

Poster presentation

## Performance of different sets of criteria for clinical response evaluation in a non-selected cohort of juvenile idiopathic arthritis (JIA) patients

R Gutiérrez-Suárez\*<sup>1,2</sup> and R Burgos-Vargas<sup>1</sup>

Address: <sup>1</sup>Hospital General de México, México D.F., Mexico and <sup>2</sup>Hospital Shriners para niños. A.C., México D.F., Mexico

\* Corresponding author

from 15<sup>th</sup> Paediatric Rheumatology European Society (PreS) Congress  
London, UK. 14–17 September 2008

Published: 15 September 2008

*Pediatric Rheumatology* 2008, **6**(Suppl 1):P104 doi:10.1186/1546-0096-6-S1-P104

This abstract is available from: <http://www.ped-rheum.com/content/6/S1/P104>

© 2008 Gutiérrez-Suárez and Burgos-Vargas; licensee BioMed Central Ltd.

### Objective

To compare the performance of 4 sets of criteria for clinical response evaluation in JIA patients.

### Methods

An observational study of a non-selected cohort of JIA patients in the out-patient clinic was conducted. Four sets of criteria: DAS, DAS28, CDAI and SDAI were evaluated and compared with the ACR-Ped-30 and the clinician judgment of response (CJR) (100 mm-VAS) as the gold standard to evaluate clinical response in JIA patients. Performance was assessed by the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve analysis and other statistics for diagnostic tests.

### Results

50 JIA patients (female/male ratio: 1.2:1; mean age at diagnosis:  $6.4 \pm 3.3$  years; mean disease duration:  $5.3 \pm 2.7$  years) were evaluated. The area under the ROC curve (AUC) with 95% confidence interval (95%CI), the likelihood ratio (LR) with 95%CI, the sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV) and negative predictive value (NPV) were: 0.842 (0.691–0.994); 6.48 (1.03–40.75); 80.9; 87.5; 97.1; and 46.6; respectively for the CJR in comparison with the ACR-Ped-30 as gold standard; and of 0.700 (0.532–0.868); 2.00 (1.05–3.80); 80.0; 60.0; 82.3 56.2; respectively for the DAS28; 0.752 (0.599–0.906); 2.89 (1.23–6.83); 77.1; 73.3; 87.1 57.8; respectively for the SDAI; and 0.705 (0.542–0.868); 2.23 (1.06–4.68); 74.2; 66.6 83.8; 52.6; respectively for the CDAI,

when compared with the CJR. The performance of the four sets of criteria in comparison with the ACR-Ped-30 was poor.

### Conclusion

In the daily clinical practice the DAS 28, SDAI and CDAI can be used for the evaluation of clinical response in JIA patients.