

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email editorial.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Abdominal aortic calcification, bone mineral density and fractures: a systematic review and meta-analysis protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-026232
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	23-Aug-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Rodriguez, Alex; Bone and Muscle Health Research Group, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash Medical Centre Leow, Kevin; The University of Sydney, Centre for Kidney Research, School of Public Health, Sydney Medical School, Children's Hospital at Westmead Szulc, Pawel; INSERM UMR 1033, University of Lyon, Hospices Civils de Lyon Scott, David ; Bone and Muscle Health Research Group, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash Medical Centre Ebeling, Peter; Bone and Muscle Health Research Group, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash Medical Centre Sim, Marc; Edith Cowan University, School of Medical and Health Sciences; The University of Western Australia, Medical School, Royal Perth Hospital Unit Wong, Germaine; The Children's Hospital at Westmead, Centre for Kidney Research Lim, Wai H.; Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Department of Renal Medicine; University of Western Australia, Schousboe, John; Park Nicollet Osteoporosis Center and HealthPartners Institute, Minneapolis, MN, USA; and Division of Health Policy and Management, University of Minnesota Kiel, Douglas; Institute for Aging Research, Hebrew Senior Life, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School Prince, Richard ; Medical School, The University of Western Australia; Department of Endocrinology and Diabetes, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital Lewis, Joshua; School of Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University; Children's Hospital at Westmead Centre for Kidney Research, Centre for Kidney Research
Keywords:	vascular calcification, bone mineral density, fracture, abdominal aorta, vascular disease

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Abdominal aortic calcification, bone mineral density and fractures:**
4
5 **a systematic review and meta-analysis protocol**
6
7
8

9 Alexander Rodriguez¹, Kevin Leow², Pawel Szulc³, David Scott¹, Peter Ebeling¹, Marc
10 Sim^{4,5}, Germaine Wong², Wai H. Lim^{5,6}, John T. Schousboe⁷, Douglas P. Kiel⁸, Richard L.
11 Prince^{5,9}, and Joshua R. Lewis^{2,4,5}
12
13
14
15

16
17
18
19 **Affiliations**

20
21 ¹ Bone and Muscle Health Research Group, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health,
22 Monash Medical Centre, Victoria, Australia;

23
24
25 ² The University of Sydney, Centre for Kidney Research, School of Public Health, Sydney
26 Medical School, Children's Hospital at Westmead, New South Wales, Australia;

27
28
29
30 ³ INSERM UMR 1033, University of Lyon, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France;

31
32
33 ⁴ School of Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup, Australia;

34
35
36 ⁵ Medical School, University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia;

37
38
39 ⁶ Department of Renal Medicine, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Perth, Australia;

40
41 ⁷ Park Nicollet Osteoporosis Center and HealthPartners Institute, Minneapolis, MN, USA and
42 Division of Health Policy and Management, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN,
43 USA;
44
45

46
47
48 ⁸ Institute for Aging Research, Hebrew Senior Life, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center,
49 Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA;

50
51
52 ⁹ Department of Endocrinology and Diabetes, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Perth Australia;
53
54
55
56
57
58

Corresponding author:

Dr Joshua Lewis

Tel: +61 8 6304 4602

Edith Cowan University

E-mail: joshua.lewis@ecu.edu.au

School of Medical and Health Sciences

270 Joondalup drive, Joondalup, WA, 6027, AUSTRALIA

Word count: 2004

For peer review only

Abstract

Introduction: Abdominal aortic calcification (AAC) is associated with low bone mass and increased fracture risk. Two previous meta-analyses have investigated the association between AAC and fracture. However, these meta-analyses undertook limited searches and did not explore potential sources of between-study heterogeneity. Our aim is to undertake a sensitive and comprehensive assessment of the relationship between AAC, bone mineral density (BMD) as well as prevalent and incident fractures.

Methods: We will search MEDLINE, EMBASE, Web of Science core collection, and Google scholar (top 200 articles sorted by relevance) from their inception until 1st June 2018. Reference lists of included studies and previous systematic reviews will be hand searched for additional eligible studies. Retrospective and prospective cohort studies (cross-sectional, case-control and longitudinal) reporting the association between AAC, BMD and fracture at any site will be included. At least two investigators will independently: (A) evaluate study eligibility and extract data, with a third investigator to adjudicate when discrepancies occur, (B) assess study quality by the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for each cohort/study. The meta-analysis will be reported in adherence to the Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) criteria. AAC will be grouped as either: (1) AAC present or absent, (2) AAC categorised as “low” (referent – lowest reported group) vs. “high” (all other groups) or (3) dose-response when AAC was assessed in three or more groups. Where primary event data was reported in individual studies, pooled risk differences and risk ratios with 95%CI will be calculated, from which, a summary estimate will be determined using DerSimonian-Laird random effects models. For the AAC and BMD pooled analyses estimates will be expressed as standardised mean difference with 95%CI. We will examine the likelihood of publication bias and where possible, investigate potential reasons for between-study heterogeneity using subgroup analyses and meta-regression.

1
2
3 **Prospero registration number:** CRD42018088019
4

5 **Key words:** vascular calcification, bone mineral density, fracture, abdominal aorta, vascular
6
7 disease
8
9

10
11 **Article summary: strengths and limitations**
12

- 13
14 • Previous meta-analyses have not utilised comprehensive search strategies and have found
15 moderate to high amounts of heterogeneity, which for the most part has been unexplained.
16 The planned comprehensive meta-analysis is warranted and will help address uncertainties
17 regarding the measurement of AAC for the prediction of fracture outcomes. Additionally,
18 this study will use meta-regression to identify sources of heterogeneity and identify
19 subgroups or subpopulations where AAC is more or less predictive of poorer outcomes.
20
21 • To our knowledge there has been no systematic review and meta-analysis that has
22 investigated the association between AAC and BMD, which is along the hypothesised
23 causal pathway to fracture.
24
25 • The main limitation of this review is that causality cannot be established due to the
26 observational nature of the studies.
27
28 • A further limitation is the differences in imaging modality, measurement and reporting of
29 AAC.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Introduction

Vascular and bone diseases are both chronic age-related disease that share many common dietary and lifestyle risk factors and cause considerable morbidity and mortality ¹. Atherosclerotic lesions in the abdominal aorta generally begin around the major vessel bifurcations and branching arteries such as the inferior mesenteric artery and the lumbar arteries that supply blood and nutrients to the lumbar vertebrae. ² Occlusion of these vessels may causes ischemia in the lumbar spine and may result in disc degeneration and asymptomatic vertebral fractures. ³ Additionally the underlying processes regulating arterial calcification share many similarities to bone physiology ⁴ and calcified atherosclerotic plaques release both local and systemic osteochondrogenic factors that may affect regional and systemic bone homeostasis. ⁵ Conversely circulating levels of factors regulating bone homeostasis may also regulate vascular calcifications ⁶ with a number of studies demonstrating osteoporosis and bone mineral density being a risk factor for CVD disease. ^{7,8}

Assessment of lateral spine images are often undertaken to detect prevalent vertebral fractures and have been shown to improve fracture prediction. ⁹⁻¹¹ These images can also be used to assess the degree of abdominal aortic calcification (AAC). To date there are conflicting findings as to whether AAC is associated with bone mineral density and fractures and whether or not these associations are due to ageing, shared fracture risk factors or are a non-traditional independent fracture risk factor. Recent meta-analyses published in 2016 ¹² and 2017 ¹³, looking at observational studies, showed that people with any or high AAC were at greater risk of fractures than those with no or low AAC. However, the previous studies did not systematically review and search the literature (searches found 91 and 105 articles respectively) and the meta-analyses missed many of the known studies. Furthermore studies identified moderate-high heterogeneity without properly exploring or explaining the cause. As such uncertainty exists as to the importance of identifying AAC for predicting incident

fractures. We will therefore undertake a meta-analysis of studies reporting on AAC, bone mineral density (BMD) at any site and prevalent and incident fractures at any site.

