Short Disease Duration Is Associated With Increased Risk of Treatment Failure in Biologic-Treated Patients With Ulcerative Colitis

Nghia H. Nguyen, MD, MAS,* Soumya Kurnool, MD,⁺ Parambir S. Dulai, MD,* Brigid S. Boland, MD,* William J. Sandborn, MD,* and Siddharth Singh, MD, MS^{*,‡}

Background: Longer disease duration is associated with inferior response to biologic therapy in Crohn's disease. However, the effect of disease duration on response to biologic therapy in ulcerative colitis (UC) has not been well studied.

Methods: In a single-center retrospective cohort study of outpatients with UC starting a biologic agent, we evaluated treatment response by disease duration. The primary outcome was treatment failure (composite outcome of inflammatory bowel disease [IBD]–related surgery/hospitalization or treatment modification including dose escalation, treatment discontinuation, or addition of corticosteroids); secondary outcomes were risk of IBD-related surgery/hospitalization and endoscopic remission. We conducted multivariate Cox proportional hazard analyses to evaluate the independent impact of disease duration on clinical outcomes.

Results: We included 160 biologic-treated UC patients (73% biologic-naïve) with a median age (interquartile range) of 36 (26–52) years and disease duration (range) of 4.5 (1–9) years. After adjusting for immunosuppressive medications, albumin, and body mass index, each 1-year increase in disease duration was associated with a 5% lower risk of treatment failure (adjusted hazard ratio, 0.95; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.91–0.99) and a 9% higher risk of achieving endoscopic remission (adjusted odds ratio, 1.09; 95% CI, 1.01–1.18). This association of short disease duration with treatment failure was observed only in biologic-naïve patients, but not biologic-experienced patients. No significant association was seen between disease duration and risk of surgery or hospitalization.

Conclusion: Shorter disease duration is independently associated with increased risk of treatment failure in biologic-treated patients with UC. Requirement of biologic therapy early in the course of disease may be a negative prognostic marker in patients with UC.

Key Words: Disease duration, prognosis, treatment failure, IBD

INTRODUCTION

Several disease-related prognostic factors have been studied in patients with ulcerative colitis (UC) and frequently overlap with factors identified in Crohn's disease (CD). However, unlike in CD, the impact of disease duration on response to therapy has not been well studied in patients with UC.^{1,2} Disease duration has been consistently associated with response to different biologic agents in patients with Crohn's disease. Suboptimally treated inflammatory CD may progress

Pharmaceuticals, Robarts Clinical Trials (owned by Health Academic Research Trust, HART), Series Therapeutics, Shire, Sienna Biopharmaceuticals, Sigmoid Biotechnologies, Sterna Biologicals, Sublimity Therapeutics, Takeda, Theravance Biopharma, Tigenix, Tillotts Pharma, UCB Pharma, Ventyx Biosciences, Vimalan Biosciences, Vivelix Pharmaceuticals; and stock or stock options from BeiGene, Escalier Biosciences, Gossamer Bio, Oppilan Pharma, Precision IBD (owns Prometheus Laboratories), Progenity, Ritter Pharmaceuticals, Ventyx Biosciences, Vimalan Biosciences. Spouse: Opthotech: consultant, stock options; Progenity: consultant, stock; Oppilan Pharma: employee, stock options; Escalier Biosciences: employee, stock options; Ventyx Biosciences: employee, stock options; Vimalan Biosciences: employee, stock options; Vimalan Biosciences: employee, stock options; Vimalan Biosciences: employee, stock options; Vimalan

Author contributions: Study concept and design: S.S. Acquisition of data: S.S., S.K. Analysis and interpretation of data: N.H.N., W.J.S., S.S. Drafting of the manuscript: S.S. Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: N.H.N., S.K., B.S.B., P.S.D., W.J.S. Approval of the final manuscript: N.H.N., S.K., B.S.B., P.S.D., W.J.S., Guarantor of the article: Dr. Siddharth Singh had full access to all the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Address correspondence to: Siddharth Singh, MD, MS, Divisions of Gastroenterology and Biomedical Informatics, University of California San Diego, 9452 Medical Centre Drive, ACTRI 1W501, La Jolla, CA 92093 (sis040@ucsd.edu).

© 2019 Crohn's & Colitis Foundation. Published by Oxford University Press. All rights reserved. For permissions, please e-mail: journals.permissions@oup.com. doi: 10.1093/ibd/izz276 Published online 21 November 2019

Received for publications August 29, 2019; Editorial Decision October 4, 2019.

From the *Division of Gastroenterology, [†]School of Medicine, and [‡]Division of Biomedical Informatics, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California, USA

Supported by: Dr. Nguyen is supported by the National Institutes of Health (NIH)/National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases (NIDDK; T32 DK007202). Dr. Dulai is supported by the American Gastroenterological Association Research Scholar Award. Dr. Singh is supported by the NIH/NIDDK (K23DK117058), an American College of Gastroenterology Junior Faculty Development Award, and the Crohn's and Colitis Foundation Career Development Award (#404614).

Conflicts of interest: S.S.: research grants from AbbVie; consulting fees from AbbVie, Takeda, Pfizer, AMAG Pharmaceuticals. N.H.N.: none to declare. S.K.: none to declare. B.S.B.: research grant from Prometheus Laboratories (owned by Precision IBD), consulting fees from Abbvie, Pfizer, P.S.D.: research support from Takeda, Pfizer, Abbvie, Janssen, Polymedco, ALPCO, Buhlmann; consulting fees from Takeda, Pfizer, Abbvie, Janssen. WJ.S.: research grants from Atlantic Healthcare Limited, Amgen, Genentech, Gilead Sciences, Abbvie, Janssen, Takeda, Lilly, Celgene/Receptos, Pfizer, Prometheus Laboratories (owned by Precision IBD); consulting fees from Abbvie, Allergan, Amgen, Arena Pharmaceuticals, Avexegen Therapeutics, BeiGene, Boehringer Ingelheim, Celgene, Celltrion, Conatus, Cosmo, Escalier Biosciences, Ferring, Forbion, Genentech, Gilead Sciences, Gossamer Bio, Incyte, Janssen, Kyowa Kirin Pharmaceutical Research, Landos Biopharma, Lilly, Oppilan Pharma, Otsuka, Pfizer, Precision IBD (owns Prometheus Laboratories), Progenity, Prometheus Laboratories (owned by Precision, Ritter

to fibrostenotic and penetrating complications that are not responsive to medical management; hence, early initiation of biologic therapy is more effective and is recommended in patients with CD.³ Over the last decade, treatment targets in UC have evolved from focusing on symptomatic remission toward achieving mucosal healing, which has been associated with a decrease in risk of colectomy.⁴ Population-based cohort studies have demonstrated a decline in colectomy rates with increasing use of tumor necrosis factor (TNF)-a antagonists.^{5, 6} However, whether the timing of initiation of biologic therapy impacts its effectiveness in patients with UC is unknown. Unlike CD, UC is primarily a luminal disease with mucosal inflammation, although long-term inadequate control of disease may result in mural changes and submucosal fibrosis. It is unclear whether timing of biologic therapy may influence its effectiveness. Prior small retrospective studies or post hoc analyses of clinical trials have variably demonstrated either no association between disease duration and response to biologic therapy or higher risk of treatment failure in patients with short disease duration at the time of starting biologic therapy.^{7–11}

Hence, we conducted a retrospective cohort study of biologic-treated patients with UC to understand how disease duration may impact treatment response, achieving endoscopic remission, and risk of colectomy and/or hospitalization in biologic-naïve and biologic-experienced patients.

