Acknowledgements This study was performed using data from the GLADEL cohort.

#### CE-20

## LUPUS AUTO-ANTIBODIES AND CLINICAL OUTCOMES AMONG JAMAICAN SLE PATIENTS

Davis Stacy\*, Onyefulu Cynthia, De Ceulaer Karel. Division of Rheumatology, Department of Medicine, University of the West Indies, Mona

10.1136/lupus-2016-000179.99

Background The purpose of this study is to correlate lupus antibodies with clinical features of Jamaican SLE patients and assess their predictive value.

Materials and methods The study was guided by two research questions. To answer these questions, an ex-post facto research design was used. This design was used because the subjects already had Lupus before treatment, which paved the way for a retrospective study of possible relationships and effects of the treatments to be conducted. The sample size used was (n = 136). Between May 2009 and December 2010, 136 SLE patients were tested for auto-antibodies.

Results Fifty five percent were positive for anti-ssDNA, 35% positive for anti-dsDNA, 46% for anti-Sm, 83% for anti-RNP/ Sm, 76% for anti-Ro, 31% for anti-La, 30% for anti-histone and 65% for anti-chromatin. After a mean follow up of 4.5 years, the findings showed that elevated ssDNA and dsDNA in the initial samples were predictive of proteinuria, while elevated anti-Sm levels were predictive of proteinuria, low haemoglobin, lymphopenia and increased heart rate. The results of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation showed a weak to moderation relationships between ssDNA and Creartinine (r = 0.209, p < 0.05); DMARD use (r = 0.226, p < 0.05); Proteinuria (r = 0.286, p < 0.01); and Average Prednisone Dose (APD) (r = 0.363, p < 0.01). A weak to moderation relationships were also observed between dsDNA and Hb (r = -0.218, p < 0.05); Proteinuria (r = 0.399, p < 0.01); and APD (r = 0.457, p < 0.01). Anti SM correlated with Proteinuria (r = 0.374, p < 0.05) while anti RNP/SM correlated with Hb (r = 0.304, p < 0.05), and anti-Histone correlated with Proteinuria (r = 0.461, p < 0.05). The simple regression analysis conducted to examine if SM be used to predict heart rate, Hb, and Lymphocytes. The results were significant: Hb  $(R^2 = 0.217, F = 23.843, p < 0.01)$ ; Hb and APD  $(R^2 = 0.262, p < 0.01)$ F = 15.070, p < 0.01); and Hb, APD and organ involvement  $(R^2 = 0.305, F = 12.311, p < 0.01).$ 

Conclusions This retrospective study showed that elevated ssDNA and dsDNA in the initial samples were predictive of proteinuria, while elevated anti-Sm levels were predictive of proteinuria, low haemoglobin, lymphopenia and increased heart rate.

CE-21

# THE PREVALENCE AND DETERMINANTS OF ANTI-DFS70 ANTIBODIES IN AN INTERNATIONAL INCEPTION COHORT OF SYSTEMIC LUPUS ERYTHEMATOSUS (SLE) PATIENTS

