Resistance Analyses of Patient Viral Samples From the Remdesivir Phase 3 Adaptive COVID-19 Treatment Trial-1 (ACTT-1)

¹Gilead Sciences, Inc., Foster City, CA; ²National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, National Institutes of Health, Rockville, MD; ³University of Washington, Seattle, WA.

Introduction

- Remdesivir (RDV) is a broad-spectrum nucleotide analog prodrug approved for the treatment of COVID-19 in nonhospitalized and hospitalized adult and pediatric patients¹
- The clinical benefit of RDV for patients with COVID-19 has been demonstrated in multiple clinical trials, including the randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 Adaptive COVID-19 Treatment Trial-1 (ACTT-1),² PINETREE,³ and SIMPLE studies^{4,5}

Objectives

- To determine amino acid substitutions in SARS-CoV-2 nsp12, the RNA-dependent RNA polymerase (RdRp), and nsp8, nsp10, nsp13, and nsp14 of the polymerase complex arising in patients treated with RDV compared with placebo
- To determine whether SARS-CoV-2 amino acid substitutions identified in RDV-treated participants alter antiviral susceptibility to RDV

Methods

 In ACTT-1, oropharyngeal or nasopharyngeal swab samples were collected on Days 1, 3, 5, 8, 11, 15, and 29 (**Figure 1**)



- All participants with >80th percentile and 50% of participants with <20th percentile of cumulative viral shedding underwent resistance analysis in both the RDV and placebo arms
- The SARS-CoV-2 genome was sequenced using next-generation sequencing
- Phenotyping was conducted using virus isolation from clinical samples or generation of select site-directed mutants (SDMs) in a SARS-CoV-2 subgenomic replicon system

Results

Participants Included in the Study

- Of those, 31 of 94 (33.0%) participants in the RDV arm and 30 of 79 (38.0%) participants in the placebo arm had both baseline and postbaseline sequencing data available (**Table 1**)

Table 1. Participants

Treated populat Met resistance sequencing atte Sequencing da Baseline

> Postbaseline Baseline +

RDV, remdesivir.

Frequency of Emergent Substitutions in nsp12

substitutions.

RDV, remdesivir

with wild-type sequence

Michael Gale Jr,³ Jiani Li,¹ Jason K. Perry,¹ Dong Han,¹ Gregory Camus,¹ Danielle P. Porter¹

 Of 1,048 patients treated in total, 94 participants in the RDV arm and 79 participants in the placebo arm met resistance analysis criteria

	Number of	Number of participants	
	RDV	Placebo	
tion	532	516	
analysis criteria and empted	94	79	
ta available			
	47	44	
	36	34	
ostbaseline	31	30	

 Among participants with both baseline and postbaseline data, emergent substitutions in nsp12 were observed in 12 of 31 (38.7%) participants treated with RDV and 12 of 30 (40.0%) participants in the placebo arm (Figure 2)

• Overall, emergent substitutions in nsp12 were observed in 2.3% of participants in both the RDV arm and the placebo arm



 nsp12 substitutions that emerged in participants treated with RDV were observed in 1 participant each, and the majority were present as mixtures

Phenotype of Emergent nsp12 Substitutions

- RNA (Figure 3B):

Figure 3. Emergent substitutions in nsp12 relatively A) distant and B) closer to the RdRp active site or RNA.



RdRp, RNA-dependent RNA polymerase

 nsp12 mutations successfully phenotyped as clinical isolates or SDMs had low to no fold-change in RDV susceptibility (Table 2)

Table 2. Phenotyped nsp12 Mutations in Participants **Treated With RDV**

nsp12 substitution	RDV EC ₅₀ (nM)	EC ₅₀ fold-change from wild-type reference		
Clinical isolates				
Wild type	235	1.00		
A16V	175	0.75		
V792I	503	2.17		
C799C/F	584	2.51		
Replicon SDMs				
Wild type	14.6	1.00		
K59N	14.4	0.98		
K59N+V792I	49.7	3.41		
V792I	45.9	3.15		
D684N	No replication	NA		
V764L	No replication	NA		
RDV, remdesivir; EC ₅₀ , 50% inhibition of virus replication; SDM, site-directed mutant; NA, not applicable.				

