Drug efficacies on bone mineral density and fracture rate for the treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis: a network meta-analysis

L. YANG, N. KANG, J.-C. YANG, O.-J. SU, Y.-Z. LIU, L. GUAN, T. LIU, X.-L. MENG, Y. WANG, Y. HAI

Department of Orthopedics, Beijing Chaoyang Hospital, Capital Medical University, Beijing, China

Abstract. - OBJECTIVE: Globally, a great number of elderly suffer from osteoporosis, especially postmenopausal women. Osteoporosis results in low bone mineral density (BMD) and high risk of fragility fracture. However, there is no defined strategy to select the most suitable anti-osteoporotic drugs for osteoporosis patients. Therefore, this study aims to select the most effective anti-osteoporotic drug for postmenopausal women with osteoporosis.

MATERIALS AND METHODS: Literature search was conducted in PubMed, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Library. Raw data from the related randomized clinical trials were extracted. A pairwise and network meta-analysis model was utilized to assess the efficacy of ten drugs on the percentage change of BMD in the lumbar spine and total hip from baseline to one year of treatment. Risks of vertebral fracture and non-vertebral fracture were evaluated as well. We reported the effect size with a weighted mean difference (WMD) for continuous outcomes and odds ratio (OR) for dichotomous outcomes. All the drugs were ranked based on the surface under the cumulative ranking curve (SUCRA) value. Furthermore, the heterogeneity, consistency and publication bias of enrolled literature were assessed.

RESULTS: With regard to lumbar spine BMD, the ten selected drugs all showed significant efficacy compared with placebo. In regard to total hip BMD and vertebral fracture, with the exception of calcitonin, the remaining nine drugs all showed significant efficacy compared with placebo. Six drugs – abaloparatide, alendronate, risedronate, strontium ranelate, teriparatide, and zoledronate – were significantly more effective compared with placebo for the treatment of non-vertebral fractures. As the SUCRA values indicated, abaloparatide performed the best on improving lumbar spine BMD, vertebral fracture and non-vertebral fracture, while denosumab was the best choice to improve total hip BMD.

CONCLUSIONS: To sum up, abaloparatide, denosumab, and teriparatide showed the best efficacy for the treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis, especially abaloparatide.

Key Words

Postmenopausal osteoporosis, Abaloparatide, Denosumab, Teriparatide, Network meta-analysis.

Introduction

Osteoporosis is a systemic skeletal disease in which increased bone weakness highlights the risk of fracture¹. It is associated with a significant social and public health burden. Elderly women are more likely to suffer from this disease since the reduced estrogen levels after menopause contributes to a rapid decline in bone mass^{2,3}. According to the National Osteoporosis Foundation, there are approximately 9.1 million osteoporosis women and an additional 26 million women with low bone mass in America, which is far more than the estimated 2.8 million osteoporosis men and 14.4 million men with low bone mass. Several prospective studies^{4,5} suggested that improved bone mineral density (BMD) is associated with a reduction in the fracture rate. Hence, improving BMD and reducing fracture are the primary therapeutic goals.

There are two main categories of therapies applied to prevent or treat postmenopausal osteoporosis. One is anti-resorptive agents containing estrogen or selective estrogen receptor modulators (bazedoxifen, raloxifene), calcitonin, bisphosphonates (alendronate, ibandronate, risedronate, zoledronate), denosumab, and odanacatib. The other category is the drugs which have anabolic effects on bone such as strontium ranelate, PTH1-84, and PTH1-34 (teriparatide)⁶. Recently, a new drug abaloparatide, which is also a parathyroid hormone-related protein analog drug similar to teriparatide, has completed the Phase III trial and exerts a marked effect on the improvement of BMD and fracture rate⁷.

There are multiple therapies for postmenopausal osteoporosis. Previously, randomized clinical trials (RCTs) and traditional pairwise meta-analyses have been performed to determine the most effective one. However, the conclusions remain controversial. Therefore, a network meta-analysis (NMA) is necessary for identifying the most effective therapy⁸. However, one previously-published NMA⁹ had some drawbacks because it included some sub-standard trials reporting osteoporosis induced by glucocorticoid treatment or male osteoporosis. Furthermore, some other articles^{10,11} only assessed a few drugs and the sample size was small.

Therefore, we conducted this NMA in order to evaluate the comparative efficacy of ten primary drugs in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis, including abaloparatide (ALE), alendronate (ALE), calcitonin (CT), denosumab (DEN), ibandronate (IBA), risedronate (RIS), raloxifene (RLX), strontium ranelate (STR), teriparatide (TPD), and zoledronate (ZOL). The efficacy of the ten drugs on percentage change of BMD from baseline to one-year treatment in the lumbar spine and total hip, vertebral fracture (VF) rate and non-vertebral fracture (NVF) rate was assessed.

Materials and Methods

Search Strategy

Literature search and identification process were conducted in PubMed, EMBASE, and the Cochrane Library from inception until April 18, 2018 (date of final search). Articles published in both English and Chinese languages were searched using the following medical subject headings: "Osteoporosis, Postmenopausal, Abaloparatide, Alendronate, Calcitonin, Denosumab, Ibandronate, Risedronate, Raloxifene, Strontium Ranelate, Teriparatide, Zoledronate, randomized controlled trial", and their synonyms. The search procedures were performed by two independent reviewers. Reference lists of acquired articles were manually searched.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies meeting the following criteria were included: (1) A randomized controlled trial; (2) Subjects were postmenopausal women with osteoporosis; (3) The study was designed to compare the effects of the following drugs with placebo (PLA) or between each other: ABL, ALE, CT, DEN, IBA, RIS, RLX, STR, TPD, ZOL; (4) At least one of the following outcomes was assessed in each study: percentage change of BMD from baseline to one-year treatment of the lumbar spine or total hip, VF and NVF; (5) Sufficient data should be provided in the original studies.

Exclusion data were applied: (1) Men or premenopausal women were included in the study; (2) Participants were treated by combined therapy or sequential therapy; (3) The duration of follow-up was less than 12 months.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Data extracted from the included studies were assessed independently by two reviewers (San Zhang, Si Li), with discussion to the third reviewer (Er Wang) to resolve any discrepancies. Information including the name of first author, year of publication, sample size, comparators, drug dosage, mean age of patients, blinding condition, outcomes of the study and maximum follow-up time were extracted. The quality of the included studies was assessed according to the modified JADAD score (out of 7). The studies gaining scores of 4 to 7 were considered as high-quality and regarded as low-quality if they gained a score of 1 to 3¹².

Statistical Analysis

Four outcomes (lumbar spine BMD, total hip BMD, VF, and NVF) were analyzed. Pairwise meta-analysis of studies that directly compared different treatments was conducted using STATA 14.0 (Stata Corp., College Station, TX, USA) software. The percentage change of BMD in the lumbar spine and total hip was reported using the weighted mean difference (WMD) and the 95% confidence interval (95% CI). The risk of vertebral fracture and non-vertebral fracture was reported using the odds ratio (OR) and the 95% confidence interval (95% CI). Cochran's O test and Higgins' I-squared test were used to test the heterogeneity of enrolled studies. A p-value of the Cochran's Q test statistic less than 0.05 or I-square larger than 50% indicated significant heterogeneity among included studies for each pairwise comparison. The fixed-effect model was applied for studies without significant heterogeneity and otherwise, the random-effects model was applied.

Next, the network meta-analysis was performed by Bayesian analysis methods using R software (Version 3.2.3; R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria)¹³. The effect sizes of WMD and OR and their corresponding 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) were calculated with a random-effects model. In order to evaluate the consistency of the network meta-analysis model, the node-splitting method was utilized to assess the difference between direct and indirect comparisons. Furthermore, the effects of drugs were ranked by the surface under the cumulative ranking (SUCRA) curve values¹⁴. Higher SUCRA value indicated the pronounced efficacy of the drug. Funnel plots were depicted to evaluate the risk of publication bias of the studies included in this review.

Results

Study Selection and Study Characteristics

A total of 13,542 articles were initially searched and three articles were identified from other reviews. After removal of 4,874 duplicate references, 8,671 articles remained. Of these, 644 full-text articles were retrieved after 8,027 articles were excluded by reviewing the title and abstract. Another 540 articles were removed for other reasons (e.g., combined therapy or sequential therapy, unrelated drugs or diseases other than osteoporosis, re-analysis or extension of primary studies, duration of follow-up < 12 months, irrelevant outcomes). 106 articles were excluded due to lack of complete data. As a result, a total of 103 studies were included^{7,15-116}. Details of the literature selection process were shown in Figure 1. The networks of the comparisons of four outcomes were presented in Figure 2.

The following drugs were analyzed for their efficacy: ABL, ALE, CT, DEN, IBA, RIS, RLX, STR, TPD, and ZOL. A total of 103 studies involving 122,685 participants with postmenopausal osteoporosis. Six of the 103 studies were three-arm studies and the remaining studies were two-arm ones. The treatment, drug dosage, mean age and follow-up time of each study were summarized in Table I.



Figure 1. Study flow and selection diagram.



Figure 2. Evidence network of eligible comparisons for network meta-analysis. The width of the lines is proportional to the number of trials comparing each pair of treatments; the area of circles represents the cumulative number of patients for each intervention, **A**, Lumbar spine BMD, **B**, Total hip BMD, **C**, Vertebral fracture, and **D**, Non-vertebral fracture.

Results of Pairwise Meta-Analysis Lumbar spine BMD

Results of lumbar spine BMD in the pairwise meta-analysis were presented in Table II. Compared with PLA, nine drugs significantly increased the lumbar spine BMD: ABL (WMD = 9.31, 95%CI = 8.62-10.00), ALE (4.58, 4.14-5.02), DEN (5.32, 4.91-5.73), IBA (3.54, 2.78-4.30), RIS (2.85, 2.07-3.63), RLX (2.26, 1.90-2.62), STR (5.13, 3.39-6.87), TPD (6.35, 3.77-8.93) and ZOL (3.56, 2.19-4.93). Among the ten drugs, ALE performed better than CT (3.95, 3.14-4.77) and RLX (2.86, 1.88-3.85), but worse than ZOL (-8.08, -10.60--5.56). DEN outperformed IBA (2.11, 1.56-2.66), RIS (2.30, 1.76-2.84) and ZOL (2.03, 1.51-2.55). Similarly, TPD was superior to CT (4.11, 3.73-4.49), RIS (2.69, 1.12-4.26) and ZOL (2.75, 1.56-3.94); however, it was inferior to ABL (-1.48, -2.12--0.84). In addition, IBA was better than RIS (2.51, 1.34-3.68).

Total hip BMD

Results of total hip BMD in the pairwise meta-analysis were presented in Table III. Similar to lumbar spine BMD, nine drugs with significant effects increased total hip BMD compared with PLA: ABL (WMD = 3.35, 95% CI = 3.02-3.68), ALE (2.39, 2.01-2.77), CT (0.53, 0.32-0.74), DEN (3.18, 2.91-3.45), IBA (1.83, 1.21-2.44), RLX (1.43, 0.93-1.92), STR (3.26, 2.62-3.90), TPD (2.31, 2.01-2.61) and ZOL (2.70, 2.28-3.11). Among the ten drugs, ALE was more effective than RIS (1.09, 0.69, 1.49) and RLX (1.21, 0.78-1.64) but less effective than DEN (-1.44, -2.41--0.47), TPD (-2.41, -3.97--0.85) and ZOL (-3.70, -4.22--3.18). Furthermore, DEN achieved a better performance than IBA (1.18, 0.81-1.55), RIS (1.56, 1.22-1.90), TPD (1.84, 0.41-3.27) and ZOL (1.31, 0.90-1.72). Meanwhile, TPD was inferior to ZOL (-1.08, -1.93 - 0.23).

 Table I. Key features of included studies.

Trial	Mean age (yrs)	Dosage*	Sample size	Follow-up (yrs)	Years after menopausal (yrs)	Out-come [#]
ABL/TPD/PLA Miller 2016	68.9/68.7	20 ug QD/80 ug QD	2463	1.5	20.6/20.4/19.9	1,2,3,4
ALE/CT/PLA						
Dursun 2001	60.2/63.2/60.6	10 mg QD/100 IU QD	150	1	14.32/17.56/14.88	1
Downs 2000	64.6/64.1/64.6	10 mg QD/200 IU QD	299	1	16.5/16.1/16.5	1
Adami 1993	59/60/59	10–20 mg QD/100 IU QD	286	2	NS	1
ALE/DEN/PLA						
Lewiecki 2007	62.8/62.3/63.7	70 mg QW/6–210 mg Q6M	412	2	NS	1,2
ALE/IBA/RIS						
Paggiosi 2014	67.8/66.9/66.8	70 mg QW/150 mg QM/35 mg QW	172	2	19.2/17.4/16.4	1,2
ALE/IBA						
Miller 2008'	65.6/65.6	70 mg QW/150 mg QM	1760	1	18.2/18.5	3,4
Guanabens 2013	65.5/63.6	70 mg QW/150 mg QM	42	2	NS	1,2
ALE/PLA						
Yen 2000	59/60.3	10 mg OD	46	1	11.7/11.8	1
Stpan 1999	59.3/60.9	10 mg OD	30	1	14.4/14.4	1
Chesnut 1995	62.9/63.6	5–40 mg QD	188	2	15.0/16.9	1,2
Yan 2009	65.2/64.6	70 mg OW	560	1	15.36/15.14	1,2,4
Pols 1999	62.8/62.8	10 mg QD	1908	1	15.8/15.9	1,2,4
Devogelaer 1996	61.2/62.7	5–20 mg QD	516	3	16/15.2	1
Liberman 1995	64/64	5–20 mg QD	994	3	16/17	1,3,4
Tucci 1996	63.9/64.2	5–20 mg QD	392	3	17.1/17.8	1
Hochberg 2005	69.1/69.3	5 mg QD	5093	2	23.1/23.1	3,4
Quandt 2005	60.6/70.2	5–10 mg QD	3737	4.5	23.4/24.1	2
Rossini 2001	72/74	10 mg QD	26	2	23/24	1,2
Bone 1997	70.8/71.1	1–5 mg QD	359	2	24.8/22.8	1,3,4
Lau 2000	74/74	10 mg QD	78	1	24/24	1,2
Hosking 1998	53/53	2.5–5 mg QD	1358	2	6/6	1,2,4
Ravn 1999	55/55	2.5–5 mg QD	1609	4	9/8	1,2
Black 1996	71/70.7	5 mg QD	2027	3	NS	1,2,3,4
Cummings 1998	67.6/67.7	5 mg QD	4432	4	NS	1,2,3,4
ALE/RIS						
Sarioglu 2006	57.3/60.3	70 mg QW/5 mg QD	50	1	12.1/14.7	1
Rosen 2005	64.2/64.8	70 mg QW/35 mg QW	1053	1	18.3/18.7	1,2

