to rheumatological disease and occurred after being hospitalized in intensive care unit.

Conclusion: The patients with inflammatory rheumatic diseases usually apply to the emergency department with urgent or less urgent clinical pictures. Rheumatoid arthritis, one of the most common inflammatory rheumatic diseases in almost all societies, was also the most common diagnosis in our study. In the vast majority of applications, infectious causes and disease activations related to immunosuppressive treatments were in the foreground. In addition, although vasculitis is the most common reason for the in-patients in clinical service, since the most frequent in-patients in intensive care unit and death is seen in the scleroderma group; caution should be exercised in the emergency applications of patients with these two groups.

References:

- [1] Rheumatology consultation in the emergency department: Annual results. RAED 2014

Table. Examination of the diagnosis of 233 patients who were hospitalized and/or died from the emergency department

Parameters	In-patients in clinical service n, (%)	In-patients in intensive care units n, (%)	Died patients n, (%)
Vasculitis	38 (17.9)	5 (23.8)	1 (1)
Ankylosing spondylitis	33 (15.5)		
Rheumatoid arthritis	31 (14.6)	3 (14.2)	2 (20)
Behcet's disease	25 (11.7)	2 (9.5)	
Systemic lupus erythematosus	16 (7.5)	1 (4.7)	5 (50)
Scleroderma	10 (4.7)	7 (33.3)	
Antiphospholipid syndrome	10 (4.7)		
Psoriatic arthritis	9 (4.2)		
Family Mediterranean fever	8 (3.7)		
Sjogren's Syndrome	8 (3.7)		
Still Disease	7 (3.3)	1 (4.7)	1 (10)
Gout	7 (3.3)		
Undifferentiated connective tissue disease	7 (3.3)	2 (9.5)	1 (10)
Dermatomyositis	3 (1.4)		
Total	212 (100)	21 (100)	10 (100)

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2020-eular.2938

AB1157

SEASONAL INFLUENZA VACCINATION: KNOWLEDGE AND ATTITUDES IN RHEUMATIC PATIENTS

G. Figueroa-Parra¹, L. Santoyo-Fexas¹, A. Moreno-Salinas¹, C. M. Gamboa-Alonso¹, A. L. De-Leon-Ibarra¹, D. Á. Galarza-Delgado¹, J. A. Esquivel Valerio¹. ¹Hospital Universitario "Dr. José Eleuterio González", Servicio de Reumatología, Monterrey, Mexico

Background: Vaccines are one of the safest and effective public health interventions (1). Patients with rheumatic diseases (RD) have a higher risk of morbidity and mortality from vaccine-preventable infections (2). Seasonal Influenza vaccination (SIV) had shown to reduce the incidence, complications, admissions, and mortality from Influenza in patients with RD (3). Vaccine hesitancy is one of the threats to global health established by the WHO.

Objectives: To assess the knowledge and attitudes of rheumatic patients about SIV.

Methods: A self-questionnaire was applied during a community speech for rheumatic patients in October 2019 and also was applied in the rheumatology clinic of the university hospital "Dr. Jose Eleuterio Gonzalez" in Monterrey, Mexico, between November and December 2019. The questionnaire asks age, rheumatic diagnosis, and ten questions. Results are shown in descriptive statistics, the Chi-square and Mann-Whitney U tests were performed to compare groups. A P-value ≤ 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Analyses were performed using SPSS version 22.0.

Results: A total of 205 self-questionnaires were applied. 122 (59.5%) in the community speech and 83 (40.5%) in the clinic. The median age was 55 (45.75-62.25) years in the community population and 44 (28-59) years in the clinic, also the diagnosis distribution was different (Table 1). Most patients considered that rheumatic patients can be vaccinated. About 80% of patients have ever been vaccinated for seasonal influenza. 87.7% and 77.1% considered that SIV is safe and effective. About 85% of patients considered SIV the best way to avoid complications of Influenza. About 40% considered not safe to be vaccinated for influenza and other vaccine at the same time. 23.8% and 48.2% considered that SIV weakens the immune system and renders it susceptible to infections. Most of the patients know that SIV is free. 23.0% and 42.2% considered other measures better than SIV. 17.2% and 33.7% considered that SIV

will get them worse instead of helping them, and 9.0% and 14.5% think that his RD will get worst with SIV.

