



AMERICAN ACADEMY OF ORTHOPAEDIC SURGEONS

**THE TREATMENT OF SYMPTOMATIC
OSTEOPOROTIC SPINAL COMPRESSION
FRACTURES**

GUIDELINE AND EVIDENCE REPORT

**Adopted by the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons
Board of Directors
September 24, 2010**

Disclaimer

This Clinical Practice Guideline was developed by an AAOS physician volunteer Work Group based on a systematic review of the current scientific and clinical information and accepted approaches to treatment and/or diagnosis. This Clinical Practice Guideline is not intended to be a fixed protocol, as some patients may require more or less treatment or different means of diagnosis. Clinical patients may not necessarily be the same as those found in a clinical trial. Patient care and treatment should always be based on a clinician's independent medical judgment, given the individual patient's clinical circumstances.

Disclosure Requirement

In accordance with AAOS policy, all individuals whose names appear as authors or contributors to Clinical Practice Guideline filed a disclosure statement as part of the submission process. All panel members provided full disclosure of potential conflicts of interest prior to voting on the recommendations contained within this Clinical Practice Guidelines.

Funding Source

This Clinical Practice Guideline was funded exclusively by the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons who received no funding from outside commercial sources to support the development of this document.

FDA Clearance

Some drugs or medical devices referenced or described in this Clinical Practice Guideline may not have been cleared by the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) or may have been cleared for a specific use only. The FDA has stated that it is the responsibility of the physician to determine the FDA clearance status of each drug or device he or she wishes to use in clinical practice.

Copyright

All rights reserved. No part of this Clinical Practice Guideline may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form, or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without prior written permission from the AAOS.

Published 2010 by the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons
6300 North River Road
Rosemont, IL 60018
First Edition
Copyright 2010
by the American Academy of Orthopaedic Surgeons

Summary of Recommendations

The following is a summary of the recommendations in the AAOS' clinical practice guideline, The Treatment of Symptomatic Osteoporotic Spinal Compression fractures. This summary does not contain rationales that explain how and why these recommendations were developed nor does it contain the evidence supporting these recommendations. All readers of this summary are strongly urged to consult the full guideline and evidence report for this information. We are confident that those who read the full guideline and evidence report will see that the recommendations were developed using systematic evidence-based processes designed to combat bias, enhance transparency, and promote reproducibility.

This summary of recommendations is not intended to stand alone. Treatment decisions should be made in light of all circumstances presented by the patient. Treatments and procedures applicable to the individual patient rely on mutual communication between patient, physician, and other healthcare practitioners.

1. We suggest patients who present with an osteoporotic spinal compression fracture on imaging with correlating clinical signs and symptoms suggesting an acute injury (0-5 days after identifiable event or onset of symptoms) and who are neurologically intact be treated with calcitonin for 4 weeks.

Strength of Recommendation: Moderate

2. Ibandronate and strontium ranelate are options to prevent additional symptomatic fractures in patients who present with an osteoporotic spinal compression fracture on imaging with correlating clinical signs and symptoms.

Strength of Recommendation: Weak

3. We are unable to recommend for or against bed rest, complementary and alternative medicine, or opioids/analgesics for patients who present with an osteoporotic spinal compression fracture on imaging with correlating clinical signs and symptoms and who are neurologically intact.

Strength of Recommendation: Inconclusive

4. It is an option to treat patients who present with an osteoporotic spinal compression fracture at L3 or L4 on imaging with correlating clinical signs and symptoms suggesting an acute injury and who are neurologically intact with an L2 nerve root block.

Strength of Recommendation: Weak

5. We are unable to recommend for or against treatment with a brace for patients who present with an osteoporotic spinal compression fracture on imaging with correlating clinical signs and symptoms and who are neurologically intact.

