Objectives: The objective of this study was to evaluate the prevalence of hyperuricemia in PsA patients and to identify the associated factors.

Methods: Design: cross-sectional study, including consecutive, unselected, adult PsA patients. Data collection: demographic variables (age, gender, disease duration), clinical variables (affected joints, current moderate/severe psoriasis, nail disease, axial involvement, enthesitis, dactylitis), biological factors (acute phase reactants), treatment-related variables (non-steroidal antiinflammatory drugs, corticosteroids, synthetic and biologic disease modifying drugs) and comorbidities [2]. Hyperuricemia was defined as uric acid level above 6.8 mg/dl [3]. Statistical analysis: the factors that were potentially associated with hyperuricemia were assessed by Spearman correlation and uni- and multivariate logistic regressions.

Results: In all, 120 PsA patients were included in the study: 69 (57.5%) women, mean age±standard deviation 54±11.8 years, mean disease duration 7±7.4 years; 24 (20%) had moderate/severe psoriasis and 30 (25%) were taking a biologic. A high percentage of patients had cardiovascular comorbidities, i.e., dyslipidemia 80%, hypertension 51.7%, obesity 34.2% and cardiovascular events 34.2%. Around a quarter of patients had hyperuricemia (33; 27.5%). Hyperuricemia was significantly associated with obesity, diabetes, ischemic heart disease and hypertension, but there was no correlation with current skin psoriasis. In the multivariate analysis, it was best explained by diabetes (odds ratio: 4.95, [95% confidence intervals: 1.47; 16.67]), ischemic heart disease (3.61 [1.00; 12.98]) and obesity (1.86 [1.04; 3.32]).

Conclusions: Hyperuricemia in PsA is associated with metabolic syndrome rather than skin psoriasis, but further longitudinal studies are needed to identify causal relationships.

References:

- [1] Bruce IN, Schentag CT, Gladman DD. Hyperuricemia in psoriatic arthritis: prevalence and associated features. *J Clin Rheumatol* 2000;6(1):6–9.
- [2] Baillet A, Gossec L, Carmona L, et al. Points to consider for reporting, screening for and preventing selected comorbidities in chronic inflammatory rheumatic diseases in daily practice: a EULAR initiative. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2016;75(6):965–73.
- [3] Campion EW, Glynn RJ, DeLabry LO. Asymptomatic hyperuricemia. Risks and consequences in the Normative Aging Study. *Am J Med* 1987;82(3):421–6.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2017-eular.5744

AB0791 HIGH PREVALENCE OF METABOLIC DISORDERS AND OBESITY IN PSORIATIC ARTHRITIS COMPARED TO PSORIASIS ALONE: A RETROSPECTIVE DERMATOLOGICAL CLINIC-BASED STUDY

N. Batkaeva¹, T. Korotaeva², E. Batkaev¹. ¹Department of dermatology, RUDN University; ²V.A. Nasonova Research Institute of Rheumatology, Moscow, Russian Federation

Background: An association between increased adiposity, obesity (Obs), and psoriasis has emerged. In addition to obesity, patients with psoriasis are more likely to have metabolic syndrome.

Objectives: to evaluate the prevalence of endocrine diseases, nutritional and metabolic disorder (ENMD) comorbidity in patients (pts) with PsA and Psoriasis (PsO) patients without arthritis in the dermatological hospital cohort.

Methods: 889 pts (Male-516/Female-329) with moderate-to-severe plaque PsO, mean age 50.4±17.6 years, mean PsO duration 21.5±14.7 were included. PsO pts with Endocrine, nutritional and metabolic diseases (E00-E90) (ENMD), including Disorders of thyroid gland (E00-E07), Obesity and other hyperalimentation (E65-E68), Diabetes mellitus (E10-E14) (DM) were identify in the hospital Database reporting and coding by International Statistical Classification of Disease and Related Health Problems (ICD-10) between 2010 - 2015 years. M±m, t-test, χ^2 , (%) were calculated. All p<0.05 were considered to indicate statistical significance.

