TSH-suppressive therapy can reduce bone mineral density in patients with differentiated thyroid carcinoma: a meta-analysis

M.-Y. WANG¹, Z.-O. HAN², X.-W. GONG¹, O. LI², J. MA¹

¹Department of Health Statistics, College of Public Health, Tianjin Medical University, Tianjin, China ²Department of Hepatobiliary Surgery, Tianjin Medical University Cancer Institute and Hospital, National Clinical Research Center for Cancer, Key Laboratory of Cancer Prevention and Therapy, Tianjin, China

Mengyang Wang and Zhiqiang Han contributed equally to this work

Abstract. – OBJECTIVE: To evaluate the effect of TSH-suppressive therapy on the bone mineral density in patients with differentiated thyroid carcinoma (DTC).

MATERIALS AND METHODS: The cross-sectional, cohort, prospective controlled, and case-control studies on the bone mineral density change in patients with DTC after TSH-suppressive therapy from databases were searched, including PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane library databases. The effect of TSH-suppressive therapy on bone mineral density of lumbar, femoral neck, femoral greater trochanter, and Ward triangle was analyzed. Data from the database establishment to January 2019 were all reviewed. Meta-analysis was performed with RevMan 5.3 software after two reviewers independently screened the date. The categorical variables were expressed as odds ratios, while the numerical variables were expressed as mean differences. Based on the heterogeneity of the study, a comprehensive analysis was performed by using fixed or random effect models.

RESULTS: A total of 11 studies involving 434 patients with differentiated thyroid cancer were included. No significant difference in the bone mineral density of lumbar indications between the experimental and control groups was observed (MD=0.00, 95% Cl=-0.03-0.03, p=0.96). The bone mineral density of the femoral neck indications (MD=-0.01, 95% Cl=-0.04-0.03, p=0.70). A significant difference between experimental and control groups in the bone mineral density of femoral trochanter indications was observed (MD=-0.11, 95% Cl=-0.14-0.07, p<0.00001). The bone mineral density of Ward's triangle indications (MD=-0.06, 95% Cl=-0.11-0.01, p=0.02).

CONCLUSIONS: TSH-suppressive therapy in patients with DTC mainly reduces the proximal femur bone mineral density.

Key Words:

TSH-suppressive therapy, Bone mineral density, Differentiated thyroid carcinoma, Meta-analysis.

Introduction

Thyroid cancer is a malignant tumor of the thyroid gland¹. The causes of the disease are mainly manifested in many aspects, such as sex hormone action, radiation, family factors, and so on². In general, thyroid cancer includes differentiated and undifferentiated types. In differentiated thyroid carcinoma (DTC), follicular thyroid carcinoma and papillary thyroid carcinoma can also be refined³. DTC is more common in middle-aged women and children. Incidence of men and women 1:2-3. In about 10% of cases, the first sign is enlarged lymph nodes in the neck. The clinical feature is a single and hard thyroid nodule. B-ultrasound scanner showed that the nodules were > 1 cm in diameter and solid, which could be clearly distinguished from the peripheral tissues. The radionuclide scan showed "cold nodules". The thyroid cancer based on a polynodular goiter presents as a single prominent, large, and rigid nodule distinguished from the surrounding tissue⁴.

In recent years, the incidence of DTC has been increasing significantly⁵. At present, the main treatment methods of the disease are surgery, postoperative ¹³¹I treatment, and TSH-suppressive therapy⁶. Most DTC progresses slowly and has a good prognosis. About 90% of patients can

survive for more than 15 years after treatment⁷. Conventional TSH can maintain the normal physiological needs after the operation; however, the inhibitory dose leaves patients with subclinical hyperthyroidism⁷. Reports⁸ have shown that subclinical hyperthyroidism increases the risk of fractures and cardiovascular disease. At present, many studies have reported the effect of TSH-suppressive therapy on bone mineral density; however, the sample size of each work is small, and the results of the effect on bone mineral density are different. Therefore, the conclusions are of a limited reference value. We used a meta-analysis to systematically evaluate whether TSH-suppressive therapy has a negative effect on bone mineral density to provide a theoretical basis for clinical practice.

