Published in final edited form as:

J Rheumatol. 2013 May ; 40(5): 572–578. doi:10.3899/jrheum.120715.

Clinical Response within 12 Weeks as a Predictor of Future Low Disease Activity in Early RA Patients: Results from the TEAR Trial

Jeffrey R Curtis, MD, MS MPH¹, Theresa McVie, MS¹, Ted R Mikuls, MD, MSPH², Richard J. Reynolds, PhD¹, Iris Navarro-Millán, MD¹, James O'Dell, MD², Larry W Moreland, MD³, S. Louis Bridges Jr., MD, PhD¹, Veena K. Ranganath⁴, and Stacey S Cofield, PhD¹

¹The University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL

²University of Nebraska Medical Center and Omaha VA Medical Center, Omaha NE

³The University of Pittsburgh

⁴UCLA, Los Angeles, CA

Abstract

Background—Rapidly predicting future outcomes based upon short-term clinical response would be helpful to optimize RA management in early disease.

Objective—To derive and validate a clinical prediction rule to predict low disease activity (LDA) at 1 year among patients participating in the Treatment of Early Aggressive Rheumatoid Arthritis (TEAR) trial escalating RA therapy by adding either etanercept (E) or sulfasalazine + hydroxychloroquine [triple therapy (TT)] after 6 months of methotrexate (MTX) therapy.

Methods—Eligible subjects included in the derivation cohort (used for model building, n=186) were participants with moderate or higher disease activity (DAS28ESR>3.2) despite 24 weeks of MTX monotherapy who added either etanercept or sulfasalazine+hydroxychloroquine. Clinical characteristics measured within the next 12 weeks were used to predict LDA 1 year later using multivariable logistic regression. Validation was performed in the cohort of TEAR patients randomized to initially receive either MTX+E or TT.

Results—The derivation cohort yielded three prediction models of varying complexity that included age, DAS28 at various time points, body mass index, and ESR (AUROC up to 0.83). Accuracy of the prediction models ranged between 80 and 95% in both derivation and validation cohorts, depending on the complexity of the model and the cutpoints chosen for response and non-response. Approximately 80% of patients could be predicted to be responders or non-responders at week 12.

Conclusion—Clinical data collected early after starting or escalating DMARD/biologic treatment could accurately predict LDA at 1 year in early RA patients. For patients predicted to be non-responders, treatment could be changed at 12 weeks to optimize outcomes.

Keywords

rheumatoid arthritis; prediction; anti-TNF; triple therapy

Corresponding Author, Jeffrey R. Curtis, MD MS MPH, 510 20th Street South, Faculty Office Towers 805 D, Birmingham, AL 35294, jcurtis@uab.edu, 205-975-2176.

Disclosures for unrelated work

All others: none

Introduction

Predicting future clinical outcomes based upon baseline factors or early clinical response would be useful to help optimize management of rheumatoid arthritis (RA). It might guide selection of specific biologic agents, or allow for rapid switching to more effective therapies based upon a patient's early response. While factors measured at baseline would be most optimal to predict future treatment response, there are currently no clinical, genetic, or other biomarker-based predictors that can adequately predict future clinical or radiographic response for large numbers of heterogeneous RA patients, so as to guide drug selection or management for individuals (1–4).

In the absence of baseline factors being able to predict future response at an individual patient level, prediction models have therefore focused on predicting remission or low disease activity at 1 year using data collected early in the course of treatment (e.g. within twelve weeks or earlier after initiating a new anti-TNF agent) (5, 6). Other prediction models have focused mainly on the subgroup of patients predicted to be non-responders later in time on the basis of a lack of early response (7, 8). However, most work related to prediction models has focused on patients with established RA, and there is no certainty that these prediction models would perform adequately in patients with early RA.

In a large U.S. cohort of patients with early RA participating in the Treatment of Early Aggressive Rheumatoid Arthritis (TEAR) trial (9), our objectives therefore were to derive and validate a clinical prediction rule to predict low disease activity (LDA) at 1 year among early RA patients randomized to add either etanercept or sulfasalazine plus hydroxychloroquine who had moderate or higher disease activity despite 6 months of methotrexate (MTX).

