


# Make the FIRST break the LAST with **FRACTURE LIAISON SERVICES**




Osteoporosis Canada  
Ostéoporose Canada

# Executive Summary



Osteoporosis Canada  
urges all jurisdictions  
to implement FLS by

**2015**



## Introduction

Each year, hundreds of thousands of Canadians needlessly experience debilitating fractures because the underlying cause of their broken bones – osteoporosis – was undetected and untreated<sup>1-4</sup>. These fractures impose a tremendous burden on ageing Canadians, our health care and social systems, and the national economy as a whole<sup>1</sup>. This expert report examines the magnitude of this burden and describes a cost-effective model of care that has been proven to minimize the impact of osteoporosis and repeat fractures.

## Unnecessary Pain and Suffering

Approximately half of all patients who suffer a hip fracture warned us they were coming; they had previously broken another bone – a ‘signal’ fracture – before breaking their hip<sup>5-8</sup>. Effective drug treatments can reduce future fracture risk by 50% for patients presenting with fragility fractures<sup>9</sup>. These treatments have been available for 20 years and yet, 80% of Canadians who suffer a

fragility fracture still do not receive treatment for their underlying osteoporosis<sup>2, 3, 10</sup>. This is the post-fracture osteoporosis care gap which is allowing the cycle of recurring fractures to continue at great expense to both patients' quality of life and the healthcare system.

## Unnecessary Expenditures

The total cost of osteoporosis in Canada was \$2.3 billion in 2010<sup>1</sup>. This is not surprising given that the 30,000 Canadians who experience a hip fracture each year<sup>11</sup> spend an average of 23 days<sup>12</sup> in hospital and rehabilitation centres at an average acute care cost of \$20,000 per patient<sup>1</sup>. Nearly a quarter of these end up in long-term care facilities<sup>13, 14</sup> leading to \$600 million in annual costs<sup>1</sup> with additional costs attributable to the 170,000 other fragility fractures per year of the spine, wrist, shoulder, pelvis and other bones<sup>11, 15</sup>.

As Canada's baby boomers continue to age, the impact of this very common bone disease is only set to increase. Unfortunately, Canada is still lacking a systematic approach to reduce the incidence, burden and cost of osteoporotic fragility fractures.

## The Cost Effective Solution – Closing the Gap with Fracture Liaison Services

A growing number of innovators in Canada<sup>16-21</sup> and abroad<sup>22-26</sup> are establishing Fracture Liaison Services (FLS). FLS ensures that all patients who present with a 'signal' fracture receive the osteoporosis care they need to prevent future fragility fractures. The results are irrefutable: FLS significantly reduces the incidence and disability of repeat fractures and has been proven to be cost-effective.

## The Benefits of FLS

- Improved quality of life and enhanced independence of seniors
- Reduced incidence of avoidable – and often life-threatening – fractures
- Reduced disruption to patient flow in the health care system by:
  - decreasing pressure on already scarce orthopaedic resources
  - freeing up capacity for elective surgery
  - decreasing pressure on long-term care beds and demand for home care
- Significant cost-savings

# Table of Contents

<b>The post-fracture osteoporosis care gap in Canada .....</b>	<b>4</b>
The human and economic burden of osteoporosis in Canada .....	4
The post-fracture osteoporosis care gap .....	5
Why the care gap exists .....	6
<b>Clinically effective and cost-effective systems of post-fracture care .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>A business case for access to Fracture Liaison Services throughout Canada .....</b>	<b>10</b>
Clinically effective care needs to be cost-effective care .....	10
A generic business case template for Fracture Liaison Services in Canada .....	12
<b>Key steps to implement a Fracture Liaison Service .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Delivering globally endorsed standards of care.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Summary and Recommendations .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>References .....</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Appendices</b>	
The comprehensive set of appendices below are available to download from <a href="http://osteoporosis.ca/FLS">osteoporosis.ca/FLS</a>	
A. The human face of osteoporosis	
B. Fracture incidence and costs by province	
C. Best practices for post-fracture osteoporosis care: Fracture Liaison Services	
D. Other models of post-fracture osteoporosis care	
E. Generic Fracture Liaison Service business plan template	
F. Potential cost savings of FLS by province	
G. How to start and expand Fracture Liaison Services	
H. Step by step guide to setting up a Fracture Liaison Service	
I. Algorithms for FLS by fracture type (including templates for form letters to Primary Care Providers).	
J. Other practical tools for FLS	
K. Fracture Liaison Service online resources	
L. International Osteoporosis Foundation Capture the Fracture Best Practice Framework	

## The post-fracture osteoporosis care gap is:

- Allowing countless Canadians to needlessly suffer debilitating and life threatening repeat fractures
- A huge financial burden on healthcare budgets
- Readily eliminated by broad implementation of Fracture Liaison Services

# The post-fracture osteoporosis care gap in Canada

## A preventable burden on older Canadians and healthcare budgets



In 2011, Osteoporosis Canada published the White Paper – *Towards a Fracture-Free Future*<sup>27</sup> – which highlighted a nationwide post-fracture osteoporosis care gap that is leaving older Canadians needlessly at risk of suffering future fractures.

### The human and economic burden of osteoporosis in Canada

Canada is entering a period of rapid ageing. By 2031 almost a quarter of our population will be seniors as compared to 15% in 2011<sup>28</sup>. Among these, at least 1 in 3 women and 1 in 5 men will suffer a fragility fracture in their lifetime due to osteoporosis<sup>29-31</sup>. A fragility fracture is one occurring spontaneously or following minor trauma such as a cough, a sneeze or a fall from standing height or less<sup>32</sup>. Fragility fractures, which occur mostly at the hip, wrist, upper arm, pelvis or spine, make osteoporosis the most common chronic bone disease<sup>33</sup> and a major source of diminished productivity and quality of life. Osteoporosis affects not only those afflicted with the disease, but their families, friends, employers and caregivers as well. Appendix A illustrates the faces of osteoporosis.

The most devastating of all fragility fractures are hip fractures. About 30,000 Canadians break their hip every year<sup>11</sup>; of these, 28% of women and 37% of men will die within the first year after fracture<sup>34</sup>.

The rest will experience a significant reduction in their quality of life<sup>35-37</sup>.


The total number of fragility fractures occurring in Canada is in the order of 200,000 cases per year among women and men<sup>11, 15</sup>. To put this in context for women, this considerably exceeds the combined number of heart attacks, strokes and new diagnoses of breast cancer annually (figure 1)<sup>11, 15, 38, 39</sup>.

In 2010, osteoporosis was estimated to cost \$2.3 billion in Canada<sup>1</sup>. The acute care cost of treating a single hip fracture is \$20,000. The total length of stay for hip fracture patients in Canada is of the order 23 days<sup>12</sup>. For the 15%-25% of hip fracture patients who subsequently require admission to a nursing home<sup>13, 14</sup> the total cost of care including costs for long-term care facilities is over \$44,000 in the first year for each fracture<sup>40</sup>. A summary of the direct costs for fracture care at the provincial level is provided in Appendix B.

In 2007/8, fractures caused by osteoporosis were responsible for >57,000 acute care admissions and >830,000 hospitalisation days<sup>1</sup>. For individuals



Figure 1. Incidence of osteoporotic fracture, heart attack, stroke and breast cancer in Canadian women<sup>11, 15, 38, 39</sup>



aged 50-69 years, over 3 million work days were missed, with days spent in hospital or receiving home care accounting for 90% of working days lost. Care givers lost a total of \$69 million in wages. Furthermore, 47% of fracture sufferers who participated in the Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study (CaMos) reported using informal care provided by family members or friends<sup>41</sup>.