Materials and Methods

Search Strategy

Two reviewers independently searched PubMed, Embase, and Cochrane Library databases. The retrieval time is from the establishment of each journal to January 2019. The search words were: "differentiated thyroid gland carcinoma", "DTC", "TSH-suppressive therapy", "thyroxine suppressive therapy", "levothyroxine therapy", and "bone mineral density". The keyword and subject term were used to search literatures, while the language was set as English.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Inclusion criteria: (1) cross-sectional studies, cohort studies, prospective controlled studies, and case-control studies on TSH-suppressive therapy; (2) inhibition group was DTC patients receiving TSH-suppressive therapy, while control group was healthy people matching the age, gender, weight, and menstrual status of patients in the inhibition group; (3) age of the patient was older than 18 years old; (4) time of TSH-suppressive therapy was provided; (5) TSH level of the patients reached the inhibition target; (6) the corresponding research data were provided.

Exclusion criteria: (1) republished studies; (2) literature without access to abstracts or full texts; (3) the data were unable to achieve; (4) non-monotherapy research; (5) cases of diseases were related to bone metabolism; (6) there were other cases at risk of osteoporosis; (7) patients use glucocorticoids or other drugs that may affect bone metabolism.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Two reviewers selected literature independently. In case of disagreement and inability to decide after the discussion, the third reviewer would decide. Data were extracted, including study author, gender, region, number of participants, mean age, duration of medication, and outcome measures.

We evaluated the quality of each research using the Newcastle Ottawa scale (NOS). When disagreements arise, they are determined by a third reviewer. The full score of NOS score was 9, and the evaluation included selection, comparability, and exposure factors of the case-control study between groups. Reports with a score of more than 6 are of high quality.

Outcome Indicators

The results included in this study are were as follows: (1) lumbar vertebra bone density; (2) femoral neck bone density; (3) femoral trochanter bone density; (4) Ward triangle bone density.

Statistical Analysis

We used RevMan 5.3 statistical software (London, UK) to make a statistical analysis of the data. The counted data were analyzed by odd ratio (OR), while the measured ones were analyzed by mean difference (MD). We used a chi-square test to determine whether there was heterogeneity among the results of various studies. If there was no statistical heterogeneity (p>0.10, I² ≤ 50%), the fixed-effect model was used for analysis. On the contrary, when there was statistical heterogeneity, a random effect model analysis was adopted after excluding the influence of significant heterogeneity. p<0.05 indicated a statistically significant difference.

Results

Study Selection and Study Characteristics

We initially included 1680 literatures after searching the databases. After reading titles, abstracts and the full text, 11 articles⁹⁻¹⁹ were finally included. The screening process is shown in Figure 1. Among them, Schneider's et al¹² included male and female studies, which were divided into two parts to reduce the heterogeneity of results and facilitate subgroup analysis. Baseline characteristics of the included reports are shown in Table I. The quality assessments of various works



Figure 1. Study flow and selection diagram.

are shown in Table II. Results showed that the quality of all the reports was more than 6 points, indicating that the included researches were all of high quality.

Results of Meta-Analysis

Lumbar Vertebrae Bone Mineral Density

Nine studies^{9-14,16,18,19} reported lumbar vertebra bone density levels in 392 DTC patients. There was a statistical heterogeneity among the researches (p<0.00001, I²=73%). Therefore, the random effect model was selected for analysis. Subgroup analysis showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the lumbar vertebra bone mineral density between postmenopausal female (MD=-0.03, 95% CI=-0.09-0.02, p=0.25), premenopausal female (MD=0.02, 95% CI=-0.00-0.05, p=0.07), and male DTC pa-

Table I. Baseline characteristics of included studies.

tients (MD=0.03, 95% CI=-0.02-0.08, p=0.27) and control group after the TSH-suppressive therapy (Figure 2).

