Conclusion: ICB criteria are more likely to diagnose BD and classify more patients with severe manifestations of the disease.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Atienza-Mateo B, et al. *Rheumatology* (Oxford) 2018;57(5):856-864. doi: 10.1093/rheumatology/kex480.
- [2] Vegas-Revenga N, et al. *Am J Ophthalmol*. 2019; 200:85-94. doi: 10.1016/j.ajo.2018.12.019
- [3] Calvo-Río V, et al. *Clin Exp Rheumatol*. 2014;32(4 Suppl 84):S54-7. PMID: 25005576
- [4] Santos-Gómez M, et al. *Clin Exp Rheumatol*. 2016;34(6 Suppl 102): S34-S40. PMID:27054359
- [5] Atienza-Mateo B, et al. *Arthritis Rheumatol*. 2019; 71(12):2081-2089. doi: 10.1002/art.41026.
- [6] Martín-Varillas JL, et al. *Ophthalmology*. 2018;125(9):1444-1451. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2018.02.020

Disclosure of Interests: Carmen Álvarez-Reguera: None declared, Alba Herrero-Morant: None declared, Lara Sanchez-Bilbao: None declared, David Martínez-López: None declared, José Luis Martín-Varillas: None declared, Guillermo Suárez Amorín: None declared, Cristina Mata-Arnaiz: None declared, Miguel Á. González-Gay Speakers bureau: Abbvie, Pfizer, Roche, Sanofi and MSD., Grant/research support from: Abbvie, MSD, Janssen and Roche., Ricardo Blanco Speakers bureau: Abbvie, Pfizer, Bristol-Myers, Janssen, Lilly and MSD., Grant/research support from: Abbvie, MSD and Roche.

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-eular.3331

HPR Abstract Session (I)

OP0153-HPR

BRIDGING GAPS ACROSS LEVELS OF CARE IN REHABILITATION OF PATIENTS WITH RHEUMATIC AND MUSCULOSKELETAL DISEASES: RESULTS FROM A STEPPED WEDGE CLUSTER RANDOMISED CONTROLLED TRIAL

G. Børdal¹, A. L. Sand-Svartrud¹, M. Azimi², I. Bø³, T. Nygaard Dager⁴, S. Eppeland⁵, G. Ohldeick Fredheim⁶, A. Sirnes Hagland⁷, A. Klokkeide⁸, A. D. Linde⁹, K. Tennebo¹⁰, H. Lindtvedt Valaas⁶, A. M. Aasvold¹¹, J. Sexton¹², I. Kjekshus¹. ¹National Advisory Unit on Rehabilitation in Rheumatology, Dept. of Rheumatology, Diakonhjemmet Hospital, Oslo, Norway; ²Diakonhjemmet Hospital, Dept. of Rheumatology, Oslo, Norway; ³Hospital for Rheumatic Diseases, Dept. of Rehabilitation, Lillehammer, Norway; ⁴National Advisory Unit on Rehabilitation in Rheumatology, Dept. of Rheumatology, Diakonhjemmet Hospital, Oslo, Norway; ⁵Sorlandet Hospital, Dept. of Rheumatology, Arendal, Norway; ⁶Vikersund Spa Rehabilitation Centre, Dept. of Rehabilitation, Vikersund, Norway; ⁷Haugesund Sanitetsforening's Rheumatism Hospital, Dept. of Rehabilitation, Haugesund, Norway; ⁸Rehabilitation West Rehabilitation Centre, Dept. of Rehabilitation, Haugesund, Norway; ⁹Muritunet Rehabilitation Centre, Dept. of Rehabilitation, Ålesund, Norway; ¹⁰Valnesfjord Health Sports Centre, Dept. of Rehabilitation, Valnesfjord, Norway; ¹¹Meråker Spa Rehabilitation Centre, Dept. of Rehabilitation, Meråker, Norway; ¹²Diakonhjemmet Hospital, Dept. of Rheumatology, Oslo, Norway

Background: Previous research show that patients with rheumatic and musculoskeletal diseases (RMDs) benefit from rehabilitation, but the health effects are small and decline over time. Later reports reveal that the quality of rehabilitation services varies largely, with lack of coordination and continuity across levels of care. This may weaken the effect on patients' long-lasting health, ability to self-manage their conditions and achieve their goals. We therefore developed a new, evidence-based rehabilitation program to strengthen the quality and bridge the gaps in rehabilitation services for this patient group.

