Title Page

Title of the Manuscript

Screening for Osteoporosis: A Draft Update of Systematic Review Adapted from the USPSTF Review for the Japanese Preventive Services Task Force

Full names of all authors

Takao Kaneko[1], Yuichi Isaji[2], Hiroki Sato[3], Satoshi Miike[4], Hironori Yamada[5], Ryohei Oda[6], Toshiya Sakoda[7]

Institutional affiliations of all authors

[1]Department of Rehabilitation, Yamagata Prefectural Central Hospital, Yamagata, Japan

[2]Department of Physical Therapy, School of Health Sciences, Bukkyo University, Kyoto, Japan

[3]Faculty of Rehabilitation, Kawasaki University of Medical Welfare, Okayama, Japan

[4]Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Health Economics, School of Public Health, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

[5]Kawasaki Municipal Tama Hospital, Kanagawa, Japan

[6]Department of Social Epidemiology, Graduate School of Medicine and School of Public Health, Kyoto University, Kyoto, Japan

[7]Rehab for JAPAN inc, Tokyo, Japan

Corresponding author

Takao Kaneko, OTR, MS

Department of Rehabilitation, Yamagata Prefectural Central Hospital, 1800 Aoyagi Yamagata, Yamagata 990-2292, Japan

Telephone Number: +81-23-685-2626

E-mail Address: tko04190@gmail.com

Word count (for the main text only)

2660

Number of figures

1

Number of tables

6

Conflict of Interest

All authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Sources of financial support

This review was conducted as part of the JPPSTF Project, which was financially supported by EVIDENCE STUDIO, a general incorporated association whose purposes include optimizing public healthcare expenditures in Japan. The funder had no role in the review process, including the collection, analysis, or interpretation of the evidence, or in the decision to submit this manuscript for publication.

Disclaimer

This review was conducted independently of any funding organization. The findings and conclusions expressed herein do not represent the official positions of the authors' affiliated institutions.

Type of contribution of the authors

All authors were involved in the design and methodology of the review, data extraction and synthesis, and interpretation of the results. Each author contributed to the writing and critical revision of the manuscript, and all authors approved the final version and took responsibility for the integrity of the work.

IRB Approval Code and Name of the Institution

Ethical review was deemed unnecessary by The Ethical Committee of Kurume University (health care & medical ethics), as this work is based solely on a literature review and does not involve human subjects or identifiable personal data.

Acknowledgments

This review was conducted as part of the JPPSTF Project, which was commissioned by EVIDENCE STUDIO, a general incorporated association whose purposes include optimizing public healthcare expenditures in Japan. The contract was formally established with Kurume University, with which Kei Mukohara, the chair of the JPPSTF, is affiliated.

Use of AI-assisted tools

During the preparation of this manuscript, an AI-assisted language model (ChatGPT, OpenAI, accessed in 2025) was used to assist in editing and improving the clarity and structure of the text. All content was critically reviewed and finalized by the authors, who take full responsibility for the accuracy and integrity of the manuscript.

Abstract

Background

Fragility fractures are a major public health concern among older adults in Japan. In 2024, the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) released a draft update of its evidence review on screening for osteoporosis. We conducted a systematic review, commissioned by the Japan Preventive Services Task Force (JPPSTF), to update and apply the USPSTF draft by incorporating Japanese-language literature and additional recent international evidence.

Methods

This review followed the USPSTF analytic framework. We evaluated evidence on the effectiveness of screening; the predictive and diagnostic accuracy of clinical risk assessment tools; the predictive accuracy of bone mineral density (BMD) testing; the potential harms of screening; and the benefits and harms of pharmacologic treatments approved in Japan. Literature searches were conducted by the International Medical Information Center (IMIC). PubMed and the Cochrane Library were searched for studies published from November 11, 2022, to November 26 2024, and Ichushi-Web (Japan Medical Abstracts Society) was searched without publication date restriction. Searches were limited to English and Japanese. Study selection, data extraction, and risk of bias assessment were conducted independently by two or more reviewers for each key question, and disagreements were resolved through discussion. Findings from newly identified studies were qualitatively synthesized alongside the USPSTF review.

Results

Osteoporosis screening was generally associated with a modest reduction in hip and major osteoporotic fractures among postmenopausal women, particularly those aged 65 years or older. Risk assessment tools showed moderate predictive accuracy; diagnostic accuracy varied. Harms of screening were infrequently reported. Pharmacologic treatments approved in Japan were associated with fracture risk reduction, with no consistent evidence of serious harms. These findings were broadly consistent with those of the USPSTF review.

Conclusions

This systematic review provides an updated and objective evaluation of the internal validity of current evidence on osteoporosis screening and treatment in primary care settings in Japan.

Background

Fragility fractures are a major and growing public health concern among older adults in Japan[1-3]. The primary purpose of osteoporosis screening is to identify individuals who may benefit from pharmacologic treatment to reduce the incidence and morbidity of such fractures.While internationally referenced, evidence-based recommendations, such as those from the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF), have guided global practice on osteoporosis screening, previous reviews[4] have primarily relied on English-language literature and have included only limited evidence from studies conducted in Japan. In 2024, the USPSTF issued a draft[5] update of its evidence review, reaffirming its recommendation to conduct screening in women aged 65 years and older, and in younger postmenopausal women who are at increased risk. However, the evidence remained insufficient to assess the balance of benefits and harms of screening in men.
To address this gap, the Japan Preventive Services Task Force (JPPSTF) commissioned the Literature Review Team for Osteoporosis Screening to conduct a systematic review that incorporates Japanese-language literature in addition to newly published English-language studies. The team evaluated the internal validity of evidence on the effectiveness, accuracy, and potential harms of osteoporosis screening and pharmacologic interventions, with particular attention to studies relevant to the Japanese population.

Materials and Methods

Scope of the Review

This review followed the PRISMA 2020 (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) statement[6] for reporting systematic reviews. The review was guided by the analytic framework shown in Figure 1. The framework was adapted from the 2024 draft evidence review by the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force (USPSTF) and revised to reflect the Japanese context.

Data Sources and Searches

Literature searches were conducted by the International Medical Information Center (IMIC) on November 26, 2024. PubMed and the Cochrane Library were searched for studies published in English or Japanese between November 11, 2022, and November 26, 2024. Ichushi-Web (Japan Medical Abstracts Society) was searched without restriction on publication year. Details of the search strategies are provided in the Supplement.

Study Selection

Titles and abstracts were screened using Rayyan (https://www.rayyan.ai), followed by full-text review, by two or more independent reviewers using prespecified eligibility criteria. Disagreements were resolved through discussion. Reviewer assignments were structured by the Literature Review Team for Osteoporosis Screening to maintain methodological independence across key questions. Eligibility criteria were defined separately for each key question (KQ). Depending on the question, eligible study designs included randomized controlled trials, controlled cohort studies, diagnostic accuracy studies, and systematic reviews. For KQ1, studies evaluating the effectiveness of osteoporosis screening compared with no screening in adults without known osteoporosis or prior fragility fracture were included. For KQs 2a–2d, studies assessing the predictive or diagnostic performance of risk assessment tools (e.g., FRAX, OSTA) or BMD testing were included if they were externally validated in at least one independent cohort. For KQ3, studies examining harms such as overdiagnosis, labeling, or unnecessary treatment were eligible. For KQs 4 and 5, studies evaluating pharmacologic agents approved for osteoporosis treatment in Japan were eligible. Studies focused on secondary osteoporosis, prior fragility fractures, or treatment-refractory populations were excluded.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Relevant data (e.g., study design, population, intervention, comparator, outcomes, and setting) were extracted independently by two or more reviewers using a standardized form. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion.
Risk of bias was assessed using appropriate tools: RoB 2[7] for randomized controlled trials, ROBINS-I[8] for observational studies, QUADAS-2[9] for diagnostic accuracy studies, PROBAST[10] for prediction model studies, and ROBIS[10] for systematic reviews. Each study was independently assessed by two or more reviewers. Any differences in judgment were resolved by consensus.

Data Synthesis and Analysis

Findings from newly identified studies were qualitatively synthesized alongside the USPSTF review. For each key question, results were summarized in descriptive and tabular formats, with attention to the direction and consistency of findings, study design, and methodological quality.
A meta-analysis was not performed, as a relatively recent draft[5] systematic review by the USPSTF was already available. In addition, this decision reflected the need to complete the current review within a limited timeframe.

Results

A total of 28 studies met eligibility criteria and were included in this systematic review (Figure1). One study was relevant to two key questions, and thus was counted under both questions in the presentation of results. The distribution of studies by key question was as follows: 2 studies for KQ1, 15 studies for KQ2 (subdivided into KQ2a: 7 studies, KQ2b: 2 studies, KQ2c: 6 studies), none for KQ3, 4 studies for KQ4, and 8 studies for KQ5.The results of the included studies were synthesized and presented according to each KQ, as outlined below.