Results: 302 out of 889 pts (33.9%) had PsA and 587 out of 889 pts (66.1%) had PsO alone. PsA pts were older than PsO pts – 55.3±13.7 and 50.4±17.6 (p<0.001). 155 out of 889 pts (17.4%) had ENMD. In PsA pts ENMD were found in significantly more cases than in PsO pts – in 76 out of 302 pts (25.2%) and in 79 out of 587 pts (13.5%) accordingly ($\chi^2=18.986$, df=2, p<0.00001). In PsA pts ENMD coding as E00–E07 were found in significantly more cases than in PsO pts – in 25 out of 302 pts (8.3%) and in 23 out of 587 pts (3.9%) accordingly ($\chi^2=7.4211$, df=2, p=0.00645). Obs coding as E65-E68 were found in significantly more cases in PsA pts compare to PsO pts - in 54 out of 302 pts (17.9%) and in 64 out of 587 pts (10.9%) accordingly ($\chi^2=8.4345$, df=2, p=0.00368).

DM coding as E10-E14 were found in more cases in PsA pts compare to PsO pts - in 54 out of 302 pts (17.9%) and in 83 out of 587 pts (14.1%) accordingly ($\chi^2=2.1410$, df=2, p=0.14341).

Conclusions: ENMD comorbidities are common for PsA and PsO without arthritis pts. Obs and disorders of thyroid gland were found in significantly more cases in PsA pts compare to PsO pts. Obesity and PsA are an unhealthy combination. Obesity may represent an additive cardio-metabolic risk factor in PsA subjects. High frequency of ENMD in PsA than PsO could be due to share inflammation pathways with insulin resistance and age. Patients with more severe psoriasis are at higher odds of endocrine, nutritional and metabolic diseases compared with those with mild psoriasis.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2017-eular.2969

AB0792 CURRENT STATUS AND UNMET NEEDS IN THE MANAGEMENT OF PSORIATIC ARTHRITIS WITH CONVENTIONAL SYNTHETIC AND BIOLOGICAL DISEASE MODIFYING ANTI-RHEUMATIC DRUGS: TAIWANESE NATIONWIDE PHYSICIANS' PERSPECTIVES

T.-H. Li¹, C.-C. Lai², C.-Y.T. Tsai². ¹Division of Allergy, Immunology and Rheumatology, Department of Internal Medicine, Chiayi Branch, Taichung Veteran General Hospital, Chiayi City; ²Division of Allergy, Immunology and Rheumatology, Department of Internal Medicine, Taipei Veteran General Hospital, Taipei City, Taiwan, Province of China

Background: Psoriatic arthritis (PsA) contributes to enormous burden of disease and thus early correct diagnosis and adequate therapeutic management are essential for physicians in practice; however, There have been several studies highlighting the inadequate diagnosis and suboptimal therapies for PsA worldwide and physicians generally report difficulties in managing psoriasis.

Objectives: To analyze the real-world clinical practice of PsA in Taiwan, and assess physicians' adopted methods and difficulties of diagnosis, therapeutic consideration and strategy, in addition to rationales for biologic agents and unmet needs.

Methods: A nationwide cross-sectional observational study in Taiwan was conducted by means of the face-to-face in depth interviews with the 80 physicians, composed of 50 rheumatologists and 30 dermatologists, from November 2014 to January 2015.

Results: The major adopted diagnostic examinations for PsA are arthritis performance, psoriasis and nail dystrophy, roentgenological studies, personal and family history; however, more dermatologists rely on RF for initial diagnosis (p<0.05). The difficulties for diagnosis, considerations on therapeutic management and current prescription were reported and displayed some interdisciplinary difference. Rationales for biological agent selection were investigated and physicians generally favored etanercept in terms of milder symptoms or more conservative treatment. The main unmet needs for current biologic therapies for PsA included the aspects of better efficacy, safety, sustainability and oral administration.

Conclusions: The nationwide study is the first survey for real-world clinical practice of PsA in Asia and provides detailed messages about the diagnostic difficulties and therapeutic consideration, especially rationales and unmet needs on current biologic therapies, which may offer possible directions for new drug development. We also made interdisciplinary comparison, hence in order to improve comprehensive care.

References:

- [1] Liu JT, Yeh HM, Liu SY, Chen KT. Psoriatic arthritis: Epidemiology, diagnosis, and treatment. *World J Orthop* 2014;5:537–43.
- [2] van de Kerkhof PC, Reich K, Kavanaugh A, et al. Physician perspectives in the management of psoriasis and psoriatic arthritis: results from the population-based Multinational Assessment of Psoriasis and Psoriatic Arthritis survey. *J Eur Acad Dermatol Venereol* 2015;29:2002–10.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2017-eular.1360

AB0793 EFFICACY OF IXEKIZUMAB IMPROVING SF-36 SCORES IN BIOLOGIC DMARD-NAIVE PATIENTS WITH ACTIVE PSORIATIC ARTHRITIS: RESULTS FROM A PHASE 3 STUDY (SPIRIT-P1)

