RAPID RESPONSE WITH UPADACITINIB TREATMENT IN PATIENTS WITH RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS AND AN INADEQUATE RESPONSE TO CSDMARDs OR BDMARDs
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Background: Upadacitinib (UPA), an oral JAK inhibitor selective for JAK1, demonstrated efficacy in patients (pts) with moderate to severe rheumatoid arthritis (RA) with an inadequate response (IR) to csDMARDs or bDMARDs in the SELECT-NEXT1 and SELECT-BEYOND2 trials, respectively.

Objectives: To investigate the speed of response to UPA across disease measures in csDMARD- and bDMARD-IR pts.

Methods: 661 pts in NEXT and 498 in BEYOND received UPA 15 mg or UPA 30 mg once daily (QD) or placebo (PBO) for 12 weeks (wks)1,2. Time to first achievement of ACR20/50, DAS28-CRP<3.2 and Low Disease Activity (LDA) measures of CDAI (≤10) and SDAI (≤11) was evaluated. The cumulative incidences of ACR20/50, DAS28-CRP<3.2 and LDA by CDAI and SDAI over 12 wks were estimated. Hazard ratios between UPA and PBO were obtained using Cox proportional hazards model with treatment group, corresponding baseline values and main stratification factors, without control for multiple comparisons. All analyses were based on observed data without imputation.

RESULTS: Pts receiving UPA at either 15 mg or 30 mg QD were more likely to achieve various clinical responses at significantly earlier time points when compared with pts receiving PBO. Irrespective of being csDMARD-IR or bDMARD-IR, times to achieve various clinical responses were consistent between pt populations.
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SAT0240 VAGUS NERVE STIMULATION IN PATIENTS WITH RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS: TWO-YEAR SAFETY AND EFFICACY
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Background: Rheumatoid arthritis (RA) is a debilitating chronic disease with an unmet need for additional therapeutic approaches. Activating neuro-immune reflex pathways by stimulation of the vagus nerve (VNS) could represent a novel means of treating RA [1] and other immune-mediated inflammatory diseases. Last year we reported a 12-week proof-of-concept study using a VNS device, approved for drug-resistant epilepsy, showing reduction in the DAS28-CRP clinical disease activity score, with concomitant reductions in TNF and IL-6 levels [2].

Objectives: To understand the long term safety and efficacy of this novel treatment approach, we followed the patients in a 24 months long-term extension study and report on the safety and clinical efficacy data.

Methods: VNS devices were implanted into 17 RA patients, mostly with insufficient response to multiple conventional and biologic disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs), on stable background of methotrexate (25 mg weekly) therapy. The devices electrically stimulated the vagus nerve, 1–4 minutes/day, over a 12 week open label period. On completion, subjects were offered to enroll into a follow-up study, where the study physicians were given flexibility to alter VNS dosing parameters and/or to add a biologic DMARD to the treatment regimen. DAS28-CRP and Health Assessment Questionnaire-Disability Index (HAQ-DI) were collected over 2 years.

Results: All subjects elected continue on VNS treatment through 24 months of the long term follow-up study. Biologic DMARDs were started in 1 and restarted in 8 of 17 subjects; of these, 4 were non-responders to VNS, and 5 had stable improvement but had not yet achieved disease remission on VNS alone (table 1). At the start of the follow-up study, the mean DAS28–28 + HAQ-DI were significantly reduced compared to the pre-implant baseline (mean difference: mean DAS28–28 + HAQ-DI=–1.60±0.37; p<0.0001: mean difference: mean DAS28–28 + HAQ-DI=–0.44±0.21; p<0.037), and the depth of effect was retained through 24 months. At 24 months, there was no significant difference in DAS28-CRP between the subjects using VNS monotherapy or those using a combination of VNS and biologic medicines.