

Bastounis Anastasios (Orcid ID: 0000-0001-5861-9373)
Paskins Zoe (Orcid ID: 0000-0002-7783-2986)

Assessing the effectiveness of bisphosphonates for the prevention of fragility fractures: an updated systematic review and network meta-analyses

Corresponding author

Dr Anastasios Bastounis, PhD

Division of Epidemiology & Public Health, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, City Hospital, Nottingham NG5 1PB, UK

E-mail: Anastasios.Bastounis1@nottingham.ac.uk

Dr Tessa Langley, PhD

Division of Epidemiology & Public Health, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, City Hospital, Nottingham NG5 1PB, UK

E-mail: tessa.langley@nottingham.ac.uk

Ms Sarah Davis, MPhys

School of Health and Related Research, Regent Court (SchARR), University of Sheffield, Sheffield, S1 4DA, UK

E-mail: s.davis@sheffield.ac.uk

Dr Zoe Paskins, PhD, MBChB

School of Medicine, Keele University, Keele, ST5 5BG, UK

Haywood Academic Rheumatology Centre, Midlands Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, Stoke-on-Trent, Staffordshire, UK

E-mail: z.paskins@keele.ac.uk

Professor Neil Gittoes, PhD, MBChB

Centre for Endocrinology, Diabetes and Metabolism (CEDAM), University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK

Queen Elizabeth Hospital, University Hospitals Birmingham NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, B15 2TH, UK

Email: Neil.Gittoes@uhb.nhs.uk

Professor Jo Leonardi-Bee*, PhD

Division of Epidemiology & Public Health, School of Medicine, University of Nottingham, City Hospital, Nottingham NG5 1PB, UK

E-mail: jo.leonardi-bee@nottingham.ac.uk

Professor Opinder Sahota*, DM, MBChB

This article has been accepted for publication and undergone full peer review but has not been through the copyediting, typesetting, pagination and proofreading process which may lead to differences between this version and the [Version of Record](#). Please cite this article as doi: [10.1002/jbm4.10620](https://doi.org/10.1002/jbm4.10620)

Queens Medical Centre (QMC), University of Nottingham, Nottingham University Hospitals
NHS Trust, Nottingham, NG7 2UH, UK
E-mail: opinder.sahota@nuh.nhs.uk

***joint senior**

Study registration: PROSPERO 2020 CRD42020177155

Keywords: bisphosphonates; fractures; network meta-analysis; systematic review; osteoporosis

Abstract

Bisphosphonates have been found to be effective in preventing fragility fractures. However, their comparative effectiveness in populations at risk has yet to be defined. In light of recent clinical trials, we aimed to compare four bisphosphonates (alendronate, ibandronate, risedronate, and zoledronate) and to identify which are the most effective for the prevention of fragility fractures. This is an update of a systematic review previously published as part of a NICE HTA report. We conducted a systematic review and network meta-analysis, updating the estimates regarding the comparative effectiveness of the aforementioned bisphosphonates. Studies identified from published and unpublished sources between 2014 and 2021 were added to the studies identified in the previous review. Screening, data extraction and risk of bias assessment were independently undertaken by two reviewers. Outcomes were fractures, femoral neck bone mineral density (BMD), mortality, and adverse events. We identified 25 additional trials, resulting in a total population of 47,007 participants. All treatments had beneficial effects on fractures versus placebo with zoledronate being the most effective treatment in preventing vertebral fractures HR=0.38 (95%CrI: 0.28, 0.49). Zoledronate HR=0.71 (95%CrI: 0.61, 0.81) and risedronate HR=0.70 (95%CrI: 0.53, 0.84) were found to be the most effective treatments in preventing non-vertebral fractures. All treatments were associated with increases in femoral neck BMD versus placebo with zoledronate being the most effective treatment MD=4.02 (95%CrI: 3.2, 4.84). There was a paucity of data regarding hip and wrist fractures. Depending on its cost-effectiveness, zoledronate could be considered a first-line option for people at increased risk of fragility fractures.

Keywords: Fracture prevention; Antiresorptives; Osteoporosis; Screening; Injury/fracture healing

List of statistical terms, abbreviations and acronyms reported in the manuscript and appendices

ALN: Alendronate

BMD: Bone mineral density
CINeMA: Confidence in Network Meta-Analysis
CrI: Credible interval
 d_k : Relative effect
 D_{res} : Total residual deviance
DIC: deviance information criterion
FN: Femoral neck
HR: Hazard ratio
HRQoL: Health related quality-of-life
HTA: Health Technology Assessment
IBN: Ibandronate
ICDF: Inconsistency degrees of freedom
iv: Intravenous
 m_k : Mean treatment effect
MD: Mean difference
mg: Milligram
NICE: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
OP: Osteoporotic
 pD : effective number of parameters
RIS: Risedronate
SD: Standard deviation
SE: Standard error
SUCRA: Surface under the cumulative ranking
ZOL: Zoledronate
 β : regression coefficient
 κ : Cohen's kappa
 σ : between-study standard deviation
 τ : heterogeneity parameter

Introduction

Bisphosphonates, such as alendronate (ALN), risedronate (RIS), ibandronate (IBN), and zoledronate (ZOL), have been found to be effective in reducing the risk of osteoporotic fragility fractures[1]. However, there is no conclusive evidence regarding their comparative effectiveness in specific patient groups, such as patients with low bone mineral density (BMD)[2]. This can be accounted for by the paucity of comparative trials which would provide insight on how bisphosphonates work through time in the light of adverse events associated to bisphosphonates' use[2]. There is a need therefore to undertake a comparative evaluation of bisphosphonates, testing their effectiveness in reducing the risk of fragility fractures.

This is an update of a systematic review which was previously published as part of a NICE HTA report[3]. The update of the systematic review is timely given that there are recently published trials that are likely to alter the confidence in findings, providing an opportunity to update estimates to facilitate clinical decision-making[4]. In the current review, five interventions were considered: alendronate 10mg/daily or 70mg/weekly (ALN), orally-administered ibandronate 150mg/monthly (IBN-oral), intravenously-administered ibandronate 3mg/quarterly (IBN-iv), risedronate 5mg/daily or 35mg/weekly (RIS), and zoledronate 5mg/annually (ZOL). Supplementary to fractures, this review also investigated the effects of bisphosphonates on femoral neck BMD, health-related quality-of-life (HRQoL), adverse events and mortality. Within the context of osteoporosis, BMD constitutes a biological surrogate measure of patients' risk to develop fragility fractures[5], while recent evidence has shown that treatment-induced BMD changes at femoral neck predict lower risk in developing vertebral, non-vertebral, and hip fractures[6]. The aim of this systematic review was to provide updated estimates regarding the comparative effectiveness of the

aforementioned bisphosphonates, which in turn will inform an economic evaluation regarding bisphosphonates' benefit-to-risk ratio.

Methods

This network meta-analysis is an update of a systematic review which was previously published as part of a NICE HTA report[3]. This study was reported following the PRISMA Extension Statement for Reporting of Systematic Reviews Incorporating Network Meta-analyses of Health Care Interventions checklist[7]. This systematic review and network meta-analysis has been registered with PROSPERO database [CRD42020177155][8].

