

University of Groningen

2022 American College of Rheumatology/EULAR Classification Criteria for Takayasu Arteritis

DCVAS Study Group; Grayson, Peter C.; Ponte, Cristina; Suppiah, Ravi; Robson, Joanna C.; Gribbons, Katherine Bates; Judge, Andrew; Craven, Anthea; Khalid, Sara; Hutchings, Andrew

Published in:
Arthritis and Rheumatology

DOI:
[10.1002/art.42324](https://doi.org/10.1002/art.42324)

IMPORTANT NOTE: You are advised to consult the publisher's version (publisher's PDF) if you wish to cite from it. Please check the document version below.

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

Publication date:
2022

[Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

DCVAS Study Group, Grayson, P. C., Ponte, C., Suppiah, R., Robson, J. C., Gribbons, K. B., Judge, A., Craven, A., Khalid, S., Hutchings, A., Danda, D., Luqmani, R. A., Watts, R. A., & Merkel, P. A. (2022). 2022 American College of Rheumatology/EULAR Classification Criteria for Takayasu Arteritis. *Arthritis and Rheumatology*, 74(12), 1872-1880. <https://doi.org/10.1002/art.42324>

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

The publication may also be distributed here under the terms of Article 25fa of the Dutch Copyright Act, indicated by the "Taverne" license. More information can be found on the University of Groningen website: <https://www.rug.nl/library/open-access/self-archiving-pure/taverne-amendment>.

Take-down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from the University of Groningen/UMCG research database (Pure): <http://www.rug.nl/research/portal>. For technical reasons the number of authors shown on this cover page is limited to 10 maximum.

2022 American College of Rheumatology/EULAR Classification Criteria for Takayasu Arteritis

Peter C. Grayson,¹  Cristina Ponte,²  Ravi Suppiah,³  Joanna C. Robson,⁴  Katherine Bates Gribbons,¹  Andrew Judge,⁵  Anthea Craven,⁶  Sara Khalid,⁶  Andrew Hutchings,⁷  Debashish Danda,⁸  Raashid A. Luqmani,⁶  Richard A. Watts,⁹ and Peter A. Merkel¹⁰ , for the DCVAS Study Group

This criteria set has been approved by the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) Board of Directors and the EULAR Executive Committee. This signifies that the criteria set has been quantitatively validated using patient data, and it has undergone validation based on an independent data set. All ACR/EULAR-approved criteria sets are expected to undergo intermittent updates.

The ACR is an independent, professional, medical and scientific society that does not guarantee, warrant, or endorse any commercial product or service.

Objective. To develop and validate new classification criteria for Takayasu arteritis (TAK).

Methods. Patients with vasculitis or comparator diseases were recruited into an international cohort. The study proceeded in 6 phases: 1) identification of candidate criteria items, 2) collection of candidate items present at diagnosis, 3) expert panel review of cases, 4) data-driven reduction of candidate items, 5) derivation of a points-based classification score in a development data set, and 6) validation in an independent data set.

Results. The development data set consisted of 316 cases of TAK and 323 comparators. The validation data set consisted of an additional 146 cases of TAK and 127 comparators. Age ≤ 60 years at diagnosis and imaging evidence of large-vessel vasculitis were absolute requirements to classify a patient as having TAK. The final criteria items and weights were as follows: female sex (+1), angina (+2), limb claudication (+2), arterial bruit (+2), reduced upper extremity pulse (+2), reduced pulse or tenderness of a carotid artery (+2), blood pressure difference between arms of ≥ 20 mm Hg (+1), number of affected arterial territories (+1 to +3), paired artery involvement (+1), and abdominal aorta plus renal or mesenteric involvement (+3). A patient could be classified as having TAK with a cumulative score of ≥ 5 points. When these criteria were tested in the validation data set, the model area under the curve was 0.97 (95% confidence interval [95% CI] 0.94–0.99) with a sensitivity of 93.8% (95% CI 88.6–97.1%) and specificity of 99.2% (95% CI 96.7–100.0%).

Conclusion. The 2022 American College of Rheumatology/EULAR classification criteria for TAK are now validated for use in research.

This article is published simultaneously in *Annals of the Rheumatic Diseases*.

The Diagnostic and Classification Criteria in Vasculitis (DCVAS) study, which included the development of this classification criteria, was funded by grants from the American College of Rheumatology (ACR), EULAR, the Vasculitis Foundation, and the University of Pennsylvania Vasculitis Center. This study was also supported by the Intramural Research Program of the National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases, NIH.

¹Peter C. Grayson, MD, MSc, Katherine Bates Gribbons, BS: Systemic Autoimmunity Branch, National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases, NIH, Bethesda, Maryland; ²Cristina Ponte, MD, PhD: Department of Rheumatology, Centro Hospitalar Universitário Lisboa Norte, Centro Académico de Medicina de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal, and Rheumatology Research

Unit, Instituto de Medicina Molecular, Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de Lisboa, Centro Académico de Medicina de Lisboa, Lisbon, Portugal; ³Ravi Suppiah, MBChB, MD, FRACP: Te Whatu Ora - Health New Zealand, Auckland, New Zealand; ⁴Joanna C. Robson, MBBS, PhD: Centre for Health and Clinical Research, University of the West of England, and Rheumatology Department, University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust, Bristol, UK; ⁵Andrew Judge, PhD: Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, Oxford NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK, Musculoskeletal Research Unit, Translational Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK, and National Institute for Health Research Bristol Biomedical Research Centre, University Hospitals Bristol and Weston NHS Foundation Trust and University of Bristol, Bristol, UK; ⁶Anthea Craven, BSc, Sara Khalid, DPhil, Raashid A.