Strength of Recommendation: Inconclusive

6. We are unable to recommend for or against a supervised or unsupervised exercise program for patients who present with an osteoporotic spinal compression fracture on imaging with correlating clinical signs and symptoms and who are neurologically intact.

Strength of Recommendation: Inconclusive

7. We are unable to recommend for or against electrical stimulation for patients who present with an osteoporotic spinal compression fracture on imaging with correlating clinical signs and symptoms and who are neurologically intact.

Strength of Recommendation: Inconclusive

8. We recommend against vertebroplasty for patients who present with an osteoporotic spinal compression fracture on imaging with correlating clinical signs and symptoms and who are neurologically intact.

Strength of Recommendation: Strong

9. Kyphoplasty is an option for patients who present with an osteoporotic spinal compression fracture on imaging with correlating clinical signs and symptoms and who are neurologically intact.

Strength of Recommendation: Weak

10. We are unable to recommend for or against improvement of kyphosis angle in the treatment of patients who present with an osteoporotic spinal compression fracture on imaging with correlating clinical signs and symptoms.

Strength of Recommendation: Inconclusive

11. We are unable to recommend for or against any specific treatment for patients who present with an osteoporotic spinal compression fracture on imaging with correlating clinical signs and symptoms and who are not neurologically intact.

Strength of Recommendation: Inconclusive

Work Group

Stephen I Esses, MD, Chair

Southwest Orthopedic Group
6560 Fannin St Ste 1016
Houston TX 77030-2761

Robert McGuire, MD, Vice-Chair

University of Mississippi Medical Center
Department of Orthopedic Surgery
2500 N State St
Jackson MS 39216-4500

John Jenkins, MD

University of Mississippi Medical Center
Division of Rheumatology, Dept of
Medicine
2500 N State St
Jackson MS 39216-4500

Joel Finkelstein, MD

2075 Bayview Ave MG361
Toronto ON M4N3M

Eric Woodard, MD

New England Baptist Hospital
125 Parker Hill Ave.
Boston MA 02120

Guidelines and Technology Oversight Chair

William C. Watters III MD

6624 Fannin #2600
Houston, TX 77030

Guidelines and Technology Oversight

Vice-Chair

Michael J. Goldberg, MD

Department of Orthopaedics
Seattle Children's Hospital
4800 Sand Point Way NE

Seattle, WA 98105

Evidence Based Practice Committee Chair

Michael Keith, MD

2500 Metro Health Drive
Cleveland, OH 44109-1900

AAOS Staff:

Charles M. Turkelson, PhD

Director of Research and Scientific Affairs
6300 N. River Rd, Suite 503
Rosemont, IL 60018

Janet L. Wies, MPH

AAOS Clinical Practice Guideline Manager

Patrick Sluka, MPH

AAOS Research Analyst

Kevin M. Boyer

AAOS Research Analyst

Kristin Hitchcock, MLS

AAOS Medical Librarian

Special Acknowledgements

Sara Anderson, MPH

Laura Raymond, MA

Peer Review

Participation in the AAOS peer review process does not constitute an endorsement of this guideline by the participating organization.

The following seven organizations participated in peer review of this clinical practice guideline and gave their explicit consent to have their names listed in this document:

American Academy of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation (AAPMR)

American Association of Neurological Surgeons/Congress of Neurological Surgeons (AANS/CNS Joint Section)

American College of Radiology (ACR)

AO Spine International

International Spine Intervention Society (ISIS)

National Osteoporosis Foundation (NOF)

North American Spine Association (NASS)

Participation in the AAOS peer review process does not constitute an endorsement of this guideline by the participating organization.

