Age at Onset and Its Association With Damage Accrual in Systemic Lupus Erythematosus (SLE): Insights From 5 Registries in the Lupus Federated Data Network (LupusNet)

Kaleb Michaud,[1*] Sarah Gasman,[2] Federico Zazzetti,[3] Ashley Orillion,[2] Anna Sheahan,[3] Clair Blacketer,[2] Michel van Speybroeck,[4] Reyhan Sonmez,[5,6] Erika Noss,[2] Manuel F. Ugarte-Gil,[7,8] Rocio V. Gamboa-Cardenas,[7,8] Victor Pimentel-Quiroz,[7,8] Guillermo A. Pons-Estel,[9] Diana C. Fernández-Ávila,[10] Carmen Funes Soaje,[11] Henrique Ataide Mariz,[12] Edgard Torres dos Reis-Neto,[13] Carlos Alberto Cañas Davila,[14,15] Gerardo Quintana-Lopez,[16–18] Miguel Ángel Saavedra Salinas,[19] Margarita Portela Hernández,[20] Claudia Mora-Trujillo,[21] Patricia Katz,[22] Rangi Kandane-Rathnayake,[23] Eric Morand,[23,24] Worawit Louthrenoo,[25] Alberta Hoi,[23,24] Mandana Nikpour,[26,27] Sandra Navarra,[28] Chak Sing Lau,[29] Laniyati Hamijoyo,[30] Yeong-Jian Jan Wu,[31] Yasuhiro Katsumata,[32] Iñigo Rúa-Figueroa,[33] José María Pego-Reigosa,[34,35] Raúl Menor Almagro,[36] Jaime Calvo Alén,[37] María Galindo-Izquierdo,[38] Zulema Plaza,[39] Fernando Sánchez-Alonso[39]

[1]University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, NE, USA; [2]Johnson & Johnson, Spring House, PA, USA; [3]Johnson & Johnson, Horsham, PA, USA; [4]Johnson & Johnson, Beerse, Belgium; [5]Johnson & Johnson, Zurich, Switzerland; [6]Capgemini Consulting, Zurich, Switzerland; [7]Rheumatology Department, Hospital Guillermo Almenara Irigoyen, Lima, Peru; [8]Grupo Peruano de Estudio de Enfermedades Autoinmunes Sistemicas, Universidad Científica del Sur, Lima, Peru; [9]Centro Regional de Enfermedades Autoinmunes y Reumáticas (GO-CREAR), Rosario, Santa Fe, Argentina; [10]Centros Médicos Colsanitas, Bogotá, Colombia; [11]Hospital Italiano de Córdoba, Córdoba, Argentina; [12]Universidad Federal de Pernambuco, Recife, Brazil; [13]Division of Rheumatology, Escola Paulista de Medicina/Universidade federal de São Paulo (EPM/Unifesp), São Paulo, Brazil; [14]Unit of Rheumatology, Fundación Valle del Lili, Cali, Colombia; [15]Universidad Icesi, CIRAT: Centro de Investigación en Reumatología, Autoinmunidad y Medicina Traslacional, Cali, Colombia; [16]Facultad de Medicina, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia; [17]Servicio de reumatología, Hospital Universitario Fundación Santa Fe de Bogotá, Bogotá, Colombia; [18]Hospital Universitario Nacional de Colombia, Bogotá, Colombia; [19]División de Investigación en Salud, Hospital de Especialidades Dr. Antonio Fraga Mouret, Centro Médico Nacional La Raza, Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social, Mexico City, Mexico; [20]Hospital de Especialidades del Centro Médico Nacional SXXI, Instituto Mexicano del Seguro Social (IMSS), Mexico City, Mexico; [21]Hospital Nacional Edgardo Rebagliati, Lima, Peru; [22]University of California San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, USA; [23]Monash University, Rheumatology Research Group, Centre for Inflammatory Diseases, School of Clinical Sciences, Clayton, Victoria, Australia; [24]Monash Health Hospital, Rheumatology Department, Clayton, Victoria, Australia; [25]Chiang Mai University Hospital, Department of Internal Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Chiang Mai, Thailand; [26]University of Sydney, School of Public Health, Faculty of Medicine and Health, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia; [27]St Vincent's Hospital Melbourne, Department of Rheumatology, Fitzroy, Victoria, Australia; [28]University of Santo Tomas Hospital, Section of Rheumatology, Manila, Philippines; [29]Queen Mary Hospital, the University of Hong Kong, Division of Rheumatology & Clinical Immunology, Department of Medicine, Pok fu lam, Hong Kong, China; [30]Padjadjaran University/Hasan Sadikin General Hospital, Division of Rheumatology, Department of Internal Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Bandung, Indonesia; [31]Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Chang Gung University, Department of Rheumatology, Allergy and Immunology, Keelung, Taiwan; [32]Tokyo Women's Medical University, Division of Rheumatology, Department of Internal Medicine, Tokyo, Japan; [33]Department of Rheumatology, Hospital Universitario Doctor Negrín, Las Palmas de Gran Canaria, Spain; [34]Department of Rheumatology, University Hospital of Vigo, Vigo, Spain; [35]RIDIS Group (Investigation in Rheumatology and Immune-Diseases), Galicia Sur Health Research Institute, Vigo, Spain; [36]Department of Rheumatology, Hospital de Jerez, Jerez De La Frontera, Spain; [37]Department of Rheumatology, Hospital Universitario Araba, School of Medicine, Universidad del País Vasco, BIOARABA Health Research Institute, Vitoria, Spain; [38]Department of Rheumatology, Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre, Madrid, Spain; [39]Research Unit of the Spanish Society of Rheumatology, Madrid, Spain

