limit value was 10%. The difference test was used for the comparison between the IGU+MTX and MTX monotherapy arms. Two-way ANOVA was used to analyze the difference of the changes of mTSS score of each arm compared with baseline value (0 week).

Results: A total of 895 patients were randomized to IGU 25mg bid ($n=297$), MTX 10-15mg qw($n=293$), and IGU+MTX ($n=305$). Baseline characteristics were comparable between the arms (Table 1).

Table 1. Demographic and Other Baseline Characteristics (SAS)

	IGU	MTX	IGU+MTX
Number of Subjects	297	293	305
Age, mean (SD) years	46.87(10.67)	47.63(10.70)	48.37(10.69)
Female/male, %	77.44/22.56	79.18/20.82	78.03/21.97
Duration of RA, mean(SD) years	11.67±7.16	11.60±7.98	11.67±7.27
CRP, mean(SD) mg/L ²	22.32±35.47	20.67±26.61	19.74±31.38
Tender joint count, mean (SD)	14.59±9.16	14.83±9.30	14.93±9.88
Swollen joint count, mean (SD)	9.81±6.63	9.73±7.20	9.51±6.22
DAS28-CRP, mean (SD)	5.084±0.994	5.102±0.979	5.103±0.956
HAQ score, mean (SD)	15.82±11.25	15.24±10.93	16.06±10.92

SAS: Safety Analysis Set; CRP: C-reactive protein;

DAS28: disease activity score; HAQ: Health Assessment Questionnaire

The study met its primary endpoints. More concretely, IGU monotherapy and IGU+MTX were found to be superior to MTX at week 52 with a higher ACR20 response of 77.44%(230/297, $P=0.0019$) and 77.05%(235/305, $P=0.0028$) versus 65.87%(193/293) (fig 1). As shown in fig 1

, the structural remission ($\Delta mTSS \leq 0.5$) was statistically significant for IGU monotherapy (57.4%, $P=0.0308$) but not for IGU+MTX arm (55%) versus MTX monotherapy (47.8%).

Figure 1. ACR20 response and the percent of patients with no progression (FAS)

Overall incidence of the adverse events (AEs) leading to study discontinuation were reported in 13.8% (41/297) in IGU monotherapy arm, 11.26% (33/293) in MTX monotherapy arm and 11.51% (35/305) patients in IGU+MTX arm. The incidence of adverse drug reactions (ADR) leading to study discontinuation were 11.45% (34/297), 8.53% (25/293) and 9.21% (28/305), respectively. There was no one death and no significant difference in all the safety indicators among the three arms.

Conclusion: Igaratimod alone or in combination with MTX demonstrated superior efficacy with acceptable safety compared to MTX for patients with active RA who have not previously used MTX bDMARDs.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-eular.1486

POS0665 TRAJECTORIES OF GLUCOCORTICOID-THERAPY IN EARLY RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS: FIRST RESULTS OF A SCOPING SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS OF OBSERVATIONAL COHORT STUDIES

A. Palmowski¹, F. Buttgerit¹, ¹Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Department of Rheumatology and Clinical Immunology, Berlin, Germany

Background: Glucocorticoids (GCs) are regularly used as a bridging therapy in early rheumatoid arthritis (eRA). As long-term treatment, especially at higher dosages, may lead to undesirable adverse events, GCs should be tapered as rapidly as clinically feasible.

Objectives: To assess real-world trajectories of GC-therapy initiated in patients with eRA and in methotrexate-naïve RA patients.

Methods: We conducted a scoping search in MEDLINE (via PubMed) to find articles (years 2005 – 2020) reporting on eRA (or methotrexate-naïve RA) patients from observational cohorts who start or take GCs at baseline. Articles had to describe either dosages or proportions of patients who took GCs or were able to taper GCs at two (minimum) pre-specified time points. The articles were screened by one reviewer (AP). Random-effects meta-analyses pooled results per outcome and time point if ≥ 3 studies were available. R software with package

metafor was used for statistical analyses. A research protocol was published with protocols.io (10.17504/protocols.io.bpyfmptn).

Results: Our highly specific search strategy yielded 165 results. Twelve articles on nine cohorts were finally included. Eight cohorts originated in Europe, one in Africa. At baseline, about half of the patients with eRA were prescribed GCs with a mean dosage of 8mg/d prednisone equivalent (fig 1). Over time, both the proportion taking GCs and the mean dosage declined. There was substantial heterogeneity between studies.