<sup>1</sup>May Choi, <sup>1</sup>**Ann Clarke\***, <sup>2</sup>John G Hanly, <sup>3,4</sup>Murray Urowitz, <sup>5</sup>Juanita Romero-Diaz, <sup>6</sup>Caroline Gordon, <sup>7</sup>Sang-Cheol Bae, <sup>8</sup>Sasha Bernatsky, <sup>9</sup>Daniel J Wallace, <sup>10</sup>Joan T Merrill, <sup>11</sup>David A Isenberg, <sup>12</sup>Anisur Rahman, <sup>13</sup>Ellen M Ginzler, <sup>14</sup>Paul R Fortin, <sup>15</sup>Dafna Gladman, <sup>16</sup>Jorge Sanchez-Guerrero, <sup>17</sup>Michelle Petri, <sup>18</sup>Ian N Bruce, <sup>19</sup>Mary Anne Dooley, <sup>20</sup>Rosalind Ramsey-Goldman, <sup>21</sup>Cynthia Aranow, <sup>22</sup>Graciela S Alarcon, <sup>23</sup>Kristján Steinsson, <sup>24</sup>Ola Nived. <sup>25</sup>Gunnar K Sturfelt. <sup>26</sup>Susan Manzi. <sup>27</sup>Munther Khamashta. <sup>28</sup>Ronald F van Vollenhoven, <sup>29</sup>Asad Zoma, <sup>30</sup>Guillermo Ruiz-Irastorza, <sup>31</sup>S Sam Lim, <sup>32</sup>Thomas Stoll, <sup>33</sup>Murat Inanc, <sup>34</sup>Kenneth C Kalunian, <sup>35</sup>Diane L Kamen, <sup>36</sup>Peter Maddison, <sup>37</sup>Christine A Peschken, <sup>38</sup>Søren Jacobsen, <sup>39</sup>Anca Askanase, <sup>40</sup>Jill P Buyon, <sup>41</sup>W Winn Chatham, <sup>42</sup>Manuel Ramos-Casals, <sup>43</sup>Yvan St Pierre, <sup>1</sup>Marvin J Fritzler. <sup>1</sup>Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada; <sup>2</sup>Rheumatology, Dalhousie University and Nova Scotia Health Authority, Halifax, NS, Canada; <sup>3</sup>Rheumatology, TWH, Toronto, ON, Canada; <sup>4</sup>Rheumatology, U of Toronto, Toronto Western Hospital, Toronto, ON, Canada; <sup>5</sup>Immunology and Rheumatology, Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición Salvador Zubirán, Mexico City, Mexico; <sup>6</sup>Rheumatology, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom; <sup>7</sup>Rheumatology, Hanyang University Hospital for Rheumatic Diseases, Seoul, South Korea; 8Rheumatology/Clinical Epidemiology, McGill University, Montreal, QC, Canada; <sup>9</sup>Cedars-Sinai Medical Centre, West Hollywood, CA, USA; <sup>10</sup>Clinical Pharmacology, Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, Oklahoma City, OK, USA; <sup>11</sup>Rayne Institute, Centre for Rheumatology Research, UCL Division of Medicine, London, United Kingdom; 12Centre for Rheumatology Research, U College of London, London, United Kingdom; <sup>13</sup>Medicine, SUNY-Downstate, Brooklyn, NY, USA; <sup>14</sup>Rheumatology, University of Laval, Quebec, QC, Canada; <sup>15</sup>Rheumatology, University of Toronto, Toronto Western Hospital, Toronto, ON, Canada; <sup>16</sup>Rheumatology, Toronto Western Hospital, Toronto, ON, Canada; 17Rheumatology, Johns Hopkins University Hospital, Baltimore, MD, USA; 18Central Manchester University Hospital and Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, NIHR Manchester, Musculoskeletal Biomedical Research Unit, Manchester, United Kingdom; <sup>19</sup>UNC Kidney Centre, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA; <sup>20</sup>Rheumatology, Northwestern University, Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA; <sup>21</sup>Feinstein Institute for Medical Research, Mahasset, NY, USA; <sup>22</sup>Medicine, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, USA; 23Rheumatology, University Hospital, Reykjavik, Iceland; <sup>24</sup>Rheumatology, Inst of Clinical sciences, Lund, Sweden; <sup>25</sup>Department of Rheumatology, University Hospital Lund, Lund, Sweden; <sup>26</sup>Rheumatology, Allegheny Health Network, Pittsburgh, PA, USA; <sup>27</sup>Graham Hughes Lupus Research Laboratory, The Rayne Institute, St Thomas' Hospital, London, United Kingdom; <sup>28</sup>Department of Medicine, Rheumatology Unit, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden; <sup>29</sup>Rheumatology, Hairmyres Hospital, East Kilbride, United Kingdom; 30 Universidad del Pais Vasco, Servicio de Medicina Interna, Hospital de Cruces, Bizkaia, Spain; <sup>31</sup>Medicine/Rheumatology, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA; <sup>32</sup>Abteilung Rheumatologie/Rehab, Kantonsspital Schaffhausen, Schaffhausen, Switzerland; 33 Department of Internal Medicine, Division of Rheumatology, Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey, <sup>34</sup>Division of Rheumatology, Allergy & Immunology, UCSD School of Medicine Centre for Innovative Therapy, La Jolla, CA, USA; <sup>35</sup>Medicine, Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, SC, USA; <sup>36</sup>School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences, Bangor University, Bangor, United Kingdom; <sup>37</sup>Rheumatology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, MB, Canada; <sup>38</sup>Rheumatology, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark; <sup>39</sup>Columbia University College of Physicians & Surgeons, New York, NY, USA; 40 Medicine, Division of Rheumatology, New York University School of Medicine, New York, NY, USA; 41 Medicine/Clinical Immunology and Rheumatology, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, USA; 42 Department of Autoimmune Diseases, CELLEX-IDIBAPS, Hospital Clínic, Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain; 43Clinical Epidemiology, Research Institute of the McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, QC,

