Web Annex B. PICO questions, EtD tables, GDG recommendations

WHO Guidelines for the Treatment of Human African Trypanosomiasis



© World Health Organization 2024

Some rights reserved. This work is available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-ncsa/3.0/igo).

Under the terms of this licence, you may copy, redistribute and adapt the work for non-commercial purposes, provided the work is appropriately cited, as indicated below. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that WHO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the WHO logo is not permitted. If you adapt the work, then you must license your work under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If you create a translation of this work, you should add the following disclaimer along with the suggested citation: "This translation was not created by the World Health Organization (WHO). WHO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original English edition shall be the binding and authentic edition".

Any mediation relating to disputes arising under the licence shall be conducted in accordance with the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization (http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/media-tion/rules/).

Suggested citation. Web Annex B. PICO questions, evidence-to-decision tables, GDG recommendations. In: Guidelines for the treatment of human African trypanosomiasis. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2024. https://doi.org/10.2471/B09070. Licence: CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO.

Cataloguing-in-Publication (CIP) data. CIP data are available at https://iris.who.int/.

Sales, rights and licensing. To purchase WHO publications, see https://www.who.int/publications/ book-orders. To submit requests for commercial use and queries on rights and licensing, see https:// www.who.int/copyright.

Third-party materials. If you wish to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, it is your responsibility to determine whether permission is needed for that reuse and to obtain permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

General disclaimers. The designations employed and the presentation of the material in this publication do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of WHO concerning the legal status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. Dotted and dashed lines on maps represent approximate border lines for which there may not yet be full agreement.

The mention of specific companies or of certain manufacturers' products does not imply that they are endorsed or recommended by WHO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned. Errors and omissions excepted, the names of proprietary products are distinguished by initial capital letters.

All reasonable precautions have been taken by WHO to verify the information contained in this publication. However, the published material is being distributed without warranty of any kind, either expressed or implied. The responsibility for the interpretation and use of the material lies with the reader. In no event shall WHO be liable for damages arising from its use.

The named authors alone are responsible for the views expressed in this publication.

This publication forms part of the WHO guideline entitled *Guidelines for the treatment of human African trypanosomiasis*. It is being made publicly available for transparency purposes and information, in accordance with the WHO handbook for guideline development, 2nd edition (2014).

Web Annex B. PICO questions, EtD tables, GDG recommendations

- WHO guidelines for the treatment of human African trypanosomiasis, 2024 -

PICO questions and their framework

There were three PICO questions:

- 1. Should fexinidazole be recommended as first line treatment for first stage rhodesiense HAT?
- 2. Should fexinidazole be recommended as first line treatment for second stage rhodesiense HAT?
- 3. Should pentamidine be recommended as an alternative treatment of rhodesiense HAT in particular circumstances (e.g. to avoid treatment delays or when suramin is unsuitable for a given patient)?

The Framework for the PICO questions was:

- **Population:** Adults and Children with rhodesiense HAT infection. Patients in first-stage versus in second-stage. Special groups (children <6 years old, pregnant and lactating women, comatose patients, etc.).
- **Intervention:** oral fexinidazole, administered once daily for 10 days, with one dosage in the first 4 days, and a lower dosage in the last 6 days, accompanied with a meal, to treat both stages of the disease. Pentamidine IM , once daily x 7 days, given when suramin is not readily available, or as an alternative when suramin is unsuitable for a given patient.
- **Comparison:** First-stage treatment with suramin IV (test dose of 4–5mg/kg on day 1, followed by five injections of 20 mg/kg every 7 days). Second-stage treatment with melarsoprol IV, 2.2 mg/kg per day for 10 days. For pentamidine, it depends on the situation: when suramin is not readily available, the comparator is "delaying the treatment"; when suramin is unsuitable for a given patient, the comparator is suramin.
- **Outcomes:** Critical for decision-making: Efficacy; Safety. Other important outcomes: Need for posttherapeutic follow-up. Need for lumbar puncture for staging. Adherence. Treatment-related adverse events leading to discontinuation of therapy. Management of adverse events. Workload of healthcare staff. Costeffectiveness. Context of use (outpatients, hospitalized).

