gismo.net





XVII CONGRESSO NAZIONALE

Malattie muscolo-scheletriche e pandemia da SARS-CoV-2

CATANIA

24 - 25 settembre 2021



EFFETTI DELLA PANDEMIA SULLE MALATTIE MUSCOLO-SCHELETRICHE

Moderatori: G. Isaia - L. Malatino

15.30	Le consegue	enze della	pand	emia su	ll'appa	arato	scheletrico	
	I. Chiodini							

- 15.45 Rapporti tra Vitamina D e COVID-19 L. Gennari
- 16.00 COVID 19, farmaci biologici e osso B. Frediani
- 16.15 Alterazioni nutrizionali nel corso della pandemia S. Migliaccio

16.30 Discussione interattiva tra docenti e discenti

GISMO

Gruppo Italiano Studio Malattie Metabolismo Osseo organizzazione di volontariato

- Osteporosi
- Malattie Muscolo-Scheletriche
- Malattie Metaboliche
- Dolore
- Nutrizione

What impact on osteoporosis care have we witnessed during pandemic?

What bone health comorbidities associated with COVID-19 should we be vigilant about?

- Systemic corticosteroids
- COVID-19 and vertebral fractures
- Racial disparities and bone health
- Surgically treatable secondary osteoporosis causes during pandemic
- COVID-19 and Vitamin D
- COVID-19 and bone tissue

Osteoporosis treatment options during the pandemic







BURDEN AND MANAGEMENT OF FRAGILITY FRACTURES IN THE LARGEST FIVE COUNTRIES OF THE EUROPEAN UNION PLUS SWEDEN (EU6)

Number of fragility fractures by country in the EU6 and the projected numbers in 2030

Annual cost of fractures by site in the EU6 for 2017 and projected increase by 2030





Borgström F et al, Arch Osteoporos 2020



SYSTEMATIC, COMMUNITY-BASED SCREENING PROGRAMME OF FRACTURE RISK IN OLDER WOMEN IN THE UK IS FEASIBLE, AND COULD BE EFFECTIVE IN REDUCING HIP FRACTURES

12.483 women 70-85 from seven centers in the UK, randomized to screening or standard care, followed up for 5 years

	Control (n=6250)	Screening (n=6233)	Hazard ratio (95% CI)*	p value
Osteoporosis-rel	ated			
No fracture	5398 (86.4%)	5428 (87.1%)		
Fracture	852 (13.6%)	805 (12.9%)	0·94 (0·85–1·03)	0.178
Hips				
No fracture	6032 (96.5%)	6069 (97·4%)		
Fracture	218 (3.5%)	164 (2.6%)	0.72 (0.59–0.89)	0.002
All clinical				
No fracture	5248 (84.0%)	5282 (84.7%)		
Fracture	1002 (16.0%)	951(15.3%)	0·94 (0·86–1·03)	0.183
Mortality				
Survived	5725 (91.6%)	5683 (91·2%)		
Died	525 (8.4%)	550 (8.8%)	1.05 (0.93–1.19)	0.436

All clinical fractures included all osteoporosis-related fractures as well as fractures of the hands, feet, ankle, face, and skull. FRAX=Fracture Risk Assessment Tool. *Adjusted for recruiting region, baseline FRAX probability, and falls.

Table 3: Efficacy outcomes

The absolute reduction in hip fracture risk was 0.9%, i.e. **111 women between the ages of 70-85 should be screened to avert a single hip fracture**





Shepstone L et al, Lancet 2018

NUMBER OF DXA EXAMINATIONS PERFORMED DURING THE FIRST 4 MONTHS OF 2019 AND 2020 IN IN A NORTHERN ITALY HOSPITAL







DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS OF ACCESS TO FRAX FRACTURE RISK ONLINE TOOL FOR PREVENTION OF OSTEOPOROTIC FRACTURES





