(KO) mice were bred to generate homozygous KOs and mouse articular cartilage was isolated to culture chondrocytes.

Results: miR-34a expression was significantly elevated in the plasma as well as cartilage and synovium of TKR patients (KL IV) compared to healthy controls and early OA patients (KL-I), respectively. Similarly, miR-34a was significantly overexpressed in mouse knee joints (cartilage and synovium) at 10 weeks post OA surgery compared to sham. To identify the biological effects of miR-34a on chondrocyte and synovial fibroblast (SF), functional studies were conducted *in vitro*. Chondrocytes treated with miR-34a mimic had a significant reduction of SIRT1 (a direct target of miR-34a), anabolic (type II collagen and aggrecan) and autophagy markers, as well as, elevated catabolic markers (MMP13), suggesting that miR-34a contributes to cartilage degeneration. Chondrocytes treated with miR-34a inhibitor reversed these destructive effects. SFs treated with miR-34a mimic expressed elevated inflammatory (TNF- α , IL-6), fibrotic (TGF- β , Type 1 Collagen), and autophagy markers, suggesting that miR-34a is involved in mediating synovial inflammation and fibrosis. SFs treated with miR-34a inhibitor reversed these effects.

In vivo, intra-articular injection of miR-34a mimic induced cartilage damage, loss of proteoglycan content, and elevated cell death markers (PARP p85 and Caspase 3) in the articular cartilage. To confirm the destructive effects of miR-34a in the articular cartilage, we used miR-34a KO mice. MiR-34a KO mice further confirmed that genetic ablation of miR-34a resulted in marked elevation in the expression of anabolic markers (type II collagen and aggrecan) and decreased expression of catabolic ADAMTS-5 in the articular cartilage.

To test the therapeutic potential of blocking miR-34a, we intra-articularly injected miR-34a inhibitor in mice subjected to OA surgery. Results showed marked reduction in the severity of cartilage degeneration in mice treated with miR-34a inhibitor. **Conclusion:** This study, for the first time, demonstrates miR-34a as a crucial mediator involved in OA pathogenesis and as a potential therapeutic target for limiting cartilage destruction during OA.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-eular.2677

OP0019-HPR A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS ASSESSING GASTROINTESTINAL, LIVER, RENAL AND CARDIOVASCULAR ADVERSE EVENTS OF PARACETAMOL

Jaspreet Kaur, Burak Kundaki, Georgina Nakafero, Abhishek Abhishek, Michael Doherty, Weiya Zhang. *University of Nottingham, Academic Rheumatology, Nottingham, United Kingdom*

Background: Despite its modest efficacy, guidelines consistently recommend paracetamol as a first-line analgesic for osteoarthritis (OA) based on its perceived safety. However, there is growing controversy, highlighted in the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) 2014 guidance on OA, that paracetamol is not as safe as previously thought, especially at the highest therapeutic dose of 4gm/day.

Objectives: To investigate the association between paracetamol and gastrointestinal, liver, renal and cardiovascular adverse events both in randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and observational studies.

Methods: We systematically searched MEDLINE, EMBASE, PUBMED, AHMED, CINAHL, Web of Science, and Google Scholar for published literature in any language to the end of November 2018 for (1) RCTs of paracetamol in symptomatic OA, and (2) observational studies irrespective of any underlying condition, to determine the risk of gastrointestinal, liver, renal and cardiovascular adverse events. We included studies assessing oral paracetamol in people aged ≥ 18 years and reporting on clinically relevant adverse effects. Risk ratio (RR) and 95% confidence interval (CI) were estimated for RCT and cohort studies, whereas odds ratio (OR) and 95% CI were used for case-control studies. Results were pooled as appropriate using random effects model. The risk of bias was assessed using modified Cochrane tool for RCTs and Newcastle Ottawa scale for observational studies.

Results: We reviewed titles and abstracts of 3,622 records in the systematic search (1,997 RCTs and 1,635 observational studies). After examining full papers 23 RCTs (7,863 participants), 15 cohort studies (2,262,517 participants) and 34 case-control studies (441,638 participants) met inclusion criteria.

Compared to placebo, paracetamol was associated with increased incidence of treatment-related adverse events (RR 1.35, 95% CI 1.04 to 1.75), especially diarrhoea (RR 2.14, 95% CI 1.35 to 3.37) and abnormal liver function (RR 3.99, 95% CI 2.05 to 7.77). The pooled OR from twelve age and gender matched case-control studies (7894 participants) was 1.36 (95% CI 1.13 to 1.64) for upper gastrointestinal bleeding. In addition, a dose response relationship was observed in a cohort study (382,404 participants) for this outcome. The RR was 1.11 (95% CI 1.04 to 1.21) with low dose paracetamol (measured as medication possession rate) and 1.49 (95% CI 1.29 to 1.71) with high dose paracetamol. Paracetamol was not associated with cardiovascular events in two RCTs (775 participants)

(RR 1.27, 95% CI 0.06 to 27.77) and three case-control studies (42,180 participants) (OR 0.97, 95% CI 0.77 to 1.21), but in three cohort studies (208,926 participants) (RR 1.35, 95% CI 1.14 to 1.59). There were insufficient data in RCTs and case-control studies for renal adverse events. However, three cohort studies (7,360 participants) demonstrated a dose response relationship between paracetamol and renal function impairment (defined as ≥ 30 percentage decrease in estimated glomerular filtration rate). The data of these three cohort studies could not be pooled due to different doses of paracetamol. One cohort study (1697 participants) reported RR of 1.40 (95% CI 0.79 to 2.48) for renal impairment for paracetamol 100-499g, and 2.19 (95% CI 1.4 to 3.43) for paracetamol >3000 g.