2644

Trial	Mean age (yrs)	Dosage*	Sample size	Follow-up (yrs)	Years after menopausal (yrs)	Out-come [#]
ALE/RLX						
Sambrook 2004	61.5/61.8	70 mg QW/60 mg QD	487	1	14.5/14.9	1,2
Luchey 2004	63.8/64.7	70 mg QW/60 mg QD	456	1	17.3/17.8	1,2
Recker 2007	65.7/65.5	10 mg QD/60 mg QD	1423	2	19.0/18.5	3,4
Iwamoto 2008	70.3/68.5	5 mg QD/60 mg QD	122	1	NS	1,3
ALE/TPD						
Body 2002	65/66	10 mg QD/40 ug QD	146	2	19/18	1,2,4
Finkelstein 2010	64/65	$10 \text{ mg} \ \text{QD}/40 \text{ ug} \ \text{QD}$	49	3	NS	1
ALE/ZOL						
Tan 2016	68/68.1	70 mg QD/5 mg QY	105	3	NS	1,2
CT/PLA						
Chesnut 2000	68.2/68.2	100–400 IU QD	1254	5	23/22	1,3,4
Reginster 1995	53.2/53	50–200 IU QD	251	2	3.0/2.7	1
Binkley 2012	66.5/66.5	0.2 mg QD	367	1	NS	1,2
Binkley 2014	67.5/66.6	0.2 mg QD	129	1	NS	1
Henriksen 2016	66.5/67	0.8 mg QD	4665	3	NS	1,2,3,4
Overgaard 1994	52/52	100–400 IU QD	134	2	NS	1
CT/TPD						
Zhang 2012	63.3/64.3	200 IU QD/20 ug QD	124	1	13.5/14.7	1
Li 2013	65/65.1	200 IU QD/20 ug QD	453	1.5	NS	1
DEN/IBA						
Recknor 2013	67.2/66.2	60 mg Q6M/150 mg QM	833	1	20.4/19.7	1,2,3,4
DEN/PLA						
Bone 2011	59.4/58.9	60 mg Q6M	256	4	10.3/9.4	1,2
Nakamura 2012	65.1/64.6	14–100 mg QD	212	2	15.6/5.6	1,2
Bone 2008	59.8/58.9	60 mg Q6M	332	2	NS	1,2,3,4
Cummings 2009	72.3/72.3	60 mg Q6M	7808	3	NS	1,2,3,4
DEN/RIS						
Roux 2014	67.8/67.7	60 mg Q6M/150 mg QM	870	1	20.2/20.1	1,2
DEN/TPD						
Tsai 2013	66.3/65.5	60 mg Q6M/20 ug QD	94	1	NS	1,2

 Table I (Continued). Key features of included studies.

Continued

Comparison of ten drugs for the treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis

Trial	Mean age (yrs)	Dosage*	Sample size	Follow-up (yrs)	Years after menopausal (yrs)	Out-come [#]
DEN/ZOL						
Miller 2016'	68.5/69.5	60 mg Q6M/5 mg QY	643	1	20.8/19.9	1,2
Anastasilakis 2015	63/63	60 mg Q6M/5 mg QY	58	1	NS	1
IBA/PLA						
Chesnut 2004	69/69	2.5 mg QD	2946	3	20.9/20.8	3,4
Stakkestad 2003	54.8/54.6	0.5–2 mg Q3M	629	1	4.3/4.1	1,2
Mcclung 2009	53.7/53.4	150 mg QM	160	1	5.3/5.5	1,2
Mcclung 2004	58.2/57.9	0.5–2.5 mg QD	653	2	9/8.2	1,2
Lester 2012	NS	150 mg QM	50	5	NS	1
Lewiecki 2009	64.8/63.5	150 mg QM	93	1	NS	1,2
Ravn 1996	65.2/63.9	0.5–5 mg QD	180	1	NS	ĺ
RIS/PLA						
Valimaiki 2007	66.1/65.4	5 mg QD	170	2	17.7/19.5	1
Fogelman 2000	65/64	2.5–5 mg QD	541	2	18/17	1,3
Clemmesen 1997	67/70	2.5 mg QD	88	3	20/23	1,3,4
Harris 1999	68/69	2.5–5 mg QD	2468	3	24/24	1,3,4
Reginster 2000	71/71	2.5–5 mg OD	1226	3	25/25	1.3.4
Mcclung 2001	74/74	2.5–5 mg OD	5445	3	28/28	4
Hooper 2005	53/52.6	2.5–5 mg OD	383	3	3.62/3.88	1.3.4
Mortensen 1998	52,1/51,2	5 mg OD	111	2	3/3	1.3.4
Li 2005	NS	5 mg OD	60	1	NS	1
Palomba 2008	52.3/51.4	35 mg OW	81	3	NS	3.4
Siris 2008	64/64	5 mg QD	620	3	NS	3,4
RIS/STR						
Narula 2012	55.6/57.7	35 mg QW/2 g QD	190	1	NS	1,2
RIS/TPD						
Anastasilakis 2008	64.7/65.4	35 mg QW/20 ug OD	44	1	16.1/19.2	1
Kendler 2017	71.6/72.6	$35 \text{ mg} \widetilde{\text{QW}}/20 \text{ ug} \widetilde{\text{QD}}$	1360	2	NS	3,4
RLX/PLA						
Zheng 2003	59.5/59.4	60 mg QD	204	1	10.3/10.0	1
Miller 2008	57.86/57.7	60 mg QD	564	2	10.69/11.15	1,2
Meunier 1999	60.2/59.2	60–150 mg OD	129	2	11.7/12.7	1.2
Morii 2003	65.2/64.3	60–120 mg OD	280	-	15.2/14.4	1.3.4
Liu 2004	65.5/65.1	60 mg OD	204	1	17.3/16.4	1,2
Ettinger 1999	65/65	60–120 mg OD	6828	3	17/18	3.4

 Table I (Continued). Key features of included studies.

Continued

2646

L. Yang, N. Kang, J.-C. Yang, O.-J. Su, Y.-Z. Liu, L. Guan, T. Liu, X.-L. Meng, Y. Wang, Y. Hai

Trial	Mean age (yrs)	Dosage*	Sample size	Follow-up (yrs)	Years after menopausal (yrs)	Out-come [#]
RLX/PLA (continued)						
Silverman 2008	66.4/66.5	60 mg QD	3734	3	19.5/19.5	3,4
Lufkin 1998	68.2/68.2	60–80 mg QD	143	1	22.0/22.2	1,2,3,4
Delmas 1997	55/55	30–150 mg QD	601	2	5/4	1
Mcclung 2006	57.5/57.5	60 mg QD	246	2	9/8	1,2
Bueno 2017	NS	60 mg QD	2924	3	NS	3,4
Ensrud 2008	67.5/67.5	60 mg QD	10101	5	NS	3,4
STR/PLA						
Hwang 2008	64.3/65.8	2 g QD	125	1	16.2/18.2	1,2
Meunier 2002	66.7/65.6	0.5–2 g QD	353	2	17.5/19.1	3
Liu 2009	66.4/66.1	2 g Q D	329	1	18.0/17.2	1,2
Meunier 2004	69.4/69.3	2 g QD	1649	3	22.1/21.6	3,4
Meunier 2009	69.4/69.3	2 g QD	1649	4	22.1/21.7	3
Reginster 2005	76.7/76.8	2 g QD	5091	5	28.4/28.5	3,4
Reginster 2008	76.7/76.8	2 g QD	5091	5	28.4/28.5	3,4
TPD/PLA						
Miyauchi 2010	69.2/70.4	20 ug QD	203	2	19.66/20.50	1,2
Neer 2001	69/69	20–40 ug QD	1637	1.9	21/21	3,4
Nakamura 2012'	75/75.4	56.5 ug QD	578	1.5	25.6/25.3	1,2,3,4
Krege 2012	NS	20 ug QD	1085	1.8	NS	4
TPD/ZOL						
Cosman 2011	63.8/66.1	20 ug QD/5 mg QY	275	1	NS	1,2,3,4
ZOL/PLA						
Mcclung 2009'	184/186	5 mg QY	400	2	11.5/11.4	1,2
Bai 2013	56.5/57.1	5 mg QY	483	2	NS	3,4
Black 2007	NS	5 mg QY	7765	3	NS	3,4
Chao 2013	54.6/55.3	5mg QY	660	3	NS	3,4
Grey 2009	65/62	5 mg QY	50	2	NS	1,2
Grey 2014	65/65	1–5mg QY	172	2	NS	1
Hwang 2011	72.5/73.3	5 mg QY	323	3	NS	2,3,4

Table I (Continued). Key features of included studies.

*Dosage: QD, once a day; QW, once a week; QM, once a month; QY, once a year; IU, International Unit *Outcome: 1, lumbar spine BMD; 2, total hip BMD; 3, vertebral fracture; 4, non-vertebral fracture NS, not specified

Comparison	WMD (95 % CI)	P-heterogeneity	I-squared	Tau-squared
ABL/TPD	1.48 (0.84, 2.12)	_	_	-
ABL/PLA	9.31 (8.62, 10.00)	_	_	_
ALE/CT	3.95 (3.14, 4.77)	0.74	<0.01 %	< 0.001
ALE/DEN	-0.20 (-1.59, 1.19)	_	-	_
ALE/IBA	0.38 (-0.32, 1.08)	0.6	<0.01 %	< 0.001
ALE/PLA	4.58 (4.14, 5.02)	< 0.00001	88 %	0.63
ALE/RIS	0.99 (-0.64, 2.62)	0.008	79 %	1.47
ALE/RLX	2.86 (1.88, 3.85)	0.11	56 %	0.4
ALE/TPD	-5.28 (-10.93, 0.36)	0.002	89 %	14.83
ALE/ZOL	-8.08 (-10.60, -5.56)	_	-	_
CT/PLA	0.37 (-2.05, 2.80)	< 0.00001	98 %	13.05
CT/TPD	-4.11 (-4.49, -3.73)	0.61	<0.01 %	< 0.001
DEN/IBA	2.11 (1.56, 2.66)	_	-	_
DEN/PLA	5.32 (4.91, 5.73)	0.31	16 %	0.04
DEN/RIS	2.30 (1.76, 2.84)	_	_	_
DEN/TPD	-0.70 (-2.67, 1.27)	_	-	_
DEN/ZOL	2.03 (1.51, 2.55)	0.16	48 %	0.98
IBA/PLA	3.54 (2.78, 4.30)	0.02	62 %	0.47
IBA/RIS	2.51 (1.34, 3.68)	_	-	_
RIS/PLA	2.85 (2.07, 3.63)	0.0003	75 %	0.80
RIS/STR	-2.31 (-5.99, 1.37)	_	-	_
RIS/TPD	-2.69 (-4.26, -1.12)	_	-	_
RLX/PLA	2.26 (1.90, 2.62)	0.08	46 %	0.23
STR/PLA	5.13 (3.39, 6.87)	0.06	71 %	1.12
TPD/PLA	6.35 (3.77, 8.93)	< 0.00001	96 %	6.64
TPD/ZOL	2.75 (1.56, 3.94)	_	-	_
ZOL/PLA	3.56 (2.19, 4.93)	0.03	72 %	1.03

Table II. Summary WMD of percentage change in lumbar spine BMD from baseline to one year of treatment for each direct comparison.

p-value less than 0.05 is considered as significance with italic fonts

Table III.	Summary	WMD	of percentage	change	in to	otal hip	BMD	from	baseline	to	one	year	of	treatment	for	each	direct
compariso	1.																

Comparison	WMD (95 % CI)	P-heterogeneity	I-squared	Tau-squared
ABL/TPD	1.10 (0.76, 1.44)	_	_	_
ABL/PLA	3.35 (3.02, 3.68)	_	-	_
ALE/DEN	-1.44 (-2.41, -0.47)	_	-	_
ALE/IBA	0.14 (0.00, 0.28)	0.29	20 %	0.02
ALE/PLA	2.39 (2.01, 2.77)	< 0.00001	78 %	0.22
ALE/RIS	1.09 (0.69, 1.49)	0.67	<0.01 %	< 0.001
ALE/RLX	1.21 (0.78, 1.64)	0.21	36 %	0.05
ALE/TPD	-2.41 (-3.97, -0.85)	_	-	_
ALE/ZOL	-3.70 (-4.22, -3.18)	_	-	_
CT/PLA	0.53 (0.32, 0.74)	0.53	<0.01 %	< 0.001
DEN/IBA	1.18 (0.81, 1.55)	_	-	_
DEN/PLA	3.18 (2.91, 3.45)	0.14	42 %	0.08
DEN/RIS	1.56 (1.22, 1.90)	_	-	_
DEN/TPD	1.84 (0.41, 3.27)	-	_	_
DEN/ZOL	1.31 (0.90, 1.72)	_	-	_
IBA/PLA	1.83 (1.21, 2.44)	0.02	70 %	0.25
IBA/RIS	0.84 (-0.34, 2.02)	_	-	_
RIS/STR	-0.59 (-3.76, 2.58)	_	-	_
RLX/PLA	1.43 (0.93, 1.92)	0.70	<0.01 %	< 0.001
STR/PLA	3.26 (2.62, 3.90)	0.37	<0.01 %	< 0.001
TPD/PLA	2.31 (2.01, 2.61)	0.55	<0.01 %	< 0.001
TPD/ZOL	-1.08 (-1.93, -0.23)	_	-	_
ZOL/PLA	2.70 (2.28, 3.11)	0.64	<0.01 %	< 0.001

p-value less than 0.05 is considered as significance with italic fonts

Comparison	WMD (95 % CI)	P-heterogeneity	I-squared	Tau-squared
ABL/PLA	0.13 (0.05, 0.37)	_	_	_
ABL/TPD	0.66 (0.19, 2.35)	_	-	_
ALE/IBA	1.02 (0.29, 3.53)	-	-	-
ALE/PLA	0.53 (0.45, 0.63)	0.99	<0.01 %	<0.001
ALE/RLX	1.33 (0.62, 2.82)	0.68	<0.01 %	<0.001
CT/PLA	0.79 (0.51, 1.24)	0.07	69	0.07
DEN/IBA	1.00 (0.14, 7.12)	—	_	_
DEN/PLA	0.31 (0.24, 0.40)	0.96	<0.01 %	<0.001
IBA/PLA	0.46 (0.32, 0.67)	_	_	-
RIS/PLA	0.55 (0.45, 0.69)	0.83	<0.01 %	< 0.001
RIS/TPD	2.38 (1.50, 3.77)	_	-	-
RLX/PLA	0.63 (0.54, 0.74)	0.47	<0.01 %	< 0.001
STR/PLA	0.61 (0.51, 0.73)	0.04	60 %	0.02
TPD/PLA	0.26 (0.17, 0.37)	0.53	<0.01 %	< 0.001
TPD/ZOL	0.19 (0.02, 1.68)	_	_	_
ZOL/PLA	0.30 (0.24, 0.37)	0.38	2 %	< 0.001

Table IV. Summary ORs of vertebral fracture for each direct comparison.

p-value less than 0.05 is considered as significance with italic fonts

Vertebral fracture

As presented in Table IV, nine drugs showed a significant decrease in vertebral fractures compared with PLA: ABL (OR = 0.13, 95% CrI = 0.05-0.37), ALE (0.53, 0.45-0.63), DEN (0.31, 0.24-0.40), IBA (0.46, 0.32-0.67), RIS (0.55, 0.45-0.69), RLX (0.63, 0.54-0.74), STR (0.61, 0.51-0.73), TPD (0.26, 0.17-0.37) and ZOL (0.30, 0.24-0.37). However, mutual comparisons of the ten drugs revealed that there was only one significant result which was that RIS was superior to TPD (2.38, 1.50-3.77).