I. Chiodini



DURING LOCKDOWN, FEWER OUTPATIENTS ATTENDED THE FRACTURE CLINIC, FOR NON-HIP FRAGILITY FRACTURES, WHILE NO CHANGE IN INPATIENT ADMISSIONS FOR HIP FRACTURE WAS OBSERVED

2015 ($n = 393$)	2016 (n = 400)	2017 (n = 459)	2018 ($n = 428$)	2019 (n = 473)	2020 (<i>n</i> = 182)	p value
						0.003
178 (45.3)	171 (42.8)	178 (38.8)	182 (42.5)	191 (40.4)	73 (40.1)	
22 (5.6)	12 (3.0)	29 (6.3)	16 (3.7)	23 (4.9)	8 (4.4)	
78 (19.8)	81 (20.3)	101 (22.0)	79 (18.5)	82 (17.3)	23 (12.6)	
9 (2.3)	11 (2.8)	19 (4.1)	31 (7.2)	19 (4.0)	14 (7.7)	
3 (0.8)	6 (1.5)	8 (1.7)	7 (1.6)	8 (1.7)	8 (4.4)	
103 (26.2)	119 (29.8)	124 (27.0)	113 (26.4)	150 (31.7)	56 (30.8)	
	2015 (n = 393) 178 (45.3) 22 (5.6) 78 (19.8) 9 (2.3) 3 (0.8) 103 (26.2)	2015 (n = 393) $2016 (n = 400)$ $178 (45.3)$ $171 (42.8)$ $22 (5.6)$ $12 (3.0)$ $78 (19.8)$ $81 (20.3)$ $9 (2.3)$ $11 (2.8)$ $3 (0.8)$ $6 (1.5)$ $103 (26.2)$ $119 (29.8)$	2015 (n = 393) $2016 (n = 400)$ $2017 (n = 459)$ $178 (45.3)$ $171 (42.8)$ $178 (38.8)$ $22 (5.6)$ $12 (3.0)$ $29 (6.3)$ $78 (19.8)$ $81 (20.3)$ $101 (22.0)$ $9 (2.3)$ $11 (2.8)$ $19 (4.1)$ $3 (0.8)$ $6 (1.5)$ $8 (1.7)$ $103 (26.2)$ $119 (29.8)$ $124 (27.0)$	2015 (n = 393) $2016 (n = 400)$ $2017 (n = 459)$ $2018 (n = 428)$ $178 (45.3)$ $171 (42.8)$ $178 (38.8)$ $182 (42.5)$ $22 (5.6)$ $12 (3.0)$ $29 (6.3)$ $16 (3.7)$ $78 (19.8)$ $81 (20.3)$ $101 (22.0)$ $79 (18.5)$ $9 (2.3)$ $11 (2.8)$ $19 (4.1)$ $31 (7.2)$ $3 (0.8)$ $6 (1.5)$ $8 (1.7)$ $7 (1.6)$ $103 (26.2)$ $119 (29.8)$ $124 (27.0)$ $113 (26.4)$	2015 (n = 393) $2016 (n = 400)$ $2017 (n = 459)$ $2018 (n = 428)$ $2019 (n = 473)$ $178 (45.3)$ $171 (42.8)$ $178 (38.8)$ $182 (42.5)$ $191 (40.4)$ $22 (5.6)$ $12 (3.0)$ $29 (6.3)$ $16 (3.7)$ $23 (4.9)$ $78 (19.8)$ $81 (20.3)$ $101 (22.0)$ $79 (18.5)$ $82 (17.3)$ $9 (2.3)$ $11 (2.8)$ $19 (4.1)$ $31 (7.2)$ $19 (4.0)$ $3 (0.8)$ $6 (1.5)$ $8 (1.7)$ $7 (1.6)$ $8 (1.7)$ $103 (26.2)$ $119 (29.8)$ $124 (27.0)$ $113 (26.4)$ $150 (31.7)$	2015 (n = 393) 2016 (n = 400) 2017 (n = 459) 2018 (n = 428) 2019 (n = 473) 2020 (n = 182) 178 (45.3) 171 (42.8) 178 (38.8) 182 (42.5) 191 (40.4) 73 (40.1) 22 (5.6) 12 (3.0) 29 (6.3) 16 (3.7) 23 (4.9) 8 (4.4) 78 (19.8) 81 (20.3) 101 (22.0) 79 (18.5) 82 (17.3) 23 (12.6) 9 (2.3) 11 (2.8) 19 (4.1) 31 (7.2) 19 (4.0) 14 (7.7) 3 (0.8) 6 (1.5) 8 (1.7) 7 (1.6) 8 (1.7) 8 (4.4) 103 (26.2) 119 (29.8) 124 (27.0) 113 (26.4) 150 (31.7) 56 (30.8)