INTRODUCTION

Takayasu arteritis (TAK) is one of the major forms of large-vessel vasculitis (LVV) (1). TAK is a chronic disease defined by granulomatous inflammation affecting the aorta and its primary branches. Complications from vascular damage can result in substantial morbidity including stroke, myocardial infarction, mesenteric ischemia, and limb claudication.

Unlike diagnostic criteria, the purpose of classification criteria is to ensure that a homogenous population is selected for inclusion into clinical trials and other research studies (2). In 1990, the American College of Rheumatology (ACR) endorsed classification criteria for TAK (3). These criteria were developed using data from only 63 patients with TAK and have never been independently validated. Additionally, these criteria were derived using data from patients exclusively from North America without representation from Europe or Asia, where clinical patterns of disease may differ (4), limiting the generalizability of results. Given these constraints, the 1990 ACR criteria for TAK no longer satisfy accepted current standards (5) for classification criteria development, and updated criteria are warranted. Further highlighting a need for uniform, revised criteria in TAK is the use of divergent eligibility criteria to define study populations in 2 recent randomized clinical trials conducted in North America and Japan, making comparisons between the trial findings difficult (6,7).

Advancements in imaging techniques and the ongoing adoption of noninvasive vascular imaging approaches in clinical practice have broadened understanding of the clinical heterogeneity in LVV (8). Disease of the extracranial arteries is increasingly recognized in patients with giant cell arteritis (GCA), making the distinction between TAK and GCA more challenging (9). Age is typically used as a primary classifier to differentiate between TAK and GCA; however, specific age thresholds to define each disease have not been standardized. Therefore, in addition to incorporating data from a larger patient population from a wider geographic spectrum, the updated TAK classification criteria should reflect modern clinical practice, including current imaging techniques, and also define specific age thresholds.

This article outlines the development and validation of the new ACR/EULAR-endorsed classification criteria for TAK.

METHODS

An international Steering Committee comprising clinician investigators with expertise in vasculitis, statisticians, and data

managers was established to oversee the overall development of classification criteria for primary vasculitis (10). A detailed and complete description of the methods involved in the development and validation of the classification criteria for TAK is located in Supplementary Appendix 1 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>). Briefly, the Steering Committee implemented a 6-stage plan using data-driven and consensus methodology to develop the following criteria.

Stage 1: generation of candidate classification items for the systemic vasculitides. Candidate classification items were generated by expert opinion and reviewed by a group of vasculitis experts across a range of specialties using nominal group technique.

Stage 2: Diagnostic and Classification Criteria for Vasculitis (DCVAS) prospective observational study. A prospective, international, multisite observational study was conducted (see Appendix A for study investigators and sites). Ethical approval was obtained from local ethics committees. Consecutive patients representing the full spectrum of vasculitides were recruited from academic and community practices. Patients were included if they were 18 years or older and had a diagnosis of vasculitis or a condition that mimics vasculitis (e.g., infection, malignancy, atherosclerosis). Patients with TAK could only be enrolled within 5 years of diagnosis. Only data present at diagnosis were used to develop the classification criteria.

Stage 3: expert review to derive a gold standard-defined set of cases of LVV. Experts in vasculitis from a wide range of geographic locations and specialties (see Appendix A) reviewed all submitted cases of vasculitis and a random selection of vasculitis mimics. Each reviewer was asked to review ~50 submitted cases to confirm the diagnosis and to specify the degree of certainty of their diagnosis as follows: very certain, moderately certain, uncertain, or very uncertain. Only cases agreed upon with at least moderate certainty by 2 reviewers were retained for further analysis.

Stage 4: refinement of candidate items specifically for LVV. The Steering Committee conducted a data-driven process to reduce the number of candidate items of relevance to cases

Luqmani, DM, FRCP: Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, Oxford NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK; ⁷Andrew Hutchings, MSc: Department of Health Services Research and Policy, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK; ⁸Debashish Danda, MD, DM, FRCP: Department of Clinical Immunology and Rheumatology, Christian Medical College, Vellore, Tamil Nadu, India; ⁹Richard A. Watts, MD: Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, Oxford NIHR Biomedical Research Centre, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK, and Norwich Medical School, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK; ¹⁰Peter A. Merkel, MD, MPH:

Division of Rheumatology, Department of Medicine, and Division of Epidemiology, Department of Biostatistics, Epidemiology, and Informatics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.

Author disclosures are available at <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/action/downloadSupplement?doi=10.1002%2Fart.42324&file=art42324-sup-0001-Disclosureform.pdf>.

Address correspondence via email to Peter A. Merkel, MD, MPH, at pmerkel@upenn.edu.

Submitted for publication February 14, 2022; accepted in revised form July 30, 2022.

and comparators for LVV. Density plots were assessed to study age distribution at diagnosis and symptom onset for TAK and GCA. Absolute age requirements versus incorporation of age as a candidate criteria item were considered. Items related to the vascular physical examination, vascular imaging, arterial biopsy, and laboratory values were combined or eliminated based on consensus review. Items were selected for exclusion if they had a prevalence of <5% within the data set, and/or they were not clinically relevant for classification criteria (e.g., related to infection, malignancy, or demography). Low-frequency items of clinical importance could be combined, when appropriate. Patterns of vascular imaging findings detected by vascular ultrasound, angiography, or positron emission tomography were defined by K-means clustering (11).