Osteoporosis imposes a tremendous financial burden on our healthcare system, fracture patients and their families. Enhancing patient flow in Canadian hospitals has been the subject of considerable activity in recent years<sup>42-44</sup>. Fragility fractures create a patient flow burden in terms of unscheduled acute care bed occupancy and subsequent demand for placement into alternative-level-of-care environments.

### The post-fracture osteoporosis care gap

Individuals who suffer a fragility fracture are at substantially increased risk of suffering second and subsequent fractures. Crucially, half of all patients who suffer a hip fracture had previously broken another bone – a ‘signal’ fracture – before breaking their hip<sup>5-8</sup>. In other words, half of hip fracture patients had already warned us they were coming when they had their signal fracture. Unfortunately, for the vast majority, osteoporosis is not diagnosed when ‘signal’


fractures occur. This is the post-fracture osteoporosis care gap.

Even though bone mineral density (BMD) testing is widely available; even though we can reduce fracture risk by 30-70% within the first year of treatment with a broad range of highly effective medicines; even though these medications are funded by provincial drug plans; even though the 2010 Osteoporosis Canada Clinical Practice Guidelines<sup>9</sup> clearly state that individuals aged over 50 who have suffered a fragility fracture should be

assessed for risk factors for osteoporosis and fracture, nevertheless, >80% who fracture are neither assessed nor treated. A pervasive care gap is still evident across Canada<sup>2-4, 10, 45-61</sup>.

This 80% post-fracture osteoporosis care gap is in stark contrast to the excellent rates of secondary preventive care offered to heart attack victims<sup>62</sup> as shown in figure 2. Given the major impact of osteoporotic fractures on individuals and healthcare budgets, we need to care for victims of ‘bone attacks’ just as well as we do victims of heart attacks.

Figure 2. Secondary preventive care after fragility fractures compared to heart attacks<sup>10, 62</sup>



Simply put,  
half of all  
hip fracture  
patients had  
already warned  
us they were  
coming



At least  
**1 in 3**  
**women** and  
**1 in 5 men**  
will suffer  
a broken  
bone from  
osteoporosis  
in their  
lifetime

Broken bones  
from osteoporosis  
are more common  
than heart attack,  
stroke and breast  
cancer combined



### Why the care gap exists

A significant body of work has been undertaken in Canada and internationally to understand why the post-fracture osteoporosis care gap exists and how it can be eliminated<sup>63-70</sup>. Put simply, there is a disconnect between the management of the fracture, usually by orthopaedic services, and recognition and management of the underlying osteoporosis (BMD testing and/or osteoporosis treatment) as follows<sup>71</sup>:


- The fracture is treated as an acute event by the orthopaedic surgeon or emergency physician who provide the best of immediate care for the fracture itself.
- The patient also treats their fracture as an acute event as he or she is unaware of his or her bone fragility/failure (a man who suffers a heart attack from shovelling snow blames his heart, not the snow bank – but a patient who breaks his/her wrist from a simple fall blames the floor).
- Thus, the opportunity for post-fracture intervention is missed.

Figure 3 provides an illustration of the multi-decade ‘osteoporotic career’ suffered by an individual who experiences several fragility fractures before breaking their hip. It is self-evident that every fracture which occurred before the hip fracture – every

‘signal’ fracture<sup>7</sup> – created an opportunity for osteoporosis assessment and treatment. Each time this opportunity was missed, the patient was left needlessly at risk and continued to suffer subsequent fractures until finally devastated by a hip fracture. This is why the post-fracture osteoporosis care gap must be eliminated.

Osteoporosis Canada is committed to working with all key stakeholders in Canada – policy makers, professionals in all relevant areas of medicine, patients and their families – to eliminate this unnecessary care gap which is costing older Canadians and the national economy so much. The purpose of this paper, *Make the FIRST break the LAST with Fracture Liaison Services*, is to provide practical guidance on the implementation of a clinically effective and cost-effective healthcare delivery solution that has been proven to close the care gap within Canada and many other countries. Widespread implementation of **Fracture Liaison Services**, described in the next section, will significantly reduce the incidence of repeat fractures and will create the infrastructure to deliver post-fracture care in accordance with Osteoporosis Canada’s Clinical Practice Guidelines<sup>9</sup>. This will also ensure that Canadian fracture patients receive globally endorsed standards of care<sup>73</sup>.

Figure 3. Osteoporosis and fragility fractures throughout the life course<sup>72</sup>



Each and every  
fracture was a missed  
opportunity to diagnose  
and treat osteoporosis  
to prevent the  
subsequent fractures

# CLINICALLY EFFECTIVE AND COST-EFFECTIVE SYSTEMS OF POST-FRACTURE CARE

Fracture Liaison Services  
are proven to close the  
care gap and reduce costs

Fracture Liaison Services are:

1. Systems of post-fracture care
2. Proven to be highly effective in reducing repeat fractures
3. Proven to be highly cost-effective
4. Eliminating the post-fracture osteoporosis care gap throughout the world

In 2011, Canadian investigators undertook a systematic review describing clinical models intended to close the post-fracture osteoporosis care gap<sup>74</sup>. Sixty-five percent of the world's literature described the critical role of dedicated personnel to proactively identify patients, to facilitate BMD testing and to initiate osteoporosis treatment. These service models have been referred to by a range of terms<sup>16, 17, 20, 22-26, 66, 75-117</sup>. In accordance with major international post-fracture care initiatives, this document will use the term Fracture Liaison Service (FLS)<sup>32, 73, 118, 119</sup>.

The main objectives of a FLS include:

- **Identification:** All men and women

over 50 years of age who present with fragility fractures will be assessed for risk factors for osteoporosis and future fractures.

- **Investigation:** As per 2010 Osteoporosis Canada Guidelines, those at risk will undergo BMD testing.
- **Initiation:** Where appropriate, osteoporosis treatment will be initiated by the FLS.

These objectives are often referred to as the 3 “i’s”. The FLS will employ dedicated personnel, usually a nurse practitioner (NP) or a registered nurse (RN), to coordinate the fracture patient's care. The NP can

*The risk of  
having a  
fracture from  
osteoporosis  
can be  
reduced and  
valuable  
healthcare  
dollars saved*





The Fracture Liaison Service (FLS) model of care has been shown within Canada and many other countries to eliminate the post-fracture osteoporosis care gap, reducing the incidence of repeat fractures and resulting in significant cost savings. Osteoporosis Canada calls for implementation of FLS across all Canadian provinces as a matter of urgency.

**A Fracture Liaison Service (3 i model) to identify, investigate, and initiate appropriate osteoporosis treatment must be the standard of care across Canada. Osteoporosis Canada urges all jurisdictions to implement FLS by 2015.**

provide all 3 i's<sup>5</sup> whereas the RN can only provide the first 2 (leaving the initiation of treatment to the primary care provider). The FLS nurse(s) will work according to pre-agreed protocols within the particular institution, with input from a physician with expertise in osteoporosis.

In 2013, investigators from Australia published a systematic review and meta-analysis on post-fracture models of care which provides a useful framework for classification<sup>66</sup>. Models of varying intensity were classified as Types A to D, the description and outcomes for which are summarised in table 1.

