

Project Plan – October 2018Updated March 2019

#### PARTICIPANTS

(still being finalized)

#### Core Oversight Team

John FitzGerald, MD, PhD (Co-Principal Investigator/Voting Panel Leader) Tuhina Neogi, MD, PhD, FRCPC (Co-Principal Investigator/Voting Panel Leader) Ted Mikuls, MD, MSPH (Content Expert) Nicola Dalbeth, MD, FRACP (Content Expert) Romina Brignardello-Petersen, DDS, MSc, PhD (Literature Review Leader) Gordon Guyatt, MD, MSc, FRCP, OC (GRADE Expert)

#### Literature Review Team

Sharon Bae, MD Abhijeet Danve, MBBS, MD, FACP Puja P. Khanna, MD, MPH Seoyoung Kim, MD, ScD, MSCE Aleksander Lenert, MD, FRCPC Samuel Poon, MD Anila Qasim, HBSc, MSc Shiv T. Sehra, MD Amit Aakash Shah, MD, MPH Tarun Sudhir Kumar Sharma, MD Michael Toprover, MD Marat Turgunbaev, MD, MPH Linan Zeng Mary Ann Zhang, MD

#### Voting Panel

Aryeh Abeles, MD N. Lawrence Edwards, MD, MACP, MACR Allan Gelber, MD, MPH, PhD Leslie Harrold, MD Dinesh Khanna, MD, MSc Charles King, MD Gerald Levy, MD, MBA Caryn Libbey, MD David Mount, MD Michael Pillinger, MD Ann Rosenthal, MD Jasvinder Singh, MD, MPH James Edward Sims (patient) Benjamin J. Smith, PA-C, DFAAPA Neil Wenger, MD Patient (TBD)

#### Expert Panel

Ted Fields, MD, FACP Angelo Gaffo, MD, MSPH Kenneth G. Saag, MD, MSc

#### **ACR Board of Directors Liaison** Kelly Weselman, MD

Patient Panel

TBD

#### ACR Staff

Robin Lane Regina Parker Amy Turner



1	
2	ORGANIZATIONAL LEADERSHIP AND SUPPORT
3	
4	This updated clinical practice guideline is being developed by the American College of Rheumatology
5	(ACR) with funding by the ACR.
6	
7	BACKGROUND
8	
9	Gout is the most common inflammatory arthritis, affecting 4% of adults in the United States. While the
10	pathophysiology is well-understood and effective treatments are available, the management of gout
11	remains poor, with 70% experiencing recurrent flares, and a substantial proportion burdened by tophi,
12	joint damage, and functional limitations.
13	
14	OBJECTIVES
15	The chieve of this project is to develop recommendations for the monoport of patients with south
16 17	The objective of this project is to develop recommendations for the management of patients with gout. Specifically, we aim to develop recommendations for:
18	specifically, we all to develop recommendations for.
10	1. Indications for urate-lowering therapy.
20	<ol> <li>Approaches to initiating urate-lowering therapy.</li> </ol>
20	3. Ongoing management of urate-lowering therapy.
22	4. Management of gout flares.
23	5. Lifestyle factors in patients with gout.
24	6. Asymptomatic hyperuricemia.
25	
26	Additionally, we will develop recommendations for each of the categories above for specific subgroups
27	of patients as appropriate.
28	
29	METHODS
30	
31	Identification of Studies
32	
33	Literature search strategies, based on PICO questions (Population/patients, Intervention, Comparator,
34	and Outcomes; see Appendix A) will be developed by the research librarian, systematic literature review

- leader, and principal investigators, with input from the Core Team. The search strategies will be peer
- 36 reviewed by another medical librarian using Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies (PRESS) (1).



37 38	Searches will be performed in OVID Medline (1946 +), Embase (1974 +), the Cochrane Library, and PubMed (mid-1960s +).
39 40 41 42 43 44	The search strategies will be developed using the controlled vocabulary or thesauri language for each database: Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) for OVID Medline, PubMed and Cochrane Library; and Emtree terms for Embase. Text words will also be used in OVID Medline, PubMed, and Embase, and keyword/title/abstract words in the Cochrane Library.
45 46	Search Limits
47 48	Only English language articles will be retrieved.
49 50	Grey Literature
51 52 53	The websites of appropriate agencies, such as the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), will be searched for peer-reviewed reports not indexed by electronic databases.
54 55	Literature Search Update
56 57 58	Literature searches will be updated one month prior to the voting panel meeting to ensure completeness.
50 59 60	Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria
61 62 63	See PICO questions ( <i>Appendix A</i> ), which outline the defined patient population, interventions, comparators and outcomes.
64 65	Management of Studies and Data
66 67 68 69 70 71 72 73	References and abstracts will be imported into bibliographic management software (Reference Manager) (2), duplicates removed, and exported to Distiller SR, a web-based systematic review manager (3). Screening forms will be created in Distiller SR. Search results will be divided among reviewers, and two reviewers will screen each title/abstract, with disagreements at the title/abstract screening stage defaulting to inclusion for full manuscript review. Following the same dual review process, disagreements at the full manuscript screening stage will be discussed and adjudicated by the literature review leadership, if necessary.



74 75	Dhacoc	
75 76	Phases	
77	1.	A search for randomized controlled trials and observational studies about interventions aimed
78 79		at the management of gout will be performed to determine existing studies covering outcomes of interest.
80	2.	Additionally, recently published systematic reviews covering outcomes of interest will also be
81		sought and used for reference cross-checking.
82 83	3.	Data will be abstracted and evidence will be synthesized using RevMan (4) and GRADE Pro software (5), respectively.
84 85	4.	Chosen studies will be assessed for risk of bias using modified versions of the Cochrane Risk of
85 86	-	Bias tool (6) and the ROBINS-I (7).
86 87	5.	The evidence will be synthesized and assessed at the outcome level within each question using the GRADE approach.
88		the GRADE approach.
89	GRADE	Methodology
90	UNADE	We though by
91	GRADE	methodology (8) will be used in this project to rate the certainty of evidence and facilitate
92	develo	oment of recommendations. The certainty in the evidence (also known as "quality" of evidence)
93	will be	graded as high, moderate, low or very low. The strength of recommendations will be graded as
94	-	or conditional. The strength of recommendations will not depend solely on the certainty in the
95		ce, but also on patient preferences and values, the balance between benefits and harms, and
96		mportant considerations when necessary (e.g., resources, feasibility, acceptability). A series of
97		that describe the GRADE methodology can be found on the GRADE working group's website:
98	<u>www.g</u>	radeworkinggroup.org.
99		
100	Analysi	s and Synthesis
101	The lite	
102		erature review team will appraise and synthesize data from included studies that address the
103		uestions. Meta-analysis will be conducted to pool results across studies whenever possible. When
104 105	•	ssible, a narrative synthesis of the results will be presented. An evidence summary, which is the estimates of effects comparing the options and details regarding the assessment of the
105		ty of the evidence, will be prepared for each PICO question using GRADEprofiler (GRADEpro)
107		re (5). The evidence summary will contain all of the outcomes (benefits and harms) considered
108		ant for formulating recommendations summarized across studies. For each outcome, the
109	•	ry will present the relative effects comparing the options under consideration, the assumed and
110		ponding risk for comparators and interventions (95% CI), the risk difference, the number of