Non-vertebral fracture

As presented in Table V, all significant results of the comparisons were from placebo-controlled trials: ABL (OR = 0.53, 0.30-0.95), ALE (0.78, 0.69-0.88), DEN (0.78, 0.66-0.93), RIS (0.69, 0.59-0.80), STR (0.86, 0.76-0.96), TPD (0.67, 0.52-0.87), and ZOL (0.69, 0.60-0.79).

Comparison	WMD (95 % CI)	P-heterogeneity	I-squared	Tau-squared
ABL/TPD	0.74 (0.40, 1.37)	_	_	_
ABL/PLA	0.53 (0.30, 0.95)	_	-	_
ALE/IBA	0.87 (0.40, 1.89)	-	_	_
ALE/PLA	0.78 (0.69, 0.88)	0.08	45 %	0.03
ALE/RLX	0.91 (0.44, 1.91)	-	-	_
ALE/TPD	3.70 (0.98, 14.06)	-	_	_
CT/PLA	0.91 (0.70, 1.18)	0.98	<0.01 %	< 0.001
DEN/IBA	1.13 (0.53, 2.40)	_	_	_
DEN/PLA	0.78 (0.66, 0.93)	0.19	41 %	0.23
IBA/PLA	0.89 (0.65, 1.22)	-	_	_
RIS/PLA	0.69 (0.59, 0.80)	0.13	38 %	0.06
RIS/TPD	1.53 (0.91, 2.57)	-	_	_
RLX/PLA	0.94 (0.86, 1.04)	0.63	<0.01 %	<0.001
STR/PLA	0.86 (0.76, 0.96)	0.89	<0.01 %	< 0.001
TPD/PLA	0.67 (0.52, 0.87)	0.81	<0.01 %	<0.001
TPD/ZOL	0.87 (0.31, 2.46)	-	_	_
ZOL/PLA	0.69 (0.60, 0.79)	0.38	2 %	< 0.001

Table V. Summary ORs of non-vertebral fracture for each direct comparison.

p-value less than 0.05 is considered as significance with italic fonts

Results of Network Meta-Analysis Lumbar spine BMD

Seventy-nine studies were included in the analysis of lumbar spine BMD. Figure 2a showed the network plot of eligible comparisons. As shown in Figure 3, patients treated with any of the ten drugs showed a significantly greater increase of lumbar spine BMD than those treated with PLA: ABL (WMD = 9.0, 95% CI = 6.7-11.0), ALE (4.4, 3.9-4.9), CT (1.8, 0.97-2.7), DEN (5.6, 4.7-6.5), IBA (3.9, 3.0-4.8), RIS (3.1, 2.3-3.8), RLX (2.0, 1.1-2.9), STR (5.2, 3.3-7.0), TPD (7.2, 6.3-8.2) and ZOL (4.8, 3.6-6.0). Apart from that, ABL was better than most of the other drugs such as: (4.6, 2.3-7.0) for ALE, (7.2, 4.8-9.6) for CT, (3.4, 0.95-5.8) for DEN, (5.1, 2.7-7.6) for IBA, (5.9, 3.5-8.4) for RIS, (7.0, 4.5-9.5) for RLX, (3.8, 0.89-6.8) for STR and (4.2, 1.7-6.8) for ZOL. Moreover, ALE was associated with a significant increase of BMD in the lumbar spine compared with CT (2.6, 1.6-3.5), RIS (1.3, 0.44-2.2) and RLX (2.4, 1.4-3.3). Furthermore, DEN performed better than ALE (1.2, 0.24-2.3), CT (3.8, 2.6-5.0), IBA (1.7, 0.55-2.9), RIS (2.6, 1.5-3.7) and RLX (3.6, 2.3-4.9). Both IBA and RIS performed better than CT (2.1, 0.86-3.3; 1.3, 0.12-2.4) and IBA was also better than RLX (1.9, 0.61-3.1). Furthermore, TPD showed greater efficacy than ALE (2.8, 1.8-3.9), CT (5.4, 4.3-6.6), DEN (1.6, 0.36-2.9), IBA (3.3, 2.0-4.6), RIS (4.2, 3.0-5.4), RLX (5.2, 3.9-6.6) and ZOL (2.5, 1.0-3.8). Both STR and ZOL were better than CT (3.4, 1.4-5.4; 3.0, 1.6-4.4), RIS (2.1, 0.2-4.1; 1.7, 0.37-3.1) and RLX (3.2, 1.1-5.2; 2.7, 1.3-4.3). As stated above, CT and RLX were inferior to the other drugs and there was no significant difference between the two drugs.

Total hip BMD

Forty-seven studies were included in the analysis of total hip BMD. Figure 2b showed the network plot of eligible comparisons. As shown in Figure 4, except for CT, the remaining nine drugs all showed significantly greater efficacy compared with PLA, ABL (WMD = 3.5, 95% CI = 2.3-4.8), ALE (2.2, 1.8-2.6), DEN (3.6, 3.0-4.1), IBA (1.9, 1.4-2.5), RIS (1.5, 0.61-2.4), RLX (1.3, 0.65-2.0), STR (3.2, 2.1-4.3), TPD (2.6, 1.9-3.3) and ZOL (3.4, 2.7-4.1). Apart from that, ABL outperformed ALE (1.3, 0.0054-2.6), CT (2.9, 1.3-4.5), IBA (1.6, 0.19-2.9), RIS (2.1, 0.52-3.6) and RLX (2.2, 0.80-3.6). In addition, ALE performed better than CT (1.6, 0.49-2.7) and RLX (0.91, 0.22-1.8). Meanwhile, DEN was better than ALE (1.4, 0.74-2.0), CT (2.9, 1.8-4.1), IBA (1.6, 0.91-2.3), RIS (2.1, 1.2-3.0), RLX (2.3, 1.4-3.1) and TPD (0.96, 0.12-1.8). IBA was better than CT (1.3, 0.17-2.5) and STR achieved a better performance than CT (2.6, 1.1-4.1), RIS (1.7, 0.37-3.1) and RLX (1.9, 0.61-3.2). Furthermore, TPD was better than CT (2.0, 0.72-3.2), RIS (1.1, 0.038-2.2) and RLX (1.3, 0.34-2.3) and ZOL was better than ALE (1.2, 0.49-1.9), CT (2.8, 1.6-4.0), IBA (1.5, 0.62-2.3), RIS (1.9, 0.89-3.0) and RLX (2.1, 1.2-3.0). Similar to lumbar spine BMD, the efficacy of CT was unsatisfactory, demonstrating its inferiority to ABL, ALE, DEN, IBA, STR, TPD, and ZOL.

Vertebral fracture

Forty-three studies were included in the analysis of vertebral fracture. Figure 2c showed the network plot of eligible comparisons. As shown in Figure 5, except for CT, the remaining nine drugs all showed a significantly lower risk of vertebral fracture compared with PLA: ABL (OR = 0.13, 95% CI = 0.04-0.34), ALE (0.55, 0.44-0.67), DEN (0.31, 0.22-0.43), IBA (0.46, 0.30-0.69), RIS (0.55, 0.43-0.69), RLX (0.62, 0.51-0.75), STR (0.62, 0.53-0.72), TPD (0.23, 0.17-0.32) and ZOL (0.32, 0.25-0.44). Apart from that, patients treated with ABL were significantly better than those treated with ALE (0.23, 0.072-0.65), CT (0.16, 0.047-0.44), IBA (0.28, 0.082-0.83), RIS (0.23, 0.071-0.64), RLX (0.21, 0.063-0.54) and STR (0.21, 0.064-0.56). ALL, ALE, IBA and RIS were better than CT (0.66, 0.47-0.95; 0.56, 0.34-0.93; 0.67, 0.46-0.97, respectively). Furthermore, DEN was superior to ALE (0.57, 0.38-0.83), CT (0.38, 0.24-0.59), RIS (0.56, 0.37-0.85), RLX (0.50, 0.34-0.73) and STR (0.50, 0.35-0.72). In addition, TPD was more effective than ALE (0.43, 0.28-0.63), CT (0.28, 0.18-0.44), IBA (0.51, 0.30-0.86), RIS (0.42, 0.30-0.60), RLX (0.38, 0.25-0.55) and STR (0.38, 0.26-0.54). Besides, ZOL have more curative effects than ALE (0.59, 0.42-0.85), CT (0.39, 0.27-0.61), RIS (0.59, 0.41-0.88), RLX (0.52, 0.38-0.76) and STR (0.52, 0.38-0.75).

Non-vertebral fracture

Forty-four studies were included in the analysis of non-vertebral fracture. Figure 2d showed the network plot of eligible comparisons. As shown in Figure 6, there were six drugs with a significantly lower risk of non-vertebral fracture compared with PLA, including ABL (OR = 0.49, 95% CI = 0.27-0.83), ALE (0.78, 0.68-0.89), DEN (0.80, 0.64-0.98), RIS (0.69, 0.58-0.81), TPD (0.60, 0.47-0.77) and ZOL (0.67, 0.56-0.80). Apart from that, ABL was superior to CT (0.54, 0.28-0.98), RLX (0.53, 0.29-0.90) and STR (0.58, 0.31-0.98).



Figure 3. Forest plot of Lumbar spine BMD.



Figure 4. Forest plot of Total hip BMD.



Figure 5. Forest plot of Vertebral fracture.

Odds Ratio (95% Crl)

0.23 (0.071, 0.64)

0.99 (0.74, 1.4) 1.5 (1.0, 2.2) 0.56 (0.37, 0.85)

0.83 (0.52, 1.3) 1.8 (1.4, 2.3)

1.1 (0.84, 1.5)

1.1 (0.85, 1.5) 0.42 (0.30, 0.60)

0.59 (0.41, 0.88)

Odds Ratio (95% Crl)

0.21 (0.063, 0.56) 0.88 (0.67, 1.2) 1.3 (0.93, 1.9) 0.50 (0.34, 0.73)

0.74 (0.47, 1.2) 1.6 (1.3, 2.0)

0.89 (0.65, 1.2) 1.0 (0.78, 1.3) 0.38 (0.25, 0.55)

0.52 (0.38, 0.76)

Odds Ratio (95% Crl)

0.21 (0.064, 0.56)

0.88 (0.69, 1.1) 1.3 (0.96, 1.8) 0.50 (0.35, 0.72)

0.74 (0.48, 1.2) 1.6 (1.4, 1.9)

0.89 (0.67, 1.2) 1.0 (0.78, 1.3)

0.38 (0.26, 0.54)

0.52 (0.38, 0.75)

Odds Ratio (95% Crl)

0.55 (0.17, 1.5)

2.3 (1.6, 3.5) 3.5 (2.3, 5.5)

5.5 (2.3, 5.5) 1.3 (0.82, 2.1) 2.0 (1.2, 3.3) 4.3 (3.1, 6.1) 2.4 (1.7, 3.3) 2.7 (1.8, 3.9) 2.7 (1.8, 3.8)

1.4 (0.88, 2.2)

Odds Ratio (95% Crl)

0.39 (0.12, 1.1)

0.96 (0.61, 1.5) 1.4 (0.85, 2.3)

3.1 (2.3, 4.2) 1.7 (1.1, 2.4) 1.9 (1.3, 2.7)

1.9 (1.3, 2.6) 0.72 (0.46, 1.1)

1.7 (1.2, 2.4) 2.5 (1.6, 3.8)

3

2

2

1

ר 5

Odds Ratio (95% Crl)

0.72 (0.38, 1.2)

1.1 (0.92, 1.4) 1.3 (0.95, 1.8) 1.1 (0.88, 1.5)

1.1 (0.88, 1.5) 1.2 (0.89, 1.8) 1.4 (1.2, 1.7) 1.3 (1.1, 1.7) 1.2 (1.0, 1.6) 0.86 (0.66, 1.1)

0.97 (0.77, 1.2)

Odds Ratio (95% Crl)

0.53 (0.29, 0.90)

0.53 (0.25, 0.50) 0.83 (0.70, 0.99) 0.97 (0.71, 1.3) 0.85 (0.67, 1.1) 0.91 (0.67, 1.3) 1.1 (0.95, 1.2)

0.74 (0.59, 0.90) 0.91 (0.76, 1.1)

0.64 (0.49, 0.84)

0.72 (0.58, 0.88)

Odds Ratio (95% Crl)

0.58 (0.31, 0.98)

0.58 (0.51, 0.98 0.91 (0.75, 1.1) 1.1 (0.77, 1.5) 0.93 (0.71, 1.2) 1.0 (0.71, 1.4) 1.2 (1.0, 1.3)

0.81 (0.63, 1.0) 1.1 (0.90, 1.3) 0.69 (0.53, 0.92)

0.79 (0.62, 0.98)

Odds Ratio (95% Crl)

0.83 (0.45, 1.4)

1.3 (0.99, 1.7) 1.5 (1.0, 2.2)

1.5 (1.0, 2.2) 1.3 (0.95, 1.8) 1.4 (0.96, 2.1) 1.7 (1.3, 2.1) 1.2 (0.87, 1.5) 1.6 (1.2, 2.1) 1.4 (1.1, 1.9)

1.1 (0.83, 1.5)

Odds Ratio (95% Crl)

0.73 (0.39, 1.3)

1.2 (0.93, 1.4) 1.3 (0.97, 1.9)

1.2 (0.90, 1.6) 1.3 (0.91, 1.8)

1.5 (1.2, 1.8) 1.0 (0.81, 1.3) 1.4 (1.1, 1.7) 1.3 (1.0, 1.6)

0.89 (0.66, 1.2)

-0-

2

2

7

3

0-

-0

-0

-0

-0--

-0

-0-

-0

2

~



Figure 6. Forest plot of Non-vertebral fracture.

