Disclosure of Interests: None declared
DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2020-eular.5318

AB1162 ANTI-TNF BIOSIMILARS: HOW KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF INFLUENCE PRESCRIPTION

A. De Chateaubriant¹, P. Ingrand², E. Gervais^{1,3}. ¹Poitiers University Hospital, Rheumatology, Poitiers, France; ²Poitiers University Hospital, Poitiers, France; ³University of Poitiers, LITEC, Poitiers, France

Background: Biological agents change the management of rheumatic inflammatory disease with improving care but increasing costs. Biosimilars for subcutaneous TNF inhibitors (SC TNFi) are available in France since 2015 and provide the same treatments at lower cost. French health agencies do not legally oblige rheumatologist to first prescribe or switch to biosimilars.

Objectives: To assess the knowledge and beliefs of French rheumatologists about biosimilars.

Methods: The assessment was developed with a questionnaire consisting of five parts: demographics data, professional practice, theoretical knowledge, beliefs and confidence. The questionnaire was administrated via the website Limesurvey and sent by email to French rheumatologist. A descriptive analysis of the data and associated factors to initiation and switch of biosimilars have been done.

Results: One hundred one rheumatologists have participated to the study. 47.1% was less than forty years old. 92% of them have the authorization to prescribe TNFi. 53.2 always prescribed a biosimilars when they prescribed a SC TNFi for the first time and 78.5% in 90% of cases. 30.6% of French rheumatologist never switched to a biosimilars. Those who switch, do it in more than 75% of cases. 96.5%, 87.1% and 91.8% respectively answered that biosimilars are as efficient, as safe and have the same immunogenicity profile compared to originator. The initial biosimilars prescription is associated with a better knowledge about biosimilars. For example, 77.4% of rheumatologist who prescribe in more than 90% of the case, answer **NO** to the question "biosimilars and originator have to be compared in a phase III study for EACH indications for which originator obtained marketing approval". Only 31.2% of rheumatologist who prescribed in less than 90% of the case respond **NO** to this question. This difference was significant $p < 0.001$. The switch to a biosimilars is associated with the beliefs and confidence. For example 25.4% of rheumatologists who switch for biosimilar in more than 75% of the case, answer **YES** to the question "There is not enough experiences with biosimilar". 57.7% of rheumatologist who switched in less than 75% of the case respond **YES** to this question. This difference was significant $p < 0.003$.

Conclusion: Despite good knowledge on biosimilars, some French rheumatologists do not switch for these molecules. Our study suggests that this is due to lack of confidence.

Acknowledgments: The authors thank French rheumatologist who answer to the questionnaire

Disclosure of Interests: Arnaud De Chateaubriant: None declared, Pierre Ingrand: None declared, Elisabeth Gervais Speakers bureau: Novartis, Janssen, Roche, Pfizer, BMS, Abbvie

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2020-eular.4174

AB1163 IMPACT ON COSTS AND WORKING LIFE OF RHEUMATIC PATIENTS WITH CHANGE IN BIOLOGICAL THERAPY FOR NO MEDICAL REASONS. REAL LIFE EXPERIENCE IN REGIONAL HOSPITAL OF SOCIAL SECURITY

L. Pablo Olivares¹, E. González Figueroa², M. F. López Marquet¹, M. V. Goycochea Robles³. ¹IMSS, Rheumatology external consult, Mexico City, Mexico; ²IMSS, Clinical Research Unit HGR 1, Benito Juarez, Mexico; ³UNAM, Departamento de Enseñanza Clínica Facultad de Medicina, Coyoacan Mexico City, Mexico

Background: Biologics as new therapeutic alternatives have revolutionized the management of rheumatic diseases. Biosimilars have been emerged as less expensive alternative. Most part of evaluations of biosimilars had proved effectiveness by clinical trials with outcomes as remission, but specific social aspects and economic variables not always has been considered. These aspects must be assessed in specific and real contexts (countries, health institutions) The effect on non-medical switch of biological therapy for rheumatic diseases in costs and working variables has not been documented in patients of the Mexican Social Security Institute (IMSS)

Objectives: Evaluate the impact of the change of biological therapy for non-medical reasons on the economic variables, costs and working aspects with rheumatic diseases on Mexican patients with social security

Methods: Cross-sectional observational study included patients from rheumatology clinical service of an IMSS Regional Hospital in Mexico City during last trimester of 2018. A structured questionnaire was applied who diagnosis of rheumatoid arthritis and spondyloarthropathies where received treatment biological

for at least 24 months prior to the study. The individuals were divided into two comparison groups, G1: patients who changed to biosimilar biological treatment for non-medical reasons and G2: patients with original biological treatment without changes in the therapeutic scheme. In addition to socio-demographic characteristics, functional capacity (HAQ-di), disease activity (DAS28) and labor aspects were evaluated. A sex and age adjusted logistic regression analysis was performed where the outcome variable was the evolution

