Bisphosphonates after denosumab withdrawal reduce the vertebral fractures incidence

Giorgia Grassi¹, Iacopo Chiodini^{2,3}, Serena Palmieri⁴, Elisa Cairolì^{2,5}, Maura Arosio^{1,4} and Cristina Eller-Vainicher¹

¹Unit of Endocrinology, Fondazione IRCCS Cà Granda-Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy, ²Department of Endocrine and Metabolic Diseases, IRCCS, Istituto Auxologico Italiano, Milan, Italy, ³Department of Medical Biotechnology and Translational Medicine, ⁴Department of Clinical Sciences and Community Health, and ⁵Department of Pathophysiology and Transplantation, University of Milan, Milan, Italy

Correspondence should be addressed to C Eller-Vainicher
Email
eller.vainicher@gmail.com

Abstract

Objective: Several studies showed the occurrence of vertebral fracture (VFX) in patients discontinuing denosumab (Dmab), suggesting the need of bisphosphonate (BPs) therapy to mitigate this VFX risk increase. However, the morphometric VFX (morphoVFX) incidence after Dmab discontinuation and the BPs effect on VFX risk in this setting are still a matter of debate.

Design: Retrospective, monocentric study.

Methods: In 120 patients (111 females) discontinuing Dmab, 19 have not been treated (non-treated group: 16 females, aged 63.5 ± 15.0 years) and 101 patients have been treated (treated group: 95 females, aged 70.0 ± 10.6 years) with BPs (28 alendronate (ALN); 73 zoledronate ZOL, single infusion), respectively. We evaluated the incidence of both clinical VFX and morphoVFX in treated group and non-treated group.

Results: Patients in treated group showed a 5.5% VFX incidence ($n = 6$, three clinical, three morpho VFX), which was anyway lower than non-treated group patients ($n = 4$, 21.1%, four clinical, three multiple, $P = 0.029$), despite a comparable FRAX score at the time of Dmab initiation. The logistic regression analysis showed that the VFX incidence was independently associated with the lack of BPs treatment (odds ratio: 13.9, 95% CI 1.7–111.1, $P = 0.014$), but not with the number of Dmab injections, age, duration of BPs before Dmab initiation, the BMD at Dmab withdrawal, and the prevalence of VFX at Dmab withdrawal.

Conclusions: The Dmab withdrawal is associated with an increased risk of clinical but not morphometric VFX. Therapy with ALN or with a single ZOL treatment is partially effective in reducing the increased VFX risk after Dmab withdrawal.

European Journal of
Endocrinology
(2021) **185**, 387–396

Introduction

Denosumab (Dmab), a MAB against the receptor activator of nuclear factor κ B ligand (RANKL), is a potent antiresorptive agent, which profoundly and continuously suppresses bone turnover markers (BTMs), increases bone mineral density (BMD), and reduces fracture risk (1). Nowadays, a good safety profile is guaranteed for up to 10 years (1).

At variance with bisphosphonates (BPs), Dmab does not incorporate into the bone matrix, and, for this reason, its effects are reversible when therapy is discontinued. Indeed, after Dmab discontinuation, BTMs increase rapidly and, at 9 months after the last injection, exceed their baseline levels and remain elevated for about 2 years, decreasing slowly to baseline levels approximately

30 months after the last injection. In keeping with the BTMs behavior, after Dmab withdrawal, the BMD gained during treatment is lost, reaching baseline values within 12 and 24 months (2, 3, 4, 5). This phenomenon, commonly described as the 'rebound phenomenon', has been suggested to be due, among other causes, to the fact that osteoclast precursors, which remained quiescent during the treatment period, retake simultaneously their activity (6). Notably, longer is the Dmab therapy, faster is the BMD decline (7).

This rebound phenomenon seems to be associated with an increased risk of clinical vertebral fractures (VFX). Indeed, since 2015, several case reports and series have been published describing the occurrence of unexpected VFX, including multiple VFX (MVFX) in patients discontinuing Dmab (6, 8). A *post hoc* analysis of the FREEDOM and FREEDOM Extension studies showed that as compared with the placebo arm, patients discontinuing Dmab had a significantly higher frequency of multiple VFX (7). However, many authors believe that the increased VFX incidence after Dmab withdrawal is evident mainly in patients with the high-risk of fracture before Dmab therapy and that after Dmab discontinuation, this high-risk population returns to the pretreatment fracture risk (9).

To prevent this 'rebound phenomenon' in patients stopping Dmab, a BPs treatment, such as oral alendronate (ALN) or i.v. zoledronate (ZOL) has been advocated, irrespective of the attained BMD at the time of the transition between treatments. Although, several scientific societies have issued position statements on this topic, the optimal BPs regimen to mitigate bone loss and the subsequent fracture risk is still a matter of ongoing research (9, 10, 11, 12).

The available studies show that ALN and ZOL therapy after Dmab discontinuation only attenuate the rebound-related bone loss (13, 14, 15, 16). Indeed, recent data suggest that a not negligible number of patients discontinuing Dmab show a BMD loss after a single ZOL irrespective of the duration of Dmab therapy and the timing of ZOL administration (9, 13, 14). Up to now, data about the BPs effect on VFX in this setting are not conclusive, although some data suggest that BPs may have a protective effect on MVFX after Dmab withdrawal (12, 15). Finally, data on morphometric VFX (morphoVFX) incidence after Dmab discontinuation have been reported in only one study (12).

This retrospective real-life monocentric study was designed to evaluate in a sample of consecutive patients who discontinued Dmab the incidence of both clinical VFX and morphoVFX and the effect of post-Dmab BPs

treatment on VFX risk, and possibly the factors associated with VFX risk in treated patients.