p values are calculated using chi-square test for categorical variables and Kruskal-Wallis test for differences in median age *Abbreviations: n*, number; *IQ*, interquartiles



New outpatients to the Fracture Clinic in the first 19 weeks of 2020, across the years 2015 to 2020

Ogliari G et al, Arch Osteoporos 2020







What impact on osteoporosis care have we witnessed during pandemic?

What bone health comorbidities associated with COVID-19 should we be vigilant about?

- Systemic corticosteroids
- COVID-19 and vertebral fractures
- Racial disparities and bone health
- Surgically treatable secondary osteoporosis causes during pandemic
- COVID-19 and Vitamin D
- COVID-19 and bone tissue

Osteoporosis treatment options during the pandemic







STEROID THERAPY AND THE RISK OF OSTEONECROSIS* IN SARS PATIENTS: A DOSE-RESPONSE META-ANALYSIS

Study	Year	High vs Low	(g)		RR (95% CI)	Weight (%)
Dong	2007	6.0 vs 1.0			8.80 (2.04, 37.91)	3.07
Gao	2005	10.0 vs 2.0		<u> </u>	3.08 (0.93, 10.19)	11.84
Griffith	2005	7.2 vs 0.6	-	*	8.00 (0.77, 83.40)	2.00
Han	2005	4.5 vs 1.0		*	5.80 (0.38, 88.65)	4.17
Lv	2009	18 vs 2.4	-		1.55 (0.76, 3.16)	28.04
Wang	2006	25.0 vs 1.3		*	13.50 (3.78, 48.15)	3.30
Wang	2006	8.0 vs 1.0	_	<u> </u>	2.12 (0.59, 7.56)	15.84
Xu	2004	12.5 vs 2.5			2.15 (0.88, 5.21)	27.68
Zhang	2008	20.0 vs 0.5			2.27 (0.38, 13.62)	4.06
Overall	(I-squa	ared = 36.3%,	p = 0.128)	\diamond	2.94 (1.96, 4.41)	100.00
		,	Favors non-osteonecrosis	1 Favours osteonecrosis		

*hips, knees, shoulders, ankles and wrists

Zhao R et al, Osteoporos Int 2017





What impact on osteoporosis care have we witnessed during pandemic?

What bone health comorbidities associated with COVID-19 should we be vigilant about?

- Systemic corticosteroids
- COVID-19 and vertebral fractures
- Racial disparities and bone health
- Surgically treatable secondary osteoporosis causes during pandemic
- COVID-19 and Vitamin D
- COVID-19 and bone tissue

Osteoporosis treatment options during the pandemic







RADIOLOGICAL THORACIC VERTEBRAL FRACTURES ARE HIGHLY PREVALENT IN COVID-19 AND PREDICT DISEASE OUTCOMES





Di Filippo L et al, JCE&M 2020





RADIOLOGICAL THORACIC VERTEBRAL FRACTURES ARE HIGHLY PREVALENT IN COVID-19 AND PREDICT DISEASE OUTCOMES

114 Hospitalized COVID-19 patients

a) Clinical outcomes i	atcomes in patients with or without vertebral fractures		
	VFs+ group (41)	VFs– group (73)	P Value
Hospitalization	36 (87.8%)	54 (73.9%)	P = 0.08
Length of stay, days	15 [8.7-33.5]	12 [7-22.5]	P = 0.26
ICU admission	4 (9.7%)	9 (12.3%)	P = 0.77
NIMV requirement	20 (48.8%)	20 (27.4%)	P = 0.02
Mortality	9 (22%)	7 (9.6%)	P = 0.07