Stage 5: derivation of the final classification criteria for TAK. The DCVAS data set was split into development (70%) and validation (30%) sets. Comparisons were performed between cases of TAK and a randomly selected comparator group in the following proportions: GCA, 33.6%; other vasculitides that mimic GCA and TAK (isolated aortitis, primary central nervous system vasculitis, polyarteritis nodosa, Behçet's disease, and other LVV), 33.1%; a comparator mimic of LVV (e.g., headache syndrome or atherosclerosis), 33.3%. Least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (lasso) logistic regression was used to identify predictors from the data set and create a parsimonious model including only the most important predictors. The final items in the model were formulated into a clinical risk-scoring tool, with each factor assigned a weight based on its respective regression coefficient. A threshold that best balanced sensitivity and specificity was identified for classification.

Stage 6: validation of the final classification criteria for TAK. Performance of the new criteria was validated in an independent set of cases and comparators. Performance of the final classification criteria was examined in specific subsets of patients with TAK using data from the combined development and validation sets, to maximize sample sizes for the subgroups. Patients were studied according to different intervals of age at diagnosis to determine if the criteria performed well across the age spectrum of TAK. Performance characteristics of the new criteria were also tested in patients recruited into the DCVAS study from different regions of the world where prevalence of TAK and clinical assessment approaches may differ. Comparison was made between the measurement properties of the new 2022 ACR/EULAR classification criteria for TAK and the 1990 ACR classification criteria.

RESULTS

Generation of candidate classification items for the systemic vasculitides. The Steering Committee identified >1,000 candidate items for the DCVAS Case Report Form

(Supplementary Appendix 2, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>).

DCVAS prospective observational study. Between January 2011 and December 2017, the DCVAS study recruited 6,991 participants from 136 sites in 32 countries. Information on the DCVAS sites, investigators, and study participants is listed in Supplementary Appendices 3, 4, and 5 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>).

Expert review methodology to derive a gold standard-defined final set of cases of LVV. The LVV expert panel review process included 56 experts who reviewed vignettes derived from the Case Report Forms for 2,131 cases submitted with a diagnosis of LVV (1,608 [75.5% of Case Report Forms]), another type of vasculitis (118 [5.5% of Case Report Forms]), or a mimic of vasculitis (405 [19.0% of Case Report Forms]). Characteristics and the list of expert reviewers are shown in Supplementary Appendices 6 and 7 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>). A sample vignette and the LVV expert panel review flow chart are shown in Supplementary Appendices 8 and 9. A total of 1,695 cases (80%) passed the main LVV process. An additional 373 cases of LVV and comparators, confirmed during a previous review process to derive the classification criteria for antineutrophil cytoplasmic antibody-associated vasculitis, were also included. In total, after both review processes, 2,068 cases were available for the stages 4 and 5 analyses.

The submitting physician diagnosis of TAK was confirmed in 500 of 610 cases (82.0%) after both expert panel reviews. The reasons for exclusion were diagnosis of TAK categorized as “uncertain” or “very uncertain” during panel review ($n = 95$) or change in diagnosis during panel review to another type of vasculitis (e.g., GCA, isolated aortitis, LVV that could not be subtyped) ($n = 10$) or to a comparator disease ($n = 5$). An additional 9 patients who were not initially diagnosed as having TAK by the submitting physician were diagnosed as having TAK after panel review and DCVAS Steering Committee member adjudication. Per Steering Committee consensus, imaging evidence of LVV was considered an absolute requirement to classify TAK. Of 509 cases confirmed by expert panel review, 47 patients with TAK did not have documented disease according to a vascular imaging study and were excluded from further analysis, leaving a total of 462 patients with TAK for subsequent analysis.

Refinement of candidate items specifically for TAK.

Patients with TAK were diagnosed in the following age groups: 18–39 years ($n = 355$; 77%); 40–60 years ($n = 104$; 23%); and >60 years ($n = 3$; <1%) (see Supplementary Appendix 10 for the distribution of “age at diagnosis” in patients with LVV, and the similar distribution of “age at symptom onset,” <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>). Therefore, an age

of ≤ 60 years at diagnosis was considered an absolute requirement to classify a patient as having TAK.

Prevalence of arterial damage (stenosis, occlusion, or aneurysm) was greater in TAK compared to GCA in the following 9 arterial territories: thoracic aorta, abdominal aorta, left and right carotid, left and right subclavian, mesenteric, and left and right renal arteries (Supplementary Appendix 11, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>). Therefore, a composite variable representing the number of affected arteries was created based upon luminal damage in those 9 territories. As previously reported, cluster analyses identified vascular damage in the abdominal aorta and the renal or mesenteric arteries as a specific imaging pattern for TAK in the DCVAS cohort (11); thus, this arterial pattern was tested as a potential classifier of TAK (Supplementary Appendix 12, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>). Symmetric disease in branch arteries (carotid, subclavian, and renal arteries) was seen in 30.3% patients with TAK compared to 2.7% of the comparators ($P < 0.01$) and, therefore, was included as a potential classifier. A systolic blood pressure difference of ≥ 20 mm Hg between upper extremities optimized specificity to differentiate TAK from other forms of LVV.

Following a data-driven and expert consensus process, 72 items from the DCVAS Case Report Form were retained for lasso regression analysis, including 32 demographic and clinical items, 14 laboratory items (including values of C-reactive protein level and erythrocyte sedimentation rate, each divided into 5 categories), 14 imaging items (13 composite), 11 vascular examination items (5 composite, and upper extremity blood pressure

divided into 6 categories), and 1 arterial biopsy item (Supplementary Appendix 13, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>). Criteria for TAK and GCA were independently derived from this common set of 72 items.

