REVIEW



A meta-analysis of secondary osteoporosis in systemic lupus erythematosus: prevalence and risk factors

Chaoyu Gu¹ · Rui Zhao² · Xiaomei Zhang² · Zhifeng Gu^{3,4} · Wei Zhou² · Yilin Wang² · Jiaxin Guo² · Yanfeng Bao³ · Chi Sun³ · Chen Dong^{3,4,5} · Jianlin Gao⁵

Received: 29 June 2019 / Accepted: 5 November 2019 / Published online: 4 December 2019 © International Osteoporosis Foundation and National Osteoporosis Foundation 2019

Abstract

Purpose This study aimed to evaluate the prevalence and risk factors of secondary osteoporosis (OP) in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) and provide a theoretical basis for clinical prevention and treatment of SLE.

Methods Take systematic review and meta-analysis of relevant studies. Data sources are CINAHL databases, PubMed, Embase, Wan Fang, Weipu, and CNKI databases. Eligibility criteria are cross-sectional or case–control studies which analyzed the prevalence and risk factors of OP in SLE. Two authors independently screened all studies; a third author verified and identify controversial studies. The quality of the included articles was evaluated. Stata 11 and Rev-Man 5.2 software were used for data processing.

Results Thirty-one articles were included, with a total sample size of 3089 SLE, including 529 OP cases and 2560 non-OP cases. Meta-analysis showed that the prevalence of OP among SLE was 16% (95% CI (0.12, 0.19)). The risk of OP in SLE cases compared with controls was significantly greater with OR of 2.03 (95% CI 1.33–3.10, P = 0.001). Age, disease duration, cumulative glucocorticoid dose, duration of glucocorticoid therapy, SLICC, and menopause had significant differences between two groups. No statistical differences of daily glucocorticoid dose, SLEDAI, and BMI were found between OP and non-OP cases.

Conclusions Our study found a statistically significant increased risk of OP in SLE patients compared with controls. SLE patients should be actively screened for OP and its consequences. Larger longitudinal studies are needed to confirm this possible association. The prevalence of OP in SLE was 16%. Compared with controls, the risk of OP in SLE was 2.03. There were significant differences of age, disease duration, cumulative glucocorticoid dose, time of glucocorticoid, SLICC, and menopause, while daily glucocorticoid dose, SLEDAI, and BMI had no statistical differences between OP and non-OP cases.

Keywords Systemic lupus erythematosus · Osteoporosis · Risk factors · Meta-analysis

Chaoyu Gu, Rui Zhao and Xiaomei Zhang contributed equally to this work.

Chaoyu Gu, Rui Zhao, Xiaomei Zhang are the first author

Chen Dong dongchensc@126.com

- ☑ Jianlin Gao JL4486@ntu.edu.cn
- ¹ Medical College, Nantong University, 19th Qixiu Road, Nantong 226001, China
- ² Department of Nursing, Affiliated Hospital of Nantong University, 20th Xisi Road, Nantong 226001, China
- ³ Research Center of Clinical Medicine, Affiliated Hospital of Nantong University, 20th Xisi Road, Nantong 226001, China
- ⁴ Department of Rheumatology, Affiliated Hospital of Nantong University, 20th Xisi Road, Nantong 226001, China
- ⁵ Center for Geriatrics Research, Affiliated Hospital of Nantong University, 20th Xisi Road, Nantong 226001, China

Introduction

Systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) is an autoimmune disease involving multiple organ systems and the presence of anti-nuclear antibodies [1, 2], predominantly affecting women, particularly those of childbearing age [3]. Glucocorticoids (GCs) are potent anti-inflammatory and immunosuppressive agents, which are indispensable in the treatment of SLE [4]. However, long-term use and even abuse of GCs in SLE do great harms. Ruiz-Irastorza et al. [4] reported that GCs were associated with the development of hyperglycemia, coronary heart disease, osteoporosis, osteonecrosis, cataracts, and others.

Osteoporosis (OP), as one of the most serious complications of SLE, is characterized by a reduction of bone mass per unit volume and destruction of bone microstructure, leading to increased bone fragility and fracture risk in patients with SLE [5]. OP is common in SLE. Bultink [6] indicated that the incidence rate of osteopenia in SLE was 25–74%, OP was 1.4–60.5%. In China, Ji et al. [7] found that osteopenia was 41.7%, OP was 39%, which corresponds to the increased risk of fracture. Studies have reported that the incidence of fracture in SLE was 34.6%, seriously decreasing the quality of life of patients and upregulating mortality rates [8].

In decades, OP have recently received more attention for their damage in SLE. Di Munno et al. [9] reported that risk factors for OP in female patients with SLE were disease-specific (reduced physical activity, cytokines, renal impairment, endocrine factors) and non-diseasespecific mechanisms (sunshine avoidance, GCs, immunosuppressants). Bultink indicated that the etiology of bone loss in SLE is multifactorial, including inflammation, serological factors, hormonal factors, metabolic factors, possibly genetic factors, and medication-induced adverse effects [10]. Studies have different opinions. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the risk factors of secondary OP in SLE patients and prevent the occurrence of secondary OP.

Methods

This review was conducted according to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines for systematic reviews and meta-analyses [11]. Key words and study eligibility criteria were determined. The protocol for the review was registered with PROSPERO (Registration number: CRD42018117580).

Literature search

Two investigators took systematic literature search in PubMed, Embase, CINAHL databases, Wan Fang, Weipu, and CNKI databases till December 2018. The medical subject heading (MeSH) search headings were all combinations of index terms: "Systemic lupus erythematosus" or "SLE" or "lupus" and "osteoporosis" or "OP" and "risk factors". Eligibility criteria include observational studies which analyzes the prevalence and risk factors of OP in SLE. At the same time, the reference lists of identified manuscripts were hand-searched and scrutinized to identify other relevant publications. We took the search again before the final analyses on 06/01/2019.

Selection criteria

Inclusion criteria include (1) met SLE classification criteria revised by the American Society of Rheumatology (ACR); (2) included secondary OP and non-secondary OP groups; (3) OP diagnostic criteria which met World Health Organization (WHO) diagnostic criteria—Dual Energy Xray Absorption Density (DXA). Patients were determined to be either normal (T score > - 1.0), osteogenic (T score < -1.0), and osteoporotic (T score < - 2.5) [12].

Exclusion criteria include (1) history of taking estrogen, androgen, anticoagulant, and drugs affecting bone metabolism; (2) severe liver and kidney dysfunction, Cushing syndrome, history of thyroid and parathyroid diseases, ovariectomy, and other diseases affecting bone metabolism.

Study selection

Two authors independently screened the title and abstract of all included studies. We excluded unrelated studies. We took full-text review for the rest of the studies. Reviewers also took discussion to solve disagreement over study eligibility at both the title/abstract and full-text review stages. A third reviewer was identified in case of disagreement or uncertainty. Any disagreements were resolved by discussion.

Data extraction

The following information was extracted from each included study: first author, publication year, country, risk factors (age, disease duration, cumulative oral GCs doses, duration of GCs therapy, daily GCs dose, SLEDAI, SLE damage index (SLICC/ACR), menopause, and BMI), numbers of OP cases, numbers of SLE cases, method of ascertainment of OP, and study quality. Extracted data were extracted into a standardized Excel (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA, USA) file. Missing information were obtained by email. The data were independently extracted by two authors.

