# Summary of findings tables, grading of the evidence and detailed conclusions of evidence bone mineral density surveillance

# Who needs bone mineral density surveillance?

1a. What is the risk (%) of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors?

PICO	Study	No. of particip ants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Disease category	Treatment (% treated)	Risk (% low and very low BMD)	Risk of bias
1.a. Risk of low and very low BMD (n=47 studies)	Aaron 2019 <sup>a</sup>	242	Mean time since treatment is 13.1 years (range 4-29 years)	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 59% SCT: 0%	BMD Z-score ≤-1: LS 25.2%, TB 25.2% BMD Z-score ≤-2: LS 5.8%, TB 5.8%	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk
(ii-47 studies)	Benmiloud 2010	89	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 15.0 ± 4.5 years	ALL 83% NHL 17%	Chemotherapy: Prednisolone 100% Dexamethasone 52.8% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy: RT at any site: 53.9% CNS RT 36% CRT 32.6% CSRT 3.4% TBI 18.0% SCT: 18.0%	BMD Z-score ≤-1: At any site: 59.1%; At the LS: 50.5% At the FN: 25.8%; At the Hip: 31.5% BMD Z-score ≤-2: At any site: 10.1%; At the LS: 10.1% At the FN: 2.2%; At the Hip: 2.2%	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk
	Bhandari 2021	446	Median 14.2 years (range 2–65 years) since completing therapy	Leukemia/lympho ma 70.2% Solid tumor 24.9% Nonmalignant hematologic disease 4.9%	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 57.5% Methotrexate 40.4% Radiotherapy: CRT NR TBI ± 24% SCT: 40.8% (30.9% allogeneic)	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 33.9%	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk
	Bloomhardt 2020	542	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	ALL 65.1% Other acute leukemia 6.5% HL 14.6% NHL 13.8%	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 17.2% LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 3.5%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
	Choi 2013	78	Mean time from initial diagnosis to measurement of	ALL 49% AML 45% CML 6%	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> Glucocorticoids for chemotherapy 42%	LS BMD Z-score <-2: 25.7% FN BMD Z-score <-2: 24.4%	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk

		BMD: 4.42±2.47 in males, 5.36±3.2 years in females		Glucocorticoids for GVHD 53% Radiotherapy: 62% SCT: 64%		
De Matteo 2019	72	Mean (±SD) time since treatment 41.2 ±37.8 months (95% CI: 49.9, 32.5)	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 100% Dexamethasone 100% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: 4% SCT: 0%	Proximal phalanx QUS AD-SoS Z-score below −2: 13.8%	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: unclear
Den Hoed 2015 <sup>b</sup>	346	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	ALL 50.0 % AML 4.9 % HL 12.7 % NHL 13.3 % Brain tumour 6.1% Renal tumour 6.1% Sarcoma 5.2% Neuroblastoma 3.7%	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Esbenshade 2014	171 (91 had DXA)	Median 2.68 years (range 0.03–10.83) off therapy	ALL 70.8% AML 0.6% Lymphoma 21.1% LCH 7.6%	Chemotherapy: Steroids 100% Other agents NR Radiotherapy: NR SCT: NR	BMD Z-score <-1: TB 16.5%, LS 15.7% BMD Z-score <- 2: TB 5.5%, LS 5.6%	SB: low risk AB: high risl DB: low risk
Gawade 2012 <sup>c</sup>	662	Median 26.1 (IQR 21.5, 31.6) years from diagnosis	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide 66% Radiotherapy: TBI 2% CRT 66% SCT: 2%	QCT LS BMD Z-score <-2: 5.2%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Gurney 2014 <sup>c</sup>	845	>10 years after diagnosis	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide % NR Radiotherapy: CRT: 61.3% CRT + spinalRT or TBI 12.5% SCT: 2.5%	QCT LS BMD Z-score <-1: 29.5% QCT LS BMD Z-score <-2: 5.7% cumulative prevalence QCT BMD Z-score of <-1 at age 40 years was 37.9% (95% CI 33.3–42.5%) overall, 46.2% (95%CI 39.9–52.4%) for males and 28.3% (95% CI 21.9–34.9%) for females	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk
Henderson 1996	60	At least 12 months post chemotherapy	Wilms 8.3%; PNET 5%	Chemotherapy: Ifofosfamide 3% Glucocorticoids 75%	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 23.3% LS BMD Z-scores <-2: 8.3%	SB: unclear AB: unclear DB: low risk

		Mean time since treatment: 4.3 yrs range 12mths-14.5 yrs	Teratoma 3.3%; Ewing 1.7% Hepatoblastoma 1.7% ALL 50%; ANLL 5% Hodgkin 8.3%; NHL 11.7%	MTX 62% Radiotherapy: CRT 25% <u>SCT</u> : NR		
Hesseling 1998	97	Median length of FU 112 months	ALL 22.7%; AML 2.1% CNS tumors 16.5% Wilms' tumor 10.3% Lymphoma 16.5% Neuroblastoma 7.2% Other 24.7%	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> NR <u>Radiotherapy:</u> CRT 35% <u>SCT</u> : NR	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45.4% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 13.4%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Hobush 2014	56	Minimum FU 5 years after treatment; Mean FU 15 years (5-48 years)	Ewing sarcoma 89.3% primitive neuro- ectodermal tumor 10.7%	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agents (ifosfamide/cyclophosphamide) 100% Radiotherapy: Local radiation 64% SCT: NR	LS and/or Hip BMD T-score <-1: 55% LS and/or Hip BMD T-score <-2.5 (or Z-score <-2 in adolescents): 13%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Holzer 2003	48	Mean 16±2.2 years follow-up	Malignant Osteosarcoma (100%)	Chemotherapy: HD-MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Ifosfamide 100% Radiotherapy: 2% SCT:NA	LS and/or Hip BMD T-score <-1: 65% LS and/or Hip BMD T-score <-2.5: 21%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Hudson 2013 <sup>c</sup>	1142	At least 10 years post treatment	Various pediatric tumors (numbers given for n=1713; 1142 had DXA)	Chemotherapy: Methotrexate 82% Glucocorticoids 85% Radiotherapy: HPA radiation 63% 100% of 1142 received either of the treatments above	Prevalence of osteoporosis (site and BMD cutpoint not defined, presumably LS BMD Z-score ≤-2) N = 110/1142 (9.6%), 95% CI 8.0-11.5	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Isaksson 2020	125	Mean (SD) follow- up 24.3 years (7.1)	Various pediatric tumors	Chemotherapy: GCs 19 (15%) Alkylating agents 16 (13%) Median cyclophosphamide equivalent dose 4854 mg/m² MTX 17 (14%) Median methotrexate dose 11 g/m²	Survivors: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 21% Controls: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 28% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk

				Radiotherapy: CRT 26% SCT: 2%		
Joyce 2011 <sup>c</sup>	493	12.7 to 46.5 years from diagnosis of childhood ALL (median, 27.2y)	ALL (100%)	Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 70% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z- scores <-1.0: 28% LS BMD Z-scores <-2.5: 3%	SB: high ris AB: low risl DB: low risl
Kaste 2006a <sup>c</sup>	320	NR	Leukemia/lympho ma 45.6% Brain tumor 44.4% Solid tumor 10.0%	NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score: <-2: 30% DXA LS BMD Z-score <-2: 27.8%	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Kaste 2006b <sup>c</sup>	study I n=141, study II n=57	Study I: >4 years after therapy (mean time after dx 11.7 yrs) Study II: 2-5 years after study I (mean time after dx 16.1 yrs)	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Prednisone 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 37% of 57; percentage of 141 NR SCT: 0%	Study I: LS BMD Z-score below the mean (<0) 57.9%; Z-score <-1 10.5%; Z-score <-2 1.5% Study II: LS BMD Z-score below the mean 59.6%; Z-score <-1 19.3%; Z-score <-2 0%	SB: unclear AB: high ris DB: low risl
Kaste 2009 <sup>c</sup>	109	Median 7.5 yrs (5.8- 20.7 yrs) from diagnosis to QCT	HL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Cyclophosphamide 67.9% Methotrexate 69% Prednisone 65% Radiotherapy: LS RT 28.4% Pelvic RT 6% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score <-1.5: 14.7% QCT LS BMD Z-score <-2.0: 7.3% Restricted to white race: QCT LS BMD Z-score <-1.5: 12.0% QCT LS BMD Z-score <-2.0: 6.0%	SB: low risl AB: low ris DB: high ris
Kaste 2014 <sup>c</sup>	424	Median 8.4 yrs (4.6- 19.1) from completion of ALL therapy to entry into study	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 36.1% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score <-1: 48.9% QCT LS BMD Z-score <-2: 6.8%	SB: high ris AB: high ris DB: low ris
Latoch 2021	326	Median (range) 6.12 (4.0-22.0) years since end of treatment	Various pediatric tumors (excluding brain and bone tumor)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 71.2% Methotrexate 50.9% Radiotherapy: CRT 25.5% TBI 4% Abdominal RT 16.7% SCT: 7%	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 20% TB BMD Z-score <-1: 24% LS and/or TB BMD Z-score <-2: 8%	SB: high ris AB: low risl DB: low ris
Lemay 2019 <sup>a</sup>	246	Median time since diagnosis 15.2 (range 5.4-28.2) years	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 98% Methotrexate 98% Radiotherapy: CRT 40.2% SCT: 0%	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 22%	SB: unclea AB: low ris DB: low ris

Le Meignen 2011	159	Mean time from diagnosis to DXA 14.66 ± 0.44 yrs	ALL (81.8%) AML (18.2%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 86.2% Other chemotherapy NR Radiotherapy: CRT 18.9% TBI 40.4% of HSCT recipients SCT: 34%	BMD Z-score <-2: FN 3.2%; LS 3.8%	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: high risk
Leung 2007	155	Median 9 yrs from HSCT (range 3 to 10 years)	54% myeloid malignancy; 26% lymphoid malignancy; 20% non- malignant	Chemotherapy: Alkylator-based conditioning pre-HSCT in 21% Radiotherapy: TBI-based conditioning in 79% SCT: yes (100%)	QCT BMD Z-score <-1: 39% (site NR, presumably LS) The cumulative incidence of BMD Z-score <-1 at 10 years was 47.7% (95%CI 38.4 to 58)	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: unclear
Liuhtho 2020	4459	NR	Various pediatric tumors	NR	Billing code osteoporosis (CCS vs. controls): HR 13.1, 95%CI 4.3-39.7	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: high risk
Mandel 2004	106	Average time since diagnosis 10.1 years (range 5.5 to 15.4 years)	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy: 47% SCT: 0%	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 23% Femoral neck BMD less than 89% of the healthy average: 20%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk
Miyoshi 2008	122	Time since therapy from 2 to 30 years (mean 8.8; median 8.0)	Various pediatric tumors	Chemotherapy: 95% Radiotherapy: 59% SCT: 53%	LS BMD Z-score <-1.7: 42% LS BMD Z-score <-2.6: 11%	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Molinari 2017	101	At least 5 years	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Alkylating agents 56.4% Radiotherapy: 23.8% SCT: NR	<20 years: LS, TB or Hip BMD Z-score <-1.1: 24.1% LS, TB or Hip BMD Z-score <-2: 3.8% >20 years: LS, TB or Hip BMD T-score <-1: 45.5%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Muszynska- Roslan 2009	114	Mean time from end of therapy ALL: 2.4 ± 1.9 years HL: 2.8 ± 2.1 years Solid tumor: 3.7 ± 4.6 years	ALL: 37.7% HL: 30.7% Solid Tumor: 31.6%	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroids 68.4% Methotrexate 37.7% Radiotherapy: CRT 24.6% Abdominal XRT 36% SCT: NR	LS or TB BMD Z-score <-2: ALL: 10.5% HL: 6.9% Solid Tumor: 30.5%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Pietila 2006	52	Mean 6.4 yrs (range 1.4-14.8 y) after off- therapy	Brain tumors (100%)	Chemotherapy: 24% Steroids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 21.7% Craniospinal 11.1% Combination of CRT and chemotherapy 19.6% SCT: 0%	TB BMD Z-score <-2: 33%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk

Polgreen 2012	319	Mean time since treatment (±SE) 10.1 ± 0.2 years (range 4.3-17.8)	Leukemia 34.5% Solid tumors 39.8% CNS tumors 25.7%	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid: 42.0% Radiotherapy: 23.2%) Cranial (CNS) 31 (9.7%), other 43 (13.5%) SCT: 0%	TB BMD Z-score <-1: 11% LS BMD Z-score <-1: 23% TB BMD Z-score <-2: 2.3% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 3.5%	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Remes 2018	74	Mean time since cessation of tumor therapy (±SD): 18.9 ± 6.1 years	Brain tumors (100%)	Chemotherapy: 63.5% Radiotherapy: Local irradiation: 52.7% Craniospinal with local boost to the tumor bed: 40.5% Cranial with local boost to the tumor bed: 4.1% Stereotactic: 2.7% SCT:NR	LS BMD and/or FN BMD and/or TH Z-score ≤-2: 23.6%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: unclear
Ruza 2006	95 (63 had DXA)	Mean duration of remission was 6.12 years (SD 3.67) in patients with osteosarcomas and 6.11 years (SD 3.73) for Ewing's sarcoma patients	Osteosarcoma 62% Ewing's sarcoma 38%	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: NR SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 43.6% FN BMD Z-score <-1: 42.9% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9.7% FN BMD Z-score <-2: 17.5%	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk
Siegel 2017	475	Mean (±SD) time after Rx 5.4 ± 4.3 years	ALL 59.6% AML 7.4% Hodgkins 6.1% NHL 14.3% NBL 4.6% Renal tumour 1.3% Sarcoma 6.1% Other 0.6%	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid 83.4% Methotrexate 77.1% Radiotherapy: Cranial / craniospinal 13.3% TBI 9.9% SCT: 17.9%	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-1: 29.3% (LS 22.8%, TB 21.9%) TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-2: 8.2% (LS 7.4%, TB 4.0%)	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Siviero- Miachon 2017	56	Mean (±SD) 8.1 (±3.5) yrs post therpay	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Steroids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 44.6% Spinal XRT 1.8% SCT: 0%	TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: 35.8% LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 48.2% TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: 5.4% LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 8.9%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Sloof 2019	253	NR	Various pediatric tumors	Chemotherapy: NR Radiotherapy: CRT 36% SCT: 0%	BMD Z-score <-1: 25.4% (site NR)	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: unclear

Staba Hogan 2013	213	>3 years after cancer diagnosis	Leukemia 37.6% Non-CNS solid tumor 33.3% Lymphoma 20.2% CNS tumor 8.9%	Chemotherapy: Aklylating agents 63.8% Not otherwise stated Radiotherapy: Any radiation: 48.8% Chest radiation 38% Cranial radiation 27.2% SCT: 14.1%	LS or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: 20%	SB: unclear AB: unclear DB: low risk
Tabone 2021	89	Mean (± SD) interval from diagnosis to first scan 7.0 ± 4.7 yrs Mean (± SD) interval from diagnosis to second scan 11.7 ± 5.2 yrs	ALL 76.4% AML 23.6%	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 74% Radiotherapy: CRT 13.6% TBI 42% SCT: 49.4%	LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 1st 15.7%, 2nd 14.6% FN BMD Z-score ≤-2: 1st 14.5%, 2nd 4.3% TH BMD Z-score ≤-2: 1st 14.5%, 2nd 7.2% TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: 1st 7%, 2nd 9,3%	SB: high risl AB: low risk DB: low risk
van Atteveld 2019 <sup>b/c</sup>	2032 (develo pment) 403 (validati on)	Median time since cancer dx: SJLIFE (model development) 21.6 yrs (range 10.4-40.6) Dutch survivors (model validation) 15.1 yrs (range 5.1-39.8)	Various pediatric tumors	Chemotherapy: SJLIFE Alkylating agent 56.6% MTX 53.9% GCs 53.9% Dutch survivors Alkylating agent 50.6% MTX 60.5% GCs 70.0% Radiotherapy: SJLIFE Cranial 33.9% Abdominal 21.7% Dutch survivors Cranial 22.6% Abdominal 6.5% SCT: NR	LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: SJLIFE 51.5% (LS 25.1%, TB 48.0%); Dutch survivors 44.7% (LS 27.3%, TB 37.0%) LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: SJLIFE 20.2%; Dutch survivors 10.2%	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
van Iersel 2019 <sup>c</sup>	3141	Mean time since treatment 24.1 (range 6.8 to 51.1) years	Various pediatric tumors	Chemotherapy: Any 85.2% Alkylating agents 58.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 34.6% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-scores <-2: 25.6%	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk
van Santen 2020	177	Median 16 years (range 1-62)	Craniopharyngio ma (100%)	Chemotherapy: 0% Radiotherapy: CRT: 51% 90Yttrium brachytherapy: 13% SCT: None	LS, TB or FN BMD T or Z-score <-1: 50% LS, TB or FN BMD T-score between -1 and -2.5 or Z-score between -1 and -2: 46% LS, TB or FN BMD T-score below -2.5 or Z-score below -2: 24%	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk

Watsky 2014 <sup>c</sup>	418	Median time from completion of treatment of ALL was 8.5 years (range, 4.5-19.1 years)	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroids 100% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: CRT >24Gy 8.4% SCT: 0%	QCT LS BMD Z-scores <-1: 30.9% QCT LS BMD Z-scores <-2: 6.9%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Wei 2018	49	Median (range) time since HSCT-TBI 9.1 (2.3-16.6) years. >2 years after Rx for chemotherapy-only participants	ALL 85% AML 15%	Chemotherapy: NR, apart from steroids 100% Radiotherapy: TBI: 67.3% CRT 33.4% SCT: 67.3%	LS BMD Z-score <-2: 4.1% LS BMAD Z-score <-2: 0%	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Wilson 2016 <sup>c</sup>	862	Median duration between diagnosis and follow-up was 25.1 years (range, 10.5 to 47.7 years)	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: HD Methotrexate 60.7% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Glucocorticoids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 48.5% CRT+CS or TBI 12.4% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤ -1: 39.4% for men, 20.9% for women QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤ -2.5: 2.8% for men, 0.7% for women	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: unclear
Woo Han 2015	108	Mean duration since cancer treatment 9.2 yrs ± 5.4 yrs	Various pediatric tumors	Chemotherapy: 98.2%, type NR Radiotherapy: 55.6% Head and neck radiation: 45% (assuming this is 49 out of the 60 who had radiotherapy but this is not explicit) SCT: 16.7%	BMD Z-score <-1: 52.7% at any site (39.6% LS, 39.2% FN, 38.79% TH) BMD Z-score <-2: 16.7% at any site (13.2% LS, 13.7% FN, 13.9% TH)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Zürcher 2020	150	Median 22.2 years since diagnosis (IQR 16.0; 29.1)	Leukemia 35% Lymphoma 21% CNS 11% Other 32%	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids: 61% Radiotherapy: CRT 17% SCT: NR	LS, TH and/or FN BMD Z-score <-1 measured by pQCT or DXA: females: 56%, males: 70% LS BMD Z-score <-1 measured by pQCT or DXA: females: 30%, males: 50% pQCT Z-score (tibia 4%) <-1: Total vBMD: females 32.9%, males 55.7% Trabecular vBMD: females 20.5%, males 20.5% Any pQCT site: females 34.3%, males 55.7% DXA Z-scores <-1: FN: females 26.4%, males 23.8% TH: females 16.7%, males 17.9% LS: females 28.6%, males 43.5% Any DXA site: females 41.7%, males 50.0%	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk

### GRADE assessment:

**Study design:** +4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

Study limitations: -1 Some limitations: Selection bias low in 13/47, unclear in 10/47, high in 24/47; Attrition bias low in 35/47, unclear in 2/47, high in 10/47; Detection bias low in 38/47, unclear in 5/47, high in 4/47

Consistency: No important inconsistency: 41/47 studies show an increased risk and 6/47 an equal risk of low and very low BMD compared to healthy controls based on what would be expected from normal distribution. Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable Directness: 0 Precision: 0 No important imprecision, high total number of patients **Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely Effect size: 0 NA Dose-response: 0 NA Plausible confounding: 0 No plausible confounding Quality of evidence: ⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE **Conclusion:** CAYA cancer survivors are at risk for low bone mineral density (Z-score ≤-1) (29 studies increased risk, 4 studies equal risk compared to healthy controls) CAYA cancer survivors are at risk for very low bone mineral density (Z-score ≤-2) (36 studies increased risk, 3 studies equal risk compared to healthy controls) Prevalence of low lumbar spine BMD ranges from 10.5% to 50.5% after a follow-up ranging from 2.7 to 27.2 years (28 studies); Prevalence of low total body BMD ranges from 11.0% to 48.0% after a follow-up ranging from 2.7 to 21.6 years (9 studies); Prevalence of low femoral neck BMD ranges from 25.1% to 42.9% after a follow-up ranging from 6.1 to 22.2 years (4 studies); Prevalence of low total hip BMD ranges from 17.3% to 38.8% after a follow-up ranging from 9.2 to 24.3 years (3 studies); Prevalence of low BMD at 1 or more sites ranges from 20% to 59.1% after a follow-up ranging from 5.4 to 22.2 years (12 studies); Prevalence of very low lumbar spine BMD ranges from 1.5% to 25.9% after a follow-up ranging from 2.7 to 26.1 years (23 studies); Prevalence of very low total body BMD ranges from 2.3% to 33% after a follow-up ranging from 2.7 to 21.6 years (7 studies); Prevalence of very low femoral neck BMD ranges from 2.2% to 24.4% after a follow-up ranging from 6.1 to 15.0 years (6 studies); Prevalence of very low total hip BMD ranges from 2.2% to 14.5% after a follow-up ranging from 9.2 to 15.0 years (3 studies): Prevalence of very low BMD at 1 or more sites ranges from 3.8% to 24.0% after a follow-up ranging from 3.0 to 21.6 years (12 studies) in CAYA cancer survivors.

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

a/b/c: (possible) overlap in included patients.

(47 studies, 21,262 participants)

# 1b. What is the risk (%) of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors?

PICO	Study	No. of particip ants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Disease category	Treatment (% treated)	Risk (mean/median BMD Z-score)	Risk of bias
1.b. Risk of lower BMD (n=30 studies)	Aaron 2019	242	Mean time since treatment is 13.1 years (range 4-29 years)	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 59% SCT: 0%	Mean LS BMD Z-score: -0.2 (range -2.9-3.1) Mean TB BMD Z-score: -0.2 (range -3.3-3.5)	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk
	Alikasifoglu 2005 <sup>a</sup>	59	Mean 3.40 (1.77) years after cessation of therapy	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Conventional dose prednisolone 51% Megadose methylprednisolone 49% Cyclophosphamide 100% HD-MTX 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 76% SCT: 0%	Mean (SD) LS BMD Z-score: -1.73 (0.84)	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk
	Benmiloud 2010	89	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 15.0 ± 4.5 years	ALL 83% NHL 17%	Chemotherapy: Prednisolone 100% Dexamethasone 52.8% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy RT at any site: 53.9% CNS RT 36% CRT 32.6% CSRT 3.4% TBI 18.0% SCT_18.0%	Mean LS BMD Z-score: -0.60±1.14 Mean FN BMD Z-score: -0.22±1.04 Mean Hip BMD Z-score: -0.26±0.98	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk
	Choi 2013	78	Mean time from initial diagnosis to measurement of BMD: 4.42±2.47 in males, 5.36±3.2 years in females	ALL 49% AML 45% CML 6%	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids for chemotherapy 42% Glucocorticoids for GVHD 53% Radiotherapy: 62% SCT: 64%	LS BMD Z-score: mean -0.91±1.41 FN BMD Z-score: mean -1.13±1.79	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk
	De Matteo 2019	72	Mean (±SD) time since treatment 41.2 ±37.8 months (95% CI: 49.9, 32.5)	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 100% Dexamethasone 100% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: 4% SCT: 0%	Proximal phalanx (QUS) mean AD-SoS Z-score: −1.22 ± 1.19 (95% CI: −1.5,−0.94)	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: unclear

