AB0515

SPANISH SOCIETY OF RHEUMATOLOGY (SER) RECOMMENDATIONS ON PRIMARY ANTIPHOSPHOLIPID SYNDROME (APS). IN A PATIENT WITH OBSTETRIC APS, WHICH TREATMENTS ARE MORE EFFECTIVE? SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

H. Sánchez Pérez¹, M. Nishishinya Aquino², C. Pereda³, P. Díaz del Campo Fontecha⁴, M. Martínez Zamora⁵. ¹Rheumatology, Hospital Universitario de Canarias, La Laguna; ²Programa de doctorado en Ciencias de la Educación y el Deporte de la Facultat de Psicologia, Ciències de l'Educació i de l'Esport Blanquerna, Institut Traumatólògic Quirón, Barcelona; ³Rheumatology, Hospital Mediterráneo, Almería; ⁴Unidad de Investigación, Sociedad Española de Reumatología, Madrid; ⁵Servicio de Obstetricia y Ginecología, Hospital Clínic, Barcelona, Spain

Background: Pregnancy complications and poor obstetric prognosis are part of the manifestations of APS. The obstetric APS (O-APS) includes 3 or more early miscarriages, 1 or more intrauterine foetal deaths, prematurity secondary to preeclampsia or placental insufficiency, intrauterine growth retardation and HELLP syndrome among others. There is disagreement among different published studies regarding the need of preconceptual or primary thromboprophylaxis (treating with anticoagulant/antiaggregant drugs in the presence of specific autoantibodies but without previous clinical events) and the most effective and safest drug to use, as well as which treatment should be chosen in the case of secondary thromboprophylaxis (treating in the presence of autoantibodies and recurrent miscarriages or previous obstetric complications).

Objectives: To evaluate the available scientific evidence on which treatments are the most effective and safest in O-APS.

Methods: A systematic review (SR) was performed to evaluate the efficacy and safety of different interventions (Aspirin (ASA), Heparin, Antimalarials, Immuno-globulin IV (IVI), others) in pregnant women with O-APS. We included SR, randomised clinical trials (RCTs) and comparative cohort studies. Result measures on morbidity (prematurity, low birth weight, need for intensive care, impaired cognitive development, preeclampsia, eclampsia, HELLP, abruptio placentae) and mortality included both the newborn and the pregnant woman. A peer review selection and analysis of the studies was carried out (SP, H; NA, MB).

Results: 788 citations were identified (Medline, EMBASE, CENTRAL, May 2017). We included 17 studies: 5 SR, 5 RCTs and 7 cohort studies. Results are shown on the table 1 below:

Abstract AB0515 – Table 1

Drugs	Efficacy	Level of evidence
ASA vs placebo	Inconclusive	1+
ASA + Heparin	The combination is more effective than ASA on its own in order to achieve better obstetric results in women with O-APS One SR and one RCT did not found added benefits with the combination compared to ASA monotherapy	1+, 1+, 1-,2+ 1+, 2+
IVI	Inconclusive, but: Comparing IVI with ASA+heparin is favourable to this combination: it is easier to use and has a lower cost IVI compared with prednisone could be a better option to decrease maternal complications in patients with O-APS	1+ 1+,1-,2+ 2-
Corticoids	There is not enough evidence available.	1+, 2-
Statins	There is not enough evidence available.	2+

Conclusions: In women with O-APS:

- **Secondary thromboprophylaxis:** The combination of ASA +Heparin is more effective than ASA monotherapy.

With regards to the use of IVI, corticosteroids and statins: NO representative conclusions can be drawn from published studies

- **Pre-conceptual thromboprophylaxis, primary thromboprophylaxis:** NO representative conclusions can be drawn from published studies.

Acknowledgements: This review is part of the preparation of SER Recommendations on Primary APS treatment.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.4842

AB0516

THERAPEUTIC STRATEGIES AND PROGNOSIS IN CHINESE PATIENTS WITH SEROLOGICALLY ACTIVE CLINICALLY QUIESCENT SYSTEMIC LUPUS ERYTHEMATOSUS

H. Huang^{1,2}, L. Mou¹, Y. Hao¹, Z. Zhang¹, W. Zhou¹. ¹Rheumatology and Clinical Immunology Department, Peking University First Hospital; ²Rheumatology and Clinical Immunology Department, First Hospital of Tsinghua University, Beijing, China

Background: SACQ patients with SLE appears to account for 6%–12% of all patients with SLE, but there is disagreement about whether such patients are indeed clinically stable, especially in Chinese patients. And there is no conclusion as to what kind of treatment should be taken for such patients.

