

Instructional lecture

The osteoporosis revolution marches on

LAWRENCE G. RAISZ

UConn Center for Osteoporosis, University of Connecticut Health Center, Farmington, CT 06030-5456, USA

Introduction

In 1997, when I reported on the progress of the “osteoporosis revolution,”¹ five topics were emphasized: genetics, local factors, bone mass measurements, biochemical markers, and prevention and therapy. During the past 10 years there has been substantial progress in all of these areas, but the revolution is by no means over. This review summarizes our current concepts of epidemiology, pathogenesis, diagnosis, prevention, and treatment with an emphasis on the advances that have been made during the past decade.

The osteoporosis revolution is a relatively recent problem in human history, due largely to the great increase in life expectancy and the effects of “civilization,” that is, the movement of humans from outdoors to indoors and from heavy physical activity to sedentary occupations. Although originally the diagnosis of osteoporosis was made after patients had had a fragility fracture, we now can make a diagnosis of osteoporosis before fractures occur when there is a marked reduction of bone mineral density (BMD) or of osteopenia, when there is a moderate reduction in BMD. This has made it possible to start preventive measures and early therapy in high-risk patients before there is any fracture. Nevertheless, most patients are not diagnosed until after their first fragility fracture; and, unfortunately, many are not diagnosed or treated even after that fracture. Although the highest incidence is among postmenopausal women, substantial numbers of older men are affected; and a few younger individuals, particularly those with important secondary causes for bone loss, are also at risk for fragility fractures.

Offprint requests to: L.G. Raisz

Received: February 7, 2007 / Accepted: March 8, 2007

This Instructional Lecture was presented at the 21st Annual Research Meeting of the Japanese Orthopaedic Association, Nagasaki, October 19, 2006

Epidemiology

Osteoporosis is a common disorder. There were approximately 2 million fragility fractures in the United States in 2005, and this number will increase to 3 million by 2025 unless we institute more effective preventive measures.² Similar figures have been reported for most developed countries.³ In the United States, about half of these fractures occur in patients with a sufficiently low bone mass to warrant the diagnosis of osteoporosis (i.e., more than 2.5 SD below the young adult mean), and the other half occur in patients with osteopenia (i.e., BMD of -1.0 to 2.5 SD). The most common fragility fractures are of the proximal femur, lower thoracic and lumbar vertebrae, and distal radius. However, fragility fractures can occur in many other sites. Although the absolute incidence of fragility fractures is increasing rapidly, largely because of greater longevity, a number of studies have suggested that age-specific rates are decreasing in some countries, perhaps due to greater recognition of the problem and greater attention to bone health. The U.S. Surgeon General made this the subject of a major report on “Bone Health and Osteoporosis.”⁴ The World Health Organization, which established the present diagnostic criteria, is making a major effort to redefine osteoporosis in terms of absolute fracture risk and establish better approaches to diagnosis and prevention.

Pathogenesis

Our basic concepts of the pathogenesis of osteoporosis have not changed greatly during the last decade, but some new pathways have been identified.⁵ The four basic mechanisms are (1) failure to achieve optimal peak bone mass and strength during growth and development. This is largely determined by genetics but is also contributed to by nutrition and lifestyle. (2)

Increased bone resorption with aging, particularly after menopause. This is largely due to estrogen deficiency but may be enhanced by calcium and vitamin deficiency producing secondary hyperparathyroidism. An increase in inflammatory cytokines may play a role. (3) Inadequate bone formation during remodeling. This is probably due to age-related impairment of osteoblastic cell renewal and function and to changes in specific growth factors. (4) Increased propensity to fall. This occurs because of neural and muscular impairment with aging as well as the increasing number of drugs given to the elderly for other disorders that can impair balance or perception.

Genetics

There have been remarkable advances in our understanding of the genetic determinants of bone mass and strength.⁶⁻⁸ Perhaps the most important has been identification of the Wnt signaling pathway.⁹ Activation of Wnt signaling in bone results in increased bone formation and probably in decreased resorption. The pathway also has an effect on early precursor cells to direct them to the osteoblastic lineage rather than to adipocytes or cartilage cells. Activating mutations of lipoprotein-related receptor-5 (LRP-5), which is part of the receptor complex for Wnt ligands, produce a high bone mass phenotype.⁹⁻¹¹ Deletion of LRP5 produces severe osteoporosis.¹² A high bone mass phenotype also occurs when inhibitors of this pathway, sclerostin or dickkopf (DKK),¹³ are deleted. The potential role of polymorphisms in the multiple proteins involved in this complex regulatory system are just beginning to be explored and could account for genetic differences in bone mass and strength.

