Approach to the woman with long-term bisphosphonate therapy
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Abstract
Bisphosphonates are commonly used to treat osteoporosis because randomized clinical trials have shown reduction of fracture incidence. The data about long-term use after 5 years are sparse, but several extensions of clinical trials have suggested that these drugs have a satisfactory safety profile up to ten years. Patients who have taken alendronate for 5 years have similar clinical fracture rates for the next 5 years if they continue the drug or if they take placebo. Bone biopsies of patients taking bisphosphonates show bone formation rates that are decreased by 75 to 95%, and in one study one third of patients with long-term use had unmeasurable tetracycline double labels. Recent reports about atypical fractures associated with low bone formation rates are of concern but the risk of these types of fractures with long-term use is unknown. Because the available data suggests limited efficacy beyond 5 years, I am cautious about continuing bisphosphonates. If patients are doing well, I discontinue the bisphosphonates and monitor bone turnover, realizing that there is not much evidence for this strategy. For frail or severely osteoporotic patients I consider a change to another medication. If they are not doing well they require re-evaluation. If patients have fractures or fail to respond to bisphosphonates and they have suppressed bone turnover, I suggest anabolic therapy with teriparatide. Further research is needed to determine the best approach for these patients.

Illustrative case
A 61 year old lawyer was referred for evaluation of bilateral midfemoral shaft stress fractures. She was health-conscious without serious medical problems, and underwent screening bone densitometry when she was 48 years old. The T-scores were -2.2 at the spine and -1.7 at the hip. She was prescribed alendronate to prevent osteoporosis, which she had continued for 13 years. She was not underweight, had no previous fractures, did not have rheumatoid arthritis, had not taken corticosteroids, did not smoke cigarettes or drink more than 2 alcoholic beverages daily, and neither parent had fractured a hip. She had been experiencing bilateral pain in the mid-femurs for about 4 years. Initially this was treated with exercises without resolution. Six months prior to her visit she had an F18 bone scan which demonstrated bilateral increased uptake in the mid-femur, lateral surface. An MRI of the hip was reported to be normal and not the etiology of her pain. The bone scan was repeated 5 months later and showed persistence of the uptake in the mid femur. She had taken estrogen for 3 years after her menopause, and for the past 3 years was taking tamoxifen to prevent breast cancer. Her other medications were levothyroid .125 mg/day, simvastatin 20mg/day, vitamin D2 50,000 units/week, aspirin 81mg/day, and calcium and vitamin supplements. The physical examination was unremarkable except for bilateral mild tenderness over the anterior thighs. The laboratory chemistry panel
was normal, 25-OH-vitamin D was 127 nMol/L (normal 50-150), PTH was 34 pg/mL (normal 12 to 88), and urine N-telopeptide was 38 nM BCE/mM Cr (post-menopausal normal 26-124).

Bone density showed T-scores of -2.5 at the spine and -1.6 at the hip. Her radiographs are shown in Figure 1.

Background

Alendronate, the first amino-bisphosphonate, became available in 1996. Large clinical trials of 3 to 5 years duration have provided consistent evidence that fracture incidence is reduced when patients with osteoporosis are treated with bisphosphonates. Beyond 5 years the data are relatively sparse. There may be some adverse effects from the bisphosphonates. Osteonecrosis of the jaw has received wide-spread publicity, but the risk in patients with osteoporosis is estimated to be less than 1/10,000 (1). Atrial fibrillation has been seen more often in alendronate groups than in placebo groups in two clinical trials (2, 3) and in one case-control study (4) but it has not been related to bisphosphonates in a large population-based case control study (5) or in an analysis by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) (6). A letter from the FDA (FDA) stated that 23 cases of esophageal cancer had been reported in patients using oral bisphosphonates, and they suggested there could potentially be a relationship and called for further research (7). Nephrotic syndrome and bone pain could be related to these drugs but these cases are rare, particularly in doses used to treat osteoporosis. Recent reports of patients with unusual long-bone fractures have raised concern about possible adverse skeletal effects with prolonged use of the bisphosphonates. This side effect is very difficult to define because study designs must take into account confounding by indication.

