Conclusion: In our cohort, the vaccination protocol proved to be a good tool to improve the vaccination rate of rheumatological patients, despite this, the vaccination of Hepatitis B and specially of influenza, continues to have a lower prevalence to general population. The vaccines were effective since none of the preventable infections occurred during follow up, despite the use of an immunosuppressant. Vaccination showed a good safety profile, without reported serious adverse effects or worsening of the underlying disease.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-eular.1801

AB0805

A SURVEY OF RHEUMATOLOGY PATIENTS' SATISFACTION TO SWITCHING FROM ORIGINATOR TO BIOSIMILAR AGENTS

C. B. Ng¹, S. Samec¹, P. Kavanagh¹, G. McCarthy¹, S. Donnelly¹, A. G. Wilson¹.

¹The Mater Misericordiae University Hospital, Department of Rheumatology, Dublin, Ireland

Background: The recent widespread switching of patients with inflammatory rheumatic conditions from originators to biosimilars has largely been driven by costs. The views of patients on switching are also important in the successful long term switching to biosimilars. We conducted a survey of patients views on patients satisfaction with the switch to biosimilar therapy.

Objectives: To assess satisfaction and response after switching from originator (Humira or Enbrel) to biosimilar (Amgevita or Benepali respectively), and to describe efficacy, side effects and reactions to biosimilar.

Methods: All patients diagnosed with an inflammatory arthritis and switched to biosimilar were identified using the Irish national HighTech electronic prescriptions system. Participants had been administered the biosimilar for > 3 months and were invited to take part via a telephone survey. This consisted of 4 questions (Question 1: satisfaction with the response to the new medication [Using 5 point Likert scale = 0: very dissatisfied; 1: dissatisfied; 2: neutral; 3: satisfied; 4: very satisfied]; Question 2: overall satisfaction with biosimilar compared to originator if originator was 10 [satisfaction rating from 1 – 10 scale: 1,2: very dissatisfied; 3,4: dissatisfied; 5: neutral; 6,7,8: satisfied; 9,10: very satisfied]); Question 3: adverse effects with biosimilars; Question 4: opinion on usage of new device [0: very difficult; 1: difficult; 2: same as previous device; 3: improvement compare to previous device]).

Results: Baseline characteristics of biosimilar switch patients with disease category were:

Category	(n)
Gender	Male (39), Female (56)
Mean age (years)	56
Rheumatoid arthritis	58
Psoriatic arthritis	18
Ankylosing spondylitis	16
Reactive arthritis	1
Enteropathic arthritis	1
Juvenile idiopathic arthritis	1

48 switched from Humira to Amgevita.

The majority of the patients had positive view towards the effectiveness of the biosimilar: 36% very satisfied; 28% satisfied; 13% neutral; 10% dissatisfied; 13% very dissatisfied.

45% of the patients gave score of 9 and 10 in the survey of overall satisfaction to biosimilar if originator was given a score of 10, followed by 32% of them gave a score from 6 to 8, 4% of the patients gave a score of 5 and 7% of them gave a score of 3 and 4. The rest of them gave a score of 1 and 2.

12 participants switched back to originator (Humira, n=5; Enbrel, n=7) for the reasons of unable to use the device, anxiety, hemoptysis, nose bleeding, tongue swelling, neck pain, lethargy and generalized itchiness.

The most common complaints were (12 patients) systemic side effects (tiredness, headache, nausea, skin rashes, hair loss, muscle ache, tongue swelling, mood swing, dizzy, nose bleed, erectile dysfunction, hypertension, hemoptysis and red sclera).

17% of the patients find the biosimilars device easier to use compare to originator and 55% of the patients find both device are similar. 24% and 4% of them find the new device is difficult to very difficult to use respectively.

Conclusion: 69% of patients from Amgevita group and 60% of patients from Benepali group were satisfied with the change. Only 28% of the patients found the new device difficult to use. Overall conclusion from the study showed less than one quarter of the participants showed dissatisfaction towards biosimilar and less than 12 % experienced systemic side effects and whether biosimilar could be a next cost effective biologic therapy to replace originator in future requires a longer duration of study.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-eular.2981

