World Journal of Gastroenterology

Submit a Manuscript: http://www.f6publishing.com

World J Gastroenterol 2018 June 14; 24(22): 2363-2372

DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v24.i22.2363

ISSN 1007-9327 (print) ISSN 2219-2840 (online)

MINIREVIEWS

Quality of care in inflammatory bowel diseases: What is the best way to better outcomes?

Matthew Strohl, Lorant Gonczi, Zsuzsanna Kurt, Talat Bessissow, Peter L Lakatos

Matthew Strohl, Talat Bessissow, Peter L Lakatos, Division of Gastroenterology, McGill University Health Center, Montreal, Québec H4A 3J1, Canada

Lorant Gonczi, Zsuzsanna Kurti, Peter L Lakatos, First Department of Medicine, Semmelweis University, Koranyi, Budapest 1083, Hungary

ORCID number: Matthew Strohl (0000-0001-8482-7846); Lorant Gonczi (0000-0002-8819-6460); Zsuzsanna Kurti (0000-0001-8671-6576); Talat Bessissow (0000-0003-2610-1910); Peter L Lakatos (0000-0002-3948-6488).

Author contributions: All authors contributed to writing of the manuscript and approved the final version for submission.

Conflict-of-interest statement: There are no conflicts of interest to report from any of the study's authors.

Open-Access: This article is an open-access article which was selected by an in-house editor and fully peer-reviewed by external reviewers. It is distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution Non Commercial (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits others to distribute, remix, adapt, build upon this work non-commercially, and license their derivative works on different terms, provided the original work is properly cited and the use is non-commercial. See: http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Manuscript source: Invited manuscript

Correspondence to: Peter L Lakatos, DSc, MD, PhD, Professor, Staff Physician, Division of Gastroenterology, McGill University Health Center, 1650 Cedar Avenue, Montreal, Québec H4A 3J1, Canada. kislakpet99@gmail.com
Telephone: +36-1-2100278
Fax: +36-1-3130250

Received: March 22, 2018
Peer-review started: March 23, 2018
First decision: April 18, 2018
Revised: April 24, 2018
Accepted: April 24, 2018
Article in press: May 26, 2018
Published online: June 14, 2018

Abstract

Inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) is a lifelong, progressive disease that has disabling impacts on patient's lives. Given the complex nature of the diagnosis of IBD and its management there is consequently a large economic burden seen across all health care systems. Quality indicators (QI) have been created to assess the different façades of disease management including structure, process and outcome components. Their development serves to provide a means to target and measure quality of care (QoC). Multiple different QI sets have been published in IBD, but all serve the same purpose of trying to achieve a standard of care that can be attained on a national and international level, since there is still a major variation in clinical practice. There have been many recent innovative developments that aim to improve QoC in IBD including telemedicine, home biomarker assessment and rapid access clinics. These are some of the novel advancements that have been shown to have great potential at improving QoC, while offloading some of the burden that IBD can have vis-a-vis emergency room visits and hospital admissions. The aim of the current review is to summarize and discuss available QI sets and recent developments in IBD care including telemedicine, and to give insight into how the utilization of these tools could benefit the QoC of IBD patients. Additionally, a treating-to-target structure as well as evidence surrounding aggressive management directed at tighter disease control will be presented.

Key words: Inflammatory bowel disease; Telemedicine; Quality indicators; Quality of care; Treat-to-target

© **The Author(s) 2018.** Published by Baishideng Publishing Group Inc. All rights reserved.

Core tip: The approach to diagnosis, follow up and management of inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) has undergone a major transformation in the past decade. Many different international quality indicators that span structure, process and outcome measures have been

developed. These serve as major targets in optimizing quality of care (QoC). New developments have been designed to improve QoC including utilizing telemedicine, home biomarker testing and providing rapid access care to patients. Treating to target with proactive disease management guided by clinical history utilizing adjunctive biomarkers at the onset of IBD has been shown to improve objective outcomes. This will likely serve as the new favored treatment approach in many IBD centers across the globe.

Strohl M, Gonczi L, Kurt Z, Bessissow T, Lakatos PL. Quality of care in inflammatory bowel diseases: What is the best way to better outcomes? *World J Gastroenterol* 2018; 24(22): 2363-2372 Available from: URL: http://www.wjgnet.com/1007-9327/full/v24/i22/2363.htm DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3748/wjg.v24.i22.2363

INTRODUCTION

Inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) which primarily encompass ulcerative colitis (UC) and Crohn's disease (CD) are chronic, progressive and disabling inflammatory diseases of the gastrointestinal (GI) tract, that in the uncontrolled setting often have disabling effects on an individual's health and overall quality of life[1-3]. The prevalence and incidence of IBD is higher in North America and Western Europe compared to other parts of the world with data suggesting these rates are increasing[4,5]. Owing to IBD's chronicity, varying degrees of severity and lifelong presence it contributes a large economic burden in all health care systems[1,6].

The treatment approach to managing IBD has evolved in the past decade undergoing a significant paradigm shift in philosophy. With the advent of early and routine use of biological therapies the manner in which IBD is diagnosed, managed and monitored has been in constant flux. The most recent advancements have been catalyzed by evidence suggesting that targeting symptom-based outcome parameters does not largely alter the natural course of IBD[7,8]. Inspired by evidence in other specialties, notably from the rheumatoid arthritis literature, the International Organization for the Study of Inflammatory Bowel Diseases (IOIBD) devised the STRIDE recommendations with the objective of providing a treat-to-target framework for IBD[9]. In parallel, ongoing evidence was amounting in the IBD literature regarding the association of endoscopic healing with improved clinical and long-term outcomes. This supports the notion of treating-to-target in IBD patients[10]. The STRIDE recommendations include targeting improvement in clinical and endoscopic outcomes and also incorporate patient reported outcome measures (PROM). These recommendations give rise to the potential of a greater impact on IBD compared to the former symptom derived scales including the Crohn's Disease Activity Index (CDAI) or the partial Mayo Score. Virtually all newly designed and recently published clinical trials in IBD have moved towards a similar structure focusing on complex outcomes encompassing clinical, endoscopic and PROM improvements[11].

A major challenge in the field of IBD lies in the large heterogeneity in clinical practice. This variation in everyday practice is seen in many domains of IBD management such as diagnostic testing, monitoring, therapeutic interventions and knowledge of preventative care recommendations[12-14]. As a result of the apparent differences in practice, a major interest was sparked in devising a standard set of measures to assess quality and provide a means to quantify quality of care (QoC). This occurred by developing quality indicators (QIs). QIs may be related to three components in health care: Structure, process and outcome parameters of care[15]. The goal is to utilize them to develop standards by which QoC can be assessed and measured[16].

In the following review, an overview of the various QIs that have been developed for IBD will be provided. Additionally, emerging evidence supporting the widespread application of high QoC will be discussed along with some data on actual QI adherence at different centers and institutions. This will highlight how QIs can influence the level of care in IBD. Novel advancements which may have the potential to positively influence QoC will also be reviewed. Finally, the concept of treating-to-target along with aggressive management directed at tighter disease control will be presented.

QUALITY INDICATORS IN IBD

In general, QIs provide specific measurable elements of care for which there is evidence or consensus that can be applied to assess the QoC provided. This, thereore has the capacity to influence and improve QoC[17,18]. In 2011 the American Gastrointestinal Association (AGA) published their clinical performance metrics that is used by federal health insurance providers to incentivize or penalize gastroenterologists managing IBD patients depending on the QoC they provide[19]. Given the limited scope of the AGA measures the Crohn's and Colitis Foundation of America (CCFA) set out to develop, *via* a robust method, a set of top process and outcome rated QIs. The CCFA came out with its top-ten highly rated process and outcome related measures with the ultimate goal of having an impact on improving QoC in IBD[16].

