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Concept
Osteoporosis is the most common bone metabolic disease. It is generally defined as "systemic skeletal disease characterized by decreased bone strength with consequent increase in bone fragility and susceptibility to fractures". The essential elements of this definition are low bone mass and microarchitectural alteration, which distinguish osteoporosis from other bone diseases. The alteration of the microarchitecture is characterized by the loss, thinning and lack of connection between the bony trabeculae, together with a series of factors, such as alterations in the bone remodeling and the bone geometry itself, among others that have been grouped under the concept of bone quality. On the whole, osteoporosis involves a deterioration of the structural integrity of the bone which favors skeletal fragility and causes increased risk of fractures (fx).

The World Health Organization (WHO) established an operational definition based on bone mineral density (BMD) determination in any skeletal region for white women. Thus, normal BMD values were established to those higher than -1 standard deviation (SD) in relation to the mean of young adults. Normal BMD values were established to those higher than -1 standard deviation (SD) in relation to the mean of young adults.

Normal (T-score > of -1); osteopenia BMD values between -1 and -2.5 SD (T-score between -1 and -2.5); osteoporosis BMD values lower than -2.5 SD (T-score below -2.5) and established osteoporosis when, together with the previous conditions, one or more osteoporotic fx is associated.

It is important to consider that the WHO criteria should be used preferably to ascertain the epidemiology of osteoporosis and not to apply them in isolation or to indicate preventive and therapeutic measures. Although not perfect, the definition of osteoporosis according to BMD is valid, since there is a strong association between BMD and fracture risk. Prospective studies show that the decrease of a SD in BMD increases the risk of fracture between 50 and 160% (relative risk: 1.5-2.6).

Pathophysiology
Throughout life, bone tissue is being formed and destroyed continuously, a process known as bone remodeling, which occurs in the so-called remodeling units. Among the functions of bone remodeling are replacing old bone with new, and therefore more resistant, and participating in bone mineral homeostasis.

Osteoporosis is the result of an alteration in bone remodeling that is always due to an imbalance between the formation and bone resorption, with predominance of the latter, which leads to both the loss of bone mass and the development of microstructural alterations that we have called bone quality.

Bone remodeling is a complex process involving mechanical and humoral factors (hormones: PTH, calcitonin, vitamin D, sex hormones, estrogen, androgens, thyroid hormones, growth hormone and corticosteroids), as well as local factors (IL-1, IL-6, TNF, M-CSF, RANKL, TGF, OPG, IGFs... etc.) and bone cells: osteoblasts, osteoclasts and osteocytes. Alterations in bone remodeling can lead to a negative balance of bone that will produce bone loss and the development of osteoporosis.

Bone remodeling is a complex process involving mechanical and humoral factors (hormones: PTH, calcitonin, vitamin D, sex hormones, estrogen, androgens, thyroid hormones, growth hormone and corticosteroids), as well as local factors (IL-1, IL-6, TNF, M-CSF, RANKL, TGF, OPG, IGFs... etc.) and bone cells: osteoblasts, osteoclasts and osteocytes. Alterations in bone remodeling can lead to a negative balance of bone that will produce bone loss and the development of osteoporosis.

The relationship between osteoblasts and osteoclasts is established by two different molecular systems that, however, contribute to the same final effect. One of them is the M-CSF growth factor, for which the osteoclasts have the c-FSM receptor. M-CSF is soluble, and therefore secreted by osteoclasts or their precursors and has an osteoclast-stimulating effect.

The other is the RANK-RANKL-OPG system, mentioned above. RANK (receptor for activation of nuclear factor κ B [NFκB]) is a receptor of the TNFR family present in osteoclasts, to which the RANKL (or ligand of RANK, of the TNF family) present in the membrane of osteoblast/medullary stroma cells. As a consequence of this union, the proliferation and activity of the osteoclasts increases, while their apoptosis decreases. OPG (osteoprotegerin) is a decoy receptor that competes with RANKL for the RANK receptor, thereby inhibiting osteoclast differentiation and function. OPG expression is increased in response to estrogen deprivation and is believed to be involved in the prevention of bone loss in postmenopausal women.
protegerin) is produced in the osteoblast, also a member of the TNFR family. Its ligand is RANKL itself, so it can be said that it stands between it and the RANK, thus preventing its contact. Therefore, the osteoblast produces both the activator of the osteoclasts and a substance that neutralizes this activator. Bone quality includes a group of factors other than bone mass, which also determine bone fragility. These include structural aspects of the bone (such as the size and angle of the femoral neck) and microscopic or microstructural aspects (such as the connection between the trabeculae and the thickness thereof, as well as the mineralization of the bone, the microscopic damage that could have, the quality of collagen and osteocytes)11.

Clinical aspects: Fractures
Osteoporosis is a very common disease that affects 150-200 million people in the world. Approximately half of these patients belong to developed countries such as North America, Europe and Japan. In general, it is estimated that around 33% of women 50 and older will suffer from osteoporosis.

The prevalence of osteoporosis increases with age. In women between 20-44 years, the prevalence of the disease is only 0.3% while among women 70-80 years of age, the prevalence is 40%. In men, the prevalence figures are lower. Among women aged 70-80 years, only 11.3% had densitometric osteoporosis values in the lumbar spine and 2.6% in the proximal extremity of the femur12.

As a disease, osteoporosis is asymptomatic, with fx and its complications being the only clinical manifestations of the disease13. The fx of the proximal extremity of the femur, vertebrae, humerus, ribs and distal extremity of the radius or fx of Colles are considered to be typically osteoporotic14, although any fx can be produced with the exception of skull fractures.

Clinically, peripheral fx is the same as fx of the same non-osteoporotic location15,16. What distinguishes them, fundamentally, is the fact that osteoporotic fx occurs in the face of minor trauma (typically, simple fall from the standing position). For the rest, the patient also presents pain, functional limitation and deformity.

Epidemiology of fragility fractures
The fx constitute the clinical complication of osteoporosis. The risk of suffering a fx from 50 years on ranges in women between 39-53%, and between 13-22% in men, depending on the country under study.

The vertebral fx are the most common in patients with osteoporosis17. It is estimated that around 25 percent of women over 50 years of age will suffer one or more vertebral osteoporotic fx. The risk of vertebral fx for men is around 5.4%. Its prevalence in Spain is estimated between 17% and 23% in women over 50 years of age and somewhat less in men of the same age18. These fx can be asymptomatic, then being diagnosed accidentally when a chest x-ray is done, or also produce pain or other complications. Some of these patients develop, after the initial episode, chronic pain that worsens with prolonged standing and improves with decubitus. In addition, the vertebral fx cause a reduction in height and an alteration of the static of the spine, with kyphosis, shortening of the trunk and rectification of the lumbar lordosis, depending on the location of the fractured vertebra.

