Disease severity and economic burden in Japanese patients with systemic lupus erythematosus: A retrospective, observational study
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Abstract

Aim: To describe the healthcare resource utilization (HRU), direct medical costs and clinical characteristics for Japanese patients with mild, moderate or severe systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE). The primary objectives were to describe HRU and examine the direct medical costs for Japanese patients with mild, moderate, or severe SLE over the 3-year study period. Secondary objectives included recording patient demographics, clinical characteristics and frequency and cost of mild, moderate or severe flares. Exploratory objectives included a description of treatment patterns, and to explore which factors affect medical costs.

Methods: This retrospective, observational cohort study identified patients with SLE (diagnosed April 2010 to March 2012), from the Japan Medical Data Center claims database.

Result: The study cohort comprised 295 patients with mild (28, 9.5%), moderate (134, 45.4%), or severe (133, 45.1%) SLE. Outpatient visits, hospitalizations and emergency room stays were experienced by 295 (100%), 116 (39.3%) and 31 (10.5%) patients, respectively, over the 3-year study period. Over the 3-year period, the mean total direct medical cost was US$27,004, and cost increased with SLE severity: mild, US$5,549 moderate, US$15,290; and severe, US$43,322 (analysis of variance, P < 0.0001). During this period, the majority of patients (282, 95.6%) experienced at least one flare episode and the mean (standard deviation) frequency was 5.5 (3.3) flares. The mean total direct medical cost per flare increased with SLE severity.

Conclusion: This descriptive study provides information on the economic burden and clinical characteristics of Japanese patients with SLE based on claims data; high levels of HRU and direct medical costs were exhibited, particularly in patients with moderate or severe disease.
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1 | INTRODUCTION

Systemic lupus erythematous (SLE) is a systemic autoimmune disease characterized by periods of exacerbation (flare), and remission.1–3 Patients with SLE experience substantial impairment in their health-related quality of life (HRQoL), both physically and mentally.4 Symptoms of SLE range from general malaise, arthralgia and fever, to more severe manifestations including fatigue, nephritis, cognitive impairment and cardiovascular diseases.5,6 Approximately 90% of patients with SLE are female and symptoms and diagnosis of SLE occur most often between the ages of 15 and 45 years. The global incidence and prevalence of SLE varies considerably, with the overall incidence ranging from 0.3 to 31.5 per 100,000 per year and the prevalence ranging from 3.2 to 517.5 per 100,000; in Japan the prevalence ranges from 3.7 to 37.7 per 100,000.7 Boers et al reported that Asian patients at a medical center in south-eastern Asia/Chinese patients had a median SLE Disease Activity Index (SLEDAI) of 13, compared with 8 (P = 0.002) among Caucasians.8 The treatment options for patients with SLE remain limited compared with those for other rheumatic diseases, such as rheumatoid arthritis, and many existing therapies are ineffective or poorly tolerated in some subsets of patients.9 In 2011, belimumab was the first drug to be approved in the USA and Europe for over 50 years as an add-on treatment for SLE.10–12 In addition, belimumab has recently been approved in Japan.13 Given the ongoing need for more efficacious and cost-effective therapies, it is important to understand the economic burden among Japanese patients with SLE.14

The disease burden of Japanese patients with SLE, in terms of costs and HRQoL, is not fully understood. The aim of this observational retrospective cohort study was to use medical and pharmacy administrative claims data to describe the healthcare resource utilization (HRU) and direct medical costs for Japanese patients with SLE.

2 | METHODS

The primary objective of this study was to describe the HRU and direct medical costs of SLE for all patients with mild, moderate or severe SLE defined by a proxy disease severity algorithm, using insurance claims data. Other objectives were to describe clinical characteristics, and the frequency and cost of a mild, moderate or severe flare, a description of treatment patterns, and to explore which factors affect medical costs (cost predictors).

2.1 | Study design

This observational retrospective study (GSK study HO-15-16208) was conducted using the Japan Medical Data Center Co. Ltd claims database (JMDC-CDB).15 JMDC-CDB is a nationwide database of fully anonymized records containing prescription, procedure and diagnostic information from over 90 healthcare insurance payers. JMDC-CDB covers approximately 3% (approximately 4 million registrations) of the total Japanese population <75 years of age and consists of JMDC-CDB employees and their family members. The study was conducted in accordance with the Ethical Guidelines for Medical and Health Research Involving Human Subjects from The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology, The Ministry of Education, Technology and the Ministry of Health,16 privacy requirements and the guiding principles of the Declaration of Helsinki, and it was approved by the ethics committee of external healthcare providers (Kitamachi Clinic ethics committee, Tokyo).

