THURSDAY, 14 JUNE 2018

WIN and HOT session

SP0063

WIN SESSION: ABOUT DIAGNOSIS AND CLASSIFICATION OF SPONDYLOARTHRITIS

V. Navarro Compán. *Rheumatology, University Hospital La Paz, IdPaz, Madrid, Spain, Madrid, Spain*

In patients with axial spondyloarthritis (axSpA) an early diagnosis is becoming progressively more relevant. Nowadays, several therapies have shown to be efficacious to control disease symptoms and signs and they are even more useful if administered in early stages of the disease. However, the aim of an early diagnosis is not easy to achieve. Similar to the majority of rheumatic diseases, axSpA is heterogeneous in its presentation, course, and outcome, and does not have a single clinical, laboratory, pathological, or radiological feature to serve as a gold standard in support of diagnosis. With the new therapies available, many research studies are focusing on how to make an early diagnosis of axSpA.

Additionally, some confusion remains about differences between classification and diagnosis of axSpA. In clinical practice, in the absence of diagnostic criteria, the classification criteria are often used to assist in the diagnostic process of a disease. Based on this, there is an ongoing debate about whether or not the current classification criteria should be revised. During this session, the new insights on diagnosis and classification in axSpA will be highlighted.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.7752

SP0064

HOT SESSION: RECENT ADVANCES IN THE MANAGEMENT OF SPONDYLOARTHRITIS

S. Ramiro^{1,2}. ¹*Rheumatology, Zuyderland Medical Center, Heerlen;*
²*Rheumatology, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, Netherlands*

In the last years the treatment armamentarium for spondyloarthritis (SpA) has been expanded. In addition to non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and tumour necrosis factor (TNF)-inhibitors, we nowadays count in daily clinical practice with IL-17-blockers for the treatment of patients with axial SpA. This increase in treatment options has led to an update of the ASAS-EULAR management recommendations, which will be discussed in this lecture, together with the evidence supporting them.

Currently, several studies on tapering to stop biologics in patients with axial SpA with inactive disease are being conducted and the first results available will be discussed. The path is being paved for a treat-to-target approach that is gaining shape in SpA. More evidence towards such an approach has been gathered throughout the last years and strategy trials are now ongoing.

Inhibition of structural progression remains a hot topic in SpA. Whether or not the current interventions we have can achieve such an outcome is not yet fully clear, and the challenges related to this will be discussed in this lecture. More data has come out to help us gain more insight into this complex relationship between disease activity and structural damage and the effect of therapy on it.

Disclosure of Interest: S. Ramiro Grant/research support from: MSD, Consultant for: Lilly, Novartis, AbbVie

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.7645

THURSDAY, 14 JUNE 2018

To taper or not to taper in RA

SP0065

TO TAPER OR NOT TO TAPER NON BIOLOGICAL DMARDS IN RA REMISSION?

K.F. Baker, J.D. Isaacs. *Musculoskeletal Research Group, Newcastle NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, Newcastle University and Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK*

Remission is now a realistic goal in rheumatoid arthritis (RA), with a third of patients achieving sustained remission through the use of conventional synthetic disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs (csDMARDs) in modern treat-to-target strategies. Nevertheless, csDMARDs pose a risk of severe side-effects and require regular blood safety monitoring, which is both intrusive for patients and expensive for healthcare systems. This poses a therapeutic challenge – when is it appropriate to withdraw csDMARDs from patients with RA in sustained disease remission?

In the first part of this presentation we will use case histories to contrast the possible outcomes following withdrawal of csDMARDs from patients in sustained remission, highlighting the uncertainty facing patients and their clinicians in this scenario (presented by Dr Kenneth Baker). In the second section of this lecture (presented by Prof John Isaacs) we will discuss the criteria to consider when stopping csDMARDs, any potential risks to the strategy, and the potential to identify informative biomarkers to help guide management of the patient in remission.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.7678

SP0066

BIOLOGICAL DMARD CASE PRESENTATION

J. Kedra. *Rhumatologie, Hôpital Pitié-Salpêtrière, Paris, France*

We present the case of a male patient, who developed in 2002 (at the age of 37) rheumatoid arthritis, at that time positive for RF and ACPA without erosions on X-rays. He was first treated with salazopyrine, stopped in 2003 because of residual disease activity and structural damage progression on X-rays (MTP 5 erosion, JSN on both carpal joints), then methotrexate, which was efficient but was finally stopped in 2004 for suspicion of MTX pulmonary toxicity (cough, short breath, with CT-scan abnormality). Leflunomide 20 mg/day was started with adequate response up to 2009, when loss of efficacy was recorded. Addition of adalimumab 40 mg every other week was decided, leading to sustained remission.

In 2011, he was on remission with this combination of treatments, and he stopped adalimumab abruptly on his own, resulting in a flare after 4 months (7 tender joints and 5 swollen joints). Adalimumab every other week was restarted, and remission was obtained a few weeks later.

In 2013, he remained on sustained remission, which led to his inclusion in a trial testing the progressive spacing of adalimumab. Every 6 months, the disease activity was assessed in consultation, and hands and feet X-rays were repeated every year: the patient remained on sustained remission according to DAS28, and there was no additional structural damage. Finally, in May 2017, DAS28 was at 1.71 with leflunomide 20 mg/day and adalimumab 40 mg every 2 months, so we proposed to stop adalimumab.

When last seen, in November 2017, the patient was still on remission with leflunomide monotherapy.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.7714

SP0067

TO TAPER OR NOT TO TAPER BIOLOGICAL DMARD

B. Fautrel. *Rheumatology, Sorbonne Université – Paris 6/Assistance publique – Hôpitaux de Paris, Paris, France*

Remission is more and more achievable in the course of rheumatoid arthritis (RA) or spondyloarthritis (SpA). Tapering strategies have been proposed to reduce the risk of overtreatment of patients with inactive disease. They have been tested in several observational or randomised controlled trials. On this basis, EULAR guidelines recommend to consider careful DMARD tapering in people with sustained remission.

The lecture will develop the potential benefits and risks of a tapering strategy for people affected by RA or SpA, in remission thanks to biologic agents. It will also highlight the residual unmet needs for the care of RA or SpA patients in remission.

Disclosure of Interest: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.7831

THURSDAY, 14 JUNE 2018

Can we improve the care of gout?

SP0068

DECT IMAGING IN GOUT – READY FOR PRIME TIME?

N. Dalbeth. *University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand*

Dual energy computed tomography (DECT) allows visualisation of urate crystal deposition in people with hyperuricaemia and gout. This technology is increasingly used in clinical practice for gout diagnosis, and can also guide treatment decisions in gout. The diagnostic properties of DECT will be described and compared with other advanced imaging methods such as ultrasonography. The potential for false positive results due to artefact, and false negative results in the case of small urate crystal deposits will be demonstrated. The role of DECT in