



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Identifying arthralgia suspicious for progression to rheumatoid arthritis*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/108248/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Mankia, K, Nam, J and Emery, P (2017) Identifying arthralgia suspicious for progression to rheumatoid arthritis. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*, 76 (6). e14-e14. ISSN 0003-4967

<https://doi.org/10.1136/annrheumdis-2016-210853>

© 2016, Article author (or their employer). This is an author produced version of a letter published in *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Identifying Arthralgia Suspicious for Progression to Rheumatoid Arthritis

We read with interest the article by van Steenbergen et al[1] in which a definition for arthralgia suspicious for progression to rheumatoid arthritis was proposed. The authors used a three-phase Delphi exercise to crystallise the concept of clinically suspect arthralgia (CSA), which is inherently subjective, into a core set of definable parameters. We agree that this set of characteristics should provide a useful secondary care framework for identifying homogeneous at-risk populations for future clinical studies.

Recent data suggest that rheumatologists can use symptoms and signs to identify which arthralgia patients referred to them will imminently develop RA [2,3]. In the current cohort up to 20% of individuals identified as CSA by their rheumatologist developed RA during follow up, the majority doing so within 6 months [2]. Although a useful signpost for the experienced rheumatologist, it is not yet clear whether CSA can be as effectively identified in primary care. This is important as the vast majority of RA patients will first present to their general practitioner (GP) when they develop symptoms. In general, GPs have less expertise in assessing arthralgia; in the UK it is estimated that RA patients visit their GP on average four times before being referred to a specialist for diagnosis (insert NAO ref). Furthermore, patients are usually only referred once synovitis has developed. Thus for many RA patients there is not the opportunity for the symptomatic pre-RA phase to be captured in secondary care at all. We would therefore argue that including primary care in any strategy to identify at-risk individuals would be optimal.

One such approach is to send individuals with any new musculoskeletal (MSK) complaint in primary care for an anti-CCP test. Those that test anti-CCP positive are at high risk of imminent RA, with 45% progressing to clinical arthritis, the majority within 1 year [4]. A key advantage of this approach is that it can be performed by healthcare professionals without any specific rheumatology expertise. It also allows at-risk individuals to be identified when they first access healthcare. Interestingly, symptoms in the hands, shoulders and feet were associated with anti-CCP positivity [4] and the EULAR taskforce also agreed that symptoms and signs in the hands were important in identifying arthralgia that precedes RA [1]. One limitation of this primary care approach is that only anti-CCP positive at-risk individuals will

be identified. As it is also important to identify seronegative at-risk individuals, a potential algorithm combining the two approaches in a primary care setting will be a strategy worth investigating in the future.

We agree that the next important step is to develop criteria for imminent RA. As suggested by van Steenbergen et al [1], it is likely that this will need to incorporate clinical, laboratory and imaging parameters to achieve superior predictive accuracy compared to clinical parameters alone. Prediction models that combine clinical and laboratory markers in at-risk cohorts have been published [5-7]. Measurement of T cell subset dysregulation has recently been shown to add predictive accuracy to clinical symptoms in those at risk of RA [7]. The Leeds prediction model also included ultrasound imaging and identified high risk individuals with a 62% risk of progression to arthritis [6]. MSK ultrasound is now routinely used alongside clinical markers for real-time decision making in early arthritis clinics. Ultrasound examination in at-risk individuals has also recently been included in a diagnostic algorithm for RA patients [8].

Identifying individuals at high risk of imminent RA is now achievable. Incorporating clinical, laboratory and imaging biomarkers into an agreed criteria for imminent RA is an important ambition. This will likely accelerate the identification of homogeneous groups of at-risk individuals necessary for larger observational studies and future interventional trials.

1. van Steenbergen HW, Aletaha D, Beart-van de Voorde LJJ, Brouwer E, Codreanu C, Combe B, Fonseca JE, Hetland ML, Humby F, Kvien TK, et al.: **EULAR definition of arthralgia suspicious for progression to rheumatoid arthritis**. *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases* 2016.
2. van Steenbergen HW, Mangnus L, Reijnierse M, Huizinga TW, van der Helm-van Mil AH: **Clinical factors, anticitrullinated peptide antibodies and MRI-detected subclinical inflammation in relation to progression from clinically suspect arthralgia to arthritis**. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2016, **75**:1824-1830.
3. van Steenbergen HW, van der Helm-van Mil AH: **Clinical expertise and its accuracy in differentiating arthralgia patients at risk for rheumatoid arthritis from other patients presenting with joint symptoms**. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2016, **55**:1140-1141.

4. Nam JL, Hunt L, Hensor EM, Emery P: **Enriching case selection for imminent RA: the use of anti-CCP antibodies in individuals with new non-specific musculoskeletal symptoms - a cohort study.** Ann Rheum Dis 2015.
5. van de Stadt LA, Witte BI, Bos WH, van Schaardenburg D: **A prediction rule for the development of arthritis in seropositive arthralgia patients.** Ann Rheum Dis 2013, **72**:1920-1926.
6. Rakieh C, Nam JL, Hunt L, Hensor EM, Das S, Bissell LA, Villeneuve E, McGonagle D, Hodgson R, Grainger A, et al.: **Predicting the development of clinical arthritis in anti-CCP positive individuals with non-specific musculoskeletal symptoms: a prospective observational cohort study.** Ann Rheum Dis 2014.
7. Hunt L, Hensor EM, Nam J, Burska AN, Parmar R, Emery P, Ponchel F: **T cell subsets: an immunological biomarker to predict progression to clinical arthritis in ACPA-positive individuals.** Ann Rheum Dis 2016, **75**:1884-1889.
8. D'Agostino MA, Terslev L, Wakefield R, Ostergaard M, Balint P, Naredo E, Iagnocco A, Backhaus M, Grassi W, Emery P: **Novel algorithms for the pragmatic use of ultrasound in the management of patients with rheumatoid arthritis: from diagnosis to remission.** Ann Rheum Dis 2016, **75**:1902-1908.