111	participants/number of studies providing evidence for that outcome, and the certainty of the evidence
112	(i.e., high, moderate, low or very low).
113	
114	The evidence summary will also document the overall certainty in the evidence for each critical and
115	important outcome across studies and summarize the rationale of the GRADE criteria for rating down
116	(risk of bias, inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision and publication bias), or rating up the certainty in a
117	body of evidence (large magnitude of effect, dose-response gradient, and all plausible confounding that
118	would reduce a demonstrated effect).
119	
120	Development of Recommendation Statements
121	
122	PICO questions will be revised to formulate recommendation statements. Using the evidence
123	summaries, the voting panel, consisting of nine rheumatologists, one nephrologist, one physician
124	assistant, one health services researcher, and two patient representatives (one still to be determined),
125	will consider the drafted recommendation statements in two stages. The voting panel will first
126	individually evaluate and vote on each drafted recommendation statement using the evidence
127	summary. The initial votes are anonymous and used to determine where consensus (70% or greater
128	agreement) exists on the drafted recommendation statements. The results of round 1 voting will
129	determine the in person voting panel meeting agenda. At the face-to-face voting panel meeting, chaired
130	by the co-principal investigators, the panelists will review results of all PICO round 1 votes, discuss the
131	evidence in the context of their clinical experience and expertise to reach consensus on the final
132	recommendations. The voting panel meeting discussions will be supported by the literature review
133	leader, the GRADE expert, and selected members of the literature review team, who will attend the
134	meeting to provide details about the evidence, as requested. Voting panel discussions and decisions will
135	be informed by a separately convened patient panel, which will meet in the days before the voting panel
136	meeting, to provide unique patient perspectives on the drafted recommendations based on their
137	experiences and the available literature; the two patients on the voting panel will participate in the
138	separate patient panel meeting.
139	
140	PLANNED APPENDICES (AT MINIMUM)
141	
142	A. Final literature search strategies
143	B. Evidence summaries, including GRADE evidence profiles, for each PICO question
144	
145	
146	
147	



#### Project Plan – October 2018Updated March 2019

#### 148 AUTHORSHIP

149

150 Authorship of the guideline will include: co-principal investigators, Drs. John FitzGerald and Tuhina

151 Neogi, as the lead authors and voting panel leaders; Dr. Romina Brignardello-Petersen, literature review

152 leader; Drs. Ted Mikuls and Nicola Dalbeth, content experts; and Dr. Gordon Guyatt, GRADE expert.

153 Members of the literature review team and voting panel will also be authors. The co-PIs will determine

154 final authorship and order of authors, dependent on the efforts made by individuals throughout the

155 guideline development process, using international authorship standards as guidance.

156

# 157 DISCLOSURES/CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

158

159 The ACR's disclosure and COI policies for guideline development will be followed for this project. These

160 can be found in the ACR Guideline Manual on <u>this page of the ACR web site</u>, under Policies &

161 Procedures. See Appendix B for participant disclosures.

# 162163 REFERENCES

- 164
- 1651. Sampson M, McGowan J, Lefebvre C, Moher D, Grimshaw J. PRESS: Peer Review of Electronic166Search Strategies. Ottawa: Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health. 2008.
- 167 2. Reference Manager [software]. Thomson Reuters. 2013. http://www.refman.com/
- 168 3. DistillerSR. Ottawa, Canada: Evidence Partners. 2013. http://systematic-review.net/
- Review Manager [software]. Oxford (UK): Cochrane Collaboration. 2013.
   http://ims.cochrane.org/revman
- 171
  5. GRADEprofiler [software]. Oxford (UK): Cochrane Collaboration. 2013.
  172 http://ims.cochrane.org/revman/gradepro
- Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions
   Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration. 2011. Available:
   http://handbook.cochrane.org.
- Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, Savović J, Berkman ND. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. BMJ. 2016.
- 178 8. GRADE guidelines best practices using the GRADE framework. 2013. Available:
- 179 http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/publications/JCE2011.htm



#### Project Plan – October 2018Updated March 2019

#### 180 **APPENDIX A – PICO Questions**

#### 181 Best Practice Statements

- Unless otherwise stated, prescribers should adhere to regulatory and labelling guidance.
- Patients starting any therapy for gout should be educated on the role of each therapy (e.g. antiinflammatory for symptoms relief, urate lowering with purpose of reducing risk of gout attack or tophus burden), and for those starting ULT, the need for continuous use.
- Pertinent comorbidities (e.g., cardiovascular disease, hypertension, diabetes, renal insufficiency, nephrolithiasis) should be assessed in all patients with gout with appropriate management of the condition(s).

#### 190 **Definitions**

189

192

200

201 202

203

204

207

208

209

210

- 191 <u>ACTH</u>: adrenocorticotropic hormone
  - <u>Anti-IL1 therapy</u>: anakinra, canakinumab, rilonacept
- Anti-inflammatory treatments for flare or prophylaxis: colchicine, NSAIDs, glucocorticoids (oral, parenteral or intra-articular), anti-IL-1 therapy
- Asymptomatic Hyperuricemia: individual with serum urate >=6.8mg/dL with no prior gout flares or subcutaneous tophi or imaging
- 197 <u>Chronic Kidney Disease Stage 3</u>, Glomerular Filtration Rate < 60 ml/min/1.73m2
- 198 <u>Clinical remission</u>: no gout flares in the last 12 months AND no subcutaneous tophi
- 199 Flare Frequency:
  - Infrequent gout flares (< 2 per year) vs.
  - o Frequent gout flares (≥ 2 per year)
  - Medications that impact serum urate levels:
    - Increase serum urate: hydrochlorothiazide, furosemide, low-dose ASA (<=325mg/d)
    - o Decrease serum urate: losartan, fenofibrate

# Suboptimal Flare Treatment Response: Failure to achieve low pain score (e.g. ≤ 2 using a VAS scale of 0 to 10) OR failure to return to baseline pain score

- <u>ULT (urate-lowering therapy)</u>: allopurinol, febuxostat, probenecid, lesinurad, pegloticase
  - <u>Low dose ULT</u>: Allopurinol ≤150 mg/day, Febuxostat ≤ 40 mg/day, Probenecid ≤250 mg twice daily
    - Intensive ULT: pegloticase OR serum urate target < 3 mg/dL</li>
- Subcutaneous tophus A tophus that is detectable by physical examination.

# Imaging evidence of MSU crystal deposition - Findings that are highly suggestive of monosodium urate crystals on an imaging test (regardless if clinically palpable)

• Durability of ULT: Duration of ULT adherence. Lack of ULT abandonment.



