

population. Our aim was to evaluate the rate of infliximab-related IAE in elderly IBD patients.

Methods: All adult patients in the ENEIDA registry (a large, prospectively maintained database of the Spanish Working Group in IBD–GETECCU) who received a first course of infliximab treatment were identified. Patients were selected in two cohorts regarding the age at the beginning of infliximab treatment: over 60 years, and between 18 and 50 years of age. The rates of IAE recorded in the ENEIDA database (infusion reactions, delayed hypersensitivity, oedema, allergy, anaphylaxis, psoriasis, lupus-like syndrome) were compared, as well as the rate of secondary loss of response (SLR).

Results: We included 939 (12%) patients who started infliximab over 60 years and 6844 (88%) patients below 50 years. The rate of IAE (15% vs. 15%, ns) and treatment withdrawal due to IAE (13% vs. 12%, ns) was similar in both groups. Neither differences were observed according to IAE: infusion reactions (8.3% vs. 8.2%), late hypersensitivity (1.4% vs. 1.2%), paradoxical psoriasis (0.9% vs. 1.4%) and drug-induced lupus erythematosus (0.7% vs. 0.6%). Patients below 50 years were significantly more often treated with concomitant immunosuppressants (57% vs. 48.1% >60 years, $p < 0.05$). In the multi-variate analysis, combination with immunosuppressants (OR 0.741; 95% CI 0.64–8.5, $p < 0.05$) and female sex (OR 1.8; 95% CI 1.6–2.1, $p < 0.05$) were the only independent predictors to develop IAE. The rate of SLR was also similar in both study groups (20% vs. 21%). Combination therapy with immunosuppressants was the unique risk factor to develop SLR (OR 0.85; CI 95% 0.73 to 0.98, $p = 0.021$).

Conclusions: Elderly IBD patients who start treatment with infliximab have a similar risk of developing IAE and SLR than younger patients. From this point of view, elderly would benefit from combination therapy.

P438

Lupus-like reactions in patients with inflammatory bowel disease treated with anti-TNFs are rare but insidious adverse events: data from a large single-centre cohort

F. S. Macaluso, C. Sapienza, M. Ventimiglia, M. Cottone, A. Orlando

IBD Unit, 'Villa Sofia-Cervello' Hospital, Palermo, Italy

Background: The occurrence of lupus-like reactions (LLRs) may complicate the management of patients with inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) treated with anti-TNFs. However, very few data on the incidence, predictors, and clinical outcomes of LLRs have been reported. We aimed to describe all these features in a large cohort of IBD patients treated with anti-TNF drugs

Methods: All records of consecutive patients who started a treatment with an anti-TNF from January 2006 to June 2018 were retrospectively reviewed. Patients were defined as having LLR by the presence of immunologic abnormalities (positivity for ANA and/or anti-ds-DNA), along with clinical features that included at least two of the following: arthralgia, fatigue, fever, cutaneous manifestations, or serositis, which had a clear temporal association with exposure to the anti-TNFs, and resolved without recurrence once the drug was discontinued. Univariable and multiple Cox proportional hazard models were used to estimate the association between all variables at baseline and occurrence of LLRs.

Results: In total, 760 patients (1059 total treatments with anti-TNFs) were included. Participants contributed a total of 2863.5

person-years of follow-up, during which 16 cases of LLRs (2.1% of patients) were reported, with an incidence rate of 5.6 per 1000 person-years. Female gender and being former smokers were more prevalent in the LLR group (75.0% vs. 44.1%, $p = 0.02$; and 18.8% vs. 5.4%, $p = 0.037$, respectively), with a hazard ratio of 3.86 (95% CI: 1.21–12.38; $p = 0.023$) and 4.42 (95% CI: 1.20–16.24; $p = 0.025$), respectively, at Cox regression analysis adjusted for possible confounders. LLRs occurred after a mean of 12.0 ± 9.7 months of therapy with anti-TNFs. Antinuclear antibodies were universally positive, and 10 out of 16 (62.5%) patients had also anti-ds-DNA. Arthropathy was the most frequent symptom (87.5%), followed by fatigue (81.2%), and fever (31.2%). Three cases presented with a concomitant autoimmune hepatitis-like syndrome. The diagnosis of LLR was further confirmed by a re-challenge with the culprit agent in half of the cases. All LLRs resolved following discontinuation of the drug after a mean of 8.1 ± 4.2 weeks, even if 10 patients required corticosteroids for the control of symptoms. Five patients (31.2%) were switched to a second anti-TNFs, and one of them developed a second LLR.

