

Cover Page



Universiteit Leiden



The handle <http://hdl.handle.net/1887/19033> holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation.

Author: Lukas, Cédric

Title: Methodological aspects of outcome assessment in inflammatory rheumatic diseases

Date: 2012-05-31



Résumé and perspective

1 Development, exploration and testing of outcome measures in inflamma-
2 tory rheumatic disorders is a continuously ongoing process in rheumatology.
3 Results presented in this thesis are based on the considerable work that is con-
4 stantly done by clinicians, methodologists and epidemiologists. These efforts
5 are ultimately aiming at improving the daily management of patients suffering
6 from rheumatic diseases, both in improving the methodology of clinical trials
7 and evaluation of drugs or therapeutic strategies, and in providing better tools
8 to monitor the disease in every day clinical practice in an individual patient.

9 10 11 **OUTCOME MEASURES IN RHEUMATOLOGY: A CONSTANT** 12 **EVOLUTION**

13
14 The work conducted and reported in this thesis strengthens our conviction
15 that a constant improvement in the metrological performance of outcome
16 measures is possible, from conventional and traditional assessment tools like
17 radiography in RA to innovative methods like MRI in AS. This progress
18 systematically requires collaborative efforts involving patients, clinicians,
19 methodologists, radiologists and others, usually in the context of organisations
20 such as OMERACT and ASAS.

21 22 23 **REPERCUSSION OF THE STUDIES ON RA MANAGEMENT AND** 24 **EVALUATION**

25
26 The results of the work that has been conducted in the field of RA may have
27 several implications for the management of the disease as well as for the assess-
28 ment of its consequences in affected patients:

29 In particular, validation of the **SENS method** may reasonably make objec-
30 tive and standardized assessment of radiographic damage in RA feasible in
31 daily clinical practice: The reasonable amount of time required to score hands
32 and feet radiographs in an individual patient, with the advantage of obtaining
33 valid and standardized assessment of the damage due to RA, should help the
34 implementation of monitoring **radiographic progression in daily clinical**
35 **practice**, which is currently not done frequently. Such a monitoring may al-
36 low evaluating the impact of therapeutic strategies in clinical practice, or the
37 consequences of joint damage on functional or professional status for example.

38 We have convincingly proven that repair of previously existing joint damage
39 is a credible concept in the era of biologics. This concept has changed our

1 vision on the course of progression of joint damage caused by RA from an
2 irreversible process to a more optimistic point of view including a potential
3 reversal of erosive lesions.

4 The **analysis of the therapeutic behavior of rheumatologists in daily**
5 **clinical practice in the ESPOIR study** has convinced us that dissemination
6 of recommendations in the management of inflammatory disorders should be
7 taken seriously. The heterogeneity in therapeutic approaches we have found
8 was common in daily care and may invoke unwarranted differences with
9 regard to the long term prognosis of individual patients: The results of our
10 prognostic study in ESPOIR has cemented the well-known **recommendation**
11 **that a DMARD should be started very early** in a patient diagnosed with RA,
12 which was so far a general recommendation with poor evidence to support it.

13 **Automated measurement of joint space width** may, in addition to the
14 “manual” scoring of erosions, improve accuracy of radiographic evaluation.
15 The consequence of such an extension of radiographic assessment would be a
16 **decreased number of patients required to be included in a trial to demon-**
17 **strate efficacy of a treatment or therapeutic strategy**, as the discriminatory
18 ability would be increased, and consequently the ability to demonstrate a
19 difference improved. Automated joint space width measurement may bring
20 radiographic assessment closer to small proof-of-concept trials.

21 22 23 CONSEQUENCES OF THE RESULTS ON AS MANAGEMENT AND 24 EVALUATION

25
26 The evaluation of different **scoring methods of the spine of AS patients by**
27 **MRI** will help the designers of clinical trials and observational research to
28 make an educated choice for how to assess MRI-activity.

29 **The development of the ASDAS** has changed the world of disease activity
30 assessment in spondyloarthritis. This method has been received extremely well
31 by the professionals working in the field of SpA, as can be concluded from the
32 plethora of articles that have appeared after the publication of the main paper,
33 in which ASDAS was used to evaluate disease activity in all kinds of cohorts
34 and trial populations. ASDAS may have impact on the design of clinical trials
35 in AS and axial SpA, for example by **decreasing the required number of pa-**
36 **tients**, and will influence daily clinical practice because of its face validity and
37 value in monitoring disease activity status and therapeutic response. Recent
38 data in particular suggest that if the initiation of TNF-blockers in AS patients
39

1 with persistent disease activity would be based on ASDAS instead of BASDAI
2 the efficiency of treatment would improve [21].

