Steroids cause osteoporosis

We read with great interest the article by Gudbjörnsson and colleagues and concur with the accompanying leader by Dr Paget on the issue of corticosteroid associated osteoporosis.1 Osteoporosis is a major public health problem, associated with significant morbidity and mortality, and is estimated to cost £614 million annually in England and Wales alone. Despite well published guidelines on the prevention and treatment of corticosteroid associated osteoporosis, as a profession, we are failing to meet the targets set by these guidelines.1

In the light of the American College of Rheumatology guidelines in 2001, we performed an audit of our current practice relating to the issue of steroid prescription, calcium supplementation, measurement of bone density, and the prescription of antiresorptive treatment to see if we had been adhering to the recommendations of the National Osteoporosis Society. Our rheumatology department has a continually updated database on all current and past patients who have attended our unit. This contains information on patient demographics, primary rheumatological diagnosis, comorbid conditions, current drug treatment, past disease modifying treatment (including corticosteroids), and records all patient generated events, including outpatient and inpatient episodes. From our database of over 10 000 patients, we identified 258 patients who were currently receiving prednisolone and had been taking the drug for a minimum of three months. Forty patients (29 female) were randomly selected. The median patient age was 63 years (range 33–85). The patients were taking a mean daily dose of 6.7 mg prednisolone (range 1–45) and had been prescribed prednisolone for a median of 6 years (range 3 months–20 years). The most common reason for the prescription of prednisolone was for polymyalgia rheumatica for 14 (35%) of those selected, followed by systemic lupus crythematous (SLE) in nine (23%), rheumatoid arthritis or associated complications for four (10%), and mixed connective tissue disease for three (8%). There were also isolated prescriptions for juvenile idiopathic arthritis, dermatomyositis, polymyositis, psoriatic arthritis, Wegener’s granulomatosis, iritis, and unspecified systemic vasculitis.

Encouragingly, 34 (85%) of our cohort were receiving some form of bone protective treatment: 22 (55%) were taking an oral bisphosphonate and one patient received intravenous pamidronate. Four of the postmenopausal women were taking hormone replacement therapy and two patients were receiving calcitriol. Twenty (50%) were prescribed calcium and vitamin D supplements, and this was the only treatment in eight (20%) of the cohort. However, of the six patients not receiving any form of bone therapy, five were over the age of 65 years and the one patient under the age of 65 years had no previous history of osteoporosis. We performed our study in northeast Iceland and this was the only study in the literature that did not report the prevalence of fragility fractures in their patient group. Although this is a much higher proportion than in the literature, others have previously reported that 20% of their patients were not treated with any antiresorptive agent and 15% were neither receiving specific bone protective treatment nor calcium or vitamin D supplementation.

The figures show that even in a specialist clinic with attention to osteoporosis, further work needs to be done in primary prevention against steroid-induced osteoporosis. Since we performed our study in northeast Iceland, an Osteoporosis Clinic with DXA has been established in the study area, and the Director of Public Health in Iceland has published clinical guidelines concerning this issue.7 Thus, it will be of interest to re-perform our study in the near future for evaluation of the actual improvement in preventing bone morbidity in patients in need of long term treatment with corticosteroids.

M-M Gordon, S Stevenson, J A Hunter
Department of Rheumatology (Floor 7), Gartnavel General Hospital, 1053 Great Western Road, Glasgow G12 0YN, UK

Correspondence to: Dr M-M Gordon; m.m.gordon@hotmail.com

References

Authors’ response

We appreciate the comment by Dr Gordon and her coworkers on our article on the prevalence of decision making against steroid-induced osteoporosis, which was recently published in the Annals and which included a leader from Dr Paget. In their letter, they further highlight the importance of prevention against corticosteroid-induced osteoporosis. They also reported their experience at their rheumatological clinic with more than 10 000 patients. Surprisingly, only 2.6% of their patients with various rheumatological disorders were receiving long term treatment with corticosteroids, in comparison with 0.7% of our unselected population based cohort. More than half of these patients were receiving bisphosphonate, but unfortunately they did not report whether this was primary or secondary prevention or treatment against manifest osteoporosis, nor did they report the prevalence of fragility fractures in their patient group. Although this is a much higher proportion than in the literature, others have previously reported that 20% of their patients were not treated with any antiresorptive agent and 15% were neither receiving specific bone protective treatment nor calcium or vitamin D supplementation.8

These figures show that even in a specialist clinic with attention to osteoporosis, further work needs to be done in primary prevention against steroid-induced osteoporosis. Since we performed our study in northeast Iceland, an Osteoporosis Clinic with DXA has been established in the study area, and the Director of Public Health in Iceland has published clinical guidelines concerning this issue.9