AB0806

THE JOURNEY OF AXIAL SPONDYLOARTHRITIS IN SPAIN: FROM THE GENERAL PRACTITIONER TO THE RHEUMATOLOGIST

E. Flores-Fernández¹, C. Valera-Ribera¹, I. Vázquez-Gómez¹, A. V. Orenes Vera¹, E. Valls-Pascual¹, A. Martínez-Ferrer¹, D. Ybáñez-García¹, A. Sendra-García², J. J. Alegre-Sancho¹. ¹Doctor Peset University Hospital, Rheumatology, València, Spain; ²Doctor Peset University Hospital, Hospital Pharmacy, València, Spain

Background: The delay in the diagnosis of axial spondyloarthropathies (AxSp), with the morbidity and economic burden that this entails, is well known^{1,2}. According to the 2017 Atlas of axial spondyloarthritis in Spain³, the mean diagnostic delay was 8,5 years, with an average total cost per patient of 659,8€ including medical consultations and complementary tests until diagnosis. However, nowadays there are still many patients who are incorrectly referred from the general practitioner (GP) despite showing typical features of AxSp.

Objectives: To describe the AxSp journey until diagnosis and treatment. To analyze additional costs of either a wrong or a delayed referral of the patients with AxSp to rheumatologists.

Methods: Type of study: observational, retrospective, descriptive. We included all the patients who were referred to our Department of Rheumatology from Jan-2019 to Dec-2020 and whose final diagnosis was AxSp. All the data since the first contact to the GP until the final diagnosis and initiation of treatment in Rheumatology were collected, including consultations to our emergency department (EmD) and other specialists. The number of consultations, complementary tests (analytical and imaging), as well as the direct costs of all of them were also collected. A descriptive and associative analysis of these data was carried out using the SPSS software. We used median and interquartile range (IQR) for descriptive analysis and a significant p value < 0,05.

Results: From Jan-2019 to Dec-2020, 15 patients with AxSp and a median age of 43 (Interquartile range (IQR) 34-51) years were diagnosed, 10 women and 5 men. The main reason for referral was inflammatory low back pain (66.7%). The 60% of the patients were referred from the GP, followed by the EmD (20%). Despite typical symptoms, 4 patients (26,7%) were initially referred to Traumatology, and 3 out of them returned to the GP without the right diagnosis.

The median delay for referral from the GP to the rheumatologist was 47 (IQR 20-173) days. A wrong referral of the patient was associated with a delayed diagnosis (p 0,018) and higher direct costs of management (p 0,034). The average cost (including medical consultation and complementary tests) of the patient referred directly to Rheumatology was 267,71 (IQR 193,7-462,3) €, while the average cost of patients referred to other specialists was 578,83 (IQR 368,32-898,7) €. The extra cost of a wrong referral of a patient with AxSp was 311€ on average per patient in our sample (Table 1).

Table 1.

Women/men	10/5
Median age (years; IQR)	43; 34-51
Median diagnostic delay (days; IQR)	45; 20-173
Median cost of patient referred initially to Rheumatology (€; IQR)	267,71; 193,7-462,3
Median cost of patient referred initially to another specialist (€; IQR)	578,83; 368,32-898,7
Extra cost of wrong referral per patient(€)	311

Conclusion: AxSp is still a disease with a not negligible diagnostic delay, but it seems to be lower than previously reported. A wrong referral of the patient to other specialists, mainly Traumatology, is associated with this delay and can double the cost of managing these patients. This demonstrates the still unmet need of improving the management and referral of the patients with AxSp from the GP to the rheumatologist, ensuring an early diagnosis and treatment at the lowest cost for the system. Our study has limitations due to its small sample size, but preliminary results indicate that a larger-scale study would be necessary to correctly assess the magnitude of this problem.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Fernández Carballido C. Diagnosing early spondyloarthritis in Spain: the ESPeranza program. *Reumatol Clin*. 2010;6(SUPPL. 1):6-10
- [2] Muñoz-Fernández S et al. A model for the development and implementation of a national plan for the optimal management of early spondyloarthritis: The Esperanza Program. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2011;70(5):827-830
- [3] Garrido Cumbre M et al. *Atlas de Espondilartrosis Axial En España* 2017. Vol 45.; 2017.
- [4] Generalitat Valenciana. LEY 20/2017, de 28 de diciembre, de la Generalitat, de tasas. [2017/12159]:96-222.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank Novartis for its support.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-eular.3205

AB0807

TOAST-STUDY: TREATMENT AND OSTEOARTHRITIS, WHAT ARE PEOPLE SAYING ON TWITTER?

A. Mouamnia¹, A. Desvages². ¹Valenciennes Hospital, Rheumatology, Valenciennes, France; ²Lille University Hospital, Rheumatology, Lille, France