Patients and methods

Patients

In this observational study, we retrospectively examined the available data at September 2020 of all patients ($n=415$), referred to our outpatient clinic for Metabolic Bone Diseases, who had been treated since May 2011 with Dmab (60 mg subcutaneously every 6 months) for at least 12 months (two injections), on the basis of the Italian prescription rules (http://www.agenziafarmaco.gov.it/sites/default/files/Determinazione_446-2017_agg_nota79.pdf). Of these, we evaluated data of all patients ($n=195$), who discontinued the Dmab therapy within September 2018.

Of these patients, we excluded 75 subjects on the basis of the following criteria: (i) administration of less than two injections of Dmab ($n=6$); (ii) premenopausal status and/or secondary osteoporosis other than aromatase inhibitors (AI) related osteoporosis ($n=39$); (iii) lack of BMD measurement by dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry (DXA) and/or of thoracolumbar spinal radiographs at the time of Dmab discontinuation and/or at the end of follow-up ($n=25$); (vi) treatment after Dmab discontinuation with bone active drugs beyond bisphosphonates ($n=5$).

Eventually we enrolled 120 patients (9 males and 111 females). According to the Italian prescription rules, all patients had been treated for primary osteoporosis ($n=106$) or for concomitant therapy with aromatase-inhibitors (AI, $n=14$). Of the included patients, 19 patients expressly wanted to discontinue Dmab, regardless of BMD levels, and did not accept treatment with BPs (non-treated group) due to the fear of jaw osteonecrosis, although they were exhaustively warned about the high fracture risk related to the rebound phenomenon and the very low risk of jaw osteonecrosis. The remaining 101 patients were suggested to discontinue therapy (treated group) and were subsequently treated with BPs. Within the treated group, 11 patients (10.8%) were suggested to discontinue denosumab due to suboptimal compliance, regardless of the BMD status. During each consultation, patients were asked to report the dates of denosumab injections. A good compliance was defined if patients reported an injection interval ≤ 7 months (16). All patients, defined as non-compliant, showed a moderate adherence (injection delay 1–3 months) but they were considered at risk of

possible unplanned further discontinuation. One of these patients experienced a clinical vertebral fracture during denosumab therapy possibly due to denosumab delay. All non-compliant patients were treated with a single infusion of ZOL in order to avoid a subsequent lack of compliance. Within the remaining 90 patients, 78 were suggested to discontinue denosumab in the presence of BMD at lumbar spine (LS) and total hip (TH) above -2.5 . This BMD threshold, which until 2017 was considered safe, was evaluated together with other possible risk factors in order to define the overall patients fracture risk (17, 18). Twelve patients were suggested to discontinue Dmab for AI therapy discontinuation and without other criteria to continue Dmab therapy, regardless of BMD (according for Italian prescription rules).

In the treated group, 73 patients were treated with ZOL (single infusion, administered between 30 and 60 days after Dmab discontinuation) and 28 patients with ALN (once a week, immediately after Dmab discontinuation, for the whole follow up). We planned a single ZOL infusion on the basis of the evidence that the ZOL infusion effect persists well beyond 12 months (19) and in keeping with the ECTS position statement, which suggested to administer a single ZOL infusion (to be given possibly after Dmab discontinuation at the time of bone turnover increase) or to initiate oral bisphosphonates after Dmab withdrawal (20). During each consultation, patients treated with ALN were asked about their compliance (referred compliance $\geq 80\%$

in all patients) and they were encouraged to contact our center in case of poor drug tolerability to evaluate ZOL infusion. All patients discontinued Dmab and AI therapy simultaneously. All patients were taking vitamin D and calcium supplements. Among treated group and non-treated group 71 and 8 patients respectively had been treated with BPs prior to Dmab therapy (27 and 1, respectively discontinued BPs ≤ 12 months before Dmab therapy). The study plan is depicted in Fig. 1.

Ethical approval

Ethical approval was obtained from the ethic committee (Milan, Area 2) of our Center.

Informed consent

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Methods

We report data of all patients at Dmab withdrawal (t_1) and at the end of the follow-up period (t_2), which lasted 24 months. From all the enrolled patients, we collected information on BMI, smoking habits, family history of osteoporosis, and hip fractures.

Figure 1

The study flowschart. Dmab, denosumab; DXA, dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry; AI, aromatase inhibitors; BPs, bisphosphonates; ALN, alendronate; ZOL, zoledronate; VFx, vertebral fracture.

Moreover, information on prevalent and incident clinical fragility fractures at Dmab initiation (t_0 , t_1 and t_2) was obtained from all subjects at consultation. The fracture was considered prevalent and due to bone fragility if occurred before Dmab therapy and without any evident trauma or after a low-energy trauma (e.g. a fall from a standing height), respectively. The information given by patients was confirmed by reviewing the medical records. Traumatic fractures were not considered in the analysis. Information on incident clinical fragility fractures was obtained from all subjects at regular clinical visits and confirmed by reviewing the medical records. We also encouraged patients to contact us in case of ascertained VFx and/or symptoms suggesting VFx. All data were confirmed by reviewing the medical records. We reported as prevalent at t_1 if all fractures occurred before Dmab withdrawal. Fractures at t_2 were considered incident only if occurred after Dmab discontinuation (t_1) and if due to bone fragility.

For all patients, we calculated, at baseline (before starting Dmab therapy), the 10 years probability of a major fracture with FRAX (21), and we reported serum creatinine and 25hydroxy-vitamin D (25OHD) before starting Dmab, at Dmab discontinuation, and at the end of follow-up.