Eligibility criteria

The eligibility criteria of this systematic review have been described elsewhere [3]. Briefly, only studies in which the interventions of interest (ALN, IBN-iv, IBN-oral, RIS, ZOL) have been assessed within their licenced doses for treating osteoporosis were eligible for inclusion. Studies which report data for both licensed and unlicensed dose study groups were considered eligible only if data for the licensed groups were separately reported. Studies reporting comparisons among the interventions of interest were considered eligible for inclusion. Interventions could also be compared with placebo or other non-active treatments (e.g. treatment without the potential to augment bone, calcium/vitamin D). Outcomes consisted of fragility fractures, bone mineral density (BMD) at femoral neck, mortality, adverse effects, and health-related quality of life (HRQoL). Only randomised controlled trials (RCTs) were eligible for inclusion.

Search strategy and information sources

A comprehensive search was undertaken to systematically identify eligible studies regarding the aforementioned bisphosphonates' effects in preventing the occurrence of fragility fractures (Appendix 1). Only studies published in English language were included at the full-

text stage, given that no relevant studies published in other languages were identified. The search strategy comprised the following main elements: searching of electronic databases (including unpublished data and trial registries), extensive keyword hand-searching, and scrutiny of bibliographies of retrieved papers. The following databases were searched:

- MEDLINE(R) In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations and MEDLINE(R) (Ovid), including PubMed;
- EMBASE (Ovid);
- Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (Wiley Interscience);
- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) (Wiley Interscience);
- Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL, EBSCO);
- Database of Abstract of Reviews of Effects (Wiley Online Library);
- Health Technology Assessment Database (CRD Database);
- NHS Economic Evaluation Database (CRD Database);
- OpenGrey;
- Science Citation Index (ISI Web of Knowledge);
- Conference Proceedings Citation Index - Science (Web of Science);
- ClinicalTrials.gov.

Searches of Medline, EMBASE, CINAHL and CENTRAL covered the period from September 2014 to 1st March 2021. Searches of the rest of databases and trial registries were conducted from 2014 to 8th February 2021. All potentially relevant citations were downloaded to Endnote X8 Reference Manager bibliographic software (version 8.0; Clarivate Analytics, Philadelphia, PA, USA).

Study selection, data collection process, and data items

Newly-identified studies were imported into Rayyan online software[9]. Two independent reviewers screened studies for relevance based on titles/abstracts and later full-texts (AB & TL) with disagreements resolved through discussion or by consulting a third reviewer (OS). Two independent reviewers (AB & TL) conducted full-text screening with a high-level of agreement ($\kappa = .91$). A standardised and pilot-tested data extraction form was used to extract relevant data. One reviewer (AB) extracted data with a second reviewer (TL) independently checking at least of 80% of the extracted records. Where multiple publications of the same study were identified, data extraction was undertaken on the associated publications where relevant data exists. Where different follow-ups of an eligible study were identified, these were included in the extraction phase where relevant data existed. Data extracted consisted of the following categories: i) descriptive statistics (e.g. number recruited and randomised, participants' characteristics), ii) baseline data on outcomes of interest (e.g. comorbidities, fractures at baseline, alcohol use, number of falls), iii) moderators of action (e.g. glucocorticoids (GC) use, patients with osteoporosis, history of fractures/fractures at baseline), iv) interventions' characteristics (e.g. drug-type, administration mode, concomitant treatments), v) statistics and relevant data on the main outcome expressed either as continuous or binary outcomes, vi) data on adverse events (total and by type), and vii) data on mortality and HRQoL. Authors were contacted when there was lack of data on outcomes of interest and/or further information were needed in order to attest eligibility of relevant studies.

Geometry of networks

Both treatment-placebo and treatment-active comparisons were examined and network plots were created for all outcomes (Appendix 3). Nodes indicate the different treatments included

in the analysis and thickness of edges connecting the nodes indicate the number of studies informing each comparison (thicker lines indicate more populated comparisons). For those from the main outcomes with connected networks (i.e. femoral neck BMD and vertebral fractures), an additional visual representation of network plots is provided (Appendix 7). Nodes' size indicates the number of studies included in each node and thickness of lines indicate the overall sample size informing each comparison (thicker edges indicate more populated pairwise comparisons).

Risk of bias within individual studies

The methodological quality of the included RCTs was independently assessed at the study-level by two reviewers (AB & JLB), using the Cochrane Collaboration risk of bias tool 1.0[10]. Any disagreements were resolved through discussion ($\kappa > 80\%$). The Cochrane Collaboration risk of bias tool 1.0 addresses the following specific domains: sequence generation; allocation concealment; blinding of participants and personnel; blinding of outcome assessment; incomplete outcome data and selective outcome reporting. Studies were rated with a low-risk of bias in randomisation sequence if they provided an explicit statement on how they performed the randomisation. Open-label trials were rated as high risk in the 'blinding' category while higher than 20% attrition at 12 months follow-up resulted in high-risk rating in 'incomplete outcome data' category. Risk-of-bias plots were created by using the 'robvis' tool[11].

Summary measures and methods of analysis

Fractures, mortality, and adverse events were reported in a binary form (number of participants experiencing at least one event out of the total number of participants). The data generation process followed a binomial likelihood, assuming an underlying Poisson process for each trial arm. The complementary log-log link function was used to model the NMAs

for the binary outcomes [12]. Log hazard ratios (HR) were estimated from the median and corresponding 95% credibility intervals (CrI) from the 2.5th and 97.5th centiles of the posterior distribution. Treatment ranking probabilities for all fracture outcomes are reported. Changes in BMD were reported as percentage changes per arm from baseline (mean percentage difference per arm plus SE). The data generation process followed a normal likelihood. The identity link function was used to model the NMA for BMD change, including study duration as a trial-level covariate and assuming an equal interaction effect between treatments and reference treatment one [13]. The treatment effects represent the mean difference between the percentage change in the treatment group and the comparator group. Mean percentage difference plus 95%CrI were estimated from the posterior distribution. Treatment ranking probabilities and surface under the cumulative ranking (SUCRA) are reported for the BMD data [14].

Two different modelling strategies were considered for the treatment effects: i) a standard, independent random (treatment)-effects model[15] was fitted for assessing the comparative effectiveness of bisphosphonates in increasing femoral neck BMD, and ii) exchangeable treatment-effects models (i.e. effects model where the treatment effects are assumed to arise from a common distribution according to the class of drug)[16,17] were fitted for assessing the comparative effectiveness of bisphosphonates in preventing fractures, deaths, and adverse events, given the relative paucity of data in the aforementioned variables. For BMD changes, the model was completed by using conventional reference prior distributions: i) trial-specific baseline, $\mu_i \sim N(0, 100^2)$, ii) treatment effects relative to reference treatment, $d_{1k} \sim N(0, 100^2)$, iii) between-study SD of treatment effects, $\tau \sim U(0, 100)$. Where there were sufficient data for binary outcomes, conventional reference prior distributions were used: i) trial-specific baseline, $\mu_i \sim N(0, 100^2)$, ii) treatment effects relative to reference treatment, $d_{1k} \sim N(0, 100^2)$, and iii) between-study SD of treatment effects, $\tau \sim U(0, 5)$. Due to the paucity of

Accepted Article

data, we used a weakly informative prior distribution for the between-study SD [i.e. $\tau \sim \text{HN}(0,0.32^2)$] for the NMAs of hip and wrist fractures, and specific-type adverse events (i.e. influenza-like symptoms, myalgia, nasopharyngitis, and headache). Based on clinical plausibility, a weakly informative prior distribution for the between-study SD (i.e. $\tau \sim \text{HN}(0,0.32^2)$) was used for the NMA of mortality data.