Other findings point to a possible role of abnormalities of collagen in osteoporosis, particularly polymorphisms of the $\alpha 1$ collagen gene, which are associated with increased skeletal fragility.¹⁴ This and other findings call into question the concept that there are no biochemical abnormalities of the matrix in osteoporosis. Subtle abnormalities may indeed exist and contribute to fragility. Many other candidate genes have been analyzed, all of which appear to contribute relatively small effects on bone mass and fragility but which in combination could be important determinants of fracture risk as well as the response to therapy.¹⁵ Moreover, interactions between genetics and environment may modify these effects.¹⁶

Nutrition and lifestyle

Our hunter-gatherer and agricultural ancestors probably had stronger bones. This could be due not only to a

direct effect of physical activity but to greater nutrient intake, particularly of calcium, associated with this activity, as well as greater sun exposure and hence higher levels of vitamin D.¹⁷ These factors may be of particular importance during childhood and adolescence, when peak bone mass is developed. Many studies indicate that gains in bone mass can be achieved by improving physical activity and nutrition, but most also show that these gains are lost when the program is discontinued.¹⁸ In addition to calcium and vitamin D, protein intake and vitamin K may be critical for achieving bone mass and strength.¹⁹ Other nutritional interventions have been explored, such as changes in the proportion of saturated and unsaturated fats or in omega-3 fatty acids, but the data are limited.^{20,21}

Accelerated bone resorption

Although it is clear that estrogen deficiency results in accelerated bone resorption at any age, the precise mechanisms have still not been established.⁵ Moreover, there may be separate effects of androgens and other hormones involved in gonadal regulation such as follicle-stimulating hormone (FSH) or inhibin.²²⁻²⁴ Recent studies indicate that estrogen may act at multiple sites — on both the hematopoietic precursors of the osteoclasts and the osteoblast-osteoclast interaction that regulates bone resorption. Thus, estrogen administration can decrease bone resorption by decreasing the ability of marrow cells to respond to stimulation by receptor activator of NF κ B (RANKL) and by decreasing the expression of RANKL in marrow cells.^{25,26} We are still not sure whether the RANKL-expressing cells that are affected by estrogen are entirely from the osteoblast lineage or include members of the lymphocyte family. In any event, the production of bone-resorbing cytokines may mediate this response.²⁷⁻³¹ Of great interest is the observation that the amount of estrogen required to affect bone in postmenopausal women may be substantially less than that required to affect the classic target organs, such as the breast or uterus, although this may not be the case in rodents.^{32,33} Fracture risk is highest in both men and women with the lowest estrogen levels, and doses of estrogen that are one-quarter or less of the usual doses that are given at menopause can prevent bone loss. Because of the recent data indicating that with higher doses of estrogen the costs may outweigh the benefits, the exploration of ultra-low-dose estrogen for prevention and treatment of osteoporosis is quite attractive. Large studies are required to determine if these low doses actually do have less risk and are effective in reducing fractures.

Low intake of calcium and low levels of vitamin D are quite common in the elderly population at risk for osteo-

porosis.³⁴ These conditions aggravate bone loss by producing secondary hyperparathyroidism and increased bone resorption; and they may also have adverse effects on muscle strength and physical performance and thus increase the risk of falls.^{35,36} Recent studies have suggested that vitamin D requirements for optimal health may be much higher than the usually recommended levels. Because the sun does not activate vitamin D formation in the skin in northern latitudes during the winter, supplementation is important. Moreover vitamin D insufficiency is still quite common in equatorial regions, probably because the individuals cover themselves and avoid sun exposure. There is still debate concerning the optimal levels of vitamin D, but a daily intake of 2000 U or even more appears to be quite safe.^{17,36}

Inadequate bone formation

During childhood and adolescence the skeleton maintains remarkably high rates of bone formation for the modeling of new bone and for remodeling. Thus, rates of bone resorption much higher than those encountered in patients with osteoporosis can occur in the presence of substantial bone gain. At some point shortly after peak bone mass has been achieved, this capacity for high rates of bone formation diminishes and the amount of new bone in remodeling sites on the trabecular bone surfaces (mean wall thickness) progressively decreases.³⁷ Trabecular bone and, to a lesser extent, cortical bone mass probably begin to decrease at some sites when people are in their twenties, long before the major hormonal changes of menopause or aging.³⁸ However, sex hormones may still play a role in the changes in bone of younger individuals.^{39,40}

The reasons for the age-related decrease in bone formation are not well understood. It is possible that after multiple replications the precursor cells of the osteoblastic lineage gradually lose their capacity to replicate and differentiate. The changes in bone mass during this period are extremely variable, and it is also possible that individuals destined to become osteoporotic are the ones who show the greatest impairment of bone formation as younger adults.^{41,42} This may be due to changes in growth factors. Many growth factors affect the skeleton, including insulin-like growth factor-1, fibroblast growth factor, vascular endothelial growth factor, bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs), transforming growth factor- β , and prostaglandins.⁴³⁻⁴⁸ Moreover, cytokines can inhibit formation as well as stimulate resorption.⁴⁹ Polymorphisms in the genes for some of these factors have been implicated as determinants of bone mass and fracture risk.^{50,51}

The role of the Wnt signaling pathway in the pathogenesis of osteoporosis has not yet been fully defined.⁵²

