during the past 5 years. Collected variables: age, sex, ECOG, adjuvant chemotherapy, treatment line, dose reduction and adverse events (AE). Efficacy endpoints were progression-free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS) obtained by the Kaplan–Meier method. Adverse effects (AE) were collected for safety profile assessment. Descriptive statistical analysis was performed using the SPSS Statistics program V22.0.

Results Forty-seven patients (30 men and 17 women) were included. The median age was 59 years (29–82). At the beginning of the treatment, more than 80% presented ECOG 0–1: 23.4% had received previous adjuvant chemotherapy (gemcitabine and/or fluoropyrimidines). They were treated with nab-paclitaxel 125 mg/m² and gemcitabine 1000 mg/m² on days 1, 8 and 15 every 28 days. In 89.4% of the patients it was prescribed as first-line treatment. Dose reduction was performed in 68.1%. The median duration of treatment was 4.5 months (0.5–22.9), with four long survivors (longer than 15 months). The median PFS was 9.1 months (95% CI 8.36 to 9.73) and the median OS was 9.11 months (95% CI 4.0 to 14.2). Eighty-three per cent of patients (n=39) had AE of some grade and 17% (n=8) of grade 3–4. The most common AE were: asthenia (n=17), neutropenia (n=16), thrombocytopenia (n=15), neuropathy (n=13), alopecia (n=5), diarrhoea (n=7), mucositis (n=3), vomiting (n=3), oedema (n=3) and dermatitis (n=2). These were grade 3–4: neutropenia (n=7), thrombocytopenia (n=4), mucositis (n=1), alopecia (n=1) and neuropathy (n=1). The causes of treatment discontinuation were mainly due to progression in 42.6% and deterioration of general health in 29.8%. At the end of the study, five patients continued treatment.

Conclusion The PFS obtained in our study is greater than those described in the pivotal trial MPACT or CA046. This difference may be due to the four patients with a considerably longer treatment than the average and a small sample. Regarding OS, there are no significant differences with the pivotal trial. The AE described were similar to those published in the literature

REFERENCE AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

BMC Cancer 2016;16:817.

No conflict of interest.

4CPS-120 ERLOTINIB IN NON-SMALL-CELL LUNG CANCER WITHOUT EPIDERMAL GROWTH FACTOR RECEPTOR ACTIVATING MUTATIONS

D Yáñez Fera, IM Carrion Madroñal, MT Garrido Martínez, O Montero Pérez*, MD Santos Rubio. Juan Ramon Jimenez Hospital, Pharmacy, Huelva, Spain

10.1136/ejhp-2019-eahpconf.269

Background Erlotinib is indicated in patients without epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR)-activating mutations who have had at least one previous chemotherapy treatment that has failed and when other treatments are considered unsuitable.

Purpose To analyse the effectiveness and safety of erlotinib in non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC) in patients without EGFR-activating mutations

Material and methods A retrospective observational study was conducted in a third-level hospital. We included patients

treated with erlotinib without EGFR-activating mutations from August 2012 to August 2018.

Following variables were recorded: age, sex, ECOG, histopathology, progression-free survival (PFS), smokers/non-smokers or ex-smokers, type of previous chemotherapy regimens, reported adverse events (AEs) and dose reductions between cycles.

We obtained data from electronic clinical records, the software where we register chemotherapy treatments (chemotherapy management software Oncogest) and the optimised computerised order entry ATHOS software.

AEs were classified according to the National Cancer Institute of Canada Common Toxicity Criteria v4.0.

Results Thirty-seven patients were included, with a median age of 64 years and 70% men. Fifty-seven per cent of patients presented ECOG 0 and the rest ECOG 1–2. Seventy-eight per cent of patients were smokers and/or ex-smokers. Ninety per cent of patients received erlotinib as the second line of treatment or subsequently, and the median PFS was 9.3 weeks. Previous chemotherapy regimens used before erlotinib in NSCLC were: taxane-based-chemotherapy 60%, platinum-based-chemotherapy 83% and both 74%. Forty-eight per cent of patients had at least one AE during treatment. The most frequent was skin rash g1–2 (60%). Thirty per cent of patients had dose reductions due to toxicity.

Conclusion In our patients, erlotinib median PFS was lower than in the BR21 trial. It could be explained because our patients received more previous regimens of chemotherapy for metastatic disease as well as our sample size was smaller. Regarding safety, erlotinib was well tolerated and in most of the cases, the AEs did not force a dose reduction.

REFERENCES AND/OR ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

No conflict of interest.

4CPS-121 COST-MINIMISATION ANALYSIS OF MAINTENANCE THERAPY OF ANTINEUTROPHIL CYTOPLASM ANTIBODY-ASSOCIATED VASCULITIDES

¹AB Guisado Gil, ¹M Muñoz Burgos*, ¹FJ Bautista Paloma, ²FJ García Hernandez, ¹B Santos Ramos. ¹Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío, Hospital Pharmacy, Seville, Spain; ²Hospital Universitario Virgen del Rocío, Internal Medicine, Seville, Spain

10.1136/ejhp-2019-eahpconf.270

Background The use of rituximab as maintenance treatment of antineutrophil cytoplasm antibody-associated vasculitides (AAVs) was supported by the MAINRITSAN trial. MAINRITSAN2 was a randomised, open-label, multicentre phase III trial which evaluated the difference between an individually tailored and a fixed-schedule maintenance therapy with rituximab. We found a large number of studies evaluating rituximab as a maintenance treatment in AAVs, but only a few looked at economic considerations. This cost-minimisation analysis (CMA) provides the best data available to date on the cost-saving option between a tailored-therapy and a fixed-schedule regimen with rituximab for the maintenance treatment of AAVs.

Purpose The present study used a cost-minimisation approach to examine the real-world costs of an individually tailored therapy compared to a fixed-schedule therapy with rituximab for remission maintenance of AAVs.