Objectives

1. To determine the association between AAC with BMD at any site.
2. To determine the association between AAC with prevalent fractures (cross-sectional) by reported prevalent fracture sites.
3. To determine the association between AAC with incident fractures by reported incident fracture sites.
4. To assess the impact of potential effect modifiers on previous published findings.

Methods and Analysis

The systematic review and meta-analysis has been registered with PROSPERO (CRD42018088019) and reported in adherence to the Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) reporting criteria¹⁴.

Patient and public involvement statement

There is no patient or public involved in this systematic review/meta-analysis.

Eligibility criteria for studies included in this review

Criteria for considering studies for review

- a) Observational studies in humans. These include cohort (both retrospective and prospective cohort studies), case control and cross-sectional studies that report eligible exposure(s) and outcome(s)
- b) Abdominal aortic calcification assessed by any methodology.
- c) Report any bone mineral density measure or prevalent or incident fracture outcome.

Exclusion criteria

- a) Reviews of existing literature.

Exposure

AAC identified from either radiography, DXA machine or CT. AAC will be presented as;

a) AAC present or absent or

b) AAC categorized as low (referent – lowest reported group) vs. moderate to high (all other reported groups).

c) AAC dose-response when AAC was assessed in three or more groups categorised as low (lowest reported category), moderate (middle reported category[ies]) and high (highest reported category).

Outcomes

1. Bone mineral density (by site).
2. Prevalent fractures (by fracture site).
3. Incident fractures (by fracture site).

Cohort characteristics for meta-regression (where available)

- Cohort age (cohort mean)
- Gender (% female)
- Years since menopause (cohort mean)
- Hormone replacement therapy (%)
- Modality of assessing AAC (DXA, standard radiograph or CT).
- Cut points chosen for comparison (low vs high, tertiles etc.)
- Diabetes (% of cohort)
- Current smoker (% of cohort)
- History of smoking (% of cohort)
- Body mass index (cohort mean)
- Chronic kidney disease (% of cohort)

- History of CVD (% of cohort)
- Location of study (Europe, Asia-Pacific, North America), i.e. are association consistent across ethnicities and nation wealth
- Prevalence of CVD medication use (% of cohort)
- History of fracture (% of cohort)

Study Design

Search strategies

A comprehensive literature search within MEDLINE, Web of Science core collection and EMBASE databases will be conducted to source all possibly relevant studies for review, without language restriction. Google scholar will be searched for the top 200 articles sorted by relevance. The search terms will be combined with the boolean “AND” to find all potentially relevant studies. Conference proceedings and abstracts will also be evaluated. A hand search of reference lists of eligible studies and previous meta-analyses will also be undertaken. Non-English papers will be translated and evaluated for eligibility. If more than one publication of a study is retrieved, articles with the most up to date and complete information will be included, although additional unique data from all sources will be considered and included when relevant. Examples of the search strategy are shown in **Table 1**.

Process for selecting studies

Two or more independent authors [A.J.R., K.L., M.S. and J.R.L.] will assess retrieved citations to assess studies for eligibility. Briefly the process for selecting studies for inclusion in the review and meta-analysis will be as follows: merge all identified records using EndNote; remove duplicate records of the same report; retrieve full text of the potentially relevant reports; link together multiple reports of the same study (using the first or largest report as the primary record and subsequent reports to supplement other data); examine full-

1
2
3 text reports for compliance with eligibility criteria; correspond with investigators, where
4 appropriate, to clarify study eligibility and request missing data; make final decisions on
5 study inclusion. Discrepancies about inclusion will be resolved via iteration and consensus or
6 a third reviewer if consensus cannot be reached between the two reviewers. Excluded studies
7 identified that may plausibly be expected to be an included will be reported in supplementary
8 data with a detailed explanation for the reason of exclusion.
9
10
11
12
13
14

15 16 **Risk of bias and quality assessment**

17
18 The risk of bias for observational studies will be assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS).
19 An example of this scale is provided in Supplementary Material 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D. In addition
20 publication bias will be assessed by visual inspection of a funnel plots and the Egger's and Begg's
21 regression tests. Summary estimates of the confidence placed on the evidence will be evaluated using
22 the Grading of Recommendations Assessment Development and Evaluation (GRADE) of evidence
23 about prognosis. GRADE for evidence about prognosis starts with high quality evidence that can then
24 be rated down. These criteria are based on; a) 5 domains diminishing confidence (-1 for risk of bias,
25 inconsistency, imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias) and b) 2 situations increasing
26 confidence (+1 or +2 for large-very large effect size and a +1 for a dose-response gradient [increasing
27 pooled relative risks for fractures with increasing severity of AAC]).¹⁵
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Statistical analysis and data synthesis**

40
41 Analysis of outcome variables will be presented according to either: (1) AAC present or
42 absent (2) AAC categorised as “low” (referent – lowest reported group) vs. “high” (all other
43 groups) or (3) dose response when AAC was assessed in three or more groups. For the dose-
44 response analysis the lowest reported group (low AAC group) will be compared to the middle
45 group(s) vs the highest reported AAC group (high AAC). Where data on more than three
46 groups of AAC were presented the middle groups were combined as “moderate AAC”. This
47 approach was selected due to many studies reporting on variable number of AAC groups with
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the majority of studies using different cut-points for these groupings. Data on the severity of
4 AAC quantification presented as a continuous measure or in three or more groupings of AAC
5 will be used to determine the impact of increased abdominal aortic calcium load on
6 outcomes. Where primary event data was reported in individual studies, pooled risk
7 differences and risk ratios (RR) with 95% confidence intervals will be calculated, from
8 which, a summary estimate was determined using DerSimonian-Laird random effects models.
9 For the AAC and BMD pooled analyses estimates will be expressed as standardised mean
10 difference (SMD) with 95% CI. Values will be considered significant if the 95%CI of the
11 point estimate does not cross unity. Between-study heterogeneity will also investigated by
12 using subgroup analyses and the I^2 statistic by study ID which quantifies inconsistency across
13 studies to assess the impact of heterogeneity on the meta-analysis.^{16 17} We will evaluate for
14 heterogeneity using the I^2 statistic and considered the I^2 thresholds of <25%, 25-49%, 50-
15 75% and >75% to represent low, moderate, high and very-high heterogeneity.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity**

32 We will perform meta-regression of cohort characteristics to identify factors potentially
33 explaining heterogeneity as well as performing subgroup analyses. P values of <0.01 will be
34 considered statistically significant for subgroup analyses. Pre-planned subgroup analyses to
35 explore statistical heterogeneity will include stratification by:
36
37
38
39
40
41

- 42 1. Subgroups based on clinical heterogeneity e.g. disease populations (general
43 population, diabetics, chronic kidney disease, other) and age groups (<60 years, 60-69
44 years and ≥ 70 years).
 - 45 2. Methodological heterogeneity e.g. AAC assessment methods (Radiography, Dual X-
46 ray absorptiometry or CT), fracture reporting and validation.
 - 47 3. Statistical heterogeneity e.g. cohort characteristics (mean ages of the cohorts)
- 48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Further analyses

Where data on the severity of AAC quantification is presented as a continuous measure or in tertile/categories these data will be used to determine the impact of increased abdominal aortic calcium load on prognosis. *Where AAC is not scored using the AAC24 scale equivalent values will be relative to estimated vertebral heights from similar aged populations. Where AAC is assessed by CT the categorical low vs moderate and high AAC will be used.

