for 30 weeks (treatment period 1). The primary endpoint was a $\geq 20\%$ improvement in ACR response (ACR20) at Wk 14. At Wk 30 (treatment period 2 [TP2]), patients receiving IFX-EU were blindly re-randomised (1:1) to remain on IFX-EU or transition to GP1111 for 24 wks. Here we report longer-term efficacy, safety and immunogenicity data from Wks 30–54.

Results: 650 patients were randomised initially (GP1111, n=324; IFX-EU, n=326). At Wk 30, 566 patients entered TP2 (continued GP1111, n=280; continued IFX-EU, n=143; switched from IFX-EU to GP1111, n=143). ACR20 rates and DAS28-CRP scores were comparable between groups at all TP2 visits after re-randomisation in the TP2 population (figure 1). Incidences of TP2 treatment-emergent adverse events (AEs) (36.8%, 33.6%, and 37.8%), serious AEs (4.6%, 7.7% and 2.8%) and infusion-related reactions (3.2%, 8.4% and 4.2%) were comparable between the GP1111/GP1111, IFX-EU/IFX-EU, and IFX-EU/GP1111 groups, respectively. Pre-dose ADA rates at Wk 30 (TP2) were 47.1%, 53.8% and 45.5% for the GP1111/GP1111, IFX-EU/IFX-EU, and IFX-EU/GP1111 groups, respectively. Overall, post-dose ADA rates in TP2 were comparable between groups (52.1%, 60.1%, and 58.0% respectively).

Abstract FRI0137 – Figure 1. ACR20 response rate and change in DAS28-CRP score at Wk 30 and 54 for the overall population during TP2

Conclusions: Results from TP2 (Wks 30–54) continued to show the absence of clinically meaningful differences in efficacy, safety and immunogenicity between patients with RA remaining on GP1111 or IFX-EU, or when blindly switched from IFX-EU to GP1111.

Disclosure of Interest: R. Alten Grant/research support from: Pfizer Inc., Consultant for: Pfizer Inc., Speakers bureau: Pfizer Inc., V. Tseluyko Speakers bureau: Pfizer Inc., AstraZeneca, Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Servier, Sanofi, Takeda, KRKA, T. Hala: None declared, S. Mehmedagic: None declared, M. Pilecky: None declared, E. Dokoupilová: None declared, D. Jovic: None declared, M. Rehman Shareholder of: Proctor and Gamble, Employee of: Pfizer Inc., M. Zhang Shareholder of: Pfizer Inc., Employee of: Pfizer Inc., L. Sewell Shareholder of: Pfizer Inc., Employee of: Pfizer Inc., S. Hackley Shareholder of: Pfizer Inc., Employee of: Pfizer Inc., S. Salts Shareholder of: Pfizer Inc., Mirati Therapeutics, Employee of: Pfizer Inc., C. Cronenberger Shareholder of: Pfizer Inc., Employee of: Pfizer Inc., K. Schumacher Shareholder of: Novartis, Employee of: Sandoz Biopharmaceuticals, O. von Richter Employee of: Sandoz Biopharmaceuticals, B. Batko Consultant for: Pfizer Inc., Sandoz, MSD

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.5121

FRI0138

TREAT TO TARGET STRATEGY PLUS CERTOLIZUMAB IN COMPARISON TO CONTINUED, FIXED CSDMARD PLUS CORTICOSTEROIDS IN PATIENTS WITH RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS AND INADEQUATE RESPONSE TO CSDMARDS (REMISSION BY INTRA-ARTICULAR INJECTION PLUS CERTOLIZUMAB, THE RICE STUDY): A MULTI-CENTRE RANDOMISED CONTROLLED TRIAL

R. Mueller¹, M. Spaeth², C. von Restorff³, C. Ackermann⁴, J. von Kempis¹.

¹Department of Rheumatology, Kantonsspital St. Gallen, St. Gallen; ²Division of Rheumatology, Spital Linth, Uznach; ³Medical practice, Männedorf, Switzerland; ⁴Medical practice, Triesen, Liechtenstein

Background: Treatment of rheumatoid arthritis (RA) includes the use of conventional (cs) or targeted synthetic (ts) and biologic disease-modifying anti-rheumatic drugs (DMARDs) and oral or subcutaneous (SC) glucocorticoids (GC).

Objectives: We aimed to test the hypothesis that an improved outcome can be achieved by employing a treat to target (T2T) strategy optimising csDMARD, oral, and SC-GC treatment in parallel to a new onset certolizumab pegol (CZP) in RA patients with an incomplete response to csDMARD as compared to a conventional step up strategy with CZP.