METHODS

Study Design

We performed a retrospective cohort study in biologictreated patients with UC seen and followed at the University of California San Diego (UCSD). Patients were included if they had UC, were new users of any biologic agent (TNFa antagonists such as infliximab, adalimumab or golimumab, or an anti-integrin agent such as vedolizumab) started at conventional Food and Drug Administration (FDA)-approved doses and regimens between January 1, 2011, and December 31, 2016, and were followed at UCSD for at least 6 months. Patients were excluded if they (a) had Crohn's disease or indeterminate colitis, (b) were not treated with biologic agents or biologics were initiated as during inpatient hospitalization for acute severe UC, (c) were followed at UCSD for <6 months, (d) were pregnant, or (e) had already undergone colectomy before starting biologic therapy. As patients hospitalized with acute severe ulcerative colitis represent a distinct set of patients with known poor prognosis, with high rates of treatment failure and short-term colectomy, we opted to exclude them to avoid confounding by disease severity. Prevalent users of biologic agents (ie, patients who were already on a biologic agent at the time of the study start date) were also excluded to minimize immortal time bias. This study was approved by the UCSD Institutional Review Board (IRB #160967).

Data Abstraction

A single reviewer abstracted data through medical record review using a piloted data abstraction form, in consultation with a second gastroenterologist reviewer. Besides exposure and outcomes (as detailed below), data on the following variables were abstracted: (a) patient characteristics-age, sex, smoking status, and body mass index (BMI) at time of starting new biologic therapy; (b) disease characteristics-disease extent, disease duration, endoscopic disease activity at the time of starting a biologic agent, classified by Mayo endoscopy score, laboratory variables including hemoglobin, erythrocyte sedimentation rate, albumin, and C-reactive protein at time of starting the biologic agent, prior hospitalization within 1 year of cohort entry; (c) treatment characteristics-current index biologic agent, prior use of immunomodulators and other biologic agents, prior use of corticosteroids within the past year, concurrent therapy with immunomodulators and/or corticosteroids; and (d) outcomes-date of IBD-related surgery, hospitalization, dose escalation, treatment discontinuation and addition of corticosteroids, and endoscopic re-assessment after starting biologic therapy.

Exposure

The primary predictor variable was disease duration as a continuous variable. We evaluated the association between each 1-year increase in disease duration and clinical outcomes. Secondary analysis using disease duration (<2 years vs \geq 2 years) as a categorical predictor variable was also performed.

Outcomes

The primary outcome of interest was time to treatment failure, a composite outcome of IBD-related surgery, hospitalization, or treatment modification (including index biologic dose escalation beyond FDA-approved dosing regimen, drug discontinuation, or addition/continuation of corticosteroids \geq 3 months after starting index biologic therapy). Secondary outcomes of interest were time to IBD-related surgery (ileal pouch anal anastomosis, ileorectal anastomosis, or colectomy with end ileostomy), time to IBD-related hospitalization (primary discharge diagnosis of UC flare), or achieving endoscopic remission (Mayo endoscopy subscore of 0 or 1, based on review of endoscopy reports performed by study IBD specialists) within 1 year of starting biologic therapy. Patients were followed from time of starting biologic therapy until occurrence of study outcome or definitive colectomy surgery (all other outcomes were considered independently), loss to follow-up, treatment interruption for >6 months, or study completion (December 31, 2016).

Statistical Analysis

We performed univariate time-to-event analysis or logistic regression (for endoscopic remission outcome) to evaluate the

association between disease duration and clinical outcomes. To evaluate the independent effect of disease duration on response to biologic therapy, we performed multivariate Cox proportional hazard analyses with a combination of backward variable selection (P < 0.15 in univariate analysis among age, sex, BMI, disease duration, disease extent, C-reactive protein, prior and concomitant use of steroids and/or immunomodulators) and inclusion of clinically relevant variables (albumin as a continuous variable [per 1 g/dL], prior anti-TNF failure for all outcomes; in addition, for hospitalization outcome, prior hospitalization within 1 year of cohort entry). To meet the assumption of normality, we performed a logarithmic transformation of the variable for disease duration and performed our analysis using the logarithmically transformed variable. The proportional hazard assumption was met based on graphical evaluation and examining weighted residuals.

All outcomes were analyzed in all biologic-treated patients, and subsequently stratified by biologic-naïve and biologic-experienced patients. To evaluate whether disease duration may differentially impact response to $TNF\alpha$ antagonists vs vedolizumab, we performed stratified analysis by drug type. Our sample was a convenient consecutive sample, starting from the time the IBD center was established at our hospital. No formal sample size assessment was performed.

All hypothesis testing was performed using a 2-sided P value with a statistical significance threshold <0.05. All statistical analyses were performed with Stata MP (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA).

RESULTS

Patient Characteristics

Table 1 shows the baseline characteristics of 160 patients with UC who formed the study cohort. The median age of cohort (interquartile range [IQR]) was 36.0 (26.0-51.8) years, with 80 males and 80 females. Forty-three patients (27%) had a disease duration <2 years at the time of initiation of biologic agents. The median BMI (IQR) was 24.3 (21.4-28.7), and 18.1% were obese. Approximately 61% of patients had pancolitis, and 53% had severely active endoscopic disease. Approximately 73% of patients were biologic-naïve at the time of cohort entry, 55% were treated with infliximab, and 18.8% were treated with vedolizumab. About 53% and 52% were concomitantly on immunomodulators and corticosteroids, respectively, and 81% had used corticosteroids in the year before initiation of biologic therapy. Over a median follow-up of 2 years after starting biologic therapy, 110 patients experienced treatment failure, 23 patients underwent surgery, and 41 patients experienced IBDrelated hospitalization. All patients with "treatment failure" underwent treatment modification as the primary reason for treatment failure; within treatment modification, initiation of corticosteroids was the most common intervention. These have been detailed in Supplementary Table 1.

Primary Outcome

Using time-to-event analysis, shorter disease duration (<2 years) was associated with a higher risk of treatment failure in all biologic-treated patients with UC (Fig. 1). On multivariate analysis, adjusting for prior corticosteroid and TNF α antagonist exposure, concomitant immunomodulator use, albumin, disease extent, and body mass index, each 1-year increase in disease duration was associated with a 5% lower risk of treatment failure (adjusted hazard ratio [aHR], 0.95; 95% CI, 0.91–0.99) (Table 2). On categorical analysis, longer disease duration (\geq 2 y) was independently associated with a 23% lower risk of treatment failure (aHR, 0.77; 95% CI, 0.60–0.98). Besides disease duration, low albumin was associated with treatment failure.

Biologic-naïve and biologic-experienced patients

Approximately 29% of biologic-naïve patients (34/117) and 21% of biologic-experienced patients (9/43) had a short disease duration at the time of starting biologic therapy. The negative impact of disease duration on response to biologic therapy was strongest in biologic-naïve patients (Fig. 2A); in patients with prior biologic exposure, disease duration did not significantly impact response to second- or third-line biologic therapy (Fig. 2B). On multivariate analysis, in biologic-naïve patients, longer disease duration (≥ 2 y) was independently associated with a 46% lower risk of treatment failure (aHR, 0.54; 95% CI, 0.32–0.90) (Supplementary Table 2).

Type of biologic agent

On stratifying by type of biologic agent, longer disease duration was associated with lower risk of treatment failure in TNF α antagonist-treated patients (Supplementary Fig. 1A). Disease duration was not associated with treatment response in vedolizumab-treated patients with UC on univariate analysis (Supplementary Fig. 1B); due to the small number of vedolizumab-treated patients, multivariate analysis was not performed.

Secondary Outcomes

Surgery and/or hospitalization

Disease duration was not significantly associated with risk of surgery and/or hospitalization on univariate (Fig. 3) or multivariate analysis (odds ratio [OR] per 1 year of disease duration, 0.99; 95% CI, 0.93–1.07).