Outside of the Unites States of America there have been multiple other published QI sets looking at various measures. In Spain a set of structure, process and outcome measures for quality of care was published using the Delphi consensus framework[20]. In Canada a similar set of QIs was published in 2014[21]. The Spanish and Canadian QI sets had the added layer of looking at structure metrics focusing on the importance of having a medical expert, a multidisciplinary team including a dedicated IBD nurse to assist in managing these complex cases. More recently in Canada, through the development of the Promoting Access and Care through Centers of Excellence (PACE) program a new set of structure, process and outcome QIs has been

developed[22]. The PACE program's focus is to standardize QoC provided by physicians both in community hospitals and academic centers in an attempt to reduce the existing variation in practice. Unique to the process of developing these QIs was the involvement of actual IBD patients and IBD nurses in the QI selection procedure.

The British Society of Gastroenterology initially published guidelines to serve as their foundation for QoC in 2012[23]. On a similar theme with comparable components a QI set was published in Asia[24]. All these QIs have been established to accomplish the same and improve QoC. The difficulty of these approaches lies in finding the balance between a wide array of data captured and the practicality of the QI set to be used in clinical practice (Table 1).

VARIATION IN CLINICAL PRACTICE

Despite the development of multiple clinical practice guidelines in diagnosing and managing IBD from Europe[25-28] and North America[29,30] as well as the various of published quality measures in IBD highlighted above there is substantial heterogeneity in the practice of individual physicians. Feuerstein *et al*[31] retrospectively audited medical records from practices in academic, community and private centers in the United States to assess the adherence to quality measures published by the AGA. The authors discovered poor documentation of IBD quality measures by physicians regardless of practice settings. Specifically, a low proportion of physicians evaluated vaccination status with only 16.7% of patients evaluated for pneumococcal vaccine and 28.7% of patients evaluated for influenza vaccine. Additionally, only 25% of patients were assessed for bone loss. A survey of patients with CD and UC in the United States also demonstrated a large variation in practice between gastroenterologists (GI) in academic centers (GIA) *vs* private GI and other GIs[32]. In this survey CD patients seen by a GIA compared to private GIs had less use of 5-aminosalicylates and higher rates of biologic and immunomodulator uses ($P < 0.001$ for all). Furthermore, on multivariate analysis in GIA patients with CD there was less steroid use (OR = 0.84, 95%CI: 0.567-1.06), higher rates of influenza vaccination (OR = 1.33, 95%CI: 1.15-1.53) and higher rates of clinical remission (OR = 1.18, 95%CI: 1.02-1.37). Another study from Asia using a questionnaire devised from the AGA quality metrics showed a large variety in the deliverance of performance measures, again highlighting the heterogeneity in practice[24]. The European Crohn's and Colitis Organization conducted a web based survey study of patients from 27 different European Countries also showing significant impact on quality of life (QoL)[33]. 4990 patients responded to the survey of which 52% reported corticosteroid use within 12 mo, 71% experienced at least 2 flares in a 2-year period and 44% of felt their lives were negatively impacted at times in between flares. Many reported on the negative impact the disease had with respect to work notably 44% reported losing their jobs or having to quit. Surprisingly, adequate access to care was only reported by 70% of those who responded to the survey with 53% of responders feeling they were unable to convey important information after consultation with a specialist. Clearly there are large differences in the practice of IBD between and even within a given health care system. Consequently, quality metrics and guidelines need to be reiterated and reinforced along with potential auditing measures to ensure that health professionals are upheld to appropriate standards.

EVIDENCE SURROUNDING QI APPLICATION

Intuitively one would stipulate that the more rigorously QIs are adhered to in IBD, the more one would expect to note an improvement in outcomes. Peña-Sánchez *et al*[34] conducted a retrospective population matched cohort study attempting to demonstrate a measureable outcome difference in patients exposed to a multidisciplinary IBD clinic (MIBDC) compared to controls who were not. The MIBDC accounted for some structural QIs such as having an IBD fellowship trained GI specialist, specialized IBD nurses, registered dieticians and a clinical psychologist. The goal set out by this unit was to ensure quality and continuity of care. Ultimately, what their study showed in the exposed UC group was lower rates of IBD related hospitalization (HR = 0.66, 95%CI: 0.49-0.89) and lower odds of corticosteroid dependence (OR = 0.39, 95%CI: 0.15-0.98). In the entire exposed group compared to the un-exposed matched cohort they demonstrated a lower risk of IBD-related surgeries (HR = 0.78, 95%CI: 0.61-0.99), lower rates of 5-ASA use (HR = 0.81, 95%CI: 0.69-0.95), higher rates of immunomodulatory use (HR = 1.68, 95%CI: 1.42-1.99) and higher rates of biologic use (HR = 1.85, 95%CI: 1.52-2.27). This study effectively showed that an integrated medical care model in IBD was associated with better QoC in IBD patients compared to standard practice.

Law *et al*[35] performed a cohort study focusing on the impact of having exclusively subspecialized IBD trained physicians manage IBD patients admitted to hospital on short and long term clinical outcomes. They compared a cohort whereby inpatients were managed under general gastroenterology care to ones managed under specialized IBD care. Looking at multiple in-hospital process and outcome QIs there were many similarities between the cohorts. The only statistically significant difference was that the specialized cohort ensured more objective disease assessment as evidenced by the higher rates of CRP testing at admission (82% *vs* 71%, $P = 0.05$) and discharge (25% *vs* 13%, $P = 0.05$). The cohort managed by specialized IBD care had increased frequency of high dose biologic therapy for induction (26% *vs* 9% $P = 0.04$, OR = 5.5, 95%CI: 1.3-23.17) and a higher proportion of patients in remission at 90 d (OR = 1.6, 95%CI: 0.99-2.69). Although there was no difference in rates of surgery at 90 d, early surgery (within 30 d) was more

Table 1 Available quality indicators-set to assess the quality of care in inflammatory bowel disease