Eligible patients (15 to 65 years of age) had: (a) an SLE-related visit between April 2010 and March 2012 (SLE diagnosis code, International Classification of Diseases [ICD-10] M32); (b) continuous inclusion eligibility for 6 months before and 3 years after the date of the first SLE-related claim (index date); (b) a second diagnosis record of SLE determined during the 3-year follow-up period; and (d) records of SLE diagnosis and SLE-related immunological blood tests in the latest 1-year period available in the database. Immunological blood tests included complement levels, anti-nuclear antibody (ANA), anti-double-stranded DNA (anti-dsDNA) antibody, and anti-phospholipid antibody. Duration of SLE treatment at the index date was determined by the oldest diagnosis record available. No specific exclusion criteria were applied.

2.2 | Assessments

To assess the disease burden among Japanese patients with SLE by varying disease activity, the algorithm for determining SLE disease severity combined elements of disease activity with cumulative damage, based on SLEDAI, Systemic Lupus Erythematous Activity Measure (SLAM), and British Isles Lupus Assessment Group (BILAG), with use of SLE medications and a consensus of expert clinical opinion to adapt to claims data.17–19 The algorithm for identifying SLE flares and categorizing severity is based on the Lupus Foundation of America (LFA) definition. The LFA categorizes flare severity as mild, moderate, or severe, encompassing the consensus of expert clinical opinion, and including outpatient visits, hospitalizations, and emergency room (ER) visits supported by a qualifying SLE diagnosis or SLE-related condition.20 Detailed definitions of SLE severity and flare severity algorithms are shown in Tables S1 and S2. SLE severity was determined as the highest severity the patient experienced during the 3-year follow-up period.

All data, including demographics, were collected individually by disease, medication, procedure names or codes such as ICD-10, Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical or procedure codes, in the 3-year follow-up period, and at baseline (6-month period prior to index date). HRU, direct medical costs, comorbidities and treatments were assessed. A continuous prescription treatment period was defined by intervals of 6 months. HRU outcomes [hospital clinic services [inpatient admission, ER admission, and outpatient visit], prescribed class of medications, laboratory services, operations and procedures] were collected by SLE-severity status. The claims of interest to analyze were separated two ways, by “all-cause” or “SLE-related.” Direct medical cost was computed based on the medical fee points (1 point
TABLE 1 Baseline patient characteristics and demographics

| Patient demographics | Total (N = 295) | Mild (n = 28) | Moderate (n = 134) | Severe (n = 133) |
|----------------------|----------------|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Female, n (%)        | 256 (86.8)    | 25 (89.3)    | 112 (83.6)        | 119 (89.5)      |
| Age at index date, y, mean (SD) | 41.6 (10.3) | 43.8 (9.1) | 40.7 (11.0) | 42.0 (9.8) |
| Principal insurer, full-time worker, n (%) | 107 (36.3) | 12 (42.9) | 50 (37.3) | 45 (33.8) |
| Treatment period at index date, y, mean (SD) | 6.5 (6.0) | 4.9 (4.7) | 6.6 (6.1) | 6.9 (6.1) |
| NP lupus             | 12 (4.5)      | 0            | 4 (3.0)           | 8 (6.0)         |
| Lupus nephritis      | 110 (41.2)    | 0            | 48 (35.8)         | 62 (46.6)       |

NP, neuropsychiatric; SD, standard deviation.

The proportion of patients experiencing irregular outpatient visits (out of office hours, late night, holiday, or emergency treatment) was 51.9% and the mean frequency per patient of the study cohort was 3.0 times over the study period. The majority of HRU (295/295 [100%]) outpatient visits, 100/116 [86.2%] inpatient stays, and 31/31 [100%] emergency stays were directly attributed to SLE.