Outcomes	ABL	ALE	СТ	DEN	IBA	PLA	RIS	RLX	STR	TPD	ZOL
Lumbar spine BMD	98.5%	53.3%	13.6%	75.8%	43.0%	0.0%	30.6%	16.8%	66.0%	90.2%	60.2%
Total hip BMD	85.7%	49.5%	11.4%	87.5%	41.2%	1.1%	27.2%	23.0%	78.9%	60.4%	83.9%
VF	97.3%	43.8%	10.4%	76.1%	54.6%	0.8%	42.5%	29.4%	28.8%	89.2%	75.2%
NVF	93.1%	53.3%	23.4%	46.2%	41.4%	5.8%	69.1%	19.1%	33.4%	88.7%	73.6%

Table VI. SUCRA values of all studied interventions with regard to lumbar spine BMD, total hip BMD, VF, and NVF.

Furthermore, ALE and RIS were more effective than RLX (0.83, 0.70-0.99; 0.74, 0.59-0.90). In addition, both TPD and ZOL were associated with a lower risk of non-vertebral fracture than RLX (0.64, 0.49-0.84; 0.72, 0.58-0.88, respectively) and STR (0.69, 0.53-0.92; 0.79, 0.62-0.98, respectively).

Rank of Treatments

The corresponding rank of eleven interventions including PLA was presented based on their SUCRA value. For the four outcomes (lumbar spine BMD, total hip BMD, VF, and NVF) of the analysis, the best treatments were ABL (98.5%), DEN (87.5%), ABL (97.3%), and ABL (93.1%), respectively. The full details of all four ranks were presented in Table VI and Figure 7.

Consistency

The node-splitting method was used to assess the consistency of direct and indirect evidence (Figures 8, 9, 10, and 11). The evidence between direct and indirect comparisons appeared to be consistent if the *p*-value was > 0.05. For the results of lumbar spine BMD, the overall consistency was satisfactory except for the comparison between ZOL and ALE. For the results of total hip BMD, inconsistency occurred in three group comparisons (TPD and ALE, ZOL and ALE, ZOL and ALE, ZOL and DEN). For the results of vertebral fracture and non-vertebral fracture, all the groups met the criteria of consistency with *p*-values > 0.05.



Figure 7. Ranking graph of A, Lumbar spine BMD, B, Total hip BMD, C, Vertebral fracture, and D, Non-vertebral fracture.

Study P-value	Mean Difference (95% Crl)	Study P-value	Mean Difference (95% Crl)
CT vs ALE		PLA vs IBA	
direct	-3.8 (-5.6, -2.1)	direct 📀	-3.8 (-5.0, -2.6)
indirect 0.11415 -	-2.2 (-3.3, -1.0)	indirect 0.740025 -0-	-4.1 (-5.5, -2.7)
network 📀	-2.6 (-3.5, -1.6)	network 📀	-3.9 (-4.8, -3.0)
DEN vs ALE		RIS vs IBA	
direct -	- 0.20 (-2.7.3.1)	direct	-25(-53028)
indirect 0.452175	14 (0 28, 2, 5)	indirect 0 19075	-0.50 (-1.8, 0.76)
network	1 2 (0 24 2 2)	network	-0.83 (-2.0, 0.30)
	1.2 (0.24, 2.2)		0.00 (2.0, 0.00)
IBA VS ALE		RIS VS PLA	
direct -	-0.42 (-2.1, 1.2)	direct O	2.8 (1.8, 3.8)
indirect 0.815975	-0.66 (-1.9, 0.58)	indirect 0.4587	3.4 (2.2, 4.7)
network o	-0.50 (-1.5, 0.48)	network	3.1 (2.3, 3.9)
PLA vs ALE		RLX vs PLA	
direct O	-4.7 (-5.3, -4.0)	direct 📀	2.3 (1.3, 3.4)
indirect 0.06415 📀	-3.5 (-4.5, -2.4)	indirect 0.250775 +0-	1.2 (-0.61, 2.9)
network O	-4.4 (-4.9, -3.8)	network 🔷	2.0 (1.1, 2.9)
RIS vs ALE		STR vs PLA	
direct -0-	-0.97 (-2.7, 0.77)	direct	51(3172)
indirect 0.66765	-1.4 (-2.5 -0.35)	indirect 0.930225	54(0.84 9.9)
network	-1.3 (-2.2, -0.44)	network	5.2 (3.4. 7.0)
RLX vs ALE		TPD vs PI A	0.2 (0.1, 1.0)
direct	-21(-48 -15)	direct	7 5 (5 0 0 0)
indirect 0.25625	-3.1(-4.0, -1.5) -2.0(-3.2, -0.76)		7.5 (5.9, 9.0)
network	-2.0(-3.2, -0.70) -2.4(-3.3, -1.4)		7.1 (0.0, 0.4)
	-2.4 (-3.3, -1.4)		1.2 (0.3, 0.2)
TPD vs ALE		ZOL vs PLA	
direct	-0- 5.0 (2.5, 7.5)	direct -O-	3.6 (2.0, 5.3)
indirect 0.0591	• 2.4 (1.2, 3.5)	indirect 0.0505	5.9 (4.3, 7.6)
network	• 2.8 (1.8, 3.9)	network 🔶	4.8 (3.6, 5.9)
ZOL vs ALE		STR vs RIS	
direct	—0 — 8.1 (4.9, 11.0)	direct	2.3 (-2.1, 6.8)
indirect 0 🗠	-0.75 (-1.9, 0.40)	indirect 0.92685	2.1 (-0.054, 4.2)
network 🔶	0.36 (-0.85, 1.6)	network	2.1 (0.20, 4.1)
PLA vs CT		TPD vs RIS	
direct 📀	-1.8 (-2.8, -0.92)	direct	2.7 (-0.26, 5.7)
indirect 0.3398	-3.1 (-5.6, -0.65)	indirect 0.27945	4.4 (3.2, 5.8)
network 📀	-1.8 (-2.7, -0.98)	network 🔶	4.2 (3.0, 5.4)
TPD vs CT		ZOL vs TPD	
direct	-0 4 3 (2 1 6 6)	direct	-28 (-56 0 053)
indirect 0.251975	- C 58(4572)	indirect 0 805675	-24(-40, -0.71)
network	•• 5.4 (4.2, 6.6)	network	-2.5(-3.8, -1.1)
IBA vs DEN			
direct	-21(-47047)	-8 0	20
indirect 0.735225	-16(-30, -0.28)		
network	-1.7(-2.9, -0.54)		
	(1.0, 0.0.1)		
FLA VS DEN	54400 40		
direct	-5.4 (-6.6, -4.2)		
Indirect 0.458975 -0-	-6.1(-7.5, -4.7)		
	-5.6 (-6.5, -4.7)		
RIS VS DEN			
direct	-2.3 (-4.9, 0.28)		
indirect 0.815675 -0-	-2.6 (-3.9, -1.4)		
network 📀	-2.6 (-3.7, -1.5)		
TPD vs DEN			
direct	0.70 (-2.4, 3.9)		
indirect 0.546775	► 1.8 (0.41, 3.1)		
network -	► 1.6 (0.36, 2.8)		
ZOL vs DEN			
direct -	-1.5 (-3.6, 0.68)		
indirect 0.47495	-0.51 (-2.1, 1.2)		
network	-0.87 (-2.1, 0.45)		
	20		
-0 0	20		

Figure 8. Comparison of Lumbar Spine BMD between direct and indirect evidence.

Publication Bias and Quality of Included Studies

Funnel plots were depicted to assess publication bias (Figure 12). Each dot represented a study, and the conclusion regarding publication bias was drawn based on the asymmetrical distribution of dots. As a result, no significant publication bias was observed in the four funnel plots of outcomes. The studies included in this network meta-analysis were assessed based on the Modified JADAD Scale. The full mark was 7, which comprised blinding techniques (0-2), randomization (0-2), concealment allocation (0-2) and disclosure of withdrawals (0-1). The results of the Modified JADAD Scale of all 105 studies were presented in Table VII.

Study	P-value			Mean Difference (95% Crl)
DEN vs A	LE			
direct	0 907475	-		1.4 (-0.26, 3.1)
network	0.907475		~	1.4 (0.73, 2.0)
IBA vs A	LE			
direct	0 77325	~	E	-0.36 (-1.3, 0.53)
network	0.77525	-	-	-0.25 (-0.85, 0.34)
PLA vs A	LE			
direct	0.006975	-0-		-2.5(-3.0, -2.0)
network	0.090875	÷.		-2.2 (-2.6, -1.8)
RIS vs A	LE			
direct	0.0000	-0-		-1.2 (-2.3, -0.045)
network	0.2002			-0.72 (-1.6, 0.13)
RLX vs A	LE			
direct		-0		-1.2 (-2.3, -0.19)
ndirect	0.3976		-	-0.65 (-1.6, 0.24) -0.91 (-1.6, -0.22)
TPD vs A	LE			
direct	0 02795			2.4 (0.37, 4.5)
network	0.03765		- -	0.40 (-0.39, 1.2)
ZOL vs A	LE			
direct			-0-	3.7 (2.8, 4.6)
ndirect	0	-	- -	0.31 (-0.22, 0.88) 1.2 (0.48, 1.9)
IBA vs D	EN			
direct			-	-1.2 (-2.6, 0.24)
indirect network	0.484225	- - -		-1.7 (-2.6, -0.94) -1.6 (-2.3, -0.90)
PLA vs D	EN	-		
direct		-0-		-3.4 (-4.1, -2.7)
indirect	0.505475	- -		-3.8(-4.7, -2.9) -3.6(-4.1, -3.0)
RIS vs D	EN	•		0.0 (4.1, 0.0)
direct				-1.6 (-3.0, -0.16)
indirect	0.321	-0		-2.5 (-3.6, -1.3)
TPD vs D	EN			2.1(3.0, 1.2)
direct		— ——	•	-1.8 (-3.8, 0.14)
indirect network	0.327825			-0.76 (-1.7, 0.17) -0.95 (-1.8, -0.12)
ZOL vs D	EN			,,
direct		-0		-1.3 (-2.6, -0.017)
indirect network	0.0332		0- -	0.41 (-0.46, 1.2) -0 13 (-0 91, 0.63)
PLA vs I	ЗА			
direct		-0-		-1.8 (-2.7, -1.1)
indirect network	0.711425	-0-		-2.1 (-2.9, -1.2) -1.9 (-2.5, -1.4)
RIS vs IB	A			
direct			_	-0.84 (-2.6, 0.98)
indirect network	0.602725		_	-0.28 (-1.4, 0.88) -0.47 (-1.4, 0.47)
RLX vs P	LA	-		0.11 (1.1, 0.11)
direct			-0-	1.5 (0.70, 2.3)
indirect network	0.391025	-		0.90 (-0.22, 2.0) 1 3 (0 65, 1 9)
STR vs P	LA		-	
direct			— —	3.3 (2.2, 4.5)
network	0.47505			- 2.0 (-1.6, 5.6) 3.2 (2.1, 4.3)
TPD vs P	LA			
direct			-0-	2.5 (1.5, 3.4)
ndirect	0.693			2.8 (1.6, 3.9) 2.6 (1.9, 3.3)
ZOL vs P	LA			
direct			-0-	2.8 (1.8, 3.7)
inairect network	0.059575		- -	4.0 (3.1, 4.9) 3.4 (2.8, 4.1)
STR vs R	lis		-	,,
direct			• <u> </u>	0.61 (-2.8, 4.0)
indirect network	0.483225			2.0 (0.47, 3.5) 1.7 (0.38, 3.1)
ZOL vs T	PD		-	(, 0)
direct		-	— —	1.1 (-0.55, 2.7)
indirect network	0.706425		↓	0.70 (-0.37, 1.8) 0.82 (-0.074 17)
	г _^	5 ()	
			-	-

Figure 9. Comparison of Total hip BMD between direct and indirect evidence.