Femoral Neck Bone Mineral Density

Seven studies^{9,11,13-15,17,18} reported bone mineral density levels of the femoral neck in 248 DTC patients. There was statistical heterogeneity among studies (p=0.003, $I^2=70\%$). Therefore, we used the random effect model for analysis. Results showed that there was no statistically significant difference in lumbar vertebra bone density between DTC patients and control group after the TSH-suppressive therapy (MD=-0.01, 95% CI=-0.04-0.03, p<0.70; Figure 3A) Heterogeneity was significantly reduced by subgroup analysis (p=0.15, $I^2=35\%$). Therefore, the fixed-effect model was used for analysis. Results showed that there was no statistically significant difference in the femoral neck bone mineral density between postmenopausal women (MD=-0.03, 95% CI=-0.07-0.01, p=0.10), premenopausal women (MD=0.01, 95% CI=-0.01-0.03, p=0.24), and men (MD=0.01, 95%) CI=-0.03-0.04, p=0.76), as well as control group (Figure 3B).

Femoral Trochanter Bone Mineral Density

Two works^{9,14} reported bone mineral density levels of the greater trochanter of the femur in a total of 135 DTC patients. There was no significant heterogeneity between studies (p=0.28, $I^2=$ 13%). Therefore, we adopted a fixed-effect model for analysis. The results of the meta-analysis showed that the bone mineral density of the femoral trochanter was lower in inhibition group than

Study	Region	No. of patients	Mean age (years old)	Length of medication use (years)	TSH (mU/L)
Eftekhari et al ¹⁹ 2008	Iran	66	51.7 ± 7.3	14.9 ± 2.1	< 0.30
Giannini et al ¹⁰ 1994	Italy	25	49.7 ± 2.1	7.6 ± 0.9	< 0.10
Hawkins et al ¹⁶ 1994	Spain	21	59.6 ± 7.5	5	0.30 ± 0.40
Kung et al ⁹ 1993	China	34	62.0 ± 8.0	12.2 ± 6.6	< 0.05
Mendonca et al ¹⁷ 2016	Brazil	17	27.4 ± 6.4	14.2 ± 7.2	0.16 ± 0.22
Muller et al ¹⁵ 1995	Canada	25	47.0 ± 3.0	10.0 ± 1.4	0.08 ± 0.01
Reverter et al ¹³ 2005	Spain	88	51.0 ± 12.0	12.0 ± 5.0	0.03 ± 0.03
Reverter et al ¹¹ 2010	Germany	33	56.0 ± 14.0	2.0-3.0	< 0.10
Sajjinanont et al ¹⁸ 2005	Thailand	22	38.0 ± 7.3	7.0 ± 3.4	< 0.10
Schneider et al ¹² 2012 (1)	Germany	46	39.2 ± 7.7	4.9 ± 5.2	0.05 ± 0.20
Schneider et al ¹² 2012 (2)	Germany	28	40.8 ± 8.0	5.9 ± 5.1	0.04 ± 0.07
Toivonen et al ¹⁴ 1998	Finland	29	27.0-71.0	9.0-11.0	< 0.05

Study	Selection	Comparability	Exposure	Total
Eftekhari et al ¹⁹ 2008	4	2	3	9
Giannini et al ¹⁰ 1994	4	2	2	8
Hawkins et al ¹⁶ 1994	4	2	2	8
Kung et al ⁹ 1993	4	1	2	7
Mendonca et al ¹⁷ 2016	4	2	3	9
Muller et al ¹⁵ 1995	4	1	3	8
Reverter et al ¹³ 2005	4	2	3	9
Reverter et al ¹¹ 2010	4	2	3	9
Sajjinanont et al ¹⁸ 2005	4	2	2	8
Schneider et al ¹² 2012	4	1	3	8
Toivonen et al ¹⁴ 1998	4	2	2	8

Table II. NOS scores of included studies.

in control group. Also, the difference was statistically significant (MD=-0.11, 95% CI=-0.14-0.07, p<0.00001; Figure 4).

Ward's Triangle Bone Mineral Density

Two studies^{9,14} reported bone mineral density levels in Ward's triangle, involving 135 patients with DTC. There was no statistical heterogeneity between studies (p=0.49, I²= 0%). Therefore, we used the fixed-effect model for analysis. The results of the meta-analysis showed that the level of bone mineral density in Ward's triangle of patients in inhibition group was lower than that in control group. Also, the difference was statistically significant (MD=-0.06, 95% CI=-0.11-0.01, p=0.02; Figure 5).