Objectives: To evaluate if a new rehabilitation program (the BRIDGE program) designed to improve the quality and continuity of rehabilitation across levels of care, was more effective than traditional rehabilitation in improving goal achievement, function, self-assessed health and health related quality of life (HR-QoL) in patients with RMDs.

Methods: In a stepped wedge cluster randomised controlled trial 8 rehabilitation centres organised in secondary health care and located across all health regions of Norway recruited a total of 374 patients with rheumatic and musculoskeletal diseases. These patients received either traditional rehabilitation (control) (n=206), or traditional rehabilitation extended with an individually adapted complex intervention consisting of structured goal setting, plans for self-management, motivational interviewing, self-monitored digital feedback, and tailored follow-up support after discharge according to patients' needs and available resources in primary healthcare (the BRIDGE program) (n=168). Patient-reported data were collected electronically on admission and discharge from rehabilitation, and after 2, 7, and 12 months. The primary outcome measure was patients' goal achievement measured by the Patient Specific Functional Scale (PSFS) (0-10, 10=best) seven months after rehabilitation stay. Secondary

outcome measures were function measured by the 30-seconds Sit-To-Stand Test (30secSTS), self-assessed health and HR-QoL measured by the Euro-QoL instruments EQ-5D-5L-VAS (0-100, 100=best) and EQ 5D-5L-index (-1 to 1, 1=best). The main comparative analysis was performed on the intention to treat population, using all available data, by linear mixed models adjusted for the baseline scores and for the potentially confounding effects of calendar time and data clustering. Sensitivity analyses were performed on data provided by the per protocol population according to predefined criteria, in addition to centerwise comparisons of the control and intervention groups.

Results: No significant treatment effects of the BRIDGE-program were demonstrated either for patients' goal achievement (mean difference 0.1 [95% CI: -0.5, 0.8], p=0.70) (Figure 1), function (mean difference 0.9 [95% CI: -0.4, 2.2], p=0.18), self-assessed health (mean difference -0.1 [95% CI: -4.1, 3.9], p=0.98), or HR-QoL (mean difference 0.0 [95% CI: -0.0, 0.0], p=0.99) seven months after rehabilitation. Sensitivity analyses confirmed the findings from the primary analysis. A significant proportion of missing data for the primary outcome measure (29% in the control and 41% in the intervention group), caused by errors in the digital data collection system, may impair the reliability of the results.

Conclusion: The BRIDGE program was not shown to be more effective than traditional rehabilitation in terms of improving goal achievement, function, self-assessed health and HR-QoL in patients with RMDs. There is still a need for more knowledge about factors that can improve the quality, continuity and long-term health effects of rehabilitation for this patient group.

Figure 1. Goal achievement measured with PSFS (0-10, 10 best) indicated by difficulty to perform goal at 4 time-points: discharge from rehabilitation (baseline for this particular outcome) and after 2, 7 and 12 months. Vertical lines indicate the estimated mean values (center) with 95% confidence interval. Horizontal lines show the fluctuating mean PSFS values from baseline to 12 months after discharge. Graph A shows the average of the first three goals set by the patients, measured over time, while the graphs B, C and D show the results separately for the first, second and third goal, respectively.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-eular.987

OP0154-HPR

FEASIBILITY OF A WEB-BASED, PEER-SUPPORTED EXERCISE PROGRAM FOR PEOPLE WITH HIP OR KNEE OSTEOARTHRITIS

K. L. Joseph^{1,2}, H. Solveig Dagfinrud¹, K. B. Hagen³, K. Røren Nørdén¹, C. Fongen¹, O. M. Wold⁴, A. T. Tveter¹. ¹Diakonhjemmet Hospital, National Advisory Unit on Rehabilitation in Rheumatology, The division of Rheumatology and Research, Oslo, Norway; ²University of Oslo, Faculty of Medicine, Institute of Health and Society, Oslo, Norway; ³Norwegian Institute of Public Health, Division of Health Service, Oslo, Norway; ⁴Norwegian Association for Rheumatic diseases, Norwegian Association for Rheumatic diseases, Oslo, Norway

Background: Long-term physical activity (PA) and exercise is recommended as a cornerstone in the treatment of people with osteoarthritis (OA) (1), yet adherence to exercise is challenging (2). The treatment needs for this large group of patients cannot be fully managed within the health-care system, thus developing innovative and effective follow-up strategies is urgently needed.