V. Strand¹, A.B. Gottlieb², T.K. Kvien³, A. Naegeli⁴, C.-Y. Lin⁴, O. Benichou⁴, J. Birt⁴. ¹Stanford University School of Medicine, Palo Alto; ²New York Medical College, Valhalla, United States; ³Diakonhjemmet Hospital, Oslo, Norway; ⁴Eli Lilly and Company, Indianapolis, United States

Background: In a phase 3 randomized controlled trial (RCT), ixekizumab (IXE), a high affinity mAb that selectively targets interleukin-17A, significantly improved signs and symptoms of psoriatic arthritis (PSA) and health status vs placebo (PBO).

Objectives: To evaluate the efficacy of IXE improving patient (pt)-reported health status, assessed by Short Form Survey (SF-36) physical and mental component summary (PCS and MCS) and domain scores in pts with active PSA vs PBO, compared with age- and gender (A/G)-matched population normative scores².

Methods: In phase 3 RCT (SPIRIT-P1; NCT01695239), bDMARD-naïve pts with active PSA (N=417) randomly received IXE 80 mg either once every 4 Wks (Q4W) or 2 Wks (Q2W) after a 160 mg starting dose, or 40 mg adalimumab (ADA) Q2W, or PBO (all subcutaneous). Health status was assessed by SF-36 at baseline, Wk 12, and Wk 24. Treatment comparisons were by mixed model for repeated measures for continuous data and logistic regression for categorical data. Missing values were imputed by nonresponder imputation.

Results: Baseline SF-36 scores were similar across treatment groups. At Wk 24, significant improvements vs PBO were observed with ADA and IXEQ2W for PCS, and 5/8 domains (PF, RP, BP, GH, and RE), and with IXEQ4W for PCS and 6/8 domains (except VT and MH) (Figure) (post hoc for individual domains). In pts with baseline scores <A/G norms, significant improvements vs PBO were observed with ADA and IXEQ4W for PCS, MCS, and 5/8 domain scores (PF, RP,

BP, VT and RE) and with IXE Q2W for PCS, MCS, and 7/8 domains (except MH) (post hoc). Within the same subgroup, a greater percentage of pts in each of the 3 active groups reported SF-36 scores $\geq$ normative values at Wk 24 vs PBO, with statistical significance for PCS, MCS, and majority of the individual domains (Table) (post hoc).

Table 1. Percentage of patients with SF-36 scores $\geq$ normative values at week 24 (n) among the patients reporting SF-36 scores $<$ normative values at baseline (N) (nonresponder imputation)

SF-36 Scores, n/N (%)	PBO	ADA	IXEQ4W	IXEQ2W
Physical Component Summary	4/101 (4.0)	20/93 (21.5 [†])	12/98 (12.2 [*])	19/95 (20.0 ^{**})
Mental Component Summary	10/53 (18.9)	21/52 (40.4 [*])	21/58 (36.2 [*])	21/55 (38.2 [*])
Physical Functioning Domain	5/94 (5.3)	22/91 (24.2 [†])	14/97 (14.4 [*])	19/87 (21.8 ^{**})
Role Physical Domain	5/98 (5.1)	19/91 (20.9 ^{**})	16/93 (17.2 [*])	19/86 (22.1 ^{**})
Bodily Pain Domain	12/95 (12.6)	28/87 (32.2 ^{**})	27/96 (28.1 [*])	28/93 (30.1 ^{**})
General Health Domain	8/97 (8.2)	14/88 (15.9)	16/92 (17.4)	21/91 (23.1 [*])
Vitality Domain	11/73 (15.1)	22/71 (31.0 [*])	28/87 (32.2 [*])	22/74 (29.7 [*])
Social Functioning Domain	15/72 (20.8)	22/66 (33.3)	21/68 (30.9)	28/68 (41.2 [*])
Role Emotional Domain	7/54 (13.0)	17/59 (28.8 [*])	23/66 (34.8 [*])	27/64 (42.2 [†])
Mental Health Domain	17/69 (24.6)	19/62 (30.6)	18/69 (26.1)	24/68 (35.3)

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.005$; [†] $p < 0.001$.