Endoscopic remission

On multivariate logistic regression analysis, each 1-year increase in disease duration was associated with 9% higher odds of achieving endoscopic remission (adjusted OR [aOR], 1.09; 95% CI, 1.01–1.18) (Table 3). Among biologic-naïve patients, longer disease duration (≥ 2 years) was associated with a numerically higher odds of achieving endoscopic remission (aOR, 2.59;

No. patients 160 43 117 - Patient characteristics	Baseline Characteristics	All Patients	<2 y	≥2 y	Р
Patient characteristics star. ande s(°) 37.0 (23.0 - 51.0) 40.2 (37.3 - 43.2) 0.33 Sex, males (°) 50 49 50 0.89 Disease duration, median (IQR), y 4.5 (1.0-9.0) N/A N/A - Ollow-up, median (IQR), kg/m' 24.3 (21.4 28.7) 22.4 (64.2-47.7 27.0) 0.70 Smoking staus, No. (%) - 21.0 (14.2-47.7) 25.8 (24.7 27.0) 0.70 Smoking staus, No. (%) - 21.0 (14.2-37.7) 23.1 (10.9) - -'Current smokers 39 (24.4) 16 (37.2) 23.1 (10.7) - -'Never smoker 111 (69.4) 26 (60.5) 85 (72.7) 0.82 Disease characteristics - - - - Disease characteristics 10.0.6 0 (0.0) 1 (0.9) - Disease severity. No. (%) - - - - -tef-sided collis 61 (63.1) 7.1 (63.7) 45 (35.6) - -Mayo score 0 1 (1.0) 0 (0.0) 1 (1.4) 0.39 -	No. patients	160	43	117	-
Age at cohort entry, median (IQR), y 36.0 ($26.0.51.8$) 37.0 ($23.0.51.0$) 40.2 ($27.3.43.2$) 0.33 Sex, males (%)5040500.89Disease duration, median (IQR), y 4.5 ($1.0.9.0$)N/AN/A-Follow-up, median (IQR), kg/m 24.0 ($14.8-34.7$) 22.1 ($14.4-24.7$) 22.8 ($25.6-31.6$) 0.00 BMI, median (IQR), kg/m 24.3 ($21.4-28.7$) 22.6 ($25.6-31.6$) 0.00 0.00 Smoking status, No. (%) 24.3 ($21.4-28.7$) 24.6 ($21.5-28.7$) 22.8 ($25.6-31.6$) 0.00 • Current smokers 8 (5.0) 0.000 8 (6.8) 0.03 • Recent past smoker (<1 y from cohort entry)	Patient characteristics				
Sex, males (%) 50 49 50 0.93 Disease duration, median (IQR), y 4.5 (1.0-9.0) N/A N/A - Follow-up, median (IQR), kym ¹ 2.4.0 (14.4-34.7) 22.1 (14.4-24.7) 25.8 (2.5.6-31.6) -0.01 BMI, median (IQR), kym ¹ 2.4.3 (21.4-28.7) 22.4 (21.5-28.7) 25.8 (24.7-27.0) 0.70 Sexempt stamkers 8 (5.0) 0 (0.0) 8 (6.8) 0.03 Recent past smokers 3.9 (24.4) 16 (37.2) 23 (19.7) - -Former smokers 3.9 (24.4) 16 (37.2) 23 (19.7) - -Never smokers 111 (69.4) 26 (60.5) 85 (72.7) Disease characteristis Disease extent, No. (%) 1 1.06.6) 0 (0.0) 1.09.7 - -1.41-side Colitis 6 1 (38.1) 16 (37.2) 4.5 (38.5) - - -1.41-side Colitis 10.06.0 0 (0.0) 1.0.4 .0.93 - -1.41-side Colitis 10.09.8 3.01.37.9 26 (35.6) - - -1.41-side Colitis	Age at cohort entry, median (IQR), y	36.0 (26.0-51.8)	37.0 (23.0-51.0)	40.2 (37.3-43.2)	0.33
Disease duration, median (IQR), y 4.5 (1.0-9.0) N/A N/A N/A Follow-up, median (IQR), mo 24.0 (14.8-34.7) 22.1 (14.4-24.7) 28.6 (25.6-31.6) <0.01	Sex, males (%)	50	49	50	0.89
$ Follow up, mcdian (1QR), mo 240 (148-34.7) 22.1 (14.4-24.7) 28.6 (23.6-31.6) (0.00) BMI, mcdian (1QR), kg/m² 24.3 (21.4-24.7) 24.6 (21.5-28.7) 25.8 (24.7-27.0) 0.70 Smoking status, No. (%) - Current smokers 8 (5.0) 0 (0.0) 8 (6.8) 0.03 Pocent past smoker (<1 pf fom cohort entry) 2 (1.3) 1 (2.3) 1 (0.9) - Former smoker (3 pf fom cohort entry) 2 (1.3) 1 (2.3) 1 (0.9) - Former smoker (5 pf fom cohort entry) 2 (1.3) 1 (2.3) 1 (0.9) - Sweare smoker (5 pf fom cohort entry) 2 (1.3) 1 (6.37.2) 23 (19.7) - Never smoker (5 pf fom cohort entry) 2 (1.3) 1 (10.9) Disease characteristics Disease characteristics - Factensive colitis 6 1 (38.1) 16 (37.2) 45 (38.5) - Proctitis 0 1 (0.6) 0 (0.0) 1 (0.9) Disease serverity, No. (%) - Prostitis 0 1 (0.6) 0 (0.0) 1 (1.4) 0.93 - Mayo score 1 1 (1.0) 0 (0.0) 1 (1.4) 0.93 - Mayo score 2 27 (36.3) 11 (37.9) 26 (35.6) - Mayo score 2 27 (36.3) 11 (37.9) 26 (35.6) - Mayo score 2 3 44 (22.9) 15 (51.7) 39 (53.4) Protici Ib hospitalization <1 y from cohort entry (%) 44 (27.5) 14 (32.6) 30 (25.6) 0.39 Treat match characteristics TNF\alpha antagonists taken at cohort entry (%) 44 (27.5) 14 (32.6) 30 (25.6) 0.39 Treat matgonists taken at cohort entry, No. (%) - Cortoizumab pegol 1 (0.6) 0 (0.0.0) 1 (0.9) - Vedoizumab 10 (6.3) 2 (4.7) 8 (6.8) - Cortoizumab pegol 1 (0.6) 0 (0.0.0) 1 (0.9) - Vedoizumab pegol 1 (0.6) 0 (0.0.0) 1 (0.9) - Vedoizumab pegol 1 (0.6) 0 (0.0.0) 1 (0.9) - Prior TNF a mtagonist failures - O 117 (73.1) 34 (79.1) 83 (70.9) 0.44 - Cortoizumab pegol 1 (0.6) 0 (0.0.0) 1 (0.9) - Zattioprine (40.67) 1 (6.69.6) 38 (57.6) 0.34 - Cortoizumab pegol 1 (0.6) 0 (0.0.0) 1 (0.9) - For steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%) 83 (51.9) 27 (62.8) 6 (64.7.9) 0.09 - Sortoizumab (1.0, 0.0) 0 (1.0.3) 1 (0.6) 1 (0.0) 1 (0.9)$	Disease duration, median (IQR), y	4.5 (1.0-9.0)	N/A	N/A	-
BMI, median (QR), kg/m² $24.3 (21.4-28.7)$ $24.6 (21.5-28.7)$ $25.8 (24.7-27.0)$ $0.70.$ Smoking status, No. (%)'Current smokers $8 (5.0)$ $0 (0.0)$ $8 (6.8)$ 0.3 -Recent past smoker (<1 y from cohort entry)	Follow-up, median (IQR), mo	24.0 (14.8-34.7)	22.1 (14.4–24.7)	28.6 (25.6-31.6)	< 0.01
Smoking status, No. (%) • Current smokers 8 (5.0) 0 (0.0) 8 (6.8) 0.03 • Recent past smoker (≤1 y from cohort entry) 2 (1.3) 1 (2.3) 1 (0.9) • Former smokers 39 (24.4) 16 (37.2) 23 (19.7) • Never smoker 111 (69.4) 26 (60.5) 85 (72.7) Disease characteristics Procitis 0.6 (3.1) 27 (62.8) 71 (60.7) 0.82 • Left-sided colitis 61 (38.1) 16 (37.2) 45 (38.5) • Procitis 0.10.6) 0 (0.0) 1 (1.4) 0.93 • Disease severity, No. (%) 3 (10.3) 7 (65.6) • Mayo score 2 27 (36.3) 11 (37.9) 26 (35.6) • Thy or mochort entry (%) 44 (27.5) 14 (32.6) 30 (25.6) 0.39 • Treatment characteristics • Otif Ib Dospitalization <1 y from cohort entry (%)	BMI, median (IQR), kg/m ²	24.3 (21.4–28.7)	24.6 (21.5-28.7)	25.8 (24.7-27.0)	0.70
