BACKGROUND: Autoimmune disease (AID) has been associated with increased risk of influenza and influenza-like illness (ILI) and its worse clinical outcomes complications.

OBJECTIVES: We aimed to assess the influence and difference of several immunosuppressive (IS) treatments in the incidence of ILI, including glucocorticoids (GC), classic DMARDs and biologic DMARDs.

METHODS: We conducted a cross-sectional study in two autoimmune clinics. Patients were invited to answer a survey reporting ILI symptoms between October 2017 and March 2018. ILI definition was considered according to the European Center for Disease Control. Data regarding current IS, diagnostic, disease activity, comorbidities, and vaccination coverage were collected from electronic registry. Patients with history of cancer, HIV, IGIV treatment, or lack of information were excluded. Univariate and multivariate logistic regression analysis were used to access predictors of ILI.

RESULTS: We included 109 patients, with mean age 51 years and 81% female gender. The majority of patients had autoimmune arthropathy (n=54) or a connective tissue disease (n=44). Active disease was present in 39% of patients. IS treatment was: GC 31%, classic DMARD 44%, biologic DMARD 28%. Vaccine coverage was 51%. Overall 41% reported ILI. We did not find any association between studied variables and ILI, including univariate and multivariate analysis. Univariate odds ratio calculation for IS treatment were: GC [OR 1.68 IC 0.7-3.8], classic DMARD [OR 1.03 IC 0.5-2.2], and biologic DMARD [OR 0.86 IC 0.4-2.0]. Comorbidity of pulmonary disease (n=8) may contribute to higher risk to ILI [OR 2.76 IC 0.8-10.0].

CONCLUSION: There was no difference in risk of ILI within different IS treatment regimens, although GC may increase the risk. The study is limited by the subjectivity of the ILI survey and the small size of the sample. The stratification of influenza risk will help in designing better vaccine coverage strategies in this population.
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Table. Overall number and global prevalence by age and sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups in adults (n=358)</th>
<th>Sample size (N)</th>
<th>Cases of uveitis (N)</th>
<th>Prevalence (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-30</td>
<td>90075</td>
<td>55 (15.4)</td>
<td>61.1 (60.7-77.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-44</td>
<td>148359</td>
<td>94 (26.3)</td>
<td>63.4 (51.2-75.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>100672</td>
<td>78 (21.8)</td>
<td>77.5 (61.9-96.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>74180</td>
<td>50 (14.0)</td>
<td>67.4 (50.8-88.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥65</td>
<td>116658</td>
<td>81 (22.6)</td>
<td>69.5 (55.2-86.4)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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BACKGROUND: Epidemiologic studies about the distribution of the various types of uveitis and their etiology are important in helping the clinician to investigate, diagnose, and manage these pathologies. Approximating prevalence of uveitis is an important public health challenge, though studies on this purpose are scarce and of low quality. Therefore it is difficult to estimate accurately the impact of this disease in our days.

OBJECTIVES: To estimate the prevalence of uveitis and to describe its etiologic and anatomical pattern by means of a population study carried out in a Spanish region

METHODS: A cross-sectional descriptive, population-based, and multicentre study was conducted. The selection criteria consisted of having a diagnosis of uveitis. All data were collected from existing information in medical records. The clinical information was collected prospectively in all cases with a diagnosis of uveitis regardless its aetiology in the participating centres from the date of the study and during the following year. All patients underwent a complete ophthalmological examination with assessment of visual acuity, biomicroscopy, applanation tonometry and indirect funduscopiy.

RESULTS: The target population was the 687,892 inhabitants of the province of Toledo (Spain). During the study 389 cases of uveitis were registered. The prevalence was 58.7 (95% CI 53.0-64.9). The mean age was 47.0±20.6 years, and 57.8% were women. The most prevalent anatomical pattern was the anterior uveitis (54.2; 95%CI 48.1-60.8). For adults, idiopathic constitute the group with the highest prevalence (31.7; 95%CI 27.1-36.9), and in children autoimmune uveitis was the most frequent (10.6; 95%CI 5.8-17.7).

CONCLUSION: It is a precise population study that analyzes uveitis in a Spanish region, analyzing in detail different diagnoses and etiological factors in a Spanish region.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS: None.

DISCLOSURE OF INTERESTS: None declared.

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2020-eular.1409

EPIDEMIOLOGY AND CLINICAL PHENOTYPE OF BEHÇET’S DISEASE IN A WELL-DEFINED POPULATION OF NORTHERN SPAIN


BACKGROUND: Epidemiologic studies about the distribution of the various types of uveitis and their etiology are important in helping the clinician to investigate, diagnose, and manage these pathologies. Approximating prevalence of uveitis is an important public health challenge, though studies on this purpose are scarce and of low quality. Therefore it is difficult to estimate accurately the impact of this disease in our days.

OBJECTIVES: To estimate the prevalence of uveitis and to describe its etiologic and anatomical pattern by means of a population study carried out in a Spanish region

METHODS: A cross-sectional descriptive, population-based, and multicentre study was conducted. The selection criteria consisted of having a diagnosis of uveitis. All data were collected from existing information in medical records. The clinical information was collected prospectively in all cases with a diagnosis of uveitis regardless its aetiology in the participating centres from the date of the study and during the following year. All patients underwent a complete ophthalmological examination with assessment of visual acuity, biomicroscopy, applanation tonometry and indirect funduscopiy.

RESULTS: The target population was the 687,892 inhabitants of the province of Toledo (Spain). During the study 389 cases of uveitis were registered. The prevalence was 58.7 (95% CI 53.0-64.9). The mean age was 47.0±20.6 years, and 57.8% were women. The most prevalent anatomical pattern was the anterior uveitis (54.2; 95%CI 48.1-60.8). For adults, idiopathic constitute the group with the highest prevalence (31.7; 95%CI 27.1-36.9), and in children autoimmune uveitis was the most frequent (10.6; 95%CI 5.8-17.7).

CONCLUSION: It is a precise population study that analyzes uveitis in a Spanish region, analyzing in detail different diagnoses and etiological factors in a Spanish region.
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