Figure: SF-36 domain scores at baseline, Weeks 12 and 24, compared with age- and gender-matched normative scores

PF, Physical Functioning; RP, Role Physical; BP, Bodily Pain; GH, General Health; VT, Vitality; SF, Social Functioning; RE, Role Emotional; MH, Mental Health; PCS, Physical Component Score; MCS, Mental Component Score; AG norms, age- and gender-normalized; ADA, adalimumab; BL, baseline; IXE, ixekizumab; PBO, placebo; Wk, week

Conclusions: In pts with active PSA, both IXE and ADA treatment groups reported significant improvements in p-reported health status as assessed by SF-36 and the majority of its individual domains, both in the general trial population, and in the subgroup of pts with baseline scores $<$ A/G norms.

References:

- Mease PJ et al. ARD, 2017, 76(1):79–87.
- Ware J, et al. How to score version 2 of the SF-36 health survey. Lincoln, RI: QualityMetric Inc.; 2000.

Disclosure of Interest: V. Strand Consultant for: Eli Lilly and Company, Abbvie, Amgen, BMS, Boehringer Ingelheim, Celltrion Corrona, EMD Serono, GSK, Janssen, Merck, Novartis, Pfizer, Regeneron, Sandoz, Sanofi, UCB, A. Gottlieb Grant/research support from: Centocor (Janssen), Amgen, Abbott (Abbvie), Novartis, Celgene, Pfizer, Lilly, Levia, Merck, Xenoport, Dermira, Baxalta, Consultant for: Amgen Inc.; Astellas, Akros, Centocor (Janssen), Inc.; Celgene Corp., Bristol Myers Squibb Co., Beiersdorf, Inc., Abbott Labs. (Abbvie), TEVA, Actelion, UCB, Novo Nordisk, Novartis, Dermipor Ltd., Incyte, Pfizer, Canfit, Lilly, Coronado, Vertex, Karyopharm, CSL Behring Biotherapies for Life, Glaxo Smith Kline, Xenoport, Catabasis, Meiji Seika Pharma Co., Ltd, Takeda, Mitsubishi Tanabe Pharma Development America, Inc, Genentech, Baxalta, Kineta One, KPI Therapeutics, Crescendo Bioscience, Aclaris, Amicus, Reddy Labs, T. Kvien Consultant for: AbbVie, Biogen, BMS, Boehringer Ingelheim, Celltrion, Eli Lilly, Epirus, Janssen, Merck-Serono, MSD, Mundipharma, Novartis, Oktal, Orion Pharma, Hospira/Pfizer, Roche, Sandoz and UCB, Speakers bureau: AbbVie, Biogen, BMS, Boehringer Ingelheim, Celltrion, Eli Lilly, Epirus, Janssen, Merck-Serono, MSD, Mundipharma, Novartis, Oktal, Orion Pharma, Hospira/Pfizer, Roche, Sandoz and UCB, A. Naegeli Employee of: Eli Lilly and Company, C.-Y. Lin Employee of: Eli Lilly and Company, O. Benichou Employee of: Eli Lilly and Company, J. Birt Employee of: Eli Lilly and Company

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2017-eular.2331

AB0794 EFFECT OF TOFACITINIB ON PATIENT-REPORTED OUTCOMES IN PATIENTS WITH ACTIVE PSORIATIC ARTHRITIS: RESULTS FROM TWO PHASE 3 STUDIES

V. Strand¹, K. de Vlam², J.A. Covarrubias-Cobos³, P.J. Mease⁴, D.D. Gladman⁵, T. Hendriks⁶, E. Kudlacz⁷, D. Graham⁷, J. Wu⁷, L. Chen⁸.
¹Division of Immunology/Rheumatology, Stanford University, Palo Alto, CA, United States; ²UZ Leuven, Leuven, Belgium; ³Unidad Reumatologica Las Americas S.C.P., Mérida, Yucatán, Mexico; ⁴Swedish Medical Center and University of Washington, Seattle, WA, United States; ⁵Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto Western Hospital, Toronto, ON, Canada; ⁶Pfizer Inc, Collegeville, PA; ⁷Pfizer Inc, Groton, CT; ⁸Pfizer Inc, New York, NY, United States

Background: Tofacitinib is an oral Janus kinase inhibitor under investigation for treatment of psoriatic arthritis (PsA). The safety and efficacy of tofacitinib for the treatment of PsA has been investigated in two Phase 3 randomised controlled trials (RCTs: OPAL Broaden [12 months; NCT01877668]; OPAL Beyond [6 months; NCT01882439]).

Objectives: To evaluate patient-reported outcomes (PROs) in patients (pts) with active PsA enrolled in OPAL Broaden (N=422) and OPAL Beyond (N=394). OPAL Broaden pts had an inadequate response (IR) to ≥ 1 conventional synthetic disease-modifying antirheumatic drug and were naïve to tumour necrosis factor inhibitors (TNFi) whilst OPAL Beyond pts had an IR to ≥ 1 TNFi.