The clinical findings of increased bone mass due largely to increased bone formation in patients with increased activity of this pathway as well as the finding of severe osteoporosis in the LRP-5-deficient osteoporosis pseudoglioma syndrome, make it reasonable to look for smaller variations in Wnt signaling as a mechanism for impaired bone formation in osteoporosis. The regulation of this pathway is complex, and there are many sites at which abnormalities could occur, including not only the inhibitory proteins such as sclerostin, secreted frizzled related protein, and dickkopf but also Wnt ligands and the LRP-5 and frizzled receptors themselves.^{53,54} Polymorphisms of LRP-5 have been associated with differences in bone mass and fracture incidence.⁵⁵ Moreover, mutations in LRP-5 have been described in children with primary osteoporosis.⁵⁶ This possibility is reinforced by the observation that the most effective current anabolic agent, intermittent PTH, appears to act at least in part by reducing sclerostin, presumably leading to activation of Wnt signaling.^{11,57-59} One feature of the Wnt pathway that is of particular interest is the observation that not only does activation increase bone formation, it may also decrease bone resorption and decrease the propensity for precursor cells to differentiate into adipocytes.

Another exciting new area that may be relevant to the pathogenesis of osteoporosis is the evidence that bone formation is under neural control. Effects of leptin mediated by the central nervous system and peripheral effects of both the β -adrenergic and the cannabinoid systems have been implicated in regulation of the skeleton.⁶⁰⁻⁶² Moreover, an effect of β -blockers on bone density and fractures has been reported, although the results are not entirely consistent.⁶³

Diagnosis of osteoporosis and assessment of fracture risk

Although the use of BMD for diagnosing osteoporosis has been broadly applied during the last two decades, a new approach in which BMD and other risk factors are used together to estimate true absolute fracture risk is rapidly being developed and likely to replace the use of BMD alone, with its arbitrary diagnostic cutoffs.⁶⁴ Currently, the factors that are most frequently used to assess fracture risk are age, family and personal fracture history, body weight, and the presence of aggravating disorders such as rheumatoid arthritis. The use of biochemical markers of bone turnover to refine this assessment has not yet become established, even though there is good evidence that high turnover is associated with increased fracture risk.⁶⁵ One reason for the uncertainty concerning the use of biochemical markers is the lack of uniformity in their assay measurements.⁶⁶

An important advance that is under development, but likely to be widely available in the next decade, is assessment of the microarchitecture of the skeleton. It is now possible to assess trabecular structure and measure such important properties as trabecular spacing and the relative proportion of rods and plates using either high-resolution computed tomography (CT) or magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), but these procedures are still not at the stage of general clinical application.^{67,68}

One critical aspect of diagnosis is the appropriate workup to rule out important secondary causes of bone loss and fragility.⁶⁹ A number of cost-effective stepwise approaches have been described, but they are not being applied in most cases.

Genetic diagnosis, except for the severe forms of skeletal fragility that we term osteogenesis imperfecta, is not yet a clinically useful option. However, it seems likely that in the future, when a substantial number of genetic polymorphisms that impinge on bone mass and strength have been identified, a genetic profile could be developed that would greatly enhance the assessment of fracture risk.

Prevention and treatment

There have been substantial advances in the orthopedic management of fragility fractures that have reduced morbidity and mortality and shortened the time to recovery, but they are beyond the scope of this review. The concept of fracture prevention is central to medical treatment of osteoporosis. The goal of treatment is to reduce fracture risk (i.e., prevent future fractures). There has been increasing emphasis on a lifelong approach to this goal.⁴ Improved bone health in children, particularly in adolescents during the rapid growth spurt, through better nutrition and exercise might have a substantial effect on the risk of fractures later in life. These same bone health measures are critical for any therapeutic program in older individuals who have moderate to severe bone loss. In many of these patients, however, pharmacotherapy is also indicated. Ten years ago the most widely used agents were estrogens; but with the evidence from the Women's Health Initiative that the risks of estrogen in terms of cardiovascular disease and breast cancer might outweigh the benefits, this use has decreased.⁷⁰ Hence, bisphosphonate therapy has become the preferred approach.^{71,72}

Large clinical trials have demonstrated the antifracture efficacy of bisphosphonates, but they are far from ideal drugs. When given orally only 1% or less of the dose is absorbed, and variations of this absorption are likely to alter efficacy. There are also side effects, particularly with oral administration, that limit their use; furthermore, fracture reduction averages only about

50%. Intravenous bisphosphonates are being developed. For zoledronic acid, there is recent evidence of substantial antifracture efficacy when given as a single infusion once a year for 3 years.⁷³ One concern is that we still do not know the long-term safety of bisphosphonates.⁷⁴

During the past decade there has also been increasing use of a selective estrogen receptor modulator (SERM), raloxifene.⁷² Efficacy has been demonstrated, but only for vertebral fractures. Newer SERMs are being tested and may show greater clinical efficacy. Another approach that deserves further exploration is the use of ultra-low-dose estrogen. This might avoid the adverse effects of therapy and has been shown to increase bone density, but it has not yet been tested for fracture efficacy.^{75,76}

Calcitonin is an antiresorptive agent, but its efficacy in the treatment of osteoporosis remains uncertain.^{71,72,77}