Study P-value	Odds Ratio (95% Crl)
IBA vs ALE	
direct indirect 0.8163 network	0.98 (0.28, 3.5) 0.83 (0.52, 1.3) 0.84 (0.54, 1.3)
PLA vs ALE	
direct o.4143	1.9 (1.5, 2.3) 1.4 (0.70, 2.7) 1.8 (1.5, 2.2)
RLX vs ALE	
direct	0.76 (0.34, 1.6) 1.2 (0.92, 1.6) 1.1 (0.88, 1.5)
IBA vs DEN	
direct 0.80035	1.1 (0.12, 10.0) 1.5 (0.90, 2.6) 1.5 (0.90, 2.5)
PLA vs DEN	
direct 0.76985	3.3 (2.3, 4.6) 2.3 (0.23, 25.0) 3.2 (2.3, 4.5)
PLA vs IBA	
direct indirect 0.9889 network	2.2 (1.4, 3.3) 2.2 (0.76, 6.5) 2.2 (1.5, 3.3)
RIS vs PLA	
direct indirect 0.90535 network	0.54 (0.42, 0.70) 0.57 (0.30, 1.1) 0.55 (0.44, 0.69)
RLX vs PLA	
direct o indirect 0.25135	0.64 (0.53, 0.77) 0.40 (0.18, 0.87) 0.62 (0.51, 0.75)
TPD vs PLA	
direct -0- indirect 0.524325 -0- network -0-	0.26 (0.17, 0.38) 0.20 (0.12, 0.35) 0.23 (0.16, 0.32)
ZOL vs PLA	
direct 0.0998	0.31 (0.24, 0.42) 1.5 (0.24, 190.0) 0.32 (0.25, 0.44)
IPD vs RIS	
direct -0- indirect 0.955175 -0- network -0-	0.42 (0.25, 0.70) 0.43 (0.26, 0.68) 0.42 (0.29, 0.60)
ZOL vs TPD	4 19 WAY-1997 - 20032 1971
direct 0.162325	- 6.9 (0.72, 160.0) 1.3 (0.83, 2.0) 1.4 (0.92, 2.2)
0.1 1	200

Figure 10. Comparison of Vertebral fracture between direct and indirect evidence.

Discussion

In this NMA, we systematically assessed the efficacy of ABL, ALE, CT, DEN, IBA, RIS, RLX, STR, TPD, and ZOL in increasing BMD and reducing fracture rate. A total of 122, 685 cases from 103 studies were included. As shown in our assessment, ABL was considered as the best therapy for the treatment of postmenopausal women with osteoporosis because it ranked first in the outcomes of lumbar spine BMD, VF, and NVF based on the SUCRA value and second in the outcome of total hip BMD. Similar to the

Study	P-value				Odds Ratio (95% Crl)	
IBA vs A	LE					
direct indirect network	0.7707		-	۰ ۲	1.2 (0.54, 2.6) 1.1 (0.77, 1.5) 1.1 (0.81, 1.5)	
PLA vs	ALE					
direct indirect network	0.397625		_	o o	1.3 (1.1, 1.5) 1.0 (0.60, 1.7) 1.3 (1.1, 1.5)	
RLX vs	ALE					
direct indirect network	0.7751			ہ ہ ہ	1.1 (0.51, 2.3) 1.2 (1.0, 1.4) 1.2 (1.0, 1.4)	
TPD vs	ALE					
direct indirect network	0.069575		~~ ~		0.23 (0.057, 0.87) 0.80 (0.60, 1.1) 0.77 (0.59, 1.0)	
IBA vs D	DEN					
direct indirect network	0.5958		-	 - -	0.90 (0.40, 1.9) 1.1 (0.78, 1.7) 1.1 (0.78, 1.6)	
PLAVS	DEN				10/10 10	
indirect network	0.52585		_	¢ ¢	1.3 (1.0, 1.6) 0.98 (0.44, 2.3) 1.3 (1.0, 1.6)	
PLA vs	IBA					
direct indirect network	0.7595		-	0 0 0-	1.1 (0.79, 1.6) 1.3 (0.72, 2.2) 1.2 (0.87, 1.6)	
RIS vs F	PLA					
direct indirect network	0.232125		↓	-	0.67 (0.54, 0.80) 0.98 (0.54, 1.8) 0.69 (0.57, 0.82)	
RLX vs	PLA					
direct indirect network	0.8033				0.94 (0.82, 1.1) 0.85 (0.38, 1.7) 0.94 (0.82, 1.1)	
TPD vs	PLA					
direct indirect network ZOL vs	0.06915 P LA		~ ~ ~		0.67 (0.51, 0.88) 0.41 (0.27, 0.64) 0.60 (0.47, 0.76)	
direct			-0-		0.68 (0.56, 0.80)	
indirect network	0.98865			-	0.67 (0.21, 1.9) 0.67 (0.56, 0.80)	
TPD vs RIS						
direct indirect network	0.255525		ρ _τ γ	+ } }-	0.66 (0.38, 1.1) 0.95 (0.70, 1.3) 0.87 (0.66, 1.2)	
airect indirect network	0.989			0 0 0	1.1 (0.41, 3.3) 1.1 (0.85, 1.5) 1.1 (0.84, 1.5)	
	0.0	05		1	4	

Figure 11. Comparison of Non-vertebral fracture between direct and indirect evidence.

related drug TPD, ABL was also a parathyroid hormone-related protein analog drug applied to treat osteoporosis, which successfully completed a Phase III trial in 2016⁷. It has 41% homology to parathyroid hormone (PTH1-34) and 76% homology to parathyroid hormone-related protein¹¹⁷. It works as an anabolic agent for bone, selectively activated by the parathyroid hormone 1 receptor

of osteoblasts and osteocytes^{118,119}. On 28 April 2017, it was approved by the USA food and drug administration for the treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis. As a result, ABL may become a new standard for the treatment of postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. Furthermore, for the outcome of total hip BMD, DEN achieved the highest SUCRA value, indicating that DEN was the best drug to improve the total hip BMD. DEN is a human monoclonal antibody and a RANKL inhibitor, which prevents the development of osteoclasts and inhibits bone resorption¹²⁰. For patients with evidently low total hip BMD, DEN may be a more suitable drug available for them. In addition, DEN had good efficacy in other aspects, ranking third, third and sixth in the outcomes of lumbar spine BMD, VF, and NVF, respectively. TPD was still efficient enough to be a fine choice, ranked just behind ABL in the outcomes of lumbar spine BMD, VF, and NVF. However, the performances of CT and RLX were not satisfactory. CT performed worst in the outcomes of lumbar spine BMD, total hip BMD, and VF and ranked the last but one in the outcome of NVF among ten drugs. Meanwhile, RLX ranked the lowest in the outcome of NVF, the third to last in the outcome of VF, and last but one in the outcomes of lumbar spine BMD and total hip BMD. The primary function of CT is to reduce blood calcium, opposing the effects of parathyroid hormone¹²¹ and RLX is a selective estrogen receptor modulator that can function analogously to estrogen to prevent postmenopausal osteoporosis¹²². The remaining five drugs all had medium efficacy in the treatment parameters, including four bisphosphonates (ALE, IBA, RIS, and ZOL) and STR. Bisphosphonates are the most common drug used for osteoporosis, especially ALE, which can prevent bone loss and reduce fracture rate¹²³. STR is a strontium salt of ranelic acid that has both anti-resorptive and anabolic effects¹²⁴.

To our knowledge, this was the very largest NMA with respect to the effect of therapies for postmenopausal osteoporosis on BMD in the lumbar spine and fracture rate. A large number of studies and cases were included in this NMA. Furthermore, both direct and indirect comparisons were applied to achieve convincing results. Our results were consistent with previous studies. For instance, as the meta-analysis conducted by Wang et al¹²⁵ demonstrated, TPD is more effective than ALE in improving lumbar spine BMD. Moreover, a meta-analysis performed by Lin et al¹²⁶ suggested that DEN is more effective in in-



Figure 12. Funnel plots assessing publication bias. Asymmetry patterns indicate the presence of potential significant publication bias. **A**, Lumbar spine BMD, **B**, Total hip BMD, **C**, Vertebral fracture, and **D**, Non-vertebral fracture; (A) Abaloparatide, (B) Alendronate, (C) Calcitonin, (D) Denosumab, (E) Ibandronate, (F) Risedronate, (G) Raloxifene, (H) Strontium Ranelate, (I) Teriparatide, (J) Zoledronate, and (K) Placebo.

creasing BMD in the lumbar spine and total hip of postmenopausal women compared to ALE. Similar results were also found in the meta-analysis performed by Zhang et al¹²⁷, indicating that TPD and DEN perform better than ALE and RIS in the reduction of risk of VF. In the NMA undertaken by Reginster et al¹²⁸, ABL proved superior to DEN and TPD in reducing the risk of VF and NVF. However, there still remain some limitations in our NMA. As mentioned above, some inconsistency remained in the groups including ZOL vs. ALE in lumbar spine BMD, and TPD vs. ALE, ZOL vs. ALE and ZOL vs. DEN in total hip BMD. It may be explained that only one trial reporting the direct comparison between ZOL and ALE, with only 105 participants involved¹⁰⁹. As a result, the corresponding results should be interpreted with caution and a clinical trial with a large sample size is suggested. In addition, another limitation is that the mode of administration

is not uniform. For example, for the same ALE, some patients were instructed to take 10 mg once a day and some to take 70 mg once a week or even 150 mg once a month. It may contribute to the increased heterogeneity among studies due to the difference in compliance of participants and drug dosage. Therefore, further researches are needed to illuminate the influence of the mode of administration.

Conclusions

This network meta-analysis demonstrated that ABL can be considered as the preferable drug for improving BMD and reducing the risk of fracture. DEN and TPD are also quite effective, and in particular, DEN performs best in improving total BMD. Nevertheless, more high-quality RCTs are necessary to support and update our conclusions.

Studies	Blinding	Randomization	Concealment allocation	Withdrawal	Total scores
ABL/TPD/PLA					
Miller 2016	2	0	2	1	5
ALE/CT/PLA					
Adami 1993	2	2	1	0	5
Downs 2000	2	1	2	0	5
Dursun 2001	0	1	0	0	1
ALE/DEN/PLA					
Lewiecki 2007	2	2	1	1	6
ALE/IBA/RIS					
Paggiosi 2014	0	1	2	1	4
ALE/IBA					
Guanabens 2013	0	2	2	1	5
Miller 2008'	1	1	1	1	4
ALE/PLA					
Black 1996	2	2	2	1	7
Bone 1997	1	1	0	0	2
Chesnut 1995	1	2	2	1	6
Cummings 1998	2	2	2	l	7
Devogelaer 1996	2	2	2	0	6
Hochberg 2005	2	1	0	0	3
Hosking 1998	2	1	2	0	5
Lau 2000	1	1	2	1	2
Liberman 1995	1	1	0	1	3
Pois 1999 Ouendt 2005	2	1	1	0	4
Qualitit 2005 Payn 1000	2	1	1	0	4
Ravii 1999 Rossini 2001	0	1	0	0	1
Stnan 1000	2	1	2	0	5
Tucci 1996	2	1	2	0	5
Yan 2009	2	1	0	1	4
Yen 2000	1	2	2	1	6
ALE/RIS	-				
Rosen 2005	2	2	2	1	7
Sarioglu 2006	$\frac{1}{0}$	1	1	0	2
AIF/RIX	Ŭ	*	-		
Luchev 2004	2	2	2	1	7
Iwamoto 2008	0	1	0	1	2
Recker 2007	2	2	2	1	- 7
Sambrook 2004	2	2	2	1	7
ALE/TPD					
Body 2002	2	1	0	1	4
Finkelstein 2010	0	2	2	1	5
ALE/ZOL					
Tan 2016	2	2	2	1	7
	2	2	2	1	/
Rinkley 2012	2	1	2	1	6
Binkley 2012	2	1	0	1	4
Chesnut 2000	2	2	2	1	7
Henriksen 2016	$\overline{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	$\frac{1}{2}$	1	, 7
Overgaard 1994	2	-2	2	0	6
Reginster 1995	- 1	- 1	- 1	1	4
CT/TPD					
Li 2013	0	1	0	1	2.
Zhang 2012	Ő	1	õ	0	1
DEN/IRA	~	*	~	~	-
Recknor 2013	0	2	2	1	5

Table VII. Modified Jadad Scale.

Continued

Studies	Blinding	Randomization	Concealment allocation	Withdrawal	Total scores
DEN/PLA					
Bone 2008	2	1	0	1	4
Bone 2011	2	2	1	1	6
Cummings 2009	0	1	0	1	2
Nakamura 2012	1	1	1	1	4
DEN/RIS					
Roux 2014	0	1	1	1	3
DEN/TPD	Ŭ	*	-		
Tsai 2013	2	2	2	1	7
	2	2	2	1	1
Miller 2016	2	1	1	1	5
A pastasilakis 2015	0	1	1	1	5
Allastasilakis 2015	0	2	2	1	
IBA/PLA Charmant 2004	2	2	2	0	(
Lester 2012	2	2	2	0	0
	1	1	0	1	3
Lewiecki 2009	1	1	0	1	3
Meelung 2004	2	1	2	1	6
Mcclung 2009	2	1	0	0	3
Ravn 1996	2	1	1	1	5
Stakkestad 2003	2	1	2	1	6
RIS/PLA					
Clemmesen 1997	1	1	0	0	2
Fogelman 2000	1	1	1	1	4
Harris 1999	2	2	2	1	7
Hooper 2005	2	2	2	1	7
Li 2005	2	1	0	1	4
Mcclung 2001	2	1	1	0	4
Mortensen 1998	2	1	2	0	5
Palomba 2008	1	2	2	1	6
Reginster 2000	1	1	1	1	4
Siris 2008	1	1	0	0	2
Valimaiki 2007	1	2	1	0	4
RIS/STR					
Narula 2012	0	1	1	0	2
RIS/TPD					
Anastasilakis 2008	0	1	0	1	2
Kendler 2017	2	2	2	1	7
RLX/PLA					
Bueno 2017	1	2	2	0	5
Delmas 1997	2	1	2	0	5
Ensrud 2008	2	1	2	0	5
Ettinger 1999	2	2	2	1	7
Liu 2004	2	1	1	1	5
Lufkin 1998	1	1	2	1	5
Mcclung 2006	2	1	0	0	3
Meunier 1999	1	1	1	0	3
Miller 2008	2	2	2	1	7
Morii 2003	2	2	2	1	7
Silverman 2008	1	1	1	1	4
Zheng 2003	1	1	1	1	4
STR/PLA					
Hwang 2008	2	1	0	0	3
Liu 2009	1	1	1	1	4
Meunier 2002	2	1	2	1	6
Meunier 2004	1	1	0	1	3
Meunier 2009	2	1	0	1	4
Reginster 2005	1	1	1	1	4
Reginster 2008	1	1	1	1	4

Table VII (Continued). Modified Jadad Scale.