Sensitivity analysis

We will carry out sensitivity analyses for:

1. Large studies alone to establish how much they dominate the results (n > 500 participants).
2. Methodology - we will assess the methodological quality of studies using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses (Supplementary Material 1). For the purpose of this sensitivity analysis we will use 3 categories of quality (Good, Fair, or Poor).
3. Studies conducted in individuals without a history of a prior fracture (as this is the biggest risk factor for a new fracture).
4. Studies conducted in high income vs. low income countries.
5. Studies that included non-osteoporotic fractures (fractures of the toes, fingers, face and skull fractures)

Concluding statement

Previous meta-analyses on this topic have a number of important limitations. By undertaking the pre-planned comprehensive review and meta-analysis, we will gain better understanding of the relationship between abdominal aortic calcification (AAC), bone mineral density and

1
2
3 increased fracture risk. The review will provide impetus for further research, diagnosis and
4 treatment of this novel fracture risk factor. This review will also evaluate the quality of the
5 published evidence and our confidence in the estimates for the meta-analysis, while
6 identifying important knowledge gaps, potential sources of between-study heterogeneity and
7 issues with imaging, assessing or reporting of AAC in published studies.
8
9
10
11
12

13 **Ethics and dissemination:** The systematic review and meta-analysis does not require ethical
14 approval. The study will be submitted to a peer reviewed journal and disseminated via
15 research presentations.
16
17
18

19 **Data statement**

20 Technical appendix and dataset will be available on request from the corresponding author
21 (J.R.L).
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Conflicts of interest**

28 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests in this study protocol.
29

30 **Funding and acknowledgements**

31 The salaries of J.R.L. and D.S. are supported by a National Health and Medical Research
32 Council of Australia (NHMRC) Career Development Fellowship (ID: 1107474 and 1123014,
33 respectively). Funding agencies had no input into any aspect of the design and management
34 of this study.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Author contribution**

42 All authors contributed to the study concept and design. A.R. and K.L. led the writing of the
43 manuscript and is the primary designer of the protocol under the guidance of J.R.L, J.T.S and
44 P.S and all-authors conceived the conceptual ideas presented in the revised protocol critically.
45 All authors read and approved the revised version and final supported versions. J.R.L has the
46 primary responsibility for the final content.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. Farhat GN, Cauley JA. The link between osteoporosis and cardiovascular disease. *Clin Cases Miner Bone Metab* 2008;5(1):19-34.
2. Lillemark L, Ganz M, Barascuk N, et al. Growth patterns of abdominal atherosclerotic calcified deposits from lumbar lateral X-rays. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging* 2010;26(7):751-61. doi: 10.1007/s10554-010-9606-3
3. Kauppila LI, Mikkonen R, Mankinen P, et al. MR aortography and serum cholesterol levels in patients with long-term nonspecific lower back pain. *Spine* 2004;29(19):2147-52.
4. Thompson B, Towler DA. Arterial calcification and bone physiology: role of the bone-vascular axis. *Nat Rev Endocrinol* 2012;8(9):529-43. doi: 10.1038/nrendo.2012.36 [published Online First: 2012/04/05]
5. Szulc P. Abdominal aortic calcification: A reappraisal of epidemiological and pathophysiological data. *Bone* 2016;84:25-37. doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2015.12.004
6. Touw WA, Ueland, T., Bollerslev, J., Schousboe, J.T., Lim, W.H., Wong, G, Thompson, P.L., Kiel, D.P., Prince, R.L., Rivadeneira, F., Lewis, J.R. Association of Circulating Wnt Antagonists With Severe Abdominal Aortic Calcification in Elderly Women. *The J Endocrine Soc* 2017;1(1):26-38. doi: 10.1210/js.2016-1040
7. Warburton DE, Nicol CW, Gatto SN, et al. Cardiovascular disease and osteoporosis: balancing risk management. *Vasc Health Risk Manag* 2007;3(5):673-89. [published Online First: 2007/12/15]

- 1
2
3
4
5 8. Tanko LB, Christiansen C, Cox DA, et al. Relationship between osteoporosis and
6
7 cardiovascular disease in postmenopausal women. *J Bone Min Res* 2005;20(11):1912-
8
9 20. doi: 10.1359/JBMR.050711 [published Online First: 2005/10/20]
10
11 9. Ferrar L, Roux C, Felsenberg D, et al. Association between incident and baseline vertebral
12
13 fractures in European women: vertebral fracture assessment in the Osteoporosis and
14
15 Ultrasound Study (OPUS). *Osteoporo Int* 2012;23(1):59-65. doi: 10.1007/s00198-
16
17 011-1701-3
18
19 10. Black DM, Arden NK, Palermo L, et al. Prevalent vertebral deformities predict hip
20
21 fractures and new vertebral deformities but not wrist fractures. Study of Osteoporotic
22
23 Fractures Research Group. *J Bone Min Res* 1999;14(5):821-8. doi:
24
25 10.1359/jbmr.1999.14.5.821
26
27
28 11. Ross PD, Genant HK, Davis JW, et al. Predicting vertebral fracture incidence from
29
30 prevalent fractures and bone density among non-black, osteoporotic women.
31
32 *Osteoporo Int* 1993;3(3):120-6.
33
34 12. Chen Z, Yu Y. Aortic calcification was associated with risk of fractures: A meta-analysis.
35
36 *J Back Musculoskeletal Rehab* 2016;29(4):635-42.
37
38 13. Wei D, Zheng G, Gao Y, et al. Abdominal aortic calcification and the risk of bone
39
40 fractures: a meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *J Bone Miner Metab* 2017
41
42 doi: 10.1007/s00774-017-0849-0
43
44
45 14. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in
46
47 epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in
48
49 Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* 2000;283(15):2008-12. [published Online
50
51 First: 2000/05/02]
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 15. Iorio A, Spencer FA, Falavigna M, et al. Use of GRADE for assessment of evidence
4
5 about prognosis: rating confidence in estimates of event rates in broad categories of
6
7 patients. *BMJ* 2015;350:h870. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h870
8
9 16. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med*
10
11 2002;21(11):1539-58. doi: 10.1002/sim.1186 [published Online First: 2002/07/12]
12
13 17. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses.
14
15 *BMJ* 2003;327(7414):557-60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557 [published Online
16
17 First: 2003/09/06]
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 1. Example search strategies

Keyword	MEDLINE	Embase
Population = Adults	No search strategy	No search strategy
Intervention/Test = aortic calcification	exp Vascular Calcification/ or exp Calcinosis/ or exp Vascular Diseases/ or arterial calcification.mp or exp Arteriosclerosis/ or exp Arterial Occlusive Diseases/ or exp Aortic Diseases/ or aortic.mp or vascular calcifications.mp. or exp Vascular Calcification/ or calcified atherosclerosis.mp or calcification.mp or calcified atherosclerotic plaque.mp or arterial calcium.mp or aortic calcification.mp or aorta calcification.mp and aort\$.mp and calc\$.mp	vascular calcification.mp. or exp blood vessel calcification/ or artery calcification.mp. or exp artery calcification/ or exp coronary artery disease/ or exp arteriosclerosis/ or calcified atherosclerosis.mp or arterial calcium.mp or calcified atherosclerotic plaque.mp or calcification.mp or aortic calcification.mp or aorta calcification.mp or vascular calcifications.mp or arteriosclerosis.mp or extracoronary.mp and aort\$.mp and calc\$.mp
Methodology = observational	No search strategy	No search strategy
Comparator = None	No search strategy	No search strategy
Outcome =	bone mineral density.mp or exp Bone Density/ or Fracture.mp or Fractures.mp	bone mineral density.mp or exp bone density/ or fracture.mp or fractures.mp or exp fracture/
Additional specific filters	Human	Human

*The reference lists of recent literature reviews and guidelines will be hand-searched for possibly relevant studies.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL 1A

NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE - CASE CONTROL STUDIES

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Exposure categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability.