Laboratory blood test services were utilized for all patients during their visits. Immunological tests were recorded for ANAs (72.5%), anti-dsDNA (84.7%), complement (93.2%), anti-phospholipid antibodies (42.7%), and other disease-related auto-antibodies (69.2%). The mean number of blood tests for anti-dsDNA, complement, and serum creatinine correlated with SLE severity (Fisher’s exact test, P < 0.01). Proteinuria was examined in 59 (20.0%) patients with moderate and severe SLE. Imaging services (X-ray, computed tomography, positron emission tomography, single-photon emission computed tomography, magnetic resonance imaging, and bone mineral density) and cardiovascular examinations (echocardiography, electrocardiogram [ECG] and cardiac ultrasonic imaging) were provided more frequently for patients with higher severity of SLE. In severe cases, 9 (6.8%), 7 (5.3%) and 6 (4.5%) patients were treated with dialysis (mean frequency, 289.9), intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIg) and apheresis, respectively. Medication classes for patients were non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (86.8%), corticosteroid (oral and IV) (86.4%), osteoporosis therapeutic medications (68.1%), oral immunosuppressants (40.0%), other biologicals (3.1%) and IVIg (2.7%).

3.3 | Direct medical cost

The mean total all-cause direct medical cost per patient over the 3-year study period was $29,135 (2,913,509 JPY) and the corresponding costs increased with SLE severity: mild ($7184), moderate ($16,862), and severe ($46,122) (ANOVA, P < 0.001) (Figure 1A). The mean costs for each type of claim were: inpatient, $7995; outpatient, $12,981; pharmacy, $8159 (Figure 1A). Outpatient claims formed the largest proportion of overall costs (mild, 62.4%;
The proportion of inpatient claims ranged from 9.5% in patients with mild disease to 34.0% in those with severe disease ($P < 0.001$). Pharmacy claims comprised 28.0% of the direct medical cost. The breakdown distributions (mean [SD]) of direct medical cost in inpatient claims were management (55.6% [28.7]), medication (17.3% [24.9]), operation services (10.1% [19.2]), laboratory services (9.4% [12.8]), and imaging and pathology services (4.5% [9.5]). The corresponding distributions (mean [SD]) in outpatient claims were management (10.3% [6.8]), medication (52.4% [23.1]), operation services (2.8% [11.3]), laboratory services (29.0% [17.6]), and imaging and pathology services (4.0% [5.4]).

As most all-cause claims were related to SLE treatment, the direct medical cost limited to SLE-related claims was lower than