Table of Contents

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS	III
WORK GROUP	V
PEER REVIEW	VI
TABLE OF CONTENTS	VII
LIST OF FIGURES	XI
LIST OF TABLES	XII
I. INTRODUCTION	1
Overview	1
Goals and Rationale	1
Intended Users	1
Patient Population	2
Etiology	2
Incidence	2
Burden of Disease	2
Emotional and Physical Impact.....	2
Potential Benefits, Harms, and Contraindications	2
II. METHODS	3
Formulating Preliminary Recommendations.....	3
Study Selection Criteria	3
Outcomes Considered	5
Minimal Clinically Important Improvement	5
Literature Searches	6
Data Extraction.....	7

Judging the Quality of Evidence	7
Treatment Studies	7
Defining the Strength of the Recommendations	8
Consensus Development.....	9
Statistical Methods	9
Peer Review.....	10
Public Commentary.....	10
The AAOS Guideline Approval Process.....	11
Revision Plans	11
Guideline Dissemination Plans	11
III. RECOMMENDATIONS AND SUPPORTING DATA	12
Recommendation 1	12
Summary of Evidence.....	14
Study Quality	15
Calcitonin vs. Placebo	17
Calcitonin vs. No Calcitonin.....	20
Recommendation 2	21
Summary of Evidence.....	23
Study Quality	25
Alendronate	31
Alendronate vs. Alfacalcidol	31
Alendronate vs. Etidronate	31
Calcitonin.....	32
Calcitriol	32
Estrogen.....	33
Estrogen vs. Estrogen+Calcitriol	34
Estrogen+Etidronate	34
Estrogen vs. Etidronate vs. Estrogen+ Etidronate.....	34
Estrogen+Fluoride	35
Estrogen vs. Fluoride vs. Estrogen+Fluoride.....	35
Etidronate.....	36
Etidronate vs. Alendronate	36
Etidronate vs. Risedronate	36
Etidronate vs. Fluoride.....	36
Etidronate+Estrogen	37
Etidronate vs. Estrogen vs. Etidronate+Estrogen.....	37
Etidronate+Phosphate.....	38
Etidronate vs. Phosphate vs. Etidronate+Phosphate	38
Fluoride.....	39
Fluoride vs. Etidronate.....	40
Fluoride+Estrogen	40
Fluoride vs. Estrogen vs. Fluoride+Estrogen.....	40
Ibandronate	41
Ipriflavone	41

Menatetrenone	42
Minondronate.....	42
Nandrolone vs. 1 α -OH D3 vs. Calcium infusion.....	42
Pamidronate	43
Phosphate.....	43
Phosphate vs. Etidronate vs. Phosphate+Etidronate	43
Raloxifene.....	44
Risedronate	44
Risedronate vs. Etidronate	44
Strontium Ranelate	45
Teriparatide.....	46
Teriparatide vs. Teriparatide+Calcitonin.....	46
Kyphoplasty.....	47
Vertebroplasty vs. Placebo	47
Vertebroplasty vs. Conservative.....	47
Kyphoplasty vs. Vertebroplasty.....	48
Recommendation 3	49
Recommendation 4	50
Study Quality.....	51
Nerve Block vs. Subcutaneous Injection	53
Recommendation 5	56
Study Quality.....	57
Brace vs. No Brace	58
Recommendation 6	59
Study Quality.....	60
Exercise vs. No Exercise	61
Recommendation 7	62
Study Quality.....	63
Electrical Stimulation vs. Placebo	66
Recommendation 8	69
Summary of Evidence.....	71
Study Quality.....	72
Vertebroplasty vs. Placebo	78
Vertebroplasty vs. Conservative.....	82
Recommendation 9	86
Summary of Evidence.....	88
Study Quality.....	89
Kyphoplasty vs. Conservative	95
Kyphoplasty vs. Vertebroplasty.....	99
Recommendation 10	101
Recommendation 11	102
Future Research	103
IV. APPENDIXES	104

