TREATMENT OF ACROMEGALIC OSTEOPATHY IN REAL-LIFE CLINICAL PRACTICE: THE BAAC (Bone Active drugs in ACromegaly) STUDY.

Gherardo Mazziotti^{1,2}, Claudia Battista³, Filippo Maffezzoni⁴, Sabrina Chiloiro⁵, Emanuele Ferrante⁶, Nunzia Prencipe⁷, Ludovica Grasso⁸, Federico Gatto⁹, Roberto Olivetti¹⁰, Maura Arosio^{6,11}, Marco Barale⁷, Antonio Bianchi⁵, Miriam Cellini¹, Iacopo Chiodini¹², Laura De Marinis⁵, Giulia Del Sindaco¹¹, Carolina Di Somma⁸, Alberto Ferlin¹³, Ezio Ghigo⁷, Antonella Giampietro⁵, Silvia Grottoli⁷, Elisabetta Lavezzi¹, Giovanna Mantovani^{6,11}, Emanuela Morenghi^{2,14}, Rosario Pivonello⁸, Teresa Porcelli¹⁵, Massimo Procopio⁷, Flavia Pugliese³, Alfredo Scillitani³, Andrea Gerardo Lania^{1,2*}.

¹Endocrinology, Diabetology and Medical Andrology Unit, Osteoporosis and Metabolic Bone Disease Section, Humanitas Clinical and Research Center, IRCCS, Rozzano-Milan, Italy; ²Department of Biomedical Sciences, Humanitas University, Milan, Italy; ³Unit of Endocrinology, "Casa Sollievo della Sofferenza" Hospital, IRCCS, San Giovanni Rotondo (FG), Italy; ⁴Endocrinology and Metabolism, Department of Medicine, ASST Spedali Civili Brescia, Italy; ⁵Pituitary Unit, Department of Endocrinology and Metabolism, Fondazione Policlinico "A. Gemelli", IRCCS – Universita' Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Rome, Italy; ⁶Endocrinology Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Ca' Granda Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico, Milan, Italy; ⁷Division of Endocrinology, Diabetology and Metabolism, Department of Medical Science, University of Turin, Italy; ⁸Endocrinology Section, Department of Clinical and Surgical Medicine, University Federico II of Naples, Italy; ⁹Endocrinology Unit, IRCCS San Martino Hospital, Genoa, Italy; ¹⁰Endocrinology Unit, ASST Carlo Poma Hospital, Mantua, Italy; ¹¹Department of Clinical Sciences and Community Health, University of Milan, Italy;

journals.permissions@oup.com jc.2020-00937

 $[\]ensuremath{\mathbb{C}}$ Endocrine Society 2020. All rights reserved. For permissions, please e-mail:

https://academic.oup.com/endocrinesociety/pages/Author_Guidelines for Accepted Manuscript disclaimer and additional information.

¹²Unit for Bone Metabolism Diseases and Diabetes & Laboratory of Endocrine and Metabolic Research, Istituto Auxologico Italiano, IRCCS, Milan, Italy. ¹³Endocrinology and Metabolism, Department of Clinical and Experimental Sciences, University of Brescia, Italy; ¹⁴Biostatistics Unit, Humanitas Clinical and Research Center, IRCCS, Rozzano-Milan, Italy. ¹⁵Endocrinology, Montichiari Hospital, ASST Spedali Civili Brescia.

*co-corresponding authorship.

Disclosure Statement

G. Mazziotti received consultant fees from Ipsen, Novartis Farma and Eli Lilly. A. Lania received grants and consultant fees from Ipsen, Novartis and Pfizer. The other Authors don't have conflict of interest that is relevant to the subject matter or materials included in this Work.

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

Address correspondence to:

Andrea Gerardo Lania, MD, PhD

Endocrinology, Diabetology and Andrology Unit, Humanitas Clinical and Research Center, IRCCS, Via Alessandro Manzoni, 56, 20089, Rozzano, Milan, Italy

E-mail andrea.lania@humanitas.it

Abstract

Background. Vertebral fractures (VFs) are a frequent complication of acromegaly, but no studies have been so far published on effectiveness of anti-osteoporotic drugs in this clinical setting.

Objective. To evaluate whether in real-life clinical practice bone-active drugs may reduce the risk of VFs in patients with active or controlled acromegaly.

Study design. Retrospective-longitudinal study including 9 tertiary care Endocrine Units.

Patients and Methods. Two-hundred-forty-eight patients with acromegaly (104 males; mean age 56.0 ± 13.6 years) were evaluated for prevalent and incident VFs by quantitative morphometric approach. Bone-active agents were used in 52 patients (20.97%) and the median period of follow-up was 48 months (range 12-132).

