

Importance of Whole-Body Scintigraphy or Positron Emission Tomography for Early Detection of Femoral Lesions in Breast Cancer Patients Treated with Bisphosphonates

Soo Min Cha, MD, Yun Ki Kim, MD, Hyun Dae Shin, MD, Jae Young Park, MD, Sang Hyun Lee, MD*

Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Regional Rheumatoid and Degenerative Arthritis Center, Chungnam National University Hospital, Chungnam National University School of Medicine, Daejeon, *Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Medical Research Institute, Pusan National University Hospital, Pusan National University School of Medicine, Busan, Korea

Background: We hypothesized that most of the atypical femoral fractures (AFFs) associated with bisphosphonate treatment for breast cancer (BC) could be found before the fracture event in another radiological examination already performed by breast surgeons, rather than on simple radiographs (SRs).

Methods: We thoroughly inspected the clinical charts of BC patients treated at our institute between 2008 and 2017. In total, 228 patients were categorized into three groups based on SRs: complete AFF on at least one side (group 1); incomplete fracture on at least one side, but not any complete fracture (group 2); and no suspicious lesion (group X) on either femur. Then, we inspected whole-body scintigraphy (WBS) and positron emission tomography (PET)-computed tomography (CT) images in all groups. For group X, patients with radiological clues from at least one femur were categorized, ultimately, into final group 3 and the rest made up the normal group.

Results: About 35% of the patients showed AFFs (complete or incomplete) or suspicious lesions as AFFs, associated with the side effect of Bisphosphonate. In group 1, bilateral lesions (complete or incomplete fractures) were more frequently seen on SRs than unilateral lesions (p = 0.008). The initially identified findings in WBS and PET-CT for the respective complete and incomplete fractures on SRs of groups 1 and 2 were seen at a mean of 7 months previously. SRs did not reveal the lesions in group 3 until 5 months after the initial identification of the lesions in WBS and PET-CT.

Conclusions: Even before incomplete AFFs were detectable on SRs, they could be found at check-ups using WBS and PET-CT that had been previously examined by breast surgeons and radiologists for metastasis surveillance. Awareness of the lesions creates an opportunity for prophylactic surgery before complete fractures occur.

Keywords: Radionuclide imaging, Positron-emission tomography, Breast Neoplasms, Atypical fracture, Femur

Received February 7, 2022; Revised November 4, 2022; Accepted February 10, 2023 Correspondence to: Hyun Dae Shin, MD Department of Orthopedic Surgery, Chungnam National University School of Medicine, 266 Munwha-ro, Jung-Gu, Daejeon, Korea Tel: +82-42-280-7349, Fax: +82-42-252-7098 E-mail: hyunsd@cnu.ac.kr Soo Min Cha and Yun Ki Kim contributed equally to this work. Bisphosphonate (BP) therapy has become the principal method for managing osteoporosis. BPs increase bone mineral density and prevent fragility fractures.¹⁻³⁾ However, atypical fractures, particularly of the femur, are a serious issue, so radiologic surveillance is essential. Longterm use of BPs carries a potential risk of severely suppressing bone turnover, which can paradoxically weaken the ability of the bone to remodel. This eventually leads to

Copyright © 2023 by The Korean Orthopaedic Association

Clinics in Orthopedic Surgery • pISSN 2005-291X eISSN 2005-4408

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

accumulated microdamage, reduced bone toughness, and increased brittleness.⁴⁾ The lesions of atypical femoral fractures (AFFs) typically occur in the subtrochanteric area, and most of these fractures occur after the appearance of various prodromal symptoms, such as pain or discomfort around the hip. However, most patients are diagnosed after a complete fracture, and a bony insufficiency lesion is occasionally revealed in the contralateral femur during regular follow-up radiography.

High-dose BPs are administered to patients with solid malignancies such as breast cancer (BC) or multiple myeloma to prevent bony metastasis or hypercalcemia induced by existing metastatic lesions. High-dose BPs have been incorporated into standard postoperative treatment algorithms of early-stage BC without metastasis since 2000.⁵⁻⁸⁾ Although BP therapy reduces the risk of skeletal-related events (SREs) in diseases that metastasize to the bone and may improve quality of life, there is no effect on survival rate in metastatic BC.⁹⁾ Interestingly, most BPs are prescribed by breast surgeons, and the radiological surveil-lance of bony metastasis after breast surgery is performed by musculoskeletal radiologists and breast surgeons through whole-body scintigraphy (WBS) and positron emission tomography (PET)-computed tomography (CT).