Appendix I	105
Work Group.....	105
Appendix II	106
AAOS Bodies That Approved This Clinical Practice Guideline.....	106
Documentation of Approval.....	107
Appendix III	108
Study Attrition Flowchart.....	108
Appendix IV	109
Literature Searches.....	109
Appendix V	112
Data Extraction Elements.....	112
Appendix VI	113
Judging the Quality of Treatment Studies.....	113
Opinion-Based Recommendations.....	115
Appendix VII	118
Form for Assigning Strength of Recommendation (Interventions).....	118
Appendix VIII	120
Voting by the Nominal Group Technique.....	120
Appendix IX	121
Structured Peer Review Form.....	121
Appendix X	125
Peer Review Panel.....	125
Public Commentary.....	127
Appendix XI	128
Interpreting the Graphs.....	128
Abbreviations Used in this Report.....	130
Appendix XII	132
Conflict of Interest.....	132
Appendix XIII	133
References.....	133
Excluded Articles and Reason for Exclusion.....	140

List of Figures

Calcitonin vs. Placebo – Difference in Pain	17
Meta-analysis of Estrogen vs. Placebo or Control - Fractures.....	33
Meta-analysis of Fluoride vs. Placebo or Control - Fractures	39
Nerve Block vs. Subcutaneous Injection - Difference in Pain.....	53
CCEF Stimulation vs. Placebo - Difference in Pain	66
Vertebroplasty vs. Placebo – Difference in Pain	78
Vertebroplasty vs. Placebo – Difference in Physical Function.....	78
Vertebroplasty vs. Conservative – Difference in Pain.....	82
Vertebroplasty vs. Conservative – Difference in Physical Function (Barthel Index).....	82
Kyphoplasty vs. Conservative – Difference in Pain	95
Kyphoplasty vs. Conservative – Difference in Physical Function (Roland-Morris Disability)	95
Kyphoplasty vs. Vertebroplasty - Difference in Pain	99
Kyphoplasty vs. Vertebroplasty - Difference in Physical Function	99

List of Tables

MCII of outcomes	5
Descriptive terms for results with MCII	6
Strength of recommendation descriptions	8
AAOS guideline language	9
Summary of Calcitonin Outcomes	14
Quality of Included Studies for Recommendation 1 - Randomized Trials	15
Calcitonin vs. Placebo - Pain	18
Calcitonin vs. Placebo – Bedridden Patients	19
Calcitonin vs. Placebo – Adverse Events	19
Calcitonin vs. No Calcitonin – Pain and Function	20
Fracture Prevention Outcomes	23
Treatment Comparisons for Recommendation 2	24
Quality of Included Studies for Recommendation 2 - Randomized Trials	25
Quality of Included Studies for Recommendation 2 - Prospective Comparative Studies	30
Alendronate vs. Placebo - Fractures	31
Alendronate vs. Alfacalcidol - Fractures	31
Alendronate vs. Etidronate - Fractures	31
Calcitonin vs. Placebo - Fractures	32
Calcitriol vs. Placebo - Fractures	32
Estrogen vs. Placebo or Control - Fractures	33
Estrogen vs. Estrogen+Calcitriol - Fractures	34
Estrogen+Etidronate vs Control - Fractures	34
Estrogen vs. Etidronate vs. Etidronate+Estrogen - Fractures	34
Estrogen+Fluoride vs. Placebo - Fractures	35
Estrogen vs. Fluoride vs. Estrogen+Fluoride - Fractures	35
Etidronate vs. Placebo or Control - Fractures	36
Etidronate vs. Alendronate - Fractures	36
Etidronate vs. Risedronate - Fractures	36
Etidronate vs. Fluoride - Fractures	36
Etidronate+Estrogen vs. Control - Fractures	37
Etidronate vs. Estrogen vs. Etidronate+Estrogen - Fractures	37
Etidronate+Phosphate vs. Placebo - Fractures	38
Etidronate vs. Phosphate vs. Etidronate+Phosphate - Fractures	38
Fluoride vs. Placebo or Control - Fractures	39
Fluoride vs. Etidronate - Fractures	40
Fluoride+Estrogen vs. Placebo - Fractures	40
Fluoride vs. Estrogen vs. Fluoride+Estrogen - Fractures	40
Ibandronate vs. Placebo - Fractures	41
Ipriflavone vs. Placebo - Fractures	41
Menatetrenone vs. Control - Fractures	42
Minodronate vs. Placebo - Fractures	42
Nandrolone vs. 1 α -hydroxyvitaman D3 vs. Calcium Infusion - Fractures	42
Pamidronate vs. Placebo - Fractures	43
Phosphate vs. Placebo - Fractures	43