Methods

Overall description

Detailed methods on the TEAR trial have been published (9). Briefly, TEAR was an investigator initiated, randomized double-blind study using a two-by-two factorial design resulting in four treatment arms: immediate treatment with 1) MTX +ETN; or 2) MTX+SSZ +HCQ (triple therapy); or initial MTX, with step-up treatment if DAS28-ESR was ≥ 3.2 at week 24 to 3) MTX + ETN or 4) MTX+SSZ+HCQ. For the purpose of this post-hoc analysis, the two initial MTX arms who received step-up treatment at week 24 were combined and used to derive the prediction model. The model was applied in a separate validation cohort comprised of the two immediate treatment arms, treatment arms 1 and 2 above, to assess the robustness of the model in an independent sample and to ensure its generalizability to different RA treatment regimens.

Derivation cohort for prediction model

To derive the prediction model, we identified TEAR participants with moderate or higher disease activity ($\text{DAS28} > 3.2$) despite 24 weeks of MTX monotherapy who were adding either etanercept or sulfasalazine + hydroxychloroquine (drugs complementary to MTX that comprise triple therapy, TT) at week 24. Receipt of etanercept or TT was both randomized and blinded.

Among these individuals, described throughout as the derivation cohort (i.e. training dataset), data collected within the 12 week period from week 24 through week 36 of the TEAR Trial, were evaluated as predictors of low disease activity (LDA, defined as a 4 variable $\text{DAS28ESR} \leq 3.2$) measured approximately 1 year later (i.e. week 72 of the trial).

For the purposes of this analysis, week 24 was considered as 'baseline', since it was at that time when patients were considered to have failed MTX monotherapy and received 'step up' therapy. For the 11 participants with no outcome data 48 weeks later due to withdrawal from the trial, we conservatively used the data from these participants and imputed their outcome as non-response (i.e. did not achieve LDA).

Validation cohort of prediction model

Because of the potential that any prediction model derived using one set of data would not perform as well when applied to new data, validation of the prediction model created using the derivation cohort was assessed in an independent group of participants in the TEAR trial. This validation cohort (i.e. testing dataset) included TEAR participants randomized to start MTX + etanercept or TT at baseline. Their baseline characteristics have been previously described (9). The outcome of interest for the validation cohort was LDA assessed one year after initiating these combination RA treatment regimens (i.e. at week 48 in the trial). The treatment arms were not the same in the validation cohort as in the derivation cohort (derivation cohort had failed to reach LDA despite 6 months of MTX monotherapy and then escalated care with either etanercept or triple therapy; validation cohort initiated these same combination therapies together at the start of TEAR). However, the validation cohort allowed us to test the hypothesis that the prediction model would perform adequately to predict clinical response approximately one year later among RA patients escalating their RA therapy, with less concern for the specific RA treatment regimen they were using.

As a separate validation step (although not a completely independent population), all TEAR patients originally randomized to MTX monotherapy in the two 'step up' arms were examined during the first 6 months of the trial (when they were on MTX monotherapy). The best performing prediction model created in the derivation cohort was examined as to its accuracy of predicting response (i.e. LDA) to MTX monotherapy at 6 months using predictors measured within the first 12 weeks.

Statistical analysis

Multivariable logistic regression was used to derive a clinical prediction rule which was scaled to approximate the likelihood of response ranging from 0 – 1 (i.e. 0 – 100%). Factors initially considered for this model were based upon a-priori clinical interest, review of the published literature (e.g. body mass index (10)), availability of the data, and exploratory analyses that had already been conducted in TEAR (11). Final model selection and associated variables within each model were chosen based upon Wald's global statistic and goodness-of-fit tests, Akaike's Information Criteria (AIC) and the c statistic, similar to an area under the receiver operator curve (AUROC) (12, 13). The weights from the logistic models were used in the formula $1 / [1 + \exp(-\sum(\text{patient's data} \times \text{model parameter estimate}))]$ to generate a predicted probability of LDA (DAS28ESR < 3.2) at 1 year. This procedure yields a similar result to what would be obtained with the predicted probability option available in common software packages ('predicted' in a SAS model statement). Discrimination (assessed by the model c statistic) was evaluated; c statistics between 0.60 and 0.69 are generally considered fair, between 0.70 and 0.79 good, and 0.80 or above excellent (12). Model calibration (i.e. accuracy) was evaluated by evaluating the observed response across the range of predicted response scaled to integer values. All analyses were conducted using SAS 9.2 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC). The TEAR study protocol was approved by local and central institutional review boards (IRBs), and each patient provided written consent.

