Maturitas 68 (2011) 98–101

Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

Maturitas

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/maturitas

EMAS position statement: Bone densitometry screening for osteoporosis

Mark Brincat*, Jean Calleja-Agius, C. Tamer Erel, Marco Gambacciani, Irene Lambrinoudaki, Mette H. Moen, Karin Schenck-Gustafsson, Florence Tremollieres, Svetlana Vujovic, Margaret Rees, Serge Rozenberg

Department of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Mater Dei Hospital, B'Kara, Malta

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:
Received 22 September 2010
Received in revised form
22 September 2010
Accepted 22 September 2010

Keywords:
Bone densitometry
Menopause
Osteoporosis
Estrogen deficiency
FRAX tool

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Osteoporosis and its consequent fractures is a major public health problem.
Aim: To formulate a position statement on the use of bone densitometry in screening postmenopausal women for osteoporosis and in their management.
Materials and methods: Literature review and consensus of expert opinion.
Results and conclusions: Bone densitometry has an important role in screening postmenopausal women for osteoporosis. For higher sensitivity and specificity, there may be a stronger case for screening in later life, depending on the extent to which risk factors add to the value of bone mineral density tests.

Contents

1. Introduction

The aim of this position statement is to provide evidence-based advice for health professionals on the use of bone densitometry in screening postmenopausal women for osteoporosis and in their management.

Osteoporosis is still an often under-recognized disease and considered to be an inevitable consequence of ageing [1]. The morbidity of osteoporosis is secondary to the fractures that can occur in the spine, hip, forearm and proximal humerus. These fractures, especially hip fractures, lead to high morbidity and mortality, as well as an increase in direct costs for health services. The lifetime probability of hip fractures in women at the age of 50 exceeds 20% in developed countries. Vertebral fractures in the elderly can be regarded as a risk factor for subsequent, long-term morbidity, especially in women, and for mortality in both genders [2]. In fact, the

* Corresponding author.
E-mail addresses: brincatm@maltanet.net, Margaret.Rees@obs-gyn.ox.ac.uk (M. Brincat).

0378-5122/$ – see front matter © 2010 Elsevier Ireland Ltd. All rights reserved.
doi:10.1016/j.maturitas.2010.09.009

risk for total osteoporotic fractures is over 40% in postmenopausal women. In high-income countries, osteoporotic fractures account for a larger number of hospital bed days than those for myocardial infarction or breast cancer [3,4].

In the past two decades, there have been major improvements in diagnostic technology and assessment facilities, and it is now possible to detect the disease before fractures occur. There have been advances in the development of treatments of proven efficacy. Stratification of risk is best assessed by consideration of clinical risk factors in conjunction with bone mineral density (BMD). Two individualized fracture risk calculation tools that are increasingly used and are web-based, are the FRAX algorithm [5] and the Garvan fracture risk calculator [6]. These tools integrate BMD and clinical risk factors for fracture risk calculation in individual patients [7]. The FRAX tool has been developed by the World Health Organization (WHO) [8]. It is based on individual patient models, developed from studying population-based cohorts from Europe, North America, Asia and Australia, that integrates clinical risk factors and BMD at the femoral neck. The FRAX algorithms give the 10-year probability of hip fracture and of a major osteoporotic fracture (clinical spine, forearm, hip or shoulder fracture) [9]. The risk of fracture can be calculated on clinical risk factors alone or with femoral neck BMD in addition. Although both tools include straightforward risk factors, such as age, gender, previous fractures, body weight and BMD, they differ in several aspects, for example, the inclusion of other clinical risk factors, fall risks and number of previous fractures. Both models still need to be validated in different populations before they can be generalized to other populations, since the background risk for fractures is definitely population-specific. Further studies are needed to validate their contribution in selecting patients who will achieve fracture risk reduction with anti-osteoporosis therapy [7,10,11].

