PROMs and markers

POS0181

HOW FIT ARE THE SOCIAL SUPPORT INSTRUMENTS USED IN RMDs: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF VALIDATION STUDIES

D. De Cock¹, D. Benavent², L. Falzon³, S. Ramiro^{4,5}, L. Carmona⁶. ¹KU Leuven, Skeletal Biology and Engineering Research Centre, Leuven, Belgium; ²Hospital Universitario la Paz-IdiPaz, Rheumatology Service, Madrid, Spain; ³Northwell Health, Center for Personalized Health, New York, United States of America; ⁴Leiden University Medical Center, Rheumatology, Leiden, Netherlands; ⁵Zuyderland Medical Center, Rheumatology, Heerlen, Netherlands; ⁶Instituto de Salud Musculoesquelética (InMusc), Rheumatology, Madrid, Spain

Background: Rheumatic and musculoskeletal diseases (RMDs) diminish psychosocial well-being. Social support (SS) is considered to improve this psychosocial wellbeing. Therefore, SS is an important construct to measure in RMDs.

Objectives: To systematically review and summarize the psychometric properties of SS instruments developed or validated in RMDs.

Methods: A comprehensive search in Medline, Embase, PsycINFO, CINAHL and Epistemonikos was performed from inception to June 8, 2020, with the aid of an experienced librarian (LF). Two researchers (DDC and DB) independently screened articles on title+abstract and next on full text. Reference lists of included studies were reviewed for additional references. Articles were included if covering psychometric properties (detailed in the Table 1) of SS instruments used in RMDs. Studies on questionnaires lacking an English version, unpublished material, case reports, editorials, letters, or reviews were excluded. Risk of bias of studies and instruments was assessed via the COSMIN checklist.

Results: From 4986 articles captured, 30 met the predefined inclusion criteria. These articles included 21 SS instruments used in 8 RMDs, mainly rheumatoid arthritis and osteoarthritis.

Table 1 shows the psychometric properties per instrument. Construct validity, structural validity, and internal consistency were assessed for most instruments, while measurement invariance, measurement error, criterion validity and responsiveness in ≤ 3 instruments each. Development and content validity of the instruments gave consistently high risk of bias by the COSMIN checklist.

The most widely validated instruments were the Arthritis Impact Measurement Scales (AIMS) and the Osteoarthritis Knee and Hip Quality of Life (OAKHQOL), with their respective derived instruments (AIMS2, AIMS2-SF, mini-OAKHQOL and e-OAKHQOL). For the AIMS SS scale, internal consistency ranged between 0.33-0.69 (Cronbach's α) and test-retest reliability was estimated 0.92 (Guttman reproducibility coefficient). For the OAKHQOL SS scale, internal consistency ranged between 0.78-0.81 (Cronbach's α) and test-retest reliability ranged between 0.5-0.85 (ICC). Responsiveness was only investigated in AIMS and the Sickness Impact Profile (SIP) instrument. Relative efficiency for SS for the SIP was considerably higher than for AIMS (0.74 vs 0.18).

Conclusion: This review gives a summary of the psychometric properties of SS instruments in RMDs. Most instruments show sufficient structural validity internal consistency and reliability, but some psychometric properties such as criterion

validity, measurement error and invariance, need to be investigated before choosing an optimal SS instruments.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-eular.2020

POS0182

MINIMAL CLINICALLY IMPORTANT IMPROVEMENT (MCII) AND PATIENT ACCEPTABLE SYMPTOM STATE (PASS) FOR PAIN AND FUNCTION INSTRUMENTS IN HAND OSTEOARTHRITIS (OA)

E. Kroon^{1,2}, L. Van de Stadt¹, D. Van der Heijde¹, M. Kloppenburg^{1,3}. ¹Leiden University Medical Center, Rheumatology, Leiden, Netherlands; ²Zuyderland Medical Center, Rheumatology, Heerlen, Netherlands; ³Leiden University Medical Center, Clinical Epidemiology, Leiden, Netherlands

Background: Australian/Canadian Hand OA Index (AUSCAN), Michigan Hand Outcomes Questionnaire (MHQ), Functional Index of Hand OA (FIHOA) and visual analogue scale (VAS) are frequently used instruments to measure pain and function in hand OA research. MCII and PASS are useful to interpret results of patient reported outcomes.