Selection

1) Is the case definition adequate?

- a) yes, with independent validation *
- b) yes, e.g. record linkage or based on self reports
- c) no description

2) Representativeness of the cases

- a) consecutive or obviously representative series of cases *
- b) potential for selection biases or not stated

3) Selection of Controls

- a) community controls *
- b) hospital controls
- c) no description

4) Definition of Controls

- a) no history of disease (endpoint) *
- b) no description of source

Comparability

1) Comparability of cases and controls on the basis of the design or analysis

- a) study controls for fracture risk factors (age) *
- b) study controls for any additional factor * (other fracture risk factors)

Exposure

1) Ascertainment of exposure

- a) secure record (verified fracture) *
- b) structured interview where blind to case/control status *
- c) interview not blinded to case/control status
- d) written self report or medical record only
- e) no description

2) Same method of ascertainment for cases and controls

- a) yes *
- b) no

1
2
3 **3) Non-Response rate**

- 4 a) same rate for both groups *
- 5
- 6 b) non respondents described
- 7
- 8 c) rate different and no designation
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29
- 30
- 31
- 32
- 33
- 34
- 35
- 36
- 37
- 38
- 39
- 40
- 41
- 42
- 43
- 44
- 45
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56
- 57
- 58
- 59
- 60

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL 1B

NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE - COHORT STUDIES

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability

Selection

1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort

- a) truly representative of the average **general population of that age** in the community *
- b) somewhat representative of the average **general population of that age** in the community *
- c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
- d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Selection of the non exposed cohort

- a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort *
- b) drawn from a different source
- c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort

3) Ascertainment of exposure

- a) secure record (**verified fracture**) *
- b) structured interview *
- c) written self report
- d) no description

4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study

- a) yes *
- b) no

Comparability

1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis

- a) study controls for **age***
- b) study controls for any **additional fracture risk factors***

Outcome

1) Assessment of outcome

- a) independent blind assessment *
- b) record linkage *
- c) self report
- d) no description

1
2
3 **2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur**

4 a) yes (fracture - 1 year) *

5
6 b) no

7
8 **3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts**

9 a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for *

10 b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - <20% lost
11 to follow up, or description provided of those lost) *

12
13
14 c) follow up rate < 80% (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost

15
16 d) no statement
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL 1C

CODING MANUAL FOR COHORT STUDIES

Selection

1) Representativeness of the Exposed Cohort

Item is assessing the representativeness of exposed individuals in the community, not the representativeness of the sample of women from some general population. For example, subjects derived from groups likely to contain middle class, better educated, health oriented women are likely to be representative of postmenopausal estrogen users while they are not representative of all women (e.g. members of a health maintenance organisation (HMO) will be a representative sample of estrogen users. While the HMO may have an under-representation of ethnic groups, the poor, and poorly educated, these excluded groups are not the predominant users of estrogen).

Allocation of stars as per rating sheet

2) Selection of the Non-Exposed Cohort

Allocation of stars as per rating sheet

3) Ascertainment of Exposure

Allocation of stars as per rating sheet

4) Demonstration That Outcome of Interest Was Not Present at Start of Study

In the case of mortality studies, outcome of interest is still the presence of a disease/ incident, rather than death. That is to say that a statement of no history of disease or incident earns a star.

Comparability

1) Comparability of Cohorts on the Basis of the Design or Analysis

A maximum of 2 stars can be allotted in this category

Either exposed and non-exposed individuals must be matched in the design and/or confounders must be adjusted for in the analysis. Statements of no differences between groups or that differences were not statistically significant are not sufficient for establishing comparability. Note: If the relative risk for the exposure of interest is adjusted for the confounders listed, then the groups will be considered to be comparable on each variable used in the adjustment.

There may be multiple ratings for this item for different categories of exposure (e.g. ever vs. never, current vs. previous or never)

Age = , Other controlled factors =

Outcome

1) Assessment of Outcome

For some outcomes (e.g. fractured hip), reference to the medical record is sufficient to satisfy the requirement for confirmation of the fracture. This would not be adequate for vertebral fracture outcomes where reference to x-rays would be required.

- a) Independent or blind assessment stated in the paper, or confirmation of the outcome by reference to secure records (x-rays, medical records, etc.)
- b) Record linkage (e.g. identified through ICD codes on database records)
- c) Self-report (i.e. no reference to original medical records or x-rays to confirm the outcome)
- d) No description.

2) Was Follow-Up Long Enough for Outcomes to Occur

An acceptable length of time should be decided before quality assessment begins (e.g. 5 yrs. for exposure to breast implants)

3) Adequacy of Follow-Up of Cohorts

This item assesses the follow-up of the exposed and non-exposed cohorts to ensure that losses are not related to either the exposure or the outcome.

Allocation of stars as per rating sheet.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL 1D

NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE – CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDIES

Selection (Maximum 5 stars)

1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort

- a) Truly representative of the average **general population of that age** in the community
* (all subjects or random sampling)
- b) Somewhat representative of the average **general population of that age** in the community *(non-random sampling)
- c) Selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
- d) No description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Sample size

- a) Justified*
- b) Non-justified

3) Non-respondents

- a) Comparability between respondents and non-respondents characteristics is established, and the response rate is satisfactory*
- b) The response rate is unsatisfactory, or the comparability between respondents and non-respondents is unsatisfactory
- c) No description of the response rate or the characteristics of the responders and the non-responders

4) Ascertainment of the exposure (risk factor):

- a) Validated measurement tool **
- b) Non-validated measurement tool, but the tool is available or described *
- c) No description of the measurement tool

Comparability (Maximum 2 stars)

1) The subjects in different outcome groups are comparable, based on the study design or analysis. Confounding factors are controlled

- a) Study controls for **age** *
- b) Study controls for any **additional fracture risk factors** *

Outcome (Maximum 3 stars)

1) Assessment of outcome

- a) Independent blind assessment **
- b) Record linkage **

1
2
3 c) Self-report *

4 d) No description
5

6 **2) Statistical test**

7 a) The statistical test used to describe the data is clearly described and appropriate, and
8 the measurement of the association is presented, including confidence intervals and the
9 probability level (p value) *

10
11
12 b) The statistical test is not appropriate, not described or incomplete
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Page number
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	NA
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	2,6
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	12
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	NA
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	12
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	12
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	12
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	5
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	6
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	6-8
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	8-9
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	16

Study records:			
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	8
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	8
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	9
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	9
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	7
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	9
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	9-10
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2 , Kendall's τ)	9-10
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	10-11
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	NA
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	11
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	9

*** It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.

BMJ Open

Abdominal aortic calcification, bone mineral density and fractures: a systematic review and meta-analysis protocol