Table 1. Population Characteristics

	Community N= 95	Clinic N= 83	P
Age, years, median (IQR)	55 (45.75-62.25)	44 (28-59)	0.001*
Diagnosis, n (%)			
-RA	67 (70.5)	46 (55.4)	0.037*
-OA	14 (14.7)	7 (8.4)	0.194
-SLE	3 (3.2)	11 (13.3)	0.013*
-Other AID	8 (8.4)	8 (9.6)	0.780
-Other NAID	3 (3.1)	11 (13.2)	0.012*

Conclusion: Misinformation about SIV is patent among rheumatic patients. It is a big challenge to clarify these myths to gain confidence about his safety and effectiveness and provide his benefits.

References:

- [1] Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2013;9(8):1774-1778.
[2] Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2018;14(6):1311-1322.
[3] Ann Rheum Dis. 2020;79:39-52

Table 2. Questionnaire

		Community N= 122 (%)	Clinic N= 83 (%)	P
1. Can rheumatology patients be vaccinated?	Yes	114 (93.4)	75 (90.4)	0.420
	No	8 (6.6)	8 (9.6)	
2. Have you ever been vaccinated for Influenza?	Yes	97 (79.5)	68 (81.9)	0.668
	No	25 (20.5)	15 (18.1)	
3. Influenza vaccine is safe and effective:	Yes	107 (87.7)	64 (77.1)	0.045*
	No	15 (12.3)	19 (22.9)	
4. The best way to avoid complications of influenza is by using SIV:	Yes	104 (85.2)	71 (85.5)	0.953
	No	18 (14.8)	12 (14.5)	
5. It is safe to be vaccinated for Influenza and other vaccines at the same time:	Yes	73 (59.8)	48 (57.8)	0.774
	No	49 (40.2)	35 (42.2)	
6. SIV weakens the immune system and renders it susceptible to infections	Yes	29 (23.8)	40 (48.2)	<0.001*
	No	93 (76.2)	43 (51.8)	
7. Do you know that SIV is freely provided?	Yes	115 (94.3)	76 (91.6)	0.453
	No	7 (5.7)	7 (8.4)	
8. Herbal medications, traditional medicine and some food (like orange) are better than SIV:	Yes	28 (23.0)	35 (42.2)	0.003*
	No	94 (77.0)	48 (57.8)	
9. SIV instead of helping me will get me worst:	Yes	21 (17.2)	28 (33.7)	0.006*
	No	101 (82.8)	55 (66.3)	
10. SIV will worst my rheumatic disease:	Yes	11 (9.0)	12 (14.5)	0.226
	No	111 (91.0)	71 (85.5)	

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2020-eular.5074

AB1158

VACCINATION BARRIERS IN PATIENTS WITH RHEUMATIC DISEASES

G. Figueroa-Parra¹, A. Moreno-Salinas¹, L. Santoyo-Fexas¹, C. M. Gamboa-Alonso¹, A. L. De-Leon-Ibarra¹, I. D. J. Hernandez-Galarza¹, D. Á. Galarza-Delgado¹, J. A. Esquivel Valerio¹. ¹Hospital Universitario "Dr. José Eleuterio González", Servicio de Reumatología, Monterrey, Mexico

Background: Patients with rheumatic diseases (RD) are at increased risk of infections, attributed to the underlying RD, comorbidities and immunosuppressive therapy, including glucocorticoids, disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs, etc. (1). While many infectious diseases can generally be prevented by vaccines, immunization rates in this specific patient population remain suboptimal (2). Despite being recognized as one of the most successful public health measures, vaccination is perceived as unsafe and unnecessary by a growing number of individuals. Lack of confidence in vaccines is now considered a threat to the success of vaccination programs (3).

Objectives: To describe the main causes of non-vaccination in patients with RD.