	Experimental Control							Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% Cl	IV. Random, 95% CI	
1.1.1 Postmenopaus	al wome	en								
Eftekhari 2008	0.98	0.21	33	0.95	0.17	66	6.6%	0.03 [-0.05, 0.11]		
Giannini 1994	0.85	0.02	13	0.91	0.03	11	10.4%	-0.06 [-0.08, -0.04]		
Hawkins 1994	0.854	0.157	21	0.889	0.143	53	6.9%	-0.04 [-0.11, 0.04]	-+	
Kung 1993	0.749	0.147	34	0.917	0.161	34	7.2%	-0.17 [-0.24, -0.09]		
Reverter 2005	1.094	0.248	44	0.978	0.355	44	4.3%	0.12 [-0.01, 0.24]	<u> </u>	
Toivonen 1998	0.876	0.084	10	0.891	0.129	12	6.2%	-0.02 [-0.10, 0.07]	- <u>+</u> -	
Subtotal (95% CI)			155			220	41.5%	-0.03 [-0.09, 0.02]		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Cł	ni² = 21.3	31, df =	= 5 (P =	0.0007); l ² = 7	7%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.14	(P = 0.2	25)							
1.1.2 Premenopausa	l woman	ı								
Eftekhari 2008	1.08	0.18	22	1.05	0.09	66	6.9%	0.03 [-0.05, 0.11]	<u>+-</u>	
Giannini 1994	1.1	0.3	12	1	0.3	10	1.6%	0.10 [-0.15, 0.35]		
Reverter 2005	1.229	0.167	44	1.223	0.155	44	7.6%	0.01 [-0.06, 0.07]	+	
Sajjinanont 2005	1.023	0.088	22	0.98	0.075	22	8.9%	0.04 [-0.01, 0.09]		
Schneider 2012 (1)	1.268	0.14	46	1.245	0.13	60	8.6%	0.02 [-0.03, 0.08]	1-	
Toivonen 1998	1.082	0.131	15	1.084	0.077	22	7.2%	-0.00 [-0.08, 0.07]	1	
Subtotal (95% CI)			161			224	40.6%	0.02 [-0.00, 0.05]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Cł	ni² = 1.7:	2, df =	5 (P = 0).89); l²	= 0%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.81	(P = 0.0	07)							
1.1.3 Men										
Eftekhari 2008	1.11	0.21	11	1.04	0.09	66	4.4%	0.07 [-0.06, 0.20]	<u> </u>	
Reverter 2010	1.253	0.156	33	1.238	0.171	33	6.8%	0.01 [-0.06, 0.09]	7-	
Schneider 2012 (2)	1.253	0.18	28	1.226	0.13	29	6.6%	0.03 [-0.05, 0.11]	T	
Subtotal (95% CI)			72			128	17.8%	0.03 [-0.02, 0.08]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Cł	$hi^2 = 0.53$	3, df =	2 (P = 0).77); l ²	= 0%				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.10	(P = 0.2)	27)							
			200			570	100.0%	0.001.0.02.0.021	▲	
Total (95% CI)	0.00.01		388			5/2	100.0%	0.00 [-0.03, 0.03]		
Heterogeneity: I au ² =	0.00; Ch	$11^{2} = 51.0$	61, df =	= 14 (P ·	< 0.000	01); l² =	13%		-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1	
l est for overall effect:	∠ = 0.05	(P = 0.9)	96)	0 (5	0.47	12 /2	00/		Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
Test for subaroup differences: $Chi^2 = 3.50$. df = 2 (P = 0.17). $l^2 = 42.9\%$										

Figure 2. Forest plot for comparison of lumbar vertebrae bone mineral density between two groups.

