IL-6 inhibitors (tocilizumab, n=13; sarilumab, n=3), JAK inhibitors (tofacitinib, n=7; baricitinib, n=4), and B-cell depleting agent (rituximab, n=4). The pooled study population of 27,215 moderate-to-severe RA patients primarily consisted of middle-aged Caucasian females (mean age: 47-55 yrs; % Caucasian: 44% - 97%; % female: 69% - 88%). Thirty three trials were on patients previously treated with cDMARD or TNFi, while 6 trials were on cDMARD-naïve patients. Total aggregated AEs (total AEs, n=37; SAEs, n = 37; treatment-related AEs, n = 14) and infection (serious infection, n = 35; total infection, n = 26) were the most frequently reported safety outcomes.

The NMA was performed on 23 trials. Indirect comparisons were made between IL-6 inhibitors, JAK inhibitors, B cell depleting agent and abatacept, with TNFi or cDMARD as direct comparators. The risk of total AEs was significantly higher for IL-6 inhibitors compared with abatacept (RR = 1.13, 95% CrI = 1.05 - 1.22). For SAEs and other analyzed safety outcomes, no significant difference was observed between abatacept and other non-TNFi drug classes. Similar results were observed in sensitivity analyses for all patients on concomitant cDMARD, including those who were treatment-naïve before the study (n=26 trials).

Conclusion: When comparing aggregated safety outcomes, abatacept shared a similar safety profile with most non-TNFi RA treatments. However, patients on abatacept had a statistically significantly lower risk of total AEs compared to US recommended doses of IL-6 inhibitors. More studies with head-to-head comparison in clinical trials and real-world setting are required to provide further understanding of the safety profile and risk of specific adverse events for non-TNFi in order to optimize treatments for moderate-to-severe RA patients.

REFERENCES

- [1] Schoels M, et al. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2012;71(8):1303-1308
- [2] Christensen R, et al. *Int J Clin Rheumatol* 2013; 8(6):647-655
- [3] Jin Y, et al. *J Rheumatol* 2018; 45(9): 1240-1248

Disclosure of Interests: Damemarie Paul Shareholder of: Bristol-Myers Squibb, Employee of: Damemarie Paul is an employee of Bristol-Myers Squibb., Benjamin Taylor Grant/research support from: Benjamin Taylor is an employee of Doctor Evidence LLC, and the study was funded by Bristol-Myers Squibb., Yuting Kuang Grant/research support from: Yuting Kuang is an employee of Doctor Evidence LLC, and the study was funded by Bristol-Myers Squibb., Mir Sohail Fazeli Grant/research support from: Mir Sohail Fazeli is an employee of Doctor Evidence LLC, and the study was funded by Bristol-Myers Squibb.

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-eular.4357

AB0399 EVOLUTION OF BIOLOGIC/SMALL MOLECULE SWITCHING PATTERNS IN RA BETWEEN 2016 AND 2018

Philpouliot¹, Lynn Price². ¹spherix global insights, Exton, United States of America; ²Spherix Global Insights, Exton, United States of America

Background: TNF therapy has been the standard of care for adult patients diagnosed with autoimmune conditions and are typically used as a first-line biologic/small molecule in the treatment of rheumatoid arthritis (RA). However, the adoption of systemic agents with alternate mechanisms of action (AMOA) such as JAK and interleukin inhibitors have increased in recent years across many indications. As such, the practice of sequential TNF prescribing following an initial TNF discontinuation is becoming less common, with switches to AMOAs, such as JAK and IL-6 inhibitors, becoming more popular.

Objectives: This research sought to track the evolution of biologic/small molecule switch patterns among US RA patients between 2016 and 2018 and to identify differentiating patient characteristics between the switch patterns.

Methods: An independent market analytics firm collaborated with US rheumatologists to conduct a retrospective chart review of RA patients who switched biologic/small molecule treatment 12 weeks prior to being surveyed. Physicians were able to submit up to 7 patient charts. Data were collected via a HIPAA-compliant online audit in January 2016 (n=198 rheumatologists/980 patient charts), in September 2017 (n=176 rheumatologists/1,002 patient charts), and September 2018 (211 rheumatologists/1,074 patient charts). Results were analyzed in SPSS.