A number of other antiresorptives are currently under study.⁷⁸ They include the use of an antibody to RANKL, which blocks its interaction with RANK and rapidly reduces bone resorption. Injections of this antibody can maintain decreased resorption rates for 6 months and increase BMD as effectively as bisphosphonates.⁷⁹ Direct inhibition of osteoclast activity by blocking acid secretion, inhibiting cathepsin K, or interfering with the adhesion of osteoclasts via integrin receptors are also being explored.⁸⁰⁻⁸²

The relative effects of antiresorptive therapy are similar in patients with mild or severe osteoporosis; in the latter, the fracture rate of remains quite high, so many patients might be regarded as therapeutic failures. In addition some patients continue to lose BMD on antiresorptive therapy. As yet, there is no evidence that changing from one antiresorptive to another has any benefit, although intravenous therapy might be considered in patients who do not absorb or do not tolerate oral bisphosphonates. It is in these patients that anabolic therapy is most often considered.

Anabolic therapy

That low doses of parathyroid hormone given intermittently could increase bone mass was demonstrated in experimental animals more than half a century ago. However, the clinical application of this effect was achieved only in the last decade.^{83,84} Daily subcutaneous administration of synthetic 1-34 parathyroid hormone (teriparatide) was found to increase bone density and reduce fracture risk, not by inhibiting resorption but by stimulating both resorption and formation, with a greater formation effect, thus resulting in increased bone mass. This may be related to decreased sclerostin or increased insulin-like growth factor-2 production.^{57,85}

The new bone formed is structurally sound, in contrast to the earlier studies using sodium fluoride, which increased bone mass but also increased fragility at higher doses.⁸⁶ Teriparatide has been shown to be effective in both men and women and in patients with glucocorticoid-induced osteoporosis. One concern has been that its initial efficacy may be reduced in patients who are treated with bisphosphonates.⁸⁷ However, teriparatide still increases bone density in such patients.⁸⁸

Although teriparatide is effective, its use has been limited by the inconvenience of daily injection as well as the high cost. Alternatives to injection of teriparatide are being explored, including administration by nasal spray⁸⁹ or the use of “calcilytic” agents that interfere with the calcium receptor and produce a transient increase in endogenous parathyroid hormone (PTH) secretion.⁹⁰ Prostaglandins have been shown to increase both bone resorption and formation with a net increase in bone mass in animals.⁹¹ Selective agonists for prostaglandin receptors are being explored for the therapy of local skeletal defects,⁹² but their multiple effects on other organ systems may limit their use as skeletal anabolic agents.

Agents that inhibit resorption and stimulate formation

Most recently, strontium ranelate has been developed as an agent that is reported to inhibit bone resorption and stimulate bone formation. Its effects on bone mass are difficult to evaluate because strontium is incorporated into the mineral and alters its density. However, strontium ranelate has been shown to reduce fractures.⁹³ An exciting new approach to the possible simultaneous inhibition of resorption and stimulation of formation would be activation of the Wnt signaling pathway. An approach that is currently being explored is “disinhibition” of Wnt signaling, which can be achieved by antibodies to sclerostin.⁹⁴

Future direction

In view of the remarkable and unexpected findings of the last decade, it is hazardous to predict where the next decade will lead. Many more factors that regulate bone remodeling and influence skeletal integrity are being discovered, and studies of these factors should lead to better understanding of the pathogenesis and new approaches to therapy. An equally critical goal is to improve the application of what we already know to reversing the ever-increasing burden of osteoporotic fractures worldwide. This will require political and socioeconomic changes as well as improvements in the

distribution of medical care. Orthopedists can play an important role here — for example, developing programs that ensure that patients with fragility fractures are followed up with appropriate diagnosis and treatment and supporting and promoting efforts to improve bone health at all ages.