Continued

Studies	Blinding	Randomization	Concealment allocation	Withdrawal	Total scores
TPD/PLA					
Krege 2012	1	1	0	0	2
Miyauchi 2010	1	1	2	1	5
Nakamura 2012'	2	2	1	1	6
Neer 2001	0	1	1	0	2
TPD/ZOL					
Cosman 2011	2	2	2	1	7
ZOL/PLA					
Bai 2013	1	1	0	0	2
Black 2007	2	2	1	1	6
Chao 2013	1	1	0	0	2
Grey 2009	2	2	2	1	7
Grey 2014	2	2	2	1	7
Hwang 2011	1	1	0	0	2
Mcclung 2009'	2	2	2	0	6

Table VII (Continued). Modified Jadad Scale.

Conflict of Interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- ZHANG HG, WANG XB, ZHAO H, ZHOU CN. MicroR-NA-9-5p promotes osteoporosis development through inhibiting osteogenesis and promoting adipogenesis via targeting Wnt3a. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci 2019; 23: 456-463.
- [No AUTHORS LISTED]. Management of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women: 2010 position statement of The North American Menopause Society. Menopause 2010; 17: 25-56. (PMID: 20061894)
- RIGGS BL, KHOSLA S, MELTON LJ 3RD. A unitary model for involutional osteoporosis: estrogen deficiency causes both type I and type II osteoporosis in postmenopausal women and contributes to bone loss in aging men. J Bone Miner Res 1998; 13: 763-773.
- KANIS JA. Assessment of fracture risk and its application to screening for postmenopausal osteoporosis: synopsis of a WHO report. WHO Study Group. Osteoporos Int 1994; 4: 368-381.
- 5) LESLIE WD, LIX LM, YOGENDRAN MS, MORIN SN, METGE CJ, MAJUMDAR SR. Temporal trends in obesity, osteoporosis treatment, bone mineral density, and fracture rates: a population-based historical cohort study. J Bone Miner Res 2014; 29: 952-959.
- 6) LOOKER AC, MELTON LJ 3RD, BORRUD LG, SHEPHERD JA. Changes in femur neck bone density in US adults between 1988-1994 and 2005-2008: demographic patterns and possible determinants. Osteoporos Int 2012; 23: 771-780.
- 7) MILLER PD, HATTERSLEY G, RIIS BJ, WILLIAMS GC, LAU E, RUSSO LA, ALEXANDERSEN P, ZERBINI CAF, HU MY,

HARRIS AG, FITZPATRICK LA, COSMAN F, CHRISTIANSEN C. Effect of abaloparatide vs placebo on newvertebral fractures in postmenopausalwomen with osteoporosis a randomized clinical trial. JAMA 2016; 316: 722-733.

- BUCHER HC, GUYATT GH, GRIFFITH LE, WALTER SD. The results of direct and indirect treatment comparisons in meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. J Clin Epidemiol 1997; 50: 683-691.
- 9) WANG G, SUI L, GAI P, LI G, QI X, JIANG X. The efficacy and safety of vertebral fracture prevention therapies in post-menopausal osteoporosis treatment: Which therapies work best? a network meta-analysis. Bone Joint Res 2017; 6: 452-463.
- 10) FREEMANTLE N, COOPER C, DIEZ-PEREZ A, GITLIN M, RAD-CLIFFE H, SHEPHERD S, ROUX C. Results of indirect and mixed treatment comparison of fracture efficacy for osteoporosis treatments: a meta-analysis. Osteoporos Int 2013; 24: 209-217.
- 11) LIU GF, WANG ZQ, LIU L, ZHANG BT, MIAO YY, YU SN. A network meta-analysis on the short-term efficacy and adverse events of different anti-osteoporosis drugs for the treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis. J Cell Biochem 2018; 119: 4469-4481.
- 12) JADAD AR, MOORE RA, CARROLL D, JENKINSON C, REYN-OLDS DJ, GAVAGHAN DJ, MCOUAY HJ. Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: is blinding necessary? Control Clin Trials 1996; 17: 1-12.
- LUMLEY T. Network meta-analysis for indirect treatment comparisons. Stat Med 2002; 21: 2313-2324.
- 14) SALANTI G, ADES AE, IOANNIDIS JP. Graphical methods and numerical summaries for presenting results from multiple-treatment meta-analysis: an overview and tutorial. J Clin Epidemiol 2011; 64: 163-171.
- 15) Adami S, Baroni MC, Broggini M, Carratelli L, Caruso I, Gnessi L, Laurenzi M, Lombardi A, Norbiato G,

ORTOLANI S, RICERCA E, ROMANINI L, SUBRIZI S, WEINBERG J, YATES AJ. Treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis with continuous daily oral alendronate in comparison with either placebo or intranasal salmon calcitonin. Osteoporos Int 1993; 3: 21-27.

- 16) ANASTASILAKIS AD, GOULIS DG, POLYZOS SA, GEROU S, KOUKOULIS GN, EFSTATHIADOU Z, KITA M, AVRAMIDIS A. Head-to-head comparison of risedronate vs. teriparatide on bone turnover markers in women with postmenopausal osteoporosis: a randomised trial. Int J Clin Pract 2008; 62: 919-924.
- 17) ANASTASILAKIS AD, POLYZOS SA, GKIOMISI A, SARIDAKIS ZG, DIGKAS D, BISBINAS I, SAKELLARIOU GT, PAPATHEODOROU A, KOKKORIS P, MAKRAS P. Denosumab versus zoledronic acid in patients previously treated with zoledronic acid. Osteoporos Int 2015; 26: 2521-2527.
- 18) BAI H, JING D, GUO A, YIN S. Randomized controlled trial of zoledronic acid for treatment of osteoporosis in women. J Int Med Res 2013; 41: 697-704.
- 19) BINKLEY N, BOLOGNESE M, SIDOROWICZ-BIALYNICKA A, VALLY T, TROUT R, MILLER C, BUBEN CE, GILLIGAN JP, KRAUSE DS. A phase 3 trial of the efficacy and safety of oral recombinant calcitonin: the Oral Calcitonin in Postmenopausal Osteoporosis (ORACAL) trial. J Bone Miner Res 2012; 27: 1821-1829.
- 20) BINKLEY N, BONE H, GILLIGAN JP, KRAUSE DS. Efficacy and safety of oral recombinant calcitonin tablets in postmenopausal women with low bone mass and increased fracture risk: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. Osteoporos Int 2014; 25: 2649-2656.
- 21) BLACK DM, CUMMINGS SR, KARPF DB, CAULEY JA, THOMP-SON DE, NEVITT MC, BAUER DC, GENANT HK, HASKELL WL, MARCUS R, OTT SM, TORNER JC, QUANDT SA, REISS TF, ENSRUD KE. Randomised trial of effect of alendronate on risk of fracture in women with existing vertebral fractures. Fracture Intervention Trial Research Group. Lancet 1996; 348: 1535-1541.
- 22) BLACK DM, DELMAS PD, EASTELL R, REID IR, BOONEN S, CAULEY JA, COSMAN F, LAKATOS P, PING CL, MAN Z, MAUTALEN C, MESENBRINK P, HU H, CAMINIS J, TONG K, ROSARIO-JANSEN T, KRASNOW J, HUE TF, SELLMEYER D, ERIKSEN EF, CUMMINGS SR. Once-yearly zoledronic acid for treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis. N Engl J Med 2007; 356: 1809-1822.
- 23) BODY JJ, GAICH GA, SCHEELE WH, KULKARNI PM, MILLER PD, PERETZ A, DORE RK, CORREA-ROTTER R, PAPAIOAN-NOU A, CUMMING DC, HODSMAN AB. A randomized double-blind trial to compare the efficacy of teriparatide [recombinant human parathyroid hormone (1-34)] with alendronate in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2002; 87: 4528-4535.
- 24) BONE HG, BOLOGNESE MA, YUEN CK, KENDLER DL, MILLER PD, YANG YC, GRAZETTE L, MARTIN JS, GALLAGHER JC. Effects of denosumab treatment and discontinuation on bone mineral density and bone turnover markers in postmenopausal women with low bone mass. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2011; 96: 972-980.
- 25) BONE HG, BOLOGNESE MA, YUEN CK, KENDLER DL, WANG H, LIU Y, SAN MARTIN J. Effects of denosumab on bone mineral density and bone turnover in

postmenopausal women. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2008; 93: 2149-2157.

- 26) BONE HG, DOWNS RW, TUCCI JR, HARRIS ST, WEINSTEIN RS, LICATA AA, MCCLUNG MR, KIMMEL DB, GERTZ BJ, HALE E, POLVINO WJ. Dose-response relationships for alendronate treatment in osteoporotic elderly women. Alendronate Elderly Osteoporosis Study Centers. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1997; 82: 265-274.
- 27) BUENO JAH, ARIAS L, YU CR, WILLIAMS R, KOMM BS. Efficacy and safety of bazedoxifene in postmenopausal Latino women with osteoporosis. Menopause 2017; 24: 1033-1039.
- 28) CHAO M, HUA Q, YINGFENG Z, GUANG W, SHUFENG S, YUZHEN D, WEI W, HAIFENG T. Study on the role of zoledronic acid in treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis. Pak J Med Sci 2013; 29.
- 29) CHESNUT CH 3RD, MCCLUNG MR, ENSRUD KE, BELL NH, GENANT HK, HARRIS ST, SINGER FR, STOCK JL, YOOD RA, DELMAS PD, ET AL. Alendronate treatment of the postmenopausal osteoporotic woman: effect of multiple dosages on bone mass and bone remodeling. Am J Med 1995; 99: 144-152.
- 30) CHESNUT CH 3RD, SKAG A, CHRISTIANSEN C, RECKER R, STAKKESTAD JA, HOISETH A, FELSENBERG D, HUSS H, GILBRIDE J, SCHIMMER RC, DELMAS PD. Effects of oral ibandronate administered daily or intermittently on fracture risk in postmenopausal osteoporosis. J Bone Miner Res 2004; 19: 1241-1249.
- 31) CHESNUT ICH, SILVERMAN S, ANDRIANO K, GENANT H, GIMONA A, HARRIS S, KIEL D, LEBOFF M, MARICIC M, MILLER P, MONIZ C, PEACOCK M, RICHARDSON P, WATTS N, BAYLINK D. A randomized trial of nasal spray salmon calcitonin in postmenopausal women with established osteoporosis: the prevent recurrence of osteoporotic fractures study. Am J Med 2000; 109: 267-276.
- 32) CLEMMESEN B, RAVN P, ZEGELS B, TAQUET AN, CHRISTIAN-SEN C, REGINSTER JY. A 2-year phase II study with 1-year of follow-up of risedronate (NE-58095) in postmenopausal osteoporosis. Osteoporos Int 1997; 7: 488-495.
- 33) COSMAN F, ERIKSEN EF, RECKNOR C, MILLER PD, GUA-NABENS N, KASPERK C, PAPANASTASIOU P, READIE A, RAO H, GASSER JA, BUCCI-RECHTWEG C, BOONEN S. Effects of intravenous zoledronic acid plus subcutaneous teriparatide [rhPTH(1-34)] in postmenopausal osteoporosis. J Bone Miner Res 2011; 26: 503-511.
- 34) CUMMINGS SR, BLACK DM, THOMPSON DE, APPLEGATE WB, BARRETT-CONNOR E, MUSLINER TA, PALERMO L, PRINEAS R, RUBIN SM, SCOTT JC, VOGT T, WALLACE R, YATES AJ, LACROIX AZ. Effect of alendronate on risk of fracture in women with low bone density but without vertebral fractures: results from the Fracture Intervention Trial. JAMA 1998; 280: 2077-2082.
- 35) CUMMINGS SR, SAN MARTIN J, MCCLUNG MR, SIRIS ES, EASTELL R, REID IR, DELMAS P, ZOOG HB, AUSTIN M, WANG A, KUTILEK S, ADAMI S, ZANCHETTA J, LIBANATI C, SIDDHANTI S, CHRISTIANSEN C. Denosumab for prevention of fractures in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. N Engl J Med 2009; 361: 756-765.

- 36) DELMAS PD, BJARNASON NH, MITLAK BH, RAVOUX AC, SHAH AS, HUSTER WJ, DRAPER M, CHRISTIANSEN C. Effects of raloxifene on bone mineral density, serum cholesterol concentrations, and uterine endometrium in postmenopausal women. N Engl J Med 1997; 337: 1641-1647.
- 37) DEVOGELAER JP, BROLL H, CORREA-ROTTER R, CUMMING DC, DE DEUXCHAISNES CN, GEUSENS P, HOSKING D, JAEGER P, KAUFMAN JM, LEITE M, LEON J, LIBERMAN U, MENKES CJ, MEUNIER PJ, REID I, RODRIGUEZ J, ROMANO-WICZ A, SEEMAN E, VERMEULEN A, HIRSCH LJ, LOMBARDI A, PLEZIA K, SANTORA AC, YATES AJ, YUAN W. Oral alendronate induces progressive increases in bone mass of the spine, hip, and total body over 3 years in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. Bone 1996; 18: 141-150.
- 38) DOWNS RW, BELL NH, ETTINGER MP, WALSH BW, FAVUS MJ, MAKO B, WANG L, SMITH ME, GORMLEY GJ, MELTON ME. Comparison of alendronate and intranasal calcitonin for treatment of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2000; 85: 1783-1788.
- 39) DURSUN N, DURSUN E, YALCIN S. Comparison of alendronate, calcitonin and calcium treatments in postmenopausal osteoporosis. Int J Clin Pract 2001; 55: 505-509.
- 40) ENSRUD KE, STOCK JL, BARRETT-CONNOR E, GRADY D, MOSCA L, KHAW KT, ZHAO Q, AGNUSDEI D, CAULEY JA. Effects of raloxifene on fracture risk in postmenopausal women: the Raloxifene Use for the Heart Trial. J Bone Miner Res 2008; 23: 112-120.
- 41) ETTINGER B, BLACK DM, MITLAK BH, KNICKERBOCKER RK, NICKELSEN T, GENANT HK, CHRISTIANSEN C, DELMAS PD, ZANCHETTA JR, STAKKESTAD J, GLUER CC, KRUEGER K, COHEN FJ, ECKERT S, ENSRUD KE, AVIOLI LV, LIPS P, CUMMINGS SR. Reduction of vertebral fracture risk in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis treated with raloxifene: results from a 3-year randomized clinical trial. JAMA 1999; 282: 637-645.
- 42) FINKELSTEIN JS, WYLAND JJ, LEE H, NEER RM. Effects of teriparatide, alendronate, or both in women with postmenopausal osteoporosis. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2010; 95: 1838-1845.
- 43) FOGELMAN I, RIBOT C, SMITH R, ETHGEN D, SOD E, REGINSTER JY. Risedronate reverses bone loss in postmenopausal women with low bone mass: results from a multinational, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2000; 85: 1895-1900.
- 44) GREY A, BOLLAND M, MIHOV B, WONG S, HORNE A, GAMBLE G, REID IR. Duration of antiresorptive effects of low-dose zoledronate in osteopenic postmenopausal women: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. J Bone Miner Res 2014; 29: 166-172.
- 45) GREY A, BOLLAND MJ, WATTIE D, HORNE A, GAMBLE G, REID IR. The antiresorptive effects of a single dose of zoledronate persist for two years: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial in osteopenic postmenopausal women. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2009; 94: 538-544.
- 46) GUANABENS N, MONEGAL A, CERDA D, MUXI A, GIFRE L, PERIS P, PARES A. Randomized trial comparing monthly ibandronate and weekly alendronate for

osteoporosis in patients with primary biliary cirrhosis. Hepatology 2013; 58: 2070-2078.