-Current smokers 8 (5.0) 0 (0.0) 8 (6.8) 0.03 -Recent past smoker (<1 y from cohort entry)	Smoking status, No. (%)				
•Recent past smoker (<1 y from cohort entry)2 (1.3)1 (2.3)1 (0.9)•Former smokers39 (24.4)16 (37.2)23 (19.7)•Never smoker111 (69.4)26 (60.5)85 (72.7)Disease characteristics*********************************	•Current smokers	8 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	8 (6.8)	0.03
•Former smokers 39 (24.4) 16 (37.2) 23 (19.7) •Never smoker 111 (69.4) 26 (60.5) 85 (72.7) Disease characteristics Disease characteristics 98 (61.3) 27 (62.8) 71 (60.7) 0.82 -tert-side colitis 61 (38.1) 16 (37.2) 45 (38.5) 106.7) 0.82 •Left-side colitis 1 (0.6) 0 (0.0) 1 (0.9) 10 (9.8) 3 (10.3) 7 (9.6) •Mayo score 0 1 (1.0) 0 (0.0) 1 (1.4) 0.93 0.93 (25.6) 0.39 •Mayo score 3 27 (36.3) 11 (37.9) 26 (35.6) 0.39 17 (30.7) 39 (63.4) •Mayo score 3 54 (52.9) 15 (51.7) 39 (53.4) 10 (7.5) 14 (32.6) 30 (25.6) 0.39 Treatment characteristics TNF a antagonistis take at cohort entry, No. (%) 44 (27.5) 14 (32.6) 23 (19.7) 4 (63.8) 24 (20.1) 0.74 +Adalinumab 10 (6.3) 24 (4.7) 8 (68.0) 10 (7.1) 34 (79.1) 38 (70.9) 0.64 - - -	•Recent past smoker (<1 y from cohort entry)	2 (1.3)	1 (2.3)	1 (0.9)	
•Never smoker111 (69.4)26 (60.5)85 (72.7)Disease characteristicsDisease characteristicsDisease characteristics•Pactensive colitis98 (61.3)27 (62.8)71 (60.7)0.82•Inferinder Colitis61 (38.1)16 (37.2)45 (38.5)•Proctitis61 (36.1)16 (37.2)45 (38.5)•Proctitis10 (0.6)0 (0.0)1 (0.9)Disease severity, No. (%)11 (10.9)0 (0.0)1 (1.4)0.93•Mayo score 01 (10.9)3 (10.3)7 (9.6)••Mayo score 227 (36.3)11 (37.9)26 (35.6)••Mayo score 354 (52.9)15 (51.7)39 (53.4)•Prior IBD hospitalization <1 y from cohort entry (%)	•Former smokers	39 (24.4)	16 (37.2)	23 (19.7)	
Disease characteristics Disease extent, No. (%) Extensive colitis $98 (61.3) 27 (62.8) 71 (60.7) 0.82$ Left-sided colitis $61 (38.1) 16 (37.2) 45 (38.5)$ Proctitis $10.60 00.0 10.9$ Disease severity. No. (%) Mayo score $0 11 (1.0) 0 (0.0) 11 (1.4) 0.93$ Mayo score $2 27 (36.3) 11 (37.9) 26 (35.6)$ Mayo score $2 27 (36.3) 11 (37.9) 26 (35.6)$ Mayo score $3 54 (52.9) 15 (51.7) 39 (53.4)$ Prior IBD hospitalization <1 y from cohort entry (%) 44 (27.5) 14 (32.6) 30 (25.6) 0.39 Treatment characteristics TNF α antagonists taken at cohort entry, No. (%) 4.061 20 (20.8) 27 (62.8) 61 (52.1) 0.74 4.04alimumab $88 (55.0)$ 27 (62.8) 61 (52.1) 0.74 4.04alimumab 10 (6.3) 2 (4.7) 8 (6.8) Colinumab 10 (6.3) 2 (4.7) 8 (6.8) Colinumab 20 (18.8) 61 (3.9) 24 (20.5) No. prior TNF α antagonist failures 10 117 (73.1) 34 (79.1) 83 (70.9) 0.64 1 12 34 (21.3) 81 (8.6) 27 (60.) 10.6 0 (0.0) 1 (0.9) Frior steroius ext cohort entry, No. (%) 130 (81.3) 41 (95.4) 89 (76.1) <0.01 Steroiu use at cohort entry, No. (%) 130 (81.3) 41 (95.4) 89 (76.1) <0.01 Steroiu use at cohort entry, No. (%) 83 (51.9) 27 (62.8) 56 (47.9) 0.09 Prior use or immunomodulators, No. (%) 83 (51.9) 27 (62.8) 56 (47.9) 0.00 Prior use or immunomodulators, No. (%) 83 (51.9) 27 (62.8) 56 (47.9) 0.00 Prior use or immunomodulators, No. (%) 83 (51.9) 27 (62.8) 56 (47.9) 0.00 Prior use or immunomodulator, No. (%) 83 (51.9) 27 (62.8) 56 (47.9) 0.00 Prior use or immunomodulators, No. (%) 83 (51.9) 27 (62.8) 56 (47.9) 0.00 Prior use or immunomodulators, No. (%) 83 (51.9) 27 (62.8) 56 (47.9) 0.00 Prior use or immunomodulators, No. (%) 83 (51.9) 27 (62.8) 50 (0.0130) (6.9). CRP, median (10R), mg/dL 0.03 (0.10-1.40) 0.50 (0.15-1.95) 0.30 (0.10-1.30) 0.18 Albumin, median (10R), mg/dL 10.30 (30.30 4.00 (3.70-4.30) 4.10 (3.80-4.30) 0.33 Hgb, men (SD), g/dL 12.2 (2.1) 11.8 (1.01-2.80) 150 (60-2.80) 0.58	•Never smoker	111 (69.4)	26 (60.5)	85 (72.7)	
Disease extent, No. (%)	Disease characteristics				
•Extensive colitis98 (61.3)27 (62.8)71 (60.7)0.82•I-eff-sided colitis61 (38.1)16 (57.2)45 (38.5)•Proctitis1 (0.6)0 (0.0)1 (0.9)Disease severity, No. (%)*•Mayo score 01 (1.0)0 (0.0)1 (1.4)•Mayo score 227 (36.3)11 (37.9)26 (35.6)•Mayo score 354 (52.9)15 (51.7)39 (53.4)Prior IBD hospitalization <1 y from cohort entry (%)	Disease extent, No. (%)				
Left-sided colitis $61 (38.1)$ $16 (37.2)$ $45 (38.5)$ -Procitis $1 (0.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ Disease severity, No. (%) $1 (1.0)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (1.4)$ 0.93 -Mayo score 0 $1 (0.9, 8)$ $3 (10.3)$ $7 (9.6)$ -Mayo score 1 $10 (9.8)$ $3 (10.3)$ $7 (9.6)$ -Mayo score 3 $54 (52.9)$ $15 (51.7)$ $39 (53.6)$ -Mayo score 3 $54 (52.9)$ $15 (51.7)$ $39 (53.6)$ -Mayo score 3 $54 (52.9)$ $14 (32.6)$ $30 (25.6)$ 0.39 Treatment characteristics $7 (6.6)$ $27 (62.8)$ $61 (52.1)$ 0.74 -Infiximab $88 (55.0)$ $27 (62.8)$ $61 (52.1)$ 0.74 -Adalinumab $31 (19.4)$ $8 (18.6)$ $22 (19.7)$ -Golimumab $10 (6.3)$ $24 (1.7)$ $8 (6.8)$ -Certolizumab pegol $1 (0.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ -Vedolizumab $30 (18.8)$ $6 (13.9)$ $24 (20.5)$ No. prior TNF\alpha antagonist failures $10 (6.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ -V $10 (6.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ $10 (6.1)$ -V $34 (21.3)$ $8 (18.6)$ $26 (22.2)$ $22 (2.5)$ -2 $8 (5.0)$ $1 (2.3)$ $7 (6.0)$ -3 $1 (0.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ -10 (0.6) $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ $10 (5.0)$ -2 $8 (5.0)$ $1 (2.3)$ $7 (6.0)$ -2 $8 (5.0)$ $1 (2.3)$ $7 (6.0)$ -3 $1 (0.6)$ <td< td=""><td>•Extensive colitis</td><td>98 (61.3)</td><td>27 (62.8)</td><td>71 (60.7)</td><td>0.82</td></td<>	•Extensive colitis	98 (61.3)	27 (62.8)	71 (60.7)	0.82