Evidence-to-decision tables

PICO 1 Question

Should Fexinidazole vs. Suramin be used for first stage rhodesiense HAT ?					
POPULATION:	First stage rhodesiense HAT (PICO 1)				
INTERVENTION:	Fexinidazole				
COMPARISON:	Suramin				

Assessment

Desirable Effects How substantial are the desirable anticipated effects?							
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS					
 o Trivial o Small Moderate o Large o Varies o Don't 	See also Summary of Findings in Web Annex A All evidence presented in this summary comes from stage 1 patients unless otherwise indicated and derives from one single arm trial in n=10 participants (children aged >6 and adults with stage 1 r-HAT treated with fexinidazole and 7 single arm prospective cohorts/retrospective cohorts/case series with n range	 Whether data from stage 2 (as indirect evidence) is informative for stage 1: likely yes Patients in suramin trials might have been staged 					

N	between 17-152 with suramin. Se reports in peopl	Participants in children and adults with stage 1 r- ee also evidence report for additional evidence fro e with r-HAT and indirect evidence from people w	HAT treated m case ith g-HAT
	Outcome Overall certai	N of studies nty	Impact
	Overall mortality during treatment	 Fexinidazole: 1 single-arm trial, N = 10 children >6y and adults 	0% (0/10)
	⊕○○○ Very low	 Suramin 3 retrospective cohorts and 1 case series, follow- up to 5 weeks, N ranging between 17 and 152 adults and children 	3-5%
	Overall mortality at 12 months	 Fexinidazole: 1 single-arm trial, N = 10 children >6y and adults 	0% (0/10)
	⊕○○○ Very low	 Suramin: 3 retrospective cohorts and 1 prospective cohort with N ranging between 47 and 152 children and adults, overall mortality up to 3 years follow-up 	1-19%
	Death likely due to treatment \oplus Very low	Fexinidazole: • 1 single-arm trial, N = 10 children >6y and adults Suramin:	0% (0/10)
		No studies reported on this outcome	
	Death likely due to rHAT \oplus O Very low	 Fexinidazole: 1 single-arm trial, N = 10 children >6y and adults, follow-up 12 months 	0% (0/10)
		Suramin: • 1 retrospective cohort, N=36 adults and children, follow-up not reported	6% (2/36)
	Relapse \oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc Very low	 Fexinidazole: 1 single-arm trial, N = 10 children >6y and adults, follow-up 12 months 	0% (0/10)
		 Suramin: 2 retrospective cohorts, 1 prospective cohort, N ranging between 36 and 152 adults and children, follow up >2 years or 3 years 	11-34%
	Treatment success/clinical cure at end of	Fexinidazole: • 1 single-arm trial, N = 10 children >6y and adults	100% (10/10)
	⊕○○○ Very low	Suramin: • 1 case series, n=19 adults	95% (18/19)
	Treatment success/clinical cure at 12 months	 Fexinidazole: 1 single-arm trial, N = 10 children >6y and adults, follow-up 12 months 	100% (10/10)
	⊕○○○ Very low	Suramin: • 1 retrospective cohort reported on this outcome, N 36 adults and children o at 6-12 months o 2 years o >2 years	14% (5/36) 22% (8/36)

wrongly (considering suramin is not effective in stage 2); fexinidazole efficacy is not stage dependent

- Data from mouse models is supportive of the efficacy of fexinidazole in r-HAT
- Even in terms of adverse effects fexinidazole is more desirable (less AEs).
- Lumbar puncture could be avoided with fexinidazole (not required for treatment decisions), so avoiding complications of lumbar puncture.
- No injection-associated complications with oral fexinidazole

