

**Clinical aspects of endogenous hypothyroidism and subclinical hyperthyroidism in patients with differentiated thyroid carcinoma** Heemstra, K.A.

# Citation

Heemstra, K. A. (2009, September 2). *Clinical aspects of endogenous hypothyroidism and subclinical hyperthyroidism in patients with differentiated thyroid carcinoma*. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/13946

Version:	Corrected Publisher's Version
License:	<u>Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the</u> <u>Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden</u>
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/13946

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

# 

The Effects of Thyrotropin Suppressive Therapy on Bone Metabolism in Patients with Well-Differentiated Thyroid Carcinoma

K.A. Heemstra, N.A.T. Hamdy, J.A. Romijn, J.W.A. Smit Thyroid. 2006;16(6):583-91

# Abstract

Patients with differentiated thyroid carcinoma (DTC) are commonly treated long-term with thyrotropin (TSH)-suppressive thyroxin replacement therapy resolving in a state of subclinical hyperthyroidism. The relationship between subclinical hyperthyroidism and osteoporosis is not clear. In this review, we systematically selected and analyzed 21 studies addressing this issue. Although multiple methodological differences between studies prevented a structured meta- analysis, our data suggest that postmenopausal women with subclinical hyperthyroidism are most at risk, whereas no increased risk was observed in men and premenopausal women. Based on these findings we believe that measurement of bone mineral density is recommended in postmenopausal women with DTC starting TSH suppressive therapy. This should be subsequently regularly measured to enable timely intervention with bone protective agents.

# Background

Differentiated thyroid carcinoma (DTC) is associated with an excellent prognosis, with reported 10-year survival rates reaching 90% (1). This is because of a combination of the favorable biological behaviour of the tumor as well as the availability of effective therapy in the form of total thyroidectomy followed by radioiodine ablation. After initial therapy, all patients with DTC are treated with high doses of thyroxin aiming at significantly suppressing thyrotropin (TSH) levels, the rationale of this approach is based on the potential harmful effects of TSH on tumor recurrence (2;3). One study demonstrated a preventive effect of TSH suppression on tumor recurrence or progression only in high risk DTC patients (4). However long-term TSH suppression may be associated with potential harmful effects, so a recent European Consensus Meeting on thyroid cancer (5), recommended that not all patients with DTC should be indiscriminately treated with TSH suppressive therapy because this represents in effect a state of subclinical hyperthyroidism, as defined by suppressed serum TSH levels in the presence of normal serum levels of (free) thyroxin. The question which clearly is to be answered is whether long-term TSH suppressive therapy is beneficial and safe in patients with DTC.

Subclinical hyperthyroidism has effects on carbohydrate metabolism (6), the cardiovascular system (7-11) and psychological well being (7;12). Whether subclinical hyperthyroidism also deleteriously affects the skeleton remains the subject of discussion (13;14).

Overt hyperthyroidism is associated with an increased risk for osteoporosis (15), the pathophysiology of which is multifactoral (16), including shortening of the bone remodelling cycle (17) and acceleration of bone turnover (18). Thyroid hormone indirectly promotes osteoclast formation and activation by inducing the expression of cytokines, prostaglandins and the receptor activator of nuclear factor NF-kB ligand (RANKL) (16;19;20). RANKL is the key molecule in osteoclast differentiation. It binds to its receptor, RANK, which is expressed on dendritic cells, T cells, osteoclast precursors and mature osteoclasts (21:22), RANKL increases the survival of RANK positive T cells (21), promotes osteoclast differentiation (23-27), stimulates the activity of mature osteoclasts (24;28;29) and promotes survival of osteoclasts by preventing apoptosis (29). Osteoclast differentiation is also stimulated by contact with stromal cells and M-CSF (30;31). Thyroid hormone also inhibits chondrocyte proliferation and promotes hypertrophic differentiation, mineralization, matrix synthesis but also apoptosis of chondrocytes in the growth plate. An exciting new development has been the discovery of functional TSH receptors in bone (32;33) because of the implication that effects that traditionally have been attributed to high thyroid hormone levels may be in effect related to low TSH levels.

The relationship between subclinical hyperthyroidism and osteoporosis is not clear. Several studies have addressed this issue, but there is no consensus largely because of differences in study design, included patient groups, methodology used, follow-up time and choice of outcome parameters. It is of note that although the role of subclinical hyperthyroidism in the pathogenesis of osteoporosis has been the topic of several reviews, no attempt has been made to categorize the original studies so far published according to the various parameters above mentioned. In this review, all clinical studies on TSH suppressive thyroxin therapy in thyroid cancer patients have been systematically selected for analysis.

### Methods

Searches of Medline, Cochrane and EMBASE were conducted using the keywords: "thyroid cancer AND bone mineral density", "thyroid cancer AND osteoporosis" and "thyroid cancer AND bone metabolism". Our aim was to include all studies in which patients with DTC were treated with TSH suppressive thyroxin therapy. We restricted our search to publications in "English language", on "Human subjects" and "articles containing Abstracts". The last search was conducted on January 17, 2006. Of the initial 230 publications found, 32 publications fulfilled these criteria and were selected for detailed analysis.