| TABLE 2 | All-cause healthcare resource utilization in Japanese patients with SLE over the study period |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|                                | Total (N = 295)   | Mild (n = 28)   | Moderate (n = 134) | Severe (n = 133) | $P$ value |
|-------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Inpatient**                 |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| $\geq 1$ inpatient stay, n (%)| 116 (39.3)        | 3 (10.7)        | 34 (25.4)       | 79 (59.4)       | $< 0.001$     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Number, mean (SD)             | 2.3 (2.6)         | 1.3 (0.6)       | 1.5 (0.8)       | 2.7 (3.0)       | 0.054         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Duration, days, per event, mean (SD) | 19.9 (32.4)    | 3.5 (2.4)       | 13.0 (19.2)     | 21.9 (34.9)     | 0.126         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| $\geq 1$ ER stays, n (%)      | 31 (10.5)         | 0               | 4 (3.0)         | 27 (20.3)       | $< 0.001$     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Number, mean (SD)             | 1.8 (1.4)         | -               | 1.3 (0.5)       | 1.9 (1.5)       | 0.442         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| **Outpatient**                |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| $\geq 1$ outpatient visit, n (%)| 295 (100.0)      | 28 (100.0)      | 134 (100.0)     | 133 (100.0)     | NA            |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Number, mean (SD)             | 64.9 (65.3)       | 40.4 (23.4)     | 53.4 (32.8)     | 81.6 (88.1)     | $< 0.001$     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| $\geq 1$ outpatient visit, irregular, n (%) | 153 (51.9)     | 14 (50.0)       | 64 (47.8)       | 75 (56.4)       | 0.353         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Number, mean (SD)             | 3.0 (4.3)         | 3.9 (8.4)       | 2.7 (4.3)       | 3.0 (3.1)       | 0.639         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| **Laboratory services**       |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| ANA, n (%)                    | 214 (72.5)        | 21 (75.0)       | 94 (70.1)       | 99 (74.4)       | 0.722         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Antibody for double-stranded DNA |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| n (%)                         | 250 (84.7)        | 21 (75.0)       | 111 (82.8)      | 118 (88.7)      | 0.129         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Complement, n (%)             | 275 (93.2)        | 25 (89.3)       | 126 (94.0)      | 124 (93.2)      | 0.547         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Anti-phospholipid antibody, n (%) | 126 (42.7) | 6 (21.4)        | 46 (34.3)       | 74 (55.6)       | $< 0.001$     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Proteinuria, n (%)            | 59 (20.0)         | 0               | 19 (14.2)       | 40 (30.1)       | $< 0.001$     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| **Imaging**                   |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Imaging, n (%)                | 275 (93.2)        | 21 (75.0)       | 124 (92.5)      | 130 (97.7)      | $< 0.001$     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| X-ray, n (%)                  | 258 (87.5)        | 19 (67.9)       | 116 (86.6)      | 123 (92.5)      | 0.003         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Head CT, PET, SPECT and MRI, n (%) | 61 (20.7)   | 2 (7.1)         | 20 (14.9)       | 39 (29.3)       | 0.003         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Body CT, PET and MRI, n (%)   | 172 (58.3)        | 9 (32.1)        | 65 (48.5)       | 98 (73.7)       | $< 0.001$     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Bone mineral density, n (%)   | 102 (34.6)        | 1 (3.6)         | 46 (34.3)       | 55 (41.4)       | $< 0.001$     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Electrocardiogram/echocardiography/cardiac ultrasonic imaging, n (%) | 158 (53.6) | 10 (35.7)       | 58 (43.3)       | 90 (67.7)       | $< 0.001$     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| **Operation/procedure**       |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Dialysis, n (%)               | 9 (3.1)           | 0               | 0               | 9 (6.8)         | 0.003         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Apheresis, n (%)              | 6 (2.0)           | 0               | 0               | 6 (4.5)         | 0.032         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| **Medications**               |                   |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Corticosteroids (oral and IV) | 255 (86.4)        | 16 (57.1)       | 118 (88.1)      | 121 (91.0)      | $< 0.001$     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Immunosuppressants, oral, n (%) | 118 (40.0)  | 0               | 52 (38.8)       | 66 (49.6)       | $< 0.001$     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| NSAIDs, n (%)                 | 256 (86.8)        | 18 (64.3)       | 120 (89.6)      | 118 (88.7)      | 0.003         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| IVIg, n (%)                   | 8 (2.7)           | 0 (0.0)         | 1 (0.7)         | 7 (5.3)         | 0.069         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Steroid ointment, n (%)       | 168 (56.9)        | 14 (50.0)       | 72 (53.7)       | 82 (61.7)       | 0.323         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Other biologics, n (%)        | 9 (3.1)           | 0               | 3 (2.2)         | 6 (4.5)         | 0.451         |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |
| Osteoporosis therapeutic medication, n (%) | 201 (68.1) | 7 (25.0)       | 93 (69.4)       | 101 (75.9)      | $< 0.001$     |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |                 |

ANA, anti-nuclear antibody; CT, computed tomography; ER, emergency room; IVIg, intravenous immunoglobulin; MRI, magnetic resonance imaging; NSAIDs, non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs; PET, positron emission tomography; SD, standard deviation; SLE, systemic lupus erythematosus; SPECT, single-photon emission computed tomography.
that for all-cause claims. However, higher SLE-related costs were associated with a higher level of SLE disease burden: $27,004 (total cohort); $5,549 (mild); $15,290 (moderate); $43,322 (severe) (ANOVA, \( P < 0.001 \)) (Figure 1B). The mean SLE-related costs for the total cohort for each type of claim were: $7,237 (inpatient); $12,008 (outpatient); and $7,759 (pharmacy). In this study, age (\( P = 0.941 \)), gender (\( P = 0.707 \)), and disease duration (\( P = 0.064 \)) were not associated with direct medical costs in univariate regression analyses. Disease duration (\( P = 0.342 \)) or numbers of flare episodes (\( P = 0.438 \)) were not associated with direct medical costs in multivariate regression analyses.

