letter and having the opportunity to contact if necessary. This made the process quite smooth, easy to administer and avoided costs associated with face-to-face review. Substantial annual cost savings of nearly £100,000 were achieved once the switch process completed. Only six patients (7%) encountered adverse effects, two of whom had uncontrolled disease despite switching back to the originator. We support the routine switching from originator to biosimilar etanercept in view of good patient experience and disease outcomes. This can be achieved with minimal contact in a cost-efficient manner.
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Background: Indirect costs due to absenteeism of rheumatoid arthritis (RA) and ankylosing spondylitis (AS) in Slovenia have not been thoroughly researched despite availability of national administrative data on sick leave and evidence from other countries on their sizable burden [1, 2].

Objectives: To compare absenteeism trends in Slovenia in the 2001-2016 period between three age cohorts of RA and AS patients given that age is an important determinant of sick leave [3].

Methods: Retrospective population data on sick leave from the Slovenian National Institute of Public Health was collected. Total annual number of days on sick leave was used as an indicator of absenteeism. Patients were classified into three age cohorts (20-39 years, 40-54 years and 55-69 years). Changes in absenteeism during the 16-year period were estimated using a linear trend function.

Results: In the 2001-2016 period, patients with RA spent 448,828 days on sick leave. For AS patients the number of sick days was 92,990.
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Background: Indirect costs due to absenteeism of rheumatoid arthritis (RA) and ankylosing spondylitis (AS) in Slovenia have not been thoroughly researched despite availability of national administrative data on sick leave and evidence from other countries on their sizable burden [1, 2].

Objectives: To compare absenteeism trends in Slovenia in the 2001-2016 period between three age cohorts of RA and AS patients given that age is an important determinant of sick leave [3].

Methods: Retrospective population data on sick leave from the Slovenian National Institute of Public Health was collected. Total annual number of days on sick leave was used as an indicator of absenteeism. Patients were classified into three age cohorts (20-39 years, 40-54 years and 55-69 years). Changes in absenteeism during the 16-year period were estimated using a linear trend function.

Results: In the 2001-2016 period, patients with RA spent 448,828 days on sick leave. For AS patients the number of sick days was 92,990.
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Background: Indirect costs due to absenteeism of rheumatoid arthritis (RA) and ankylosing spondylitis (AS) in Slovenia have not been thoroughly researched despite availability of national administrative data on sick leave and evidence from other countries on their sizable burden [1, 2].

Objectives: To compare absenteeism trends in Slovenia in the 2001-2016 period between three age cohorts of RA and AS patients given that age is an important determinant of sick leave [3].

Methods: Retrospective population data on sick leave from the Slovenian National Institute of Public Health was collected. Total annual number of days on sick leave was used as an indicator of absenteeism. Patients were classified into three age cohorts (20-39 years, 40-54 years and 55-69 years). Changes in absenteeism during the 16-year period were estimated using a linear trend function.

Results: In the 2001-2016 period, patients with RA spent 448,828 days on sick leave. For AS patients the number of sick days was 92,990.
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others are dedicated to primary immunodeficiencies and autoinflammatory diseases (respectively 15 registries, 28%, and 12 registries, 23%). Fifteen registries (28%) exclusively collect data from patients with a single specific disorder: in particular, three registries are devoted to systemic lupus erythematosus, two registries to Kawasaki disease or Behcet disease, and single registry to juvenile dermatomyositis, juvenile systemic sclerosis, juvenile idiopathic arthritis (JIA)-related uveitis, systemic JIA, Blau syndrome, sarcoidosis, Guillain-Barre syndrome, and myasthenia gravis. More than 55000 patients with RMD are enrolled. The majority of registries (36; 68%) enroll only patients from national territories. Among the internationals, six collect data on autoimmune disorders (Pharmacloyd, BrainWorks, EuroMyositis, EUULAR web library, UKIVAS registry and JIR cohort), five on primary immunodeficiencies (ESID, EBMNT, SCETIDE, PCID and HLH registry), and three are devoted to autoinflammatory diseases (Eurofever, Infevers, and ImmuN-AID), despite also ESID registry and JIR cohort collect data on autoinflammatory diseases. Data usually collected in these registries are demography, diagnosis, clinical manifestations, laboratory tests and treatment, while genetic and imaging data are less frequently reported (respectively in 38% and 9% of registries). A treatment safety profile is reported in 29 registries (55%). Collectively, fifteen biobanks are counted.