Conclusion: Our results indicate that GCs remain regularly used drugs in eRA patients and in methotrexate-naïve patients with RA. While about 40% of patients still receive GCs after 24 months, mean dosages were tapered to “low” dosages (≤ 7.5 mg/d prednisone equivalent)¹ in all cohorts that reported respective data. Heterogeneity might be caused by country-specific differences. Unfortunately, the validity of sensitivity analyses would be poor due to the paucity of published data regarding GC dosages and proportions of patients taking GCs in observational RA cohorts. Major limitations of this scoping review are the very specific (and consequently less sensitive) search strategy and that the screening was conducted by one reviewer only.

REFERENCES:

- Buttgereit F, Da Silva JAP, Boers M, et al. Standardised nomenclature for glucocorticoid dosages and glucocorticoid treatment regimens: current questions and tentative answers in rheumatology. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2002;61(8):718-22. doi: 10.1136/ard.61.8.718.

Figure 1. Meta-analyses of proportions taking glucocorticoids and mean dosages at baseline and 24 months. GCs: Glucocorticoids; CI: Confidence interval.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-eular.1526

POS0666 TREATMENT EFFECTIVENESS OF UPADACITINIB AT 3 MONTHS IN US PATIENTS WITH RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS FROM THE UNITED RHEUMATOLOGY NORMALIZED INTEGRATED COMMUNITY EVIDENCE (NICE(TM)) REAL-WORLD DATA

A. Gibofsky¹, B. Dhillon², M. E. Pearson³, N. Tundia⁴, Y. Song⁴, K. Dunlap⁴, G. Wright⁵. ¹Weill Cornell Medical College, Hospital for Special Surgery, New York, United States of America; ²United Rheumatology, Rheumatology, Hauppauge, United States of America; ³West Suburban Center for Arthritis, Rheumatology, Brookfield, United States of America; ⁴AbbVie Inc, Immunology, North Chicago, United States of America; ⁵Association of Women in Rheumatology, Rheumatology, New York, United States of America

Background: Upadacitinib (UPA), an oral Janus kinase inhibitor (JAKi), has demonstrated efficacy in the phase 3 SELECT clinical program, conducted across a range of patients (pts) with rheumatoid arthritis (RA).¹⁻⁶ Real-world data for UPA, including in pts previously treated with a JAKi, have not yet been reported since global approvals beginning in 2019.

Objectives: To assess the characteristics of US-based pts receiving UPA and its effectiveness in clinical practice at 3 months.

Methods: This observational study included US-based pts from the United Rheumatology Normalized Integrated Community Evidence (UR-NICE) database who initiated UPA 15mg once daily from FDA approval (August 2019) to July 31, 2020 and had ≥ 6 -month pre-baseline data available. Effectiveness was assessed in pts with a reported Clinical Disease Activity Index (CDAI) score at 3 months after UPA initiation and included proportions of pts achieving CDAI remission (≤ 2.8), CDAI low disease activity (≤ 10), other disease activity measures, and pt-reported outcomes. A subgroup analysis assessed UPA effectiveness in pts with or without prior tofacitinib (TOFA) treatment.

Results: This analysis included 252 pts treated with UPA 15 mg, of whom 98 (38.9%) received UPA monotherapy and 154 (61.1%) received UPA combined with conventional synthetic (cs) disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs (DMARDs). 64.3% of pts were from the Southern region of the USA. 86.1%, 72.2%, and 47.6% of pts had been previously treated with csDMARDs, biologic DMARDs, and JAKis, respectively. Baseline characteristics were largely similar between UPA monotherapy and combination therapy groups and those with or without prior TOFA treatment (Table 1). Pts with prior TOFA treatment had a longer duration of RA since diagnosis and higher steroid use versus those without. UPA 15 mg improved disease activity scores (including CDAI) and pt-reported outcomes (including physical function and pain) after 3 months of treatment (Figure 1). Similar effectiveness was observed with UPA 15 mg in pts with or without prior TOFA treatment.

Conclusion: In the UR-NICE real-world database of US-based pts, improvements in clinical and pt-reported outcomes were observed at 3 months in UPA-treated pts with RA, including those with or without prior TOFA treatment, despite the treatment-refractory population included in this dataset.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Burmester GR, et al. *Lancet* 2018;391:2503–12.
- [2] Smolen JS, et al. *Lancet* 2019;393:2303–11.
- [3] Fleischmann R, et al. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 2019;71:1788–800.
- [4] Genovese MC, et al. *Lancet* 2018;391:2513–24.
- [5] van Vollenhoven R, et al. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 2020;72:1607–20.
- [6] Rubbert-Roth A, et al. *N Engl J Med* 2020;383:1511–21.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics

n (%), unless otherwise stated	Full analysis set(n=252)		Pts with prior TOFA treatment(n=113)		Pts without prior TOFA treatment (n=139)	
Mean (SD) exposure, days	219.7	(112.1)	215.7	(116.7)	222.9	(108.5)
Female	199	(79.0)	85	(75.2)	114	(82.0)
Age ≥65 years	75	(29.8)	34	(30.1)	41	(29.5)
Oral steroid use	140	(55.6)	70	(61.9)	70	(50.4)
Prior csDMARDs	217	(86.1)	102	(90.3)	115	(82.7)
Prior TOFA	113	(44.8)	113	(100.0)	0	
Prior biologic DMARDs	182	(72.2)	86	(76.1)	96	(69.1)
Tumor necrosis factor inhibitor	147	(58.3)	66	(58.4)	81	(58.3)
Interleukin-6 receptor inhibitor	87	(34.5)	47	(41.6)	40	(28.8)
	n	Mean (SD)	n	Mean (SD)	n	Mean (SD)
Duration of RA diagnosis, years	188	4.0 (3.0)	89	5.1 (2.9)	99	3.1 (2.8)
Methotrexate dose, mg/week	88	17.0 (5.1)	28	17.8 (5.0)	60	16.6 (5.2)
SJC28	239	4.8 (5.7)	108	4.5 (5.0)	131	5.0 (6.2)
TJC28	237	6.5 (6.7)	107	6.5 (6.8)	130	6.5 (6.6)
CDAI	225	20.4 (13.4)	105	20.2 (13.5)	120	20.6 (13.3)
Routine assessment of patient index data 3	165	4.2 (2.3)	72	4.2 (2.4)	93	4.3 (2.2)
Disease Activity Score in 28 joints based on C-reactive protein	167	3.9 (1.5)	83	3.9 (1.5)	84	3.9 (1.5)
Health Assessment Questionnaire-Disability Index (0–10)	170	2.5 (2.1)	74	2.4 (2.2)	96	2.5 (2.1)
Pain	229	56.5 (28.5)	104	56.9 (29.3)	125	56.1 (28.0)

SD, standard deviation; S/TJC, swollen/tender joint count

Acknowledgements: AbbVie funded this study; contributed to its design; participated in data collection, analysis, and interpretation of the data; and participated in the writing, review, and approval of the abstract. No honoraria or payments were made for authorship. Medical writing support was provided by Hilary Wong, PhD, of 2 the Nth (Cheshire, UK), and was funded by AbbVie.

Disclosure of Interests: Allan Gibofsky Shareholder of: AbbVie, Amgen, Johnson & Johnson, and Pfizer, Consultant of: AbbVie, Celgene, Eli Lilly, Flexion, Pfizer, Relburn Pharma, and Samumed. Paid consultant with investment analysts on behalf of the Gerson Lehrman Group, Bhavna Dhillon Shareholder of: May own stock or options in United Rheumatology,

Figure UPA 15 mg effectiveness at Month 3

CDAI, Clinical Disease Activity Index; DAS28(CRP), Disease Activity Score in 28 joints based on C-reactive protein; HAQ-DI, Health Assessment Questionnaire-Disability Index; LDA, low disease activity; RAPID-3, routine assessment of patient index data 3; S/TJC28, swollen/tender joint count in 28 joints; TOFA, tofacitinib; UPA, upadacitinib

Employee of: United Rheumatology, Mark E. Pearson Shareholder of: May own AbbVie stock or options, Namita Tundia Shareholder of: May own stock or options in AbbVie, Employee of: AbbVie, Yanna Song Shareholder of: May own stock or options in AbbVie, Employee of: AbbVie, Kendall Dunlap Shareholder of: May own stocks or shares in AbbVie, Employee of: AbbVie, Grace Wright Speakers bureau: AbbVie, Amgen, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Eli Lilly, Exagen, Myriad Autoimmune, Novartis, Sanofi/Regeneron, UCB, and Vindico, Consultant of: AbbVie, Amgen, Bristol-Myers Squibb, Eli Lilly, Exagen, Gilead, Janssen, Myriad Autoimmune, Novartis, Pfizer, Sanofi/Regeneron, and UCB, Employee of: President and Founder of the Association of Women in Rheumatology

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-eular.1565

POS0667

TOFACITINIB IN PATIENTS WITH RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS IN REAL-WORLD SETTINGS: A NATIONAL MULTICENTER STUDY OF 167 PATIENTS FROM ARGENTINA

M. D. R. Maliandi¹, Y. S. Malvano², A. Cusa³, M. J. Gamba⁴, R. Gomez⁴, J. Got⁵, O. Gut⁶, U. V. Paris⁷, M. A. Spinetto⁸, C. Mariach⁸, A. I. Abalo⁹, A. Estevez⁹, J. L. Velazco Zamora¹⁰, J. P. Vinicki¹¹. ¹Sanatorio Garay, Rheumatology, Santa Fe, Argentina; ²Sanatorio Modelo Adrogué, Rheumatology, Burzaco, Argentina;