Results

Characteristics of the 186 RA patients in the derivation cohort who received methotrexate monotherapy for 24 weeks but did not achieve LDA at week 24 are shown in Table 1. Time-varying factors such as disease activity were represented at week 24 when these patients added either etanercept or sulfasalazine+hydroxychloroquine. Approximately seventy percent of patients were women, and most were seropositive for rheumatoid factor or anti-CCP antibody (one of the study inclusion criteria, along with presence of baseline radiographic erosions). Mean DAS28 was approximately 4.9, mean HAQ was 1.1, and mean ESR was at the upper limit of normal.

After assessing multiple factors listed in Table 1 at this time point (week 24 of the TEAR trial) and factors through the next 12 weeks (week 36 of the trial) to predict LDA 48 weeks later (i.e. week 72 of the trial) the following key predictors were identified utilizing the Wald's test statistic: age, body mass index (BMI), DAS28ESR at various time points (at the time of receiving step-up therapy at week 24, and 6 and 12 weeks later), and ESR. Using these variables in various combinations, three final prediction models were derived, and all satisfied goodness-of-fit tests. Model A included age, DAS28 at week 24 (when etanercept or triple therapy was added), 6, and 12 weeks later, and yielded a c statistic = 0.80. Model B included the same predictors as model A and added BMI and had a c statistic = 0.82. Model C was the best performing model and included the same predictors as model B and added ESR at week 24, with a c statistic = 0.83.

Weights for the predictor variables are shown in Table 2, and an example of how the weights could be used to derive a predicted likelihood of response is described in the footnote. All other factors listed in Table 1 (e.g. sex, mHAQ, seropositivity) were assessed but were not predictive of response. Interaction terms between the treatment arm (etanercept vs. SSZ + HCQ) and the key predictor variables were not significant.

The accuracy of the prediction models in relation to the cutpoint chosen from the prediction rule is shown in Table 3. Accuracy up to 95% could be obtained, depending on the cutpoints chosen for response and non-response. Using the derivation cohort, for example, and using a cutpoint for predicted non-response of less than 0.2, model accuracy for patients predicted to be non-responders was 93% and applied to 23% of the TEAR participants. Similarly, model accuracy for predicted responders varied according to the cutpoint chosen; accuracy was 87% for predicted responders using a cutpoint of > 0.7 and applied to 25% of the TEAR population. In general, the accuracy of the prediction model was greater for participants predicted to be non-responders than for participants predicted to be responders. Overall, if one was satisfied with approximately 80% accuracy and therefore chose a cutpoint of < 0.4 for predicted non-responders, and > 0.6 for predicted responders, a total of 79% of patients were able to be predicted (i.e. 45% of the population would be predicted to be non-responders, and an additional 34% of patients would be predicted to be responders). The remaining 21% of patients had an uncertain likelihood of response, with predicted values in the range between 0.4 and 0.6. Results were similar in the validation group, with accuracy slightly lower for predicted non-responders, and slightly higher for predicted responders. Discrimination in the validation cohort was similar to the derivation cohort, yielding c statistics for models A, B, and C of 0.81, 0.81, and 0.79, respectively (not shown).

Given interest in understanding how well the prediction model would perform to predict LDA among patients initiating MTX monotherapy, the prediction models were applied to all TEAR patients in those two arms (i.e. the original two TEAR MTX monotherapy arms, including the subset of patients who went on to later need step-up therapy 6 months later), and using the outcome of LDA at 6 months. Accuracy of the best performing prediction

model (Model C) was 93% (59/64 patients achieving LDA at 6 months) for the 47% of patients predicted to be non-responders by week 12 using a prediction cutpoint of < 0.2 . There were too few patients predicted to be responders (using any cutpoint for response) to MTX using this model to assess its accuracy.

