**17**:17 doi: 10.1111/hiv.12310[published Online First: Epub Date]].

5. Julie A, Jacob M. Men with HIV age faster according to DNA methylation study. *JAMA* 2016;**316**(2):2

6. Zevin A, McKinnon L, Burgener A, et al. Microbial translocation and microbiome dysbiosis in HIV-associated immune activation. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS* 2016;**11**(2):17 doi: 10.1097/COH.0000000000000234[published Online First: Epub Date]].

7. DeVaughn S, Müller-Oehring E, Markey B, et al. Aging with HIV-1 Infection: Motor Functions, Cognition, and Attention – A Comparison with Parkinson’s Disease. *Neuropsychol Rev* 2015;**25**:16 doi: 10.1007/s11065-015-9305-x[published Online First: Epub Date]].

8. World Health Organization. Antiretroviral therapy for HIV infection in adults and adolescents: Recommendations for a public health approach [2006 revision]. World Health Organization 2006:134

9. WHO. Workshop on AIDS in Central Africa: Bangui, Central African Republic; 22 to 25 October 1985. WHO/CDS/AIDS 1985;**85**(1):16

10. WHO. WHO case definitions for AIDS surveillance in adults and adolescents. *Wkly epidem rec* 1994;**69**(37):3

11. WHO. Acquired Immuno Deficiency Syndrome WHO/CDC case definition for AIDS. *Wkly epidem rec* 1986;**61**:5

12. World Health Organization. WHO case definitions of HIV for surveillance and revised clinical staging and immunological classification of HIV-related disease in adults and children. World Health Organization 2007 2007:52

13. Koyanagi A, Humphrey JH, Moulton LH, et al. Predictive value of weight loss on mortality of HIV-positive mothers in a prolonged breastfeeding setting. *AIDS research and human retroviruses* 2011;**27**(11):1141-8 doi: 10.1089/AID.2010.0293[published Online First: Epub Date]].

14. Zaba B, Calvert C, Marston M, et al. Effect of HIV infection on pregnancy-related mortality in sub-Saharan Africa: secondary analyses of pooled community-based data from the network for Analysing Longitudinal Population-based HIV/AIDS data on Africa (ALPHA). *The Lancet* 2013;**381**(9879):1763-71 doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(13)60803-x[published Online First: Epub Date]].

15. Guttmacher institute. HIV Linked to Many Pregnancy-Related Deaths In Sub-Saharan Africa \_ Guttmacher Institute.pdf. International perspective on sexual and reproductive health 2013;**39**(2):4

16. World Health Organization, United Nations Children’s Fund. Guideline: updates on HIV and infant feeding: the duration of breastfeeding, and support from health services to improve feeding practices among mothers living with HIV. Geneva: World Health Organization 2016

17. Otieno PA, Brown ER, Mbori-Ngacha DA, et al. HIV-1 disease progression in breast-feeding and formula-feeding mothers: a prospective 2-year comparison of T cell subsets, HIV-1 RNA levels, and mortality. *J Infect Dis* 2007;**195**(2):220-9 doi: 10.1086/510245[published Online



- First: Epub Date]] .
18. Nduati R, Richardson B, John G, et al. Effect of breastfeeding on mortality among HIV-1 infected women: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 2001;**357**:1651–55 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(00)04820-0[published Online First: Epub Date]] .
  19. Papathakis P, Van Loan M, Rollins N, et al. Body Composition Changes During Lactation in HIV-Infected and HIV-Uninfected South African Women. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2006;**43**:8
  20. Sedgh G, Spiegelman D, Larsen U, et al. Breastfeeding and maternal HIV-1 disease progression and mortality. *AIDS* 2004;**18**:1043–49 doi: 10.1097/01.aids.0000125943.42948.98[published Online First: Epub Date]] .
  21. Kuhn L, Kasonde P, Sinkala M, et al. Prolonged breast-feeding and mortality up to two years post-partum among HIV-positive women in Zambia. *AIDS* 2005;**19**:1677–81
  22. Winkvist A, Rasmussen K, and Lissner L. Associations between reproduction and maternal body weight: examining the component parts of a full reproductive cycle. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2003;**57**:14
  23. Murnane PM, Arpadi SM, Sinkala M, et al. Lactation-associated postpartum weight changes among HIV-infected women in Zambia. *International journal of epidemiology* 2010;**39**(5):1299–310 doi: 10.1093/ije/dyq065[published Online First: Epub Date]] .
  24. Ladner J, Castetbon K, Leroy V, et al. Pregnancy, body weight and human immunodeficiency virus infection in African women: a prospective cohort study in Kigali (Rwanda), 1992-1994. *International journal of epidemiology* 1998;**27**:6
  25. Hartmann P, Sherriff J, and Mitoulas L. Homeostatic Mechanisms that Regulate Lactation during Energetic Stress. *J. Nutr.* 1998;**128**:6
  26. Somé E, Engebretsen I, Nagot N, et al. <R\_BreastfeedingandBMI\_Main\_ENSOME\_WithoutTrackChange.pdf>. *PloS one* 2017
  27. Nagot N, Kankasa C, Meda N, et al. Lopinavir/Ritonavir versus Lamivudine peri-exposure prophylaxis to prevent HIV-1 transmission by breastfeeding: the PROMISE-PEP trial Protocol ANRS 12174. *BMC Infect. Dis* 2012;**12**:246 doi: 10.1186/1471-2334-12-246[published Online First: Epub Date]] .
  28. Nagot N, Kankasa C, Tumwine J, et al. Extended pre-exposure prophylaxis with lopinavir–ritonavir versus lamivudine to prevent HIV-1 transmission through breastfeeding up to 50 weeks in infants in Africa (ANRS 12174): a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet* 2015;**14**(04841):8 doi: 10.1016/pii[published Online First: Epub Date]] .
  29. ANRS. ANRS scale to grade the severity of adverse events in adults; version n° 1.0 4 November 2008. file:///C:/Users/install/Downloads/ANRS-GradeEI-V1-En-2008.pdf ; Accessed 14 Jan 2016 2008:10
  30. Becquet R, Bland R, Leroy V, et al. Duration, pattern of breastfeeding and postnatal transmission of HIV: pooled analysis of individual data from West and South African cohorts. . *PloS one* 2009;**4**(10):e7397 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0007397[published Online First: Epub Date]] .
  31. Crowell D. Weight change in the postpartum period: a review of the Literature. *J Nurse Midwifery* 1995;**40**(5):6
  32. Rogers I, Golding J, Emmett P. The effects of lactation on the mother. *Early Hum Dev* 1997;**49**:13
  33. Coutoudis A, Coovadia H, Pillay K, et al. Are HIV-infected women who breastfeed at increased risk of mortality? *AIDS* 2001;**15**(5):3
  34. Taha T, Kumwenda N, Hoover D, et al. The impact of breastfeeding on the health of HIV-positive mothers and their children in sub-Saharan Africa. *Bull World Health Organ* 2006;**84**:546-54
  35. Breastfeeding and HIV International Transmission Study Group. Mortality Among HIV-1-Infected Women According to Children's Feeding Modality An Individual Patient Data Meta-Analysis. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2005;**39**:9



STROBE Statement—checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

	Item No	Recommendation	
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	OK OK
Introduction			
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	OK
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	OK
Methods			
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	OK
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection	OK
Participants	6	(a) Cohort study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up Case-control study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls Cross-sectional study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants (b) Cohort study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed Case-control study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	OK OK NA
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable	OK
Data sources/measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	OK
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	OK
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	NA
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why	OK
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	OK OK OK OK OK

Continued on next page

**Results**

Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed <b>OK</b>
		(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage <b>OK</b>
		(c) Consider use of a flow diagram <b>used in a previous related paper</b>
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders <b>OK</b>
		(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest <b>NO</b>
		(c) <i>Cohort study</i> —Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) <b>OK</b>
Outcome data	15*	<i>Cohort study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time <b>NA</b>
		<i>Case-control study</i> —Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure
		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> —Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included <b>OK</b>
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized <b>NA</b>
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period <b>NA</b>
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses <b>OK</b>

**Discussion**

Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives <b>OK</b>
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias <b>OK</b>
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence <b>OK</b>
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results <b>OK</b>

**Other information**

Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based <b>OK</b>
---------	----	---

\*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at [www.strobe-statement.org](http://www.strobe-statement.org).



# BMJ Open

## HIV-1 disease progression in immune-competent HIV-1 infected and breastfeeding mothers participating in the ANRS12174 clinical trial in Burkina Faso, South Africa, Uganda and Zambia: a cohort design.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-019239.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Nov-2017
Complete List of Authors:	SOME, Eric; Institut de Recherche en Sciences de la Santé (IRSS), Département biomédical et santé publique; Universitetet i Bergen Institutt for indremedisin, Centre for International Health Engbreetsen, Ingunn; Universitetet i Bergen Institutt for indremedisin, Centre for International Health Nagot, Nicolas; INSERM UMR 1058, Pathogenesis and control of chronic infections; Université de Montpellier MEDA, Nicolas; University of Ouagadougou, Faculty of Health Sciences; Centre MURAZ Vallo, Roselyne; INSERM UMR 1058, Pathogenesis and control of chronic infections Kankasa, Chipepo; University of Zambia School of Medicine, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health Tumwine, James; Makerere University, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health Singata-Madliki, Mandisa; East London Hospital Complex, Effective Care Research Unit (ECRU) Harper, Kim; University of Fort Hare, Effective Care Research Unit Hofmeyr, G Justus ; University of Fort Hare, Effective Care Research Unit Van de Perre, Philippe; INSERM UMR 1058, Pathogenesis and control of chronic infections; Université de Montpellier Tylleskär, Thorkild; Universitetet i Bergen Institutt for indremedisin
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Infectious diseases
Secondary Subject Heading:	Nutrition and metabolism, Epidemiology
Keywords:	HIV & AIDS < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Tropical medicine < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, NUTRITION & DIETETICS

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**HIV-1 disease progression in immune-competent HIV-1 infected and breastfeeding mothers participating in the ANRS12174 clinical trial in Burkina Faso, South Africa, Uganda and Zambia: a cohort design**

Eric N. Somé<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Ingunn M. S. Engebretsen<sup>1</sup>, Nicolas Nagot<sup>3,4,5</sup>, Nicolas Meda<sup>6</sup>, Roselyne Vallo<sup>3,4</sup>, Chipepo Kankasa<sup>7</sup>, James K. Tumwine<sup>8</sup>, Mandisa Singata<sup>9</sup>, Kim Harper<sup>9</sup>, G. Justus Hofmeyr<sup>9</sup>, Philippe Van de Perre<sup>3,4,5</sup>, Thorkild Tylleskär<sup>1</sup> for the ANRS 12174 Trial Group<sup>^</sup>

- <sup>1</sup>Centre for International Health, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway  
<sup>2</sup>National Health Research Institute, Centre National pour la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso  
<sup>3</sup>INSERM UMR 1058, Pathogenesis and control of chronic infections, Montpellier, France  
<sup>4</sup>Université de Montpellier, Montpellier, France  
<sup>5</sup>Centre Hospitalier Universitaire, Montpellier, France  
<sup>6</sup>University of Ouagadougou, Faculty of Health Sciences, Centre de Recherche International en Santé (CRIS) Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso  
<sup>7</sup>University of Zambia, School of Medicine, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health, University Teaching Hospital, Lusaka, Zambia  
<sup>8</sup>Makerere University, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health, School of Medicine, College of Health Sciences, Kampala, Uganda  
<sup>9</sup>University of Fort Hare, Effective Care Research Unit, Eastern Cape, South Africa

**\*Corresponding author:**  
E-mail: [eric.nsome@gmail.com](mailto:eric.nsome@gmail.com) (ENS)  
10 BP 250 Ouagadougou 10 Burkina Faso  
Tel: +226 78 84 95 74

<sup>^</sup>Membership of the ANRS 12174 Trial Group (PROMISE PEP Consortium) is provided in the Acknowledgments

Words count: 3097

## Abstract

### Objective

We have assessed HIV-1 disease progression among HIV-1 positive mothers in relation to duration of any or exclusive breastfeeding in the context of ANRS12174 trial (clinical trial no NCT0064026).

### Methods

The analysis was completed on 203, 212, 272 and 529 HIV-1-positive and lactating mothers with CD4 count >350 cell/ $\mu$ l from Burkina Faso, South Africa, Uganda and Zambia, respectively. The trial compared Lamivudine and Lopinavir/Ritonavir as a peri-exposure prophylaxis during a 50-week follow-up time. A multiple logistic regression model was run with the mothers' weight, CD4 count and HIV-1 viral load as separate dependent variables, then combined into a dependent composite end-point called HIV-1 disease progression where HIV-1 viral load were replaced by the HIV-1 clinical stage. Exclusive or predominant breastfeeding and any breastfeeding duration were the key explanatory variables.

### Results

In the adjusted model, the associations between EPBF duration and weight change, CD4 cell count and the HIV-1 viral load were consistently insignificant. The CD4 cell count was associated with a significantly higher mothers' body mass index (BMI; a mean increase of 4.9 (95% CI: 2.1; 7.7) CD4 cells/ $\mu$ l per each extra kilogram per square meter of BMI) and hemoglobin concentration (19.4 (95% CI: 11.4; 27.4) CD4 cells/ $\mu$ l per each extra gram per decilitre of hemoglobin concentration).

There was no significant association between EPBF duration and HIV-1 disease progression. However, randomization to the lopinavir/ritonavir arm was related to a significant acceleration of HIV-1 disease progression (adjusted odd ratio of 1.3 (95% CI: 1.0; 1.6;  $p=0.04$ ) at the multivariate model). In South Africa any breastfeeding duration was associated with an increase of the HIV-1 viral load.

### Conclusion

Breastfeeding was not a risk factor for a faster progression of HIV-1 disease in mothers of this cohort with a baseline CD4 cell count >350 cells/ $\mu$ l.

**Keywords:** HIV-1 infection; breastfeeding; Sub Saharan Africa

**Strengths and limitations of this study**

- Our study has been implemented in 4 Countries in Africa, namely Burkina Faso (West), South Africa and Zambia (South), and Uganda (East), which made our sample representative of the wider Sub-Sahara African population.
- The data were collected in the context of a rigorous clinical trial, which minimized the lost to follow-up, the missing data as well as other data collection errors, and therefore improved the quality of our data.
- However, the selection associated with the environment of a clinical trial, usually quite different from a routine environment, may have biased our findings. Also AZT and 3TC are usually administered together. However in our data collection tool (the questionnaire), the investigators had to ask specifically and separately the question for AZT and 3TC. We suspect that they may have been some reporting errors, creating slight differences in the percentages of women who complied with the prophylaxis requirements.
- Nonetheless, the variables analysed separately as dependent variables or as part of our composite end-points (mother's weight, CD4 cell count, HIV-1 viral load or HIV-1 clinical stage) were sufficiently robust and had a high validity.

**INTRODUCTION**

In 2015, 36.7 [34.0-39.8] million people were infected with HIV. Among them 17.4 [16.1-20.0] million were women of childbearing age [1 2]. HIV-1 prevalence is estimated between 5.3 and 6.5% among pregnant women in Sub-Saharan Africa [3]. Because of the almost irreversible immune activation involved, HIV-1 infection creates a condition of metabolic stress that may result in wasting and immune depression [4-7]. Ten per cent weight loss and a CD4 count of <350 cells/ $\mu$ l in the context of HIV-1 infection have been recognized as major criteria of the diagnosis of AIDS [8]. This weight loss is also associated with a higher risk of mortality in HIV-1-infected breastfeeding mothers [9]. Furthermore, HIV-1 is a major cause of maternal mortality in affected countries in Southern Africa. About 25% of pregnancy-related deaths in Sub-Saharan Africa are attributable to HIV [10], and 88% of deaths among pregnant and postpartum women with HIV infection are attributable to the virus [11].

In women, pregnancy is, though a physiological condition, a period of increased metabolic activities and synthesis requiring a supplement of energy and nutrients. After delivery, breastfeeding prolongs the increased metabolic demands. In spite of this, WHO still recommends HIV-1-infected women to breastfeed as the best choice for the infant and the mother [12] in contexts where replacement feeding does not meet AFASS (affordable, feasible, available, safe and sustainable) criteria.

There have been conflicting results on assessment of the impact of breastfeeding in HIV-1-

infected mothers. Some studies found that breastfeeding was harmful to HIV-positive mothers by either accelerating HIV disease progression as assessed by the mother's weight loss, a decrease in CD4 cells count, or even an increased risk of maternal mortality, suggesting that metabolic, immunologic or hormonal changes associated with breastfeeding may accelerate HIV-1 disease progression in postpartum mothers [13-15]. Others found no effect on the mothers' health assessed by death, development of a low CD4 cell count, anaemia or excessive weight loss [16 17]. Some studies have found breastfeeding protective, allowing weight gain in HIV-1 infected breastfeeding mothers [15 18-22].