### 3.4 Clinical manifestations and comorbidities

The most frequently reported clinical manifestations and comorbidities (not used for SLE or flare severity definitions) were other infections (93.9%) and inflammation (94.2%) (Table 3). Infections included herpes infections (19.3%) such as herpes zoster and herpes simplex. Hematological, endocrine, cardiovascular, psychiatric or cutaneous symptoms were present in many patients with SLE. Solid organ/hematological malignancies occurred in 10.2% of patients (Table 3). Major SLE-related conditions used to define SLE severity were arthritis/arthralgia (50.8%), dry eye/tear film insufficiency (46.4%), kidney disease: nephritis (45.1%), kidney disease: nephrotic syndrome (23.1%), arterial/venous thrombosis (21.0%), mononeuropathy/polyneuropathy (20.7%), vasculitis excluding aortitis (16.9%), and stroke/transient ischemic attack (4.6%) (Table S3).

### 3.5 Flare incidence

The majority of patients (282, 95.6%) experienced at least one flare episode and 105 (35.6%) experienced severe flare; the frequency of overall, moderate and severe flares increased with SLE severity (Table 4). The mean (SD) frequency was 5.5 (3.3) times over the 3-year study period, and also increased with SLE severity (ANOVA \( P < 0.001 \)). Mean direct medical cost per flare episode was $15,765 (median $5,417) per study cohort patient, and increased with SLE severity.
Treatment patterns

Eleven (8.3%) patients were treated with pulses of steroid and 7 (5.3%) with cyclophosphamide, considered for emergency use for patients with SLE in Japan (mean frequency over study period: steroid pulse, 1.3; cyclophosphamide pulse, 6.4). There were 40 patients who did not receive corticosteroid treatment over the study period; 24 (60.0%) of these patients received loxoprofen sodium hydrate, 18 (45.0%) received acetaminophen, and 17 (42.5%) received rebamipide, a frequently prescribed medication for patients with SLE in Japan who have previously experienced steroid-induced ulcers.

More patients (44, 14.9%) initiated corticosteroid treatment over the study period than terminated (19, 6.4%). The specified treatments that were initiated included: 19 (6.4%) azathioprine; 11 (3.7%) cyclosporine; 4 (1.4%) methotrexate; 2 (0.7%) mycophenolate mofetil; 24 (8.1%) tacrolimus; 8 (2.7%) IVIg; 9 (3.1%) cyclophosphamide; 1 (0.3%) rituximab; and 17 (5.8%) mizoribine. The specified treatments that were terminated included: 14 (4.7%) azathioprine; 6 (2.0%) cyclosporine; 3 (1.0%) methotrexate; 1 (0.3%) mycophenolate mofetil; 8 (2.7%) tacrolimus; 10 (3.4%) cyclophosphamide; 1 (0.3%) rituximab; 7 (2.4%) IVIg; and 7 (2.4%) mizoribine. It should be noted that there are currently no treatment guidelines for patients with SLE in Japan; the above treatment patterns highlight realistic clinical practice in Japan, which has previously been otherwise unknown.

Cost predictors

The direct medical costs, adjusted for corticosteroid dose, were $5538 for patients with mild SLE severity (reference), $11,621 for...
moderate (110% increase), and $24,942 for severe (350% increase). In multivariate analyses, patients with skin and renal organ manifestations had 84.5% ($5,538) and 78.3% ($5,129) greater costs, respectively, than those without (P < 0.001) (Table 5). Other predictors (P < 0.05) of higher medical costs are shown in Table 5.

4 | DISCUSSION

This study reports high levels of HRU and SLE-related costs in Japanese patients with SLE, particularly among patients with moderate and severe disease severity. A recent report states that over 60,000 Japanese patients with SLE receive subsidies from the Japanese government-funded intractable disease program, with an estimated prevalence of 46 per 100,000. In the present study, a population of Japanese patients with SLE was identified from the JMDC-CDB claims database. Among this population, the majority had moderate (45%) or severe (45%) disease; 10% were identified with mild disease. In comparison, a study of patients with SLE in the USA identified fewer patients with severe disease (22%) and more patients with mild disease (26%); the percentage with moderate disease was similar (52%). These differences may have been caused by the stringent inclusion criteria in the present study.

