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**Background:** Because of an aging population, osteoporotic vertebral fractures are becoming more frequent. Conservative therapy was considered the gold standard for treating osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures (OVCFs) in the past. Percutaneous vertebroplasty (PVP) or balloon kyphoplasty (BKP) as minimally invasive techniques are new treatments that are widely used for painful OVCFs. However, an increase in new vertebral compression fractures at non-treated levels following augmentation is of concern. There is no convincing evidence that new fractures are inevitable after augmentation compared to after conservative treatment, and it is still unclear whether further fractures are the consequence of augmentation or a result of the natural progression of osteoporosis.

**Objective:** The objective of this study was to evaluate the new-level fracture risk after PVP or BKP compared with conservative (non-operative) treatment and to determine the dominant risk factor associated with new OVCFs.

**Study Design:** A meta-analysis of comparative studies was performed to evaluate the incidence of new vertebral fractures between vertebral augmentation, such as vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty, and no operation.

**Setting:** The PubMed, ISI Web of Science, ELSEVIER ScienceDirect, and Cochrane Library databases and abstracts published in annual proceedings were systematically searched. In addition, we also retrieved data from references when titles met our inclusion criteria.

**Methods:** Detailed searches of a number of online databases comparing operative and non-operative groups were performed. We included randomized controlled trials, clinical controlled trials, and prospective clinical studies to provide available data. All studies were reviewed by 2 reviewers independently, and all the references that met our inclusion criteria were searched for additional trials, using the guidelines set by the QUOROM (Quality of Reporting of Meta-analysis) statement.

**Results:** We evaluated 12 studies encompassing 1,328 patients in total, including 768 who underwent operation with polymethylmethacrylate and 560 who received non-operative treatments. For new-level vertebral fractures, our meta-analysis found no significant difference between the 2 methods, including total new fractures ($P = 0.55$) and adjacent fractures ($P = 0.5$). For pre-existing vertebral fractures, there was no significant difference between the 2 groups (operative and non-operative groups) ($P = 0.24$). Additionally, there was no significant difference in bone mineral density, both in the lumbar ($P = 0.13$) and femoral neck regions ($P = 0.37$), between the 2 interventions.

**Limitation:** All studies we screened were published online except for unpublished articles. Moreover, only a few data sources could be extracted from the published studies. There were only 5 randomized clinical trials and 7 prospective studies that met our inclusion criteria.

**Conclusion:** Vertebral augmentation techniques, such as vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty, have been widely used to treat osteoporotic vertebral fractures in order to alleviate back pain and correct the deformity, and it has been frequently reported that many new vertebral fractures occurred after this operation. Our analysis did not reveal evidence of an increased risk of fracture of vertebral bodies, especially those adjacent to the treated vertebrae, following augmentation with either method compared with conservative treatment.
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The continued aging of the population around the world has aroused concern regarding osteoporosis and osteoporotic vertebral compression fractures (OVCFs). Conservative therapy such as bed rest, opioid analgesia, muscle relaxants, bracing, external fixation, and a combination of these treatments is routine. However, patients can become dissatisfied with long-term bed rest as it may cause various complications, such as pneumonia, urinary infection, bedsores, and deep venous thrombosis (1,2), especially among the elderly. Conservative care can exacerbate bone demineralization, which inevitably increases the risk of bone fracture. Additionally, patients may have to tolerate the adverse effects of anti-inflammatory drugs and analgesics.

During the last few decades, 2 minimally invasive techniques for treating painful OVCFs, percutaneous vertebroplasty (PVP) and balloon kyphoplasty (BKP), have become widely used all over the world (3-8). Both procedures not only alleviate unbearable pain, but also stabilize the fractured vertebral body by injecting a small quantity of bone cement into the collapsed vertebral body (3,7), and many authors have reported its advantages (9-15). However, bone cement injection can also cause many complications, such as cement leakage into the vertebral body, lungs, and veins, and new vertebral fractures can occur during follow-up after PVP (4,16-23). Although vertebroplasty is increasingly used as a treatment for OVCFs, some authors have indicated that augmentation increases the risk for subsequent vertebral fractures (24-27), while others state that there is no explicit evidence that this procedure results in this poor outcomes (28-31). Additionally, some researchers have suggested that the procedure may actually reduce the incidence of adjacent level fractures (32). Furthermore, there are reports of this procedure being used for unalleviated pain at previously treated vertebral levels (33) and of the prophylactic use of vertebroplasty in non-fractured vertebrae at high risk for future fracture (34). However, controversy exists as to whether augmentation can increase the risk for new OVCFs during follow-up, and although there have been reported a number of clinical studies comparing PVP with conservative treatment (27,28,30-32,35-41), including randomized controlled trials and prospective clinical studies, it remains unclear whether new fractures are due to this augmentation or simply are the result of the natural progression of osteoporosis. There are no data comparing PVP or BKP with conservative treatment to assess any increased risk of new fractures following treatment. Therefore, the purpose of this meta-analysis was to determine whether this procedure increased new-level vertebral fractures and whether vertebral fracture occurs adjacent to the treated one.