Assessment of study quality

Two reviewers used the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) and Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) to assess methodological quality independently. NOS uses a "star" rating system (range from 0 star to 9 stars) to judge quality. Seven to 9 points were considered to be high quality, <7 points were considered to be low quality [13]. AHRQ, 11-item checklist, an item would be scored "0" if it was answered "No" or "Unclear", if it was answered "Yes", then the item scored "1" [14]. Article quality was assessed as follows: low quality, 0–3; moderate quality, 4–7; and high quality, 8–11. Finally, to ensure the quality of research, we choose studies with a score of more than 7 points.

Data analysis

Meta-analysis was performed using Stata 11 and RevMan 5.2 software recommended by Cochrane Collaboration

Network. Bi-categorized variables were analyzed by odds ratio (OR), and continuous variables were analyzed by mean difference (MD). Age, disease duration, cumulative oral GC dose, duration of GC therapy, daily GC dose, SLEDAI, SLICC, menopause, and BMI as research statistics were analyzed. Each effect was expressed by 95% confidence interval (CI), P < 0.05 was the significant difference. Heterogeneity was assessed visually with forest plots and quantified numerically using the I^2 index. Nonheterogeneity ($I^2 < 50\%$) data used a fixed effect model, heterogeneity ($I^2 > 50\%$) data used sensitivity analysis to find out the causes of heterogeneity, and if there was no clinical heterogeneity, a random effect model was used. If there is clinical heterogeneity, subgroup analysis can be done according to the origin of heterogeneity.

Results

Study selection

\The details of the study selection process are shown in Fig. 1. One thousand twelve potentially relevant articles were identified using the search strategy. After removal of duplicates, 742 remained. Following title/abstract review, animal model studies, case reports, and those with unavailable, 665 articles were excluded. The 77 remaining full-length articles were screened. Finally, 31 were included in the qualitative and quantitative analysis [14–21, 12, 22–44].

Study characteristics

The summary of the included study characteristics is shown in Table 1. Thirty-one identified studies matched the inclusion criteria, reporting on 3650 cases, healthy control group 561 cases and SLE 3089 cases. The included articles were published between 1985 and 2017. The sample size of the studies is different and the population is female dominated. This meta-analysis included 13 case–control studies and 18 cross-sectional studies. Most studies (16/31) were published in China. The diagnostic criteria for OP was mainly through DXA. The quality of studies evaluated by the NOS and AHRQ is shown in Table 1. The correlations between OP and risk factors in SLE patients are also shown in Table 2. "+" mainly refers to the development of osteoporosis related to those risk



First author	Year	Number of SLE cases	Number of OP cases	Prevalence of OP%	Study type	Country	Diagnosis	Characteristics	Quality
Banno S [39]	2002	60	12	20	cs	Japan	DXA		10
Becker, A [40].	2001	67	7	10.4	cs	Germany	DXA		10
Bultink, I. E [14].	2005	107	5	4	cs	Netherlands	DXA	Premenopausal	7
Carli, L [.] [15]	2017	186	52	27.95	cs	Italy	DXA	Inception	7
Chong, H. C [16].	2007	60	4	6.6	cs	Malaysia	DXA		8
Claudia [38]	2009	100	5	5	cs	Mexico	DXA	Remission stage	8
Compeyrot [17]	2007	64	13	20.3	cs	Canada	DXA		10
Congzhu Ding [18]	2002	48	8	16.7	cc	China	DXA		7
F. PONS [19]	1985	28	5	18	cc	Spain	DXA	Premenopausal	8
Furukawa, M [20].	2011	58	29	50	cs	Japan	DXA		7
G Cramarossa [11]	2016	81	10	12.3	CS	Canada	DXA	Premenopausal	8
Gang Wang [21]	2017	118	50	42.4	cc	China	DXA	Premenopausal	7
H. P. Bhattoa [22]	2002	79	19	23.7	cs	Hungary	DXA	Premenopausal	8
Hongjin Liang [37]	2010	210	11	5.2	cc	China	DXA		9
Jiugen Liang [23]	2006	142	21	14.8	сс	China	DXA	Premenopausal	9
Jiajing Yu [<mark>36</mark>]	2015	387	296		cs	China	DXA		10
Linchao Shen [24]	2004	74	15	19.7	cc	China	DXA		10
Pin Sui [35]	2008	50	3	6	cc	China	DXA	Inception	9
Pineau, C. A [25].	2004	205	37	18	CS	Toronto	DXA	Untreated	9
Qing Ye [26]	2013	42	8	19	cc	China	DXA	Premenopausal	10
Qingqing Yuan [41]	2014	48	8	16.7	cs	China	DXA	Premenopausal	10
Sinigaglia L [42]	1999	84	19	22.6	cs	Italy	DXA		10
Sun, Y. N [27].	2015	119	10	8.5	CS	China	DXA		10
Weizhen He [34]	2009	49	8	17.1	сс	China	DXA		10
Xiaojun Zhu [28]	2000	100	8	8	cc	China	DXA	Premenopausal	10
Xiaozhen Liu [29]	2000	50	4	8	cc	China	DXA		9
Xiuzhu Hou [30]	2015	261	96	36.78	CS	China	NA	Premenopausal	8
Yeap, S. S [31].	2009	98	6	6.1	CS	Malaysia	DXA	Premenopausal	6
Yee, C. S [32].	2005	242	25	10.3	cs	UK	DXA	Premenopausal	10
Zefang Wang [23]	2017	52	3	5.8	cc	China	DXA		10
Ziyan Luo [33]	2014	128	9	7	сс	China	DXA		7

Table 1 Characteristics of the studies reporting frequency of osteoporosis (OP) in systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE)

cs cross-sectional study, cc case-control study, DXA dual energy X-ray absorption density

factors. "—" mainly refers to the development of osteoporosis not related to those risk factors. The blank indicates that the risk factor was not discussed in the article.

Prevalence of OP in SLE

The prevalence of OP in SLE was 4 to 42.4% in individual studies (Table 1). Meta-analyses revealed the prevalence of major OP was 16% (95% CI (0.12, 0.19)), with high heterogeneity ($I^2 = 88.9\%$) (Fig. 2a). After subgroup analysis, the prevalence of major OP in premenopausal SLE was 11% (95% CI (0.06, 0.14), $I^2 = 59.6\%$) (Fig. 2b). On meta-analysis of nine studies, the risk of OP in SLE patients compared with the healthy control group was significantly greater with OR 2.03 (95% CI (1.33, 3.10), $I^2 = 32\%$) (Fig. 3).

Meta-analysis results

To explore the risk factors of OP in SLE patients, we undertook sub-analyses. We compared the risk factors between with OP and without OP SLE patients.

Age

Among the 14 studies that reported the age of patients, heterogeneity analysis of the included studies indicated that there was heterogeneity (P < 0.01, $I^2 = 80\%$), but there was no clinical heterogeneity. A random effect model was used. The results showed that there were significant differences of age between the two groups (MD = 4.73, 95% CI (2.4, 7.05), P < 0.01) (Fig. 4a).

Disease duration

Among the 9 studies that reported the disease duration of patients, heterogeneity analysis of the included studies indicated that there was heterogeneity (P < 0.01, $I^2 = 87\%$) (Fig. 4b). Removing untreated study, heterogeneity decreased (P = 0.21, $I^2 = 28\%$). A fixed effect model was used. The results showed that there were significant differences in disease duration between the two groups (MD = 5.09, 95% CI (3.75, 6.44), P < 0.01) (Fig. 4c).