	AGA	CCFA	PACE[1]	Spanish[1]	Asia
Structural QIs					
IBD unit/clinic					
Has access to healthcare professionals: pharmacist, ophthalmologist, rheumatologist, obstetrician and dermatologist			√		
Has access to all of the following healthcare professionals: Dieticians, mental health worker/psychologist, stoma therapist			√		
Has a dedicated IBD nurse.			√	√	
Has at least one gastroenterologist with specialized IBD training			√		
Has timely access to an Endoscopy Unit			√	√	
Has access to CT and MRI with at least one modality with enterography			√	√	
Has access to a GI radiologist and a GI histopathologist			√	√	
Has access to a surgical program that performs at least 10 Ileoanal pouch operations a year			√		
Has access to a fellowship trained colorectal surgeon			√	√	
Should be integrated in a hospital with an Emergency Department			√	√	
Process QIs					
IBD type documented including disease location and severity	√	√	√		√
Latent tuberculosis and Hepatitis B testing before anti-TNF therapy	√	√	√	√	√
Appropriate initiation of steroid-sparing therapy	√	√	√	√	√
Clostridium difficile testing during acute flares	√	√	√	√	√
Venous thromboembolism prophylaxis is administered to patients according to national guidelines	√	√	√	√	√
Cytomegalovirus testing *via* flexible sigmoidoscopy in steroid-refractory UC		√	√	√	
TPMT testing prior to thiopurine therapy		√	√		
Colectomy or close surveillance for low-grade dysplasia		√	√	√	
Surveillance colonoscopy for patients with colonic disease		√	√	√	
Screening and counseling for smoking cessation	√	√	√	√	√
Vaccine education including pneumococcal and influenza	√	√	√	√	√
Each IBD patient should be assigned one identifiable IBD specialist in charge of their care			√	√	
In patients with corticosteroid refractory IBD other induction therapies are recommended			√		
Medical salvage therapy and surgery are offered in UC inpatients failing to respond to intravenous corticosteroids within 5 d			√		
The IBD Unit/clinic has a mechanism to screen for mental health issues			√		
Patients with IBD receiving maintenance immunosuppressive therapy are monitored with a blood count and liver profile every three months			√	√	
Disease activity assessment is performed after initiating induction therapy			√		
The IBD Unit/clinic has a formal process for transfer of care from pediatric to adult			√		
IBD patients at risk for metabolic bone disease are assessed managed accordingly	√	√	√		√
Calcium and Vitamin D are recommended in conjunction with systemic corticosteroids			√		
All HBsAg+ IBD patients should receive antiviral drugs while being treated with an anti-TNF drug			√	√	
Outcomes QIs					
Proportion of patients with steroid-free clinical remission (CR) for > 12-mo period		√	√		
Proportion of patients currently taking prednisone (excluding those diagnosed within 112 d)		√			
Number of days per month/year lost from school/work attributable to IBD		√			
Number of days per year in the hospital attributable to IBD		√	√		
Number of emergency room visits per year for IBD		√	√		
Proportion of patients with malnutrition		√			
Proportion of patients with anemia		√			
Proportion of patients with normal disease-targeted health-related quality of life		√			
Proportion of patients currently taking narcotic analgesics		√			
Proportion of patients with nighttime BM's or leakage		√			
Proportion of patients with incontinence in the last month		√			
Number of IBD-related surgeries per patient-year			√		
Validated assessment of patient adherence to management plan			√		

[1]Only selected QIs included. AGA: American Gastrointestinal Association; CCFA: Crohn's and Colitis Foundation of America; MRI: Magnetic resonance imaging; PACE: Promoting access and care through centers of excellence; QI: Quality indicators; IBD: Inflammatory bowel disease; CT: Computed tomography; GI: Gastrointestinal; UC: Ulcerative colitis.

commonly seen in the subspecialized IBD care group (OR = 2.73, 95%CI: 1.22-6.12). While both retrospective in nature these two studies support the notion that providing resources and specialized care geared at focusing on optimizing and maximizing QoC is associated with better outcomes in IBD patients.

There is a scarcity of published data in the literature of IBD centers reporting on their performances with respect to the various published QIs. Recently, a study from Hungary was one of the first of its kind to report on its center's performance with respect to well accepted structure, process and outcome QIs. Gonczi *et al*[36] vigorously evaluated whether or not their center was meeting the targeted QIs. In addition, they demonstrated effective implementation of a fast track open clinic concept centered on IBD care. This func-

tioned by providing immediate access for outpatient consultation within a median of 1 d following request. This fast track resource coupled with the IBD center applying and self-assessing adherence to QIs has a large potential on positively effecting QoC, optimizing resource utilization and possibly impacting disease outcomes. An important shortcoming to highlight while assessing QIs is that certain outcome QIs may differ depending on center type. For instance, the outcomes at subspecialized referral centers for complex, refractory IBD cases are certainly different than community GI centers.

NOVEL ADVANCEMENTS WITH POTENTIAL TO INFLUENCE QOC

Optimizing patient care in IBD is a challenging process owing to the fact that achieving tight disease control and adequately monitoring patients requires substantial resource utilization, while requiring a significant commitment from patients with respect to their time. This, coupled with the current demand to incorporate PROMs and assessing quality metrics to optimize QoC has sparked initiatives for reorganization of how care is delivered. Telemedicine, generally referred to as medicine practiced at a distance, has been present in healthcare in a variety of chronic diseases for nearly two decades[37] [Wootton, 2012 #61]. It provides a means to incorporate patient self-management by allowing patients to relay information to health care providers and to receive feedback[37]. Given the constraints and high resource usage in active IBD care, incorporating telemedicine appears promising. A systematic review and meta-analysis published in 2014 looked at all the published randomized control trials (RCTs) found that distance management significantly decreased clinic visits (mean difference of -1.08, 95%CI: -1.6 to -0.55) but did not affect relapse or hospital admission rates[38]. One of the main limitations of this analysis was the heterogeneity in the type of distance management or forms of telemedicine used in the included trials.

Many platforms for telemedicine in IBD exist but are limited to specific subsets of IBD patients[39]. A group from the Netherlands recognized this limitation which provided the foundation for the development of MyIBDcoach[40]. MyIBDcoach is the first telemedicine system that enables home monitoring for all subtypes of IBD. The platform may be used in academic and non-academic settings and looks at IBD facets, non-IBD related aspects as well as other features including PROMS and quality metrics. De Jong *et al*[40] showed in their inception study that myIBDcoach was practical and well received by patients and health care providers. The same group then conducted a multicenter randomized control trial (RCT) to investigate the effect on care that their system may have compared to standard of care[41]. In the trial, they sought to compare outpatient visits; patient reported quality care and PROMs between the two groups. Overall the group that incorporated telemedicine *via* myIBDcoach had fewer outpatient visits, fewer telephone consultations, fewer admissions to hospital as well as an increased adherence to medication. Importantly there were no significant differences in flare rates, rates of surgeries, emergency room visits or rates of corticosteroid use. Effectively *via* the well-designed myIBDcoach system the authors showed improved QoC, decreased resource utilization in terms of outpatient visits without demonstrating negative outcomes with respect to flares or complications of active disease.

Another major challenge with a large economic burden in the management of IBD relates to frequent emergency room (ER) visits. In a study from Manitoba, Canada, over a three-year period 76% of newly diagnosed IBD cases and 49% of patients already known to have IBD had at least 1 ER visit[42]. Many strategies have been utilized to decrease this burden in the ER and provide rapid access to the appropriate clinical care needed in times of active IBD. A pediatric study showed that increasing the availability of IBD specialists and specialized nurses *via* an electronic platform can decrease the frequency of ER visits[43]. Although in its infancy, a tertiary IBD center at McGill University in Montreal aimed to demonstrate improved quality of care by implementing a rapid access clinic (RAC)[44]. The RAC was structured by providing IBD patients followed at the clinic with an emergency contact email address, with a specific document explaining the pertinent symptoms that merit utilization of this access avenue. Each email was read and reviewed by a specialized IBD nurse or physician and depending on the situation a RAC visit was booked and the patient was seen. The preliminary data demonstrated a more optimized resource utilization including frequent use of proactive biomarker measurements such as therapeutic drug monitoring, fecal calprotectin and C-reactive protein levels. The preliminary data also revealed that there was less need for computed tomography (CT), magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) and endoscopy. Notably, only a few patients in the RAC cohort required an ER visit within 30-90 d after accessing care. Clearly at high volume IBD centers this model of implementing a RAC may have significant potential to optimize resource utilization, decrease ER visits and improve QoC.