The most severe osteoporotic fx is hip fx, which in most cases occurs after a fall. The global incidence of hip fx due to osteoporosis increases with age and it is estimated that its incidence is around 2/100,000 in people under 35 years and 3,000/100,000 in people over 85 years. This translates into approximately 40,000 hip fx a year due to osteoporosis15.

The hip fx is a process that affects more women than men, the ratio between women and men is very variable in the different published series, ranging between 2 and 3.

The mortality after a hip fx is appreciable. The figures differ according to the populations studied, but range between 12% and 40% in the first year. Its incidence in Spain is estimated at around 220 cases per 100,000 inhabitants/year, although with regional variations16. The hip fx has repercussions that are immediate after the fx itself, such as surgery in 80% of cases and, in general, a long hospital stay. However, the repercussions of a hip fx are not limited to its hospital treatment, but the patients’ quality of life deteriorates considerably. Thus, most have residual disability and a percentage of cases lose the ability to lead an independent life. Only one fifth of the patients who walked without help before the fx did so six months later. The prognosis depends, in part, on the functional capacity prior to fx.

Colles’ Fx is very common, and up to 15% of women can present it during their lifetime. They present a different pattern of incidence compared with vertebral and hip fx. They predominate in the female sex in a proportion of 4:1, occurring 85% in women.

Although this fx is the least deteriorating of all osteoporotic fx, its morbidity is often underestimated. In the ECOSAP study conducted in our country17, it was observed in an outpatient population of 5,195 women over 65 years of age that the forearm fracture was 33.7% of all the fx. Colles’ fx can cause persistent pain, functional disability, neuropathy and post-traumatic arthritis, as well as being a significant risk factor for the future presentation of vertebral or hip fx.

Finally, the psychological and social impact that osteoporotic fx can engender must be taken into account. The development of depression, anxiety, fear of new fractures, and other emotional reactions are also important, and influence the recovery of patients.

To sum up, since osteoporosis is a disease closely linked to age, the demographic aging of Western countries suggests the problem will multiply. There seems to be an increase related to fac-
tors inherent in the changes in our standard of living. The incidence of fx will also increase in other areas of the planet, such as in Asia, where a large increase is expected in the 21st century.
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Self-assessment test

1. Which of the following statements is not true?
   a. RANK is a receptor present in osteoclasts
   b. The binding of RANK and RANKL (RANK ligand) is inhibited by OPG
   c. The osteocyte regulates the synthesis of RANKL
   d. All the above is true

2. Which of the osteoporotic fractures (fx) is the most frequent in clinical practice?
   a. Vertebral fx
   b. Fx of the upper third of the humerus
   c. Fx of the distal extremity radio
   d. Hip fx

3. Which of the following statements is not true?
   a. The prevalence of osteoporosis increases with age
   b. The vertebral fracture can be asymptomatic
   c. Mortality after a hip fx is less than 10%
   d. Everything is true

Answer key on page 24
Osteoporosis and Primary Care. How to assess the risk of fracture. Use of risk scales
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Introduction
Osteoporosis is a metabolic bone disease characterized by a low bone mass and a deterioration of the microstructure of the bone tissue that leads to an increase in bone fragility and consequently to an increased risk of fracture1. Its real incidence is difficult to calculate since it is a silent process until the appearance of the fracture. It is one of the most prevalent osteo-articular diseases in primary care consultations. Since in 1994 the World Health Organization defined the densitometric values of osteoporosis which have been widely used to identify the population susceptible to suffering a fragility fracture2. Currently, population screening strategies3 are not recommended to identify patients with osteoporosis. Rather, a precautionary search is suggested in those subjects with a high risk of fracture4. In addition, in recent years the role of the exclusive assessment of bone mass to estimate the risk of fracture in patients has been questioned. Identifying these patients at risk to direct the necessary diagnostic and therapeutic options is one of our most difficult and controversial tasks.

Risk factors for fracture
One of the first steps is to ascertain the risk factors associated with the appearance of fractures. Classically they are divided into:

- Older: those who present a relative risk twice or more higher than the population without risk factor. We can distinguish:
  1. Age >65 years. With age, the risk of fractures increases, independently of other risk factors. For every decade the risk of fracture is multiplied by 1.5-2 times.
  2. Personal history of fragility fracture.
  3. Family history of hip fracture, particularly in the parents.
  4. Body mass index lower than 19 Kg/m² or if there is a weight loss greater than 10% of adult weight.
  5. Use of oral glucocorticoids (dose of 5 mg or more of prednisone, or equivalent, for three or more months).
  6. Untreated primary ovarian failure or hypogonadism in man.
  7. Frequent falls (two or more falls per year).
  8. Other diseases such as hyperparathyroidism, eating disorders, chronic malnutrition and malabsorption disorders.
- Minors: those who present a relative risk between one and two times higher than the population without the risk factor. Among them are:
  1. Female sex.
  2. Smoking.
  3. Alcohol consumption of 3 or more basic units per day is associated with an increased risk of fracture.
  4. Early menopause (before age 40).
  5. Rheumatoid arthritis.
  6. Type 1 diabetes is associated with a decrease in bone mass and an increased risk of fractures of any location.
  7. Hyperthyroidism not corrected

In addition to these classic factors, the list of diseases (chronic liver disease, chronic renal failure, hypertension, diabetes mellitus type 2, etc.) and drugs (aromatase inhibitors, proton pump inhibitors and anticonvulsants, among others) associated with an increased in osteoporotic fracture risk has increased in recent years.
Assessment of fracture risk

Different primary care studies emphasize that in a high percentage of clinical records the risk factors are not correctly recorded, and when they are recorded they are not taken into account when requesting a densitometry.

We can assess the risk through a qualitative assessment (based on the number of risk factors present) or quantitative (through the use of fracture risk scales).

The 2010 National Health System guide recommends a qualitative assessment and, in the case of two or more major risk factors, carry out a study of bone mass.

Different national and international clinical practice guidelines consider that the presence of a previous vertebral or hip fracture, or the presence of two or more fractures from other locations, are indicators of a high risk of fracture and, consequently, they are patients that must be treated.

In case of choosing to make a quantitative assessment, we have different scales: Index Fracture, Garvan and FRAX.

In a survey of primary care physicians in the Canary Islands, more than 75% of the physicians surveyed answered a qualitative assessment, based on the presence of risk factors, while 28.6% used risk scales regularly.

Use of risk scales

FRAX is the most applicable scale. It allows us to estimate the absolute risk of fracture at 10 years through a quick and simple assessment of a few risk factors. Allows calculation with or without value of bone mass. One of the main drawbacks is that many variables are dichotomous, so that it does not consider, for example, the total number and location of previous fractures or the total cumulative dose of corticosteroids. Studies conducted in cohorts of Spanish patients observe that the FRAX tool underestimates the risk of fractures, especially for major fractures.

Two calibrations of the FRAX tool have been published for the Spanish population (Figure 1). The first of these proposes as low risk a risk of published for the Spanish population (Figure 1). The predictive capacity of both cut points was intermediate risk requires further studies.