VFx may integrate the cardiorespiratory risk of COVID-19 patients, being a useful and easy to measure clinical marker of fragility and poor prognosis

b) Clinical outcome	es according to the degree of	fracture severity
Hospitalization		
Mild (21)	20 (95%)	P = 0.33
Moderate (15)	12 (80%)	
Severe (5)	4 (80%)	
ICU admission		
Mild (21)	3 (14.3%)	P = 0.52
Moderate (15)	1 (6.6%)	
Severe (5)	0 (0%)	
NIMV requirement		P = 0.6
Mild (21)	11 (52.4%)	
Moderate (15)	6 (40%)	
Severe (5)	3 (60%)	
Mortality		
Mild (21)	5 (23.8%)	P = 0.04
Moderate (15)	1 (6.6%)	
Severe (5)	3 (60%)	

Di Filippo L et al, JCE&M 2020





What impact on osteoporosis care have we witnessed during pandemic?

What bone health comorbidities associated with COVID-19 should we be vigilant about?

- Systemic corticosteroids
- COVID-19 and vertebral fractures
- Racial disparities and bone health
- Surgically treatable secondary osteoporosis causes during pandemic
- COVID-19 and Vitamin D
- COVID-19 and bone tissue

Osteoporosis treatment options during the pandemic







ANNUALIZED RATES OF FRACTURE BY RACE/ETHNICITY ACCORDING TO THE WOMEN'S HEALTH INITIATIVE OBSERVATIONAL STUDY







RACIAL DISPARITIES EXIST IN OUTCOMES AFTER MAJOR FRAGILITY FRACTURES

Incidence rate ratio of post-fracture outcomes by fracture type in black women compared to white women with postmenopausal osteoporosis.

To the right of the line of unity (1), a higher incidence rate of postfracture outcomes in black women compared with white women; to the left of the line, a lower incidence rate of postfracture outcomes in black women compared with white women.



Wright NC et al, J Am Ger Soc 2020





What impact on osteoporosis care have we witnessed during pandemic?

What bone health comorbidities associated with COVID-19 should we be vigilant about?

- Systemic corticosteroids
- COVID-19 and vertebral fractures
- Racial disparities and bone health
- Surgically treatable secondary osteoporosis causes during pandemic
- COVID-19 and Vitamin D
- COVID-19 and bone tissue

Osteoporosis treatment options during the pandemic







Endocrine surgery in the Coronavirus disease 2019 pandemic: Surgical Triage Guidelines

1.1 | Phase I

Few COVID-19 patients, hospital resources not exhausted, institution still has ICU ventilator capacity and COVID-19 trajectory not in rapid escalation phase.

Surgery restricted to patients likely to have survivorship compromised if surgery not performed within next 3 months.

Surgical cases that need to be performed as soon as feasible:

- Thyroid cancer requiring acute airway management
- Resectable anaplastic or poorly differentiated thyroid cancer without *BRAFV600E* mutation*
- Progressive/clinically aggressive differentiated or medullary thyroid cancer
- Large suspected thyroid malignancy with documented progression
- Large goiters with significant symptomatic airway compression**
- Suspected parathyroid carcinoma with significant symptomatic hypercalcemia
- Suspected adrenocortical carcinoma
- Medically uncontrolled hyperfunctioning endocrine tumors

Surgical cases that can be safely deferred:

- Differentiated thyroid cancer***
- Medullary thyroid cancer***
- Indeterminate thyroid nodules without documented progression
- Thyroid goiters**
- Primary hyperparathyroidism
- Medically controlled hyperfunctioning endocrine
 tumors
- Incidental, nonfunctional adrenal lesions

Jozaghi Y et al, Head & Neck 2020





What impact on osteoporosis care have we witnessed during pandemic?