Results. During the follow-up, 65 patients (26.21%) developed incident VFs in relationship with pre-existing VFs (odds ratio (OR) 3.75; p<0.001), duration of active acromegaly (OR 1.01; p=0.04), active acromegaly at the study entry (OR 2.48; p=0.007) and treated hypoadrenalism (OR 2.50; p=0.005). In the entire population, treatment with bone active drugs did not have a significant effect on incident VFs (p=0.82). However, in a sensitive analysis restricted to patients with active acromegaly at the study entry (*111 cases*), treatment with bone-active drugs was associated with a lower risk of incident VFs (OR 0.11; p=0.004), independently of prevalent VFs (OR 7.65; p<0.001) and treated hypoadrenalism (OR 3.86; p=0.007).

Conclusions. Bone-active drugs may prevent VFs in patients with active acromegaly.

Key-words: acromegaly – vertebral fractures – osteoporosis – bisphosphonates – teriparatide – denosumab- bone active drugs –

Introduction

Skeletal fragility is an emerging complication of acromegaly, characterized by increased bone turnover, profound abnormalities in bone microstructure and high risk of vertebral fractures (VFs) [1]. VFs were reported in 30-40% of patients with acromegaly in close relationship with duration of exposure to growth hormone (GH) hypersecretion, hypogonadism and pre-existing VFs [2]. VFs may be a clinically relevant complication of acromegaly due to their potential impact on morbidity and quality of life [3]. As a matter of fact, acromegalic subjects with VFs may be predisposed to have kyphosis, sagittal spine imbalance and back pain [4 5]. However, the management of skeletal fragility in acromegaly is a clinical challenge since VFs may occur even in presence of normal bone mineral density (BMD) [4 6], the biochemical control of acromegaly does not always normalize the risk of fractures [7 8] and some drugs used for treatment of acromegaly may produce effects on skeletal health independently of GH hypersecretion [9]. Furthermore, differently from the other forms of secondary osteoporosis in which bone-active drugs can improve BMD and decrease the risk of fractures [1 10], the effectiveness of anti-osteoporotic therapies in acromegalic osteopathy has not been so far investigated [11].

In this retrospective-multicenter study reflecting the real-life clinical practice, we aimed at evaluating for the first time whether treatment with bone-active drugs may reduce the risk of VFs in patients with active and controlled acromegaly.

Materials and Methods

Subjects and Protocol

The study included 248 patients with acromegaly (144 females, 104 males) attending nine tertiary care Endocrine Units in the period between 2003 and 2019. The inclusion criteria were: 1) diagnosis of acromegaly; 2) age older than 18 years; 3) availability of at least two spine X-rays; 3) full availability of data on diagnosis, treatment, and clinical outcome of acromegaly; 4) follow-up of at least 12 months. Exclusion criteria: 1) use of bone-active drugs (except of calcium and vitamin D) in the 12 months prior to study entry; 2) untreated primary hyperparathyroidism; 3) untreated hyperthyroidism; 4) neoplastic disease in progression; 5) surgical intervention of the spine; 5) clinical history of spine trauma. The primary end-point of the study was the incidence of VFs during treatment with bone active drugs vs. no-treatment in patients with active or controlled acromegaly. As secondary endpoints, we explored the impact of prevalent VFs, hypopituitarism and diabetes mellitus on risk of incident VFs.

Bone active-drugs were prescribed in each Endocrine Unit according to the guidelines for treatment of primary osteoporosis and the Italian reimbursement criteria in force during the study period.

Acromegaly was diagnosed by failure of suppression of serum GH concentrations below 1 ng/mL after a 75-g oral glucose load together with fasting plasma IGF-I concentrations above the normal ranges for age [12]. Patients under somatostatin receptor ligands (SRLs) treatment were evaluated by measurement of serum random GH and IGF-I, those under pegvisomant were evaluated by serum IGF-I alone, whereas patients treated with neurosurgery alone were evaluated by GH after a 75-g oral glucose load and serum random GH and IGF-I [13]. Acromegaly was defined as controlled if the IGF-I values were in the reference ranges for age and, in patients under SRLs and after neurosurgery, random GH was below 1.0 ng/mL. When the 75-g oral glucose load was performed, the GH values at or below 0.4 ng/mL were considered expression of cured disease [13]. Patients with discordant GH and IGF-I values were considered controlled by therapy if IGF-I values were in the normal range for age [14]. The biochemical evaluation of acromegaly was performed in each Endocrine Unit measuring GH and IGF-I by assays in use during the study period. Specifically, GH and IGF-I were measured by a chemiluminescent immunometric assay (Immulite 2000, Siemens Healthcare Diagnostics Products, UK) in 240 patients, whereas the remaining 8 patients were evaluated using radio-immunoassay (SM-C-RIA-CT, DIAsource ImmunoAssays, Belgium) and immunoradiometric assay (IRMA GH, Beckman Coulter, Czech Republic) for IGF-I and GH measurements, respectively. In all patients, the duration of active disease was estimated on the basis of clinical history, i.e., when the patient recalled appearance of signs and symptoms of the disease, and duration of uncontrolled disease during medical treatment.