Physiological mechanisms

The bisphosphonates are rapidly cleared from the circulation, but they bind to calcified tissues so strongly that they remain deposited in the skeleton longer than ten years. On a molecular level, they inhibit farnesyl pyrophosphate synthase, and the end result of this is inhibition of osteoclastic bone resorption.
Some increase in mineralization density but it was similar to the placebo values. A significant increase in mineralization density was found in a study including 10 patients on risedronate. Bone biopsies from patients taking alendronate showed increased mineralization density. Bone, like any other structural material, may become damaged when subjected to mechanical forces. Small micro-cracks develop with normal activities of living. Bone that is more porous is more liable to become damaged, and this may explain why people of African ancestry, who have higher bone mass, also have lower bone formation rates.

When a patient initially takes a bisphosphonate, the osteoblasts in the recently resorbed cavities continue to form new bone. On average, it takes about 3 months to fill in a resorption cavity. New resorption cavities occur less frequently because the osteoclasts are inhibited. In normal remodeling bone, the bone formation follows bone resorption, so when bone resorption decreases, bone formation eventually decreases as well. The mineralizing surface, which is labelled with tetracycline, directly reflects the bone formation rate. Bone biopsies from patients treated with bisphosphonates longer than 5 years show mean mineralizing surfaces of 0.4% (11), 1.4% (2), and 3.6% (12). A study of 50 women treated with bisphosphonates for a mean of 6.5 yrs found that 33% had not have sufficiently visible tetracycline labels to measure the bone formation rate (11). For comparison, the mean mineralizing surface in studies of untreated women with osteoporosis is 5.5 to 6.5% (12-14), and is about 7% in normal postmenopausal women (15, 16) and 6 to 8% with a standard deviation of 3% in normal premenopausal women (15, 17, 18).

When bone turnover decreases, bone density increases because more mineral is deposited into the existing bone and dense older bone is not replaced with new bone. It takes 2 to 3 years to fully mineralize a bone structural unit. Bone biopsies from patients taking alendronate show increased mineralization density (19). A study including 10 patients on risedronate found a significant increase in mineralization density but it was similar to the placebo values (20). Some increase in mineralization density probably improves bone strength, but too much could potentially make the bone more brittle.

Bone, like any other structural material, may become damaged when subjected to mechanical forces. Small micro-cracks develop with normal activities of living. Bone that is more porous is more liable to become damaged, and this may explain why people of African ancestry, who have higher bone mass, also have lower bone formation rates (15). The bone volume is not consistently increased in biopsy studies of bisphosphonates, but moderate increases are difficult to detect because of the variance in this measurement. In cases where the bone volume does increase there may be lower likelihood of micro-damage. Also, the bisphosphonate-treated bones are less likely to develop perforations which weaken the bone; this may also limit damage. Micro-cracks stimulate bone resorption, and the damaged bone is replaced with new bone (21). The decreased bone turnover seen with bisphosphonates may cause accumulation of micro-cracks. Animal studies show increased micro-cracks during the first year of bisphosphonates, but apparent stabilization after that (22). Because the development and repair of micro-cracks is complex, it is difficult to predict what will happen with long-term bisphosphonate use. Studies of biopsies from women taking long-term bisphosphonates are inconsistent: - one study did find accumulation of micro-cracks (12) but one did not (11).

In summary, bisphosphonates decrease bone resorption. This reduces fracture risk by stabilizing the bone architecture. Bone volume probably increases during the interval following initiation of a bisphosphonate. Thereafter, the bone formation rate decreases substantially, the mineralization density increases, and micro-cracks may accumulate. The net effect on bone strength is complex, and the optimal bone turnover rate remains undefined. Whether any of these effects will eventually contribute to fractures in patients is unknown and vigorously debated.