•Proctitis1 (0.6)0 (0.0)1 (0.9)Discase severity, No. (%)•Mayo score 01 (1.0)0 (0.0)1 (1.4)0.93•Mayo score 110 (9.8)3 (10.3)7 (9.6)•Mayo score 227 (36.3)11 (37.9)26 (35.6)•Mayo score 354 (52.9)15 (51.7)39 (53.4)Prior IBD hospitalization <1 y from cohort entry (%)	•Left-sided colitis	61 (38.1)	16 (37.2)	45 (38.5)	
Disease severity, No. (%)	•Proctitis	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	
• Mayo score 01 (1.0)0 (0.0)1 (1.4)0.93• Mayo score 110 (9.8)3 (10.3)7 (9.6)• Mayo score 227 (36.3)11 (37.9)26 (35.6)• Mayo score 354 (52.9)15 (51.7)39 (53.4)Prior IBD hospitalization <1 y from cohort entry (%)	Disease severity, No. (%)				
• Mayo score 110 (9.8)3 (10.3)7 (9.6)• Mayo score 227 (36.3)11 (37.9)26 (35.6)• Mayo score 354 (52.9)15 (51.7)39 (53.4)Prior IBD hospitalization <1 y from cohort entry (%)	•Mayo score 0	1 (1.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (1.4)	0.93
• Mayo score 227 (36.3)11 (37.9)26 (35.6)• Mayo score 354 (52.9)15 (51.7)39 (53.4)Prior IBD hospitalization <1 y from cohort entry (%)	•Mayo score 1	10 (9.8)	3 (10.3)	7 (9.6)	
• Mayo score 3 $54 (52.9)$ $15 (51.7)$ $39 (53.4)$ Prior IBD hospitalization <1 y from cohort entry (%)	•Mayo score 2	27 (36.3)	11 (37.9)	26 (35.6)	
Prior IBD hospitalization <1 y from cohort entry (%)44 (27.5)14 (32.6)30 (25.6)0.39Treatment characteristicsTNFa antagonists taken at cohort entry, No. (%)•Infliximab88 (55.0)27 (62.8)61 (52.1)0.74•Adalimumab31 (19.4)8 (18.6)23 (19.7)•Golimumab10 (6.3)2 (4.7)8 (6.8)•Certolizumab pegol1 (0.6)0 (0.0)1 (0.9)•Vedolizumab30 (18.8)6 (13.9)24 (20.5)No. prior TNFa antagonist failures117 (73.1)34 (79.1)83 (70.9)0.64•134 (21.3)8 (18.6)26 (22.2)•28 (5.0)1 (2.3)7 (6.0)•310.660 (0.0)1 (0.9)•10 est cohort entry, No. (%)130 (81.3)41 (95.4)89 (76.1)<0.01	•Mayo score 3	54 (52.9)	15 (51.7)	39 (53.4)	
Treatment characteristics TNFα antagonists taken at cohort entry, No. (%) I-Infliximab 88 (55.0) 27 (62.8) 61 (52.1) 0.74 Adalimumab 31 (19.4) 8 (18.6) 23 (19.7) Golimumab 10 (6.3) 2 (4.7) 8 (6.8) • Certolizumab pegol 1 (0.6) 0 (0.0) 1 (0.9) • Vedolizumab 30 (18.8) 6 (13.9) 24 (20.5) No. prior TNFα antagonist failures - - - • 0 117 (73.1) 34 (79.1) 83 (70.9) 0.64 • 1 34 (21.3) 8 (18.6) 26 (22.2) • 2 8 (5.0) 1 (2.3) 7 (60.0) • 3 1 (0.6) 0 (0.0) 1 (0.9) Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	Prior IBD hospitalization <1 y from cohort entry (%)	44 (27.5)	14 (32.6)	30 (25.6)	0.39
TNFα antagonists taken at cohort entry, No. (%)•Infliximab88 (55.0)27 (62.8)61 (52.1)0.74•Adalimumab31 (19.4)8 (18.6)23 (19.7)•Golimumab10 (6.3)2 (4.7)8 (6.8)•Certolizumab pegol1 (0.6)0 (0.0)1 (0.9)•Vedolizumab30 (18.8)6 (13.9)24 (20.5)No. prior TNFα antagonist failures117 (73.1)34 (79.1)83 (70.9)0.64•134 (21.3)8 (18.6)26 (22.2)•28 (5.0)1 (2.3)7 (6.0)•31 (0.6)0 (0.0)1 (0.9)Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	Treatment characteristics				
• Inflixinab $88 (55.0)$ $27 (62.8)$ $61 (52.1)$ 0.74 • Adalimumab $31 (19.4)$ $8 (18.6)$ $23 (19.7)$ • Golimumab $10 (6.3)$ $2 (4.7)$ $8 (6.8)$ • Certolizumab pegol $1 (0.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ • Vedolizumab $30 (18.8)$ $6 (13.9)$ $24 (20.5)$ No. prior TNF α antagonist failures $1117 (73.1)$ $34 (79.1)$ $83 (70.9)$ 0.64 • 0 $117 (73.1)$ $34 (79.1)$ $83 (70.9)$ 0.64 • 1 $34 (21.3)$ $8 (18.6)$ $26 (22.2)$ • 2 $8 (5.0)$ $1 (2.3)$ $7 (6.0)$ • 3 $1 (0.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	TNF α antagonists taken at cohort entry, No. (%)				
\cdot Adalimumab $31 (19.4)$ $8 (18.6)$ $23 (19.7)$ \cdot Golimumab $10 (6.3)$ $2 (4.7)$ $8 (6.8)$ \cdot Certolizumab pegol $1 (0.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ \cdot Vedolizumab $30 (18.8)$ $6 (13.9)$ $24 (20.5)$ No. prior TNF α antagonist failures \cdot \cdot \cdot $\cdot 0$ $117 (73.1)$ $34 (79.1)$ $83 (70.9)$ 0.64 $\cdot 1$ $34 (21.3)$ $8 (18.6)$ $26 (22.2)$ $\cdot 2$ $8 (5.0)$ $1 (2.3)$ $7 (6.0)$ $\cdot 3$ $1 (0.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	•Infliximab	88 (55.0)	27 (62.8)	61 (52.1)	0.74
•Golimunab10 (6.3)2 (4.7)8 (6.8)•Certolizumab pegol1 (0.6)0 (0.0)1 (0.9)•Vedolizumab30 (18.8)6 (13.9)24 (20.5)No. prior TNF α antagonist failures \cdot \cdot \cdot •0117 (73.1)34 (79.1)83 (70.9)0.64•134 (21.3)8 (18.6)26 (22.2)•28 (5.0)1 (2.3)7 (6.0)•31 (0.6)0 (0.0)1 (0.9)Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	•Adalimumab	31 (19.4)	8 (18.6)	23 (19.7)	
• Certolizumab pegol1 (0.6)0 (0.0)1 (0.9)• Vedolizumab30 (18.8)6 (13.9)24 (20.5)No. prior TNFα antagonist failures \cdot \cdot \cdot •0117 (73.1)34 (79.1)83 (70.9)0.64•134 (21.3)8 (18.6)26 (22.2)•28 (5.0)1 (2.3)7 (6.0)•31 (0.6)0 (0.0)1 (0.9)Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	•Golimumab	10 (6.3)	2 (4.7)	8 (6.8)	
• Vedolizumab $30 (18.8)$ $6 (13.9)$ $24 (20.5)$ No. prior TNFα antagonist failures $117 (73.1)$ $34 (79.1)$ $83 (70.9)$ 0.64 •1 $34 (21.3)$ $8 (18.6)$ $26 (22.2)$ •2 $8 (5.0)$ $1 (2.3)$ $7 (6.0)$ •3 $1 (0.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	•Certolizumab pegol	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	