215		
216	Ind	ications for urate-lowering therapy
217 218 219	1.	For patients with one or more subcutaneous tophi (with any number of gout flares), what is the impact of starting ULT compared with no ULT on gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global
220		assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in
221		gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate
222		and serious)?
223 224		<ul> <li>Does the relative impact differ across different ULT medications (allopurinol, febuxostat, probenecid, lesinurad, pegloticase)?</li> </ul>
225 226		<ul> <li>Does this differ in patients with radiographic damage vs. those without radiographic damage?</li> </ul>
227 228		<ul> <li>Do the effects differ in patients with tophi on advanced imaging (ultrasound, MRI, CT, or dual energy CT) but no subcutaneous tophi vs those with subcutaneous tophi?</li> </ul>
229		<ul> <li>People with CKD 3 or worse versus normal or mild CKD stages (1 or 2)?</li> </ul>
230 231	2.	For patients with radiographic damage (any modality) due to gout, but no subcutaneous tophi on exam (with any number of gout flares), what is the impact of starting ULT compared with no ULT on
232		gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity
233		limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in
234		serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?
235 236		<ul> <li>Does the relative impact differ across different ULT medications (allopurinol, febuxostat, probenecid, lesinurad, pegloticase)?</li> </ul>
237		<ul> <li>People with CKD 3 or worse versus normal or mild CKD stages (1 or 2)?</li> </ul>
238	3.	For patients without subcutaneous tophi and with frequent gout flares (two or more gout
239		flares/year), what is the impact of starting ULT compared with no ULT on gout flares, pain scores,
240		tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage,
241		serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse
242		events (mild-moderate and serious)?
243 244		<ul> <li>Does the relative impact differ across different ULT medications (allopurinol, febuxostat, probenecid, lesinurad, pegloticase)?</li> </ul>
245		<ul> <li>People with CKD 3 or worse versus normal or mild CKD stages (1 or 2)?</li> </ul>
246	4.	For patients without tophi who have previously experienced more than one flare but have had a low
247		frequency < 2/year of flares, what is the impact of starting ULT compared with no ULT on gout
248		flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity
249		limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in
250		serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?



251		• Does the relative impact differ across different ULT medications (allopurinol, febuxostat,
252		probenecid, lesinurad, pegloticase)?
253		<ul> <li>Do these effects differ in the following subgroups?</li> </ul>
254		<ul> <li>People with CKD 3 or worse versus normal or mild CKD stages (1 or 2)?</li> </ul>
255		<ul> <li>People with urolithiasis versus no urolithiasis?</li> </ul>
256		<ul> <li>People with cardiovascular disease versus no cardiovascular disease?</li> </ul>
257		<ul> <li>People with hypertension versus no hypertension?</li> </ul>
258		<ul> <li>People with marked hyperuricemia (SU &gt; 9 mg/dl), versus SU ≤9mg/dL?</li> </ul>
259		• People with early onset disease (<30 in men, premenopausal women) versus those with
260		later onset?
261		<ul> <li>People with renal transplantation versus no renal transplantation?</li> </ul>
262	5.	For patients without tophi and who have experienced a single gout flare, what is the impact of
263		starting ULT compared with no ULT on gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment,
264		health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or
265		tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?
266		• Does the relative impact differ across different ULT medications (allopurinol, febuxostat,
267		probenecid, lesinurad, pegloticase)?
268		• Do these effects differ in the following subgroups?
269		• People with CKD 3 or worse versus normal or mild CKD stages (1 or 2)?
270		• People with urolithiasis versus no urolithiasis?
271		• People with cardiovascular disease versus no cardiovascular disease?
272		• People with hypertension versus no hypertension?
273		• People with marked hyperuricemia (SU > 9 mg/dl), versus SU $\leq$ 9mg/dL?
274		• People with early onset disease (<30 in men, premenopausal women) versus those with
275		later onset?
276		<ul> <li>People with renal transplantation versus no renal transplantation?</li> </ul>
277		
278	Ар	proaches to Initiating urate lowering therapy (ULT)
279		
280	6.	For patients diagnosed with gout starting any ULT, what is the impact of starting ULT during a gout
281		flare <u>compared with</u> starting ULT after the gout flare has resolved on: current gout flare severity,
282		current gout flare duration, subsequent gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment,
283		serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse
284		events (mild-moderate and serious)?
285		• Does the relative impact differ across different ULT medications (allopurinol, febuxostat,
286		probenecid, lesinurad, pegloticase)?



287	7.	For patients diagnosed with gout starting any ULT, what is the impact of starting a low dose of the
288		ULT agent (e.g., allopurinol ≤150mg, febuxostat ≤40mg, probenecid 250mg bid) with gradual dose
289		escalation compared with starting the ULT at a higher dose (e.g., allopurinol 300mg, febuxostat
290		80mg, probenecid 1g bid) on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health
291		related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus
292		as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious), patient
293		adherence, durability of ULT?
294		• Does the relative impact differ across different ULT medications (allopurinol, febuxostat,
295		probenecid, lesinurad, pegloticase)?
296	8.	For patients diagnosed with gout prescribed any ULT (allopurinol, febuxostat, probenecid, lesinurad,
297		pegloticase), what is the impact of an non-physician health care professional-augmented (e.g.
298		nursing or pharmacy) package of care <u>compared with</u> usual care on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus,
299		patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum
300		urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events
301		(mild-moderate and serious) patient adherence, durability of ULT?
302		<ul> <li>Does the relative impact differ across different ULT medications (allopurinol, febuxostat,</li> </ul>
303		probenecid, lesinurad, pegloticase)?
304	9.	For patients diagnosed with gout starting any ULT (allopurinol, febuxostat, probenecid, lesinurad,
305		pegloticase), what is the relative impact of concomitant anti-inflammatory prophylaxis therapy
306		(colchicine, NSAIDs, prednisone/prednisolone, canakinumab, rilonacept, anakinra) compared with
307		no anti-inflammatory prophylaxis on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment,
308		health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or
309		tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)
310		patient adherence, durability of ULT? <u>REVISED QUESTION (changed during literature review): For</u>
311		patients diagnosed with gout with an indication for ULT, what is the relative impact of starting
312		allopurinol, febuxostat, probenecid, allopurinol/lesinurad 200mg combination, febuxostat/lesinurad
313		200mg combination, pegloticase, or no treatment?
314		<ul> <li>Does the impact differ if the anti-inflammatory prophylaxis is continued for only three</li> </ul>
315		months, if continued for six months, or if continued until complete resolution of tophi and
316		gout flares?
317		<ul> <li>Does the relative impact differ across different ULT medications (allopurinol, febuxostat,</li> </ul>
318		probenecid, lesinurad, pegloticase)?
319		<ul> <li>Does the relative impact of prophylaxis differ across different starting dosage levels of ULT</li> </ul>
320		(e.g., allopurinol ≤150mg, febuxostat ≤40mg, probenecid 250mg bid) with gradual dose
321		escalation compared with starting the ULT at a higher dose (e.g., allopurinol 300mg,
322		febuxostat 80mg, probenecid 1g bid?