What bone health comorbidities associated with COVID-19 should we be vigilant about?

- Systemic corticosteroids
- COVID-19 and vertebral fractures
- Racial disparities and bone health
- Surgically treatable secondary osteoporosis causes during pandemic
- COVID-19 and Vitamin D
- COVID-19 and bone tissue

Osteoporosis treatment options during the pandemic







OSTEOPOROSIS AND COVID-19

Inflammation, reduced mobilization, muscle wasting, breathing difficulties





BONE METABOLISM IN SARS-COV-2 DISEASE: POSSIBLE OSTEOIMMUNOLOGY AND GENDER IMPLICATIONS



Salvio G et al, Clin Rev Bone Mineral Metab 2020





BONE METABOLISM IN SARS-COV-2 DISEASE: INFLAMMAGING

RAGE: receptor for advanced glycation end products HMGB1: high mobility group box 1 protein



Salvio G et al, Clin Rev Bone Mineral Metab 2020







SEX BIAS IN INFECTIOUS DISEASES, INFLAMMATORY DISEASES AND CANCERS

lmmune component	Characteristic	Sex difference	Immune component	Characteristic	Sex difference	
Sex differences in t	he innate immune system		Sex differences in t	he adaptive immune system		
TLR pathways	TLR pathway gene expression	Higher in females	Thymus	Size of thymus	Larger in males	
	TLR7 expression	Higher in females	T cells	CD4+ T cell counts	Higher in females	
	IL-10 production by TLR9-stimulated	Higher in males		CD4/CD8 T cell ratio	Higher in females	
	PBMCs			CD8 ⁺ T cell counts	Higher in males	
APCs	APC efficiency	Higher in females		Number of activated T cells	Higher in females	
Dendritic cells	TLR7 activity	Higher in females		T cell proliferation	Greater in females	
	Type 1 interferon activity	Higher in females		Cytotoxic T cells	Increased cytotoxic	
Macrophages	TLR4 expression	Higher in males		-	activity in females	
	Activation	Higher in females		$T_H 1$ versus $T_H 2$ cell bias	T _H 2 cell bias in females,	
	Phagocytic capacity	Higher in females			I _H I cell blas in mates	
	Pro-inflammatory cytokine production	Higher in males		I _{reg} cell numbers	Increased in males	
	IL-10 production	Higher in females	Bcells	B cell numbers	Increased in females	
Neutrophils	Phagocytic capacity	Higher in females	Immunoglobulins	Antibody production	Higher in females	
	TLR expression	Higher in males	APC, antigen-present mononuclear cells; T _H	nting cell; IL, interleukin; NK, natural killer; PBMCs, peripheral blood r _w , Thelper; TLR, Toll-like receptor; T _{ma} , regulatory T. *Based on data from		
NK cells	NK cell numbers	Higher in males	humans and rodents and primary cell cultures.			

Generally, females show increased susceptibility to autoimmune disease development and males show increased susceptibility to non-reproductive malignant cancers.

Although at a less pronounced magnitude, sex differences are also seen in susceptibility to various infectious diseases. Reproductive status, including pregnancy, as well as immune-mediated pathology contributes to female-biased infectious diseases, whereas pathogen-associated damage, including delayed clearance, is associated with male-biased infectious diseases.

MERS, Middle East respiratory syndrome.

Klein SL and Flanagan KL, Nat Rev Immunol 2016





RALOXIFENE AND BAZEDOXIFENE PROMISING CANDIDATES FOR PREVENTING THE COVID-19 RELATED CYTOKINE STORM?





IL-6/GP130/STAT3 signal transduction. IL-6 first binds to IL-6R α to form the binary complex through site I interactions. The IL-6/IL-6R α complex then binds to D2 and D3 domains of GP130 through site II interactions and forms trimeric complex IL-6/IL-6R α /GP130. The subsequent site III reciprocal interaction of IL-6 of one trimer with the D1 domain of P130 of the other trimer leads to homodimerization of the heterotrimer into heterohexamer complex (PDB code 1P9M).