- 47) HARRIS ST, WATTS NB, GENANT HK, MCKEEVER CD, HAN-GARTNER T, KELLER M, CHESNUT ICH, BROWN J, ERIKSEN EF, HOSEYNI MS, AXELROD DW, MILLER PD. Effects of risedronate treatment on vertebral and nonvertebral fractures in women with postmenopausal osteoporosis: a randomized controlled trial. JA-MA 1999; 282: 1344-1352.
- 48) HENRIKSEN K, BYRJALSEN I, ANDERSEN JR, BIHLET AR, RUSSO LA, ALEXANDERSEN P, VALTER I, QVIST P, LAU E, RIIS BJ, CHRISTIANSEN C, KARSDAL MA. A randomized, double-blind, multicenter, placebo-controlled study to evaluate the efficacy and safety of oral salmon calcitonin in the treatment of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women taking calcium and vitamin D. Bone 2016; 91: 122-129.
- 49) HOCHBERG MC, THOMPSON DE, BLACK DM, QUANDT SA, CAULEY J, GEUSENS P, ROSS PD, BARAN D. Effect of alendronate on the age-specific incidence of symptomatic osteoporotic fractures. J Bone Miner Res 2005; 20: 971-976.
- 50) HOOPER MJ, EBELING PR, ROBERTS AP, GRAHAM JJ, NICH-OLSON GC, D'EMDEN M, ERNST TF, WENDEROTH D. Risedronate prevents bone loss in early postmenopausal women: a prospective randomized, placebo-controlled trial. Climacteric 2005; 8: 251-262.
- 51) HOSKING D, CHILVERS CE, CHRISTIANSEN C, RAVN P, WASNICH R, ROSS P, MCCLUNG M, BALSKE A, THOMPSON D, DALEY M, YATES AJ. Prevention of bone loss with alendronate in postmenopausal women under 60 years of age. Early Postmenopausal Intervention Cohort Study Group. N Engl J Med 1998; 338: 485-492.
- 52) HWANG JS, CHEN JF, YANG TS, WU DJ, TSAI KS, HO C, WU CH, SU SL, WANG CJ, TU ST. The effects of strontium ranelate in Asian women with postmenopausal osteoporosis. Calcif Tissue Int 2008; 83: 308-314.
- 53) Hwang JS, CHIN LS, CHEN JF, YANG TS, CHEN PQ, Tsai KS, LEUNG PC. The effects of intravenous zoledronic acid in Chinese women with postmenopausal osteoporosis. J Bone Miner Metab 2011; 29: 328-333.
- 54) IWAMOTO J, SATO Y, UZAWA M, TAKEDA T, MATSU-MOTO H. Comparison of effects of alendronate and raloxifene on lumbar bone mineral density, bone turnover, and lipid metabolism in elderly women with osteoporosis. Yonsei Med J 2008; 49: 119-128.
- 55) KENDLER DL, MARIN F, ZERBINI C, RUSSO LA, GREEN-SPAN SL, ZIKAN V, BAGUR A, MALOUF-SIERRA J, LAKATOS P, FAHRLEITNER-PAMMER A, LESPESSAILLES E, MINISOLA S, BODY JJ, GEUSENS P, MORICKE R, LOPEZ-ROMERO P. Effects of teriparatide and risedronate on new fractures in post-menopausal women with severe osteoporosis (VERO): a multicentre, double-blind, double-dummy, randomised controlled trial. Lancet 2018; 391: 230-240.
- 56) KREGE JH, WAN X. Teriparatide and the risk of nonvertebral fractures in women with postmenopausal osteoporosis. Bone 2012; 50: 161-164.

- 57) LAU EMC, WOO J, CHAN YH, GRIFFITH J. Alendronate prevents bone loss in Chinese women with osteoporosis. Bone 2000; 27: 677-680.
- 58) LESTER JE, DODWELL D, BROWNJE, PUROHIT OP, GUTCHER SA, ELLIS SP, THORPE R, HORSMAN JM, COLEMAN RE. Prevention of anastrozole induced bone loss with monthly oral ibandronate: final 5 year results from the ARIBON trial. J Bone Oncol 2012; 1: 57-62.
- 59) LEWIECKI EM, KEAVENY TM, KOPPERDAHL DL, GENANT HK, ENGELKE K, FUERST T, KIVITZ A, DAVIES RY, FITZPAT-RICK LA. Once-monthly oral ibandronate improves biomechanical determinants of bone strength in women with postmenopausal osteoporosis. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2009; 94: 171-180.
- 60) LEWIECKI EM, MILLER PD, MCCLUNG MR, COHEN SB, BO-LOGNESE MA, LIU Y, WANG A, SIDDHANTI S, FITZPATRICK LA. Two-year treatment with denosumab (AMG 162) in a randomized phase 2 study of postmenopausal women with low BMD. J Bone Miner Res 2007; 22: 1832-1841.
- 61) LI Y, XUAN M, WANG B, YANG J, ZHANG H, ZHANG XZ, GUO XH, LÜ XF, XUE QY, YANG GY, JI QH, LIU ZM, LI CJ, WU TF, SHENG ZY, LI PQ, TONG JC. Comparison of parathyroid hormone (1-34) and elcatonin in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis: an 18-month randomized, multicenter controlled trial in China. Chin Med J (Engl) 2013; 126: 457-463.
- 62) LI Y, ZHANG Z, DENG X, CHEN L. Efficacy and safety of risedronate sodium in treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis. J Huazhong Univ Sci Technolog Med Sci 2005; 25: 527-529.
- 63) LIBERMAN UA, WEISS SR, BRÖLL J, MINNE HW, QUAN H, BELL NH, RODRIGUEZ-PORTALES J, DOWNS JR RW, DE-OUEKER J, FAVUS M, SEEMAN E, RECKER RR, CAPIZZI T, SAN-TORA IAC, LOMBARDI A, SHAH RV, HIRSCH LJ, KARPF DB. Effect of oral alendronate on bone mineral density and the incidence of fractures in postmenopausal osteoporosis. N Engl J Med 1995; 333: 1437-1443.
- 64) LIU JL, ZHU HM, HUANG QR, ZHANG ZL, LI HL, QIN YJ, ZHANG Y, WEI DL, LU JH, LIU H, CHEN XP, LIU YJ, EKANGAKI A, ZHENG YM, DIEZ-PEREZ A, HARPE K. [Effect of raloxifene hydrochloride on bone mineral density, bone metabolism and serum lipids in Chinese postmenopausal women with osteoporosis]. Zhonghua Yi Xue Za Zhi 2004; 84: 269-273.
- 65) LIU JM, WAI-CHEE KUNG A, PHENG CS, ZHU HM, ZHANG ZL, WU YY, XU L, MENG XW, HUANG ML, CHUNG LP, HUSSAIN NHN, SUFIAN SS, CHEN JL. Efficacy and safety of 2 g/day of strontium ranelate in Asian women with postmenopausal osteoporosis. Bone 2009; 45: 460-465.
- 66) LUCKEY M, KAGAN R, GREENSPAN S, BONE H, KIEL RD, SIMON J, SACKAROWITZ J, PALMISANO J, CHEN E, PETRUS-CHKE RA, DE PAPP AE. Once-weekly alendronate 70 mg and raloxifene 60 mg daily in the treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis. Menopause 2004; 11: 405-415.
- 67) LUFKIN EG, WHITAKER MD, NICKELSEN T, ARGUETA R, CAPLAN RH, KNICKERBOCKER RK, RIGGS BL. Treatment of established postmenopausal osteoporosis with raloxifene: a randomized trial. J Bone Miner Res 1998; 13: 1747-1754.

- 68) MCCLUNG M, MILLER P, RECKNOR C, MESENBRINK P, BUC-CI-RECHTWEG C, BENHAMOU CL. Zoledronic acid for the prevention of bone loss in postmenopausal women with low bone mass: a randomized controlled trial. Obstet Gynecol 2009; 114: 999-1007.
- 69) MCCLUNG MR, BOLOGNESE MA, SEDARATI F, RECKER RR, MILLER PD. Efficacy and safety of monthly oral ibandronate in the prevention of postmenopausal bone loss. Bone 2009; 44: 418-422.
- 70) MCCLUNG MR, GEUSENS P, MILLER PD, ZIPPEL H, BENSEN WG, ROUX C, ADAMI S, FOGELMAN I, DIAMOND T, EASTELL R, MEUNIER PJ, REGINSTER JY; Hip Intervention Program Study Group. Effect of risedronate on the risk of hip fracture in elderly women. Hip Intervention Program Study Group. N Engl J Med 2001; 344: 333-340.
- 71) MCCLUNG MR, SIRIS E, CUMMINGS S, BOLOGNESE M, ETTINGER M, MOFFETT A, EMKEY R, DAY W, SOMAYAJI V, LEE A. Prevention of bone loss in postmenopausal women treated with lasofoxifene compared with raloxifene. Menopause 2006; 13: 377-386.
- 72) MCCLUNG MR, WASNICH RD, RECKER R, CAULEY JA, CHESNUT CH, 3RD, ENSRUD KE, BURDESKA A, MILLS T. Oral daily ibandronate prevents bone loss in early postmenopausal women without osteoporosis. J Bone Miner Res 2004; 19: 11-18.
- 73) MEUNIER PJ, ROUX C, ORTOLANI S, DIAZ-CURIEL M, COMPSTON J, MARQUIS P, CORMIER C, ISAIA G, BADURSKI J, WARK JD, COLLETTE J, REGINSTER JY. Effects of long-term strontium ranelate treatment on vertebral fracture risk in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. Osteoporos Int 2009; 20: 1663-1673.
- 74) MEUNIER PJ, ROUX C, SEEMAN E, ORTOLANI S, BADURSKI JE, SPECTOR TD, CANNATA J, BALOGH A, LEMMEL EM, PORS-NIELSEN S, RIZZOLI R, GENANT HK, REGINSTER JY. The effects of strontium ranelate on the risk of vertebral fracture in women with postmenopausal osteoporosis. N Engl J Med 2004; 350: 459-468.
- 75) MEUNIER PJ, SLOSMAN DO, DELMAS PD, SEBERT JL, BRANDI ML, ALBANESE C, LORENC R, PORS-NIELSEN S, DE VERNEJOUL MC, ROCES A, REGINSTER JY. Strontium ranelate: Dose-dependent effects in established postmenopausal vertebral osteoporosis – A 2-year randomized placebo controlled trial. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2002; 87: 2060-2066.
- 76) MEUNIER PJ, VIGNOT E, GARNERO P, CONFAVREUX E, PARIS E, LIU-LEAGE S, SARKAR S, LIU T, WONG M, DRAPER MW. Treatment of postmenopausal women with osteoporosis or low bone density with raloxifene. Raloxifene Study Group. Osteoporos Int 1999; 10: 330-336.
- 77) MILLER PD, CHINES AA, CHRISTIANSEN C, HOECK HC, KENDLER DL, LEWIECKI EM, WOODSON G, LEVINE AB, CONSTANTINE G, DELMAS PD. Effects of bazedoxifene on BMD and bone turnover in postmenopausal women: 2-yr results of a randomized, double-blind, placebo-, and active-controlled study. J Bone Miner Res 2008; 23: 525-535.
- 78) MILLER PD, EPSTEIN S, SEDARATI F, REGINSTER JY. Once-monthly oral ibandronate compared with

weekly oral alendronate in postmenopausal osteoporosis: results from the head-to-head MOTION study. Curr Med Res Opin 2008; 24: 207-213.

- 79) MILLER PD, PANNACCIULLI N, BROWN JP, CZERWINSKI E, NEDERGAARD BS, BOLOGNESE MA, MALOUF J, BONE HG, REGINSTER JY, SINGER A, WANG C, WAGMAN RB, CUMMINGS SR. Denosumab or zoledronic acid in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis previously treated with oral bisphosphonates. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2016; 101: 3163-3170.
- 80) MIYAUCHI A, MATSUMOTO T, SUGIMOTO T, TSUJIMOTO M, WARNER MR, NAKAMURA T. Effects of teriparatide on bone mineral density and bone turnover markers in Japanese subjects with osteoporosis at high risk of fracture in a 24-month clinical study: 12-month, randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind and 12-month open-label phases. Bone 2010; 47: 493-502.
- 81) MORII H, OHASHI Y, TAKETANI Y, FUKUNAGA M, NAKAMU-RA T, ITABASHI A, SARKAR S, HARPER K. Effect of raloxifene on bone mineral density and biochemical markers of bone turnover in Japanese postmenopausal women with osteoporosis: results from a randomized placebo-controlled trial. Osteoporos Int 2003; 14: 793-800.
- 82) MORTENSEN L, CHARLES P, BEKKER PJ, DIGENNARO J, JOHNSTON JR CC. Risedronate increases bone mass in an early postmenopausal population: two years of treatment plus one year of follow-up. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1998; 83: 396-402.
- 83) NAKAMURA T, MATSUMOTO T, SUGIMOTO T, SHIRAKI M. Dose-response study of denosumab on bone mineral density and bone turnover markers in Japanese postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. Osteoporos Int 2012; 23: 1131-1140.
- 84) NAKAMURA T, SUGIMOTO T, NAKANO T, KISHIMOTO H, ITO M, FUKUNAGA M, HAGINO H, SONE T, YOSHIKAWA H, NISHIZAWA Y, FUJITA T, SHIRAKI M. Randomized Teriparatide [human parathyroid hormone (PTH) 1-34] Once-Weekly Efficacy Research (TOWER) trial for examining the reduction in new vertebral fractures in subjects with primary osteoporosis and high fracture risk. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2012; 97: 3097-3106.
- 85) NARULA R, MUJTABA T, IRAQI AA, SINGH S. Effect of risedronate and strontium therapy on bone mineral density in postmenopausal osteoporosis. Int J Res Ayurveda Pharmacy 2012; 3: 543-547 (DOI: 10.1016/S0003-9969(00)00049-2).
- 86) NEER RM, ARNAUD CD, ZANCHETTA JR, PRINCE R, GAICH GA, REGINSTER JY, HODSMAN AB, ERIKSEN EF, ISH-SHA-LOM S, GENANT HK, WANG O, MITLAK BH. Effect of parathyroid hormone (1-34) on fractures and bone mineral density in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. N Engl J Med 2001; 344: 1434-1441.
- 87) Overgaard K. Effect of intranasal salmon calcitonin therapy on bone mass and bone turnover in early postmenopausal women: a dose-response study. Calcif Tissue Int 1994; 55: 82-86.
- 88) PAGGIOSI MA, WALSH JS, PEEL NFA, MCCLOSKEY EV, EASTELL R. A comparison of the effects of three oral bisphosphonates on the peripheral skeleton

in postmenopausal osteoporosis: the TRIO study. Osteoporos Int 2014; 25: 2729-2741.

