Attachment I:

EULAR recommendations (2010) for the management of RA; Differences between participating

rheumatologists and rheumatologists that stopped or were lost to follow-up during the study.

1110	imatologists and medinatologists that stopped		pants (n=72)		s/LF* (n=50)
		•	(Some)times	Always	· · · · · ·
		Always	/Never	Always	(Some)times /Never
A ro	you aware of the recommendations? N (0/)	72 (100)	/INEVEL	50 (100)	/INEVEL
	you aware of the recommendations? N (%)	58 (81)	14 (10)		12 (24)
1.	you following the recommendations? N (%) Treatment with synthetic DMARDs should be started as	` ′	14 (19)	38 (76)	` '
1.	soon as the diagnosis of RA is made	70 (99)	1 (1)	48 (96)	2 (4)
2.	Treatment should be aimed at reaching a target of	64 (90)	7 (10)	47 (94)	3 (6)
	remission or low disease activity as soon as possible in	0 1 (2 0)	, ()	(> 1)	
	every patient; as long as the target has not been reached,				
	treatment should be adjusted by frequent (every 1–3 months) and strict monitoring.				
3.	MTX should be part of the first treatment strategy in	69 (97)	2 (3)	47 (94)	3 (6)
	patients with active RA	7 0 (0 0)		10 (0.1)	
4.	When MTX contraindications (or intolerance) are present, the following DMARDs should be considered as	59 (83)	12 (17)	42 (84)	8 (16)
	part of the (first) treatment strategy: leflunomide, SSZ				
	or injectable gold.				
5.	In DMARD naïve patients, irrespective of the addition of	56 (79)	15 (21)	41 (82)	9 (18)
	GCs, synthetic DMARD monotherapy rather than combination therapy of synthetic DMARDs may be				
	applied.				
6.	GCs added at low to moderately high doses to synthetic	64 (90)	7 (10)	43 (86)	6 (14)
	DMARD monotherapy (or combinations of synthetic DMARDs) provide benefit as initial short-term				
	treatment, but should be tapered as rapidly as clinically				
	feasible.				
7.	If the treatment target is not achieved with the first	60 (85)	11 (15)	39 (78)	11 (22)
	DMARD strategy, addition of a biological DMARD should be considered when poor prognostic factors are				
	present; in the absence of poor prognostic factors,				
	switching to another synthetic DMARD strategy should				
8.	be considered In patients responding insufficiently to MTX and/or	61 (86)	10 (14)	41 (82)	9 (18)
	other synthetic DMARDs with or without GCs,	01 (00)	10 (14)	41 (62)) (10)
	biological DMARDs should be started; current practice				
	would be to start a TNF inhibitor (adalimumab, certolizumab, etanercept, golimumab, infliximab) which				
	should be combined with MTX				
9.	Patients with RA for whom a first TNF inhibitor has	67 (94)	4 (6)	45 (90)	5 (10)
	failed, should receive another TNF inhibitor, abatacept, rituximab or tocilizumab				
10.	In cases of refractory severe RA or contraindications to	49 (69)	22 (31)	32 (64)	18 (36)
	biological agents or the previously mentioned synthetic	., (4,)	(==)	(- 1)	()
	DMARDs, the following synthetic DMARDs might be also considered, as monotherapy or in combination with				
	some of the above: azathioprine, ciclosporin A (or				
	exceptionally, cyclophosphamide)				
11.	Intensive medication strategies should be considered	67 (94)	4 (6)	42 (86)	7 (14)
	in every patient, although patients with poor prognostic factors have more to gain.				
12.	If a patient is in persistent remission, after having	54 (76)	17 (24)	37 (76)	12 (24)
	tapered GCs, one can consider tapering biological DMARDs, especially if this treatment is combined with a		•		•
	synthetic DMARD				
13.	In cases of sustained long-term remission, cautious	61 (86)	10 (14)	43 (88)	6 (12)
	titration of synthetic DMARD dose could be considered,	` /	• /	` /	. /
14.	as a shared decision between patient and doctor DMARD naïve patients with poor prognostic markers	47 (86)	10 (14)	31 (63)	18 (37)
	might be considered for combination therapy of MTX	-1 7 (00)	10 (17)	31 (03)	10 (37)
	plus a biological agent	50 (C=)	a (a)	4.5 (6.5)	2 (1)
15.	When adjusting treatment, factors apart from disease activity, such as progression of structural damage,	69 (97)	2 (3)	47 (96)	2 (4)
	comorbidities and safety concerns should be taken into				
***	account	MTDX .1 .			