**Table 1. Post-fracture models of care and improvement in patient care outcomes<sup>66</sup>**

Model	Description	Proportion receiving BMD testing*	Proportion receiving osteoporosis treatment
Status Quo <sup>54</sup>	Manitoba statistics for major osteoporotic fractures (2007/2008)	13%	8%
Type D (Zero i model)	Only provides osteoporosis education to the fracture patient. Primary care provider (PCP) is not alerted or educated.	No study on BMD testing	8%
Type C (1 i model)	1. Identification The PCP is alerted that a fracture has occurred and further assessment is needed. Leaves the investigation and initiation of treatment to the PCP.	43%	23%
Type B (2 i model)	1. Identification 2. Investigation Leaves the initiation of treatment for fragility fracture patients to the PCP.	60%	41%
Type A (3 i model)	1. Identification 2. Investigation 3. Initiation of osteoporosis treatment where appropriate.	79%	46%

\* Although BMD testing is an important aspect of post-fracture care, in and of itself it cannot impact the rate of repeat fractures. Osteoporosis medication is necessary in order to reduce the rate of repeat fractures.

Type A models deliver the 3 i's i.e. identification, investigation and initiation; Type B models deliver the 2 i's i.e. identification and investigation; Type C models deliver 1 i.e. identification; Type D models could be classified as 'Zero i' models given that

<sup>5</sup>At the time of printing, Ontario nurse practitioners can prescribe osteoporosis medications but cannot requisition spine x-rays or BMDs independently. This is likely to change in the near future as a result of recent legislative changes.





no proactive case-finding occurs. The clear message from this analysis is that greater effectiveness is achieved by more intensive models of post-fracture care.

A Type B model can be easily expanded to a Type A model within the same infrastructure. There may also be hybrid models that combine both NPs and RNs that may prove to be more cost-effective (the lower costing RNs could do the work for identification and investigation, leaving the higher costing NPs to deliver initiation).

The Ganda systematic review reported that FLS significantly reduce repeat fracture rates<sup>66</sup>. Key findings included:

- **St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto:** Modelling of the FLS program reported a 9% reduction of secondary hip fracture rates **within the first year of operation**<sup>16, 17</sup>.
- **Concord FLS, Sydney, Australia:** Repeat fracture rates over a 4 year period were reduced by 80%; there were 4.1% new fractures in the intervention group compared to 19.7% in the control group<sup>22</sup>.
- **Glasgow FLS, Scotland, UK:** Between 1998 and 2008, hip fracture rates in Glasgow decreased by 7.3% compared to

a 17% increase during the same time period in England<sup>109</sup>, where only 37% of localities operated an FLS by late 2010<sup>120</sup>. The Glasgow FLS has provided comprehensive care for all fracture patients aged 50 and over since 2000<sup>24, 25</sup>.

In addition to reducing fracture rates, Fracture Liaison Services have been shown to be highly cost-effective in Canada<sup>17</sup>, Australia<sup>23</sup>, the United Kingdom<sup>25, 121</sup> and the United States<sup>85</sup>. These analyses are described in the next section titled 'A business case for access to Fracture Liaison Services throughout Canada'.

More details on the Type A and Type B FLS models considered in the systematic review and meta-analysis<sup>66</sup> are provided in Appendix C. A more comprehensive evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of FLS is also provided in Appendix C. An overview of Type C and Type D FLS models (interventions which have been found to be less effective in closing the post-fracture care gap in the meta-analysis<sup>66</sup>) is provided in Appendix D. Surprisingly, educational-based interventions (Type D - Zero i), the traditional solution for such care gaps, are found to be consistently ineffective at having any impact on the post-fracture care gap.



Broken bones  
can be  
warning signs  
of osteoporosis

# A business case for access to Fracture Liaison Services throughout Canada

The most expensive approach to post-fracture osteoporosis care is to allow the care gap to persist. Cost-effectiveness studies from FLS within Canada and in other countries demonstrate that FLS is associated with lower costs than the status quo.



Doing post-fracture osteoporosis care well is a lot cheaper than doing it occasionally, or not at all

## Clinically effective care needs to be cost-effective care

As increasing demands are placed upon the capacity of Canada's healthcare system by an ageing population, a finite budget must be deployed in the most cost-effective way. For a new model of care to be broadly adopted, the model must improve outcomes in the most cost-effective way possible. In this regard, FLS has been demonstrated consistently in Canada and other countries to do precisely that.

### FLS within Canada:

- **Toronto:** The Osteoporosis Exemplary Care Program at St. Michael's Hospital in

Toronto established that a hospital which hired an FLS coordinator who manages 500 patients with fragility fractures annually could **reduce the number of secondary hip fractures by 9% in the first year**, with net hospital cost savings of \$48,950 (2004 Canadian dollars)<sup>16, 17</sup>. Greater savings were anticipated after the first year and when additional costs such as rehabilitation and dependency costs are considered.

- **Edmonton:** A formal health-economic evaluation of a coordinator to improve osteoporosis treatment after hip fracture found that for every 100 patients assessed, 6 fractures (including 4 hip

fractures) were prevented, 4 quality-adjusted life years were gained, and \$260,000 (2006 Canadian dollars) was saved by the healthcare system<sup>18, 19</sup>. The intervention cost was just \$56 per patient and the intervention would break even within two years. A similar analysis which evaluated a nurse coordinating management after wrist fracture reported a cost per patient of \$44<sup>20, 21</sup>.

## FLS in other countries:

■ **Australia:** A formal cost-effectiveness analysis of the Concord FLS in Sydney, Australia reported that the cost of the FLS was less than AU\$150 (CN\$146) per patient per year over the 10 year modelling period<sup>23</sup>. Furthermore, the incremental costs per quality adjusted life year (QALY) gained (incremental cost-effectiveness ratio - ICER) were AU\$17,291 (CN\$16,772), which is well below the Australian accepted maximum willingness to pay for one QALY gained of AU\$50,000 (CN\$48,500).

■ **United Kingdom:** The Glasgow FLS<sup>24</sup> has provided comprehensive care for the 1 million residents of Glasgow since the turn of the century. In excess of 50,000 consecutive fracture patients have been assessed by the FLS. A formal cost-effectiveness analysis reported that, for every 1,000 patients managed by FLS versus 'usual care' in the UK, 18 fractures were prevented, including 11 hip fractures, and GBP21,000 (CN\$33,600) was saved<sup>25</sup>. The authors calculated that universal access to FLS could be provided across the UK for just 0.6% of the annual cost of hip fracture to the UK economy<sup>122</sup>.

■ **United States of America:** The Kaiser Permanente Healthy Bones Program is arguably the most comprehensive fragility fracture prevention program in the world<sup>26, 84, 85, 89, 123</sup>. The Healthy Bones Program was led by orthopaedic surgeons with a highly focused objective from the project outset; to reduce the incidence of hip fracture by 20% in 5 years<sup>124</sup>. The program was developed in an incremental fashion, initially providing post-fracture

osteoporosis care to just hip fracture patients. As the program proved effective, more time and resources were allocated to provide care for patients with fragility fractures at any skeletal site, and subsequently a structured primary fracture prevention strategy was implemented. In 2009, 7 years after a fully integrated Healthy Bones Program was in place at all 11 Kaiser Southern California medical centres, hip fracture rates had been reduced by more than 40%<sup>26</sup>. A 2013 publication from leading health system CEOs in the United States highlighted the Healthy Bones Program as an effective strategy to lower costs, improve quality and engage patients<sup>125</sup>.