Madindoline A (MDL-A) binds to the GP130 D1 domain and inhibits hexameric complex formation by disrupting interactions between IL-6 and the GP130 D1 domain Modeling of binding interactions of raloxifene with the key residues in the active site in the GP130 D1 domain.

Raloxifene is in thick ball-and-stick representation. Native residues Leu57 and Trp157 of IL-6 are thin red lines. Residues of GP130 are labeled in blue color. Asn92 and Cys6 form hydrogen bonds (green dotted lines) with RAL

Huameng Li et al, J Med Chem 2014







PREVALENT THORACIC VERTEBRAL FRACTURES IN COVID 19 PATIENTS ARE NOT ASSOCIATED WITH GENDER



114 Hospitalized COVID-19 patients

Univariate Analysis of Pred	ictive Factors for Vertebra	l Fractures	
Variables	Odds Ratio [95% P Value Confidence Interval]		
Age	1.05 [1.02-1.09]	P < 0.001	
Male gender	1.12 [0.47-2.68]	P = 0.79	
BMI	1.03 [0.93-1.14]	P = 0.53	
Hypertension	2.96 [1.34-6.55]	P = 0.007	
Coronary artery disease	3.82 [1.19-12.34]	P = 0.025	
Diabetes	1.31 [0.38-4.42]	P = 0.66	
Chronic kidney disease	1.55 [0.44-5.43]	P = 0.49	
Cancer	0.7 [0.13-3.8]	P = 0.67	
Multivariate analysis of p	redictive factors for Vertel	oral Fractures	
Variables ^a	Odds ratio [95% confidence in-	P Value	
	terval		
Age	1.04 [1.003-1.08]	<i>P</i> < 0.001	
Hypertension	1.39 [0.52-3.76]	P = 0.51	
Coronary artery disease	1.83 [0.5-6.75]	P = 0.36	

Di Filippo L et al, JCE&M 2020





POTENTIAL MODEL OF AGE ASSOCIATED MUSCLE LOSS (SARCOPENIA) EXACERBATED BY PERIODS OF EXTENDED BED REST/HOSPITALIZATION DUE TO ACUTE ILLNESS OR INJURY (CATABOLIC CRISES).



Adapted from English KL & Paddon-Jones D. Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care. 2010







COMPOSITION OF CHANGES IN BODY WEIGHT DURING CALORIE RESTRICTION UNDER NORMAL AND RESTRICTED SLEEP CONDITIONS



From: Nedeltcheva AV et al. Ann Intern Med. 2010







What impact on osteoporosis care have we witnessed during pandemic?

What bone health comorbidities associated with COVID-19 should we be vigilant about?

- Systemic corticosteroids
- COVID-19 and vertebral fractures
- Racial disparities and bone health
- Surgically treatable secondary osteoporosis causes during pandemic
- COVID-19 and Vitamin D
- COVID-19 and bone tissue

Osteoporosis treatment options during the pandemic







INITIATION OF OSTEOPOROSIS THERAPY

- Not to be delayed in patients at high risk for fracture
- Oral BISPH via a non-face-to-face (ie, telephone or video) visit
- Teriparatide/Dmab may also be considered but require additional patient training
- Patients who have fractures requiring hospital admission should be considered for osteoporosis medication initiation while hospitalized to minimize (no evidence for impaired fracture healing in patients who receive early initiation of osteoporosis treatment, including bisphosphonates)
- The administration of iv bisphosphonates may cause a post-infusion inflammatory reaction