IBD has a large psychosocial impact on patients with respect to their careers, productivity and social and intimate lives dramatically affecting their QoL[45,46]. The European Federation of Crohn's and Ulcerative Colitis Associations published the results of a large survey to assess the impact of IBD from the patient's perspective[45]. In total 4670 patients responded to a questionnaire that spanned 6 categories and contained 52 questions. 48% of respondents felt that their life was significantly impacted by IBD even in times in remission. With respect to work, 60% of surveyed patients felt stresses or pressured about taking time off when sick with 20% reporting being discriminated at workplace due to IBD. 56% of people felt that IBD had affected their career

paths with 31% of individuals stating they either lost a job or quit a job due to their illness. 35% felt that their disease had prevented them from pursuing intimate relationships. These negative impact patient centered measures on QoL were not incorporated into outcome metrics in many of the landmark IBD clinical trials. More recently however, this has changed and incorporating PROMs are an integral component in newly designed trials[11].

To address the issue of incorporating PROMs the IBD Disability index (IBD-DI) was developed as a tool that physicians can administer to evaluate the functional status of IBD patients[47]. The IBD-DI was validated for use in clinical trials showing high internal consistency, inter-observer reliability and construct validity[48]. The limitations of such a tool are its length and the fact that it was designed to be administered by health care professionals in the setting of clinical trials. Given the importance of QoL in managing IBD a recently developed tool known as the IBD-Disk was developed[49]. It is a self-administered shortened adaptation of key components integrated in the IBD-DI tool. There are 10 items within the questionnaire with explanatory statements for each item. These are scored in a disc-shaped visual analog scale from 0 (absolutely disagree) to 10 (absolutely agree). This shortened IBD-Disk has the potential to be an integral PROM that can be used in day-to-day practice. Further work is needed to assess the tool's operating characteristics and should compare the tool to the IBD-DI.

Within the realm of IBD management a major limitation that exists in many heath care systems is the challenge in objectively determining disease activity. Endoscopy is ubiquitously considered the gold standard[50] but is expensive, invasive and utilizes significant health care resources thus imposing limitations when assessing IBD disease response during time of disease activity. Non-invasive markers biochemical and fecal markers such as CRP and FC are therefore often used in adjunct with clinical parameters in assessing disease response to therapy[51,52]. FC physiologically representing gut specific inflammation, has become more commonly implemented as it has been shown to more accurately reflect endoscopic activity compared to CRP[51]. The drawback of conventionally available FC testing is that the test is enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) based and often is run in batches in hospitals. Consequently, there are often delays from obtaining the test and acting on the results which may result in unnecessary therapy escalation or utilizing endoscopy, which is more immediately available and reliable while waiting on the results of FC[53]. This limitation sparked the development of more rapidly available ELISA testing with the caveat that these tests also need to be performed in the hospital as point of care testing[54, 55]. Recognizing this drawback, a group out of Norway (CALPRO, Inc., Oslo, Norway) set out to develop a test that would allow FC testing directly by the patient as opposed to the point of care model which was simultaneously being developed[56]. The same group developed the CalproSmart that allows FC testing to be performed by the patients themselves at home with the results available within minutes[53]. Vinding *et al*[53] compared the performance of the CalproSmart tool to conventional FC ELISA testing with exciting results. The correlation coefficient was 0.685 with sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value and negative predictive values of 82%, 85%, 47% and 97% respectively using a cut-off of 150 μg/g. The positive likelihood ratio (LR+) at this cut-off was 5.51 while the negative likelihood ratio (LR-) was 0.21. Extrapolating from the performance of the CalproSmart home assessment at the cut-off used (150 μg/g) it appears to be more suitable in correlating the absence of disease activity rather than predicting disease activity. Nevertheless, this kind of tool empowers the patient, can be integrated in eHealth and telemedicine systems and provides a means of potentially identifying early relapse in IBD.

TREATING TO TARGET IN IBD

There has been a major shift in the management of IBD in the past decade. Classically, IBD was managed in a step-up approach escalating therapy if it were felt to be indicated based primarily on symptom driven scores[57]. However, the step-up paradigm of management has many limitations. Firstly, it puts individuals at a higher risk of prolonged corticosteroid exposure and the associated increased adverse events[58]. Secondly, due to time constraints inherent in a step-up framework there is a delay in delivering more effective therapy in high risk patients[59]. Lastly, this model depends on symptom derived scales for disease activity which poorly correlate to endoscopic disease activity[59]. Evidence has been conclusive in the rheumatoid arthritis (RA) literature whereby treatment strategies that utilize aggressive upfront strategies treating-to-target, as opposed to conventional step up therapy have resulted in better outcomes[60]. In RA management strategies are employed that modify treatments aggressively and proactively in response to changes in validated outcome measures indicative of active disease[61].

Motivated by the rheumatology field and other chronic diseases such as diabetes mellitus that use a model that actively guide therapy based on specific targets, a treat-to-target paradigm was devised for IBD. Initially Bouguen *et al*[59] proposed a framework to guide treating-to-target in Crohn's disease. In this model during the initial treatment phase, disease response should be actively followed using clinical symptoms, biochemical markers adjunctively and ultimately targeting mucosal healing. If there is a lack of response, initial therapy should be optimized accordingly with consideration of adding adjunctive medication. If, despite this, treatment targets are not achieved then a class switch should be considered. While the CD specific framework was developed IOIBD were simultaneously working on developing IBD related treat-to-target recommendations. The IOIBD published the STRIDE recommendations

encompassing targets to strive for in both UC and CD[9]. These recommendations encompassed specific targets that should be the main focus when managing IBD.

EVIDENCE SUPPORTING TIGHTER CONTROL LEADING TO BETTER OUTCOME

Prior to the innovation and development of treating-to-target, the concept of early combined immunosuppression (ECI) emerged. This treatment strategy was conceived due to the evidence of shortcomings in how IBD was being managed at the time using a step-up approach. Both the TOP-DOWN[62] [D'Haens, 2008 #78] and SONIC[63] were well designed RCTs for treatment naïve Crohn's patients that showed superiority in the ECI group compared to conventional therapy. Note that both these trials utilized symptoms derived primary outcome measures: Harvey Bradshaw Index (HBI) $\leqslant$ 4 for SONIC and Crohn's disease activity index (CDAI) < 150 in TOP-DOWN. Despite the results of these two landmark trials, the common practice at the time remained limited to the step-up model. Subsequently the REACT trial was designed to validate the generalizability of algorithm-based therapy notably in the practice of community GIs in existing IBD patients[64]. The REACT trial randomized two groups to either the algorithm-based or conventional therapy. Disease activity was assessed at 4 or 12 wk post initial corticosteroid therapy with remission being defined by a HBI $\leqslant$ 4. In the algorithm-based group disease was reassessed every 12 wk and therapy was optimized if clinical remission was not attained. Ultimately, although the study did not demonstrate statistically different rates of corticosteroid free clinical remission at 12 mo, the trial did show that at 24 mo the composite outcome rate of surgery, hospital admissions and or serious disease related complications was lower in the algorithm-based group while no differences in serious drug related adverse events was noted.

Novel concepts of treating-to-target combined with a top-down approach were the inspirations for designing the CALM study[65]. This study was a RCT aimed at investigating the efficacy and safety of two treatment algorithms in achieving mucosal healing in early CD. One arm, the tight control group, was modelled on a treat-to-target framework with therapy decisions determined on the basis of pre-specified treatment failure criteria compromised of clinical symptoms (CDAI) and biomarkers of inflammation (CRP and FC). Comparatively, the clinical management group's treatment plan was solely based on clinical symptoms (CDAI). A few of the exclusion criteria included current or previous biologic or immunomodulator exposure, fibrostenotic disease and fistulizing disease (only perianal fistula not draining at enrolment were included). The primary endpoint was the proportion of patients with mucosal healing, defined by a Crohn's disease endoscopic index of severity (CDEIS) < 4 and no deep ulcers 48 wk after randomization. With respect to the primary outcome 46% of patients in the tight control group achieved mucosal healing compared to 30% in the clinical management group (P = 0.01). In terms of secondary outcomes, statistically significant differences were observed between the two groups in deep remission, biological remission and steroid-free remission at every follow up visit. There were no significant differences in adverse events nor serious adverse events between the two arms. The CALM study is a pivotal trial in IBD as it is the first to show superiority of incorporating objective markers of inflammation in addition to clinical symptoms in a treat-to-target framework that leads to better outcomes in IBD compared to conventional clinical management approaches.

