relevant information. There is also functionality for the rheumatology team to reply to the referral with advice, which creates a new permanent document in the patient's EPR. The Orthopaedic team, who are the first point of call for hot joints in our Trust, were consulted to ensure that there were not any unintended consequences as a result of this change. The form included the following sentence to avoid delays in patient care for septic arthritis: 'patients with suspected septic arthritis should be referred to Orthopaedics by ringing the on-call registrar'.

Conclusion: The current method of paper rheumatology referrals was inefficient and referrals often lacked vital information. The new electronic system will ensure relevant items are included in the referral and that there is a clear audit trail of the referral process. Referrals will be re-evaluated again in three months to assess the impact of this change on outcomes including time to rheumatology review and inpatient bed stay. In the second round of this project we plan to include an education component onto the rheumatology referral form. For example, if gout is suspected, the referrer will be linked to guidelines and patient information sheets to assist best management whilst awaiting review. We would encourage others to consider their referral systems- could you improve yours?

REFERENCES:

- [1] Shephard E, Stockdale C, May F, et al. E-referrals: improving the routine interspecialty inpatient referral system. *BMJ Open Quality* 2018;7:e000249. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-000249

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-eular.5160

THU0626

SOCIAL NETWORKS AS A SOURCE OF INFORMATION FOR PATIENTS WITH RHEUMATIC DISEASES

Daniel G. Fernández-Ávila¹, Julián Barahona-Correa², Diana Romero-Alvernia³, Angel García³, Oscar Muñoz³. ¹Pontificia Universidad Javeriana – Hospital Universitario San Ignacio, Internal Medicine – Rheumatology, Bogotá, Colombia; ²Pontificia Universidad Javeriana – Hospital Universitario San Ignacio, Internal Medicine, Cra 7 No. 40-62, Colombia; ³Pontificia Universidad Javeriana – Hospital Universitario San Ignacio, Internal Medicine, Bogotá, Colombia

Background: Internet is an informative source for patients with different diseases. False information in social networks about health issues is a growing problem. Rheumatology is no stranger to this problem and there is a lot of false information regarding rheumatic diseases.

Objectives: To show objective data on misinformation published in social networks available to spanish-speaking rheumatic patients

Methods: We create accounts on Facebook (FB) and Google unique for this work. Multimedia was included in Spanish, with a convenience sampling according to the deployment of the platform (FB) or in descending order for reproductions on YouTube (YT). Two independent reviewers extracted information on online time, number of reproductions and characteristics of the most popular videos. Videos consulted on 10-11-18.

Results: With the search term "rheumatoid arthritis" (RA), the most reproduced video is titled "celery green juice for arthritis" (6.4 million reproductions). Of the first 50 videos with more reproductions, 39 are of natural or home remedies such as vinegar, "moringa", etc., and 35 videos indicate in their content, that they can cure RA. With the term "lupus", the most reproduced video is titled "God's tea, cure chronic tiredness, thyroid, arthritis, lupus and vertigo" (1.4 million reproductions). Of the first 50 videos with more reproductions, 31 correspond to natural or home remedies such as celery, thyme, diets among others and 29 videos indicate that they can cure lupus. With the term "fibromyalgia", the most reproduced video is entitled "I am 61 years old and this cured my arthritis, vertigo, fibromyalgia, lupus, chronic fatigue and the thyroid" (1.1 million reproductions). Of the 50 first videos with more reproductions, 40 are of natural or home remedies such as thyme, tea, among others and 33 videos indicate that they can cure the disease. With the data of the videos uploaded online in October 2018, 50 videos were chosen in YT and FB. There was no correlation between online time and the number of views on any platform. In FB, 56% of the videos contained false information, with no difference in online time in both groups (16 [12-22] vs 18 [13-25], $p = 0.3$). In YT, only 38% was considered false information, without differences between groups in online time (19 [11-26] vs 22 [12-24]).