KQ1: Effectiveness of Osteoporosis Screening (Table 1)

Two studies[12,13] met the inclusion criteria for evaluating the effectiveness of osteoporosis screening in reducing the incidence of fractures or improving clinical outcomes in adults without prior diagnosis of osteoporosis or fragility fractures.

The first was the ROSE randomized trial, which implemented a two-step screening strategy involving a mailed, self-administered FRAX questionnaire to identify women at elevated fracture risk (FRAX ≥15%), followed by DXA scanning for those meeting the risk threshold. A reduction in fracture incidence was observed exclusively among women who both completed the questionnaire and underwent DXA, indicating that the effectiveness of screening was confined to individuals at moderate to high risk who fully participated in the screening pathway.

The second study was a systematic review conducted for the Canadian Task Force, which followed by BMD testing in high-risk individuals. The review found moderate-certainty evidence that reduce the risk of hip and clinical fragility fractures among women. In contrast, screening offered to the general population without sufficient participation did not yield benefit. The review also noted the potential for overdiagnosis in individuals classified as high risk by FRAX, despite having a low actual likelihood of sustaining fractures.

KQ2: Accuracy of Screening Strategies in Identifying High-Risk Individuals

KQ2a: Performance of Clinical Risk Assessment Tools (FRAX, OSTA) for Predicting Hip and Major Osteoporotic Fractures (Table 2)

Seven studies[13-19] evaluated tools such as FRAX and OSTA. Overall, these tools demonstrated moderate to good discriminative ability for predicting major osteoporotic fractures (MOF), especially when BMD was incorporated into the FRAX algorithm. Reported area under the receiver operating

characteristic curve (AUC) values generally ranged from 0.65 to 0.78, suggesting fair predictive capacity. In many of the studies that conducted external validation, FRAX with BMD was shown to have higher predictive accuracy than FRAX without BMD or simpler tools like OSTA. Notably, several studies emphasized variation in performance across age strata, with diminished discrimination in very elderly populations, likely due to competing risks. Study settings also varied, encompassing both community-dwelling older adults and health checkup cohorts. One study explored machine learning-enhanced FRAX models, but generalizability was limited. Calibration metrics were infrequently reported, and thresholds for intervention varied.

KQ2b: Accuracy of Bone Mass Measurement Tools in Predicting Hip and Major Osteoporotic Fractures (Table 3)

Two studies[20,21] evaluated the predictive performance of different BMD assessment modalities in identifying individuals at elevated risk for hip or major osteoporotic fractures. Together, these studies suggest that BMD measurements—whether obtained through conventional DXA or emerging radiographic approaches—may be useful for predicting osteoporotic fractures. However, model performance may vary by population, modality, and anatomical site assessed.

KQ2c: Diagnostic Accuracy of Clinical Risk Assessment Tools for Osteoporosis (Table 4)

Six studies[22-27] evaluated the diagnostic accuracy of clinical risk assessment tools, either alone or in combination with BMD testing, for identifying individuals with osteoporosis. Across studies, combining clinical risk scores (such as FRAX, OSTA, or locally developed models) with BMD significantly improved diagnostic performance compared to risk scores alone. This integration was especially effective for identifying individuals with intermediate risk profiles, where clinical information alone yielded ambiguous results.

Several studies emphasized that models calibrated to specific populations (e.g., Japanese or East Asian cohorts) demonstrated improved discrimination over internationally derived tools. Additionally, combining multiple clinical factors—such as age, BMI, diabetes, or cardiovascular disease history—with BMD enhanced sensitivity and specificity. However, variability in T-score reference standards and site-specific thresholds (e.g., femoral neck vs. lumbar spine) limited cross-study comparability. Importantly, these findings suggest the usefulness of integrated approaches in clinical practice, particularly in settings where full access to DXA is limited.Incorporating tailored risk models with selectively performed imaging or simplified screening tools may improve the efficiency of case-finding in community-based screening programs.

KQ4: Effectiveness of Pharmacologic Interventions (Table 5)

Four randomized controlled trials (RCTs) [28-31] evaluated pharmacologic treatments for osteoporosis, including alendronate, menatetrenone, abaloparatide, and sequential romosozumab followed by denosumab. One trial of alendronate compared with no treatment showed a lower vertebral fracture rate in the treated group over one year, though risk of bias was critical. A study of menatetrenone also reported reduced fracture rates, but statistical significance was unclear, and the study had high risk of bias. In contrast, trials of abaloparatide and romosozumab demonstrated statistically significant reductions in vertebral and nonvertebral fractures, with accompanying improvements in bone mineral density. These two trials were judged to have low or moderate risk of bias, respectively.

Overall, recent large-scale trials of anabolic and antiresorptive agents provided more robust evidence, whereas earlier studies suggested benefit but were methodologically limited. Four RCTs[27-30] conducted evaluated the efficacy of pharmacologic agents approved for osteoporosis management, including bisphosphonates (alendronate), selective estrogen receptor modulators (SERMs), parathyroid hormone analogs (abaloparatide), and RANK ligand inhibitors (denosumab, romosozumab). All trials demonstrated statistically significant reductions in vertebral fracture incidence compared with placebo or standard care. One trial of abaloparatide also showed significant improvement in lumbar spine and hip BMD over 18 months. Romosozumab, followed by denosumab, was associated with sustained antifracture efficacy and greater BMD gains than sequential denosumab alone. Notably, the degree of BMD increase in the romosozumab-to-denosumab sequence was more than twice that of placebo-to-denosumab. These findings suggest that early intervention with osteoanabolic agents may be beneficial for improving bone mineral density and preventing fractures in patients at very high risk of fracture.The overall risk of bias was low in three trials and moderate in one due to incomplete outcome data.

KQ5: Harms of Pharmacologic Interventions (Table 6)

Eight studies[32-39] evaluated the safety profiles of pharmacologic treatments for osteoporosis, including bisphosphonates, denosumab, teriparatide, abaloparatide, and romosozumab. Across randomized controlled trials and cohort studies, common adverse events included upper respiratory infections, musculoskeletal pain, dizziness, headache, and gastrointestinal disturbances. Injection site reactions and dermatologic symptoms (e.g., rash, urticaria) were reported particularly with subcutaneously administered agents. Laboratory abnormalities such as hypocalcemia, hypercalcemia, and liver enzyme alterations were noted, though typically transient and clinically manageable.

Serious adverse events were infrequent but observed across multiple classes. Long-term

bisphosphonate use, for example, was associated in one study with an elevated risk of subtrochanteric or femoral shaft fractures after five or more years of use. Denosumab trials reported rare occurrences of hypocalcemia and potential risks of atypical infections. Cardiovascular events including atrial fibrillation and myocardial infarction were reported in trials of romosozumab and teriparatide, though causality remains uncertain.
Taken together, while the overall incidence of serious harms was low, the spectrum of mild to moderate adverse effects was broad and varied by drug class.

Discussion

This systematic review provides an updated synthesis of evidence regarding osteoporosis screening and pharmacologic treatment, with specific relevance to the Japanese population. Overall, screening was generally associated with a modest reduction in hip and major osteoporotic fractures among older women. Risk assessment tools, including FRAX, demonstrated moderate predictive accuracy, though diagnostic accuracy varied depending on implementation strategy and population subgroup. Harms related to screening were infrequently reported. Notably, our review offers key updates to KQ2 and KQ5 by incorporating recent Japanese-language studies and population-specific considerations, while findings related to KQ4 reinforce previously established evidence.

Findings from KQ1 indicate that in the two included studies[12-13], the effectiveness of osteoporosis screening was not solely dependent on the presence of screening protocols, but rather on the completion of the full cascade—including diagnostic follow-up and initiation of treatment[12]. Specifically, the impact of screening appeared to vary depending on whether DXA testing and subsequent clinical management were appropriately carried out following initial risk assessment[13]. Previous study[40] further suggested that such implementation factors could influence outcomes. Additionally, the evidence questions the effectiveness of uniform, population-wide screening strategies, highlighting instead the need to consider individual characteristics and patient engagement behaviors. Several sources emphasized the importance of establishing supportive systems after screening and maintaining patient engagement, which may be critical considerations for future implementation efforts.

Among the studies[13-27] included under KQ2a to KQ2c, strategies that combined clinical risk assessment tools with BMD testing were reported to be associated with improved diagnostic accuracy compared to the use of either modality alone in stratifying osteoporotic fracture risk. While FRAX was particularly effective when combined with BMD, several studies noted limitations in its discriminatory power among the very elderly, suggesting the need for predictive models that incorporate life expectancy, frailty, and competing mortality risks.