These unique patient populations have had occasional AFFs and have been treated by orthopedic surgeons. However, most breast surgeons are unaware of the association between fractures and BP treatment and have little interest unless skeletal lesions occur due to metastasis. Interestingly, AFFs associated with BPs for osteoporosis show pathognomonic lesions (incomplete fracture) before a displaced fracture on simple radiographs, and some orthopedic surgeons suggest preventive fixation for these findings.¹⁰⁻¹³⁾ We have treated AFFs after patients are diagnosed with BC for a few decades and hypothesized that most of the fractures could be found earlier than the final fracture event in another radiological examination rather than on simple radiographs. Thus, we evaluated (1) the preceding lesions in WBS/PET-CT before actual development to complete/displaced AFFs or detection of incomplete AFFs on simple radiographs among the BC patients treated by BPs and (2) when these lesions are detectable on WBS/PET-CT before being evident on simple radiographs through a retrospective study.

METHODS

We conducted this study in compliance with the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki. The protocol of this study was reviewed and approved by the Institutional Review Board of Chungnam National University Hospital (No. 2019-08-023), and all patients provided informed consent before study participation.

Patient Selection

We retrospectively inspected the clinical charts of BC patients treated at Chungnam National University Hospital between 2008 and 2017. Among the 304 patients screened, 228 were investigated. The patients were selected based on the following criteria: (1) history of BP therapy or ongoing administration for at least 1 year after surgery for early BC, (2) presence of simple radiographs of both femurs, (3) complete medical records and radiological data available, and (4) follow-up period > 5 years after breast surgery.

The exclusion criteria were (1) evidence of skeletal metastasis, as evidenced by a thorough inspection using WBS, PET-CT, or single-photon emission CT, (2) traumatic femoral fracture, (3) typical osteoporotic fracture in the femur with low bone mineral density estimated by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry, and (4) pathological fracture or impending fracture due to metastasis.

Demographic and Clinical Characteristics

We evaluated demographic factors, including age. The clinical variables included in the analyses were the kind of BP agent used, period of administration, and total amount of dosage. Additional therapies received after BC surgery were also investigated.

Three Groups Classified According to the Femoral Lesion

We divided the 228 patients into three groups: complete AFF on at least one side, regardless of displacement (group 1); any pathognomonic lesion or incomplete fracture of the femur on at least one side on simple radiographs, but not any complete fracture (group 2); and no suspicious lesion on simple radiographs (group X) (Fig. 1). The group allocation was performed using the femoral status on one side in all patients. For example, a right-side complete fracture was designated as group 1, regardless of contralateral left femoral status. Group 3 means that both femurs had neither complete nor incomplete fractures on simple radiographs.

Retrospective Radiological Evaluation for the Final Three Groups

After the designation of groups based on the simple radiographs, we thoroughly reviewed all WBS/PET-CT images. Then, we checked for hotspot uptake by any lesion, increased metabolism, and increased radiopaque/sclerosis

Cha et al. Atypical Femoral Fracture

Clinics in Orthopedic Surgery • Vol. 15, No. 4, 2023 • www.ecios.org



Fig. 1. Flowchart of this study. AFF: atypical femur fracture, WBS: whole-body scintigraphy, PET: positron emission tomography, CT: computed tomography.

of any lesion. In group 1, we evaluated the period from the initial detection of special radiological findings to a broken femur. Similarly, in group 2, we checked the period from the initial detection on special radiology images to the initial typical lesion (incomplete fracture) on simple radiographs. Group X was composed of patients without abnormal findings in either femur on the most recent simple radiographs. We sought to find lesions from a specific radiological study; thus, we ultimately designated the patients to final group 3. Then, we checked the period from the lesion on a specific study to the most recent simple radiograph seen as normal. The rest without any clue despite inspection for special radiology of both femurs were finally categorized as the normal group (Fig. 1).