04

Each study included was scored semi-quantitatively by assessing the following: whether hormonal state of female patients was mentioned; whether they were estrogen-replete or -deplete; whether additional risk factors for osteoporosis were reported; whether a control group was included; whether duration of follow-up was shorter or longer than 5 years; and whether TSH concentrations were adequately suppressed. Eleven studies were excluded on the basis of insufficient data: Mikosch et al. (34) and Rosen et al. (35) did not report the duration of thyroxin therapy. Rosen and coworkers included patients who were taking thyroid hormone for at least 6 months. In one study patients did not have sufficiently suppressed serum TSH concentrations (36). Guo et al. (37) and Gonzalez et al. (38) did not report serum TSH levels. Mikosch et al. (34;39) and Taimelia et al. (40) did not measure bone mineral density. Subanalysis according to gender and menopausal state were not performed in two studies (35;41). In an additional 4 studies (40-43), it was not indicated if other risk factors for osteoporosis were investigated. The last 4 studies (38:40:42:44) lacked control groups. Twenty-one studies fulfilling all criteria were finally included in the analysis, the following parameters were documented: study design, number of patients included, age, gender, hormonal status of female patients, additional risk factors for osteoporosis, dose of thyroxin prescribed, serum level of TSH, duration of TSH-suppressive therapy, the presence of a control group and the final outcome based on differences in bone mineral density (BMD). The studies were categorized according to gender and menopausal state and subgroup analyses undertaken accordingly.

Although we set out to conduct a structural meta-analysis, the heterogeneity of the available data did not allow us to do so.

#### Results

The results of the analyses are shown in Tables 1-5. Almost all studies excluded patients with diseases and those using glucocorticoids or other drugs potentially affecting bone metabolism. Of the 21 studies included, 4 of 6 prospective studies reported a significant decrease in BMD with time on treatment, as in 4 of 17 cross-sectional studies there was a significant difference in BMD between DTC patients and controls. The results of the subgroup analyses according to gender and menopausal state were as follows:

#### Premenopausal women

The effect of TSH suppressive therapy in premenopausal women is described in 15 studies, of which 12 had a cross-sectional design and 4 were prospective studies (Table 1 and 2). Two cross-sectional studies found a significant decrease in BMD in DTC patients receiving TSH suppressive therapy compared to controls: Jodar *et al.* (45) evaluated 37 DTC patients, significantly lower BMD of the distal radius was found in DTC patients compared to controls; although, this was still within the normal range for age and gender. There was a significantly positive relationship between thyroxin dose and lumbar spine and distal radius BMD. Diamond *et al.* (46) evaluated 14 DTC patients. BMD of the femoral neck in DTC patients was significantly lower (-10.6%) than in age-, gender- and menopausal state-matched controls. There were no significant differences between patients and controls in the other cross-sectional studies analyzed.

Two of the prospective studies found a significant effect of TSH suppressive therapy on BMD. Jodar *et al.* (45) studied 14 DTC patients for 18 months. He reported that BMD of the femoral neck was significantly lower in DTC patients than in age-, gender-, body- weight-and menopausal state-matched controls. There were no differences observed between premenopausal and postmenopausal women. Sijanovic *et al.* (47) studied 19 premenopausal women. There was a significant reduction in BMD of the distal radius after 4 years of follow-up.

Table 1. Premenopa	usal women Cross-	sectional studies				
Author	Patients (N)	Duration (Years)	L-thyroxin Dose (µg/day)	TSH (mU/L)	Controls	Outcome (BMD (z-scores), unless otherwise indicated)
Franklyn (13)	18	7.7 (1-19)	217 (100-300)	0.67 ± 2.20	Yes	N
Jodar (45)	37	5.4 ± 2.8	177 ± 43	0.61 ± 1.18	Yes	BMD (z-score): DTR : -0.84 ± 1.00 (significant below 0)
Toivonen (64)	15	9-11	215 ± 53	<0.05	Yes	NS
Marcocci (65)	47 (38 DTC)	10.1 Median: 9.2 (5-28)	154.3±5	No quantitative data	Yes	NS
Stepan (50)	20	$6.0 \pm 5.2$	$151.1 \pm 47.1$	0.10 (0.01-3.80)	Yes	NS
Goerres (66)	2	5.7±6.8	Cumulative dose: 7124.5 ± 9448.6 µg/kg	0.019 ± 0.056	Yes	NS
Gianinni (67)	12	9.25 ± 0.9	152.1 ± 3.72	<0.1	Yes	NS
Diamond (46)	14	10.7 ± 1.7	Cumulative dose: 816 ± 159 mg	No quantitative data	Yes	FN 0.98 ± 0.03 vs. 1.03 ± 0.01 (p=0.01)
Florkowski (68)	20	Median: 9.6 (3-42)	167 (125-300)	< 0.2 mU/I	No	NS
Chen (69)	44	7.2 ± 2.8	No quantitative data	1.98 ± 0.44 n=22 partly suppressive n=22 suppressive	Yes	NS
Heijckmann (70)	26	Median: 4 (1-14)	2.2 ± 0.5 µg/kg/day	0.06 (< 0.05-0.35)	No	NS
Reverter (71)	44	$12 \pm 5$	195 ± 43	0.03 ± 0.03	Yes	NS
All values expressed	as mean±SD unle	ss indicated otherwise, DTR	8: Distal Third of the Radius; FN	V: Femoral Neck, NS=Not si	gnificant	