Undesira How substan	able Effec	ts esirable anticipated eff	ects?		
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDE	NCE			ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
• Trivial	See also Sumn	nary of Findings in Web	Annex A		Vomiting and nausea can be
 Small Moderate Large Varies 	Outcome N of studies Overall certainty			Impact	significant with fexinidazole
o Don't know	Serious adverse events at 12 months ⊕○○○ Very low	Fexinidazole: • 1 single-arm trial adults Suramin: No studies reported	l, N =10 children >6y and l on this outcome	0% (0/10)	Suramin has major complications such as anaphylaxis, and CNS side effects
	Adverse Fexinidazole: events at 12 • 1 single-arm tria adults with stage ⊕○○○ Suramin: • 1 prospective conchildren: 11% experienced rash a • 1 case series, n= 5% experienced m		I, N = 45 children >6y and 1 and 2 r-HAT nort, N=95, adults and igour and chills, 2% nd urticaria 19 adults yocarditis		50% small/50% trivial
Certaint What is the c	y of evide	NCE of the evidence of effe	ects?		
JUDGEMENT	RES	EARCH EVIDENCE			ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 Very low Low Moderate High No included studies 			ed studies on fexinidazole and udged as very low certainty, c Il studies were included.	d suramin only non-	
Values Is there impo	rtant uncertain	ty about or variability i	n how much people value the	e main outcor	nes?
JUDGEMENT			RESEARCH EVIDENCE		ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 Important i Possibly im Probably n No importa 	uncertainty or v portant uncerta o important un unt uncertainty	variability ainty or variability certainty or variability or variability			

Balance of effects Does the balance between desirable and undesirable effects favor the intervention or the comparison? **RESEARCH EVIDENCE** JUDGEMENT ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS O Favors the comparison • Probably favors the comparison O Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison • Probably favors the intervention O Favors the intervention o Varies o Don't know **Resources required** How large are the resource requirements (costs)?" JUDGEMENT **RESEARCH EVIDENCE** ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS Large costs Perspective: from the point of view of the patients, their families, • Moderate costs hospital Negligible costs and savings Resources needed: Moderate savings cost of the medication (at this point, both drugs are available • O Large savings for free through donation) cost of food (particularly with fexinidazole); there is also the Varies • o Don't know cost of food for the companions staff (12 days hospitalization with fexinidazole; 2-3 days for • suramin); duration of hospitalization will depend on the severity of the illness staff must invest time for the directly observed treatment • cost and effort for training staff • Cost for patient vs. hospital perspective fexinidazole: might be less costly for the patient, more costly •

Cost attactivanass	offactivanass	Cost

Does the cost-effectiveness of the intervention favor the intervention or the comparison?								
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS						
 o Favors the comparison o Probably favors the comparison o Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison o Probably favors the intervention o Favors the intervention o Varies No included studies 								

•

context

for the hospital; Suramin: might be the opposite

varies across context and across patients within the same

Equity What would be the impact on health equity?						
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS				
 Reduced Probably reduced Probably no impact Probably increased Increased Varies Don't know 		Favors fexinidazole: fewer and less severe side effects (and can be handled at the primary care level) and no injections; might improve availability at lower level hospitals. Does not favor fexinidazole: less information on special groups (pediatrics, pregnancy, lactating women, comorbidities); excludes those below 6 years, and below 20 kg. However, their proportion among r-HAT patients is low.				

Acceptability Is the intervention acceptable to key stakeholders?

JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 o No o Probably no o Probably yes • Yes o Varies o Don't know 		Fexinidazole is more likely to be acceptable given it is orally administered Lumbar puncture could be avoided with fexinidazole (more acceptable to patients and clinicians)
Feasibility		

intervention forsible to implement

JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS					
 ○ No ○ Probably no ○ Probably yes ● Yes ○ Varies ○ Don't know 							

Summary of judgements

	JUDGEMENT						
DESIRABLE EFFECTS	Trivial	Small	Moderate	Large		Varies	Don't know
UNDESIRABLE EFFECTS	Trivial	Small	Moderate	Large		Varies	Don't know
CERTAINTY OF EVIDENCE	Very low	Low	Moderate	High			No included studies
VALUES	Important uncertainty or variability	Possibly important uncertainty or variability	Probably no important uncertainty or variability	No important uncertainty or variability			
BALANCE OF EFFECTS	Favors the comparison	Probably favors the comparison	Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison	Probably favors the intervention	Favors the intervention	Varies	Don't know