Derivation of the final classification criteria for TAK.

Table 1 lists the demographic and disease features of the 462 patients with TAK and 450 comparators used to develop and validate the criteria, of which 316 patients with TAK and 323 comparators were in the development data set and 146 patients with TAK and 127 comparators were in the validation data set. The patients with TAK were recruited from Asia ($n = 298$), Europe ($n = 130$), North America ($n = 28$), Africa ($n = 3$), and Oceania ($n = 3$). Clinical diagnoses assigned to patients in the comparator group are detailed in Supplementary Appendix 14 (<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>).

Lasso logistic regression analysis using all 72 items resulted in a model of 9 independent items (Supplementary Appendix 15B, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>). Weighting of individual criterion was based on logistic regression fitted to the 9 selected predictors. The number of affected arterial territories functioned as an almost perfect classifier (Supplementary Appendix 16B) and was thus also included in the final model, with criterion weighting determined by consensus of the Steering Committee (Supplementary Appendix 17B).

Validation of the final classification criteria for TAK.

Using a cutoff of ≥ 5 in total risk score in the validation data set (see Supplementary Appendix 18B for cutoff points), the sensitivity was

Table 1. Demographic and disease features of the patients with Takayasu arteritis and the comparators*

	TAK ($n = 462$)	Comparators ($n = 450$)†	<i>P</i>
Age, mean $\pm$ SD years	32.3 $\pm$ 10.4	58.6 $\pm$ 18.0	<0.001
Female sex	391 (84.6)	246 (54.7)	<0.001
Clinical features			
Angina	56 (12.1)	7 (1.6)	<0.001
Arm claudication	233 (50.4)	11 (2.4)	<0.001
Leg claudication	88 (19.0)	17 (3.8)	<0.001
Vascular examination findings			
Arterial bruit	263 (56.9)	32 (7.1)	<0.001
Reduced or absent pulse in upper extremity	309 (66.9)	16 (3.6)	<0.001
Carotid artery with reduced pulse or tenderness	171 (37.0)	16 (3.6)	<0.001
Difference in systolic blood pressure ≥ 20 mm Hg between arms	190 (41.1)	16 (3.6)	<0.001
Imaging findings			
1 affected arterial territory	76 (16.5)	36 (8.0)	<0.001
2 affected arterial territories	114 (24.7)	12 (2.7)	<0.001
≥ 3 affected arterial territories	89 (19.2)	5 (1.1)	<0.001
Vasculitis affecting paired branch arteries	140 (30.3)	12 (2.7)	<0.001
Abdominal aorta involvement with renal or mesenteric artery involvement	83 (18.0)	5 (1.1)	<0.001

* Except where indicated otherwise, values are the number (%).

† Diagnoses of comparators for the classification criteria for Takayasu arteritis (TAK) included giant cell arteritis ($n = 151$), Behçet's disease ($n = 80$), polyarteritis nodosa ($n = 39$), clinically isolated aortitis ($n = 12$), primary central nervous system vasculitis ($n = 11$), large-vessel vasculitis (LVV) that could not be subtyped ($n = 7$), and other diseases that mimic LVV ($n = 150$).

93.8% (95% confidence interval [95% CI] 88.6–97.1%), and the specificity was 99.2% (95% CI 96.7–100.0%). The area under the curve for the model was 0.97 (95% CI 0.94–0.99) (Supplementary Appendix 19B, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>).

The final classification criteria for TAK are shown in Figure 1 (for the slide presentation versions, see Supplementary Figure 1, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>).

2022 AMERICAN COLLEGE OF RHEUMATOLOGY / EULAR CLASSIFICATION CRITERIA FOR TAKAYASU ARTERITIS

CONSIDERATIONS WHEN APPLYING THESE CRITERIA

- These classification criteria should be applied to classify the patient as having Takayasu arteritis when a diagnosis of medium-vessel or large-vessel vasculitis has been made
- Alternate diagnoses mimicking vasculitis should be excluded prior to applying the criteria

ABSOLUTE REQUIREMENTS

Age ≤ 60 years at time of diagnosis

Evidence of vasculitis on imaging¹

ADDITIONAL CLINICAL CRITERIA

Female sex	+1
Angina or ischemic cardiac pain	+2
Arm or leg claudication	+2
Vascular bruit ²	+2
Reduced pulse in upper extremity ³	+2
Carotid artery abnormality ⁴	+2
Systolic blood pressure difference in arms ≥ 20 mm Hg	+1

ADDITIONAL IMAGING CRITERIA

Number of affected arterial territories (select one) ⁵	
One arterial territory	+1
Two arterial territories	+2
Three or more arterial territories	+3
Symmetric involvement of paired arteries ⁶	+1
Abdominal aorta involvement with renal or mesenteric involvement ⁷	+3

Sum the scores for 10 items, if present. A score of ≥ 5 points is needed for the classification of TAKAYASU ARTERITIS.

