INTRAVENOUS HIGH DOSE GLUCOCORTICOIDS CAUSE PROLONGATION OF QT INTERVAL IN CONNECTIVE TISSUE DISEASE PATIENTS EXCEPT ANTI-RO POSITIVE SUBGROUP
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Background: Recent literature indicates that anti-Ro antibodies may be associated with prolongation of corrected QT (QTC) interval in the adult patients with connective tissue diseases. Moreover, glucocorticoids (frequently used in the therapy) are known to probably induce electrocardiographic changes including prolongation of QT interval. Prolongation of QTC interval is a risk factor for malignant ventricular arrhythmias. We hypothesised that patients with anti-Ro positivity have a higher risk of QT prolongation especially in the case of high dose intravenous glucocorticoids (IVGC) treatment.

Objectives: The aim of the study was to analyse risk of QTC interval prolongation in anti-Ro and anti-La positive patients before and after high dose IVG treatment in patients with connective tissue diseases.

Methods: We performed a retrospective study of 115 patients (21 males), mean age of 48±14.7 years, range 19-78 years with connective tissue disease. Anti-Ro antibodies were examined in all patients before IVGC treatment. The patients were given 5x1000 mg methylprednisolone i.v. during five consecutive days. ECG recording was performed at baseline and after IVGC. The QT intervals were measured in each of 12-lead standard ECGs from two consecutive cycles. The QT intervals were measured from the onset of QRS complex to the end of the T wave by the means of a tangential method. Fridericia formula was used to obtain heart rate-corrected values for QT intervals.

Results: Comparing patients with anti-Ro positivity (n=39; 33.9%) and anti-Ro-negativity (n=76; 66.1%), we found significant difference in QTC interval; QTCRo+ = 417.2±28.4ms and QTCRo− = 420.8±25.6ms (P=0.051), respectively. Admission of IVGVC showed significant prolongation of QTC in all patients, mean QTC1 before treatment was 399.4±25.2ms, and QTC2 after therapy 412.7±27.2ms, P=0.00021. On the other hand, anti-Ro and anti-La positivity showed shorter QTC interval 391±18.7ms, to compare patients without these antibodies QTCRo=414.8±25.7ms, P=0.019 after treatment.

Conclusion: IVGVC treatment significantly prolongs QT interval. Prolongation of QT over 445 ms was found in nine patients, but ventricular arrhythmias were not observed. The presence of anti-Ro and anti-La antibodies did not show QT prolongation. Therefore, shortening of QT/QTC interval needs further confirmation. Motivated by this experience, we consider ECG monitoring and careful observation of patients during IVGC treatment.
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HCQ COULD ACT ON SLE PATIENTS THROUGH THE MODULATING EXPRESSION OF IL-8 ALONG WITH S100 PROTEINS
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Background: Some reports revealed that S100A8 and S100A9 proteins were associated with disease activity of lupus nephritis(LN) [1]. However, there have been no reports about the mechanism of additional hydroxychloroquine (HCQ) treatment for systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) patients with low disease activity.

Objectives: To clarify the mechanism of additional HCQ treatment for Japanese SLE patients with low disease activity.

Methods: All the 44 patients were enrolled in this study. These patients had been receiving additional oral HCQ sulfate continuously for at least 3 months. These patients had no need for additional immunosuppressants including glucocorticoids, during this study because of their sustained low disease activity for 3 months prior to starting HCQ. Low disease activity was defined as SELENA-SLEDAI score of 8 or less and with no activity in major organ systems. As conventional immunological and clinical assessment for SLE disease activity were determined to examine the levels of complement (C3, C4, CH50), anti-dsDNA antibody, blood cell count, SELENA-SLEDAI and CLASI score. Serum levels of S100A8 and S100A9 reported as novel markers for SLE disease activity [1] were measured using ELISA (CircuLex ELISA Kit, MBL) at the time of HCQ administration as well as 3 months later. In addition, several expressions of cytokines (IFN-α, IFN-γ, TNF-α, IL-2, IL-4, IL-5, IL-8, IL-9, IL-10, IL-17, IL-1x, IL-1β, VEGF, GM-CSF, G-CSF, CCL2, CCL4, CXCL1) were measured by multiplex assay (Human Luminex assay, RD systems).

Results: Data was extracted from 1376 PRFs, and 591 PSCs. 35.6% of patients were currently on their first line of therapy, 40.0% second line, and 24.4% third line or more. Significant differences were observed between US and EU5 in current treatment classes for first line (p<0.0001) and second line (p=0.0007). Descriptive differences were observed in the third line.