A	Experimental Control			ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95%	CI IV. Random. 95% CI
Kung 1993	0.662	0.123	34	0.708	0.127	34	12.7%	-0.05 [-0.11, 0.01	1]
Mendonca 2016	1.058	0.17	17	1.029	0.13	34	7.8%	0.03 [-0.06, 0.12	2]
Muller 1995	0.78	0.03	25	0.82	0.03	25	21.9%	-0.04 [-0.06, -0.02	2]
Reverter 2005	0.971	0.148	88	0.956	0.13	88	16.7%	0.02 [-0.03, 0.06	5]
Reverter 2010	0.948	0.128	33	0.997	0.151	33	11.3%	-0.05 [-0.12, 0.02	2]
Sajjinanont 2005	0.8	0.068	22	0.77	0.061	22	17.4%	0.03 [-0.01, 0.07	7]
Toivonen 1998	0.84	0.144	29	0.807	0.104	38	12.3%	0.03 [-0.03, 0.09	9]
Total (95% CI)			248			274	100.0%	-0.01 [-0.04, 0.03	s] 🔶
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	ni² = 20.1	18, df =	= 6 (P =	0.003);	$l^2 = 70^{\circ}$	%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.38	(P = 0.1	70)						Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
В	Exp	perimen	tal	C	Control			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
1.4.1 Postmenopausa	I wome	n							
Kung 1993	0.622	0.123	34	0.708	0.127	34	7.7%	-0.09 [-0.15, -0.03]	
Reverter 2005	0.927	0.124	44	0.921	0.148	44	8.4%	0.01 [-0.05, 0.06]	+
Toivonen 1998	0.733	0.096	10	0.736	0.094	12	4.3%	-0.00 [-0.08, 0.08]	+
Subtotal (95% CI)			88			90	20.4%	-0.03 [-0.07, 0.01]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 5	5.38, df =	= 2 (P =	0.07);	l² = 63%	þ				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.65	(P = 0.1	10)						
1.4.2 Premenopausal	woman								
Reverter 2005	1.032	0.124	44	1.017	0.125	44	10.1%	0.02 [-0.04, 0.07]	+-
Sajjinanont 2005	0.8	0.068	22	0.77	0.061	22	18.8%	0.03 [-0.01, 0.07]	-
Schneider 2012 (1-1)	1.009	0.13	46	1.017	0.12	60	11.7%	-0.01 [-0.06, 0.04]	*
Schneider 2012 (1-2)	1.012	0.12	46	1.011	0.11	60	13.8%	0.00 [-0.04, 0.05]	*
Toivonen 1998	0.892	0.141	15	0.861	0.094	22	4.1%	0.03 [-0.05, 0.11]	
Subtotal (95% CI)			173			208	58.5%	0.01 [-0.01, 0.03]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	.96, df =	= 4 (P =	0.74);	² = 0%					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.18	(P = 0.2	24)						
1.4.3 Men									
Reverter 2010	0.948	0.128	33	0.997	0.151	33	6.0%	-0.05 [-0.12, 0.02]	
Schneider 2012 (2-1)	1.055	0.13	28	1.015	0.1	29	7.5%	0.04 [-0.02, 0.10]	
Schneider 2012 (2-2)	1.03	0.13	28	1.015	0.1	29	7.5%	0.02 [-0.05, 0.08]	+-
Subtotal (95% CI)			89			91	21.0%	0.01 [-0.03, 0.04]	◆
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3	8.85. df =	= 2 (P =	0.15);	² = 48%	, D				
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.31	(P = 0.7	76)						
Total (95% CI)			350			389	100.0%	0.00 [-0.01, 0.02]	•
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	5.30 df	= 10 (P	= 0.12): $ ^2 = 3$	5%		/*		I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.30	(P = 0.7)	76)	,,	- /0				-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1
Test for subgroup diffe	rences:	$Chi^2 = 4$	11. df	= 2 (P =	0.13)	$ ^2 = 51$	4%		Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
. socio: suburbub dille	511003.	- 4		2.0 -	0.101.				

Figure 3. Forest plot for comparison of femoral neck bone mineral density between two groups. **A**, Overall results of metaanalysis; **B**, Results of subgroup analysis.