## FLS in government policy:

■ **Department of Health, England:** In 2009, the Department of Health published *Falls and fractures: Effective interventions in health and social care*<sup>126</sup>. The policy called for a top-down approach to fracture care and prevention as advocated in figure 4 of this document. FLS was highlighted as the mechanism to

'Fracture prevention makes sense in Kaiser because it is considerably less expensive to prevent a hip fracture than to manage it, simple as that.'<sup>124</sup>

Richard Dell MD, Orthopaedic Lead, Kaiser Healthy Bones Program, U.S.A.





## Fracture Liaison Services have been shown to be highly cost-effective in Canada



**28%**  
of women and  
**37%**  
of men who  
suffer a hip  
fracture will  
die within  
the following  
year

deliver a response to the first fracture to prevent the next fracture. A subsequent economic evaluation concluded that localities operating an FLS would save GBP56,000 (CN\$89,600) for each year's cohort of fracture patients managed over a 5 year period, compared to localities not operating an FLS<sup>121</sup>. In 2012, secondary fracture prevention indicators were introduced into the UK general practitioners' contract with government, with the intention of improving the long-term care of osteoporosis for fragility fracture patients<sup>127</sup>.

The cost-effectiveness analyses of FLS described above are based primarily upon Type A models reviewed previously<sup>66</sup>. It is important to recognise that Type A and Type B models outperformed the less intensive Type C and Type D models by a considerable margin, in terms of the proportion of fracture patients undergoing bone density testing and those who received treatment for osteoporosis. Thus, Osteoporosis Canada refers to Type A and Type B models as FLS,


and strongly recommends Type A models as the preferred FLS for implementation in Canada.

### A generic business case template for Fracture Liaison Services in Canada

To support implementation efforts, a generic FLS business plan template for use in the Canadian healthcare system is provided in Appendix E and potential cost savings from implementation of FLS by province in Appendix F.

Echoing Kaiser's Healthy Bones Program, Osteoporosis Canada's White Paper calls for Canada to target those individuals who have already suffered fractures for osteoporosis intervention because they are at highest risk of suffering more fractures<sup>27</sup>. As indicated in the Osteoporosis Canada 'fracture pyramid' in figure 4, FLS provides the healthcare delivery solution to close the post-fracture care gap.

Figure 4. A systematic approach to fragility fracture prevention for Canada<sup>27</sup>





# Key steps to implement a Fracture Liaison Service




Year after year, across Canada, considerable financial resources are being committed to fund the costs of treating fragility fractures. Canada is spending \$600 million per year on direct costs associated with hip fracture care alone<sup>1</sup>. If this persistent drain on healthcare resources is to be reduced, plans must be developed - in every province - to fund fracture prevention through the implementation of FLS models of care.

Osteoporosis Canada recognises that provincial Ministries of Health may elect to stage implementation of FLS. One staged implementation strategy consists of initially targeting just hip fracture patients then all patients admitted with fragility fractures to hospital and finally those patients managed completely in the out-patient setting, as illustrated in figure 5. An alternate strategy would be to establish an initial centre of excellence within the province which could subsequently expedite sharing of best practice with other centres that receive fracture patients. In order to improve quality of post-fracture care for all fragility fracture patients - and so maximise associated cost savings - the most rapid path which leads to province-wide access to FLS must be

determined by local policy makers and healthcare professionals.

The globally endorsed standards for FLS developed in 2013 by the International Osteoporosis Foundation - with input from Osteoporosis Canada - provide a very useful starting point for service design<sup>73</sup>. A detailed description of practical steps in the initial development of an FLS is provided in Appendices G and H. Algorithms by fracture type and other practical tools for FLS are available in Appendices I to K.

Figure 5. The scope of an FLS can be expanded as time and resources permit<sup>73</sup>



The vast majority of local healthcare systems in Canada currently lack an FLS. Every provincial Ministry of Health must develop a plan to establish FLS across their province.



Making the  
FIRST break  
the LAST is  
an achievable  
goal through  
the widespread  
implementation  
of FLS



## Delivering globally endorsed standards of care

This decade has seen the development of initiatives intended to catalyse implementation of FLS by leading organizations across the world. All of the following organizations explicitly endorse widespread implementation of FLS:

- **International Osteoporosis Foundation:** ‘Capture the Fracture’ Campaign<sup>73, 118, 119, 128</sup>
- **American Society for Bone and Mineral Research:** Task Force on Secondary Fracture Prevention<sup>32</sup>
- **U.S. National Bone Health Alliance:** Fracture Prevention CENTRAL<sup>129</sup>

These organizations have developed extensive resources intended to share best practice and support those healthcare systems that are yet to broadly implement FLS<sup>128-130</sup>.

During 2012-13, the IOF developed internationally endorsed standards of best practice for FLS<sup>73</sup>. Given the variation in structure of healthcare systems throughout the world, IOF consulted with leading experts from many countries who have established FLS in their localities and undertook beta-testing to ensure that the standards were internationally relevant and fit-for-purpose. Osteoporosis Canada was a contributor to this process. The IOF Best Practice Framework (BPF) sets an international benchmark for FLS, which defines essential and aspirational elements of service delivery. IOF cites the reasons for creation of the BPF as<sup>131</sup>:

- **Empower Change:** For those who already have an operating FLS, the BPF is a tool to empower clinical champions and healthcare administrators to rationally evaluate and enhance provision of secondary fracture prevention in their healthcare system in the context of globally-endorsed standards.
- **Guidance:** For those healthcare systems that have yet to establish an FLS, the BPF describes the essential and aspirational elements of service delivery and can thus inform the business planning process for new FLS in a very specific way.
- **Recognition and fine-tuning:** The BPF also offers leaders of established FLS an objective means to identify where their service delivers optimal care – and to be recognised internationally for excellence – and identifies opportunities to refine the delivery and scope of care that could further improve outcomes.

The second point is most relevant in Canada where very few centres currently offer FLS. The BPF standards provide a practical road-map for those designing services from scratch to ensure that the FLS model they develop will be successful in improving outcomes (reducing fractures and their associated costs). More details are available in Appendix L.

# Summary and Recommendations

Currently, the vast majority of Canadians do not receive the globally endorsed standards of post-fracture care advocated by Osteoporosis Canada. This care gap can be readily eliminated by broad implementation of Fracture Liaison Services. FLS have been shown within Canada and throughout the world to eliminate the post-fracture osteoporosis care gap, reduce the incidence of repeat fractures and significantly reduce their associated costs to the healthcare system. FLS have been shown to be highly cost-effective in Canada<sup>17</sup>, Australia<sup>23</sup>, the United Kingdom<sup>25, 121</sup> and the United States<sup>85</sup>.

*A Fracture Liaison Service (3 i model) to identify, investigate, and initiate appropriate osteoporosis treatment must be the standard of care across Canada. Osteoporosis Canada urges all jurisdictions to implement FLS by 2015.*

Consensus exists amongst all relevant healthcare professionals and their organizations on the need for implementation of FLS in all provinces – and patients desperately want and need better care. Osteoporosis Canada calls upon all policy makers in every province with responsibility for the care of fragility fracture patients to work collaboratively to bring an end to avoidable fragility fractures. This opportunity to better care for our senior citizens and to save precious healthcare dollars is far too good to miss.



A nationwide post-fracture osteoporosis care gap exists throughout Canada which is leaving Canadians needlessly at risk of suffering future fractures and resulting in an enormous avoidable expenditure on fracture care. Access to Fracture Liaison Services for all Canadians will transform the delivery of post-fracture care and result in significant financial savings.

By implementing Fracture Liaison Services across our provinces we **CAN** make their FIRST break their LAST!



## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

*Make the FIRST break the LAST with Fracture Liaison Services* is the product of a diverse team of volunteers who all share a common objective: to make FLS the standard of care in Canada.

The FLS Working Group has generously donated their time and expertise to help ensure that the recommendations in this report are pragmatic, achievable and in the best interests of Canadian taxpayers. They are to be commended for their valuable contributions.

### FLS Working Group

#### Chair:

Diane Thériault, MD, FRCPC, CCD, Nova Scotia  
Chief Scientific Officer, Fracture Liaison Services

#### Members:

Marie-Claude Beaulieu, MD, CCFP, Québec  
Earl Bogoch, MD, FRCSC, Ontario  
Jennifer Fletcher, MD, FRCSC, New Brunswick  
Heather Frame, MD, BSc(Med), FCFP, Manitoba  
Larry Funnell, Chair, Canadian Osteoporosis Patient Network,  
British Columbia  
David Hanley, MD, FRCPC, Alberta  
Brigadier General (Retired) Hilary Jaeger, MSc, MD, CHE, Ontario

Meera Jain, MSc, PhD, Ontario  
Ravi Jain, MA, MHSc, CHE, Ontario  
Brendan Lewis, MD, FRCSC, Newfoundland and Labrador  
Marg MacDonell, Past Chair, Canadian Osteoporosis Patient  
Network, Manitoba  
Sarah Nixon-Jackle, RN, BScN, NCMP, Saskatchewan  
Brenda Payne, RN, BN, MN, CEC, Nova Scotia  
Irene Polidoulis, MD, CCFP, FCFP, Ontario  
Carla Purcell, BScN, RN, CMSN(C), Nova Scotia  
Christine MacNearney, BSc, MD, Prince Edward Island  
Nashater Sanghera, BComm, CA, CPA, British Columbia  
Government Relations Officer, Fracture Liaison Services  
Sonia Singh, MD, MHSc, British Columbia

A special acknowledgement goes to Paul Mitchell, Synthesis Medical NZ Limited, for his invaluable assistance in creating this document.

**Dedicated to the  
hundreds of thousands  
of Canadians who  
needlessly fracture  
and suffer each  
year because their  
osteoporosis goes  
undiagnosed and  
untreated.**





# REFERENCES


- Tarride JE, Hopkins RB, Leslie WD, et al. The burden of illness of osteoporosis in Canada. *Osteoporos Int*. Nov 2012;23(11):2591-2600.
- Papaioannou A, Giangregorio L, Kvern B, Boulos P, Ioannidis G, Adachi JD. The osteoporosis care gap in Canada. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord*. Apr 6 2004;5:11.
- Papaioannou A, Kennedy CC, Ioannidis G, et al. The osteoporosis care gap in men with fragility fractures: the Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study. *Osteoporos Int*. Apr 2008;19(4):581-587.
- Fraser LA, Ioannidis G, Adachi JD, et al. Fragility fractures and the osteoporosis care gap in women: the Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study. *Osteoporos Int*. Mar 2011;22(3):789-796.
- Gallagher JC, Melton LJ, Riggs BL, Bergstrath E. Epidemiology of fractures of the proximal femur in Rochester, Minnesota. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. Jul-Aug 1980(150):163-171.
- McLellan A, Reid D, Forbes K, et al. *Effectiveness of Strategies for the Secondary Prevention of Osteoporotic Fractures in Scotland (CEPS 99/03)*: NHS Quality Improvement Scotland; 2004.
- Port L, Center J, Briffa NK, Nguyen T, Cumming R, Eisman J. Osteoporotic fracture: missed opportunity for intervention. *Osteoporos Int*. Sep 2003;14(9):780-784.
- Edwards BJ, Bunta AD, Simonelli C, Bolander M, Fitzpatrick LA. Prior fractures are common in patients with subsequent hip fractures. *Clin Orthop Relat Res*. Aug 2007;461:226-230.
- Papaioannou A, Morin S, Cheung AM, et al. 2010 clinical practice guidelines for the diagnosis and management of osteoporosis in Canada: summary. *CMAJ*. Nov 23 2010;182(17):1864-1873.
- Bessette L, Ste-Marie LG, Jean S, et al. The care gap in diagnosis and treatment of women with a fragility fracture. *Osteoporos Int*. Jan 2008;19(1):79-86.
- Leslie WD, O'Donnell S, Lagace C, et al. Population-based Canadian hip fracture rates with international comparisons. *Osteoporos Int*. Aug 2010;21(8):1317-1322.
- Lefavre KA, Macadam SA, Davidson DJ, Gandhi R, Chan H, Broekhuysen HM. Length of stay, mortality, morbidity and delay to surgery in hip fractures. *J Bone Joint Surg Br*. Jul 2009;91(7):922-927.
- Jaglal S. Osteoporotic fractures: incidence and impact. In: Williams J, Badley E, eds. *Patterns in Health Care in Ontario: Arthritis and Related Conditions*. Toronto; 1998:143-156.
- Papaioannou A, Wiktorowicz M, Adachi JD, et al. Mortality, Independence in Living, and Re-fracture, One Year Following Hip Fracture in Canadians. *J Soc Obstet Gynaecol Can*. 2000;22(8):591-597.
- Burge R, Dawson-Hughes B, Solomon DH, Wong JB, King A, Tosteson A. Incidence and economic burden of osteoporosis-related fractures in the United States, 2005-2025. *J Bone Miner Res*. Mar 2007;22(3):465-475.
- Bogoch ER, Elliot-Gibson V, Beaton DE, Jamal SA, Josse RG, Murray TM. Effective initiation of osteoporosis diagnosis and treatment for patients with a fragility fracture in an orthopaedic environment. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Jan 2006;88(1):25-34.
- Sander B, Elliot-Gibson V, Beaton DE, Bogoch ER, Maetzel A. A coordinator program in post-fracture osteoporosis management improves outcomes and saves costs. *J Bone Joint Surg Am*. Jun 2008;90(6):1197-1205.