Esbenshade 2014	171 (91 had DXA)	Median 2.68 years (range 0.03–10.83) off therapy	ALL 70.8% AML 0.6% Lymphoma 21.1% LCH 7.6%	Chemotherapy: Steroids 100% Other agents NR Radiotherapy: NR SCT: NR	Median TB BMD Z-score: 0.1 (range -4.2, 3.6) Median LS BMD Z-score: 0.0 (range -4.2, 3.3)	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk
Gawade 2012 <sup>a</sup>	662	Median 26.1 (IQR 21.5, 31.6) years from diagnosis	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide 66% Radiotherapy: TBI 2% CRT 66% SCT: 2%	Median QCT LS BMD Z-score: -0.36 (IQR -1.14, 0.36)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Henderson 1996	60	At least 12 months post chemotherapy Mean time since treatment: 4.3 yrs range 12mths-14.5 yrs	Wilms 8.3%; PNET 5% Teratoma 3.3%; Ewing 1.7% Hepatoblastoma 1.7% ALL 50%; ANLL 5% Hodgkin 8.3%; NHL 11.7%	Chemotherapy: Ifofosfamide 3% Glucocorticoids 75% MTX 62% Radiotherapy: CRT 25% SCT: NR	Mean LS BMD Z-score for all patients = $-0.28 \pm 0.14$ (SE) Range -3.3 to 1.89	SB: unclear AB: unclear DB: low risk
Im 2018 <sup>a</sup>	856	NR (± 25 yrs)	Various pediatric tumors	Chemotherapy: Methotrexate 100% Glucocorticoid 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 59% SCT: NR	Median QCT LS BMD Z-score (range): -0.4 (-3.5, 5.4)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Isaksson 2020	125	Mean (SD) follow- up 24.3 years (7.1)	Various pediatric tumors	Chemotherapy: GCs 19 (15%) Alkylating agents 16 (13%) Median cyclophosphamide equivalent dose 4854 mg/m² MTX 17 (14%) Median methotrexate dose 11 g/m² Radiotherapy: CRT 26% SCT: 2%	Survivors: Mean LS BMD Z-score: -0.25 (1.11) Mean TH BMD Z-score: -0.17 (1.06) Mean FN BMD Z-score: -0.14 (0.99) Controls: Mean LS BMD Z-score: -0.36 (1.10) Mean TH BMD Z-score: -0.13 (1.09) Mean FN BMD Z-score: -0.16 (1.06)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Jones 2008 <sup>a</sup>	309	At least 4 years of continuous remission	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Prednisone 100% Radiotherapy: NR SCT: NR	Mean QCT LS BMD Z-score (SD): -0.47 (1.26)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Joyce 2011 <sup>a</sup>	493	12.7 to 46.5 years	ALL (100%)	Glucocorticoids 100%	Mean LS BMD Z-scores: -0.3±1.2	SB: high risk

		childhood ALL (median, 27.2y)		Cyclophosphamide 100% <u>Radiotherapy:</u> CRT 70% <u>SCT</u> : NR		DB: low risk
Kaste 2006a <sup>a</sup>	320	NR	Leukemia/lympho ma 45,6% Brain tumor 44,4% Solid tumor 10,0%	NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score median: -1.43 range: -5.96 to 3.2 DXA LS BMD Z-score median: -1.30 (-5.5 to 2.8)	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Kaste 2014 <sup>a</sup>	424	Median 8.4 yrs (4.6- 19.1) from completion of ALL therapy to entry into study	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 36.1% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score, median, range: Females: -0.3 (-3.7 to 3.2) Males -0.6 (-3.9 to 5.1)	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk
Latoch 2021	326	Median (range) 6.12 (4.0-22.0) years since end of treatment	Various pediatric tumors (excluding brain and bone tumor)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 71.2% Methotrexate 50.9% Radiotherapy: CRT 25.5% TBI 4% Abdominal RT 16.7% SCT: 7%	Mean LS BMD Z-score: 1 <sup>st</sup> -0.277, 2 <sup>nd</sup> -0.180 Mean TB BMD Z-score: 1 <sup>st</sup> -0.176, 2 <sup>nd</sup> -0.262	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Le Meignen 2011	159	Mean time from diagnosis to DXA 14.66 ± 0.44 yrs	ALL (81.8%) AML (18.2%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 86.2% Other chemotherapy NR Radiotherapy: CRT 18.9% TBI 40.4% of HSCT recipients SCT: 34%	Mean BMD Z-score ± SE: FN -0.19± 0.08; LS -0.37 ± 0.08	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: high risk
Mostoufi- Moab 2012	55	At least a 3 year interval from alloHST (median 6.8 years, range 3.0 to 16.4)	AML 42% ALL 22% CML 11% MDS 9% JML 9% Aplastic anemia 4% Bone marrow failure syndrome 4%	Chemotherapy: Conditioning regimen: Cyclophosphamide + thiotepa (69%) Busulfan + cyclophosphamide (unknown %) Busulfan + Cytoxan ± melphelan or fludarabine (unknown %) Radiotherapy: TBI 69% SCT: 100%	QCT Trabecular vBMD Z-score -1.05 (-1.33 to -0.78) QCT Cortical vBMD Z-score -0.20 (-0.48 to 0.08)	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Nysom 1998	95	Median 10.7 yrs after diagnosis (3.4- 23.4) Median 7.6 yrs after off-therapy (1.2- 18.3)	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Corticosteroids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 41.1% SCT: 0%	Mean TB BMC/area Z-score - 0.17 (- 2.90-2.80) Mean TB BMC Z-score - 0.37 (- 3.33-2.64) Mean TB BMD Z-score - 0.39 (- 3.18-2.44) Mean LS BMD Z-score - 0.55(- 2.99-1.84)	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk

Pietila 2006	52	Mean 6.4 yrs (range 1.4-14.8 y) after off- therapy	Brain tumors (100%)	Chemotherapy: 24% Steroids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 21.7% Craniospinal 11.1% Combination of CRT and chemotherapy 19.6% SCT: 0%	Mean TB BMD Z-score -1.7 (-5.7 - +0.6)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
Pluskiewicz 2002	54	Mean (±SD) time since treatment 4.6 years ± 3.4 SD	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Corticosteroids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 38.9% SCT: NR	Mean QUS Ad-SoS values patients (2018 $\pm$ 73 m/s) and controls (2003 $\pm$ 80 m/s), not significantly different.	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk
Remes 2018	74	Mean time since cessation of tumor therapy (±SD): 18.9 ± 6.1 years	Brain tumors (100%)	Chemotherapy: 63.5% Radiotherapy: Local irradiation: 52.7% Craniospinal with local boost to the tumor bed: 40.5% Cranial with local boost to the tumor bed: 4.1% Stereotactic: 2.7% SCT:NR	Mean (SD) Z-score: LS BMD -0.83 (1.15); FN BMD right: -0.91 (0.93); left: -0.82 (1.93); Hip BMD right: -0.77 (1.08); left: -0.69 (1.16)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: unclear
Ruza 2006	95 (63 had DXA)	Mean duration of remission was 6.12 years (SD 3.67) in patients with osteosarcomas and 6.11 years (SD 3.73) for Ewing's sarcoma patients	Osteosarcoma 62% Ewing's sarcoma 38%	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: NR SCT: NR	Mean BMD Z-score osteosarcoma LS BMD: -0.76 (0.96); FN BMD: -0.88 (1.10) Mean BMD Z-score Ewing's sarcoma LS BMD: - 0.84 (1.05); FN BMD: -0.76 (1.15)	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk
Sawicka- Zukowska 2013	74	Not specifically stated, but the average time at the time of analysis post treatment completion would be 6.6 years	ALL 86.5% Lymphomas 13.5%	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> NR <u>Radiotherapy:</u> CRT 21.6% <u>SCT</u> : NR	Mean TB BMD Z-score -0.01 Mean LS BMD Z-score -0.26 Mean TB BMC Z-score 0.32	SB: unclear AB: unclear DB: low risk
Siegel 2017	475	Mean (±SD) time after Rx 5.4 ± 4.3 years	ALL 59.6% AML 7.4% Hodgkins 6.1% NHL 14.3% NBL 4.6% Renal tumour 1.3% Sarcoma 6.1% Other 0.6%	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid 83.4% Methotrexate 77.1% Radiotherapy: Cranial / craniospinal 13.3% TBI 9.9% SCT: 17.9%	Mean BMD Z-score –0.1 ± 1.2 for TB and LS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk

	Siviero- Miachon 2017	56	Mean (±SD) time since treatment 8.1 (±3.5) yrs post therapy	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Steroids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 44.6% Spinal XRT 1.8% SCT: 0%	Mean LS and TB BMD Z-score in irradiated patients –0.78(Mean (±SD) time since treatment 1.04), -0.89 (Mean (±SD) time since treatment 1.0) respectively. In non-irradiated patients -0.79 (Mean (±SD) time since treatment 0.91), -0.37 (Mean (±SD) time since treatment 0.79).	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
	Tabone 2021	89	Mean (± SD) interval from diagnosis to first scan 7.0 ± 4.7 yrs Mean (± SD) interval from diagnosis to second scan 11.7 ± 5.2 yrs	ALL 76.4% AML 23.6%	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 74% Radiotherapy: CRT 13.6% TBI 42% SCT: 49.4%	Mean ( $\pm$ SD) LS BMD Z-score: 1st $-1.18 \pm 1.10$ , 2nd $-1.07 \pm 1.05$ Mean ( $\pm$ SD) FN BMD Z-score: 1st $-0.85 \pm 1.02$ , 2nd $-0.64 \pm 0.97$ Mean ( $\pm$ SD) TH BMD Z-score: 1st $-0.78 \pm 1.11$ , 2nd $-0.59 \pm 1.17$ Mean ( $\pm$ SD) TB BMD Z-score: 1st $-0.36 \pm 1.19$ , 2nd $-0.33 \pm 1.16$	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
	Van Beek 2006	90	Mean (range) 12.7 (2.0-29.7) yrs after dx	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 52.2% Dexamethasone 47.8% MTX 71.1% Radiotherapy: CRT 21.1% SCT: 0%	"BM(A)D at the LS and TB was normal in the survivors compared to the controls"	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk
	van Santen 2020	177	Median 16 years (range 1-62)	Craniopharyngio ma (100%)	Chemotherapy: 0% Radiotherapy: CRT: 51% 90Yttrium brachytherapy: 13% SCT: None	Mean TB BMD Z-score: $0.1 \pm 1.5$ (range, -4.1 to 3.5) Mean FN BMD Z-score: $-0.1 \pm 1.3$ (range, -2.7 to 4.7), Mean LS BMD Z-score: $0.0 \pm 2.0$ (range, -3.5 to 6.8)	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk
	Wei 2018	49	Median (range) time since HSCT-TBI 9.1 (2.3-16.6) years. >2 years after Rx for chemotherapy-only participants	ALL 85% AML 15%	Chemotherapy: NR, apart from steroids 100% Radiotherapy: TBI: 67.3% CRT 33.4% SCT: 67.3%	Mean LS BMD Z-score –0.52 (95%CI –0.89, –1.15) Mean LS BMAD Z-score 0.20 (95%CI –0.15, 0.54)	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
GRADE assessme	Wilson 2016 <sup>a</sup>	862	Median duration between diagnosis and follow-up was 25.1 years (range, 10.5 to 47.7 years)	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: HD Methotrexate 60.7% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Glucocorticoids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 48.5% CRT+CS or TBI 12.4% SCT: NR	Mean QCT LS BMD Z-score -0.64 (±SD 1.08) for men; -0.04 (±SD 1.18) for women.	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: unclear