Lesion Location

We categorized the locations of all lesions into the subtrochanteric, diaphyseal, and supracondylar areas. The subtrochanteric area included lesions below the lesser trochanter to 5 cm distal in the shaft of the femur. The supracondylar was defined from the metaphyseal-diaphyseal junction to the articular surface of the knee, involving approximately the distal 15 cm of the femur.¹⁴⁾ We checked lateral bowing using the Yau method.¹⁵⁾ According to this method, the lateral femoral bowing angle in the coronal plane is measured by dividing the femoral diaphysis into four equal parts. As Yau et al.¹⁵ did not exactly describe the femoral diaphysis, we defined the femoral diaphysis from the lower border of the lesser trochanter to the upper border of the distal femoral segment, demarcated by a square whose sides had the same length as the widest part of the femoral condyle or the so-called rule of the square. Thus, the overall lateral femoral bowing angle was measured as the angle between the proximal and distal quarters of the femoral diaphysis.¹⁶⁾

Patient's Awareness of the Association between BPs and Fracture Risk

A thorough investigation into the patient's medical records and counseling by the orthopedic surgeon (SMC) were used to evaluate the patient's awareness or knowledge of the purpose and effectiveness of BPs, the association between BPs and the patient's awareness or knowledge, and the occurrence of AFFs.

Statistical Analyses

One-way analysis of variance and Scheffé post hoc analyses were performed to compare variables among groups 1, 2, and 3. Student *t*-test was used to analyze continuous variables among the three groups and the normal group. The chi-square test or Fisher's exact test was used for categorical variables in the three groups. The sample size calculation was performed using the G*Power program (ver. 3.1.9.2; Franz Faul, Universität Kiel, Germany). Data were analyzed using IBM SPSS ver. 22.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY, USA). A *p*-value < 0.05 was considered significant.

RESULTS

A total of 228 patients were analyzed, and 149 patients were not categorized into any of the three groups because they had no suspicious AFF lesions. Namely, 35% of patients (79 / 228) showed AFFs (complete or incomplete) or suspicious lesions as AFFs, associated with the side effect

661

of BPs. About 20% of the affected patients (16 / 79, three groups) had normal findings on simple radiographs, despite the fact that suspicious lesions were detected in WBS and PET-CT. Complete fractures occurred accidentally in group 1 without any awareness of their lower extremity condition. However, the concurrent incomplete fracture lesion on the contralateral side was preventively fixed in 13 patients after a previous complete fracture (Fig. 2). Among 21 patients in group 2, only 4 were managed by prophylactic fixation after incomplete AFFs, and they had little information about the femur before the advice from an orthopedic surgeon (Fig. 3).

The mean ages at the initial diagnosis of BC in groups 1, 2, and 3 were not significantly different (p =

0.863). The total amount of Zolendronate-injections was 46.76 ± 4.28, 37.14 ± 3.61, and 28.63 ± 2.03 gm in groups 1, 2, and 3, respectively (p < 0.01) (Table 1). The amount in the three groups was significantly higher than that in the 149 patients in the normal group (p < 0.01) (Table 2). The type of additional management after breast surgery was not different among the three groups (p = 0.173). The pathognomonic lesions in WBS and PET-CT before respective complete and incomplete fractures on simple radiographs in groups 1 and 2 were present at a mean of 7 ± 3 and 7 ± 1 months ago, respectively (p > 0.05). In group 3, simple radiographs did not show any lesions until the final 5 ± 2 months after the initial identification of the lesion in WBS and PET-CT (Table 1, Fig. 4). In group 1 only, the



Fig. 2. (A) A 59-year-old woman (group 1) presented with a typical atypical femur fracture. The contralateral left side showed an incomplete atypical fracture. Prophylactic intramedullary nailing for the left side was refused by the patient at the time. The left side finally broke 4 months later. (B) Twelve months after surgery on the left side. Union was considerably delayed compared to an ordinary subtrochanteric fracture. (C) A hypermetabolic lesion of a right-sided complete fracture was detected retrospectively on positron emission tomography-computed tomography (PET-CT) image 12 months ago; however, the breast surgeon and radiologist were unaware of the lesion. (D) Both lesions were found in whole-body scintigraphy 8 months after the initial PET-CT findings (4 months before the right-side fracture), and unfortunately, no simple radiographs had been taken just before the right-side fracture.



Fig. 3. (A) A 52-year-old woman was referred to us for vague discomfort around the right hip (group 2). She had not been screened with simple radiographs or counseled by an orthopedic surgeon during the 25 months of bisphosphonate administration after breast surgery. (B) Prophylactic intramedullary nailing was performed for the right femur 1 month later, and the final lesion improved 6 months later. (C) Increased uptake and a hypermetabolic lesion were detected in whole-body scintigraphy and positron emission tomography-computed tomography 5 months before the detection of a right-side incomplete fracture on simple radiographs.