In all patients, BMD was measured by DXA (Hologic Discovery, software version 13.3:3, Bedford, MA) at the lumbar (L1–L4) spine (LS, Z-LS, *in vivo* precision 1.0%), femoral neck (FN, Z-FN, *in vivo* precision 1.8%), and total hip (TH, Z-TH, *in vivo* precision 1.7%) at t_0 , t_1 (~6 months after the last Dmab injection) and t_2 (~30 months after last Dmab injection). We calculated the LS-, FN and TH-BMD changes between t_1 and t_0 (Δt_1-t_0) to evaluate BMD variation during Dmab therapy, between t_2 and t_1 (Δt_2-t_1) to evaluate BMD variation after Dmab discontinuation, and between t_2 and t_0 (Δt_2-t_0) to evaluate BMD variation between the end of the follow-up and the Dmab initiation. The BMD variation was considered significant if above or below the LSC (LS: 2.8%, FN: 5.9%, TH: 4.8%). Patients were classified as 'improved' or 'worsened' if their BMD was significantly increased or reduced, respectively.

At t_0 , t_1 and t_2 , a conventional spinal radiograph in lateral and anteroposterior projection (T4–L4) was obtained in all subjects using a standardized technique. Morphometric VFx (morphoVFx) was diagnosed using the semiquantitative visual assessment (SQ) (22). Fractures were defined as reductions of >20% in anterior, middle, or posterior vertebral height. From lateral spine radiographs, 13 vertebrae from T4 to L4 were assessed visually as intact (SQ grade 0) or as having approximately mild (20% to

25% height reduction), moderate (25% to 40% height reduction), or severe (>40% height reduction) deformity (SQ grades 1, 2, and 3, respectively). In all patients, we calculated spinal deformity index (SDI) by summing the fracture grades of all vertebrae (T4 to L4) that is considered as a tool for assessing future VFx risk (23). Two radiologists, who were blinded to BMD data, independently reviewed the radiographs. The questionable cases were collectively discussed to agree on a diagnosis.

Statistical analysis

Statistical analysis was performed by SPSS version 26.0 statistical package (IBM).

The results were expressed as mean $\pm$ S.D. The normality of distribution was tested by Kolmogorov–Smirnov test. The comparison of continuous variables was performed using Student's *t*-test or Mann–Whitney *U*-test as appropriate. Categorical variables were compared by χ^2 test or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate.

The logistic regression analysis assessed the association between the BPs therapy after Dmab withdrawal and the subsequent occurrence of VFx after adjusting for the variables that resulted to be different between treated group and non-treated group at the time of Dmab withdrawal and for the factors commonly associated with the risk of VFx after Dmab withdrawal, such as age, BMD at LS and prevalent multiple VFx at the time of Dmab initiation.

P-values of less than 0.05 were considered significant.

Results

The clinical and biochemical parameters of all patients ($n = 120$) at the time of Dmab discontinuation and the comparison between BPs-treated patients (treated group, $n = 101$) and non-treated patients (non-treated group, $n = 19$) at the time of Dmab discontinuation are reported in Table 1. Overall, ten patients (8.3%) experienced a VFx, which occurred in four patients (21.1%) from non-treated group, but, importantly, even in six patients (5.9%) from treated group.

In non-treated group, all VFx ($n = 4$) were clinical, and three out of four were multiple VFx (2, 4 and 9 VFx, respectively). These four patients presented symptoms of clinical VFx 3–4 months after Dmab discontinuation (i.e. 9–10 months after last Dmab injection). At variance, in treated group, only three patients (2.5% of treated patients) experienced the occurrence of clinical VFx, while the other three fractured patients had only morphoVFx. No treated

Clinical Study	G Grassi and others	Bisphosphonates and Denosumab withdrawal	185:3	391
----------------	---------------------	--	-------	-----

Table 1 Clinical and biochemical parameters of all patients at the time of denosumab discontinuation and comparison between treated and non-treated patients after denosumab discontinuation. Data are mean $\pm$ S.D. with range in parentheses or *n* (%).