	JUDGEMENT						
RESOURCES REQUIRED	Large costs	Moderate costs	Negligible costs and savings	Moderate savings	Large savings	Varies	Don't know
COST EFFECTIVENESS	Favors the comparison	Probably favors the comparison	Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison	Probably favors the intervention	Favors the intervention	Varies	No included studies
EQUITY	Reduced	Probably reduced	Probably no impact	Probably increased	Increased	Varies	Don't know
ACCEPTABILITY	No	Probably no	Probably yes	Yes		Varies	Don't know
FEASIBILITY	No	Probably no	Probably yes	Yes		Varies	Don't know

Type of recommendation

Strong recommendation against the intervention	Conditional recommendation against the intervention	Conditional recommendation for either the intervention or the comparison	Conditional recommendation for the intervention	Strong recommendation for the intervention
0	0	0	•	0

Conclusions

Recommendation

WHO suggests fexinidazole over suramin for first stage rhodesiense HAT (conditional recommendation based on very low certainty evidence)

Remarks:

Suramin may be the preferred option if

- there is a contraindication for fexinidazole according to the manufacturer's instructions;
- the patient is in a critical condition and oral absorption of fexinidazole may be questionable; and
- the patient is unable to swallow. Whether fexinidazole tablets can be crushed is currently the subject of investigation and cannot be recommended at present.

With fexinidazole treatment, lumbar puncture (LP) and CSF microscopy can be avoided in most patients. A patient aged < 6 years or body weight < 20 kg (i.e. a patient for whom fexinidazole is not indicated) must undergo a lumbar puncture and a CSF examination to determine the choice of treatment (suramin vs. melarsoprol).

Subgroup considerations

Pregnant women:

In view of the acute presentation and rapid clinical evolution of r-HAT, treatment usually cannot not be delayed until after delivery. Recommendations for anti-trypanosomal treatment during pregnancy and lactation are based on clinical practice rather than on solid evidence. Fexinidazole and pentamidine can be given after the first trimester. Suramin and melarsoprol are theoretically contraindicated, but their use may become necessary as rescue treatment. The benefits and risks must be clearly explained to the patient and her relatives. After delivery, the newborn should be examined clinically and checked for the presence of circulating trypanosomes in the blood. Breastfeeding should continue during HAT treatment.

Implementation considerations

•

Implementation considerations when prescribing fexinidazole

- Food intake: For fexinidazole to be absorbed in therapeutic levels it must be taken in a fed condition (i.e. after a substantial meal). As a condition for prescribing fexinidazole, the prescriber must have confidence that the patient has access to food, which must be eaten directly before the drug administration each day.
- Directly observed treatment: Each intake of fexinidazole must be supervised by a trained health worker who must ensure that the patient is in a fed condition.
 - Hospitalization is preferred and should be mandatory in the following cases:
 - patients with neuropsychiatric disorders (considering both the risk of neuropsychiatric adverse effects of fexinidazole and the risk of poor compliance with treatment);
 - patients with history of alcohol use disorder (considering both the risk of the antabuse (disulfiram) effect (shared with other nitroimidazoles like fexinidazole) and the risk of poor compliance)
 - children and patients with body weight < 35 kg; risk of poor compliance with treatment.
 - o consider early admission if vomiting occurs following administration of fexinidazole
- In exceptional circumstances, outpatient administration (under daily supervision) may be considered in the course of the treatment in consultation with the patient, his/her family and clinicians, taking into account the following factors:
 - o the clinical condition;
 - existing comorbidities;
 - convenience to the patient and the family (e.g. distance and costs);
 - $\circ \quad$ development of side-effects interfering with treatment compliance; and
 - capacity of the healthcare system for supervised administration as an outpatient.
- Patients should be asked to attend for general examination in the hospital where they were treated at least at the end of treatment (day 10), and at 1 and 3 months post-treatment. At 6 and 12 months post-treatment, a check-up is required. However, this can be done by the treating clinician by phone or other electronic communication, by a trained health professional, or by a health community worker, whichever is most suitable. A patient should return to the hospital at any time if symptoms reappear. If signs or symptoms suggest a possibility of relapse, laboratory examinations of body fluids, including CSF, should be performed in order to detect trypanosomes and/or CSF leukocytosis.