*Presenting author

Scan the QR code
The QR code is intended to provide scientific information for individual reference, and the information should not be altered or reproduced in any way.

Key Takeaways

- SLE diagnosis before and after 50 years of age was associated with distinct clinical and damage profiles
  - Patients with SLE diagnosed at ≥50 years of age were less likely to have severe disease activity but more likely to have damage present at baseline and follow-up
- Among patients with no damage at registration, new damage accrual was associated with greater severity of disease activity in patients diagnosed at <50 years of age but not in patients diagnosed at ≥50 years of age
  - The rate of new damage accrual did not differ by age in patients without damage at baseline
- Age at SLE diagnosis was associated with certain types of damage
  - Features such as osteoporosis, cataracts, myocardial infarction, and diabetes were overrepresented in patients diagnosed at ≥50 years of age
- The differences observed in damage accrual patterns may reflect a difference in age-related risks
- These findings underscore the need for age-specific management strategies to prevent damage accrual in SLE

Background

- Systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) is a chronic autoimmune disease that is associated with a significant disease burden and increased risk for mortality[1–3]
- Age of SLE onset is associated with differences in disease severity, organ manifestations, and mortality[4,5]
- Late-onset SLE, diagnosed at ≥50 years of age, typically presents as a milder disease (ie, lower disease activity scores), with fewer renal and neurological manifestations and more musculoskeletal and serosal involvement[4]; however, it is also associated with greater damage accrual and lower survival rates[5]

Objective

To describe organ damage in patients with late-onset SLE versus patients with earlier-onset SLE and to analyse patterns and determinants of organ damage accrual using data from the Lupus Federated Data Network (LupusNet)

Methods

Data Source

- LupusNet is the largest existing federated SLE data network, with data from 5 large, longitudinal observational registries across North America, Latin America, Europe, and Asia Pacific mapped in LupusNet: The National Data Bank for Rheumatic Diseases (FORWARD), Grupo Latino Americano De Estudio del Lupus (GLADEL 2.0) and Rheumatology Department of the Hospital Guillermo Almenara Irigoyen (Almenara), Lupus Register of the Spanish Society of Rheumatology (RELESSER), and Asia Pacific Lupus Collaboration (APLC), respectively[6]
  - Registries included both incident and prevalent patients
  - Registry datasets were harmonised using the Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership Common Data Model v5.4, a standard representation of healthcare experiences and common vocabularies for coding clinical concepts, which enables consistent analyses across data sources and improves the characterisation of clinical presentation and global SLE outcomes