The 2010 National Health System guide recommends a qualitative assessment and, in the case of two or more major risk factors, carry out a study of bone mass.

Different national and international clinical practice guidelines consider that the presence of a previous vertebral or hip fracture, or the presence of two or more fractures from other locations, are indicators of a high risk of fracture and, consequently, they are patients that must be treated.

In case of choosing to make a quantitative assessment, we have different scales: Index Fracture, Garvan and FRAX.

In a survey of primary care physicians in the Canary Islands, more than 75% of the physicians surveyed answered a qualitative assessment, based on the presence of risk factors, while 28.6% used risk scales regularly.

Use of risk scales

FRAX is the most applicable scale. It allows us to estimate the absolute risk of fracture at 10 years through a quick and simple assessment of a few risk factors. Allows calculation with or without value of bone mass. One of the main drawbacks is that many variables are dichotomous, so that it does not consider, for example, the total number and location of previous fractures or the total cumulative dose of corticosteroids. Studies conducted in cohorts of Spanish patients observe that the FRAX tool underestimates the risk of fractures, especially for major fractures.

Two calibrations of the FRAX tool have been published for the Spanish population (Figure 1). The first of these proposes as low risk a risk of major fractures of less than 3.6% and as a high risk >10%. The threshold sensitivity of 3.6% for diagnosing osteoporosis was 51%, the specificity 68%, the positive predictive value 20% and the negative predictive value 90%. The other calibration comes from the FRIDEX cohort. This considers a risk of major fractures lower than 5% and high risk if >7.5% at risk. For these cut-off points the sensitivity is 40.8%, the specificity 92.3%, the positive predictive value is 25.3% and the negative predictive value is 96%. Its discriminative capacity is similar to the exclusive assessment of the value of the bone mass, especially for femur fracture.

These cut-offs have been validated in an external cohort, although the low number of fractures observed and the fact that no data are available on what happens in patients at intermediate risk requires further studies.

Recent work done in 361 patients found that the predictive capacity of both cut points was similar to the qualitative assessment (presence of 2 or more major risk factors), with better values observed for the cutoff point >3.5% for the cut-off point ≥5%, when identifying high-risk patients against whom to request densitometry.

Although at international level different clinical practice guidelines recommend the assessment of fracture risk using FRAX, at the national level there are few clinical practice guidelines that recommend its use when deciding which patients to direct diagnostic and therapeutic strategies, being the usual the non-recommendation of the Spanish version of FRAX.

The Garvan scale only considers a low number of variables (age, sex, weight, number of previous fractures, number of previous falls and bone mineral density optionally). It has been validated for a sample of 121 Spanish patients; a cut-off point >18.5% had a sensitivity and specificity of 67%. Further studies are needed to corroborate the predictive capacity of this cut-off point for the Spanish population.

QFracture is a scale based on the database of primary care physicians in the United Kingdom. For its calculation, 25 variables are necessary, among them the previous falls (very important predictor of fractures) and new emerging risk factors. There is no published work that validates this scale for the Spanish population.

Conclusion

Osteoporosis is therefore a reason for consultation that is highly prevalent in primary care. Identification and assessment are required in those patients that present a high risk of fracture based on the presence of risk factors. Although we have different scales that provide information on the absolute risk of fractures, it is not advisable to use them for the Spanish population due to the limitations mentioned above. It would perhaps be more interesting to have a scale that would allow estimating the absolute risk for the Spanish population.
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Figure 1. Calibración de la escala FRAX® para la población española

**Spanish calibration of FRAX®, adapted from Gómez-Vaquero**

- **CALCULATION OF FRAX® WITHOUT BMD**
  - **HIGH:** FRAX >10%
  - **TREAT**
  - **MODERATE:** FRAX 3.6-10%
  - **Do DEXA and re-calculate**
  - **LOW:** FRAX ≤3.5%
  - **Measurements hygienic-dietetics**

**Spanish calibration of FRAX®, adapted from Azagra**

- **CALCULATION OF FRAX® WITHOUT BMD**
  - **HIGH:** FRAX >7.5%
  - **TREAT**
  - **MODERATE:** FRAX 5-7.5%
  - **Do DEXA and re-calculate**
  - **LOW:** FRAX <5%
  - **Measurements hygienic-dietetics**

---


SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST

1. Which of these is not considered a major risk factor for fracture?
   a. Age 70 years
   b. BMI 20.5 Kg/m²
   c. Femoral fracture in father
   d. Previous vertebral fracture

2. Which of these scales allows the estimation of the risk of fracture of the femur at 5 years?
   a. FRAX®
   b. QFracture
   c. Garvan
   d. B and C

3. According to the Spanish calibration of FRAX® of Azagra, indicate the correct one:
   a. A risk of major fracture without BMD of 3% recommends performing densitometry
   b. A risk of major fracture without BMD of 10% recommends assessing treatment
   c. A risk of major fracture without BMD of 6% recommends assessing treatment
   d. A risk of major fracture with BMD of 5% recommended treatment

Answer key on page 24
Clinical practice guidelines concerning osteoporosis

Introduction
Clinical practice guidelines (CPG) are a useful tool in medical practice, because they help guide the doctor in making decisions regarding a certain disease, based on a series of recommendations from the most up-to-date evidence available, combined with the consensus opinion of a group of experts on the subject.

CPGs not only provide knowledge and recommendations to the clinician in managing a specific ailment, but are also useful for the sustainability of health services, as costs soar in an increasingly aging and more technologically advanced society.

With CPG, heterogeneity in clinical practice is reduced, maintaining the balance between scientific evidence, economic efficiency and competent variability of the medical professional.

This is especially important in the case of osteoporosis. Patients often require multidisciplinary care, participating in different levels of care, so that it is necessary to try to achieve maximum homogeneity in the management of patients.

Despite being governed by a series of statements or recommendations, the CPGs do not have to limit the doctor’s autonomy, as they are usually not binding. That is, they may not be followed in certain cases, if the patient’s specific characteristics or conditions advise another action guideline. In other words, the CPG will not replace the clinical judgment of the doctor who treats the patient.

In short, CPGs aim to maintain the quality of care through the adequate use of available resources, avoiding clinical decisions that are not scientifically based and reducing the variability of the practice.

How are clinical practice guidelines developed?
A CPG is carried out in several stages:

1. Justification, scope and objectives. A document of the scope and objectives of the guide should be drafted. It must be clearly structured and

2. Composition of the CPG working group. To prepare a guide, a multidisciplinary working group is required, with the participation of all those involved in the process: clinical and methodological coordinators, members of the technical or methodological team, health and non-health professionals, expert collaborators and external reviewers. All personnel must make a declaration of possible conflicts of interest.

3. Formulation of clinical questions. A list of clinical questions that will be answered with scientific evidence should be made. The questions will be formulated whenever possible in a structured format (PICO: patient, intervention, comparator, outcome).