Table 2 The correlations between OP and risk factors in systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE)

Author	Age	Disease duration	Cumulative corticosteroid dose	Time of hormone	Daily steroid dose	SLEDAI	SLICC	Menopause	BMI
Claudia	+	_	_						+
Banno S	_		+	+	_	-	+		
Becker, A.		+	+				+		_
Bultink, I. E.	_							+	+
Carli, L.	+	+	+					-	_
Chong, H. C.		_	+	+					
Compeyrot	+	+	+	+		_	+		_
Congzhu Ding	_	+	+		+	_	+		_
F. PONS		+	+	+					
Furukawa, M.	+	_		_	_	_		_	_
G Cramarossa	+						+		
Gang Wang	-	+	+						+
H. P. Bhattoa	+	_	+		+	-		+	-
Hongjin Liang	+	+	_	-	-	-		+	-
Jiajing Yu	+	+	+	+				+	
Jiugen Liang			+	+					
Linchao Shen					+				
Pin Sui			+						
Pineau, C. A.	+	+	_		_	-	+		
Qing Ye			+	+				+	
Qingqing Yuan	-					-		-	-
Sinigaglia L	-	+	+	-	-	-	+		-
Sun, Y. N.	_	_				-			_
Weizhen He	_	_	+	_	_				
Xiaojun Zhu			+	+		-			
Xiaozhen Liu			+	+					
Xiuzhu Hou	_								
Yeap, S. S.			+	+		-			
Yee, C. S.	+								
Zefang Wang		+							
Ziyan Luo	+	+	+			+			

+ Relevant; - Unrelated

Cumulative GC dose

Among the 13 studies that reported the cumulative GC dose of patients, heterogeneity analysis of the included literature indicated that there was no heterogeneity (P = 0.07, $I^2 = 41\%$). A fixed effect model was used. The results showed that there were significant differences in cumulative GC dose between the two groups (MD = 16.11, 95% CI (13.42, 18.79), P < 0.01) (Fig. 4d).

Duration of GC therapy

Among the 10 studies that reported the duration of GC therapy of patients, heterogeneity analysis of the included literature indicated that there was heterogeneity (P < 0.01, $I^2 = 92\%$) with no clinical heterogeneity. A random effect model was conducted. The results showed that there was a significant difference in the duration of GC therapy between the two groups (MD = 9.22, 95% CI (4.78, 13.66), P < 0.01) (Fig. 4e).

Daily GC dose

Among the 6 studies that reported the daily GC dose of patients, heterogeneity analysis of the included literature indicated that there was no heterogeneity (P = 0.14, $I^2 = 39\%$). A fixed effect model was used. The results showed that there was no significant difference in daily GC dose between the а

STURY		
ID	ES (95% CI) Tever	t Tsample
Bases 6 2000	0.20 (0.40, 0.20), 42	
Banno S 2002	0.20 (0.10, 0.30) 12	87
Beder, A. 2001	0.05(0.01,0.09) 5	107
Codi L 2007	0.05 (0.01, 0.05) 5	108
Chang H C 2007	0.28 (0.22, 0.34) 52	80
Comperent 2007		84
Constru Ding 2002	0.17 (0.06 0.27) 8	49
E PONS 1985	- 0.12 (0.04, 0.22) 5	20
F. FONS 1365	0.18 (0.04, 0.32) 5	20
G Cramarassa 2018	0.12 (0.05 0.20) 10	00
Goog Wang 2017	0.12 (0.03, 0.20) 10	440
U. P. Phattas 2002	0.42 (0.35, 0.51) 50	70
H. P. Bhattos 2002	- 0.24 (0.15, 0.33) 19	79
H. P. Bhattos 2002	0.10 (-0.01, 0.21) 3	30
H. P. Bhattoan 2002	0.33 (0.20, 0.46) 10	49
Hongjin Liang 2010	0.05 (0.02, 0.08) 11	210
Jiugen Liang 2000	0.15 (0.09, 0.21) 21	742
Linchao Shen 2004	0.20 (0.11, 0.29) 15	/4
Mendoza-Pinto, Claudia 2009	0.05 (0.01, 0.09) 5	100
Pin Sui 2008	0.06 (-0.01, 0.13) 3	50
Pineau, C. A. 2004	0.18 (0.13, 0.23) 37	205
Qing Ye 2013	0.19 (0.07, 0.31) 8	42
Qingqing Yuan 2014	0.17 (0.06, 0.27) 8	48
Sinigaglia L 1999	0.23 (0.14, 0.32) 19	84
Sun, Y. N. 2015	0.08 (0.03, 0.13) 10	119
Weizhen He 2009	0.16 (0.06, 0.27) 8	49
Xiaojun Zhu 2000	0.08 (0.03, 0.13) 8	100
Xiaozhen Liu 2000	0.08 (0.00, 0.16) 4	50
Xiuzhu Hou 2015	0.37 (0.31, 0.43) 96	261
Yeap, S. S. 2009	0.06 (0.01, 0.11) 6	98
Yee, C. S. 2005	0.10 (0.06, 0.14) 25	242
Zefang Wang 2017	0.06 (-0.01, 0.12) 3	52
Ziyan Luo 2014	0.07 (0.03, 0.11) 9	128
D+L Overall (I-squared = 88.9%, p = 0.000)	0.16 (0.12, 0.19)	
I-V Overall	0.12 (0.11, 0.13)	
NOTE: Weights are from random effects analysis		
	1	





Fig. 2 Prevalence of osteoporosis in patients with SLE. a All studies. b Subgroup analysis

	SLE		Health control gi	roups		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Hongjin Liang 2010	11	210	3	70	13.0%	1.23 [0.33, 4.56]	
Jiugen Liang 2006	21	142	2	78	6.7%	6.60 [1.50, 28.93]	
Linchao Shen 2004	15	74	18	74	43.8%	0.79 [0.36, 1.72]	
Pin Sui 2008	3	50	1	30	3.6%	1.85 [0.18, 18.65]	
Qing Ye 2013	8	42	4	50	9.0%	2.71 [0.75, 9.73]	
Weizhen He 2009	8	49	2	68	4.3%	6.44 [1.30, 31.82]	
Xiaojun Zhu 2000	8	100	1	48	3.8%	4.09 [0.50, 33.65]	
Xiaozhen Liu 2000	4	50	1	48	2.9%	4.09 [0.44, 37.96]	
Ziyan Luo 2014	9	128	4	95	13.0%	1.72 [0.51, 5.76]	
Total (95% CI)		845		561	100.0%	2.03 [1.33, 3.10]	◆
Total events	87		36				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	1.73, df =	8 (P =	0.16); I ² = 32%				
Test for overall effect: 2	0.01 0.1 1 10 100						
	(-		,				SLE Health control grou

Fig. 3 Meta-analyses of prevalence rate between SLE patients and controls

two groups (MD = -0.71, 95% CI (-2.73, 0.91), P = 0.39) (Fig. 4f).

SLEDAI

Among the 9 studies that reported the SLEDAI of patients, heterogeneity analysis of the included literature indicated that there was no heterogeneity (P = 0.86, $I^2 = 0\%$). A fixed effect model was used. The results showed that there was no significant difference in SLEDAI between the two groups (MD = -0.46, 95% CI (-1.06, 0.15), P = 0.14) (Fig. 4g).

SLICC

Among the 5 studies that reported the SLICC of patients, heterogeneity analysis of the included literature indicated that there was heterogeneity (P = 0.07, $I^2 = 53\%$), but there was no clinical heterogeneity. A random effect model was used. The results showed that there was a significant difference in SLICC between the two groups (MD = 0.78, 95% CI (0.38, 1.18), P < 0.01) (Fig. 4h).

Menopause

Among the 6 studies that reported menopause of patients, heterogeneity analysis of the included literature indicated that there was heterogeneity (P = 0.03, $I^2 = 62\%$), but there was no clinical heterogeneity. A random effect model was used. The results showed that there was significant difference of menopause between the two groups (MD = 4.4, 95% CI (2.13, 9.08), P < 0.01] (Fig. 4i).