323	10. For patients diagnosed with gout starting ULT, what is the relative impact of starting allopurinol,
324	febuxostat, probenecid, allopurinol/lesinurad 200mg combination, febuxostat/lesinurad 200mg
325	combination, or pegloticase on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health
326	related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus
327	as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)? <u>REVISED</u>
328	QUESTION (changed during literature review): For patients diagnosed with gout with an indication
329	for ULT, what is the relative impact of starting allopurinol, febuxostat, probenecid,
330	allopurinol/lesinurad 200mg combination, febuxostat/lesinurad 200mg combination, pegloticase, or
331	no treatment?
332	<ul> <li>Do the effects differ in people in people with or without established cardiovascular disease,</li> </ul>
333	or in people in people with CKD 3 or worse versus normal or mild CKD stages (1 or 2)?
334	11. For patients diagnosed with gout receiving haemodialysis who are starting ULT, what is the impact
335	of starting allopurinol <u>compared with</u> febuxostat on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global
336	assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in
337	gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate
338	and serious)?
339	12. For patients diagnosed with gout starting allopurinol, what is the impact of testing HLA-B*5801 and
340	avoiding allopurinol if positive result <u>compared with</u> not testing HLA-B*5801 and starting allopurinol
341	in all patients on: cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?
342	<ul> <li>Do the effects differ in people of African American ancestry versus people with Chinese,</li> </ul>
343	Thai, or Korean ancestry versus those with all other ancestries?
344	<ul> <li>Do the effects differ in people with CKD 3 or worse versus normal or mild CKD stages (1 or</li> </ul>
345	2)?
346	<ul> <li>Do the effects differ in people starting a low allopurinol dose (e.g. ≤100mg) with gradual</li> </ul>
347	dose escalation vs. starting allopurinol at a higher dose (eg, 300mg)?
348	
349	Ongoing Management of Urate-Lowering Therapy in patients with gout
350	
351	Definitions: Conceptual detail for ULT dosing for PICO 13
352	<u>ULT dosing</u> is either a
353	<ul> <li>Pre-specified ULT fixed dose based on drug, dose and renal function: E.g. allopurinol 300</li> </ul>
354 255	mg, febuxostat 40 mg, probenecid 500 mg twice daily or allopurinol 200 mg (or lower),
355	febuxostat 40 mg in patients with CKD > 3 <b>OR</b>
356	<ul> <li>Serum urate target specified ULT dose where ULT dosing is guided by serial serum urate</li> </ul>
357	values measured after each change in dose
358	



359	13.	For patients with gout on ULT, what is the relative impact of ULT dose titration and subsequent
360		management guided by serial serum urate values <u>compared with</u> fixed, standard doses of ULT on:
361		gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity
362		limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in
363		serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious), patient adherence, durability of
364		ULT?
365		• Does the impact of dosing strategy differ by presence vs absence of comorbid disease (e.g.
366		CKD 3 or worse or cardiovascular disease), frequency of gout flares, presence of
367		subcutaneous tophi?
368		• Specifically, could serum urate target dosing exceeding Hande dosing recommendations?
369		Does the impact differ by frequency of monitoring?
370	14.	For patients with gout on ULT who are not in <i>clinical remission</i> , what is the relative impact of
371		prescribing ULT to achieve a serum urate target of [INSERT VALUE] on: gout flares, pain scores,
372		tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage,
373		serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse
374		events (mild-moderate and serious), patient adherence, durability of ULT?
375		< 6 mg/dL vs. <u>&gt;</u> 6mg/dL, OR
376		< 5 mg/dL vs. <u>&gt;</u> 5mg/dL OR
377		< 4 mg/dL vs. <u>&gt;</u> 4mg/dL OR
378		< 3 mg/dL vs. <u>&gt;</u> 3mg/dL?
379		
380		• Does the impact differ by flare frequency, presence of subcutaneous tophi? (See below for
381		patients in <i>clinical remission</i> .)
382		<ul> <li>Does the impact differ by frequency of monitoring?</li> </ul>
383	15.	For patients with gout on ULT who are in clinical remission, what is the relative impact of prescribing
384		ULT to achieve a serum urate target of [INSERT VALUE] on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient
385		global assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate,
386		changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-
387		moderate and serious), patient adherence, durability of ULT?
388		< 8 mg/dL vs. <u>&gt;</u> 8mg/dL, OR
389		< 7 mg/dL vs. <u>&gt;</u> 7mg/dL, OR
390		< 6.8 mg/dL vs. <u>&gt;</u> 6.8mg/dL, OR
391		< 6 mg/dL vs. <u>&gt;</u> 6mg/dL?
392		
393		<ul> <li>Does the impact differ by duration of clinical remission (e.g., 1-year vs. 5-years)?</li> </ul>
394		<ul> <li>Does the impact differ by frequency of monitoring?</li> </ul>



Project Plan – October 2018Updated March 2019

395 16. For patients with gout on ULT > 2 years, what is the impact of checking serum urate on a regular 396 schedule and making adjustments in ULT guided by serum urate concentration compared with not 397 checking serum urate to guide future ULT use / dosing on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient 398 global assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, 399 changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-400 moderate and serious), patient adherence, and durability of ULT? 401 Does the impact of checking vs. not checking differ by: 402 Frequency of monitoring (e.g., every 6 months vs. every 12 months) 403 Disease severity: presence or duration of clinical remission, flare frequency, • 404 presence of subcutaneous tophi 405 17. For patients with gout on ULT who have achieved serum urate target but still have sufficient 406 inflammatory symptoms to warrant ULT re-evaluation (e.g.,  $\geq 2$  flares in the last 12-months), what is 407 the impact of lowering serum urate target by an additional 1 mg/dL and dose escalating ULT to this 408 target compared with not changing the serum urate target and making no change to ULT on: gout 409 flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity 410 limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in 411 serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)? 18. For patients with gout adherent to ULT who have not achieved serum urate target, but have 412 infrequent symptoms (gout flares well controlled (< 1 flare in last 6 months)) and no subcutaneous 413 414 tophi, what is the impact of increasing ULT dose to achieve serum urate target compared with 415 continuing current ULT dose on gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health 416 related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus 417 as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)? 418 Does this impact differ if patient is in 1-year or 5-year clinical remission? 419 19. For patients with gout on ULT in *clinical remission*, what is the impact of stopping or reducing ULT 420 compared with continuing ULT on gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health 421 related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)? 422 423 Do these effects differ based on the sustainable serum urate level following ULT reduction 424 or cessation off ULT or the duration of clinical remission (e.g. 1-year vs. 5-years)? 425 20. For patients with gout on ULT in clinical remission, what is the impact of relaxing the serum urate 426 target compared with continuing current serum urate target on gout flares, pain scores, tophus, 427 patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events 428 429 (mild-moderate and serious)? 430 Do these effects differ based on the duration of clinical remission (e.g. 1-year vs. 5-years)? •