3 4 **PERSPECTIVES IN FURTHER EVALUATION OF THE STUDIED** 5 **OUTCOME MEASURES** 6

7
8 With regard to radiographic assessments of RA, numerous studies might be
9 conducted to further enhance the performance. In particular, acceptability
10 and feasibility of the systematic scoring of radiographs in RA with SENS in
11 the context of a daily practice could be evaluated, which might then convince
12 non-academic rheumatologists to measure radiographic progression methodi-
13 cally themselves. If adopted, the collected data would consequently serve as a
14 working tool in the evaluation of radiographic progression in RA.

15 With regard to repair of erosions under biological treatment, the impact
16 of repair on long-term outcomes such as functional status should be further
17 investigated, just as the potential susceptibility to repair of specific subgroups
18 of patients.

19 Concerning the therapeutic management of early RA, the regular evalua-
20 tion of the impact of periodically updated guidelines and recommendations
21 remains necessary, and the expected and induced change in behaviors concern-
22 ing the time-to-DMARD-initiation will be among the most crucial targets.
23 This time lapse encompasses both the referral to the rheumatologist by the
24 initially consulted health professional -usually the general practitioner- and
25 the responsiveness of the specialist in the diagnostic process and therapeutic
26 decision. Further efforts are needed to convince the practitioners responsible
27 for the first contact with the patient about the -relative- emergency of the
28 condition, as it might have an unfavorable long term outcome if not treated
29 timely and adequately.

30 In the field of AS management, assessment of disease activity by ASDAS
31 is gradually becoming a standard, and current work is conducted to confirm
32 validity of the tool in the daily care management of individual patients. In par-
33 ticular, the appropriate selection of patients requiring and potentially mostly
34 benefiting from a treatment with TNF blocking drugs might be improved if
35 disease activity is assessed by ASDAS. Indeed, acute phase reactants have been
36 shown to be predictive of an increased likelihood of response to TNF blockers,
37 and are included in the assessment of the disease activity [22-24]. Confirma-
38 tion of the advantage of using ASDAS in this context may then change the
39

1 recommendations about the screening of patients with regard to the decision
2 to start a TNF blocker.

3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

REFERENCES

1. Boers M, Brooks P, Strand CV, Tugwell P. The OMERACT filter for Outcome Measures in Rheumatology. *The Journal of rheumatology*. 1998;25(2):198-9.
2. van der Heijde D, Dankert T, Nieman F, Rau R, Boers M. Reliability and sensitivity to change of a simplification of the Sharp/van der Heijde radiological assessment in rheumatoid arthritis. *Rheumatology (Oxford, England)*. 1999;38(10):941-7.
3. van der Heijde DM. Plain X-rays in rheumatoid arthritis: overview of scoring methods, their reliability and applicability. *Bailliere's clinical rheumatology*. 1996;10(3):435-53.
4. van der Heijde D. How to read radiographs according to the Sharp/van der Heijde method. *The Journal of rheumatology*. 2000;27(1):261-3.
5. Klareskog L, van der Heijde D, de Jager JP, Gough A, Kalden J, Malaise M, et al. Therapeutic effect of the combination of etanercept and methotrexate compared with each treatment alone in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: double-blind randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2004;363(9410):675-81.
6. Boers M, Verhoeven AC, Markusse HM, van de Laar MA, Westhovens R, van Denderen JC, et al. Randomised comparison of combined step-down prednisolone, methotrexate and sulphasalazine with sulphasalazine alone in early rheumatoid arthritis. *Lancet*. 1997;350(9074):309-18.
7. Combe B. The French early arthritis registry. *Clinical and experimental rheumatology*. 2003;21(5 Suppl 31):S123-8.
8. Combe B, Benessiano J, Berenbaum F, Cantagrel A, Daures JP, Dougados M, et al. The ESPOIR cohort: a ten-year follow-up of early arthritis in France: methodology and baseline characteristics of the 813 included patients. *Joint Bone Spine*. 2007;74(5):440-5.
9. Little RJ, Rubin DB. Causal effects in clinical and epidemiological studies via potential outcomes: concepts and analytical approaches. *Annual review of public health*. 2000;21:121-45.
10. Combe B, Landewe R, Lukas C, Bolosiu HD, Breedveld F, Dougados M, et al. EULAR recommendations for the management of early arthritis: report of a task force of the European Standing Committee for International Clinical Studies Including Therapeutics (ESCSIT). *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2007;66(1):34-45.
11. Saag KG, Teng GG, Patkar NM, Anuntiyo J, Finney C, Curtis JR, et al. American College of Rheumatology 2008 recommendations for the use of nonbiologic and biologic disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs in rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis and rheumatism*. 2008;59(6):762-84.
12. Smolen JS, Aletaha D, Bijlsma JW, Breedveld FC, Boumpas D, Burmester G, et al. Treating rheumatoid arthritis to target: recommendations of an international task force. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 69(4):631-7.
13. Smolen JS, Landewe R, Breedveld FC, Dougados M, Emery P, Gaujoux-Viala C, et al. EULAR recommendations for the management of rheumatoid arthritis with synthetic and biological disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 69(6):964-75.
14. Braun J, Baraliakos X, Golder W, Brandt J, Rudwaleit M, Listing J, et al. Magnetic resonance imaging examinations of the spine in patients with ankylosing spondylitis, before and after successful therapy with infliximab: evaluation of a new scoring system. *Arthritis and rheumatism*. 2003;48(4):1126-36.
15. Braun J, van der Heijde D. Imaging and scoring in ankylosing spondylitis. *Best practice & research*. 2002;16(4):573-604.