All analyses were conducted using OpenBUGS (MRC Biostatistics Unit, Cambridge, UK)[18] and R Studio (R version 4.0.3)[19], using the ‘gemtc’[20,21] and ‘rjags’[22] packages. Convergence to the target posterior distributions was assessed using the Gelman–Rubin statistic for three independent chains with different initial values. For all outcomes, results were based on three independent chains of initial values and 105,000 iterations after a burn-in of 50,000 iterations. Most of NMAs exhibited moderate correlation between successive iterations of the Markov chain, so were thinned by retaining every 10th sample.

Assessment of inconsistency

Consistency of evidence was assessed by using the node-splitting method[23,24,25] in OpenBUGS and RStudio (R version 4.0.3). Differences between direct and indirect evidence in all network loops were calculated with p-values lower than 0.05 indicating the presence of significant inconsistency. In the case of fracture data, inconsistency was assessed for vertebral fractures only. For non-vertebral fractures, no indirect evidence was available. For hip fractures, an assessment of inconsistency was not performed because the direct evidence between ALN and RIS were provided by one small and, unbalanced in terms of sample size, study[26] with zero events in one arm. For wrist fractures, an assessment of inconsistency was not performed because the direct evidence between ALN and RIS were provided by the same small study and the only direct evidence between ALN and oral IBN-oral were provided by the only 3-arm study included in the NMA[27]. For BMD data, the assessment

of inconsistency was performed after excluding an outlier study[28], which was the only study informing the direct relationship between ZOL and ALN, and the 3-arm study[27] which was the only study providing direct evidence for the relationship between RIS and IBN-oral. For the overall adverse events outcome, an assessment of inconsistency was not formally performed as the fit of the model with the data was poor. For myalgia, headache, and pyrexia, assessment of inconsistency was not performed as there was no indirect evidence. For influenza-like symptoms, an assessment of inconsistency was not performed as there was only one small study with zero events in the control arm informing the direct relationship between IBN-oral and placebo and three small studies with zero events in control arms informing the direct relationship between ZOL and placebo.

Credibility of the findings/Risk of bias across studies

A post-hoc assessment of methodological quality of the included studies was undertaken at outcome-level. A more liberal assessment was applied to the categories of ‘blinding’ and ‘incomplete outcome data’, taking into account that the NMAs assessed pharmacological treatment effects on objective outcomes. When attrition was comparable between arms ($\leq 10\%$) at follow-up, a low-risk rating was applied. Our aim was to appropriately evaluate the credibility of results obtained from the NMA of RCTs with different endpoints. The assessment of the credibility of findings was conducted by following the CINeMA approach[29], where the credibility of findings is accounted for by the assessment of: i) within-study bias, ii) reporting bias, iii) indirectness, iv) imprecision, v) heterogeneity, and vi) incoherence[29]. Conventional levels of HR (0.8, 1.25) and MD=2.71 (1/2 SD of baseline control arms) were used to indicate clinical significance for fractures and BMD outcomes respectively. The assessment of credibility of findings was conducted using CINeMA’s freely available web application [30].

Additional analyses

Sensitivity analysis was conducted on the main outcomes (vertebral and non-vertebral fractures and BMD at femoral neck). Studies with an overall high risk of bias, studies in which patients were switched to different treatment doses, and a single study which was an independent sub-study of an included trial were excluded in the sensitivity analysis of vertebral and non-vertebral fractures. For BMD outcome, two sensitivity analyses were conducted. The first sensitivity analysis assessed the comparative effectiveness of bisphosphonates after excluding those studies with an overall high-risk rating in the risk of bias assessment and the one study which was an independent sub-study of an included trial. The second sensitivity analysis was conducted after excluding those studies in which BMD data was extracted from graphs.

Heterogeneity in treatment effects was explored by considering potential treatment effect modifiers [13]. A set of subgroup meta-regressions were conducted on the main outcomes, testing the effects of the following three covariates: i) proportion of patients with osteoporosis $\geq 75\%$ ii) proportion of patients with increased risk of fractures $\geq 75\%$, and iii) mode of administration (oral versus intravenous). In all subgroup analyses, we assumed a common interaction effect that applies to relative effects of all the treatments relative to the reference treatment one [13]. For BMD changes, study duration was included in meta-regression as a trial-level continuous covariate (centred). For both fractures and BMD outcomes, additional meta-regressions were run, adjusting for participants' baseline-risk, where the interaction term indicates the change in the treatment effect (e.g. log-HR for fracture data and change in mean difference between treatments for BMD data) per unit change in the baseline risk/response.

Results

Study selection

A PRISMA flow diagram shows the selection of papers for inclusion and exclusion in the updated systematic review (Fig. 1). A total of 6,623 articles were retrieved, of which 1,889 were duplicates. Overall, 4,535 studies were excluded following title and abstract screening, and 170 were excluded following full text screen. Data from 25 newly-identified trials obtained from 29 published reports were added to the data obtained from 43 trials identified in the previous review [3], resulting in a total of 68 trials of 47,007 participants.

----- INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE -----

Networks' structures and geometry

Network graphs comparing bisphosphonates for the prevention of fragility fractures are presented for all outcomes (Appendix 3). Four networks were created for fractures data. Data for vertebral and hip fractures provided us with one closed loop of evidence. Data for non-vertebral fractures did not provide us with a closed loop of evidence and the indirect effects were drawn from a single study. Similarly, data for wrist fractures provided us with a single loop after removing the only 3-arm study of the network. Data for BMD provided us with five closed loops after removing the single 3-arm study while three of the loops were accounted for by single studies. A total of 28,340 (nstudies=27) participants received bisphosphonates (ntreatments=5) to prevent vertebral fractures. The most commonly studied treatments were ZOL (n=10) and RIS (n=10). Placebo was used as the comparator arm in 24 studies. The most frequently used comparisons were ZOL versus placebo (n=9) and RIS versus placebo (n=8). A total of 26,435 (nstudies=19) received bisphosphonates (ntreatments=5) for preventing non-vertebral fractures. The drug which was more commonly studied was ZOL (n=7). Placebo was used as the comparator arm in 18 studies. The most

commonly studied comparisons were ZOL versus placebo (n=7) and ALN versus placebo (n=6). A total of 28,570 (nstudies=44) participants received bisphosphonates (ntreatments=5) providing us with data for femoral neck BMD. Data was drawn from 43, 2-arm, studies and one 3-arm study. The studied medications were more commonly ALN (nstudies=23) and RIS (nstudies=16). Placebo was used as the comparator arm in 37 studies. The most commonly studied comparisons were ALN versus placebo (n=17 studies) and RIS versus placebo (n=11 studies). No trials testing IBN-iv against any of the aforementioned bisphosphonates were identified.