CONCLUSION

The field of IBD is rapidly changing with major shifts in the philosophy of management. Meeting structure, process and outcome QIs and keeping the patient at the center of focus is key in achieving good QoC. Much advancement in the diagnosis, follow-up and access to care are being made with promising results.

It is becoming increasingly clear, particularly looking at the CALM and REACT trials, aggressive and proactive management guided by treating-to-target and actively reassessing a patient's evolution is a promising path to improve long term related IBD disease outcomes. Measuring multiple QIs and adjusting the treatment plan accordingly will help to improve the level of care and optimize patient access, monitoring and outcomes of patients with IBD.

REFERENCES

1 **Luces C**, Bodger K. Economic burden of inflammatory bowel disease: a UK perspective. *Expert Rev Pharmacoecon Outcomes Res* 2006; **6**: 471-482 [PMID: 20528516 DOI: 10.1586/14737167.6.4.471]

2 **Abraham C**, Cho JH. Inflammatory bowel disease. *N Engl J Med* 2009; **361**: 2066-2078 [PMID: 19923578 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMra0804647]

3 **Bernstein CN**. The Natural History of Inflammatory Bowel Disease. Crohn's Disease and Ulcerative Colitis: From Epidemiology and Immunobiology to a Rational Diagnostic and Therapeutic Approach 2012 [DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4614-0998-4_26]

4 **Molodecky NA**, Soon IS, Rabi DM, Ghali WA, Ferris M, Chernoff G, Benchimol EI, Panaccione R, Ghosh S, Barkema HW, Kaplan GG. Increasing incidence and prevalence of the inflammatory bowel diseases with time, based on systematic review. *Gastroenterology* 2012; **142**: 46-54.e42; quiz e30 [PMID: 22001864 DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2011.10.001]

5 **Burisch J**, Pedersen N, Čuković-Čavka S, Brinar M, Kaimakliotis I, Duricova D, Shonová O, Vind I, Avnstrøm S, Thorsgaard N, Andersen V, Krabbe S, Dahlerup JF, Salupere R, Nielsen KR, Olsen J, Manninen P, Collin P, Tsianos EV, Katsanos KH, Ladefoged K, Lakatos L, Björnsson E, Ragnarsson G, Bailey Y, Odes S, Schwartz D, Martinato M, Lupinacci G, Milla M, De Padova A, D'Incà R, Beltrami M, Kupcinskas L, Kiudelis G, Turcan S, Tighineanu O, Mihu I, Magro F, Barros LF, Goldis A, Lazar D, Belousova E, Nikulina I, Hernandez V, Martinez-Ares D, Almer S, Zhulina Y, Halfvarson J, Arebi N, Sebastian S, Lakatos PL, Langholz E, Munkholm P; EpiCom-group. East-West gradient in the incidence of inflammatory bowel disease in Europe: the ECCO-EpiCom inception cohort. *Gut* 2014; **63**: 588-597 [PMID:

23604131 DOI: 10.1136/gutjnl-2013-304636]
6 **Kappelman MD**, Rifas-Shiman SL, Porter CQ, Ollendorf DA, Sandler RS, Galanko JA, Finkelstein JA. Direct health care costs of Crohn's disease and ulcerative colitis in US children and adults. *Gastroenterology* 2008; **135**: 1907-1913 [PMID: 18854185 DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2008.09.012]
7 **Magro F**, Rodrigues A, Vieira AI, Portela F, Cremers I, Cotter J, Correia L, Duarte MA, Tavares ML, Lago P, Ministro P, Peixe P, Lopes S, Garcia EB. Review of the disease course among adult ulcerative colitis population-based longitudinal cohorts. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2012; **18**: 573-583 [PMID: 21793126 DOI: 10.1002/ibd.21815]
8 **Peyrin-Biroulet L**, Loftus EV Jr, Colombel JF, Sandborn WJ. Long-term complications, extraintestinal manifestations, and mortality in adult Crohn's disease in population-based cohorts. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2011; **17**: 471-478 [PMID: 20725943 DOI: 10.1002/ibd.21417]
9 **Peyrin-Biroulet L**, Sandborn W, Sands BE, Reinisch W, Bemelman W, Bryant RV, D'Haens G, Dotan I, Dubinsky M, Feagan B, Fiorino G, Gearry R, Krishnareddy S, Lakatos PL, Loftus EV Jr, Marteau P, Munkholm P, Murdoch TB, Ordás I, Panaccione R, Riddell RH, Ruel J, Rubin DT, Samaan M, Siegel CA, Silverberg MS, Stoker J, Schreiber S, Travis S, Van Assche G, Danese S, Panes J, Bouguen G, O'Donnell S, Pariente B, Winer S, Hanauer S, Colombel JF. Selecting Therapeutic Targets in Inflammatory Bowel Disease (STRIDE): Determining Therapeutic Goals for Treat-to-Target. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2015; **110**: 1324-1338 [PMID: 26303131 DOI: 10.1038/ajg.2015.233]
10 **Colombel JF**, Rutgeerts PJ, Sandborn WJ, Yang M, Camez A, Pollack PF, Thakkar RB, Robinson AM, Chen N, Mulani PM, Chao J. Adalimumab induces deep remission in patients with Crohn's disease. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2014; **12**: 414-22.e5 [PMID: 23856361 DOI: 10.1016/j.cgh.2013.06.019]
11 **Williet N**, Sandborn WJ, Peyrin-Biroulet L. Patient-reported outcomes as primary end points in clinical trials of inflammatory bowel disease. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2014; **12**: 1246-56.e6 [PMID: 24534550 DOI: 10.1016/j.cgh.2014.02.016]
12 **Esrailian E**, Spiegel BM, Targownik LE, Dubinsky MC, Targan SR, Gralnek IM. Differences in the management of Crohn' s disease among experts and community providers, based on a national survey of sample case vignettes. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2007; **26**: 1005-1018 [PMID: 17877507 DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2036.2007.03445.x]
13 **Spiegel BM**, Ho W, Esrailian E, Targan S, Higgins PD, Siegel CA, Dubinsky M, Melmed GY. Controversies in ulcerative colitis: a survey comparing decision making of experts versus community gastroenterologists. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2009; **7**: 168-174, 174.e1 [PMID: 18952199 DOI: 10.1016/j.cgh.2008.08.029]
14 **Reddy SI**, Friedman S, Telford JJ, Strate L, Ookubo R, Banks PA. Are patients with inflammatory bowel disease receiving optimal care? *Am J Gastroenterol* 2005; **100**: 1357-1361 [PMID: 15929770 DOI: 10.1111/j.1572-0241.2005.40849.x]
15 **Donabedian A**. The role of outcomes in quality assessment and assurance. *QRB Qual Rev Bull* 1992; **18**: 356-360 [PMID: 1465293 DOI: 10.1016/S0097-5990(16)30560-7]
16 **Melmed GY**, Siegel CA, Spiegel BM, Allen JI, Cima R, Colombel JF, Dassopoulos T, Denson LA, Dudley-Brown S, Garb A, Hanauer SB, Kappelman MD, Lewis JD, Lynch I, Moynihan A, Rubin DT, Sartor RB, Schwartz RM, Wolf DC, Ullman TA. Quality indicators for inflammatory bowel disease: development of process and outcome measures. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2013; **19**: 662-668 [PMID: 23388547 DOI: 10.1097/mib.0b013e31828278a2]
17 **Kirk SA**, Campbell SM, Kennell-Webb S, Reeves D, Roland MO, Marshall MN. Assessing the quality of care of multiple conditions in general practice: practical and methodological problems. *Qual Saf Health Care* 2003; **12**: 421-427 [PMID: 14645757 DOI: 10.1136/qhc.12.6.421]
18 **MacLean CH**, Saag KG, Solomon DH, Morton SC, Sampsel S, Klippel JH. Measuring quality in arthritis care: methods for developing the Arthritis Foundation's quality indicator set. *Arthritis Rheum* 2004; **51**: 193-202 [PMID: 15077259 DOI: 10.1002/art.20248]
19 **Allen JI**. Adult Inflammatory Bowel Disease Physician Performance Measures Set. American Gastroenterological Association, 2011
20 **Calvet X**, Panés J, Alfaro N, Hinojosa J, Sicilia B, Gallego M, Pérez I, Lázaro y de Mercado P, Gomollón F; Members of Consensus Group, Aldeguera X, Alós R, Andreu M, Barreiro M, Bermejo F, Casis B, Domenech E, Espín E, Esteve M, García-Sánchez V, López-Sanromán A, Martínez-Montiel P, Luis Mendoza J, Gisbert JP, Vera M, Dosal A, Sánchez E, Marín L, Sanromán L, Pinilla P, Murciano F, Torrejón A, Ramón García J, Ortega M, Roldán J. Delphi consensus statement: Quality Indicators for Inflammatory Bowel Disease Comprehensive Care Units. *J Crohns Colitis* 2014; **8**: 240-251 [PMID: 24295646 DOI: 10.1016/j.crohns.2013.10.010]
21 **Nguyen GC**, Devlin SM, Afif W, Bressler B, Gruchy SE, Kaplan GG, Oliveira L, Plamondon S, Seow CH, Williams C, Wong K, Yan BM, Jones J. Defining quality indicators for best-practice management of inflammatory bowel disease in Canada. *Can J Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2014; **28**: 275-285 [PMID: 24839622 DOI: 10.1155/2014/941245]
22 **Bitton A**, VM, Lytvyak E , Kachan N , Bressler B , Jones JL, Lakatos PL, Sewitch M, El-Matary W, Melmed GY, Nguyen GC, and the QI consensus group. Selection of Quality indicators in IBD: Integrating physician and patient perspectives
23 **Group TIS**. Quality Care: Service Standards for the health-care of people who have Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IBD).
24 **Song HK**, Lee KM, Jung SA, Hong SN, Han DS, Yang SK; IBD study group of Korean Association for the Study of Intestinal Diseases (KASID). Quality of care in inflammatory bowel disease in Asia: the results of a multinational web-based survey in the 2(nd) Asian Organization of Crohn's and Colitis (AOCC) meeting in Seoul. *Intest Res* 2016; **14**: 240-247 [PMID: 27433146 DOI: 10.5217/ir.2016.14.3.240]
25 **Gionchetti P**, Dignass A, Danese S, Magro Dias FJ, Rogler G, Lakatos PL, Adamina M, Ardizzone S, Buskens CJ, Sebastian S, Laureti S, Sampietro GM, Vucelic B, van der Woude CJ, Barreiro-de Acosta M, Maaser C, Portela F, Vavricka SR, Gomollón F; ECCO. 3rd European Evidence-based Consensus on the Diagnosis and Management of Crohn's Disease 2016: Part 2: Surgical Management and Special Situations. *J Crohns Colitis* 2017; **11**: 135-149 [PMID: 27660342 DOI: 10.1093/ecco-jcc/jjw169]
26 **Gomollón F**, Dignass A, Annese V, Tilg H, Van Assche G, Lindsay JO, Peyrin-Biroulet L, Cullen GJ, Daperno M, Kucharzik T, Rieder F, Almer S, Armuzzi A, Harbord M, Langhorst J, Sans M, Chowers Y, Fiorino G, Juillerat P, Mantzaris GJ, Rizzello F, Vavricka S, Gionchetti P; ECCO. 3rd European Evidence-based Consensus on the Diagnosis and Management of Crohn's Disease 2016: Part 1: Diagnosis and Medical Management. *J Crohns Colitis* 2017; **11**: 3-25 [PMID: 27660341 DOI: 10.1093/ecco-jcc/jjw168]
27 **Harbord M**, Eliakim R, Bettenworth D, Karmiris K, Katsanos K, Kopylov U, Kucharzik T, Molnár T, Raine T, Sebastian S, de Sousa HT, Dignass A, Carbonnel F; European Crohn's and Colitis Organisation [ECCO]. Third European Evidence-based Consensus on Diagnosis and Management of Ulcerative Colitis. Part 2: Current Management. *J Crohns Colitis* 2017; **11**: 769-784 [PMID: 28513805 DOI: 10.1093/ecco-jcc/jjx009]
28 **Magro F**, Gionchetti P, Eliakim R, Ardizzone S, Armuzzi A, Barreiro-de Acosta M, Burisch J, Gecse KB, Hart AL, Hindryckx P, Langner C, Limdi JK, Pellino G, Zagórowicz E, Raine T, Harbord M, Rieder F; European Crohn's and Colitis Organisation [ECCO]. Third European Evidence-based Consensus on Diagnosis and Management of Ulcerative Colitis. Part 1: Definitions, Diagnosis, Extra-intestinal Manifestations, Pregnancy, Cancer Surveillance, Surgery, and Ileo-anal Pouch Disorders. *J Crohns Colitis* 2017; **11**: 649-670 [PMID: 28158501 DOI: 10.1093/ecco-jcc/jjx008]
29 **Lichtenstein GR**, Hanauer SB, Sandborn WJ; Practice Parameters Committee of American College of Gastroenterology. Management of Crohn's disease in adults. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2009; **104**: 465-483; quiz 464, 484 [PMID: 19174807 DOI: 10.1038/ajg.2008.168]
30 **Bressler B**, Marshall JK, Bernstein CN, Bitton A, Jones J, Leontiadis

GI, Panaccione R, Steinhart AH, Tse F, Feagan B; Toronto Ulcerative Colitis Consensus Group. Clinical practice guidelines for the medical management of nonhospitalized ulcerative colitis: the Toronto consensus. *Gastroenterology* 2015; **148**: 1035-1058.e3 [PMID: 25747596 DOI: 10.1053/j.gastro.2015.03.001]

31 **Feuerstein JD**, Castillo NE, Siddique SS, Lewandowski JJ, Geissler K, Martinez-Vazquez M, Thukral C, Leffler DA, Cheifetz AS. Poor Documentation of Inflammatory Bowel Disease Quality Measures in Academic, Community, and Private Practice. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2016; **14**: 421-428.e2 [PMID: 26499928 DOI: 10.1016/j.cgh.2015.09.042]