- 89) PALOMBA S, MANGUSO F, ORIO JR F, RUSSO T, OPPEDISANO R, SACCHINELLI A, FALBO A, TOLINO A, ZULLO F, MASTRAN-TONIO P. Effectiveness of risedronate in osteoporotic postmenopausal women with inflammatory bowel disease: a prospective, parallel, open-label, two-year extension study. Menopause 2008; 15: 730-736.
- 90) POLS HA, FELSENBERG D, HANLEY DA, STEPÁN J, MUÑOZ-TOR-RES M, WILKIN TJ, QIN-SHENG G, GALICH AM, VANDORMAEL K, YATES AJ, STYCH B. Multinational, placebo-controlled, randomized trial of the effects of alendronate on bone density and fracture risk in postmenopausal women with low bone mass: results of the FOSIT study. Fosamax International Trial Study Group. Osteoporos Int 1999; 9: 461-468.
- 91) QUANDT SA, THOMPSON DE, SCHNEIDER DL, NEVITT MC, BLACK DM. Effect of alendronate on vertebral fracture risk in women with bone mineral density T scores of-1.6 to -2.5 at the femoral neck: the Fracture Intervention Trial. Mayo Clin Proc 2005; 80: 343-349.
- 92) RAVN P, BIDSTRUP M, WASNICH RD, DAVIS JW, MC-CLUNG MR, BALSKE A, COUPLAND C, SAHOTA O, KAUR A, DALEY M, CIZZA G. Alendronate and estrogen-progestin in the long-term prevention of bone loss: four-year results from the early postmenopausal intervention cohort study. A randomized, controlled trial. Ann Intern Med 1999; 131: 935-942.
- 93) RAVN P, CLEMMESEN B, RIIS BJ, CHRISTIANSEN C. The effect on bone mass and bone markers of different doses of ibandronate: a new bisphosphonate for prevention and treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis: a 1-year, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled dose-finding study. Bone 1996; 19: 527-533.
- 94) RECKER RR, KENDLER D, RECKNOR CP, ROONEY TW, LEWIECKI EM, UTIAN WH, CAULEY JA, LORRAINE J, QU Y, KULKARNI PM, GAICH CL, WONG M, PLOUFFE L, JR., STOCK JL. Comparative effects of raloxifene and alendronate on fracture outcomes in postmenopausal women with low bone mass. Bone 2007; 40: 843-851.
- 95) RECKNOR C, CZERWINSKI E, BONE HG, BONNICK SL, BIN-KLEY N, PALACIOS S, MOFFETT A, SIDDHANTI S, FERREIRA I, GHELANI P, WAGMAN RB, HALL JW, BOLOGNESE MA, BENHAMOU CL. Denosumab compared with ibandronate in postmenopausal women previously treated with bisphosphonate therapy: a randomized open-label trial. Obstet Gynecol 2013; 121: 1291-1299.
- 96) REGINSTER JY, DEROISY R, LECART MP, SARLET N, ZEGELS B, JUPSIN I, LONGUEVILLE M, FRANCHIMONT P. A double-blind, placebo-controlled, dose-finding trial of intermittent nasal salmon calcitonin for prevention of postmenopausal lumbar spine bone loss. Am J Med 1995; 98: 452-458.
- 97) REGINSTER JY, FELSENBERG D, BOONEN S, DIEZ-PEREZ A, RIZZOLI R, BRANDI ML, SPECTOR TD, BRIXEN K, GOEMAE-RE S, CORMIER C, BALOGH A, DELMAS PD, MEUNIER PJ. Effects of long-term strontium ranelate treatment

on the risk of nonvertebral and vertebral fractures in postmenopausal osteoporosis: results of a five-year, randomized, placebo-controlled trial. Arthritis Rheum 2008; 58: 1687-1695.

- 98) REGINSTER JY, MINNE HW, SORENSEN OH, HOOPER M, ROUX C, BRANDI ML, LUND B, ETHGEN D, PACK S, ROU-MAGNAC I, EASTELL R. Randomized trial of the effects of risedronate on vertebral fractures in women with established postmenopausal osteoporosis. Osteoporos Int 2000; 11: 83-91.
- 99) REGINSTER JY, SEEMAN E, DE VERNEJOUL MC, ADAMI S, COMPSTON J, PHENEKOS C, DEVOGELAER JP, CURIEL MD, SAWICKI A, GOEMAERE S, SORENSEN OH, FELSENBERG D, MEUNIER PJ. Strontium ranelate reduces the risk of nonvertebral fractures in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis: Treatment of Peripheral Osteoporosis (TROPOS) study. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2005; 90: 2816-2822.
- 100) ROSEN CJ, HOCHBERG MC, BONNICK SL, MCCLUNG M, MILL-ER P, BROY S, KAGAN R, CHEN E, PETRUSCHKE RA, THOMP-SON DE, DE PAPP AE. Treatment with once-weekly alendronate 70 mg compared with once-weekly risedronate 35 mg in women with postmenopausal osteoporosis: a randomized double-blind study. J Bone Miner Res 2005; 20: 141-151.
- 101) Rossini M, Gatti D, Isala G, Sartori L, Braga V, Adami S. Effects of oral alendronate in elderly patients with osteoporosis and mild primary hyperparathyroidism. J Bone Miner Res 2001; 16: 113-119.
- 102) ROUX C, HOFBAUER LC, HO PR, WARK JD, ZILLIKENS MC, FAHRLEITNER-PAMMER A, HAWKINS F, MICAELO M, MINISOLA S, PAPAIOANNOU N, STONE M, FERREIRA I, SIDDHANTI S, WAGMAN RB, BROWN JP. Denosumab compared with risedronate in postmenopausal women suboptimally adherent to alendronate therapy: efficacy and safety results from a randomized open-label study. Bone 2014; 58: 48-54.
- 103) SAMBROOK PN, GEUSENS P, RIBOT C, SOLIMANO JA, FER-RER-BARRIENDOS J, GAINES K, VERBRUGGEN N, MELTON ME. Alendronate produces greater effects than raloxifene on bone density and bone turnover in postmenopausal women with low bone density: results of EFFECT (Efficacy of FOSAMAX versus EVISTA Comparison Trial) International. J Intern Med 2004; 255: 503-511.
- 104) SARIOGLU M, TUZUN C, UNLU Z, TIKIZ C, TANELI F, UYANIK BS. Comparison of the effects of alendronate and risedronate on bone mineral density and bone turnover markers in postmenopausal osteoporosis. Rheumatol Int 2006; 26: 195-200.
- 105) SILVERMAN SL, CHRISTIANSEN C, GENANT HK, VUKICEV-IC S, ZANCHETTA JR, VILLIERS TJ, CONSTANTINE GD, CHINES AA. Efficacy of bazedoxifene in reducing new vertebral fracture risk in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis: results from a 3-year, randomized, placebo-, and active-controlled clinical trial. J Bone Miner Res 2008; 23: 1923-1934.
- 106) SIRIS ES, SIMON JA, BARTON IP, MCCLUNG MR, GRAUER A. Effects of risedronate on fracture risk in postmenopausal women with osteopenia. Osteoporos Int 2008; 19: 681-686.

- 107) STĚPÁN JJ, VOKROUHLICKÁ J. Comparison of biochemical markers of bone remodelling in the assessment of the effects of alendronate on bone in postmenopausal osteoporosis. Clin Chim Acta 1999; 288: 121-135.
- 108) STAKKESTAD JA, BENEVOLENSKAYA LI, STEPAN JJ, SKAG A, NORDBY A, OEFJORD E, BURDESKA A, JONKANSKI I, MA-HONEY P. Intravenous ibandronate injections given every three months: a new treatment option to prevent bone loss in postmenopausal women. Ann Rheum Dis 2003; 62: 969-975.
- 109) TAN W, SUN J, ZHOU L, LI Y, WU X. Randomized trial comparing efficacies of zoledronate and alendronate for improving bone mineral density and inhibiting bone remodelling in women with post-menopausal osteoporosis. J Clin Pharm Ther 2016; 41: 519-523.
- 110) TSAI JN, UIHLEIN AV, LEE H, KUMBHANI R, SIWILA-SACKMAN E, MCKAY EA, BURNETT-BOWIE SAM, NEER RM, LEDER BZ. Teriparatide and denosumab, alone or combined, in women with postmenopausal osteoporosis: The DA-TA study randomised trial. Lancet 2013; 382: 50-56.
- 111) TUCCI JR, TONINO RP, EMKEY RD, PEVERLY CA, KHER U, SANTORA AC 2ND. Effect of three years of oral alendronate treatment in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. Am J Med 1996; 101: 488-501.
- 112) VÄLIMÄKI MJ, FARRERONS-MINGUELLA J, HALSE J, KRÖGER H, MARONI M, MULDER H, MUÑOZ-TORRES M, SÄÄF M, SNORRE ØFJORD E. Effects of risedronate 5 mg/d on bone mineral density and bone turnover markers in late-postmenopausal women with osteopenia: a multinational, 24-month, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, parallel-group, phase III trial. Clin Ther 2007; 29: 1937-1949.
- 113) YAN Y, WANG W, ZHU H, LI M, LIU J, LUO B, XIE H, ZHANG G, LI F. The efficacy and tolerability of once-weekly alendronate 70 mg on bone mineral density and bone turnover markers in postmenopausal Chinese women with osteoporosis. J Bone Miner Metab 2009; 27: 471-478.
- 114) YEN ML, YEN BL, JANG MH, HSU SH, CHENG WC, TSAI KS. Effects of alendronate on osteopenic postmenopausal Chinese women. Bone 2000; 27: 681-685.
- 115) ZHANG L, YANG M, LIU D, GUO C, LI L, YANG G. The rhPTH (1-34), but not elcatonin, increases bone anabolic efficacy in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. Exp Clin Endocrinol Diabetes 2012; 120: 361-366.
- 116) ZHENG S, WU Y, ZHANG Z, YANG X, HUI Y, ZHANG Y, CHEN S, DENG W, LIU H, EKANGAKI A, STOCKS J, HARPER C, LIU J. Effects of raloxifene hydrochloride on bone mineral density, bone metabolism and serum lipids in postmenopausal women: a randomized clinical trial in Beijing. Chin Med J (Engl) 2003; 116: 1127-1133.
- 117) TELLA SH, KOMMALAPATI A, CORREA R. Profile of abaloparatide and its potential in the treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis. Cureus 2017; 9: e1300.
- 118) PIOSZAK AA, PARKER NR, GARDELLA TJ, XU HE. Structural basis for parathyroid hormone-related pro-

tein binding to the parathyroid hormone receptor and design of conformation-selective peptides. J Biol Chem 2009; 284: 28382-28391.

- 119) TAY D, CREMERS S, BILEZIKIAN JP. Optimal dosing and delivery of parathyroid hormone and its analogues for osteoporosis and hypoparathyroidism--translating the pharmacology. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2017.
- 120) PAGEAU SC. Denosumab. MAbs 2009; 1: 210-215.
- 121) SILVERMAN SL. Calcitonin. Endocrinol Metab Clin North Am 2003; 32: 273-284.
- 122) MUCHMORE DB. Raloxifene: a selective estrogen receptor modulator (SERM) with multiple target system effects. Oncologist 2000; 5: 388-392.
- 123) FASSBENDER WJ, WILLMANN B. [Drug treatment of osteoporosis]. Dtsch Med Wochenschr 2014; 139: 497-500.
- 124) BOIVIN G, DOUBLIER A, FARLAY D. Strontium ranelate--a promising therapeutic principle in osteoporosis. J Trace Elem Med Biol 2012; 26: 153-156.

- 125) WANG YK, QIN SQ, MA T, SONG W, JIANG RQ, GUO JB, LI K, ZHANG YM. Effects of teriparatide versus alendronate for treatment of postmenopausal osteoporosis. Medicine (Baltimore) 2017; 96: e6970.
- 126) LIN T, WANG C, CAI XZ, ZHAO X, SHI MM, YING ZM, YUAN FZ, GUO C, YAN SG. Comparison of clinical efficacy and safety between denosumab and alendronate in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis: a meta-analysis. Int J Clin Pract 2012; 66: 399-408.
- 127) ZHANG L, PANG Y, SHI Y, XU M, XU X, ZHANG J, JI L, ZHAO D. Indirect comparison of teriparatide, denosumab, and oral bisphosphonates for the prevention of vertebral and nonvertebral fractures in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. Menopause 2015; 22: 1021-1025.
- 128) REGINSTER J, BIANIC F, CAMPBELL R, MARTIN M, WILLIAMS S, FITZPATRICK L. Abaloparatide for risk reduction of nonvertebral and vertebral fractures in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis: a network meta-analysis. Value in Health 2017; 20: A527.

2668