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2018-026232.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	19-Dec-2018
Complete List of Authors:	Rodriguez, Alex; Bone and Muscle Health Research Group, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash Medical Centre Leow, Kevin; The University of Sydney, Centre for Kidney Research, School of Public Health, Sydney Medical School, Children's Hospital at Westmead Szulc, Pawel; INSERM UMR 1033, University of Lyon, Hospices Civils de Lyon Scott, David ; Bone and Muscle Health Research Group, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash Medical Centre Ebeling, Peter; Bone and Muscle Health Research Group, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash Medical Centre Sim, Marc; Edith Cowan University, School of Medical and Health Sciences; The University of Western Australia, Medical School, Royal Perth Hospital Unit Wong, Germaine; The Children's Hospital at Westmead, Centre for Kidney Research Lim, Wai H.; Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Department of Renal Medicine; University of Western Australia, Schousboe, John; Park Nicollet Osteoporosis Center and HealthPartners Institute, Minneapolis, MN, USA; and Division of Health Policy and Management, University of Minnesota Kiel, Douglas; Institute for Aging Research, Hebrew Senior Life, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School Prince, Richard ; Medical School, The University of Western Australia; Department of Endocrinology and Diabetes, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital R. Lewis, Joshua; School of Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University; Children's Hospital at Westmead Centre for Kidney Research, Centre for Kidney Research
Primary Subject Heading:	Rheumatology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Cardiovascular medicine, Radiology and imaging
Keywords:	vascular calcification, bone mineral density, fracture, abdominal aorta, vascular disease

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



1
2
3 **Abdominal aortic calcification, bone mineral density and fractures:**
4
5 **a systematic review and meta-analysis protocol**
6
7
8
9

10 Alexander Rodriguez¹, Kevin Leow², Pawel Szulc³, David Scott¹, Peter Ebeling¹, Marc Sim^{4,5},
11 Germaine Wong², Wai H. Lim^{5,6}, John T. Schousboe⁷, Douglas P. Kiel⁸, Richard L. Prince^{5,9},
12 and Joshua R. Lewis^{2,4,5}
13
14
15
16

17
18
19
20 **Affiliations**
21

22
23 ¹ Bone and Muscle Health Research Group, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health,
24 Monash Medical Centre, Victoria, Australia;

25
26
27 ² The University of Sydney, Centre for Kidney Research, School of Public Health, Sydney
28 Medical School, Children's Hospital at Westmead, New South Wales, Australia;

29
30
31 ³ INSERM UMR 1033, University of Lyon, Hospices Civils de Lyon, Lyon, France;

32
33
34 ⁴ School of Medical and Health Sciences, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup, Australia;

35
36
37 ⁵ Medical School, University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia;

38
39
40 ⁶ Department of Renal Medicine, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Perth, Australia;

41
42
43 ⁷ Park Nicollet Osteoporosis Center and HealthPartners Institute, Minneapolis, MN, USA and
44 Division of Health Policy and Management, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN,
45 USA;

46
47
48 ⁸ Institute for Aging Research, Hebrew Senior Life, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center,
49 Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA;

50
51
52 ⁹ Department of Endocrinology and Diabetes, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Perth Australia;
53
54
55

1
2
3 **Corresponding author:**
4

5 Dr Joshua Lewis

Tel: +61 8 6304 4602

6
7 Edith Cowan University

E-mail: joshua.lewis@uwa.edu.au

8
9 School of Medical and Health Sciences

10
11
12 270 Joondalup drive, Joondalup, WA, 6027, AUSTRALIA
13
14

15
16
17 **Word count:** 1979
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Abstract

Introduction: Abdominal aortic calcification (AAC) is associated with low bone mass and increased fracture risk. Two previous meta-analyses have investigated the association between AAC and fracture. However, these meta-analyses only identified articles until December 2016, undertook limited searches and did not explore potential sources of between-study heterogeneity. We aim to undertake a sensitive and comprehensive assessment of the relationship between AAC, bone mineral density (BMD) as well as prevalent and incident fractures.

Methods: We will search MEDLINE, EMBASE, Web of Science core collection, and Google scholar (top 200 articles sorted by relevance) from their inception until 1st June 2018. Reference lists of included studies and previous systematic reviews will be hand searched for additional eligible studies. Retrospective and prospective cohort studies (cross-sectional, case-control and longitudinal) reporting the association between AAC, BMD and fracture at any site will be included. At least two investigators will independently: (A) evaluate study eligibility and extract data, with a third investigator to adjudicate when discrepancies occur, (B) assess study quality by the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale for each cohort/study. The meta-analysis will be reported in adherence to the Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) criteria. AAC will be grouped as either: (1) AAC present or absent, (2) AAC categorised as “low” (referent – lowest reported group) vs. “high” (all other groups) or (3) dose-response when AAC was assessed in ≥ 3 groups. Where primary event data was reported in individual studies, pooled risk differences and risk ratios with 95%CI will be calculated, from which, a summary estimate will be determined using DerSimonian-Laird random effects models. For the AAC and BMD pooled analyses estimates will be expressed as standardised mean difference with 95%CI. We will examine the likelihood of publication bias and where

possible, investigate potential reasons for between-study heterogeneity using subgroup analyses and meta-regression.

Prospero registration number:CRD42018088019

Key words: vascular calcification, bone mineral density, fracture, abdominal aorta, vascular disease

Article summary: strengths and limitations

- Previous meta-analyses have only searched the literature until 2016, have found limited numbers of studies and identified moderate to high amounts of between-study heterogeneity, which for the most part has been unexplained. The planned comprehensive meta-analysis is warranted and will help address uncertainties regarding the measurement of AAC for the prediction of fracture outcomes and understand the role of AAC alongside, but independent of BMD in fracture risk prediction. Additionally, this study will use meta-regression to identify sources of heterogeneity and identify subgroups or subpopulations where AAC is more or less predictive of poorer outcomes.
- To our knowledge there has been no systematic review and meta-analysis that has investigated the association between AAC and BMD, which is along the hypothesised causal pathway to fracture.
- The main limitation of this review is that causality cannot be established due to the observational nature of the studies.
- A further limitation is the differences in imaging modality, measurement and reporting of AAC across studies but we attempted to overcome this by exploring these aspects in pre-specified sub-analyses.

Introduction

Vascular and bone diseases are both chronic age-related disease that share many common dietary and lifestyle risk factors and cause considerable morbidity and mortality ¹. Atherosclerotic lesions in the abdominal aorta generally begin around the major vessel bifurcations and branching arteries such as the inferior mesenteric artery and the lumbar arteries that supply blood and nutrients to the lumbar vertebrae. ² Occlusion of these vessels may causes ischemia in the lumbar spine and may result in disc degeneration and asymptomatic vertebral fractures. ³ Additionally the underlying processes regulating arterial calcification share many similarities to bone physiology ⁴ and calcified atherosclerotic plaques release both local and systemic osteochondrogenic factors that may affect regional and systemic bone homeostasis. ⁵ Conversely circulating levels of factors regulating bone homeostasis may also regulate vascular calcifications ⁶ with a number of studies demonstrating osteoporosis and bone mineral density being a risk factor for cardiovascular disease (CVD). ^{7 8}

Assessment of lateral spine images are often undertaken to detect prevalent vertebral fractures and have been shown to improve fracture prediction. ⁹⁻¹¹ These images can also be used to assess the degree of abdominal aortic calcification (AAC). To date there are conflicting findings as to whether AAC is associated with bone mineral density and fractures and whether or not these associations are due to ageing, shared fracture risk factors or are a non-traditional independent fracture risk factor. Recent meta-analyses published in 2016 ¹² and 2017 ¹³, looking at observational studies, showed that people with any or high AAC were at greater risk of fractures than those with no or low AAC. However, the previous studies by Chen et al. ¹² and Wei et al. ¹³, only identified a limited number of articles due to the search strategies employed (searches found 91 and 105 articles respectively) and the meta-analyses missed many of the known studies in the area (by way of example - both studies missed Wang et al. ¹⁴). For example, our recent search identified 1561 potentially eligible reports. Furthermore, studies

1
2
3 identified moderate-high unexplained heterogeneity that needs to be explored further. As such
4
5 uncertainty exists as to the importance of identifying AAC for incident fracture risk,
6
7 particularly with respect to AAC cut points, types of fracture and potential explanations for the
8
9 observed between-study heterogeneity. We will therefore undertake a meta-analysis of studies
10
11 reporting on AAC, bone mineral density (BMD) at any site and prevalent and incident fractures
12
13 at any site.
14
15

