

Original Article**Normative Bone Mineral Density values in Isfahani women**

Z. Sayed Bonakdar* MD, H. Karimzadeh* MD, P. Motaghi* MD

ABSTRACT

Background: The correct interpretation of bone mineral density (BMD) measurement by dual energy x ray absorptiometry (DEXA) requires a population specific reference range. We collected data on age 20-35 years to obtain reference values of BMD for Isfahani women in order to make a population specific diagnosis of osteoporosis.

Methods: In 660 healthy Isfahani women Volunteers (20-35 years) without illness, use of drugs or predisposing conditions to osteoporosis, the BMD (gr/cm²) of lumbar spine and non-dominant femur was measured by lunar DPX –IQ machine.

Results: The mean BMD and its standard deviations at each site were calculated and compared with normative data from Caucasian US/North European women. No significant differences were detected between them.

Conclusions: Bone mineral density measurements of these 660 healthy Isfahani women can serve as a reference guide for the diagnosis of osteoporosis in Isfahani women.

Key words: Bone Mineral Density, Osteoporosis, Normative data, DEXA

JRMS 2005; 10(3): 142-146

Osteoporosis is the most common metabolic bone disease, characterized by decrease in bone mass and deterioration of bony micro architecture, resulting in an increased susceptibility to fracture¹. Its pathogenesis consists of genetic and environmental factors. Genetic factor account for about 46-62% of inter individual variation in peak bone mass in both sex. Environmental factors, especially diet and mechanical loading also play a role in determining peak bone mass (38-54%)². In some studies, 20-30% of postmenopausal woman³ and more than 50% of men^{4,5,6} with osteoporosis had a secondary cause. Secondary causes of bone loss are drugs, endocrine abnormalities, gastrointestinal and kidney diseases, immobilization, marrow-related disorders, cancer and eating disorders.

Now, osteoporosis is recognized as a silent epidemic disorder and affects an estimated 75 million people in Europe, USA and Japan⁷. In the United States, 54% of postmenopausal women are osteopenic and 30% osteoprotic⁸.

In Canada, approximately 1 in 4 women and 1 in 8 men have osteoporosis⁹.

The public health and clinical importance of osteoporosis lies in the fractures associated with

disease. There is an inverse relationship between bone density and gradient of risk for fracture¹⁰, but 10-12% decrement in the bone density is associated with 2-fold increase risk of fracture¹¹. At age 50, the lifetime risk of having a hip, wrist, or clinical vertebral fracture is about 40% in white women and 13% in white men. Hip fractures are associated with 20% mortality rate within the first year of fracture, and 50% of patients are unable to ambulate independently¹².

The Cost of osteoporotic fractures in USA is estimated at \$ 7-10 billion annually for a population of 250 million. In England, the total cost of osteoporosis is estimated to be £ 614 million annually for a population of 50 million¹.

Osteodensitometry by dual energy X-ray absorptiometry (DEXA) is a widely used method to determine bone mineral density (BMD) at different skeletal sites. For reliable interpretation of individual BMD data, however, they should be expressed in relation to established normative data. Comparison can be made either in terms of the age-matched standard deviation score, commonly referred to Z score, or by T Score, which indicates deviation from the mean BMD of a young

*Assistant professor, Department of Internal Medicine, Faculty of medicine, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, Isfahan, Iran.
Correspondence to: Dr Zahra Sayed Bonakdar Email: bonakdar@med.mui.ac.ir

normal population. For this reason, comparison of T Scores yields the best available information on the extent of osteoprotic bone loss and the associated fracture risk. WHO defines osteopenia and osteoporosis as T score between -1 and -2.5 and T score \leq -2.5 respectively^{13,14}. Severe osteoporosis is defined as additional presence of one or more fragility fractures.

Although BMD data provide an important basis for lifestyle counseling to prevent osteoporosis, and are of paramount importance for planning and monitoring of antiresorptive therapies, a reliable interpretation of individual BMD data as assessed by DEXA methods is hampered by two facts: first, there is an apparent discrepancy between normative data used by different manufacturers (Hologic or Lunar system); Second, as all manufacturers use normative data derived from an adult population in USA, they can be applied only for studying similar large population in, for example the UK and Northern Europe¹⁶, but might not be an appropriate reference for local or selected populations with a different genetic, geographic and socio-economic background. Recently, the necessity for using regional reference values rather than those supplied by the manufacturers of DEXA systems has been emphasized¹⁷⁻²⁰.