Objectives: To explore the feasibility and preliminary efficacy of a web-based, peer-supported exercise program for people with hip or knee OA.

Methods: This study was a single-group, pre-post feasibility study. Patients aged 40-80 years with hip or knee OA who were not candidates for surgery were eligible. The 12-week intervention was delivered through a patient-organizations (The Norwegian Association for Rheumatic Diseases) web-based platforms, and included weekly exercise programs, weekly motivational messages, an OA and exercise website and assigned peer-supporters. Feasibility was evaluated by calculating the proportion of eligible patients who were enrolled and retained at follow-up, as well as time resources used on delivery of the intervention. Acceptability was evaluated by calculating proportion of patients who had valid baseline accelerometer data and completed the maximal cardiorespiratory exercise test according to protocol. Primary efficacy measures were change in PA assessed by accelerometers and change in exercise capacity (VO₂peak) assessed by indirect maximal cardiorespiratory exercise test. Secondary efficacy measures were change in patient reported outcomes assessed by HOOS and KOOS (www.koos.nu) (a 10-point change in normalized scores was considered a minimally important change). Data was analysed using paired sample t-test, given as mean change (95% confidence interval) and p-values.

Results: We identified 49 eligible patients of which 35 (71%) consented and were enrolled. Among those who consented, 22 (63%) were retained. Time resources used on delivery of the exercise programs and motivational messages were mean (SD) 7.3±1.1 min per week/patient. Compliance with wearing the accelerometer was mean (SD) 6.1±1.0 valid days (mean (SD) 13.8±1.3 hours/day). Twenty (67%) out of 30 patients who attended baseline testing performed the maximal cardiorespiratory exercise test, of which 18 completed according to protocol. Due to Covid-19 restrictions, follow-up testing of primary efficacy measures included only eight patients. For these patients there was a significant increase from baseline to follow-up on moderate-to-vigorous PA (mean change 16.4 minutes/day; 95% CI 6.9, 25.9, p=0.005) and VO₂peak (mean change 1.83 ml/kg/min; 95% CI 0.29, 3.36, p=0.026). Across all secondary efficacy measures 30-52% of the patients (n=21) improved from baseline to follow-up (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Proportion (%) of patients with Minimally Important Change (from baseline to follow-up) in normalized scores in subdomains of Hip disability and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (HOOS) / Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS).

Conclusion: Overall, the examined study processes were considered to be feasible and acceptable. Some minor amendments should be applied to improve the recruitment and retention rate before it can be carried out in a larger trial. The efficacy results should be interpreted with caution due to the small sample size. However, if the positive results in this study are confirmed in a power-calculated randomised controlled trial, our novel follow-up strategy may be implemented and recommended for long-term management of hip and knee OA.

REFERENCES:

- [1] Kolasinski SL, Neogi T, Hochberg MC, Oatis C, Guyatt G, Block J, et al. 2019 American College of Rheumatology/Arthritis Foundation Guideline for the Management of Osteoarthritis of the Hand, Hip, and Knee. *Arthritis Rheumatol.* 2020;72(2):220-33.
- [2] Williamson W, Kluzek S, Roberts N, Richards J, Arden N, Leeson P, et al. Behavioural physical activity interventions in participants with lower-limb osteoarthritis: a systematic review with meta-analysis. *BMJ Open.* 2015;5(8):e007642.

Acknowledgements: The authors wish to acknowledge all patients for participating, the patient representative who gave invaluable input on interventional components and the peer-supporters for volunteering to provide interventional support.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-eular.1313

OP0155-HPR

REMOTE MANAGEMENT OF RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS VS ROUTINE OUTPATIENT FOLLOW-UP: A PROSPECTIVE, LONGITUDINAL REAL-WORLD STUDY

M. Ndosí¹, S. Kingsbury², P. G. Conaghan². ¹University of the West of England, Faculty of Health and Applied Sciences, Bristol, United Kingdom; ²University of Leeds, Leeds Institute of Rheumatic and Musculoskeletal Medicine, Leeds, United Kingdom

Background: Remote management of rheumatoid arthritis (RA) using patient self-assessment of disease and patient-reported outcomes has potential to inform timely clinical decisions on disease management, reduce burden on busy rheumatology services and promote effective self-management. However, it is unclear how patients' self-reporting relates to treatment decisions.