Monitoring and evaluation

Safety and efficacy monitoring for fexinidazole use is recommended (intensive pharmacovigilance), whereby the experience with fexinidazole PV in gambiense HAT can be built upon.

PICO 2 Question

Should Fexinidazole vs. Melarsoprol be used for second stage rhodesiense HAT?				
POPULATION:	Second stage rhodesiense HAT (PICO 2)			
INTERVENTION:	Fexinidazole			
COMPARISON:	Melarsoprol			

Assessment

Desirable	Effects	le anticipated effects?		
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENC	E		ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
JUDGEMENT O Trivial O Small O Moderate • Large O Varies O Don't know	All evidence pre r-HAT (unless in Annex A. See als people with r-H/ Annex A, , Appe Outcome Overall certaint Overall mortality during treatment	sented in this summary is from people with second secon	stage Web reports in Web Impact 3% (1/35)	 Question whether there is less chance of developing resistance with fexinidazole? possible but not proven Data from mouse models is supportive of the efficacy of fexinidazole in r-HAT In terms of adverse effects fexinidazole is more desirable (less AEs).
	⊕○○○ Very low	 Melarsoprol: 1 prospective cohort study, N = 107 children and adults 1 retrospective cohort, N = 156 children and adults 	8% (9/107) 9/156 (6%)	 No injection-associated complications with oral fexinidazole Potential of reduced efficacy in advanced
	Overall mortality at 12 months \oplus Very low	 Fexinidazole 1 single-arm trial, N = 35 children >6y and adults Melarsoprol 1 prospective cohort study, N = 107 children and adults 1 case series, N = 33 patients with stage 2 r-HAT 	3% (1/35) 11% (12/107) 9% (2/22)	disease • Patients who are severely ill might not be candidates for fexinidazole
	Death due to treatment at up to 16 months \oplus OO Very low	 Fexinidazole 1 single-arm trial, 12 months FU, N = 35 children >6y and adults Melarsoprol 1 prospective cohort, 10 days FU, N = 107 children and adults 3 additional non-randomised studies, follow-up to 16 months, N ranging between 130 and 183 patients 	0% (0/35) 7% (8/107) 3-8%	
	Death due to r- HAT at up to 4 years ⊕○○○ Very low	 Fexinidazole, 1 single-arm trial, 12 months FU, N = 35 children >6y and adults Melarsoprol 1 prospective cohort, 10 days FU, N = 107 children and adults 2 non-randomised studies, follow-up range up to 4 years, N ranging between 136 and 272 	0% (0/35) 1% (1/107) 3-10%	
	Relapse at 12 months \oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc Very low	Fexinidazole: • 1 single-arm trial, N = 35 children >6y and adults Melarsoprol: 2 studies	3% (1/34)	

		 1 prospective cohort, n=107, children and adults 1 additional case series, n=33, age not reported 	1% (1/107) 18% (6/33)	
	Treatment success/clinical cure at end of treatment	 Fexinidazole: 1 single-arm trial, N = 35 children >6y and adults 	97% (34/35)	
	⊕○○○ Very low	 Melarsoprol: 1 prospective cohort, N = 107 children and adults 	92% (98/107)	
Treatment success/clinical cure at 12		 Fexinidazole: 1 single-arm trial, N = 35 children >6y and adults 	94% (33/35)	
	⊕○○○ Very low	 Melarsoprol: 1 prospective cohort, N = 107 children and adults 1 retrospective cohort, age not reported 	88% (94/107) 13% (36/272)	
Undesira How substantia	ble Effects al are the undesira	ble anticipated effects?		
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE			ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 Trivial Small Moderate Large Varies Don't know 	All evidence pres (unless indicated See also evidence with rHAT and in Appendix 6.	ented in this summary is from people with second otherwise). See full Summary of Findings in Web A e report for additional evidence from case reports i direct evidence from people with g-HAT in Web An	stage rHAT Annex A, in people nex A,	Vomiting and nausea can be significant with fexinidazole
	Outcome Overall certainty	N of studies	Impact	including (by decreasing frequency) insomnia,
	Serious adverse events at 12 months	Fexinidazole: • 1 single-arm trial, N = 35 children >6y and adults	9% (3/35)	agitation, anxiety, psychotic disorder, abnormal behaviour, depression, logorrhoea, nightmare, personality
	⊕○○○ Very low	Melarsoprol • 1 prospective cohort, N = 107 children and adults	25% (27/107)	change, and suicidal ideation.
	Adverse events at 12 months	 Fexinidazole: 1 single-arm trial, N= 45 children >6y and adults, stage 1 and 2 r-HAT, follow-up: 12 months 	53% (24/45)	
		 Melarsoprol 1 prospective cohort, N=107 children and adults (7% experienced encephalopathic syndrome during treatment) 	65.5%	