Thus, it will be of interest to re-perform our study in the near future for evaluation of the actual improvement in preventing bone morbidity in patients in need of long term treatment with corticosteroids.
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Manthorpe also criticizes the SS classification criteria for the interdependent relation between anti-Ro/anti-La antibodies (item IV) and the focus score (item VI). They are certainly associated with each other, but why is that a problem? The worldwide accepted American Rheumatism Association criteria for rheumatoid arthritis also contain interdependent items—for example, positive rheumatoid factor serology is generally considered as strongly associated with erosive rheumatoid joint damage. Interdependency can also be found in the American College of Rheumatology classification criteria for systemic lupus erythematosus (presence of antinuclear antibodies is a distinct item from presence of anti-dsDNA or anti-Sm, items 11 and 10 respectively). Furthermore, it appears inconsistent that Manthorpe recommends including the pathognomonic signs in the SS classification criteria. This would also introduce an interdependent item.

The dependency does not equal a one-on-one relation—that is, seronegative patients may have a positive focus score and vice versa. In particular, because numerous reports have shown that the focus score alone can be false positive or false negative,10 the presence of anti-Ro/anti-La antibodies—which are still the most disease-specific and sensitive parameters available, has additional value for the accuracy of diagnosis. Finally, it has yet to be proved that the suggested new antibodies (anti-fodrin, anti-muscle) are more sensitive and disease-specific than the existing classic anti-Ro and anti-La antibodies. Therefore it is too early to include such items in classification criteria.

While our knowledge of Sjögren’s syndrome increases, classification criteria may develop in a way that enhances early diagnosis of possibly reversible target organ damage. Therefore not the end stage symptoms and signs (items I–III and V) but rather the early target organ histological signs and serological signs are likely to retain their place in the classification criteria. Therefore, in our view the US-European consensus group is right to emphasise items IV and VI, which should not be neglected, and to look for better alternatives have been introduced.
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Zandbelt and van den Hoogen raise and discuss some important issues in the diagnosis of Sjögren’s syndrome, which is currently forward in the June Leader of the Annals concerning Sjögren’s syndrome (SS) criteria published by a consensus group consisting of European and North American SS experts.

The authors read, “American (US-Eur) and Japanese Groups’ criteria compared and contrasted.” Zandbelt’s and van den Hoogen’s points are well taken, although the issues put forward are not new. I agree with them that final diagnostic criteria will not arrive on the day when we know the aetiopathogenesis. Until that happens, we trust that criteria will develop and improve. I am of the opinion that it is best to have as few preliminary classification criteria as possible. When coming up with new proposals, these should include changes that are up to date in all aspects, otherwise other proposals will arise too soon. It is here, among other things, that I am disappointed by the consensus group’s latest proposal.

Most SS specialists agree that it is difficult to diagnose SS without close collaboration between clinical specialists within ophthalmology, oral medicine/oral surgery, and rheumatology. The US-Eur proposal is written by 3 authors but not a single person is an ophthalmologist! We have known for some years that patients with genuine SS do not complain of dry eyes because the cornea—although heavily innervated—lacks nerves that register dryness. This makes item I in the proposed criteria set invalid and should have been changed.

As far as smoking is concerned, it seems of great importance that clinicians should know how much cigarettes are smoked, and smoking habits not only a specific disease but also another one. The following papers from both the main affected exocrine organs, lachrymal and salivary glands, very often lack circulating anti-SSA/B autoantibodies and simultaneously have a florid histopathological test.

As the greatest percentage of the world population is present or past smokers with a consumption of >21 cigarettes/week some will have eye and oral symptoms similar to patients with SS (item I updated plus item III), and I find it difficult to accept that such

Sjögren’s syndrome criteria
In the June issue of the Annals Manthorpe comments on the recently proposed US-European classification criteria for Sjögren’s syndrome (SS).1 We would like to deal with some of the issues he raises, and add some comments.

Now that the classification criteria have evolved from rather subjectively biased ones to more objective assessments, it is surprising that the two most disease-specific objective parameters currently available for SS are subject to such a critical remark. Of course, when serological and histological items are emphasised in the new SS classification criteria, their individual disease sensitivity and specificity should always be kept in mind.

In fact, all six items that are included in the classification criteria may be subject to discussion. For example, the Schirmer-I test, and unstimulated whole saliva flow test have been criticised in a number of papers,2 but these items are recommended in Manthorpe’s paper. Manthorpe expresses his concerns about the accuracy of sublabial salivary gland biopsies (SLGBs), referring to one paper in which a change of diagnosis of >50% is reported after a second examination of the SLGBs. However, the authors themselves report that not using the focus scoring system was probably the most important reason for the change of diagnosis on the second examination. They did not conclude that the focus score itself—which is mandatory to fulfil item VI—changed dramatically upon re-examination of the specimens!