16 17 18 **Objectives**

- 19
20 1. To determine the association between AAC with BMD at any site.
- 21
22 2. To determine the association between AAC with prevalent fractures (cross-sectional)
23
24 by reported prevalent fracture sites.
- 25
26 3. To determine the association between AAC with incident fractures by reported incident
27
28 fracture sites.
- 29
30 4. To assess the impact of potential effect modifiers, including aspects of clinical,
31
32 methodological and statistical heterogeneity on previous published findings.
33
34
35

36 37 **Methods and Analysis**

38
39 The systematic review and meta-analysis has been registered with PROSPERO
40
41 (CRD42018088019) and reported in adherence to the Meta-analysis of Observational Studies
42
43 in Epidemiology (MOOSE) reporting criteria ¹⁵.
44
45

46 47 **Patient and public involvement statement**

48
49 There is no patient or public involved in this systematic review/meta-analysis.
50

51 52 **Eligibility criteria for studies included in this review**

53
54 *Criteria for considering studies for review*
55
56
57
58
59
60

- a) Observational studies in humans. These include cohort (both retrospective and prospective cohort studies), case control and cross-sectional studies that report eligible exposure(s) and outcome(s)
- b) Abdominal aortic calcification assessed by any methodology.
- c) Report any bone mineral density measure or prevalent or incident fracture outcome.

Exclusion criteria

- a) Reviews of existing literature.

Exposure

AAC identified from either radiography, DXA machine or CT. AAC will be presented as;

- a) AAC present or absent or
- b) AAC categorized as low (referent – lowest reported group) vs. moderate to high (all other reported groups).
- c) AAC dose-response when AAC was assessed in three or more groups categorised as low (lowest reported category), moderate (middle reported category[ies]) and high (highest reported category).

Outcomes

1. Bone mineral density (by site).
2. Prevalent fractures (by fracture site).
3. Incident fractures (by fracture site).

Cohort characteristics for meta-regression (where available)

- Cohort age (cohort mean)
- Gender (% female)
- Years since menopause (cohort mean)
- Hormone replacement therapy (%)

- Modality of assessing AAC (DXA, standard radiograph or CT).
- Cut points chosen for comparison (low vs high, tertiles etc.)
- Diabetes (% of cohort)
- Current smoker (% of cohort)
- History of smoking (% of cohort)
- Body mass index (cohort mean)
- Chronic kidney disease (% of cohort)
- History of CVD (% of cohort)
- Location of study (Europe, Asia-Pacific, North America), i.e. are associations consistent across ethnicities and nation wealth
- Prevalence of CVD medication use (% of cohort)
- History of fracture (% of cohort)

Study Design

Search strategies

A comprehensive literature search within MEDLINE, Web of Science core collection and EMBASE databases will be conducted to source all possibly relevant studies for review, without language restriction. Google scholar will be searched for the top 200 articles sorted by relevance. The search terms will be combined with the boolean “AND” to find all potentially relevant studies. Conference proceedings and abstracts will also be evaluated. A hand search of reference lists of eligible studies and previous meta-analyses will also be undertaken. Non-English papers will be translated and evaluated for eligibility. If more than one publication of a study is retrieved, articles with the most up to date and complete information will be included, although additional unique data from all sources will be considered and included when relevant. Examples of the search strategy are shown in **Table 1**.

Process for selecting studies

Two or more independent authors [A.J.R., K.L., M.S. and J.R.L.] will assess retrieved citations to assess studies for eligibility. Briefly the process for selecting studies for inclusion in the review and meta-analysis will be as follows: merge all identified records using EndNote; remove duplicate records of the same report; retrieve full text of the potentially relevant reports; link together multiple reports of the same study (using the first or largest report as the primary record and subsequent reports to supplement other data); examine full-text reports for compliance with eligibility criteria; correspond with investigators, where appropriate, to clarify study eligibility and request missing data; make final decisions on study inclusion. Discrepancies about inclusion will be resolved via iteration and consensus or a third reviewer if consensus cannot be reached between the two reviewers. Excluded studies identified that may plausibly be expected to be included will be reported in supplementary data with a detailed explanation for the reason of exclusion.

Risk of bias and quality assessment

The risk of bias for observational studies will be assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS). An example of this scale is provided in Supplementary Material 1A, 1B, 1C, 1D. In addition publication bias will be assessed by visual inspection of a funnel plots and the Egger's and Begg's regression tests. Summary estimates of the confidence placed on the evidence will be evaluated using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment Development and Evaluation (GRADE) of evidence about prognosis. GRADE for evidence about prognosis starts with high quality evidence that can then be rated down. These criteria are based on; a) 5 domains diminishing confidence (-1 for risk of bias, inconsistency, imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias) and b) 2 situations increasing confidence (+1 or +2 for large-very large effect size and a +1 for a dose-response gradient [increasing pooled relative risks for fractures with increasing severity of AAC]).¹⁶

Statistical analysis and data synthesis

Analysis of outcome variables will be presented according to either: (1) AAC present or absent (2) AAC categorised as “low” (referent – lowest reported group) vs. “high” (all other groups) or (3) dose response when AAC was assessed in three or more groups. For the dose-response analysis the lowest reported group (low AAC group) will be compared to the middle group(s) vs the highest reported AAC group (high AAC). Where data on more than three groups of AAC were presented the middle groups were combined as “moderate AAC”. This approach was selected due to many studies reporting on variable number of AAC groups with the majority of studies using different cut-points for these groupings. Data on the severity of AAC quantification presented as a continuous measure or in three or more groupings of AAC will be used to determine the impact of increased abdominal aortic calcium load on outcomes. Where primary event data was reported in individual studies, pooled risk differences and risk ratios (RR) with 95% confidence intervals will be calculated, from which, a summary estimate was determined using DerSimonian-Laird random effects models. For the AAC and BMD pooled analyses estimates will be expressed as standardised mean difference (SMD) with 95% CI. Values will be considered significant if the 95%CI of the point estimate does not cross unity. Between-study heterogeneity will also be investigated by using subgroup analyses and the I^2 statistic by study ID which quantifies inconsistency across studies to assess the impact of heterogeneity on the meta-analysis.^{17 18} We will evaluate for heterogeneity using the I^2 statistic and considered the I^2 thresholds of <25%, 25-49%, 50-75% and >75% to represent low, moderate, high and very-high heterogeneity.