10.1136/lupus-2016-000179.100

LUPUS 2016;**3**(Suppl 1):A1-A80

**Abstract CE-21 Table 1** Baseline demographic, clinical, and autoantibody profiles of anti-DFS 70 negative and positive patients and univariate and multivariate associations with anti-DFS70

	DFS-negative Mean or% n = 1056	DFS-70 positive Mean or% n = 81	Univariate model Odds ratio 95% CI:	Most informative multivariate model Odds ratio 95% CI:
Age at diagnosis, yr	35.3	33.5	0.99 (0.97,1.01)	
Female	89.9	90.1	1.03 (0.48, 2.19)	
Ethnicity				
Asian	22.1	18.5	0.80 (0.45, 1.43)	
Black	16.0	8.6	0.50 (0.22, 1.10)	
Hispanic	3.1	6.2	2.09 (0.79, 5.52)	
White	54.1	63.0	1.44 (0.90, 2.30)	
Other <sup>1</sup>	4.7	3.7	0.78 (0.24, 2.58)	
Post-secondary education	66.3	71.8	1.29 (0.78, 2.15)	
Current smoker	15.7	13.3	0.82 (0.41, 1.64)	
Former smoker	21.3	24.0	1.17 (0.67, 2.03)	
Alcohol, F: >10/wk; M: >15/wk	1.5	1.3	0.86 (0.11, 6.58)	
Hypertension, on meds	27.5	26.3	0.94 (0.56, 1.57)	
Nephritis <sup>2</sup> at enrollment	29.5	21.3	0.65 (0.37, 1.15)	
# ACR criteria	4.8	4.6	0.89 (0.71, 1.12)	
SLEDAI-2Kscore	5.2	6.0	1.03 (0.99, 1.07)	
Neurological	0.2	0.5	1.08 (0.97, 1.21)	
Mucocutaneous	1.1	1.3	1.06 (0.95, 1.18)	
Musculoskeletal	0.8	1.5	1.24 (1.10, 1.40)	1.25 (1.10, 1.41)
Renal	1.4	1.1	0.97 (0.89, 1.05)	1123 (1110)
Serositis	0.1	0.0	0.58 (0.23, 1.48)	
Constitutional	0.0	0.1	1.44 (0.50, 4.16)	
Immunological	1.5	1.5	0.99 (0.86, 1.14)	
Hematological	0.1	0.1	0.60 (0.25, 1.44)	
Steroids,% ever using	80.3	80.2	1.00 (0.56, 1.76)	
Antimalarials,% ever using	73.3	77.8	1.28 (0.74, 2.19)	
	43.0	37.0		
Immunosuppressants,		0	0.78 (0.49, 1.24)	
% ever using Biologics,% ever using	0.76	U		
ANA	93.8	93.8	1.01 (0.40 2.59)	
DFS ANA by indirect immunofluorescence	0.7	12.3	,,	
Anti-dsDNA	40.1	26.3	0.53 (0.32, 0.89)	0.53 (0.31, 0.92)
Autoantibodies			, , , , , ,	, , , , ,
Monospecific DFS70	0	16.0		
PCNA	6.9	8.6	1.27 (0.57, 2.87)	
Ribosomal-P	15.7	11.1	0.67 (0.33, 1.37)	
Ro52/TRIM21	35.4	27.2	0.68 (0.41, 1.13)	
SSA/Ro60	46.3	34.6	0.61 (0.38, 0.98)	
SSB/La	16.0	4.9	0.27 (0.10, 0.75)	0.25 (0.08, 0.82)
Sm	23.9	16.0	0.61 (0.33, 1.12)	0.25 (0.00, 0.02)
U1-RNP	31.5	21.0	0.58 (0.33, 1.0)	
Lupus anticoagulant	6.6	7.4	1.39 (0.81, 2.40)	
Anticardiolipin	12.5	12.3		
Anti-β2 qlycoprotein1	14.3	24.7	0.98 (0.48, 2.03) 1.96 (1.12, 3.43)	2.15 (1.21, 3.84)