References

1. Raisz LG. The osteoporosis revolution. *Ann Intern Med* 1997; 126(6):458–62.
2. Cooper C. Epidemiology of osteoporotic fracture: looking to the future. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2005;44(suppl 4):iv36–40.
3. Johnell O, Kanis JA. An estimate of the worldwide prevalence and disability associated with osteoporotic fractures. *Osteoporos Int* 2006;17(12):1726–33.
4. General OotS. Bone health and osteoporosis: a report of the surgeon general. Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services; 2004.
5. Raisz LG. Pathogenesis of osteoporosis: concepts, conflicts, and prospects. *J Clin Invest* 2005;115(12):3318–25.
6. Baldock PA, Eisman JA. Genetic determinants of bone mass. *Curr Opin Rheumatol* 2004;16(4):450–6.
7. Liu Z, Tang Y, Qiu T, Cao X, Clemens TL. A dishevelled-1/Smad1 interaction couples WNT and bone morphogenetic protein signaling pathways in uncommitted bone marrow stromal cells. *J Biol Chem* 2006;281(25):17156–63.
8. Yang F, Shen H, Jiang H, Deng HW. On genetic studies of bone loss. *J Bone Miner Res* 2006;21(11):1676–7.
9. Little RD, Carulli JP, Del Mastro RG, Dupuis J, Osborne M, Folz C, et al. A mutation in the LDL receptor-related protein 5 gene results in the autosomal dominant high-bone-mass trait. *Am J Hum Genet* 2002;70(1):11–9.
10. Boyden LM, Mao J, Belsky J, Mitzner L, Farhi A, Mitnick MA, et al. High bone density due to a mutation in LDL-receptor-related protein 5. *N Engl J Med* 2002;346(20):1513–21.
11. Van Wesenbeeck L, Cleiren E, Gram J, Beals RK, Benichou O, Scopelliti D, et al. Six novel missense mutations in the LDL receptor-related protein 5 (LRP5) gene in different conditions with an increased bone density. *Am J Hum Genet* 2003;72(3):763–71.
12. Gong Y, Slee RB, Fukai N, Rawadi G, Roman-Roman S, Reginato AM, et al. LDL receptor-related protein 5 (LRP5) affects bone accrual and eye development. *Cell* 2001;107(4):513–23.
13. Morvan F, Boulukos K, Clement-Lacroix P, Roman Roman S, Suc-Royer I, Vayssiere B, et al. Deletion of a single allele of the *Dkk1* gene leads to an increase in bone formation and bone mass. *J Bone Miner Res* 2006;21(6):934–45.
14. Mann V, Ralston SH. Meta-analysis of COL1A1 Sp1 polymorphism in relation to bone mineral density and osteoporotic fracture. *Bone* 2003;32(6):711–7.
15. Morrison NA, George PM, Vaughan T, Tilyard MW, Frampton CM, Gilchrist NL. Vitamin D receptor genotypes influence the success of calcitriol therapy for recurrent vertebral fracture in osteoporosis. *Pharmacogenet Genomics* 2005;15(2):127–35.
16. Ferrari SL, Rizzoli R, Slosman DO, Bonjour JP. Do dietary calcium and age explain the controversy surrounding the relationship between bone mineral density and vitamin D receptor gene polymorphisms? *J Bone Miner Res* 1998;13(3):363–70.
17. Heaney RP. Barriers to optimizing vitamin D₃ intake for the elderly. *J Nutr* 2006;136(4):1123–5.
18. Lock CA, Lecouturier J, Mason JM, Dickinson HO. Lifestyle interventions to prevent osteoporotic fractures: a systematic review. *Osteoporos Int* 2006;17(1):20–8.