Because of no DEXA reference ranges for Iran, we initiated the present study to generate an appropriate database for DEXA measurements in adult Isfahani women.

Subjects and Methods

Six hundreds and sixty healthy Isfahani females aged 20-35 years were sampled clusterly and systematically by selected household listings, from 25 regions across Isfahan equally. All subjects were screened by a detailed questionnaire, history and physical examination. Exclusive criteria were conditions affecting bone metabolism Such as chronic renal failure, urolithiasis, cirrhosis, malabsorption syndromes, gastrectomy, intestinal bypass, thyroid or parathyroid diseases, hypogonadism, diabetes mellitus, menstrual abnormality, rheumatoid arthritis, lupus erythematosus, ankylosing spondylitis, malignancy, hematologic diseases, previous pathologic frac-

tures, pregnancy, lactation, immobilization, smoking and drugs (steroid, estrogen, anticonvulsants, sodium fluorides, anticoagulants, prolonged or excessive thyroid replacement therapy, vitamin D or calcium).

Bone mineral density of anteroposterior lumbar spine (L1-L4) and non-dominant femur was done for all subjects at supine position. In vivo reproducibility for lumbar spine and femur was 1%. Machine calibration using the phantom spine was done daily prior to doing any scan to ensure precision of the machine. The BMD (gr/cm^2) was measured by lunar DPX-IQ densitometry.

SPSS (version11.5) Statistically analyzed the mean and standard deviation (SD) of BMD at various skeletal regions.

Results

The basic characters were Age (20-35 year), Height ($158.5 \pm 5.820\text{cm}$), Weight ($62.2 \pm 11.507\text{kg}$) and BMI ($24.7 \pm 4.5 \text{ kg}/\text{m}^2$).

The mean BMD, corresponding standard deviations (SD) and minimum and maximum BMD at each site are shown in Table 1. Table 2 provides detailed mean BMD at each site with corresponding +1, +2.5, -1 and -2.5 SDs. The mean BMD and corresponding values for a Caucasian US/North European population at the lumbar spine and femur are shown in Table 3.

Table 1: BMD reference values (gr/cm^2) with min/max at all sites in Isfahani women

Site	Mean (SD)	Minimum	Maximum
Neck Femur	0.94093(0.11932)	0.674	1.426
Total Femur	1.00019(0.12487)	0.708	1.449
L ₁	1.09872(0.13804)	0.740	1.552
L ₂	1.18786(0.14335)	0.807	1.699
L ₃	1.23785(0.14335)	0.889	1.853
L ₄	1.20008(0.14296)	0.789	1.716
L ₂ -L ₄	1.20849(0.13504)	0.857	1.731

BMD = bone mineral density SD =standard deviation

Table 2: The mean BMD (gr/cm²) and corresponding +1,+2.5,-1, -2.5 SDs at each site in Isfahani women

Site	Mean	Mean-1SD	Mean+1SD	Mean-2.5 SD	Mean+2.5 SD
Neck Femur	0.94093	0.82161	1.06025	0.64263	1.23923
Total Femur	1.0099	0.87532	1.12506	0.689725	1.312365
L ₁	1.09872	0.96068	1.23676	0.75362	1.44382
L ₂	1.18786	1.04451	1.33121	0.829495	1.546235
L ₃	1.23785	1.09353	1.38217	0.87705	1.59865
L ₄	1.20008	1.05712	1.34304	0.84268	1.55743
L ₂ -L ₄	1.20849	1.07345	1.34353	0.87089	1.54609

BMD = bone mineral density SD = standard deviation


Table 3: Comparative mean BMD between Isfahani and Caucasian women.

Site	BMD (Isfahani)	BMD (Caucasians)
Neck Femur	0.94093	0.97952
Total Femur	1.00019	1.00124
L ₁	1.09872	1.13015
L ₂	1.18786	1.20008
L ₃	1.23785	1.20050
L ₄	1.20008	1.20094
L ₂ -L ₄	1.20849	1.20047


BMD = bone mineral density SD =standard deviation

The relation between BMD at the various sites and age variations were analyzed by cubic regression models.


Figure 1 presents the fitting curves and the distribution of age related changes of BMD at different skeletal sites.



(a)



(b)



(c)

Figure 1. Curves (a, b, c) and distribution of age related BMD at femoral neck, total femur, lumbar 12-14 and corresponding +1, normal, -1,-2.5 SDs at each site.