Cha et al. Atypical Femoral Fracture

Clinics in Orthopedic Surgery • Vol. 15, No. 4, 2023 • www.ecios.org

Table 1. Clinical and Radiologic Data in Three Groups					
Variable	Group 1 (complete fracture, n = 42)	Group 2 (incomplete fracture, n = 21)	Group 3 (no lesion on simple radiographs, n = 16)	<i>p</i> -value	Post hoc
Age at diagnosis of breast cancer (yr)	56 ± 5	55 ± 8	56 ± 5	0.863	
Total amount (gm)	46.76 ± 4.28	37.14 ± 3.61	28.63 ± 2.03	< 0.01	Group 1 > 2 > 3
Additional therapy after breast surgery					
Radiotherapy + chemotherapy	34	18	16	0 172	
Chemotherapy	8	3	0	0.173	
Radiologic period (mo)	7 ± 3*	7 ± 1*	$5 \pm 2^{\dagger}$	< 0.001	Group 1, 2 > 3

Values are presented as mean ± standard deviation.

*The period between the time of identified complete or incomplete fracture on simple radiographs and the time of first showing the lesions in wholebody scintigraphy (WBS)/positron emission tomography (PET)-computed tomography (CT) (group 1 or 2). ¹The period between the most recent time of normal finding on simple radiographs and the time of first showing the lesions in WBS/PET-CT (group 3).

Table 2. Clinical Data of Three Gro	oups and Noi	mal Group	
Variable	Group 1, 2, 3 (n = 79)	Normal group (n = 149)	<i>p</i> -value
Age at diagnosis of breast cancer (yr)	56 ± 6	55 ± 3	0.757
Total amount (gm)	40.53 ± 8.18	18.78 ± 3.13	< 0.010

Values are presented as mean ± standard deviation.

bilateral lesions (complete or incomplete fractures) were more frequently seen on simple radiographs than unilateral lesions (p = 0.008). However, in groups 2 and 3, corresponding lesions on the contralateral limb were less prevalent than the absence of contralateral lesions (p = 0.007 and p < 0.001, respectively) (Table 3). Fractures in the diaphyseal area were seen in 8 patients (5 in group 1, 2 in group 2, and 1 in group 3), and the mean bowing angle was $8.62^{\circ} \pm 3.66^{\circ}$, which was significantly different from the angle for the subtrochanteric area ($2.27^{\circ} \pm 1.45^{\circ}$, p = 0.002).

DISCUSSION

BPs have routinely been utilized in patients with BC. BPs prevent or delay SREs and can improve pain control in patients with metastatic disease and bone involvement.¹⁷⁾ BPs significantly reduce distant recurrence, bone recurrence, and BC mortality, which is observed only in postmenopausal women. The relative benefit of BPs is not affected by receptor status, tumor grade, nodal involvement, or administration of adjuvant chemotherapy. Current guide-lines support considering adjuvant zoledronic acid or oral clodronate for 3–5 years in postmenopausal women with

early-stage disease.¹⁷⁻²⁰⁾

Zoledronic acid is most commonly used in our institute for preventing distant metastasis or local recurrence by breast surgeons according to its protocol.^{7,8)} Surprisingly, 35% of the participants in the current study had opportunities for being diagnosed with AFF before a complete or incomplete fracture. The findings in WBS and PET-CT in these patients were not as interesting as a metastatic lesion for breast surgeons. Also, we discovered that breast surgeons and radiologists commonly rule out these lesions as "not serious" findings due to several reasons. First, subtrochanteric hot-uptake or hypermetabolism is not an ordinary location for a single distant metastasis. Most skeletal metastasis occurs initially at the spine or bony structures around the trunk. In addition, axillary lymph node involvement would be the primary predictor of bony metastasis at the time of breast surgery. Thus, most of the lesions in the current study were considered not serious and even benign bone lesions by breast surgeons and radiologists. Second, the degree of uptake and metabolism were relatively weak compared to those for metastases. Necrosis of the jaw is associated with BPs, but rarely in patients with AFFs.²¹⁻²³⁾ Ohbayashi et al.²¹⁾ reported that the degree of tracer uptake after long-term BP use is notably distinct in the jaw than other bones, including the femur and humerus and they regarded the uptake differences as differences in secondary turnover after primary excessive mineralization by BP and microcracks. Similarly, AFFs were finally considered only after consultation with an orthopedic surgeon due to patient discomfort in the lower extremity or even after sudden complete fractures, although the radiological clue was visible for several months, which was easily neglected (Table 4). Finally, even