4. Search and selection of evidence. A CPG implies carrying out systematic and exhaustive searches, mainly by searching the large bibliographic databases, such as PubMed/MEDLINE, EMBASE, Web of Science, Scopus, Psycinfo or CINAHL.

5. Evaluation and synthesis of the evidence. Although the quality of the evidence is a continuous spectrum, GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation), proposes a simple and explicit classification in four grades: high, moderate, low and very low. The quality of the evidence is determined based on 4 factors: methodological quality, coherence, relevance of the study and sufficiency of the data.

6. Formulation of recommendations. The drafting of a recommendation must be concise, clear (avoiding ambiguities) and easy to transfer to clinical practice. The recommended actions must be established with precision and the strength of the recommendation must be reflected by labels, numbers, letters and symbols. The Scottish...
Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN) system is still widely used to establish grades of recommendation (Table 1)³.

7. **External review and public exposure.** The validation of the CPG by agents who have not participated in its preparation is essential to ensure greater quality, trust and acceptance. External review and public exposure are two processes of external validation that complement each other.

8. **Edition of the CPG.** CPGs can have different versions and formats depending on the use that they want to give and the users to whom they are addressed: clinicians, managers or patients. In the CPG Program of the National Health System, the following versions are proposed: complete CPG, brief guide, information for patients/citizens, methodological material and digital support.

9. **Updating the CPG.** To be useful for the decision making of health professionals and citizens, the CPG must be kept up-to-date, and it is recommended that this update be done every 2 or 3 years.

**What are the main CPGs on osteoporosis?**

CPGs on osteoporosis usually make recommendations for the diagnosis or identification of patients with high risk of fracture and for treatment. In the diagnosis section, the importance of clinical fracture risk factors, including bone mineral density values, is usually reviewed. In the treatment section, CPGs usually review the evidence of each drug in both primary and secondary fracture prevention.

The IOF (International Osteoporosis Foundation) collects on its website a list of the majority of CPGs on European osteoporosis (https://www.iofbonehealth.org/europe-guidelines) and other countries of the world.

In Spain there are several CPGs on osteoporosis at the national level, some of which are multi-disciplinary, such as that of the SEIOMM (Spanish Society of Bone Research and Mineral Metabolism), and others more focused on a specific medical group, such as family medicine, internal medicine, rheumatology, endocrinology, gynecology, traumatology and geriatrics, etc...

Although each guide has its own distinctiveness, there are a series of recommendations that are repeated in all the guides and practically year after year, because some aspects of both osteoporosis diagnosis and treatment do not vary among countries or geographical areas. They change with the years.

**Alendronate treatment in the CPGs**

The SEIOMM's most recent CPG on osteoporosis was published in 2014 (with an update in 2015)⁴. This guide highlights the importance of age, sex, bone mineral density (BMD) and the personal history of fracture as the main risk factors for fracture, exactly the same risk factors of the 2003 SEIOMM CPG⁵. In the therapeutic recommendations section, there have been new developments, with the incorporation of new treatments and the disappearance of some others no longer on the market. However, the treatment of first choice in patients with osteoporosis is still alendronate.

In the 2003 guide, alendronate and risedronate were the only first-line treatments that were repeated in all patients (with and without fractures, over and under 70 years), on the basis that, as set out in that guideline, "alendronate has a positive effect on lumbar and femoral BMD, and decreases the risk of vertebral, non-vertebral and femur fracture (level of evidence 1a)". More than 10 years later, the GSE of SEIOMM continues to position oral bisphosphonates (specifically alendronate and risedronate) as first-line treatments. In this guide, it is said that "alendronate at a dose of 70 mg/week reduces vertebral fractures, non-vertebral fractures.

---

**Table 1. Degrees of recommendation according to the SIGN system**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degrees of recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>At least one meta-analysis, systematic review or clinical trial classified as 1++ and directly applicable to the target population of the guideline; or a volume of scientific evidence composed of studies classified as 1+ and with great consistency among them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>A volume of scientific evidence composed of studies classified as 2++, directly applicable to the target population of the guide and showing great consistency between them; or scientific evidence extrapolated from studies classified as 1++ or 1+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>A volume of evidence composed of studies classified as 2+, directly applicable to the target population of the guide and showing great consistency between them; or scientific evidence extrapolated from studies classified as 2++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Scientific evidence level 3 or 4; or scientific evidence extrapolated from classified studies as 2+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>✓</td>
<td>Good clinical practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommended practice, based on clinical experience and consensus of the group of experts</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and hip fractures at around 45, 25-30 and 45-55%, respectively (evidence 1a)\(^6\) (Figure 1).

Another guide of interesting national scope is the CPG on osteoporosis and prevention of fragility fractures in the SNS of the Ministry of Health\(^6\). In this guide, the effectiveness of alendronate in primary prevention of vertebral and secondary fracture of all fractures (vertebral, non-vertebral, hip and wrist) is highlighted from a meta-analysis\(^7\).

Finally, there are two additional advantages to the efficacy of alendronate that are also repeated in the guidelines: safety and cost-effectiveness. Although some patients report gastrointestinal symptoms, alendronate is usually well tolerated. It is also the most economical osteoporosis treatment. According to a recent NICE publication (https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/TA464/chapter/1-Recommendations), alendronate is cost-effective in any male or female with any risk factor for osteoporosis or of fracture and that present a FRAX value for main fracture >1%. In this regard, it should be noted that a cost-utility study carried out in Spain showed that the prevention of hip fracture with alendronate in osteoporotic women over 64 years is cost-effective in the long term (20 years), and particularly profitable in the 75-79-year age group\(^8\).
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**Figure 1. Treatment algorithm according to the 2014 SEIOMM GPC**

- **Patient prescribed antiosteoporosis drug treatment**
  - Risk of high vertebral fracture (equivalent to two or more vertebral fractures)
  - Start with PTH 1-34 (at 24 m antiresorptive)
    - Alternative: standard
    - ALN/RIS
    - 2nd choice

- **Standard treatment**
  - Less risk of fracture hip
    - < 65-70 años
    - BMD in CF > -2.5 T
    - No fractures

- **Restrictive factors for orally**
  - Digestive problems DP
  - Polypharmacy
  - Comorbidity
  - Old age
  - Greater risk of fracture of hip (e.g. >75 years)

- **Alternative: standard**
  - SERM

- **Preference No day hospital**
  - No^1^ day hospital

- **2nd choice**
  - ZOLE/Dmab
  - 1bandronate, RE, SERM

| DP | problems: problems in the digest device; RF: renal failure (see indication according to glomerular filtering in the text) |


SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST

1. How should the drafting of each of the recommendations of a CPG be?
   a. As long as you can follow the PICO format
   b. From 3 to 5 lines
   c. Concise, clear and easy to transfer to clinical practice
   d. A and C are correct

2. A recommendation that includes a meta-analysis or a systematic review corresponds to a grade of recommendation
   a. A
   b. B
   c. C
   d. D

3. Which of the following attributes according to the GPC is false with respect to alendronate
   a. It's economic
   b. It is well tolerated
   c. It is effective in both primary and secondary prevention of vertebral fracture
   d. It is a useful cost in the short and medium term, although not in the long term, in preventing hip fracture in women over 64 years of age
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Introduction
Fracture fractures are the only clinical complication of osteoporosis1-3. Therefore, treatment should be aimed at preventing the appearance of fractures, since they are associated with an increase in morbidity and mortality4,5. In this sense, the presence of fragility fractures is a cause for alarm and treatment needs to be established as early as possible. It is wrong to think that when we treat a fractured patient we have arrived late and that it is not cost-beneficial to start treatment, because, on the one hand, having suffered a fragility fracture is a risk factor for a new fracture and on the other hand, the establishment of treatment for osteoporosis not only reduces the risk of new fractures, but also decreases the mortality of patients who have suffered them5-8.