Methods: Pts were randomised to tofacitinib 5 mg twice daily (BID), tofacitinib 10 mg BID, placebo (PBO) $\rightarrow$ tofacitinib 5 mg BID, PBO $\rightarrow$ tofacitinib 10 mg BID and, in OPAL Broaden, also to adalimumab 40 mg subcutaneously every two weeks (active comparator). Pts receiving PBO advanced to either tofacitinib 5 mg BID or 10 mg BID at month 3 (M3) in both RCTs. Least squares mean changes from baseline in: Patient's Global Assessment of Arthritis (PtGA; Visual Analogue Scale [VAS]); Arthritis Pain (Pain; VAS); Short Form-36 Health Survey (SF-36); Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy–Fatigue (FACIT-F); Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI) and Ankylosing Spondylitis Quality of Life (ASQOL) questionnaires are reported. Nominal p values are reported without adjustments for multiple comparisons.

Results: Patients with active PsA in OPAL Broaden and OPAL Beyond RCTs receiving tofacitinib 5 mg and 10 mg BID reported improved PROs compared with PBO (Table 1). Greater improvements in PtGA and Arthritis Pain were observed as early as Week 2 through M3 with both tofacitinib doses compared with PBO in both studies ($p \leq 0.05$). Greater improvements were also reported in SF-36 Physical Component Summary, DLQI and ASQOL scores at M1 and M3 with both tofacitinib doses compared with PBO ($p \leq 0.05$). There were greater improvements in SF-36 physical functioning, bodily pain and vitality domains with both tofacitinib doses compared with PBO in both studies ($p \leq 0.05$) at M3. SF-36 social functioning domain showed greater improvement with tofacitinib 5 mg BID in OPAL Broaden and both tofacitinib doses in OPAL Beyond compared with PBO at M3 ($p \leq 0.05$). SF-36 role-physical domain showed greater improvement with tofacitinib 10 mg BID in OPAL Beyond at M3 compared with PBO ($p \leq 0.05$). FACIT-F showed a greater improvement in both studies at M3 with both tofacitinib doses compared with PBO ($p \leq 0.05$). In OPAL Broaden, improvements in PROs were similar between tofacitinib and adalimumab.