Using the combined derivation and validation cohort, the tradeoff between greater prediction accuracy and the proportion of the TEAR participants for whom prediction was possible was depicted visually for non-responders (Figure 1a) and responders (Figure 1b). As demonstrated, there was a clear, inverse relation between the accuracy of prediction and the proportion of the TEAR participants who could be predicted to be responders or non-responders.

Discussion

In a clinical trial of patients with early RA, clinical data collected early after starting or escalating DMARD/biologic treatment could predict LDA at 1 year with high accuracy, up to 95%. The greater the accuracy demanded of the prediction model, the fewer patients who could be predicted with that level of accuracy. Overall, if one desired at least 85–90% accuracy in the prediction of non-response or response by week 12, approximately 60% of patients could be predicted to be responders or non-responders by week 12. Allowing for somewhat lesser accuracy (e.g. 75–80%) of prediction, approximately 80% of patients could be predicted to achieve LDA or not 1 year later. For patients predicted to be non-responders with very high accuracy, treatment could be changed at 12 weeks to optimize outcomes. For the 20–25% of patients for whom an accurate prediction could not be made by week twelve, 12, further research will be needed to identify other factors that could aid in predicting treatment response. It is possible, for example, that additional information such as synovial power Doppler signal using musculoskeletal ultrasound or a biomarker-based approach to disease activity assessment (14) could potentially aid in making early treatment decisions.

Several studies have analyzed the role of patient's baseline characteristics as predictors of response. Some of these have found that either health assessment questionnaire (HAQ) (15), disease duration (16) and baseline disease activity (6) play an important role in achieving LDA or remission in the long-term. The therapies received by the RA patients in these studies varied; some populations received only non-biologic DMARDs and others received combination therapy with biologics and non-biologic DMARDs. Some factors that seemed to relate to future treatment responses were the baseline characteristics like such as sex, age and smoking (15, 17, 18). However, these factors are generally not informative in isolation to manage individual patients. Moreover, smoking was previously examined in TEAR and was not correlated with treatment response (11). Like others (10), we did find an association between body mass index and treatment response.

For that reason, we examined predictors of clinical response measured shortly after initiation of new RA treatments. Our results are consistent with past analyses that have examined early response as a predictor of later response. In a pooled analysis of treatment data with MTX, anti-TNF monotherapy, and the combination of MTX and anti-TNF therapy, disease activity during the first 3 months of treatment was significantly associated with disease activity at 1 year (19). Keystone et al (7) showed that patients that responded by weeks 6 and 12 had better clinical, radiographic, and patient-reported outcomes at week 52 compared with week 12 (but not 6) responders, or week 12 non-responders. Additional studies also have shown that initial or short-term response to treatment is a strong predictor of future response and outcomes (20, 21). Early response to treatment has also been shown to be a predictor of longer term response at 5 years in the CAMERA study (22). In CAMERA, both disease activity and radiographic progression were significantly lower in the early EULAR

good responders compared with early moderate or non-responders. Limitations to most these analyses have generally been that only single predictors measured at one time point were considered; in some analyses, only a small fraction of the overall population could be predicted with reasonable accuracy. Using methods similar to ours that allowed for examination of multiple predictors, Ma et al (23) developed a prediction model of RA remission ($\text{DAS28ESR} < 2.6$) among early RA patients receiving non-biologic DMARDs. As in our study, they found that age was independently associated with 24-month remission. Though they did not consider DAS28 as a predictor, they found that only TJC at baseline was associated with remission at 24 months. However, they did not take into consideration initial response to treatment, and discrimination of their prediction model (c statistic 0.70–0.71) was somewhat lower than ours.