Cha et al. Atypical Femoral Fracture Clinics in Orthopedic Surgery • Vol. 15, No. 4, 2023 • www.ecios.org



Fig. 4. (A) A 55-year-old woman presented with intermittent discomfort on the left side of the hip or knee (group 3). The patient had not recognized the possibility of an atypical femur fracture, even without any radiological workups for the lower extremities. Fortunately, no suspicious lesion was detected on simple radiographs. (B) However, whole-body scintigraphy and positron emission tomography-computed tomography had revealed the lesions 5 months previously but they were dismissed by the breast surgeon and radiologist as non-serious lesions.

Table 3. Lesions of Atypical Femoral	Fractures i	n Three Gro	ups
Variable	Bilateral lesion	Unilateral lesion	<i>p</i> -value
Group 1 (complete fracture, n = 42)	30*	12 [†]	0.008
Group 2 (incomplete fracture, n = 21)	4^{\ddagger}	17 [§]	0.007
Group 3 (no lesion on simple radiographs, n = 16)	1	15	< 0.001

*Complete fracture at least on one side, complete or incomplete fracture on the contralateral side. [†]Only one side complete fracture, normal lesion in all radiologic examinations on the contralateral side. [‡]Incomplete fractures on both sides. [§]Incomplete fracture on only one side, normal lesion in all radiologic examinations on the contralateral side.

after complete AFFs, a few breast surgeons still use BPs as an important part of postoperative chemotherapy. Despite knowledge among orthopedic surgeons about the effects of BPs, the benefits of BP therapy could not be ignored by the breast surgeon. A drug holiday for BPs has been emphasized by established guidelines to prevent AFFs when treating osteoporosis; however, the dosages of BPs for BC are too high to be applied to the same guidelines.¹¹

There are three reasons why we strongly suggest early detection of clues using advanced radiological tools. First, an incomplete fracture does not spontaneously heal due to compromised bone physiology, and several studies have supported the necessity of prophylactic fixation using simple intramedullary nailing.¹⁰⁻¹³⁾ Furthermore, complete displaced subtrochanteric fractures cannot always be fixed easily. In addition, noninvasive intramedullary nailing for displaced/complete fractures requires a prolonged period for final bone healing and has an increased risk of delayed union or nonunion, which demands secondary surgery rather than prophylactic fixation. Second, considering the mean 7.36 and 7.29 months from the identifiable lesions in WBS and PET-CT to complete fractures and incomplete fractures on simple radiographs in groups 1 and 2, respectively, the calculated differences between the time periods mean that incomplete fractures found on simple radiographs would soon proceed to complete displaced fractures with vulnerability to minor trauma. Finally, most of the patients were immunocompromised under regular cycles of chemo-radiotherapy. Thus, another surgery after a complete fracture and prolonged immobilization, if necessary, would increase the risk of mortality compared to prophylactic fixation with least immobilization.

In the current study, the mean total amount of BPs administered to the overall three groups was significantly greater than that in the normal group. Once attached to the bony surface, BPs are not eliminated for a few years until transcytosis into osteoclasts; thus, the total times for the BP injections would properly reflect the total accumulated amount, if there were a non-injection period within 3 years. In addition, a few lesions were found in the diaphyseal area, and the locations were well correlated with increased lateral bowing, as described previously (Fig. 5).^{14,15)} Thus, it is worth noting that breast surgeons and radiologists can use the total number of BP injections and the degree of bowing to identify the lesions with a detailed suspicion based on WBS and PET-CT findings.