Other ways of bypassing interobserver variability are also available—for example, measuring two parameters instead of one (for example IgA% and focus score) provides a suitable tool for the accuracy of diagnosis,3 and, moreover, computer aided scoring methods may provide non-observer dependent data. For measuring the IgA% reliable and reproducible objective data from the biopsies are obtained by combining microscopic, computer, and calibrated software. These biopsies show what is going on in the target organs of this disease and may provide early diagnostic markers; one should not put them aside too easily.
patients would not be diagnosed as having SS if the US-Eur criteria were followed. Given that the patient in question is a present or past smoker should lead to the consequence that a focus score ≤1 and/or absence of anti-SSA/B autoantibodies (items IV and VI) cannot be trusted and consequently should be disregarded. Beside the personal family consequences it might have great social effects in some countries. In Sweden, for example, patients might get their dental repair bill subsidised by the State if they have SS diagnosed according to the SSA/B autoantibodies but be open to never ones as well. As mentioned in the legend of figure 4, factors should not, therefore, concentrate solely upon the SSA/B autoantibodies but be open to newer ones as well. As mentioned in the legend of figure 4, factors should not, therefore, concentrate solely upon the SSA/B autoantibodies but be open to newer ones as well.

A brief history of spa therapy

We read with great interest the paper entitled “A brief history of spa therapy” by van Tubergen and van der Linden in the March edition of the Annals.1 Spas have certainly played an important part throughout the centuries not only in recreation but also in restoring physical and mental health. Clinicians and spa doctors have greatly influenced the progress of rheumatology—for example, Bruce from Scotland described polymyalgia, Forester introduced gold treatment for rheumatoid arthritis in France, and Sitja and Zitnan from Piestany described polyarticular chondrocalcinosis.

We regret that this paper failed to mention the famous spas of the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, and Romania. From their conception, Czech and Slovak spas became gathering places not only for aristocrats but also for kings and emperors. Hungary, one of the richest countries of thermal waters in the world, has a bath culture dating back to the pre-Roman Celtic times. Budapest is a capital unique for its thermal waters. It is renowned for Lake Vize, the second biggest hot lake in the world, second to Rotorua, New Zealand.

We are proud to have published in English the first double blind controlled trials with thermal water.3,4 Hungary is the only country where medical use of thermal waters is practised based on its efficacy proved in controlled trials.

We profoundly disagree with the authors, that “taking the water, balneotherapy, spa therapy, hydrotherapy are more or less interchangeable.” We are certain that they are not. Even in their paper, they quote Priessnitz and Kneipp, who distinguished between thermal water (balneotherapy) and hydrotherapy. Hydrotherapy uses only the physical qualities of water (buoyancy of water, resistance, sometimes its temperature, cold or warm), whereas thermal waters are not only naturally warm (>20°C) but their mineral content is also significant. In Hungary a recognised mineral water should have minerals ≥1 g/l or more, but no nitrates, nitrates, or bacterial growth. It is not known whether the minerals of mineral water penetrate the body surface, but they are known to cause a so-called spa or mineral water reaction.5 The mineral water reaction includes tiredness and fatigue especially after 5–8 baths with an associated rise in the leucocyte count and erythrocyte sedimentation rate even within the normal range. The mineral water reaction passes away after 5–10 baths, and the optimal “taking the waters” is a total of 15–22 baths taken daily.

There is no evidence between thermal mineral waters and spa therapy either. As we pointed out in a debate in the columns of the Journal of Rheumatology6 the effect of thermal mineral waters and the effect of complex spa therapy should be distinguished. We performed our double blind trials on inhabitants of ordinary Hungarian towns and villages with no spa facilities to exclude the placebo effect of a change in environment, physiotherapy, and being in a holiday atmosphere. In spa surroundings no double blind trials can be done. The results of follow up of these subjects suggest that non-spa treatment can be used as a control for future studies. Furthermore, the effect of spa water and heated tap water can be used for local residents to exclude the placebo effect of spa atmosphere, associated physiotherapy, or the patient’s want to have evidence based proof for thermal mineral water or spa treatment, or both, we should keep strictly to these rules.

We agree that spa resorts are excellent places for the rehabilitation of patients with rheumatic diseases, especially ankylosing spondylitis. In addition, rehabilitation treatments are available for patients with fibromyalgia, a group who are frequent users of spa facilities. Most of the German, Czech, Slovak, Hungarian, and Russian spas also function as rehabilitation centres. In Hungary, thermal mineral water and spa treatment is a recognised treatment for rheumatic patients, although hard data are lacking. The Hungarian government has launched a 10 year spa programme for the development of Hungarian spas. In addition, the Hungarian National Activity Network of the Bone and Joint Decade was given the task by the minister of health to start evidence-based research about the effect of mineral water and spa treatment. Hungary organises the 34th World Congress of the International Society of Medical Hydrology and Climatology at Budapest and Hévíz in October this year. Attendance by rheumatologists and rehabilitation experts is expected.