- Majumdar SR, Beaupre LA, Harley CH, et al. Use of a case manager to improve osteoporosis treatment after hip fracture: results of a randomized controlled trial. *Arch Intern Med*. Oct 22 2007;167(19):2110-2115.
- Majumdar SR, Lier DA, Beaupre LA, et al. Osteoporosis case manager for patients with hip fractures: results of a cost-effectiveness analysis conducted alongside a randomized trial. *Arch Intern Med*. Jan 12 2009;169(1):25-31.
- Majumdar SR, Johnson JA, Bellerose D, et al. Nurse case-manager vs multifaceted intervention to improve quality of osteoporosis care after wrist fracture: randomized controlled pilot study. *Osteoporos Int*. Jan 2011;22(1):223-230.
- Majumdar SR, Johnson JA, McAlister FA, et al. Multifaceted intervention to improve diagnosis and treatment of osteoporosis in patients with recent wrist fracture: a randomized controlled trial. *CMAJ*. Feb 26 2008;178(5):569-575.
- Lih A, Nandapalan H, Kim M, et al. Targeted intervention reduces refracture rates in patients with incident non-vertebral osteoporotic fractures: a 4-year prospective controlled study. *Osteoporos Int*. Mar 2011;22(3):849-858.
- Cooper MS, Palmer AJ, Seibel MJ. Cost-effectiveness of the Concord Minimal Trauma Fracture Liaison service, a prospective, controlled fracture prevention study. *Osteoporos Int*. Jan 2012;23(1):97-107.
- McLellan AR, Gallacher SJ, Fraser M, McQuillan C. The fracture liaison service: success of a program for the evaluation and management of patients with osteoporotic fracture. *Osteoporos Int*. Dec 2003;14(12):1028-1034.
- McLellan AR, Wolowacz SE, Zimovetz EA, et al. Fracture liaison services for the evaluation and management of patients with osteoporotic fracture: a cost-effectiveness evaluation based on data collected over 8 years of service provision. *Osteoporos Int*. Jul 2011;22(7):2083-2098.
- Dell R. Fracture prevention in Kaiser Permanente Southern California. *Osteoporos Int*. Aug 2011;22 Suppl 3:457-460.
- Osteoporosis Canada. *Osteoporosis: Towards a fracture free future*. Toronto 2011.
- Statistics Canada. *Population Projections for Canada, Provinces and Territories 2009 to 2036*. Ottawa, Ontario 2010.
- van Staa TP, Dennison EM, Leufkens HG, Cooper C. Epidemiology of fractures in England and Wales. *Bone*. Dec 2001;29(6):517-522.
- Office of the Surgeon General. Bone Health and Osteoporosis: A Report of the Surgeon General. In: US Department of Health and Human Services, ed. Washington; 2004.
- Kanis JA, McCloskey EV, Johansson H, et al. European guidance for the diagnosis and management of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women. *Osteoporos Int*. Oct 19 2012.
- Eisman JA, Bogoch ER, Dell R, et al. Making the first fracture the last fracture: ASBMR task force report on secondary fracture prevention. *J Bone Miner Res*. Oct 2012;27(10):2039-2046.
- Mauck KF, Clarke BL. Diagnosis, screening, prevention, and treatment of osteoporosis. *Mayo Clin Proc*. May 2006;81(5):662-672.
- Jiang HX, Majumdar SR, Dick DA, et al. Development and initial validation of a risk score for predicting in-hospital and 1-year mortality in patients with hip fractures. *J Bone Miner Res*. Mar 2005;20(3):494-500.
- Papaioannou A, Kennedy CC, Ioannidis G, et al. The impact of incident fractures on health-related quality of life: 5 years of data from the Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study. *Osteoporos Int*. May 2009;20(5):703-714.
- Adachi JD, Ioannidis G, Pickard L, et al. The association between osteoporotic fractures and health-related quality of life as measured by the Health Utilities Index in the Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study (CaMos). *Osteoporos Int*. Nov 2003;14(11):895-904.
- Adachi JD, Ioannidis G, Berger C, et al. The influence of osteoporotic fractures on health-related quality of life in community-dwelling men and women across Canada. *Osteoporos Int*. 2001;12(11):903-908.
- Public Health Agency of Canada. *2009 Tracking Heart Disease and Stroke in Canada*. Ottawa, Ontario 2009.
- Canadian Cancer Society/National Cancer Institute of Canada. *Canadian Cancer Statistics*. Toronto, Canada 2007.
- Wiktorowicz ME, Goeree R, Papaioannou A, Adachi JD, Papadimitropoulos E. Economic implications of hip fracture: health service use, institutional care and cost in Canada. *Osteoporos Int*. 2001;12(4):271-278.
- Kaffashian S, Raina P, Oremus M, et al. The burden of osteoporotic fractures beyond acute care: the Canadian Multicentre Osteoporosis Study (CaMos). *Age Ageing*. Sep 2011;40(5):602-607.
- Evans B, Potvin C, Johnson G, et al. Enhancing patient flow in an acute care hospital: successful strategies at the Juravinski Hospital. *Healthc Q*. 2011;14(3):66-74.
- Schull MJ, Vermeulen MJ, Stukel TA, et al. Evaluating the effect of clinical decision units on patient flow in seven Canadian emergency departments. *Acad Emerg Med*. Jul 2012;19(7):828-836.
- Lin D, Patrick J, Labeau F. Estimating the waiting time of multi-priority emergency patients with downstream blocking. *Health Care Manag Sci*. May 21 2013.
- Khan SA, de Geus C, Holroyd B, Russell AS. Osteoporosis follow-up after wrist

