flare cluster included Delaware, Delaware Bay area, and Chesapeake Bay area between 2003 and 2014. Maps were generated highlighting the study area, flares, and identified clusters from all analyses. The space-time effects of environmental and demographic variables on the identified clusters will be considered in subsequent analysis.

Conclusions We describe the first space-time clusters of lupus organ-specific disease activity strongly supporting the role of environmental factors as drivers of lupus activity.

PS3:46

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN DAMAGE CLUSTERING AND MORTALITY IN JUVENILE SYSTEMIC LUPUS ERYTHEMATOSUS: CLUSTER ANALYSES IN A LARGE COHORT FROM THE SPANISH SOCIETY OF RHEUMATOLOGY LUPUS REGISTRY

¹V Torrente-Segarra, ²TC Salman-Monte, ³I Rua-Figueroa, ⁴J Calvo-Alén, ⁵FJ López-Longo, ⁶M Galindo, ⁷A Olivé, ⁸JM Pego-Reigosa. ¹Hospital General Hospitalet-HSJDMoisès Broggi, Universitat de Barcelona (UB), Hospitalet Llobregat, Spain; ²Parc de Salut Mar-IMIM, Department of Medicine, Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona (UAB), Barcelona, Spain; ³Hospital Universitario Dr Negrín, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain; ⁴Hospital Cruces, Bilbao, Spain; ⁵Hospital Gregorio Marañón, Madrid, Spain; ⁶Instituto de Investigación Hospital 12 de Octubre (I+12), Madrid, Spain; ⁷Hospital Germans Tries i Pujol, Badalona, Spain; ⁸Hospital do Meixoeiro, Vigo, Spain

10.1136/lupus-2018-abstract.94

Objectives To identify patterns (clusters) of damage manifestations within a large cohort of juvenile SLE (jSLE) patients and evaluate the potential association of these clusters with a higher risk of mortality.

Methods This is a multicentre, descriptive, cross-sectional study of a cohort of 345 jSLE patients from the Spanish Society of Rheumatology Lupus Registry. Organ damage was ascertained using the Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics Damage Index. Using cluster analysis, groups of patients with similar patterns of damage manifestations were identified.

Results Mean age at diagnosis 14.2±2.89, 88.7% were female and 93.4% were Caucasian. A total of 12 (3.5%) patients

died, mean SLICC/ACR DI 1.27±1.63. Three damage clusters were identified:

Cluster 1 (72.7% of patients) showed damage in only 22.3% of patient, but no significant domain was involved.

Cluster 2 (14.5%) was featured by renal damage in 60% of patients, ocular damage in 54%, cardiovascular damage in 20% and gonadal failure in 14%, all significantly higher than clusters 1 and 3 (p<0.001). All patients scored for some damage in SLICC/ACR DI index, with a mean of 2.90 ± 1.54 and mean affected domains of 1.86 ± 0.93 .

Cluster 3 (12.7%) was the only group with musculoskeletal damage (100%), clearly higher than clusters 1 and 2. All patients scored for some damage in SLICC/ACR DI index, with a mean of 2.66 ± 1.87 and mean affected domains of 1.89 ± 1.18 .

The overall mortality rate of patients in clusters 2 and 3 was higher than in cluster 1 (p<0.05) and significantly higher in cluster 2 (2.2x times than cluster 3 and 5x times than cluster 1) (See table 1).

Conclusion In a large cohort of jSLE patients, we found one cluster with several damage domains involved that we consider clinically meaningful. Another cluster with important musculos-keletal damage manifestations and another cluster with no clinically significant damage at all were also found. These two clusters of jSLE with important clinical damage were found to be associated to higher rates of mortality, specially for the cluster involving renal, ocular, cardiovascular and gonadal domains. Physicians should pay special attention to the early prevention of damage in these particular subsets of patients.

PS3:47

MULTI-YEAR ANALYSIS OF PREVALENCE/OUTCOMES
OF PULMONARY EMBOLISM IN SYSTEMIC LUPUS
ERYTHEMATOSUS DISCHARGES FROM NATIONWIDE
INPATIENT SAMPLE DATABASE & COMPARISON TO
NATIONAL HOSPITAL DISCHARGE SURVEY

V Majithia, T Nasir, S Lirette, S Kishore. *University of Mississippi School of Medicine, Jackson, USA*

10.1136/lupus-2018-abstract.95

Abstract PS3:47 Table 1 Outcomes

All Patients	PE	No PE	OR	p-Value
6132 (2%)	226 (6%)	5906 (2%)	2.99 (CI 2.56 - 3.49)	<0.001
77904 (26%)	1184 (31%)	76720 (26%)	1.26 (CI 1.16 - 1.37)	<0.001
All Patients	PE	No PE	Co-efficient	p-Value
4	6	4	2.91 (Cl 2.54 - 3.27)	<0.001
23100	34900	22900	1.94 (CI 1.59 – 2.29)	<0.001
	6132 (2%) 77904 (26%) All Patients 4	6132 (2%) 226 (6%) 77904 (26%) 1184 (31%) All Patients PE 4 6	6132 (2%) 226 (6%) 5906 (2%) 77904 (26%) 1184 (31%) 76720 (26%) All Patients PE No PE 4 6 4	6132 (2%) 226 (6%) 5906 (2%) 2.99 (CI 2.56 – 3.49) 77904 (26%) 1184 (31%) 76720 (26%) 1.26 (CI 1.16 – 1.37) All Patients PE No PE Co-efficient 4 6 4 2.91 (CI 2.54 – 3.27)

Data are presented as Number of patients (%) or Median (± IQR).

Abbreviations: OR = Odds Ratio (95% Confidence Intervals (CI)); LOS = Length of stay; PE = Pulmonary Embolism; IQR = Interquartile range

LUPUS 2018;**5**(Suppl 1):A1–A129