Studies of long-term use of bisphosphonates

For this discussion, I consider long-term bisphosphonate use to be greater than 5 years. This is about as long as the lifespan of an
average cancellous bone structural unit (23). It is also as long as clinical trials included untreated controls.

A 2-yr uncontrolled extension (24) followed a trial of risedronate which had blinded controls for 5 years (25). Initially 407 women were in the risedronate group; 115 completed 5 years, and 83 were enrolled in the extension. Vertebral fracture rates were 4.7%/yr during yrs 0-3 and 3.8%/yr during yrs 6-7, significantly lower than the rate in the placebo group of 7.6% during yrs 0-3. Non-vertebral fractures were seen in 10.9% of risedronate-treated patients during the first 3 yrs and in 6% during the 2 yr extension. Markers remained suppressed throughout the 7 yrs. BMD of spine and hip did not change from yrs 5 to 7.

A controlled trial of alendronate (26) lasted 3 yrs, and was extended without controls up to ten yrs (27). There were 398 patients randomly assigned to alendronate, and 164 remained in the study for yrs 8-10. During yrs 8-10 BMD of spine increased by about 2%; no change was seen at the hip or total body. Non-vertebral fracture rate was similar in yrs 0-3 and yrs 6-10. Vertebral fractures occurred in approximately 3% of women the first 3 years and 9% the last 5 years. No insufficiency fractures or non-union were reported.

In the FIT trial 3236 women were in the alendronate group (28). After a mean of 5 yrs on alendronate, 1099 of them were re-randomized into alendronate and placebo groups (29). During the next 5 yrs, the hip BMD in the placebo group decreased 3.4% and in the alendronate group it decreased by 1.0%. At the spine, the placebo group gained less than the alendronate group (1.5% vs. 5.3%). Markers were stable in those continuing alendronate, and gradually increased in those who discontinued, but they were still lower than the baseline (pre-alendronate) values. There were no significant differences between all clinical fractures, nonvertebral fractures or vertebral fractures as measured on radiographs. There was also no difference in the number of severe vertebral fractures (those with >=2-grade change on the radiograph) (30). There were, however, fewer "clinical spine" fractures in the group continuing alendronate (2.4% vs 5.3% over 5 years). In those 39 women with a "clinical spine" fracture, mean height loss was 3.5cm in the alendronate group and 2.1cm in the placebo group. Subgroup analysis showed that there were no significant differences in fracture rates between placebo and alendronate groups in those with baseline BMD T scores less than -2.5 or greater than -2, or in those with or without baseline vertebral fractures. Overall the nonvertebral fracture rate was similar during the first 5 years as during the last 5 years when adjusted for age. This implies that alendronate had a lasting beneficial effect even after discontinuation (as opposed to an adverse effect on bone strength of long-term alendronate).

An analysis of an administrative database from a healthcare organization evaluated 9,063 women who were prescribed bisphosphonates. Those who discontinued or were non-compliant during the first 2 years had higher rates of hip fractures than compliant patients. After 3 years of use, those who discontinued the bisphosphonates had similar rates of hip fractures during the next year as those who continued taking the medication (31). The level of evidence from these observational studies is uncertain.

**Atypical fractures**

Recent reports have described unusual fractures in patients who have taken bisphosphonates (Table 1) (32-43). Many of the patients had been taking other medication that could suppress bone remodeling (such as estrogen or prednisone). These fractures are often preceded by leg pain, typically in the mid thigh. Radiographs and bone scans show stress fractures on the lateral side of the femur, which resemble Looser's zones. These radiographic features are not typical for osteoporosis, but are reminiscent of the stress fractures seen with hypophosphatasia, an inherited disease characterized by severely decreased bone formation (44). The cortical bone is thick and may show beaking. Fractures often occur prior to falling, after very minor mis-steps - such as tripping, stepping off an elevator, or being jolted by a subway stop. Bone biopsies, when performed, show very low bone formation rates. Pathologists from St. Louis reviewed all bone biopsies from patients who were seen between
2004 and 2007 who had an unusual cortical fracture while taking a bisphosphonate. A total absence of double tetracycline labels was seen in 11 of the 16 patients (45).