GRADE assessment:

Study design: +4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

Study limitations:	-1	Some limitations: Selection bias low in 8/30, unclear in 7/30, high in 15/30; Attrition bias low in 21/30, unclear in 2/30, high in 7/30; Detection bias low in 26/30,
		unclear in 3/30, high in 1/30

Consistency: 0 No important inconsistency: 24/30 studies show an increased risk and 6/30 studies show an equal risk of lower BMD compared to healthy controls based on what would be expected from normal distribution.

**Directness:** 0 Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable

**Precision:** 0 No important imprecision, high total number of patients

Publication bias:0UnlikelyEffect size:0NADose-response:0NA

Plausible confounding: 0 No plausible confounding

Quality of evidence: ⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE

**Conclusion:** CAYA cancer survivors are at risk for lower bone mineral density.

(24 studies increased risk, 6 studies equal risk compared to healthy controls; 6,742 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>: (possible) overlap in included patients.

# 1c. What is the risk (%) of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors?

PICO	Study	No. of particip ants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Disease category	Treatment (% treated)	Risk (%fractures)	Risk of bias
1.c. Risk of fracture (n=10 studies)	Aaron 2019 <sup>a</sup>	242	Mean time since treatment is 13.1 years (range 4-29 years)	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 59% SCT: 0%	At least 1 vertebral fracture (on X-ray): 22.3%	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk
	Bloomhardt 2020	542	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	ALL 65.1% Other acute leukemia 6.5% HL 14.6% NHL 13.8%	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	Frequency of fractures:  Non-digit (1 or more posttreatment) fracture: 21.4%  Upper extremity long bone (includes wrist): 12.2% Lower extremity long bone (includes ankle): 5.4% Hand/foot: 4.1%  Vertebra: 0.7%  Other (clavicle, rib, jaw, pelvis, nose): 3.9%  Multiple fractures: 2 fractures: 3.0%; ≥3 fractures: 1.7%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
	Fiscaletti 2021	251	Median 15.1 years (range 5.4 to 28.2 years) since cancer diagnosis	ALL (100%)	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% <u>Radiotherapy:</u> CRT 59% <u>SCT</u> : None	Frequency of fractures: Vertebral fractures: 23% Non-vertebral fractures: 31%	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
	Hobush 2014	56	Minimum FU 5 years after treatment; Mean FU 15 years (5-48 years)	Ewing sarcoma 89.3% primitive neuro- ectodermal tumor 10.7%	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agents (ifosfamide/cyclophosphamide) 100% Radiotherapy: Local radiation 64% SCT: NR	21 pts (41%) reported 29 fractures (6 (11%) low impact fracture, 15 (27%) high impact fracture)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
	Im 2021	2453 (discove ry) 1417 (replicat ion)	At least 5 years Discovery: Approximately 37 years Replication: Approximately 25 years	Various pediatric tumors (excluding bone tumor)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 47.2% discovery, 48.3% replication IV MTX 18.5% discovery, 29.2% replication IT MTX 38.4% discovery, 38.3% replication Radiotherapy: CRT 45.9% discovery, 38.5% replication SCT: 0% (exclusion criterion)	Fracture frequency (any type post diagnosis) Discovery: 37.9% Replication: 46.0%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk
	Lemay 2019 <sup>a</sup>	246	Median time since diagnosis 15.2	ALL (100%)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 98%	Presence of vertebral fracture (on X-ray): 23.2%	SB: unclear AB: low risk

			(range 5.4-28.2) years		Methotrexate 98% Radiotherapy: CRT 40.2% SCT: 0%		DB: low risk
	Liuhto 2020	4459	NR	Various pediatric tumors	NR	Fractures (CCS vs. controls): HR 1.3, 95%CI 1.1-1.6	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: high risk
	Mueller 2018	3152	Median 9.1 years (range 0.1-27 years) after index date (= 5 years after dx)	Various pediatric tumors	NR	Fractures (CCS vs. controls): HR 1.6, 95%CI 1.1-2.3	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: high risk
	van Santen 2020	177	Median 16 years (range 1-62)	Craniopharyngio ma (100%)	Chemotherapy: 0% Radiotherapy: CRT: 51% 90Yttrium brachytherapy: 13% SCT: None	Fractures: 18% over time (5.8 fractures per 1000 person-years)	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: high risk
	Wilson 2012	7414	Median length of follow-up was 22.7 years (range, 15.6- 34.2 years)	Various pediatric tumors	Chemotherapy: Methotrexate 43.6% Steroids 47% Radiotherapy: CRT 32% Pelvic RT 13% SCT: 0%	Proportion of participants with fractures <u>over their lifetime</u> Survivors: 34.8% Siblings: 38.9%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk
GRADE assessment Study design:	t: +4	Cross sosti	onal cohort studies				
Study design. Study limitations:				in 2/3, high in 1/3; A	Attrition bias low in 1/3, high in 2/3	3: Detection bias high in 3/3	
Consistency:	-1		inconsistency, two studie			trols, and one study shows a lower percentage of fractu	res compared
<u>Directness:</u>	0		direct, population and o				
Precision:	0		ant imprecision, high tota	I number of patients			
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely					
Effect size:	0 0	NA					
<u>Dose-response:</u> Plausible confound		NA No plausibl	e confounding				
Quality of evidence							
Conclusion:	•		isk of fractures in CAYA o	ancer survivors vs. c	ontrols.		
		(2 studies s	ignificant effect, 1 study	no significant effect,	15,025 participants)		
GRADE assessment	t:						
Study design:	+4	Cross-section	onal cohort studies				
Study limitations:		Some limita	ations: Selection bias low	in 1/8, unclear in 2/	8, high in 5/8; Attrition bias low in	7/8, high in $1/8$ ; Detection bias low in $5/8$ , high in $3/8$	
Consistency:	0		of patients with fracture	•			
Directness:	0		direct, population and o				
Precision:	0		ant imprecision, high tota	I number of patients			
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely					
Effect size:	0	NA					
<u>Dose-response:</u>	0	NA Na ralavisibil	fd:				
Plausible confound	ung: ∪	ivo piausibl	e confounding				

