integrity and stability is reliant on efficient pharmacy processes necessary to accommodate the use of new formulations for dose banding.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.1300

AB1260

BASILINE CHARACTERISTICS AND PATIENT SATISFACTION DATA FROM COACH@HOME: THE GERMAN SUPPORT PROGRAM FOR PATIENTS WITH RHEUMATIC DISEASES TREATED WITH CERTOLIZUMAB PEGOL

N. Böhme¹, A.-D. Holst², F. Dybowski³, C. Volberg⁴, H.-G. Pott⁵, U. Lendl⁶.

¹Healthcare at Home Deutschland GmbH, Weinheim; ²Rheumapraxis, Ludwigslust; ³Rheumapraxis Ruhr, Herne; ⁴Rheumatologie in Neuss, Neuss; ⁵Rheumatologikum Hannover, Hannover; ⁶UCB Pharma, Monheim, Germany

Background: Certolizumab pegol (CZP)-treated patients (pts) with rheumatoid arthritis (RA), axial spondyloarthritis (axSpA, including ankylosing spondylitis [AS] and non-radiographic [nr]-axSpA), and psoriatic arthritis (PsA) may be recommended the patient-coaching program, coach@home (c@h) in Germany to manage their disease. Eight coaching calls are offered over one year, scheduled around 'critical' milestones along the therapeutic journey. These calls are made by professionally-trained nurses, who offer support and information about both the disease and its treatment with CZP.

Objectives: The purpose of this observational analysis was to assess the baseline characteristics of pts subscribed to c@h, and the level of pt satisfaction with the program.

Methods: c@h was launched in June 2014 and is available to pts who are prescribed CZP according to the local product label. Pts must be CZP-naïve when subscribed to the program, and pt consent is required prior to subscription by the treating physician. There are no additional criteria for enrolment, although the program must be recommended to the pt by the treating physician.

Pt satisfaction was measured either at the end of the program or at discontinuation using the net promoter score (NPS), which has previously been used for this purpose.¹ The NPS is derived by asking pts to state how likely it is that they would recommend c@h to others (on a 0–10 scale). Rankings of 9–10 are considered 'promoters', 7–8 'passives', and 0–6 'detractors'. Subtracting the percentage of detractors from that of promoters yields the NPS (figure 1).

Results: A cumulative total of 655 pts had been registered to the program as of 5 Oct 2017. Of the total number of reported indications (n=683; multiple indications per pt possible), 55.9% were RA, 16.5% AS, 7.6% nr-axSpA, and 19.9% PsA. The mean age at baseline was 55 (RA), 54 (AS), 53 (nr-axSpA), and 52 (PsA), and the proportion of female pts was 80%, 58%, 65%, and 69%, respectively. Prior biologic DMARD exposure was 32.8%.

The most common topics discussed on phone calls were therapy compliance (in 1339 calls), CZP maintenance dose (in 1333 calls) and syringe disposal (in 870 calls). The average length per call was 15.9 min at the end of Week 0 (total: 28 calls), and 14.0 min at the end of Week 52 (total: 1796 calls). A cumulative total of 272 pts had either completed the 1 year coaching period (n=70) or discontinued (n=202) by 28 Sep 2017, of whom 106 rated the program. Of these, 87.5% gave promoter scores, 10.4% passive, and 3.8% detractor, yielding an NPS of 83.7 (figure 1). The program was still ongoing at the time of this data cut.

Abstract AB1260 – Figure 1. Patient ratings and Net Promoter Score for the coach@home program (as of September 2017)

Patients were asked to rate the coach@home program on a scale of 0–10, where 0="I would certainly not recommend this program" and 10="I would most probably recommend this program". Scores of 9–10 were considered 'promoters', 7–8 'passives' and 0–6 'detractors'. Percentages shown are out of the total number of responders by the end of September 2017 (n=106). NPS: Net Promoter Score.

Conclusions: The c@h program offers guidance and support to pts treated with CZP in Germany. Feedback from pts who were willing to provide a rating indicates a high level of satisfaction with the program.

REFERENCE:

[1] Hamilton DF. Bone Joint J 2014;96-B(5):622–8.

Acknowledgements: The c@h program is performed by Healthcare@home Deutschland GmbH, funded by UCB Pharma, led by Elke Zeise and managed by Karen Thiel and Manh Dan Nguyen. We thank the patients and their caregivers in addition to the investigators and their teams who contributed to this program. Editorial services were provided by Costello Medical.

Disclosure of Interest: N. Böhme: None declared, A.-D. Holst Grant/research support from: AbbVie, BMS, Chugai, Pfizer, Paid instructor for: BMS, Lilly, UCB Pharma, F. Dybowski: None declared, C. Volberg: None declared, H.-G. Pott Paid instructor for: Hexal, Lilly, Novartis, MSD, Speakers bureau: AbbVie, Biogen, Chugai, Roche, Pfizer, Celgene, UCB Pharma, Medac, U. Lendl Employee of: UCB Pharma

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.1989

AB1261

DEVELOPMENT OF A LOCAL NEEDS-BASED GP CURRICULUM FOR SHARED CARE IN RHEUMATOLOGY

O. Hussein, T. Duffy. Rheumatology, Connolly Hospital Blanchardstown, Dublin 15, Ireland

Background: There is a role for shared care between rheumatologist and primary care for Musculoskeletal (MSK) disorders. General practitioners (GPs) are involved in monitoring of clinical status of patients and their management, in addition to psychosocial aspects of chronic pain and disability. We are going to look at the rheumatology knowledge and skills needed by local GPs and based on their needs we plan to develop an initiative to improve the service provided to our patients. Here are the results of the initial survey of local GPs.

Objectives: We aim to identify knowledge and skill gaps in primary care related to MSK disorders and to develop a need-based curriculum to address these gaps. Develop an implementation plan to deliver the curriculum components.

Methods: Initially we identify the needs and gaps in the current practice using survey in a small group of local GPs. There are two rounds of questionnaires to reach a list of important areas to develop the curriculum. The second round will include large number of GPs. Also, there will be meetings with GPs to reach agreement and to adopt method of delivering these training and skills.

Results: In the first survey, 31 out of 36 GPs (86%) returned questionnaires. One GP (3.2%) refer to rheumatology department twice a week, 4 GPs (13%) refer weekly, 23 GPs (74%) refer every month and three GPs (9.7%) rarely refer to rheumatologist. Reasons for referral were diagnosis and long-term management,²¹ diagnosis and discharge back to GP¹⁵ and patient's request.⁴ Thirteen GPs (42%) have interest in rheumatology conditions management. Regarding GPs' concerns with rheumatology service, 22 of them (71%) mentioned the long wait time for rheumatology appointment. Other issues were delayed clinic letter, need for clear instruction, patients not aware of appointment time, whether there is an urgent clinic and which clinic patient should be referred to (outpatient versus procedure clinics). Nineteen GPs (61%) received undergraduate rheumatology training, 16 (52%) during GP training programme and 4 (13%) attended postgraduate courses. Topics of interest by GPs were variable rheumatology conditions in addition to joint injections,³ referral guidance² and update on DMARD. Preferred teaching methods to deliver the syllabus were small group tutorials,¹² face-to-face lectures⁵ and protocols and guidelines.⁵

Conclusions: From this initial survey, we could identify that the major concern of local GPs is the long waiting time for rheumatology clinic. Some of GPs (42%) expressed their interest to have further training in rheumatology. When we reach an agreed curriculum with GPs, we aim to deliver the syllabus through preferred methods by GPs. Shared care between rheumatologists and GPs would improve quality standard of care in community, provide patient care close to home and reduce referral rates.