## REFERENCES

- fractures following minor trauma. *Arch Intern Med.* May 28 2001;161(10):1309-1312.
46. Juby AG, De Geus-Wenceslau CM. Evaluation of osteoporosis treatment in seniors after hip fracture. *Osteoporos Int.* Mar 2002;13(3):205-210.
47. Cree MW, Juby AG, Carriere KC. Mortality and morbidity associated with osteoporosis drug treatment following hip fracture. *Osteoporos Int.* Sep 2003;14(9):722-727.
48. Meadows LM, Mrkonjic LA, O'Brien MD, Tink W. The importance of communication in secondary fragility fracture treatment and prevention. *Osteoporos Int.* Feb 2007;18(2):159-166.
49. Singh S, Foster R, Khan KM. Accident or osteoporosis?: Survey of community follow-up after low-trauma fracture. *Can Fam Physician.* Apr 2011;57(4):e128-133.
50. Ashe MC, McKay HA, Janssen P, Guy P, Khan KM. Improving osteoporosis management in at-risk fracture clinic patients. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* Apr 2005;53(4):727-728.
51. Davis JC, Ashe MC, Guy P, Khan KM. Undertreatment after hip fracture: a retrospective study of osteoporosis overlooked. *J Am Geriatr Soc.* Jun 2006;54(6):1019-1020.
52. Metge CJ, Leslie WD, Mannes LJ, et al. Postfracture care for older women: gaps between optimal care and actual care. *Can Fam Physician.* Sep 2008;54(9):1270-1276.
53. Leslie WD, Brennan SL, Prior HJ, Lix LM, Metge C, Elias B. The post-fracture care gap among Canadian First Nations peoples: a retrospective cohort study. *Osteoporos Int.* Mar 2012;23(3):929-936.
54. Leslie WD, Giangregorio LM, Yogendran M, et al. A population-based analysis of the post-fracture care gap 1996-2008: the situation is not improving. *Osteoporos Int.* May 2012;23(5):1623-1629.
55. Petrella RJ, Jones TJ. Do patients receive recommended treatment of osteoporosis following hip fracture in primary care? *BMC Fam Pract.* 2006;7:31.
56. Hajcsar EE, Hawker G, Bogoch ER. Investigation and treatment of osteoporosis in patients with fragility fractures. *CMAJ.* Oct 3 2000;163(7):819-822.
57. Byszewski A, Lemay G, Molnar F, Azad N, McMartin SE. Closing the osteoporosis care gap in hip fracture patients: an opportunity to decrease recurrent fractures and hospital admissions. *J Osteoporos.* 2011;2011:404969.
58. Hamel ME, Sebaldt RJ, Siminoski K, et al. Influence of fracture history and bone mineral density testing on the treatment of osteoporosis in two non-academic community centers. *Osteoporos Int.* Feb 2005;16(2):208-215.
59. Jaglal SB, Cameron C, Hawker GA, et al. Development of an integrated-care delivery model for post-fracture care in Ontario, Canada. *Osteoporos Int.* 2006;17(9):1337-1345.
60. Vanasse A, Dagenais P, Niyonsenga T, Gregoire JP, Courteau J, Hemiri A. Bone mineral density measurement and osteoporosis treatment after a fragility fracture in older adults: regional variation and determinants of use in Quebec. *BMC Musculoskelet Disord.* 2005;6:33.
61. Perreault S, Dragomir A, Desgagne A, et al. Trends and determinants of antiresorptive drug use for osteoporosis among elderly women. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf.* Oct 2005;14(10):685-695.
62. Austin PC, Tu JV, Ko DT, Alter DA. Factors associated with the use of evidence-based therapies after discharge among elderly patients with myocardial infarction. *CMAJ.* Oct 21 2008;179(9):901-908.
63. Elliot-Gibson V, Bogoch ER, Jamal SA, Beaton DE. Practice patterns in the diagnosis and treatment of osteoporosis after a fragility fracture: a systematic review. *Osteoporos Int.* Oct 2004;15(10):767-778.
64. Giangregorio L, Papaioannou A, Cranney A, Zytaruk N, Adachi JD. Fragility fractures and the osteoporosis care gap: an international phenomenon. *Semin Arthritis Rheum.* Apr 2006;35(5):293-305.
65. Little EA, Eccles MP. A systematic review of the effectiveness of interventions to improve post-fracture investigation and management of patients at risk of osteoporosis. *Implement Sci.* 2010;5:80.
66. Ganda K, Puech M, Chen JS, et al. Models of care for the secondary prevention of osteoporotic fractures: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Osteoporos Int.* Jul 25 2012.
67. Dreinhofer KE, Anderson M, Feron JM, et al. Multinational survey of osteoporotic fracture management. *Osteoporos Int.* Mar 2005;16 Suppl 2:S44-53.
68. Chami G, Jeys L, Freudmann M, Connor L, Siddiqi M. Are osteoporotic fractures being adequately investigated? A questionnaire of GP & orthopaedic surgeons. *BMC Fam Pract.* 2006;7:7.
69. Chakravarthy J, Ali A, Iyengar S, Porter K. Secondary prevention of fragility fractures by orthopaedic teams in the UK: a national survey. *Int J Clin Pract.* Mar 2008;62(3):382-387.
70. Kurup HV, Andrew JG. Secondary prevention of osteoporosis after Colles fracture: Current practice. *Joint Bone Spine.* Jan 2008;75(1):50-52.
71. Harrington J. Dilemmas in providing osteoporosis care for fragility fracture patients. *US Musculoskeletal Review - Touch Briefings.* December 2006 2006;11:64-65.
72. British Orthopaedic Association, British Geriatrics Society. *The care of patients with fragility fracture* 2007.
73. Akesson K, Marsh D, Mitchell PJ, et al. Capture the Fracture: a Best Practice Framework and global campaign to break the fragility fracture cycle. *Osteoporos Int.* Apr 16 2013.
74. Sale JE, Beaton D, Posen J, Elliot-Gibson V, Bogoch E. Systematic review on interventions to improve osteoporosis investigation and treatment in fragility fracture patients. *Osteoporos Int.* Jul 2011;22(7):2067-2082.
75. Astrand J, Nilsson J, Thorngren KG. Screening for osteoporosis reduced new fracture incidence by almost half. *Acta Orthop.* Dec 2012;83(6):661-665.
76. Blonk MC, Erdsieck RJ, Wernekinck MG, Schoon EJ. The fracture and osteoporosis clinic: 1-year results and 3-month compliance. *Bone.* Jun 2007;40(6):1643-1649.
77. Boudou L, Gerbay B, Chopin F, Ollagnier E, Collet P, Thomas T. Management of osteoporosis in fracture liaison service associated with long-term adherence to treatment. *Osteoporos Int.* Jul 2011;22(7):2099-2106.
78. Carpintero P, Gil-Garay E, Hernandez-Vaquero D, Ferrer H, Munuera L. Interventions to improve inpatient osteoporosis management following first osteoporotic fracture: the PREVENT project. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* Feb 2009;129(2):245-250.
79. Chandran M, Tan MZ, Cheen M, Tan SB, Leong M, Lau TC. Secondary prevention of osteoporotic fractures-an "OPTIMAL" model of care from Singapore. *Osteoporos Int.* Apr 25 2013.
80. Che M, Ettinger B, Liang J, Pressman AR, Johnston J. Outcomes of a disease-management program for patients with recent osteoporotic fracture. *Osteoporos Int.* 2006;17(6):847-854.
81. Chevalley T, Hoffmeyer P, Bonjour JP, Rizzoli R. An osteoporosis clinical pathway for the medical management of patients with low-trauma fracture. *Osteoporos Int.* 2002;13(6):450-455.
82. Clunie G, Stephenson S. Implementing and running a fracture liaison service: An integrated clinical service providing a comprehensive bone health assessment at the point of fracture management. *Journal of Orthopaedic Nursing.* 2008;12:156-162.
83. Collinge C, LeBus G, Gardner MJ, Gehrig L. Osteoporosis in orthopaedic trauma patients: a diagnosis and treatment protocol. *J Orthop Trauma.* Sep 2008;22(8):541-547; discussion 548-549.
84. Dell RM, Greene D, Anderson D, Williams K. Osteoporosis disease management: What every orthopaedic surgeon should know. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Nov 2009;91 Suppl 6:79-86.
85. Dell R, Greene D, Schelkun SR, Williams K. Osteoporosis disease management: the role of the orthopaedic surgeon. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* Nov 2008;90 Suppl 4:188-194.
86. Edwards BJ, Bunta AD, Madison LD, et al. An osteoporosis and fracture intervention program increases the diagnosis and treatment for osteoporosis for patients with minimal trauma fractures. *Jt Comm J Qual Patient Saf.* May 2005;31(5):267-274.
87. Geisinger Health System. Osteoporosis. <http://www.geisinger.org/professionals/services/osteo/index.html>. Accessed 21-01-2013.
88. Giles M, Van Der Kallen J, Parker V, et al. A team approach: implementing a model of care for preventing osteoporosis related fractures. *Osteoporos Int.* Aug 2011;22(8):2321-2328.
89. Greene D, Dell RM. Outcomes of an osteoporosis disease-management