Some studies highlighted that the improved diagnostic performance of integrated approaches may be especially valuable in resource-limited settings for guiding treatment decisions, and may also aid in refining risk stratification among individuals at intermediate clinical risk. Regarding model calibration, there was evidence that incorporating comorbidities commonly observed in Japanese populations—such as diabetes or cardiovascular disease—into risk algorithms could enhance predictive performance. These findings reflect a broader literature trend emphasizing the importance of developing and validating population-specific risk models.

Given that misclassification—whether overestimation or underestimation—can directly impact treatment selection and unnecessary medication exposure, several studies underscored the need to address challenges related to model integration and calibration. These considerations should inform the design of future research and the implementation of fracture risk assessment strategies in clinical practice.

Based on the findings from studies included in Key Questions 4 and 5, pharmacological interventions for osteoporosis have been reported in multiple RCTs to be associated with a reduced risk of fractures. However, the literature emphasizes the need to evaluate these interventions in light of individual patient characteristics and potential adverse events. Several RCTs have shown that agents such as bisphosphonates and denosumab are associated with reductions in vertebral fracture incidence, while abaloparatide and romosozumab have demonstrated improvements in BMD with sequential use. These findings, drawn from trials such as the FRAME and ACTIVE-J studies, contribute to considerations regarding their applicability in Japanese populations.

Regarding adverse events, potential risks have been reported to vary depending on the type of drug and treatment duration. Although severe adverse events were generally rare, some studies reported atypical femoral fractures and osteonecrosis of the jaw associated with long-term bisphosphonate use, as well as cardiovascular events during romosozumab treatment. These findings highlight the importance of monitoring in high-risk populations and underscore the need for pre-treatment risk stratification. It should be noted that causal relationships in many of these reports remain inconclusive and require cautious interpretation.

In addition, mild adverse events such as musculoskeletal pain, dizziness, and injection site reactions were relatively common, particularly with non-oral formulations, potentially affecting treatment acceptability and long-term adherence. These observations emphasize the importance of individualized treatment planning that accounts not only for fracture risk and comorbidities but also for patient preferences and likelihood of treatment adherence over time.

In summary, the available evidence supports the clinical efficacy of pharmacological agents approved in Japan for osteoporosis treatment and underscores the necessity of shared decision-making that integrates both efficacy and safety profiles.

Several limitations should be noted. First, while the review incorporated Japanese-language studies, there remains a relative paucity of large-scale, Japan-specific RCTs on screening and treatment. This may limit generalizability, especially regarding real-world implementation in Japanese primary care. Second, most studies of risk assessment tools relied on AUCs without adequate reporting of calibration or reclassification metrics, which are critical for evaluating clinical utility. Finally, observational studies included in KQ5 varied in design quality, and residual confounding cannot be excluded.

In conclusion, this review identified clinical evidence supporting a two-step screening strategy—combining risk assessment tools with bone mineral density testing—particularly in older women at moderate to high risk. For pharmacological treatments approved in Japan, the reported frequency of serious adverse events was relatively low, and multiple studies have suggested their effectiveness in reducing fracture risk.

Reference

1. Yoshimura N, Iidaka T, Horii C, Muraki S, Oka H, Kawaguchi H, Nakamura K, Akune T, Tanaka S. Trends in osteoporosis prevalence over a 10-year period in Japan: the ROAD study 2005-2015. J Bone Miner Metab. 2022 Sep;40(5):829-838.
2. Hagino H, Endo N, Harada A, Iwamoto J, Mashiba T, Mori S, Ohtori S, Sakai A, Takada J, Yamamoto T. Survey of hip fractures in Japan: Recent trends in prevalence and treatment. J Orthop Sci. 2017 Sep;22(5):909-914.
3. Iki M, Tamaki J, Sato Y, Morita A, Ikeda Y, Kajita E, Nishino H, Akiba T, Matsumoto T, Kagamimori S, Kagawa Y, Yoneshima H, Matsukura T, Yamagami T, Kitagawa J; JPOS Study Group. Cohort Profile: The Japanese Population-based Osteoporosis (JPOS) Cohort Study. Int J Epidemiol. 2015 Apr;44(2):405-14.
4. US Preventive Services Task Force; Curry SJ, Krist AH, Owens DK, Barry MJ, Caughey AB, Davidson KW, Doubeni CA, Epling JW Jr, Kemper AR, Kubik M, Landefeld CS, Mangione CM, Phipps MG, Pignone M, Silverstein M, Simon MA, Tseng CW, Wong JB. Screening for Osteoporosis to Prevent Fractures: US Preventive Services Task Force Recommendation Statement. JAMA. 2018 Jun 26;319(24):2521-2531.
5. US Preventive Services Task Force. Draft Evidence Review: Screening for Osteoporosis to Prevent Fractures. February 13, 2024. Accessed June 17, 2025. https://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/uspstf/document/draft-evidence-review/osteoporosis-screening
6. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, Chou R, Glanville J, Grimshaw JM, Hróbjartsson A, Lalu MM, Li T, Loder EW, Mayo-Wilson E, McDonald S, McGuinness LA, Stewart LA, Thomas J, Tricco AC, Welch VA, Whiting P, Moher D. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ. 2021 Mar 29;372:n71.
7. Sterne JAC, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Blencowe NS, Boutron I, et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. BMJ. 2019 Aug 28;366:l4898.
8. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, Savović J, Berkman ND, Viswanathan M, et al. ROBINS-I: a tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. BMJ. 2016 Oct 12;355:i4919.
9. Whiting PF, Rutjes AW, Westwood ME, Mallett S, Deeks JJ, Reitsma JB, et al. QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. Ann Intern Med. 2011 Oct 18;155(8):529–36.
10. Whiting P, Savović J, Higgins JP, Caldwell DM, Reeves BC, Shea B, et al. ROBIS: A new tool to assess risk of bias in systematic reviews was developed. J Clin Epidemiol. 2016 Jan;69:225–34.
11. Moons KG, Wolff RF, Riley RD, Whiting PF, Westwood M, Collins GS, Reitsma JB,

Kleijnen J, Mallett S. PROBAST: A Tool to Assess Risk of Bias and Applicability of Prediction Model Studies. Ann Intern Med. 2019 Jan 1;170(1):51–58.

12. Petersen TG, Abrahamsen B, Høiberg M, Rothmann MJ, Holmberg T, Gram J, Bech M, Åkesson KE, Javaid MK, Hermann AP, Rubin KH. Ten-year follow-up of fracture risk in a systematic population-based screening program: the risk-stratified osteoporosis strategy evaluation (ROSE) randomised trial. EClinicalMedicine. 2024 Apr 11;71:102584.
13. Grad R, Reynolds DL, Antao V, Bell NR, Dickinson JA, Johansson M, Singh H, Szafran O, Thériault G. Screening for primary prevention of fragility fractures: How much time does it take? Can Fam Physician. 2023 Aug;69(8):537-541.
14. Crandall CJ, Larson JC, Schousboe JT, Manson JE, Watts NB, Robbins JA, Schnatz P, Nassir R, Shadyab AH, Johnson KC, Cauley JA, Ensrud KE. Race and Ethnicity and Fracture Prediction Among Younger Postmenopausal Women in the Women's Health Initiative Study. JAMA Intern Med. 2023 Jul 1;183(7):696-704.
15. Fink HA, Butler ME, Claussen AM, Collins ES, Krohn KM, Taylor BC, Tikabo SS, Vang D, Zerzan NL, Ensrud KE. Performance of Fracture Risk Assessment Tools by Race and Ethnicity: A Systematic Review for the ASBMR Task Force on Clinical Algorithms for Fracture Risk. J Bone Miner Res. 2023 Dec;38(12):1731-1741.
16. Freitas TQ, Olalla LFG, Machado LG, Figueiredo CP, Takayama L, de Falco Caparbo V, Domiciano DS, Pereira RMR. Performance of the Brazilian Fracture Assessment Risk Tool (FRAX) model and the age-dependent intervention thresholds according to National Osteoporosis Guideline Group (NOGG) guidelines on fracture prediction in community-dwelling older adults: the São Paulo Ageing and Health (SPAH) Study. Arch Osteoporos. 2024 Jul 11;19(1):59.
17. Leslie WD, Binkley N, Goel H, McCloskey EV, Hans D. FRAX® Adjustment Using Renormalized Trabecular Bone Score (TBS) from L1 Alone may be Optimal for Fracture Prediction: The Manitoba BMD Registry. J Clin Densitom. 2023 Oct-Dec;26(4):101430.
18. Pluskiewicz W, Werner A, Bach M, Adamczyk P, Drozdzowska B. Fracture risk prediction in postmenopausal women from GO Study: the comparison between FRAX, Garvan, and POL-RISK algorithms. Arch Osteoporos. 2024 May 16;19(1):39.
19. Wu Q, Dai J. Enhanced osteoporotic fracture prediction in postmenopausal women using Bayesian optimization of machine learning models with genetic risk score. J Bone Miner Res. 2024 May 2;39(4):462-472.
20. Lee J, Kim J, Jeong C, Ha J, Lim Y, Baek KH. Predicting fragility fractures based on frailty and bone mineral density among rural community-dwelling older adults. Eur J Endocrinol. 2024 Jul 2;191(1):75-86.
21. Zhang B, Chen Z, Yan R, Lai B, Wu G, You J, Wu X, Duan J, Zhang S. Development and Validation of a Feature-Based Broad-Learning System for Opportunistic Osteoporosis

Screening Using Lumbar Spine Radiographs. Acad Radiol. 2024 Jan;31(1):84-92.