In the ANRS12174 trial, we assessed mothers' HIV-1 disease progression (measured by the change in weight, CD4 cells count and HIV-1 disease stage as per WHO classification) in relation to exclusive breastfeeding or duration of any breastfeeding during the infant first 6 months of life and until week 50 post-partum.

## METHODS

### Study design

The ANRS 12174 clinical trial in Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso), East London (South Africa), Mbale (Uganda) and Lusaka (Zambia) was conducted from 2009 to 2013. The protocol and the main outcome have been published [23 24]. Briefly, a cohort of HIV-1 infected, pregnant women, at the time not eligible for highly active antiretroviral therapy because CD4 count was  $>350$  cells/ $\mu$ l, aged 18 or above, planning to breastfeed were identified from antenatal clinics between 28 and 40 weeks of amenorrhea. As part of the HIV post-test counselling session, they were informed on the different feeding options for their babies. Only women intending to breastfeed were referred to the research clinic for further assessment of the inclusion criteria during the antenatal period and again with their child within 6 days after birth, for an enrolment and randomisation at day 7 postpartum. From 28 weeks of pregnancy to day 7 after birth, programmatic mother to child transmission prophylaxis was implemented with antepartum zidovudine, intrapartum single dose nevirapine and zidovudine-lamivudine for mothers and nevirapine for infants for 7 days postpartum. Twins and triplets, infants with positive HIV-1 DNA PCR test result at day 7 ( $\pm$  2 days) postpartum, low birth-weight or ill babies (ranked grade II or above of the ANRS classification for adverse events) were excluded [25]. The intervention provided an infant prophylaxis in the breastfeeding period plus one week from day 7 to 50 weeks of age with either lopinavir/ritonavir or lamivudine.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1     **Data management and analysis**

2     Data was collected on a paper case-report form or directly entered online using the  
3     Electronic Data capture system: OpenClinica™ ([www.openclinica.com](http://www.openclinica.com)). Twenty-four hour  
4     and one week breastfeeding recalls were collected during the enrolment visit at day 7±2  
5     days after birth and the 13 monthly-scheduled follow-up visits that started at week 2.  
6     During these visits, mothers were asked in particular if they gave their infants other  
7     foods/liquids as well as breastmilk. Prelacteal feeding data - defined as any food item  
8     except mothers' milk given to infants before initial breastfeeding - were also collected at  
9     the enrolment visit.

10    The mothers at each visit were categorized into the following groups: 1) exclusive  
11    breastfeeding, EBF (only breastmilk being given to the infant without any other food or  
12    liquid, except medically prescribed drugs or vitamins); 2) predominant breastfeeding, PBF  
13    (breastmilk with some liquid-based food, such as juice, tea, sugar-water and salt-water,  
14    including glucose without any kind of formula, or animal milk); and 3) mixed feeding, MF  
15    (breastmilk with other solid or liquid-based food, including other kinds of milk). We  
16    thereafter combined EBF and PBF into one group called "exclusive or predominant  
17    breastfeeding" (EPBF) ) as PBF presented few cases and was assessed as having much  
18    the same risk as EBF, at least with regard to postnatal HIV transmission [26].

19    During the follow-up visits, the mothers underwent a clinical assessment, including weight  
20    measurement and HIV-1 infection staging at the first screening visit or screening one  
21    (between 28 and 40 weeks of gestation), day 7 post-partum, weeks 26 and 50; CD4 cell  
22    count analysis at screening one, weeks 26 and 50; and HIV-1 viral load at screening one,  
23    day 7, weeks 6, 14, 26, 38 and 50. The dependant variables were mothers' weight, CD4 cell  
24    count and HIV-1 viral load considered separately and measured at the same time points as  
25    per above. We generated a new variable called "weight loss", which was calculated as the  
26    mothers' weight at W26 (because of missing data mothers' weights were not available for  
27    week 50) minus the baseline weight at day 7 postpartum, which was compared to the  
28    baseline weight to assess if the loss had reached 10%. Furthermore, we combined CD4 cell  
29    count, mothers' weight loss and HIV-1 disease stage as per WHO classification to create the  
30    composite endpoint called "HIV-1 disease progression". HIV-1 disease progression was  
31    accelerated when CD4 cell count decreased to<350 Cells/µl, or the HIV-1 infection was  
32    assessed by the trial physician at stage 3 or above, or the mothers lost >10% of their weight;  
33    otherwise, HIV-1 disease progression was deemed absent or slow. Our main independent  
34    variable was EPBF (until week 26 post-partum) or any breastfeeding (until week 50 post-  
35    partum) duration. The data were collected by trained physicians, pharmacists, biologists and  
36    counsellors. Seca-brand scales and stadiometers were used to measure the mother's height  
37    and weight. Weights were rounded to the nearest 10 grams and the height at the nearest



millimetre. Weight and height were measured twice based on the WHO guidelines (<http://www.who.int/childgrowth/training/en/>).

We first ran linear mixed-effect models that considered separately the mothers' weight, CD4 cell count and HIV-1 viral load changes as dependant variables, and EPBF or any breastfeeding as key independent variables. The lost to follow up were censored in a survival analysis completed to build the EPBF and any breastfeeding variables [27]. When the inter-country variability was not significant, a linear multivariate regression analysis was run. We ran a logistic regression regarding the composite endpoint. Adjustment covariates included baseline variables measured at the screening one visit (BMI, education level, marital status, hemoglobin concentration) or on day 7 postpartum (mode of delivery, breastfeeding initiation time, the baby's gender, and the trial arm). These multivariate analyses were run taking all participants together and also as 2 strata comprising South African mothers (stratum 1) and Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia together (stratum 2) because South Africa presented important socio-economic, cultural and demographic differences compared with the other countries. For continuous variables, the mean values with 95% confidence interval (CI) were estimated, and for categorical variables, percentages were used. Associations between variables were tested using the Chi-square test for categorical variables. STATA/SE 13.1 statistical software has been used for the analyses.

## Ethics

Prior to enrolment, the mothers signed a written informed consent and assent form for themselves and their children, respectively. The trial was conducted according to the sponsor (ANRS) ethic charter, Good Clinical Practices and the principles of the Helsinki declaration. The protocol had obtained approval from the relevant ethical committees, including the Ethical Committee for Health Research in Burkina Faso (EC N° 2008-039), the Biomedical Research Ethics Committee in Zambia (EC N° 008-02-08), the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology (EC N° HS470), the Stellenbosch University ethical committees and the Medicines Control Council in South Africa (EC N° 20090938).

## RESULTS

In the ANRS 12174 trial, 1,273 mother-infant pairs were randomized and 6 were excluded due to protocol violations. Of the remaining 1,267 participants, 204 were from Ouagadougou, 222 from East London, 278 from Mbale and 563 from Lusaka. In all, 42 were excluded from analysis due to lack of breastfeeding data after inclusion, 7 due to inaccurate feeding duration data and 2 women had no data on weights. The analysis included 1,216 subjects. The complete flow chart has been published elsewhere [27]. The

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 mean baseline weight, the percentage of educated and employed women was highest,  
2 and the mean EPBF and any breastfeeding durations shortest in South Africa where the  
3 HIV-1 viral load was also the lowest (Table 1a and 1b).

For peer review only

1 **Table 1:**

2 Table 1a: Baseline characteristics collected at screening one or on day 7 postpartum and breastfeeding duration data (continuous variables)

	<b>Burkina Faso</b>	<b>South Africa</b>	<b>Uganda</b>	<b>Zambia</b>	<b>All sites</b>
	N=203	N=212	N=272	N=529	N=1216
	Mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)
<b>Mean duration of AZT regimen post-delivery (days)</b>	6.6 (6.5; 6.8)	7 (7.0; 7.0)	6.8 (6.7; 6.9)	7.0 (6.9; 7.0)	6.9 (6.8; 7.0)
<b>Mean duration 3TC regimen post-delivery (days)</b>	6.6 (6.5; 6.8)	Data not available	6.7 (6.6; 6.8)	7.0 (6.9; 7.0)	6.8 (6.8; 6.9)
<b>Mean baseline CD4 count*10<sup>2</sup>cel/μl</b>	5.6 (5.4; 5.8)	5.5 (5.3;5.7)	5.6 (5.4; 5.8)	6.0 (5.8;6.2)	5.8 (5.7; 5.9)
<b>Mean baseline viral load*10<sup>3</sup> copies/μl</b>	23.0 (7.3; 38.7)	13.5 (7.5; 19.6)	34.9 (19.7; 50.0)	29.1 (21.5; 36.6)	26.4 (21.1; 31.8)
<b>Baseline mothers' weight (kg)</b>	62.9 (61.4; 64.5)	72.1 (70.0; 74.1)	58.1 (57.0; 59.2)	62.0 (61.0; 62.9)	63.0 (62.3; 63.7)
<b>Mean EPBF duration (months)</b>	6.3 (6.2; 6.4)	4.8 (4.7; 4.9)	5.6 (5.5; 5.7)	6.0 (5.9; 6.1)	5.8 (5.7; 5.9)
<b>Mean breastfeeding duration (months)</b>	10.5 (10.4; 10.6)	6.7 (6.6; 6.8)	8.4 (8.3; 8.5)	8.4 (8.3; 8.5)	8.4 (8.3; 8.5)

1           2           3           4           5           6           7           8           9           10           11           12           13           14           15           16           17           18           19           20           21           22           23           24           25           26           27           28           29           30           31           32           33           34           35           36           37           38           39           40           41           42           43           44           45           46           47

1       Table 1b: Baseline characteristics collected at screening one or on day 7 postpartum and breastfeeding duration data (categorical variables).

	Burkina Faso	South Africa	Uganda	Zambia	All sites
	N=203	N=212	N=272	N=529	N=1216
	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)
<b>Mother's age group</b>					
Below 25 years	26.2 (20.5; 32.6)	34.4 (28.3; 41.1)	39.3 (33.7; 45.3)	37.8 (33.8; 42.0)	35.6 (33.0; 38.3)
25 – 30 years	36.9 (30.6; 43.8)	31.2 (25.2; 37.7)	35.7 (30.2; 41.5)	33.1 (29.2; 37.2)	34.0 (31.3; 36.7)
30 and above	36.9 (30.6; 43.8)	34.4 (28.3; 41.1)	25.0 (20.2; 30.5)	29.1 (25.4; 33.1)	30.4 (27.9; 33.1)
<b>HIV stage 1</b>	93.1 (88.7; 95.9)	98.6 (95.7; 99.5)	92.3 (88.4; 94.9)	99.8 (98.7; 100.0)	96.8 (95.6; 97.6)
<b>Education</b>					
Uncomplete primary school	68.5 (61.7; 74.5)	8.5 (5.4; 13.1)	48.5 (42.6; 54.5)	28.2 (24.5; 32.2)	36.0 (33.4 ; 0.38.8)
Completed primary school	7.4 (4.5; 11.9)	0.5 (0.1; 3.3)	15.8 (11.9; 20.6)	18.5 (15.4; 22.1)	12.9 (11.1; 14.9)
Secondary school and more	24.1 (18.7; 30.5)	91.0 (86.4; 94.2)	35.7 (0.30.2; 41.5)	53.3 (49.0; 57.5)	51.1 (48.2; 53.9)
<b>Marital status (married)</b>	90.6 (85.8; 94.0)	39.1 (32.8; 45.9)	82.0 (76.9; 86.1)	88.7 (85.7; 91.1)	78.9 (76.5; 81.1)
<b>Occupation (employed)</b>	8.9 (5.6; 13.6)	41.5 (35.0; 48.3)	35.3 (29.8; 41.2)	17.0 (14.0; 20.5)	24.0 (21.7; 26.5)
<b>Primipara</b>	21.7 (16.5; 27.9)	33.5 (27.4; 40.1)	18.0 (13.9; 23.0)	20.6 (17.4; 24.3)	22.4 (20.2; 24.9)
<b>Vaginal delivery</b>	93.6 (89.3; 96.2)	65.1 (58.4; 71.2)	93.4 (89.7; 95.8)	96.2 (94.2; 97.5)	89.7 (87.9; 91.3)
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time (within one hour)</b>	6.9 (4.1; 11.3)	51.4 (44.7; 58.1)	55.9 (49.9; 61.7)	80.7 (77.1; 83.9)	57.7 (54.9; 60.5)
<b>Lamivudine arm</b>	49.7 (42.9; 56.6)	51.9 (45.1; 58.6)	49.6 (43.7; 55.6)	50.3 (46.0; 54.5)	50.3 (47.5; 53.1)
<b>Female baby</b>	41.9 (35.2; 48.8)	49.1 (42.4; 55.8)	52.9 (46.0; 58.8)	48.4 (44.1; 52.7)	48.4 (45.6; 51.2)

2           3           4           5           6           7           8           9           10           11           12           13           14           15           16           17           18           19           20           21           22           23           24           25           26           27           28           29           30           31           32           33           34           35           36           37           38           39           40           41           42           43           44           45           46           47

3       Overall in the adjusted model, the association between EPBF duration and weight change was negative and non-significant. Mothers who

completed secondary school had a significant mean increase of 1.1 kg compared to those who did not complete primary school (Table 2a).).

## Table 2:

**Table 2a: Mother's weight change according to EPBF duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
<b>Dependant variable=mother's weight</b>						
<b>EPBF duration (months)</b>	0.1 (-0.7; 0.9)	-0.2 (-0.6; 0.1)	-0.1 (-0.5; 0.3)	0.1 (-0.0; 0.3)	-0.2 (-0.5; 0.2)	-0.1 (-0.2; 0.1)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup></b>	2.5 (2.4; 2.7)	2.4 (2.3; 2.6)	2.5 (2.4; 2.6)	2.4 (2.3; 2.5)	2.5 (2.4; 2.6)	2.4 (2.3; 2.5)
<b>Mother's age</b>	0.8 (0.5; 1.2)	0.1 (0.0; 0.3)	0.5 (0.4; 0.6)	0.1 (0.1; 0.2)	0.5 (0.4; 0.7)	0.1 (0.1; 0.2)
<b>HIV disease stage</b>						
HIV stage 1						
HIV stage >1	12.4 (-4.5; 29.4)	6.7 (0.4; 13.1)	-2.8 (-6.4; 0.8)			
<b>Education</b>						
Not completed primary school			1	1	1	1
Completed primary school			3.9 (2.0; 5.9)	0.2 (-0.7; 1.1)	4.4 (2.2; 6.5)	0.6 (-0.3; 1.5)
Secondary school and more			2.7 (1.2; 4.1)	0.7 (0.1; 1.4)	3.1 (1.5; 4.6)	1.1 (0.4; 1.8)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers	1				1	
Single mothers	-3.1 (-7.2; 0.9)				-1.2 (-3.0; 0.5)	
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery	1		1		1	1
C-section delivery	3.7 (-0.4; 7.9)		4.5 (1.5; 7.6)		4.4 (2.1; 6.7)	-1.1 (-2.1; -0.1)
<b>Parity</b>						
Primipara	1		1		1	-
Multipara	6.1 (1.9; 10.3)		3.1 (1.4; 4.7)		3.9 (2.3; 5.4)	-
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	2.0 (-2.0; 6.1)	0.8 (-0.7; 2.3)	-0.1 (-1.4; 1.3)	-0.3 (-0.9; 0.2)	0.3 (-1.0; 1.6)	-0.1 (-0.7; 0.4)

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval  
<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

**Table 2b: Mother's CD4 count change according to EPBF duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
<b>Dependent variable=CD4 count</b>						
<b>EPBF duration (months)</b>	-1.0 (-8.9; 7.0)	-6.4 (-18.6; 5.8)	9.3 (2.3; 16.3)	7.9 (-4.2; 20.1)	5.4 (-0.1; 10.9)	4.5 (-6.2; 15.1)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup></b>			4.9 (2.4; 7.3)	5.9 (2.5; 9.2)	3.3 (1.3; 5.3)	4.9 (2.1; 7.7)
<b>Mother's age</b>	-3.1 (-7.5; 1.2)		-4.9 (-7.3; -2.5)	-6.2 (-8.6; -3.8)	-4.7 (-6.9; -2.6)	-6.2 (-8.4; -4.1)
<b>Hemoglobin concentration</b>	33.3 (12.7; 53.8)	34.8 (14.4; 55.1)	15.2 (7.8; 22.6)	12.9 (4.6; 21.2)	19.3 (12.3; 26.4)	19.4 (11.4; 27.4)
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time</b>						
Breastfeeding initiation within 1 h	1	1	1	1	1	-
Breastfeeding initiation after 1 h	-56.2 (-94.9; - 17.4)	-39.9 (-90.3; 10.6)	-40.5 (-60.1; -20.9)		-42.5 (-61.1; - 23.9)	-
<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies	1	1	1			
Female babies	-53.1 (-104.7; -	-52.9 (-103.0; -	21.8 (-3.9; 47.4)			