Results: The 71 cases evaluated included 90% female with schooling > 9 years in 90%. G1 included 49%, age 51.1 years $\pm$ 15.1 vs G2 55.8 $\pm$ 12.7; evolution in years: G1: 13.8 $\pm$ 4.7 vs G2: 9.74 $\pm$ 5.97. Both groups persisted in remission by DAS28 (G1: 2.50 $\pm$ 0.489 VS G2: 2.39 $\pm$ 0.63). The G1 had a higher percentage of moderate affection in functional capacity: 58.8% vs G2: 35.9%, required more travel time to work, 2 hours less work per day and required more disability (48% vs 43% [RM0 1.6 95% CI: 0.45-3.4]) After logistic regression models adjusted by age and sex, no significant results were found for economic and costs variables. However, a statistically significant association ($p = 0.017$) were found for time progression disease as predictor variable between G1 Vs Group 2 (OR=1.15, 95% CI 1.02, 1.30). Mean time progression disease for G1 were 9.38 $\pm$ 6.5 years (n=43) and for G2 were 14.17 $\pm$ 5.5 years (n=28)

Conclusion: IMSS rheumatic patients who were on their original biological treatment, had more working time and improved statistically significative their time progression disease. Switch to biosimilar not have impact in clinical remission but can impact in economic and working aspects. IMSS serves 50% of Mexican population, covering medical care (physician fees, laboratory and medication purchase), and social security; so, should consider not only clinical aspects to acquisition of biologics drugs

Acknowledgments: FUNDACION IMSS

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2020-eular.6301

AB1164 A COST PER RESPONDER ANALYSIS OF ABATACEPT VERSUS ADALIMUMAB FOR THE TREATMENT OF RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS AMONG PATIENTS WITH SHARED EPITOPE (SE) POSITIVITY FROM A UNITED STATES PAYER PERSPECTIVE

S. H. Park¹, X. Han², F. Lobo², S. Nanji¹, D. Patel¹. ¹Pharmerit International, Bethesda, United States of America; ²Bristol-Myers Squibb, Lawrence Township, United States of America

Background: The shared epitope (SE) is a significant genetic risk factor for rheumatoid arthritis (RA), and it has been proposed to be associated with T-cell activation and the production of anti-citrullinated protein antibody (ACPA).¹⁻³ The results from the Early AMPLE trial, a head-to-head trial comparing the efficacy of abatacept versus adalimumab among early moderate-to-severe RA patients with positive ACPA (ACPA+) and rheumatoid factor (RF), showed that at week 24, patients with SE positivity (SE+) responded better to abatacept compared to adalimumab across all efficacy measures evaluated (ACR20 [American College of Rheumatology], ACR50, ACR70, DAS[disease activity score]28-CRP[C-reactive protein]).⁴

Objectives: To compare the cost per responder (CPR) between abatacept and adalimumab among RA patients with SE+ at week 24 using the Early AMPLE trial data from a United States (US) payer perspective.

Methods: A CPR analysis was conducted for RA patients with SE+, ACPA+, and RF. Responders were defined as patients achieving ACR20, ACR50, ACR70, or DAS28-CRP ≤ 2.6 and efficacy data was sourced from the trial (Figure 1).⁴ Approved product labels were referenced for treatment dosing regimen and wholesale acquisition cost was used to calculate pharmacy cost.⁵ A real-world rebate scenario was considered for adalimumab (30%) to reflect the real-world pricing in the US market. The CPR was calculated as the total pharmacy cost divided by the proportion of responders.

Results: The total pharmacy cost at week 24 was \$26,273 per patient for abatacept and \$21,731 per patient for adalimumab. With achieving ACR70 as the definition of responder, the CPR at 24-week was \$46,337 for abatacept and \$74,935 for adalimumab, a difference of \$28,598 (Table 1). The CPR was consistently lower for abatacept compared to adalimumab across all clinical measures, with difference ranging from \$7,099 to \$43,609.

Table 1. Overall cost per responder results

	Abatacept	Adalimumab	Difference
ACR20	\$30,303.74	\$37,403.06	-\$7,099.32
ACR50	\$34,254.68	\$48,077.83	-\$13,823.15
ACR70	\$46,337.46	\$74,935.10	-\$28,597.64
DAS28-CRP ≤ 2.6	\$52,546.68	\$96,155.65	-\$43,608.97