future studies are to design a prospective study, include persistence and adherence measures in the study design, and to assess patient outcomes with additional measures such as patient outcomes based on a patient-centric approach and adverse effects.

Disclosure of interest: This literature review was funded by AbbVie Inc.

REFERENCES

- [1] Van den Bosch F, Ostor AJK, Wassenberg S, Chen NJ, Wang C, Garg V, Kalabic J. 2017. Impact of participation in the adalimumab (Humira) patient support program on rheumatoid arthritis treatment course: results from the PASSION study. *Rheumatol Ther*, 4(1): 85-96
- [2] Marshall JK, Bessette L, Thorne C, Shear NH, Lebovic G, Gerega SK, Millson B, Oraichi D, Gaetano T, Gazel S, Latour MG, Laliberté MC. 2018. Impact of the adalimumab patient support program's care coach calls on persistence and adherence in Canada: an observational retrospective cohort study. *Clin Ther*, 40(3): 415-429
- [3] Rubin DT, Mittal M, Davis M, Johnson S, Chao J, Skup M. 2017. Impact of a patient support program on patient adherence to adalimumab and direct medical costs in Crohn's disease, ulcerative colitis, rheumatoid arthritis, psoriasis, psoriatic arthritis, and ankylosing spondylitis. *J Manag Care Spec Pharm*, 23(8): 859-867

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-eular.6258

AB1224

IS THERE A NEED TO OPTIMIZE REFERRAL DIAGNOSIS TO A RHEUMATOLOGY DEPARTMENT?:

Tobias Hoffmann, Peter Oelzner, Gunter Wolf, Alexander Pfeil. Jena University Hospital – Friedrich Schiller University Jena, Department of Internal Medicine III, Jena, Germany

Background: The initial visitation of patient suffering from rheumatic disease related symptoms often occurs in absence of a rheumatologist.

Objectives: This study evaluated the following questions: I. Which medical specialists referral patients to a rheumatology department? II. To quantify the accordance of the presumptive diagnosis and the final diagnosis of a rheumatologist.

Methods: 1151 patients (355 men and 796 women) were admitted to a hospital for rheumatological diagnostic. The referral medical specialists were identified. Kappa-Analysis was performed to evaluate the presumptive diagnosis and the final diagnosis by the rheumatologists.

Results: 73.0% of the referrals were performed by general practitioner. The other referrals were: 7.7% rheumatologist, 4.8% specialist in internal medicine (excluding rheumatology), 4.3% orthopaedic surgeon, 1.0% ortho surgeon and 9.2% other specialists.

The highest accordance of the presumptive diagnosis and the final diagnosis was $\kappa=0.534$ for rheumatologists and $\kappa=0.400$ for specialist in internal medicine (excluding rheumatology). Lower kappa values were evaluated for general practitioner ($\kappa=0.345$), orthopaedic surgeon ($\kappa=0.310$) and other specialists ($\kappa=0.252$).

Conclusion: The referrals were frequently realized by general practitioners. In this context the presumptive diagnosis of a general practitioner presents a low accordance with the final diagnosis. In this context, general practitioners should achieve a detailed education in the assessment of rheumatic-related symptoms to optimize the dedicated referral to rheumatological departments.

Disclosure of Interests: Tobias Hoffmann: None declared, Peter Oelzner: None declared, Gunter Wolf: None declared, Alexander Pfeil Grant/research support from: This study is a part of the Investigator Initiated Study "The quantification of inflammatory related periarticular bone loss in certolizumab pegol treated patients with rheumatoid arthritis" which is funded and supported by UCB Pharma GmbH, Monheim, Germany (number: IIS-2014-101458).

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-eular.4083

AB1225

POSSIBLE EARLY DETECTION OF ADVERSE EVENTS USING REMOTE SYSTEMATIC WEEKLY ELECTRONIC MDHAQ

Theodore Pincus. Rush University Medical Center, Chicago, United States of America

Background: Adverse events of medications are reported to account for 5% of hospital admissions in the USA, including 10% in the elderly. Warnings from doctors and pharmacies concerning adverse events are given at initiation of new medications, but adverse events occur between visits and reporting depends primarily on communication between a patient and a health professional, which may be variable. Therefore, recognition and reporting of adverse events remain relatively haphazard. Several reports present strategies for systematic monitoring for adverse events, primarily involving telephone contacts from nurses to patients. A far less expensive systematic approach based on patient self-report using a remote electronic multidimensional health assessment questionnaire

Date	19 Jan 2018	25 Jan 2018	11 May 2018	2 Aug 2018	15-29 Aug 2018	24 Sep 2018	26 Sep 2018	4 Oct 2018	9 Oct 2018	9 Nov 2018	25 Nov 2018	28 Dec 2018
Site of MDHAQ	Clinic	Clinic	Clinic	Clinic	None	Home	Home	Home	Home	Home	Home	Home
RAPID3 (0-30)*	14.0	10.2	5.7	3.5	?	19.5	10.2	6.7	6.5	4.8	6.0	4.2
Fatigue VAS (0-10)	6	4.5	2.0	2.0		9.0	4.5	4.0	3.5	1.0	1.0	1.0
Medications												
Prednisone mg/day	B 40	↓20	↓7	↓6	D/C 0	R 10	5	5	5	5	5	5
Methotrexate mg/w			B 10	20	D/C 0	0	0	0	0	R 10	10	10
pirfenidone					B3-9/d	9/d	D/C	0	0	3/D	D/C	0
#Symptoms (0-60)	10	5	6	6		15	15	13	13	6	8	6
Weight loss	+	+				+	+	+	+			
Feeling sickly	+											
Unusual fatigue	+					+	+	+	+	+	+	
Bruising/bleeding	+			+							+	
Other skin problem				+								
Loss of appetite						+	+	+	+	+	+	
Other eye problems			+									
Stuffy nose	+		+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dry mouth	+	+	+			+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Problems with smell/taste				+		+	+	+	+			
Cough	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Dyspnea	+	+	+	+		+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Heartburn/gas	+					+	+	+	+			
Dizziness	+											
Muscle weakness		+				+	+	+	+		+	+
Swelling of hands						+	+	+	+			
Swell-other joints						+	+	+	+			
Joint pain						+	+	+	+			+
Back pain						+	+					
Anxiety			+									
Sleep problems						+	+					