- program managed by nurse practitioners. *J Am Acad Nurse Pract.* Jun 2010;22(6):326-329.
90. Harrington JT, Lease J. System-based coordination of postfracture osteoporosis care compared with traditional approaches. *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken).* Nov 2010;62(11):1646-1649.
  91. Harrington JT, Lease J. Osteoporosis disease management for fragility fracture patients: new understandings based on three years' experience with an osteoporosis care service. *Arthritis Rheum.* Dec 15 2007;57(8):1502-1506.
  92. Harrington JT, Deal CL. Successes and failures in improving osteoporosis care after fragility fracture: results of a multiple-site clinical improvement project. *Arthritis Rheum.* Oct 15 2006;55(5):724-728.
  93. Harrington JT, Barash HL, Day S, Lease J. Redesigning the care of fragility fracture patients to improve osteoporosis management: a health care improvement project. *Arthritis Rheum.* Apr 15 2005;53(2):198-204.
  94. Huntjens KM, van Geel TA, Blonk MC, et al. Implementation of osteoporosis guidelines: a survey of five large fracture liaison services in the Netherlands. *Osteoporos Int.* Jul 2011;22(7):2129-2135.
  95. Huntjens KM, van Geel TC, Geusens PP, et al. Impact of guideline implementation by a fracture nurse on subsequent fractures and mortality in patients presenting with non-vertebral fractures. *Injury.* Sep 2011;42 Suppl 4:S39-43.
  96. Inderjeeth CA, Glennon DA, Poland KE, et al. A multimodal intervention to improve fragility fracture management in patients presenting to emergency departments. *Med J Aust.* Aug 2 2010;193(3):149-153.
  97. Kuo I, Ong C, Simmons L, Bliuc D, Eisman J, Center J. Successful direct intervention for osteoporosis in patients with minimal trauma fractures. *Osteoporos Int.* Dec 2007;18(12):1633-1639.
  98. Langridge CR, McQuillan C, Watson WS, Walker B, Mitchell L, Gallacher SJ. Refracture following fracture liaison service assessment illustrates the requirement for integrated falls and fracture services. *Calcif Tissue Int.* Aug 2007;81(2):85-91.
  99. McLellan AR. Risk Factors Associated with Secondary Fractures & Mortality in Fracture Patients Managed by a Fracture Liaison Service. *ASBMR 31st Annual Meeting.* San Diego, California, USA; 2011.
  100. McLellan AR, Fraser M. 8 year Fracture & Mortality Outcomes of the Fracture Liaison Service That Provides Systematic Assessment for Prevention of Secondary Fractures to All Patients Age 50+ With New Low-trauma Fractures. *ASBMR 30th Annual Meeting.* Montréal, Québec, Canada; 2010.
  101. Mulherin D, Williams S, Smith JA, Edwards J, Sheeran TP, Price T. Identification of risk factors for future fracture in patients following distal forearm fracture. *Osteoporos Int.* Sep 2003;14(9):757-760.
  102. Murray AW, McQuillan C, Kennon B, Gallacher SJ. Osteoporosis risk assessment and treatment intervention after hip or shoulder fracture. A comparison of two centres in the United Kingdom. *Injury.* Sep 2005;36(9):1080-1084.
  103. Newman ED, Ayoub WT, Starkey RH, Diehl JM, Wood GC. Osteoporosis disease management in a rural health care population: hip fracture reduction and reduced costs in postmenopausal women after 5 years. *Osteoporos Int.* Apr 2003;14(2):146-151.
  104. Partnership for Progress in Bone Health. Models for Success. <http://www.partnershipforprogress.org/models.asp#>. Accessed 21-01-2013.
  105. Premeaor MO, Pilbrow L, Tonkin C, Adams M, Parker RA, Compston J. Low rates of treatment in postmenopausal women with a history of low trauma fractures: results of audit in a Fracture Liaison Service. *QJM.* Jan 2010;103(1):33-40.
  106. Queally JM, Kiernan C, Shaikh M, Rowan F, Bennett D. Initiation of osteoporosis assessment in the fracture clinic results in improved osteoporosis management: a randomised controlled trial. *Osteoporos Int.* Dec 15 2012.
  107. Rozental TD, Makhni EC, Day CS, Boussein ML. Improving evaluation and treatment for osteoporosis following distal radial fractures. A prospective randomized intervention. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* May 2008;90(5):953-961.
  108. Schurink M, Hegeman JH, Kreeftenberg HG, Ten Duis HJ. Follow-up for osteoporosis in older patients three years after a fracture. *Neth J Med.* Feb 2007;65(2):71-74.
  109. Skelton D, Neil F. *NHS Greater Glasgow and Clyde Strategy for Osteoporosis and Falls Prevention 2006-2010: An evaluation 2007-2009 2009.*
  110. Stone D. Managing osteoporosis in a rural community. *Nurs Times.* Jun 12-18 2012;108(24):25-27.
  111. Sugi MT, Sheridan K, Lewis L, et al. Active Referral Intervention following Fracture Fractures Leads to Enhanced Osteoporosis Follow-Up Care. *J Osteoporos.* 2012;2012:234381.
  112. Vaile J, Sullivan L, Bennett C, Bleasel J. First Fracture Project: addressing the osteoporosis care gap. *Intern Med J.* Oct 2007;37(10):717-720.
  113. van Helden S, Cauberg E, Geusens P, Winkes B, van der Weijden T, Brink P. The fracture and osteoporosis outpatient clinic: an effective strategy for improving implementation of an osteoporosis guideline. *J Eval Clin Pract.* Oct 2007;13(5):801-805.
  114. Wallace I, Callachand F, Elliott J, Gardiner P. An evaluation of an enhanced fracture liaison service as the optimal model for secondary prevention of osteoporosis. *JRSM Short Rep.* 2011;2(2):8.
  115. Ward SE, Laughren JJ, Escott BG, Elliot-Gibson V, Bogoch ER, Beaton DE. A program with a dedicated coordinator improved chart documentation of osteoporosis after fragility fracture. *Osteoporos Int.* Aug 2007;18(8):1127-1136.
  116. Wright SA, McNally C, Beringer T, Marsh D, Finch MB. Osteoporosis fracture liaison experience: the Belfast experience. *Rheumatol Int.* Aug 2005;25(6):489-490.
  117. Yoon RS, Macaulay W, Torres G, et al. Assessment of inpatient fragility fracture education and outpatient follow-up at an urban tertiary care institution. *Endocr Pract.* Jan-Feb 2008;14(1):58-68.
  118. International Osteoporosis Foundation. *Capture the Fracture: A global campaign to break the fragility fracture cycle.* Nyon 2012.
  119. Marsh D, Akesson K, Beaton DE, et al. Coordinator-based systems for secondary prevention in fragility fracture patients. *Osteoporos Int.* Jul 2011;22(7):2051-2065.
  120. Royal College of Physicians' Clinical Effectiveness and Evaluation Unit. *Falling standards, broken promises: Report of the national audit of falls and bone health in older people 2010.* 2011.
  121. Department of Health. Fracture prevention services: an economic evaluation.; 2009.
  122. Cooper C, Mitchell P, Kanis JA. Breaking the fragility fracture cycle. *Osteoporos Int.* Jul 2011;22(7):2049-2050.
  123. Cheng H, Gary LC, Curtis JR, et al. Estimated prevalence and patterns of presumed osteoporosis among older Americans based on Medicare data. *Osteoporos Int.* Sep 2009;20(9):1507-1515.
  124. Dell R. Osteoporosis: Breaking Bones Is Not Inevitable. In: Harrington JT, Newman ED, eds. *Great Health Care: Making It Happen.* New York, New York: Springer; 2012:113-122.
  125. Cosgrove DM, Fisher M, Gabow P, et al. Ten strategies to lower costs, improve quality, and engage patients: the view from leading health system CEOs. *Health Aff (Millwood).* Feb 2013;32(2):321-327.
  126. Department of Health. Falls and fractures: Effective interventions in health and social care. In: Department of Health, ed; 2009.
  127. NHS Commissioning Board, British Medical Association, NHS Employers. *Quality and Outcomes Framework guidance for GMS contract 2013/14 2013.*
  128. International Osteoporosis Foundation. *Capture the Fracture: Break the worldwide fragility fracture cycle.* <http://www.capturethefracture.org/>. Accessed 21 June 2013.
  129. National Bone Health Alliance. Fracture Prevention CENTRAL. <http://www.nbha.org/fpc>. Accessed 27 June 2013.
  130. Eisman JA, Bogoch ER, Dell R, et al. Appendix A to 'Making the First Fracture the Last Fracture': ASBMR Task Force Report on Secondary Fracture Prevention. <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jbmr.1698/supinfo>. Accessed 1 November 2012.
  131. International Osteoporosis Foundation. *Capture the Fracture: Best Practice Framework.* <http://www.capturethefracture.org/best-practice-framework>. Accessed 27 June 2013.





Osteoporosis Canada

Ostéoporose Canada

1090 Don Mills Road, Suite 301  
Toronto, Ontario, Canada  
M3C 3R6

Tel: (416) 696-2663  
Fax: (416) 696-2673  
1-800-463-6842 (M-F, 10-4 ET)

[www.osteoporosis.ca](http://www.osteoporosis.ca)

Charitable Registration Number 89551 0931 RR0001  
Copyright © October 2013