1. Evidence of vasculitis in the aorta or branch arteries must be confirmed by vascular imaging (e.g., computed tomographic/catheter-based/magnetic resonance angiography, ultrasound, positron emission tomography).
2. Bruit detected by auscultation of a large artery, including the aorta, carotid, subclavian, axillary, brachial, renal, or iliofemoral arteries.
3. Reduction or absence of pulse by physical examination of the axillary, brachial, or radial arteries.
4. Reduction or absence of pulse of the carotid artery or tenderness of the carotid artery.
5. Number of arterial territories with luminal damage (e.g., stenosis, occlusion, or aneurysm) detected by angiography or ultrasonography from the following nine territories: thoracic aorta, abdominal aorta, mesenteric, left or right carotid, left or right subclavian, left or right renal arteries.
6. Bilateral luminal damage (stenosis, occlusion, or aneurysm) detected by angiography or ultrasonography in any of the following paired vascular territories: carotid, subclavian, or renal arteries.
7. Luminal damage (stenosis, occlusion, aneurysm) detected by angiography or ultrasonography involving the abdominal aorta and either the renal or mesenteric arteries.

Figure 1. The final 2022 American College of Rheumatology/EULAR Classification Criteria for Takayasu arteritis.

Table 2. Performance characteristics of the 2022 ACR/EULAR classification criteria for Takayasu arteritis*

Patient subset	Total no. patients (no. TAK patients)	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)	AUC (95% CI)
Development data set	639 (316)	89.9 (86.0–93.0)	96.6 (94.0–98.3)	0.93 (0.91–0.95)
Validation data set	273 (146)	93.8 (88.6–97.1)	99.2 (96.7–100.0)	0.97 (0.94–0.99)
Age intervals				
18–39 years	437 (351)	94.0 (91.0–96.3)	97.7 (91.9–99.7)	0.96 (0.94–0.98)
40–60 years	226 (104)	83.7 (75.1–90.2)	91.8 (85.4–96.0)	0.88 (0.83–0.92)
World regions				
North America	127 (28)	85.7 (67.3–96.0)	92.9 (86.0–97.1)	0.89 (0.82–0.96)
Europe	422 (130)	91.5 (85.4–95.7)	94.9 (91.7–97.1)	0.93 (0.90–0.96)
North America/Europe combined	549 (158)	90.5 (84.8–94.6)	94.4 (91.6–96.4)	0.92 (0.90–0.95)
Asia	357 (298)	92.0 (88.3–94.8)	93.2 (83.5–98.1)	0.94 (0.89–0.96)

* Performance characteristics for the age and regional subsets were reported using data from the combined development and validation data sets to maximize sample size. ACR = American College of Rheumatology; TAK = Takayasu arteritis; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval; AUC = area under the curve.

The performance characteristics of the criteria in different subsets of patients with TAK are shown in Table 2 and Supplementary Appendix 20B. For patients who were diagnosed between 18 and 39 years of age, the sensitivity of the criteria was 94.0% (95% CI 91.0–96.3%), and the specificity was 97.7% (95% CI 91.9–99.7%). For patients who were diagnosed between 40 and 60 years of age, the sensitivity of the criteria was 83.7% (95% CI 75.1–90.2%), and the specificity was 91.8% (95% CI 85.4–96.0%). Because age restrictions are absolute requirements for the 2022 ACR/EULAR classification criteria for TAK (≤ 60 years at diagnosis) and GCA (≥ 50 years at diagnosis), patients with LVV between the ages of 50 and 60 years are potentially eligible to fulfill criteria for TAK and GCA. Of the 26 patients with TAK diagnosed between the ages of 50 and 60 years, 23 (88.5%) were classified correctly as having TAK, 1 (3.9%) was incorrectly classified as having GCA, and 1 (3.9%) fulfilled criteria for both TAK and GCA (Supplementary Appendix 21, <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/art.42324>). The criteria performed well in both Asia (sensitivity 92.0%, specificity 93.2%) and Europe/North America (sensitivity 90.5%, specificity 94.4%).

When the 1990 ACR classification criteria for TAK were applied to the DCVAS validation data set, the criteria performed poorly due to low sensitivity (84.3% [95% CI 77.3–89.7%]) but retained excellent specificity (99.2% [95% CI 95.7–100.0%]). In particular, the 1990 criteria had poor sensitivity for patients who were diagnosed as having TAK between 40 and 60 years of age (62.5% [95% CI 52.5–71.8%]).

DISCUSSION

Presented here are the final 2022 ACR/EULAR TAK classification criteria. A 6-stage approach was used, underpinned by data from the multinational, prospective DCVAS study and informed by expert review and consensus at each stage. The comparator group for developing and validating the criteria were other vasculitides and conditions that mimic TAK, where

discrimination from TAK is difficult but important. In the validation data set, the new criteria had a sensitivity of 93.8% (95% CI 88.6–97.1%) and a specificity of 99.2% (95% CI 96.7–100.0%). These are the official final values that should be quoted when referring to the criteria. The sensitivity and specificity values calculated in the development data set were very similar, providing reassurance that the statistical methods avoided overfitting of models. Calculations of sensitivity and specificity for patient subgroups were made in the combined development and validation data sets to maximize sample sizes for the subgroups. Reassuringly, the new criteria for TAK have excellent sensitivity and specificity across different regions of the world. The criteria also incorporate modern imaging techniques, which are useful both to diagnose LVV and to differentiate among different types of vasculitis. The criteria were designed to have face and content validity for use in clinical trials and other research studies.

These criteria are validated and intended for the purpose of *classification* of vasculitis and are not appropriate for use to establish a *diagnosis* of vasculitis (2). The aim of the classification criteria is to differentiate cases of TAK from similar types of vasculitis in research settings (5). Therefore, *the criteria should only be applied when a diagnosis of large- or medium-vessel vasculitis has been made and all potential “vasculitis mimics” have been excluded*. For example, the criteria were not developed to differentiate patients with TAK from patients with atherosclerosis or noninflammatory genetic diseases that damage the large arteries. The 1990 ACR classification criteria for vasculitis perform poorly when used for diagnosis (i.e., when used to differentiate between cases of vasculitis versus mimics without vasculitis), and it is expected that the 2022 criteria would also perform poorly if used inappropriately as diagnostic criteria (12).

