In their important and provocative article, Reuben Granich and colleagues argue that universal voluntary HIV testing and immediate antiretroviral therapy, irrespective of the degree of immune suppression, could eliminate HIV from countries where the infection is highly prevalent. However, we agree with Geoffrey Garnett and Rebecca Baggaley that this approach could strongly shift the benefits of treatment from the individual to the population.

Although current HIV treatment guidelines favour earlier treatment, the risks and benefits of treatment for people with CD4+ cell counts above 350 per μL are unknown. Trials of therapy for patients with higher counts are yet to begin.

Within the field of communicable diseases, we are aware of little precedent for the approach of “treating for the common good”. Treatment of diseases such as tuberculosis might have the effect of decreasing transmission, but the primary goal is to decrease morbidity and mortality for the affected person. A better analogy might be found in immunisation programmes—eg, rubella vaccination of infants and children aims to reduce exposure among pregnant women. However, there is still a clear benefit and minimal risk for the individual vaccinee.

The World Medical Association international code of medical ethics states that “A physician shall act in the patient’s best interest when providing medical care.” If we are to deviate from this basic principle, we will need a robust ethical model for balancing individual and societal benefits.
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Reuben Granich and colleagues’ use mathematical models to show that annual screening of most adults for HIV, with immediate commencement of antiretroviral therapy for all infected, would strikingly reduce HIV incidence. The findings are very interesting. We would like to share our lessons from Ethiopia.

Ethiopia had a millennium AIDS campaign with the objective of increasing the number of people tested for HIV through universal voluntary counselling and testing and providing antiretroviral treatment for eligible patients. We were able to increase the number of people tested in 1 year from 560 000 in 2005/06 to 4·6 million in 2007/08. The number of patients started on antiretroviral therapy per month increased from 3500 to more than 5700.2

Even though we accomplished a lot in terms of HIV testing and antiretroviral therapy provision, we had challenges during the rapid scale-up of these services. We learnt that mass testing is very resource-intensive and needs a strong health system, including adequate human resources and a continuous supply of commodities. As a result, our current guiding principle is “high yield” and “high impact” through targeted testing of most-at-risk populations: patients with tuberculosis or sexually transmitted diseases, and pregnant women.

Universal voluntary HIV testing and antiretroviral therapy provision might be effective in reducing HIV transmission, but with the current health system constraints in many sub-Saharan African countries such as Ethiopia, it is really not feasible to practise it. We recommend “high yield” and “high impact” HIV testing with early initiation of antiretroviral therapy, and improved adherence and retention of patients in care and treatment.
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Authors’ reply

We thank the many colleagues around the world who have commented on our theoretical paper, and are encouraged by the ongoing discussion about how best to use antiretroviral therapy for HIV prevention. These comments signal that more research is needed.

The hypothetical approach that was modelled need not be interpreted as putting public health in competition with individual health. There is increasing evidence of individual benefit from earlier initiation of antiretroviral therapy, and the optimum time to start therapy remains uncertain. Only research can determine conclusively whether the modelled approach would benefit individuals by reducing HIV transmission and HIV disease, or whether drug toxicity and other considerations would outweigh advantages.

We agree that operational challenges in high burden, resource-constrained settings are formidable. The paper was a hypothetical exercise and further research is required to assess whether the studied approach has merit. We also agree that ethical and human rights issues need to be addressed, along with technical and financial considerations, as the concept of antiretroviral therapy for HIV prevention is further developed. We stress that other prevention modalities would continue to have a role, including ethical partner notification, as appropriate.