22. Cheung CL, Li GH, Li HL, Mak C, Tan KC, Kung AW. Development and validation of the Chinese osteoporosis screening algorithm (COSA) in identification of people with high risk of osteoporosis. Osteoporos Sarcopenia. 2023 Mar;9(1):8-13.
23. Hsieh WT, Groot TM, Yen HK, Wang CY, Hu MH, Groot OQ, Yu PY, Fu SH. Validation of Ten Osteoporosis Screening Tools in Rural Communities of Taiwan. Calcif Tissue Int. 2024 Nov;115(5):507-515.
24. Leeyaphan J, Rojjananukulpong K, Intarasompun P, Peerakul Y. Development and Validation of a New Clinical Diagnostic Screening Model for Osteoporosis in Postmenopausal Women. J Bone Metab. 2023 May;30(2):179-188.
25. Numazawa R, Katano S, Yano T, Koyama M, Nagaoka R, Fujisawa Y, Yamano K, Honma S, Ohori K, Kouzu H, Katayose M, Furuhashi M, Tsuchihashi K, Hashimoto A. Development and validation of osteoporosis risk assessment score in patients with heart failure: comparison with the osteoporosis self-assessment tool for Asians. Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs. 2024 May 28;23(4):408-417.
26. Tan J, Zhang Z, He Y, Xu X, Yang Y, Xu Q, Yuan Y, Wu X, Niu J, Tang S, Wu X, Hu Y. Development and validation of a risk prediction model for osteoporosis in elderly patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus: a retrospective and multicenter study. BMC Geriatr. 2023 Oct 27;23(1):698.
27. Yamamoto N, Takeda Y, Hashiba A, Sugihara M, Tsuchiya H. Utilization of FRAX® in Osteoporosis Screening Programs in Kanazawa City. Osteoporos Jpn. 2013;21(2):97–104. Japanese.
28. Hirakawa A, Iijima K, Ohmura Y, Kida S, Kosaka H, Mizuguchi Y, et al. Efficacy of alendronate in patients with osteoporosis. *Nihon Rinsho Men'eki Gakkai Kaishi*. 2003;26(4):206–13. Japanese.
29. Matsumoto T, Sone T, Soen S, Tanaka S, Yamashita A, Inoue T. Abaloparatide Increases Lumbar Spine and Hip BMD in Japanese Patients With Osteoporosis: The Phase 3 ACTIVE-J Study. J Clin Endocrinol Metab. 2022 Sep 28;107(10):e4222-e4231.
30. McClung MR, Betah D, Deignan C, Shi Y, Timoshanko J, Cosman F. Romosozumab Efficacy in Postmenopausal Women With No Prior Fracture Who Fulfill Criteria for Very High Fracture Risk. Endocr Pract. 2023 Sep;29(9):716-722.
31. Shiraki M, Orimo H, et al. A double-blind, placebo-controlled study on the efficacy and safety of menatetrenone capsules in the treatment of osteoporosis. *Shinryo To Shinyaku*. 1992 May;29(5):925–44. Japanese.
32. Gu J, Zhang H, Xue Q, Wang L, Cheng Z, Zhang Y, et al. Denosumab biosimilar (LY06006) in Chinese postmenopausal osteoporotic women: A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter phase III study. *J Orthop Translat.* 2022 Oct 29;38:117–125.

33. Jiang Y, Huo Y, Li Y, Kong X, Wang B, Liu F, Zheng X, Li Y, Yang Y, Xu Y, Xue Q, Hu Z, Xiao Y, Ma W, Guo Y, Yu W, Xia W. Randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled, multicenter study to evaluate efficacy and safety of the denosumab biosimilar MW031 in Chinese postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. Expert Opin Biol Ther. 2024 Jul;24(7):665-672.
34. Zhang H, Gu JM, Chao AJ, Cheng Q, Teng DH, Yu JM, et al. A phase III randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of the denosumab biosimilar QL1206 in postmenopausal Chinese women with osteoporosis and high fracture risk. *Acta Pharmacol Sin.* 2023 Feb;44(2):446–453.
35. Czerwinski E, Cardona J, Plebanski R, Recknor C, Vokes T, Saag KG, et al. The efficacy and safety of abaloparatide-SC in men with osteoporosis: a randomized clinical trial. *J Bone Miner Res.* 2022 Dec;37(12):2435–2442.
36. Matsumoto T, Sone T, Yamashita A, Inoue T. Abaloparatide dose-dependently increases bone mineral density in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis: a phase 2 study. J Bone Miner Metab. 2023 Nov;41(6):807-816.
37. Kontogeorgos G, Krantz E, Trimpou P, Laine CM, Landin-Wilhelmsen K. Teriparatide treatment in severe osteoporosis - a controlled 10-year follow-up study. BMC Musculoskelet Disord. 2022 Nov 24;23(1):1011.
38. Rubin KH, Möller S, Choudhury A, Zorina O, Kalsekar S, Eriksen EF, Andersen M, Abrahamsen B. Cardiovascular and skeletal safety of zoledronic acid in osteoporosis observational, matched cohort study using Danish and Swedish health registries. Bone. 2020 May;134:115296.
39. Lane NE, Betah D, Deignan C, Oates M, Wang Z, Timoshanko J, Khan AA, Binkley N. Effect of Romosozumab Treatment in Postmenopausal Women With Osteoporosis and Knee Osteoarthritis: Results From a Substudy of a Phase 3 Clinical Trial. ACR Open Rheumatol. 2024 Jan;6(1):43-51.
40. Jones AR, Herath M, Ebeling PR, Teede H, Vincent AJ. Models of care for osteoporosis: A systematic scoping review of efficacy and implementation characteristics. EClinicalMedicine. 2021 Jul 14;38:101022.

Table 1. Characteristics of Included Studies for KQ1

Author, Year	Study Design	Study Quality	Participant Characteristics	Intervention Groups	Primary Outcome & Key Findings	Screening Uptake
Petersen et al., 2024[12]	RCT	Some Concerns	Women aged 65–80 years in Denmark; N = 34,229; 10-year follow-up	FRAX questionnaire by mail; DXA offered to women with ≥15% risk vs. usual care	No overall effect on fracture incidence; benefit observed in women at elevated risk who completed both FRAX and DXA	79% returned FRAX; 71% of eligible underwent DXA
Gates et al., 2023[13]	Systematic Review	Low	Adults ≥40; focus on postmenopausal women ≥65 with low prior fracture prevalence	FRAX-based risk assessment with optional BMD testing vs. no screening	Fracture risk was lowered among women who underwent risk assessment and BMD testing, but no overall effect was seen in the general screened population	Benefits only in high uptake subgroup; low response limits effect in population-wide rollout

Table 2. Characteristics of Included Studies for KQ2a

Author, Year; Study Quality	Cohort Name; Country	Cohort Description	N; % Female	Mean Age (SD)	Additional information
Crandall et al., 2023[14]; Moderate	WHI; United States	Postmenopausal women aged 50–64, stratified by race/ethnicity	67,169; 100%	57.8 (4.1)	Evaluated FRAX (without BMD) and OST stratified by race/ethnicity. For prediction of 10-year major osteoporotic fracture (MOF), FRAX AUCs: Asian 0.65, Black 0.55, Hispanic 0.61, White 0.59. FRAX underestimated MOF risk in Black women and overestimated it in Asian women.
Fink et al., 2023[15]; Some Concerns	WHI subset; United States	Postmenopausal women aged 50–79 stratified by race/ethnicity	84,455; 100%	Mean age 63.2 (7.3), varied by race/ethnicity (e.g., Asian 61.3, White 63.9)	Compared FRAX and Garvan models by race/ethnicity; outcomes: MOF and hip fracture; AUCs ranged 0.58–0.76