The 2022 ACR/EULAR TAK classification criteria reflect the collaborative effort of the international vasculitis community to delineate the salient clinical features that differentiate TAK from

other forms of vasculitis, most notably GCA. The final criteria include 10 clinical items that are routinely assessed during clinical evaluation of patients with TAK. The criteria highlight the importance of clinical symptoms, vascular physical examination, and vascular imaging as important disease classifiers. Features of TAK may differ in patients from different parts of the world (13). The 2022 ACR/EULAR TAK classification criteria retained excellent performance characteristics when tested in patients from different regions, including Asia where the disease is most prevalent (14). While TAK is often considered a disease of the young, 25% of the patients with TAK in the DCVAS cohort were older than 40 years at the time of diagnosis. Therefore, an age at diagnosis of ≤ 60 years, rather than a lower age threshold, was set as an absolute requirement for disease classification. The 2022 ACR/EULAR TAK classification criteria performed well when applied to patients ages 18–60 years and outperformed the 1990 ACR Classification Criteria for TAK in the subset of patients diagnosed as having TAK ages 40–60 years.

There are several strengths of the new 2022 ACR/EULAR TAK classification criteria. The criteria were developed by a large group of international experts in systemic vasculitis, with guidance from the ACR regarding modern methods of classification criteria development. The criteria represent several important methodologic advancements compared to the original 1990 ACR classification criteria for TAK. First, expert review rather than submitting physician diagnosis was used as the diagnostic reference standard to minimize investigator bias. Second, while the 1990 ACR criteria were entirely derived using data from 63 North American patients with TAK and not validated in a separate data set, the new criteria were developed in 316 patients with TAK and validated in an independent data set which contained an additional 146 patients with TAK from an international cohort. Third, unlike the 1990 ACR criteria, the new ACR/EULAR TAK criteria are weighted to reflect the relative importance of specific items (e.g., number of affected arterial territories). Finally, when both criteria sets were tested within the DCVAS cohort, the performance characteristics of the 2022 ACR/EULAR TAK criteria outperformed the 1990 ACR criteria.

There are some study limitations to consider. Acquisition of clinical and imaging data among patients with LVV and comparators was not standardized (e.g., not all pulses were recorded by the investigators; patients with suspected diagnosis of TAK rarely underwent investigation of the cranial arteries; temporal artery biopsy was not performed in all patients with suspected GCA). However, this limitation reflects the existing differences in how these diseases are assessed in routine clinical practice. Most patients were recruited from Europe, Asia, and North America, with fewer patients from Africa and Oceania. The performance characteristics of the criteria should be further tested in populations that were underrepresented in the DCVAS cohort and may have different clinical presentations of TAK. These criteria were

developed using data collected from adult patients with vasculitis and should be tested in children with TAK (15).

The 2022 ACR/EULAR classification criteria for TAK are the product of a rigorous methodologic process that utilized an extensive data set generated by the work of a remarkable international group of collaborators. These criteria have been endorsed by the ACR and EULAR and are now ready for use in research.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge the patients and clinicians who provided data to the DCVAS project.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

All authors were involved in drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content, and all authors approved the final version to be published. Dr. Merkel had full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Study conception and design. Grayson, Ponte, Suppiah, Robson, Judge, Craven, Hutchings, Luqmani, Watts, Merkel.

Acquisition of data. Grayson, Ponte, Suppiah, Robson, Craven, Danda, Luqmani, Watts, Merkel.

Analysis and interpretation of data. Grayson, Ponte, Suppiah, Robson, Gribbons, Judge, Craven, Khalid, Hutchings, Luqmani, Watts, Merkel.

REFERENCES

- Jennette JC, Falk RJ, Bacon PA, et al. 2012 revised International Chapel Hill Consensus Conference nomenclature of vasculitides. *Arthritis Rheum* 2013;65:1–11.
- Aggarwal R, Ringold S, Khanna D, et al. Distinctions between diagnostic and classification criteria? [review]. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)* 2015;67:891–7.
- Arend WP, Michel BA, Bloch DA, et al. The American College of Rheumatology 1990 criteria for the classification of Takayasu arteritis. *Arthritis Rheum* 1990;33:1129–34.
- Maksimowicz-McKinnon K, Clark TM, Hoffman GS. Limitations of therapy and a guarded prognosis in an American cohort of Takayasu arteritis patients. *Arthritis Rheum* 2007;56:1000–9.
- Singh JA, Solomon DH, Dougados M, et al. Development of classification and response criteria for rheumatic diseases [editorial]. *Arthritis Rheum* 2006;55:348–52.
- Langford CA, Cuthbertson D, Ytterberg SR, et al. A randomized, double-blind trial of Abatacept (CTLA-4Ig) for the treatment of Takayasu arteritis. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 2017;69:846–53.
- Nakaoka Y, Isobe M, Takei S, et al. Efficacy and safety of tocilizumab in patients with refractory Takayasu arteritis: results from a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial in Japan (the TAKT study). *Ann Rheum Dis* 2018;77:348–54.
- Dejaco C, Ramiro S, Duftner C, et al. EULAR recommendations for the use of imaging in large vessel vasculitis in clinical practice. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2018;77:636–43.
- Koster MJ, Matteson EL, Warrington KJ. Large-vessel giant cell arteritis: diagnosis, monitoring and management. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2018;57 Suppl:ii32–42.
- Craven A, Robson J, Ponte C, et al. ACR/EULAR-endorsed study to develop Diagnostic and Classification Criteria for Vasculitis (DCVAS). *Clin Exp Nephrol* 2013;17:619–21.