The strengths of our study include reasonably large numbers of patients with very early RA participating in a randomized, blinded, investigator initiated trial. We also examined our model's validity using an independent set of participants from other arms of the TEAR trial. Our study may be potentially limited in that the validation population from the other treatment arms in TEAR was not initiating the identical treatment regimen (i.e. adding etanercept or SSZ + HCQ to methotrexate after 6 months) as our derivation cohort, which likely lowered the performance of our prediction models in the validation sample. However, it did allow us to consider whether the prediction model performed adequately across two different (but frequently used) combination RA treatment regimens. This issue is important since a clinical prediction model would be most useful if it was not unique to only one RA treatment regimen but if it rather could be applied to multiple commonly used regimens that early RA patients might receive. We had limited statistical power to detect whether a prediction model derived separately for the addition of etanercept rather than SSZ + HCQ might have performed better.

We recognize that despite use of relatively straightforward statistical methods (i.e. logistic regression) to create a prediction score, a calculator or computer program likely would be required to apply the prediction score in routine practice. Given that a calculator is required to calculate the Disease Activity Score (DAS28ESR), this requirement may not be very burdensome given the increasing use of health information technology tools in clinical medicine. We selected our target outcome as LDA using the DAS28 at 1 year, a disease state that is consistent with treat to target guidelines (24), commonly used in RA clinical trials, and the endpoint at 6 months in TEAR that warranted patients to 'step up' their therapy. However, we recognize that despite its common use in RA clinical trials, the DAS28 may not be as easily calculated as other measures of RA disease activity, such as the Clinical Disease Activity Index (CDAI) (25), given the need for an acute phase reactant which may not be available in real time at the office visit. Given the choice of this outcome, we anticipated that the performance of any prediction model that used the DAS28 as predictor variables would be somewhat superior to other disease activity predictors. Additional work to consider other target outcomes such as the CDAI at 1 year, and using other predictor variables including patient reported outcomes, may be useful. Finally, TEAR collected only limited information on specific comorbidities, which precluded us from including these in the prediction models.

In conclusion, results of this prediction model derived in very early RA patients participating in TEAR was shown to predict LDA at 1 year for a meaningful number of RA patients. Clinical and laboratory data included in the prediction rule yielded an accuracy in the 80–95% range for between two-thirds and three quarters of early RA patients. Augmenting this type of model with genetic or other biomarker-based data in the future, especially for patients for whom clinical factors yield uncertainty in predicting response by week 12, will likely allow for better prediction and optimize RA management.

Acknowledgments

Financial support for the trial was from Amgen. An NIH planning grant from NIAMS supported the initial phases of the TEAR study. Dr. Curtis receives support from the NIH (AR 053351) and AHRQ (R01 HS018517). Dr. Ranganath also receives support from NIH (NIAMS K23 AR057818).

JC: research grants and/or consulting: Amgen, Abbott, BMS, Crescendo, CORRONA, Genentech, Janssen, Pfizer, UCB