Objectives: The aim of our study was to identify the frequency and outcome of SACQ patients with SLE. And we tried to find out potential predictors of flare.

Methods: 682 patients with systemic lupus erythematosus who were followed up for more than 6 months at Peking University First Hospital from January 2007 to December 2015 were summarised. SACQ was defined as an at least a 6 month period with persistent serologic activity and without clinical activity and could be taking a daily dose of prednisone or equivalent less than 7.5 mg. Serologically quiescent clinically quiescent (SQCQ) patients and serologically active clinically active (SACA) patients served as control groups. Data including demographics, initial symptoms, duration to SACQ, treatments before and after SACQ, and characteristics of the flare group were analysed.

Results: Of the 682 patients, 170 were SACQ patients (24.9%), 187 were SQCQ patients, and 325 were SACA patients (47.7%). SQCQ patients (38.61±15.08 years old) were older at study start than did SACQ patients (38.61±15.08 years vs. 32.09±14.35 years, p=0.000), but there was no significant difference between that of SACQ and SACA patients. 56 of the 170 SACQ patients (32.9%) experienced flare. Corticosteroids (OR 1.323, 95% CI 1.135 to 1.542; p=0.000) was an independent risk factor for flare, while antimalarials (OR 0.040, 95% CI 0.004 to 0.418; p=0.007) and immunosuppressants (OR 0.321, 95% CI 0.153 to 0.673; p=0.003) were protective factors.

Conclusions: SLE patients with SACQ remained relatively stable, with 32.9% of patients relapsed. The group of flare patients took greater use of corticosteroids than non-flare ones, whereas antimalarials and immunosuppressants agents were protective factors.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Gladman DD, Urowitz MB, Keystone EC. Serologically active clinically quiescent systemic lupus erythematosus: a discordance between clinical and serologic features. *Am J Med* 1979;66:210–5.
- [2] Huang WN, Tso TK, Wu HC, Yang HF, Tsay GJ. Impaired phagocytosis of apoptotic cell material in serologically active clinically quiescent patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. *Int J Rheum Dis* 2016;19:1310–6.
- [3] Steiman AJ, Gladman DD, Ibañez D, Urowitz MB. Prolonged serologically active clinically quiescent systemic lupus erythematosus: frequency and outcome. *J Rheumatol* 2010;37:1822–7.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.4624

AB0517

INVASIVE ASPERGILLOSIS IN PATIENTS WITH SYSTEMIC LUPUS ERYTHEMATOSUS: A RETROSPECTIVE STUDY FOCUS ON CLINICAL CHARACTERISTICS AND RISK FACTORS OF IN-HOSPITAL MORTALITY

H. Mingli¹, C.-Y. Tsai². ¹Rheumatology/Immunology/Allergy, Taipei Veterans General Hospital; ²Rheumatology/Immunology/Allergy, Taipei Veterans General Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan, Province of China

Objectives: To analyse the clinical features and outcomes of patients with invasive aspergillosis (IA), the mortality risk factors and all-cause mortality in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) in single centre of Taiwan.

Methods: A retrospective study was performed to identify the mortality risk factors associated with IA in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE). We reviewed the medical records of patients with SLE who were diagnosed with invasive aspergillosis between Jan. 2006 and Jun. 2017 from Taipei Veterans General Hospital in Taiwan. Clinical and laboratory parameters as well as treatment outcomes were analysed.

Results: Twenty-one patients diagnosed with proven (n=4; 19.04%) and probable (n=17; 80.95%) invasive aspergillosis according to revised definition by European Organisation for Research and Treatment of Cancer/Invasive Fungal Infections Cooperative Group and the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Mycoses Study Group (EORTC/MSG) Consensus Group were enrolled in the study and separated into survivors (n=7; 33.33%) and non-survivors (n=14;