Objectives: To estimate MCII and PASS for these instruments using anchor-based methods.

Methods: Hand OA patients participating in a six-week randomised placebo-controlled trial with prednisolone (RCT; NTR5263) and those attending the two-year follow-up visit of the observational Hand Osteoarthritis cohort completed AUSCAN subscales pain and function, MHQ subscales pain, activities of daily living (ADL) and overall function, FIHOA and 100mm VAS pain. RCT participants were asked to indicate whether they changed compared to baseline (improved/no change/worse) and to rate the importance of improvement (very much/moderately/slightly/not at all). MCII was defined as the minimal improvement in symptoms achieved by 75% of participants who stated a slight/moderate improvement during the RCT, calculated as the 75th percentile of the distribution of change scores from baseline in this group. Absolute and relative percentage change were evaluated. For MCII direction of effect was unified, so positive values indicate worse symptoms and vice versa. Participants from both studies rated satisfaction with their state of health (acceptable/unacceptable). PASS was defined as the minimal score considered acceptable for 75% of participants, calculated as the 75th percentile of the distribution of scores in participants who rated their health 'acceptable'.

Results: Demographics of the RCT (n=92, mean age 63.9, 79% women) and cohort (n=383, 60.9 years, 84% women) participants were typical for hand OA. RCT participants were more symptomatic (e.g. mean [SD] VAS pain 54.0 [20.5] versus 35.2 [19.1]). Of the function instruments, only AUSCAN had a credible MCII (relative percentage improvement 9.8%), while the (positive) MCII values for FIHOA and MHQ subscales would indicate that worsening was rated as functional improvement (table 1). MCII was negative (corresponding to improvement) for all pain instruments, with relative percentage change around 25% for VAS and MHQ, compared to only 2% for AUSCAN. PASS values of all instruments were comparable in the two populations. Most instruments had a PASS around 50% of the possible maximum score, except for MHQ ADL, in which higher is better and a relatively high PASS is thus indicative of a floor effect (table 1).

Table 1. psychometric properties per social support instrument

Instrument	Face validity	Content validity	Structural validity	Criterion validity	Internal consistency	Reliability	Measurement error	Hypothesis testing for construct validity	Cross-cultural validity/Measurement invariance	Responsiveness
AIMS			+		+	+		+		+
AIMS2	+	+	+		+	+		+		
AIMS2-SF			+		+			+		
Brief Screening Questions	+			+				+		
Dyadic Efficacy Scale	+	+	+		+			+		
EIS			+		+	+		+		
Flanagan QOL			+		+	+		+		
FS	+	+	+		+	+		+	+	
IRGL			+	+	+	+		+		
ISSI					+	+		+		
LISRES					+	+		+		
MEPS	+	+	+		+	+	+	+		
MWA			+		+	+		+		
OAKHQOL	+	+	+		+	+	+	+		
e-OAKHQOL			+		+			+		
Mini-OAKHQOL	+	+	+		+	+		+		
PFFSADI			+	+	+	+		+		
RASP			+		+	+		+		
SIP								+		+
SPQ			+		+	+		+		
SSQT			+		+	+		+	+	

Arthritis Impact Measurement Scales (AIMS); Short Form (SF); Emotional Intimacy Scale (EIS); Quality of Life (QOL); Friendship Scale (FS); Impact on Rheumatic diseases and General health and Lifestyle (IRGL); Interview Schedule for Social Interactions (ISSI); Life Stressors and Social Resources Inventory (LISRES); Medical Issues, Exercise, Pain, and Social Support (MEPS); Modified Work APGAR (MWA); Osteoarthritis Knee and Hip Quality of Life (OAKHQOL); preferences for formal social support of autonomy and dependence in pain inventory (PFFSADI); Responses and Attitudes to Support during Pain questionnaire (RASP); Sickness Impact Profile (SIP); Social support and Pain Questionnaire (SPQ); Social Support Questionnaire for Transactions (SSQT).