There were some limitations in this study. First, our report was based just on clinical/radiologic data from a single institute, thus the evidence was too weak to answer several questions about the overwhelming efficacy for bony metastasis, the proper period of BP injections after breast surgery, or the cessation and restart after diagnosis and surgical intervention of AFFs. For the management of postmenopausal osteoporosis, BP treatment was under the well-established guideline; however, in our study, the same agent was applied at a high dose to different patient groups

Cha et al. Atypical Femoral Fracture

Clinics in Orthopedic Surgery • Vol. 15, No. 4, 2023 • www.ecios.org

Table 4. Period of Pain Recognition in Three Groups			
Variable	Bilateral lesion	Unilateral lesion	<i>p</i> -value
Group 1 (complete fracture, n = 42)	30	12	0.008
Both complete : complete + incomplete : only one side complete	13 : 17 : 0	0:0:12	
Period of pain recognition in both complete (n = 13) (right : left)	Null* : Null (12 patients) Null : 2 mo (1 patient)	-	
Period of pain recognition in complete + incomplete (n = 17) (right : left)	Null : 2.18 mo [†]	-	
Period of pain recognition in only one side complete ($n = 12$)	-	Null	
Group 2 (incomplete fracture, n = 21)	4	17	0.007
Period of pain recognition in both incomplete (right : left)	$2.25 \text{ mo}^{\dagger}: 3 \text{ mo}^{\dagger}$	-	
Period of pain recognition in only one side incomplete	-	3.2 mo [†]	
Group 3 (no lesion on simple radiographs, n = 16)	1	15	< 0.001
Period of pain recognition in both lesions (right : left)	2 mo : Null	-	
Period of pain recognition in only one lesion	-	Null (9 patients) 1.33 mo (6 patients) [†]	

*Null: there was no clinical data on the pain around the fracture or corresponding lesion. [†]Mean data.



Fig. 5. (A) A 65-year-old woman presented with intermittent discomfort around the left knee. A simple radiograph showed an incomplete atypical femur fracture at the diaphysis. The lateral bowing angle was 6.4°. (B) The patient had not recognized the possibility of an atypical femoral fracture, even after a suspicious lesion had been detected in whole-body scintigraphy 4 months previously. (C) Complete union was acquired 8 months after prophylactic nailing.

by different surgeons. Thus, a well-designed, prospective, multicenter trial is needed. Second, the patients in group 3 could have the potential to move toward group X. During the treatment of osteoporosis using BP, the radiologic reversibility of incomplete AFFs after cessation of the agent was recently reported.²⁴⁾ However, breast surgeons argue that anti-metastatic treatment still has a priority rather than the prevention of fracture events, if there were no guidelines. Thus, through regular check-ups, prophylactic fixation for patients in group 2 may be a reasonable option.

In conclusion, about one-third (35%) of the patients had at least one femur affected under high-dose BP therapy after surgery for early-stage BC. Even before incomplete AFFs were detectable on simple radiographs, they could be found at check-ups using WBS and PET-CT that had been previously examined by breast surgeons and radiologists for metastasis surveillance. Awareness of the lesions creates an opportunity for prophylactic surgery before a complete fracture occurs.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by research fund of 2019 Basic Science Research Program through the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF), funded by the Ministry of Science, ICT & Future Planning (NRF-2019R1I-1A3A01059198).

ORCID

Soo Min Cha	https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1663-406X
Yun Ki Kim	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7366-6979
Hyun Dae Shin	https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4290-1125
Jae Young Park	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8004-3016
Sang Hyun Lee	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2084-9824

REFERENCES

- Boivin GY, Chavassieux PM, Santora AC, Yates J, Meunier PJ. Alendronate increases bone strength by increasing the mean degree of mineralization of bone tissue in osteoporotic women. Bone. 2000;27(5):687-94.
- 2. Bone HG, Hosking D, Devogelaer JP, et al. Ten years' experience with alendronate for osteoporosis in postmenopausal women. N Engl J Med. 2004;350(12):1189-99.
- Eastell R, Barton I, Hannon RA, Chines A, Garnero P, Delmas PD. Relationship of early changes in bone resorption to the reduction in fracture risk with risedronate. J Bone Miner Res. 2003;18(6):1051-6.
- Allen MR, Iwata K, Phipps R, Burr DB. Alterations in canine vertebral bone turnover, microdamage accumulation, and biomechanical properties following 1-year treatment with clinical treatment doses of risedronate or alendronate. Bone. 2006;39(4):872-9.
- Diel IJ, Solomayer EF, Costa SD, et al. Reduction in new metastases in breast cancer with adjuvant clodronate treatment. N Engl J Med. 1998;339(6):357-63.
- von Minckwitz G, Mobus V, Schneeweiss A, et al. German adjuvant intergroup node-positive study: a phase III trial to compare oral ibandronate versus observation in patients with high-risk early breast cancer. J Clin Oncol. 2013;31(28): 3531-9.
- Friedl TWP, Fehm T, Muller V, et al. Prognosis of patients with early breast cancer receiving 5 years vs 2 years of adjuvant bisphosphonate treatment: a phase 3 randomized clinical trial. JAMA Oncol. 2021;7(8):1149-57.
- Coleman R, de Boer R, Eidtmann H, et al. Zoledronic acid (zoledronate) for postmenopausal women with early breast cancer receiving adjuvant letrozole (ZO-FAST study): final 60-month results. Ann Oncol. 2013;24(2):398-405.
- Stopeck AT, Lipton A, Body JJ, et al. Denosumab compared with zoledronic acid for the treatment of bone metastases in patients with advanced breast cancer: a randomized, double-blind study. J Clin Oncol. 2010;28(35):5132-9.
- Oh CW, Oh JK, Park KC, Kim JW, Yoon YC. Prophylactic nailing of incomplete atypical femoral fractures. Scientific-