Charlotte Hedskog,^{1,*} Lauren Rodriguez,¹ John H. Beigel,² Walla Dempsey,² Alexander L. Greninger,³ Pavitra Roychoudhury,³ Meei-Li Huang,³ Keith R. Jerome,³ Linhui Hao,³ Renee C. Ireton,³

• The majority of substitutions identified were distant from the RdRp active site or RNA (Figure 3A); of the substitutions located closer to the RdRp active site or

– V792I and C799F have been previously identified through in vitro resistance selection experiments⁶

- None of the other nsp12 substitutions observed in the RDV-treated participants have been previously associated with resistance to RDV

- For substitutions D684N and V764L, recovery of neither clinical isolates nor SDMs for phenotypic analysis were successful
- A similar rate of emerging substitutions was observed in other proteins of the replication complex in participants treated with RDV compared with placebo (**Table 3**)

Table 3. Participants With Emergent Substitutions in **Other Proteins of the Replication Complex**

Substitution, n (%)	RDV (n = 31)	Placeb
nsp8	3 (9.7)	1
nsp10	2 (6.5)	
nsp13	11 (35.5)	10
nsp14	7 (22.6)	6 (
RDV, remdesivir.		





*Presenting author.

Tel: (650) 574-3000

Clinical Outcomes in Participants With Emergent nsp12 Substitutions

 Clinical recovery was comparable between participants in the RDV arm with and without emergent nsp12 substitutions (Figure 4)

o(n = 30)

(33.3)

(20.0)

Figure 4. Clinical recovery^a in participants treated with RDV with or without nsp12 substitutions.



^aRecovery was defined as either discharged from the hospital or hospitalized but not requiring supplemental oxygen and no longer requiring ngoing medical care at Day 28.

Conclusions

- Rates of emerging nsp12 substitutions were similar in participants treated with RDV compared with those who received placebo in the ACTT-1 study
- There was low to no fold-change in RDV susceptibility among the treatment-emergent nsp12 substitutions tested
- The resistance analysis results from the ACTT-1 study support a high barrier to RDV resistance development with lack of any considerable resistance emergence among COVID-19 patients
- Similar rates of clinical recovery were observed among participants in the RDV arm regardless of emergent nsp12 substitutions

Disclosures: CH, LR, JL, JKP, DH, and DPP are employees and shareholders of Gilead Sciences, Inc. ALG reports contract testing from Abbott, Cepheid, Novavax, Pfizer, Janssen, and Hologic; and reports research support from Gilead Sciences, Inc., outside of the described work. MG is a consultant for Merck, Biogen, and HDT Bio. GC is a shareholder and former employee of Gilead Sciences, Inc., and an employee of Vir Biotechnology. JHB, WD, PR, M-LH, KRJ, LH, and RCI have no conflicts of interest.

Acknowledgments: This study is funded by Gilead Sciences, Inc., and by the Infectious Diseases Clinical Research Consortium through the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, part of the National Institutes of Health, under award number UM1AI148684. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health. Medical writing and editorial support were provided b Analise Berkelbach, PhD, of Lumanity Communications Inc., and were funded by Gilead Sciences, Inc.

References: 1. VEKLURY (remdesivir) [prescribing information]. Foster City, CA: Gilead Sciences, Inc.; June 2022 Beigel JH, et al. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(19):1813-1826.
Gottlieb RL, et al. N Engl J Med. 2022;386(4):305-315
Spinner CD, et al. JAMA. 2020;324(11):1048-1057.
Goldman JD, et al. N Engl J Med. 2020;383(19):1827-1837 6. Stevens LJ, et al. *Sci Transl Med*. 2022;14(656):eabo0718.