Certainty of evidence What is the overall certainty of the ev	idence of effects?			
JUDGEMENT		RESEAR	CH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 Very low Low Moderate High No included studies 		The evidence from included studies on fexinidazole and melarsoprol across all outcomes was judged as very low certainty, only non- comparative observational studies were included.		
Values Is there important uncertainty about	or variability in how mu	uch peo	ple value the main outcomes?	
JUDGEMENT		RESEAR	CH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 Important uncertainty or variability Possibly important uncertainty or variability Probably no important uncertainty No important uncertainty or variability 	ariability or variability lity			
Balance of effects Does the balance between desirable a	and undesirable effects	favor tł	ne intervention or the comparis	on?
JUDGEMENT		RESEAR	CH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 o Favors the comparison o Probably favors the comparison o Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison o Probably favors the intervention o Favors the intervention o Varies o Don't know 				
Resources required How large are the resource requirement	ents (costs)?"			
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE		ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS	
 o Large costs o Moderate costs o Negligible costs and savings Moderate savings o Large savings o Varies o Don't know 			 Perspective: from the point of families, and hospital Resources needed: cost of the medication (at available for free through cost of food (particularly valse the cost of food for the staff (12 days for hospitalia 10-12 days for melarsoprochospitalization will depen illness staff must invest time for treatment cost and effort for training fexinidazole: is less costly for the hospital part of the increased cost to the associated side effet varies across context and same context 	view of the patients, their this point, both drugs are donation) with fexinidazole); there is ne companions ization with fexinidazole; ol); duration of d on the severity of the the directly observed g staff for the patient, less costly with melarsoprol is related ects across patients within the

Cost effectiveness Does the cost-effectiveness of the intervention favor the intervention or the comparison?						
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL	CONSIDERATIONS			
 Favors the comparison Probably favors the comparis Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison Probably favors the intervent Favors the intervention Varies No included studies 	No included studies					
Equity What would be the impact on h	nealth equity?					
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL	CONSIDERATIONS			
 Reduced Probably reduced Probably no impact Probably increased Increased Varies Don't know 		Favors fexi (and can b injections; hospitals. Does not f groups (pe commoditi years and r-HAT patie Very sever	inidazole: fewer and less severe side effects e handled at the primary care level) and no might improve availability at lower level avor fexinidazole: less information on special ediatrics, pregnancy, lactating women, ies); excludes group of those who are below 6 below 20 kg. However, the proportion among ents is low. e cases may not be candidates for fexinidazole			
Acceptability Is the intervention acceptable t	o key stakeholders?					
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL	CONSIDERATIONS			
 ○ No ○ Probably no ○ Probably yes ● Yes ○ Varies ○ Don't know 		Fexinidazo the appreh LP could be to patients Fexinidazo orally adm	le is more acceptable in certain settings given nension around lumbar puncture (LP) e avoided with fexinidazole (more acceptable s and clinicians) le is more likely to be acceptable given it is inistered			
Feasibility Is the intervention feasible to in	mplement?					
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE		ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS			
 ○ No ○ Probably no ○ Probably yes ● Yes ○ Varies ○ Don't know 						