BMI

Among the 9 studies that reported the BMI of patients, heterogeneity analysis of the included literature indicated that there was heterogeneity (P = 0.008, $I^2 = 61\%$), but there was no clinical heterogeneity. A random effect model was used.

The results showed that there was no significant difference in BMI between the two groups (MD = -0.32, 95% CI (-1.18, 0.55), P = 0.47) (Fig. 4j).

Publication bias

The analysis of 31 studies shows that funnel charts are symmetrical and considered to have no obvious publication bias.

Discussion

SLE is a chronic systemic autoimmune disease involving multiple systems. OP, as one of the complications of SLE, has received a great deal of attention due to its great harm [45]. OP is very common in SLE people. Compared with healthy control groups, the risk of OP in SLE patients was 2.03. In our study, the prevalence of OP in SLE was 16%. OP can easily lead to fracture. Bultink and Lems [46] reported that vertebral fractures often occurred asymptomatically, but were associated with a reduced quality of life, increased future fracture risk, and an increased mortality risk. Le et al. [45] also indicated that vertebral and hip fractures were significant contributors to mortality in SLE patients.

Current studies have found that the occurrence of OP in SLE patients is closely related to disease activity and treatment options [9]. Bultink and Lems [46] reported that age, disease duration, disease severity, and GC use were important risk factors in SLE patients with OP. Briot et al. [47] have reported that the inflammatory disease activity was on top of the osteoporotic risk factors. Based on the results above, age and disease duration were the risk factors of OP, which is consistent with most of studies.

GC plays an important role in SLE. Most of the patients receive GCs, which have their own deleterious effects on bone. Long-term GC use leads to increased incidence of osteoporosis in patients with SLE [48]. Balasubramanian et al.

	OF	in SLE		non-	OP in S	SLE		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
anno S 2002	36	8.1	12	35.5	7.9	48	6.7%	0.50 [-4.60, 5.60]	
Carli, L. 2017	56.9	12	52	42.3	10.9	134	7.8%	14.60 [10.85, 18.35]	
Compeyrot. 2007	16.6	2.1	13	14.3	3.3	27	9.4%	2.30 [0.61, 3.99]	-
Congzhu Ding 2002	32	10	48	30	10	38	7.4%	2.00 [-2.26, 6.26]	
Furukawa, M. 2011	46.6	14.2	37	39.3	11.2	21	5.5%	7.30 [0.68, 13.92]	
G Cramarossa 2016	44.72	17.14	90	34.89	10.55	196	7.8%	9.83 [5.99, 13.67]	 -
Gang Wang 2017	41.04	10.36	67	39.65	10.88	51	7.7%	1.39 [-2.49, 5.27]	
Hongjin Liang 2010	46.8	13.8	11	33.3	10.1	105	4.3%	13.50 [5.12, 21.88]	
Jiajing Yu 2015	38.3	12.25	296	36.24	9.74	91	8.9%	2.06 [-0.38, 4.50]	
Pineau, C. A. 2004	50.6	13.2	37	42.8	11.3	68	6.7%	7.80 [2.77, 12.83]	
Qingqing Yuan 2014	47.55	13.17	20	41.82	11.77	28	5.0%	5.73 [-1.50, 12.96]	
Sinigaglia L 1999	32.1	7.1	19	29.8	7.5	65	7.9%	2.30 [-1.38, 5.98]	+ - -
Sun, Y. N. 2015	33.9	16.1	47	31.6	8.9	72	6.7%	2.30 [-2.74, 7.34]	+
Kiuzhu Hou 2015	36	13.4	96	36	13.4	165	8.2%	0.00 [-3.37, 3.37]	+
Total (95% CI)			845			1109	100.0%	4.73 [2.40, 7.05]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	14.27; C	hi² = 64	.89, df	= 13 (P	< 0.000	001); l²	= 80%	_	
est for overall effect:	Z = 3.99	(P < 0.0	0001)			,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			-20 -10 0 10 20

k)	
	_	

d

-	O	P in SLI	=	non-OP in SLE			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Carli, L. 2017	22.5	8	52	16.5	7.7	134	13.3%	6.00 [3.46, 8.54]	-
Congzhu Ding 2002	13	7	40	6	5	38	13.1%	7.00 [4.31, 9.69]	
Furukawa, M. 2011	18.03	8.47	37	13.8	8.2	21	10.3%	4.23 [-0.21, 8.67]	
Gang Wang 2017	8.92	6.29	67	6.06	3.98	51	14.3%	2.86 [1.00, 4.72]	-
Hongjin Liang 2010	9.17	6.74	11	3.05	2.73	105	11.0%	6.12 [2.10, 10.14]	
Jiajing Yu 2015	17	0	296	13.45	0	91		Not estimable	
Pineau, C. A. 2004	16.7	11.3	37	11.8	9.5	68	10.5%	4.90 [0.62, 9.18]	
Sinigaglia L 1999	11.2	6.4	19	5.5	4.6	65	12.5%	5.70 [2.61, 8.79]	
Sun, Y. N. 2015	1.68	2.875	40	2	2.89	79	15.1%	-0.32 [-1.42, 0.78]	<u>†</u>
Total (95% CI)			599			652	100.0%	4.41 [1.97, 6.85]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	9.96; Cł	ni² = 52.	51, df =	= 7 (P <	0.0000	1); l ² =	87%	-	
Test for overall effect:	OP in SLE non-OP in SLE								

С OP in SLE non-OP in SLE Mean Difference Mean Difference Study or Subgroup IV, Random, 95% CI SD Total SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% CI Mean Mean Carli, L. 2017 6.00 [3.46, 8.54] 22.5 8 52 16.5 7.7 134 18.2% 7.00 [4.31, 9.69] -Congzhu Ding 2002 13 40 6 5 38 16.8% 7 Furukawa, M. 2011 37 21 4.23 [-0.21, 8.67] 18.03 8.47 13.8 8.2 7.8% Gang Wang 2017 8.92 6.29 67 6.06 3.98 51 25.9% 2.86 [1.00, 4.72] Hongjin Liang 2010 9.17 6.74 11 3.05 2.73 105 9.2% 6.12 [2.10, 10.14] Jiajing Yu 2015 17 0 296 13.45 0 91 Not estimable Pineau, C. A. 2004 16.7 11.3 37 11.8 9.5 68 8.3% 4.90 [0.62, 9.18] Sinigaglia L 1999 11.2 6.4 19 5.5 4.6 65 13.8% 5.70 [2.61, 8.79] Sun, Y. N. 2015 1.68 2.875 40 2 2.89 79 Not estimable Total (95% CI) 559 573 100.0% 5.09 [3.75, 6.44] ê Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.91; Chi² = 8.38, df = 6 (P = 0.21); I² = 28% -20 -10 10 20 0 Test for overall effect: Z = 7.44 (P < 0.00001) OP in SLE non-OP in SLE

	OP	in SLE		non-0	OP in SI	E	Mean Difference		
Subgroup	Mean	SD	lotal	Mean	SD	lotal	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	
2002	44	21.5	12	24.4	17.2	48	4.2%	19.60 [6.50, 32.70]	
017	37.1	25.5	52	24.4	16.6	134	12.9%	12.70 [5.22, 20.18]	