During the study period, all patients were evaluated and managed for coexistent hypopituitarism [15]. Glucocorticoid deficiency was defined by basal serum cortisol values lower than 3 μ g/dL or by 1 μ g corticotrophin-stimulated cortisol below 18 μ g/dL. Hypothyroidism was defined by serum free T4 below the reference ranges. In men, hypogonadism was diagnosed by measuring morning total testosterone levels; in those patients, in whom total testosterone concentrations were near the lower limit of the normal range, sex-hormone binding protein was measured for calculating the bioavailable testosterone [16]. In women, hypogonadism was defined by irregular or absent menstrual cycles. Patients with diagnosis of hypogonadism under chronic replacement treatment with sex steroids were considered eugonadal. For the study purposes, untreated hypogonadism and post-menopausal status were considered together in the evaluation of determinants of VFs. The presence of diabetes mellitus was defined by fasting plasma glucose values \geq 126 mg/dl or 2-h plasma glucose values \geq 200 mg/dl during 75-g oral glucose load [17]. This

latter test was performed in patients with fasting plasma glucose values below 126 mg/dl and before starting SRLs treatment. For patients without history of diabetes undergoing treatment with SRLs, the diagnosis of diabetes was made only by the measurement of fasting glucose.

Assessment of VFs

VFs were detected on lateral spine X-rays using a qualitative evaluation of vertebral shape and quantitative morphometric assessment. Using a cursor, six points were marked on each vertebral body to describe vertebral shape. Anterior (Ha), middle (Hm), and posterior (Hp) vertebral heights were measured and height ratios (Ha/Hp, Ha/Hm, Hm/Hp) were calculated for each vertebra from T4 to L4. Prevalent and incident VFs were assessed on the spine X-rays at baseline and follow-up, respectively. According to the quantitative morphometric method [18], the fractures were defined as mild, moderate, and severe on the basis of height ratio decreases of 20–25%, 25–40%, and more than 40% respectively. Spine deformity index (SDI) was calculated by summing the score of each vertebral fracture assigned on the basis of the grade of fracture (score 1, 2, or 3 for mild, moderate, and severe fractures, respectively) [19]. Incident VFs were defined as new fractures (from no VF to any grade of VF) between baseline and the follow-up. Prevalent and incident VFs were assessed by one observer for each Endocrine Unit.

This multicenter retrospective observational study was approved by the local Ethical Committees (EC) (EC of Mantova, Cremona and Lodi; EC of Brescia; EC of Casa Sollievo della Sofferenza, IRCCS, San Giovanni Rotondo; EC of Humanitas Clinical and Research Center, IRCCS, Rozzano; EC of Fondazione Policlinico Universitario "Agostino Gemelli", Rome; EC City of Health and Sciences University Hospital of Turin; EC of Milano Area 2; EC Regionale, Regione Liguria) and the patients gave their consent to use the clinical data for research purposes.

Statistical analysis

Data were described as number and percentage, or mean and standard deviation, as appropriate. Associations of variables with anti-osteoporotic therapies were explored. Association with possible risk factors for VFs was explored with logistic regression analysis. All risk factors with a p value under 0.25 were then submitted to a backward multivariable logistic regression analysis. A p value less than 0.05 was considered as significant. A sensitive analysis of patients with or without active acromegaly at the study entry was also performed. All analyses were made with Stata15.

Results

The study included 248 patients with acromegaly, mean age 56.0 ± 13.6 , 104 (41.94%) males. **Table 1** shows the clinical data at study entry. Active acromegaly, hypoadrenalism, hypothyroidism, hypogonadism and diabetes mellitus were found in 111 (44.8%), 79 (31.98%), 88 (35.50%), 92 (37.10%) and 80 (32.30%), respectively. At the study entry, 78 patients (31.45%) had VFs, which were either moderate/severe or multiple in 42 cases. In patients with prevalent VFs, the median SDI was 2 (range: 1-16).

Outcome of acromegaly during the follow-up

Patients were followed-up for a median period of 48 months (range: 12-132). Among 137 patients with baseline cured/controlled acromegaly, 132 patients remained so for the entire study period (36 patients cured by neurosurgery alone, 65 treated with SRLs, 8 with pegvisomant, 2 with cabergoline and 21 with combination therapies), whereas 5 patients (one patient after neurosurgery, 1 under pegvisomant and 3 under SRLs therapy) showed active disease at the end of follow-up. Among 111 patients with active acromegaly at the study

entry, 77 patients had a controlled disease at the end of follow-up (19 with neurosurgery alone, 39 with SRLs, 3 with pegvisomant and 16 with combination therapies), whereas 34 patients remained with active disease notwithstanding the treatments.

During the follow-up, all patients with hypothyroidism and hypoadrenalism were treated with l-thyroxine and cortisone acetate or hydrocortisone, respectively. Among patients with hypogonadism at study entry, 33 patients were treated with sex steroids during the follow-up whereas 59 patients remained with untreated hypogonadism. Patients with diabetes mellitus were treated with several anti-diabetic drugs (metformin, sulfonylurea, repaglinide, incretins, and insulin).