Objectives: To determine the agreement between remote treatment decisions based on patient self-assessment questionnaire assessed blindly by a health professional and treatment decisions based on routine outpatient monitoring appointments.

Methods: This was a prospective real-world study including patients (who gave informed consent) enrolled in an observational study of RA patients starting a new biologic therapy.

Enrolled patients continued with their usual care and usual clinic monitoring. In addition, they completed at home, self-assessment questionnaires at monthly intervals, including: two self-reported components which are collected as part of routine clinical practice (joint stiffness and flare), visual analogue scales for pain, global health and fatigue; and HAQ-DI and self-efficacy scales (Arthritis Self-Efficacy Pain and Other Symptoms subscales) at inclusion visits, 12 and 24 months. Remote treatment decisions were made by an independent (blinded) health professional, based on the self-assessment questionnaires and information collected in the study: medical history, ongoing therapies for RA, clinical outcomes, adverse events and toxicity. In this analysis, the independent blinded clinician did not have the same information as the routine hospital visit clinician (blood results and joints assessment).

The remote decisions were matched with the hospital visit decisions (within 2 weeks) and the measure of agreement between the 2 raters (independent blinded health professional and clinician at outpatient appointment) were evaluated using kappa coefficient: <0.2, 0.21-0.40, 0.41-0.60, 0.61-0.80 and 0.81-0.99 representing poor, fair, moderate, substantial and almost perfect agreement respectively.

Results: A total of 72 RA patients were recruited into the sub-study: mean (SD) age 57.8 (11.6), disease duration 11.7 (10.3) and 52 (87%) were female. The pre-categorised remote decisions were: no change to biologic, stop biologic, add concomitant DMARD, reduction/removal of a concomitant DMARD and bring in for review. There were 57 matched decisions between the independent health professional and the outpatient clinicians. The outpatient clinician made 7 changes to biologic and 18 non-biologic therapy changes, while the remote health professional made 1 change to biologic and 17 changes to a non-biologic DMARD including bringing in for review. The self-assessment questionnaires reported 34 RA flares of which 21 had resolved. In the matched decisions, there was only one adverse event that needed stopping treatment, identified by both the remote and the outpatient treatment. The independent health professional and the outpatient clinician had a 'fair' agreement on changes to biologic therapy (Kappa = 0.226, p = 0.007) and overall changes to RA therapy (Kappa = 0.24, p = 0.07).

Conclusion: Remote RA monitoring using patient self-assessment and outcome measures was feasible with fair agreement on treatment decisions. Further work is required on understanding the importance of adding blood test monitoring to remote decision-making.

Disclosure of Interests: None declared

DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-eular.3356

OP0156-HPR

THE EFFECT OF A PERSON-CENTERED SMOKING CESSATION PROGRAM IN RHEUMATOID ARTHRITIS PATIENTS IN A RHEUMATOLOGY OUTPATIENT CLINIC SETTING – RESULTS OF AN INTERVENTIONAL FEASIBILITY STUDY

M.L. Karlsson^{1,2}, K. Hertzberg-Nyquist³, S. Saevarsdottir², I. E. Lundberg^{1,2}, I. Demmelmaier⁴, S. Pettersson¹, K. Chatzidionysiou^{2,5}, ¹Karolinska University Hospital, Department of Gastroenterology, Dermatology and Rheumatology, Stockholm, Sweden; ²Karolinska Institute, Department of medicine Solna, Stockholm, Sweden; ³Centre of Rheumatology, Rheumatology, Stockholm, Sweden; ⁴Uppsala University, Department of Public Health and Caring Science, Uppsala, Sweden; ⁵Karolinska University Hospital, Department of Gastroenterology, Dermatology and Rheumatology, Stockholm, Sweden

Background: Smoking is associated with worse treatment response¹ and higher mortality² in rheumatoid arthritis (RA).