	1.6)	2.9)				
<b>HIV disease stage</b>						
HIV stage 1			1	1	1	1
HIV stage >1			-85.8 (-131.5; -40.2)	-86.5 (-147.1; -26.0)	-70.2 (-115.5; -25.0)	-83.7 (-144.1; -23.4)
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1		1	1
Completed primary school			29.2 (-8.6; 67.1)		25.1 (-12.6; 62.9)	24.4 (-12.9; 61.6)
Secondary school and more			1.0 (-26.8; 28.9)		-7.8 (-34.9; 19.3)	-9.3 (-36.8; 18.2)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers			1	1	1	1
Single mothers			-34.5 (-73.2; 4.2)	-44.6 (-83.1; -6.03)	-24.6 (-55.9; 6.6)	-29.7 (-61.0; 1.6)
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery			1	1		
C-section delivery			71.6 (11.7; 131.4)	71.1 (11.1; 131.2)		
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1



Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	-33.4 (-69.2; 2.3)	-65.3 (-116.4; -14.1)	-12.8 (-31.6; 6.1)	-12.9 (-38.2; 12.4)	-15.8 (-32.6; 1.0)	-19.2 (-41.9; 3.6)
-------------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	--------------------	---------------------	--------------------	--------------------

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

**Table 2c: Mother's HIV-1 viral load change according to EPBF duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
<b>Dependent variable=viral load (coefficient * 10<sup>3</sup>)</b>						
<b>EPBF duration (months)</b>	4.5 (-3.4; 12.4)	-3.6 (-11.5; 4.4)	5.4 (-7.1 18.0)	2.0(-11.3 15.4)	6.2 (-2.5; 14.9)	1.7 (-7.3; 10.8)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup></b>	-7.7 (-10.9; -4.6)	-14.5 (-17.9; -11.0)	-4.7 (-8.5; -1.0)	-5.7 (-9.8; -1.6)	-6.5 (-9.2; -3.8)	-8.0 (-11.0; -4.9)
<b>Mother's age</b>	-2.7 (-5.3; -0.1)	-2.7 (-5.5; 0.1)	-1.9 (-4.6; 0.8)	-4.5 (-7.7; -1.4)	-2.1 (-4.3; 0.1)	-4.5 (-7.0; -2.0)
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time</b>						
Breastfeeding	1	1				

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

initiation<1h						
Breastfeeding initiation>1h	70.5 (41.3; 99.7)	45.1 (13.5; 76.7)				
<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies	1	1	1	1	1	1
Female babies	-49.1 (-79.4-18.7)		-19.5 (-48.5; 9.4)	-36.5 (-66.0 - 7.2)	-25.3 (-49.2; -1.4)	-35.2 (-59.2; -11.1)
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1	1	1	1
Completed primary school			-10.2 (-53.9;33.5)	2.9 (-41.4; 47.2)	-5.0 (-45.1; 35.2)	13.4 (-26.9; 53.8)
Secondary school and more			-76.7 (-108.1; -45.3)	-73.4 (-105.9; -41.0)	-72.7 (-98.7; -46.7)	-62.0 (-89.7; -34.3)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers	1	1				
Single mothers	55.6 (21.6; 89.5)	127.9 (92.8 163.0)				
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery	1	1	1	1	1	1
C-section delivery	118.5 (86.4; 150.5)	143.2(108.8; 177.5)	72.6 (6.8; 138.4)	84.2 (17.6;150.7)	90.8 (49.8; 131.8)	105.5 (65.2; 145.7)

Parity						
Primipara	1	1	1	1	1	1
Multipara	66.5 (34.8; 98.2)	125.9 (90.5; 161.2)	47.7 (12.1; 83.2)	56.7 (15.1; 98.2)	54.8 (26.7; 83.0)	65.1 (32.8; 97.4)
Trial arm						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	-48.4 (-77.6; -19.2)	-37.6 (-67.5; -7.6)	39.9 (12.4; 67.4)	47.0 (17.9; 76.1)	22.6 (-0.0; 45.2)	31.1 (7.1; 55.0)
Birthweight	0.0 (0.0 ; 0.1)	0.1 (0.0; 0.1)	0.0 (0.0; 0.1)	0.1 (0.0; 0.1)		

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

**Table 2d: Mother's HIV-1 disease progression according to EPBF duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
<b>EPBF duration (months)</b>	1.0 (0.9; 1.1)		1.1 (1.0; 1.2)	1.0 (0.9; 1.1)	1.1 (1.0; 1.1)	1.1 (1.0; 1.2)
<b>Mother's age</b>			1.0 (1.0; 1.1)	1.0 (1.0; 1.1)		1.0 (1.0; 1.0)
<b>Child's gender</b>						

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Male babies			1		1	1
Female babies			0.8 (0.6; 1.0)		0.8 (0.6; 1.0)	0.8 (0.6; 1.0)
<b>HIV disease stage</b>						
HIV stage 1			1	1		
HIV stage >1			4.0 (2.5; 6.2)	4.2 (2.6; 6.5)		
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers			1	1	1	1
Single mothers			1.6 (1.1; 2.2)	1.8 (1.3; 2.6)	1.5 (1.2; 1.9)	1.6 (1.3; 2.1)
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm			1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm			1.3 (1.0; 1.6)	1.3 (1.0; 1.7)	1.3 (1.0; 1.6)	1.3 (1.0; 1.6)
Birthweight			0.9 (0.8; 1.0)			

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

1 **Table 3**

2 **Table 3a: Mother's weight change according to any breastfeeding duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting**  
 3 **South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	<b>Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Adjusted coefficient (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Adjusted coefficient (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Unadjusted Odd Ratio (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>
		<b>Weight</b>				
<b>Any breastfeeding duration</b>	0.3 (-0.2; 0.8)	-0.1 (-0.3; 0.0)	-0.0 (-0.3; 0.2)	0.1 (0.0; 0.3)	-0.0 (-0.3; 0.2)	-0.0 (-0.2; 0.1)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup></b>	2.5 (2.4; 2.7)	2.5 (2.3; 2.6)	2.5 (2.4; 2.6)	2.4 (2.3; 2.5)	2.5 (2.4; 2.6)	2.4 (2.3; 2.5)
<b>Mothers' age</b>	0.8 (0.5; 1.2)	0.2 (0.0; 0.3)	0.5 (0.4; 0.6)	0.1 (0.1; 0.2)	0.5 (0.4; 0.7)	0.1 (0.1; 0.2)
<b>HIV disease stage</b>						
HIV stage 1	1	1	1			
HIV stage>1	12.4 (-4.5; 29.4)	6.4 (0.0; 12.7)	-2.8 (-6.4; 0.8)			
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1	1	1	1
Completed primary school			3.9 (2.0; 5.9)	0.3 (-0.6; 1.1)	4.4 (2.2; 6.5)	0.6 (-0.3; 1.5)
Secondary school and further			2.7 (1.2; 4.1)	0.9 (0.2; 1.5)	3.1 (1.5; 4.6)	1.0 (0.4; 1.7)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers	1				1	
Single mothers	-3.1 (-7.2; 0.9)				-1.2 (-3.0; 0.5)	
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery			1		1	
C-section delivery	3.7 (-0.4; 7.9)	-1.6 (-3.2; 0.0)	4.5 (1.5; 7.6)		4.4 (2.1; 6.7)	-1.2 (-2.1; -0.2)
<b>Parity</b>						
Primipara	1	1	1	1	1	
Multipara	6.1 (1.9; 10.3)		3.1 (1.4; 4.7)		3.9 (2.3; 5.4)	
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	2.0 (-2.0; 6.1)	0.7 (-0.8; 2.2)	-0.1 (-1.4; 1.3)	-0.3 (-0.9; 0.3)	0.3 (-1.0; 1.6)	0.1 (-0.7; 0.4)

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

**Table 3b: Mother's CD4 cell count change according to any breastfeeding duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

		South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis
	<b>Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Adjusted coefficient (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Adjusted coefficient (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Unadjusted Odd Ratio (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>
		<b>CD4 cells count</b>				
<b>Any breastfeeding duration</b>	0.4 ( -6.8; 7.6)	-2.4 (-9.5; 4.7)	1.2 (-5.8; 8.3)	9.8 (-2.1; 21.8)	1.5 (-3.9; 7.0)	5.7 (0.4; 10.9)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup></b>			4.9 (2.4; 7.3)	5.7 (2.4; 9.1)	3.3 (1.3; 5.3)	4.2 (1.5; 6.9)
<b>Mother's age</b>	-3.1 (-7.5; 1.2)		-4.9 (-7.3; -2.5)	-6.5 (-8.9; -4.1)	-4.7 (-6.9; -2.6)	-6.2 (-8.4; -4.1)
<b>Hemoglobin concentration</b>	33.3 (12.7; 53.8)	33.9 (13.5; 54.3)	15.2 (7.8; 22.6)	15.7 (7.2; 24.3)	19.3 (12.3; 26.4)	16.7 (9.0; 24.4)
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time</b>						
Within 1 hour			1		1	
After 1 hour	-56.2 (-94.9; -17.4)		-40.5 (-60.1; -20.9)		-42.5 (-61.1; -23.9)	
<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies	1	1	1			



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Female babies	-53.1 (-104.7; -1.6)	-54.1 (-104.3; -3.6)	21.7 (-3.9; 47.4)			
<b>HIV stage</b>						
HIV stage 1			1	1	1	1
HIV stage>1			-85.8 (-131.5; -40.2)	-91.5 (-152.9; -30.1)	-70.2 (-115.5; -25.0)	-88.8 (-148.3; -29.3)
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1		1	1
Completed primary school			29.2 (-8.6; 67.1)		25.1 (-12.6; 62.9)	19.9 (-16.7; 56.5)
Secondary school and further			1.0 (-26.8; 28.9)		-7.8 (-34.9; 19.3)	-17.4 (-43.7; 9.5)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/ cohabiting mothers			1	1	1	1
Single mothers			-34.5 (-73.2; 4.2)	-43.1 (-81.5; -4.6)	-24.6 (-55.9; 6.6)	-43.3 (-72.8; -13.7)
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery			1	1		
C-section delivery			71.6 (11.7; 131.4)	71.8 (11.9; 131.7)		
<b>Parity</b>						
Primipara			1			

Multipara						
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	-33.4 (-69.; 2.3)	-58.7 (-109.6; -7.8)	-12.8 (-31.6; 6.1)	-13.4 (-38.6; 11.8)	-15.8 (-32.6; 1.0)	-19.2 (-41.9; 3.6)

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

**Table 3c: Mother's HIV-1 viral load change according to any breastfeeding duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted Odd Ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
		HIV-1 Viral load (coefficient*10 <sup>3</sup> ) copies/μl				
<b>Any breastfeeding duration</b>	11.2 (6.8; 15.6)	7.7 (3.4; 12.1)	5.9 (-1.5; 13.2)	2.5 (-5.2; 10.2)	9.8 (4.9; 14.7)	6.1 (1.0; 11.2)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup></b>	-7.7 (-10.9; -	-14.0 (-17.4; -10.6)	-4.7 (-8.5; -1.0)	-5.7 (-9.8; -	-6.5 (-9.2; -3.8)	-7.6 (-10.7; -

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

	4.6)			1.5)		4.5)
<b>Mother's age</b>	-2.7 (-5.3; -0.1)	-3.4 (-6.2; -0.6)	-1.9 (-4.6; 0.8)	-4.6 (-7.8; -1.4)	-2.1 (-4.3; 0.1)	-4.8 (-7.3; -2.3)
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time</b>						
Within 1 hour	1	1				
After 1 hour	70.5 (41.3; 99.7)	34.2 (2.7; 65.7)				
<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies	1		1	1	1	1
Female babies	-49.1 (-79.4; -18.7)		-19.5 (-48.5; 9.4)	-37.2 (-66.6; -7.9)	-25.3 (-49.2; -1.4)	-36.2 (-60.2; -12.2)
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1	1	1	1
Completed primary school			-10.2 (-53.9; 33.5)	4.7 (-39.8; 49.3)	-4.9 (-45.1; 35.2)	16.6 (-23.8; 57.0)
Secondary school and further			-76.7 (-108.1; -45.3)	-70.7 (-104.4; -37.1)	-72.7 (-98.7; -46.7)	-54.5 (-82.8; -26.1)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/ cohabiting mothers	1	1			1	
Single mothers	55.6 (21.6; 99.7)	124.9 (89.9; 160.0)				

	89.5)					
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery	1	1	1	1	1	1
C-section delivery	118.5 (86.4; 150.5)	137.0 (102.7; 171.2)	72.6 (6.8; 138.4)	84.4 (18.0; 150.7)	90.8(49.8; 131.8)	104.7 (64.5; 144.9)
<b>Parity</b>						
Primipara	1	1	1	1	1	1
Multipara	66.5 (34.8; 98.3)	125.0 (89.8; 160.3)	47.7 (12.1; 83.2)	57.2 (15.6; 98.8)	54.8 (26.7; 83.0)	65.0 (32.7; 97.3)
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	-48.4 (-77.6; -19.2)	-35.0 (-64.8; -5.3)	39.9 (12.4; 67.4)	47.6 (18.6; 76.7)	22.6 (-60.2; 45.2)	31.9 (8.0; 55.8)

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

1   **Table 3d: Mother’s HIV-1 disease progression according to any breastfeeding duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification**  
2   **presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
		HIV disease progress				
Any breastfeeding duration			1.1 (1.0; 1.2)	1.0 (0.9; 1.1)	1.0 (0.9; 1.0)	1.0 (0.9; 1.0)
Baseline BMI <sup>b</sup>			1.0 (1.0; 1.1)			
Mother’s age				1.0 (1.0; 1.1)	1.0 (0.9; 1.0)	
Breastfeeding initiation time						
Within 1 h	1					
After 1 h						
Child’s gender						
Male babies			1		1	
Female babies			0.8 (0.6; 1.0)		0.8 (0.6; 1.0)	
HIV stage						
HIV stage 1			1	1	1	1

HIV stage>1			4.0 (2.5; 6.2)	4.2 (2.6; 6.6)	4.4 (2.8; 6.7)	4.6 (2.9; 7.3)
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1			1
Completed primary school						1.4 (0.9; 2.0)
Secondary school and further						0.7 (0.5; 0.9)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers			1	1		
Single mothers			1.6 (1.1; 2.2)	1.8 (1.2; 2.6)	1.5 (1.2; 1.9)	
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm			1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm			1.3 (1.0; 1.6)	1.3 (1.0; 1.7)	1.3 (1.0; 1.6)	1.3 (1.0; 1.6)

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 The association between CD4 cells count and EPBF duration was non-significant (5.4 (95%  
2 CI:-0.1; 10.9) and 4.5 (95% CI:-6.2; 15.1) CD4 cells/µl increase per month of EPBF duration  
3 at univariate and multivariate analysis, respectively. The association was significantly  
4 positive between the mothers' baseline BMI, hemoglobin concentration and CD4 cell count  
5 yielding a mean increase of 4.9 (95% CI: 2.1; 7.7) CD4 cells/µl per BMI unit and 19.4 (95%  
6 CI:11.4; 27.4) CD4 cells/µl per each additional unit of hemoglobin throughout the EPBF  
7 period (Table 2b).  
8  
9 There was no significant association between HIV-1 viral load and EPBF duration. The  
10 heavier and older mothers, those who delivered female babies and the best educated  
11 women group had a significantly lower mean viral load in the multivariate analysis. The  
12 mothers allocated to the lopinavir/ritonavir group had a significantly higher mean viral load  
13 than the ones in the Lamivudine arm (Table 2c).  
14  
15 We found no significant association between EPBF duration and HIV-1 disease progression.  
16 However, randomization to the lopinavir/ritonavir arm or being single mother led to a  
17 significantly adjusted odd ratios (AOR) of 1.3 (95% CI: 1.0; 1.6; p=0.04) and 1.6 (95% CI:  
18 1.3; 2.1), respectively (Table 2d).  
19  
20 There was no weight change at univariate and multivariate analysis considering any  
21 breastfeeding duration (Table 3a). Still regarding any breastfeeding, overall, there was a  
22 significant mean increase of 5.7 (95% CI: 0.4; 10.9) CD4 cells/µl per month of any  
23 breastfeeding. We found also that being a single mother was associated with a mean  
24 decrease of -43.3 (95% CI: -72.8; -13.7) CD4 cells/ µl as compared to married ones (Table  
25 3b). Any breastfeeding duration was also associated with a significantly higher mean viral  
26 load (Table 3c). Analysis with any breastfeeding pattern and HIV-1 disease progression  
27 showed the same associations as EPBF and HIV-1 disease progression (Table 3d).  
28  
29 In the stratified analysis, we found that EPBF duration had no influence on mothers' weight,  
30 CD4 count, or HIV viral load, whatever the stratum. HIV disease progression was not  
31 associated either with EPBF duration (Table 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d). In stratum 2, C-section delivery  
32 was associated with an increase in CD4 cell count (Table 2b), whereas delivering a female  
33 baby and being educated beyond secondary school were associated with a decrease in HIV-  
34 1 viral load (Table 2c).  
35  
36 In South Africa, initiating breastfeeding one hour post-delivery and being a single mother  
37 were related to an increase in HIV-1 viral load. In both strata, C-section delivery and



1 multiparity were also related to an increase in HIV-1 viral load. Being randomised to the  
2 lopinavir/ritonavir arm in South Africa was associated with a decrease in HIV-1 viral load,  
3 while being randomised to the lopinavir/ritonavir arm from another country participating in the  
4 trial was associated to an increase in HIV-1 viral load (Table 2c). When it comes to HIV-1  
5 disease progression, being randomised to the lopinavir/ritonavir arm from another country  
6 than South Africa was associated with a more rapid progression of the HIV-1 disease.  
7 However the confidence interval was border-line significant with an adjusted hazard ratio of  
8 1.3 (95% CI: 1.0; 1.7) (Table 2d). There was no association between any breastfeeding and  
9 the mothers' weight, CD4 cells count and HIV-1 disease progression in any of the strata  
10 (Table 3a, 3b, 3d). However, any breastfeeding duration was associated with an increase of  
11 the HIV-1 viral load in South African women (Table 3c).