Table 2. Premenopausal women Longitudinal studies

Author	Patients (N)	Duration (Years)	L-thyroxin Dose (µg/day)	TSH (mU/L)	Controls	Outcome (BMD (z-scores) unless otherwise indicated)
Jodar (45)	14	5.4 ± 2.8	177 ± 43	0.61 ± 1.18	Yes	BMD (z-score): DTR: -0.84 ± 1.00 (significant below 0)
						FN: (% year): -1.50 ± 3.18 (patients) vs. -0.24 ± 1.32 (controls) (p<0.05)
Muller (48)	15	$11.2 \pm 0.9$	200 ± 7	$0.09 \pm 0.01$	Yes	NS
Sijanovic (47)	19 (p<0.05)	9.4 ± 6.4	171 ± 30	0.07 ± 0.062	Yes	DR baseline: 0.670 ± 0.037 4 y: 0.657 ± 0.039
Karner (54)	19	$9.4 \pm 6.4$	171 ± 30	0.07 ± 0.62	No	NS

All values expressed as mean±SD unless indicated otherwise, DTR: Distal Third of the Radius; FN: Femoral Neck, DR= Distal Radius, NS=Not significant

A significant negative correlation was found between thyroxin dose and BMD of the distal radius. Muller *et al.* (48) studied 23 patients: 8 with a non-toxic goitre and 15 DTC, who were followed up for an average of 1.5 years. There were no significant differences in BMD of the lumbar spine, femoral neck, trunk and extremities between patients and age-, gender-, body mass index (BMI)- and years of menopause-matched controls.

#### Postmenopausal women

The effect of TSH suppressive therapy in post-menopausal women was investigated in 16 studies (Table 3 and 4). Fourteen studies were cross-sectional. Four found a significant difference in BMD between patients and controls. Kung *et al.* (49) studied 34 postmenopausal women. The patients had a significant lower BMD than age-, gender- and menopausal statematched controls. Jodar *et al.* (45) studied 39 patients. Average TSH levels were  $0.50 \pm 1.28$  mU/l. BMD of the distal radius was significantly lower than the average of controls, although is was still within the normal range. Stepan *et al.* (50) studied 15 patients using both thyroxin and liothyronine. BMD of the lumbar spine was significantly decreased compared to matched controls. Diamond *et al.* (46) studied 10 postmenopausal women. BMD measurements at the lumbar spine, femoral neck and forearm were significantly lower than those of matched controls. There were no differences in BMD observed between patients and controls in the remaining cross-sectional studies analyzed.

There was a significant difference in 2 of the 4 prospective studies analysed. Jodar *et al.* (45) studied 13 postmenopausal women for a period of  $2.25 \pm 0.6$  years. BMD of the femoral neck was significantly lower in DTC patients than in matched controls. Kung *et al.* (51)studied 46 patients who were randomly assigned to treatment with calcitonin and calcium (n=16), calcium (n=15) or placebo (n=15) and followed for 2 years. At the end of the two years, the BMD of patients treated with calcitonin or calcium remained unchanged, whereas BMD was significantly lower in the placebo-group. In the other 2 analyzed studies (48;52) there were no differences in BMD.

Table 3. Postmenop	ausal women Cru	oss-sectional studies				
Author	Patients (N)	Duration (Years)	L-thyroxin Dose (µg/day)	TSH (mU/L)	Controls	Outcome (BMD (z-scores) unless otherwise indicated)
Hawkins (72)	21	6.2 ± 2.5	158.3 ± 43.7	0.03 ± 0.4 80% < 0.3	Yes	NS
Kung (49)	34	12.2 ± 6.6	179 ± 60	< 0.05	Yes	Values versus controls: BMC 1 total body 1652 ± 356 vs. 1994 ± 270
						PC:000 LS 20.749 ± 0.147 vs. 0.917 ± 0.161 (P<0.005) FN 3 0.622 ± 0.123vs 0.708 ± 0.127 (p<0.01) T 4 0.552 ± 0.115 vs. 0.635 ± 0.119 (p<0.001) WT 5 0.554 ± 0.139 vs. 0.630 ± 0.144 (p<0.005)
Franklyn (13)	26	8.1 (1-19)	175 (100-200)	0.26 ± 0.54	Yes	NS
Jodar (45)	39	5.8 ± 2.9	160 ± 38	$0.50 \pm 1.28$	Yes	DTR 6 -0.77 $\pm$ 0.98 (significant below 0)
Toivonen (64)	10	9-11	215 ± 53	< 0.05	Yes	NS
Stepan (50)	25	7.4 ± 4.5	148.7 ± 49.4	0.05 (0.01-2.26)	Yes	LS -1.08 ± 1.40 vs0.05 ± 0.98 (controls, p<0.01)
Goerres (66)	23	$10.3 \pm 4.4$	Cumulative dose: 9195.8 ± 5193 µg/kg	0.019 ± 0.056	Yes	NS
Diamond (46)	10	5.9 ± 1.0	Cumulative dose: 337 ± 72 mg	No quantitative data	Yes	LS 0.876 ± 0.04 vs. 1.069 ± 0.04 (-16% vs. controls, p<0.01) FN 0.702 ± 0.03 vs. 0.916 ± 0.02 (-15%), p<0.001) Forearm 33.5 ± 1.3 vs. 38.8 ± 1.5 (-11%, p<0.05)
Fujiyama (52)	24	11.6 ± 7.36 14.8 ± 9.43	152.1 ± 22.51 95.83 ± 50.94	n=12: < 0.1 n=12: > 0.1	No	NS
Gianinni (67)	13	$6.0 \pm 1.5$	$144.2 \pm 4.15$	< 0.1	Yes	NS
Florkowski (68)	18	9.6 (3-42)	167 (125-300)	< 0.2	No	NS
Chen (69)	25	7.8 ± 3.1	No quantitative data	1.76 ± 0.41 n=8 partly suppressive n=17 suppressive	Yes	NS
Heijckmann (70)	14	median: 5.5 (1-52)	2.2 ± 0.5 µg/kg/day	0.06 (< 0.05-0.35)	No	NS
Reverter (71)	44	12 ± 5	195 ± 43	0.03 ± 0.03	Yes	NS
All values expresser 6 DTR= Distal Thirr	d as mean±SD u d of the Radius, I	nless indicated otherwis NS=not significant	e. 1 BMC=Bone Mineral	Content, 2 LS=Lumbar S <sub>i</sub>	oine, 3 FN=F	-emoral Neck, 4 T=Trochanter, 5 WT=Ward's triangle,