The osteoporosis treatment pyramid
Figure 1 shows the “osteoporosis treatment pyramid”7. Treatment should commence by indicating a series of general non-pharmacological measures, summarized in table 1. These measures have been shown to be effective in reducing the risk of the appearance of fragility fractures8-9. From the moment osteoporosis is diagnosed, patients who smoke should be advised to stop smoking, and all those who carry out load-bearing physical exercise, according to their physical state (walking being the simplest and the first that should indicate), recommending to do it for 1 hour a day, which can be fractioned8-10. Patients who have appropriate physical condition can dance or practice activities in a gym, such as Tai-Chi11 or Pilates12 if they choose. Weight-lifting exercises should be avoided, especially those involving flexion of the spine due to the risk of vertebral fracture.

Patients are instructed to maintain a balanced, healthy diet, which must include dairy products12. Depending on weight and lipid metabolism, dairy products can be taken in skim or whole form, since the amount of calcium is the same, differing only in levels of fat. It is a mistake to restrict or eliminate dairy products from the diet, as it leads to the development of a negative balance in calcium metabolism and the production of secondary hyperparathyroidism, which worsens osteoporosis12. Before starting treatment with osteoporosis drugs, it is advisable that patients visit their dentist to check their mouth and resolve any pathology that may require further surgical manipulation: extractions, de-vitalizations, implants, etc. Thus, one of the most important risk factors in the appearance of maxillary osteonecrosis (ONJ), may be eliminated13-14.

Most fragility fractures occur as a result of a fall and, therefore, it is advisable at the time of gaining clinical history data, to ascertain whether patients are suffering from repeated falls and to find out the possible causes5, to act on them as much as possible...
possible. In this sense it should be taken into account that most of the falls are usually produced inside the house and, in it, in the bathroom. Polypharmacy, so prevalent among the elderly, must also be monitored and, on occasion, it can condition an increased risk of falls\textsuperscript{16}.

Is it necessary to administer calcium and vitamin D?\textsuperscript{17}

Yes, for several reasons. First and foremost, because all the reference studies conducted to establish the risk reduction of fragility fractures have been carried out by administering a supplement of calcium and vitamin D\textsuperscript{7} to the patients. If we want to obtain the same results for which the drug was approved for use in patients, we should, if possible, try to reproduce the same clinical conditions as in the study. Second, most patients with osteoporosis and fragility fractures have hypovitaminosis D and do not ingest the recommended amounts of calcium by consensus\textsuperscript{17}. Finally, although controversial, calcium and vitamin D supplementation may have a certain beneficial effect in reducing the risk of new fractures, especially in the hip and in patients with previous hypovitaminosis\textsuperscript{14-17}. without forgetting that vitamin D supplements have been shown to be effective in reducing the risk of falls\textsuperscript{15,16}. For all these reasons, it is advisable to administer 1,000 IU/day of vitamin D\textsubscript{3} and 600 mg/day of calcium to all patients under treatment for osteoporosis\textsuperscript{18-20}.

Which drug to choose? Are they all the same?\textsuperscript{17}

The drug should be chosen according to the circumstances of each patient, once we have made the complete clinical assessment and diagnosed osteoporosis\textsuperscript{1,7,21,22}. In principle, we should use a drug that reduces the risk of suffering any fracture: vertebral, non-vertebral and hip, but at this time in the vademecum of our country we have only 4 drugs that meet this requirement: alendronate, risedronate, zoledronate, and denosumab\textsuperscript{7,22}. Strontium ranelate has recently been withdrawn from the market as well as calcitonin and other bisphosphonates (etidronate, pamidronate and ibandronate), selective modulators of estrogen receptors (SERMs) and the two parathormones (teriparatide and intact PTH) which do not reduce the risk of fracture of the femur (Table 2).

Although it reduces the risk of all fragility fractures, zoledronate is administered iv and its use is reserved for the hospital setting, which is why it is considered a second-choice drug\textsuperscript{22}. Denosumab must also be administered by injection, subcutaneously, and is also considered a second-choice drug\textsuperscript{22,26}.

Teriparatide and, within SERMs, bazedoxifene are drugs to be taken into account in certain circumstances. Thus, if the patient presents vertebral fractures at the time of diagnosis or presents very low BMD levels, two-year treatment with teriparatide could begin, which is allowed by the health authorities\textsuperscript{26}. Once finished, another drug should be continued. It has been reported that after suspending teriparatide, the addition of a bisphosphonate prolonged the beneficial effect in reducing the risk of fracture\textsuperscript{29} although there is a certain residual effect\textsuperscript{28}.

Bazedoxifene can be used as an alternative to alendronate and risedronate, when these cannot be used for any reason\textsuperscript{7,22,26}, but its clinical spectrum is totally opposite to teriparatide, since it would be indicated in patients with a lower risk of hip fracture\textsuperscript{26}.

Denosumab is a potent antiresorptive that completely reduces fragility fracture risk\textsuperscript{30}. In all therapeutic guidelines, it is considered a second-line drug and alternative to alendronate and risedronate\textsuperscript{21,23,31,32}. On the one hand, it is to be administered parenterally every other year. On the other hand, at its price that almost triples the annual cost of alendronate\textsuperscript{27} and, finally, because several articles have recently been published that show that, if patients are not strictly compliant, or if the drug is discontinued, there may be a notable loss of previously obtained BMD and an alarming increase in the incidence of new vertebral fractures\textsuperscript{33,34}. This may already be observed 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Table 1. Risk factors to be taken into account in the treatment of osteoporosis and its possible solution</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Risk factor</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sedentary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption of alcohol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polypharmacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unbalanced diet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouth in poor condition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
months after suspending the drug, which in clinical practice is equivalent to forgetting a dose.
In a recent meta-analysis, it was concluded that the best initial treatment for postmenopausal osteoporosis, in terms of cost-effectiveness, is alendronate or zoledronate, both generic.