Skeletal outcome during the follow-up

Fifty-two patients (20.97%) started treatment with bone-active agents (30 with oral alendronate 70 mg/week, 9 with oral risedronate 35 mg/week, 1 with intravenous zoledronate 5 mg /yearly, 3 with subcutaneous denosumab 60 mg every 6 months, 3 with subcutaneous teriparatide 20 μ g/day, 2 with oral raloxifene 60 g/day, one with oral strontium ranelate 2 gr/day and 3 with sequential therapies). One-hundred-ninety-two patients (77.40%) received vitamin D3 (in combination with calcium in 67 cases, alone in 125 cases). One patient (0.40%) was treated with calcium supplements without vitamin D. Doses of vitamin D3 ranged from 800 to 4000 units per day, whereas the daily doses of calcium were between 500 and 1200 mg.

Patients undergoing treatment with bone-active drugs were significantly older $(65.0\pm10.5 \text{ years vs. } 53.6\pm13.4 \text{ years; } p<0.001)$, received more frequently calcium supplements (50.0% vs. 21.43%; p<0.001), had more frequently VFs at the study entry (61.54% vs. 23.47%; p<0.001) and diabetes mellitus (46.15% vs. 28.57%; p=0.016), were more frequently with untreated hypogonadism or in post-menopausal period (82.69% vs.

57.65%; p=0.001) and had lower prevalence of treated hypoadrenalism (19.23% vs. 35.38%; p=0.026) as compared to patients who were not treated with bone-active agents, without significant differences in sex (p=0.229), rate of active acromegaly at the study entry (p=0.476), duration of active acromegaly (p=0.070), duration of follow-up (p=0.104), treated hypothyroidism (p=0.424) and treatment with vitamin D3 (p=0.163).

During the follow-up, 65 patients (26.21%) developed new VFs. In these patients, the median SDI was 3 (range: 1-18). Patients experiencing incident VFs had more frequently prevalent VFs, treated hypoadrenalism, active acromegaly and longer duration of active disease as compared to patients who did not fracture (**Table 2**). In the multivariate logistic regression analysis, incident VFs maintained the significant associations with prevalent VFs, duration of active acromegaly, active acromegaly at the study entry and treated hypoadrenalism (**Table 3**).

In the entire population, treatment with bone active drugs did not induce any significant effect on incident VFs (**Table 3**). However, when the analysis was restricted to patients with active acromegaly at the study entry, treatment with bone-active drugs was associated with lower incidence of VFs as compared to untreated patients (14.3% vs. 41.1%; p=0.021) (**Figure 1**). In this subgroup of patients, treatment with bone active drugs maintained the significant association with incident VFs (OR 0.11; 95%CI 0.02-0.50; p=0.004) independently of prevalent VFs (OR 7.65; 95%CI 2.55-22.95; p<0.001),) and treated hypoadrenalism (OR 3.86; 95%CI 1.46-10.22; p=0.007). In patients with controlled disease at the study entry, incident VFs resulted to occur more frequently in treated vs. untreated patients with bone active drugs (32.26% vs. 14.15%; p=0.022) (**Figure 1**). The result did not change when the patient with controlled acromegaly under treated with strontium ranelate was excluded from the analysis (data not shown). However, patients with controlled acromegaly receiving bone-active drugs were significantly older (65 years, range

42-88 vs. 57 years, range: 27-80; p<0.001), had more frequently untreated hypogonadism or were in post-menopausal period (83.87% vs. 57.55%; p=0.02) and showed more frequently prevalent VFs (58.06% vs. 21.70%; p<0.001) as compared to patients who were not treated with bone-active drugs. In the multivariate analysis, incident VFs resulted to be significantly associated with prevalent VFs (OR 3.14, 95%CI 1.23-8.04; p=0.017), untreated hypogonadism or post-menopausal status (OR 4.00, 95%CI 1.19-13.45, p=0.025), but not with anti-osteoporotic drugs (OR 2.22; 95%CI 0.76-6.45; p=0.145).

Discussion

In this retrospective study, anti-osteoporotic therapies resulted to be effective in decreasing the risk of VFs when acromegaly was active, independently of pre-existing VFs and duration of active disease. This effect was not observed in patients with controlled acromegaly, in whom incident VFs were correlated with pre-existing VFs and hypogonadism.

Several studies have consistently demonstrated that patients with acromegaly develop skeletal fragility with high risk of VFs [11]. In this multicenter study including for the first time a large population of acromegaly patients evaluated for skeletal health, incident VFs were reported in about one-quarter of patients after a median period of 4 years and, in agreement with previous observations provided by smaller longitudinal studies [7 8 20], the fractures developed mainly in patients with pre-existing fractures and exposed to longer duration of active acromegaly. This latter finding is consistent with the concept that VFs are a direct consequence of GH hypersecretion which causes increase in bone turnover, bone loss and profound alterations in bone structure [1]. The close relationship between prevalent and incident VFs in our patients with active and controlled acromegaly is a further proof that morphometric VFs are markers of skeletal fragility, similarly to patients with primary osteoporosis in whom a single VF increases more than three times the risk to develop further fractures [21]. From this point of view, the morphometric assessment of VFs even in absence of specific symptoms and signs may be the cornerstone in the management of skeletal fragility in patients with acromegaly [22].