## 12 13 **DISCUSSION**

14 Considered separately, there appeared to be no variations in the mothers' weight, CD4 cell  
15 count and HIV-1 viral load related to EPBF or any breastfeeding. The same conclusion  
16 applied to these outcomes combined in a composite endpoint representing HIV-1 disease  
17 progression. Unsurprisingly, mothers' baseline BMIs were consistently associated with an  
18 increase in the mothers' weight and CD4 cell count, and with a lower mean HIV-1 viral load  
19 for both EPBF and any breastfeeding groups. Associated also with the study outcomes, but  
20 in an opposite direction, was the allocation of the babies to the lopinavir/ritonavir arm, which  
21 appeared to be associated with an acceleration of the mother's HIV-1 disease progression  
22 and a higher HIV-1 viral load. We do not have any clear explanation for this finding. We think  
23 that this may be due to chance.

24  
25 In a review of the literature on weight change in the postpartum period, there appeared to be  
26 no association between breastfeeding, or generally between the mode of infant feeding, and  
27 postpartum weight loss. However C-section delivery was a risk factor for postpartum weight  
28 loss [28], similar to our findings. South Africa had markedly lower rates of vaginal deliveries  
29 versus other countries (table 1b). In the years 2000, studies were published demonstrating  
30 that elective C-section before the labour and before the rupture of membranes added  
31 protection against HIV transmission to the new born [29 30]. The lower rates of vaginal  
32 deliveries in South Africa was likely due to the country policies (influenced by the scientific  
33 evidence) which supported HIV-infected women toward delivering HIV-free babies. This  
34 support included, free formulas and probably scheduled C-section for the HIV-infected  
35 pregnant women and mothers. Why the rest of the countries did not implement the same  
36 policy is certainly a matter of affordability and availability of local resources. Another reason

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 is that C-section rate is «recklessly high» in South Africa where up to 90% of pregnant  
2 women deliver through this method in private hospitals (The Guardian  
3 <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/sep/24/caesarean-section-south-africa> [Accessed  
4 on 27 October 2017]. This practise may have spilled over but at a lesser extent into public  
5 health facilities. We believe this practice has not skewed our results, since these C-section  
6 deliveries were not medically indicated at first hand, at least not based on a vaginal delivery  
7 risk, then they are not done on women with poorer health status. Actually, South Africa  
8 women had the lowest mean HIV viral load and the highest mean BMI.

9 Yet, this review of literature [28] found that less educated mothers (<12 years of schooling)  
10 were at risk of postpartum weight retention; we found that higher educated women  
11 (secondary school or further) were at risk of that weight retention. This difference in our  
12 finding may be explained by the difference in our categorization of the education variable. In  
13 our study less educated participants included only women with primary school level, meaning  
14 around six years of schooling. Therefore, the results of the two studies are not really  
15 comparable. In a further review of literature on the effects of lactation on the mother's  
16 bodyweight, it is clear that the assumption that the postpartum weight loss is due to the high  
17 energy demand associated with lactation has been challenged by many studies [31]. Some  
18 reports conflict with our own findings, such as the one in KwaZulu Natal, where HIV-1  
19 infected mothers at between 8 and 24 weeks had a mean weight loss of 1.4 kg in contrast to  
20 a 0.4-kg weight gain in HIV-1 uninfected mothers (P=0.01) during breastfeeding [15].

21  
22 Regarding the change in CD4 cells count, the South African data support the conclusion that  
23 CD4 cell count did not differ significantly between women who breastfed and those who did  
24 not [32]. This finding contradicts the Kenyan Study that found that the rate of CD4 cell count  
25 decline was higher in breast-feeding than in non-breast-feeding mothers [13]. However, in  
26 that Kenyan study, HIV-1 RNA levels did not differ significantly between breast-feeding and  
27 formula-feeding mothers.

28 Regarding HIV-1 disease progression, the same data showed no deleterious effect of  
29 breastfeeding in HIV-1-infected mothers, similar to our study-findings. The outcome variables  
30 were the CD4 and CD8 cell count, the mothers' illness and mortality, and their hemoglobin  
31 levels [32]. Another study from Malawi reached the same conclusion that breastfeeding was  
32 not associated with higher risk of maternal morbidity or mortality [33]. A study in Zambia  
33 concluded in the same direction that at 12 months after delivery, there was no difference in  
34 mortality between women who breastfed for a short duration (4 months) versus those who  
35 breastfed for a duration of their own choice [17]. An individual patient data meta-analysis on  
36 mortality among HIV-1 infected mothers according to children's feeding modality confirmed  
37 that the risk of dying within 18 months postpartum was not significantly affected by the

infants' feeding modality (i.e. ever versus never breastfed) [34].

In healthy breastfeeding mothers, the postpartum weight loss would be around 0.5 kg per month among population with relatively high mean of BMI. The mechanism of the weight loss would be burning of 483 -538 kcal per day [35 36]. Therefore, losing weight after birth is likely when the mother's calorie intake does not cover the calorie expense related to breast-milk production. Considering these findings, we think that energy requirement and thus the metabolic stress related to breastfeeding would be quite bearable. This may explain why in our study HIV-1-infected, immune-competent and breastfeeding mothers health status was not deteriorated by breastfeeding. This evidence inspires the idea that option A peri-exposure antiretroviral prophylaxis might still have pertinent indications since breastfeeding remained the most frequent feeding option in Sub Saharan Africa and since breast-milk might still host HIV-1 reservoirs that mother's prophylaxis could not always 100% suppress [37].

### Strengths and limitations

Our study has been implemented in four countries in Africa, including Burkina Faso (West), South Africa and Zambia (South) and Uganda (East). Therefore we consider our study population representative of the Sub-Sahara African population. The data were also collected in the rigorous context of a clinical trial, which minimized the lost to follow-up, the missing data as well as other data collection errors, and therefore improved the quality of our data.

However, the selection associated with the environment of a clinical trial - usually quite different from a routine environment - may have biased our findings. Nonetheless, our endpoints (mother's weight, CD4 cell count and HIV-1 viral load) were sufficiently robust for us to vouch for their validity. Another point of note is the stratification of the participants into two strata, i.e. South Africa versus Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia. This stratification reduced the sample size in South Africa. Thus some of the modelling for South Africa could be less rigorous, and the findings regarding the risk factors there may not truly reflect the reality.

### CONCLUSION

Breastfeeding as far as this study can conclude was not a risk factor for the HIV-1 infected mothers weight, CD4 cell count, and HIV-1 viral load change, or HIV-1 disease progression, keeping in mind that all the participants had a baseline CD4 cell count >350 cells/ul. The mothers' baseline high weight and high hemoglobin concentration were important factors in being consistently associated with an improvement of the outcome variables at stake. A higher education level was also a factor associated with a slower HIV-1 disease progression.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 Considering the benefits of breast milk for infants, and the consensus results from different  
2 studies elsewhere that breastfeeding does not harm HIV-1-infected mothers, this study also  
3 supports the WHO 2016 guidelines on infant feeding, which indicates that mothers living with  
4 HIV should breastfeed for at least 12 months and up to 24 months, provided that the right  
5 treatment or prophylaxis for the infection is given where formula feeding is unsafe [12].

6  
7 **Acknowledgments**

8 We would like to thank all the mothers who agreed to be part of the trial together with their  
9 children. Our acknowledgments also go to the different ANRS 12174 site staffs for their  
10 dedicated effort in this research. We are also very grateful to the University of Bergen and  
11 the Centre for International Health for providing the infrastructure, and the needed  
12 supervision and training. We also thank the UMR 1058, pathogenesis and control of chronic  
13 infections, Montpellier, France, from which we received invaluable support regarding data  
14 management. The final typescript has been improved through the help of BioMedES Ltd, UK  
15 ([www.biomedes.co.uk](http://www.biomedes.co.uk)).

16  
17  
18 **Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

19  
20 **Funding:** This study used data collected in the context of the ANRS 12174 clinical trial  
21 funded by the French National Institute of Health and Medical Research - National Agency  
22 for Research on AIDS and Viral Hepatitis (Inserm-ANRS), the European and Developing  
23 Countries Clinical Trials Partnership (EDCTP; grant number CT.2006.33020.004), the  
24 Research Council of Norway (GlobVac grant number 183600), and the Total Foundation.  
25 NES benefited from a PhD grant from the Norwegian Quota Scheme. The funders had no  
26 role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the  
27 manuscript.

28  
29 **Data Availability Statement:** The study sponsor (the French agency for research on HIV  
30 and viral hepatitis: ANRS) offers data sharing upon request. ANRS will be the contact  
31 organisation ([direction@anrs.fr](mailto:direction@anrs.fr)). The shared data will be those presented in the article.

32  
33 **Contributorship statement:**

34 Conceptualization: ENS, IMSE, NN, NM, PVP, TT.  
35 Data curation: ENS, RV.  
36 Formal analysis: ENS, IMSE.  
37 Investigation: ENS, MS, NM, JKT, CK, JGH.

Methodology: ENS, IMSE, TT.  
 Project administration: NN, PVP, TT, NM.  
 Resources: TT, IMSE.  
 Supervision: TT, IMSE, NM, NN.  
 Validation: TT, IMSE, NM, NN.  
 Writing the original draft: ENS, IMSE.  
 Writing and review and editing: ENS, IMSE, NN, NM, TT, RV, CK, JKT, JGH, MS, KH

## References

1. UNAIDS. Core epidemiology. UNAIDS July 2015; [http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2015/20150714\\_coreepidemiology\\_slides\\_ppt](http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2015/20150714_coreepidemiology_slides_ppt); Accessed 11 Nov 2015:12
2. UNAIDS. Global AIDS update 2016. UNAIDS [\[http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2016/Global-AIDS-update-2016\]](http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2016/Global-AIDS-update-2016) Accessed on 17th October 2016 2016:16
3. Eaton JW, Rehle TM, Jooste S, et al. Recent HIV prevalence trends among pregnant women and all women in sub-Saharan Africa: implications for HIV estimates. *AIDS* 2014;**28** [suppl 4]:8 doi: 10.1097/QAD.0000000000000412[published Online First: Epub Date]].
4. Younas M, Psomas C, Reynes J, et al. Immune activation in the course of HIV-1 infection: Causes, phenotypes and persistence under therapy. *HIV Medicine* 2016;**17**:17 doi: 10.1111/hiv.12310[published Online First: Epub Date]].
5. Julie A, Jacob M. Men with HIV age faster according to DNA methylation study. *JAMA* 2016;**316**(2):2
6. Zevin A, McKinnon L, Burgener A, et al. Microbial translocation and microbiome dysbiosis in HIV-associated immune activation. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS* 2016;**11**(2):17 doi: 10.1097/COH.0000000000000234[published Online First: Epub Date]].
7. DeVaughn S, Müller-Oehring E, Markey B, et al. Aging with HIV-1 Infection: Motor Functions, Cognition, and Attention – A Comparison with Parkinson’s Disease. *Neuropsychol Rev* 2015;**25**:16 doi: 10.1007/s11065-015-9305-x[published Online First: Epub Date]].
8. World Health Organization. Antiretroviral therapy for HIV infection in adults and adolescents: Recommendations for a public health approach [2006 revision]. World Health Organization 2006:134
9. Koyanagi A, Humphrey JH, Moulton LH, et al. Predictive value of weight loss on mortality of HIV-positive mothers in a prolonged breastfeeding setting. *AIDS research and human retroviruses* 2011;**27**(11):1141-8 doi: 10.1089/AID.2010.0293[published Online First: Epub Date]].
10. Zaba B, Calvert C, Marston M, et al. Effect of HIV infection on pregnancy-related mortality in sub-Saharan Africa: secondary analyses of pooled community-based data from the network for Analysing Longitudinal Population-based HIV/AIDS data on Africa (ALPHA). *The Lancet* 2013;**381**(9879):1763-71 doi: 10.1016/s0140-6736(13)60803-x[published Online First: Epub Date]].
11. Guttmacher institute. HIV Linked to Many Pregnancy-Related Deaths In Sub-Saharan Africa \_ Guttmacher Institute.pdf. International perspective on sexual and reproductive health 2013;**39**(2):4
12. World Health Organization, United Nations Children’s Fund. Guideline: updates on HIV and infant feeding: the duration of breastfeeding, and support from health services to improve feeding



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

practices among mothers living with HIV. Geneva: World Health Organization 2016

13. Otieno PA, Brown ER, Mbori-Ngacha DA, et al. HIV-1 disease progression in breast-feeding and formula-feeding mothers: a prospective 2-year comparison of T cell subsets, HIV-1 RNA levels, and mortality. *J Infect Dis* 2007;**195**(2):220-9 doi: 10.1086/510245[published Online First: Epub Date]].

14. Nduati R, Richardson B, John G, et al. Effect of breastfeeding on mortality among HIV-1 infected women: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 2001;**357**:1651–55 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(00)04820-0[published Online First: Epub Date]].

15. Papathakis P, Van Loan M, Rollins N, et al. Body Composition Changes During Lactation in HIV-Infected and HIV-Uninfected South African Women. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2006;**43**:8

16. Sedgh G, Spiegelman D, Larsen U, et al. Breastfeeding and maternal HIV-1 disease progression and mortality. *AIDS* 2004;**18**:1043–49 doi: 10.1097/01.aids.0000125943.42948.98[published Online First: Epub Date]].

17. Kuhn L, Kasonde P, Sinkala M, et al. Prolonged breast-feeding and mortality up to two years postpartum among HIV-positive women in Zambia. *AIDS* 2005;**19**:1677–81

18. Winkvist A, Rasmussen K, and Lissner L. Associations between reproduction and maternal body weight: examining the component parts of a full reproductive cycle. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2003;**57**:14

19. Murnane PM, Arpadi SM, Sinkala M, et al. Lactation-associated postpartum weight changes among HIV-infected women in Zambia. *International journal of epidemiology* 2010;**39**(5):1299-310 doi: 10.1093/ije/dyq065[published Online First: Epub Date]].

20. Ladner J, Castetbon K, Leroy V, et al. Pregnancy, body weight and human immunodeficiency virus infection in African women: a prospective cohort study in Kigali (Rwanda), 1992-1994. *International journal of epidemiology* 1998;**27**:6

21. Hartmann P, Sherriff J, and Mitoulas L. Homeostatic Mechanisms that Regulate Lactation during Energetic Stress. *J. Nutr.* 1998;**128**:6

22. Somé E, Engebretsen I, Nagot N, et al. <R\_BreastfeedingandBMI\_Main\_ENSOME\_WithoutTrackChange.pdf>. *PloS one* 2017

23. Nagot N, Kankasa C, Meda N, et al. Lopinavir/Ritonavir versus Lamivudine peri-exposure prophylaxis to prevent HIV-1 transmission by breastfeeding: the PROMISE-PEP trial Protocol ANRS 12174. *BMC Infect. Dis* 2012;**12**:246 doi: 10.1186/1471-2334-12-246[published Online First: Epub Date]].

24. Nagot N, Kankasa C, Tumwine J, et al. Extended pre-exposure prophylaxis with lopinavir–ritonavir versus lamivudine to prevent HIV-1 transmission through breastfeeding up to 50 weeks in infants in Africa (ANRS 12174): a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet* 2015;**14**(04841):8 doi: 10.1016/pii[published Online First: Epub Date]].

25. ANRS. ANRS scale to grade the severity of adverse events in adults; version n° 1.0 4 November 2008. file:///C:/Users/install/Downloads/ANRS-GradeEI-V1-En-2008.pdf ; Accessed 14 Jan 2016 2008:10

26. Becquet R, Bland R, Leroy V, et al. Duration, pattern of breastfeeding and postnatal transmission of HIV: pooled analysis of individual data from West and South African cohorts. . *PloS one* 2009;**4**(10):e7397 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0007397[published Online First: Epub Date]].

27. Somé E, Engebretsen I, Nagot N, et al. Breastfeeding patterns and its determinants among mothers living with Human Immuno-deficiency Virus -1 in four African countries participating in the ANRS 12174 trial. *International breastfeeding journal* 2017:12 doi: 10.1186/s13006-017-0112-2[published Online First: Epub Date]].