Table 4. Postmenopausal	women Longitudinal studies
-------------------------	----------------------------

Author	Patients (N)	Duration (Years)	L-thyroxin Dose (µg/day)	TSH (mU/L)	Controls	Outcome (BMD (z-scores) unless otherwise indicated)
Jodar (45)	39 13	5.8 ± 2.9	160 ± 38	0.50 ± 1.28	Yes	FN change (%/year): -1.50 ± 3.18 vs. -0.24 ± 1.32 (p<0.05)
Muller (48)	10	11.2 ± 0.9	200 ± 7	$0.09 \pm 0.01$	Yes	NS
Kung (51)	46	2	2	< 0.03	No	LS1 -5% vs. baseline FN2 -6.7% T3 -4.7% WT4 -8.8%
Fujiyama (52)	24	11.6 ± 7.36 14.8 ± 9.43	152.1 ± 22.51 95.83 ± 50.94	n=12: < 0.1 n=12: > 0.1	No	NS

All values expressed as mean±SD unless indicated otherwise. 1 LS=Lumbar Spine, 2 FN=Femoral Neck, 3 T=Trochanter, 4 WT=Ward's triangle

#### Men

Eight studies selected for analysis addressed the effects of TSH suppressive therapy on bone metabolism in men in a cross-sectional study design (table 5). One study was longitudinal (table 6). Only one cross-sectional study found a significant difference between patients and controls. Jodar *et al.* (53) studied 49 men, of whom 17 were treated for DTC and 32 were treated for Graves' disease. DTC patients had a mean TSH concentration of 0.20  $\pm$  0.27 mU/mL. Graves' disease patients had a mean TSH concentration of 1.07  $\pm$  1.85 mU/mL. BMD of patients with Graves' disease and DTC were significantly lower than that of controls. In the longitudinal study (54), 9 men were studied for one year. A significant bone loss at the distal radius, but not the lumbar spine and femoral neck was found.

#### Discussion

The clinical implications of long-term suppressive thyroxin therapy on bone are critical, largely because of the favourable prognosis of DTC. However, the potential deleterious effects of TSH suppressive therapy on the skeleton remain controversial. Our aim was to review the literature on the effects of TSH-suppressive therapy on bone metabolism focussing on reported changes in BMD measurements. There are many differences in the outcome of studies addressing this issue so that we have systematically categorized studies according to predefined criteria in an attempt to reach a more uniform conclusion.

The majority of studies do not report an effect of TSH suppressive therapy on BMD in men and premenopausal women. A significant effect of TSH-suppressive thyroxin replacement on BMD is reported in a substantial number of studies conducted in postmenopausal women. This suggests that there may indeed be a relevant effect of TSH-suppressive therapy on bone mass in postmenopausal women, whereas these effects are not clear in men and in premenopausal women. This conclusion is in agreement with that of other reviews and metaanalyses addressing this issue (14;15;55-57). Another important aspect of TSH suppressive therapy in young patients is that it may affect bone development and the peak bone mass as investigated together with the contribution of hypoparathyroidism by Schneider *et al.* (58).

