



A Population-based study of Point-of-Care HPV Testing, Visual Inspection with Acetic Acid, and Cervical Cytology in Rwandan Women of Known HIV-Serostatus

#### **Eugene MUTIMURA PhD**,

Director of Research and Scientific Capacity Building Women's Equity in Access to Care and Treatment (WE-ACTx) Kigali, Rwanda



### EPIDEMIOLOGY

- Cervical Cancer is most common cause of cancer deaths in African and Rwandan women
- 80% of cervical cancer deaths occur in lower-income nations
- In higher-income countries cervical cancer mortality reduced 90% through cytology-based screening and treatment
- HPV is the etiologic agent of cervical cancer
   ~15 HPV types causes nearly all cervical cancer

# Percent of worldwide cervical cancer caused by HPV Types

(A)						CU	MULATIVE	
							%	
HPV-16				53.5			53.5	
HPV-18					17.2		70.7	
HPV-45					6.7		77.4	
HPV-31					2.9		80.3	
HPV-33					2.6		82.9	
HPV-52					2.	3	85.2	
HPV-58					2	.2	87.4	
HPV-35					1	.4	88.8	
HPV-59						1.3	90.2	
HPV-56						1.2	91.4	
HPV-51					B	1	92.4	
HPV-39						0.7	93.1	
HPV-68						0.6	93.7	
HPV-73						0.5	94.2	
HPV-82						0.3	94.5	
Other						1.2		
HPV X						4.	4	
	0	20	40	60	80	100		

#### **Cancers in Rwandan Women, 2001-2005 10 MOST FREQUENT CANCERS IN WOMEN** Cervix **Breast Stomac** NHL SITES Kaposi Uterus Liver Ovary Bone Rectum 5 10 15 20 25 30 0 PERCENTAGE

Ngendahayo L. 2006

## Principles of Screening

- Significant burden of disease in the community-high prevalence, bad outcomes
- There must be an asymptomatic (preclinical) period in which disease can be detected and treated
- **#** Early detection must improve outcomes
- Screening test(s) must be acceptable to the population, inexpensive and relatively accurate
- There must be an effective and acceptable treatment

## **The Ideal Screening Test**

Should be inexpensive, easy to administer (low risk) and with minimal discomfort

There should be a Gold Standard based on the evidence

Results should be accurate/valid and reliable/reproducible/precise

#### Screening tests for cervical cancer

Cytology (pap smears)
HPV testing
Visual inspection with acetic acid (VIA)
Screen and treat protocols can be performed with VIA and with a rapid HPV test



1) To compare the sensitivity of a rapid point-of-care HPV test (*care*HPV) and VIA in identifying high-grade squamous intraepithelial lesions (HSIL) or cancer.

2) To assess possible differences in test performance in HIV+ and HIV- women RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODS

Cross-sectional study
Population based recruitment
Oversampled for HIV+ women
Screen and treat protocol

# POPULATION

- 2000 population-based participants in Nduba and Jabana sectors (semi-urban)
  - Offered participation through Nyacyonga Health Center, mobile VCT teams, and Community Health Workers
  - Expected 3% would be HIV+ (population prevalence)
- 1000 HIV+ women receiving care at WE-ACTxOffered participation by WE-ACTx clinical staff

Primary Outcomes and Predictors

#### ■ Outcome variables

- High-grade squamous intraepithelial neoplasia, or higher-grade lesion, on cytology (HGSIL+)
- Cancer diagnosed by biopsy

#### **#** Primary predictor Variables

- Rapid HPV point-of-care, positive vs. negative
- VIA, positive or negative
- HIV serostatus

#### Inclusion Criteria

- **#** 30 65 years of age;
- **Have never been screened for cervical cancer**
- Are willing and able to give consent for study procedures;
- **#** Agree to HIV-testing and
- If HIV-positive, agree to CD4 cell count determination.