No. prior TNFα antagonist failures•0 $117 (73.1)$ $34 (79.1)$ $83 (70.9)$ 0.64 •1 $34 (21.3)$ $8 (18.6)$ $26 (22.2)$ •2 $8 (5.0)$ $1 (2.3)$ $7 (6.0)$ •3 $1 (0.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	•Vedolizumab	30 (18.8)	6 (13.9)	24 (20.5)	
$\cdot 0$ $117 (73.1)$ $34 (79.1)$ $83 (70.9)$ 0.64 $\cdot 1$ $34 (21.3)$ $8 (18.6)$ $26 (22.2)$ $\cdot 2$ $8 (5.0)$ $1 (2.3)$ $7 (6.0)$ $\cdot 3$ $1 (0.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	No. prior TNFα antagonist failures				
$\cdot 1$ $34 (21.3)$ $8 (18.6)$ $26 (22.2)$ $\cdot 2$ $8 (5.0)$ $1 (2.3)$ $7 (6.0)$ $\cdot 3$ $1 (0.6)$ $0 (0.0)$ $1 (0.9)$ Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	•0	117 (73.1)	34 (79.1)	83 (70.9)	0.64
$\cdot 2$ 8 (5.0)1 (2.3)7 (6.0) $\cdot 3$ 1 (0.6)0 (0.0)1 (0.9)Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	•]	34 (21.3)	8 (18.6)	26 (22.2)	
$\cdot 3$ 1 (0.6)0 (0.0)1 (0.9)Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	•2	8 (5.0)	1 (2.3)	7 (6.0)	
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	•3	1 (0.6)	0 (0.0)	1 (0.9)	
Steroid use at cohort entry, No. (%) 83 (51.9) 27 (62.8) 56 (47.9) 0.09 Prior use of immunomodulators, No. (%) 85 (53.1) 19 (44.2) 66 (56.4) 0.17 Immunomodulator use at cohort entry, No. (%) 54 (60.7) 16 (69.6) 38 (57.6) 0.34 •Azathioprine 26 (29.2) 4 (17.4) 22 (33.3) - •Methotrexate 9 (10.1) 3 (13.0) 6 (9.1) CRP, median (IQR), mg/dL 0.30 (0.10–1.40) 0.50 (0.15–1.95) 0.30 (0.10–1.30) 0.18 Albumin, median (IQR), g/dL 4.10 (3.75–4.30) 4.00 (3.70–4.30) 4.10 (3.80–4.30) 0.33 Hgb, mean (SD), g/dL 12.3 (2.1) 11.8 (1.8) 12.4 (2.2) 0.14 ESR, median (IQR), mm/h 15.0 (6.3–28.0) 18.0 (11.0–28.0) 15.0 (6.0–28.0) 0.58	Prior steroid use <1 y from cohort entry, No. (%)	130 (81.3)	41 (95.4)	89 (76.1)	< 0.01
Prior use of immunomodulators, No. (%) 85 (53.1) 19 (44.2) 66 (56.4) 0.17 Immunomodulator use at cohort entry, No. (%) - - - - - - - 0.17 •Azathioprine 54 (60.7) 16 (69.6) 38 (57.6) 0.34 - - - 0.34 - - - 0.34 - - 0.34 - - - 0.34 - - 0.34 - - 0.34 - - 0.34 - - 0.34 - - 0.34 - - 0.34 - - 0.34 - 0.34 - 0.34 0.34 - 0.30 0.17 1 0.34 - 0.34 - 0.34 - 0.34 - 0.34 - 0.34 - 0.30 0.17 1 0.30 0.17 1 0.30 0.17 0.31 0.31 0.31 0.31 0.30 0.10 1.10 0.30 0.10 1.10 0.30 0.10 1.10 0.30 0.10 1.10	Steroid use at cohort entry, No. (%)	83 (51.9)	27 (62.8)	56 (47.9)	0.09
Immunomodulator use at cohort entry, No. (%) •Azathioprine 54 (60.7) 16 (69.6) 38 (57.6) 0.34 •6-mercaptopurine 26 (29.2) 4 (17.4) 22 (33.3) •Methotrexate 9 (10.1) 3 (13.0) 6 (9.1) CRP, median (IQR), mg/dL 0.30 (0.10–1.40) 0.50 (0.15–1.95) 0.30 (0.10–1.30) 0.18 Albumin, median (IQR), g/dL 4.10 (3.75–4.30) 4.00 (3.70–4.30) 4.10 (3.80–4.30) 0.33 Hgb, mean (SD), g/dL 12.3 (2.1) 11.8 (1.8) 12.4 (2.2) 0.14 ESR, median (IQR), mm/h 15.0 (6.3–28.0) 18.0 (11.0–28.0) 15.0 (6.0–28.0) 0.58	Prior use of immunomodulators, No. (%)	85 (53.1)	19 (44.2)	66 (56.4)	0.17
•Azathioprine 54 (60.7) 16 (69.6) 38 (57.6) 0.34 •6-mercaptopurine 26 (29.2) 4 (17.4) 22 (33.3) •Methotrexate 9 (10.1) 3 (13.0) 6 (9.1) CRP, median (IQR), mg/dL 0.30 (0.10–1.40) 0.50 (0.15–1.95) 0.30 (0.10–1.30) 0.18 Albumin, median (IQR), g/dL 4.10 (3.75–4.30) 4.00 (3.70–4.30) 4.10 (3.80–4.30) 0.33 Hgb, mean (SD), g/dL 12.3 (2.1) 11.8 (1.8) 12.4 (2.2) 0.14 ESR, median (IQR), mm/h 15.0 (6.3–28.0) 18.0 (11.0–28.0) 15.0 (6.0–28.0) 0.58	Immunomodulator use at cohort entry, No. (%)				
•6-mercaptopurine 26 (29.2) 4 (17.4) 22 (33.3) •Methotrexate 9 (10.1) 3 (13.0) 6 (9.1) CRP, median (IQR), mg/dL 0.30 (0.10–1.40) 0.50 (0.15–1.95) 0.30 (0.10–1.30) 0.18 Albumin, median (IQR), g/dL 4.10 (3.75–4.30) 4.00 (3.70–4.30) 4.10 (3.80–4.30) 0.33 Hgb, mean (SD), g/dL 12.3 (2.1) 11.8 (1.8) 12.4 (2.2) 0.14 ESR, median (IQR), mm/h 15.0 (6.3–28.0) 18.0 (11.0–28.0) 15.0 (6.0–28.0) 0.58	•Azathioprine	54 (60.7)	16 (69.6)	38 (57.6)	0.34
•Methotrexate 9 (10.1) 3 (13.0) 6 (9.1) CRP, median (IQR), mg/dL 0.30 (0.10–1.40) 0.50 (0.15–1.95) 0.30 (0.10–1.30) 0.18 Albumin, median (IQR), g/dL 4.10 (3.75–4.30) 4.00 (3.70–4.30) 4.10 (3.80–4.30) 0.33 Hgb, mean (SD), g/dL 12.3 (2.1) 11.8 (1.8) 12.4 (2.2) 0.14 ESR, median (IQR), mm/h 15.0 (6.3–28.0) 18.0 (11.0–28.0) 15.0 (6.0–28.0) 0.58	•6-mercaptopurine	26 (29.2)	4 (17.4)	22 (33.3)	
CRP, median (IQR), mg/dL0.30 (0.10–1.40)0.50 (0.15–1.95)0.30 (0.10–1.30)0.18Albumin, median (IQR), g/dL4.10 (3.75–4.30)4.00 (3.70–4.30)4.10 (3.80–4.30)0.33Hgb, mean (SD), g/dL12.3 (2.1)11.8 (1.8)12.4 (2.2)0.14ESR, median (IQR), mm/h15.0 (6.3–28.0)18.0 (11.0–28.0)15.0 (6.0–28.0)0.58	•Methotrexate	9 (10.1)	3 (13.0)	6 (9.1)	
Albumin, median (IQR), g/dL4.10 (3.75-4.30)4.00 (3.70-4.30)4.10 (3.80-4.30)0.33Hgb, mean (SD), g/dL12.3 (2.1)11.8 (1.8)12.4 (2.2)0.14ESR, median (IQR), mm/h15.0 (6.3-28.0)18.0 (11.0-28.0)15.0 (6.0-28.0)0.58	CRP, median (IQR), mg/dL	0.30 (0.10-1.40)	0.50 (0.15–1.95)	0.30 (0.10-1.30)	0.18
Hgb, mean (SD), g/dL12.3 (2.1)11.8 (1.8)12.4 (2.2)0.14ESR, median (IQR), mm/h15.0 (6.3–28.0)18.0 (11.0–28.0)15.0 (6.0–28.0)0.58	Albumin, median (IQR), g/dL	4.10 (3.75-4.30)	4.00 (3.70-4.30)	4.10 (3.80-4.30)	0.33
ESR, median (IQR), mm/h 15.0 (6.3–28.0) 18.0 (11.0–28.0) 15.0 (6.0–28.0) 0.58	Hgb, mean (SD), g/dL	12.3 (2.1)	11.8 (1.8)	12.4 (2.2)	0.14
	ESR, median (IQR), mm/h	15.0 (6.3–28.0)	18.0 (11.0-28.0)	15.0 (6.0-28.0)	0.58