	All (<i>n</i> = 120)	Treated (<i>n</i> = 101)	Non-treated (<i>n</i> = 19)	<i>p</i>
Age (years)	68.9 $\pm$ 11.6	70.0 $\pm$ 10.6	63.5 $\pm$ 15.0	0.025
Sex (F)	111 (92.5)	95 (94.1)	16 (84.2)	0.135
BMI (kg/m ²)	24.0 $\pm$ 3.9	24.0 $\pm$ 3.9	24.5 $\pm$ 3.9	0.661
Patients treated with AI	14 (11.7)	12 (11.9)	2 (10.5)	0.866
Dmab injections, <i>n</i>	6.2 $\pm$ 2.7	6.6 $\pm$ 2.6	3.6 $\pm$ 1.8	0.001
Short Dmab therapy (%)	46 (38.3)	31 (30.7)	15 (78.9)	0.001
Family history of Fx (%)	30 (25.0)	25 (24.7)	5 (26.3)	0.891
Currently smoking (%)	19 (15.8)	16 (13.3)	3 (15.8)	0.995
Prevalent fragility Fx (t ₀) (%)	102 (85.0)	88 (87.1)	14 (73.7)	0.160
Prevalent VFx (t ₀) (%)	99 (82.5)	86 (85.1)	13 (68.4)	0.081
Prevalent VFx (t ₁) (%)	99 (82.5)	86 (85.1)	13 (68.4)	0.081
Prevalent multiple VFx (t ₀) (%)	67 (55.8)	60 (59.4)	7 (36.8)	0.082
Prevalent multiple VFx (t ₁) (%)	69 (57.5)	62 (61.4)	7 (36.8)	0.042
Previous BPs treatment	79 (65.8)	71 (70.3)	8 (42.1)	0.032
BPs duration before Dmab (months)	28.6 $\pm$ 37.9	30.7 $\pm$ 38.7	17.2 $\pm$ 32.1	0.153
BPs discontinued $\leq$ 12 months pre-Dmab (%)	28 (23.3)	27 (26.7)	1 (5.3)	0.042
Spinal deformity index	4.1 $\pm$ 4.8	4.4 $\pm$ 5.1	2.3 $\pm$ 2.1	0.077
FRAX score (all Fx) t ₀ (%)	21.8 $\pm$ 14.3	22.6 $\pm$ 14.8	17.5 $\pm$ 10.4	0.151
Creatinine (mg/dL)	0.9 $\pm$ 0.8	0.9 $\pm$ 0.9	0.8 $\pm$ 0.2	0.855
25OHD (ng/mL)	46.7 $\pm$ 15.1	46.7 $\pm$ 15.5	46.0 $\pm$ 11.9	0.896
LS T-score (t ₁)	-2.3 $\pm$ 1.2	-2.4 $\pm$ 1.1	-1.9 $\pm$ 1.7	0.228
LS Z-score (t ₁)	-0.4 $\pm$ 1.1	-0.4 $\pm$ 1.1	-0.2 $\pm$ 1.4	0.615
Δ LS (t ₂ -t ₁)	-2.7 $\pm$ 6.3	-2.7 $\pm$ 6.5	-2.2 $\pm$ 4.2	0.831
Patients with LS BMD worsening (t ₂ -t ₀)	18 (15.0)	13 (12.9)	5 (22.6)	0.126
TH T-score (t ₁)	-1.9 $\pm$ 0.8	-2.0 $\pm$ 0.8	-1.8 $\pm$ 0.9	0.625
TH Z-score (t ₁)	-0.5 $\pm$ 0.9	-0.5 $\pm$ 0.9	-0.6 $\pm$ 0.7	0.693
Δ TH (t ₂ -t ₁)	-1.7 $\pm$ 5.4	-1.5 $\pm$ 5.4	-3.3 $\pm$ 5.7	0.332
Patients with TH worsening (t ₂ vs t ₀)	14 (11.7)	9 (8.9)	5 (26.3)	0.046
FN T-score (t ₁)	-2.3 $\pm$ 0.8	-2.3 $\pm$ 0.8	-2.2 $\pm$ 0.7	0.804
FN T-score (t ₁)	-0.5 $\pm$ 0.9	-0.5 $\pm$ 0.9	-0.7 $\pm$ 0.6	0.483
Δ FN (t ₂ -t ₁)	-3.1 $\pm$ 7.3	-2.9 $\pm$ 7.3	-5.1 $\pm$ 6.7	0.378
Patients with FN BMD worsening (t ₂ -t ₀)	22 (18.3)	18 (17.8)	4 (21.1)	0.750
Incident VFx (t ₁ -t ₂) (%)	10 (8.3)	6 (5.9)	4 (21.1)	0.029
Incident clinical VFx (t ₁ -t ₂) (%)	7 (5.8)	3 (3.0)	4 (21.1)	0.002
Incident multiple VFx (t ₁ -t ₂) (%)	3 (2.5)	0 (0.0)	4 (21.1)	0.001
Incident morphometric VFx (t ₁ -t ₂) (%)	3 (2.5)	3 (3.0)	(0.0)	0.485

25OHD, 25-hydroxy-vitamin D levels; AI, aromatase inhibitors; BPs, bisphosphonates; current smoking, >5 cigarettes/day; DMab, denosumab; FN, femoral neck; FRAX, fracture risk assessment tool; Fx, fractures; LS, lumbar spine; short DMab therapy, less than 2.5 years of treatment (i.e. <5 injections); t₀, Dmab initiation; t₁, DMab withdrawal; t₂, end of follow-up (24 months after Dmab withdrawal); TH, total hip; VFx, vertebral fractures; Δ BMD percentage changes; BMD worsening, BMD variation higher than the least significant change (LS 2.8%, FN 5.9%, TH 4.8%).

patients experienced multiple VFx. In ALN group, two patients experienced a clinical VFx (6.1% of ALN patients), 1 and 3 months after Dmab discontinuation (i.e. 7–9 months after last Dmab injection), no patient in ALN presented morpho VFx. In ZOL group, only one patient experienced a clinical VFx (1.4% of ZOL patients), 11 months after ZOL infusion (i.e. 18 months after last Dmab Injection), while three patients showed a morpho VFx. Incidence of VFx between ALN and ZOL group, both considering all VFx or only clinical VFx, was not significantly different ($P=0.752$ and $P=0.126$, respectively).

As compared with patients in treated group, those in non-treated group were younger and had less Dmab

injections and Dmab therapy duration, lower prevalence of multiple VFx, and had less frequently been treated with BPs before Dmab and less frequently withdrawn BPs therapy ≤ 12 months before Dmab initiation. The gender distribution, BMI, family history of fragility fractures, AI treatment, current smoking, SDI, FRAX score for all fractures, BMD at any site at Dmab discontinuation, and 25OHD and creatinine levels were not different between patients from non-treated group and those from treated group. As compared with these latter, patients in non-treated group had a higher incidence of VFx, both clinical and multiple, despite a similar, if not lower, overall risk profile for fractures (10 years probability of a major fracture

with FRAX 16.8 ± 10.2 and 20.8 ± 13.3 , respectively, $P=0.224$).