#### **Research Procedures**

Informed Consent (video)

■A short interview (15 minutes)

Cervical cancer screening: pelvic exam with:
Endocervical specimen for *care*HPV
Standard cervical cytology
Visual Inspection with Acetic Acid



■HPV testing run same day, batch testing, 2 hour test Research Procedure: Screen and Treat

**I**Immediate Treatment during VIA

- cryotherapy of identified treatable lesions by standard VIA protocol
- lesions not amenable to cryotherapy referred for appropriate further treatment (colposcopy, LEEP, biopsy)
- Cryotherapy for HPV+ if not treated during VIA
- Women newly found HIV+ referred to HIV care services (WE-ACTx)

Didactic and Practical Training on Visual Inspection with Acetic Acid (VIA) & Cryo





# Training for all staff--15





3018 women recruited
1707 HIV-negative
1311 HIV-positive

Reported cytology results available (n=1996):
 1300 HIV-negative
 696 HIV-positive

## **Demographic Characteristics**

Characteristic Mean (SD)	HIV-negative n=1300	HIV-positive n=696	<b>P-value</b>
Age	41.9 (8.1)	39.8 (6.7)	< 0.0001
Age at first intercourse	18.7 (4.0)	17.4 (4.1)	0.0015
Age at first birth	21.2 (3.8)	20.1 (3.6)	< 0.0001
BMI, Mean	22.0 (3.8)	22.5 (4.5)	0.0129
CD4 count		485 (232)	

#### **Demographic Characteristics**

Characteristic n (%)	HIV-negative n=1300	HIV-positive n=696	<b>P-value</b>
# of sexual partners 0-1 2 >2	931 (72.1) 238 (18.4) 123 (9.5)	172 (25.2) 207 (30.3) 304 (44.5)	<0.0001
# of pregnancies 0-2 3-4 5-6 >=7	149 (11.6) 324 (25.3) 366 (28.5) 444 (34.6)	145 (21.6) 233 (34.8) 182 (27.2) 110 (16.4)	<0.0001
Hormonal Contraception Use Ever Last six months	387 (29.9) 308 (23.8)	163 (23.4) 123 (17.7)	0.002 0.002

### **Demographic Characteristics**

Characteristic n (%)	HIV-negative n=1300	HIV-positive n=696	<b>P-value</b>
Marital Status			
Married/Partner	867 (66.9)	319 (46.0)	< 0.0001
Widowed	300 (23.2)	240 (34.6)	
Divorced	129 (10.0)	135 (19.5)	
Number of Children			
0	28 (2.2)	45 (6.7)	< 0.0001
1-2	289 (22.5)	245 (36.6)	
3-4	499 (39.0)	265 (39.6)	
5 +	467 (36.4)	115 (17.2)	
Post-menopausal	211 (16.3)	67 (9.64)	< 0.0001
Use Tobacco	210 (16.2)	41 (5.9)	
Take ARV		496 (72.6)	

# Cytology findings

	Total	HIV-negative # (%)	HIV-positive # (%)	<b>P-value</b>
Normal	1791 (89.7)	1179 (90.7)	612 (87.9)	0.0011
ASCUS	119 (6.0)	82 (6.3)	37 (5.3)	
Low grade SIL*	29 (1.5)	14 (1.1)	15 (2.2)	
High grade SIL+	57 (2.9)	25 (1.9)	32 (4.6)	

**\***Squamous Intraepithelial Lesion

#### Prevalence by Each Screening Test

Finding	HIV-negative n=1300 % (n)	HIV-positive n=696 % (n)	<b>P-value</b>
High grade cytology	1.9% (25)	4.6% (32)	0.001
HPV-positive	9.9% (128)	30.0% (209)	< 0.0001
VIA positive	8.1% (105)	11.6% (81)	0.012

Sensitivity and Specificity in detecting HGSIL+					
	Sensitivity	Specificity			
HIV-positive	% (95% CI*)	% (95% CI*)			
VIA	43.8 (26.4, 62.3)	89.9 (87.6, 92.2)			
HPV	71.9 (56.3, 87.5)	72.0 (68.6, 75.4)			
HIV-negative	HIV-negative				
VIA	8.0 (1.0, 0.19)	91.9 (90.4, 93.3)			
HPV	40.0 (0.20, 0.59)	90.8 (89.0. 92.3)			

\*CI=confidence Interval

	Projected proportion of those with disease detected if screening repeated				
	TEST	Screen once	Screen Twice	Screen three times	
H	HIV-positive				
	HPV	71.9%	92.1%	97.8%	
	VIA	43.8%	72.8%	84.7%	
H ne	IV- egative				
	HPV	40.0%	64.0%	78.4%	
	VIA	8.0%	15.4%	22.2%	