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

We will perform meta-regression of cohort characteristics to identify factors potentially explaining heterogeneity as well as performing subgroup analyses. P values of <0.01 will be

1
2
3 considered statistically significant for subgroup analyses. Pre-planned subgroup analyses to
4
5 explore statistical heterogeneity will include stratification by:
6
7

- 8 1. Subgroups based on clinical heterogeneity e.g. disease populations (general population,
9
10 diabetics, chronic kidney disease, other) and age groups (<60 years, 60-69 years and
11
12 ≥ 70 years).
- 13
14 2. Methodological heterogeneity e.g. AAC assessment methods (Radiography, Dual X-
15
16 ray absorptiometry or CT), thresholds to define high or severe AAC, fracture reporting
17
18 and validation.
- 19
20
21 3. Statistical heterogeneity e.g. cohort characteristics (mean ages of the cohorts)
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Further analyses**

28
29 Where data on the severity of AAC quantification is presented as a continuous measure or in
30
31 tertile/categories these data will be used to determine the impact of increased abdominal aortic
32
33 calcium load on prognosis. *Where AAC is not scored using the AAC24 scale equivalent
34
35 values will be relative to estimated vertebral heights from similar aged populations. Where
36
37 AAC is assessed by CT the categorical low vs moderate and high AAC will be used.
38
39
40

41 **Sensitivity analysis**

42
43 We will carry out sensitivity analyses for:
44
45

- 46 1. Large studies alone to establish how much they dominate the results ($n > 500$
47
48 participants).
- 49
50 2. Methodology - we will assess the methodological quality of studies using the
51
52 Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in
53
54 meta-analyses (Supplementary Material 1). For the purpose of this sensitivity analysis
55
56 we will use 3 categories of quality (Good, Fair, or Poor).
57
58
59
60

- 1
- 2
- 3 3. Studies conducted in individuals without a history of a prior fracture (as this is the
- 4 biggest risk factor for a new fracture).
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8 4. Studies conducted in high income vs. low income countries.
- 9
- 10 5. Studies that included non-osteoporotic fractures (fractures of the toes, fingers, face and
- 11 skull fractures)
- 12
- 13
- 14 6. Study design bias comparing outcomes in cross-sectional and prospective studies
- 15 (given that prospective studies may also include prevalent fractures and BMD
- 16 measurements at baseline that can be analysed cross-sectionally).
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20

21 **Concluding statement**

22 Previous meta-analyses on this topic have a number of important limitations. By undertaking
23 the pre-planned comprehensive review and meta-analysis, we will gain better understanding of
24 the relationship between abdominal aortic calcification (AAC), bone mineral density and
25 increased fracture risk. The review will provide impetus for further research, diagnosis and
26 treatment of this novel fracture risk factor. This review will also evaluate the quality of the
27 published evidence and our confidence in the estimates for the meta-analysis, while identifying
28 important knowledge gaps, potential sources of between-study heterogeneity and issues with
29 imaging, assessing or reporting of AAC in published studies.

30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42 **Ethics and dissemination:** The systematic review and meta-analysis does not require ethical
43 approval. The study will be submitted to a peer reviewed journal and disseminated via research
44 presentations.

45 **Data statement**

46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

56 **Conflicts of interest**

57 The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests in this study protocol.

58 **Funding and acknowledgements**

1
2
3 The salaries of J.R.L. and D.S. are supported by a National Health and Medical Research
4 Council of Australia (NHMRC) Career Development Fellowship (ID: 1107474 and 1123014,
5
6 respectively). Funding agencies had no input into any aspect of the design and management of
7
8 this study.
9
10

11 12 **Author contribution**

13
14 A.R, K.L, P.S, D.S, P.E, M.S, G.W, W.H.L, J.T.S, D.P.K, R.L.P and J.R.L contributed to the
15
16 study concept and design. A.R and K.L led the writing of the manuscript and is the primary
17
18 designer of the protocol under the guidance of J.R.L, J.T.S and P.S and all-authors conceived
19
20 the conceptual ideas presented in the revised protocol critically. All authors read and approved
21
22 the revised version and final supported versions. J.R.L has the primary responsibility for the
23
24 final content.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 **References**

- 32
33 1. Farhat GN, Cauley JA. The link between osteoporosis and cardiovascular disease. *Clin*
34
35 *Cases Miner Bone Metab* 2008;5(1):19-34.
36
37
38 2. Lillemark L, Ganz M, Barascuk N, et al. Growth patterns of abdominal atherosclerotic
39
40 calcified deposits from lumbar lateral X-rays. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging*
41
42 2010;26(7):751-61. doi: 10.1007/s10554-010-9606-3
43
44
45 3. Kauppila LI, Mikkonen R, Mankinen P, et al. MR aortography and serum cholesterol
46
47 levels in patients with long-term nonspecific lower back pain. *Spine*
48
49 2004;29(19):2147-52.
50
51
52 4. Thompson B, Towler DA. Arterial calcification and bone physiology: role of the bone-
53
54 vascular axis. *Nat Rev Endocrinol* 2012;8(9):529-43. doi: 10.1038/nrendo.2012.36
55
56 [published Online First: 2012/04/05]
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 5. Szulc P. Abdominal aortic calcification: A reappraisal of epidemiological and
4
5 pathophysiological data. *Bone* 2016;84:25-37. doi: 10.1016/j.bone.2015.12.004
6
7
- 8 6. Touw WA, Ueland, T., Bollerslev, J., Schousboe, J.T., Lim, W.H., Wong, G, Thompson,
9
10 P.L., Kiel, D.P., Prince, R.L., Rivadeneira, F., Lewis, J.R. Association of Circulating
11
12 Wnt Antagonists With Severe Abdominal Aortic Calcification in Elderly Women. *J*
13
14 *Endocrine Soc*2017;1(1):26-38. doi: 10.1210/js.2016-1040
15
16
- 17 7. Warburton DE, Nicol CW, Gatto SN, et al. Cardiovascular disease and osteoporosis:
18
19 balancing risk management. *Vasc Health Risk Manag* 2007;3(5):673-89. [published
20
21 Online First: 2007/12/15]
22
23
- 24 8. Tanko LB, Christiansen C, Cox DA, et al. Relationship between osteoporosis and
25
26 cardiovascular disease in postmenopausal women. *J Bone Min Res* 2005;20(11):1912-
27
28 20. doi: 10.1359/JBMR.050711 [published Online First: 2005/10/20]
29
30
- 31 9. Ferrar L, Roux C, Felsenberg D, et al. Association between incident and baseline vertebral
32
33 fractures in European women: vertebral fracture assessment in the Osteoporosis and
34
35 Ultrasound Study (OPUS). *Osteoporosis International* 2012;23(1):59-65. doi:
36
37 10.1007/s00198-011-1701-3
38
39
- 40 10. Black DM, Arden NK, Palermo L, et al. Prevalent vertebral deformities predict hip
41
42 fractures and new vertebral deformities but not wrist fractures. Study of Osteoporotic
43
44 Fractures Research Group. *J Bone Min Res* 1999;14(5):821-8. doi:
45
46 10.1359/jbmr.1999.14.5.821
47
48
- 49 11. Ross PD, Genant HK, Davis JW, et al. Predicting vertebral fracture incidence from
50
51 prevalent fractures and bone density among non-black, osteoporotic women.
52
53 *Osteoporosis Int* 1993;3(3):120-6.
54
55
- 56 12. Chen Z, Yu Y. Aortic calcification was associated with risk of fractures: A meta-analysis.
57
58 *J Back Musculoskeletal Rehab* 2016;29(4):635-42.
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
13. Wei D, Zheng G, Gao Y, et al. Abdominal aortic calcification and the risk of bone fractures: a meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *J Bone Mineral Metab* 2017;1-8.
 14. Wang TKM, Bolland MJ, Pelt NCv, et al. Relationships between vascular calcification, calcium metabolism, bone density, and fractures. *J Bone Min Res* 2010;25(12):2777-85.
 15. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* 2000;283(15):2008-12. [published Online First: 2000/05/02]
 16. Iorio A, Spencer FA, Falavigna M, et al. Use of GRADE for assessment of evidence about prognosis: rating confidence in estimates of event rates in broad categories of patients. *BMJ* 2015;350:h870. doi: 10.1136/bmj.h870
 17. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Stat Med* 2002;21(11):1539-58. doi: 10.1002/sim.1186 [published Online First: 2002/07/12]
 18. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2003;327(7414):557-60. doi: 10.1136/bmj.327.7414.557 [published Online First: 2003/09/06]