Considering BMD change after Dmab withdrawal, we found no statistically significant difference between treated and non-treated group; however, non treated patients seem to present a more pronounced worsening of TH and FN BMD ($\Delta TH_{t_2-t_1}$ and $\Delta FN_{t_2-t_1}$, respectively). Among treated patients, we found no difference between ALN and ZOL groups in $\Delta LS_{t_2-t_1}$, $\Delta TH_{t_2-t_1}$ and $\Delta FN_{t_2-t_1}$ (-2.7 ± 6.9 vs -2.7 ± 5.0 , $P=0.976$; -1.5 ± 5.6 vs -1.4 ± 4.8 , $P=0.923$; -3.3 ± 7.6 vs -1.5 ± 6.4 , $P=0.343$, respectively). Bone mineral density changes at LS, TH, and FN during Dmab therapy and after Dmab discontinuation in non-treated and ALN and ZOL groups are reported in Fig. 2.

In keeping, the frequency of patients who experienced a worsening of TH BMD between the beginning of Dmab

therapy and the end of follow-up $\geq LSC$ was higher in non-treated group than in treated group. A similar, though not statistically significant, trend was found even as far as LS BMD was concerned.

Considering only treated subjects, no difference was found between ALN and ZOL groups (10.7% vs 13.7%, $P=0.488$; 10.7% vs 8.2, $P=0.478$ and 14.2% vs 19.2%, $P=0.773$, BMD worsening $\geq LSC$ at LS, TH, and FN, respectively). Moreover, Dmab therapy duration was similar between patients with and without BMD loss $\geq LSC$ at LS, TH (5.7 ± 2.5 vs 6.8 ± 2.6 , $P=0.155$; 5.4 ± 2.3 vs 6.8 ± 2.6 , $P=0.146$; 7.0 ± 2.4 vs 6.6 ± 2.6 , $P=0.536$, respectively).

The logistic regression analysis showed that the VFx incidence was 15.4-fold higher in patients not treated with BPs after Dmab discontinuation regardless of the number of Dmab injections, age, duration of BPs treatment before Dmab therapy, the LS-BMD at Dmab withdrawal and the prevalence of VFx at Dmab discontinuation (Table 2). The same results were obtained even considering, TH-BMD at Dmab withdrawal (odds ratio: 12.3, 95% CI: 1.6–100.0, $P=0.016$) and considering only clinical VFx (odds ratio: 30.3, 95% CI: 2.0–500.0, $P=0.013$).

The clinical and biochemical parameters of BPs-treated patients with and without VFx after Dmab discontinuation are reported in Table 3. The age, gender distribution, BMI, AI treatment, type of BPs used (ALN or ZOL), frequency of BPs withdrawal ≤ 12 months before Dmab initiation, number of Dmab injections and therapy duration, period of time between the last Dmab injection and the beginning of BPs therapy, family history of fragility Fx, current smoking, SDI, FRAX score, Dmab compliance, BMD at Dmab discontinuation, BMD changes between Dmab initiation and discontinuation and between Dmab discontinuation and end of follow-up, 25OHD and creatinine levels were not different between fractured and not-fractured BPs-treated patients.

Discussion

The present study confirms that the risk of both clinical and multiple VFx is increased in patients who discontinued Dmab therapy in the absence of a BPs treatment. After Dmab discontinuation, BPs treatment has a protective effect on the VFx risk. Indeed, the lack of a BPs treatment is associated with a 13.9-fold increased VFx risk independent of age, the duration of Dmab therapy, BMD, previous BPs treatment and prevalent VFx. Finally, the present data confirm that the rebound VFx, when present, are clinical and often multiple as already reported (7).

Figure 2

Percent changes (mean $\pm$ s.e.) during denosumab treatment (t_0-t_1) and after denosumab discontinuation (t_1-t_2) in lumbar spine (LS), total hip (TH), femoral neck (FN) BMD in patients not treated or treated with weekly alendronate (ALN) or with a single zoledronate infusion (ZOL) after denosumab discontinuation.

Clinical Study	G Grassi and others	Bisphosphonates and Denosumab withdrawal	185:3	393
----------------	---------------------	--	-------	-----

Table 2 Factors associated with vertebral fractures post denosumab discontinuation.

	OR (95% CI)	P
BPs therapy post Dmab (n)	13.9 (1.7–111.1)	0.014
Dmab injections, n	1.3 (0.9–1.9)	0.117
Age (1 year)	1.0 (0.9–1.1)	0.813
BPs treatment duration before Dmab therapy (months)	1.0 (1.0–1.0)	0.751
T-score LS t ₁ (1 unit increase)	0.5 (0.2–1.1)	0.077
Prevalent (t ₁) VFx	0.2 (0.0–1.5)	0.125

BPs, bisphosphonates; Dmab, denosumab; LS, lumbar spine; t₁, Dmab discontinuation; VFx, vertebral fractures.

Up to date, the optimal regimen to prevent the risk of rebound fragility VFx in patients stopping Dmab is yet to be clarified, and the BPs treatments effectiveness in preventing VFx is still debated (9). Indeed, some studies

suggested possible beneficial effects of BPs (mainly ZOL) on the VFx risk (9, 12, 15). However, the reduced sample size and/or the absence of a control group of non-treated subjects render these data still preliminary. On the other hand, a large study showed a lower incidence of clinical VFx and the absence of multiple VFx in a group of patients treated with ZOL after Dmab withdrawal, but the authors did not adjust for confounding factors possibly influencing their findings (15).

The present data show that the BPs therapy is effective in reducing the VFx risk regardless of several potential factors known to influence the 'rebound phenomenon'. The finding that no patient in treated group experienced multiple VFx, in keeping with the previous study of Evert-Graber and co-authors (14), is almost reassuring as regards of BPs therapy effectiveness, after Dmab discontinuation,

Table 3 Clinical and biochemical parameters of bisphosphonates-treated patients with and without vertebral fractures after denosumab discontinuation. Data are mean $\pm$ S.D. or n (%).