These case reports are all anecdotal, and do not allow calculation of the risk of fractures in patients taking bisphosphonates. Certainly subtrochanteric fractures occur in people who have never taken bisphosphonates and have high bone turnover. The bone biopsies do not necessarily show complete suppression of bone formation. Low turnover alone, however, does not explain the occurrence of these fractures, because a large percentage of patients taking bisphosphonates have very low or absent bone formation, yet the vast majority of them have not experienced unusual fractures. Other factors as yet unknown may predispose some patients to develop these fractures.

Two groups have done systemic surveys of subtrochanteric fractures from their hospitals. Goh et al (33) identified 13 non-traumatic subtrochanteric fractures from a review of medical records over a 10 month period. Nine of the patients were taking bisphosphonates, and they were younger, had higher bone density, and thicker bone on the radiographs of the femur. During the next 10 months 8 more patients taking alendronate had non-traumatic subtrochanteric fractures (35). The second series included all low-energy subtrochanteric fractures seen over 5 years from a large New York hospital (37, 46, 47). There were 69 patients, and 36% of them had been taking alendronate with mean duration of 6.2yrs. Twenty patients had an unusual radiographic appearance of thick cortices and a unicortical beak; 19 of them were taking alendronate. These cases were then matched to patients with hip fractures who were the same age, race, and body mass index. A higher percentage of subtrochanteric fractures cases were associated with bisphosphonates. The unusual appearance of the radiographs is the main reason that physicians think bisphosphonates may play a role in the development of these fractures. These studies still do not allow an estimation of the incidence rate among patients who are taking these drugs.

Investigators from Denmark took advantage of the computerized databases of hospital discharge codes and of medication usage. There were 160,565 persons whose first fracture was between 1997 and 2005. The rate of alendronate use in those with subtrochanteric and diaphyseal femur fractures was similar to those with hip fractures (6.7%). A cohort of fracture cases (excluding hip fractures) older than 51 who started taking a bisphosphonate after the index and continued for at least 6 months (N=5,187) were matched to two controls with the same age, gender and fracture site, and the subsequent hip or subtrochanteric fracture rates were recorded. The rate per year of subtrochanteric or diaphyseal femur fractures was 0.28% in alendronate group and 0.17% in control; the rate of hip fractures was 1.82% in alendronate group and 1.18% in controls. They concluded that the subtrochanteric fractures were like typical osteoporotic fractures because the adjusted hazard ratio for an atypical fracture (1.46) was similar to that for a hip fracture (1.45). Unlike findings in randomized clinical trials, there were more fractures in those taking alendronate, even though they were matched by age, gender, and location of the first fracture. Perhaps this was because physicians had prescribed alendronate to patients who were at a higher risk. In this registry-based study, details about the fracture or the degree of trauma could not be analyzed, and distal femur fractures were included with subtrochanteric ones. Only 178 patients had been taking the bisphosphonates longer than 6 years and 1.1% of them had a subtrochanteric fracture, while 0.8% of their controls also had a subtrochanteric fracture (48).

Diagnostic and therapeutic strategies

To assess skeletal status, the most common diagnostic measurements are bone density using dual xray absorptiometry (DXA) and the biochemical markers of bone turnover: Bone alkaline phosphatase (BAP), procollagen type I N-terminal propeptide (P1NP) reflect formation and the collagen cross-linking molecules, N-telopeptide (NTX) and C-telopeptide (CTX) are correlated with resorption. The gold standard way to measure
bone formation is an iliac crest bone biopsy with tetracycline labelling.

Controversies that exist

First, it is important to state that there is consensus about treating patients with a high risk of fracture, especially elderly patients with a vertebral compression fracture or other low-trauma osteoporotic fracture, or hip BMD T-score lower than -2.5. Too often these men and women are ignored, and osteoporosis is considered just an ordinary part of getting older. When these patients are given bisphosphonates, the benefit from preventing another fracture definitely outweighs the risks of side effects. No drug is 100% perfect and I have heard of too many patients who are afraid to take bisphosphonates because of over-exaggerated adverse events.