431 432 433 434	21. For patients with gout on <i>intensive ULT</i> management (e.g. ULT to achieve sUA < 3 mg/dL), what is the impact of the duration of intensive ULT therapy for [INSERT VALUE] on gout flares, tophus burden, neurotoxicity and cancer risk, mortality rates?	
435 436 437	< 1 year vs. <u>&gt;</u> 1 year OR < 2 years vs. <u>&gt;</u> 2 years	
438 439 440 441 442 443	22. For patients with gout on <u>febuxostat</u> with a history of CVD or a new CV event, what is the impact of stopping and switching to an alternative ULT agent <u>compared with</u> continuing febuxostat after reviewing the risks and benefits of febuxostat with the patient on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?	
444 445 446 447	<ol> <li>In patients with gout who have experienced an allergic response to allopurinol and who cannot be treated with other oral ULT, what is the impact of allopurinol desensitization on tolerability of allopurinol, adverse events, cost, and patient acceptability.</li> </ol>	
448 449 450	For patients not at serum urate target <u>and</u> the inflammatory symptoms of gout or tophi are poorly controlled:	
450 451 452 453 454 455 455 456 457	24. For patients with gout on their first XOI monotherapy at maximum tolerated or FDA indicated dose who are not at serum urate target and/or have continued frequent gout flares or non-resolving subcutaneous tophi, what is the impact of switching the first XOI to an alternate XOI agent <u>compared with</u> adding a uricosuric agent on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?	
458 459	<ul> <li>Do these effects differ based on the presence of chronic kidney disease or the magnitude of hyperuricemia?</li> </ul>	
460 461 462 463 464 465	25. For patients with gout on second (maximum tolerated or FDA indicated dose) XOI agent who are n at serum urate target and/or have continued frequent gout flares or non-resolving subcutaneous tophi, what is the impact of adding a uricosuric <u>compared with</u> switching to uricosuric monotherap on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activit limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?	by :y
466 467	<ul> <li>Do these effects differ based on the presence of chronic kidney disease or the magnitude of hyperuricemia or 24 hour urate excretion?</li> </ul>	of



468	26. For patients with gout on (max) probenecid monotherapy (e.g. XOI failure) who are not at serum
469	urate target and/or have continued frequent flares or non-resolving subcutaneous tophi, what is the
470	impact of adding XOI <u>compared with</u> switching to lesinurad/XOI on gout flares, pain scores, tophus,
471	patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum
472	urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events
473	(mild-moderate and serious)?
474 475	• Do these effects differ based on the presence of chronic kidney disease or the magnitude of hyperuricemia?
476	27. For patients with gout where XOI, uricosurics and other interventions failed to achieve serum urate
477	target and have frequent gout flares or non-resolving subcutaneous tophi what is the impact of
478	changing to pegloticase <u>compared with</u> continuing current ULT on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus,
479	patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum
480	urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events
481	(mild-moderate and serious)?
482	Does the impact differ by frequency or severity of symptoms or presence or severity of tophi
483	affect recommendation?
484	
485	For patients considered for or on uricosuric treatment:
486	
487	28. Prior to starting any uricosuric treatment, what is the impact of checking urinary uric acid compared
488	with not checking urinary uric acid on: nephrolithiasis?
489	• Does this recommendation differ for patients where uricosuric is to be added to XOI
490	treatment compared with those who will receive uricosuric treatment alone?
491	29. For all patients on uricosuric treatment, what is the impact of alkalinizing urine <u>compared with</u> not
492	doing so on: nephrolithiasis?
493	• Does this recommendation differ for patients where uricosuric is to be added to XOI
494	treatment compared with those who will receive uricosuric treatment alone?
495	30. For all patients on uricosuric treatment, what is the impact of monitoring urinary uric acid at regular
496	intervals while on therapy <u>compared with</u> not doing so on: nephrolithiasis?
497	• Does this recommendation differ for patients where uricosuric is to be added to XOI
498	treatment compared with those who will receive uricosuric treatment alone?
499	
500	
501	Gout Flares
502	
503	General Management of a Gout Flare
504	



505	31.	For patients experiencing a gout flare initiating anti-inflammatory treatment, what is the impact of
506		using topical ice as an adjuvant treatment compared with no adjuvant treatment on: pain scores,
507		patient global assessment, joint tenderness, activity limitation, adverse events (mild-moderate and
508		serious)?
509	32.	For patients experiencing a gout flare, what is the relative impact of colchicine, NSAIDs, systemic
510		glucocorticoids (e.g. prednisone/prednisolone), intra-articular glucocorticoids, ACTH, or IL-1
511		inhibition on: pain scores, patient global assessment, joint tenderness, joint swelling, activity
512		limitation, cost, or adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)? <u>REVISED QUESTION (changed</u>
513		during literature review): For patients experiencing a gout flare, what is the relative impact of high
514		dose colchicine, low dose colchicine, NSAIDs, systemic glucocorticoids (e.g.
515		prednisone/prednisolone), intra-articular glucocorticoids, ACTH, IL-1 inhibition, or no treatment?
516		<ul> <li>Does the relative impact of these agents differ based on any of the following?</li> </ul>
517		<ul> <li>The number of joints involved</li> </ul>
518		o Pain levels
519		<ul> <li>Duration of the flare at presentation</li> </ul>
520		<ul> <li>Duration of anti-inflammatory therapy</li> </ul>
521		<ul> <li>Ability to tolerate or take oral agents (e.g. NPO status)</li> </ul>
522		<ul> <li>Dose of the agent given</li> </ul>
523	33.	For patients experiencing a gout flare for whom anti-inflammatory therapies are poorly tolerated or
524		contraindicated, what is the impact of IL-1 inhibition <u>compared with</u> no therapy (beyond supportive
525		/ analgesic treatment) on: pain scores, patient global assessment, joint tenderness, joint swelling,
526		activity limitation, cost, or adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?
527		
528	Ма	nagement in Patients with Suboptimal Treatment Responses after 36-48 hours
529		
530	34.	For patients experiencing a gout flare and achieving a suboptimal treatment response after 36-48
531		hours, what is the impact of switching to an alternative anti-inflammatory monotherapy <u>compared</u>
532		with continuing the same treatment on: pain scores, patient global assessment, joint tenderness,
533		joint swelling, activity limitation, cost, or adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?
534	35.	For patients experiencing a gout flare and achieving a suboptimal treatment response after 36-48
535		hours, what is the impact of adding an additional anti-inflammatory agent (e.g. escalating to
536		combination therapy) <u>compared with</u> continuing the same treatment on pain scores, patient global
537		assessment, joint tenderness, joint swelling, activity limitation, cost, or adverse events (mild-
538		moderate and serious)?
539	36.	For patients experiencing a gout flare and achieving a suboptimal treatment response after 36-48
540		hours, what is the impact of switching to an alternative anti-inflammatory monotherapy <u>compared</u>
541		with adding an additional anti-inflammatory agent (e.g. escalating to combination therapy) on: pain



