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We thank Dr Pons-Estel and colleagues\(^1\) for their interest in our\(^2\) paper proposing that a score of 20 or more in the 2019 European League Against Rheumatism/American College of Rheumatology (EULAR/ACR) classification criteria\(^3\) predicts more severe disease activity in the following 5 years after the systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) classification.\(^2\)

Pons-Estel et al\(^1\) demonstrated that 98 (15.31%) patients who were classified by 1982/1997 ACR criteria, but not classified as SLE with the 2019 EULAR/ACR classification criteria, having a score of less than 10 points, accrued less damage compared with those who had a score of \(\geq 10\).\(^3\) In our cohort of patients with SLE, only 16 (1.8%) had a EULAR/ACR score of less than 10. The 1997 ACR domain involvement of this subgroup of patients was predominated by skin, musculoskeletal and haematological involvement, and only rarely had severe organ-threatening disease (figure 1). We did not specifically assess their disease course compared with those who did score 10 or more. We recognise the possible utility of this analysis and congratulate the authors on their interesting results.\(^4\)

The findings from Ugarte-Gil et al\(^5\) and Carneiro et al\(^6\) suggest an association between the EULAR/ACR score and damage accrual. In our recent work\(^2\) we did not find a correlation between the EULAR/ACR score at baseline and damage at 5 years after SLE classification. We acknowledge that 5 years is too early to adequately establish damage accrual and are currently looking into the possible implications of a higher EULAR/ACR score at diagnosis and long-term outcomes.

We agree with the authors regarding the possible novel use of the new 2019 EULAR/ACR SLE classification criteria. Indeed, taking together the results from Ugarte-Gil et al\(^5\), Carneiro et al\(^6\) and our findings,\(^2\) using these criteria as a predictor of outcomes in patients with SLE is possible. This concept is certainly of interest as it could facilitate upfront patient stratification, leading to early recognition of patients at higher risk of an “ominous” outcome.

We also agree that further studies on separate cohorts are needed to corroborate the results and cut-offs.

Laura Whittall-Garcia,1 Dafna D Gladman ⊳,1 Murray Urowitz ⊳,1
Jiandong Su,2 Zahi Touma ⊳,1 Sindhu R Johnson ⊳,1,3
1Division of Rheumatology, Department of Medicine, Toronto Western Hospital, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
2Lupus Clinic, Centre for Prognosis Studies in the Rheumatic Diseases, University Health Network, Toronto, Ontario, Canada
3Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Ontario, Canada
Correspondence to Dr Sindhu R Johnson, Division of Rheumatology, Department of Medicine, Toronto Western Hospital, Mount Sinai Hospital; Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada; sindhu.johnson@uhn.ca
Handling editor Josef S Smolen
Acknowledgements We like to thank the Systemic Lupus Cooperating Clinics for allowing us to use the SLICC inception cohort as a validating cohort for our study.
Contributors All authors contributed to study design, data collection and/or evaluation and critical review of the final manuscript.
Funding Support for this study came from the Lupus Programme, Centre for Prognosis Studies in the Rheumatic Diseases. SRI is supported by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research Award. ZT is supported by a research salary award from the Department of Medicine, University of Toronto.
Competing interests SRI reports grants from Bayer, Boehringer Ingelheim, Corbus, GSK, Roche and Merck, and personal fees from Boehringer Ingelheim and Ikaria.
Patient and public involvement Patients and/or the public were involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of this research. Refer to the Methods section for further details.
Patient consent for publication Not required.
Ethics approval The study was approved by the University Health Network Research Ethics Board (REB 11-0397).
Provenance and peer review Commissioned; internally peer reviewed.
© Author(s) (or their employer(s)) 2021. No commercial re-use. See rights and permissions. Published by BMJ.

To cite Whittall-Garcia L, Gladman DD, Urowitz M, et al., Ann Rheum Dis Epub ahead of print: [please include Day Month Year]. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-221014
Received 14 July 2021
Accepted 16 July 2021

http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-220994
Ann Rheum Dis 2021;0:1–2. doi:10.1136/annrheumdis-2021-221014

ORCID iDs
Dafna D Gladman http://orcid.org/0000-0002-9074-0592
Murray Urowitz http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7506-9166
Zahi Touma http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5177-2076
Sindhu R Johnson http://orcid.org/0000-0003-0591-2976

REFERENCES

Figure 1 Distribution of the 1997 ACR criteria domains in patients with a score <10 in EULAR/ACR (n=16). ACR, American College of Rheumatology; ANA, antinuclear antibodies; EULAR, European League Against Rheumatism.
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