32 **Weaver KN**, Kappelman MD, Sandler RS, Martin CF, Chen W, Anton K, Long MD. Variation in Care of Inflammatory Bowel Diseases Patients in Crohn's and Colitis Foundation of America Partners: Role of Gastroenterologist Practice Setting in Disease Outcomes and Quality Process Measures. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2016; **22**: 2672-2677 [PMID: 27755268 DOI: 10.1097/MIB.0000000000000933]

33 **Wilson B**, Lonnfors S, Hommes DW, Vermeire S, Greco M, Bell C, Avedano L. P406 A European Crohn's and ulcerative colitis patient life IMPACT survey. *Journal of Crohn's and Colitis* 2012; **6**: S171 [DOI: 10.1016/S1873-9946(12)60425-5]

34 **Peña-Sánchez JN**, Lix LM, Teare GF, Li W, Fowler SA, Jones JL. Impact of an Integrated Model of Care on Outcomes of Patients With Inflammatory Bowel Diseases: Evidence From a Population-Based Study. *J Crohns Colitis* 2017; **11**: 1471-1479 [PMID: 28981633 DOI: 10.1093/ecco-jcc/jjx106]

35 **Law CC**, Sasidharan S, Rodrigues R, Nguyen DD, Sauk J, Garber J, Giallourakis C, Xavier R, Khalili H, Yajnik V, Ananthakrishnan AN. Impact of Specialized Inpatient IBD Care on Outcomes of IBD Hospitalizations: A Cohort Study. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2016; **22**: 2149-2157 [PMID: 27482978 DOI: 10.1097/MIB.0000000000000870]

36 **Gonczi L**, Kurti Z, Golovics PA, Lovasz BD, Menyhart O, Seres A, Sumegi LD, Gal A, Ilias A, Janos P, Gecse KB, Bessisow T, Afif W, Bitton A, Vegh Z, Lakatos PL. Quality of care indicators in inflammatory bowel disease in a tertiary referral center with open access and objective assessment policies. *Dig Liver Dis* 2018; **50**: 37-41 [PMID: 29107471 DOI: 10.1016/j.dld.2017.09.137]

37 **Wootton R**. Twenty years of telemedicine in chronic disease management--an evidence synthesis. *J Telemed Telecare* 2012; **18**: 211-220 [PMID: 22674020 DOI: 10.1258/jtt.2012.120219]

38 **Huang VW**, Reich KM, Fedorak RN. Distance management of inflammatory bowel disease: systematic review and meta-analysis. *World J Gastroenterol* 2014; **20**: 829-842 [PMID: 24574756 DOI: 10.3748/wjg.v20.i3.829]

39 **Cross RK**, Cheevers N, Rustgi A, Langenberg P, Finkelstein J. Randomized, controlled trial of home telemanagement in patients with ulcerative colitis (UC HAT). *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2012; **18**: 1018-1025 [PMID: 21688350 DOI: 10.1002/ibd.21795]

40 **de Jong M**, van der Meulen-de Jong A, Romberg-Camps M, Degens J, Becx M, Markus T, Tomlow H, Cilissen M, Ipenburg N, Verwey M, Colautti-Duijsens L, Hameeteman W, Masclee A, Jonkers D, Pierik M. Development and Feasibility Study of a Telemedicine Tool for All Patients with IBD: MyIBDcoach. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2017; **23**: 485-493 [PMID: 28267047 DOI: 10.1097/MIB.0000000000001034]

41 **de Jong MJ**, van der Meulen-de Jong AE, Romberg-Camps MJ, Becx MC, Maljaars JP, Cilissen M, van Bodegraven AA, Mahmmod N, Markus T, Hameeteman WM, Dijkstra G, Masclee AA, Boonen A, Winkens B, van Tubergen A, Jonkers DM, Pierik MJ. Telemedicine for management of inflammatory bowel disease (myIBDcoach): a pragmatic, multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2017; **390**: 959-968 [PMID: 28716313 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)31327-2]

42 **Nugent Z**, Singh H, Targownik LE, Strome T, Snider C, Bernstein CN. Predictors of Emergency Department Use by Persons with Inflammatory Bowel Diseases: A Population-based Study. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2016; **22**: 2907-2916 [PMID: 27846193 DOI: 10.1097/MIB.0000000000000965]

43 **Dykes D**, Williams E, Margolis P, Ruschman J, Bick J, Saeed S, Opipari L. Improving pediatric Inflammatory Bowel Disease (IBD) follow-up. *BMJ Qual Improv Rep* 2016; **5** [PMID: 27559472 DOI: 10.1136/bmjquality.u208961.w3675]

44 **Restellini S**, Morin I, Bessissow T, Afif W, Wild G, Seidman E, Bitton A, Lakatos P. A154 benefits of implementing a rapid access clinic in a high volume inflammatory bowel disease center: accessibility, resource utilization and outcomes. *Can J Gastroenterol* 2018; **1** suppl: 230-230 [DOI: 10.1093/jcag/gwy009.154]

45 **Lönnfors S**, Vermeire S, Greco M, Hommes D, Bell C, Avedano L. IBD and health-related quality of life -- discovering the true impact. *J Crohns Colitis* 2014; **8**: 1281-1286 [PMID: 24662394 DOI: 10.1016/j.crohns.2014.03.005]

46 **Floyd DN**, Langham S, Séverac HC, Levesque BG. The economic and quality-of-life burden of Crohn's disease in Europe and the United States, 2000 to 2013: a systematic review. *Dig Dis Sci* 2015; **60**: 299-312 [PMID: 25258034 DOI: 10.1007/s10620-014-3368-z]

47 **Peyrin-Biroulet L**, Cieza A, Sandborn WJ, Coenen M, Chowers Y, Hibi T, Kostanjsek N, Stucki G, Colombel JF; International Programme to Develop New Indexes for Crohn's Disease (IPNIC) group. Development of the first disability index for inflammatory bowel disease based on the international classification of functioning, disability and health. *Gut* 2012; **61**: 241-247 [PMID: 21646246 DOI: 10.1136/gutjnl-2011-300049]

48 **Gower-Rousseau C**, Sarter H, Savoye G, Tavernier N, Fumery M, Sandborn WJ, Feagan BG, Duhamel A, Guillon-Dellac N, Colombel JF, Peyrin-Biroulet L; International Programme to Develop New Indexes for Crohn's Disease (IPNIC) group; International Programme to Develop New Indexes for Crohn's Disease (IPNIC) group. Validation of the Inflammatory Bowel Disease Disability Index in a population-based cohort. *Gut* 2017; **66**: 588-596 [PMID: 26646934 DOI: 10.1136/gutjnl-2015-310151]

49 **Ghosh S**, Louis E, Beaugerie L, Bossuyt P, Bouguen G, Bourreille A, Ferrante M, Franchimont D, Frost K, Hebuterne X, Marshall JK, O'Shea C, Rosenfeld G, Williams C, Peyrin-Biroulet L. Development of the IBD Disk: A Visual Self-administered Tool for Assessing Disability in Inflammatory Bowel Diseases. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2017; **23**: 333-340 [PMID: 28146002 DOI: 10.1097/MIB.0000000000001033]

50 **Annese V**, Daperno M, Rutter MD, Amiot A, Bossuyt P, East J, Ferrante M, Götz M, Katsanos KH, Kießlich R, Ordás I, Repici A, Rosa B, Sebastian S, Kucharzik T, Eliakim R; European Crohn's and Colitis Organisation. European evidence based consensus for endoscopy in inflammatory bowel disease. *J Crohns Colitis* 2013; **7**: 982-1018 [PMID: 24184171 DOI: 10.1016/j.crohns.2013.09.016]