Conclusions: In this very large cohort of patients treated with anti-TNFs, LLRs were rare adverse events, more common in women and former smokers. Clinical features are non-specific and insidious. All LLRs resolved following discontinuation of the drug, but the use of corticosteroids was required in most of the cases.

P439

Effectiveness and safety of the sequential use of a second and third anti-TNF agent in patients with inflammatory bowel disease: results from the ENEIDA registry

M. J. Casanova^{*1}, M. Chaparro¹, M. Mínguez², E. Ricart³, C. Taxonera⁴, S. García-López⁵, J. Guardiola⁶, A. López-San Román⁷, E. Iglesias⁸, B. Beltrán⁹, B. Sicilia¹⁰, M. I. Vera¹¹, J. Hinojosa¹², S. Riestra¹³, E. Domènech¹⁴, X. Calvet¹⁵, J. L. Pérez-Calle¹⁶, M. D. Martín-Arranz¹⁷, X. Aldegue¹⁸, M. Rivero¹⁹, D. Monfort²⁰, J. Barrio²¹, M. Esteve²², L. Márquez²³, R. Lorente²⁴, E. García-Planella²⁵, L. de Castro²⁶, F. Bermejo²⁷, O. Merino²⁸, A. Rodríguez-Pérez²⁹, P. Martínez-Montiel³⁰, M. Van Domseelaar³¹, G. Alcaín³², M. Domínguez-Cajal³³, C. Muñoz³⁴, F. Gomollón³⁵, L. Fernández-Salazar³⁶, M. F. García-Sepulcre³⁷, I. Rodríguez-Lago³⁸, A. Gutiérrez³⁹, F. Argüelles-Arias⁴⁰, C. Rodríguez⁴¹, G. E. Rodríguez⁴², L. Bujanda⁴³, J. Llaó⁴⁴, P. Varela⁴⁵, L. Ramos⁴⁶, J. M. Huguet⁴⁷, P. Almela⁴⁸, P. Romero⁴⁹, M. Navarro-Llavat⁵⁰, Á. Abad⁵¹, P. Ramírez-de la Piscina⁵², A. J. Lucendo⁵³, E. Sesé⁵⁴, R. E. Madrigal⁵⁵, M. Charro⁵⁶, A. García-Herola⁵⁷, R. Pajares⁵⁸, S. Khorrami⁵⁹, J. P. Gisbert¹

¹Hospital Universitario de La Princesa, IIS-IP, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid and CIBEREHD, Gastroenterology Unit, Madrid, Spain, ²Hospital Clínico Universitario de Valencia, Gastroenterology Unit, Valencia, Spain, ³Hospital Clínic i Provincial, CIBEREHD and IDIBAPS, Gastroenterology Unit, Barcelona, Spain, ⁴Hospital Universitario Clínico San Carlos, Gastroenterology Unit, Madrid, Spain, ⁵Hospital Universitario Miguel Servet and CIBEREHD, Gastroenterology Unit, Zaragoza, Spain, ⁶Hospital Universitario de Bellvitge, Gastroenterology Unit, Barcelona, Spain, ⁷Hospital Universitario Ramón y Cajal, Gastroenterology Unit, Madrid, Spain, ⁸Hospital Universitario Reina Sofía, Gastroenterology Unit, Córdoba, Spain, ⁹Hospital Universitario y Politécnico La Fe and CIBEREHD, Gastroenterology Unit, Valencia, Spain,