28. Crowell D. Weight change in the postpartum period: a review of the Literature. *J Nurse Midwifery* 1995;**40**(5):6

29. Maguire A, Sánchez E, Fortuny C, et al. Potential risk factors for vertical HIV-1 transmission in Catalonia, Spain: the protective role of cesarean section. *AIDS* 1997;**11**:1851–57

30. Kind C, Rudin C, Siegrist C, et al. Prevention of vertical HIV transmission: additive protective effect of elective Cesarean section and zidovudine prophylaxis. *AIDS* 1998;**12**:205–10

- 1 31. Rogers I, Golding J, Emmett P. The effects of lactation on the mother. *Early Hum Dev* 1997;**49**:13
- 2 32. Coutsooudis A, Coovadia H, Pillay K, et al. Are HIV-infected women who breastfeed at increased
- 3 risk of mortality? *AIDS* 2001;**15**(5):3
- 4 33. Taha T, Kumwenda N, Hoover D, et al. The impact of breastfeeding on the health of HIV-positive
- 5 mothers and their children in sub-Saharan Africa. *Bull World Health Organ* 2006;**84**:546-54
- 6 34. Breastfeeding and HIV International Transmission Study Group. Mortality Among HIV-1–Infected
- 7 Women According to Children’s Feeding Modality
- 8 An Individual Patient Data Meta-Analysis. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2005;**39**:9
- 9 35. IOM. Dietary reference intakes for energy, carbohydrate, fiber, fat, fatty acids,
- 10 cholesterol, protein and amino acids. Micronutrients IoMPo, editor. Institute of Medicine, Food and
- 11 Nutrition Board: National Academies Press 2005:1-1357
- 12 36. Lovelady C. Balancing intake and output: food v. exercise; Balancing exercise and food intake with
- 13 lactation to promote post-partum weight loss. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*
- 14 2011;**70**:181 -84 doi: 10.1017/S002966511100005X[published Online First: Epub Date] | .
- 15 37. Van de Perre P, Rubbo P, Viljoen J, et al. HIV-1 reservoirs in breast milk and challenges to
- 16 elimination of breast-feeding transmission of HIV-1. *Sci Transl Med*. 2012;**4**(143):14
- 17
- 18



STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract: <b>YES ; page 1 row 3</b> (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found: <b>YES; page2 row 8-28</b>
<b>Introduction</b>		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported: <b>YES; page 3 row 23-37 ; page 4 row 1-8</b>
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses: <b>YES; page 4 row 10-13</b>
<b>Methods</b>		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper: <b>YES page 4 row 10-34</b>
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection: <b>YES page 4 row 17-18</b>
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up: <b>YES page 4 row 20-22 and row 30-32</b> (b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable: <b>YES page 5 row 19-35</b>
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group: <b>YES page 5 row 10-18 and 35-37 ; page 6 row 1-2</b>
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias: <b>YES page 6 row 2-11</b>
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at: <b>YES page 6 row 30-35</b>
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why: <b>YES page 6 row 15-17</b>
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding: <b>YES page 6 row 3-17</b> (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions: <b>YES page 6 row 6-8 and 11-15</b> (c) Explain how missing data were addressed: <b>YES page page 6 row 5-6 and 32-34</b> (d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <b>YES page 6 row 5-6</b> (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses: <b>page page 6 row 11-15</b>
<b>Results</b>		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed: <b>YES; page 6 row 30-35</b> (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage: <b>YES; page 6 row 30-35</b> (c) Consider use of a flow diagram: <b>YES; page 6 row 35</b>
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders: <b>YES tables 1a and 1b</b> (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest: <b>Yes page 6 row 31-35</b> (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) <b>YES (mean EPBF</b>

**and any breastfeeding) table 1a**

Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time <b>NO</b>
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included: <b>YES tables 2 and 3</b>
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized: <b>YES table 1b (mothers' age)</b>
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period: <b>not relevant</b>
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses: <b>YES page 6 row 11-17</b>
<b>Discussion</b>		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives: <b>YES page 28 row 14-23</b>
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias: <b>YES page 30 row 21-28</b>
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence: <b>YES page 30 row 25-28 and 32-34</b>
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results: <b>YES page 30 row 16-20</b>
<b>Other information</b>		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based: <b>YES page 31 row 20-27</b>

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at <http://www.strobe-statement.org>.

# BMJ Open

## HIV-1 disease progression in immune-competent HIV-1 infected and breastfeeding mothers participating in the ANRS12174 clinical trial in Burkina Faso, South Africa, Uganda and Zambia: a cohort study

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2017-019239.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Dec-2017
Complete List of Authors:	<p>SOME, Eric; Institut de Recherche en Sciences de la Santé (IRSS), Département biomédical et santé publique; Universitetet i Bergen Institutt for indremedisin, Centre for International Health</p> <p>Engelbrechtsen, Ingunn; Universitetet i Bergen Institutt for indremedisin, Centre for International Health</p> <p>Nagot, Nicolas; Université Montpellier, INSERM, Pathogenesis and control of chronic infections, Université Montpellier, INSERM, Etablissement français du sang (EFS), CHU Montpellier</p> <p>MEDA, Nicolas; University of Ouagadougou, Faculty of Health Sciences; Centre MURAZ</p> <p>Vallo, Roselyne; Université Montpellier, INSERM, Pathogenesis and control of chronic infections, Université Montpellier, INSERM, Etablissement français du sang (EFS), CHU Montpellier</p> <p>Kankasa, Chipepo; University of Zambia School of Medicine, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health</p> <p>Tumwine, James; Makerere University, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health</p> <p>Singata-Madliki, Mandisa; East London Hospital Complex, Effective Care Research Unit (ECRU)</p> <p>Harper, Kim; University of Fort Hare, Effective Care Research Unit</p> <p>Hofmeyr, G Justus ; University of Fort Hare, Effective Care Research Unit</p> <p>Van de Perre, Philippe; Université Montpellier, Pathogenesis and control of chronic infections, Université Montpellier, INSERM, Etablissement français du sang (EFS), CHU Montpellier</p> <p>Tylleskär, Thorkild; Universitetet i Bergen Institutt for indremedisin</p>
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Infectious diseases
Secondary Subject Heading:	Nutrition and metabolism, Epidemiology
Keywords:	HIV & AIDS < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, Tropical medicine < INFECTIOUS DISEASES, NUTRITION & DIETETICS



For peer review only

BMJ Open: first published as 10.1136/bmjopen-2017-019239 on 5 April 2018. Downloaded from <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/> on March 20, 2024 by guest. Protected by copyright.

# **HIV-1 disease progression in immune-competent HIV-1 infected and breastfeeding mothers participating in the ANRS12174 clinical trial in Burkina Faso, South Africa, Uganda and Zambia: a cohort study**

Eric N. Somé<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Ingunn M. S. Engebretsen<sup>1</sup>, Nicolas Nagot<sup>3</sup>, Nicolas Meda<sup>6</sup>, Roselyne Vallo<sup>3</sup>, Chipepo Kankasa<sup>7</sup>, James K. Tumwine<sup>8</sup>, Mandisa Singata<sup>9</sup>, Kim Harper<sup>9</sup>, G. Justus Hofmeyr<sup>9</sup>, Philippe Van de Perre<sup>3</sup>, Thorkild Tylleskär<sup>1</sup> for the ANRS 12174 Trial Group

<sup>1</sup>Centre for International Health, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway

<sup>2</sup>National Health Research Institute, Centre National pour la Recherche Scientifique et Technologique, Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

<sup>3</sup>Pathogenesis and control of chronic infections, Université Montpellier, INSERM, Etablissement français du sang (EFS), CHU Montpellier, Montpellier, France

<sup>6</sup>University of Ouagadougou, Faculty of Health Sciences, Centre de Recherche International en Santé (CRIS) Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso

<sup>7</sup>University of Zambia, School of Medicine, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health, University Teaching Hospital, Lusaka, Zambia

<sup>8</sup>Makerere University, Department of Paediatrics and Child Health, School of Medicine, College of Health Sciences, Kampala, Uganda

<sup>9</sup>University of Fort Hare, Effective Care Research Unit, Eastern Cape, South Africa

## **\*Corresponding author:**

E-mail: [eric.nsome@gmail.com](mailto:eric.nsome@gmail.com) (ENS)

10 BP 250 Ouagadougou 10 Burkina Faso

Tel: +226 78 84 95 74

<sup>^</sup>Membership of the ANRS 12174 Trial Group (PROMISE PEP Consortium) is provided in the Acknowledgments

Words count: 3097

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Abstract**

**Objective**

We have assessed HIV-1 disease progression among HIV-1 positive mothers in relation to duration of any or exclusive breastfeeding in the context of ANRS12174 trial (clinical trial no NCT0064026).

**Methods**

The analysis was completed on 203, 212, 272 and 529 HIV-1-positive and lactating mothers with CD4 count >350 cell/µl from Burkina Faso, South Africa, Uganda and Zambia, respectively. The trial compared Lamivudine and Lopinavir/Ritonavir as a peri-exposure prophylaxis during a 50-week follow-up time. A multiple logistic regression model was run with the mothers' weight, CD4 count and HIV-1 viral load as separate dependent variables, then combined into a dependent composite end-point called HIV-1 disease progression where HIV-1 viral load was replaced by the HIV-1 clinical stage. Exclusive or predominant breastfeeding and any breastfeeding duration were the key explanatory variables.

**Results**

In the adjusted model, the associations between EPBF duration and weight change, CD4 cell count and the HIV-1 viral load were consistently insignificant. The CD4 cell count was associated with a significantly higher mothers' body mass index (BMI; a mean increase of 4.9 (95% CI: 2.1; 7.7) CD4 cells/µl per each additional kilogram per square meter of BMI) and hemoglobin concentration (19.4 (95% CI: 11.4; 27.4) CD4 cells/µl per each additional gram per decilitre of hemoglobin concentration). There was no significant association between EPBF duration and HIV-1 disease progression. A higher education level was a factor associated with a slower HIV-1 disease progression

**Conclusion**

Breastfeeding was not a risk factor for a faster progression of HIV-1 disease in mothers of this cohort with a baseline CD4 cell count >350 cells/µl.

**Keywords:** HIV-1 infection; breastfeeding; Sub Saharan Africa

**Strengths and limitations of this study**

- Our study has been implemented in 4 Countries in Africa, namely Burkina Faso (West), South Africa and Zambia (South), and Uganda (East), which made our

- sample representative of the wider Sub-Sahara African population.
- The data were collected in the context of a rigorous clinical trial, which minimized the lost to follow-up, the missing data as well as other data collection errors, and therefore improved the quality of our data.
  - However, the selection associated with the environment of a clinical trial, usually quite different from a routine environment, may have biased our findings.
  - Nonetheless, the variables analysed separately as dependent variables or as part of our composite end-points (mother's weight, CD4 cell count, HIV-1 viral load or HIV-1 clinical stage) were sufficiently robust and had a high validity.

## INTRODUCTION

In 2015, 36.7 [34.0-39.8] million people were infected with HIV. Among them 17.4 [16.1-20.0] million were women of childbearing age [1 2]. HIV-1 prevalence is estimated between 5.3 and 6.5% among pregnant women in Sub-Saharan Africa [3]. Because of the almost irreversible immune activation involved, HIV-1 infection creates a condition of metabolic stress that may result in wasting and immune depression [4-7]. Ten per cent weight loss and a CD4 count of <350 cells/ $\mu$ l in the context of HIV-1 infection have been recognized as major criteria of the diagnosis of AIDS [8]. This weight loss is also associated with a higher risk of mortality in HIV-1-infected breastfeeding mothers [9]. Furthermore, HIV-1 is a major cause of maternal mortality in affected countries in Southern Africa. About 25% of pregnancy-related deaths in Sub-Saharan Africa are attributable to HIV [10], and 88% of deaths among pregnant and postpartum women with HIV infection are attributable to the virus [11].

In women, pregnancy is, though a physiological condition, a period of increased metabolic activities and synthesis requiring a supplement of energy and nutrients. After delivery, breastfeeding prolongs the increased metabolic demands. In spite of this, WHO still recommends HIV-1-infected women to breastfeed as the best choice for the infant and the mother [12] in contexts where replacement feeding does not meet AFASS (affordable, feasible, available, safe and sustainable) criteria.

There have been conflicting results on assessment of the impact of breastfeeding in HIV-1-infected mothers. Some studies found that breastfeeding was harmful to HIV-positive mothers by either accelerating HIV disease progression as assessed by the mother's weight loss, a decrease in CD4 cells count, or even an increased risk of maternal mortality, suggesting that metabolic, immunologic or hormonal changes associated with breastfeeding may accelerate HIV-1 disease progression in postpartum mothers [13-15]. Others found no effect on the mothers' health assessed by death, development of a low CD4 cell count,



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 anaemia or excessive weight loss [16 17]. Some studies have found breastfeeding  
2 protective, allowing weight gain in HIV-1 infected breastfeeding mothers [15 18-22].

3  
4 In the ANRS12174 trial, we assessed mothers' HIV-1 disease progression (measured by the  
5 change in weight, CD4 cells count and HIV-1 disease stage as per WHO classification) in  
6 relation to exclusive breastfeeding or duration of any breastfeeding during the infant first 6  
7 months of life and until week 50 post-partum.

8  
9 **METHODS**

10 **Study design**

11 The ANRS 12174 clinical trial in Ouagadougou (Burkina Faso), East London (South  
12 Africa), Mbale (Uganda) and Lusaka (Zambia) was conducted from 2009 to 2013. The  
13 protocol and the main outcome have been published [23 24]. Briefly, a cohort of HIV-1  
14 infected, pregnant women, at the time not eligible for highly active antiretroviral therapy  
15 because CD4 count was >350 cells/ $\mu$ l, aged 18 or above, planning to breastfeed were  
16 identified from antenatal clinics between 28 and 40 weeks of amenorrhea. As part of the  
17 HIV post-test counselling session, they were informed on the different feeding options for  
18 their babies. Only women intending to breastfeed were referred to the research clinic for  
19 further assessment of the inclusion criteria during the antenatal period and again with their  
20 child within 6 days after birth, for an enrolment and randomisation at day 7 postpartum.  
21 From 28 weeks of pregnancy to day 7 after birth, programmatic mother to child  
22 transmission prophylaxis was implemented with antepartum zidovudine, intrapartum  
23 single dose nevirapine and zidovudine-lamivudine for mothers and nevirapine for infants  
24 for 7 days postpartum. Twins and triplets, infants with positive HIV-1 DNA PCR test result  
25 at day 7 (+/- 2 days) postpartum, low birth-weight or ill babies (ranked grade II or above of  
26 the ANRS classification for adverse events) were excluded [25]. The intervention provided  
27 an infant prophylaxis in the breastfeeding period plus one week from day 7 to 50 weeks of  
28 age with either lopinavir/ritonavir or lamivudine.

29  
30 **Data management and analysis**

31 Data was collected on a paper case-report form or directly entered online using the  
32 Electronic Data capture system: OpenClinica™ ([www.openclinica.com](http://www.openclinica.com)). Twenty-four hour  
33 and one week breastfeeding recalls were collected during the enrolment visit at day 7 $\pm$ 2  
34 days after birth and the 13 monthly-scheduled follow-up visits that started at week 2.  
35 During these visits, mothers were asked in particular if they gave their infants other  
36 foods/liquids as well as breastmilk. Prelacteal feeding data - defined as any food item



except mothers' milk given to infants before initial breastfeeding - were also collected at the enrolment visit.

The mothers at each visit were categorized into the following groups: 1) exclusive breastfeeding, EBF (only breastmilk being given to the infant without any other food or liquid, except medically prescribed drugs or vitamins); 2) predominant breastfeeding, PBF (breastmilk with some liquid-based food, such as juice, tea, sugar-water and salt-water, including glucose without any kind of formula, or animal milk); and 3) mixed feeding, MF (breastmilk with other solid or liquid-based food, including other kinds of milk). We thereafter combined EBF and PBF into one group called "exclusive or predominant breastfeeding" (EPBF) as PBF presented few cases and was assessed as having much the same risk as EBF, at least with regard to postnatal HIV transmission [26].

During the follow-up visits, the mothers underwent a clinical assessment, including weight measurement and HIV-1 infection staging at the first screening visit or screening one (between 28 and 40 weeks of gestation), day 7 post-partum, weeks 26 and 50; CD4 cell count analysis at screening one, weeks 26 and 50; and HIV-1 viral load at screening one, day 7, weeks 6, 14, 26, 38 and 50. The dependant variables were mothers' weight, CD4 cell count and HIV-1 viral load considered separately and measured at the same time points as per above. We generated a new variable called "weight loss", which was calculated as the mothers' weight at W26 (because of missing data, mothers' weights were not available for week 50) minus the baseline weight at day 7 postpartum, which was compared to the baseline weight to assess if the loss had reached 10%. Furthermore, we combined CD4 cell count, mothers' weight loss and HIV-1 disease stage as per WHO classification to create the composite endpoint called "HIV-1 disease progression". HIV-1 disease progression was accelerated when CD4 cell count decreased to  $<350$  Cells/ $\mu$ l, or the HIV-1 infection was assessed by the trial physician at stage 3 or above, or the mothers lost  $>10\%$  of their weight; otherwise, HIV-1 disease progression was deemed absent or slow. Our main independent variable was EPBF (until week 26 post-partum) or any breastfeeding (until week 50 post-partum) duration. The data were collected by trained physicians, pharmacists, biologists and counsellors. Seca-brand scales and stadiometers were used to measure the mother's height and weight. Weights were rounded to the nearest 10 grams and the height to the nearest millimetre. Weight and height were measured twice based on the WHO guidelines (<http://www.who.int/childgrowth/training/en/>).