19. Mundy GR. Nutritional modulators of bone remodeling during aging. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2006;83(2):427S–30S.
20. Bhattacharya A, Rahman M, Sun D, Fernandes G. Effect of fish oil on bone mineral density in aging C57BL/6 female mice. *J Nutr Biochem* 2007;18(6):372–9.
21. Corwin RL, Hartman TJ, Maczuga SA, Graubard BI. Dietary saturated fat intake is inversely associated with bone density in humans: analysis of NHANES III. *J Nutr* 2006;136(1):159–65.
22. Falahati-Nini A, Riggs BL, Atkinson EJ, O'Fallon WM, Eastell R, Khosla S. Relative contributions of testosterone and estrogen in regulating bone resorption and formation in normal elderly men. *J Clin Invest* 2000;106(12):1553–60.
23. Iqbal J, Sun L, Kumar TR, Blair HC, Zaidi M. Follicle-stimulating hormone stimulates TNF production from immune cells to enhance osteoblast and osteoclast formation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2006;103(40):14925–30.
24. Perrien DS, Akel NS, Edwards PK, Carver AA, Bendre MS, Swain FL, et al. Inhibin A is an endocrine stimulator of bone mass and strength. *Endocrinology* 2007;148(4):1654–65.
25. Eghbali-Fatourehchi G, Khosla S, Sanyal A, Boyle WJ, Lacey DL, Riggs BL. Role of RANK ligand in mediating increased bone resorption in early postmenopausal women. *J Clin Invest* 2003;111(8):1221–30.
26. Kanako H, Taxel P, Lee K, Toyama Y, Aguila HI, Raisz LG, et al. Estradiol therapy inhibits in vitro osteoclastogenesis and RANKL expression in the bone marrow of postmenopausal women. *J Bone Miner Res* 2005;20(suppl 1).
27. Ammann P, Rizzoli R, Bonjour JP, Bourrin S, Meyer JM, Vassalli P, et al. Transgenic mice expressing soluble tumor necrosis factor-receptor are protected against bone loss caused by estrogen deficiency. *J Clin Invest* 1997;99(7):1699–703.
28. Kanamaru F, Iwai H, Ikeda T, Nakajima A, Ishikawa I, Azuma M. Expression of membrane-bound and soluble receptor activator of NF-kappaB ligand (RANKL) in human T cells. *Immunol Lett* 2004;94(3):239–46.
29. Kimble RB, Matayoshi AB, Vannice JL, Kung VT, Williams C, Pacifici R. Simultaneous block of interleukin-1 and tumor necrosis factor is required to completely prevent bone loss in the early postovariectomy period. *Endocrinology* 1995;136(7):3054–61.
30. Lorenzo JA, Naprta A, Rao Y, Alander C, Glaccum M, Widmer M, et al. Mice lacking the type I interleukin-1 receptor do not lose bone mass after ovariectomy. *Endocrinology* 1998;139(6):3022–5.
31. Kawaguchi H, Pilbeam CC, Vargas SJ, Morse EE, Lorenzo JA, Raisz LG. Ovariectomy enhances and estrogen replacement inhibits the activity of bone marrow factors that stimulate prostaglandin production in cultured mouse calvariae. *J Clin Invest* 1995;96(1):539–48.
32. Modder UI, Riggs BL, Spelsberg TC, Fraser DG, Atkinson EJ, Arnold R, et al. Dose-response of estrogen on bone versus the uterus in ovariectomized mice. *Eur J Endocrinol* 2004;151(4):503–10.
33. Prestwood KM, Kenny AM, Unson C, Kulldorff M. The effect of low dose micronized 17 β -estradiol on bone turnover, sex hormone levels, and side effects in older women: a randomized, double blind, placebo-controlled study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2000;85(12):4462–9.
34. Lips P. Vitamin D deficiency and secondary hyperparathyroidism in the elderly: consequences for bone loss and fractures and therapeutic implications. *Endocr Rev* 2001;22(4):477–501.
35. Bischoff-Ferrari HA, Dawson-Hughes B, Willett WC, Staehelin HB, Bazemore MG, Zee RY, et al. Effect of vitamin D on falls: a meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2004;291(16):1999–2006.
36. Bischoff-Ferrari HA, Giovannucci E, Willett WC, Dietrich T, Dawson-Hughes B. Estimation of optimal serum concentrations of 25-hydroxyvitamin D for multiple health outcomes. *Am J Clin Nutr* 2006;84(1):18–28.
37. Lips P, Courpron P, Meunier PJ. Mean wall thickness of trabecular bone packets in the human iliac crest: changes with age. *Calcif Tissue Res* 1978;26(1):13–7.
38. Riggs BL, Melton III LJ 3rd, Robb RA, Camp JJ, Atkinson EJ, Peterson JM, et al. Population-based study of age and sex differences in bone volumetric density, size, geometry, and structure at different skeletal sites. *J Bone Miner Res* 2004;19(12):1945–54.
39. Khosla S, Melton LJ 3rd, Atkinson EJ, O'Fallon WM. Relationship of serum sex steroid levels to longitudinal changes in bone density in young versus elderly men. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2001;86(8):3555–61.
40. Khosla S, Melton LJ 3rd, Robb RA, Camp JJ, Atkinson EJ, Oberg AL, et al. Relationship of volumetric BMD and structural parameters at different skeletal sites to sex steroid levels in men. *J Bone Miner Res* 2005;20(5):730–40.
41. Eriksen EF, Hodgson SF, Eastell R, Cedel SL, O'Fallon WM, Riggs BL. Cancellous bone remodeling in type I (postmenopausal) osteoporosis: quantitative assessment of rates of formation, resorption, and bone loss at tissue and cellular levels. *J Bone Miner Res* 1990;5(4):311–9.
42. Parfitt AM, Villanueva AR, Foldes J, Rao DS. Relations between histologic indices of bone formation: implications for the pathogenesis of spinal osteoporosis. *J Bone Miner Res* 1995;10(3):466–73.
43. Balooch G, Balooch M, Nalla RK, Schilling S, Filvaroff EH, Marshall GW, et al. TGF-beta regulates the mechanical properties and composition of bone matrix. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2005;102(52):18813–8.
44. Harada S, Nagy JA, Sullivan KA, Thomas KA, Endo N, Rodan GA, et al. Induction of vascular endothelial growth factor expression by prostaglandin E₂ and E₁ in osteoblasts. *J Clin Invest* 1994;93(6):2490–6.
45. Hurley MM, Okada Y, Xiao L, Tanaka Y, Ito M, Okimoto N, et al. Impaired bone anabolic response to parathyroid hormone in Fgf2^{-/-} and Fgf2^{+/-} mice. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 2006;341(4):989–94.
46. Pilbeam CC, Harrison JR, Raisz LG. Prostaglandins and bone metabolism. In: Bilezikian JP, Raisz LG, Rodan GA, editors. *Principles of bone biology*. San Diego: Academic Press; 2002. p. 979–94.
47. Rosen CJ. Insulin-like growth factor I and bone mineral density: experience from animal models and human observational studies. *Best Pract Res Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2004;18(3):423–35.
48. Rosen V. BMP and BMP inhibitors in bone. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2006;1068:19–25.
49. Horwitz MC, Lorenzo JA. IL-10, IL-4, the LIF/IL-6 family, and additional cytokines. In: Bilezikian JP, Raisz LG, Rodan GA, editors. *Principles of bone biology*. San Diego: Academic Press; 2002. p. 961–77.
50. Lau EM, Wong SY, Li M, Ma CH, Lim PL, Woo J. Osteoporosis and transforming growth factor-beta-1 gene polymorphism in Chinese men and women. *J Bone Miner Metab* 2004;22(2):148–52.
51. Styrkarsdottir U, Cazier JB, Kong A, Rolfsson O, Larsen H, Bjarnadottir E, et al. Linkage of osteoporosis to chromosome 20p12 and association to BMP2. *PLoS Biol* 2003;1(3):E69.
52. Krishnan V, Bryant HU, Macdougald OA. Regulation of bone mass by Wnt signaling. *J Clin Invest* 2006;116(5):1202–9.
53. Bodine PV, Billiard J, Moran RA, Ponce-de-Leon H, McLaren S, Mangina A, et al. The Wnt antagonist secreted frizzled-related protein-1 controls osteoblast and osteocyte apoptosis. *J Cell Biochem* 2005;96(6):1212–30.
54. Gardner JC, van Bezooijen RL, Mervis B, Hamdy NA, Lowik CW, Hamersma H, et al. Bone mineral density in sclerosteosis; affected individuals and gene carriers. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2005;90(12):6392–5.