Consistently with previous reports of skeletal fragility in hypogonadal patients with acromegaly [23-25], our study showed that even in the real-life clinical practice untreated hypogonadism may be a risk factor of VFs, specifically in patients with controlled/cured acromegaly. This finding suggests that a normal sex hormone milieu is likely required to guarantee the recovery of a normal skeletal strength after control of GH hypersecretion. As a matter of fact, the interplay among different neuroendocrine axes is crucial for maintaining the skeletal health in physiology and pathophysiology.

An interesting finding of this study was the relationship between incident VFs and central hypoadrenalism. The association resulted to be statistically significant in patients with active acromegaly and was independent of pre-existing VFs. The reasons of this association were not clarified by our retrospective study, but it is reasonable to hypothesize that glucocorticoid replacement therapy may have played a role. In fact, there is evidence that in real-life clinical practice several patients with hypoadrenalism may be overtreated with possible alterations in several clinical end-points [26]. Noteworthy, higher doses of either cortisone acetate or hydrocortisone were shown to be associated with bone loss and higher risk of fractures [27-29]. Besides the pathophysiological aspects, the results of this study provide a rationale for proactively and comprehensively evaluating skeletal health in patients with coexistent active acromegaly and hypoadrenalism.

A single clinical study reported an association between VFs and diabetes mellitus in male patients with controlled acromegaly [30]. Such an association was not confirmed in this study, likely because of potential biases in the retrospective enrolment of the patients.

This study evaluated for the first time the effectiveness of anti-osteoporotic drugs in patients with acromegaly. Notwithstanding the low awareness of acromegalic osteopathy in real-life clinical practice [31], bone-active agents were used in 20% of patients with acromegaly evaluated for skeletal fragility. Most of treated patients received drugs targeting osteoclastogenesis and bone resorption (i.e., mainly bisphosphonates) that are expected to be beneficial for the skeleton by decreasing the activation frequency, refilling the remodeling space and increasing mineralization. Using these drugs, the fracture risk significantly decreased only in patients with active acromegaly, whereas anti-osteoporotic therapies did not show to be effective when acromegaly was controlled. These results are consistent with the concept that increased bone resorption is the main mechanism of bone loss and skeletal fragility in patients exposed to GH hypersecretion [32 33]. However, the absent effectiveness of anti-resorptive drugs in controlled acromegaly may reflect the hypothesis that in this setting the impairment of osteoblastogenesis may be the predominant mechanism of altered bone microarchitecture and high risk of fractures [24 34-38]. One could argue that antiresorptive drugs in patients with controlled acromegaly may prevent the recovery of osteoblast function, based on the concept that osteoclasts are a source of bone formationstimulating factors by which these cells may promote osteoblastogenesis and bone formation [39].

This study has limitations. Weaknesses of the study include the retrospective design and the variety of anti osteoporotic drugs used, mainly due to the multicenter nature of the study. The retrospective design and the variable duration of follow-up did not allow to calculate the exact timing of VF development and to build survival curves. However, the duration of follow-up between fractured and non-fractured patients was comparable suggesting that the risk of VFs might not be time-dependent provided that acromegaly was controlled. This study reflected the management of acromegalic osteopathy in the real-life clinical practice and the assignment of anti-osteoporotic drugs was not randomized. Therefore, the distribution of anti-resorptive and anabolic drugs in the treated patients did not allow testing the possible differences between these drugs in preventing VFs. Moreover, the lack of randomization may have contributed to the unexpected high incidence of VFs in patients with controlled acromegaly treated with bone-active drugs. As a matter of fact, antiosteoporotic drugs were given to patients with more severe osteoporosis (i.e., those with preexisting VFs) and in those with independent risk factors of fractures (e.g., untreated hypogonadism or post-menopause). Another limitation of this study was related to the noncentralized assessment of VFs, which may have caused heterogeneous results among the different centers involved in the study. To minimize this potential bias, a single operator in each center performed the morphometric assessment of VFs and only new fractures (i.e. from no VF to any grade of VF) were considered as incident fractures, excluding from the analyses the progression of pre-existing VFs (i.e., from grade mild/moderate to moderate/severe fractures) which require more precision in vertebral height measurements. The lack of centralization in hormonal assays might cause pitfalls in defining active and controlled acromegaly across the centers, although the use of a chemiluminescent immunometric assay in more than 96% of patients may have limited the heterogeneity of biochemical data.

In conclusion, this large study provided first convincing evidence that drugs targeting osteoclastogenesis and bone resorption may be effective in preventing VFs in patients with active acromegaly.

