

Agenda for the first meeting with the working committee for the multidisciplinary and international project on Classification Criteria for polymyositis and dermatomyositis

Tuesday October 26, 2004 at 8:00 AM to 5:00 PM at the National Institutes of Health, 9000 Rockville Pike, Building 31, Room B1C02, Bethesda, Maryland, USA.

1. Introduction –Ingrid Lundberg
2. Goal of our project – Why do we want to revise the diagnostic criteria for polymyositis and dermatomyositis? What is our goal: diagnostic criteria, classification criteria or nomenclature? What is the difference? - Ingrid and Matthew Liang
3. Experience from previous work on development or revision of criteria in other disorders and the various methodologies that have been used – Matthew Liang
4. What is the process – ACR, EULAR – Neurology?
5. Background.
 - a) Which criteria have been published for poly- and dermatomyositis and how have they been tested for sensitivity and specificity – Fred Miller
 - b) Which criteria have been used in published clinical trials with poly- and dermatomyositis patients - Jessica Hoogendijk
 - c) Which criteria have been used in published studies on muscle biopsy characteristics in patients with poly- and dermatomyositis –Ingrid Lundberg
 - d) How have the methods of the different characteristics in the criteria set been defined and how have they been tested for performance (EMG, CK, and others) - Tony Amato
 - e) What criteria have been used in children with myositis - Lisa Rider
 - f) What clinical manifestations could be used in a revised set of clinical trials (what other clinical manifestations are common and how could they be defined) – everyone.
 - g) Experience from the IMACS work on development of disease activity and damage scores, and definition of improvement – Fred Miller
6. Next step – How do we proceed?
 - Revised proposal to ACR with more defined scientific part. The validation process needs to be more detailed. A more specific budget per year.

Define comparator groups

Steering committee – Neurologists, rheumatologists, paediatric rheumatologists, epidemiologist, statistician, ACR-representative, dermatologist? Pathologist? Radiologists?
International representation
Reference group IMACS? ENMC? American muscle group?
Time line
Sources of funding -
7. Other issues – Training, standardization of terms, gold standard diagnosis, subcommittees for MRI, biopsies, autoantibodies, missing data (EMG, biopsies etc)
International IRB and ethics issues
Multiple statistical approaches