TM: Research grant from Roche

VKR: research grants and/or consulting: BMS, UCB

Bibliography

1. Visvanathan S, Rahman MU, Keystone E, Genovese M, Klareskog L, Hsia E, et al. Association of serum markers with improvement in clinical response measures after treatment with golimumab in patients with active rheumatoid arthritis despite receiving methotrexate: results from the GO-FORWARD study. *Arthritis research & therapy*. 2010; 12(6):R211. Epub 2010/11/19. PubMed PMID: 2108 3889; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3046519. [PubMed: 21083889]
2. Daien CI, Fabre S, Rittore C, Soler S, Daien V, Tejedor G, et al. TGF beta1 polymorphisms are candidate predictors of the clinical response to rituximab in rheumatoid arthritis. *Joint, bone, spine : revue du rhumatisme*. 2011 Epub 2011/12/02. PubMed PMID:22129793.
3. Klimiuk PA, Sierakowski S, Domyslawska I, Chwiecko J. Effect of repeated infliximab therapy on serum matrix metalloproteinases and tissue inhibitors of metalloproteinases in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. *J Rheumatol*. 2004; 31(2):238–242. Epub 2004/02/05. PubMed PMID: 14760791. [PubMed: 14760791]
4. Padyukov L, Lampa J, Heimbürger M, Ernestam S, Cederholm T, Lundkvist I, et al. Genetic markers for the efficacy of tumour necrosis factor blocking therapy in rheumatoid arthritis. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2003; 62(6):526–529. Epub 2003/05/22. PubMed PMID: 12759288; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1754569. [PubMed: 12759288]
5. Curtis JR, Luijckens K, Kavanaugh A. Predicting future response to certolizumab pegol in rheumatoid arthritis patients: Features at 12 weeks associated with low disease activity at 1 year. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2012 Epub 2012/01/11. PubMed PMID: 22231904.
6. Curtis JR, Yang S, Chen L, Park GS, Bitman B, Wang B, et al. Predicting low disease activity and remission using early treatment response to antitumour necrosis factor therapy in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: exploratory analyses from the TEMPO trial. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2012; 71(2): 206–212. Epub 2011/10/15. PubMed PMID: 21998118. [PubMed: 21998118]
7. Keystone EC, Curtis JR, Fleischmann RM, Furst DE, Khanna D, Smolen JS, et al. Rapid improvement in the signs and symptoms of rheumatoid arthritis following certolizumab pegol treatment predicts better longterm outcomes: post-hoc analysis of a randomized controlled trial. *J Rheumatol*. 2011; 38(6):990–996. Epub 2011/03/03. PubMed PMID: 21362764. [PubMed: 21362764]
8. van der Heijde D, Keystone EC, Curtis JR, Landewe RB, Schiff MH, Khanna D, et al. Timing and magnitude of initial change in disease activity score 28 predicts the likelihood of achieving low disease activity at 1 year in rheumatoid arthritis patients treated with certolizumab pegol: a post-hoc analysis of the RAPID 1 trial. *J Rheumatol*. 2012; 39(7):1326–1333. Epub 2012/05/17. PubMed PMID: 22589265. [PubMed: 22589265]
9. Moreland LW, O'Dell JR, Paulus HE, Curtis JR, Bathon JM, St Clair EW, et al. A randomized comparative effectiveness study of oral triple therapy versus etanercept plus methotrexate in early aggressive rheumatoid arthritis: The treatment of early aggressive rheumatoid arthritis trial. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2012; 64(9):2824–2835. Epub 2012/04/18. PubMed PMID: 22508468. [PubMed: 22508468]
10. Klaasen R, Wijbrandts CA, Gerlag DM, Tak PP. Body mass index and clinical response to infliximab in rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2011; 63(2):359–364. Epub 2011/02/01. PubMed PMID: 21279992. [PubMed: 21279992]