References

- Mazziotti G, Frara S, Giustina A. Pituitary Diseases and Bone. Endocrine reviews 2018;39(4):440-88 doi:
 10.1210/er.2018-00005[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- Mazziotti G, Biagioli E, Maffezzoni F, et al. Bone turnover, bone mineral density, and fracture risk in acromegaly: a meta-analysis. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2015;100(2):384-94 doi: 10.1210/jc.2014-2937[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- Ben-Shlomo A, Sheppard MC, Stephens JM, Pulgar S, Melmed S. Clinical, quality of life, and economic
 value of acromegaly disease control. Pituitary 2011;14(3):284-94 doi: 10.1007/s11102-011-0310 7[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 4. Wassenaar MJ, Biermasz NR, Hamdy NA, et al. High prevalence of vertebral fractures despite normal
 bone mineral density in patients with long-term controlled acromegaly. European journal of
 endocrinology 2011;164(4):475-83 doi: 10.1530/eje-10-1005[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 5. de Azevedo Oliveira B, Araujo B, Dos Santos TM, et al. The acromegalic spine: fractures, deformities and
 spinopelvic balance. Pituitary 2019;22(6):601-06 doi: 10.1007/s11102-019-00991-7[published
 Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 6. Brzana J, Yedinak CG, Hameed N, Fleseriu M. FRAX score in acromegaly: does it tell the whole story?
 Clinical endocrinology 2014;80(4):614-6 doi: 10.1111/cen.12262[published Online First: Epub
 Date]|.
- 7. Claessen KM, Kroon HM, Pereira AM, et al. Progression of vertebral fractures despite long-term biochemical control of acromegaly: a prospective follow-up study. The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism 2013;98(12):4808-15 doi: 10.1210/jc.2013-2695[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- Mazziotti G, Bianchi A, Porcelli T, et al. Vertebral fractures in patients with acromegaly: a 3-year
 prospective study. The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism 2013;98(8):3402-10 doi:
 10.1210/jc.2013-1460[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 9. Chiloiro S, Giampietro A, Frara S, et al. Effects of Pegvisomant and Pasireotide LAR on Vertebral Fractures
 in Acromegaly Resistant to First-generation SRLs. The Journal of clinical endocrinology and
 metabolism 2020;105(3) doi: 10.1210/clinem/dgz054[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- Mirza F, Canalis E. Management of endocrine disease: Secondary osteoporosis: pathophysiology and
 management. European journal of endocrinology 2015;173(3):R131-51 doi: 10.1530/eje-15 0118[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 11. Mazziotti G, Lania A, Canalis E. MANAGEMENT OF ENDOCRINE DISEASE: Bone disorders associated with
 acromegaly: mechanisms and treatment. European journal of endocrinology 2019 doi: 10.1530/eje 19-0184[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 34 12. Giustina A, Barkan A, Casanueva FF, et al. Criteria for cure of acromegaly: a consensus statement. The
 35 Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism 2000;85(2):526-9 doi:
 36 10.1210/jcem.85.2.6363[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 37 13. Giustina A, Chanson P, Bronstein MD, et al. A consensus on criteria for cure of acromegaly. The Journal
 38 of clinical endocrinology and metabolism 2010;95(7):3141-8 doi: 10.1210/jc.2009-2670[published
 39 Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 14. Katznelson L, Laws ER, Jr., Melmed S, et al. Acromegaly: an endocrine society clinical practice guideline.
 The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism 2014;99(11):3933-51 doi: 10.1210/jc.2014 2700[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 15. Fleseriu M, Hashim IA, Karavitaki N, et al. Hormonal Replacement in Hypopituitarism in Adults: An
 Endocrine Society Clinical Practice Guideline. The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism
 2016;101(11):3888-921 doi: 10.1210/jc.2016-2118[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 46 16. Bhasin S, Cunningham GR, Hayes FJ, et al. Testosterone therapy in men with androgen deficiency
 47 syndromes: an Endocrine Society clinical practice guideline. The Journal of clinical endocrinology

- 48
 and metabolism 2010;95(6):2536-59 doi: 10.1210/jc.2009-2354[published Online First: Epub