OP	in SLE		non-	OP in SI	SLE Mean Difference				Mean Difference			
Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% C		IV, Fixed	d, 95% CI		_
44	21.5	12	24.4	17.2	48	4.2%	19.60 [6.50, 32.70]					
37.1	25.5	52	24.4	16.6	134	12.9%	12.70 [5.22, 20.18]			-		
626.9	381.5	13	319.5	342.1	27	0.0%	307.40 [63.15, 551.65]				\rightarrow	
30	20	40	20	16	38	11.3%	10.00 [1.98, 18.02]					
31.76	33.85	67	18.843	13.776	51	9.0%	12.92 [3.97, 21.86]			-		
24	27.6	11	9.4	11.9	105	2.7%	14.60 [-1.87, 31.07]					
211.03	0	296	138.62	0	91		Not estimable					
26.54	10.22	21	7.96	3.05	60	36.7%	18.58 [14.14, 23.02]			-		
41.01	36.78	37	38.75	40.61	68	3.1%	2.26 [-13.02, 17.54]		_	-		
32.8	18.1	8	15.5	2.9	20	4.6%	17.30 [4.69, 29.91]					
30.9	23.8	19	18.2	19.7	65	5.3%	12.70 [0.98, 24.42]					
33.32	13.36	8	9.16	3.34	53	8.4%	24.16 [14.86, 33.46]					
32.28	20.1	4	3.05	1.85	24	1.9%	29.23 [9.52, 48.94]					
		588			784	100.0%	16.11 [13.42, 18.79]			•		
18.57, df	= 11 (P	= 0.07)	; l ² = 41%	6				100	-50 (0 100	Ĺ
Z = 11.73	(P < 0.	00001)						-100	OP in SLE	non-OP i	in SLE	
	OP Mean 44 37.1 626.9 30 31.76 24 211.03 26.54 41.01 32.88 30.9 33.32 32.28 18.57, df z z = 11.73	OP In SLE Mean SD 44 21.5 37.1 25.5 626.9 381.5 30 20 31.76 33.85 24 27.6 211.03 0 26.54 10.22 41.01 36.78 33.28 13.36 33.22 13.36 32.8 33.32 33.22 13.61 32.8 13.61 32.8 13.61 32.8 11.73 8.57, df = 11 (P Z 21.1.73 (P < 0.	OP in SLE Mean SD Total 44 21.5 52 37.1 25.5 52 626.9 381.5 13 30 20 40 31.76 33.85 67 24 27.6 11 211.03 0 296 26.54 10.22 21 41.01 36.78 37 33.32 13.36 8 32.28 18.1 8 32.28 20.1 4 S88 18.57, df = 11 (P = 0.07) Z Z = 11.73 (P < 0.00001)	OP in SLE non- Mean SD Total Mean 44 21.5 52 24.4 626.9 381.5 13 319.5 30 20 40 20 31.76 33.85 67 18.843 24 27.6 11 9.4 211.03 0 296 138.62 26.54 10.22 21 7.96 41.01 36.78 37 38.75 30.9 23.8 19 18.2 33.32 13.36 8 9.16 32.28 20.1 4 9.4 32.21 13.46 9.16 32.28 11.7 8 9.16 32.28 20.1 4 9.16 32.28 11.4 9.16 9.16 32.28 20.5 58 8 18.57, df = 11 (P = 0.07); P = 419; 2 4.9	OP in SLE Non-P in SL Mean SD Total Mean SD 44 21.5 52 24.4 17.6 37.1 25.5 52 24.4 16.6 626.9 381.5 13 319.5 342.1 30 20 40 20 16 31.76 33.85 67 18.843 13.766 24 27.6 11 9.4 11.9 211.03 0 296 138.62 00 26.54 10.22 21 7.96 3.05 41.01 36.78 37 38.75 40.61 32.8 18.1 8 15.5 2.9 30.9 23.8 19 18.2 19.7 33.32 13.36 8 9.16 3.34 32.28 20.1 4 9.16 3.34 32.45 57. df = 11 (P = 0.07); I ² = 41% X X X 119	OP in SLE non-OP in SLE Mean SD Total Mean SD Total 44 21.5 12 24.4 17.2 48 37.1 25.5 52 24.4 16.6 134 626.9 381.5 13 319.5 342.1 27 30 20 40 20 16 38 31.76 33.85 67 18.843 13.76 51 24 27.6 11 9.4 11.9 105 211.03 0 296 138.62 0 91 26.54 10.22 21 7.96 3.05 60 41.01 36.78 37 38.75 2.9 20 30.9 23.8 19 18.2 19.7 65 33.32 13.66 8 9.16 3.34 53 32.28 11 $(9 = 0.07); ^2 = 41!* 784 18.57. df = 11 (P = 0.07); ^2 = 41!* 784 $	OP I SL Mean SD Total Mean SD Total Weight 44 21.5 52 24.4 16.6 134 12.9% 626.9 381.5 13 319.5 342.1 27 0.0% 30 20 40 20 16 134 11.9% 31.76 33.85 67 18.843 13.776 51 9.0% 24 27.6 11 9.4 1.9 105 2.7% 211.03 0 296 138.62 0 91 - 26.54 10.22 21 7.96 3.05 60 3.1% 32.8 18.1 8 15.5 2.9 20 4.6% 30.9 23.8 19 18.2 19.7 65 5.3% 33.32 13.36 8 9.16 3.34 53 8.4% 32.28 20.1 4 9.16 3.34	OP in SLE Mon-P in SLE Mean Oifference Mean SD Total Man SD Total Weight IV. Fixed. 95% CI 44 21.5 52 24.4 17.2 48 4.2% 19.60 [6.50, 32.70] 37.1 25.5 52 24.4 16.6 134 12.70 [5.22, 20.18] 626.9 381.5 13 319.5 342.1 27 0.0% 307.40 [63.15, 551.65] 30 20 40 20 16 38 11.3% 10.00 [1.98, 18.02] 31.76 33.85 67 18.843 13.776 51 9.0% 12.92 [3.97, 21.86] 24 27.6 11 9.4 11.9 105 2.7% 14.60 [-1.87, 31.07] 211.03 0 296 138.62 0 91 Not estimable 26.54 10.22 21 7.96 3.05 60 36.7% 18.58 [14.14, 23.02] 31.03 0.228 8.15 2.9 20	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	OP in SLE non-OP in SLE Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI IV. Fixed. 9	$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $

Fig. 4 Meta-analysis of risk factors that may place patients with systemic lupus erythematosus at a higher risk for the development of osteoporosis (OP). a Age. b Disease duration. c Subgroup of disease duration. d

Cumulative corticosteroid dose. e Time of hormone. f Daily steroid dose. g SLEDAI. h SLICC. i Menopause. j BMI

[49] reported fracture risk increased with increasing cumulative exposure, being approximately 2.5-fold higher at cumulative dose \geq 5400 mg compared with < 675 mg. GCs can increase bone resorption and reduce bone remodeling by