Study Assessments

- Baseline characteristics were collected at registration (ie, a 30-day window before and after enrolment into the registry)
- Disease activity was collected at registration and subsequent follow-up visits using the following:
  - Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Disease Activity Index 2000 (SLEDAI-2K): Almenara, APLC, GLADEL 2.0, and RELESSER
  - Systemic Lupus Activity Questionnaire (SLAQ): FORWARD
- Accumulated organ damage was measured at registration and subsequent follow-up visits using the following:
  - Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics Damage Index (SDI): Almenara, APLC, GLADEL 2.0, and RELESSER
  - Brief Index of Lupus Damage (BILD): FORWARD

Data Analyses

- Patients were grouped by age at SLE diagnosis (diagnosis at ≥50 or <50 years of age)
- Patients were classified by their highest SLEDAI-2K scores between baseline and Year 3 (mild: ≤4; moderate: >4 to <10; severe: ≥10) and by SLAQ severity categories (mild: <4; moderate: ≥4 to <7; severe: ≥7)
- The proportion of patients with damage (SDI score >0) in each group was calculated at baseline (registry entrance date) and Year 3, and new onset damage from baseline to Year 3 (SDI score change from 0 to >0) was assessed
- Unadjusted relative risk (RR) of damage was estimated to evaluate the association of onset age and severity of disease activity with damage

Results

Patient characteristics: onset age at registration, disease duration

- A total of 4122 patients in LupusNet with necessary follow-up data were included in the analysis (n=3734 from Almenara, APLC, GLADEL 2.0, and RELESSER; n=388 from FORWARD)
- Most patients (89% [3668/4122]) were diagnosed at <50 years of age
  - Patients diagnosed at ≥50 years of age entered registries at a mean age of 64.0 years, whereas those diagnosed at <50 years of age entered at a mean age of 40.6 years
  - Mean time from diagnosis to registration was shorter for those diagnosed at ≥50 years of age (7.2 years) versus those diagnosed at <50 years of age (11.6 years)

Association of age at diagnosis and disease duration with severity of disease activity through 3 years of follow-up

- Patients diagnosed at ≥50 years of age were less likely to have severe disease activity (SLEDAI-2K score ≥10 or SLAQ score ≥7) between registration and Year 3 of follow-up (16% [74/454]) versus those diagnosed at <50 years of age (28% [1020/3668]; **Table 1**)
  - In both groups, individuals with more severe SLEDAI-2K (but not SLAQ) activity were younger at the time of registration (**Figure 1**)
- More severe SLEDAI-2K (but not SLAQ) activity was linked to shorter disease duration prior to registration, regardless of age at diagnosis (**Figure 2**)

Table 1: Disease activity severity by age group

	Individuals with SLEDAI-2K activity		Individuals with SLAQ activity		Combined	
Severity, n (%)	≥50 years of age (n=388)	<50 years of age (n=3346)	≥50 years of age (n=66)	<50 years of age (n=322)	≥50 years of age (n=454)	<50 years of age (n=3668)
Mild	216 (56)	1450 (43)	38 (58)	155 (48)	254 (56)	1605 (44)
Moderate	113 (29)	955 (29)	13 (20)	88 (27)	126 (28)	1043 (28)
Severe	59 (15)	941 (28)	15 (23)	79 (25)	74 (16)	1020 (28)

Mild: SLEDAI-2K score ≤4 or SLAQ score <4; moderate: SLEDAI-2K score >4 to <10 or SLAQ score ≥4 to <7; severe: SLEDAI-2K score ≥10 or SLAQ score ≥7.
***SLAQ**=Systemic Lupus Activity Questionnaire, **SLEDAI-2K**=Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Disease Activity Index 2000.*