16. Maksymowych WP, Inman RD, Salonen D, Dhillon SS, Krishnananthan R, Stone M, et al. Spondyloarthritis Research Consortium of Canada magnetic resonance imaging index for assessment of spinal inflammation in ankylosing spondylitis. *Arthritis and rheumatism*. 2005;53(4):502-9.
17. Ten Cate DF, Luime JJ, Hazes JM, Jacobs JW, Landewe R. Does the intraclass correlation coefficient always reliably express reliability? Comment on the article by Cheung et al. *Arthritis care & research*. 62(9):1357-8; author reply 8.
18. Garrett S, Jenkinson T, Kennedy LG, Whitelock H, Gaisford P, Calin A. A new approach to defining disease status in ankylosing spondylitis: the Bath Ankylosing Spondylitis Disease Activity Index. *The Journal of rheumatology*. 1994;21(12):2286-91.
19. van der Heijde D, Lie E, Kvien TK, Sieper J, Van den Bosch F, Listing J, et al. ASDAS, a highly discriminatory ASAS-endorsed disease activity score in patients with ankylosing spondylitis. *Annals of the rheumatic diseases*. 2009;68(12):1811-8.
20. Machado P, Landewe R, Lie E, Kvien TK, Braun J, Baker D, et al. Ankylosing Spondylitis Disease Activity Score (ASDAS): defining cut-off values for disease activity states and improvement scores. *Annals of the rheumatic diseases*. 70(1):47-53.
21. Vastesaegeer N, Van Der Cruyssen B, Mulero J, Munoz-Gomariz E, Font P, Juanola X, et al. ASDAS high disease activity may be a better selection criterion than BASDAI elevation for the treatment of ankylosing spondylitis patients with anti-TNF therapy. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2011;70(Suppl3):127.
22. Arends S, Brouwer E, van der Veer E, Groen H, Leijnsma MK, Houtman PM, et al. Baseline predictors of response and discontinuation of TNF-alpha blocking therapy in ankylosing spondylitis: a prospective longitudinal observational cohort study. *Arthritis research & therapy*. 13(3):R94.
23. de Vries MK, van Eijk IC, van der Horst-Bruinsma IE, Peters MJ, Nurmohamed MT, Dijkmans BA, et al. Erythrocyte sedimentation rate, C-reactive protein level, and serum amyloid a protein for patient selection and monitoring of anti-tumor necrosis factor treatment in ankylosing spondylitis. *Arthritis and rheumatism*. 2009;61(11):1484-90.
24. Rudwaleit M, Listing J, Brandt J, Braun J, Sieper J. Prediction of a major clinical response (BASDAI 50) to tumour necrosis factor alpha blockers in ankylosing spondylitis. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2004;63(6):665-70.