е		OP	in SLE	E	non-	OP in S	SLE		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
	Banno S 2002	13.67	5.42	12	9	5.33	48	11.6%	4.67 [1.25, 8.09]	_ - -
	Compeyrot 2007	5.1	3.4	13	27	2.6	27	12.1%	2 40 [0 31 4 49]	
	Furukawa, M. 2011	16.7	3.7	37	13.7	8.8	21	11.3%	3.00 [-0.95, 6.95]	+
	Hongiin Liang 2010	5.2	6.1	11	2	2.53	105	11.5%	3.20 [-0.44, 6.84]	
	Jiaiing Yu 2015	17.01	0	296	13.41	0	91	111070	Not estimable	
	Jiugen Liang 2006	27.4	8.12	21	11.25	2.16	60	11.6%	16.15 [12.63, 19.67]	
	Qing Ye 2013	36.2	8.1	8	15.4	5.1	20	10.1%	20.80 [14.76, 26.84]	
	Sinigaglia L 1999	8.825	6.58	19	4.56	4.125	65	11.7%	4.26 [1.14, 7.39]	- - -
	Xiaoiun Zhu 2000	31.78	8.96	8	22.45	5.48	53	9.9%	9.33 [2.95, 15,71]	
	Xiaozhen Liu 2000	35.24	6.21	4	12.67	1.46	24	10.1%	22.57 [16.46, 28.68]	
	Total (95% CI)			429			514	100.0%	9.22 [4.78, 13.66]	-
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	41.17; C	;hi² = 1	01.68,	df = 8 (F	< 0.0	0001); I	² = 92%		
	Test for overall effect: Z = 4.07 (P < 0.0001)									OP in SLE non-OP in SLE
f										
•		OP	in SLE		non-0	OP in S	LE		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
-	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% Cl
	Banno S 2002	9.7	5	12	8.3	4.1	48	28.1%	1.40 [-1.66, 4.46]	
	Congzhu Ding 2002	18	10	40	17	11	38	12.0%	1.00 [-3.67, 5.67]	
	Furukawa, M. 2011	38.5	17.9	37	51.8	22	21	2.2%	-13.30 [-24.34, -2.26]	
	Hongjin Liang 2010	17.4	21.1	11	16.2	15	105	1.6%	1.20 [-11.59, 13.99]	
	Pineau, C. A. 2004	10.85	8.57	37	12.33	11.43	68	17.5%	-1.48 [-5.35, 2.39]	
	Sinigaglia L 1999	6.9	2.9	19	8.7	9.3	65	38.6%	-1.80 [-4.41, 0.81]	
	Total (95% CI)			156			345	100.0%	-0.71 [-2.33, 0.91]	•
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8	3.25, df =	= 5 (P =	= 0.14);	l ² = 399	6			-	
	Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.86	(P = 0	.39)						OP in SLE non-OP in SLE
~										
y		0	P in SI	LE	non	-OP in	SLE		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Tota	I Mean	SE) Tota	Weigh	t IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV. Fixed, 95% CI
	Banno S 2002	1.4	1.7	12	2 1.8	2.3	3 48	27.1%	6 -0.40 [-1.56, 0.76]	+
	Compeyrot. 2007	4.1	3.4	13	4.6	4.9) 27	5.4%	6 -0.50 [-3.11, 2.11]	
	Congzhu Ding 2002	6	6 4	40) 6	4	38	11.6%	6 0.00 [-1.78, 1.78]	+
	Furukawa, M. 2011	7.1	5.54	37	6.67	6.26	5 21	3.5%	6 0.43 [-2.79, 3.65]	
	Hongjin Liang 2010	2.2	2.6	11	2.7	4.1	105	12.3%	6 -0.50 [-2.23, 1.23]	-
	Pineau, C. A. 2004	7.54	5.24	37	10.1	7.88	68	5.8%	6 -2.56 [-5.08, -0.04]	
	Qingqing Yuan 2014	4.3	3 2.7	20	4.8	2.5	5 28	16.2%	6 -0.50 [-2.00, 1.00]	-
	Sinigaglia L 1999	5.9	3.2	19	9 5.6	5.4	65	9.7%	6 0.30 [-1.65, 2.25]	+
	Sun, Y. N. 2015	10.8	5.2	40) 11.7	· 6	6 79	8.4%	6 -0.90 [-2.99, 1.19]	-
	Total (95% CI)			229	1		479	100.0%	6 -0.46 [-1.06, 0.15]	•
	Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	3.99, df	= 8 (P	= 0.86	6); I ² = 0	%			-	
	Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.4	8 (P =	0.14)						OP in SLE non-OP in SLE
h	1									
•	or 1	OP	' in SL	E	non-	OP in S	SLE		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
-	Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
	Banno S 2002	1.4	1.4	12	0.7	1.1	48	14.4%	0.70 [-0.15, 1.55]	
	Congzhu Ding 2002	1.5	1.3	40	0.6	1.4	38	21.3%	0.90 [0.30, 1.50]	
	G Cramarossa 2016	0.85	1.23	90	0.46	0.88	196	33.6%	0.39 [0.11, 0.67]	■
	Pineau, C. A. 2004	2.89	2.69	37	1.21	1.53	68	12.6%	1.68 [0.74, 2.62]	
	Sinigaglia L 1999	1.6	1.4	19	0.8	1.3	65	18.1%	0.80 [0.10, 1.50]	
	Total (95% CI)			198			415	100.0%	0.78 [0.38, 1.18]	◆
	Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.11; Cł	ni² = 8.	52, df =	= 4 (P =	0.07);	l² = 53%	6		
	Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.79) (P = 0	0.0002)						OP in SLE non-OP in SLE

Fig. 4 (continued)

various actions, which affects the balance of bone metabolism and causes secondary OP [50]. From our meta-analysis, except daily GC dose, cumulative GC dose and duration of GC therapy are associated with OP. This may be related to different disease stages of lupus patients. In stable lupus patients, the dose of GCs gradually decreases, or it is not even use. Therefore, the daily dose of GCs has nothing to do with the occurrence of OP.

SLE can also have a direct or indirect negative impact on BMD. Abnormal levels of cytokines directly affect BMD. Lower levels of P1NP, the most specific bone formation marker, are predictive of BMD loss over 12 months in premenopausal SLE patients [51]. Systemic multiple organ damage can indirectly cause bone mass loss. SLEDAI scored disease activity in SLE patients and SLICC/ACR scored cumulative organ damage. Interesting, SLICC was associated with secondary OP in SLE patients, while SLEDAI has no correlation. This might be attributed that SLEDAI only assesses nine systems with 24 indicators. At the time of BMD measurements, SLEDAI serves for the model of global assessment of activity. However, SLICC/ACR is designed to assess cumulative organ damage due to SLE caused by the disease



Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.99; Chi² = 20.63, df = 8 (P = 0.008); l² = 61% Test for overall effect: Z = 0.72 (P = 0.47)

Fig. 4 (continued)

itself or by treatment since the onset of the disease. Therefore, the Systemic Lupus International Cooperation Clinical Center/American Society of Rheumatology Damage Index is better at predicting osteoporosis.

Natural menopause and aging are involved in the development of OP. Vitku et al. [52] indicated that after menopause, when estrogen levels decrease, there is room for the activity of anthropogenic substances with estrogenic properties—endocrine disruptors (EDs)—that can interfere with bone remodeling and changes in calcium-phosphate metabolism. Thus, menopause contributes to osteoporosis. Our meta-analysis is consistent with other studies. The effect of BMI on osteoporosis is still controversial. Salman-Monte et al. [53] reported that low BMI was correlated with total hip and femoral neck osteopenia. However, Carli et al. [16] indicated that BMI had no difference in two groups. Our meta-analysis showed that BMI has no correlation with the secondary OP in SLE patients.

The mechanism of osteoporosis is complex. In addition to uncontrollable factors such as age and menopause, we should control disease activities and use GCs reasonably and standardly. GC is a double-edged sword. GCs, the basic drugs for SLE, have strong anti-inflammatory and immunosuppressive effects and can reverse the disease. However, GCs also cause diabetes, osteoporosis, ulcers, bacterial and fungal infections, and so on. Given the potential dangers, we should not refuse to use GCs during treatment. SLE disease activity may have direct effects on bone formation. Timely use of hormones can quickly control inflammation, thereby inhibiting cytokine-induced osteoclast activity. Therefore, a fine balance exists between disease control and the use of GCs with regard to bone health is the focus of our research. Studies have shown that adverse effects of daily doses of <7.5 mg prednisone were least [54]. Combined treatment with HCQ and the judicious use of immunosuppressive drugs help to keep prednisone therapy within those limits [4]. In addition, all guidelines recommend supplementation with calcium and vitamin D in SLE. Bisphosphonates are considered the first choice therapy for the prevention and treatment of GIOP [55].