542		scores, patient global assessment, joint tenderness, joint swelling, activity limitation, cost, or
543		adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?
544	37.	For patients experiencing a gout flare and achieving a suboptimal treatment response after 36-48
545		hours, what is the impact of switching to an alternative anti-inflammatory agent compared with
546		switching to or adding IL-1 inhibition on: pain scores, patient global assessment, joint tenderness,
547		joint swelling, activity limitation, cost, or adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?
548	38.	For patients experiencing a gout flare and achieving a suboptimal treatment response after 36-48
549		hours, what is the impact of adding an additional anti-inflammatory agent (e.g. escalating to
550		combination therapy) <u>compared with</u> switching to or adding IL-1 inhibition on: pain scores, patient
551		global assessment, joint tenderness, joint swelling, activity limitation, cost, or adverse events (mild-
552		moderate and serious)?
553	39.	For patients experiencing a gout flare and achieving a suboptimal treatment response to an oral
554		anti-inflammatory after 36-48 hours, what is the impact of switching to an alternative oral anti-
555		inflammatory agent compared with the use of intra-articular glucocorticoids on: pain scores, patient
556		global assessment, joint tenderness, joint swelling, activity limitation, cost, or adverse events (mild-
557		moderate and serious)?
558		<ul> <li>Does the relative impact of these strategies differ by the number of joints involved (e.g.</li> </ul>
559		mono- or oligoarticular involvement vs. polyarticular involvement)?
560	40.	For patients experiencing a gout flare and achieving a suboptimal treatment response to an oral
561		anti-inflammatory after 36-48 hours, what is the impact of adding an additional anti-inflammatory
562		agent (e.g. escalating to combination therapy) <u>compared with</u> the use of intra-articular
563		glucocorticoids on pain scores, patient global assessment, joint tenderness, joint swelling, activity
564		limitation, cost, or adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?
565		<ul> <li>Does the relative impact of these strategies differ by the number of joints involved (e.g.</li> </ul>
566		mono- or oligoarticular involvement vs. polyarticular involvement)?
567		
568		
569	Life	estyle factors in patients with gout
570		
571	For	patients with gout, regardless of disease activity:
572		
573	41.	What is the impact of limiting or abstaining from alcohol intake <u>compared with</u> no limited intake of
574		alcohol on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life,
575		activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by
576		changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious), patient acceptability,
577		QOL?
578		<ul> <li>Does the impact differ by flare frequency (frequent vs. infrequent)?</li> </ul>



579		• Does the impact differ by the type of alcohol?
580	42.	What is the impact of limiting purine intake <u>compared with</u> no limited intake of purines on: gout
581		flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity
582		limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in
583		serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious), patient acceptability, QOL?
584		• Does the impact differ by flare frequency (frequent vs. infrequent)?
585	43.	What is the impact of limiting or abstaining from high-fructose corn syrup (HFCS) compared with no
586		limited intake of HFCS on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related
587		quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as
588		inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious), patient
589		acceptability, QOL?
590		<ul> <li>Does the impact differ by flare frequency (frequent vs. infrequent)?</li> </ul>
591	44.	What is the impact of increasing dairy protein intake <u>compared with</u> no increase in dairy intake on:
592		gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity
593		limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in
594		serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious), patient acceptability, QOL?
595		<ul> <li>Does the impact differ by flare frequency (frequent vs. infrequent)?</li> </ul>
596	45.	What is the impact of following the DASH (Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension) diet <u>compared</u>
597		with no specific diet or any other diet on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global
598		assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in
599		gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate
600		and serious), patient acceptability, QOL?
601		<ul> <li>Does the impact differ by flare frequency (frequent vs. infrequent)?</li> </ul>
602	46.	What is the impact of weight loss <u>compared with</u> no weight loss on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus,
603		patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum
604		urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events
605		(mild-moderate and serious), patient acceptability, QOL?
606		<ul> <li>Does the impact differ by flare frequency (frequent vs. infrequent)?</li> </ul>
607	47.	What is the impact of changing or adding medications that affect urate levels <u>compared with</u> no
608		change in medication on: gout flares, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related
609		quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as
610		inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious)?
611		<ul> <li>Does the impact differ by flare frequency (frequent vs. infrequent)?</li> </ul>
612		<ul> <li>Does the impact differ by type of medication change?</li> </ul>
613		<ul> <li>Does the impact differ by CKD?</li> </ul>



614	48. What	is the impact of vitamin C supplementation <u>compared with</u> no supplementation on: gout
615	flares	, pain scores, tophus, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity
616	limita	tion, joint damage, serum urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in
617	serun	n urate, cost, adverse events (mild-moderate and serious), patient acceptability, QOL?
618	•	Does the impact differ by flare frequency (frequent vs. infrequent)?
619	49. What	is the impact of cherry extract intake <u>compared with</u> no intake on: gout flares, pain scores,
620	tophu	us, patient global assessment, health related quality of life, activity limitation, joint damage,
621	serun	n urate, changes in gout flares or tophus as inferred by changes in serum urate, cost, adverse
622	event	s (mild-moderate and serious), patient acceptability, QOL?
623	•	Does the impact differ by flare frequency (frequent vs. infrequent)?
624	Asympto	matic Hyperuricemia
625		
626	For indivi	duals with asymptomatic hyperuricemia:
627		
628		is the impact of limiting or abstaining from alcohol intake compared with no limited intake of
629		ol on: development of gout (flare, subcutaneous tophi), adverse events (mild-moderate and
630		us), patient acceptability, QOL?
631	Does	the impact differ for:
632	•	People with marked hyperuricemia (SU > 9 mg/dl), versus SU 6.8-≤9mg/dL?
633	•	People with CKD 3 or worse versus stages 1 or 2 or no renal disease?
634	•	People with urolithiasis versus no urolithiasis?
635	•	People with cardiovascular disease versus no cardiovascular disease?
636	•	People with hypertension versus no hypertension?
637	•	People with renal transplantation versus no renal transplantation?
638	•	People with radiographic gouty bone erosion?
639	•	People with advanced imaging (US/DECT) evidence of MSU deposition?
640	•	People with early onset hyperuricemia (<30 in men, premenopausal women) versus those
641		with later onset?
642	51. What	is the impact of limiting purine intake <u>compared with</u> no limited intake of purines on:
643	devel	opment of gout (flare, subcutaneous tophi), adverse events (mild-moderate and serious),
644	patie	nt acceptability, QOL?
645	Does	the impact differ for:
646	•	People with marked hyperuricemia (SU > 9 mg/dl), versus SU 6.8-≤9mg/dL?
647	•	People with CKD 3 or worse versus stages 1 or 2 or no renal disease?
648	•	People with urolithiasis versus no urolithiasis?
649	•	People with cardiovascular disease versus no cardiovascular disease?