A56 LUPUS 2016;**3**(Suppl 1):A1–A80

Background When found in the absence of antibodies to extractable nuclear antigens (ENA) or anti-double-stranded DNA (dsDNA) (i.e., monospecific), autoantibodies to the nuclear autoantigen dense fine speckles 70 (DFS70) are purported to rule out SLE. The reported frequency of anti-DFS70 by chemiluminescence (CIA) in SLE is low compared to healthy individuals (0–5.7% vs. 1.3–23.2%), while the frequency of monospecific anti-DFS70 in SLE is even lower at 0–0.4%. There are no studies examining the frequency of anti-DFS70 in an early inception SLE cohort. This study determined the prevalence of anti-DFS70 in a multi-national, multi-ethnic early inception SLE cohort and examined demographic, clinical, and autoantibody associations.

Materials and methods Patients fulfilling ACR Classification Criteria for SLE were enrolled in the Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics (SLICC) inception cohort within 15 months of diagnosis. Demographic and clinical data were collected at enrollment. ANAs were detected by indirect immunofluorescence on HEp-2 cells (ImmunoConcepts, Sacramento) and ENAs and dsDNA by an addressable laser bead immunoassay (FIDIS Connective13, TheraDiag, Paris). Anti-DFS70 antibodies were measured by CIA (Inova Diagnostics, San Diego). The association between anti-DFS70 and baseline demographic, clinical, and autoantibody profiles was assessed using univariate and multivariate logistic regression. For the most informative model, only the remaining statistically significant predictors at the 95% CI: were included, after eliminating other potential predictors individually, starting with the least likely to be associated with the outcome.

Results 1137 patients were included; 89.9% were female and 93.8% were ANA positive (Table 1). The frequency of anti-DFS70 was 7.1% [95% CI: 5.7–8.8%]. 13 of 1137 (1.1%) [95% CI: 0.6–1.9%] were positive for anti-DFS70 only (monospecific). In univariate analysis, patients with musculoskeletal activity (based on SLEDAI items) or anti-β–2 glycoprotein-1 (anti-β2GP1) were more likely to have anti-DFS70, whereas those with anti-dsDNA, anti-SSA/Ro60, anti-SSB/La, or anti-U1RNP were less likely to have anti-DFS70. In multivariate analysis, patients with musculoskeletal activity (Odd Ratio (OR) 1.25 [95% CI: 1.10, 1.41]) or anti-β2GP1 (OR 2.15, 95% CI: 1.21, 3.84) were more likely to have anti-DFS70, while those with anti-dsDNA (OR 0.53, 95% CI: 0.31, 0.92) or anti-SSB/La (OR 0.25, 95% CI:0.08, 0.82) were less likely to have anti-DFS70.

Conclusions The prevalence of anti-DFS70 in newly diagnosed SLE patients was at the high end of the range previously published for SLE (7.1% vs. 0–5.7%) and was associated with musculoskeletal activity and anti- $\beta$ 2GP1. However, 'monospecific' anti-DFS70 was rare (1.1%) and is potentially useful to discriminate between ANA positive healthy individuals and SLE.