-10

-5

Ó

OP in SLE non-OP in SLE

5

10

The study has some limitations. Firstly, the use of calcium tablets can affect the occurrence and development of OP, but we did not check medications, such as bisphosphonates, calcium, vitamin D, and Denosumab, which affected bone turnover, so the heterogeneity of study was high. Besides, there are various factors affecting osteoporosis, such as serum cytokines, illumination, immunosuppressant medications, and smoking, which increased or reduced the risk of both SLE and OP [55]. However, due to the lack of relevant studies, we did not discuss these factors. Larger sample studies will be needed to elucidate in the future. Additionally, longitudinal studies also needed to delineate a temporal association and causality of OP in the development of SLE.

Conclusion

Our report is the first systematic review to examine the association between OP and SLE. From analysis, OP significantly increased among SLE patients as compared with controls. The age, disease duration, cumulative GC dose, duration of GC therapy, SLICC, and menopause in SLE patients play an important role in OP.

Funding information This work was financially supported by the Postgraduate Research & Practice Innovation Program of Jiangsu Province (grant number KYCX19-2071 and KYCX18-2410), National Natural Science Foundation of China (grant numbers 81671616 and 81871278), and Research Center of Gerontology and Longevity, Affiliated Hospital of Nantong University, Nantong (grant number HS2018004).

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

References

- Wang H, Wang J, Xia Y (2017) Defective suppressor of cytokine signaling 1 signaling contributes to the pathogenesis of systemic lupus erythematosus. Front Immunol 8:1292. https://doi.org/10. 3389/fimmu.2017.01292
- Wu H, Zhao M, Chang C, Lu Q (2015) The real culprit in systemic lupus erythematosus: abnormal epigenetic regulation. Int J Mol Sci 16(5):11013–11033. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms160511013
- Khaniukov O, Yehudina Y, Kalashnykova O, Sapozhnychenko L (2018) Management of patients with systemic lupus erythematosus in the prepregnancy and antenatal periods: challenges and solutions (review). Georgian Med News 280–281:54–61
- Ruiz-Irastorza G, Danza A, Khamashta M (2012) Glucocorticoid use and abuse in SLE. Rheumatology (Oxford) 51(7):1145–1153. https://doi.org/10.1093/rheumatology/ker410
- Xiao Y, Li K, Wang Z, Fu F, Shao S, Song F, Zhao J, Chen W, Liu Q, Xu J (2019) Pectolinarigenin prevents bone loss in ovariectomized mice and inhibits RANKL-induced osteoclastogenesis via blocking activation of MAPK and NFATc1 signaling. J Cell Physiol. https://doi.org/10.1002/jcp.28079
- Bultink IE (2012) Osteoporosis and fractures in systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Care Res 64(1):2–8. https://doi.org/10. 1002/acr.20568
- Ji Z, Zhang Z, Bao C, Zhao D, Lin J, Wu H, He D, Du H, Jiang L (2014) The epidemiological investigation on glucocorticoidinduced osteoporosis. Chin J Rheumatol 8:520–524. https://doi. org/10.3760/cma.j.issn.0578-1426.2017.03.006
- Dey M, Bukhari M (2018) Predictors of fracture risk in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Lupus 27(9):1547–1551. https://doi.org/10.1177/0961203318768886
- Di Munno O, Mazzantini M, Delle Sedie A, Mosca M, Bombardieri S (2004) Risk factors for osteoporosis in female patients with

systemic lupus erythematosus. Lupus 13(9):724-730. https://doi. org/10.1191/09612033031u1097oa

- Bultink IEM (2018) Bone disease in connective tissue disease/ systemic lupus erythematosus. Calcif Tissue Int 102(5):575–591. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00223-017-0322-z
- Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group P (2009) Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. J Clin Epidemiol 62(10):1006–1012. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2009.06.005
- Cramarossa G, Urowitz MB, Su J, Gladman D, Touma Z (2017) Prevalence and associated factors of low bone mass in adults with systemic lupus erythematosus. Lupus 26(4):365–372. https://doi. org/10.1177/0961203316664597
- Bundhun PK, Kumari A, Huang F (2017) Differences in clinical features observed between childhood-onset versus adult-onset systemic lupus erythematosus: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Medicine (Baltimore) 96(37):e8086. https://doi.org/10.1097/MD. 000000000008086
- Gibofsky A (2012) Comparative effectiveness of current treatments for rheumatoid arthritis. Am J Manag Care 18(13 Suppl):S303– S314
- Bultink IE, Lems WF, Kostense PJ, Dijkmans BA, Voskuyl AE (2005) Prevalence of and risk factors for low bone mineral density and vertebral fractures in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum 52(7):2044–2050. https://doi.org/10.1002/art. 21110
- Carli L, Tani C, Spera V, Vagelli R, Vagnani S, Mazzantini M, Di Munno O, Mosca M (2016) Risk factors for osteoporosis and fragility fractures in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Lupus Sci Med 3(1):e000098. https://doi.org/10.1136/lupus-2015-000098
- Chong HC, Chee SS, Goh EM, Chow SK, Yeap SS (2007) Dietary calcium and bone mineral density in premenopausal women with systemic lupus erythematosus. Clin Rheumatol 26(2):182–185. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10067-006-0258-6
- Compeyrot-Lacassagne S, Tyrrell PN, Atenafu E, Doria AS, Stephens D, Gilday D, Silverman ED (2007) Prevalence and etiology of low bone mineral density in juvenile systemic lupus erythematosus. Arthritis Rheum 56(6):1966–1973. https://doi.org/10. 1002/art.22691
- Ding C, Sun L, Wang H, Lin H, Zhang X (2002) Determinants of bone mineral density in systemic lupus erythematosus. Chin J Rheumatol 6(3):192–194. https://doi.org/10.3760/j:issn:1007-7480.2002.03.012
- Pons F, Peris P, Guanabens N, Font J, Huguet M, Espinosa G, Ingelmo M, Munoz-Gomez J, Setoain J (1995) The effect of systemic lupus erythematosus and long-term steroid therapy on bone mass in pre-menopausal women. Br J Rheumatol 34(8):742–746
- Furukawa M, Kiyohara C, Tsukamoto H, Mitoma H, Kimoto Y, Uchino A, Nakagawa M, Oryoji K, Shimoda T, Akashi K, Harada M, Horiuchi T (2011) Prevalence of and risk factors for low bone mineral density in Japanese female patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Rheumatol Int 31(3):365–376. https://doi.org/10. 1007/s00296-009-1244-5
- Wang G, Li X, Li X, Wang G, Tao J, Ma Y (2017) The effect of long-term low dose prednisone on bone mineral density in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Chin J Intern Med 56(3):179– 183. https://doi.org/10.3760/cma.j.issn.0578-1426.2017.03.006
- Bhattoa HP, Bettembuk P, Balogh A, Szegedi G, Kiss E (2002) Bone mineral density in women with systemic lupus erythematosus. Clin Rheumatol 21(2):135–141
- Liang J, Jiang N, Xu Z, Lu X, Liu X, Chen S (2006) The influence of long-term glucocorticoid use on bone mineral density in premenopausal women with SLE. Chin J Osteoporos 12(1):57–58,61. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1006-7108.2006.01.017