11. Maska LB, Sayles HR, O'Dell JR, Curtis JR, Louis Bridges S Jr, Moreland LW, et al. Serum cotinine as a biomarker of tobacco exposure is not associated with treatment response in early rheumatoid arthritis. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2012 Epub 2012/06/26. PubMed PMID: 22730343.
12. Hosmer, JDW.; Lemeshow, S. *Applied Logistic Regression*. 2nd Edition. John Wiley and Sons; 2000.
13. Lemeshow S, Hosmer JDW. A review of goodness of fit statistics for use in the development of logistic regression models. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1982; 115:92–106. [PubMed: 7055134]
14. Curtis JR, van der Helm-van Mil AH, Knevel R, Huizinga TW, Haney DJ, Shen Y, et al. Validation of a novel multi-biomarker test to assess rheumatoid arthritis disease activity. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)*. 2012 Epub 2012/06/28. PubMed PMID: 22736476.
15. Hyrich KL, Watson KD, Silman AJ, Symmons DP. Predictors of response to anti-TNF-alpha therapy among patients with rheumatoid arthritis: results from the British Society for Rheumatology Biologics Register. *Rheumatology (Oxford)*. 2006; 45(12):1558–1565. Epub 2006/05/18. 10.1093/rheumatology/ke149. PubMed PMID: 16705046. [PubMed: 16705046]
16. Anderson JJ, Wells G, Verhoeven AC, Felson DT. Factors predicting response to treatment in rheumatoid arthritis: the importance of disease duration. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2000; 43(1):22–29. Epub 2000/01/22. PubMed PMID: 10643696. [PubMed: 10643696]
17. Saevardsdottir S, Wallin H, Seddighzadeh M, Ernestam S, Geborek P, Petersson IF, et al. Predictors of response to methotrexate in early DMARD naive rheumatoid arthritis: results from the initial open-label phase of the SWEFOT trial. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2011; 70(3):469–475. Epub 2010/12/15. PubMed PMID: 21149498. [PubMed: 21149498]
18. Rezaei H, Saevardsdottir S, Forslind K, Albertsson K, Wallin H, Bratt J, et al. In early rheumatoid arthritis, patients with a good initial response to methotrexate have excellent 2-year clinical outcomes, but radiological progression is not fully prevented: data from the methotrexate responders population in the SWEFOT trial. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2012; 71(2):186–191. Epub 2011/09/21. PubMed PMID: 21930734. [PubMed: 21930734]
19. Aletaha D, Funovits J, Keystone EC, Smolen JS. Disease activity early in the course of treatment predicts response to therapy after one year in rheumatoid arthritis patients. *Arthritis Rheum*. 2007; 56(10):3226–3235. Epub 2007/10/02. PubMed PMID: 17907167. [PubMed: 17907167]
20. Verstappen SM, van Albada-Kuipers GA, Bijlsma JW, Blaauw AA, Schenk Y, Haanen HC, et al. A good response to early DMARD treatment of patients with rheumatoid arthritis in the first year predicts remission during follow up. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2005; 64(1):38–43. Epub 2004/05/08. PubMed PMID: 15130899; ard.2003.014928 [pii] PubMed Central PMCID: PMC1755186. [PubMed: 15130899]
21. Gulfe A, Kristensen LE, Geborek P. Six and 12 weeks treatment response predicts continuation of tumor necrosis factor blockade in rheumatoid arthritis: an observational cohort study from southern Sweden. *J Rheumatol*. 2009; 36(3):517–521. Epub 2009/02/12. 10.3899/jrheum.080509. PubMed PMID: 19208596. [PubMed: 19208596]
22. Bakker MF, Jacobs JW, Welsing PM, Vreugdenhil SA, van Booma-Frankfort C, Linn-Rasker SP, et al. Early clinical response to treatment predicts 5-year outcome in RA patients: follow-up results from the CAMERA study. *Ann Rheum Dis*. 2011; 70(6):1099–1103. Epub 2011/03/17. 10.1136/ard.2010.137943. PubMed PMID: 21406458. [PubMed: 21406458]
23. Ma MH, Ibrahim F, Walker D, Hassell A, Choy EH, Kiely PD, et al. Remission in early rheumatoid arthritis: predicting treatment response. *J Rheumatol*. 2012; 39(3):470–475. Epub 2012/01/17. PubMed PMID: 22247360. [PubMed: 22247360]
24. 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*. 2011; 69(4):631–637. Epub 2010/03/11. 10.1136/ard.2009.123919. PubMed PMID: 20215140. [PubMed: 20215140]
25. Aletaha D, Nell VP, Stamm T, Uffmann M, Pflugbeil S, Machold K, et al. Acute phase reactants add little to composite disease activity indices for rheumatoid arthritis: validation of a clinical activity score. *Arthritis Res Ther*. 2005; 7(4):R796–R806. Epub 2005/07/01. 10.1186/ar1740. PubMed PMID: 15987481. [PubMed: 15987481]

Figure 1.

a: Performance of 3 Prediction Models using Data Collected within 12 weeks of Escalating Treatment for Predicted Non-Responders using Combined Derivation & Validation Cohorts (n = 313 total)

b: Performance of 3 Prediction Models using Data Collected within 12 weeks of Escalating Treatment for Predicted Responders using Combined Derivation & Validation Cohorts (n = 313 total)

Table 1

Characteristics * of the Derivation Cohort used for Model Building, which included the 186 TEAR Participants on Methotrexate for 24 weeks who added either Etanercept or Triple Therapy (Sulfasalazine + Hydroxychloroquine added to Methotrexate)