TABLE 1. Baseline Characteristics of Biologic-Treated Patients With Ulcerative Colitis Included in the Cohort by Disease Duration

95% CI, 0.90–7.44), though this was not statistically significant. In contrast, among biologic-experienced patients, longer disease duration was not associated with higher odds of achieving endoscopic remission (aOR, 0.87; 95% CI, 0.08–9.64).

DISCUSSION

In this retrospective study on the impact of disease duration on treatment response and outcomes in 160 biologictreated patients with UC, we observed that short disease duration is independently associated with an increased risk of treatment failure and lower likelihood of achieving endoscopic remission. Short disease duration at the time of biologic initiation was not associated with increased risk of IBD-related surgery and/or hospitalization. When stratified by biologicnaïve vs biologic-experienced patients, short disease duration was associated with increased risk of treatment failure only in biologic-naïve patients, not in biologic-experienced patients. Our findings suggest that early need for biologic therapy may



FIGURE 1. Association between disease duration and risk of treatment failure in biologic-treated patients with UC.

be an independent negative prognostic factor in patients with UC, regardless of inflammatory burden, disease extent, or albumin. These patients may require closer proactive monitoring and aggressive treatment to decrease risk of treatment failure.

Several patient-related (high body mass index), diseaserelated (severe endoscopic activity, more extensive disease, elevated inflammatory biomarkers, low albumin), and treatment-related characteristics (low trough concentration, antidrug antibodies, lack of concomitant immunomodulators) have been associated with inferior response to biologic therapy in patients with UC.¹² However, the impact of disease duration at the time of starting biologic therapy has not been well studied. In post hoc analysis of ULTRA clinical trials of adalimumab for moderately to severely active UC, Sandborn and colleagues observed no difference in the risk of achieving clinical remission in patients with short (≤ 2 years) vs long (>2 years) disease duration¹³; subsequent analysis showed a lower risk of colectomy with longer disease duration in adalimumab-treated patients with UC.7 In a retrospective cohort study of 190 infliximab-treated patients with corticosteroid-dependent or -refractory patients, Murthy and colleagues observed a lower risk of infliximab failure and colectomy with longer disease duration; however, 35% of their cohort included patients with corticosteroid-refractory, hospitalized acute severe UC, patients who are intrinsically at significantly higher risk of colectomy.¹¹ In contrast, Ma and colleagues observed that early use of TNFa antagonists was not associated with increased risk of surgery, hospitalization, or secondary loss of response, despite these patients having more severe endoscopic disease at baseline.9 Although our study was not adequately powered to evaluate the association between disease duration and response to vedolizumab, similar results have been reported for vedolizumab in patients with UC. In the multicenter VICTORY consortium, Faleck and colleagues observed that disease duration was not associated with risk of achieving clinical remission, corticosteroid-free remission, or mucosal healing.8 In a subsequent validated prediction model for response to vedolizumab in patients with moderately to severely active UC, using data from the phase III GEMINI 1 clinical trial, Dulai and colleagues observed that disease duration ≥ 2 years was

TABLE 2. Multivariate Cox Proportional Hazard Analysis Examining Factors Associated With Treatment Failure in Biologic-Treated Patients With Ulcerative Colitis

Variables	Hazard Ratio	95% CI	Р
Prior TNFα antagonist exposure (yes vs no)	0.75	0.46-1.23	0.25
Disease duration (per 1 y)	0.95	0.91-0.99	0.016
Body mass index (per 1-kg/m ² increase)	1.04	1.00-1.08	0.047
Concomitant immunomodulators (yes vs no)	0.65	0.41-1.02	0.063
Albumin (per 1 g/dL)	0.66	0.45–0.99	0.045
Prior prednisone use (yes vs no)	1.85	0.93–3.67	0.078