Conclusion: Paracetamol is associated with diarrhoea and abnormal liver function in short-term trial data, and with upper GI bleeding and renal impairment in long-term observational data. Methodological limitations of observational data, such as channelling bias, may confound the results. Large-scale well-designed prospective studies are needed to ascertain the long-term safety of paracetamol.

Disclosure of Interests: Jaspreet Kaur: None declared, Burak Kundaki: None declared, Georgina Nakafero: None declared, Abhishek Abhishek Grant/research support from: AstraZeneca and Oxford Immunotech, Grant/research support from: AstraZeneca and Oxford Immunotech, Speakers bureau: Menarini pharmaceuticals, Speakers bureau: Menarini pharmaceuticals, Michael Doherty Grant/research support from: AstraZeneca funded the Nottingham Sons of Gout study, Consultant for: Advisory Boards on Grunenthal and Mallinckrodt, Weiya Zhang Consultant for: Grunenthal for advice on gout management, Speakers bureau: Bioiberica as an invited speaker for EULAR 2016 satellite symposium DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2019-eular.2802

OP0020 LESS IS MORE: ANA-LYSING THE IMPACT OF REPEATED ANTINUCLEAR ANTIBODY TESTING

Al Li Yeo^{1,2,3}, Jason Ong³, Kathryn Connelly¹, Suong Le², Ronnie Ptaszniak², Jane Ross², Eric F. Morand^{1,3}, Michelle Leech^{1,3}. ¹Monash Health, Department of Rheumatology, Melbourne, Australia; ²Monash Health, Department of Informatics, Melbourne, Australia; ³Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

Background: Minimising unnecessary tests is a global health economic priority with multiple initiatives in place to avoid inappropriate healthcare utilisation⁽¹⁾ and harm. Anti-nuclear antibody (ANA) testing is frequently performed as a diagnostic test for autoimmune conditions, such as systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) or as a screening test in patients with inflammatory or musculoskeletal symptoms. The value of serial testing in the monitoring of such conditions is unclear and false positive tests can lead to unnecessary further investigation and increased patient anxiety⁽²⁾.

Objectives: To evaluate the frequency of repeated ANA testing as a prelude to Electronic Medical Record (EMR) test alert design in an Australian healthcare network. The primary endpoint was calculation of the total cost associated with repeated testing and whether a longitudinal change in ANA resulted in any new ANA associated rheumatological diagnoses. Our secondary endpoint was the examination of baseline ANA testing behaviours.

Methods: We retrospectively analysed data from a multi-centre tertiary health network in Melbourne, Australia across a 7-year period (19 March 2011 to 23 July 2018). ANA and other autoimmune test results were obtained from the hospital pathology system with a positive ANA cut off set at 1:160. Clinical information was sourced from clinical information systems on patients who had a change in ANA result from negative to positive on repeat testing. The associated cost of repeated ANA testing was calculated based on the baseline cost to the public system.

Results: A total of 36,715 ANA tests (excluding 980 cancelled same-day requests) were performed in 28,840 patients. Of these, 14,058 (38.3%) were positive with females accounting for 9,265 (65.9%, $p < 0.001$). The most frequent ANA patterns were homogenous (47.4%) and nucleolar (23.3%). ANA titres were as follows: 1:160 (41.4%), 1:320 (15.3%), 1:640 (13.1%) and 1:1280 (29.2%). 7,875 (21.4%) of tests were repeat tests. Of these 511 (6.5%) results changed from negative to positive. The median time between a negative ANA result to the first positive result was 1.71 years (IQR 0.50-3.55). Clinical information was captured for a median duration of 1.24 years (IQR 0.50-2.07) following a positive ANA result. A change to positive ANA was associated with a new ANA-associated rheumatological diagnosis in only 5 cases (2 SLE, 1 scleroderma and 2 undifferentiated connective tissue disease) with a positive predictive value calculated at 0.01. When comparing patients who with a new diagnosis to those with no new diagnosis, there was no difference between ANA titre, pattern, duration to first positive ANA, ordering location or clinician, or age of first positive ANA test. The direct total cost for the government of all ANA testing was AUD\$903,189, of which repeat testing contributed AUD\$193,725.

Conclusion: Repeat ANA testing after a negative result had limited utility in the diagnosis of ANA associated rheumatological conditions with a positive predictive value of only 0.01, and resulted in high cost. New technology and clinical alert systems may help reduce unnecessary testing with potential significant direct cost savings when extrapolated across the Australian healthcare system.