Methods: A self-questionnaire was applied to a sample of patients with RD in the rheumatology clinic of the university hospital "Dr. Jose Eleuterio Gonzalez" in Monterrey, Mexico between September and December 2019. The questionnaire evaluated demographic characteristics (age, gender, diagnosis) and the vaccination status for Influenza (last year), pneumococcal (last 5 years), Herpes zoster (ever), Human papillomavirus (any dose) and Hepatitis B (any dose). It also includes a question asking: If you didn't receive any of the previous vaccines, what was the reason? (multiple-choice are shown in Table 2). Results are shown in frequencies and percentages.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics

	N= 102
Age, years, mean (SD)	51.27 (14.68)
Female, n (%)	84 (82.4)
Diagnosis, n (%)	
-RA	71 (69.6)
-SLE	13 (12.7)
-OA	12 (11.8)
-Other AID	6 (5.8)

Table 2. Vaccination barriers

	N=82
If you didn't receive any of the previous vaccines, what was the reason? n (%)	
1) Did not was recommended	22 (26.8)
2) Lack of availability	21 (25.6)
3) Vaccines don't work	13 (15.8)
4) Fear of adverse events	8 (9.7)
5) Previous adverse event	3 (3.6)
6) Other reason	
- Own decision	8 (9.7)
- Disinformation	7 (8.5)

Results: 102 patients were evaluated: Mean age was 51.27 (SD 14.68) years; 84 (82.4%) were females; 71 (69.6%) had rheumatoid arthritis, 13 (12.7%) had systemic lupus erythematosus, 6 (5.8%) had other autoimmune diseases and 12 (11.8%) had osteoarthritis. The rate of vaccination for Influenza was 49 (48%), for pneumococcal 25 (24.5%), for Herpes zoster 5 (4.9%), for Human papillomavirus 9 (8.8%), for Hepatitis B 14 (13.7%) (Table 1). 82 (80.3%) patients reported some barriers in vaccination, from these: 22 (26.8%) did not get the recommendation from the rheumatologist, 21 (25.6%) did not find available the vaccine, 13 (15.8%) believes that vaccines don't work, 8 (9.7%) had fear of adverse events, 3 (3.6%) reported previous adverse events, and 15 (18.2%) reported other reasons, that we classified as own decision 8 (9.7%) and disinformation 7 (8.5%) (Table 2).

Conclusion: The main barriers in vaccination of rheumatic patients reported were the lack of availability of the indicated vaccines and the medical and patient disinformation. This problem must be combated to ensure the complete vaccination of rheumatic patients.

References:

- [1] Ann Rheum Dis. 2020;79:39-52.
- [2] J Rheumatol. 2019;46(7):751-754
- [3] Hum Vaccin Immunother. 2013;9(8):1763-73.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2020-eular.5521

AB1159 HIGH PREVALENCE MUSCULOSKELETAL PATHOLOGY: A CHALLENGE FOR PRIMARY ATTENDING PHYSICIANS. WHAT DO WE RHEUMATOLOGISTS CONTRIBUTE TO?

L. García Hernández¹, L. Fernández de la Fuente Bursón¹, P. Muñoz Reinoso¹, D. V. Mendoza Mendoza¹, B. Hernández-Cruz¹, P. González Moreno¹, J. J. Pérez Venegas¹. ¹Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena (HUVVM), Seville, Spain

Background: Musculoskeletal Diseases (MSKD) represent one of the main health problems burdens worldwide. They cause a significant functional, quality of life and socioeconomic impact. Knee and lumbar osteoarthritis are the most prevalent¹. MSKD can be assessed by different kind of specialists: Orthopedic and Traumatology Surgery (OTS), Rheumatology and Rehabilitation, each of them focused at one of the distinct aspects of the same disease. It is the General Practitioner (GP) consultations that usually act as a gateway to specialized care. However, this derivation is carried out in non-standardized manners that leads to an evaluation from a sometimes wrong selected specialist or sometimes overlap management between several of them². The result is an endless waiting list in an overburden health system that cannot solve people's health issues. In 2018, only in our area, 32.894 patients with MSKD were referred from GP to the different medical consultations: OTS (65%), Rehabilitation (25%) and Rheumatology (10%). Furthermore, there are specialized consultations called "Primary Trauma" to which GP can refer which are managed indistinctly by any of the 3 specialists mentioned before.

Objectives: The following study aims to assess by collecting data in one of these consultations, how these pathologies are referred to the different specialist and the role that the rheumatologist plays in its management.

Methods: From January to March 2019, 300 consecutive patients' medical records from the HUVVM area that were sent to "Primary Trauma" consultations and attended by a rheumatologist have been reviewed. The reason for consultation, tests and referrals requested, diagnoses reached and procedures and other therapeutic actions performed were collected. Descriptive statistics with percentages and mean are showed.