WorldJournal. 2013;2013:450148.

- Dell R, Greene D. A proposal for an atypical femur fracture treatment and prevention clinical practice guideline. Osteoporos Int. 2018;29(6):1277-83.
- Ha YC, Cho MR, Park KH, Kim SY, Koo KH. Is surgery necessary for femoral insufficiency fractures after longterm bisphosphonate therapy? Clin Orthop Relat Res. 2010; 468(12):3393-8.
- 13. Fowler JR, Criner K, Craig MR. Prophylactic intramedullary fixation for bisphosphonate-related subtrochanteric stress fracture. Orthopedics. 2012;35(6):e954-7.
- Yoo H, Cho Y, Park Y, Ha S. Lateral femoral bowing and the location of atypical femoral fractures. Hip Pelvis. 2017; 29(2):127-32.
- Yau WP, Chiu KY, Tang WM, Ng TP. Coronal bowing of the femur and tibia in Chinese: its incidence and effects on total knee arthroplasty planning. J Orthop Surg (Hong Kong). 2007;15(1):32-6.
- Lloyd AA, Gludovatz B, Riedel C, et al. Atypical fracture with long-term bisphosphonate therapy is associated with altered cortical composition and reduced fracture resistance. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2017;114(33):8722-7.
- 17. Goldvaser H, Amir E. Role of bisphosphonates in breast cancer therapy. Curr Treat Options Oncol. 2019;20(4):26.
- Rosen LS, Gordon DH, Dugan W Jr, et al. Zoledronic acid is superior to pamidronate for the treatment of bone metastases in breast carcinoma patients with at least one osteolytic lesion. Cancer. 2004;100(1):36-43.
- Rosen LS, Gordon D, Kaminski M, et al. Zoledronic acid versus pamidronate in the treatment of skeletal metastases in patients with breast cancer or osteolytic lesions of multiple myeloma: a phase III, double-blind, comparative trial. Cancer J. 2001;7(5):377-87.
- 20. Major P, Lortholary A, Hon J, et al. Zoledronic acid is superior to pamidronate in the treatment of hypercalcemia of malignancy: a pooled analysis of two randomized, controlled clinical trials. J Clin Oncol. 2001;19(2):558-67.

- 21. Ohbayashi Y, Nakai F, Iwasaki A, et al. The utility of bone scintigraphy in the assessment of mandibular metabolism during long-term bisphosphonate administration. Odontol-ogy. 2017;105(3):382-90.
- 22. Watanabe S, Nakajima K, Mizokami A, et al. Bone scan index of the jaw: a new approach for evaluating early-stage anti-resorptive agents-related osteonecrosis. Ann Nucl Med. 2017;31(3):201-10.
- 23. Sanchez-Lopez JD, Cariati P, Cambil-Martin J, Villegas-

Calvo M, Moreno-Martin ML. Use of bone scintigraphy in the early diagnosis of bisphosphonate related osteonecrosis of the jaw: case report and review of the literature. J Clin Exp Dent. 2018;10(12):e1235-7.

24. Cha SM, Shin HD, Lee SH, Shin JW. Radiological reversibility of incomplete atypical femoral fracture with cessation of bisphosphonate: including an early stage of incomplete fracture. Indian J Orthop. 2022;56(6):1023-32.