We first ran linear mixed-effect models that considered separately the mothers' weight, CD4 cell count and HIV-1 viral load changes as dependant variables, and EPBF or any breastfeeding as key independent variables. The lost to follow up were censored in a survival analysis completed to build the EPBF and any breastfeeding variables [27]. When the inter-country variability was not significant, a linear multivariate regression analysis was run. We

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

ran a logistic regression regarding the composite endpoint. Adjustment covariates included baseline variables measured at the screening one visit (BMI, education level, marital status, hemoglobin concentration) or on day 7 postpartum (mode of delivery, breastfeeding initiation time, the baby's gender, and the trial arm). These multivariate analyses were run taking all participants together and also as 2 strata comprising South African mothers (stratum 1) and Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia together (stratum 2) because South Africa presented important socio-economic, cultural and demographic differences compared with the other countries. For continuous variables, the mean values with 95% confidence interval (CI) were estimated, and for categorical variables, percentages were used. Associations between variables were tested using the Chi-square test for categorical variables. STATA/SE 13.1 statistical software has been used for the analyses.

**Ethics**

Prior to enrolment, the mothers signed a written informed consent and assent forms for themselves and their children, respectively. The trial was conducted according to the sponsor (ANRS) ethic charter, Good Clinical Practices and the principles of the Helsinki declaration. The protocol had obtained approval from the relevant ethical committees, including the Ethical Committee for Health Research in Burkina Faso (EC N° 2008-039), the Biomedical Research Ethics Committee in Zambia (EC N° 008-02-08), the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology (EC N° HS470), the Stellenbosch University ethical committees and the Medicines Control Council in South Africa (EC N° 20090938).

**RESULTS**

In the ANRS 12174 trial, 1,273 mother-infant pairs were randomized and 6 were excluded due to protocol violations. Of the remaining 1,267 participants, 204 were from Ouagadougou, 222 from East London, 278 from Mbale and 563 from Lusaka. In all, 42 were excluded from analysis due to lack of breastfeeding data after inclusion, 7 due to inaccurate feeding duration data and 2 women had no data on weights. The analysis included 1,216 subjects. The complete flow chart has been published elsewhere [27]. The mean baseline weight, the percentage of educated and employed women was highest, and the mean EPBF and any breastfeeding durations shortest in South Africa where the HIV-1 viral load was also the lowest (Table 1a and 1b).

1 **Table 1:**

2 Table 1a: Baseline characteristics collected at screening one or on day 7 postpartum and breastfeeding duration data (continuous variables)

	Burkina Faso	South Africa	Uganda	Zambia	All sites
	N=203	N=212	N=272	N=529	N=1216
	Mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)	mean (95% CI)
<b>Mean duration of AZT regimen post-delivery (days)<sup>a</sup></b>	6.6 (6.5; 6.8)	7 (7.0; 7.0)	6.8 (6.7; 6.9)	7.0 (6.9; 7.0)	6.9 (6.8; 7.0)
<b>Mean duration 3TC regimen post-delivery (days)<sup>a</sup></b>	6.6 (6.5; 6.8)	Data not available	6.7 (6.6; 6.8)	7.0 (6.9; 7.0)	6.8 (6.8; 6.9)
<b>Mean baseline CD4 count*10<sup>2</sup>cel/μl</b>	5.6 (5.4; 5.8)	5.5 (5.3;5.7)	5.6 (5.4; 5.8)	6.0 (5.8;6.2)	5.8 (5.7; 5.9)
<b>Mean baseline viral load*10<sup>3</sup> copies/μl</b>	23.0 (7.3; 38.7)	13.5 (7.5; 19.6)	34.9 (19.7; 50.0)	29.1 (21.5; 36.6)	26.4 (21.1; 31.8)
<b>Baseline mothers' weight (kg)</b>	62.9 (61.4; 64.5)	72.1 (70.0; 74.1)	58.1 (57.0; 59.2)	62.0 (61.0; 62.9)	63.0 (62.3; 63.7)
<b>Mean EPBF duration (months)</b>	6.3 (6.2; 6.4)	4.8 (4.7; 4.9)	5.6 (5.5; 5.7)	6.0 (5.9; 6.1)	5.8 (5.7; 5.9)
<b>Mean breastfeeding duration (months)</b>	10.5 (10.4; 10.6)	6.7 (6.6; 6.8)	8.4 (8.3; 8.5)	8.4 (8.3; 8.5)	8.4 (8.3; 8.5)

<sup>a</sup> AZT and 3TC are usually administered together. However in our data collection tool (the questionnaire), the investigators had to ask specifically and separately the question for AZT and 3TC. We suspect that they may have been some reporting errors, creating slight differences in the percentages of women who complied with the prophylaxis requirements.

7

1 Table 1b: Baseline characteristics collected at screening one or on day 7 postpartum and breastfeeding duration data (categorical variables).

	Burkina Faso	South Africa	Uganda	Zambia	All sites
	N=203	N=212	N=272	N=529	N=1216
	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)	% (95% CI)
<b>Mother's age group (years)</b>					
Below 25	26.2 (20.5; 32.6)	34.4 (28.3; 41.1)	39.3 (33.7; 45.3)	37.8 (33.8; 42.0)	35.6 (33.0; 38.3)
25 – 30	36.9 (30.6; 43.8)	31.2 (25.2; 37.7)	35.7 (30.2; 41.5)	33.1 (29.2; 37.2)	34.0 (31.3; 36.7)
30 and above	36.9 (30.6; 43.8)	34.4 (28.3; 41.1)	25.0 (20.2; 30.5)	29.1 (25.4; 33.1)	30.4 (27.9; 33.1)
<b>HIV stage 1</b>	93.1 (88.7; 95.9)	98.6 (95.7; 99.5)	92.3 (88.4; 94.9)	99.8 (98.7; 100.0)	96.8 (95.6; 97.6)
<b>Education</b>					
Uncomplete primary school	68.5 (61.7; 74.5)	8.5 (5.4; 13.1)	48.5 (42.6; 54.5)	28.2 (24.5; 32.2)	36.0 (33.4 ; 0.38.8)
Completed primary school	7.4 (4.5; 11.9)	0.5 (0.1; 3.3)	15.8 (11.9; 20.6)	18.5 (15.4; 22.1)	12.9 (11.1; 14.9)
Secondary school and more	24.1 (18.7; 30.5)	91.0 (86.4; 94.2)	35.7 (30.2; 41.5)	53.3 (49.0; 57.5)	51.1 (48.2; 53.9)
<b>Marital status (married)</b>	90.6 (85.8; 94.0)	39.1 (32.8; 45.9)	82.0 (76.9; 86.1)	88.7 (85.7; 91.1)	78.9 (76.5; 81.1)
<b>Occupation (employed)</b>	8.9 (5.6; 13.6)	41.5 (35.0; 48.3)	35.3 (29.8; 41.2)	17.0 (14.0; 20.5)	24.0 (21.7; 26.5)
<b>Primipara</b>	21.7 (16.5; 27.9)	33.5 (27.4; 40.1)	18.0 (13.9; 23.0)	20.6 (17.4; 24.3)	22.4 (20.2; 24.9)
<b>Vaginal delivery</b>	93.6 (89.3; 96.2)	65.1 (58.4; 71.2)	93.4 (89.7; 95.8)	96.2 (94.2; 97.5)	89.7 (87.9; 91.3)
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time (within one hour)</b>	6.9 (4.1; 11.3)	51.4 (44.7; 58.1)	55.9 (49.9; 61.7)	80.7 (77.1; 83.9)	57.7 (54.9; 60.5)
<b>Lamivudine arm</b>	49.7 (42.9; 56.6)	51.9 (45.1; 58.6)	49.6 (43.7; 55.6)	50.3 (46.0; 54.5)	50.3 (47.5; 53.1)
<b>Female baby</b>	41.9 (35.2; 48.8)	49.1 (42.4; 55.8)	52.9 (46.0; 58.8)	48.4 (44.1; 52.7)	48.4 (45.6; 51.2)

Overall in the adjusted model, the association between EPBF duration and weight change was negative and non-significant. Mothers who completed secondary school had a significant mean increase of 1.1 kg compared to those who did not complete primary school (Table 2a).).

## Table 2:

**Table 2a: Mother's weight change according to EPBF duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
<b>Dependant variable=mother's weight</b>						
<b>EPBF duration (months)</b>	0.1 (-0.7; 0.9)	-0.2 (-0.6; 0.1)	-0.1 (-0.5; 0.3)	0.1 (-0.0; 0.3)	-0.2 (-0.5; 0.2)	-0.1 (-0.2; 0.1)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup> (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	2.5 (2.4; 2.7)	2.4 (2.3; 2.6)	2.5 (2.4; 2.6)	2.4 (2.3; 2.5)	2.5 (2.4; 2.6)	2.4 (2.3; 2.5)
<b>Mother's age (years)</b>	0.8 (0.5; 1.2)	0.1 (0.0; 0.3)	0.5 (0.4; 0.6)	0.1 (0.1; 0.2)	0.5 (0.4; 0.7)	0.1 (0.1; 0.2)
<b>HIV disease stage</b>						
HIV stage 1						
HIV stage >1	12.4 (-4.5; 29.4)	6.7 (0.4; 13.1)	-2.8 (-6.4; 0.8)			
<b>Education</b>						
Not completed primary school			1	1	1	1
Completed primary school			3.9 (2.0; 5.9)	0.2 (-0.7; 1.1)	4.4 (2.2; 6.5)	0.6 (-0.3; 1.5)
Secondary school and			2.7 (1.2; 4.1)	0.7 (0.1; 1.4)	3.1 (1.5; 4.6)	1.1 (0.4; 1.8)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

more						
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers	1				1	
Single mothers	-3.1 (-7.2; 0.9)				-1.2 (-3.0; 0.5)	
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery	1		1		1	1
C-section delivery	3.7 (-0.4; 7.9)		4.5 (1.5; 7.6)		4.4 (2.1; 6.7)	-1.1 (-2.1; -0.1)
<b>Parity</b>						
Primipara	1		1		1	-
Multipara	6.1 (1.9; 10.3)		3.1 (1.4; 4.7)		3.9 (2.3; 5.4)	-
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	2.0 (-2.0; 6.1)	0.8 (-0.7; 2.3)	-0.1 (-1.4; 1.3)	-0.3 (-0.9; 0.2)	0.3 (-1.0; 1.6)	-0.1 (-0.7; 0.4)

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

**Table 2b: Mother's CD4 count change according to EPBF duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
<b>Dependent variable=CD4 count</b>						
<b>EPBF duration (months)</b>	-1.0 (-8.9; 7.0)	-6.4 (-18.6; 5.8)	9.3 (2.3; 16.3)	7.9 (-4.2; 20.1)	5.4 (-0.1; 10.9)	4.5 (-6.2; 15.1)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup> (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>			4.9 (2.4; 7.3)	5.9 (2.5; 9.2)	3.3 (1.3; 5.3)	4.9 (2.1; 7.7)
<b>Mother's age (years)</b>	-3.1 (-7.5; 1.2)		-4.9 (-7.3; -2.5)	-6.2 (-8.6; -3.8)	-4.7 (-6.9; -2.6)	-6.2 (-8.4; -4.1)
<b>Hemoglobin concentration (g/dl)</b>	33.3 (12.7; 53.8)	34.8 (14.4; 55.1)	15.2 (7.8; 22.6)	12.9 (4.6; 21.2)	19.3 (12.3; 26.4)	19.4 (11.4; 27.4)
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time</b>						
Breastfeeding initiation within 1 h	1	1	1	1	1	-
Breastfeeding initiation after 1 h	-56.2 (-94.9; - 17.4)	-39.9 (-90.3; 10.6)	-40.5 (-60.1; -20.9)		-42.5 (-61.1; - 23.9)	-
<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies	1	1	1			

Female babies	-53.1 (-104.7; -1.6)	-52.9 (-103.0; -2.9)	21.8 (-3.9; 47.4)			
<b>HIV disease stage</b>						
HIV stage 1			1	1	1	1
HIV stage >1			-85.8 (-131.5; -40.2)	-86.5 (-147.1; -26.0)	-70.2 (-115.5; -25.0)	-83.7 (-144.1; -23.4)
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1		1	1
Completed primary school			29.2 (-8.6; 67.1)		25.1 (-12.6; 62.9)	24.4 (-12.9; 61.6)
Secondary school and more			1.0 (-26.8; 28.9)		-7.8 (-34.9; 19.3)	-9.3 (-36.8; 18.2)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers			1	1	1	1
Single mothers			-34.5 (-73.2; 4.2)	-44.6 (-83.1; -6.03)	-24.6 (-55.9; 6.6)	-29.7 (-61.0; 1.6)
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery			1	1		
C-section delivery			71.6 (11.7; 131.4)	71.1 (11.1; 131.2)		
<b>Trial arm</b>						



Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	-33.4 (-69.2; 2.3)	-65.3 (-116.4; -14.1)	-12.8 (-31.6; 6.1)	-12.9 (-38.2; 12.4)	-15.8 (-32.6; 1.0)	-19.2 (-41.9; 3.6)

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

**Table 2c: Mother's HIV-1 viral load change according to EPBF duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
<b>Dependent variable=viral load (coefficient * 10<sup>3</sup>)</b>						
<b>EPBF duration (months)</b>	4.5 (-3.4; 12.4)	-3.6 (-11.5; 4.4)	5.4 (-7.1 18.0)	2.0(-11.3 15.4)	6.2 (-2.5; 14.9)	1.7 (-7.3; 10.8)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup> (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	-7.7 (-10.9; - 4.6)	-14.5 (-17.9; - 11.0)	-4.7 (-8.5; -1.0)	-5.7 (-9.8; -1.6)	-6.5 (-9.2; -3.8)	-8.0 (-11.0; -4.9)
<b>Mother's age (years)</b>	-2.7 (-5.3; -0.1)	-2.7 (-5.5; 0.1)	-1.9 (-4.6; 0.8)	-4.5 (-7.7; -1.4)	-2.1 (-4.3; 0.1)	-4.5 (-7.0; -2.0)
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time</b>						

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Breastfeeding initiation<1h	1	1				
Breastfeeding initiation>1h	70.5 (41.3; 99.7)	45.1 (13.5; 76.7)				
<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies	1	1	1	1	1	1
Female babies	-49.1 (-79.4-18.7)		-19.5 (-48.5; 9.4)	-36.5 (-66.0 - 7.2)	-25.3 (-49.2; -1.4)	-35.2 (-59.2; -11.1)
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1	1	1	1
Completed primary school			-10.2 (-53.9;33.5)	2.9 (-41.4; 47.2)	-5.0 (-45.1; 35.2)	13.4 (-26.9; 53.8)
Secondary school and more			-76.7 (-108.1; -45.3)	-73.4 (-105.9; -41.0)	-72.7 (-98.7; -46.7)	-62.0 (-89.7; -34.3)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers	1	1				
Single mothers	55.6 (21.6; 89.5)	127.9 (92.8 163.0)				
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery	1	1	1	1	1	1
C-section delivery	118.5 (86.4; 143.2(108.8;		72.6 (6.8; 138.4)	84.2	90.8 (49.8; 105.5 (65.2; 145.7)	

	150.5)	177.5)		(17.6;150.7)	131.8)	
<b>Parity</b>						
Primipara	1	1	1	1	1	1
Multipara	66.5 (34.8; 98.2)	125.9 (90.5; 161.2)	47.7 (12.1; 83.2)	56.7 (15.1; 98.2)	54.8 (26.7; 83.0)	65.1 (32.8; 97.4)
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	-48.4 (-77.6; -19.2)	-37.6 (-67.5; -7.6)	39.9 (12.4; 67.4)	47.0 (17.9; 76.1)	22.6 (-0.0; 45.2)	31.1 (7.1; 55.0)
Birthweight (g)	0.0 (0.0 ; 0.1)	0.1 (0.0; 0.1)	0.0 (0.0; 0.1)	0.1 (0.0; 0.1)		