Table 5. Men Cross-	sectional studic	SS				
Author	Patients (N)	Duration (Years)	L-thyroxin Dose (µg/day)	TSH (mU/L)	Controls	Outcome (BMD (z-scores) unless otherwise indicated)
Franklyn (13)	ى	7.9 (2-15)	180 (100-200	0.36 ± 0.57 n=2 <0.05 mU/l n=3 normal/smaller than normal	Yes	SN
Jodar (53)	49 (17 DTC)	9.1 ± 4.9	193 ± 50	0.20 ± 0.27	oN	LS 1 -0.64 ± 1.22(p=0.046) FN 2 -0.49 ± 0.62 (p=0.007) WT 3 -0.50 ± 0.62 (p=0.004)
Toivonen (64)	4	9-11	215 ± 53	< 0.05	Yes	NS
Marcocci (73)	34 (26 DTC)	10.2 ± 0.8	172 ± 5.9	n=26 undetectable n=6: 0.1 n=2: 0.2	Yes	SN
Stepan (50)	13	4.6 ± 3.0	148.6±55.8	0.06 (0.01-2.49)	Yes	NS
Goerres (66)	17	8.1 ± 5.2	Cumulative dose: 8200.4 ± 5907.0 µg/kg	0.019 ± 0.056	Yes	SN
Florkowski (68)	9	9.6 (3-42)	167 (125-300)	< 0.2	No	NS
Heijckmann (70)	19	median: 6 (1-22)	2.2 ± 0.5 µg/kg/day	0.06 (<0.05-0.35)	No	NS
All values expressed	1 as mean±SD ι	unless indicated otherwis	se, 1 LS=Lumbar Spine, 2 FN=	=Femoral Neck, 3 WT=Ward's	triangle, NS=n	lot significant

Table 6	6. Men	Longitudinal	studies
---------	--------	--------------	---------

Author	Patients (N)	Duration (Years)	L-thyroxin Dose (µg/day)	TSH (mU/L)	Controls	Outcome (BMD (z-scores) unless otherwise indicated)
Karner (54)	9	8.1 ± 6.0	200 ± 50	0.06 ± 0.09	No	S BMD DR 0.748 ± 0.086 vs. 0.732 ± 0.083, p<0.05

All values expressed as mean±SD unless indicated otherwise. TSH, thyrotropin; DR, Distal Radius

Estrogen deprivation is the most common cause of osteoporosis. The removal of the physiological block by gonodal steroid hormones allows the release of inflammatory cytokines which in turn enhance the production of M-CSF and RANKL. RANKL is identified as an essential cytokine for the formation and activation of osteoclasts (23;24;59). This effect could be enhanced by the subclinical hyperthyroid state resulting from TSH suppressive therapy. Hofbauer *et al* (59) found that TSH inhibits RANKL mRNA levels by 60 % and upregulates OPG mRNA levels threefold. OPG inhibits osteoclastogenesis by binding to RANKL (27;59-61), thus preventing RANK-RANKL interactions. In the subclinical hyperthyroid state, TSH levels are suppressed resulting in an absence of this block.

The discrepancy in outcome between studies in postmenopausal women might be explained by a difference in duration of thyroxin therapy or additional risk factors. However, no differences in duration of thyroxin therapy or additional risk factors such as smoking, calcium intake, alcohol abuse, and physical activity were observed. A third explanation could be a difference in methodological approaches. However, all authors used BMD measurements to examine the effect of TSH-suppressive therapy on bone mass. Another explanation could be the instability of the TSH concentration in the years of TSH-suppressive therapy as suggested in the study of Pujol *et al.* (62). Other possible factors could be differences in study population with regard to additional determinants of BMD such as dietary factors, physical exercise, endogenous factors and genetic susceptibility, which become relevant only once the powerful contribution of estrogens has disappeared in postmenopausal women (63). For instance, Kung *et al* mentioned that the patients taking part in the study had a low dietary calcium (51)

Regardless of these considerations it is clear that postmenopausal women with DTC treated with TSH-suppressive therapy are most at risk for bone loss. It has also been shown that bone protecting agents such as bisphosphonates are effective in preventing bone loss in patients with DTC on TSH-suppressive therapy (35) The availability of therapeutic interventions that beneficially influence skeletal morbidity in patients with a low bone mass and consequently risk of fractures dictates that patients at high risk should be screened using BMD measurements. We have identified postmenopausal women with DTC receiving TSH suppressive therapy as a high risk group for bone loss. Based on our analysis of available data we strongly advise screening this group of patients at start of TSH suppressive therapy and at regular intervals to allow timely intervention with bone protective agents.