Whether to use DXA measurements or biochemical markers to follow patients receiving bisphosphonates is currently controversial, and the topic of this review is as controversial as possible. The major question is whether to stop bisphosphonates after 5 years, or whether they should be continued indefinitely. There has been an unfortunate scare about osteonecrosis of the jaw, which is a problem in some patients with cancer who have received long-term high doses, but this is very rare in patients who are treated for osteoporosis (lower that 1 in 10,000 patients/year)(1). The rate of atypical fractures in those on bisphosphonates is less than 2 in 1,000, and there are only a few dozen cases in the literature. The risk of these fractures with use beyond a decade, however, is unknown because too few patients have been taking these drugs that long. There are theoretical concerns about long-term over-suppression of bone formation resulting in micro-damage accumulation or increased brittleness of the bone. On the other hand, there are theoretical concerns about stopping the drugs, because the bone resorption could resume before bone formation does, which would result in an interval of rapid bone loss and potential destruction of micro-architecture.

Appropriate approach to management

After a patient with osteoporosis has been taking a bisphosphonate for 5 years, there are three choices: continue the bisphosphonate, change to another kind of medicine, or discontinue the bisphosphonate. The only randomized clinical trial of continued bisphosphonates after 5 years of use does not provide compelling evidence of efficacy. During the last 5 years the medication did not improve the incidence of all clinical fractures, non-vertebral fractures and morphometric vertebral fractures. Therefore, in patients who have been doing well, who have shown some improvement in bone density during their 5 years of treatment and have not had any fractures, I usually measure a urine NTX, which is typically lower than 30 nM BCE/mM Cr. These markers have a diurnal rhythm and daily variation, but despite their errors they do help identify suppressed bone resorption. If this is as expected, I suggest a drug holiday, and discontinue the bisphosphonate. The patient remains on calcium and vitamin D supplementation, and is encouraged to get exercise. I am particularly likely to use this approach in those patients who did not have a high fracture risk when their physicians started alendronate. The bone density tends to be stable for one or two years after discontinuation, and the biochemical markers of bone resorption remain suppressed for several years. Although the evidence for this approach is poor, I follow the urine NTX annually, and restart an anti-resorptive medication when the value increases to about 40 nM BCE/mM Cr. Other physicians would continue the bisphosphonates because they are concerned about the rate of clinical vertebral fractures, which are better in patients who remain on the drugs. Also, the single trial of only 1099 subjects did not have adequate power to give a definite answer about long-term fracture rates, whereas several large trials clearly show fracture reduction during the first 3 to 5 years of bisphosphonate use.

If a patient has been prescribed a bisphosphonate for 5 years but the NTX is not suppressed I re-evaluate the patient. Some are not taking the medication, or are not taking it
properly. Some may have another disease, such as hyperparathyroidism, malignancy, hyperthyroidism, malabsorption, or vitamin D deficiency. If repeated biochemical tests show high bone resorption, and if the bone density response is suboptimal, and no other cause is found, I often switch to an intravenous form of bisphosphonate because some patients do not seem to absorb the oral doses.

If a patient is not doing well and has had a fracture despite several years of bisphosphonate therapy, I first check for any other medical problems. The bone markers are, unfortunately, not very helpful because they increase after a fracture and stay elevated for at least 4 months (49). If there are no contraindications, treatment with teriparatide is a reasonable choice. There is evidence from human biopsies that teriparatide can reduce the number of micro-cracks that were related to bisphosphonate treatment (50), and can increase the bone formation rate even when there has been prior bisphosphonate treatment (51) (52, 53) (although the anabolic effect is blunted, it is still there (54)).