Modified from Yu EW et al, JBMR 2020





RACCOMANDAZIONI SPECIFICHE SULLA GESTIONE DELLE TERAPIE ANTI-OSTEOPOROSI DURANTE PANDEMIA COVID-19

- Bisfosfonati orali: non interrompere o ritardare la terapia nei pazienti sottoposti a vaccinazione. Reazione di fase acuta rara e improbabile che possa essere confusa con una reazione al vaccino; inoltre non interferenza sull'efficacia dei vaccini.
- Bisfosfonati endovena: distanziare di una settimana l'infusione ev del bisfosfonato e la vaccinazione (reazione di fase acuta confondibile con effetto collaterale del vaccino. I pazienti in trattamento con ZOL possono ritardare l'infusione.
- Denosumab: distanziare iniezione e vaccinazione di 4-7 giorni (reazione nel sito di iniezione confusa con quella indotta dal vaccino oppure iniettare nel deltoide controlaterale, addome o coscia). Non ritardare oltre 7 mesi: non vi è incremento del rischio di infezione dal COVID-19, né delle infezioni respiratorie, mentre è noto un aumento del rischio di fratture vertebrali dopo sospensione del denosumab
- Teriparatide: continuare la terapia nei pazienti sottoposti a vaccinazione.
- Raloxifene: continuare la terapia nei pazienti sottoposti a vaccinazione.
- Romosozumab: distanziare iniezione e vaccinazione di 4-7 giorni (reazione nel sito di iniezione confusa con quella indotta dal vaccino oppure iniettare nel deltoide contro-laterale, addome o coscia).

Vescini F from: Joint Guidance on COVID-19 Vaccination and Osteoporosis Management from the ASBMR, AACE, Endocrine Society, ECTS, IOF, and NOF







What impact on osteoporosis care have we witnessed during pandemic?

What bone health comorbidities associated with COVID-19 should we be vigilant about?

- Systemic corticosteroids
- COVID-19 and vertebral fractures
- Racial disparities and bone health
- Surgically treatable secondary osteoporosis causes during pandemic
- COVID-19 and Vitamin D
- COVID-19 and bone tissue

Osteoporosis treatment options during the pandemic







VIEWPOINTS

Identifying and managing osteoporosis before and after COVID-19: rise of the remote consultation?

Z. Paskins¹ · F. Crawford-Manning¹ · L. Bullock² · C. Jinks²





Abstract

Summary The COVID-19 pandemic is influencing methods of healthcare delivery. In this short review, we discuss the evidence for remote healthcare delivery in the context of osteoporosis.

Introduction The COVID-19 pandemic has undoubtedly had, and will continue to have, a significant impact on the lives of people living with, and at risk of, osteoporosis and those caring for them. With osteoporosis outpatient and Fracture Liaison Services on pause, healthcare organisations have already moved to delivering new and follow-up consultations remotely, where staffing permits, by telephone or video.

Methods In this review, we consider different models of remote care delivery, the evidence for their use, and the possible implications of COVID-19 on osteoporosis services.

Results Telemedicine is a global term used to describe any use of telecommunication systems to deliver healthcare from a distance and encompasses a range of different scenarios from remote clinical data transfer to remote clinician-patient interactions. Across a range of conditions and contexts, there remains unclear evidence on the acceptability of telemedicine and the effect on healthcare costs. Within the context of osteoporosis management, there is some limited evidence to suggest telemedicine approaches are acceptable to patients but unclear evidence on whether telemedicine approaches support informed drug adherence. Gaps in the evidence pertain to the acceptability and benefits of using telemedicine in populations with hearing, cognitive, or visual impairments and in those with limited health literacy.

Conclusion There is an urgent need for further health service evaluation and research to address the impact of remote healthcare delivery during COVID-19 outbreak on patient care, and in the longer term, to identify acceptability and cost- and clinical-effectiveness of remote care delivery on outcomes of relevance to people living with osteoporosis.





OSTEOPOROSIS SCREENING, DIAGNOSING, AND MONITORING USING PLATELET-RELATED PARAMETERS AND SPONTANEOUS OSTEOCLASTOGENESIS



Salamanna F et al, TEM 2021







Kirwan R et al, Geroscience 2020





Il rischio maggiore....