#### Conclusions

- Rapid point-of-care HPV test significantly more sensitive than VIA in predicting HGSIL
- Both HPV and VIA were more sensitive in HIV+ compared to HIV-negative women
- # Repeated testing is desirable (if sensitivity is similar in predicting invasive cancers)
- VIA in HIV-negative women had a low sensitivity and did not predict HGSIL+

Funding: NCI supplements to the AlbertEinsteinAIDS International Training andResearch Program (AITRP) and Central Africa IeDEA



#### WE-ACTx

#### Women's Equity in Access to Care and Treatment for HIV



www.we-actx.org

#### Many Thanks to All Collaborators

#### NCI

Philip Castle PhD

Qiagen Paul Eder PhD

Laura Bell

Albert Einstein College of MedicineKathryn Anastos MDHoward Strickler MDRobbie Burk MDMark Einstein MD

National University of Rwanda Patrick Mulindwa MD Joseph Vyankadondera MD

#### Predictors of HGSIL+: all women

	Univariate	Multivariate
Variable	OR (CI)	OR (CI)
Age (Per 10-Year)	1.40 ( 1.01- 1.95)*	2.06 ( 1.44- 2.95)***
HIV Status (+ vs)	2.46 ( 1.44- 4.18)***	1.50 ( 0.83- 2.70)
VIA Status (+ vs)	4.04 ( 2.22- 7.36)***	2.95 ( 1.52- 5.74)**
HPV Status (+ vs	7.40 ( 4.31-12.69)***	6.88 ( 3.73-12.71)***
)		
Sexual Partners		
=2 vs. 0-1	2.05 ( 1.07- 3.92)*	
>= 3 vs. 0-1	2.27 ( 1.20- 4.30)*	
Age at First Birth	0.89 ( 0.82- 0.97)*	
Menopause	2.27 ( 1.24- 4.15)**	
Rape CI-95% Confidence Interva	1.98(1.11-3.53)*	n<0.001

#### Predictors of HGSIL+:HIV-negative women

	Univariate	Multivariate
Variable	<b>OR (C.I.)</b>	<b>OR (C.I.)</b>
Age (Per 10-Year)	1.42 ( 0.88- 2.28)	1.72 ( 1.03- 2.87)*
VIA Status (+ vs)	0.98 ( 0.23- 4.23)	0.82 ( 0.18- 3.80)
HPV Status (+ vs)	6.54 ( 2.87- 14.88)***	8.53 ( 3.59-20.23)***
Sexual Partners		
2 vs. 0-1	1.99 ( 0.84- 4.71)	
≥3 vs. 0-1	0.47 ( 0.06- 3.57)	
Age at First Birth	0.94 ( 0.83- 1.06)	
Menopause	2.47 ( 1.05- 5.81)*	
Rape	1.07 ( 0.31- 3.60)	

CI=95% confidence interval; \*p<0.05; \*\*\*p<0.001

#### Predictors of HGSIL+: HIV-positive women

	Univariate	Multivariate
Variable	<b>OR (C.I.)</b>	<b>OR (C.I.)</b>
Age (Per 10-Year)	1.73 ( 1.07- 2.80)*	2.22 ( 1.31- 3.75)**
VIA Status (+ vs)	6.93 ( 3.30-14.57)***	5.72 ( 2.43-13.49)***
HPV Status (+ vs)	6.57 ( 2.98-14.46)***	5.12 ( 2.17-12.10)***
Sexual Partners		
2 vs. 0-1	1.52 ( 0.50- 4.62)	
≥3 vs. 0-1	1.98 ( 0.72- 5.46)	
Age at First Birth	0.89 ( 0.78- 1.00)	0.90 ( 0.79- 1.02)
Menopause	2.81 ( 1.17- 6.78)*	
Rape	1.83 ( 0.89- 3.74)	
Taking ART	2.74 ( 0.95- 7.91)	2.79 ( 0.90- 8.65)
CD4 Count (per 100)	0.94 (0.81-1.11)	1.09 ( 0.91- 1.30)

CI=95% confidence interval; ART=antiretroviral therapy; \*p<0.05; \*\*p<0.01; \*\*\*p<0.001

# Most common in all parks (lovely animals)





#### Rwanda: Tourism Nyungwe park in Rwanda





# Rwanda: Tourism Akagera Park