Studies characteristics and risk of bias within individual studies

Twenty-five new trials of 6,318 participants were identified from 29 published reports, covering the period from 2014 to 2021. Overall, 10 studies were conducted in China[28,31-39], five studies were conducted in Europe[27,40,41-43], three were conducted in USA[44-46], three were conducted in Oceania[47,48,49], one in Japan[50], one in South Korea[51], and two were conducted internationally[53,54]. Four extensions of original trials [52,55-57] and one ancillary sub-study of a main trial[43] were available accounting for the total number of eligible studies identified. In two cases [40,47], trials published before 2014 were deemed eligible for inclusion and included in the updated review after receiving clinicians' feedback. The sample sizes of the trials identified in the updated review ranged from 30 to 2,000 participants. A full list of included studies' characteristics are reported in the Appendices (Appendix 2). Overall, 19 trials recruited exclusively female participants[27,28,32,34,36-38,40-47,49,51,53,54]. In nine trials, most of participants had received a diagnosis of osteoporosis before entering the study[28,31-34,36,37,41,43], participants in nine trials fulfilled the criteria for secondary causes of osteoporosis[28,41,42,45,46,48,51,52,54], participants in four trials received the treatments of interest at post-operation[31,33,35,37], while the majority of participants had a history of fractures or were recruited on the basis of

fractures at baseline in six trials[32,33,35,37,50,52]. Overall, 15 trials identified in the updated review provided us with data regarding the occurrence of fractures[27,31-33,37-39,43,45,47,48-52], while 13 trials provided data regarding percentage BMD change at femoral neck[27,28,36,38,40,43-46,50-53] and three provided data regarding absolute BMD changes[33,34,41] (Appendix 2). All but two of the newly-identified trials [36,41] reported prevalence of adverse events (Appendix 2). In total, the overall risk of bias was high in 12 trials[27,31-33,35,37,38,40,41,44,51,54] (Appendix 6). Most of the high-risk ratings were observed in the ‘blinding of participants and personnel’ and ‘incomplete outcome data’ domains.

Synthesis of results on the main outcomes

Primary outcome: Vertebral fractures

Data were available from 27 RCTs (Appendix 3). The network provided six direct treatment comparisons. Three contrasts were checked for inconsistency with none of the comparisons showing significant evidence of inconsistency ($p > .1$) (Appendix 8). The model fitted the data relatively well (data points: 54; Dres: 56.34; DIC: 298.5). The between-study SD was estimated to be 0.18 (95%CrI: 0.01 to 0.46), while the between-treatment SD was estimated to be 0.19 (95% CrI: 0.01, 0.46). All treatments were associated with beneficial treatment effects relative to placebo and all treatment effects were statistically significant ($p < .05$) (Table 1). Zoledronate, ALN, and RIS were also found to exert clinically-significant effects. Zoledronate was associated with the greatest effect HR = 0.38 (95%CrI: 0.28, 0.49) and it was most likely to be the most effective treatment (probability: 0.55) (Appendix 4).

----- INSERT TABLE 1 HERE -----

Outcome: Non-vertebral fractures

Data were available from 19 RCTs (Appendix 3). The model fitted the data well (data points: 38; Dres: 28.57; DIC: 224.8). The between-study SD was estimated to be 0.08 (95%CrI: 0.06, 0.24), while the between-treatment SD was estimated to be 0.21 (95%CrI: 0.005 to 0.99). All treatments were associated with beneficial treatment effects relative to placebo, with RIS, ALN and ZOL being statistically significant ($p < .05$) (Table 1). Risedronate was associated with the greatest effect HR = 0.7 (95%CrI: 0.53, 0.84) and was most likely to be the most effective treatment (probability: 0.44) (Appendix 4). Zoledronate was found to be comparably effective, showing more precise effects HR=0.71 (95%CrI: 0.61, 0.81).

Primary outcomes: Hip fractures and wrist fractures

Data on the occurrence of hip fractures were available from 14 RCTs. The model fitted the data well (data points: 28; Dres: 22.22; DIC: 144.8). The between-study SD was estimated to be 0.1 (95%CrI: 0, 0.33), while the between-treatment SD was estimated to be 0.36 (95%CrI: 0, 1.8). All treatments were associated with beneficial treatment effects relative to placebo while ZOL, ALN, and RIS were found to exert statistically significant treatment effects ($p < .05$). Zoledronate [HR = 0.61 (95%CrI: 0.47 to 0.79)] and alendronate [HR = 0.61 (95%CrI: 0.4 to 0.86)] were associated with the greatest effects with the effects of the former being clinically significant.

Data on the occurrence of wrist fractures were available from 10 RCTs with one RCT comparing three treatments. The model fitted the data well (data points:21; Dres:21.83; DIC=95.26). The between-study SD was estimated to be 0.29 (95%CrI: 0, 0.68), while the between-treatment SD was estimated to be 0.44 (95%CrI: 0.01 to 1.8). All treatments were associated with beneficial treatment effects relative to placebo, although the treatment effects were not statistically significant ($p > .05$). Zoledronate was associated with the greatest effect,

with HR = 0.54 (95%CrI: .04, 1.36), and was most likely to be the most effective treatment (probability: 0.47) (Appendix 4).

Primary outcome: percentage change in femoral neck BMD

Data were available from 44 RCTs with one RCT comparing three treatments (27). The model's fit with the data was moderate (data points:89; Dres: 92.21; DIC: 173.4), while none of the seven comparisons showed significant evidence of inconsistency ($p>.1$) (Appendix 8). The between-study SD was 0.93 (95%CrI: 0.64, 1.34). The interaction term for duration of study was 0.78 (95%CrI: 0.3 to 1.24), implying that longer study duration predicts BMD increases for treatment arms. All treatments were associated with beneficial effects relative to placebo (Table 1), and all treatment effects were statistically significant ($p<.05$). Zoledronate was associated with the greatest effect MD = 4.02 (95%CrI: 3.2, 4.84), and was most likely to be the most effective treatment [probability: 0.96; SUCRA (%): 99] (Appendix 4).

Zoledronate was also found to exert clinically-significant effects. Additional analysis was performed on BMD data by undertaking two separate NMAs for 12-month and 24-36 month data (Appendix 5). Both models fitted the data well with ZOL being the most effective treatment at both time-points [MD12-month: 3.05 (95%CrI: 2.25, 3.85), $p<0.05$; MD24-36months: 4.11(95%CrI: 2.84, 5.52, $p<0.05$)]. In those studies where BMD changes were reported as absolute difference from baseline [33,34,41], statistically significant increases in BMD at femoral neck were observed in treatment groups at 12-month follow-up.