Table 1. Example search strategies

Keyword	MEDLINE	Embase
Population = Adults	No search strategy	No search strategy
Intervention/Test = aortic calcification	exp Vascular Calcification/ or exp Calcinosis/ or exp Vascular Diseases/ or arterial calcification.mp or exp Arteriosclerosis/ or exp Arterial Occlusive Diseases/ or exp Aortic Diseases/ or aortic.mp or vascular calcifications.mp. or exp Vascular Calcification/ or calcified atherosclerosis.mp or calcification.mp or calcified atherosclerotic plaque.mp or arterial calcium.mp or aortic calcification.mp or aorta calcification.mp and aort\$.mp and calc\$.mp	vascular calcification.mp. or exp blood vessel calcification/ or artery calcification.mp. or exp artery calcification/ or exp coronary artery disease/ or exp arteriosclerosis/ or calcified atherosclerosis.mp or arterial calcium.mp or calcified atherosclerotic plaque.mp or calcification.mp or aortic calcification.mp or aorta calcification.mp or vascular calcifications.mp or arteriosclerosis.mp or extracoronary.mp and aort\$.mp and calc\$.mp
Methodology = observational	No search strategy	No search strategy
Comparator = None	No search strategy	No search strategy
Outcome =	bone mineral density.mp or exp Bone Density/ or Fracture.mp or Fractures.mp	bone mineral density.mp or exp bone density/ or fracture.mp or fractures.mp or exp fracture/
Additional specific filters	Human	Human

*The reference lists of recent literature reviews and guidelines will be hand-searched for possibly relevant studies.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL 1A

NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE - CASE CONTROL STUDIES

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Exposure categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability.

Selection

1) Is the case definition adequate?

- a) yes, with independent validation *
- b) yes, e.g. record linkage or based on self reports
- c) no description

2) Representativeness of the cases

- a) consecutive or obviously representative series of cases *
- b) potential for selection biases or not stated

3) Selection of Controls

- a) community controls *
- b) hospital controls
- c) no description

4) Definition of Controls

- a) no history of disease (endpoint) *
- b) no description of source

Comparability

1) Comparability of cases and controls on the basis of the design or analysis

- a) study controls for fracture risk factors (age) *
- b) study controls for any additional factor * (other fracture risk factors)

Exposure

1) Ascertainment of exposure

- a) secure record (verified fracture) *
- b) structured interview where blind to case/control status *
- c) interview not blinded to case/control status
- d) written self report or medical record only
- e) no description

2) Same method of ascertainment for cases and controls

- a) yes *
- b) no

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

3) Non-Response rate

- a) same rate for both groups *
- b) non respondents described
- c) rate different and no designation

For peer review only

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL 1B

NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE - COHORT STUDIES

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability

Selection

1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort

- a) truly representative of the average general population of that age in the community *
- b) somewhat representative of the average general population of that age in the community *
- c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
- d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Selection of the non exposed cohort

- a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort *
- b) drawn from a different source
- c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort

3) Ascertainment of exposure

- a) secure record (verified fracture) *
- b) structured interview *
- c) written self report
- d) no description

4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study

- a) yes *
- b) no

Comparability

1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis

- a) study controls for age*
- b) study controls for any additional fracture risk factors*

Outcome

1) Assessment of outcome

- a) independent blind assessment *
- b) record linkage *
- c) self report
- d) no description

1
2
3 **2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur**
4

5 a) yes (fracture - 1 year) *

6
7 b) no

8 **3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts**
9

10 a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for *

11 b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - <20% lost to
12 follow up, or description provided of those lost) *

13 c) follow up rate < 80% (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost

14 d) no statement
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL 1C

CODING MANUAL FOR COHORT STUDIES

Selection

1) Representativeness of the Exposed Cohort

Item is assessing the representativeness of exposed individuals in the community, not the representativeness of the sample of women from some general population. For example, subjects derived from groups likely to contain middle class, better educated, health oriented women are likely to be representative of postmenopausal estrogen users while they are not representative of all women (e.g. members of a health maintenance organisation (HMO) will be a representative sample of estrogen users. While the HMO may have an under-representation of ethnic groups, the poor, and poorly educated, these excluded groups are not the predominant users of estrogen).

Allocation of stars as per rating sheet

2) Selection of the Non-Exposed Cohort

Allocation of stars as per rating sheet

3) Ascertainment of Exposure

Allocation of stars as per rating sheet

4) Demonstration That Outcome of Interest Was Not Present at Start of Study

In the case of mortality studies, outcome of interest is still the presence of a disease/ incident, rather than death. That is to say that a statement of no history of disease or incident earns a star.

Comparability

1) Comparability of Cohorts on the Basis of the Design or Analysis

A maximum of 2 stars can be allotted in this category

Either exposed and non-exposed individuals must be matched in the design and/or confounders must be adjusted for in the analysis. Statements of no differences between groups or that differences were not statistically significant are not sufficient for establishing comparability.

Note: If the relative risk for the exposure of interest is adjusted for the confounders listed, then the groups will be considered to be comparable on each variable used in the adjustment.

There may be multiple ratings for this item for different categories of exposure (e.g. ever vs. never, current vs. previous or never)

Age = , Other controlled factors =

Outcome

1) Assessment of Outcome

For some outcomes (e.g. fractured hip), reference to the medical record is sufficient to satisfy the requirement for confirmation of the fracture. This would not be adequate for vertebral fracture outcomes where reference to x-rays would be required.

- a) Independent or blind assessment stated in the paper, or confirmation of the outcome by reference to secure records (x-rays, medical records, etc.)
- b) Record linkage (e.g. identified through ICD codes on database records)
- c) Self-report (i.e. no reference to original medical records or x-rays to confirm the outcome)
- d) No description.

2) Was Follow-Up Long Enough for Outcomes to Occur

An acceptable length of time should be decided before quality assessment begins (e.g. 5 yrs. for exposure to breast implants)

3) Adequacy of Follow-Up of Cohorts

This item assesses the follow-up of the exposed and non-exposed cohorts to ensure that losses are not related to either the exposure or the outcome.

Allocation of stars as per rating sheet.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL 1D

NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE – CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDIES

Selection (Maximum 5 stars)

1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort

- a) Truly representative of the average general population of that age in the community *
(all subjects or random sampling)
- b) Somewhat representative of the average general population of that age in the community *(non-random sampling)
- c) Selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
- d) No description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Sample size

- a) Justified*
- b) Non-justified

3) Non-respondents

- a) Comparability between respondents and non-respondents characteristics is established, and the response rate is satisfactory*
- b) The response rate is unsatisfactory, or the comparability between respondents and non-respondents is unsatisfactory
- c) No description of the response rate or the characteristics of the responders and the non-responders

4) Ascertainment of the exposure (risk factor):

- a) Validated measurement tool **
- b) Non-validated measurement tool, but the tool is available or described *
- c) No description of the measurement tool

Comparability (Maximum 2 stars)

1) The subjects in different outcome groups are comparable, based on the study design or analysis. Confounding factors are controlled

- a) Study controls for age *
- b) Study controls for any additional fracture risk factors *

Outcome (Maximum 3 stars)

1) Assessment of outcome

- a) Independent blind assessment **
- b) Record linkage **

1
2
3 c) Self-report *

4
5 d) No description

6
7 **2) Statistical test**

8 a) The statistical test used to describe the data is clearly described and appropriate, and
9 the measurement of the association is presented, including confidence intervals and the
10 probability level (p value) *

11
12
13 b) The statistical test is not appropriate, not described or incomplete
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Page number
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION			
Title:			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	NA
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	2,6
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	12
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	NA
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	12
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	12
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	12
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	5
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	6
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	6-8
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	8-9
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	16

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

Study records:			
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	8
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	8
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	9
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	9
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	7
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	9
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	9-10
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2 , Kendall's τ)	9-10
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	10-11
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	NA
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	11
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	9

*** It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.