51 **Schoepfer AM**, Beglinger C, Straumann A, Safroneeva E, Romero Y, Armstrong D, Schmidt C, Trummler M, Pittet V, Vavricka SR. Fecal calprotectin more accurately reflects endoscopic activity of ulcerative colitis than the Lichtiger Index, C-reactive protein, platelets, hemoglobin, and blood leukocytes. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2013; **19**: 332-341 [PMID: 23328771 DOI: 10.1097/MIB.0b013e3182810066]

52 **D'Haens G**, Ferrante M, Vermeire S, Baert F, Noman M, Moortgat L, Geens P, Iwens D, Aerden I, Van Assche G, Van Olmen G, Rutgeerts P. Fecal calprotectin is a surrogate marker for endoscopic lesions in inflammatory bowel disease. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2012; **18**: 2218-2224 [PMID: 22344983 DOI: 10.1002/ibd.22917]

53 **Vinding KK**, Elsberg H, Thorkilgaard T, Belard E, Pedersen N, Elkjaer M, Marker D, Carlsen K, Burisch J, Munkholm P. Fecal Calprotectin Measured By Patients at Home Using Smartphones--A New Clinical Tool in Monitoring Patients with Inflammatory Bowel Disease. *Inflamm Bowel Dis* 2016; **22**: 336-344 [PMID: 26535869 DOI: 10.1097/MIB.0000000000000619]

54 **Coorevits L**, Baert FJ, Vanpoucke HJ. Faecal calprotectin: comparative study of the Quantum Blue rapid test and an established ELISA method. *Clin Chem Lab Med* 2013; **51**: 825-831 [PMID: 23001318 DOI: 10.1515/cclm-2012-0386]

55 **Lobatón T**, López-García A, Rodríguez-Moranta F, Ruiz A, Rodríguez L, Guardiola J. A new rapid test for fecal calprotectin predicts endoscopic remission and postoperative recurrence in

Crohn's disease. *J Crohns Colitis* 2013; **7**: e641-e651 [PMID: 23810085 DOI: 10.1016/j.crohns.2013.05.005]

56 **Elkjaer M**, Burisch J, Voxen Hansen V, Deibjerg Kristensen B, Slott Jensen JK, Munkholm P. A new rapid home test for faecal calprotectin in ulcerative colitis. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2010; **31**: 323-330 [PMID: 19817723 DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2036.2009.04164.x]

57 **Dignass A**, Van Assche G, Lindsay JO, Lémann M, Söderholm J, Colombel JF, Danese S, D'Hoore A, Gassull M, Gomollón F, Hommes DW, Michetti P, O'Morain C, Oresland T, Windsor A, Stange EF, Travis SP; European Crohn's and Colitis Organisation (ECCO). The second European evidence-based Consensus on the diagnosis and management of Crohn's disease: Current management. *J Crohns Colitis* 2010; **4**: 28-62 [PMID: 21122489 DOI: 10.1016/j.crohns.2009.12.002]

58 **Lichtenstein GR**, Feagan BG, Cohen RD, Salzberg BA, Diamond RH, Price S, Langholff W, Londhe A, Sandborn WJ. Serious infection and mortality in patients with Crohn's disease: more than 5 years of follow-up in the TREAT™ registry. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2012; **107**: 1409-1422 [PMID: 22890223 DOI: 10.1038/ajg.2012.218]

59 **Bouguen G**, Levesque BG, Feagan BG, Kavanaugh A, Peyrin-Biroulet L, Colombel JF, Hanauer SB, Sandborn WJ. Treat to target: a proposed new paradigm for the management of Crohn's disease. *Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol* 2015; **13**: 1042-50.e2 [PMID: 24036054 DOI: 10.1016/j.cgh.2013.09.006]

60 **Allaart CF**, Goekoop-Ruiterman YP, de Vries-Bouwstra JK, Breedveld FC, Dijkmans BA; FARR study group. Aiming at low disease activity in rheumatoid arthritis with initial combination therapy or initial monotherapy strategies: the BeSt study. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 2006; **24**: S77-S82 [PMID: 17083767]

61 **Smolen JS**, Landewé R, Bijlsma J, Burmester G, Chatzidionysiou K, Dougados M, Nam J, Ramiro S, Voshaar M, van Vollenhoven R, Aletaha D, Aringer M, Boers M, Buckley CD, Buttgereit F, Bykerk V, Cardiel M, Combe B, Cutolo M, van Eijk-Hustings Y, Emery P, Finckh A, Gabay C, Gomez-Reino J, Gossec L, Gottenberg JE, Hazes JMW, Huizinga T, Jani M, Karateev D, Kouloumas M, Kvien T, Li Z, Mariette X, McInnes I, Mysler E, Nash P, Pavelka K, Poór G, Richez C, van Riel P, Rubbert-Roth A, Saag K, da Silva J, Stamm T, Takeuchi T, Westhovens R, de Wit M, van der Heijde D. EULAR recommendations for the management of rheumatoid arthritis with synthetic and biological disease-modifying antirheumatic drugs: 2016 update. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2017; **76**: 960-977 [PMID: 28264816 DOI: 10.1136/annrheumdis-2016-210715]

62 **D'Haens G**, Baert F, van Assche G, Caenepeel P, Vergauwe P, Tuynman H, De Vos M, van Deventer S, Stitt L, Donner A, Vermeire S, Van De Mierop FJ, Coche JR, van der Woude J, Ochsenkühn T, van Bodegraven AA, Van Hootegem PP, Lambrecht GL, Mana F, Rutgeerts P, Feagan BG, Hommes D; Belgian Inflammatory Bowel Disease Research Group; North-Holland Gut Club. Early combined immunosuppression or conventional management in patients with newly diagnosed Crohn's disease: an open randomised trial. *Lancet* 2008; **371**: 660-667 [PMID: 18295023 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60304-9]

63 **Colombel JF**, Sandborn WJ, Reinisch W, Mantzaris GJ, Kornbluth A, Rachmilewitz D, Lichtiger S, D'Haens G, Diamond RH, Broussard DL, Tang KL, van der Woude CJ, Rutgeerts P; SONIC Study Group. Infliximab, azathioprine, or combination therapy for Crohn's disease. *N Engl J Med* 2010; **362**: 1383-1395 [PMID: 20393175 DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa0904492]

64 **Khanna R**, Bressler B, Levesque BG, Zou G, Stitt LW, Greenberg GR, Panaccione R, Bitton A, Paré P, Vermeire S, D'Haens G, MacIntosh D, Sandborn WJ, Donner A, Vandervoort MK, Morris JC, Feagan BG; REACT Study Investigators. Early combined immunosuppression for the management of Crohn's disease (REACT): a cluster randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2015; **386**: 1825-1834 [PMID: 26342731 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00068-9]

65 **Colombel JF**, Panaccione R, Bossuyt P, Lukas M, Baert F, Vaňásek T, Danalioglu A, Novacek G, Armuzzi A, Hébuterne X, Travis S, Danese S, Reinisch W, Sandborn WJ, Rutgeerts P, Hommes D, Schreiber S, Neimark E, Huang B, Zhou Q, Mendez P, Petersson J, Wallace K, Robinson AM, Thakkar RB, D'Haens G. Effect of tight control management on Crohn's disease (CALM): a multicentre, randomised, controlled phase 3 trial. *Lancet* 2018; **390**: 2779-2789 [PMID: 29096949 DOI: 10.1016/S0140-6736(17)32641-7]

P- Reviewer: Cibor D, Lin JM, Owczarek D **S- Editor**: Wang XJ
L- Editor: A **E- Editor**: Yin SY