Discussion

Because of heterogeneity in genetic determinants, differences in sunlight exposure geographically, and variations in dietary habits, height or weight, BMD accrual is different among races. Hence it is essential to establish reference values for bone mineral density for every race and country.

Bachrach was found that black females and males had consistently greater mean values than non-blacks for all BMD measurements²¹. BMD values in black were about 8-12% higher than in Caucasians^{22, 23}.

He also found that Caucasians had greater mean total hip BMD and whole body BMD, while Hispanics had lower spine BMD than Caucasian or Asian men²¹. Hence he advocated the use of gender-specific and ethnic specific norms for interpreting BMD data.

Most studies would state differences in BMD and mass between ethnic groups; however other studies point out that when weight and height adjustments have been added to the computation, BMD among ethnic groups does not largely differ. Russell-Aulet concluded that although Asian women and men have lower BMD in all regions when multiple regression was done with body weight, height and age, no significant differences found between Asians and Caucasians for bone measurements²⁴.

In this study, we assessed BMD by DEXA in 20-35 years old which is in keeping with most studies stating the peak bone mass is attained between the age of 20-35 years^{25,26}. We found that the BMD values taken at the femoral neck were 4% lower than US/North European values, and similar at the total femur.

Lumbar spine BMD values were 3% and 1% lower at L₁ and L₂, respectively and 3% higher at L₃ and not significantly different at L₄. The BMD values at L₂- L₄ were similar to US /North European values.

Despite the different ethnicity, dietary habits, and lifestyles between our subjects and Caucasian US/North European females, their BMD values are not statistically different at total femur or lumbar spine (L₂- L₄).

Recently, BMD values have been studied on Arab populations:

In normal Lebanese subjects, BMD values at lumbar spine were around 8% lower than US/North European for ages 20-59 years, 5-6% lower for older subjects and at femoral neck and 8% lower in young adults (20-39 years)²⁷.

In healthy Saudi women, BMD values were about 5% lower than in US/North European, despite higher average body weight and body mass index than their Caucasian counterparts^{28,29}.

In Kuwait, Dougherty compared bone mass of healthy women with Caucasian normative data and found similarity between them³⁰.

In healthy Filipino women, the mean BMD was closely approximates that of mean BMD in Asians than those of Caucasians³¹.

Table 4 illustrates further comparison of BMD at lumbar and femur for age 30 among different countries. Therefore it is important to use a population specific reference range for DEXA measurements.

Based on our study, the mean values for BMD of healthy Isfahani women can serve as a guide for diagnosis of osteoporosis.

Table 4: Comparative BMD (gr/cm²) at Lumbar and Femur for age 30 among Isfahani, Kuwaiti, Filipino, Austrian, Asian, Caucasian

Site	Isfahani Mean (SD)	Kuwaiti Mean (SD)	Filipino Mean (SD)	Austrian Mean (SD)	Asian Mean (SD)	Caucasian Mean (SD)
Lumbar	1.208(.135)	1.210(.13)	1.132(0.12)	1.076(0.13)	1.110(0.12)	1.18(0.12)
Femur	1.000(.125)	1.022(.11)	0.919(0.10)	0.972(0.15)	0.934(0.15)	1.00(0.12)