Outline of results on the secondary outcomes

Eleven NMAs were conducted on secondary outcomes (Appendix 5). Zoledronate was found to be significantly worse compared to placebo on overall adverse events HR = 1.52 (95%CrI: 1.19, 1.96), arthralgia HR = 1.95 (95%CrI: 1.17, 3.01), headache HR = 2.76 (95%CrI: 2.32, 3.29), influenza-like symptoms HR = 6.05 (95%CrI: 3.07, 10.86), myalgia HR = 5.21

(95%CrI: 4.35, 6.3), and pyrexia symptoms HR = 9.37 (95%CrI: 7.11, 15.56). The model fit with the data was: poor on overall adverse-events outcome (Dres: 91.23; data points: 77), good on arthralgia outcome (Dres: 31.98; data points: 32), moderate on headache outcome (Dres: 25.46; data points: 22), poor on influenza-like symptoms outcome (Dres: 35.93; data points: 24), relatively good on myalgia outcome (Dres: 24.69; data points: 22), and moderate on pyrexia outcome (Dres: 27.27; data points: 24). Additional information regarding the analysis of secondary outcomes is provided as supplementary material in the appendices (Appendix 5).

Risk of bias across studies and credibility of findings

Risk of bias assessment at outcome level was undertaken for all studies conferring data to vertebral fractures and BMD. For vertebral fractures, most of major concerns were detected in the comparisons of RIS versus placebo (>70%) and ALN versus RIS (>40%) with the former being informed by 8 direct comparisons and the latter by one direct comparison (Appendix 7). From mixed-treatment comparisons, findings drawn from two treatment-placebo comparisons were rated as highly credible (ALN vs PLB; ZOL vs PLB). Findings drawn from RIS vs PLB and RIS vs ZOL comparisons were considered of moderate credibility, with the latter being informed by only one direct pairwise comparison. Findings drawn from ALN vs IBNor and ALN vs RIS comparisons were considered of low credibility with the former comparison being informed by a small study of zero events in the control group. From indirect comparisons, evidence drawn from the treatment-placebo comparison (PLB vs IBN-oral) and one active comparison (ALN vs ZOL) were both rated as highly credible, whereas the rest of indirect comparisons produced evidence of low credibility.

For percentage BMD change, most of major concerns were detected in the active comparison of ALN versus RIS (marginally over 10%) with four studies providing evidence (Appendix

7). Proportion of evidence drawn from studies with major concerns were less than 10% in the rest of comparisons. Apart from two active comparisons (ALN vs ZOL; IBNor vs ZOL), all the comparisons provided us with highly credible findings. With regards to the two comparisons providing us with evidence of low credibility, the direct evidence for the comparison of ALN versus ZOL were drawn from a single, outlier, study [28].

Results of additional analysis

Heterogeneity of effects was explored by undertaking separate sensitivity analyses for each of the main outcomes and using risk of bias assessment as a moderator variable (Appendix 5).

For vertebral fractures, data were available from 22, 2-arm, studies. The model had a good fit with the data with a total residual deviance of 43.47 (data points: 44). The between-study SD was estimated to be 0.23 (95%CrI: 0.01, 0.53), implying mild heterogeneity in treatment effects between RCTs. The direction of the findings remained the same compared to the main analysis while only minimal differences were detected in the magnitude of observed effects.

All treatment effects were different compared to placebo ($p < .05$). Zoledronate was found to have the most beneficial effects compared to placebo HR = 0.41 (95%CrI: 0.3, 0.55). For

non-vertebral fractures, data were available from 16, 2-arm, studies. The model had a good fit with the data with a total residual deviance of 23.96 (total number of data points: 32). The between-study SD was estimated to be 0.08 (95%CrI: 0.004, 0.24), implying only minimal heterogeneity in treatment effects between RCTs. The direction of findings remained the same compared to the main analysis while the larger deviations were detected in the observed effect sizes of ALN and IBN-oral. Similar to the main analysis, only the treatment effects related to IBN-oral were not statistically significant compared to placebo ($p > .05$).

Risedronate was found to have the most beneficial effects compared to placebo HR = 0.64 (95%CrI: 0.42, 0.84). For percentage BMD change, data were available from 33, 2-arm, studies (Appendix 5). The model had a good fit with the data with a total residual deviance of

61.49 (data points: 66). The between-study SD was estimated to be 0.75 (95%CrI: 0.5, 1.09), implying high heterogeneity in treatment effects between RCTs with reasonable uncertainty. The direction of the findings remained the same compared to the main analysis and all treatment effects were statistically significant compared to placebo ($p < .05$). Zoledronate was found to have the most beneficial effects compared to placebo MD = 3.69 (95%CrI: 2.91, 4.45). Additional information regarding sensitivity analyses are provided as supplementary material (Appendix 5).

Heterogeneity was also explored by undertaking a set of four meta-regressions on the main fracture outcomes (Appendix 5). None of the tested effect modifiers were found to significantly interact with the treatment effects apart from participants' osteoporotic status on vertebral fractures. For vertebral fractures, the model fit of the meta-regression on the osteoporotic status of participants was good with a total residual deviance of 52.59 (data points: 54). The between-study SD was estimated to be 0.12 implying mild heterogeneity in treatment effects between RCTs. Treatment effects were found to vary according to the type of participants, with larger treatment effects found to be associated with osteoporotic status, providing an interaction term of -0.61(95%CrI: -1.07, -0.17). The model fit was improved by including participants' osteoporosis status as an effect modifier. Additional information regarding subgroup analyses are provided as supplementary material in the appendices (Appendix 5).

Discussion

This is an update of a systematic review which was previously published as part of a NICE HTA report. Overall, 44 trials provided data for femoral neck BMD, while 27 and 19 trials provided data for vertebral and non-vertebral fractures respectively. Only 14 and 10 trials provided data for hip and wrist fractures respectively. Zoledronate was found to be the most

Accepted Article

effective treatment in preventing the occurrence of vertebral fractures and increasing femoral neck BMD. Zoledronate was also found to be comparably effective to RIS and ALN in preventing non-vertebral fractures and hip fractures respectively. Zoledronate's effects in preventing hip and vertebral fractures, and increasing femoral neck BMD were found to be clinically significant. In addition, treatment effects in preventing vertebral fractures were found to be stronger in people with osteoporosis compared to placebo. Uptake of ZOL was also found to be accompanied by more frequently reported adverse events, however, these events are likely to be short-lived. Based on these updated estimates, ZOL could be considered as the first-line treatment for people who experience or are at increased risk of fragility fractures.

These findings arguably have important implications for clinical decision-making in terms of the preferred therapeutic approach for people with varying fracture risk. It has recently been suggested that anabolic treatments should be preferred as the first-line treatment for people who are at high risk for developing osteoporotic fractures [58]. Although recent evidence has shown that anabolic treatment is more effective than bisphosphonates in reducing fracture risk in females who are at high risk to develop fractures [59,60], their effectiveness has only been tested against oral bisphosphonates. There is an urgent need therefore, for future comparative studies to test the effectiveness of anabolic treatments versus zoledronate in reducing the fracture risk in high-risk populations. This becomes more apparent when the imminent fracture risk and the need to expedite clinical decision-making [61,62] are taken into account. Based on our findings, ZOL seems a promising treatment which could decrease the imminent fracture risk for high-risk populations within 24 months after administration. Future studies should investigate whether ZOL or anabolic treatments are more effective in reducing imminent fracture risk in high-risk populations.