	Fractured (n = 6)	Non-fractured (n = 95)	P
Age (years)	70.8 $\pm$ 9.8	69.9 $\pm$ 10.7	0.836
Sex (F)	6 (100.0)	89 (93.7)	0.526
BMI (kg/m ²)	23.9 $\pm$ 3.7	24.0 $\pm$ 4.0	0.980
Patients treated with AI	1 (16.7)	11 (11.6)	0.709
Patients treated with ZOL or ALN*	5/1 (6.8/3.6)	68/27 (93.1/96.4)	0.532
Washout Dmab BPs (months)	7.5 $\pm$ 1.8	7.4 $\pm$ 2.3	0.949
Dmab injections, n	8.0 $\pm$ 3.6	6.6 $\pm$ 2.5	0.193
Short Dmab therapy (%)	1 (16.7)	30 (31.6)	0.442
Family history of Fx (%)	2 (33.3)	23 (27.4)	0.753
Currently smoking (%)	1 (16.7)	15 (15.8)	0.954
Prevalent multiple VFx (t ₀) (%)	4 (66.7)	56 (58.9)	0.709
BPs discontinued $\leq$ 12 months pre Dmab (%)	2 (33.3)	25 (26.3)	0.706
BPs duration before Dmab (months)	28.2 $\pm$ 31.8	28.6 $\pm$ 38.6	0.972
Spinal deformity index	4.2 $\pm$ 3.4	4.4 $\pm$ 5.2	0.911
FRAX score (all Fx) t ₀ (%)	24.7 $\pm$ 17.6	22.5 $\pm$ 14.7	0.724
Creatinine (mg/dL)	0.7 $\pm$ 0.1	0.9 $\pm$ 0.9	0.579
25OHD (ng/mL)	38.5 $\pm$ 13.3	47.4 $\pm$ 15.5	0.176
LS T-score	-2.7 $\pm$ 1.1	-2.4 $\pm$ 1.1	0.472
LS Z-score	-0.5 $\pm$ 1.5	-0.4 $\pm$ 1.1	0.871
Δ LS (t ₁ -t ₀)	13.4 $\pm$ 11.1	10.2 $\pm$ 9.5	0.424
Δ LS (t ₂ -t ₁)	-5.1 $\pm$ 7.2	-2.5 $\pm$ 6.5	0.348
TH T-score (t ₁)	-1.8 $\pm$ 1.0	-2.0 $\pm$ 0.8	0.547
TH Z-score (t ₁)	-0.1 $\pm$ 1.1	-0.5 $\pm$ 0.9	0.314
Δ TH (t ₁ vs t ₀)	4.5 $\pm$ 3.9	4.2 $\pm$ 5.6	0.908
Δ TH (t ₂ vs t ₁)	-2.8 $\pm$ 4.7	-1.4 $\pm$ 5.5	0.538
FN T-score (t ₁)	-2.0 $\pm$ 1.0	-2.3 $\pm$ 0.8	0.449
FN Z-score (t ₁)	0.0 $\pm$ 1.4	-0.5 $\pm$ 0.9	0.150
Δ FN (t ₁ -t ₀)	3.0 $\pm$ 4.4	4.8 $\pm$ 8.9	0.625
Δ FN (t ₂ -t ₁)	-0.3 $\pm$ 8.0	-3.1 $\pm$ 7.3	0.359

*The percentage refers to the whole number of patients treated with ZOL or ALN.

25OHD, 25-hydroxy-vitamin D levels; AI, aromatase inhibitor; BPs, bisphosphonates; currently smoking, >5 cigarettes/day; Dmab, denosumab; FN, femoral neck; FRAX, fracture risk assessment tool; Fx, fractures; LS, lumbar spine; Morpho, morphometric; short Dmab therapy, less than 2.5 years of treatment (i.e. <5 injections); t₀, Dmab initiation; t₁, Dmab withdrawal; t₂, end of follow-up (24 months after Dmab withdrawal); TH, total hip; VFx, vertebral fractures; Washout Dmab BPs, period of time between the last Dmab injection and the beginning of BPs therapy; Δ BMD percentage changes; BMD worsening, BMD variation higher than the least significant change (LS 2.8%, FN 5.9%, TH 4.8%).

in preventing this dangerous event that often implies several irreversible effects. However, it should be noted that the percentage of patients who experienced the worsening of BMD between the beginning of Dmab therapy and the end of follow-up (LS 12.9%, TH 8.9%, FN 17.8%) was meaningful even in treated group, with no difference between ALN and ZOL group. This finding is in keeping with the recent RCT of Söling and co-authors (13) and points out the not fully satisfactory effectiveness of BPs treatment to prevent bone loss in patients treated with Dmab for more than 2.5 years. Up to now, the available studies, evaluated only the protective effect of a single ZOL infusion, in keeping with data showing that the effect of ZOL persists well beyond 12 months (19). Our study suggests that a single infusion of ZOL might not be sufficient to preserve BMD over time. This finding confirms the need of optimizing the antiresorptive therapy in patients undergoing Dmab withdrawal in terms of the type of drug, administration interval, dose, frequency and duration of treatment (9). In keeping with the data of bone turnover markers reported by Söling and co-authors, it could be hypothesized that the second infusion of ZOL, before 12 months after the first infusion, could be necessary to ensure that bone turnover remain within the lower part of the reference range (13).

Investigating the possible factors associated with the higher VFX risk after Dmab discontinuation was another aim of the present study. The limited sample of non-treated patients prevented us to deeply investigate this issue. However, the present data anyway give some interesting insights, and it is worth noting that, in future studies, non treated group will probably not be available for ethical reasons. It should be noted that the non-treated group included patients who were younger, had a considerably shorter period of Dmab treatment and, above all, less severe osteoporosis with a significantly lower prevalence of multiple VFX. In spite of being at lower risk of fragility fracture as compared with treated patients, non-treated patients had, in fact, a significantly higher number of VFX. This further underscores the validity and importance of BPs use following Dmab discontinuation.