# References

- 1. Hundahl SA, Fleming ID, Fremgen AM, Menck HR. A National Cancer Data Base report on 53,856 cases of thyroid carcinoma treated in the U.S., 1985-1995. Cancer 1998; 83(12):2638-2648
- 2. Goretzki PE, Frilling A, Simon D, Roeher HD. Growth regulation of normal thyroids and thyroid tumors in man. Recent Results Cancer Res 1990; 118:48-63.
- Mazzaferri EL, Jhiang SM. Long-term impact of initial surgical and medical therapy on papillary and follicular thyroid cancer [see comments] [published erratum appears in Am J Med 1995 Feb;98(2):215]. Am J Med 1994; 97(5):418-428.
- 4. Cooper DS, Specker B, Ho M et al. Thyrotropin suppression and disease progression in patients with differentiated thyroid cancer: results from the National Thyroid Cancer Treatment Cooperative Registry. Thyroid 1998; 8(9):737-744.
- 5. Schlumberger M, Pacini F, Wiersinga WM et al. Follow-up and management of differentiated thyroid carcinoma: a European perspective in clinical practice. Eur J Endocrinol 2004; 151(5):539-548.
- 6. Dimitriadis GD, Raptis SA. Thyroid hormone excess and glucose intolerance. Exp Clin Endocrinol Diabetes 2001; 109 Suppl 2:S225-S239.
- Biondi B, Palmieri EA, Fazio S et al. Endogenous subclinical hyperthyroidism affects quality of life and cardiac morphology and function in young and middle-aged patients. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2000; 85(12):4701-4705.
- 8. Biondi B, Palmieri EA, Lombardi G, Fazio S. Effects of thyroid hormone on cardiac function: the relative importance of heart rate, loading conditions, and myocardial contractility in the regulation of cardiac performance in human hyperthyroidism. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2002; 87(3):968-974.
- 9. Napoli R, Biondi B, Guardasole V et al. Impact of hyperthyroidism and its correction on vascular reactivity in humans. Circulation 2001; 104(25):3076-3080.
- 10. Sgarbi JA, Villaca FG, Garbeline B, Villar HE, Romaldini JH. The effects of early antithyroid therapy for endogenous subclinical hyperthyroidism in clinical and heart abnormalities. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2003; 88(4):1672-1677.
- 11. Smit JW, Eustatia-Rutten CF, Corssmit EP et al. Reversible diastolic dysfunction after long-term exogenous subclinical hyperthyroidism: a randomized, placebo-controlled study. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2005; 90(11):6041-6047.
- 12. Botella-Carretero JI, Galan JM, Caballero C, Sancho J, Escobar-Morreale HF. Quality of life and psychometric functionality in patients with differentiated thyroid carcinoma. Endocr Relat Cancer 2003; 10(4):601-610.
- 13. Franklyn JA, Betteridge J, Daykin J et al. Long-term thyroxin treatment and bone mineral density. Lancet 1992; 340(8810):9-13.
- Quan ML, Pasieka JL, Rorstad O. Bone mineral density in well-differentiated thyroid cancer patients treated with suppressive thyroxin: a systematic overview of the literature. J Surg Oncol 2002; 79(1):62-69.
- 15. Greenspan SL, Greenspan FS. The effect of thyroid hormone on skeletal integrity. Ann Intern Med 1999; 130(9):750-758.
- 16. Basset P, Okada A, Chenard MP et al. Matrix metalloproteinases as stromal effectors of human carcinoma progression: therapeutic implications. Matrix Biol 1997; 15(8-9):535-541.
- 17. Eriksen EF, Mosekilde L, Melsen F. Trabecular bone remodeling and bone balance in hyperthyroidism. Bone 1985; 6(6):421-428.
- Mosekilde L, Melsen F, Bagger JP, Myhre-Jensen O, Schwartz SN. Bone changes in hyperthyroidism: interrelationships between bone morphometry, thyroid function and calcium-phosphorus metabolism. Acta Endocrinol (Copenh) 1977; 85(3):515-525.
- Kanatani M, Sugimoto T, Sowa H, Kobayashi T, Kanzawa M, Chihara K. Thyroid hormone stimulates osteoclast differentiation by a mechanism independent of RANKL-RANK interaction. J Cell Physiol 2004; 201(1):17-25.
- 20. Miura M, Tanaka K, Komatsu Y et al. A novel interaction between thyroid hormones and 1,25(OH)(2)D(3) in osteoclast formation. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 2002; 291(4):987-994.
- 21. Anderson DM, Maraskovsky E, Billingsley WL et al. A homologue of the TNF receptor and its ligand

2

enhance T-cell growth and dendritic-cell function. Nature 1997; 390(6656):175-179.

