between patients with RA and SLE, being much lower in patients with SLE (p value< 0.0001). Regarding gender differences, in men, there were 33 (12.7%) SLE and 89 (19.6%) RA face-to-face consultations, while in women there were 227 (87.3%) SLE and 364 (80.4%) RA in a face-to-face consultation. Regarding patients who were attended through telemedicine, 45 (11.7%) SLE and 966 (18.3%) RA were men, while 341 (88.3%) SLE and 4326 (81.7%) RA were women; that means, in the RA cohort, a greater number of men prefer the face-to-face consultation than in the SLE cohort (p value= 0.0185). 10 RA patients were diagnosed with the Covid-19 in teleconsultation; in all cases, close contact with infected relatives was verified as the probable cause.

Table 1. Differences by gender in the level of teleconsultation acceptance and face-to-face assistance in patients with SLE and RA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Teleconsulting (%)</th>
<th>Face-to-face consultation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1055</td>
<td>965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4690</td>
<td>4326</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Teleconsulting (%)</th>
<th>Face-to-face consultation (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>341</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Results:**

- **Objective:** To start patients on their all rheumatology medications safely and efficiently (within 10 days).
- **Methods:** By April 2022, we had organised the filming of 10 short healthcare videos to give patients all the information they required to start a range of DMARDs and biologics.
- **Background:** We used to initiate DMARD(s) and Biologic therapies via nurse-led shared medical appointments (Group clinics) and could see up to 30 patients per week, with a maximum of 6 patients per group. We did this to start patients on their medications efficiently and safely and to manage the increase in workload.
- **Discussion:** However, with the onset of the COVID 19 pandemic, we had to stop these clinics immediately, but, we did not have capacity to start everyone on their medications in a timely manner by telephone. Telephoning each individual took > 9 hours per week, whereas previously it took 3-4 hours.
- **Conclusions:** We wanted to start patients on all their rheumatology medications safely and efficiently (within 10 days).
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Over half the patients (56%) were starting DMARDs for the first time, of those 8% requested a telephone consultation to discuss treatment further with the Rheumatology nurses. Of the 44% of patients already taking a DMARD and due to start a second medication 24% required a telephone clinic appointment.

As this is a new service, we asked for feedback, receiving replies from 34%, all scoring between 9/10 and 10/10.

We have released > 7 hours of specialist nurse time for telephone/helpline clinics.

Conclusion: The development of digital / remote medication clinics has been a success and we will continue with this approach. We have limited face-to-face appointments, started patients on rheumatology medications more quickly and safely than before, and we have had excellent patient feedback. Although, we are aware, this is at a cost of no peer-to-peer interaction, which has been of value in the past.
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LEVELS OF DEPRESSION AND ANXIETY DURING COVID-19 PANDEMIC: AT WHAT DEGREE ARE HEALTH CARE WORKERS AFFECTED IN TUNISIA?

K. Ben Abdelghani1, G. Hamdi1, S. Miladi1, M. Sellami1, K. Guenniche1, L. Souabni1, S. Kassab1, S. Chekili1, A. Fazaa1, A. Laatar1, 1Mongi Slim Hospital, Rheumatology, Tunisia, Tunisia

Background: Since December 2019, a novel pneumonia caused by coronavirus-19 (COVID-19) has been spreading internationally. Facing this critical pandemic, health care workers who are involved in treating these patients are at risk of developing psychological distress.

Objectives: To evaluate mental health outcomes among health care workers treating patients exposed to COVID-19.

Methods: This cross-sectional study collected demographic data and mental health measurements from health workers in different hospitals using an online questionnaire. Participants were divided in two groups: G1 included participants working in a COVID-19 unit and G2 included those who worked in a normal ward. Participants were asked to complete the 9-item Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9) and the 7-item Generalized Anxiety Disorder scale (GAD-7). The total scores of these measurement tools were interpreted as follows: PHQ-9 normal (0-4), mild (5-9), moderate (10-14) and severe (15-21); GAD-7 normal (0-4), mild (5-9), moderate (10-14) and severe (15-21) anxiety. We compared the two groups in terms of psychological distress using a Chi-square test.

Results: A total of 155 individuals with a mean age of 31.3 ± 5 years [26-45] and a gender ratio of 0.3 completed the online questionnaire. Seventy-two participants (46%) worked in a COVID-unit. The mean number of nights/month in the COVID-unit was 9.5 in G1 and 1.3 in G2 respectively. The mean number of work hours per day in the COVID unit was 5 hours in G1, and 0 in G2. G2 participants worked in COVID-units during nightshifts only. An increase in workload compared to the pre-epidemic was noted only in G1. Depression and anxiety scores were higher among participants of G1 compared to G2 (Table 1).

The need for psychological support was more frequent in G1 compared to G2 (38% vs 9%; p <0.005). Participants of G1 were diagnosed with depression (9 cases), anxiety (9 cases) and burn-out (3 cases). In G2, 4 participants were diagnosed with anxiety. The prescribed treatments were: antidepressants (5 cases), anxiolytics (10 cases), and psychotherapy (12 cases).

Table 1. Comparison of the participants according to the PHQ-9 and GAD-7 scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>G2</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mild depression</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate depression</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe depression</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild anxiety</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate anxiety</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe anxiety</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G: Group

Conclusion: Individuals experience varying levels of distress during pandemics. In our study, health care workers in the frontline of COVID-units experienced high levels of anxiety and depression. Thus, necessary measures should be attached to psychological support strategies for health care workers.
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ROLE OF MOBILE APPLICATIONS IN RHEUMATOLOGY CARE: A MULTICENTRIC SURVEY

R. Bixio1, A. Biglia2, G. Virelli1, A. Gioletti1, C. Montecucco2, M. Rossini1, 1Università degli studi di Verona, Rheumatology, Verona, Italy; 2Università degli studi di Pavia, Rheumatology, Pavia, Italy

Background: Although mobile health applications (apps) are becoming increasingly popular across several medical specialties, no data are available in rheumatology. The aim of this study is to investigate whether apps are routinely used by rheumatologists.

Objectives: In our study we aim assess real-life use of mobile applications in rheumatology clinical activity and to evaluate mobile apps role in rheumatology training, in particular for residents, and clinical activity.

Methods: We invited a non-selected sample of rheumatologists (consultants, residents and medical students committed to begin rheumatology residency) to participate in an anonymous web-based survey. This survey investigated mobile application use in rheumatology care and issues and concerns about mobile device use in rheumatology.

Results: Sixty participants completed the survey (40% consultants, 48.3% residents, 11.7% students), 52/60 (86.7%) declared to use mobile apps during their work. More than 50% used apps at least once a day. Apps were mostly used for calculating clinical disease activity scores for chronic inflammatory arthritides. Most rheumatology residents stated that these apps could be a useful tool in medical training. However, using a smartphone during a clinical examination was deemed to be inappropriate by 26/60 (43.3%).

Conclusion: Mobile apps as clinical tools are widespread among rheumatologists.
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