**Methods**

**Search Strategy**

In addition to the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, databases such as PubMed, ELSEVIER Science Direct, Web of Knowledge, and Embase were searched for articles on new fractures after vertebroplasty and kyphoplasty for painful OVCF. The search terms included “vertebroplasty” or “kyphoplasty” or “vertebral augmentation” and “new fracture” or “refracture” or “secondary fracture” or “subsequent fracture” and “conservative treatment” or “conservative therapy” or “optimal pain medication.” Articles dated from January 1987 to October 2014 were downloaded and analyzed. No language restrictions were used in our search, and studies were selected with pre-prepared criteria; any divergence was resolved by agreement between the reviewers. Two reviewers independently searched all the titles, abstracts, and references to screen preliminarily the potential papers to be retrieved. When there was uncertainty, full-text articles were obtained.

**Selection of Studies**

Studies were selected for this meta-analysis if they met the following criteria: (1) comparative studies, including randomized and prospective clinical trials for treating OVCFs; (2) studies enrolling ≥ 30 patients; all patients aged 50 years or older; back pain of no more than 12 months’ duration; and bone marrow edema of vertebral fracture on magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) indicated a new fracture; and, (3) the fracture must be a painful OVCF between the T4-L5 level before treatment. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) the diagnosis of OVCFs was not clinically established (such as in patients with severe traumatic or cancer-related vertebral fractures); (2) patients had untreatable coagulopathy; systemic or local spine infection, neurological deficits, or spinal stenosis; or concomitant hip fracture; (3) severe cardiopulmonary comorbidity; (4) case-control study, case report, retrospective study, systematic review, and meta-analysis; and (5) no relevant data could be extracted.

**Data Extraction**

All data extraction was done by the same 2 observ-
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Statistical Analysis
Statistical analyses were performed using Review Manager (RevMan, version 5.3, Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011). Our meta-analysis was performed in strict accordance with the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions 5.1.0 and 2009 Updated Method Guidelines for Systematic Reviews in the Cochrane Back Review Group (42). For dichotomous variables, we calculated the risk ratios (RRs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for each study while calculating mean differences (MDs) and 95% CIs for the continuous variables, and a meta-analysis was performed on crude data extracted from the text. Statistical heterogeneity was assessed using I² and chi-squared tests at a significance level of \( P < 0.05 \). A fixed effects model was performed if there was no evidence of heterogeneity (\( I^2 < 50\% \)) among these studies, and if the evidence of heterogeneity was tested, a random effects model was replaced. In addition, a subgroup analysis allowed exploration of the influence of a variety of potential prognostic factors that might be associated with the outcome of the 2 treatments.

Assessment of Methodological Quality
Two of the reviewers independently assessed the methodological quality of the included studies in accordance with the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of intervention, version 5.1.0 (42). We used a 7-item scale to assess the methodological quality of the studies included, which addressed the following issues: randomization sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, and selective reporting.