Table 1. PROs at Baseline and Change from Baseline (Δ) at Month 3

		OPAL Broaden			OPAL Beyond		
		Tofacitinib 5 mg BID N=107	Tofacitinib 10 mg BID N=104	Adalimumab 40 mg SC Q2W N=106	Placebo N=105	Tofacitinib 5 mg BID N=131	Tofacitinib 10 mg BID N=132
PtGA-VAS (mm)	Baseline, mean (SD)	54.67 (22.13)	53.60 (22.87)	50.56 (22.99)	53.90 (22.62)	57.42 (22.89)	58.52 (22.26)
	Δ , M3, LSM (SE)	-20.08 (2.28)	-25.50 (2.29)	-21.47 (2.33)	-11.40 (2.44)	-21.59 (2.23)	-19.88 (2.25)
		***	***	**		***	***
Arthritis Pain-VAS (mm)	Baseline, mean (SD)	55.74 (22.85)	54.42 (21.63)	50.68 (21.70)	53.15 (23.44)	56.35 (24.13)	59.45 (22.30)
	Δ , M3, LSM (SE)	-21.49 (2.33)	-27.10 (2.34)	-21.87 (2.39)	-10.22 (2.50)	-21.64 (2.16)	-20.88 (2.19)
		***	***	**		***	***
SF-36 PCS	Baseline, mean (SD)	35.35 (7.87)	36.37 (7.58)	35.94 (8.57)	36.01 (7.43)	33.57 (8.46)	31.73 (8.93)
	Δ , M3, LSM (SE)	5.51 (0.73)	5.69 (0.74)	6.23 (0.75)	2.68 (0.79)	5.18 (0.68)	5.34 (0.69)
		***	***	***		***	***
SF-36 physical functioning	Baseline, mean (SD)	34.45 (10.01)	36.73 (9.33)	36.55 (9.80)	36.53 (9.09)	33.45 (10.43)	32.12 (9.87)
	Δ , M3, LSM (SE)	5.17 (0.85)	5.23 (0.85)	5.22 (0.86)	2.06 (0.91)	5.00 (0.72)	4.08 (0.73)
		***	***	***		***	***
SF-36 role-physical	Baseline, mean (SD)	37.38 (8.93)	38.08 (9.20)	37.94 (9.76)	36.38 (8.71)	34.63 (10.34)	32.49 (9.25)
	Δ , M3, LSM (SE)	4.45 (0.80)	4.79 (0.80)	5.21 (0.82)	3.63 (0.86)	4.99 (0.81)	5.44 (0.81)
		***	***	***		***	***
SF-36 bodily pain	Baseline, mean (SD)	34.62 (7.44)	34.91 (8.38)	36.03 (7.88)	35.10 (7.23)	33.24 (7.88)	32.63 (6.94)
	Δ , M3, LSM (SE)	7.75 (0.84)	8.05 (0.84)	7.52 (0.86)	3.77 (0.90)	7.00 (0.79)	7.59 (0.80)
		***	***	***		***	***
SF-36 general health	Baseline, mean (SD)	35.94 (7.59)	35.61 (8.51)	35.54 (8.33)	34.57 (7.92)	34.71 (8.71)	33.53 (9.29)
	Δ , M3, LSM (SE)	4.09 (0.70)	3.95 (0.70)	4.75 (0.71)	2.64 (0.75)	3.67 (0.64)	3.92 (0.65)
		***	***	***		***	***
SF-36 vitality	Baseline, mean (SD)	41.75 (9.16)	39.87 (9.92)	42.80 (10.29)	41.55 (8.86)	39.70 (10.22)	38.51 (10.02)
	Δ , M3, LSM (SE)	5.50 (0.89)	5.90 (0.89)	4.93 (0.91)	3.05 (0.95)	4.95 (0.83)	4.75 (0.84)
		***	***	***		***	***
SF-36 social functioning	Baseline, mean (SD)	38.36 (10.30)	39.55 (11.32)	40.12 (10.61)	37.97 (9.72)	36.46 (11.47)	35.26 (11.12)
	Δ , M3, LSM (SE)	5.95 (0.90)	5.22 (0.90)	5.26 (0.92)	3.63 (0.96)	6.25 (0.84)	5.46 (0.86)
		***	***	***		***	***
FACIT-F total score	Baseline, mean (SD)	28.0 (10.46)	28.2 (10.63)	30.0 (11.23)	28.5 (9.52)	26.1 (12.15)	26.1 (10.27)
	Δ , M3, LSM (SE)	7.0 (0.87)	6.0 (0.87)	6.0 (0.87)	3.3 (0.91)	7.0 (0.81)	5.8 (0.82)
		***	***	***		***	***
DLQI	Baseline, mean (SD)	8.8 (7.27)	9.0 (7.66)	7.7 (7.10)	9.4 (7.64)	7.8 (7.05)	10.2 (8.20)
	Δ , M3, LSM (SE)	-4.7 (0.47)	-5.4 (0.47)	-4.4 (0.48)	-2.8 (0.50)	-3.2 (0.43)	-5.4 (0.44)
		***	***	***		***	***
ASQOL	Baseline, mean (SD)	11.2 (5.00)	10.5 (4.91)	10.6 (5.26)	10.4 (4.82)	11.4 (4.83)	12.2 (4.45)
	Δ , M3, LSM (SE)	-4.0 (0.45)	-3.9 (0.46)	-4.0 (0.46)	-2.1 (0.49)	-3.8 (0.38)	-3.5 (0.39)
		***	***	***		***	***

*Nominal $p \leq 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$; *** $p < 0.0001$. Other variables assessed as not achieving $p \leq 0.05$ at M3 were SF-36 Mental Component Summary (MCS), mental health and role-emotional domain scores

N is the number of patients who were randomised and received at least one dose of study medication. A subject was excluded from an analysis for an endpoint if the baseline was missing or there was no post-baseline observation

Δ , change from baseline; ASQOL, Ankylosing Spondylitis Quality of Life; BID, twice daily; DLQI, Dermatology Life Quality Index; FACIT-F, Functional Assessment of Chronic Illness Therapy–Fatigue; LSM, least squares mean; M3, Month 3; PCS, Physical Component Summary; PRO, patient-reported outcome; PtGA, Patient's Global Assessment of Arthritis; Q2W, every two weeks; SC, subcutaneously; SD, standard deviation; SE, standard error; SF-36, Short Form-36 Health Survey; VAS, Visual Analogue Scale

Conclusions: Pts with active PsA receiving tofacitinib reported greater improve-