Conclusion: The survey highlighted the pivotal role of national and international organizations in Europe to collect and organize clinical data on immune diseases, allowing the rapidly growing knowledge on these rare conditions, creating research networks and providing significant numbers of data to support new discoveries in the field. RITA network could improve the coordination of these numerous entities, supporting initiatives of collaboration. As a first attempt, the present survey revealed that the collection of key parameters about patient safety, as well as outcome data and quality of life measures should be improved among the registries of RITA network.
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Table. Mean (SD) for paper versus i-pad format for MDHAQ in 65 patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>I-Pad</th>
<th>Diff. (%95 CI)</th>
<th>ICC (%95 CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Function</td>
<td>2.0 (1.7)</td>
<td>2.1 (1.7)</td>
<td>0.04 (-0.6, 0.6)</td>
<td>0.96 (0.94, 0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>5.3 (3.2)</td>
<td>5.1 (3.1)</td>
<td>-0.03 (-0.8, 0.14)</td>
<td>0.87 (0.80, 0.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient global</td>
<td>4.8 (2.8)</td>
<td>4.5 (2.8)</td>
<td>-0.3 (-5.7, 1.3)</td>
<td>0.94 (0.90, 0.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAPID3</td>
<td>12.1 (7.1)</td>
<td>11.4 (7.2)</td>
<td>-0.7 (-1.7, 0.3)</td>
<td>0.93 (0.88, 0.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Symptom checklist</td>
<td>9.9 (8.5)</td>
<td>10.8 (9.5)</td>
<td>-0.9 (-4.1, 2.2)</td>
<td>0.75 (0.62, 0.84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient global VAS</td>
<td>9.9 (8.9)</td>
<td>11.4 (10.7)</td>
<td>-1.4 (-7.9, 1.9)</td>
<td>0.81 (0.71, 0.88)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion: An eMDHAQ appears to have similar performance compared to a paper MDHAQ version. A high percentage of patients prefer the digital version to paper, although around 20% of patients are likely to require a paper MDHAQ. An eMDHAQ offers remote completion at home, before and/or between visits, to report issues concerning efficacy and/or adverse events. Expanded eMDHAQ software can allow a doctor to develop flow-sheets and a database for all patients, a full patient medical history, and interfacing with any electronic medical record (EMR), although that requires interaction with the EMR vendor, which often is difficult. The eMDHAQ appears useful independent of the EMR.
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Background: Giant cell arteritis (GCA) is the most common systemic vasculitis in persons aged 50 and above (1). Data on incidence and prevalence of GCA are welcomed. Further information is also needed on the healthcare burden and resource consumption. The use of multiple digital databases with the integration of clinical data from a formalized network of specialists is needed.

Objectives: To estimate incidence, prevalence and costs of GCA by an integrative analysis of multiple administrative databases of the healthcare system of the Italian Region of Friuli Venezia Giulia (about 1.2 millions of inhabitants), cooperating with the existing local Rheumatology Network.

Methods: A 17-year retrospective study was conducted through the following administrative health regional digital databases of the Friuli Venezia
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AN ELECTRONIC MDHAQ (MULTIDIMENSIONAL HEALTH ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE) GIVES SIMILAR RESULTS TO A PAPER VERSION

Mariam Riad, Elena Obreja, Isabel Castrejon, Theodore Pinouc, Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, United States of America

Background: A self-report multi-dimensional health assessment questionnaire (MDHAQ) is used in many routine care rheumatology settings as a pragmatic tool to recognize efficacy and adverse events. The MDHAQ is informative in all rheumatic diseases in which it has been studied. An electronic version of the MDHAQ (eMDHAQ) could offer several advantages, including completion at home rather than in the waiting area and completion from any site between visits to report possible change in status and/or adverse events of a medication. Furthermore, the 4-page “new patient” eMDHAQ can allow a patient to store a full medical history at a password-protected, secure website. Reports of the patient history can be available for an electronic medical record (EMR) without dictation or typing by the doctor, although interaction with the EMR vendor is required, unless electronic connection has proven difficult. Implementation of eMDHAQ software requires documentation that eMDHAQ responses are similar to those on a paper MDHAQ.

Objectives: To compare scores on an eMDHAQ vs paper version of MDHAQ.

Methods: All patients with all diagnoses complete a paper MDHAQ at all visits in the waiting area part of routine clinical care in one setting. Consistent patients completed MDHAQ in paper and in an iPad at the same visit. The MDHAQ includes 0-10 scores for physical function, pain and patient global visual analog scales (VAS), compiled into 0-30 RAPID3, as well as a 0-48 self-report painful joint count, and 0-60 symptom checklist. For this study, at the conclusion of the visit, the rheumatologist asked a patient if she/he would like to complete an eMDHAQ on an iPad indicating no problem if a patient declined for any reason. Patients who agreed to participate completed the an eMDHAQ with identical content to the paper MDHAQ. The patient also completed a 3-questionary, with 2 VAS concerning the value of the MDHAQ to the patient or the doctor (0= no value, 10= great value), and a query of her/his preference for the eMDHAQ vs paper MDHAQ or no preference. Test-retest reliability was examined by intraclass correlation coefficients (ICC).

Results: 65 patients completed the study. The ICC for physical function, patient global VAS, and RAPID3 was >0.9 indicating excellent reliability between the electronic and paper versions, while the ICC for pain, self-report painful joint count, and symptom checklist was >0.75, indicating good reliability. Differences between the 2 versions were within variation on the paper questionnaire. The mean rating for the value of MDHAQ was 8.85/10 to the patient, and 8.88/10 to the doctor. Among the 65 patients, 43 (66%) indicated a preference for the eMDHAQ, 7 (11%) for the paper MDHAQ, and 15 (23%) indicated no preference.

Table. Mean (SD) for paper versus i-pad format for MDHAQ in 65 patients