Methods: We designed a randomised controlled trial in four specialised rheumatological units. 43 patients with active RA (≥ 6 tender, ≥ 6 swollen joints, and ESR ≥ 20 mm/h or CRP ≥ 7 mg/L) despite csDMARD treatment for ≥ 3 months and

naïve to biologic DMARDs were randomly allocated either to CZP plus a treat to target strategy (T2T group, n=21) or add on of CZP to a fixed dose of the already established csDMARD with or without established GCs (fixed dose group, n=22). Patients of both groups received 400 mg CZP at week 0, 2, and 4 (loading dose), followed by 200 mg every 2 weeks. The T2T strategy consisted in a step up in, or to, SC-methotrexate (dose: $15 \geq 20 \geq 25$ mg/week), followed by leflunomide (20 mg/d) and then by sulfasalazine (2×1000 mg/d). In parallel, oral GCs were initiated in the T2T group at 20 mg/d and tapered every 5 days ($15-12.5-10-7.5-5-2.5-0$ mg/d). The decision to take the next step in the DMARD modification and addition of oral GCs was taken depending on the achievement of LDA (low disease activity: DAS28 < 3.2) at the 4-weekly visits. Injections of up to five tender and/or swollen joints with triamcinolone (small joints 10 mg, intermediate 20 mg, and big joints 40 mg; max. 100 mg/visit) was allowed in the T2T group. The primary outcome measure was ACR 50 response after 24 weeks. The analysis was intention-to-treat.

Results: Three patients dropped out during the study (n=2 T2T, n=1 fixed dose). ACR 50 was achieved in 16 out of 21 T2T patients (76.2%) as compared to 8 out of 22 fixed dose patients (36.4%; χ^2 : 5.355, $p=0.020$). ACR 20 and 70 responses were achieved in 90.5% and 71.4% of the T2T patients and 59.1% and 27.3% of the fixed dose patients, respectively ($p=0.045$ and $p=0.010$, resp.). Mean reduction in DAS28 were significantly and HAQ-DI markedly greater in the T2T group than in the fixed dose group (DAS28: -3.9 [SD 1.2] vs. -2.2 [SD 1.5], $p<0.0006$; HAQ-DI: -0.63 [SD 0.58] vs. 0.20 [SD 0.67], $p<0.14$). All but five of the T2T patients required only one modification of csDMARD and one additional course of oral GC. 10.2 joints (mean) were infiltrated with triamcinolone in the T2T group (av. dose 14.1 mg/injection). The adverse event rate was similar for both groups (T2T n=51; fixed dose n=55).

Conclusions: Treat to target management with optimisation of csDMARDs, oral and intra-articular glucocorticoids of RA patients in parallel to additional CZP treatment was safe and substantially improves disease activity and the patient related outcome HAQ-DI in comparison to additional CZP to a fixed dose of csDMARDs.

Disclosure of Interest: R. Mueller Grant/research support from: Unlimited grant by UCB pharmaceuticals, M. Spaeth: None declared, C. von Restorff: None declared, C. Ackermann: None declared, J. von Kempis: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2018-eular.5556

FRI0139

COMPARATIVE SAFETY OF ABATACEPT IN RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS WITH COPD: A REAL-WORLD POPULATION-BASED OBSERVATIONAL STUDY

S. Suissa¹, P. Ernst¹, S. Dell'Aniello¹, S. Shen², T.A. Simon². ¹McGill University, Montreal, Canada; ²Bristol-Myers Squibb, Princeton, USA

Background: In the ASSURE trial (NCT00048932) comparing abatacept with placebo for the treatment of RA, there was an increased incidence of respiratory serious adverse events (SAEs; COPD exacerbation/worsening, bronchitis and pneumonia) in those receiving abatacept among the subgroup of 54 patients with a history of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD).¹

Objectives: To assess whether patients with RA and a history of co-morbid COPD treated with abatacept in a real-world, observational setting, have an increased risk of respiratory SAEs compared with similar patients treated with other biologic (b)DMARDs or the targeted synthetic DMARD tofacitinib (tofa).

Methods: The Truven MarketScan[®] Commercial and Supplemental Medicare databases were used to identify adult patients diagnosed with RA and COPD who were treated with abatacept, another bDMARD or tofa between January 2007 and December 2015. Other bDMARDs included adalimumab, anakinra, certolizumab, etanercept, golimumab, infliximab, rituximab and tocilizumab. A prevalent new-user study cohort design² was used in which each new user of abatacept was time- and propensity score-matched to two new users of other bDMARDs or tofa. Patients were required to have ≥ 6 months of continuous health plan enrolment before cohort entry and were followed up until the end of enrolment in the database or 31 December 2015. Propensity scores of abatacept treatment were estimated from the baseline covariates using a conditional logistic regression model separately in incident new users and prevalent new users. Patients with score ranges common to both abatacept and the comparator cohorts were included. An as-treated analysis based on the Cox proportional hazard regression model was used to estimate the hazard ratios (HRs) of respiratory SAEs associated with abatacept compared with other bDMARDs or tofa, further adjusted for confounders found to be unbalanced despite matching on propensity scores.

Results: A total of 9746 patients with RA and COPD initiated bDMARD or tofa therapy and included 1807 new users of abatacept matched to 3547 new users of another bDMARD or tofa. The matched cohort was followed for up to 9 years (mean 2.0 years); 53% were incident users. For users of abatacept relative to other bDMARDs or tofa, the adjusted HRs (95% CI) of respiratory SAEs were: hospitalisation for COPD exacerbation: 0.57 (0.30, 1.05); hospitalisation for pneumonia/influenza: 1.39 (0.91, 2.12); outpatient pneumonia/influenza: 1.04 (0.85,