Strengths and limitations

These network meta-analyses provide updated estimates regarding bisphosphonates' effect in preventing the occurrence of fractures. This updated systematic review has several strengths. First, this review includes a robust search strategy with clearly-demarcated eligibility criteria, covering a wide range of databases, trial registries and grey literature. Second, this review employed gold-standard methods in analysing, reporting, and assessing the quality of findings, which in turn facilitates clinical decision-making. Inevitably, this review has also some limitations. First, treatment networks for hip and wrist fractures were sparse, something which might limit the generalisation of our conclusions regarding bisphosphonates' effects on those outcomes. Second, none of the included studies had tested IBN-iv against any other bisphosphonate or placebo, preventing to provide updated estimates regarding IBN-iv effectiveness. Third, there was scarcity of data regarding bisphosphonates' effects on male populations and populations with exposure to glucocorticoids.

Conclusions

Zoledronate was found to be the most effective bisphosphonate compared to ALN, RIS, and IBN-oral for reducing the risk of fragility fracture. Depending on its cost-effectiveness, ZOL could be considered as a first-line option for people at increased risk of subsequent fractures.

Word count: 5,279 (excluding figures/tables and references)

Disclosure Page

Funding source & conflicts of interest: Grants/Fellowships supporting the writing of this paper: this work was supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), Health Technology Assessment (HTA) Programme [NIHR127550]. ZP is funded by the NIHR, Clinician Scientist Award (CS-2018-18-ST2-010)/NIHR Academy. The views expressed are

those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the National Health Service, the NIHR or the Department of Health and Social Care.

All other authors have nothing to declare.

Contributory statement: AB, TL, SD, ZP, NG, JL-B and OS conceived and designed the review. AB, TL and JL-B conducted the screening. AB, TL and JL-B conducted the data extraction and assessed studies for risk of bias. AB conducted the main statistical analyses. AB prepared the first draft of the review, with further input from TL, ZP, JL-B. All authors contributed to the interpretation and final write up. All authors had direct access to the data, or access was provided as requested. AB is the guarantor. JL-B and OS are joint senior authors. The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

Data availability statement: Data are from published research and therefore are mostly in the public domain. Extracted data are provided in the appendices.

References

***Asterisks denote the newly-identified studies included in the updated review.**

1. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Osteoporosis: assessing the risk of fragility fracture (NICE Clinical Guideline [CG146]). 2020; Available at <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg146/chapter/2-Research-recommendations> [Assessed at 15 March 2021].
2. Qaseem A, Forciea MA, McLean RM, Denberg TD. Treatment of low bone density or osteoporosis to prevent fractures in men and women: A clinical practice guideline

update from the American college of physicians. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2017;166(11):818-39.

3. Davis S, Martyn-St James M, Sanderson J, Stevens J, Goka E, Rawdin A, et al. A systematic review and economic evaluation of bisphosphonates for the prevention of fragility fractures. *Health Technol Assess*. 2016;20(78):1-406.
4. Garner P, Hopewell S, Chandler J, MacLehose H, Schunemann HJ, Akl EA, et al. When and how to update systematic reviews: consensus and checklist. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*. 2016;354:i3507.
5. Bouxsein ML, Eastell R, Lui LY, Wu LA, de Papp AE, Grauer A, et al. Change in Bone Density and Reduction in Fracture Risk: A Meta-Regression of Published Trials. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2019;34(4):632-42.
6. Black DM, Bauer DC, Vittinghoff E, Lui LY, Grauer A, Marin F, Khosla S, de Papp A, Mitlak B, Cauley JA, McCulloch CE. Treatment-related changes in bone mineral density as a surrogate biomarker for fracture risk reduction: meta-regression analyses of individual patient data from multiple randomised controlled trials. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*. 2020;8(8):672-82.
7. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, Chaimani A, Schmid CH, Cameron C, et al. The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: checklist and explanations. *Ann Intern Med*. 2015;162(11):777-84.
8. Bastounis A, Leonardi-Bee J, Langley T, Paskins Z, Davies S, Sahota O (2020). Assessing the effectiveness of bisphosphonates for the prevention of fragility fractures: an updated systematic review. PROSPERO CRD42020177155. Available from: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospERO/display_record.php?ID=CRD42020177155
9. Ouzzani, M., Hammady, H., Fedorowicz Z., & Elmagarmid, A. Rayyan — a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews* 2020; 5, 210.
10. Higgins JT, Altman D, Group CSM, Group CBM. Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in included studies. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. Chichester, UK: The Cochrane Collaboration and John Wiley & Sons Ltd.; 2011.
11. McGuinness LA, Higgins JP. Risk-of-bias VISualization (robvis): An R package and Shiny web app for visualizing risk-of-bias assessments. *Research Synthesis Methods*. 2021;12(1):55-61.
12. Dias S, Welton NJ, Sutton AJ, Ades AE. NICE DSU technical support document 2: a generalised linear modelling framework for pairwise and network meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. (Technical Support Document in Evidence Synthesis; No. TSD2). National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. 2012
13. Dias S, Sutton AJ, Welton NJ, Ades AE. Evidence synthesis for decision making 3: heterogeneity—subgroups, meta-regression, bias, and bias-adjustment. *Medical Decision Making*. 2013; 33(5):618-40.
14. Salanti G, Ades AE, Ioannidis JP. Graphical methods and numerical summaries for presenting results from multiple-treatment meta-analysis: an overview and tutorial. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2011;64(2):163-71.
15. Dias S, Ades AE, Welton NJ, Jansen JP, Sutton AJ. Chapter 4. Generalised Linear Models. *Network Meta-Analysis for Decision-Making* Oxford, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.; 2018.
16. Dakin HA, Welton NJ, Ades AE, Collins S, Orme M, Kelly S. Mixed treatment comparison of repeated measurements of a continuous endpoint: an example using topical treatments for primary open-angle glaucoma and ocular hypertension. *Statistics in medicine*. 2011;30(20):2511-35.