- 22. Hsu H, Lacey DL, Dunstan CR et al. Tumor necrosis factor receptor family member RANK mediates osteoclast differentiation and activation induced by osteoprotegerin ligand. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 1999; 96(7):3540-3545.
- 23. Kong YY, Feige U, Sarosi I et al. Activated T cells regulate bone loss and joint destruction in adjuvant arthritis through osteoprotegerin ligand. Nature 1999; 402(6759):304-309.
- 24. Lacey DL, Timms E, Tan HL et al. Osteoprotegerin ligand is a cytokine that regulates osteoclast differentiation and activation. Cell 1998; 93(2):165-176.
- 25. Matsuzaki K, Udagawa N, Takahashi N et al. Osteoclast differentiation factor (ODF) induces osteoclastlike cell formation in human peripheral blood mononuclear cell cultures. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 1998; 246(1):199-204.
- Quinn JM, Elliott J, Gillespie MT, Martin TJ. A combination of osteoclast differentiation factor and macrophage-colony stimulating factor is sufficient for both human and mouse osteoclast formation in vitro. Endocrinology 1998; 139(10):4424-4427.
- Yasuda H, Shima N, Nakagawa N et al. Osteoclast differentiation factor is a ligand for osteoprotegerin/ osteoclastogenesis-inhibitory factor and is identical to TRANCE/RANKL. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 1998; 95(7):3597-3602.
- 28. Burgess TL, Qian Y, Kaufman S et al. The ligand for osteoprotegerin (OPGL) directly activates mature osteoclasts. J Cell Biol 1999; 145(3):527-538.
- 29. Fuller K, Wong B, Fox S, Choi Y, Chambers TJ. TRANCE is necessary and sufficient for osteoblast-mediated activation of bone resorption in osteoclasts. J Exp Med 1998; 188(5):997-1001.
- 30. Hattersley G, Owens J, Flanagan AM, Chambers TJ. Macrophage colony stimulating factor (M-CSF) is essential for osteoclast formation in vitro. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 1991; 177(1):526-531.
- 31. Kodama H, Nose M, Niida S, Yamasaki A. Essential role of macrophage colony-stimulating factor in the osteoclast differentiation supported by stromal cells. J Exp Med 1991; 173(5):1291-1294.
- 32. Abe E, Marians RC, Yu W et al. TSH is a negative regulator of skeletal remodeling. Cell 2003; 115(2):151-162.
- 33. Morimura T, Tsunekawa K, Kasahara T et al. Expression of type 2 iodothyronine deiodinase in human osteoblast is stimulated by thyrotropin. Endocrinology 2005; 146(4):2077-2084.
- 34. Mikosch P, Jauk B, Gallowitsch HJ, Pipam W, Kresnik E, Lind P. Suppressive levothyroxine therapy has no significant influence on bone degradation in women with thyroid carcinoma: a comparison with other disorders affecting bone metabolism. Thyroid 2001; 11(3):257-263.
- 35. Rosen HN, Moses AC, Garber J et al. Randomized trial of pamidronate in patients with thyroid cancer: bone density is not reduced by suppressive doses of thyroxin, but is increased by cyclic intravenous pamidronate. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1998; 83(7):2324-2330.
- 36. McDermott MT, Perloff JJ, Kidd GS. A longitudinal assessment of bone loss in women with levothyroxinesuppressed benign thyroid disease and thyroid cancer. Calcif Tissue Int 1995; 56(6):521-525.
- 37. Guo CY, Weetman AP, Eastell R. Longitudinal changes of bone mineral density and bone turnover in postmenopausal women on thyroxin. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf) 1997; 46(3):301-307.
- Gonzalez DC, Mautalen CA, Correa PH, el Tamer E, el Tamer S. Bone mass in totally thyroidectomized patients. Role of calcitonin deficiency and exogenous thyroid treatment. Acta Endocrinol (Copenh) 1991; 124(5):521-525.
- 39. Mikosch P, Obermayer-Pietsch B, Jost R et al. Bone metabolism in patients with differentiated thyroid carcinoma receiving suppressive levothyroxine treatment. Thyroid 2003; 13(4):347-356.
- 40. Taimela E, Taimela S, Nikkanen V, Irjala K. Accelerated bone degradation in thyroid carcinoma patients during thyroxin treatment, measured by determination of the carboxyterminal telopeptide region of type I collagen in serum. Eur J Clin Chem Clin Biochem 1994; 32(11):827-831.
- McDermott MT, Kidd GS, Blue P, Ghaed V, Hofeldt FD. Reduced bone mineral content in totally thyroidectomized patients: possible effect of calcitonin deficiency. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1983; 56(5):936-939.
- 42. Gorres G, Kaim A, Otte A, Gotze M, Muller-Brand J. Bone mineral density in patients receiving suppressive doses of thyroxin for differentiated thyroid carcinoma. Eur J Nucl Med 1996; 23(6):690-692.
- Lecomte P, Lecureuil N, Osorio-Salazar C, Lecureuil M, Valat C. Effects of suppressive doses of levothyroxine treatment on sex-hormone-binding globulin and bone metabolism. Thyroid 1995; 5(1):19-23.