---

**TABLE 4** Frequency of flares by SLE severity and costs per flare over the 3-year study period

| Total (N = 295) | Mild (n = 28) | Moderate (n = 134) | Severe (n = 133) | P valuea |
|----------------|--------------|--------------------|-----------------|---------|
| ≥1 flare, n (%) | 282 (95.6)   | 20 (71.4)          | 131 (97.8)      | 131 (98.5) | <0.001 |
| Mild flare, n (%) | 203 (68.8)  | 17 (60.7)          | 97 (72.4)       | 89 (66.9) | 0.394 |
| Moderate flare, n (%) | 246 (83.4) | 10 (35.7)          | 118 (88.1)      | 118 (88.7) | <0.001 |
| Severe flare, n (%) | 105 (35.6)  | 1 (3.6)            | 26 (19.4)       | 78 (58.6) | <0.001 |
| Frequency of flares/patient, mean (SD) | 5.5 (3.3) | 2.9 (3.0) | 5.0 (2.8) | 6.5 (3.5) | <0.001 |
| Direct medical cost/flare, US$, mean (SD) | 1576 (3159) | 315 (238) | 739 (1134) | 2344 (4048) | <0.001 |

SD, standard deviation; SLE, systemic lupus erythematosus.

**TABLE 5** Multivariate model of direct medical cost over the 3-year period

| Variable | Coefficient | Error | P value | Increments (%) | Increasing amount (US$) |
|----------|-------------|-------|---------|----------------|------------------------|
| Intercept | 5.816       | 0.0539| <0.001  | -              | 6550 (ref)             |
| Number of flares experienced | 0.005 | 0.0067 | 0.438 | 1.202 | 79 |
| Baseline maximum daily dose of steroid (mg) | 0.003 | 0.0011 | 0.013 | 0.624 | 41 |
| SLE treated year (continuous variable) | 0.004 | 0.0037 | 0.342 | 0.818 | 54 |
| Organ damage | | | | | |
| Ocular (either eye) | 0.018 | 0.0534 | 0.732 | 4.300 | 282 |
| Renal: proteinuria, end-stage renal disease | 0.251 | 0.0514 | <0.001 | 78.304 | 5129 |
| Pulmonary | 0.151 | 0.0516 | 0.004 | 41.612 | 2725 |
| Peripheral vascular | 0.184 | 0.0713 | 0.010 | 52.862 | 3462 |
| Musculoskeletal | 0.111 | 0.0535 | 0.039 | 29.068 | 1904 |
| Skin: scarring chronic alopecia, extensive scarring or panniculum other than scalp and pulp space, skin ulceration | 0.266 | 0.0935 | 0.005 | 84.548 | 5538 |
| Gonadal failure | 0.094 | 0.0711 | 0.187 | 24.214 | 1586 |
| Diabetes | 0.173 | 0.0863 | 0.046 | 48.922 | 3204 |
| Malignancy: malignant tumor (excluding dysplasia) | 0.200 | 0.0708 | 0.005 | 58.588 | 3837 |
| Comorbidities | | | | | |
| Arthritis/arthralgia | 0.045 | 0.0455 | 0.324 | 10.887 | 713 |
| Anemia | 0.144 | 0.0458 | 0.002 | 39.470 | 2585 |
| Hypertension and related cardiovascular diseases | 0.0325 | 0.0466 | 0.486 | 7.776 | 509 |
| Nervous and psychological symptom | 0.096 | 0.0510 | 0.062 | 24.661 | 1615 |

SLE, systemic lupus erythematosus.
However, the gender ratio and age distribution, with the exception of the elderly population, were similar to those described in previous studies.22–24

The proportion of patients experiencing systemic comorbid conditions increased in correlation with increased SLE disease severity. In particular, incidence rates of hypertension and related cardiovascular disease, hyperlipidemia and anemia were significantly higher. An increase was also observed for malignancies and herpes, although this was not significant. These findings are consistent with other studies and these conditions are linked with an increased risk of mortality and deterioration of QoL.25–27