Figure 1: Mean age at registration by age at diagnosis and (A) maximum SLEDAI-2K score or (B) maximum SLAQ score over follow-up





Figure 2: Mean time from diagnosis to registration by age at diagnosis and (A) maximum SLEDAI-2K score or (B) maximum SLAQ score over follow-up




Mild: SLEDAI-2K score ≤4 or SLAQ score <4; moderate: SLEDAI-2K score >4 to <10 or SLAQ score ≥4 to <7; severe: SLEDAI-2K score ≥10 or SLAQ score ≥7.
***CI**=confidence interval, **SLAQ**=Systemic Lupus Activity Questionnaire, **SLEDAI-2K**=Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Disease Activity Index 2000.*

Association of age at diagnosis and severity of disease activity with damage accrual through 3 years of follow-up

- Patients diagnosed at ≥50 years of age were more likely to have any SDI damage (score >0) at registration (58% [226/388]) versus those diagnosed at <50 years of age (36% [1215/3346]; **Figure 3A**)
  - By Year 3 of follow-up, patients diagnosed at ≥50 years of age were more likely to have SDI damage than those diagnosed at <50 years of age (76% [295/388] vs 51% [1703/3346], respectively; unadjusted relative risk [RR]: 1.49; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 1.39–1.60)
  - However, patients diagnosed at ≥50 years of age without damage at registration were not significantly more likely to newly accrue damage (score increase from 0 to >0) from baseline to Year 3 compared with those diagnosed at <50 years of age (18% [69/388] vs 15% [488/3346], respectively; unadjusted RR: 1.22; 95% CI: 0.97–1.53)
- The proportion of patients diagnosed at ≥50 and <50 years of age with BILD damage (score >0) in the FORWARD registry at Year 3 was 95% and 92%, respectively (**Figure 3B**)


Figure 3: Percent of patients who accrued (A) SDI damage from baseline to Year 3 by age at diagnosis and maximum SLEDAI-2K score over follow-up and (B) BILD damage at Year 3 by age at diagnosis



Mild: SLEDAI-2K score ≤4; moderate: SLEDAI-2K score >4 to <10; severe: SLEDAI-2K score ≥10.
***BILD**=Brief Index of Lupus Damage, **SDI**=Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics Damage Index, **SLEDAI-2K**=Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Disease Activity Index 2000.*

- Among patients diagnosed at <50 years of age, those with severe SLEDAI-2K activity were more likely to have damage present at Year 3 compared with those with mild activity (unadjusted RR: 1.14; 95% CI: 1.05–1.23; **Figure 4**)
  - Among patients diagnosed at ≥50 years of age, SLEDAI-2K severity did not have a significant correlation with the presence of damage at Year 3 (unadjusted RR for severe activity versus mild: 0.97; 95% CI: 0.81–1.14)

Figure 4: Unadjusted RR of SDI damage at Year 3 of follow-up by age at diagnosis and maximum SLEDAI-2K score over follow-up




Mild: SLEDAI-2K score ≤4; moderate: SLEDAI-2K score >4 to <10; severe: SLEDAI-2K score ≥10.
***CI**=confidence interval, **RR**=relative risk, **SDI**=Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics Damage Index, **SLEDAI-2K**=Systemic Lupus Erythematosus Disease Activity Index 2000.*

Association of age at diagnosis and types of organ damage at Year 3

- SDI damage types varied by age at diagnosis (**Figure 5A**)
  - Osteoporosis (27% in patients diagnosed at ≥50 years of age vs 9% in those diagnosed at <50 years of age; unadjusted RR: 3.2; 95% CI: 2.7–3.8) and cataracts (25% vs 9%, respectively; unadjusted RR: 3.1; 95% CI: 2.7–3.6) were more frequent in patients diagnosed at ≥50 years of age and were the most common types of organ damage in both groups
  - Other damage types, including myocardial infarction, valvular disease, cardiomyopathy, angina, bowel infarction, mesenteric insufficiency, cognitive impairment, retinal change/optic atrophy, diabetes, malignancy, claudication ≥6 months, and pulmonary fibrosis, were also more prevalent in patients diagnosed at ≥50 years of age
  - In contrast, premature gonadal failure, avascular necrosis, and severe proteinuria were more common in patients diagnosed at <50 years of age