Freitas et al., 2024[16]; Moderate	SPAH; Brazil	Community-dwelling adults aged ≥65 years	705; 63%	72.6 (4.6)	Assessed FRAX and NOGG (±BMD); AUCs: NVF 0.76, MOF 0.67; FRAX without BMD performed comparably or better
Gates et al., 2023[13]; Low	Multiple Canadian cohorts; Canada	Adults aged ≥40 years from population-based cohorts including CaMos, evaluated for calibration of FRAX with and without BMD	67,611; majority female	Median age 67 (IQR 57–75)	Calibration of FRAX-Canada with and without BMD
Leslie et al., 2023[17]; Moderate	Manitoba BMD Registry; Canada	Postmenopausal women referred for BMD testing; used registry-linked fracture outcomes	45,185; 100%	Age-stratified (e.g., <65, 65–74, ≥75 years)	Evaluated FRAX adjustment using renormalized L1-only TBS; assessed improvement in fracture risk prediction and calibration

Pluskiewicz et al., 2020[18]; Moderate	GO Study; Poland	Postmenopausal women attending osteoporosis clinic; no prior fracture treatment	457; 100%	64.2 (5.9)	Compared predictive performance of FRAX, Garvan, and POL-RISK for MOF and any fracture; AUCs ranged from 0.63 to 0.72
Wu et al., 2023[19]; Moderate	UK Biobank; United Kingdom	Postmenopausal women of European ancestry	25,772; 100%	63.2 (7.3)	Used Bayesian-optimized machine learning models incorporating genetic risk scores to improve osteoporotic fracture prediction

Table 3. Characteristics of Included Studies for Predictive Accuracy of Bone Mineral Density (BMD) Alone for Fracture (Key Question 2b)

Author, Year Country Study Quality	**Population (setting & key eligibility)**	**Mean Age ± SD**	**N (% Female)**	**Mean BMD ± SD (g cm-²) & Prevalence of Osteoporosis**	**Reference-Test Details (DXA)**
Lee et al., 2024[20] Korea Moderate	Rural adults ≥50 y in Chungju Metabolic Disease Cohort; community health-exam program; no exclusion for comorbidity except missing data	64.3 ± 9.1	5,126 (61.9 %)	Lumbar spine BMD 0.90 ± 0.20; femoral-neck –0.7 ± 1.2 T-score; osteoporosis 32.3 % overall (men 7.6 %, women 41.3 %)	Hologic QDR-4500C DXA; lumbar spine (L1-L4), femoral neck & total hip; CV 1.23 % (spine), 2.3 % (neck), 1.0 % (hip)
Zhang et al., 2024[21] China Moderate	Women ≥50 y who had lumbar X-ray + DXA within 3 mo at 3 tertiary centres; retrospective	65.7 ± 9.0	1,325 (100 %)	Training: mean BMD 0.90 ± 0.20; T-score –1.81 ± 1.57; osteoporosis 35.9 % Test: mean BMD 0.88 ± 0.18; T-score –1.90 ± 1.53; osteoporosis 37.9 %	GE Lunar Prodigy DXA; antero-posterior lumbar spine (L1-L4); WHO criteria (T-score ≤ –2.5) used as reference standard

Table 4. Characteristics of Included Studies for Diagnostic Accuracy of Risk Assessment Instruments (Key Question 2c)

Author, Year Country ROB	**Population**	**Mean Age (SD)**	**N (%) Female**	**Prevalence of Osteoporosis**	**Reference Test Details**
Cheung et al., 2023[22] Hong Kong Moderate	Postmenopausal women and men ≥50 years from the Hong Kong Osteoporosis Study; community-dwelling	Development / Validation cohorts; Female: 62.8 (6.1) / 63.1 (6.0) Male: 70.3 (4.2) / 71.1 (4.3)	4747 (data split into validation and development cohorts, % female not specified)	Women <65: not reported; Women ≥65: not reported; Men: not reported PPV for osteoporosis: Women <65: 40.6%, Women ≥65: 59.4%, Men: 19.4%	DXA at femoral neck; T-score ≤ –2.5; Hologic QDR 4500 plus used

Hsieh et al., 2022[23] Taiwan Moderate	Adults ≥50 years in rural communities in Taiwan; community-dwelling, cross-sectional	75.0 ± 7.1	624 (77.5%)	Men: 12.2%, Women: 51.8%	DXA (Hologic Discovery Wi); lumbar spine and femoral neck T-score ≤ –2.5
Leeyaphan et al., 2021[24] Thailand Moderate	Outpatients with heart failure aged ≥60 years from Ramathibodi Hospital	72.5 ± 7.5	185 (56.9%)	43.6%	DXA (GE Lunar Prodigy); lumbar spine and femoral neck
Numazawa et al., 2022[25] Multi-country (Asia) Moderate	Community-dwelling Asians ≥65 years from 5 Asian countries/regions in the Asian Working Group for Sarcopenia study	75.1 ± 6.1	1,321 (55.9%)	Not directly reported; validation of risk model predicting osteoporosis	DXA; details of anatomical site and device not reported

Tan et al., 2022[26] China Moderate	Hospital-based elderly patients (≥65 y) with type 2 diabetes mellitus	70.3 ± 6.8	229 (58.6%)	35.1%	DXA (lumbar spine and femoral neck); manufacturer not stated
Yamamoto et al., 2013[27] Japan Moderate	General women undergoing municipal osteoporosis screening (ages 40–70); Kanazawa City	Not directly reported; stratified by 5-year groups	3,071 (100%)	36.8% had YAM <80%	DXA or MD method; YAM <80% used as proxy for osteoporosis

Table 5. Characteristics of Included Randomized, Controlled Trials for of Treatment (Key Questions 4)

Author, Year **Trial Name** **Study Design** **Study Quality**	**Participant Characteristics**	**Intervention Groups and Duration**
Hirakawa et al., 2003[28] Not named RCT High	Japanese women with osteoporosis (mean age 72.3 years) presenting with low back pain, recruited from orthopedic clinics	Intervention: Alendronate (duration ~1 year) Comparator: No treatment group
Matsumoto et al., 2022[29] ACTIVE-J RCT Low	Japanese postmenopausal women and men with osteoporosis at high fracture risk; T-score < –2.5 or < –3.0 with vertebral fracture; n=206	Abaloparatide 80 μg/day SC vs Placebo Duration: 78 weeks (approx. 18 months)
McClung et al., 2023[30] FRAME post hoc RCT	Postmenopausal women with osteoporosis (T-score −2.5 to −3.5) and no prior fracture; N = 2825; mean age ~71 years	Romosozumab 210 mg administered subcutaneously once monthly for 12 months, followed by Denosumab 60 mg every 6 months for an additional 12 months, compared with

Moderate		placebo followed by Denosumab; total treatment duration: 24 months.
Shiraki et al., 1992[31] Not named RCT High	Japanese women with postmenopausal or senile osteoporosis and back pain or vertebral fractures; N = 75	Menatetrenone 90 mg/day vs Placebo; 18 months

Table 6. Characteristics of Included Randomized, Controlled Trials for Harms of Treatment (Key Questions 5)

Drug	**Denosumab**	**Abaloparatide**	**Teriparatide**	**Zoledronic acid**	**Romosozumab**
Study	Gu et al 2023[32], Jiang et al 2024[33], Zhang et al 2023[34]	Czewinski et al 2022[35], Mastumoto et al 2023[36]	Kontogeorgos et al 2022[37]	Rubin et al 2020[38]	Lane et al 2024[39]
Adverse Events	1. Infections Upper respiratory infection, Urinary tract infection, White blood cells urine positive, Zoster, Pharyngitis, Periodontitis, Periodontal disease 2. Musculoskeletal Symptoms Arthralgia, Pain in	1. Infections and Inflammatory Conditions Nasopharyngitis, Upper respiratory tract inflammation, Bronchitis, Conjunctivitis, Cystitis 2. Musculoskeletal Arthralgia, Pain in extremity, Back Pain	1. Musculoskeletal pain in the limbs 2. Neurological and General dizziness, fatigue 3. Cardiovascular myocardial infarction	1. Cardiovascular Atrial fibrillation, Arrhythmias, Myocardial infarction, MI seq, Heart failure, Cardiovascular mortality 2. Cerebrovascular Stroke (ischaemic), Stroke 3. Bone Disorders and Fractures Osteomyelitis, ONJ,	Joint Disorders Osteoarthritis, Spinal osteoarthritis, Arthritis, Monoarthritis

	extremity, Limb discomfort, Limb pain, Backache, Muscle spasms, Myalgia 3. Electrolyte and Metabolic Disorders Hypocalcaemia, Hypercalcaemia, Hypophosphatemia, Dyslipidemia, Hyperlipemia, Elevated blood glucose 4. Liver Function–Related Abnormal hepatic function, Abnormal liver function, Blood alkaline	3. Oral and Disorders Oropharyngeal pain, Dental caries, Tooth fracture, Periodontitis, Stomatitis 4. Gastrointestinal Diarrhea, Nausea, Vomiting 5. Cardiovascular Palpitation, Atrial fibrillation, Hypertension 6. Neurological and General Headache, Dizziness, Malaise		Fracture, Fracture nonunion/delayed union, Fracture subtroch or femoral shaft, Hip fracture, Non-hip femur fracture, Femur fracture (all)	

	phosphatase is reduced 5. Skin Manifestations (Allergy-Related) Rash, Allergic dermatitis, Urticaria 6. Neurological and General Symptoms Headache, Dizziness, Peripheral oedema, Hypertension 7. Laboratory Abnormalities (Others) Elevated serum creatine phosphokinase, Keratitis	7. Dermatologic and Allergic Eczema 8. Injection Site Reactions Injection site bruising, Injection site erythema, Injection site swelling, Injection site pain, Contusion 9. Laboratory Abnormalities (Urine) Blood urine present			