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

**Table 2d: Mother's HIV-1 disease progression according to EPBF duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
<b>EPBF duration (months)</b>	1.0 (0.9; 1.1)		1.1 (1.0; 1.2)	1.0 (0.9;1.1)	1.1 (1.0; 1.1)	1.1 (1.0; 1.2)
<b>Mother's age (years)</b>			1.0 (1.0; 1.1)	1.0 (1.0; 1.1)		1.0 ( 1.0; 1.0)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies			1		1	1
Female babies			0.8 (0.6; 1.0)		0.8 (0.6; 1.0)	0.8 (0.6; 1.0)
<b>HIV disease stage</b>						
HIV stage 1			1	1		
HIV stage >1			4.0 (2.5; 6.2)	4.2 (2.6; 6.5)		
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers			1	1	1	1
Single mothers			1.6 (1.1; 2.2)	1.8 (1.3; 2.6)	1.5 (1.2; 1.9)	1.6 (1.3; 2.1)
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm			1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm			1.3 (1.0; 1.6)	1.3 (1.0; 1.7)	1.3 (1.0; 1.6)	1.3 (1.0; 1.6)
Birthweight (g)			0.9 (0.8; 1.0)			

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

**Table 3**

**Table 3a: Mother's weight change according to any breastfeeding duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted Odd Ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
		Weight				
<b>Any breastfeeding duration (months)</b>	0.3 (-0.2; 0.8)	-0.1 (-0.3; 0.0)	-0.0 (-0.3; 0.2)	0.1 (0.0; 0.3)	-0.0 (-0.3; 0.2)	-0.0 (-0.2; 0.1)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup> (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	2.5 (2.4; 2.7)	2.5 (2.3; 2.6)	2.5 (2.4; 2.6)	2.4 (2.3; 2.5)	2.5 (2.4; 2.6)	2.4 (2.3; 2.5)
<b>Mothers' age (years)</b>	0.8 (0.5; 1.2)	0.2 (0.0; 0.3)	0.5 (0.4; 0.6)	0.1 (0.1; 0.2)	0.5 (0.4; 0.7)	0.1 (0.1; 0.2)
<b>HIV disease stage</b>						
HIV stage 1	1	1	1			
HIV stage>1	12.4 (-4.5; 29.4)	6.4 (0.0; 12.7)	-2.8 (-6.4; 0.8)			
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1	1	1	1
Completed primary school			3.9 (2.0; 5.9)	0.3 (-0.6; 1.1)	4.4 (2.2; 6.5)	0.6 (-0.3; 1.5)
Secondary school and further			2.7 (1.2; 4.1)	0.9 (0.2; 1.5)	3.1 (1.5; 4.6)	1.0 (0.4; 1.7)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers	1				1	
Single mothers	-3.1 (-7.2; 0.9)				-1.2 (-3.0; 0.5)	
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery			1		1	
C-section delivery	3.7 (-0.4; 7.9)	-1.6 (-3.2; 0.0)	4.5 (1.5; 7.6)		4.4 (2.1; 6.7)	-1.2 (-2.1; -0.2)
<b>Parity</b>						
Primipara	1	1	1	1	1	
Multipara	6.1 (1.9; 10.3)		3.1 (1.4; 4.7)		3.9 (2.3; 5.4)	
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	2.0 (-2.0; 6.1)	0.7 (-0.8; 2.2)	-0.1 (-1.4; 1.3)	-0.3 (-0.9; 0.3)	0.3 (-1.0; 1.6)	0.1 (-0.7; 0.4)

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval  
<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

**Table 3b: Mother's CD4 cell count change according to any breastfeeding duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

		South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis
	<b>Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Adjusted coefficient (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Adjusted coefficient (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Unadjusted Odd Ratio (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>	<b>Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI<sup>a</sup>)</b>
		<b>CD4 cells count</b>				
<b>Any breastfeeding duration (months)</b>	0.4 ( -6.8; 7.6)	-2.4 (-9.5; 4.7)	1.2 (-5.8; 8.3)	9.8 (-2.1; 21.8)	1.5 (-3.9; 7.0)	5.7 (0.4; 10.9)
<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup> (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>			4.9 (2.4; 7.3)	5.7 (2.4; 9.1)	3.3 (1.3; 5.3)	4.2 (1.5; 6.9)
<b>Mother's age (years)</b>	-3.1 (-7.5; 1.2)		-4.9 (-7.3; -2.5)	-6.5 (-8.9; -4.1)	-4.7 (-6.9; -2.6)	-6.2 (-8.4; -4.1)
<b>Hemoglobin concentration (g/dl)</b>	33.3 (12.7; 53.8)	33.9(13.5; 54.3)	15.2 (7.8; 22.6)	15.7 (7.2; 24.3)	19.3 (12.3; 26.4)	16.7 (9.0; 24.4)
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time</b>						
Within 1 hour			1		1	
After 1 hour	-56.2 (-94.9; -17.4)		-40.5 (-60.1; -20.9)		-42.5 (-61.1; -23.9)	
<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies	1	1	1			

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Female babies	-53.1 (-104.7; -1.6)	-54.1 (-104.3; -3.6)	21.7 (-3.9; 47.4)			
<b>HIV stage</b>						
HIV stage 1			1	1	1	1
HIV stage>1			-85.8 (-131.5; -40.2)	-91.5 (-152.9; -30.1)	-70.2 (-115.5; -25.0)	-88.8 (-148.3; -29.3)
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1		1	1
Completed primary school			29.2 (-8.6; 67.1)		25.1 (-12.6; 62.9)	19.9 (-16.7; 56.5)
Secondary school and further			1.0 (-26.8; 28.9)		-7.8 (-34.9; 19.3)	-17.4 (-43.7; 9.5)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/ cohabiting mothers			1	1	1	1
Single mothers			-34.5 (-73.2; 4.2)	-43.1 (-81.5; -4.6)	-24.6 (-55.9; 6.6)	-43.3 (-72.8; -13.7)
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery			1	1		
C-section delivery			71.6 (11.7; 131.4)	71.8 (11.9; 131.7)		
<b>Parity</b>						



Primipara			1			
Multipara						
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	-33.4 (-69.; 2.3)	-58.7 (-109.6; -7.8)	-12.8 (-31.6; 6.1)	-13.4 (-38.6; 11.8)	-15.8 (-32.6; 1.0)	-19.2 (-41.9; 3.6)

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

**Table 3c: Mother's HIV-1 viral load change according to any breastfeeding duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted coefficient (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted Odd Ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
		HIV-1 Viral load (coefficient*10 <sup>3</sup> ) copies/μl				
<b>Any breastfeeding duration (months)</b>	11.2 (6.8; 15.6)	7.7 (3.4; 12.1)	5.9 (-1.5; 13.2)	2.5 (-5.2; 10.2)	9.8 (4.9; 14.7)	6.1 (1.0; 11.2)

<b>Baseline BMI<sup>b</sup> (kg/m<sup>2</sup>)</b>	-7.7 (-10.9; -4.6)	-14.0 (-17.4; -10.6)	-4.7 (-8.5; -1.0)	-5.7 (-9.8; -1.5)	-6.5 (-9.2; -3.8)	-7.6 (-10.7; -4.5)
<b>Mother's age (years)</b>	-2.7 (-5.3; -0.1)	-3.4 (-6.2; -0.6)	-1.9 (-4.6; 0.8)	-4.6 (-7.8; -1.4)	-2.1 (-4.3; 0.1)	-4.8 (-7.3; -2.3)
<b>Breastfeeding initiation time</b>						
Within 1 hour	1	1				
After 1 hour	70.5 (41.3; 99.7)	34.2 (2.7; 65.7)				
<b>Child's gender</b>						
Male babies	1		1	1	1	1
Female babies	-49.1 (-79.4; -18.7)		-19.5 (-48.5; 9.4)	-37.2 (-66.6; -7.9)	-25.3 (-49.2; -1.4)	-36.2 (-60.2; -12.2)
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1	1	1	1
Completed primary school			-10.2 (-53.9; 33.5)	4.7 (-39.8; 49.3)	-4.9 (-45.1; 35.2)	16.6 (-23.8; 57.0)
Secondary school and further			-76.7 (-108.1; -45.3)	-70.7 (-104.4; -37.1)	-72.7 (-98.7; -46.7)	-54.5 (-82.8; -26.1)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/ cohabiting mothers	1	1			1	

Single mothers	55.6 (21.6; 89.5)	124.9 (89.9; 160.0)				
<b>Delivery</b>						
Vaginal delivery	1	1	1	1	1	1
C-section delivery	118.5 (86.4; 150.5)	137.0 (102.7; 171.2)	72.6 (6.8; 138.4)	84.4 (18.0; 150.7)	90.8(49.8; 131.8)	104.7 (64.5; 144.9)
<b>Parity</b>						
Primipara	1	1	1	1	1	1
Multipara	66.5 (34.8; 98.3)	125.0 (89.8; 160.3)	47.7 (12.1; 83.2)	57.2 (15.6; 98.8)	54.8 (26.7; 83.0)	65.0 (32.7; 97.3)
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm	1	1	1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm	-48.4 (-77.6; -19.2)	-35.0 (-64.8; -5.3)	39.9 (12.4; 67.4)	47.6 (18.6; 76.7)	22.6 (-60.2; 45.2)	31.9 (8.0; 55.8)

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

1   **Table 3d: Mother’s HIV-1 disease progression according to any breastfeeding duration adjusted to different covariates: stratification**  
2   **presenting South Africa versus the other sites and pooled analysis**

	South Africa		Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia		Pooled analysis	
	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Unadjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )	Adjusted odd ratio (95% CI <sup>a</sup> )
		HIV disease progress				
Any breastfeeding duration (months)			1.1 (1.0; 1.2)	1.0 (0.9; 1.1)	1.0 (0.9; 1.0)	1.0 (0.9; 1.0)
Baseline BMI <sup>b</sup> (kg/m <sup>2</sup> )			1.0 (1.0; 1.1)			
Mother’s age (years)				1.0 (1.0; 1.1)	1.0 (0.9; 1.0)	
Breastfeeding initiation time						
Within 1 h	1					
After 1 h						
Child’s gender						
Male babies			1		1	
Female babies			0.8 (0.6; 1.0)		0.8 (0.6; 1.0)	
HIV stage						
HIV stage 1			1	1	1	1

HIV stage>1			4.0 (2.5; 6.2)	4.2 (2.6; 6.6)	4.4 (2.8; 6.7)	4.6 (2.9; 7.3)
<b>Education</b>						
Non completed primary school			1			1
Completed primary school						1.4 (0.9; 2.0)
Secondary school and further						0.7 (0.5; 0.9)
<b>Marital status</b>						
Married/cohabiting mothers			1	1		
Single mothers			1.6 (1.1; 2.2)	1.8 (1.2; 2.6)	1.5 (1.2; 1.9)	
<b>Trial arm</b>						
Lamivudine arm			1	1	1	1
Lopinavir/ritonavir arm			1.3 (1.0; 1.6)	1.3 (1.0; 1.7)	1.3 (1.0; 1.6)	1.3 (1.0; 1.6)

<sup>a</sup>Confidence interval

<sup>b</sup>Body mass index

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 The association between CD4 cells count and EPBF duration was non-significant (5.4 (95%  
2 CI:-0.1; 10.9) and 4.5 (95% CI:-6.2; 15.1) CD4 cells/µl increase per month of EPBF duration  
3 at univariate and multivariate analysis, respectively). The association was significantly  
4 positive between the mothers' baseline BMI, hemoglobin concentration and CD4 cell count  
5 yielding a mean increase of 4.9 (95% CI: 2.1; 7.7) CD4 cells/µl per additional BMI unit and  
6 19.4 (95% CI:11.4; 27.4) CD4 cells/µl per additional unit of hemoglobin throughout the EPBF  
7 period (Table 2b).

9 There was no significant association between HIV-1 viral load and EPBF duration. The  
10 heavier and older mothers, those who delivered female babies and the best educated  
11 women group had a significantly lower mean viral load in the multivariate analysis. The  
12 mothers allocated to the lopinavir/ritonavir group had a significantly higher mean viral load  
13 than the ones in the Lamivudine arm (Table 2c).

15 We found no significant association between EPBF duration and HIV-1 disease progression.  
16 However, randomization to the lopinavir/ritonavir arm or being single mother led to a  
17 significantly adjusted odd ratios (AOR) of 1.3 (95% CI: 1.0; 1.6; p=0.04) and 1.6 (95% CI:  
18 1.3; 2.1), respectively (Table 2d).

20 Considering any breastfeeding duration, there was no weight change at univariate and  
21 multivariate analysis overall(Table 3a). Still regarding any breastfeeding, overall, there was a  
22 significant mean increase of 5.7 (95% CI: 0.4; 10.9) CD4 cells/µl per month of any  
23 breastfeeding. We found also that being a single mother was associated with a mean  
24 decrease of -43.3 (95% CI: -72.8; -13.7) CD4 cells/ µl as compared to married ones (Table  
25 3b). Any breastfeeding duration was also associated with a significantly higher mean viral  
26 load (Table 3c). Analysis with any breastfeeding pattern and HIV-1 disease progression  
27 showed the same associations as EPBF and HIV-1 disease progression (Table 3d).

29 In the stratified analysis, we found that EPBF duration had no influence on mothers' weight,  
30 CD4 count, or HIV-1 viral load, whatever the stratum. HIV-1 disease progression was not  
31 associated either with EPBF duration (Table 2a, 2b, 2c, 2d). In stratum 2, C-section delivery  
32 was associated with an increase in CD4 cell count (Table 2b), whereas delivering a female  
33 baby and being educated beyond secondary school were associated with a decrease in HIV-  
34 1 viral load (Table 2c).

36 In South Africa, initiating breastfeeding one hour post-delivery and being a single mother  
37 were related to an increase in HIV-1 viral load. In both strata, C-section delivery and

1 multiparity were also related to an increase in HIV-1 viral load. There was no association  
2 between any breastfeeding and the mothers' weight, CD4 cells count and HIV-1 disease  
3 progression in any of the strata (Table 3a, 3b, 3d). However, any breastfeeding duration was  
4 associated with an increase of the HIV-1 viral load in South African women (Table 3c).

## 5 6 **DISCUSSION**

7 Considered separately, there appeared to be no variations in the mothers' weight, CD4 cell  
8 count and HIV-1 viral load related to EPBF or any breastfeeding. The same conclusion  
9 applied to these outcomes combined in a composite endpoint representing HIV-1 disease  
10 progression. Unsurprisingly, mothers' baseline BMIs were consistently associated with an  
11 increase in the mothers' weight and CD4 cell count, and with a lower mean HIV-1 viral load  
12 for both EPBF and any breastfeeding groups.

13  
14 In a review of the literature on weight change in the postpartum period, there appeared to be  
15 no association between breastfeeding, or generally between the mode of infant feeding, and  
16 postpartum weight loss. However C-section delivery was a risk factor for postpartum weight  
17 loss [28], similar to our findings. South Africa had markedly lower rates of vaginal deliveries  
18 versus other countries (table 1b). In the years 2000, studies were published demonstrating  
19 that elective C-section before the labour and before the rupture of membranes added  
20 protection against HIV transmission to the new born [29 30]. The lower rates of vaginal  
21 deliveries in South Africa were likely due to the country policies (influenced by the scientific  
22 evidence) which supported HIV-infected women toward delivering HIV-free babies. This  
23 support included, free formulas and probably scheduled C-section for the HIV-infected  
24 pregnant women and mothers. Why the rest of the countries did not implement the same  
25 policy is certainly a matter of affordability and availability of local resources. Another reason  
26 is that C-section rate is «recklessly high» in South Africa where up to 90% of pregnant  
27 women deliver through this method in private hospitals (The Guardian  
28 <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2014/sep/24/caesarean-section-south-africa> [Accessed  
29 on 27 October 2017]. This practise may have spilled over but at a lesser extent into public  
30 health facilities. We believe this practice has not skewed our results, since these C-section  
31 deliveries were not medically indicated at first hand, at least not based on a vaginal delivery  
32 risk; therefore they are not done on women with poorer health status. Actually, South African  
33 women had the lowest mean HIV-1 viral load and the highest mean BMI.

34 Yet, this review of literature [28] found that less educated mothers (<12 years of schooling)  
35 were at risk of postpartum weight retention; we found that higher educated women  
36 (secondary school or further) were at risk of that weight retention. This difference in our

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1 finding may be explained by the difference in our categorization of the education variable. In  
2 our study less educated participants included only women with primary school level, meaning  
3 around six years of schooling. Therefore, the results of the two studies are not really  
4 comparable. A higher education level was also a factor associated with a slower HIV-1  
5 disease progression. This finding is consistent with our result that higher educated women  
6 retained more weight.

7 In a further review of literature on the effects of lactation on the mother's bodyweight, it is  
8 clear that the assumption that the postpartum weight loss is due to the high energy demand  
9 associated with lactation has been challenged by many studies [31]. Some reports conflict  
10 with our own findings, such as the one in KwaZulu Natal, where HIV-1 infected mothers at  
11 between 8 and 24 weeks had a mean weight loss of 1.4 kg in contrast to a 0.4-kg weight gain  
12 in HIV-1 uninfected mothers (P=0.01) during breastfeeding [15].