17. Dias S, Ades AE, Welton NJ, Jansen JP, Sutton AJ. Chapter 8. Meta-Regression for Relative Treatment Effects. *Network Meta-Analysis for Decision-Making* Oxford, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.; 2018.
18. Lunn D, Spiegelhalter D, Thomas A, Best N. The BUGS project: Evolution, critique and future directions. *Statistics in medicine*. 2009;28(25):3049-67.
19. RStudio Team. RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, PBC, Boston, MA. 2020
20. van Valkenhoef G, Lu G, de Brock B, Hillege H, Ades AE, Welton NJ. Automating network meta-analysis. *Research synthesis methods*. 2012; 3(4):285-99.
21. van Valkenhoef, G. & Kuiper, J. Gemtc: Network Meta-Analysis Using Bayesian Methods. R Package version 0.8-8. 2020
22. Plummer, M., Stukalov, A., & Denwood, M. Rjags: Bayesian Graphical Models using MCMC. R Package version 4-10. 2019
23. Dias S, Welton NJ, Caldwell DM, Ades AE. Checking consistency in mixed treatment comparison meta-analysis. *Statistics in medicine*. 2010; 29(7-8):932-44.
24. Dias S, Ades AE, Welton NJ, Jansen JP, Sutton AJ. Chapter 7. Checking for Inconsistency. *Network Meta-Analysis for Decision-Making* Oxford, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.; 2018.
25. van Valkenhoef G, Dias S, Ades AE, Welton NJ. Automated generation of node-splitting models for assessment of inconsistency in network meta-analysis. *Research synthesis methods*. 2016; 7(1):80-93.
26. Muscoso E, Puglisi N, Mamazza C, Giudice FL, Testai M, Abbate S, Santangelo A, Panebianco P, Maugeri D. Antiresorption therapy and reduction in fracture susceptibility in the osteoporotic elderly patient: open study. *EUROPEAN REVIEW FOR MEDICAL AND PHARMACOLOGICAL SCIENCES*.. 2004;8:97-102.
- *27. Paggiosi MA, Peel N, McCloskey E, Walsh JS, Eastell R. Comparison of the effects of three oral bisphosphonate therapies on the peripheral skeleton in postmenopausal osteoporosis: the TRIO study. *Osteoporosis International*. 2014; 25(12):2729-41.
- *28. 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 postmenopausal osteoporosis. *Journal of clinical pharmacy and therapeutics*. 2016;41(5):519-23.
29. Nikolakopoulou A, Higgins JP, Papakonstantinou T, Chaimani A, Del Giovane C, Egger M, Salanti G. CINeMA: An approach for assessing confidence in the results of a network meta-analysis. *PLoS medicine*. 2020;17(4):e1003082.
30. Papakonstantinou T, Nikolakopoulou A, Higgins JP, Egger M, Salanti G. CINeMA: Software for semiautomated assessment of the confidence in the results of network meta-analysis. *Campbell Systematic Reviews*. 2020;16(1):e1080.
- *31. Hu W, Wang H, Shi X, Song Y, Zhang G, Xing S, Zhang K, Gao Y. Effect of Preoperative Zoledronic Acid Administration on Pain Intensity after Percutaneous Vertebroplasty for Osteoporotic Vertebral Compression Fractures. *Pain Research and Management*. 2020; 3;2020.
- *32. Li H, Li C, Yi X, Liu H, Wang Y. Effects of sodium alendronate on osteoporosis and apoptosis-related factors Cyt C, Apaf-1 and caspase-9. *Biomedical Research*. 2018; 29(3)
- *33. Li Y, Zhao WB, Wang DL, He Q, Li Q, Pei FX, Liu L. Treatment of osteoporotic intertrochanteric fractures by zoledronic acid injection combined with proximal femoral nail anti-rotation. *Chinese Journal of Traumatology*. 2016;19(5):259-63.

- *34. Liang BC, Shi ZY, Wang B, Wu P, Kong LC, Yao JL, Li CW, Shi XL. Intravenous Zoledronic Acid 5 mg on Bone Turnover Markers and Bone Mineral Density in East China Subjects with Newly Diagnosed Osteoporosis: A 24-month Clinical Study. *Orthopaedic surgery*. 2017; 9(1):103-9.
- *35. Liu Z, Li CW, Mao YF, Liu K, Liang BC, Wu LG, Shi XL. Study on zoledronic acid reducing acute bone loss and fracture rates in elderly postoperative patients with intertrochanteric fractures. *Orthopaedic surgery*. 2019;11(3):380-5.
- *36. Shi ZY, Zhang XG, Li CW, Liu K, Liang BC, Shi XL. Effect of traditional Chinese medicine product, QiangGuYin, on bone mineral density and bone turnover in Chinese postmenopausal osteoporosis. *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*. 2017.
- *37. Zhang J, Zhang T, Xu X, Cai Q, Zhao D. Zoledronic acid combined with percutaneous kyphoplasty in the treatment of osteoporotic compression fracture in a single T12 or L1 vertebral body in postmenopausal women. *Osteoporosis International*. 2019;30(7):1475-80.
- *38. Zhang ZL, Liao EY, Xia WB, Lin H, Cheng Q, Wang L, Hao YQ, Chen DC, Tang H, De Peng Y, You L. Alendronate sodium/vitamin D 3 combination tablet versus calcitriol for osteoporosis in Chinese postmenopausal women: a 6-month, randomized, open-label, active-comparator-controlled study with a 6-month extension. *Osteoporosis International*. 2015; 26(9):2365-74.
- *39. Zhou J, Liu B, Qin MZ, Liu JP. Fall Prevention and Anti-Osteoporosis in Osteopenia Patients of 80 Years of Age and Older: A Randomized Controlled Study. *Orthopaedic surgery*. 2020;12(3):890-9.
- *40. Eastell R, Nagase S, Ohyama M, Small M, Sawyer J, Boonen S, Spector T, Kuwayama T, Deacon S. Safety and efficacy of the cathepsin K inhibitor ONO-5334 in postmenopausal osteoporosis: the OCEAN study. *Journal of bone and mineral research*. 2011; 26(6):1303-12.
- *41. Cesareo R, Di Stasio E, Vescini F, Campagna G, Cianni R, Pasqualini V, Romitelli F, Grimaldi F, Manfredi S, Palermo A. Effects of alendronate and vitamin D in patients with normocalcemic primary hyperparathyroidism. *Osteoporosis International*. 2015; 26(4):1295-302.
- *42. Livi L, Scotti V, Desideri I, Saieva C, Cecchini S, Francolini G, Becherini C, Paoli CD, Visani L, Salvestrini V, De Feo ML. Phase 2 placebo-controlled, single-blind trial to evaluate the impact of oral ibandronate on bone mineral density in osteopenic breast cancer patients receiving adjuvant aromatase inhibitors: 5-year results of the single-centre BONADIUV trial. *European Journal of Cancer*. 2019; 108:100-10.
- *43. Popp AW, Buffat H, Cavelti A, Windolf M, Perrelet R, Senn C, Lippuner K. Cortical bone loss at the tibia in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis is associated with incident non-vertebral fractures: Results of a randomized controlled ancillary study of HORIZON. *Maturitas*. 2014;77(3):287-93.
- *44. Cosman F, Gilchrist N, McClung M, Foldes J, de Villiers T, Santora A, Leung A, Samanta S, Heyden N, McGinnis JP, Rosenberg E. A phase 2 study of MK-5442, a calcium-sensing receptor antagonist, in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis after long-term use of oral bisphosphonates. *Osteoporosis International*. 2016; 27(1):377-86.
- *45. Greenspan SL, Perera S, Ferchak MA, Nace DA, Resnick NM. Efficacy and safety of single-dose zoledronic acid for osteoporosis in frail elderly women: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA internal medicine*. 2015; 175(6):913-21.
- *46. Greenspan SL, Vujevich KT, Brufsky A, Lembersky BC, van Londen GJ, Jankowitz RC, Puhalla SL, Rastogi P, Perera S. Prevention of bone loss with risedronate in breast cancer survivors: a randomized, controlled clinical trial. *Osteoporosis International*. 2015; 26(6):1857-64.
- *47. Grey A, Bolland M, Wong S, Horne A, Gamble G, Reid IR. Low-dose zoledronate in osteopenic postmenopausal women: a randomized controlled trial. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*. 2012; 97(1):286-92.