How long should treatment with a drug be maintained?
The so-called therapeutic holidays
Most studies conducted to assess the efficacy and safety of drugs used in the treatment of osteoporosis have been designed with a follow-up of 3 years. Exceptionally, five-year follow-ups have been carried out with calcitonin and strontium ranelate (remarkably, both drugs have been withdrawn from the pharmaceutical market because of their side effects). We have observational data after a few years follow-up of the cohorts of the original studies on alendronate and risendronate, and six-year data with zoledronate. The best long-term data collected are those obtained by the study conducted with denosumab, which lasted up to 10 years.
All of them have shown that the beneficial effect on the reduction of the risk of fracture is maintained during this time, and that in the case of some bisphosphonates there is a beneficial "residual" effect that is maintained even after the drug has been suspended, specifically for alendronate, risendronate and zoledronate.
In recent years, a current of opinion has developed which suggests that, in patients treated with bisphosphonates over a certain number of years, suspension should be considered to avoid two possible complications. These are osteonecrosis of the maxillary and atypical fractures or diaphyseal fractures. This conclusion has been shared and recommended by several major scientific societies, because in these patients, studying the clinical factors associated with the appearance of these complications, bisphosphonate use for more than five years could be one of the causes.
It is a controversial issue, with discrepancies.
We believe that the so-called therapeutic holidays, (simply suspending treatment), are indicated to patients who tolerate the drug well, which is being effective in reducing the risk of fracture and that has not produced any side effects and has forced its withdrawal. Bisphosphonate is suspended on a preventive basis in these patients before possible complications, which have not yet occurred. The risk of these complications is very low, clearly lower than the risk that patients have of suffering a fragility fracture for which the drug was indicated. Therefore, our opinion is that as long as the patient tolerate the treatment well and no reasons have been identified to suspend the drug due to side effects or intolerance, it should be continued as long as possible. In addition, as the years of treatment with the drug go by, the patient increases in age, which is one of the main risk factors for fragility fracture.

Conclusion
The treatment of osteoporosis should be directed mainly at the secondary prevention of fractures. The appearance of adverse effects related to drugs

Table 2. Degree of anti-fracture efficacy of drugs used in the treatment of osteoporosis (according to the recommendation grades of the Oxford Center for Evidence-Based Medicine)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Fracture vertebral</th>
<th>Fracture no vertebral</th>
<th>Hip fracture</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alendronate</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risedronate</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etidronate</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>It has no indication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibandronate</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoledronate</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denosumab</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raloxifene</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bazedoxifene</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teriparatide</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTH 1-84</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Abandoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcitonin</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strontium</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrogens</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>It has no indication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A: highest grade of recommendation, based on consistent randomized clinical trials.
B: second grade recommendation, based on cohort studies or consistent case studies and controls.
* In post hoc analysis of a subgroup of patients demonstrated anti-fracture efficacy.
for the osteoporosis treatment has made medical professionals re-evaluate the indications, the time of treatment and even withdraw the commercialization of some of them.

General non-pharmacological measures should be observed, the risk of falls assessed and calcium and vitamin D supplemented in all cases. In general, antiresorptive drugs (alendronate and risedronate) are considered the first choice. Zoledronate or denosumab are second-line drugs and will be indicated in cases of digestive intolerance, poor adherence or an increased risk of hip fracture. Teriparatide will be indicated in patients with 2 or more previous vertebral fractures or with very low bone density.
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**Self-Assessment Test**

1. One of the following drugs has recently been considered in a meta-analysis as of first choice, with the best cost-effectiveness balance. The correct answer is:
   - a. Alendronate
   - b. Ibandronate
   - c. Risedronate
   - d. Denosumab

2. One of the following measures is not part of the "base" of the osteoporosis treatment pyramid. The correct answer is:
   - a. Exercise adequate fitness
   - b. Follow a healthy balanced diet
   - c. Stop smoking
   - e. Administer calcium and vitamin D

3. One of these drugs does not reduce hip fracture risk:
   - a. Denosumab
   - b. Alendronate
   - c. Ibandronate
   - d. Risedronate

*Answer key on page 24*
Adherence as a problem in osteoporosis: Alendronate soluble as a solution

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4321/S1889-850X2018000200005

Correspondence: José Luis Neyro - C/Gran Vía 81, 4º - 48011 Bilbao (Spain)
e-mail: doctor@neyro.com

Introduction
The decision regarding pharmacological treatment of osteoporosis should be based on three fundamental pillars: the proven anti-fracture effectiveness of the chosen drug, its safety that will condition patient tolerability and the adherence that ensures the therapy is maintained as long as necessary, presumably from the time of diagnosis.

Osteoporosis (OP) as a chronic disorder with a relatively long initial course and asymptomatic to its complications represents a major problem of individual health and public health due to the costs involved. In addition, the therapeutic regimens currently available are uncomfortable and, therefore, contribute to the patient’s low therapeutic adherence. Adherence is defined as compliance with the exact prescription provided to the patient and extended over the time indicated. When treating a chronic disorder, nothing can be achieved in the long term without persistence. Factors that influence treatment adherence include the prescribing physician’s explanations, the characteristics of the disease and the patient’s attitudes, but also the therapeutic regimen.

Other authors have indicated that the factors that influence OP therapy adherence include the cost of medications, adverse effects, frequency of dosage, education about the disease, patient follow-up and participation in the treatment decisions. As maintaining treatment adherence is fundamental, extensive follow-up studies report (9,851 postmenopausal women referred to 141 Italian centers for OP management) that, in general, 19.1% of patients discontinued the prescribed medication before attending re-evaluations of bone mass, more than half of them in the first 6 months. The interruption rate was significantly different among treatments. The most frequent reasons for interruption were side effects related to medications, insufficient motivation for treatment and fear of these side effects. The best medication is ineffective if it is not taken as it should be and the benefits of the treatment are lost if the patient does not take the medication. We currently know that patients with gastrointestinal symptoms have less adherence to treatment and worse quality of life in relation to health than patients without gastrointestinal symptoms.

OP treatment should be maintained. Non-adherent patients experience more limited decreases in bone resorption levels and worse bone mass results as well. A recent meta-analysis (which included 236,540 patients) showed that adherence is finally necessary for the maintenance of anti-fracture efficacy with a 46% increase in fracture risk in non-adherent patients. It has been observed that adherences below 80% correlate with significant decreases in protection against fractures. Thus, when the adherence is between 80 and 90%, the risk of fractures increases by 9%, but if it is between 50 and 80%, the risk increases by 18% and up to 21% when the adherence drops. beyond 50%, according to data from the monitoring of a database of 38,120 women with OP with a mean age of 66 years and a mean follow-up of 1.7 years. This probably has a considerable impact on the quality of life and healthcare costs, since the improvement of compliance in real practice can significantly reduce the risk of OP-related fracture.