References

1. World Health Organization. Assessment of fracture risk and its application to screening for postmenopausal osteoporosis. Technical Reports Serie. World Health Organization 1994, Geneva.
2. Patel MS, Rubin LA, Cole DEC. Genetic determinants of osteoporosis. In Hendreson JE, Goltzman D editors. The osteoporosis primer. cambridge Gambridge University Press :2000; 131-46.
3. Caplan GA, Scane AC, Francis RM. Pathogenesis of vertebral crush fractures in women. *JRSOC Med* 1994;87:200-202.
4. eris P, Guanabens N, Monegal A, et al. Aetiologi and presenting symptoms in male osteoporosis. *Br J Rheumatol* .1995;34:936-941.
5. Scane AC, Sutcliffe AM, Francis RM. Osteoporosis in men *Baillieres Clin Rheumatol*.1993;7:589-601.
6. Kelepouris N, Harper KD, Gannon F, Kaplan FS, Haddad JG. Severe Osteoporosis in men. *Ann Intern Med* .1995; 123:452-60.
7. Consensus development conference who are candidates for prevention and treatment for osteoporosis? *Osteoporos Int* 1997;7:1-6.
8. Melton LJ; How many women have osteoporosis now? *Bone Miner Res* 1995;10:175-7.
9. Hanley DA, Josse RG. Prevention and management of osteoporosis: consensus statements from the Scientific Advisory Borad of the Osteoporosis Society of Canada: 1 Introduction. *CMAY* 1996 ;155:921-3.
10. Cumming SR, Rubib SM, Black D. The future of hip fracture in the United states. *Clin orthop* 1990;252:163-166.
11. Lindsay, R. Cosman F. Prevention of osteoporosis, Primer on the metabolic bone disease and disorders of mineral metabolism. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins. 1999;269.
12. Riggs BL, Melton LJJ. The prevention and treatment of osteoporosis. *N Engle J Med* 1992 327:620-7.
13. Faulker KG. Clinical use of bone densitometry. In: Marcus R, Feldman D, Kelsey J. editors. *Osteoporosis* , Vol 2, San Diego-London Academic Press. 2001: pp 433-58.
14. Kanis JA, Methon L III, Christiansen C, Johnston C, Khaltaev N. The diagnosis of osteoporosis. *J bone Miner Res* 1994;1137-41.
15. Faulkner KG, Roberts LA, McClung MR. Discrepancies in normative data between lunar and Hologic DXA systems, *Osteoporosis Int* 1996;6:432-6.
16. Mazess RB, Barden H. Bone density of the spine and femur in adult white females. *Calcif Tissue Int* 1999;65:91-9.
17. Tenenhouse A, Joseph L, Kreiger N, et al. Estimation of the prevalence of low bone density in Canadian women and men using a population-specific DXA reference standard: The Canadian Multicenter Osteoporosis Study (Ca Mos). *Osteoporosis Int* 2000;11:897-904.
18. Gurlek A, Bayraktar M, Ariyurek M. Inappropriate reference range for peak bone mineral density in dual-energy X ray absorptiometry. Implications for the interpretation of T scores. *Osteoporosis Int* 2000;11:809-13.
19. Petely GW, Cotton AM, Murills AJ, et al. Reference ranges of bone mineral density for women in southern England : the impact of local data on the diagnosis of Osteoporosis. *Br J Radiol* 1996;69: 655-60.
20. Diaz Curiel M, Carrasco de la pena JL, Honorato perez J, Perez Cano R, Rapado A, Ruiz Martinez I. Study of bone mineral density in lumbar spine and femoral neck in a spanish population. *Osteoporosis Int* 1997 ; 7: 59-64.
21. Bachrach LK, Hastie T, Wang MC, Narasimhan B, Marcus R. Bone mineral acquisition in healthy Asian, Hispanic, black and Caucasian Youth: a longitudinal study. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 1999;4702-12.
22. Looker AC, Wahner HW, Dunn WL, et al. Proximal femur bone mineral levels of US adults. *Osteoporosis Int* 1995 ; 5:389-409.
23. Tobias JH, Cook DG, Chambers TJ, Dalzell N. A comparison of bone mineral density between Caucasian, Asian and Afro – Caribbean women. *Clin Sc*:1994 ;87 : 587-91.
24. Russell –Aulet M, Wang J, Thornton JC, Colt EW, Pierson RN Jr. Bone mineral density and mass in a cross –sectional study of white and Asian women. *J bone Miner Res* 1993;8:575-82.
25. Sosa M, Hernandez D, Estevez S, et al. The range of bone mineral density in healthy canarian women by dual X-ray absorptiometry radiography and quantitative computer tomography, *J Clin Densit* 1998;1:385-93.
26. Davis JW, Novotny R, Ross PD, Wasnich RD. The peak bone mass of Hawaiian, Filipino, Japanese and white women living in Hawaii. *Calcif Tissue Int* 1944; 55: 249-52.
27. Maalouf G, Salen S, Sandid M, et al. Bone mineral density of the Lebanese reference population. *Osteoporosis Int* 2000;11:756-46.
28. El-Desouki M. Bone mineral density of the spine and femur in the normal Saudi population. *Saudi Med J* 1995;16: 30-5.
29. Ghannam NN, Hammami MM, Bakheet SM, Khan BA. Bone mineral density of the spine and healthy Saudi females: relation to vitamin D status pregnancy and lactation. *Calcif Tissue Int* 1999,65:23-8.
30. Dougherty G, Al-Marzouk N. Bone density measured by dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry in healthy Kuwaiti women. *Calcif Tissue Int* 2001;68: 225-9.
31. Torrallo TP, Millicent Y, TAN-ONC, et al. Normative bone mineral density values in Filipino woman. *APLar Journal of Rheumatology*. 2004; 7: 30-7.