- *48. Cheung AS, Hoermann R, Ghasem-Zadeh A, Tinson AJ, Ly V, Milevski SV, Joon DL, Zajac JD, Seeman E, Grossmann M. Differing Effects of Zoledronic Acid on Bone Microarchitecture and Bone Mineral Density in Men Receiving Androgen Deprivation Therapy: A Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*. 2020; 35(10):1871-80.
- *49. Reid IR, Horne AM, Mihov B, Stewart A, Garratt E, Wong S, Wiessing KR, Bolland MJ, Bastin S, Gamble GD. Fracture prevention with zoledronate in older women with osteopenia. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2018; 1.
- *50. Nakamura T, Fukunaga M, Nakano T, Kishimoto H, Ito M, Hagino H, Sone T, Taguchi A, Tanaka S, Ohashi M, Ota Y. Efficacy and safety of once-yearly zoledronic acid in Japanese patients with primary osteoporosis: two-year results from a randomized placebo-controlled double-blind study (ZOledroNate treatment in Efficacy to osteoporosis; ZONE study). *Osteoporosis International*. 2017;28(1):389-98.
- *51. Shin K, Park SH, Park W, Baek HJ, Lee YJ, Kang SW, Choe JY, Yoo WH, Park YB, Song JS, Lee SG. Monthly oral ibandronate reduces bone loss in Korean women with rheumatoid arthritis and osteopenia receiving long-term glucocorticoids: a 48-week double-blinded randomized placebo-controlled investigator-initiated trial. *Clinical therapeutics*. 2017;39(2):268-78.
- *52. Black DM, Reid IR, Cauley JA, Cosman F, Leung PC, Lakatos P, Lippuner K, Cummings SR, Hue TF, Mukhopadhyay A, Tan M. The effect of 6 versus 9 years of zoledronic acid treatment in osteoporosis: a randomized second extension to the HORIZON-Pivotal Fracture Trial (PFT). *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*. 2015;30(5):934-44.
- *53. McClung MR, Grauer A, Boonen S, Bolognese MA, Brown JP, Diez-Perez A, Langdahl BL, Reginster JY, Zanchetta JR, Wasserman SM, Katz L. Romosozumab in postmenopausal women with low bone mineral density. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2014;370(5):412-20.
- *54. Sestak I, Singh S, Cuzick J, Blake GM, Patel R, Gossiel F, Coleman R, Dowsett M, Forbes JF, Howell A, Eastell R. Changes in bone mineral density at 3 years in postmenopausal women receiving anastrozole and risedronate in the IBIS-II bone substudy: an international, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *The lancet oncology*. 2014;15(13):1460-8.
- *55. 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. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*. 2014;29(1):166-72.
- *56. Grey A, Bolland MJ, Horne A, Mihov B, Gamble G, Reid IR. Duration of antiresorptive activity of zoledronate in postmenopausal women with osteopenia: a randomized, controlled multidose trial. *CMAJ*. 2017;189(36):E1130-6.
- *57. Eastell R, Nagase S, Small M, Boonen S, Spector T, Ohyama M, Kuwayama T, Deacon S. Effect of ONO-5334 on bone mineral density and biochemical markers of bone turnover in postmenopausal osteoporosis: 2-year results from the OCEAN study. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research*. 2014;29(2):458-66.
58. Kanis JA, Harvey NC, McCloskey E, Bruyère O, Veronese N, Lorentzon M, Cooper C, Rizzoli R, Adib G, Al-Daghri N, Campusano C. Algorithm for the management of patients at low, high and very high risk of osteoporotic fractures. *Osteoporosis International*. 2020;31(1):1-2.
59. Kendler DL, Marin F, Zerbini CA, Russo LA, Greenspan SL, Zikan V, Bagur A, Malouf-Sierra J, Lakatos P, Fahrleitner-Pammer A, Lespessailles E. 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. *The Lancet*. 2018;391(10117):230-40.
60. Saag KG, Petersen J, Brandi ML, Karaplis AC, Lorentzon M, Thomas T, Maddox J, Fan M, Meisner PD, Grauer A. Romosozumab or alendronate for fracture prevention in women with osteoporosis. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2017;377(15):1417-27.

61. Banefelt J, Åkesson KE, Spångeus A, Ljunggren O, Karlsson L, Ström O, Ortsäter G, Libanati C, Toth E. Risk of imminent fracture following a previous fracture in a Swedish database study. *Osteoporosis International*. 2019;30(3):601-9.
62. Balasubramanian A, Zhang J, Chen L, Wenkert D, Daigle SG, Grauer A, Curtis JR. Risk of subsequent fracture after prior fracture among older women. *Osteoporosis international*. 2019;30(1):79-92.

Figure 1. PRISMA Flow diagram of the selected studies in the updated review.




Table 1. League table presenting network meta-analysis estimates (lower triangle) and direct estimates (upper triangle) of efficacy of bisphosphonates. From the left to the right: i) % BMD change at femoral neck, ii) vertebral fractures, and iii) non-vertebral fractures. Posterior mean differences (95%CrI) are presented for percentage BMD change at femoral neck and posterior median hazard ratios (95%CrI) for vertebral and non-vertebral fractures.

ZOL				3.8(2.7, 4.8)		ZOL				0.33(0.23, 0.43)		RIS					-
1.15(.24, 2.08)	ALN			3.1(2.4, 3.8)		0.88(0.58, 1.21)	ALN			0.43(0.33, 0.53)		0.98(0.82, 1.35)	ZOL				-
1.31 (-0.08, 2.73)	.15 (-1, 1.32)	IBNor		2.3(.21, 4.3)		0.87(0.37, 1.82)	0.99(0.47, 2.18)	IBNor		-		0.95(0.5, 1.33)	0.98(0.55, 1.36)	IBNor			-
1.76(0.82, 2.74)	.6(-.09, 1.31)	.45(-0.8, 1.72)	RIS	2.4(1.5, 3.3)		0.76(0.5, 1.07)	0.88(0.6, 1.22)	0.91(0.37, 1.82)	RIS	0.54(0.39, 0.69)		0.92(0.65, 1.11)	0.93(0.74, 1.11)	0.99(0.63, 1.5)	ALN		-
4.02(3.2, 4.84)	2.86(2.37, 3.36)	2.7(1.56, 3.86)	2.25(1.61, 2.87)	PLB		0.38(0.28, 0.49)	0.44(0.33, 0.57)	0.44(0.2, 0.94)	0.5(0.37, 0.66)	PLB		0.70(0.53, 0.84)	0.71(0.61, 0.81)	0.75(0.51, 1.26)	0.77(0.63, 0.91)	PLB	

Note. ALN = Alendronate; IBNor: Ibandronate 150mg; PLB: Placebo; RIS: Risedronate; ZOL: Zoledronate.

Treatments are reported in order of relative ranking for efficacy. Comparisons between treatments should be read from left to right, and their hazard ratio is in the cell in common between the column-defining treatment and the row-defining treatment. Hazard ratios (HR) < 1 favour the column-defining treatment for the network estimates and the row-defining treatment for the direct estimates