

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 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 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 ($R^2 = 0.262$, $F = 15.070$, $p < 0.01$); 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

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 ¹	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 ² 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)	
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)	
Immunosuppressants, % ever using	43.0 0.76	37.0 0	0.78 (0.49, 1.24)	
Biologics, % ever using				
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)	
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	0.98 (0.48, 2.03)	
Anti-β2 glycoprotein1	14.3	24.7	1.96 (1.12, 3.43)	2.15 (1.21, 3.84)

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 auto-antigen 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- β 2GP1) 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- β 2GP1 (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- β 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

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