Discussion

TSH-suppressive therapy refers to the use of levothyroxine to make TSH at a low level

or even undetectable²⁰. On the one hand, TSH can supplement the thyroid hormone lacking in patients; on the other hand, TSH at a low level has an inhibitory effect on tumor cells, thereby

	Experimental Control						Mean Difference		Mean Difference						
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI			IV,	Fixed	1, 95% CI		
Kung 1993	0.552	0.115	34	0.635	0.119	34	44.7%	-0.08 [-0.14, -0.03]				-			
Toivonen 1998	0.603	0.1	29	0.727	0.108	38	55.3%	-0.12 [-0.17, -0.07]				•			
Total (95% CI)			63			72	100.0%	-0.11 [-0.14, -0.07]	_		L	٠			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1.15, df = 1 (P = 0.28); l ² = 13% Test for overall effect: Z = 5.57 (P < 0.00001)									-1	-0 Favours [e	.5 experime	(ntal]) 0. Favours [con	.5 trol]	1

Figure 4. Forest plot for comparison of femoral trochanter bone mineral density between two groups.



Figure 5. Forest plot for comparison of Ward's triangle bone mineral density between two groups.

reducing the recurrence rate and mortality of the disease²¹. Its therapeutic value for DTC has been proved. In recent years, the concept of TSH-suppressive therapy has changed, and no consensus has been reached on the clinical guidelines for TSH-suppressive therapy and its degree of inhibition. The American Thyroid Association and the European Thyroid Association advocate setting treatment goals based on the risk grade of tumor recurrence in DTC patients²². In 2015, the American Thyroid Association recommended that the TSH of high-risk patients should be controlled at <0.1 mU/L. Also, the TSH of low-risk patients should be controlled at the lower limit of the normal reference range (0.1-0.5 mU/L) or maintained at the lower limit of the normal reference range (0.5-2.0 mU/L) according to their triglyceride level²³. After the dual-risk assessment, it is recommended to control the TSH of patients with high-risk recurrence at <0.1 mU/L. regardless of the risk of TSH-suppressive therapy. The long-term use of levothyroxine beyond the physiological requirements will make thyroid function in a subclinical state of hyperthyroidism, and its potential adverse reactions have been concerned²⁴. Osteoporosis is characterized by decreased bone mass and destruction of the fine structure of bone tissue, which leads to an increased bone brittleness and fracture risk. In addition to age, gender, calcium, and vitamin D, parathyroid function and other factors affecting bone mineral density, as well as hyperthyroidism are also some of the common risk factors for osteoporosis²⁵. However, whether subclinical hyperthyroidism caused by levothyroxine will cause bone loss and the occurrence of osteoporosis has not been clearly determined²⁶. In this study, 434 cases of DTC patients in 12 researches were systematically evaluated. Results showed that the effect of TSH-suppressive therapy on bone mineral density in different parts of DTC patients had some differences. For

instance, bone mineral density of the trochanter of femur and Ward triangle area was significantly affected. The reason may be that the lumbar spine is dominated by cancellous bone, while the femur is dominated by cortical bone. The osteoclast activity of cortical bone is higher than that of cancellous bone. Besides, an excessive thyroid hormone will increase osteoclast activity. The TSH receptor is expressed on both osteoblasts and osteoclasts. Therefore, TSH has a direct impact on bone metabolism. Low TSH can reduce the inhibition of osteoclast activity, and eventually lead to bone loss and decreased bone density. Furthermore, different parts of the femur have a different sensitivity to changes in the bone mineral density. Therefore, they show different changes in different bone mineral density. Among them, the Ward triangle is the most sensitive area among several hip measurement points. Currently, it has been reported that the change of bone mineral density in the Ward triangle is prior to that in the lumbar spine and femoral neck.

Conclusions

In summary, TSH-suppressive therapy mainly reduced the proximal femur bone mineral density of DTC patients, suggesting that the patients should monitor the bone mineral density regularly during the long-term follow-up. Also, special attention was given to the trochanter and Ward triangle to early intervene and prevent the occurrence and development of osteoporosis. However, this work has also some shortcomings: (1) the results of the meta-analysis are easily affected by the inclusion of experimental methodology; (2) the literature language is limited to English; (3) there were differences in dosage, duration, and TSH-suppressive targets in human studies. All these factors may have some influence on the results. Therefore, the results obtained in this work need to be further confirmed by high-quality studies.