Improvement of adherence as a therapeutic objective in OP
Much scientific evidence indicates that an adequate efficacy of the different treatments against OP has been achieved, improving adherence is one of the basic objectives to improve the long-term effectiveness of treatments.
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fractures, a primary objective of any treatment. It has also been shown that better adherence facilitates a better cost-effectiveness balance of OP drug treatment at a time in our history when efficiency is increasingly valued, sometimes even more than efficacy itself.

Bisphosphonates (BFs) are drugs of first choice in OP according to multidisciplinary clinical practice guidelines. Surely, among all of them, alendronate (ALN) as paradigmatic, because it is probably the one with the most clinical research available. However, the frequent gastrointestinal side effects of the group tend to be a reason to abandon treatment in a high percentage of cases. In fact, prescribers perceive it when they highlight in well-designed surveys a low therapeutic adherence, mainly associated with side effects, polypharmacy and lack of communication between professionals. In this same study it is pointed out that the restriction of eating and drinking before and after the taking of the drug is the administration instruction more difficult to follow by the patients and stands out as basic to increase the safety of the drug, which may be contradictory. In this order of things, new formulations that improve the digestive tolerance of ALN seem a good contribution to improve the adherence of a first-line drug.

**Improved safety by making alendronate soluble**

The basic aim should be to reduce gastrointestinal side effects in the general framework of improving both patient compliance and therapeutic persistence, since most of the treatment discontinuations related to secondary diseases are due to gastrointestinal problems. A microencapsulation of alendronate sodium was initially designed to reduce mucous damage in rats, with polymeric microparticles as a promising way to administer ALN orally. Immediately afterwards this formula was produced as water soluble to facilitate intake even more and thus reduce the possible impact that a rather large tablet could have on contact with the digestive mucosa. This would eliminate, among other factors, the enormous variability that the disintegration of tablets could have in facilitating their absorption, which had been shown to be of paramount importance in previous studies. In fact, some ALN tablets only dissolved 80% after 20 minutes, taking up to 30 minutes to dissolve about 88%. In this study, differences in the disintegration and subsequent dissolution of the tablets were found to reduce bioavailability and effectiveness in relation to what was expected by the original drug. In fact, longer or shorter disintegration times may increase the risk of esophagitis due to ALN. The soluble formulation could represent an accessory solution that would improve this aspect.

The first description of an oral drinking solution of ALN is more than 14 years old. Each bottle contained 70 mg of ALN, with citrate as a buffer, with an artificial raspberry flavor, parabens as preservatives and saccharin as a sweetener. With this formulation, more extra water (drinkable ALN was bioequivalent to 70 mg tablets), a 6-month placebo-controlled clinical study was conducted that treated 392 postmenopausal women. Adverse events were generally mild to moderate and did not result in treatment interruption, with most patients considering the taste of the drink that could be acceptable. Subsequently, different formulations of soluble ALN were developed and tested, all of them bio-equivalents. The results showed that the drinkable ALN was a bioequivalent formulation to the tablets in terms of absorbed ALN (they were within the acceptance limits of between 80 and 125%) and may be advantageous in patients in which the transit or disintegration of the tablets were not adequately attained.

In a subsequent prospective clinical study, the rhythm of gastric emptying was evaluated with scintigraph study by labeling with 99mTc-DTPA and pH using direct nasogastric tubes, after administering “conventional” ALN tablets and effervescent form with a buffer to improve safety. Neither form affected the esophagus and there were no relevant or statistically significant differences in gastric emptying. The mean pH measured at the time of 50% gastric emptying of the radiolabel was significantly higher in the subjects treated with effervescent formulation compared with those treated with the tablets. The new ALN form was found to reduce the exposure of the gastric mucosa to a pH level <3, which per se represents a risk factor for irritation of the gastro-esophageal mucosa.

In 2013, a soluble ALN product with 70 mg weekly (called bonasol in Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands) was approved in decentralized countries by decentralized procedure. Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovak Republic and with other trade names in Sweden, Germany and the United Kingdom, as well as in Spain - soludronate), whose objective is to provide a friendlier way with ALN patients, which will lead to greater compliance and with a cost similar to that of generic ALN tablets.

This new water-soluble form has potential advantages since it avoids the adhesion of the conventional tablet to the gastric mucosa, also overcoming all the motility obstacles (for example, those present in the hernia, the spasms, the position of the patient's body during the transit) and thus eliminating the variability in the tablet's disintegration rate with the consecutive irritation by reflux of particles and control of the pH of the gastric fluid. The bio-equivalence of this drinking solution of ALN 70 mg in 100 ml was compared and confirmed by means of a randomized controlled study against reference tablets in 104 healthy volunteers. The transit time was also compared according to 24 male and female healthy volunteers (average age 52 years) standing or lying prone on the right side during the intake of the product, by means of a video recording of the swallowing
with X-rays, to characterize the esophageal passage time of the two ALN formulations. When taken in the standing position (Figure 1A), both formulations had equal mean transit times from mouth to stomach, but the dispersion was significantly less with the liquid form. When taken lying down (Figure 1B), the drinkable ALN had shorter and less variable average transit times compared to conventional tablets. These results show that soluble and drinkable ALN is bioequivalent to the tablets and can be advantageous in patients with delayed transit or in whom the disintegration of the tablets causes some damage.

Different clinical trials of casuistry collection report clinical adherence of 34.5% (with n of 245 patients) (Figure 2A) and up to 60% for the first year of treatment with BFs, specifically with ALN. A prospective follow-up study finally showed with 118 patients who took soluble ALN, that none had discontinued the therapy after 3 months from the start of their treatment; after 6 months, 6 patients (5.08%) had discontinued their therapy (p=n.s). After 12 months, the therapy was suspended for 9 subjects (7.63% of the initial number). Therefore, 109 subjects were still receiving therapy (92.37% of the total they started) (p<0.2=n.s) (Figure 2B). Finally, the goal of significant improvement in adherence was achieved.

Conclusions
• ALN is a drug of first choice in the management of osteoporosis.
• A high percentage of patients abandon the treatments in their first year of therapy.
• Most treatment withdrawals are related to gastrointestinal problems and the recommended posology.
• The poor adherence of patients to treatments suggests identifying new alternatives to improve that.
• New formulations of effervescent or soluble ALN have shown better safety indices.
• Soluble and drinkable ALN reduces gastrointestinal side effects and is shown as a valid alternative to improve adherence.
• Soluble ALN has been shown to be prospectively effective in increasing adherence at one year, from 34.5% with conventional tablets up to 92.37%.