55. Bollerslev J, Wilson SG, Dick IM, Islam FM, Ueland T, Palmer L, et al. LRP5 gene polymorphisms predict bone mass and incident fractures in elderly Australian women. *Bone* 2005;36(4):599–606.
56. Hartikka H, Makitie O, Mannikko M, Doria AS, Daneman A, Cole WG, et al. Heterozygous mutations in the LDL receptor-related protein 5 (LRP5) gene are associated with primary osteoporosis in children. *J Bone Miner Res* 2005;20(5):783–9.
57. Bellido T, Ali AA, Gubrij I, Plotkin LI, Fu Q, O'Brien CA, et al. Chronic elevation of parathyroid hormone in mice reduces expression of sclerostin by osteocytes: a novel mechanism for hormonal control of osteoblastogenesis. *Endocrinology* 2005;146(11):4577–83.
58. Keller H, Kneissel M. SOST is a target gene for PTH in bone. *Bone* 2005;37(2):148–58.
59. Koay MA, Woon PY, Zhang Y, Miles LJ, Duncan EL, Ralson SH, et al. Influence of LRP5 polymorphisms on normal variation in BMD. *J Bone Miner Res* 2004;19(10):1619–27.
60. Elefteriou F, Ahn JD, Takeda S, Starbuck M, Yang X, Liu X, et al. Leptin regulation of bone resorption by the sympathetic nervous system and CART. *Nature* 2005;434(7032):514–20.
61. Idris AI, van 't Hof RJ, Greig IR, Ridge SA, Baker D, Ross RA, et al. Regulation of bone mass, bone loss and osteoclast activity by cannabinoid receptors. *Nat Med* 2005;11(7):774–9.
62. Takeda S. Central control of bone remodeling. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* 2005;328(3):697–9.
63. Reid IR, Gamble GD, Grey AB, Black DM, Ensrud KE, Browner WS, et al. beta-Blocker use, BMD, and fractures in the study of osteoporotic fractures. *J Bone Miner Res* 2005;20(4):613–8.
64. Kanis JA, Borgstrom F, De Laet C, Johansson H, Johnell O, Jonsson B, et al. Assessment of fracture risk. *Osteoporos Int* 2005;16(6):581–9.
65. Leeming DJ, Alexandersen P, Karsdal MA, Qvist P, Schaller S, Tanko LB. An update on biomarkers of bone turnover and their utility in biomedical research and clinical practice. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 2006;62(10):781–92.
66. Seibel MJ. Biochemical markers of bone turnover. Part I. Biochemistry and variability. *Clin Biochem Rev* 2005;26(4):97–122.
67. Benito M, Gomberg B, Wehrli FW, Weening RH, Zemel B, Wright AC, et al. Deterioration of trabecular architecture in hypogonadal men. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2003;88(4):1497–502.
68. Carballido-Gamio J, Majumdar S. Clinical utility of microarchitecture measurements of trabecular bone. *Curr Osteoporos Rep* 2006;4(2):64–70.
69. Raisz LG. Clinical practice: screening for osteoporosis. *N Engl J Med* 2005;353(2):164–71.
70. Udell JA, Fischer MA, Brookhart MA, Solomon DH, Choudhry NK. Effect of the Women's Health Initiative on osteoporosis therapy and expenditure in Medicaid. *J Bone Miner Res* 2006;21(5):765–71.
71. Cranney A, Guyatt G, Griffith L, Wells G, Tugwell P, Rosen C. Meta-analyses of therapies for postmenopausal osteoporosis. IX. Summary of meta-analyses of therapies for postmenopausal osteoporosis. *Endocr Rev* 2002;23(4):570–8.
72. Hauselmann HJ, Rizzoli R. A comprehensive review of treatments for postmenopausal osteoporosis. *Osteoporos Int* 2003;14(1):2–12.
73. Black DM, Boonen S, Cauley J, Delman P, Eastell R, Reid I, et al. Effect of once-yearly infusion of zoledronic acid 5 mg on spine and hip fracture reduction in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis: the horizon pivotal fracture trial. *J Bone Miner Res* 2006;21(suppl 1):S16.
74. Ott SM. Long-term safety of bisphosphonates. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2005;90(3):1897–9.
75. Ettinger B, Ensrud KE, Wallace R, Johnson KC, Cummings SR, Yankov V, et al. Effects of ultralow-dose transdermal estradiol on bone mineral density: a randomized clinical trial. *Obstet Gynecol* 2004;104(3):443–51.
76. Prestwood KM, Kenny AM, Kleppinger A, Kulldorff M. Ultralow-dose micronized 17beta-estradiol and bone density and bone metabolism in older women: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2003;290(8):1042–8.