Search Results
A total of 956 records were identified through online databases; after excluding duplicates and irrelevant articles, 86 full-text papers were assessed for eligibility. Finally, according to the inclusion criteria, 12 studies were assessed, including 5 randomized controlled trials (27,38-41) and 7 prospective clinical controlled studies (28,30-32,35-37). The Quality of Reporting of Meta-analysis (QUOROM) flowchart illustrates the main reasons for trial exclusion (Fig. 1). The characteristics and the funnel plot of these studies are shown in Table 1 and Fig. 2.
Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the included studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
<th>Gender (F/M)</th>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
<th>Lost to follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kallmes</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>53/15</td>
<td>73.4 ± 9.4</td>
<td>74.3 ± 9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchbinder</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31/7</td>
<td>74.2 ± 14</td>
<td>78.9 ± 9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rousing</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19/6</td>
<td>80 (65-96)</td>
<td>80 (71-93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrokhi</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30/10</td>
<td>72 (59-90)</td>
<td>74 (55-87)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klazen</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>RCT</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>70/31</td>
<td>75.2 ± 9.8</td>
<td>75.4 ± 8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56/32</td>
<td>76.8 ± 8.7</td>
<td>76.1 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27/5</td>
<td>72.9 ± 12.4</td>
<td>72.7 ± 9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>35/20</td>
<td>76.5 ± 9.3</td>
<td>76.3 ± 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvarez</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>81/20</td>
<td>73.3 ± 7.9</td>
<td>69.7 ± 7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voormolen</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14/4</td>
<td>73 (55-88)</td>
<td>72 (59-84)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>113/56</td>
<td>72 ± 9.9</td>
<td>66.7 ± 14.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movrin</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Pro</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>36/10</td>
<td>67.8 ± 5.4</td>
<td>73.8 ± 7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Quality Assessment

There were only 2 studies comparing vertebroplasty and a simulated vertebroplasty without cement (38,40) in this meta-analysis, and 10 articles directly compared PVP or BKP with conservative treatment (27,28,30-32,35-37,39,41). The methodological quality and risk of bias of the included studies is shown in Tables 2 and 3.

New Vertebral Fractures

All included studies reported total new vertebral fracture rates during follow-up, except for one paper (40). There were no significant differences between vertebroplasty and conservative treatment in the other 11 articles (P = 0.55). We also analyzed the incidence of new vertebral fractures adjacent to the treated one. We found that there was no statistically significant difference for new vertebral fractures adjacent to the treated one (P = 0.50). The score on a modified 23-item version of the Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire (RDQ) was evaluated after the 2 treatments for acute osteoporotic vertebral fractures. There was a significant difference in the RDQ less than one week later (P = 0.004), while a statistically significant difference was not obvious (P = 0.64) one month later. Moreover, we calculated pain relief after the operative and non-operative therapies in different periods (Fig. 3-10).

A few potential risk factors associated with new vertebral fractures after different treatments were evaluated in this meta-analysis. They were as follows: (1) the total number of pre-existing osteoporotic vertebral fractures before a specific therapy; (2) the bone mineral density (BMD) of the lumbar or femoral neck; (3) the local kyphotic angle of the pretreated fracture vertebrae; (4) the severity of the fracture body; and (5) patients’ ages and the proportion of women (Figs. 11-16).

Discussion

PVP and BKP have become more popular for treating OVCFs since the first cases of successful vertebral augmentation by intravertebral injection of polymethyl methacrylate (PMMA) in patients with vertebral hemangiomas was described by Galibert et al (43). It has been reported that PVP or BKP is better for relieving not only chronic but also acute pain due to OVCF (4,44-46). However, any new medical technology has certain complications and risks, and these techniques are not exceptions. For example, cement leakage, related complications, and new vertebral fractures after PVP or BKP during follow-up have been reported. Complications regarding new-level fractures have been reported in many retrospective studies, raising concern over whether it is possible that augmentation increases the incidence of new compression fractures, especially in adjacent vertebrae. Although its benefits have been demonstrated, there is debate about whether PVP also increases fracture rates by inducing or facilitating subsequent vertebral fractures. Many investigators attempted to explore this issue through both biomechanical and clinical studies in order to determine the
risk factors for newly developed vertebral fractures (19,46-50).

Some experimental biomechanical studies showed that PVP or BKP increased stiffness and strength (51-59). Additionally, the vertebrae treated with cement produced increased loading in adjacent vertebrae, inducing subsequent fractures (25,55,56,60-63). Strangely, Berlemann et al (64) found the failure strength of functional spine units treated by augmentation with cement in one vertebral body was lower than that of untreated controls. In addition, a three-dimensional, non-linear finite element model by Rohlmann et al (65) showed that augmentation of vertebral bodies with bone cement had a much smaller effect on intradiscal pressure and endplate stress in the non-fractured vertebrae. They suggested that vertebral body fractures in adjacent vertebrae after PVP or PKP are not induced by increased stiffness of the treated vertebra, but instead that the anterior shift of the upper body was the dominating factor. Still another biomechanical study

Table 2. Assessment of methodological quality items presented as percentages across all included studies.