¹⁰Hospital Universitario de Burgos, Gastroenterology Unit, Burgos, Spain, ¹¹Hospital Universitario Puerta de Hierro Majadahonda, Gastroenterology Unit, Madrid, Spain, ¹²Hospital de Manises, Gastroenterology Unit, Valencia, Spain, ¹³Hospital Universitario Central de Asturias, Gastroenterology Unit, Oviedo, Spain, ¹⁴Hospital Universitario Germans Trias i Pujol and CIBEREHD, Gastroenterology Unit, Badalona, Spain, ¹⁵Hospital de Sabadell. Corporació Sanitària Universitària Parc Taulí and CIBEREHD, Gastroenterology Unit, Sabadell, Spain, ¹⁶Hospital Universitario Fundación de Alcorcón, Gastroenterology Unit, Madrid, Spain, ¹⁷Hospital Universitario La Paz and Instituto de Investigación de La Paz (IdiPaz), Gastroenterology Unit, Madrid, Spain, ¹⁸Hospital Universitari de Girona Dr. Josep Trueta, Gastroenterology Unit, Gerona, Spain, ¹⁹Hospital Universitario Marqués de Valdecilla and IDIVAL, Gastroenterology, Santander, Spain, ²⁰Consorci Sanitari Terrassa, Gastroenterology, Terrassa, Spain, ²¹Hospital Universitario Río Hortega, Gastroenterology, Valladolid, Spain, ²²Hospital Universitario Mutua Terrasa, Gastroenterology Unit, Terrasa, Spain, ²³Hospital del Mar, Gastroenterology Unit, Barcelona, Spain, ²⁴Hospital General Universitario de Ciudad Real and CIBEREHD, Gastroenterology Unit, Ciudad Real, Spain, ²⁵Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau, Gastroenterology Unit, Barcelona, Spain, ²⁶Complejo Hospitalario Universitario de Vigo, Gastroenterology Unit, Vigo, Spain, ²⁷Hospital Universitario de Fuenlabrada and Instituto de Investigación de La Paz (IdiPaz), Gastroenterology Unit, Madrid, Spain, ²⁸Hospital Universitario Cruces, Baracaldo, Spain, ²⁹Hospital Clínico Universitario de Salamanca, Gastroenterology Unit, Salamanca, Spain, ³⁰Hospital Universitario Doce de Octubre, Gastroenterology Unit, Madrid, Spain, ³¹Hospital de Torrejón, Gastroenterology Unit, Madrid, Spain, ³²Hospital Universitario Virgen de la Victoria, Gastroenterology Unit, Málaga, Spain, ³³Hospital General San Jorge, Gastroenterology Unit, Huesca, Spain, ³⁴Hospital de Basurto, Gastroenterology Unit, Bilbao, Spain, ³⁵Hospital Clínico Universitario Lozano Blesa, Gastroenterology Unit, Zaragoza, Spain, ³⁶Hospital Clínico Universitario de Valladolid, Gastroenterology Unit, Valladolid, Spain, ³⁷Hospital General Universitario de Elche, Gastroenterology Unit, Elche, Spain, ³⁸Hospital de Galdakao-Usansolo, Gastroenterology Unit, Galdakao, Spain, ³⁹Hospital General Universitario de Alicante and CIBEREHD, Gastroenterology Unit, Alicante, Spain, ⁴⁰Hospital Universitario Virgen Macarena, Gastroenterology Unit, Sevilla, Spain, ⁴¹Complejo Hospitalario de Navarra, Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Navarra (IdiSNA), Gastroenterology Unit, Pamplona, Spain, ⁴²Hospital Universitario Nuestra Señora de la Candelaria, Gastroenterology Unit, Santa Cruz de Tenerife, Spain, ⁴³Hospital Universitario de Donostia, Instituto Biodonostia, Universidad del País Vasco (UPV/EHU) and CIBEREHD, Gastroenterology Unit, San Sebastián, Spain, ⁴⁴ALTHAIA Xarxa Assistencial Universitària de Manresa, Gastroenterology Unit, Manresa, Spain, ⁴⁵Hospital Universitario de Cabueñes, Gastroenterology Unit, Gijón, Spain, ⁴⁶Hospital Universitario de Canarias, Gastroenterology Unit, La Laguna, Spain, ⁴⁷Consorcio Hospital General Universitario de Valencia, Gastroenterology Unit, Valencia, Spain, ⁴⁸Hospital General Universitario de Castellón, Gastroenterology Unit, Castellón, Spain, ⁴⁹Hospital General Universitario de Santa Lucía, Gastroenterology Unit, Murcia, Spain, ⁵⁰Hospital de Sant Joan Despí Moisès Broggi, Gastroenterology Unit, Sant Joan Despí, Spain, ⁵¹Hospital de Viladecans, Gastroenterology Unit, Barcelona, Spain, ⁵²Hospital Universitario de Álava, Gastroenterology Unit, Vitoria, Spain, ⁵³Hospital General de Tomelloso, Gastroenterology Unit, Ciudad Real, Spain, ⁵⁴Hospital Universitario Arnau de Vilanova, Gastroenterology Unit, Lérida, Spain, ⁵⁵Complejo Asistencial