 49
 Date]|.
- 50 17. Diagnosis and classification of diabetes mellitus. Diabetes care 2011;34 Suppl 1:S62-9 doi:
 51 10.2337/dc11-S062[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 18. Engelke K, Stampa B, Steiger P, Fuerst T, Genant HK. Automated quantitative morphometry of vertebral
 heights on spinal radiographs: comparison of a clinical workflow tool with standard 6-point
 morphometry. Arch Osteoporos 2019;**14**(1):18 doi: 10.1007/s11657-019-0577-2[published Online
 First: Epub Date]].
- 19. Crans GG, Genant HK, Krege JH. Prognostic utility of a semiquantitative spinal deformity index. Bone
 2005;37(2):175-9 doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2005.04.003[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 20. Chiloiro S, Mazziotti G, Giampietro A, et al. Effects of pegvisomant and somatostatin receptor ligands on
 incidence of vertebral fractures in patients with acromegaly. Pituitary 2018;21(3):302-08 doi:
 10.1007/s11102-018-0873-7[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- Prince RL, Lewis JR, Lim WH, et al. Adding Lateral Spine Imaging for Vertebral Fractures to Densitometric
 Screening: Improving Ascertainment of Patients at High Risk of Incident Osteoporotic Fractures.
 Journal of bone and mineral research : the official journal of the American Society for Bone and
 Mineral Research 2019;34(2):282-89 doi: 10.1002/jbmr.3595[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 65 22. Giustina A, Barkan A, Beckers A, et al. A Consensus on the Diagnosis and Treatment of Acromegaly
 66 Comorbidities: An Update. The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism 2020;105(4) doi:
 67 10.1210/clinem/dgz096[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- Scillitani A, Chiodini I, Carnevale V, et al. Skeletal involvement in female acromegalic subjects: the
 effects of growth hormone excess in amenorrheal and menstruating patients. J Bone Miner Res
 1997;12(10):1729-36 doi: 10.1359/jbmr.1997.12.10.1729[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- Pattista C, Chiodini I, Muscarella S, et al. Spinal volumetric trabecular bone mass in acromegalic
 patients: a longitudinal study. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf) 2009;70(3):378-82 doi: 10.1111/j.1365 2265.2008.03322.x[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 25. Mazziotti G, Bianchi A, Bonadonna S, et al. Prevalence of vertebral fractures in men with acromegaly. J
 Clin Endocrinol Metab 2008;93(12):4649-55 doi: 10.1210/jc.2008-0791[published Online First: Epub
 Date]|.
- 26. Mazziotti G, Formenti AM, Frara S, et al. MANAGEMENT OF ENDOCRINE DISEASE: Risk of overtreatment
 in patients with adrenal insufficiency: current and emerging aspects. European journal of
 endocrinology 2017;**177**(5):R231-r48 doi: 10.1530/eje-17-0154[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 27. Peacey S, Yuan Guo C, Eastell R, Weetman A. Optimization of glucocorticoid replacement therapy: the
 long-term effect on bone mineral density. Clinical endocrinology 1999;50:815-17 doi:
 10.1046/j.1365-2265.1999.00787.x[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- Schulz J, Frey K, Cooper M, et al. Reduction in daily hydrocortisone dose improves bone health in
 primary adrenal insufficiency. European journal of endocrinology 2016;174:531-38 doi:
 10.1530/eje-15-1096[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- Mazziotti G, Porcelli T, Bianchi A, et al. Glucocorticoid replacement therapy and vertebral fractures in
 hypopituitary adult males with GH deficiency. European journal of endocrinology 2010;163(1):15 20 doi: 10.1530/eje-10-0125[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 30. Mazziotti G, Gola M, Bianchi A, et al. Influence of diabetes mellitus on vertebral fractures in men with
 acromegaly. Endocrine 2011;40(1):102-8 doi: 10.1007/s12020-011-9486-x[published Online First:
 Epub Date]|.
- 92 31. Petrossians P, Daly AF, Natchev E, et al. Acromegaly at diagnosis in 3173 patients from the Liege
 93 Acromegaly Survey (LAS) Database. Endocrine-related cancer 2017;24(10):505-18 doi: 10.1530/erc 94 17-0253[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- S2. Constantin T, Tangpricha V, Shah R, et al. Calcium and Bone Turnover Markers in Acromegaly: A
 Prospective, Controlled Study. The Journal of clinical endocrinology and metabolism
 2017;102(7):2416-24 doi: 10.1210/jc.2016-3693[published Online First: Epub Date]|.

- 98 33. Ueland T. GH/IGF-I and bone resorption in vivo and in vitro. European journal of endocrinology
 99 2005;152(3):327-32 doi: 10.1530/eje.1.01874[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 10034. Malgo F, Hamdy NA, Rabelink TJ, et al. Bone material strength index as measured by impact101microindentation is altered in patients with acromegaly. European journal of endocrinology1022017;176(3):339-47 doi: 10.1530/eje-16-0808[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 35. Godang K, Olarescu NC, Bollerslev J, Heck A. Treatment of acromegaly increases BMD but reduces
 trabecular bone score: a longitudinal study. European journal of endocrinology 2016;175(2):155-64
 doi: 10.1530/eje-16-0340[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 106 36. Kuzma M, Vanuga P, Sagova I, et al. Non-invasive DXA-derived bone structure assessment of 107 acromegaly patients: a cross-sectional study. European journal of endocrinology 2019;180(3):201-111 doi: 10.1530/eje-18-0881[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 37. Godang K, Lekva T, Normann KR, et al. Hip Structure Analyses in Acromegaly: Decrease of Cortical Bone Thickness After Treatment: A Longitudinal Cohort Study. JBMR plus 2019;3(12):e10240 doi: 10.1002/jbm4.10240[published Online First: Epub Date]|.
- 38. Valenti MT, Mottes M, Cheri S, et al. Runx2 overexpression compromises bone quality in acromegalic
 patients. Endocrine-related cancer 2018;25(3):269-77 doi: 10.1530/erc-17-0523[published Online
 First: Epub Date]|.
- 39. Weivoda MM, Chew CK, Monroe DG, et al. Identification of osteoclast-osteoblast coupling factors in humans reveals links between bone and energy metabolism. Nature communications 2020;11(1):87 doi: 10.1038/s41467-019-14003-6[published Online First: Epub Date]].
- 118