- Shen L, Liu Q, Yu L, Huang A (2004) Multivariable statistical analysis of osteoporosis in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Chin J Rheumatol 8(2):92–96. https://doi.org/10.3760/j:issn: 1007-7480.2004.02.008
- Pineau CA, Urowitz MB, Fortin PJ, Ibanez D, Gladman DD (2004) Osteoporosis in systemic lupus erythematosus: factors associated with referral for bone mineral density studies, prevalence of osteoporosis and factors associated with reduced bone density. Lupus 13(6):436–441. https://doi.org/10.1191/0961203303lu1036oa
- Ye Q, Xiong Y, Cao X, Du W (2013) Bone mineral density in 42 female patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Chin J Diffic and Compl Cas 12(4):312–313. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1671-6450.2013.04.024
- Sun YN, Feng XY, He L, Zeng LX, Hao ZM, Lv XH, Pu D (2015) Prevalence and possible risk factors of low bone mineral density in untreated female patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Biomed Res Int 2015:510514. https://doi.org/10.1155/2015/ 510514
- Zhu X, Liang J, Lin B, Zhang J, Tan G (2000) Measurement of bone mineral density in premenopausal women with systemic lupus erythematosus. Chin J Dermatol 3(1):12. https://doi.org/10.3760/j.issn: 0412-4030.2000.01.004
- Liu X, Zhu X, Li S (2000) Detection and analysis of bone mineral density in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. J Nurs 15(1): 14–15. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1001-4152.2000.01.005
- Hou X, Zhang M, Cui L (2015) Serum immunological risk factors for osteoporosis in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Shandong Medical Journal 24:79–80. https://doi.org/10.3969/j. issn.1002-266X.2015.24.035
- Yeap SS, Fauzi AR, Kong NC, Halim AG, Soehardy Z, Rahimah S, Chow SK, Goh EM (2009) Influences on bone mineral density in Malaysian premenopausal systemic lupus erythematosus patients on corticosteroids. Lupus 18(2):178–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/ 0961203308094995
- Yee CS, Crabtree N, Skan J, Amft N, Bowman S, Situnayake D, Gordon C (2005) Prevalence and predictors of fragility fractures in systemic lupus erythematosus. Ann Rheum Dis 64(1):111–113. https://doi.org/10.1136/ard.2003.018127
- Luo Z, Wu J, Huang L, Liao T, He Y (2014) Study on the relationship between inflammatory states of SLE and osteoporosis. J Mod Med Health 18:2730–2732. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn. 10095519.2014.18.004
- He W, Li J, Li B, Ye Z, Guo F, Tan D, Xie Y, Xu S (2009) Influencing factors of bone mineral density in premenopausal women with rheumatism. Journal of Pratical Medcine 25(3):394– 396. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn.1006-5725.2009.03.023
- Sui P, Li X (2008) Changes of bone mineral density in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus before and after hormone therapy. J Jining Med Univ 31(4):298–299. https://doi.org/10.3969/j.issn. 1000-9760.2008.04.013
- Yu J (2015) Effects of different doses of glucocorticoid maintenance therapy on bone mineral density and bone metabolism in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus. Bengbu Medical College
- Liang H (2010) Bone mineral density changes and influencing factors in systemic lupus erythematosus. Shantou University
- Mendoza-Pinto C, García-Carrasco M, Sandoval-Cruz H, Escárcega RO, Jiménez-Hernández M, Etchegaray-Morales I, Soto-Vega E, Muñoz-Guarneros M, López-Colombo A, Delezé-Hinojosa M, Cervera R (2008) Risks factors for low bone mineral density in pre-menopausal Mexican women with systemic lupus erythematosus. Clin Rheumatol 28(1):65–70. https://doi.org/10. 1007/s10067-008-0984-z
- 40. Banno S, Matsumoto Y, Naniwa T, Hayami Y, Sugiura Y, Yoshinouchi T, Ueda R (2002) Reduced bone mineral density in

Japanese premenopausal women with systemic lupus erythematosus treated with glucocorticoids. Mod Rheumatol 12(4):323–328. https://doi.org/10.3109/s101650200057

- Becker A, Fischer R, Scherbaum WA, Schneider M (2001) Osteoporosis screening in systemic lupus erythematosus: impact of disease duration and organ damage. Lupus 10(11):809–814. https://doi.org/10.1177/096120330101001108
- 42. Yuan Q (2014) Bone mass and related factors in 100 female patients with diffuse connective tissue disease. Zhejiang University
- 43. Sinigaglia L, Varenna M, Binelli L, Zucchi F, Ghiringhella D, Gallazzi M, Limonta M, Zeni S, Fantini F (1999) Determinants of bone mass in systemic lupus erythematosus: a cross sectional study on premenopausal women. J Rheumatol 26(6):1280–1284
- 44. Wang Z (2017) The research of osteoporosis in patients with untreated systemic lupus erythematosus. Hebei Medical University
- 45. Le B, Waller JL, Radhakrishnan R, Oh SJ, Kheda MF, Nahman NS Jr, Carbone L (2018) Osteoporotic fractures in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus and end stage renal disease. Lupus 27(1):17–24. https://doi.org/10.1177/0961203317709953
- Bultink IE, Lems WF (2016) Lupus and fractures. Curr Opin Rheumatol 28(4):426–432. https://doi.org/10.1097/BOR. 00000000000290
- Briot K, Geusens P, Em Bultink I, Lems WF, Roux C (2017) Inflammatory diseases and bone fragility. Osteoporos Int 28(12): 3301–3314. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-017-4189-7
- Stojan G, Petri M (2017) The risk benefit ratio of glucocorticoids in SLE: have things changed over the past 40 years? Curr Treatm Opt Rheumatol 3(3):164–172. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40674-017-0069-8
- Balasubramanian A, Wade SW, Adler RA, Saag K, Pannacciulli N, Curtis JR (2018) Glucocorticoid exposure and fracture risk in a cohort of US patients with selected conditions. J Bone Miner Res 33(10):1881–1888. https://doi.org/10.1002/jbmr.3523
- Sarkissian A, Sivaraman V, Bout-Tabaku S, Ardoin SP, Moore-Clingenpeel M, Mruk V, Steigelman H, Morris K, Bowden SA (2019) Bone turnover markers in relation to vitamin D status and disease activity in adults with systemic lupus erythematosus. Lupus 28(2):156–162. https://doi.org/10.1177/0961203318815593
- Seguro LP, Casella CB, Caparbo VF, Oliveira RM, Bonfa A, Bonfa E, Pereira RM (2015) Lower P1NP serum levels: a predictive marker of bone loss after 1 year follow-up in premenopausal systemic lupus erythematosus patients. Osteoporos Int 26(2):459–467. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-014-2860-9
- Vitku J, Kolatorova L, Franekova L, Blahos J, Simkova M, Duskova M, Skodova T, Starka L (2018) Endocrine disruptors of the bisphenol and paraben families and bone metabolism. Physiol Res 67(Supplementum 3):S455–S464
- Salman-Monte TC, Torrente-Segarra V, Munoz-Ortego J, Mojal S, Carbonell-Abello J (2015) Prevalence and predictors of low bone density and fragility fractures in women with systemic lupus erythematosus in a Mediterranean region. Rheumatol Int 35(3):509– 515. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00296-014-3087-y
- Sciascia S, Mompean E, Radin M, Roccatello D, Cuadrado MJ (2017) Rate of adverse effects of medium- to high-dose glucocorticoid therapy in systemic lupus erythematosus: a systematic review of randomized control trials. Clin Drug Investig 37(6):519–524. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40261-017-0518-z
- 55. Gracanin AG, Markovic I, Loncarevic J, Golob M, Morovic-Vergles J (2015) Bone mineral density in patients with systemic lupus erythematosus–our results. Reumatizam 62(2):16–21

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.