Youtube	Total	Trustworthy	False	P value ^c
n (%)	50	31 (62)	19 (38)	-
Time on line ^{a, b}	21 (11-25)	19 (11-26)	22 (12-24)	0,76
# Reproductions ^b	40,5 (15,2-295,5)	25 (11-180)	239 (38-1082)	0,018
Most played video	"Rheumatoid arthritis: biological treatment changed my life" 7 years		"Green celery juice for arthritis" 5 years	
Time on line	1 million		6.4 millions	
# Reproductions				

^a Days; ^b median with interquartile range; ^c Mann-Whitney

Facebook	Total	Trustworthy	False	P value ^c
n (%)	50	22 (44)	28 (56)	-
Time on line ^{a, b}	17,5 (13-24)	16 (12 – 22,2)	18 (13 –24,7)	0,3
# Reproductions ^b	444 (47,5-1889)	1050 (308- 2077)	89,5 (4,7- 1204)	0,012
Most played video	"This woman lives with Rheumatoid Arthritis"		"Why remove gluten and dairy products in cases of rheumatoid arthritis?"	
Time on line	19 days		11 days	
# Reproductions	295 679		22 874	

^a Days; ^b median with interquartile range; ^c Mann-Whitney

Conclusion: YT and FB are social networks with a high content of false information. The majority of available videos promise to cure different rheumatic diseases (even several simultaneously). This is the first work of a line of research that seeks to highlight the high degree of misinformation. We will continue to analyze other diseases and social networks, to make publications and communications in different media and to alert local regulatory entities.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-eular.6422

THU0627

VACCINATIONS IN PATIENTS WITH AUTOIMMUNE INFLAMMATORY RHEUMATIC DISEASES: STILL ROOM FOR IMPROVEMENT

Delphine Bertrand¹, Sofie Coenen², Sofia Pazmino¹, Veerle Stouten¹, Diederik De Cock¹, Kristien Van der Elst³, Rene Westhovens^{1,3}, Marc Ferrante², Patrick Verschueren^{1,3}. ¹KU Leuven, Skeletal Biology and Engineering Research Center, Leuven, Belgium; ²UZ Leuven, Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Leuven, Belgium; ³UZ Leuven, Rheumatology, Leuven, Belgium

Background: Patients with autoimmune inflammatory rheumatic diseases (AIIRD) have an increased risk for acquiring infections. Vaccines were developed to diminish the prevalence of vaccine-preventable infections. The EULAR recommendations for vaccination in adult patients with AIIRD emphasise the importance of assessing the vaccination status of patients with AIIRD.

Objectives: To determine the vaccination status of patients with AIIRD, the reason for non-vaccination and the proportion of patients that are vaccinated according to the EULAR recommendations.

Methods: The single-centre cross-sectional COLOSseUM study was conducted in a tertiary referral centre. Between August and December 2018, all consecutive patients with AIIRD including Rheumatoid Arthritis (RA), Psoriatic Arthritis (PsA), Ankylosing Spondylitis (AS) and Juvenile Idiopathic Arthritis (JIA) who visited the outpatient clinic were included. The vaccination status (influenza winter season 2017-2018, pneumococcal, tetanus toxoid and hepatitis B vaccine) and history of varicella zoster virus infection was determined using a one-page questionnaire which was completed by the treating rheumatologist after discussion with the patient.

The patients' reason for non-vaccination was registered if applicable. Patients were classified as vaccinated according to the EULAR recommendations if they had a yearly influenza, an every-five-year pneumococcal and a decennial tetanus toxoid vaccine, the latter as recommended in the general population.

Table 1: The vaccination status of AIIRD patients

	All AIIRD patients (n=633)	RA (n=489)	PsA (n=73)	AS (n=58)	JIA (n=13)
Influenza vaccine n(%)					
Yes	438 (69.2)	360 (73.6)	45 (61.6)	28 (48.3)	5 (38.5)
No	195 (30.8)	129 (26.4)	28 (38.4)	30 (51.7)	8 (61.5)
Unk	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Pneumococcal vaccine n(%)					
Yes	203 (32.1)	174 (35.6)	19 (26.0)	10 (17.2)	0 (0)
No	352 (55.6)	259 (53.0)	45 (61.6)	39 (67.2)	9 (69.2)
Unk	78 (12.3)	56 (11.5)	9 (12.3)	9 (15.5)	4 (30.8)
Tetanus toxoid vaccine n(%)					
Yes	348 (55.0)	265 (54.2)	41 (56.2)	33 (56.9)	9 (69.2)
No	174 (27.5)	139 (28.4)	21 (28.8)	12 (20.7)	2 (15.4)
Unk	111 (17.5)	85 (17.4)	11 (15.1)	13 (22.4)	2 (15.4)
Compliant with EULAR recommendations n(%)					
Yes	117 (18.5)	100 (20.4)	9 (12.3)	8 (13.8)	0 (0)
No	429 (67.8)	318 (65.0)	55 (75.3)	45 (77.6)	11 (84.6)
Unk	87 (13.7)	71 (14.5)	9 (12.3)	5 (8.6)	2 (15.4)
Hepatitis B vaccine n(%)					
Yes	193 (30.5)	138 (28.2)	20 (27.4)	28 (48.3)	7 (53.8)
No	339 (53.6)	289 (59.1)	31 (42.5)	15 (25.9)	4 (30.8)
Unk	101 (16.0)	62 (12.7)	22 (30.1)	15 (25.9)	2 (15.4)
History of Varicella zoster virus n(%)					
Yes	447 (70.6)	355 (72.6)	47 (64.4)	34 (58.6)	11 (84.6)
No	58 (9.2)	46 (9.4)	3 (4.1)	8 (13.8)	1 (7.7)
Unk	128 (20.2)	88 (18.0)	23 (31.5)	16 (27.6)	1 (7.7)