Results: The average age of the patients was 51 years [7-88], 57% (170) women and 43% (130) men. The most frequent reasons for referral were knee pain (26), foot pathology (23%), low back pain (12%) and carpal tunnel syndrome (6%). 68% (204 patients) attended the consultation with some test already performed request in primary care, mostly radiographs (61%) and MRI scan (34%). After the first assessment during consultation, only 31% required new studies. The diagnoses that were most frequently established are showed in table 1: degenerative knee pathology (29%) was the most prevalent. 60% of the patients assessed were given exercise tables and/or postural recommendations. 14% received an infiltration on the same day of the visit. Only 78 patients (26%) needed to be reviewed later in those consultations. Of the remaining 222 (74%), 81 (27%) were referred to other specialists. 56 of them (19%) went to OTS to a surgical evaluation, most frequently of the knee (32%), hand (27%) and foot (23%). 141 (47%) were discharged and referred to GP's for follow ups.

Table 1. Diagnoses.

	N	%
Degenerative knee pathology	67	29
Plantar support alterations	34	15
Lumbar osteoarthritis	19	8
Deformities of the feet	17	7
Mechanical metatarsalgia	12	5
Plantar fasciitis	9	4
Carpal tunnel syndrome	9	4

Conclusion: The prevalence of MSKD found in medical consultation coincides with the national registers. Most patients did not need to be referred to surgical units. The role of the Rheumatologist is to take a comprehensive care for the patient, focusing on giving an effective evaluation and quick solution to his MSKD. In short, if the most prevalent MSKD are not subsidiary of surgical treatment (at least initially), the specialist whom patients with MSKD should be referred would be the rheumatologist.

References:

- [1] EPISER2016: Estudio de la prevalencia de las enfermedades reumáticas en población adulta en España. Sociedad Española de Reumatología. Madrid, 2018.
- [2] Conill EM et al. Waiting lists in public systems: from expanding supply to timely access? Reflections on Spain's National Health System. Cien Saude Colet. 2011;16:2783-94.

Disclosure of Interests: Isabel García Hernández: None declared, Lola Fernández de la Fuente Bursón: None declared, Paloma Muñoz Reinoso: None declared, Dolores V. Mendoza Mendoza: None declared, Blanca Hernández-Cruz Speakers bureau: Abbvie, Lilly, Sanofi, BMS, STADA, Paz González Moreno: None declared, José Javier Pérez Venegas: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2020-eular.4593

AB1160 A BENCHMARKING STUDY EVALUATING THE BURDEN OF AXIAL SPONDYLOARTHRITIS IN SPAIN COMPARED WITH THE REST OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES. RESULTS OF THE SPANISH ATLAS AND EMAS STUDIES.

M. Garrido-Cumbrera^{1,2}, E. Collantes-Estévez^{3,4}, V. Navarro-Compán⁵, P. Zarco Montejó⁶, C. Sastré⁷, S. Sanz-Gómez¹, P. Plazuelo-Ramos², J. Gratacos-Masmitja^{8,9} on behalf of Atlas Working Group. ¹Health & Territory Research (HTR), Universidad de Sevilla, Sevilla, Spain; ²Spanish Federation of Spondyloarthritis Associations (CEADE), Madrid, Spain; ³Reina Sofía University Hospital, Córdoba, Spain; ⁴Maimonides Biomedical Research Institute of Córdoba (IMIBIC), University of Córdoba, Córdoba, Spain; ⁵IdiPAZ, University Hospital La Paz, Madrid, Spain; ⁶Hospital Fundación Alarcón, Madrid, Spain; ⁷Novartis Spain, Barcelona, Spain; ⁸Hospital Universitari Parc Taulí, Sabadell, Spain; ⁹I3PT, UAB, Barcelona, Spain

Background: Benchmarking studies in axial spondyloarthritis (axSpA) may provide evidence of disparities, making it necessary to improve the healthcare and management of these patients.

Objectives: To evaluate differences between Spain and the rest of Europe (RoE) in relation to sociodemographic characteristics, life habits, and patient-reported outcomes (PROs) in axSpA patients.

Methods: Data from 2,846 unselected patients from the European Map of Axial Spondyloarthritis (EMAS) were collected through an online survey, with