FIGURE 2. Association between disease duration and risk of treatment failure in (A) biologic-naïve and (B) biologic-experienced patients with UC.

independently predictive of achieving corticosteroid-free clinical remission by week 26.¹⁴

Caution needs to be exercised in interpreting these findings. Due to the noninterventional nature of these studies, with lack of randomization, our study does not address or interpret the role of "step-up" vs "top-down" therapy for UC. A blinded randomized trial, stratifying patients with moderately to severely active UC based on disease duration (short vs long disease duration) to either "step-up" or "top-down" therapy will address that question. Rather, our findings suggest that patients whose disease warrants initiation of biologic agents within 2 years of UC diagnosis may have higher rates of treatment failure, perhaps related to more severe disease not being adequately represented using conventional measures of disease severity. Biologically, patients with severe disease activity shortly after disease onset may have different inflammatory pathways with more active memory adaptive cells without any fatiguing of the immune response¹⁵; in effect, short disease duration may



1434



FIGURE 3. Association between disease duration and risk of UC-related surgery or hospitalization in biologic-treated patients with UC.

be a separate "clinical biomarker" of currently unmeasured biological factors.

Our study is one of the largest studies evaluating the impact of disease duration on treatment response to biologics in patients with UC with systematic data collection and evaluation of patient-important outcomes. By limiting analyses to new users of biologics followed at our center, excluding patients with acute severe UC, and by adjusting for key confounders, we were able to mitigate the potential limitations of a tertiary referral center retrospective cohort study. However, our study has some limitations that merit attention. First, though we adjusted for typical clinical and biochemical markers of disease severity, we cannot exclude the possibility of unmeasured confounders. In fact, we believe that our findings likely represent confounding by disease severity, wherein biologic agents are started early in the disease course only in a subset of patients at high risk of adverse outcomes. Second, findings on subgroup analysis, particularly on the impact of disease duration on response to vedolizumab, should be interpreted with caution due to the small number of patients. As noted above, the VICTORY consortium, which includes vedolizumab-treated patients from our center, has already addressed this association comprehensively. Due to the recency of its approval, we could not ascertain the impact of disease duration on response to tofacitinib, and this will be addressed in an upcoming analysis of a multisite consortium of new users of tofacitinib in UC. Third, we were unable to evaluate the impact of obesity on achieving clinical remission or response based on validated disease activity indices in this retrospective study. Instead we relied on pragmatic clinically relevant outcomes including surgery, hospitalization, or need for treatment modification, which may be subject to provider preferences. The secondary outcomes including IBD-related surgery and/or hospitalization and achieving endoscopic

Remission in biologic-meated ratients with occerative contis					
Variables	Odds Ratio	95% CI	Р		
Prior TNF α antagonist exposure (yes vs no)	0.83	0.32–2.14	0.71		
Body mass index (per 1-kg/m ² increase)	0.93	0.87 - 1.00	0.056		
Age (per 1 y)	1.02	0.99-1.05	0.12		
Albumin (per 1 g/dL)	2.26	0.91-5.59	0.079		
Disease duration (per 1 y)	1.09	1.01-1.18	0.036		

TABLE 3. Multivariate Logistic Regression Analysis Examining Factors Associated With Achieving Endoscopic Remission in Biologic-Treated Patients With Ulcerative Colitis

remission, however, are more robust with limited risk of bias. All endoscopies at our center are performed by providers with a clinical and research focus on IBD, which decreases risk of misinterpretation.

Our findings have important clinical implications. In clinical practice, physicians may consider aggressive treatment and close proactive monitoring in patients with UC whose disease warrants early initiation of biologic agents. Some potential changes include potentially considering use of biologic agents in combination with immunomodulators and having a low threshold for monitoring postinduction biologic trough concentration. Ideally, to address the role of "step-up" vs "top-down" therapy for UC, a clinical trial with stratified randomization of patients with short and long disease duration, at similar levels of disease activity, to either "step-up" vs "topdown" therapy is warranted.

In conclusion, in a cohort of patients with UC starting a biologic agent, we observed that short disease duration is independently associated with increased risk of treatment failure and a lower risk of achieving endoscopic remission, particularly in biologic-naïve patients. This suggests that early need for biologic agents in routine practice in patients with UC may be a prognostic marker for adverse outcomes that warrants early recognition and an aggressive treatment approach.

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA

Supplementary data are available at *Inflammatory Bowel Diseases* online.

REFERENCES

- 1. Torres J, Mehandru S, Colombel JF, et al. Crohn's disease. *Lancet.* 2017;389:1741–1755.
- Ungaro R, Mehandru S, Allen PB, et al. Ulcerative colitis. *Lancet.* 2017;389:1756–1770.
- Danese S, Fiorino G, Peyrin-Biroulet L. Early intervention in Crohn's disease: towards disease modification trials. *Gut.* 2017;66:2179–2187.
- Peyrin-Biroulet L, Sandborn W, Sands BE, et al. Selecting Therapeutic Targets in Inflammatory Bowel Disease (STRIDE): determining therapeutic goals for treatto-target. Am J Gastroenterol. 2015;110:1324–1338.
- Eriksson C, Cao Y, Rundquist S, et al. Changes in medical management and colectomy rates: a population-based cohort study on the epidemiology and natural history of ulcerative colitis in Örebro, Sweden, 1963-2010. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther.* 2017;46:748–757.
- Parragi L, Fournier N, Zeitz J, et al; Swiss IBD Cohort Study Group. Colectomy rates in ulcerative colitis are low and decreasing: 10-year follow-up data from the Swiss IBD Cohort Study. J Crohns Colitis. 2018;12:811–818.
- Feagan BG, Sandborn WJ, Lazar A, et al. Adalimumab therapy is associated with reduced risk of hospitalization in patients with ulcerative colitis. *Gastroenterology*. 2014;146:110–118.e3.
- Faleck DM, Winters A, Chablaney S, et al. Shorter disease duration is associated with higher rates of response to vedolizumab in patients with Crohn's disease but not ulcerative colitis. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2019;17(12):2497–2505.e1.
- Ma C, Beilman CL, Huang VW, et al. Similar clinical and surgical outcomes achieved with early compared to late anti-TNF induction in mild-to-moderate ulcerative colitis: a retrospective cohort study. *Can J Gastroenterol Hepatol.* 2016;2016:2079582.
- Mir SA, Nagy-Szakal D, Smith EO, et al. Duration of disease may predict response to infliximab in pediatric ulcerative colitis. J Clin Gastroenterol. 2014;48:248–252.
- Murthy SK, Greenberg GR, Croitoru K, et al. Extent of early clinical response to infliximab predicts long-term treatment success in active ulcerative colitis. *Inflamm Bowel Dis.* 2015;21:2090–2096.
- Barré A, Colombel JF, Ungaro R. Review article: predictors of response to vedolizumab and ustekinumab in inflammatory bowel disease. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther.* 2018;47:896–905.
- Sandborn WJ, van Assche G, Reinisch W, et al. Adalimumab induces and maintains clinical remission in patients with moderate-to-severe ulcerative colitis. *Gastroenterology*. 2012;142:257–265.e1.
- Dulai PS, Singh S, Vande Casteele N, et al. Development and validation of a clinical scoring tool for predicting treatment outcomes with vedolizumab in patients with ulcerative colitis. *Gastroenterology*. 2019;156:S67.
- Kugathasan S, Saubermann LJ, Smith L, et al. Mucosal T-cell immunoregulation varies in early and late inflammatory bowel disease. *Gut.* 2007;56:1696–1705.