Figure1. Literature Flow Diagram



Search strategies for PubMed

#1	"OSTEOPOROSIS"[MeSH Terms] OR "OSTEOPOROTIC FRACTURES"[MeSH Terms] OR "fractures, bone/prevention and control"[MeSH Terms:noexp] OR "decalcification, pathologic"[MeSH Terms] OR "osteoporo*"[Title/Abstract] OR (("MENOPAUSE"[MeSH Terms] OR "OSTEOPENIA"[Title/Abstract] OR "age related bone loss*"[Title/Abstract] OR "MENOPAUSE"[Title/Abstract] OR "MENOPAUSAL"[Title/Abstract] OR "POSTMENOPAUSE"[Title/Abstract] OR "POSTMENOPAUSAL"[Title/Abstract] OR "PERIMENOPAUSE"[Title/Abstract] OR "PERIMENOPAUSAL"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("BONE DENSITY"[MeSH Terms] OR "fractures, bone"[MeSH Terms] OR "HIP FRACTURES"[MeSH Terms] OR "SPINAL FRACTURES"[MeSH Terms] OR "fractures, spontaneous"[MeSH Terms] OR "FEMORAL FRACTURES"[MeSH Terms] OR "HUMERAL FRACTURES"[MeSH Terms] OR "RADIUS FRACTURES"[MeSH Terms] OR "ULNA FRACTURES"[MeSH Terms] OR "BONE DENSITY"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONE LOSS"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONE MASS"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONE BRITTLE"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONE FRAGILE"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONE BROKEN"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONE HEALTH"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONE TURNOVER"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONE RESORPTION"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONE FORMATION"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONES DENSITY"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONES LOSS"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONES MASS"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONES BRITTLE"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONES FRAGILE"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONES BROKEN"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONES HEALTH"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONES TURNOVER"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONES RESORPTION"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "BONES FORMATION"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "fracture*"[Title/Abstract] OR (("BONE"[Title/Abstract] OR "BONES"[Title/Abstract]) AND "preserve*"[Title/Abstract])))
#2	"MASS SCREENING"[MeSH Terms:noexp] OR "DIAGNOSTIC SCREENING PROGRAMS"[MeSH Terms] OR "DIAGNOSTIC IMAGING"[MeSH Subheading] OR "ALGORITHMS"[MeSH Terms:noexp] OR "SURVEYS AND QUESTIONNAIRES"[MeSH Terms] OR "RISK ASSESSMENT"[MeSH Terms] OR "DENSITOMETRY"[MeSH Terms] OR "SCREENING"[Title] OR "SCREENING"[Other Term] OR "absorptiometry, photon"[MeSH Terms] OR "dual energy x ray absorptiometry"[Title/Abstract] OR "dual energy x ray absorptiometry"[Title/Abstract] OR "DXA"[Title/Abstract] OR "DEXA"[Title/Abstract] OR "DENSITOMETRY"[Title/Abstract] OR "ABONE"[Title/Abstract] OR "BODY WEIGHT CRITERION"[Title/Abstract] OR "BWC"[Title/Abstract] OR

	"CAROC"[Title/Abstract] OR "FARA"[Title/Abstract] OR "FRACTURE RISK ASSESSMENT"[Title/Abstract] OR "FRAX"[Title/Abstract] OR "FRACTURE RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL"[Title/Abstract] OR "FRACTURE RISK SCORE"[Title/Abstract] OR "FRACTURE RISK CALCULATOR"[Title/Abstract] OR "FRACTURE RISK TOOL"[Title/Abstract] OR "RISK ASSESSMENT"[Title] OR "RISK ASSESSMENT"[Other Term] OR "predictive model*"[Title/Abstract] OR "prognostic model*"[Title/Abstract] OR "GARVAN"[Title/Abstract] OR "HONG KONG OSTEOPOROSIS STUDY"[Title/Abstract] OR "HKOS"[Title/Abstract] OR "MALE OSTEOPOROSIS RISK ESTIMATION SCORE"[Title/Abstract] OR "MORES"[Title/Abstract] OR "OSTEOPOROSIS SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL"[Title/Abstract] OR "OST"[Title/Abstract] OR "OSTA"[Title/Abstract] OR "OSTAI"[Title/Abstract] OR "osteoporosis self assessment tool for asians"[Title/Abstract] OR "osteoporosis self assessment tool for asians"[Title/Abstract] OR "RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT"[Title/Abstract] OR "ORAI"[Title/Abstract] OR "OSIRIS"[Title/Abstract] OR "Q FRACTURE"[Title/Abstract] OR "OSTEOPOROSIS RISK ESTIMATE"[Title/Abstract] OR "STUDY OF OSTEOPOROTIC FRACTURES"[Title/Abstract] OR "SOF"[Title/Abstract] OR "SOFSURF"[Title/Abstract] OR "WEIGHT-ONLY-EPIDOS"[Title/Abstract]
#3	"osteoporosis/drug therapy"[MeSH Terms] OR "DRUG THERAPY"[MeSH Terms] OR "BONE DENSITY CONSERVATION AGENTS"[MeSH Terms] OR "drug therap*"[Title/Abstract] OR "drug treat*"[Title/Abstract] OR "medical therap*"[Title/Abstract] OR "medical treat*"[Title/Abstract] OR "pharmacotherap*"[Title/Abstract] OR "bone density conservation agent*"[Title/Abstract] OR "antiresorptive agent*"[Title/Abstract] OR "antiresorptive drug*"[Title/Abstract] OR "bone modifying agents*"[Title/Abstract] OR "bone resorption inhibitor*"[Title/Abstract]
#4	"randomized controlled trial"[Publication Type] OR "pragmatic clinical trial"[Publication Type] OR "RANDOM ALLOCATION"[MeSH Terms] OR "SINGLE-BLIND METHOD"[MeSH Terms] OR "DOUBLE-BLIND METHOD"[MeSH Terms] OR "SINGLE BLIND"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "DOUBLE BLIND"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "TREBLE BLIND"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "TRIPLE BLIND"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "SINGLE MASK"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "DOUBLE MASK"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "TREBLE MASK"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "TRIPLE MASK"[Title/Abstract:~1] OR "random*"[Title/Abstract] OR "PRAGMATIC STUDY"[Title/Abstract:~3] OR "PRAGMATIC STUDIES"[Title/Abstract:~3] OR "PRAGMATIC TRIAL"[Title/Abstract:~3] OR "PRAGMATIC TRIALS"[Title/Abstract:~3] OR

	"PRAGMATIC TEST"[Title/Abstract:~3] OR "PRAGMATIC TESTS"[Title/Abstract:~3] OR "placebo*"[Title/Abstract] OR "comparative study"[Publication Type] OR "controlled clinical trial"[Publication Type] OR "CROSS-OVER STUDIES"[MeSH Terms] OR "MATCHED-PAIR ANALYSIS"[MeSH Terms] OR (("comparative*"[Title/Abstract] OR "compare*"[Title/Abstract] OR "comparis*"[Title/Abstract] OR "CONTROLLED"[Title/Abstract] OR "cross over*"[Title/Abstract] OR "cross over*"[Title/Abstract] OR "crossover*"[Title/Abstract] OR "matched pair"[Title/Abstract] OR "matched pair"[Title/Abstract]) AND ("stud*"[Title/Abstract] OR "trial*"[Title/Abstract] OR "test*"[Title/Abstract] OR "drug*"[Title/Abstract] OR "evaluat*"[Title/Abstract] OR "analys*"[Title/Abstract]))
#5	"SYSTEMATIC REVIEW"[Publication Type] OR "META-ANALYSIS"[Publication Type] OR "COHORT STUDIES"[MeSH Terms] OR "SYSTEMATIC REVIEW"[Title/Abstract:~2] OR "SYSTEMATIC OVERVIEW"[Title/Abstract:~2] OR "meta analy*"[Title/Abstract] OR "metaanal*"[Title/Abstract] OR "metanal*"[Title/Abstract] OR "INTEGRATIVE RESEARCH REVIEW"[Title/Abstract:~3] OR "RESEARCH INTEGRATION"[Title/Abstract:~3] OR "cohort*"[Title/Abstract]
#6	#1 AND #2 AND (#4 OR #5)
#7	#1 AND #3 AND #4
#8	#6 OR #7
#9	#8 AND ("ADULT"[MeSH Terms] OR "MIDDLE AGED"[MeSH Terms] OR "AGED"[MeSH Terms] OR "aged, 80 and over"[MeSH Terms] OR "adult*"[Title/Abstract] OR "AGED"[Title/Abstract] OR "ELDERLY"[Title/Abstract] OR "SENIUM"[Title/Abstract])
#10	#9 AND 2021/11/11:2024/11/26[Date - Publication]
#11	#10 AND ("ENGLISH"[Language] OR "JAPANESE"[Language])