AIIRD autoimmune inflammatory rheumatic diseases, RA Rheumatoid Arthritis, PsA Psoriatic Arthritis, AS Ankylosing Spondylitis, JIA Juvenile idiopathic arthritis, Unk unknown by patient

Results: The vaccination status of 633 consecutive patients was obtained. The group consisted of 489 (77.2%) patients with RA, 73 (11.5%) patients with PsA, 58 (9.2%) patients with AS and 13 (2.1%) patients with JIA with a mean $\pm$ standard deviation age of 59.8 ± 13.6 , 55.8 ± 13.5 , 45.2 ± 14.0 and 35.0 ± 13.9 respectively. Of all included patients with AIIRD, 69.2% were vaccinated for influenza, followed by vaccination rates of 55.0%, 32.1% and 30.5% for tetanus toxoid, pneumococcal and hepatitis B vaccination, respectively (Table 1). In addition, 70.6% of patients with AIIRD had a history of varicella zoster virus infection. Various reasons for non-vaccination were reported, of which 'No specific reason' was the most common, closely followed by non-awareness of the need for pneumococcal vaccination. The compliance with EULAR recommendations was 18.5%. Of the 429 patients with AIIRD not vaccinated according to the EULAR recommendations, 68 (15.9%) patients were not compliant with all three of the vaccines, 136 (31.7%) were not compliant with 2 vaccines (1: pneumococcal and 2: influenza or tetanus toxoid vaccine), 148 (34.5%) were not compliant with 1 vaccine (103 pneumococcal, 41 tetanus toxoid and 4 influenza vaccine) and 77 (17.9%) patients were unaware of their vaccination status for at least 1 vaccine.

Conclusion: In our patients with AIIRD, the highest vaccination rate for recommended vaccines was observed for influenza (nearly 70%). Not being vaccinated for pneumococcus was the main reason why patients did not comply with the EULAR recommendations. More attention is needed to determine and optimise the vaccination status of AIIRD patients and to increase the awareness regarding the pneumococcal vaccine.

Disclosure of Interests: : Delphine Bertrand: None declared, Sofie Coenen: None declared, Sofia Pazmino: None declared, Veerle Stouten: None declared, Diederik De Cock: None declared, Kristien Van der Elst: None declared, Rene Westhovens Grant/research support from: Bristol-Myers Squibb, Consultant for: Celltrion, Galapagos-Gilead, Marc Ferrante Grant/research support from: Janssen, Pfizer, Takeda, Consultant for: Abbvie, Boehringer-Ingelheim, Ferring, Janssen, Mitsubishi Tanabe, Takeda, MSD, Pfizer, Speakers bureau: Abbvie, Boehringer-Ingelheim, Chiesi, Ferring, Janssen, Lampro, Mitsubishi Tanabe, MSD, Pfizer, Takeda, Tramedico, Tillotts, Zeria, Patrick Verschueren Grant/research support from: Unrestricted Pfizer Grant for Early RA research

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-eular.3060

THU0628

IMMUNE-RELATED ADVERSE EVENTS INDUCED BY CANCER IMMUNOTHERAPIES. BIG DATA ANALYSIS OF 13,051 CASES (IMMUNOCANCER INTERNATIONAL REGISTRY)