Summary of judgements

	JUDGEMENT						
DESIRABLE EFFECTS	Trivial	Small	Moderate	Large		Varies	Don't know
UNDESIRABLE EFFECTS	Trivial	Small	Moderate	Large		Varies	Don't know
CERTAINTY OF EVIDENCE	Very low	Low	Moderate	High			No included studies
VALUES	Important uncertainty or variability	Possibly important uncertainty or variability	Probably no important uncertainty or variability	No important uncertainty or variability			
BALANCE OF EFFECTS	Favors the comparison	Probably favors the comparison	Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison	Probably favors the intervention	Favors the intervention	Varies	Don't know
RESOURCES REQUIRED	Large costs	Moderate costs	Negligible costs and savings	Moderate savings	Large savings	Varies	Don't know
COST EFFECTIVENESS	Favors the comparison	Probably favors the comparison	Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison	Probably favors the intervention	Favors the intervention	Varies	No included studies
EQUITY	Reduced	Probably reduced	Probably no impact	Probably increased	Increased	Varies	Don't know
ACCEPTABILITY	No	Probably no	Probably yes	Yes		Varies	Don't know
FEASIBILITY	No	Probably no	Probably yes	Yes		Varies	Don't know

Type of recommendation

Strong recommendation against the intervention	Conditional recommendation against the intervention	Conditional recommendation for either the intervention or the comparison	Conditional recommendation for the intervention	Strong recommendation for the intervention
0	0	0	•	0

Conclusions

Recommendation

WHO suggests Fexinidazole over Melarsoprol for second stage rhodesiense HAT (conditional recommendation based on very low certainty evidence)

Remarks:

Melarsoprol may be the preferred option when the patient:

- has a contraindication to fexinidazole;
- is unable to swallow;
- has persistent vomiting despite antiemetic therapy;
- is in a critical condition and oral absorption of fexinidazole may be questionable.
- In patients with r-HAT who receive fexinidazole, LP is usually not required.

If fexinidazole is not used, LP is still required for disease staging and treatment decisions (suramin vs. melarsoprol) A lumbar puncture can be considered for diagnostic reasons when the presence of trypanosomes has not been confirmed in other body fluids while there is high r-HAT suspicion.

Subgroup considerations

Pregnant women: Same as in PICO 1

Implementation considerations

Same as in PICO 1

Monitoring and evaluation

Safety and efficacy monitoring for fexinidazole use is recommended (intensive pharmacovigilance), whereby the experience with fexinidazole PV in gambiense HAT can be built upon.

PICO 3 Question

Should immediate interim treatment with pentamidine be used over delayed treatment with other recommended agents for rhodesiense HAT in settings where those other recommended agents are not readily available ?

POPULATION:	rhodesiense HAT in settings where recommended agents are not readily available (PICO 3)		
INTERVENTION:	immediate interim treatment with pentamidine		
COMPARISON:	delayed treatment with other recommended agents		

Assessment

Desirable Effects How substantial are the desirable anticipated effects?							
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS					
o Trivial o Small o Moderate • Large o Varies o Don't know	All evidence presented in th receiving pentamidine mono Annex A. See also evidence in people with r-HAT and inc Annex A, Appendix 6.	Timeliness of treatment reduce progression of illness					
	Outcome Overall certainty	N of studies	Impact	Extent of desirable effects might depend on the clinical			
	Overall mortality at 2 years ⊕○○○ Very low	1 retrospective cohort study, N = 46	7/46 (15%)	condition at presentation			