119

x cet

120 Legend to tables and figure

- Table 1: Demographical and clinical data of 248 patients with acromegaly at the study entry.
 Categorical data were presented as frequencies, whereas continuous data were presented as either mean±SD or median and ranges, according to the data distribution.
- Table 2: Clinical data of patients experiencing incident vertebral fractures (VFs) during the follow up as compared to those who did not fracture. Categorical data were presented as
 frequencies and were compared by the Chi-square test. Continuous data were presented
 as either mean±SD or median and ranges, and the comparisons were performed by
- 128parameter and non-parameter tests, respectively.

Accer

- Table 3: Results of univariate and multivariate logistic regression analyses assessing the
 determinants of incident vertebral fractures (VFs) in the whole population of 248
 acromegalic patients.
- Figure 1: Incidence of vertebral fractures in acromegaly patients stratified for activity of diseaseand treatment with bone-active drugs.

134

135 **Table 1.**

Variables	
Age (years)	56.0 ± 13.6
Sex (M/F)	104/144
Therapies for acromegaly	
Neurosurgery alone	58 (23.39%)
SRLs	124 (50.00%)
Pegvisomant	14 (5.65%)
Cabergoline	2 (0.81%)
Combination therapies	50 (20.16%)
Active acromegaly	111 (44.80%)
Duration of active disease (months)	48 (12 – 186)
Hypothyroidism	88 (35.50%)
Hypoadrenalism	79 (31.90%)
Hypogonadism	92 (37.10%)
Post-menopausal status	97 (39.11%)
Diabetes mellitus	80 (32.30%)
Prevalent total VFs	78 (31.45%)
Prevalent multiple/moderate-severe VFs	42 (16.93%)
Baselines SDI in fractured patients	2 (1-16)

F, females; M, males; SDI, spine deformity index; SRLs, somatostatin receptor ligands; VFs,
vertebral fractures

138

139	Table 2

	Incident VFs			
	Yes	No	р	
Ν	65	183		
Age (years)	56.9 ± 13.9	55.7 ± 13.6	0.484	
Sex (M/F)	33/32	71/112	0.093	
Active acromegaly at the study entry	40 (61.54%)	71 (38.80%)	0.002	
Active acromegaly at the follow-up	15 (23.08%)	24 (13.11%)	0.058	
Duration of active acromegaly	62 (12-186)	36 (12-180)	0.001	
(months)				
Treated hypoadrenalism	31 (47.69%)	48 (26.37%)	0.002	
Treated hypothyroidism	21 (32.31%)	67 (36.61%)	0.533	
Untreated hypogonadism + post-	45 (69.23%)	111 (60.66%)	0.219	
menopausal status				
Diabetes mellitus	25 (38.46%)	55 (30.05%)	0.213	
Prevalent VFs	34 (52.31%)	44 (24.04%)	< 0.001	
Use of bone-active agents	13 (20.00%)	39 (21.31%)	0.823	
Use of calcium supplements	16 (24.62%)	52 (28.42%)	0.555	
Use of vitamin D3	52 (80.00%)	140 (76.50%)	0.562	
Follow up (months)	48 (12-120)	48 (12-132)	0.922	

140 F, females; M, males; VFs, vertebral fractures

141

142

	UNIVARIATE ANALYSIS		MULTIVARIATE ANALYSIS	
	OR (95% CI)	P-values	OR (95% CI)	P-values
Age	1.01 (0.99–1.03)	0.528		
Sex (M vs. F)	1.63 (0.92–2.88)	0.094		
Active acromegaly at the	2.52 (1.41–4.51)	0.002	2.48 (1.29–4.79)	0.007
study entry			•.0	
Duration of active	1.01 (1.00–1.01)	0.008	1.01 (1.00–1.01)	0.042
acromegaly				
Treated hypoadrenalism	2.55 (1.41-4.58)	0.002	2.50 (1.31-4.77)	0.005
Treated hypothyroidism	0.83 (0.45–1.51)	0.534		
Untreated hypogonadism +	1.46 (0.80–2.67)	0.220		
post-menopausal status				
Diabetes mellitus	1.45 (0.81–2.63)	0.214		
Prevalent VFs	3.46 (1.91–6.27)	< 0.001	3.75 (1.97–7.14)	< 0.001
Bone-active drugs	0.92 (0.46–1.86)	0.823		
Calcium supplements	0.82 (0.43–1.57)	0.556		
Vitamin D3	1.23 (0.61–2.47)	0.563		

144 CI, confidence interval; F, females; M, males; OR, odds ratio; VFs, vertebral fractures

146

Figure 1

