UC Davis

Orthopaedic Surgery

Title

Impact of Fragility Fracture Program on Osteoporosis Treatment

Permalink

https://escholarship.org/uc/item/6jf9z067

Authors

Van, Benjamin W Pina, Dagoberto Haffner, Max R et al.

Publication Date

2023

Data Availability

The data associated with this publication are not available for this reason: NA



Department of Orthopaedic Surgery



Impact of Fragility Fracture Program on Osteoporosis Treatment

Benjamin W. Van, BS, Dagoberto Piña, BS, Max R. Haffner, MD, Hai V. Le, MD, MPH Department of Orthopaedic Surgery, UC Davis Health, Sacramento, CA

Introduction

- Osteoporosis is a major public health issue, with more than 53 million people in the United States either having osteoporosis or at increased risk for developing osteoporosis.¹
- Several guidelines urge bone health evaluation and treatment for adults diagnosed with fragility fractures; however, two recent studies from UC Davis Health have reported sub-optimal rates of DEXA evaluation, endocrinology referrals, and osteoporosis medication use. ²
- We sought to bridge the inpatient and outpatient osteoporosis care gap by sending a detailed letter for primary care providers (PCP) summarizing osteoporosis treatment guidelines
- Therefore, the primary aim of this study was to determine the rates of change in osteoporosis evaluation and treatment in adult patients after fragility fracture since implementation of this PCP letter system

Methods

- IRB-approved prospective analysis From March 2021 to April 2022 patients who suffered a fragility fracture and admitted were identified and prospectively added to a single-center database
- Inclusion Criteria:
 - ≥ 60 years old
 - Fragility fracture (hip, distal radius, proximal humerus, vertebral compression) after ground-level fall
 - Follow-up care with PCP within our network
- Basic demographics were collected, and patients' charts were reviewed for DEXA imaging, endocrinology referral and prescription of anti-resorptive bone medications
- Intervention group was matched by patients extracted from our single-center database to generate control group that did not receive PCP letter
- Bivariate analysis was used to assess statistical differences between cohorts

Results

Table 1 Summary of Univariate Demo Clinical Data of Patients with Fragility	~ .
Characteristic	Value
Total Patients (n,%)	422
Male	120 (28.5%)
Female	302 (71.5%)
Mean Age (years, SD)	81.1 (8.58)
Body Mass index (kg/m²) (avg,	
CD\	04.0 (5.00)

Weall Age (years, SD)	01.1 (0.50)
Body Mass index (kg/m²) (avg,	Q (C (C (C (C (C (C (C (C (C (
SD)	24.8 (5.66)
Race, n (%)	
Hispanic	16 (3.80%)
Non-Hispanic	404 (96.2%)
Ethnicity, n (%)	
	312
White	(73.93%)

Subcategory "Other" for Ethnicity corresponds to Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Unknown, or identified race outside of proposed categories

Asian

African American, Black

Other

Table 2 Bivariate Analysis between Cohorts of Patients with
Fragility Fractures

	Gro			
Variable	No Letter	Letter	P-Value	
	n	n		
Total	332	90		
Sex	92 (27.7%)	28 (31.1%)	0.53	
Male	92 (27.7%)	20 (31.1%)	0.53	
Female	240 (73.3%)	62 (68.9%)		
Age (mean years, std dev)	81.2 (8.15)	80.7 (10.1)	0.67	
Race	243 (73.19%)	69 (76.67%)		
White	25 (7.53%)	4 (4 440/.)		
Black	25 (7.55%)	4 (4.44%)	0.24	
Asian	26 (7.83%)	11 (12.22%)		
Other	38 (11.45%)	6 (6.67%)		
Ethnicity	14 (4.24%)	2 (2.22%)		
Hispanic	14 (4.24 /0)	2 (2.22 /0)	0.37	
Non-Hispanic	316 (95.76%)	88 (97.78%)		

Note: Only 420 responses are used for Chi-Squared analysis for Ethnicity as there were 2 missing variables where patients declined to answer. Subcategory "Other" for Ethnicity corresponds to Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander, American Indian/Alaska Native, and Unknown, or identified race outside of proposed categories

Table 3 Prevalence of Interventions for Osteoporosis Evaluation and Treatment by Intervention

44 (8.77%)

29 (6.87%)

44 (10.43%)

Factor	Group		Odds	Confidence	Relative	Confidence	P-value
ractor	No Letter	Letter	Ratio	Interval	Risk	Interval	r-value
DEXA	62/332 (18.67%)	36/90 (40%)	2.9	1.75-4.80	1.32	1.12-1.54	<0.0001*
Endocrinology Referral	42/332 (12.65%)	24/90 (26.7%)	2.5	1.42-4.4	0.5	0.34-0.75	0.0012*
Vitamin D and/or Calcium	275/332 (82.83%)	63/90 (70%)	0.48	0.28-0.82	0.83	0.71-2.52	0.01*
Other Osteoporosis Meds	63/332 (19.98%)	18/90 (20%)	1.06	0.59-1.9	1.01	0.89-1.15	0.83

^{*} indicates statistical significance with p-values <0.05. DEXA = Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry. Other Osteoporosis Medications included calcitonin and bisphosphonates.

Conclusions

- Patients are 2.9 times more likely to receive a DEXA scan after intervention and are at 1.32 times greater risk of not receiving a DEXA scan if PCP's do not receive a letter
- Patients were half as likely to have an endocrinology referral if PCP letter was not sent
- Patients who did not have a PCP letter sent were at 0.83 times greater risk to not have Vitamin D and/or Ca supplementation
- The generalizability of our study may be limited because only innetwork PCPs were included and may indicate bias towards reporting higher rates of postinjury BMD evaluation and treatment
- We found a greater prevalence in osteoporosis evaluation within our in-network system following implementation of our intervention

References

- 1. NIH Osteoporosis and Related Bone Diseases National Resource Center: Osteoporosis overview. https://www.bones.nih.gov/sites/bone s/files/pdfs/osteopoverview-508.pdf. Published October 2018. Accessed December 31 2022.
- 2. Haffner MR, Delman CM, Wick JB, et al. Osteoporosis Is Undertreated After Low-energy Vertebral Compression Fractures. J Am Acad Orthop Surg. 2021;29(17):741-747. doi:10.5435/JAAOS-D-20-01132.