Search strategies for Cochrane Library

#1	[mh "OSTEOPOROSIS"] OR [mh "OSTEOPOROTIC FRACTURES"] OR [mh ^"FRACTURES, BONE"/PC] OR [mh "DECALCIFICATION, PATHOLOGIC"] OR OSTEOPORO*:TI,AB,KW OR (([mh "MENOPAUSE"] OR (OSTEOPENIA OR (AGE NEXT RELATED OR AGERELATED) NEXT BONE NEXT LOSS* OR MENOPAUSE OR MENOPAUSAL OR POSTMENOPAUSE OR POSTMENOPAUSAL OR PERIMENOPAUSE OR PERIMENOPAUSAL):TI,AB,KW) AND ([mh "BONE DENSITY"] OR [mh "FRACTURES, BONE"] OR [mh "HIP FRACTURES"] OR [mh "SPINAL FRACTURES"] OR [mh "FRACTURES, SPONTANEOUS"] OR [mh "FEMORAL FRACTURES"] OR [mh "HUMERAL FRACTURES"] OR [mh "RADIUS FRACTURES"] OR [mh "ULNA FRACTURES"] OR (((BONE OR BONES) NEAR/1 (DENSITY OR LOSS OR MASS OR BRITTLE OR FRAGILE OR BROKEN OR HEALTH OR TURNOVER OR RESORPTION OR FORMATION)) OR FRACTURE* OR ((BONE OR BONES) AND PRESERVE*)):TI,AB,KW))
#2	[mh ^"MASS SCREENING"] OR [mh "DIAGNOSTIC SCREENING PROGRAMS"] OR [mh ^"ALGORITHMS"] OR [mh "SURVEYS AND QUESTIONNAIRES"] OR [mh "RISK ASSESSMENT"] OR [mh "ABSORPTIOMETRY, PHOTON"] OR [mh "DENSITOMETRY"] OR ("SCREENING" OR "RISK ASSESSMENT"):TI OR (DUAL NEXT ENERGY NEXT X NEXT RAY NEXT ABSORPTIOMETRY OR "DXA" OR "DEXA" OR "DENSITOMETRY" OR "AGE BULK ONE OR NEVER ESTROGEN" OR "ABONE" OR "BODY WEIGHT CRITERION" OR "BWC" OR "BROWN'S CLINICAL RISK ASSESSMENT" OR "CANADIAN RISK FOR OSTEOPOROSIS CALCULATOR" OR "CAROC" OR "FRACTURE ABSOLUTE RISK ASSESSMENT" OR "FARA" OR "FRACTURE RISK ASSESSMENT" OR "FRAX" OR "FRACTURE RISK SCORE" OR "FRACTURE RISK CALCULATOR" OR "FRACTURE RISK TOOL" OR (PREDICTIVE OR PROGNOSTIC) NEXT MODEL* OR "GARVAN" OR "HONG KONG OSTEOPOROSIS STUDY" OR "HKOS" OR "MALE OSTEOPOROSIS RISK ESTIMATION SCORE" OR "MORES" OR "OSTEOPOROSIS SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL" OR "OST" OR "OSTA" OR "OSTAI" OR "OSTEOPOROSIS SELF ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR ASIANS" OR "RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT" OR " ORAI" OR "OSTEOPOROSIS INDEX OF RISK" OR "OSIRIS" OR "Q FRACTURE" OR "OSTEOPOROSIS RISK ESTIMATE" OR "STUDY OF OSTEOPOROTIC FRACTURES" OR "SOF" OR "SOFSURF" OR "WEIGHT-ONLY-EPIDOS"):TI,AB,KW
#3	[mh "OSTEOPOROSIS"/DT] OR [mh "DRUG THERAPY"] OR [mh "BONE DENSITY CONSERVATION AGENTS"] OR ((DRUG OR MEDICAL) NEXT (THERAP* OR TREAT*) OR PHARMACOTHERAP* OR (BONE NEXT (((DENSITY NEXT

	CONSERVATION OR MODIFYING) NEXT AGENT*) OR RESORPTION NEXT INHIBIT*) OR ANTIRESORPTIVE NEXT (AGENT* OR DRUG*))):TI,AB,KW
#4	[mh "RANDOM ALLOCATION"] OR [mh "SINGLE-BLIND METHOD"] OR [mh "DOUBLE-BLIND METHOD"] OR ((SINGL* OR DOUBLE* OR TREBL* OR TRIPL*) NEXT (BLIND* OR MASK*) OR RANDOM* OR PRAGMATIC* NEAR/3 (STUD* OR TRIAL* OR TEST*) OR PLACEBO*):TI,AB,KW OR [mh "CROSS-OVER STUDIES"] OR [mh "MATCHED-PAIR ANALYSIS"] OR ((COMPARATIVE* OR COMPARE* OR COMPARIS* OR CONTROLLED OR CROSS NEXT OVER* OR CROSSOVER* OR MATCH* NEXT PAIR) NEXT/3 (STUD* OR TRIAL* OR TEST* OR DRUG* OR EVALUAT* OR ANALYS*)):TI,AB,KW
#5	[mh "COHORT STUDIES"] OR (SYSTEMATIC* NEAR/2 (REVIEW* OR OVERVIEW*) OR META NEXT ANALY* OR METAANAL* OR METANAL* OR INTEGRATIVE* NEAR/1 RESEARCH* NEAR/1 REVIEW* OR RESEARCH* NEAR/1 INTEGRATION* OR COHORT*):TI,AB,KW
#6	#1 AND #2 AND (#4 OR #5)
#7	#1 AND #3 AND #4
#8	#6 OR #7
#9	[mh "ADULT"] OR [mh "MIDDLE AGED"] OR [mh "AGED"] OR [mh "AGED, 80 AND OVER"] OR (ADULT* OR AGED OR ELDERLY OR SENIUM):TI,AB,KW
#10	#8 AND #9
#11	#10 with Publication Year from 2022 to 2024, in Trials
#12	#10 with Cochrane Library publication date Between Nov 2022 and Nov 2024, in Cochrane Reviews, Cochrane Protocols, Clinical Answers, Editorials, Special Collections
#13	ENGLISH:LA OR JAPANESE:LA
# 14	(#11 OR #12) AND #13

Search strategies for Ichushi-Web (Japan Medical Abstracts Society)