Fig. 2. Funnel plot for total number of new vertebral fracture between the 2 treatments.
revealed that BKP may possibly decrease the incidence of adjacent level fracture (66). Interestingly, results suggest that post-fracture augmentation of vertebrae can increase failure load while stiffness was not restored, and stiffness appears to be maintained in prophylactic vertebroplasty but not in post-fracture vertebroplasty (67). Berlemann et al (64) postulated that the augmented vertebrae alter the biomechanics of load transfer to the adjacent vertebrae due to the increased stiffness, which they concluded based on the results of an experimental biomechanical study. Kim et al (68) showed that the greater the degree of height restoration after PVP, the greater the risk of new fracture. It seems that the resultant wedge deformation of the fractured vertebrae decreased, but the risk of new fracture increased. Though the cause is unknown, mechanical factors may be involved. A dynamic mechanical model of prophylactic augmentation found no significant difference in the stiffness of three-vertebral segment units pre- or post-augmentation in a laboratory investigation of human cadaveric three-vertebral functional spinal units (T12-L2) by Oakland et al (69). Another ex vivo biomechanical study indicated that kyphoplasty could restore the height of compressed vertebral bodies much more than could vertebroplasty during cyclic loading, while the latter had greater compression stiffness and less height reduction (52). It is possible that there is typically not extensive interdigitation of cement into the bone that surrounds the cavity that was created by the balloon. The load is then transferred to the underlying cancellous bone and then to the inferior endplate. The cancellous bone, which seemed to be damaged progressively under repetitive loading conditions, is likely the weakest link in this chain of force transmission. In vertebroplasty, the cement is injected in an interdigitated fashion throughout the fractured vertebral body, from endplate to endplate. Thus, the weaker cancellous bone is not loaded progressively as it is with the kyphoplasty technique. Another biomechanical study by Villarraga et al (70) showed that the stress and strain of spinal levels adjacent to those treated with BKP were minimal and were within the damage tolerance limits of cancellous and cortical bones. Thus, despite the clinical evidence supporting an increased risk of new fractures in vertebrae adjacent to treated levels and the biomechanical studies suggesting a plausible mechanism for these fractures, there is still no proof that vertebroplasty causes adjacent fractures (25,63).

The biomaterials, such as PMMA cement, used in these operations may play an important role in load transfer and disc mechanics; therefore, difference in cement volume, formulation, and distribution should also be evaluated (71,72). Kim et al (73) developed a three-dimensional finite-element model of a functional spinal unit to determine the optimal stiffness and volume of bone cement and their biomechanical effects on the ad-

Table 3. Methodological quality of each included study. Dropout rate < 20% indicates low risk of bias, > 20% indicates high risk of bias, if not reported, indicates unclear bias. Other bias indicates an important consideration in other domains that cannot solve bias.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Random sequence generation (selection bias)</th>
<th>Allocation concealment (selection bias)</th>
<th>Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)</th>
<th>Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)</th>
<th>Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)</th>
<th>Selective reporting (reporting bias)</th>
<th>Other bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvarez 2006</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buchbinder 2009</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond 2003a</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond 2009b</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrokhi 2011</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalimes 2009</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klazen 2010</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movrin 2012</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rousing 2009</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voormolen 2007</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang 2010</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YI 2014</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
<td>⚫</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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They demonstrated that bone cement volume can have a significant effect on the occurrence of subsequent vertebral fractures after vertebroplasty and that stiffness increases further with bone cement volume higher than 30%, resulting in the subsequent fracture of adjacent vertebral bodies, most likely in the cranial direction. The cement transfers a greater proportion of the load through the central augmented trabecular structure than that occurring naturally, causing an altered load distribution within the spinal seg-

---

### Table 1: Risk Ratio for Total Vertebral Compression Fracture

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</th>
<th>Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</th>
<th>Risk of Bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Buchbinder 2006</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.79 (0.19, 3.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rousin 2009</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.33 (0.32, 5.68)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrokhi 2011</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.17 (0.02, 1.30)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlassen 2010</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.97 (0.01, 0.32)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond 2003a</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2.13 (0.47, 1.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvaro 2008</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.49 (0.22, 1.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond 2008b</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.34 (0.12, 0.83)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlassen 2007</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.49 (0.22, 1.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang 2010</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1.04 (0.31, 2.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi 2014</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.59 (0.30, 1.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novin 2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>1.07 (0.12, 1.36)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (95% CI): 700 (497) 100.0% 0.91 (0.68, 1.23)

