Differential Influence of CDAI Components Based on Disease State in Rheumatoid Arthritis Patients: Data from A Rheumatoid Arthritis Registry

Authors: Edward Keystone[1], Mohammad Movahedi[2,3], Angela Cesta[2], Claire Bombardier[2,4,5], John S. Sampalis[6], Emmanouil Rampakakis[6]

[1]Department of Rheumatology, University of Toronto, ON, Canada; [2]Toronto General Hospital Research Institute, University Health Network, Toronto, ON, Canada; [3]Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, University of Toronto, ON, Canada; [4]University of Toronto, Department of Medicine (DMO) and Institute of Health Policy, Management, and Evaluation (IHPME), Toronto, ON, Canada; [5]Mount Sinai Hospital, Division of Rheumatology, Toronto, ON, Canada; [6]JSS Medical Research, St-Laurent, QC, Canada

Objectives: Treat-to-target recommendations for rheumatoid arthritis (RA) dictate that remission or low disease activity should be aimed. Although numerous composite indices are available, the clinical disease activity index (CDAI) is commonly used in routine clinical care due to its simplicity and non-reliance on acute phase reactants. The purpose of this analysis was to evaluate the CDAI properties both cross-sectionally and longitudinally in a cohort of RA patients followed in Canadian routine care.

Methods: RA patients enrolled in the Ontario Best Practices Research Initiative (OBRI), with available follow-up for ≥6 months and data on CDAI, disease activity score based on 28 joints (DAS28), health assessment questionnaire (HAQ), and ACR/EULAR Boolean remission were included. For both the CDAI score and its change from baseline to 6 months, construct validity was assessed with principal component analysis, internal consistency with the Cronbach's alpha coefficient (α), correlational validity with the Spearman's rho coefficient, agreement in disease state classification with percent concordant pairs and the kappa statistic. Stratified analysis by presence of CDAI low disease activity (LDA) or remission was performed.

Results: 1,582 patients met the inclusion criteria. Principal component analysis showed that CDAI could be reduced to a single component when CDAI is >10 with SJC28 accounting for most variance in score and patient global assessment (PtGA) the least; whereas, when CDAI is ≤10, two distinct components were identified, the first comprising PtGA and physician global assessment (PhGA) and the second SJC28 and TJC28. In terms of internal consistency, high levels were observed for both CDAI at baseline (α=0.83) and its change from baseline to 6 months (α=0.81); however, the consistency between CDAI components was very low when CDAI is ≤10 (α=0.23).

Overall, a strong positive correlation was observed between CDAI and DAS28 (rho=0.86) and their changes (rho=0.87) while its correlation with HAQ was weak. When stratifying by CDAI levels, the correlation of CDAI with DAS28 was moderate when CDAI is ≤10 and very weak when CDAI is ≤2.8. Similarly, agreement in the classification of LDA between CDAI and DAS28 or HAQ was fair to moderate, and agreement in classification of remission was poor to fair.

Conclusion: CDAI and DAS28 correlate well when disease activity is moderate or high and poorly in LDA or remission. PtGA had a stronger influence on CDAI at LDA or remission state compared to moderate or high disease state. Thus, careful interpretation of PtGA is necessary particularly in patients who are identified as CDAI non-remitters.