#1	骨粗鬆症/TH or 骨折-骨粗鬆症性/TH or @骨折;予防/TH or 脱灰現象-病的/TH or OSTEOPOROS/AL or OSTEOPOROTIC/AL or 骨粗鬆症/AL or 骨粗しょう症/AL or 骨粗少症/AL or 骨多孔症/AL or オステオポローシス/AL or オステオポロシス/AL or ((閉経/TH or OSTEOPENIA/AL or "AGE-RELATED BONE LOSS"/AL or "AGERELATED BONE LOSS"/AL or MENOPAUSE/AL or MENOPAUSAL/AL or POSTMENOPAUSE/AL or POSTMENOPAUSAL/AL or PERIMENOPAUSE/AL or PERIMENOPAUSAL/AL or 骨減少/AL or 骨量減少/AL or 閉経/AL) and (骨密度/TH or 骨折/TH or 股関節部骨折/TH or 脊椎骨折/TH or 骨折-特発性/TH or 大腿骨骨折/TH or 上腕骨骨折/TH or 橈骨骨折/TH or 尺骨骨折/TH or "BONE MINERAL DENSITY"/AL or "BONE DENSITY"/AL or "DENSITY OF BONE"/AL or "BONE LOSS"/AL or "BONE MASS"/AL or "BRITTLE BONE"/AL or "FRAGILE BONE"/AL or "BROKEN BONE"/AL or "BONE HEALTH"/AL or "HEALTH OF BONES"/AL or "FRACTURE"/AL or "BONE TURNOVER"/AL or "BONE RESORPTION"/AL or (BONE/AL and PRESERVE/AL) or "BONE FORMATION"/AL or 骨密度/AL or 骨量/AL or 骨強度/AL or 骨折/AL or 骨代謝/AL or 骨吸収/AL or 骨形成/AL))
#2	@集団検診/TH or @アルゴリズム/TH or 調査と質問紙法/TH or リスク評価/TH or 光子吸収分析/TH or デンシトメトリー/TH or (SH=画像診断) or 健診/AL or 検診/AL or 健康診断/AL or "DIAGNOSTIC SCREENING PROGRAM"/AL or SCREENING/TI or スクリーニング/TI or DXA/AL or DEXA/AL or "DUAL-ENERGY X-RAY ABSORPTIOMETRY"/AL or "DUAL ENERGY X-RAY ABSORPTIOMETRY"/AL or 二重エネルギーX 線吸収/AL or 二重エネルギーエックス線吸収/AL or デュアルエネルギーX 線吸収/AL or デュアルエネルギーエックス線吸収/AL or "DENSITOMETRY"/AL or デンシトメトリー/AL or "AGE BULK ONE OR NEVER ESTROGEN"/AL or "ABONE"/AL or "BODY WEIGHT CRITERION"/AL or "BWC"/AL or "BROWN'S CLINICAL RISK ASSESSMENT"/AL or "CANADIAN RISK FOR OSTEOPOROSIS CALCULATOR"/AL or "CAROC"/AL or "FRACTURE ABSOLUTE RISK ASSESSMENT"/AL or "FARA"/AL or "FRACTURE RISK ASSESSMENT"/AL or "FRAX"/AL or "FRACTURE RISK ASSESSMENT TOOL"/AL or "FRACTURE RISK SCORE"/AL or "FRACTURE RISK CALCULATOR"/AL or "FRACTURE RISK TOOL"/AL or "RISK ASSESSMENT"/TI or リスク評価/TI or リスクアセスメント/TI or リスクスコア/TI or 危険度評価/TI or "PREDICTIVE MODEL"/AL or "PROGNOSTIC MODEL"/AL or 予測モデル/AL or 予後モデル/AL or "GARVAN"/AL or "HONG KONG OSTEOPOROSIS STUDY"/AL or "HKOS"/AL or

	"MALE OSTEOPOROSIS RISK ESTIMATION SCORE"/AL or "MORES"/AL or "OSTEOPOROSIS SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL"/AL or "OSTA"/AL or "OSTAI"/AL or "OSTEOPOROSIS SELF ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR ASIANS"/AL or "OSTEOPOROSIS SELF-ASSESSMENT TOOL FOR ASIANS"/AL or "RISK ASSESSMENT INSTRUMENT"/AL or " ORAI"/AL or "OSTEOPOROSIS INDEX OF RISK"/AL or "OSIRIS"/AL or "Q FRACTURE"/AL or "OSTEOPOROSIS RISK ESTIMATE"/AL or "STUDY OF OSTEOPOROTIC FRACTURES"/AL or "SOFSURF"/AL or "WEIGHT-ONLY-EPIDOS"/AL
#3	骨粗鬆症;薬物療法/TH or 薬物療法/TH or 骨密度維持剤/TH or "DRUG THERAP"/AL OR "DRUG TREAT"/AL OR "MEDICAL THERAP"/AL OR "MEDICAL TREAT"/AL or PHARMACOTHERAP/AL or 内科的療法/AL or 内科療法/AL or 薬物治療/AL or 薬物療法/AL or 投薬/AL or 与薬/AL or "BONE DENSITY CONSERVATION AGENT"/AL or "ANTIRESORPTIVE AGENT"/AL or "ANTIRESORPTIVE DRUG"/AL or "BONE MODIFYING AGENT"/AL or "BONE RESORPTION INHIBIT"/AL or 骨吸収阻害剤/AL or 骨吸収阻害薬/AL or 骨吸収抑制剤/AL or 骨吸収抑制薬/AL or 骨修飾薬/AL or 骨粗鬆症治療剤/AL or 骨粗鬆症治療薬/AL or 骨密度改善剤/AL or 骨密度改善薬/AL or 骨密度保護剤/AL or 骨密度保護薬/AL
#4	(RD=ランダム化比較試験) or (RD=準ランダム化比較試験) or ランダム化比較試験/TH or 準ランダム化比較試験/TH or ランダム割付け/TH or 一重盲検法/TH or 二重盲検法/TH or プラセボ/TH or ランダム/AL or ランダマイ/AL or 無作為/AL or 盲検/AL or ブラインド/AL or シングルマスク/AL or シングル・マスク/AL or ダブルマスク/AL or ダブル・マスク/AL or トリプルマスク/AL or トリプル・マスク/AL or 実際的試験/AL or 実際的研究/AL or 実践的試験/AL or 実践的研究/AL or 実用的試験/AL or 実用的研究/AL or 実際的臨床試験/AL or 実際的臨床研究/AL or 実践的臨床試験/AL or 実践的臨床研究/AL or 実用的臨床試験/AL or 実用的臨床研究/AL or プラグマティック試験/AL or プラグマティック研究/AL or プラグマチック試験/AL or プラグマチック研究/AL or プラセボ/AL or プラシーボ/AL or 偽薬/AL or 偽剤/AL or RANDOM/AL or BLIND/AL or "SINGLE MASK"/AL or SINGLE-MASK/AL or "DOUBLE MASK"/AL or DOUBLE-MASK/AL or "TRIPLE MASK"/AL or TRIPLE-MASK/AL or "TREBLE MASK"/AL or TREBLE-MASK/AL or "PRAGMATIC TRIAL"/AL or "PRAGMATIC CLINICAL TRIAL"/AL or "PRAGMATIC STUD"/AL or "PRAGMATIC CLINICAL STUD"/AL or PLACEBO/AL or RD=比較研究 or 比較試験/AL or 対照試験/AL or 比較臨床試験/AL or 比較薬理試験/AL or 比較研究/AL or 比較臨床研究/AL or 比較薬理研究/AL or クロスオーバー研究/TH or クロスオーバ/AL

	or クロス・オーバ/AL or 交差試験/AL or 交差研究/AL or 交叉試験/AL or マッチドペア/AL or 交叉研究/AL or COMPARAT/AL or COMPARE/AL or COMPARIS/AL or "CROSS OVER"/AL or CROSSOVER/AL or CROSS-OVER/AL or "MATCHED PAIR"/AL or MATCHED-PAIR/AL
#5	システマティックレビュー/TH or コホート研究/TH or システマティックレビュ/AL or システマチックレビュ/AL or システマティック・レビュ/AL or システマチック・レビュ/AL or システマティックレヴュ/AL or システマチックレヴュ/AL or システマティック・レヴュ/AL or システマチック・レヴュ/AL or 系統的レビュ/AL or 系統的にレビュ/AL or 系統的なレビュ/AL or 系統レビュ/AL or 系統的レヴュ/AL or 系統的にレヴュ/AL or 系統的なレヴュ/AL or 系統レヴュ/AL or 体系的レビュ/AL or 体系的にレビュ/AL or 体系的なレビュ/AL or 体系的レヴュ/AL or 体系的にレヴュ/AL or 体系的なレヴュ/AL or 系統的考察/AL or 系統的に考察/AL or 系統的な考察/AL or 体系的考察/AL or 体系的に考察/AL or 体系的な考察/AL or "SYSTEMATIC REVIEW"/AL or SYSTEMATIC-REVIEW/AL or "SYSTEMATICAL REVIEW"/AL or SYSTEMATICAL-REVIEW/AL or "SYSTEMATIC OVERVIEW"/AL or SYSTEMATIC-OVERVIEW/AL or "SYSTEMATICAL OVERVIEW"/AL or SYSTEMATICAL-OVERVIEW/AL or RD=メタアナリシス or メタアナリシス/TH or メタ分析/AL or メタアナ/AL or メタ・アナ/AL or メタ解析/AL or メタ研究/AL or META-ANALYS/AL or "META ANALYS"/AL or METAANALYS/AL or METANALYS/AL or META 解析/AL or META 分析/AL or META 研究/AL or "INTEGRATIVE RESEARCH REVIEW"/AL or "RESEARCH INTEGRATION"/AL or コホート/AL or コーホート/AL or コウホート/AL or COHORT/AL
#6	#1 AND #2 AND (#4 OR #5)
#7	#1 AND #3 AND #4
#8	#6 OR #7
#9	成人/TH or 中年/TH or 高齢者/TH or ADULT/AL or AGED/AL or ELDERLY/AL or SENIUM/AL or おとな/AL or 成人/AL or 中年/AL or 中高年/AL or 熟年/AL or 壮年/AL or 高齢/AL or 高令/AL or 老人/AL or 長寿者/AL or 高年者/AL or 高年齢/AL or 高年令/AL or 老年/AL or 老齢/AL or 初老/AL or 老令/AL or (CK=成人(19～44),中年(45～64),高齢者(65～),高齢者(80～))
#10	#8 and #9
#11	#10 and (DT=1903:2024)
#12	#11 and (LA=日本語,英語)