Figure 1. Position of the body of the participants during the study (reference) of transit of the upper digestive tract. A. Left foot position. B. Resting position in bed in prone right decubitus position.
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**SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST**

1. Maintaining the right time a treatment is fundamental in any disease chronicle. The factors that influence the adherence to the treatment of osteoporosis, they are at your discretion:
   a. The explanations of the prescribing doctor
   b. The characteristics of the disease
   c. The patient's attitudes, but also the therapeutic regimen applied
   d. All of the above

2. Adherence to a certain treatment in a chronic disease such as osteoporosis can be improved by the following different strategies, except one:
   a. Order the treatment with explanations even in writing and severely penalize the breach
   b. Facilitate the dosage of the drug with more friendly guidelines
   c. Improve safety in the gastrointestinal area
   d. Inform the patient of the increase in the fracture rate among people who they abandon their treatments

3. The new formulations of ALN, both effervescent and soluble drinkable have demonstrated all of the following statements, except one:
   a. Favor a reduction of secondary gastrointestinal origin
   b. Improve adherence significantly up to 92% in the first year of treatment
   c. Implement the solution of all the complications of osteoarthritis, I'm afraid
   d. Increase the safety of the drug to encourage therapeutic compliance

*Answer key on page 24*
SELF-ASSESSMENT TEST *(answer key)*

**Osteoporosis: Concept. Pathophysiology Clinic. Epidemiology**
1. Which of the following statements is not true?
   c. The osteocyte regulates RANKL synthesis
2. Which of the osteoporotic fractures (fx) is the most frequent in clinical practice?
   a. vertebral fx
3. Which of the following statements is not true?
   c. Mortality after a hip fx is less than 10%

**Osteoporosis and Primary Care. How to assess the risk of fracture. Use of the risk scales**
1. Which of these is not considered a major risk factor for fracture?
   b. BMI 20.5 Kg/m²
2. Which of these scales allows the estimation of the risk of fracture of the femur at 5 years?
   d. B and C
3. According to the Spanish calibration of FRAX® of Azagra, indicate the correct one:
   b. A risk of major fracture without BMD of 10% recommends assessing treatment

**Clinical practice guidelines on osteoporosis**
1. How should the drafting of each of the recommendations of a CPG be?
   c. Concise, clear and easy to transfer to clinical practice
2. A recommendation that includes a meta-analysis or a systematic review corresponds to a grade of recommendation
   a. A
3. Which of the following attributes according to the GPC is false with respect to alendronate
   d. It is useful cost in the short and medium term, although not in the long term, in the prevention of hip fracture in women over 64 years of age

**Treatment of osteoporosis**
1. One of the following drugs has recently been considered in a meta-analysis as of first choice, being the one with the best cost-effectiveness balance. Is about:
   a. Alendronate
2. One of the following measures is not part of the “base” of the pyramid in the treatment of osteoporosis. Is about:
   c. Administer calcium and vitamin D
3. One of these drugs does not reduce the risk of hip fracture:
   c. Ibandronate

**Adherence as a problem in osteoporosis: Alendronate soluble as a solution**
1. Maintaining the right treatment is fundamental in any chronic disease. The factors that influence treatment adherence in osteoporosis are:
   d. All of the above
2. Adherence to a certain treatment in a chronic disease such as osteoporosis can be improved by the following different strategies, except one:
   a. Order the treatment with explanations even in writing and penalize severely non-compliance
3. The new formulations of ALN, both effervescent and soluble drinkable have demonstrated all of the following statements, except one:
   c. Implement the solution of all the complications of osteoarthritis, I’m afraid
1. TÍTULO DEL MEDICAMENTO: Seḫeṭalmerc Semal 70 mg oral.

2. COMPOSICIÓN QUANTITATIVA Y CUALITATIVA. Cada solución oral contiene 70 mg de alendronato sódico trihidrato. Excipientes: Cada dosis (100 ml) contiene 80 mg de parahidroxibenzoato de metilo (E219), 20 mg de parahidroxibenzoato de etilo (E210) y 6 mg de amarillo anaranjado (E110). Para consultar la lista completa de excipientes, ver sección 6.4. FORMA FARMACÉUTICA. Solución oral. Solución opaca de color dorado. 4. DATOS CLÍNICOS. 4.1 Indicaciones terapéuticas. Tratamiento de la osteoporosis posmenopáusica. El ácido alendrónico reduce el riesgo de fracturas vertebrales y de cadera. 4.2. Posología y forma de administración. Posología. Para administración oral. La posología recomendada es una dosis unitaria de 70 mg (100 ml) una vez a la semana. No deben superarse las dosis para el tratamiento de la osteoporosis posmenopáusica en mujeres de 18-90 años de edad. No se recomienda el tratamiento en mujeres de mayor edad (90 años o más) con osteoporosis con un riesgo de fractura alto. La posología recomendada en pacientes con osteoporosis con un riesgo de fractura alto no debe superarse. Se recomienda la administración de la solución oral del ácido alendrónico una vez a la semana, generalmente al inicio de la mañana. En mujeres posmenopáusicas que no han tenido una incidencia mayor que en las pacientes tratadas con el placebo en los estudios de tres años: Estudio de un año: n = 196; placebo: n = 397), los perfiles globales de seguridad del ácido alendrónico 10 mg al día y del placebo fueron semejantes. A continuación, se presentan los acontecimientos adversos notificados por los investigadores como nico una vez a la semana en comprimidos (n = 519) y del ácido alendrónico 10 mg al día (n = 370) fueron similares. En dos estudios de tres años de diseño prácticamente idéntico, en mujeres posmenopáusicas (ácido alendrónico 10 mg: 18% de pacientes tratadas con bisfosfonatos, incluyendo alendronato, presentan síntomas de irritación esofágica, como disfagia, dolor al tragar o dolor retroesternal y aparición o empeoramiento de la pirosis. El riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfosfonatos, el riesgo de acontecimientos adversos graves es mayor en las pacientes que no toman el ácido alendrónico correctamente o que lo conducen después de presentar síntomas indicativos de irritación esofágica. En un estudio que se llevó a cabo en el periodo de dos años antes del tratamiento con bisfoson...
Cada PROBLEMA tiene su SOLUCIÓN

BAJA ADHERENCIA en el tratamiento de la osteoporosis

Hasta un 50% de las pacientes abandonan el tratamiento durante el primer año1

El 92,37% de las pacientes continuaron el tratamiento tras 12 meses2

SOLUCIÓN ORAL
Una forma farmacéutica con más ventajas3,4

La solución oral de ácido alendrónico presenta un tránsito gastrointestinal más rápido4

Mejora la tolerabilidad gástrica3

Gracias a su mejor tolerabilidad y a que la solución oral accede más rápido al lugar de absorción, podría ser una buena solución para los pacientes encamados4

La vía directa a los productos y servicios de Rubió para los profesionales sanitarios implicados en el abordaje multidisciplinar de las patologías reumáticas

SomosReumatología centraliza e integra toda nuestra oferta formativa, divulgativa y científica que llevamos a cabo en este campo.

Esto permite al profesional acceder de forma directa a multitud de herramientas, publicaciones científicas y materiales que optimizan su atención sanitaria, mejoran la adherencia y le permiten centrarse en los aspectos más relevantes de la comunicación médico-paciente.

Porque queremos estar en primera línea