Indeed, some authors suggested that the increased VFX incidence after Dmab withdrawal is evident mainly in patients with high-risk of fractures before Dmab therapy and that after Dmab discontinuation, this high-risk population returns to the pretreatment fracture risk (9). This seems not to be the case in the present study, as in both treated and non-treated groups, fractured patients had an overall fragility fracture risk profile (as mirrored by FRAX score) comparable to that of not-fractured patients. In

keeping, the VFX occurrence after Dmab discontinuation was independent of prevalent multiple VFX and of spinal BMD at the time of Dmab withdrawal. Furthermore, ZOL has been suggested to be more effective in maintaining BMD when Dmab treatment did not exceed 2.5 years (five injections) (9), but data on VFX as the outcome are still lacking. In the present study, patients from the treated group showed a beneficial BPs effect in terms of clinical and multiple VFX risk despite a mean Dmab duration above 2.5 years (6.6 ± 2.6 injections). In addition, we did not find an independent association between the VFX occurrence and the Dmab therapy duration (Table 2) and, finally, among treated subjects, the Dmab therapy duration was not significantly associated with the VFX occurrence (Table 3). Therefore, the present data seem to suggest that the BPs are effective in reducing the rebound VFX regardless of the Dmab therapy duration.

We found that the prevalence of patients treated with BPs within the year before Dmab therapy was higher in the treated group. This could have played a confounding role on the effect of BPs treatment after Dmab withdrawal. Indeed, the effect of BPs administration before Dmab treatment on the rebound phenomenon is still debated (9, 12). However, in the present study, the VFX risk after Dmab withdrawal was associated with the lack of BPs therapy regardless of BPs therapy before Dmab administration. Therefore, at least from the present data, the previous BPs therapy seems to play a minor role in protecting from rebound VFX after Dmab discontinuation, as suggested even by a recently published study (12).

The small number of subjects in non-treated group did not consent to deeply explore the factors associated with rebound VFX after Dmab discontinuation. The large CI (1.8–142.8) of the association between the lack of BPs and the occurrence of VFX after Dmab discontinuation is in keeping with the small sample size. However, the present results are in line with literature data showing the importance of a BPs therapy in preventing the rebound VFX related to Dmab withdrawal (9, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16). Besides the small sample size of patients in non-treated group, our study has other limitations. First, the lack of a randomized design suggests that these findings should be taken cautiously. Secondly, the use of the BTMs could have been more informative on the possible use of a different schedule of BPs administration. Indeed, adapting the ZOL schedule to the BTM changes could importantly increase the ZOL efficacy in reducing the rebound-related VFX risk. Finally, the relatively small sample of patients treated with ALN prevents us to reliably compare the effect of ZOL and ALN on the VFX risk after Dmab discontinuation, even

though our findings did not reveal a meaningful difference of effects between the two BPs.

Notwithstanding these limitations, this study deserves clinical attention as it shows that BPs therapy at the time of Dmab withdrawal can reduce the VFX risk independently of the Dmab duration and the fragility fracture risk profile at the beginning of Dmab therapy.

Further studies are needed to investigate which antiresorptive drug and which schedule should be administered after Dmab discontinuation, to personalize the drug therapy for osteoporosis with a view of establishing the correct sequential therapy for each patient affected with this severe condition.

Declaration of interest

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest that could be perceived as prejudicing the impartiality of this study.

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial or not-for-profit sector.

Availability of data and material

The datasets of the present study are not publicly available since it is highly sensitive data. Interested researchers can contact the corresponding author.

Author contribution statement

All authors have met all the following criteria: (i) substantial contributions to conception and design, or acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; (ii) drafting the article or revising it critically for important intellectual content; (iii) approval of the version to be published and all subsequent versions.