A frail patient with a very high risk of fracture, especially one who needs treatment with glucocorticoids or who had a hip T-score below -3, presents a challenge. Many physicians are uneasy about discontinuing all osteoporosis-specific medications, even after 5 years of successful bisphosphonates. I am cautious about further bisphosphonates because these patients might have a greater chance of developing micro-damage or even subtrochanteric fractures. I will usually stop the bisphosphonate and change to another medication, such as a SERM (selective estrogen receptor modulator) or teriparatide. Until we have better long-term clinical evidence, there will be various different approaches to these patients and I can not be sure of the best one. Further research is greatly needed, because these drugs are now used very widely.

The case I chose to present is admittedly not a common one, but we have seen six similar cases recently and in two patients the femurs fractured while the stress fractures were being evaluated (see figure 2). There is no data at all about how many long-term bisphosphonate users may have these stress fractures and then heal them, or about whether treatment with teriparatide alone can cure the stress fractures. We had to make a decision without sufficient evidence. I consulted our skeletal radiologists and some of my colleagues, then had a long discussion with the patient and orthopaedic surgeon and decided to discontinue the alendronate, place intramedullary rods in both femurs, and begin a course of teriparatide.

Figure 2. Left panel: Bone scan of another patient who presented with several months of thigh pain. She had been taking alendronate for ten years. Middle panel: Radiograph of a stress fracture corresponding to the area of increased uptake on the femur. Right panel: The patient had a minor fall and fractured her femur through the area of the stress fracture. A bone biopsy after a single tetracycline label showed no tetracycline uptake in the cancellous bone.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Therapy</th>
<th>Prodrome</th>
<th>Bilateral</th>
<th>Xrays</th>
<th>Other drugs</th>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Bone biopsy</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Odvina</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Detroit and Dallas</td>
<td>referral cases</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3 to 8; mean 5.4</td>
<td>estrogen 3, prednisone 2</td>
<td>no db lb in all 9</td>
<td>some had delayed healing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ct. thick, transverse with spike</td>
<td>estrogen</td>
<td>fx preceded fall; delayed healing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheung</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>high OH-proline</td>
<td>no db lb</td>
<td>sudden thigh pain while walking caused fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imai</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NTX 123</td>
<td>no db lb</td>
<td>pelvic fx no trauma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kwek, Goh</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>all cases for 20 mo in one hospital</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53-82; mean 66</td>
<td>lateral Ct. thickening, transverse fx, medial Ct. spike</td>
<td>1 on steroids</td>
<td>7/17 had acute pain prior to fall</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neviaser, Lenert</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NY</td>
<td>all cases for 5 yrs in one hospital</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>unicortical beak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>yes in 1</td>
<td>alen users younger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayed-Noor</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>case report</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Ct. thick, transverse</td>
<td></td>
<td>no trauma; delayed healing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sayed-Noor</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>case reports</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55,78</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>yes in 1</td>
<td>Ct. lateral reaction, later transverse fx</td>
<td>ETOH</td>
<td>periprosthetic, no healing for 10 months then fx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visekruna</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>case reports</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51 - 75</td>
<td>5 to 10, mean 8.3</td>
<td>one non-displaced; others chalk-stick</td>
<td>estrogen 2 prednisone 3</td>
<td>in one, NTX 12 with stress fx</td>
<td>done in 2, both severe low ten label</td>
<td>delayed healing; one given iPTH and healed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schneider</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>referral cases</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59 to 66</td>
<td>5 to 9</td>
<td>yes in 1 for 12 mo in 2/3</td>
<td>estrogen 3 tamoxifen 2</td>
<td>within normal range</td>
<td>done in 6, low db lb</td>
<td>fx before fall; two had prophylactic rodding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odvina</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Dallas and Detroit</td>
<td>referral cases</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>38-72</td>
<td>7.3 ± 3</td>
<td>Ct. thick</td>
<td>estrogen 3 tamoxifen 2</td>
<td></td>
<td>minimal trauma; many delayed healing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ct: cortical; db lb: double label; fx: fracture; BAP: bone alkaline phosphatase; NTX: N-telopeptide