650	People with hypertension versus no hypertension?
651	<ul> <li>People with renal transplantation versus no renal transplantation?</li> </ul>
652	<ul> <li>People with radiographic gouty bone erosion?</li> </ul>
653	<ul> <li>People with advanced imaging (US/DECT) evidence of MSU deposition?</li> </ul>
654	<ul> <li>Does the impact differ by type of source purine (e.g. animal vs. vegetable)?</li> </ul>
655	52. What is the impact of limiting or abstaining from high-fructose corn syrup (HFCS) compared with no
656	limited intake of HFCS on: development of gout (flare, subcutaneous tophi), adverse events (mild-
657	moderate and serious), patient acceptability, QOL?
658	Does the impact differ for:
659	<ul> <li>People with marked hyperuricemia (SU &gt; 9 mg/dl), versus SU 6.8-≤9mg/dL?</li> </ul>
660	<ul> <li>People with CKD 3 or worse versus stages 1 or 2 or no renal disease?</li> </ul>
661	<ul> <li>People with urolithiasis versus no urolithiasis?</li> </ul>
662	<ul> <li>People with cardiovascular disease versus no cardiovascular disease?</li> </ul>
663	<ul> <li>People with hypertension versus no hypertension?</li> </ul>
664	<ul> <li>People with renal transplantation versus no renal transplantation?</li> </ul>
665	<ul> <li>People with radiographic gouty bone erosion?</li> </ul>
666	<ul> <li>People with advanced imaging (US/DECT) evidence of MSU deposition?</li> </ul>
667	• People with early onset hyperuricemia (<30 in men, premenopausal women) versus those
668	with later onset?
669	53. What is the impact of increasing dairy protein intake <u>compared with</u> no increase in dairy intake on:
670	development of gout (flare, subcutaneous tophi), adverse events (mild-moderate and serious),
671	patient acceptability, QOL?
672	Does the impact differ for:
673	<ul> <li>People with marked hyperuricemia (SU &gt; 9 mg/dl), versus SU 6.8-≤9mg/dL?</li> </ul>
674	<ul> <li>People with CKD 3 or worse versus stages 1 or 2 or no renal disease?</li> </ul>
675	<ul> <li>People with urolithiasis versus no urolithiasis?</li> </ul>
676	<ul> <li>People with cardiovascular disease versus no cardiovascular disease?</li> </ul>
677	<ul> <li>People with hypertension versus no hypertension?</li> </ul>
678	<ul> <li>People with renal transplantation versus no renal transplantation?</li> </ul>
679	<ul> <li>People with radiographic gouty bone erosion?</li> </ul>
680	<ul> <li>People with advanced imaging (US/DECT) evidence of MSU deposition?</li> </ul>
681	• People with early onset hyperuricemia (<30 in men, premenopausal women) versus those
682	with later onset?
683	54. What is the impact of following the DASH (Dietary Approaches to Stop Hypertension) diet compared
684	with no specific diet or any other diet on: development of gout (flare, subcutaneous tophi), adverse
685	events (mild-moderate and serious), patient acceptability, QOL?



686	Does the impact differ for:
687	<ul> <li>People with marked hyperuricemia (SU &gt; 9 mg/dl), versus SU 6.8-≤9mg/dL?</li> </ul>
688	<ul> <li>People with CKD 3 or worse versus stages 1 or 2 or no renal disease?</li> </ul>
689	<ul> <li>People with urolithiasis versus no urolithiasis?</li> </ul>
690	<ul> <li>People with cardiovascular disease versus no cardiovascular disease?</li> </ul>
691	<ul> <li>People with hypertension versus no hypertension?</li> </ul>
692	<ul> <li>People with renal transplantation versus no renal transplantation?</li> </ul>
693	<ul> <li>People with radiographic gouty bone erosion?</li> </ul>
694	<ul> <li>People with advanced imaging (US/DECT) evidence of MSU deposition?</li> </ul>
695	• People with early onset hyperuricemia (<30 in men, premenopausal women) versus those
696	with later onset?
697	55. What is the impact of weight loss compared with no weight loss on: development of gout (flare,
698	subcutaneous tophi), adverse events (mild-moderate and serious), patient acceptability, QOL?
699	Does the impact differ for:
700	<ul> <li>People with marked hyperuricemia (SU &gt; 9 mg/dl), versus SU 6.8-≤9mg/dL?</li> </ul>
701	<ul> <li>People with CKD 3 or worse versus stages 1 or 2 or no renal disease?</li> </ul>
702	<ul> <li>People with urolithiasis versus no urolithiasis?</li> </ul>
703	<ul> <li>People with cardiovascular disease versus no cardiovascular disease?</li> </ul>
704	<ul> <li>People with hypertension versus no hypertension?</li> </ul>
705	<ul> <li>People with renal transplantation versus no renal transplantation?</li> </ul>
706	<ul> <li>People with radiographic gouty bone erosion?</li> </ul>
707	<ul> <li>People with advanced imaging (US/DECT) evidence of MSU deposition?</li> </ul>
708	• People with early onset hyperuricemia (<30 in men, premenopausal women) versus those
709	with later onset?
710	56. What is the impact of changing or adding medications that affect urate levels (such as losartan or
711	fenofibrate) compared with no change in medication on: development of gout (flare, subcutaneous
712	tophi), adverse events (mild-moderate and serious), patient acceptability, QOL?
713	Does the impact differ for:
714	<ul> <li>People with marked hyperuricemia (SU &gt; 9 mg/dl), versus SU 6.8-≤9mg/dL?</li> </ul>
715	<ul> <li>People with CKD 3 or worse versus stages 1 or 2 or no renal disease?</li> </ul>
716	<ul> <li>People with urolithiasis versus no urolithiasis?</li> </ul>
717	<ul> <li>People with cardiovascular disease versus no cardiovascular disease?</li> </ul>
718	<ul> <li>People with hypertension versus no hypertension?</li> </ul>
719	<ul> <li>People with renal transplantation versus no renal transplantation?</li> </ul>
720	<ul> <li>People with radiographic gouty bone erosion?</li> </ul>
721	<ul> <li>People with advanced imaging (US/DECT) evidence of MSU deposition?</li> </ul>



722 723	<ul> <li>People with early onset hyperuricemia (&lt;30 in men, premenopausal women) versus those with later onset?</li> </ul>					
-						
724	57. What is the impact of initiating any pharmacologic urate-lowering therapy (allopurinol, febuxostat,					
725	probenecid) <u>compared with</u> no initiation of pharmacologic ULT on: development of gout (flare,					
726	subcutaneous tophi), adverse events (mild-moderate and serious), patient acceptability, QOL?					
727	Does the impact differ for:					
728	<ul> <li>People with marked hyperuricemia (SU &gt; 9 mg/dl), versus SU 6.8-≤9mg/dL?</li> </ul>					
729	<ul> <li>People with CKD 3 or worse versus stages 1 or 2 or no renal disease?</li> </ul>					
730	<ul> <li>People with urolithiasis versus no urolithiasis?</li> </ul>					
731	<ul> <li>People with cardiovascular disease versus no cardiovascular disease?</li> </ul>					
732	<ul> <li>People with hypertension versus no hypertension?</li> </ul>					
733	<ul> <li>People with renal transplantation versus no renal transplantation?</li> </ul>					
734	<ul> <li>People with radiographic gouty bone erosion?</li> </ul>					
735	<ul> <li>People with advanced imaging (US/DECT) evidence of MSU deposition?</li> </ul>					
736	<ul> <li>People with early onset hyperuricemia (&lt;30 in men, premenopausal women) versus those</li> </ul>					
737	with later onset?					
738						

# APPENDIX B – Participant Disclosures

In order for the College to most effectively further its mission and to otherwise maintain its excellent reputation in the medical community and with the public, it is important that confidence in the College in order to avoid undue influence of potential conflicts. The purpose of the ACR's Disclosure Policy is identification of relationships which may pose actual or potential conflicts. These actual or potential conflicts can then be evaluated by the College so that adjustments can be made that will avoid any undue influence. This policy is based on the principle that, in many cases, full disclosure of the actual or potentially conflicting relationship will of itself suffice to protect the integrity of the College and its interests.