77. Cummings SR, Chapurlat RD. What PROOF proves about calcitonin and clinical trials. *Am J Med* 2000;109(4):330–1.
78. Rodan GA, Martin TJ. Therapeutic approaches to bone diseases. *Science* 2000;289(5484):1508–14.
79. McClung MR, Lewiecki EM, Cohen SB, Bolognese MA, Woodson GC, Moffett AH, et al. Denosumab in postmenopausal women with low bone mineral density. *N Engl J Med* 2006;354(8):821–31.
80. Kim MK, Kim HD, Park JH, Lim JI, Yang JS, Kwak WY, et al. An orally active cathepsin K inhibitor, furan-2-carboxylic acid, 1-[1-[4-fluoro-2-(2-oxo-pyrrolidin-1-yl)-phenyl]-3-oxo-piperidin-4-ylcarbamoyl]-cyclohexyl)-amide (OST-4077), inhibits osteoclast activity in vitro and bone loss in ovariectomized rats. *J Pharmacol Exp Ther* 2006;318(2):555–62.
81. Murphy MG, Cerchio K, Stoch SA, Gottesdiener K, Wu M, Recker R. Effect of L-000845704, an alphaVbeta3 integrin antagonist, on markers of bone turnover and bone mineral density in postmenopausal osteoporotic women. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2005;90(4):2022–8.
82. Schaller S, Henriksen K, Sveigaard C, Heegaard AM, Helix N, Stahlhut M, et al. The chloride channel inhibitor NS3736 [corrected] prevents bone resorption in ovariectomized rats without changing bone formation. *J Bone Miner Res* 2004;19(7):1144–53.
83. Lindsay R, Nieves J, Formica C, Henneman E, Woelfert L, Shen V, et al. Randomised controlled study of effect of parathyroid hormone on vertebral-bone mass and fracture incidence among postmenopausal women on oestrogen with osteoporosis. *Lancet* 1997;350(9077):550–5.
84. Neer RM, Arnaud CD, Zanchetta JR, Prince R, Gaich GA, Reginster JY, et al. Effect of parathyroid hormone (1–34) on fractures and bone mineral density in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. *N Engl J Med* 2001;344(19):1434–41.
85. Ma YL, Zeng Q, Donley DW, Ste-Marie LG, Gallagher JC, Dalsky GP, et al. Teriparatide increases bone formation in modeling and remodeling osteons and enhances IGF-II immunoreactivity in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. *J Bone Miner Res* 2006;21(6):855–64.
86. Riggs BL, O'Fallon WM, Lane A, Hodgson SF, Wahner HW, Muhs J, et al. Clinical trial of fluoride therapy in postmenopausal osteoporotic women: extended observations and additional analysis. *J Bone Miner Res* 1994;9(2):265–75.
87. Ettinger B, San Martin J, Crans G, Pavo I. Differential effects of teriparatide on BMD after treatment with raloxifene or alendronate. *J Bone Miner Res* 2004;19(5):745–51.
88. Cosman F, Nieves J, Zion M, Woelfert L, Luckey M, Lindsay R. Daily and cyclic parathyroid hormone in women receiving alendronate. *N Engl J Med* 2005;353(6):566–75.
89. Matsumoto T, Shiraki M, Hagino H, Iinuma H, Nakamura T. Daily nasal spray of hPTH(1–34) for 3 months increases bone mass in osteoporotic subjects: a pilot study. *Osteoporos Int* 2006;17(10):1532–8.
90. Gowen M, Stroup GB, Dodds RA, James IE, Votta BJ, Smith BR, et al. Antagonizing the parathyroid calcium receptor stimulates parathyroid hormone secretion and bone formation in osteopenic rats. *J Clin Invest* 2000;105(11):1595–604.
91. Ke HZ, Crawford DT, Qi H, Simmons HA, Owen TA, Paralkar VM, et al. A nonprostanoid EP4 receptor selective prostaglandin E₂ agonist restores bone mass and strength in aged, ovariectomized rats. *J Bone Miner Res* 2006;21(4):565–75.
92. Paralkar VM, Borovecki F, Ke HZ, Cameron KO, Lefker B, Grasser WA, et al. An EP2 receptor-selective prostaglandin E₂

- agonist induces bone healing. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2003; 100(11):6736–40.
93. Meunier PJ, Roux C, Seeman E, Ortolani S, Badurski JE, Spector TD, et al. The effects of strontium ranelate on the risk of vertebral fracture in women with postmenopausal osteoporosis. *N Engl J Med* 2004;350(5):459–68.
94. Ominsky M, Stouch B, Doellgast G, Gong J, Cao J, Gao Y, et al. Administration of sclerostin monoclonal antibodies to female cynomolgus monkeys results in increased bone formation, bone mineral density and bone strength. *J Bone Miner Res* 2006; 21(suppl 1):S44.