^{*}LF=Lost to follow-up, DMARDS=disease modifying anti-rheumatic drugs, MTX=methotrexate, SSZ=Sulphasalazine, GCs=Gluccocortiocoids, RA=Rheumatoid Arthritis

Attachment IITreat to target (2010), differences between participating rheumatologists and rheumatologists that

stopped during the study.

stopped during the study.	participa	nts	Drop outs/LF*	
	Always	(Some)times /Never	Always	(Some)times /Never
Are you aware of the recommendation	ns? N (%) 70 (97)	2 (3)	47 (96)	2 (4)
Are you following the recommendation		15 (21)	31 (66)	16 (34)
The primary target for treatment of rheum arthritis should be a state of clinical remiss		5 (7)	41 (93)	3 (7)
2. Clinical remission is defined as the absence symptoms of significant inflammatory dise		2 (3)	39 (89)	5 (11)
3. While remission should be a clear target, b available evidence low disease activity may acceptable alternative		3 (4)	42 (95)	2 (5)
4. Until the desired treatment target is reache therapy should be adjusted at least every 3		5 (7)	37 (84)	7 (16)
5. Measures of disease activity must be obtain documented regularly, as frequently as mo patients with high/moderate disease activity frequently (such as every 3–6 months) for passistained low disease activity or remission	ned and 60 (86) nthly for y or less	10 (14)	31 (70)	13 (30)
6. The use of validated composite measures of activity, which include joint assessments, is routine clinical practice to guide treatment	needed in	5 (7)	39 (89)	5 (11)
7. Structural changes and functional impairn be considered when making clinical decision addition to assessing	nent should 64 (91)	6 (9)	41 (93)	3 (7)
8. The desired treatment target should be ma throughout the remaining course of the dis		5 (7)	37 (84)	7 (16)
9. The choice of the (composite) measure of d and the level of the target value may be inf consideration of co-morbidities, patient fac drug-related risks.	isease activity 67 (96) luenced by	3 (4)	38 (86)	6 (14)
10. The patient has to be appropriately inform treatment target and the strategy planned target under the supervision of the rheuma	to reach this	5 (7)	41 (93)	3 (7)

^{*}LF=lost to follow-up

Attachment III: baseline characteristics for patients in the IRIS study

Table 1. Baseline characteristics for patients in the IRIS study st

	Total patients, n=378
Female, n (%)	300 (82)
Age, mean (SD)	55 (14)
Diagnosis until first visit (wks), median (IQR)	8 (0-25)
CCP positive, n (%)	222 (67)
RF-Factor positive, n (%)	255 (70)
DAS, mean (SD)	3.1 (1.3)
HAQ, mean (SD)	1.2 (0.8)
ESR, median (IQR)	30 (16-49)
TJC, mean (SD)	9 (8)
SJC, mean (SD)	7 (7)
VAS, median (IQR)	
Patient global	67 (60-67)
Doctor global	60 (40-80)

^{*} ESR= Erythrocyte Sedimentation Rate, DAS=Disease Activity Score 44 joints, HAQ= Health Assessment Questionnaire, IQR= Inter Quartile Range, CCP=Cyclic Cictrullinated Peptide Antibody, RF=Rheumatoid Factor