- 44. Lehmke J, Bogner U, Felsenberg D, Peters H, Schleusener H. Determination of bone mineral density by quantitative computed tomography and single photon absorptiometry in subclinical hyperthyroidism: a risk of early osteopaenia in post-menopausal women. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf) 1992; 36(5):511-517.
- 45. Jodar E, Begona LM, Garcia L, Rigopoulou D, Martinez G, Hawkins F. Bone changes in pre- and postmenopausal women with thyroid cancer on levothyroxine therapy: evolution of axial and appendicular bone mass. Osteoporos Int 1998; 8(4):311-316.
- 46. Diamond T, Nery L, Hales I. A therapeutic dilemma: suppressive doses of thyroxin significantly reduce bone mineral measurements in both premenopausal and postmenopausal women with thyroid carcinoma. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1991; 72(6):1184-1188.
- 47. Sijanovic S, Karner I. Bone loss in premenopausal women on long-term suppressive therapy with thyroid hormone. Medscape Womens Health 2001; 6(5):3.
- 48. Muller CG, Bayley TA, Harrison JE, Tsang R. Possible limited bone loss with suppressive thyroxin therapy is unlikely to have clinical relevance. Thyroid 1995; 5(2):81-87.
- 49. Kung AW, Lorentz T, Tam SC. Thyroxin suppressive therapy decreases bone mineral density in postmenopausal women. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf) 1993; 39(5):535-540.
- 50. Stepan JJ, Limanova Z. Biochemical assessment of bone loss in patients on long-term thyroid hormone treatment. Bone Miner 1992; 17(3):377-388.
- 51. Kung AW, Yeung SS. Prevention of bone loss induced by thyroxin suppressive therapy in postmenopausal women: the effect of calcium and calcitonin. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1996; 81(3):1232-1236.
- 52. Fujiyama K, Kiriyama T, Ito M et al. Suppressive doses of thyroxin do not accelerate age-related bone loss in late postmenopausal women. Thyroid 1995; 5(1):13-17.
- 53. Jodar E, Martinez-Diaz-Guerra G, Azriel S, Hawkins F. Bone mineral density in male patients with Lthyroxin suppressive therapy and Graves disease. Calcif Tissue Int 2001; 69(2):84-87.
- 54. Karner I, Hrgovic Z, Sijanovic S et al. Bone mineral density changes and bone turnover in thyroid carcinoma patients treated with supraphysiologic doses of thyroxin. Eur J Med Res 2005; 10(11):480-488.
- 55. Faber J, Galloe AM. Changes in bone mass during prolonged subclinical hyperthyroidism due to L-thyroxin treatment: a meta-analysis. Eur J Endocrinol 1994; 130(4):350-356.
- 56. Murphy E, Williams GR. The thyroid and the skeleton. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf) 2004; 61(3):285-298.
- 57. Uzzan B, Campos J, Cucherat M, Nony P, Boissel JP, Perret GY. Effects on bone mass of long term treatment with thyroid hormones: a meta-analysis. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1996; 81(12):4278-4289.
- 58. Schneider P, Biko J, Reiners C et al. Impact of parathyroid status and Ca and vitamin-D supplementation on bone mass and muscle-bone relationships in 208 Belarussian children after thyroidectomy because of thyroid carcinoma. Exp Clin Endocrinol Diabetes 2004; 112(8):444-450.
- 59. Hofbauer LC, Kluger S, Kuhne CA et al. Detection and characterization of RANK ligand and osteoprotegerin in the thyroid gland. J Cell Biochem 2002; 86(4):642-650.
- 60. Simonet WS, Lacey DL, Dunstan CR et al. Osteoprotegerin: a novel secreted protein involved in the regulation of bone density. Cell 1997; 89(2):309-319.
- 61. Tsuda E, Goto M, Mochizuki S et al. Isolation of a novel cytokine from human fibroblasts that specifically inhibits osteoclastogenesis. Biochem Biophys Res Commun 1997; 234(1):137-142.
- Pujol P, Daures JP, Nsakala N, Baldet L, Bringer J, Jaffiol C. Degree of thyrotropin suppression as a prognostic determinant in differentiated thyroid cancer. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1996; 81(12):4318-4323.
- 63. Rapuri PB, Gallagher JC, Haynatzki G. Endogenous levels of serum estradiol and sex hormone binding globulin determine bone mineral density, bone remodeling, the rate of bone loss, and response to treatment with estrogen in elderly women. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 2004; 89(10):4954-4962.
- 64. Toivonen J, Tahtela R, Laitinen K, Risteli J, Valimaki MJ. Markers of bone turnover in patients with differentiated thyroid cancer with and following withdrawal of thyroxin suppressive therapy. Eur J Endocrinol 1998; 138(6):667-673.
- 65. Marcocci C, Golia F, Bruno-Bossio G, Vignali E, Pinchera A. Carefully monitored levothyroxine suppressive therapy is not associated with bone loss in premenopausal women. J Clin Endocrinol Metab 1994; 78(4):818-823.
- 66. Goerres G, Theiler R, Muller-Brand J. Interfemur variation of bone mineral density in patients receiving high-dose thyroxin therapy. Calcif Tissue Int 1998; 63(2):98-101.
- 67. Giannini S, Nobile M, Sartori L et al. Bone density and mineral metabolism in thyroidectomized patients

treated with long-term L-thyroxin. Clin Sci (Lond) 1994; 87(5):593-597.

- 68. Florkowski CM, Brownlie BE, Elliot JR, Ayling EM, Turner JG. Bone mineral density in patients receiving suppressive doses of thyroxin for thyroid carcinoma. N Z Med J 1993; 106(966):443-444.
- 69. Chen CH, Chen JF, Yang BY et al. Bone mineral density in women receiving thyroxin suppressive therapy for differentiated thyroid carcinoma. J Formos Med Assoc 2004; 103(6):442-447.
- 70. Heijckmann AC, Huijberts MS, Geusens P, de VJ, Menheere PP, Wolffenbuttel BH. Hip bone mineral density, bone turnover and risk of fracture in patients on long-term suppressive L-thyroxin therapy for differentiated thyroid carcinoma. Eur J Endocrinol 2005; 153(1):23-29.
- 71. Reverter JL, Holgado S, Alonso N, Salinas I, Granada ML, Sanmarti A. Lack of deleterious effect on bone mineral density of long-term thyroxin suppressive therapy for differentiated thyroid carcinoma. Endocr Relat Cancer 2005; 12(4):973-981.
- 72. Hawkins F, Rigopoulou D, Papapietro K, Lopez MB. Spinal bone mass after long-term treatment with Lthyroxin in postmenopausal women with thyroid cancer and chronic lymphocytic thyroiditis. Calcif Tissue Int 1994; 54(1):16-19.
- 73. Marcocci C, Golia F, Vignali E, Pinchera A. Skeletal integrity in men chronically treated with suppressive doses of L-thyroxin. J Bone Miner Res 1997; 12(1): 72-77.

9