### Fig. 3. Forest plot for risk ratio (RR) estimate for the rate of total vertebral compression fracture. RR=0.91 (95% CI, 0.68-1.23)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study or Subgroup</th>
<th>Experimental</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</th>
<th>Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% CI</th>
<th>Risk of Bias</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alvarez 2006</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.50 (0.20, 1.26)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond 2008b</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.51 (0.34, 0.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farrokhi 2011</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.27 (0.02, 3.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vlassen 2010</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.59 (0.24, 1.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movin 2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>0.66 (0.12, 1.96)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rousin 2009</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.25 (0.20, 3.10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wang 2010</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.50 (0.12, 18.44)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yi 2014</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.16 (1.17, 8.51)</td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total (95% CI): 228 (180) 100.0% 0.87 (0.58, 1.31)

### Fig. 4. Forest plot for risk ratio (RR) estimate for the rate of adjacent vertebral compression fracture.
Fig. 5. The change of Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire (RDQ) less one week after PVP and simulated vertebroplasty.

Fig. 6. The change of Roland Morris Disability Questionnaire (RDQ) less one month after PVP and simulated vertebroplasty.

Fig. 7. The pain relief after these two treatments (operation or non-operation) one week later.
Does Vertebroplasty for Osteoporotic Vertebral Fracture Increase New-level Vertebral Fracture?

Fig. 8. The pain relief after these two treatments (operation or non-operation) one month later.

Fig. 9. The pain relief after these two treatments (operation or non-operation) three months later.

Some authors reported that cement leakage into the disc can increase the risk of adjacent new vertebral fracture after PVP, and augmentation to the fracture body increased mechanical pressure, which is especially pertinent for patients who increase their daily activities as their back pain decreases after the procedure, as it places additional stress on the vertebral bodies (74, 75). Thus, many surgeons believe that the stiffening of the
augmented vertebral body may be a risk factor for subsequent fracture.

However, few randomized clinical studies have reported on this topic. In our meta-analysis, we selected 12 studies, including 5 randomized controlled trials, to evaluate whether new vertebral fracture after PVP is associated with this minimally invasive surgery, or if it is simply the natural progression of the osteoporosis. The results indicate that there was no significant difference in the re-fracture ratio after vertebroplasty or kyphoplasty when compared to non-operative treatment. There were no statistical differences in the fol-
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Following factors: the number of pre-existing vertebral fractures, the BMD of the lumbar or femoral necks, the age, the proportion of women, the local kyphotic angle of the pre-treated fracture bodies, and the severity of the fracture body. However, as many authors have reported, both procedures had a more favorable effect on pain relief compared with conservative treatment in these randomized clinical trials (27,39,41). Therefore, we believe that the presence of new vertebral fracture is not due to the augmentation but rather that subsequent level fractures may be related to the bone itself (that is, to osteoporosis rather than to the surgical intervention). This viewpoint is similar to that described in a randomized controlled trial in 2009 by Rousing et al (39).

Limitations

One limitation in this review is that it included one randomized controlled trial that did not report new vertebral fractures; thus, it may have added data
that should not have been included in the final results (40). Our study may also be limited by reporting bias. Another limitation is the inclusion of studies after we searched the online databases. We did not include unpublished studies, which might have led to a publication bias in our review. However, the risk of publication bias exists in any meta-analyses, and we believe that our review is convincing in its final results. Therefore, our results should be interpreted and applied prudently. Unfortunately, many studies did not record or state the specific time when the new fracture occurred. Thus, it is possible that some fractures could not be found ear-
lier because of the possibility that some new fractures occurred without back pain. Thus, future high quality studies are still needed, such as randomized controlled trials, to determine whether new vertebral fractures occur after PVP or BKP.

**Conclusion**

Based on this meta-analysis, we conclude that PVP and BKP as minimally invasive surgeries for treating OVCF are better choices than conventional treatment, as these techniques not only immediately alleviate back pain but also avoid many complications of patients being bedridden with conservative treatment. Moreover, these procedures may not result in a greater incidence of new vertebral fractures in terms of the total number or the number of breaks adjacent to the treated one compared with conservative therapy.
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