Conflict of Interest

The Authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

References

- Li J, DONG JN, ZHAO Z, LV Q, YUN B, LIU JQ, CAI XY. Expression of sodium/iodide transporters and thyroid stimulating hormone receptors in thyroid cancer patients and its correlation with iodine nutrition status and pathology. Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci 2018; 22: 4573-4580.
- ZHANG X, ZHANG X, CHANG Z, WU C, GUO H. Correlation analyses of thyroid-stimulating hormone and thyroid autoantibodies with differentiated thyroid cancer. J BUON 2018; 23: 1467-1471.
- ELOY C, FERREIRA L, SALGADO C, SOARES P, SOBRINHO-SI-MOES M. Poorly differentiated and undifferentiated thyroid carcinomas. Turk Patoloji Derg 2015; 31 Suppl 1: 48-59.
- Xu B, Scognamiglio T, Cohen PR, PRASAD ML, HASA-NOVIC A, TUTTLE RM, KATABI N, GHOSSEIN RA. Metastatic thyroid carcinoma without identifiable primary tumor within the thyroid gland: a retrospective study of a rare phenomenon. Hum Pathol 2017; 65: 133-139.
- MARKOVIC I, GORAN M, BESIC N, BUTA M, DJURISIC I, STOJILJKOVIC D, ZEGARAC M, PUPIC G, INIC Z, DZODIC R. Multifocality as independent prognostic factor in papillary thyroid cancer - A multivariate analysis. J BUON 2018; 23: 1049-1054.
- IBRAHIM EY, BUSAIDY NL. Treatment and surveillance of advanced, metastatic iodine-resistant differentiated thyroid cancer. Curr Opin Oncol 2017; 29: 151-158.
- ZHAO Z, SHEN GH, LI YH, ZHOU K, CAI HW. [Progress in diagnosis and treatment of radioactive iodine-refractory differentiated thyroid carcinoma]. Zhonghua Er Bi Yan Hou Tou Jing Wai Ke Za Zhi 2017; 52: 956-960.
- KIM TH, KIM YN, KIM HI, PARK SY, CHOE JH, KIM JH, KIM JS, OH YL, HAHN SY, SHIN JH, KIM K, JEONG JG, KIM SW, CHUNG JH. Prognostic value of the eighth edition AJCC TNM classification for differentiated thyroid carcinoma. Oral Oncol 2017; 71: 81-86.
- KUNG AW, LORENTZ T, TAM SC. Thyroxine suppressive therapy decreases bone mineral density in post-menopausal women. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf) 1993; 39: 535-540.
- 10) GIANNINI S, NOBILE M, SARTORI L, BINOTTO P, CIUFFRE-DA M, GEMO G, PELIZZO MR, D'ANGELO A, CREPALDI G. Bone density and mineral metabolism in thyroidectomized patients treated with long-term L-thyroxine. Clin Sci (Lond) 1994; 87: 593-597.