Phosphate vs. Etdironate vs. Phosphate+Etidronate - Fractures.....	43
Raloxifene vs. Placebo - Fractures.....	44
Risedronate vs. Placebo - Fractures.....	44
Risedronate vs. Etidronate - Fractures.....	44
Strontium Ranelate vs. Placebo - Fractures.....	45
Teriparatide vs. Placebo - Fractures.....	46
Teriparatide vs. Teriparatide+Calcitonin - Fractures.....	46
Kyphoplasty vs. Conservative Treatment - Fractures.....	47
Vertebroplasty vs. Placebo - Fractures.....	47
Vertebroplasty vs. Conservative - Fractures.....	47
Kyphoplasty vs. Vertebroplasty - Fractures.....	48
Quality of Included Study for Recommendation 4 - Randomized Trial.....	51
Nerve block vs. Subcutaneous Injection - Pain.....	54
Nerve block vs. Subcutaneous Injection – Physical Function.....	54
Nerve block vs. Control – SF-36.....	55
Quality of Included Study for Recommendation 5 - Randomized Trial.....	57
Brace vs. No Brace – Pain and Limitations of Daily Living.....	58
Quality of Included Study for Recommendation 6 - Randomized Trial.....	60
Exercise vs. Control - Osteoporosis Quality of Life Questionnaire (OQLQ).....	61
Exercise vs. Control - Sickness Impact Profile (SIP).....	61
Quality of Included Study for Recommendation 7 - Randomized Trial.....	63
CCEF Stimulation vs. Placebo - Pain.....	67
CCEF Stimulation vs. Placebo - Quality of Life.....	67
CCEF Stimulation vs. Placebo - Patients continuing NSAID usage.....	68
Summary of Vertebroplasty Outcomes.....	71
Quality of Included Studies for Recommendation 8 - Randomized Trials.....	72
Quality of Included Studies for Recommendation 8 - Prospective Comparative Study... ..	77
Vertebroplasty vs. Placebo - Pain.....	79
Vertebroplasty vs. Placebo – Physical Function.....	80
Vertebroplasty vs. Placebo – Physical and Mental Health.....	80
Vertebroplasty vs. Placebo – Analgesic Use.....	80
Vertebroplasty vs. Placebo – Quality of Life.....	81
Vertebroplasty vs. Placebo – Adverse Events.....	81
Vertebroplasty vs. Conservative - Pain.....	83
Vertebroplasty vs. Conservative – Physical Function.....	83
Vertebroplasty vs. Conservative – Quality of Life.....	84
Vertebroplasty vs. Conservative – Physical and Mental Health.....	84
Vertebroplasty vs. Conservative – Analgesic Use.....	84
Vertebroplasty vs. Conservative – Adverse Events.....	85
Summary of Kyphoplasty Outcomes.....	88
Quality of Included Studies for Recommendation 9 - Randomized Trials.....	89
Quality of Included Studies for Recommendation 9 - Prospective Comparative Studies.....	93
Kyphoplasty vs. Conservative - Pain.....	96
Kyphoplasty vs. Conservative - Physical Function.....	96
Kyphoplasty vs. Conservative - SF-36 Physical Component Score (PCS).....	97
Kyphoplasty vs. Conservative – Quality of Life.....	97

Kyphoplasty vs. Conservative – Restricted Activity	98
Kyphoplasty vs. Conservative – Opioid Use	98
Kyphoplasty vs. Conservative – Adverse Events	98
Kyphoplasty vs. Vertebroplasty - Pain	100
Kyphoplasty vs. Vertebroplasty – Physical Function	100
Excluded Articles and Reason for Exclusion.....	140

I. INTRODUCTION

OVERVIEW

This clinical practice guideline is based on a systematic review of published studies on the treatment of symptomatic osteoporotic spinal compression fractures in adults. In addition to providing practice recommendations, this guideline also highlights gaps in the literature and areas that require future research.