Participants	Role	Primary Employment	Sources of Personal Income	Intellectual Property	Research Grants/Contracts	Investments to include medical industry and nonmedical industry	Organizational Benefit	Activities with Other Organizations	Family or Other Relation
ohn FitzGerald, MD, PhD	Core Team/Co-PI/Voting Panel Leader	UCLA	N/A	N/A	UCLA OAIC	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
uhina Neogi, MD, PhD, FRCPC	Core Team/Co-PI/Voting Panel Leader	Boston University	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
				,	VA; NIH/NIGMS; NIH/NIAAA;	,	Pfizer (Steering		
					NIH/NIAMS; BMS; Horizon;		Committee/Consultant for		
ed Mikuls, MD, MSPH	Core Team/Content Expert	University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha VA Medical Center	N/A	N/A	Ironwood; RRF; Pfizer	N/A	Phase 4 Study)	N/A	N/A
licola Dalbeth, MD, FRACP	Core Team/Content Expert	The University of Auckland	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
omina Brignardello-Petersen, DDS, MSc, PhD	Core Team/Lit Review Leader	McMaster University	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Gordon Guyatt, MD, MSc, FRCP, OC	Core Team/GRADE Expert	McMaster University	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
					NIH/NIAMS; Bristol Myers				
					Squibb; Roche; Biologics & Biosimilars Collective				
					Intelligence Consortium; Merck	<i>.</i>			
			Arthritis Care & Research		BMS; AstraZeneca/Ironwood;	×,			
Seoyoung Kim, MD, ScD, MSCE	Lit Review Team	Brigham and Women's Hospital	(Associate Editor)	N/A	Genentech	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
				,	AstraZeneca; NIH; Horizon;	,	,		
Puja P. Khanna, MD, MPH	Lit Review Team	University of Michigan, VA Ann Arbor Healthcare System	SOBI (Advisory Board)	N/A	Ironwood	N/A	N/A	VA Consortium (Co-I CRYSTAL Research Registry)	N/A
Sharon Bae, MD	Lit Review Team	UCLA	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
/lary Ann Zhang, MD	Lit Review Team	Brigham and Women's Hospital	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
bhijeet Danve, MBBS, MD, FACP	Lit Review Team	Yale University School of Medicine	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Aleksander Lenert, MD, FRCPC	Lit Review Team	University of Kentucky	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
amuel Poon, MD	Lit Review Team	Manchester VA Medical Center	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
arun Sudhir Kumar Sharma, MD	Lit Review Team	Allegheny Health Network	N/A	N/A	AMGEN	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Aichael Toprover, MD	Lit Review Team	NYU Langone Health Department of Medicine	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A
Aarat Turgunbaev, MD, MPH	Lit Review Team	American College of Rheumatology	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		IN/A
Amit Aakash Shah, MD, MPH Anila Qasim, HBSc, MSc	Lit Review Team Lit Review Team	American College of Rheumatology Toronto Public Library and McMaster University	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A
Shiv T. Sehra, MD	Lit Review Team	Cambridge	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	
inan Zeng	Lit Review Team	West China Second University Hospital, Sichuan University, McMaster University	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A
N. Lawrence Edwards, MD, MACP, MACR	Voting Panel	University of Florida	(Consultant); Ironwood		N/A	N/A	N/A	Gout and Uric Acid Education Society (CEO and Chair)	
Aryeh Abeles, MD	Voting Panel	University of Connecticut	Abbvie	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
•		· · ·	SOBI (Advisory Board);	N/A	Takeda		N/A	Current Rheumatology Reports (Editorial Board)	
Michael Pillinger, MD Gerald Levy, MD, MBA	Voting Panel Voting Panel	New York University School of Medicine Southern California Permanente Medical Group	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A	N/A N/A
Dinesh Khanna, MD, MSc	Voting Panel	University of Michigan	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Charles King, MD	Voting Panel	North Mississippi Medical Center	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
								American Board of Internal Medicine; Member,	
								Rheumatology Specialty Board; American Academy of	
								Physician Assistants (Chair, Commission on Continuing	
								Professional Development and Education); American	
								Academy of Physician Assistants (Member, Audit	
								Committee); American College of	
								Rheumatology/Association of Rheumatology Health	
								Professionals (Scientific Editor, Advanced Rheumatology	
Benjamin J. Smith, PA-C, DFAAPA	Voting Panel	Florida State University College of Medicine	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	Course)	N/A
			Honoraria (gout CME						
Allan Gelber, MD, MPH, PhD	Voting Panel	Johns Hopkins University	presentation)	N/A	ACR RRF; Harvard/Hopkins	N/A	N/A	NIH/NIAMS (Study Safety Officer)	N/A
			Bristol Myers Squib (Advisory	/			,		
			Board); Roche (presentation						
Leslie Harrold, MD	Voting Panel	UMass Medical School	at EULAR)	N/A	Pfizer	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
David Mount, MD	Voting Panel	Harvard BWH	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Ann Rosenthal, MD	Voting Panel	Medical College of Wisconsin	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
					PCORI; Individualized Patient				
					Decision Making for Treatment				
			American College of		Choices Among Minorities with	1			
			Rheumatology; Horizon		Lupus; NIAMS; Gout and				
			Pharmaceuticals/DINORA;		Hyperuricemia Center for				
			Fidia Pharmaceuticals;		Research and Translation				
			WebMD (CME activity); UBM	,	(CORT); AHRQ; UAB Center for				
			LLC (CME activity);		Education and Research on				
			MMedscape (CME activity);		Therapeutics (CERTs); VA;				
			South Carolina Society		Storytelling to Improve Disease			OMERACT (Steering Committee, Editorial Board); JCR	
			Rheumatology; Georgia		outcomes in Gout: The STRIDE-	-		(Editorial Board); BMC MSD (Editorial Board); VA Field	
asvinder Singh, MD, MPH	Voting Panel	University of Alabama at Birmingham	Society of Rheumatology	N/A	GO2 study	N/A	N/A	Advisory Committee (Member)	N/A
Caryn Libbey, MD	Voting Panel	Boston Medical Center; Boston VA Hospital	N/A	N/A	Veteran Cooperative Study	N/A	N/A	Medicare Carrier Advisory Committee	N/A
					PCORI; Advance care planning i	"			
					primary care; UniHealth; NCI;			Southern CA Bioethics Consortium, board member; NCQ/	٨.
leil Wenger MD	Voting Panel	UCLA Department of Medicine	N/A	N/A	Genetic testing for breast cancer; NIA; Dementia care	N/A	N/A	GMAP; Science Center Museum, Ethics Committee	~,   N/Δ
Neil Wenger, MD	Voting Panel				Cancer, MA, Dementia Care				Amy Turner (daughter/A
ames Edward Sims (patient)	Voting Panel	Fulton County Georgia	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	employee)
ngelo Gaffo, MD, MSPH	Expert Panel	University of Alabama at Birmingham	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A N/A	N/A
אוקכוס סמווס, ועוסר ח			Ironwood/AstraZeneca						
			(Consultant); Horizon						
			(Consultant); SOBI						
			(Consultant); Takeda		Ironwood/AstraZeneca;				
enneth G. Saag, MD, MSc	Expert Panel	University of Alabama at Birmingham	(Consultant)	N/A	Horizon; SOBI; Takeda	N/A	N/A	National Osterporosis Foundation (Board President)	N/A
ed Fields, MD, FACP	Expert Panel	HSS	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A N/A	N/A	N/A N/A
		105			ויאַר	ייין		W A	