Universitario de Palencia, Gastroenterology Unit, Palencia, Spain, ⁵⁶Hospital Royo Villanova, Gastroenterology Unit, Zaragoza, Spain, ⁵⁷Hospital Marina Baixa, Gastroenterology Unit, Alicante, Spain, ⁵⁸Hospital Universitario Infanta Sofía, Gastroenterology Unit, Madrid, Spain, ⁵⁹Hospital Universitario Son Espases, Gastroenterology Unit, Palma de Mallorca, Spain

Background: The aim of the present study was to investigate the efficacy and safety of the sequential use of a second and a third anti-TNF agent after failing or developing intolerance to an anti-TNF drug.

Methods: Patients diagnosed with Crohn's disease (CD) or ulcerative colitis (UC) from ENEIDA registry (a prospectively maintained registry from GETECCU) who switched to another anti-TNF drug after failure or intolerance to a previous anti-TNF, were included. Efficacy, loss of response, and safety of the second and third anti-TNF were evaluated by logistic regression, Kaplan–Meier and Cox regression analyses.

Results: In total, 1122 patients that switched to a second anti-TNF were included (50% men, mean age at diagnosis 31 years, 73% CD). The reasons for withdrawal the first anti-TNF were: primary failure (22%), secondary failure (51%), and intolerance (27%). Remission was achieved with the second anti-TNF drug in 45% of patients in the short-term. The rate of remission was similar between CD and UC patients (46% vs. 41%, $p = 0.06$). There was no difference in remission rates according to the sequence of the anti-TNF administration: infliximab–adalimumab or adalimumab–infliximab (42% vs. 48%, $p = 0.07$). The factors associated with a lower probability of achieving remission after a second anti-TNF were: combo therapy (OR = 0.5 95% CI = 0.4–0.8), to withdraw the first anti-TNF due to a primary failure (vs. intolerance; OR = 0.6, 95% CI = 0.4–0.9), and to withdraw the first anti-TNF due to secondary failure (vs. intolerance) (OR 0.6, 95% CI = 0.5–0.9). The cumulative incidence of loss of response after achieving remission with the second anti-TNF (median follow-up of 19 months) was 45%: 23% at 1 year and 62% at 5 years. The incidence of loss of response to the second anti-TNF was 19% per patient-year of follow-up. The factors associated with a higher risk of loss of response were: UC vs. CD (HR = 1.6; 95% CI = 1.1–2.1, $p = 0.005$) and combo therapy (HR = 2.4; 95% CI = 1.8–3, $p < 0.0001$). Adverse events occurred in 15% of the patients who switched to a second anti-TNF (10% stopped the treatment). Seventy-one patients switched to a third anti-TNF and 55% achieved remission. The incidence of loss of response to a third anti-TNF was 22% per patient-year (median follow-up of 9 months). Seven patients (11%) had adverse events, but only one discontinued the therapy.

Conclusions: Almost half of the patients who switched to a second anti-TNF achieved remission; however, a high proportion of them subsequently lost response. Factors associated with loss of response were type of inflammatory bowel disease and combo therapy. Approximately 50% of patients who received a third anti-TNF achieved remission; however, again, a high proportion of them lost response subsequently.

P440

Comparison of infliximab serum levels between venous and capillary blood in paediatric IBD patients using novel blood sampling technology

M. Zijlstra^{*1}, M. Jongsma², A. de Vries³, T. Schaap³, K. Bloem³, L. de Ridder²

¹Wilhelmina Children's Hospital, Pediatric Gastro-enterology, Utrecht, The Netherlands, ²Erasmus MC-Sophia, Pediatric Gastroenterology, Rotterdam, The Netherlands, ³Sanquin Diagnostic Services, Biologics Lab, Amsterdam, The Netherlands