### CE-22

## CANCER IN SYSTEMIC LUPUS ERYTHEMATOSUS: RESULTS FROM THE SLICC INCEPTION COHORT

<sup>1</sup>Sasha Bernatsky\*, <sup>2</sup>Murray B Urowitz, <sup>3</sup>John Hanly, <sup>4</sup>Ann E Clarke, <sup>5</sup>Caroline Gordon, <sup>6</sup>Juanita Romero-Diaz, <sup>7</sup>Graciela S Alarcon, <sup>8</sup>Sang-Cheol Bae, <sup>9</sup>Michelle Petri, <sup>10</sup>Joan Merrill, <sup>11</sup>Daniel J Wallace, <sup>12</sup>Paul R Fortin, <sup>2</sup>Dafna D Gladman, <sup>13</sup>David Isenberg, <sup>13</sup>Anisur Rahman, <sup>14</sup>Susan Manzi, <sup>15</sup>Ola Nived, <sup>15</sup>Gunnar K Sturfelt, <sup>16</sup>Christine A Peschken, <sup>2</sup>Jorge Sanchez-Guerrero, <sup>17</sup>Guillermo Ruiz-Irastorza, <sup>18</sup>Cynthia Aranow, <sup>19</sup>Ronald van Vollenhoven, <sup>20</sup>Asad A Zoma, <sup>21</sup>Kristjan Steinsson, <sup>22</sup>Munther A Khamashta, <sup>23</sup>Ellen Ginzler, <sup>24</sup>Anca Askanase, <sup>25</sup>Kenneth C Kalunian, <sup>26</sup>Mary Anne Dooley, <sup>27</sup>SSam Lim, <sup>28</sup>Diane Kamen, <sup>29</sup>Soren Jacobsen, <sup>30</sup>Manuel Ramos-Casals, <sup>31</sup>Murat Inanc, <sup>32</sup>Jennifer L Lee, <sup>33</sup>Rosalind Ramsey-Goldman. <sup>1</sup>Divisions of Rheumatology and Clinical Epidemiology, McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, QC, Canada; <sup>2</sup>Centre for Prognosis Studies in the Rheumatic Diseases, Toronto Western Hospital and University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada; <sup>3</sup>Division of Rheumatology, Department of Medicine and Department of Pathology, Queen Elizabeth II Health Sciences Centre and Dalhousie University, Halifax, NS, Canada; <sup>4</sup>Division of Rheumatology, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada; <sup>5</sup>Rheumatology Research Group, School of Immunity and Infection, College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK: 6 Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición, Mexico City, Mexico; <sup>7</sup>Department of Medicine, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, USA; <sup>8</sup>Department of Rheumatology, Hanyang University Hospital for Rheumatic Diseases, Seoul, Korea; <sup>9</sup>Division of Rheumatology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD, USA: 10 Department of Clinical Pharmacology. Oklahoma Medical Research Foundation, Oklahoma City, OK, USA; 11 Cedars-Sinai/David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, USA; 12 Division of Rheumatology, Centre Hospitalier Universitaire de Québec et Université Laval, Quebec City, QC, Canada; <sup>13</sup>Centre for Rheumatology, Department of Medicine, University College London, UK; <sup>14</sup>Division of Rheumatology, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA, USA; 15 Department of Rheumatology, University Hospital Lund, Lund, Sweden; 16 University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada; <sup>17</sup>Autoimmune Diseases Research Unit. Department of Internal Medicine, BioCruces Health Research Institute, Hospital Universitario Cruces, University of the Basque Country, Barakaldo, Spain; <sup>18</sup>Feinstein Institute for Medical Research, Manhasset, NY, USA; 19 Academic Medical Centre, Dept of Clinical Immunology and Rheumatology, Amsterdam; The Netherlands; <sup>20</sup>Lanarkshire Centre for Rheumatology, Hairmyres Hospital, East Kilbride, Scotland UK; <sup>21</sup>Center for Rheumatology Research, Landspitali University hospital, Reykjavik, Iceland; <sup>22</sup>Lupus Research Unit, The Rayne Institute, St Thomas' Hospital, King's College London School of Medicine, UK, London, UK; <sup>23</sup>Department of Medicine, SUNY Downstate Medical Centre, Brooklyn, NY, USA; <sup>24</sup>Hospital for Joint Diseases, NYU, Seligman Centre for Advanced Therapeutics, New York, NY USA; <sup>25</sup>UCSD School of Medicine, La Jolla, CA, USA; <sup>26</sup>Thurston Arthritis Research Centre, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC, USA; <sup>27</sup>Emory University School of Medicine,</sup> Division of Rheumatology, Atlanta, Georgia, USA; <sup>28</sup>Medical University of South Carolina, Charleston, South Carolina, USA; <sup>29</sup>Department of Rheumatology, Rigshospitalet, Copenhagen University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark; 30 Josep Font Autoimmune Diseases Laboratory, IDIBAPS, Department of Autoimmune Diseases, Hospital Clínic, Barcelona, Spain; <sup>31</sup>Division of Rheumatology, Department of Internal Medicine, Istanbul Medical Faculty, Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey; 32 Division of Clinical Epidemiology, McGill University Health Centre, Montreal, QC, Canada; 33 Northwestern University and Feinberg School of Medicine, Chicago, IL, USA

10.1136/lupus-2016-000179.101

**Background** To describe cancer incidence in the largest inception SLE cohort in the world.

Materials and methods Patients meeting ACR criteria for newonset SLE were enrolled across 32 centres. At enrolment and

LUPUS 2016;**3**(Suppl 1):A1-A80