

CE-19

REMISSION AND LOW LUPUS DISEASE ACTIVITY STATUS (LLDAS) PROTECT LUPUS PATIENTS FROM DAMAGE OCCURRENCE: DATA FROM A MULTI-ETHNIC, MULTINATIONAL LATIN AMERICAN LUPUS COHORT

^{1,2}Manuel F Ugarte-Gil*, ³Daniel Wojdyla, ⁴Guillermo J Pons-Estel, ⁵Luis R Catoggio, ⁶Cristina Drenkard, ⁷Judith Sarano, ⁸Guillermo A Berbotto, ⁹Eduardo F Borba, ¹⁰Emilia I Sato, ¹¹Joao C Tavares Brenol, ¹²Oscar Uribe, ¹²Luis A Ramirez, ¹³Marlene Guilbert-Toledano, ¹⁴Loreto Massardo, ¹⁵Mario H Cardiel, ¹⁶Luis H Silveira, ¹⁷Rosa Chacón-Díaz, ¹⁸Graciela S Alarcón, ¹⁹Bernardo A Pons-Estel. ¹Rheumatology, Hospital Guillermo Almenara Irigoyen. EsSalud, Lima, Perú; ²Universidad Científica del Sur, Lima, Perú; ³GLADEL consultant, Rosario, Argentina; ⁴Department of Autoimmune Diseases, Hospital Clinic, Barcelona, Spain; ⁵Sección de Reumatología, Servicio de Clínica Médica, Hospital Italiano, Instituto Universitario Escuela de Medicina Hospital Italiano and Fundación Dr. Pedro M. Catoggio para el Progreso de la Reumatología, Buenos Aires, Argentina; ⁶Division of Rheumatology, Emory School of Medicine, Atlanta, USA; ⁷Instituto de Investigaciones Médicas "Alfredo Lanari", Buenos Aires, Argentina; ⁸Hospital Escuela "Eva Perón", Granadero Baigorria; ⁹Hospital das Clínicas da Faculdade de Medicina da Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil; ¹⁰Disciplina de Reumatologia, Escola Paulista de Medicina, Universidade Federal da São Paulo -UNIFESP, São Paulo, Brazil; ¹¹Hospital das Clínicas de Porto Alegre, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil; ¹²Universidad de Antioquia, Hospital Universitario "San Vicente de Paul," Medellín, Colombia; ¹³Centro de Investigaciones Médico Quirúrgicas- CIMEQ, Havana, Cuba; ¹⁴Escuela de Medicina, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile; ¹⁵Centro de Investigación Clínica de Morelia SC, Morelia, Michoacan, Mexico; ¹⁶Instituto Nacional de Cardiología "Ignacio Chávez," Ciudad de Mexico, Mexico; ¹⁷Servicio de Reumatología, Centro Nacional de Enfermedades Reumáticas, Hospital Universitario de Caracas, Caracas, Venezuela; ¹⁸Department of Medicine, Division of Clinical Immunology and Rheumatology, School of Medicine, The University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL, USA; ¹⁹Hospital Provincial de Rosario, Rosario, Argentina

10.1136/lupus-2016-000179.98

Background Recently, definitions of both Remission and LLDAS have been proposed which include disease activity status and medication intake [immunosuppressive (IS) drugs and corticosteroids]. The aim of this study was to evaluate both on the outcome of SLE patients.

Materials and methods Interval was defined as the period between two SLEDAIs or between one SLEDAI and the end of the follow-up. Four disease activity statuses were defined: Remission off-therapy = SLEDAI = 0 without prednisone or IS drugs;

Remission on-therapy = SLEDAI = 0 and a prednisone dose ≤ 5 mg/d and/or IS drugs in maintenance dose; LLDAS = SLEDAI ≤ 4 , a prednisone dose ≤ 7.5 mg/d and/or IS drugs in maintenance dose; and non-optimally controlled status = SLEDAI > 4 and/or prednisone dose > 7.5 mg/d and/or IS drugs in induction dose. Antimalarials were allowed in all groups. Predefined outcomes were mortality, new damage [defined as an increase of at least 1 point in the SLICC/ACR damage index (SDI)] and severe new damage (defined as an increase of at least 3 points in the SDI). Univariable and multivariable Cox regression models adjusted for possible confounders were performed in order to define the impact of disease activity status, as time-dependent variable, on these three outcomes.

Results One thousand three hundred and fifty patients from the GLADEL cohort, with at least two intervals, were included, including 5672 intervals. Median length of the intervals was 7.1 months (interquartile rank 5.1–11.7). Median number of intervals per patients was 4 (2–7). The most frequent interval was non-optimally controlled (4446; 78.4%), followed by LLDAS (566; 10.0%), remission on-therapy (553; 9.7%) and remission off-therapy (107; 1.9%). Seventy-nine patients died during the follow-up, 606 presented new damage and 177 severe new damage. Because of the limited number of intervals in the off-therapy group, this group was combined with the on-therapy group. The impact of these disease activity statuses on the pre-specified outcomes is depicted in Table 1. Of importance, in multivariable analyses, remission on/off therapy was associated with both, a lower risk of new damage (HR: 0.52; 95% CI: 0.37–0.72), and of severe new damage (HR: 0.32; 95% CI: 0.15–0.65); LLDAS was associated with a lower risk of severe new damage (HR: 0.46; 95% CI: 0.23–0.91). Although the HR were in the right direction for the mortality outcome, the confidence intervals were too wide, probably because of the relative low number of events in this category.

Conclusions Remission on/off therapy diminished the risk of new and severe new damage, and LLDAS diminished the risk of severe new damage after adjusting for other well-known risk factors of damage.

Abstract CE-19 Table 1 Impact of disease activity statuses on mortality, new damage and severe new damage. Univariable and multivariable analyses

Group	Mortality		New damage**		Severe new damage***	
	Unadjusted Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	Adjusted* Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	Unadjusted Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	Adjusted* Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	Unadjusted Hazard Ratio (95% CI)	Adjusted* Hazard Ratio (95% CI)
Remission (On/Off Therapy)	0.46 (0.17–1.27)	0.56 (0.20–1.55)	0.47 (0.34–0.65)	0.52 (0.37–0.72)	0.30 (0.16–0.60)	0.32 (0.15–0.65)
p-value	0.1330	0.2623	< 0.0001	< 0.0001	0.0006	0.0017
LLDAS	0.65 (0.26–1.60)	0.81 (0.32–2.02)	0.69 (0.50–0.93)	0.74 (0.54–1.01)	0.41 (0.21–0.81)	0.46 (0.23–0.91)
p-value	0.3454	0.6476	0.0164	0.0610	0.0100	0.0247
Non-Optimally Controlled	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.	Ref.

LLDAS: Lupus low disease activity status. *Adjusted by age at baseline, gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, years of instruction, medical coverage and first SDI. **One-point increment in the SDI. ***Three-point increment in the SDI.

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 moderate relationships between ssDNA and Creatinine ($r = 0.209$, $p < 0.05$); 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 moderate 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 ($R^2 = 0.262$, $F = 15.070$, $p < 0.01$); 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

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

10.1136/lupus-2016-000179.100