References

- Bone HG, Wagman RB, Brandt ML, Brown JP, Chapurlat R, Cummings SR, Czerwinski E, Fahrleitner-Pammer A, Kedler DL, Lippuner K *et al.* 10 years of denosumab treatment in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis: results from the phase 3 randomised FREEDOM Trial and open-label extension. *Lancet: Diabetes and Endocrinology* 2017 **5** 513–523. ([https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587\(17\)30138-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2213-8587(17)30138-9))
- McClung MR, Wagman RB, Miller PD, Wang A & Lewiecki EM. Observations following discontinuation of long-term denosumab therapy. *Osteoporosis International* 2017 **28** 1723–1732. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-017-3919-1>)
- Zanchetta MB, Boalchuk J, Massari F, Silveira F, Bogado C & Zanchetta JR. Significant bone loss after stopping long-term denosumab treatment: a post FREEDOM study. *Osteoporosis International* 2018 **29** 41–47. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-017-4242-6>)
- Bone HG, Bolognese MA, Yuen CK, Kendler DL, Miller PD, Yang YC, Grazette L, San Martin J & Gallagher JC. Effects of denosumab treatment and discontinuation on bone mineral density and bone turnover markers in postmenopausal women with low bone mass. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism* 2011 **96** 972–980. (<https://doi.org/10.1210/jc.2010-1502>)
- Miller PD, Bolognese MA, Lewiecki EM, McClung MR, Ding B, Austin M, Liu Y, San Martin J & Amg Bone Loss Study Group. Effect of denosumab on bone density and turnover in postmenopausal women with low bone mass after long-term continued, discontinued, and restarting of therapy: a randomized blinded phase 2 clinical trial. *Bone* 2008 **43** 222–229. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2008.04.007>)
- McClung MR. Cancel the denosumab holiday. *Osteoporosis International* 2016 **27** 1677–1682. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-016-3553-3>)
- Cummings SR, Ferrari S, Eastell R, Gilchrist N, Jensen JB, McClung M, Roux C, Torring O, Valter I, Wang AT *et al.* Vertebral fractures after discontinuation of denosumab: a post hoc analysis of the randomized placebo-controlled FREEDOM Trial and its extension. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research* 2018 **33** 190–198. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.3337>)
- Gonzalez-Rodriguez E, Aubry-Rozier B, Stoll D, Zaman K & Lamy O. Sixty spontaneous vertebral fractures after denosumab discontinuation in 15 women with early-stage breast cancer under aromatase inhibitors. *Breast Cancer Research and Treatment* 2020 **179** 153–159. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10549-019-05458-8>)
- Tsourd E, Zillikens MC, Meier C, Body JJ, Rodriguez EG, Anastasilakis AD, Abrahamsen B, McCloskey E, Hofbauer LC, Gunaebens N *et al.* Fracture risk and management of discontinuation of denosumab therapy: a systematic review and position statement by ECTS. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism* 2021 **106** 264–281. (<https://doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgaa756>)
- Meier C, Uebelhart B, Aubry-Rozier B, Birkhäuser M, Bischoff-Ferrari HA, Frey D, Kressig RW, Lamy O, Lippuner K, Stute P *et al.* Osteoporosis drug treatment: duration and management after discontinuation. A position statement from the Swiss Association Against Osteoporosis (SVGO/ASCO). *Swiss Medical Weekly* 2017 **147** w14484. (<https://doi.org/10.4414/smw.2017.14484>)
- Shoback D, Rosen CJ, Black DM, Cheung AM, Murad MH & Eastell R. Pharmacological management of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women: an Endocrine Society guideline update. *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism* 2020 **105** dgaa048. (<https://doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgaa048>)
- Burckhardt P, Faouzi M, Buclin T, Lamy O & the Swiss Denosumab Study Group. Fractures after denosumab discontinuation: a retrospective study of 797 cases. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research* 2021 In press. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.4335>)
- Anastasilakis AD, Papapoulos SE, Polyzos SA, Appelman-Dijkstra NM & Makras P. Zoledronate for the prevention of bone loss in women discontinuing denosumab treatment: a prospective 2-year clinical trial. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research* 2019 **34** 2220–2228. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.3853>)
- Sølling AS, Harsløf T & Langdahl B. Treatment with zoledronate subsequent to denosumab in osteoporosis: a randomized trial. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research* 2020 **35** 1858–1870. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.4098>)
- Everts-Graber J, Reichenbach S, Ziswiler HR, Studer U & Lehmann T. A single infusion of zoledronate in postmenopausal women following denosumab discontinuation results in partial conservation of bone mass gains. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research* 2020 **35** 1207–1215. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.3962>)
- Lehmann T & Aeberli D. Possible protective effect of switching from denosumab to zoledronic acid on vertebral fractures. *Osteoporosis International* 2017 **28** 3067–3068. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-017-4108-y>)
- Lyu H, Zhao SS, Yoshida K, Tedeschi SK, Xu C, Nigwekar SU, Leder BZ & Solomon DH. Delayed denosumab injections and bone mineral density response: an Electronic Health Record-based Study. *Journal of*

- Clinical Endocrinology and Metabolism* 2020 **105** 1435–1444. (<https://doi.org/10.1210/clinem/dgz321>)
- 18 Adler RA, El-Hajj Fuleihan G, Bauer DC, Camacho PM, Clarke BL, Clines GA, Compston JE, Drake MT, Edwards BJ, Favus MJ *et al.* Managing osteoporosis in patients on long-term bisphosphonate treatment: report of a task force of the American Society for Bone and Mineral Research. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research* 2016 **31** 16–35. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.2708>)
 - 19 Kanis JA, McCloskey E, Branco J, Brandi ML, Dennison E, Devogelaer JP, Ferrari S, Kaufman JM, Papapoulos S, Reginster JY *et al.* Goal-directed treatment of osteoporosis in Europe. *Osteoporosis International* 2014 **25** 2533–2543. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-014-2787-1>)
 - 20 Bolland MJ, Horne AM, Briggs SE, Thomas MG, Reid I, Gamble GD & Grey A. Effects of intravenous zoledronate on bone turnover and bone density persist for at least 11 years in HIV-infected men. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research* 2019 **34** 1248–1253. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.3712>)
 - 21 Tsoardi E, Langdahl Bente, Cohen-Solal M, Aubry-Rozier B, Eriksen EF, Gueñabens N, Obermayer-Pietsch B, Ralston SH, Eastell R & Zillikens MC. Discontinuation of denosumab therapy for osteoporosis: a systematic review and position statement by ECTS. *Bone* 2017 **105** 11–17. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2017.08.003>)
 - 22 Kanis JA, Cooper C, Rizzoli R, Reginster JY & Scientific Advisory Board of the European Society for Clinical and Economic Aspects of Osteoporosis and Osteoarthritis (ESCEO) and the Committees of Scientific Advisors and National Societies of the International Osteoporosis Foundation (IOF). Executive summary of the European guidance for the diagnosis and management of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women. *Calcified Tissue International* 2019 **104** 235–238. (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00223-018-00512-x>)
 - 23 Genant HK, Wu CY, van Kuijk C & Nevitt MC. Vertebral fracture assessment using a semiquantitative technique. *Journal of Bone and Mineral Research* 1993 **8** 1137–1148. (<https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.5650080915>)
 - 24 Crans GG, Genant HK & Krege JH. Prognostic utility of a semiquantitative spinal deformity index. *Bone* 2005 **37** 175–179. (<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2005.04.003>)

Received 9 February 2021

Revised version received 23 June 2021

Accepted 6 July 2021