Results: Analysis of patients recently switched from one biologic/small molecule to another revealed the decreasing popularity of cycling to another TNF after initial TNF discontinuation. TNF cycling accounted for 46% of all switches in 2016, 41% in 2017, and 40% in 2018. Conversely, switches from TNFs to JAK inhibitors accounted for 13% in

2016, 12% in 2017, and 15% in 2018. Switches to IL-6 inhibitors increased from 8% of all switches in 2016, to 9% in 2017, and 11% in 2018. The number of patients switched from a TNF to abatacept or rituximab remained stable over the study periods.

Patients who were cycled to another TNF were diagnosed with RA for a shorter amount of time, had been on a biologic for less time, had a lower swollen joint count and CRP level, were more likely to be males, were least likely to require a prior-authorization for treatment, and more likely to have been switched due to tolerability issues.

Consistent in all three years of data, patients switched to JAK inhibitors played a larger role in the switching decision, had a higher physician global assessment rating of global health, had a lower cardiovascular risk profile, were less likely to be prescribed concomitant methotrexate, and were more likely to participate in a manufacturer-sponsored co-pay assistance program.

Patients switched to an IL-6 inhibitor were largely indistinguishable from those undergoing other types of switches; however, they were slightly more likely to have more severe RA, have a slightly lower average physician global health assessment rating, were more likely to be obese, and have an elevated cardiovascular risk.

Conclusion: While the practice of TNF cycling is still the most predominant switch pattern among RA patients migrating from a first-to-second line biologic/small molecule therapy, the practice has been declining over the last three years. Over time, rheumatologists are increasingly likely to introduce a JAK or IL-6 inhibitor in the second-line setting following discontinuation of a first-line TNF.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-eular.7817

AB0400 FREQUENCY OF BIOLOGIC/SMALL MOLECULE MONOTHERAPY FOR RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS IN THE EU: REAL-WORLD EVIDENCE FROM A PATIENT AUDIT STUDY

Philpouliot, Lynn Price. *Spherix Global Insights, Exton, United States of America*

Background: Biologic/small molecule therapy has been the standard of care for adult patients diagnosed with rheumatoid arthritis (RA) who have failed conventional DMARD therapy, resulting in familiarity, comfort, and satisfaction among physicians. Prior recommendations of combining biologics/small molecules with a DMARD like methotrexate (MTX) have recently been challenged by clinical data demonstrating the effectiveness of IL-6 and JAK inhibitors as monotherapy.

Objectives: This research sought to evaluate the frequency of biologic/small molecule monotherapy regimens among European RA patients who were recently switched from one biologic/small molecule to another.

Methods: An independent market analytics firm collaborated with rheumatologists in France (n=62), Germany (n=66), Italy (n=61), Spain (n=68) and the UK (63) to conduct an online retrospective chart review of RA patients who had switched treatment from one biologic/small molecule to another in the prior twelve weeks. Rheumatologists were able to submit up to seven RA patient charts. A total of 1,312 patient charts were collected via a market-specific compliant audit form in September 2018 and included patient and physician demographics, patient treatment history, and clinical/non-clinical patient parameters.

Results: Overall, the analysis of patient chart audits revealed that 22% of all recently switched patients were switched to a biologic/small molecule monotherapy regimen. The frequency of monotherapy was highest in Germany (32%) and lowest in the UK (13%). Monotherapy was more frequent for patients switched to infliximab (39%) and tofacitinib (39%) and lowest for those switched to tocilizumab IV (12%) and rituximab (11%). When combined into classes of agents, frequency of monotherapy among recently switched patients was 25% for TNFs, 24% for JAK inhibitors, 23% for IL-6 inhibitors, and 16% for non-JAK/IL-6 AMOAs (abatacept or rituximab).

On a country-specific level, rates of TNF monotherapy were highest in Germany (38%) and lowest in the UK (16%). IL-6 monotherapy was also more common in Germany (27%) but least common in France (17%). JAK monotherapy was highest in France (34%) and lowest in the UK (7%), while monotherapy for abatacept/rituximab was highest in Germany (32%) and again lowest in the UK (13%).

Conclusion: The popularity of biologic/small molecule monotherapy varies by EU5 country and while rates are highest for TNF inhibitors, use of biologic/small molecule monotherapy for patients recently switched to a JAK or IL-6 inhibitor are comparable.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-eular.7829