It is challenging to ascertain which HRU and costs are attributable directly to SLE rather than other clinical manifestations and comorbidities. However, SLE-related costs in this study showed a similar trend and values to all-cause costs. The majority of outpatient/patient visits or ER stays were directly attributed to SLE-related systemic symptoms and damages in this study cohort. Unadjusted all-cause direct medical costs (i.e before multivariate model regression adjustment) were high (mean: $29 135 over 3 years) and increased with SLE severity ($P < 0.001). After multivariate regression model adjustment, patients with moderate disease had 110% higher costs ($P < 0.001), and patients with severe disease 350% higher costs ($P < 0.001) compared with patients with mild disease. A separate report assessed direct medical costs of Japanese patients with SLE using a hospital-based claims database.28 This report included patients with SLE who received a subsidy from the intractable disease program and those with confirmed diagnoses. The mean direct medical cost per year was reported as $7361 (median $3885),28 which is lower than the $29 135 over 3 years reported in this study. Total direct costs per patient per year in the USA and Canada were reported as $10 000 to $33 000.7 The corresponding costs of European countries ranged from $4800 to $10 000.7 These differences may be attributed to variations in background and treatment of eligible patients, differing disease severity profiles, study designs, healthcare systems and relative prices.

In this study, the proportions of costs from health insurance claims increased significantly with disease severity. Pharmacy claims constituted over a quarter of the direct medical costs. The average cost of medical services was more than six times higher in patients with severe disease compared with those with mild disease, and for patients with moderate disease it was approximately twice as costly compared with mild disease.

A variety of cost predictors for patients with SLE have been reported in other studies and include younger patients, high disease activity at onset/over the disease course, flare, greater disease damage, disease severity, active glomerulonephritis and NP involvement.29–34 In this study, age, gender or disease duration were not associated with the direct medical costs by both univariate and multivariate regression models. The majority of patients (282, 95.6%) experienced at least one flare episode and the number of patients experiencing moderate and severe flares increased with SLE severity. The mean (SD) number of flares per patient was 5.5 (3.3) times over the 3-year study period, which increased with SLE severity (ANOVA, $P < 0.001). The proportion of patients experiencing a severe flare during the study (105 patients, 35.6%) was consistent with the proportion of patients (31.9%) reported in a long-term follow-up, monocentric SLE cohort.24 The mean costs per flare increased with SLE severity, consistent with results of a study that applied chart reviews and patient-reported questionnaires in patients with SLE in Hong Kong.31 Reduction of flare could facilitate important benefits for economical and clinical burden. Costs were significantly elevated by 84.5%, 78.3% and 39.5%, in patients with skin, renal involvement, and anemia, respectively; these patients may have required additional treatment such as immunosuppressant therapies, laboratory tests or inpatient stays. In particular, patients with NP lupus/lupus nephritis showed considerably higher levels of economic burden (Tables S4 and S5).35–37

The treatments administered to Japanese patients with SLE were similar to those in other countries except for anti-malarial therapies, which only appeared on the Japanese market after the end of the study assessment period.38 However, the majority of the population received typical therapies for moderate or severe SLE patients (such as cyclophosphamide pulse or mycophenolate) despite the limited therapeutic guidelines for SLE in Japan to date. Corticosteroid treatment was the main standard of care therapy received. However, as long-term steroid use is associated with adverse events, reduction in treatment with steroids should be considered.39 Anti-malarial drugs, emerging biologicals9 or combinations of immunosuppressive agents may also prevent episodes of flare and therefore could be applied as an alternative method to improve the long-term prognosis of SLE and related damage.

There are some limitations to the data and study design. First, using administrative claims data to ascertain disease severity can be challenging. The algorithm of SLE disease and flare severity using claims databases has not been previously validated, but has been assessed using a US-managed care health plan database20 and HRU and direct medical costs were shown to be correlated with SLE severity. Second, patients were defined based on diagnostic code only; this did not capture cases of misdiagnosis and in addition, the presence of diagnosis or examination procedure codes on a medical claim does not confirm presence of the disease of interest, as these may not be correctly coded for a prescription, or may be included as rule-out criteria. Other indicators of this limitation include the lower frequency of neuropsychiatric lupus (4.5%) compared with other lupus cohorts, and the low frequency of proteinuria testing (20.0%) given 41% were coded as having lupus. Third, the database population is limited to the insurers of JMDC-contracted healthcare societies. Therefore, the socio-demographic characteristics are not directly representative of the general Japanese population, in particular those patients over 60 years of age. In addition, the principle insurer may not have been able to continue working, which may have resulted in cessation of insurance and therefore, these patients were not captured in this study. Finally, not all information is readily available in claims data and this could affect study outcomes.

In summary, this descriptive study demonstrated that Japanese patients with SLE showed high levels of HRU and associated...
costs, particularly in patients with moderate or severe disease activity.
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