- REVERTER JL, COLOMÉ E, HOLGADO S, AGUILERA E, SOL-DEVILA B, MATEO L, SANMARTI A. Bone mineral density and bone fracture in male patients receiving long-term suppressive levothyroxine treatment for differentiated thyroid carcinoma. Endocrine 2010; 37: 467-472.
- 12) SCHNEIDER R, SCHNEIDER M, REINERS C, SCHNEIDER P. Effects of levothyroxine on bone mineral density, muscle force, and bone turnover markers: a cohort study. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2012; 97: 3926-3934.
- 13) REVERTER JL, HOLGADO S, ALONSO N, SALINAS I, GRANADA ML, SANMARTI A. Lack of deleterious effect on bone mineral density of long-term thyroxine suppressive therapy for differentiated thyroid carcinoma. Endocr Relat Cancer 2005; 12: 973-981.
- 14) TOIVONEN J, TAHTELA R, LAITINEN K, RISTELI J, VALIMAKI MJ. Markers of bone turnover in patients with differentiated thyroid cancer with and following withdrawal of thyroxine suppressive therapy. Eur J Endocrinol 1998; 138: 667-673.
- MÜLLER CG, BAYLEY TA, HARRISON JE, TSANG R. Possible limited bone loss with suppressive thyroxine therapy is unlikely to have clinical relevance. Thyroid 1995; 5: 81-87.
- 16) HAWKINS F, RIGOPOULOU D, PAPAPIETRO K, LOPEZ MB. Spinal bone mass after long-term treatment with L-thyroxine in postmenopausal women with thyroid cancer and chronic lymphocytic thyroiditis. Calcif Tissue Int 1994; 54: 16-19.
- 17) MENDONÇA MONTEIRO DE BARROS G, MADEIRA M, VIEI-RA NETO L, DE PAULA PARANHOS NETO F, CARVALHO MEN-DONÇA LM, CORRÊA BARBOSA LIMA I, CORBO R, FLEI-USS FARIAS ML. Bone mineral density and bone microarchitecture after long-term suppressive levothyroxine treatment of differentiated thyroid carcinoma in young adult patients. J Bone Miner Metab 2016; 34: 417-421.
- 18) SAJJINANONT T, RAJCHADARA S, SRIASSAWAAMORN N, PAN-ICHKUL S. The comparative study of bone mineral density between premenopausal women receiving long term suppressive doses of levothyroxine for well-differentiated thyroid cancer with healthy premenopausal women. J Med Assoc Thai 2005; 88 Suppl 3: S71-S76.
- 19) EFTEKHARI M, ASADOLLAHI A, BEIKI D, IZADYAR S, GHOL-AMREZANEZHAD A, ASSADI M, FARD-ESFAHANI A, FALLA-HI B, TAKAVAR A, SAGHARI M. The long term effect of levothyroxine on bone mineral density in patients with well differentiated thyroid carcinoma after treatment. Hell J Nucl Med 2008; 11: 160-163.
- BALDINI IM, COCINO C, SEGHEZZI S, CAPPELLINI MD. TSH-suppressive therapy: a thorny issue. Eur J Case Rep Intern Med 2017; 4: 000547.
- 21) KIM HI, KIM TH, KIM H, KIM YN, JANG HW, KIM JH, HUR KY, CHUNG JH, KIM SW. Delayed TSH recovery after dose adjustment during TSH-suppressive levothyroxine therapy of thyroid cancer. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf) 2017; 87: 286-291.
- 22) LEONOVA TA, DROZD VM, SAENKO VA, MINE M, BIKO J, ROGOUNOVITCH TI, TAKAMURA N, REINERS C, YAMASHITA

S. Bone mineral density in treated at a young age for differentiated thyroid cancer after Chernobyl female patients on TSH-suppressive therapy receiving or not Calcium-D3 supplementation. Endocr J 2015; 62: 173-182.

- 23) VERBURG FA, SMIT JW, GRELLE I, VISSER TJ, PEETERS RP, REINERS C. Changes within the thyroid axis after long-term TSH-suppressive levothyroxine therapy. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf) 2012; 76: 577-581.
- 24) MICCOLI P, FRUSTACI G, FOSSO A, MICCOLI M, MATERAZZI G. Surgery for recurrent goiter: complication rate and role of the thyroid-stimulating hormone-sup-

pressive therapy after the first operation. Langenbecks Arch Surg 2015; 400: 253-258.

- 25) REVERTER JL, COLOME E, PUIG DM, JULIAN T, HALPERIN I, SANMARTI A. [Clinical endocrinologists' perception of the deleterious effects of TSH suppressive therapy in patients with differentiated thyroid carcinoma]. Endocrinol Nutr 2010; 57: 350-356.
- 26) PANICO A, LUPOLI GA, FONDERICO F, MARCIELLO F, MAR-TINELLI A, ASSANTE R, LUPOLI G. Osteoporosis and thyrotropin-suppressive therapy: reduced effectiveness of alendronate. Thyroid 2009; 19: 437-442.