In the US monotherapy is more often first line with antimalarial (AM) (monotherapy EUS 12.5% vs. US 19.3%) and immunosuppressant (IM) (monotherapy EUS 4.6% vs. US 11.1%). Glucocorticoids (GCS) use is higher in the EUS in the 1st line; both monotherapy (EUS 13.7% vs. US 11.8%) and combination (GCS+AM EUS 28.3% vs. US 16.7%). At second line, IM use (no bio) is higher in EUS (EUS 64.9% vs. US 56.7%) and biologic use is higher in the US (EU5 5.0% vs. US 8.3%); GCS use is similar (EUS 19.2% vs. US 19.0%). Globally, 84.4% of patients receiving GCS received it continuously with no significant differences observed between markets, EUS 85.5% vs. US 81.9%. A higher proportion of patients in the EU5 have been on GCS for 6 months or longer when compared to the US; EU5 79.9% vs. US 72.5%. Statistically significant differences were seen in the perception of GCS importance between markets (p=0.0004) and concerns with taking GCS (p=0.0140). A higher proportion of patients in the US regarded the use of GCS to at least be very important (very important/essential EUS 65% vs. US 80.6%). A higher proportion of patients in the US were concerned with the use of GCS (somewhat concerned/very concerned EUS 56% vs. US 61.2%).

Conclusion: Significant differences in treatment approach between regions highlights the need for a better understanding of this disparity and a united approach to SLE treatment. Despite the high profile of factors linked to GCS use in SLE, it continues to be a continuously utilized by a large proportion of SLE patients and there is poor use of flare preventing agents such as antimalarials. Patients and physicians recognize the role of GCS in the management of SLE but also express concerns. Impact of an update to the SLE guidelines and their dissemination with better understanding of risk benefits of GCS vs. immunosuppressive and biologic therapy is warranted.


RITUXIMAB THERAPY IN LUPUS NEPHRITIS RESISTANT TO CONVENTIONAL THERAPY – A SINGLE CENTER EXPERIENCE (CASE SERIES)
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Background: Lupus nephritis (LN) can be a cause of morbidity and mortality in a significant portion of patients. The treatment of lupus nephritis can be challenging in some patients who are resistant to conventional immunosuppressive treatment.

Objectives: Rituximab is a promising agent for treating resistant patients. We evaluated the response of lupus nephritis patients who were treated with rituximab treatment in our clinic retrospectively.

Methods: We evaluated LN patients who were followed and treated with at least one course of rituximab in our clinic between 2013-2018. Remission was defined as proteinuria below 500 mg/day. Also, we evaluated the reason behind the cessation of rituximab during the follow-up whether it is a side effect or lack of efficacy. A final 24-hour proteinuria level was also analyzed at the end of the follow-up.

Results: 33 patients (20 F, 13 M) were treated with rituximab. All patients had active lupus nephritis at initiation. Mean of disease duration was 6.7 years. Diagnosis was proven by renal biopsy, except two (Table). Patients received an average of 4.2 courses. All patients were treated with high dose steroids. The other medications, the patients were previously treated with, were Cyclophosphamide (n=26), Azathioprine (n=7), Mycophenolate mofetil (n=17). Also one patient was treated with plasmapheresis due to thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura. 2 patients were lost in follow-up, 13 patients (39%) are still on rituximab. Six of them (46%) still have active LN. Among 18 patients in whom rituximab therapy was terminated, 3 had inadequate response, 2 had severe infection (cellulitis, pneumonia), 1 had Rituximab-induced serum sickness, 1 had will of pregnancy. Treatment of 11 patients was terminated owing to remission of disease. All of the patients whom rituximab was terminated in disease remission did not flare, except one. The mean level of pretreatment proteinuria was 3356 ± 2478 mg/day. The mean level of proteinuria after the final course was 1025 ± 982 mg/day (p<0.0001). Mean erythrocyte sedimentation rate (ESR) was reduced from 28.62 ± 22.95 mm/h to 14.97 ± 12.32 mm/h (p<0.005). While initial steroid dose was 24 ± 19.3 mg/day, steroid dose at last rituximab course was 7.84 ± 6.13 mg/day (p<0.0001). None of the patients had a new organ involvement during therapy. End stage renal disease was developed in 3 patients. During the treatment 7 patients had infections, 2 had herpes zoster, 1 had cellulitis, 3 had pneumoniae and 1 had frequent upper respiratory infections.

Table. Histological characteristics of patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RPS/ISN Classification</th>
<th>Number of patients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Class II</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class V</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III+IV</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV+V</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusion: In lupus nephritis patients resistant to conventional therapy, rituximab can be tried as an alternative treatment choice. In our single center, most of the patients were class IV nephritis whom we observed the efficacy of rituximab. Generally, the side effects were acceptable. Rituximab can be a steroid sparing agent in these patients.
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