Figure 5: Prevalence of (A) SDI damage and (B) BILD damage at Year 3 by age at diagnosis



***BILD**=Brief Index of Lupus Damage, **eGFR**=estimated glomerular filtration rate, **GI**=gastrointestinal, **PA**=pulmonic valve closure sound, **SDI**=Systemic Lupus International Collaborating Clinics Damage Index.*

- Among BILD damage types, cataracts and hysterectomy before 40 years of age occurred more frequently in patients diagnosed at ≥50 years of age, whereas other damage types were evident more frequently in those diagnosed at <50 years of age (**Figure 5B**)

PRESENTED AT: The American College of Rheumatology (ACR) Convergence 2026; November 6–11, 2026; Orlando, Florida, USA. **REFERENCES: 1.** Ameer MA, et al. *Cureus.* 2022;14(10):e30330. **2.** Hoi A, et al. *Arthritis Res Ther.* 2021;23(1):191. **3.** Stojan G, Petri M. *Curr Opin Rheumatol.* 2018;30(2):144-150. **4.** Piga M, et al. *Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol.* 2023;37(4):101938. **5.** Pons-Estel GJ, et al. *Expert Rev Clin Immunol.* 2017;13(8):799-814. **6.** Zazzetti F, et al. *Lupus Sci Med.* 2026;13(1):e001881. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:** The study was sponsored by Johnson & Johnson. Writing and editorial assistance were provided by Chan Yoon, PharmD, of Lumanity Communications Inc., and funded by Johnson & Johnson. Layout design and formatting for this encore presentation was provided by Sandeep Chavan (SRO Medical Writing Pvt. Ltd., India). **DISCLOSURES: SG**, **FZ**, **AO**, **AS**, **CB**, **MvS**, **RS**, and **EN** are employees of Johnson & Johnson and may hold stock/stock options in Johnson & Johnson. **MFU-G** received consulting and/or speaking fees from Adium, AstraZeneca, Ferrer, GSK, and Novartis; and received research support from Johnson & Johnson. **GAP-E** received payment or honoraria for advisory boards and/or lectures and/or support for attending scientific events from AbbVie, AstraZeneca, Boehringer Ingelheim, GSK, Johnson & Johnson, Novartis, Pfizer, and RemeGen; and received grants for conducting the epidemiology study (payment made to GLADEL) from GSK and Johnson & Johnson. **ET-dR-N** received speaker fees and/or consulting fees from AstraZeneca, GSK, Novartis, and Roche; and participated in clinical research from AbbVie, Bristol Myers Squibb, and Novartis. **RK-R** received research grants from GSK and Novartis. **SN** received consulting and/or speaking fees from AstraZeneca, Biogen, Idorsia/Viatris, and Otsuka. **JMP-R** received speaker fees from and participated in advisory boards for AstraZeneca, GSK, and Otsuka; and received investigation grants from AstraZeneca and GSK. **KM**, **RVG-C**, **VP-Q**, **DCF-Á**, **CFS**, **HAM**, **CACD**, **GQ-L**, **MASS**, **MPH**, **CM-T**, **PK**, **EM**, **WL**, **AH**, **MN**, **CSL**, **LH**, **Y-JJW**, **YK**, **IR-F**, **RMA**, **JCA**, **MG-I**, **ZP**, and **FS-A** report no disclosures.
PREVIOUSLY PRESENTED AT: The European Alliance of Associations for Rheumatology (EULAR) European Congress; June 3–6, 2026; London, England, UK.