	Mean $\pm$ SD or n (%)
Age, years	50.2 $\pm$ 12.9
Body Mass Index, kg/m ²	30.3 $\pm$ 7.6
Female, %	72%
Race, %	
Caucasian	151 (81%)
African American	21 (11%)
Other	14 (8%)
Current smoker	43 (23%)
Rheumatoid factor positive	167 (90%)
Anti-CCP Antibody Status	
Positive	93 (50%)
Negative	34 (18%)
Not measured because patient was rheumatoid factor positive	59 (32%)
Disease duration, months	9.3 $\pm$ 6.0
mHAQ	1.1 $\pm$ 0.3
DAS28	4.9 $\pm$ 1.1
ESR, mm/hr	28 $\pm$ 22

Column proportions may not sum to 100% due to rounding

mHAQ = modified Health Assessment Questionnaire; DAS28 = Disease Activity Score, 28 joint count

* All factors measured at the time they added etanercept or triple therapy (i.e. 24 weeks into the TEAR trial) except for body mass index and seropositivity which were measured at baseline

Table 2

Parameter Estimates of Prediction Models to Predict Low Disease Activity at 1 year from the Derivation Cohort¹

	Model A	Model B	Model C
Age at screening (years)	0.029 (0.003, 0.056) 0.03	0.039 (0.009, 0.064) 0.01	0.039 (0.012, 0.068) 0.01
DAS28ESR at treatment escalation	-0.426 (-0.819, -0.045) 0.03	-0.348 (-0.764, 0.057) 0.09	-0.229 (-0.673, 0.212) 0.31
DAS28ESR 6 weeks later	-0.378 (-0.771, -0.0004) 0.05	-0.423 (-0.756, -0.049) 0.04	-0.432 (-0.853, -0.031) 0.04
DAS28ESR 12 weeks later	-0.416 (-0.773, -0.074) 0.02	-0.395 (-0.756, -0.049) 0.03	-0.359 (-0.723, -0.009) 0.05
Intercept	3.347 (1.264, 5.5593) 0.002	5.445 (2.961, 8.137) <0.0001	4.881 (2.314, 7.643) 0.0003
Body Mass Index	NA	-0.090 (-0.148, -0.037) 0.001	-0.085 (-0.143, -0.032) 0.002
ESR measured at treatment escalation (mm/hr)	NA	NA	-0.016 (-0.038, 0.004) 0.14
AIC used for model selection ²	210.94	201.17	200.82
c statistic ³	0.80	0.82	0.83

DAS28ESR = Disease Activity Score in 28 joints using the ESR; ESR = erythrocyte sedimentation rate; AIC = Akaike's Information Criteria

Example calculation, model A, for 40 year old with DAS at time of treatment escalation, 6 and 12 weeks later of 5.8, 4.7, and 4.2: Intercept + (40 * 0.29) + (5.8 * -0.426) + (4.7 * -0.378) + (4.2 * -0.416) = -1.474. Predicted response score = $(1 / (1 + e^{1.474})) = 0.19$. Patient is a predicted non-responder (Table 3).

¹Data are shown as beta coefficients, 95% profile confidence intervals, p-values

²Lower AIC values indicate a better fitting model

³Higher c statistic indicates better model discrimination

Cutpoints and Accuracy for Non-Responders and Responders in the Derivation and Validation Cohorts* in TEAR using Best Prediction Model (Model C)

Table 3

	Cutpoint (0–1 scale)	Derivation Cohort (n = 186)		Validation Cohort (n = 127)	
		Accuracy, %	% of Population	Accuracy	% of Population
Predicted Non-responders	< 0.1	95	10	95	15
	< 0.2	93	23	84	34
	< 0.3	86	34	79	46
	< 0.4	77	45	73	57
Predicted Responders	> 0.6	79	34	71	24
	> 0.7	87	25	84	15
	> 0.8	96	12	100	7

* The derivation cohort was comprised of patients on MTX monotherapy for 24 weeks who added either etanercept, or SSZ + HCQ because they had moderate or high disease activity at week 24. The outcome (low disease activity) was assessed 48 weeks later (week 72 of the TEAR trial).

The validation cohort was comprised of patients who initiated MTX + etanercept, or triple therapy (MTX + SSZ + HCQ) at the beginning of the TEAR trial. The outcome (low disease activity) was assessed 48 weeks later (week 48 of the TEAR trial).