13  
14 Regarding the change in CD4 cells count, the South African data support the conclusion that  
15 CD4 cell count did not differ significantly between women who breastfed and those who did  
16 not [32]. This finding contradicts the Kenyan Study that found that the rate of CD4 cell count  
17 decline was higher in breast-feeding than in non-breast-feeding mothers [13]. However, in  
18 that Kenyan study, HIV-1 RNA levels did not differ significantly between breast-feeding and  
19 formula-feeding mothers.

20 Regarding HIV-1 disease progression, the same data showed no deleterious effect of  
21 breastfeeding in HIV-1-infected mothers, similar to our study-findings. The outcome variables  
22 were the CD4 and CD8 cell count, the mothers' illness and mortality, and their hemoglobin  
23 levels [32]. Another study from Malawi reached the same conclusion that breastfeeding was  
24 not associated with higher risk of maternal morbidity or mortality [33]. A study in Zambia  
25 concluded in the same direction that at 12 months after delivery, there was no difference in  
26 mortality between women who breastfed for a short duration (4 months) versus those who  
27 breastfed for a duration of their own choice [17]. An individual patient data meta-analysis on  
28 mortality among HIV-1 infected mothers according to children's feeding modality confirmed  
29 that the risk of dying within 18 months postpartum was not significantly affected by the  
30 infants' feeding modality (i.e. ever versus never breastfed) [34].

31 In healthy breastfeeding mothers, the postpartum weight loss would be around 0.5 kg per  
32 month among population with relatively high mean of BMI. The mechanism of the weight loss  
33 would be burning of 483 -538 kcal per day [35 36]. Therefore, losing weight after birth is likely  
34 when the mother's calorie intake does not cover the calorie expense related to breast-milk  
35 production. Considering these findings, we think that energy requirement and thus the  
36 metabolic stress related to breastfeeding would be quite bearable. This may explain why in  
37 our study HIV-1-infected, immune-competent and breastfeeding mothers' health status was



not deteriorated by breastfeeding. This evidence inspires the idea that option A peri-exposure antiretroviral prophylaxis might still have pertinent indications since breastfeeding remained the most frequent feeding option in Sub Saharan Africa and since breast-milk might still host HIV-1 reservoirs that mother's prophylaxis could not always 100% suppress [37].

### Strengths and limitations

Our study has been implemented in four countries in Africa, including Burkina Faso (West), South Africa and Zambia (South) and Uganda (East). Therefore we consider our study population representative of the Sub-Sahara African population. The data were also collected in the rigorous context of a clinical trial, which minimized the lost to follow-up, the missing data as well as other data collection errors, and therefore improved the quality of our data.

However, the selection associated with the environment of a clinical trial - usually quite different from a routine environment - may have biased our findings. Nonetheless, our endpoints (mother's weight, CD4 cell count and HIV-1 viral load) were sufficiently robust for us to vouch for their validity. Another point of note is the stratification of the participants into two strata, i.e. South Africa versus Burkina Faso, Uganda and Zambia. This stratification reduced the sample size in South Africa. Thus some of the modelling for South Africa could be less rigorous, and the findings regarding the risk factors there may not truly reflect the reality.

### CONCLUSION

Breastfeeding whatever the type (exclusive or any) as far as this study can conclude was not a risk factor for the HIV-1 infected mothers weight, CD4 cell count, and HIV-1 viral load change, or HIV-1 disease progression, keeping in mind that all the participants had a baseline CD4 cell count >350 cells/ul. The mothers' baseline high weight and high hemoglobin concentration were important factors in being consistently associated with an improvement of the outcome variables at stake. A higher education level was also a factor associated with a slower HIV-1 disease progression. Considering the benefits of breast milk for infants, and the consensus results from different studies elsewhere that breastfeeding does not harm HIV-1-infected mothers, this study also supports the WHO 2016 guidelines on infant feeding, which indicates that mothers living with HIV should breastfeed for at least 12 months and up to 24 months, provided that the right treatment or prophylaxis for the infection is given where formula feeding is unsafe [12].

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Acknowledgments**

We would like to thank all the mothers who agreed to be part of the trial together with their children. Our acknowledgments also go to the different ANRS 12174 site staffs for their dedicated effort in this research. We are also very grateful to the University of Bergen and the Centre for International Health for providing the infrastructure, and the needed supervision and training. We also thank the UMR 1058, pathogenesis and control of chronic infections, Montpellier, France, from which we received invaluable support regarding data management. The final typescript has been improved through the help of BioMedES Ltd, UK ([www.biomedes.co.uk](http://www.biomedes.co.uk)).

**Competing interests:** The authors have declared that no competing interests exist.

**Funding:** This study used data collected in the context of the ANRS 12174 clinical trial funded by the French National Institute of Health and Medical Research - National Agency for Research on AIDS and Viral Hepatitis (Inserm-ANRS), the European and Developing Countries Clinical Trials Partnership (EDCTP; grant number CT.2006.33020.004), the Research Council of Norway (GlobVac grant number 183600), and the Total Foundation. NES benefited from a PhD grant from the Norwegian Quota Scheme. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

**Data Availability Statement:** The study sponsor (the French agency for research on HIV and viral hepatitis: ANRS) offers data sharing upon request. ANRS will be the contact organisation ([direction@anrs.fr](mailto:direction@anrs.fr)). The shared data will be those presented in the article.

**Contributorship statement:**

- Conceptualization: ENS, IMSE, NN, NM, PVP, TT.
- Data curation: ENS, RV.
- Formal analysis: ENS, IMSE.
- Investigation: ENS, MS, NM, JKT, CK, JGH.
- Methodology: ENS, IMSE, TT.
- Project administration: NN, PVP, TT, NM.
- Resources: TT, IMSE.
- Supervision: TT, IMSE, NM, NN.
- Validation: TT, IMSE, NM, NN.
- Writing the original draft: ENS, IMSE.
- Writing and review and editing: ENS, IMSE, NN, NM, TT, RV, CK, JKT, JGH, MS, KH

## References

1. UNAIDS. Core epidemiology. UNAIDS July 2015; [http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2015/20150714\\_coreepidemiology\\_slides\\_ppt](http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2015/20150714_coreepidemiology_slides_ppt); Accessed 11 Nov 2015:12
2. UNAIDS. Global AIDS update 2016. UNAIDS [<http://www.unaids.org/en/resources/documents/2016/Global-AIDS-update-2016>] Accessed on 17th October 2016 2016:16
3. Eaton JW, Rehle TM, Jooste S, et al. Recent HIV prevalence trends among pregnant women and all women in sub-Saharan Africa: implications for HIV estimates. *AIDS* 2014;**28** [suppl 4]:8 doi: 10.1097/QAD.0000000000000412[published Online First: Epub Date]].
4. Younas M, Psomas C, Reynes J, et al. Immune activation in the course of HIV-1 infection: Causes, phenotypes and persistence under therapy. *HIV Medicine* 2016;**17**:17 doi: 10.1111/hiv.12310[published Online First: Epub Date]].
5. Julie A, Jacob M. Men with HIV age faster according to DNA methylation study. *JAMA* 2016;**316**(2):2
6. Zevin A, McKinnon L, Burgener A, et al. Microbial translocation and microbiome dysbiosis in HIV-associated immune activation. *Curr Opin HIV AIDS* 2016;**11**(2):17 doi: 10.1097/COH.0000000000000234[published Online First: Epub Date]].
7. DeVaughn S, Müller-Oehring E, Markey B, et al. Aging with HIV-1 Infection: Motor Functions, Cognition, and Attention – A Comparison with Parkinson's Disease. *Neuropsychol Rev* 2015;**25**:16 doi: 10.1007/s11065-015-9305-x[published Online First: Epub Date]].
8. World Health Organization. Antiretroviral therapy for HIV infection in adults and adolescents: Recommendations for a public health approach [2006 revision]. World Health Organization 2006:134
9. Koyanagi A, Humphrey JH, Moulton LH, et al. Predictive value of weight loss on mortality of HIV-positive mothers in a prolonged breastfeeding setting. *AIDS research and human retroviruses* 2011;**27**(11):1141-8 doi: 10.1089/AID.2010.0293[published Online First: Epub Date]].
10. Zaba B, Calvert C, Marston M, et al. Effect of HIV infection on pregnancy-related mortality in sub-Saharan Africa: secondary analyses of pooled community-based data from the network for Analysing Longitudinal Population-based HIV/AIDS data on Africa (ALPHA). *The Lancet* 2013;**381**(9879):1763-71 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(13)60803-x[published Online First: Epub Date]].
11. Guttmacher institute. HIV Linked to Many Pregnancy-Related Deaths In Sub-Saharan Africa \_ Guttmacher Institute.pdf. International perspective on sexual and reproductive health 2013;**39**(2):4
12. World Health Organization, United Nations Children's Fund. Guideline: updates on HIV and infant feeding: the duration of breastfeeding, and support from health services to improve feeding practices among mothers living with HIV. Geneva: World Health Organization 2016
13. Otieno PA, Brown ER, Mbori-Ngacha DA, et al. HIV-1 disease progression in breast-feeding and formula-feeding mothers: a prospective 2-year comparison of T cell subsets, HIV-1 RNA levels, and mortality. *J Infect Dis* 2007;**195**(2):220-9 doi: 10.1086/510245[published Online First: Epub Date]].
14. Nduati R, Richardson B, John G, et al. Effect of breastfeeding on mortality among HIV-1 infected women: a randomised trial. *Lancet* 2001;**357**:1651-55 doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(00)04820-0[published Online First: Epub Date]].
15. Papathakis P, Van Loan M, Rollins N, et al. Body Composition Changes During Lactation in HIV-Infected and HIV-Uninfected South African Women. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2006;**43**:8
16. Sedgh G, Spiegelman D, Larsen U, et al. Breastfeeding and maternal HIV-1 disease progression and mortality. *AIDS* 2004;**18**:1043-49 doi: 10.1097/01.aids.0000125943.42948.98[published Online First: Epub Date]].
17. Kuhn L, Kasonde P, Sinkala M, et al. Prolonged breast-feeding and mortality up to two years post-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

partum among HIV-positive women in Zambia. *AIDS* 2005;**19**:1677–81

18. Winkvist A, Rasmussen K, and Lissner L. Associations between reproduction and maternal body weight: examining the component parts of a full reproductive cycle. *Eur J Clin Nutr.* 2003;**57**:14

19. Murnane PM, Arpadi SM, Sinkala M, et al. Lactation-associated postpartum weight changes among HIV-infected women in Zambia. *International journal of epidemiology* 2010;**39**(5):1299-310 doi: 10.1093/ije/dyq065[published Online First: Epub Date]] .

20. Ladner J, Castetbon K, Leroy V, et al. Pregnancy, body weight and human immunodeficiency virus infection in African women: a prospective cohort study in Kigali (Rwanda), 1992-1994. *International journal of epidemiology* 1998;**27**:6

21. Hartmann P, Sherriff J, and Mitoulas L. Homeostatic Mechanisms that Regulate Lactation during Energetic Stress. *J. Nutr.* 1998;**128**:6

22. Somé E, Engebretsen I, Nagot N, et al. <R\_BreastfeedingandBMI\_Main\_ENSOME\_WithoutTrackChange.pdf>. *PloS one* 2017

23. Nagot N, Kankasa C, Meda N, et al. Lopinavir/Ritonavir versus Lamivudine peri-exposure prophylaxis to prevent HIV-1 transmission by breastfeeding: the PROMISE-PEP trial Protocol ANRS 12174. *BMC Infect. Dis* 2012;**12**:246 doi: 10.1186/1471-2334-12-246[published Online First: Epub Date]] .

24. Nagot N, Kankasa C, Tumwine J, et al. Extended pre-exposure prophylaxis with lopinavir–ritonavir versus lamivudine to prevent HIV-1 transmission through breastfeeding up to 50 weeks in infants in Africa (ANRS 12174): a randomised controlled trial. *The Lancet* 2015;**14**(04841):8 doi: 10.1016/pii[published Online First: Epub Date]] .

25. ANRS. ANRS scale to grade the severity of adverse events in adults; version n° 1.0 4 November 2008. file:///C:/Users/install/Downloads/ANRS-GradeEI-V1-En-2008.pdf ; Accessed 14 Jan 2016 2008:10

26. Becquet R, Bland R, Leroy V, et al. Duration, pattern of breastfeeding and postnatal transmission of HIV: pooled analysis of individual data from West and South African cohorts. . *PloS one* 2009;**4**(10):e7397 doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0007397[published Online First: Epub Date]] .

27. Somé E, Engebretsen I, Nagot N, et al. Breastfeeding patterns and its determinants among mothers living with Human Immuno-deficiency Virus -1 in four African countries participating in the ANRS 12174 trial. *International breastfeeding journal* 2017:12 doi: 10.1186/s13006-017-0112-2[published Online First: Epub Date]] .

28. Crowell D. Weight change in the postpartum period: a review of the Literature. *J Nurse Midwifery* 1995;**40**(5):6

29. Maguire A, Sánchez E, Fortuny C, et al. Potential risk factors for vertical HIV-1 transmission in Catalonia, Spain: the protective role of cesarean section. *AIDS* 1997;**11**:1851–57

30. Kind C, Rudin C, Siegrist C, et al. Prevention of vertical HIV transmission: additive protective effect of elective Cesarean section and zidovudine prophylaxis. *AIDS* 1998;**12**:205–10

31. Rogers I, Golding J, Emmett P. The effects of lactation on the mother. *Early Hum Dev* 1997;**49**:13

32. Coutoudis A, Coovadia H, Pillay K, et al. Are HIV-infected women who breastfeed at increased risk of mortality? *AIDS* 2001;**15**(5):3

33. Taha T, Kumwenda N, Hoover D, et al. The impact of breastfeeding on the health of HIV-positive mothers and their children in sub-Saharan Africa. *Bull World Health Organ* 2006;**84**:546-54

34. Breastfeeding and HIV International Transmission Study Group. Mortality Among HIV-1–Infected Women According to Children’s Feeding Modality An Individual Patient Data Meta-Analysis. *J Acquir Immune Defic Syndr* 2005;**39**:9

35. IOM. Dietary reference intakes for energy, carbohydrate, fiber, fat, fatty acids, cholesterol, protein and amino acids. *Micronutrients IoMPo*, editor. Institute of Medicine, Food and Nutrition Board: National Academies Press 2005:1-1357

36. Lovelady C. Balancing intake and output: food v. exercise; Balancing exercise and food intake with lactation to promote post-partum weight loss. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* 2011;**70**:181 -84 doi: 10.1017/S002966511100005X[published Online First: Epub Date]] .

- 1  
2  
3 1 37. Van de Perre P, Rubbo P, Viljoen J, et al. HIV-1 reservoirs in breast milk and challenges to  
4 2 elimination of breast-feeding transmission of HIV-1. *Sci Transl Med.* 2012;**4**(143):14  
5 3  
6 4  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cohort studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
<b>Title and abstract</b>	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract: <b>YES ; page 1 row 3</b> (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found: <b>YES; page2 row 8-28</b>
<b>Introduction</b>		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported: <b>YES; page 3 row 23-37 ; page 4 row 1-8</b>
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses: <b>YES; page 4 row 10-13</b>
<b>Methods</b>		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper: <b>YES page 4 row 10-34</b>
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection: <b>YES page 4 row 17-18</b>
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up: <b>YES page 4 row 20-22 and row 30-32</b> (b) For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable: <b>YES page 5 row 19-35</b>
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group: <b>YES page 5 row 10-18 and 35-37 ; page 6 row 1-2</b>
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias: <b>YES page 6 row 2-11</b>
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at: <b>YES page 6 row 30-35</b>
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why: <b>YES page 6 row 15-17</b>
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding: <b>YES page 6 row 3-17</b> (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions: <b>YES page 6 row 6-8 and 11-15</b> (c) Explain how missing data were addressed: <b>YES page page 6 row 5-6 and 32-34</b> (d) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <b>YES page 6 row 5-6</b> (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses: <b>page page 6 row 11-15</b>
<b>Results</b>		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed: <b>YES; page 6 row 30-35</b> (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage: <b>YES; page 6 row 30-35</b> (c) Consider use of a flow diagram: <b>YES; page 6 row 35</b>
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders: <b>YES tables 1a and 1b</b> (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest: <b>Yes page 6 row 31-35</b> (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) <b>YES (mean EPBF</b>



**and any breastfeeding) table 1a**

Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time <b>NO</b>
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included: <b>YES tables 2 and 3</b>
		(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized: <b>YES table 1b (mothers' age)</b>
		(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period: <b>not relevant</b>
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses: <b>YES page 6 row 11-17</b>
<b>Discussion</b>		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives: <b>YES page 28 row 14-23</b>
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias: <b>YES page 30 row 21-28</b>
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence: <b>YES page 30 row 25-28 and 32-34</b>
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results: <b>YES page 30 row 16-20</b>
<b>Other information</b>		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based: <b>YES page 31 row 20-27</b>

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

**Note:** An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at <http://www.strobe-statement.org>.