This guideline is intended to be used by all appropriately trained surgeons and all qualified physicians managing the treatment of symptomatic osteoporotic spinal compression fractures. It is also intended to serve as an information resource for decision makers and developers of practice guidelines and recommendations.

GOALS AND RATIONALE

The purpose of this clinical practice guideline is to help improve treatment based on the current best evidence. Current evidence-based medicine (EBM) standards demand that physicians use the best available evidence in their clinical decision making. To assist in this, this clinical practice guideline consists of a systematic review of the available literature regarding the treatment of symptomatic osteoporotic spinal compression fractures. The systematic review detailed herein was conducted between March 2009 and February 2010 and demonstrates where there is good evidence, where evidence is lacking, and what topics future research must target in order to improve the treatment of patients with symptomatic osteoporotic spinal compression fractures. AAOS staff and the physician work group systematically reviewed the available literature and subsequently wrote the following recommendations based on a rigorous, standardized process.

Musculoskeletal care is provided in many different settings by many different providers. We created this guideline as an educational tool to guide qualified physicians through a series of treatment decisions in an effort to improve the quality and efficiency of care. This guideline should not be construed as including all proper methods of care or excluding methods of care reasonably directed to obtaining the same results. The ultimate judgment regarding any specific procedure or treatment must be made in light of all circumstances presented by the patient and the needs and resources particular to the locality or institution.

INTENDED USERS

This guideline is intended to be used by orthopaedic surgeons and all qualified physicians managing patients with symptomatic osteoporotic spinal compression fractures. Typically, orthopaedic surgeons will have completed medical training, a qualified residency in orthopaedic surgery, and some may have completed additional sub-specialty training. Insurance payers, governmental bodies, and health-policy decision-makers may also find this guideline useful as an evolving standard of evidence regarding treatment of symptomatic osteoporotic spinal compression fractures.

Treatment for symptomatic osteoporotic spinal compression fractures is based on the assumption that decisions are predicated on patient and physician mutual communication with discussion of available treatments and procedures applicable to the individual

patient. Once the patient has been informed of available therapies and has discussed these options with his/her physician, an informed decision can be made. Clinician input based on experience with conservative management and the clinician's surgical experience and skills increases the probability of identifying patients who will benefit from specific treatment options.

PATIENT POPULATION

This document addresses the treatment of symptomatic osteoporotic spinal compression fractures in adults (defined as patients 18 years of age and older).

ETIOLOGY

Symptomatic osteoporotic spinal compression fractures are a result of osteoporosis.

INCIDENCE

Symptomatic osteoporotic spinal compression fractures are a common occurrence. About 750,000 new vertebral fractures occur each year in the United States.¹

BURDEN OF DISEASE

The economic burden of treating incident osteoporotic fractures was estimated at \$17 billion in 2005.²

EMOTIONAL AND PHYSICAL IMPACT

Symptomatic osteoporotic spinal compression fractures cause pain, loss of physical function, and are associated with increased mortality.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS, HARMS, AND CONTRAINDICATIONS

The aim of treatment is pain relief and recovery of mobility. Most treatments are associated with some known risks, especially invasive and operative treatments. In addition, contraindications vary widely based on the treatment administered. Therefore, discussion of available treatments and procedures applicable to the individual patient rely on mutual communication between the patient and physician, weighing the potential risks and benefits for that patient.