2. Bone mineral density measurements and the diagnosis of osteoporosis

The most widely validated technique used to assess BMD at multiple sites, including those where osteoporotic fractures predominate, is dual energy X-ray absorptiometry. In conformity with the WHO Scientific Technical Report [12], the term DXA for dual energy X-ray absorptiometry will be used throughout this position statement. DXA is usually applied to sites of biological relevance, including the hip, spine and forearm. DXA gives measurements of BMD that predict fracture with an increase in fracture risk of approximately 1.5/standard deviation (SD) decrease in bone mineral density (termed the gradient of risk). The highest gradient of risk is provided by DXA at the femoral neck for hip fracture prediction, where the gradient of risk is approximately 2.6/SD. In postmenopausal women and men aged 50 years or more, T-scores should be reserved for diagnostic use. The T-score is defined as the number of standard deviations below the average for a young adult at peak bone density, adjusted for gender and ethnicity [13,14].

The World Health Organization has defined the following categories based on bone density:

- Normal bone: T-score greater than −1
- Osteopenia: T-score between −1 and −2.5
- Osteoporosis: T-score less than −2.5
- Established (severe) osteoporosis includes the presence of a non-traumatic fracture.

The aim of risk assessment is to identify patients at particular risk of fracture so that intervention can be considered. The approaches most widely considered are population-based screening and opportunistic case-finding. So far, case-finding strategies have focused on the identification of individuals with low BMD.

3. Population screening

Population screening of apparently healthy individuals identifies that part of the population at greatest risk of fracture who might then be considered for treatment. This is considered to be an extension of the physician–patient relationship in the sense that the intervention is considered appropriate by the individual concerned, and motivation is high, both for the patient and doctor. However, this is expensive and may be difficult to organize. Osteoporosis justifies a screening programme because it is an important public health problem and treatment is available There is clear understanding of the pattern of change in BMD with age, and the contribution of BMD to fracture risk [1].

4. Screening at the menopause

Menopause accelerates bone loss in women. Since the menopause is a readily recognizable event, a number of analyses have been carried out where it has been used as a time when to start screening women for osteoporosis using BMD [15–17]. The cost of screening itself is not the dominant factor, because most treatments are more expensive (though this may vary between countries) and may have side effects. These analyses, in general, do not seem to indicate that BMD mass screening at the time of the menopause is justified. The reasons relate to sensitivity and specificity of the bone density measurement, when applied to a population aged 50 years or more as there is a low risk of hip fracture probability at that age. Ideally, the screening tool should have a high specificity of 90% or more, in order to direct the interventions to those in need, and to avoid treatment of healthy individuals who will never fracture. The problem is that the whole idea of prevention is to detect the subpopulation who would fracture in the future or who are at higher risk of fracture [18]. It can be calculated that, in order to achieve this kind of specificity, 11% of the postmenopausal population might be selected as a high risk category. However, the sensitivity (detection rate) of the test is low, even with relatively high gradients of risk. Assuming that fracture risk increases 1.5-fold for each standard deviation decrease in BMD, sensitivity is only 18%, i.e., 82% of all fractures would occur in individuals designated by the test to be low risk. Therefore, 1000 patients would need to be screened to find 100 needing treatment. The maximal benefit to the community after the menopause using widespread testing with BMD alone appears to be the prevention of about 8% of fractures [12]. In spite of good evidence from randomized controlled studies that treatment is effective [19], compliance is low [20]. Another factor that needs to be considered is the economics of screening using BMD alone. Furthermore only a small proportion of reduction in fractures attributable to treatment is explained by a change in bone mineral density as illustrated by the MORE study of raloxifene [21].

5. Screening later in life

If higher risk individuals can be selected, screening may be more effective. One approach is to select individuals older than 65 years. The rationale is that there is an exponential rise in the risk of fractures with age [22], and older individuals may be more amenable to treatment. The major advantage of screening in later life is to increase the proportion of individuals identified who will sustain fractures and be targeted for treatment. Assuming a gradient risk of 1.5/SD and where 10% of the population could be targeted, the