	Death likely due to r- HAT, follow-up not reported $\oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$ Very low	1 retrospective cohort study, N = 46	2/46 (4%)	
	Death likely due to the treatment	Not reported		
	Relapse at 2 years ⊕○○○ Very low	1 retrospective cohort study, N = 46	4/46 (9%)	
	 Treatment success follow-up: 6 to 12 mo. 	1 retrospective cohort study, N = 46	7/46 (15%)	
	• follow-up: 2 years	1 retrospective cohort study, N = 46	15/46 (33%)	
	 follow-up: >2 years ⊕○○○ Very low 	1 retrospective cohort study, N = 46	21/46 (46%)	
	Serious adverse events	Not reported		
	Adverse events	Not reported		
	Adherence to treatment	Not reported		
	Withdrawals	Not reported		
Undesirabl	e Effects are the undesirable anticipate	ed effects?		
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE			ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 Trivial Small Moderate Large Varies Don't know 				Adverse effects of pentamidine
Certainty o	of evidence Ill certainty of the evidence o	f effects?		
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE			ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 Very low Low Moderate High No included students 	ry low w The evidence from included studies on pentamidine across all oderate outcomes was judged as very low certainty, only one non- comparative observational study was included. included studies			
Values Is there importan	t uncertainty about or variab	ility in how much people value the	main outcome	s?
JUDGEMENT		RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL	CONSIDERATIONS
 Important unce Possibly import 	rtainty or variability ant uncertainty or variability			

variability O No important uncertainty or variability		
Balance of effects Does the balance between desirable and undes	irable effects favor the intervention o	r the comparison?
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 Favors the comparison Probably favors the comparison Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison Probably favors the intervention Favors the intervention Varies Don't know 		
Resources required How large are the resource requirements (costs)?"	
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 Large costs Moderate costs Negligible costs and savings Moderate savings Large savings Varies Don't know 		Perspective: from the point of view of the patients, their families, the hospital. Hospital has to procure pentamidine; pentamidine may not be easily available; procurement might be expensive Delayed treatment: longer hospital stay Varies by setting
Cost effectiveness Does the cost-effectiveness of the intervention	favor the intervention or the compari	son?
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 Favors the comparison Probably favors the comparison Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison Probably favors the intervention Favors the intervention Varies No included studies 	No included studies	
Equity What would be the impact on health equity?	• 	•
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS
 Reduced Probably reduced Probably no impact Probably increased Increased Varies Don't know 		Concern about the need to procure; concern about the availability of pentamidine

Acceptability Is the intervention acceptable to key stakeholders?						
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS				
 No Probably no Probably yes Yes Varies Don't know 		Key stakeholders: patients, caregivers, clinicians Concern that it might not be acceptable to stock pentamidine				
Feasibility Is the intervention feasible to implement?						
JUDGEMENT	RESEARCH EVIDENCE	ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS				
 O No O Probably no O Probably yes O Yes Varies O Don't know 		concerns: availability of pentamidine				

Summary of judgements

	JUDGEMENT						
DESIRABLE EFFECTS	Trivial	Small	Moderate	Large		Varies	Don't know
UNDESIRABLE EFFECTS	Trivial	Small	Moderate	Large		Varies	Don't know
CERTAINTY OF EVIDENCE	Very low	Low	Moderate	High			No included studies
VALUES	Important uncertainty or variability	Possibly important uncertainty or variability	Probably no important uncertainty or variability	No important uncertainty or variability			
BALANCE OF EFFECTS	Favors the comparison	Probably favors the comparison	Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison	Probably favors the intervention	Favors the intervention	Varies	Don't know
RESOURCES REQUIRED	Large costs	Moderate costs	Negligible costs and savings	Moderate savings	Large savings	Varies	Don't know
COST EFFECTIVENESS	Favors the comparison	Probably favors the comparison	Does not favor either the intervention or the comparison	Probably favors the intervention	Favors the intervention	Varies	No included studies
EQUITY	Reduced	Probably reduced	Probably no impact	Probably increased	Increased	Varies	Don't know
ACCEPTABILITY	No	Probably no	Probably yes	Yes		Varies	Don't know
FEASIBILITY	No	Probably no	Probably yes	Yes		Varies	Don't know

Type of recommendation

Strong recommendation against the intervention	Conditional recommendation against the intervention	Conditional recommendation for either the intervention or the comparison	Conditional recommendation for the intervention	Strong recommendation for the intervention
0	0	0	•	0

Conclusions

Recommendation

WHO suggests immediate interim treatment with pentamidine over delayed treatment with other recommended agents for rhodesiense HAT in settings where those other recommended agents are not readily available (conditional recommendation, based on very low certainty evidence) Remarks:

- treatment should be switched to the recommended agent as soon as it becomes available
- key issue: availability of pentamidine