11. Gribbons KB, Ponte C, Carette S, et al. Patterns of arterial disease in Takayasu arteritis and giant cell arteritis. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)* 2020;72:1615–24.
12. Rao JK, Allen NB, Pincus T. Limitations of the 1990 American College of Rheumatology classification criteria in the diagnosis of vasculitis. *Ann Intern Med* 1998;129:345–52.
13. Goel R, Gribbons KB, Carette S, et al. Derivation of an angiographically based classification system in Takayasu's arteritis: an observational study from India and North America. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2020;59:1118–27.
14. Onen F, Akkoc N. Epidemiology of Takayasu arteritis. *Presse Med* 2017;46:e197–203.
15. Danda D, Goel R, Joseph G, et al. Clinical course of 602 patients with Takayasu's arteritis: comparison between Childhood-onset versus adult onset disease. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2021;60:2246–55.

APPENDIX A: THE DCVAS INVESTIGATORS

The DCVAS study investigators are as follows: Paul Gatenby (ANU Medical Centre, Canberra, Australia); Catherine Hill (Central Adelaide Local Health Network: The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, Australia); Dwarakanathan Ranganathan (Royal Brisbane and Women's Hospital, Australia); Andreas Kronbichler (Medical University Innsbruck, Austria); Daniel Blockmans (University Hospitals Leuven, Belgium); Lillian Barra (Lawson Health Research Institute, London, Ontario, Canada); Simon Carette, Christian Pagnoux (Mount Sinai Hospital, Toronto, Canada); Navjot Dhindsa (University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada); Aurore Fifi-Mah (University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada); Nader Khalidi (St Joseph's Healthcare, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada); Patrick Liang (Sherbrooke University Hospital Centre, Canada); Nataliya Milman (University of Ottawa, Canada); Christian Pineau (McGill University, Canada); Xiping Tian (Peking Union Medical College Hospital, Beijing, China); Guochun Wang (China-Japan Friendship Hospital, Beijing, China); Tian Wang (Anzhen Hospital, Capital Medical University, China); Ming-hui Zhao (Peking University First Hospital, China); Vladimir Tesar (General University Hospital, Prague, Czech Republic); Bo Baslund (University Hospital, Copenhagen [Rigshospitalet], Denmark); Nevin Hammam (Assiut University, Egypt); Amira Shatin (Cairo University, Egypt); Laura Pirla (Turku University Hospital, Finland); Jukka Putaala (Helsinki University Central Hospital, Finland); Bernhard Hellmich (Kreiskliniken Esslingen, Germany); Jörg Henes (Universitätsklinikum Tübingen, Germany); Julia Holle, Frank Moosig (Klinikum Bad Bramstedt, Germany); Peter Lamprecht (University of Lübeck, Germany); Thomas Neumann (Universitätsklinikum Jena, Germany); Wolfgang Schmidt (Immanuel Krankenhaus Berlin, Germany); Cord Sunderkoetter (Universitätsklinikum Münster, Germany); Zoltan Szekanez (University of Debrecen Medical and Health Science Center, Hungary); Debashish Danda (Christian Medical College & Hospital, Vellore, India); Siddharth Das (Chatrapathi Shahuji Maharaj Medical Center, Lucknow [IP], India); Rajiva Gupta (Medanta, Delhi, India); Liza Rajasekhar (NIMS, Hyderabad, India); Aman Sharma (Postgraduate Institute of Medical Education and Research, Chandigarh, India); Shrikant Wagh (Jehangir Clinical Development Centre, Pune [IP], India); Michael Clarkson (Cork University Hospital, Ireland); Eamonn Molloy (St. Vincent's University Hospital, Dublin, Ireland); Carlo Salvarani (Santa Maria Nuova Hospital, Reggio Emilia, Italy); Franco Schiavon (L'Azienda Ospedaliera di University of Padua, Italy); Enrico Tombetti (Università Vita-Salute San Raffaele Milano, Italy); Augusto Vaglio (University of Parma, Italy); Koichi Amano (Saitama Medical University, Japan); Yoshihiro Arimura (Kyorin University Hospital, Japan); Hiroaki Dobashi (Kagawa University Hospital, Japan); Shouichi Fujimoto (Miyazaki University Hospital [HUB], Japan); Masayoshi Harigai, Fumio Hirano (Tokyo Medical and Dental University Hospital, Japan); Junichi Hirahashi (University Tokyo Hospital, Japan); Sakae Honma (Toho University Hospital, Japan); Tamihiro Kawakami (St. Marianna University Hospital Dermatology, Japan); Shiget