We feel it is time to create European co-operation in rheumatology spa and mineral water research. We are convinced that multicentre trials would be suitable to exclude differences in mineral concentration, temperatures, cultures and beliefs. Underdevelopment of evidence-based physiotherapy is partly due to lacking of funding for necessary trials. The situation is similar for spa therapy and spa treatment trials. This problem may be overcome by conducting multicentre trials in many countries. Such trials may result in an evidence-based approach to therapeutic or recreational bathing.
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We thank the Drs Bender, Balint, and Balint for their comments on our study and their additional remarks. We did not intentionally exclude the spas in countries such as the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, and Romania. In our paper we provided some examples of spas in European countries which had found mention in published reports. We are, however, well aware of the central role of spas elsewhere in the world both in the past and the present and their major part in the development of rheumatology as a medical profession.1,2

We fully agree that because spa therapy has an important role in rheumatology in many countries more research should be done and
also support the idea of multicentre studies. We regret, and we have experienced this, that those who finance research projects are extremely reluctant to fund trials in this field. We hope that, as has been suggested, with the creation of European cooperation in rheumatology spa and mineral water research we will be able to provide strong scientific evidence for the effectiveness of spa therapy in the near future.
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BOOK REVIEW

Pathological basis of orthopaedic and rheumatic disease


The author provides an overview of the pathology of orthopaedic and rheumatic diseases which could help pathologists in finding the correct diagnosis and also support clinicians and rheumatic disease oriented researchers in obtaining information about a broad range of distinct pathological disorders.

There are eight chapters starting with skeletal structure development and progressing to injuries, infections, disorders of the skeletal development, and metabolic and other generalised diseases of the skeleton. Final chapters deal with diseases of articular tissues, including osteoarthritis and rheumatoid arthritis, and also describe tumours and tumour-like lesions of bone and soft tissue. The last two chapters covering tumour pathology comprise 40% of the content.

FORTHCOMING EVENTS

7th International Conference on Eicosanoids and Other Bioactive Lipids in Cancer, Inflammation and Related Diseases
14–17 Oct 2002; Nashville, Tennessee, USA
Contact: Lawrence J Marnett, Biochemistry Department, Vanderbilt University, School of Medicine, Nashville TN 37232-0146, USA
Tel: (615) 343 7534
Fax: (615) 343 7329
Website: www.eicosanoids.science.cayne.edu

3rd International Conference on Sex Hormones, Pregnancy, and the Rheumatic Diseases
21–24 Oct 2002; New Orleans, LA, USA
Contact: Anne Parke
Tel: 860 679 8190
Fax: 860 679 1287
Email: parke@nso.uchc.edu

66th American College of Rheumatology AGM
25–29 Oct 2002; New Orleans, USA
Contact: ACR, Ronald F Olejko, Director of Conferences and Meetings, 1800 Century Place, Suite 250, Atlanta, Georgia 30045–4300, USA
Tel: +1 404 633 3777
Fax: +1 404 633 1870
Email: acr@rheumatology.org
Website: www.rheumatology.org

Third International Meeting on Social and Economic Aspects of Osteoporosis and Osteoarthritis
7–9 November, 2002; Barcelona, Spain
Contact: Yolande Piette Communication, Boulevard Kleyer 108, 4000 Liège, Belgium
Tel: 32 4 254 12 25
Fax: 32 4 254 12 90
Email: ypc@compuserve.com

Certifying Examination in Pediatric Rheumatology
18 Nov 2002
Contact: American Board of Pediatrics, 111 Silver Cedar Court, Chapel Hill, NC 27514-1513, USA
Tel: 919 929 0461
Fax: 919 918 7114 or 919 929 9255
Website: www.abp.org

10th APLAR Congress of Rheumatology
1–6 Dec 2002; Bangkok, Thailand
Contact: APLAR 2002 Secretariat
Fax: (615) 343 7534
Email: secretariat@aplar2002.com
Website: www.aplar2002.com

Eleventh Intensive Applied Epidemiology Course for Rheumatologists
24–28 Feb 2003; ARC Epidemiology Unit, Manchester
No previous experience in epidemiology is required. The course is residential and limited to 25 places
Contact: Ms Lisa Mc Clair, ARC Epidemiology Unit, Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PT, UK
Tel: +44 (0)161 275 5993
Fax: +44 (0)161 275 5043
Email: Lisa@fs1.ser.man.ac.uk

Future EULAR congresses
18–21 June 2003; EULAR 2003 Lisbon, Portugal
9–12 June 2004; EULAR 2004 Berlin, Germany
8–11 June 2005; EULAR 2005 Vienna, Austria
21–24 June 2006; EULAR 2006 Amsterdam, The Netherlands