Manuel Ramos-Casals¹, Oliver Lambotte², Marie Kostine³, Leonard Calabrese⁴, Maria Suarez-Almazor⁵, Clifton Bingham⁶, Timothy R. Radstake⁷, Chiara Baldini⁸, Thierry Schaevebeke⁹, Jacques-Eric Gottenberg¹⁰, Hendrik Schulze-Koops¹¹, Jan Leipe¹², Cassandra Calabrese⁴, Pilar Brito-Zerón¹³, Alejandra Flores-Chávez¹⁴, Belchin Kostov¹⁵, Soledad Retamozo¹⁶, Gustavo Citera¹⁷, Eva Aguilar¹⁸, Michael Richter¹⁹, Merav Lidar²⁰, Benjamin Fisher²¹, Jean-Marie Michot²², David Liew²³, Russell Buchanan²⁴, Marte Schrupf-Heiberg²⁴, Philippe Guipain²⁵, Debashish Danda²⁶, Peter Olsson²⁷, Yasunori Suzuki²⁸, Saadetin Kılıçkap²⁹, Gabriela Hernandez-Molina³⁰, Virginia Fernandes Moça Trevisani³¹, Sonja Praprotnik³², Ildiko Fanny Horváth³³, Naoto Azuma³⁴, Berkan Armanan²⁹, Munther Khamashta³⁵, Xavier Mariette³⁶. ¹H. Clinic, IDIBAPS, Barcelona, Spain; ²Bicêtre Hosp, Paris, France; ³Centre Hosp Univ, Bordeaux, France; ⁴Cleveland Clinic Foundation, Cleveland, OH, United States of America; ⁵Univ Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, TX, United States of America; ⁶Johns Hopkins Univ, Baltimore, MD, United States of America; ⁷Univ Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, Netherlands; ⁸Pisa Univ, Pisa, Italy; ⁹Centre Hosp Univ, Bordeaux, France; ¹⁰Strasbourg Univ, CNRS, Strasbourg, France; ¹¹Univ of Munich, Munich, Germany; ¹²Univ of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany; ¹³H. CIMA-Sanitas, Barcelona, Spain; ¹⁴Hosp de Especialidades, Mexico, Mexico; ¹⁵IDIBAPS, Barcelona, Spain; ¹⁶INICSA-UNC-CONICET, IUCBC, Córdoba, Argentina; ¹⁷IREP, Buenos Aires, Argentina; ¹⁸GEAS-SEMI Spanish Registry, Madrid, Spain; ¹⁹Mayo School of Graduate Med Education, Rochester, United States of America; ²⁰Sheba Med Center, Tel Aviv, Israel; ²¹Univ of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom; ²²Aus-REISAMIC Registry, Victoria, Australia; ²³Austin Health, Melbourne, Australia; ²⁴Diakonhjemmet Hosp, Oslo, Norway; ²⁵Montpellier Univ. Hosp, Montpellier, France; ²⁶Christian Med College and Hosp, Vellore, India; ²⁷Skåne Univ Hosp Malmö, Malmö, Sweden; ²⁸Kanazawa Univ Hosp, Ishikawa, Japan; ²⁹Hacettepe Univ, Ankara, Turkey; ³⁰INCMNSZ, Mexico, Mexico; ³¹Federal Univ of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil; ³²Univ Medical Centre, Ljubljana, Slovenia; ³³Debrecen Univ, Debrecen, Hungary; ³⁴Hyogo Coll Medicine, Nishinomiya, Japan; ³⁵Dubai Hosp, UAE, Dubai, United Arab Emirates; ³⁶Université Paris-Sud, Paris, France

Background: The ImmunoCancer International Registry (ICIR) is a Big Data-Sharing multidisciplinary network composed by 39 specialists in Rheumatology, Internal Medicine, Immunology and Oncology from 18 countries focused on immune-related adverse events (irAEs) related to cancer immunotherapies (CIs).

Objectives: To analyse the worldwide scenario of irAEs associated with the use of CIs in this Century.

Methods: The first objective of the ICIR has been the development of a systematic literature review crossing CIs terms with immune diseases defined according to MedDRA V15.0.

Results: The cumulated number of cases per year of irAEs has increased exponentially, with 12,648 patients who developed 13,051 irAEs reported until Dec 31, 2018:

: Combined CIs were used in 1962 (16%) patients, checkpoint inhibitors in 7099 (66%, overwhelmingly CTLA4 and PD1 inhibitors) and Tyrosine Kinase inhibitors in 3327 (31%); ipilimumab, nivolumab and pembrolizumab were associated with nearly 60% of reported cases. Organ-specific classification of irAEs is summarized in the figure:

The Top10 irAEs included enterocolitis (18%), pneumonitis (12%), thyroiditis (11%), myocarditis (6%), myositis (5%), hypophysitis (5%), hepatitis (5%), neuropathy (4%), adrenal (3%) and joint involvement (3%). Most irAEs are organ-specific symptoms not fulfilled criteria of systemic/rheumatic diseases.

Conclusion: More than 13,000 cases of irAEs triggered by CIs have been reported, with the organ-specific autoimmune damage of the endocrine, digestive and pulmonary systems accounting for 70% of the total reported irAEs.