Kobayashi (Juntendo University Koshigaya Hospital, Japan); Hajime Kono (Teikyo University, Japan); Hirofumi Makino (Okayama University Hospital, Japan); Kazuo Matsui (Kameda Medical Centre, Kamogawa, Japan); Eri Muso (Kitano Hospital, Japan); Kazuo Suzuki, Kei Ikeda (Chiba University Hospital, Japan); Tsutomu Takeuchi (Keio University Hospital, Japan); Tatsuo Tsukamoto (Kyoto University Hospital, Japan); Shunya Uchida (Teikyo University Hospital, Japan); Takashi Wada (Kanazawa University Hospital, Japan); Hidehiro Yamada (St. Marianna University Hospital Internal Medicine, Japan); Kunihiro Yamagata (Tsukuba University Hospital, Japan); Wako Yumura (IUHW Hospital [Jichi Medical University Hospital], Japan); Kan Sow Lai (Penang General Hospital, Malaysia); Luis Felipe Flores-Suarez (Instituto Nacional de Enfermedades Respiratorias, Mexico City, Mexico); Andrea Hinojosa-Azaola (Instituto Nacional de Ciencias Médicas y Nutrición Salvador Zubirán, Mexico City, Mexico); Bram Rutgers (University Hospital Groningen, Netherlands); Paul-Peter Tak (Academic Medical Centre, University of Amsterdam, Netherlands); Rebecca Grainger (Wellington, Otago, New Zealand); Vicki Quincey (Waikato District Health Board, New Zealand); Lisa Stamp (University of Otago, Christchurch, New Zealand); Ravi Suppiah (Auckland District Health Board, New Zealand); Emilio Besada (Tromsø, Northern Norway, Norway); Andreas Diamantopoulos (Hospital of Southern Norway, Kristiansand, Norway); Jan Sznajd (University of Jagiellonian, Poland); Elsa Azevedo (Centro Hospitalar de São João, Porto, Portugal); Ruth Galdes (Hospital de Santa Maria, Lisbon, Portugal); Miguel Rodrigues (Hospital Garcia de Orta, Almada, Portugal); Ernestina Santos (Hospital Santo Antonio, Porto, Portugal); Yeong-Wook Song (Seoul National University Hospital, Republic of Korea); Sergey Moiseev (First Moscow State Medical University, Russia); Alojzija Hocevar (University Medical Centre Ljubljana, Slovenia); Maria Cinta Cid (Hospital Clinic de Barcelona, Spain); Xavier Solanich Moreno (Hospital de Bellvitge-Idibell, Spain); Inoshi Atukorala (University of Colombo, Sri Lanka); Ewa Berglin (Umeå University Hospital, Sweden); Aladdin Mohammed (Lund-Malmö University, Sweden); Mårten Segelmark (Linköping University, Sweden); Thomas Daikeler (University Hospital Basel, Switzerland); Haner Direskeneli (Marmara University Medical School, Turkey); Gulen Hatemi (Istanbul University, Cerrahpasa Medical School, Turkey); Sevil Kamali (Istanbul University, Istanbul Medical School, Turkey); Ömer Karadağ (Hacettepe University, Turkey); Seval Pehlevan (Fatih University Medical Faculty, Turkey); Matthew Adler (Frimley Health NHS Foundation Trust, Wexham Park Hospital, UK); Neil Basu (NHS Grampian, Aberdeen Royal Infirmary, UK); Iain Bruce (Manchester University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, UK); Kuntal Chakravarty (Barking, Havering and Redbridge University Hospitals NHS Trust, UK); Bhaskar Dasgupta (Southend University Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, UK); Oliver Flossmann (Royal Berkshire NHS Foundation Trust, UK); Nagui Gendi (Basildon and Thurrock University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, UK); Alaa Hassan (North Cumbria University Hospitals, UK); Rachel Hoyles (Oxford University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, UK); David Jayne (Cambridge University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, UK); Colin Jones (York Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, UK); Rainer Klocke (The Dudley Group NHS Foundation Trust, UK); Peter Lanyon (Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, UK); Cathy Laversuch (Taunton & Somerset NHS Foundation Trust, Musgrove Park Hospital, UK); Raashid Luqmani, Joanna Robson (Nuffield Orthopaedic Centre, Oxford, UK); Malgorzata Magliano (Buckinghamshire Healthcare NHS Trust, UK); Justin Mason (Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, UK); Win Win Maw (Mid Essex Hospital Services NHS Trust, UK); Iain McInnes (NHS Greater Glasgow & Clyde, Gartnavel Hospital & GRI, UK); John McLaren (NHS Fife, Whyteman's Brae Hospital, UK); Matthew Morgan (University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Queen Elizabeth Hospital, UK); Ann Morgan (Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, UK); Chetan Mukhtyar (Norfolk and Norwich University Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, UK); Edmond O'Riordan (Salford Royal NHS Foundation Trust, UK); Sanjeev Patel (Epsom and St Helier University Hospitals NHS Trust, UK); Adrian Peall (Wye Valley NHS Trust, Hereford County Hospital, UK); Joanna Robson (University Hospitals Bristol NHS Foundation

Trust, UK); Srinivasan Venkatachalam (The Royal Wolverhampton NHS Trust, UK); Erin Vermaak, Ajit Menon (Staffordshire & Stoke on Trent Partnership NHS Trust, Haywood Hospital, UK); Richard Watts (East Suffolk and North Essex NHS Foundation Trust, UK); Chee-Seng Yee (Doncaster and Bassetlaw Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, UK); Daniel Albert (Dartmouth-Hitchcock Medical Center, US); Leonard Calabrese (Cleveland Clinic Foundation, US); Sharon Chung (University of California, San Francisco, US); Lindsay

Forbess (Cedars-Sinai Medical Center, US); Angelo Gaffo (University of Alabama at Birmingham, US); Ora Gewurz-Singer (University of Michigan, US); Peter Grayson (Boston University School of Medicine, US); Kimberly Liang (University of Pittsburgh, US); Eric Matteson (Mayo Clinic, US); Peter A. Merkel, Rennie Rhee (University of Pennsylvania, US); Jason Springer (University of Kansas Medical Center Research Institute, US); and Antoine Sreih (Rush University Medical Center, US).