Quality of evidence:  $\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus \ominus \bigcirc$  MODERATE

**Conclusion:** Incidence of fractures ranges from 18.0% to 46.0% after a follow-up ranging from 6 to 37 years (8 studies) in CAYA cancer survivors.

(8 studies, 12,798 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip. <sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

# 1d. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in male versus female CAYA cancer survivors?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.d. Risk low BMD for sex (n=13 studies)	Bhandari 2021	446 CCS	Median 14.2 years (range 2– 65 years) since completing therapy	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 57.5% Methotrexate 40.4% Radiotherapy: CRT NR TBI ± 24% SCT: 40.8% (30.9% allogeneic)	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 33.9%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: sex NS	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Bloomhardt 2020	542 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 17.2% LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: male sex OR 1.4, 95%CI 0.9-2.4, p=0.06	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: male gender OR 2.3, 95%CI 1.2-4.2 TB BMD Z-score <-1: male gender OR 1.5, 95%CI 0.9-2.7	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Gurney 2014 <sup>a</sup>	845 adult ALL survivors	>10 years after diagnosis	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide % NR Radiotherapy: CRT: 61.3% CRT + spinalRT or TBI 12.5% SCT: 2.5%	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 29.5% QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 5.7%	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: male sex OR 2.38, 95%CI 1.74–3.27, p<0.0001	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Kaste 2006a <sup>a</sup>	320 CCS	NR	NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score: <-2: n=96 (30%)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-2: sex NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: unclear

				QCT LS BMD Z-score median: -1.43 range: -5.96 to 3.2 DXA LS BMD Z-score <-2: n=89 (27.8%) DXA LS BMD Z-score median: -1.30 (-5.5 to 2.8)		
Kaste 2006b <sup>a</sup>	study I n=141, study II n=57 ALL survivors	Study I: >4 years after therapy (mean time after dx 11.7 yrs) Study II: 2-5 years after study I (mean time after dx 16.1 yrs)	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Prednisone 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 37% of 57; percentage of 141 NR SCT: 0%	Study I: LS BMD Z-score <- 1 10.5%; LS BMD Z-score <-2 1.5% Study II: LS BMD Z-score <- 1 19.3%; LS BMD Z-score <-2 0%	Multivariable model: LS 'low' BMD (Z-score cut-point NR, presumably <-1): study I male sex P=0.051, study II NS	SB: unclear AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: unclear
Kaste 2009 <sup>a</sup>	109 HL survivors	Median 7.5 yrs (5.8-20.7 yrs) from diagnosis to QCT	Chemotherapy: Cyclophosphamide 67.9% Methotrexate 69% Prednisone 65% Radiotherapy: LS RT 28.4% Pelvic RT 6% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score <-1.5: 14.7% QCT LS BMD Z-score <-2.0: 7.3%	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score <-1.5: male sex OR 3.58 (95% CI:1.06–12.10), p=0.040	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: low risk
Latoch 2021	326 CCS	Median (range) 6.12 (4.0-22.0) years since end of treatment	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 71.2% Methotrexate 50.9% Radiotherapy: CRT 25.5% TBI 4% Abdominal RT 16.7% SCT: 7%	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 20% TB BMD Z-score <-1: 24% LS and/or TB BMD Z-score <-2: 8%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: male sex OR 1.84, 95%CI 1.00–3.41, p=0.050 TB BMD Z-score <-1: not included in multivariable model	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
Leung 2007	155 SCT survivors	Median 9 yrs from HSCT (range 3 to 10 years)	Chemotherapy: Alkylator-based conditioning pre-HSCT in 21% Radiotherapy: TBI-based conditioning in 79% SCT: yes (100%)	QCT BMD Z-score <-1: 39% (site NR, presumably LS)	Multivariable model: QCT BMD Z-score <-1: female sex HR 1.94, 95% CI 1.38 to 2.72, p=0.010	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: high risk
Polgreen 2012	319 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SE) 10.1 ± 0.2 years (range 4.3-17.8)	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid: 42.0% Radiotherapy: 23.2% Cranial (CNS) 9.7%, other 43 13.5% SCT: 0%	TB BMD Z-score <-1: 11% LS BMD Z-score <-1: 23% TB BMD Z-score <-2: 2.3% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: TB BMD Z-score <-1: sex (male vs. female), OR 2.6, 0.8-10.0, p=0.137 LS BMD Z-score <-1: sex (male vs. female), OR 1.6, 95%CI 0.7-3.4, p=0.270	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk

Siegel 2017	475 CCS	Mean (±SD)	<u>Chemotherapy:</u>	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-	Multivariable model:	SB: low risk
		time after Rx	Corticosteroid 83.4%	1: 29.3% (LS 22.8%, TB	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: male	AB: low risk
		5.4 ± 4.3 years	Methotrexate 77.1%	21.9%)	sex, OR 3.4, 95% CI, 1.3-9.0	DB: low risk
			Radiotherapy:	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-		CF: high risk
			Cranial / craniospinal 13.3%	2: 8.2% (LS 7.4%, TB 4.0%)		
			TBI 9.9%			
			<u>SCT</u> : 17.9%			
Sloof 2019	253 CCS	NR	Chemotherapy: NR	BMD Z-score <-1: 25.4%	Multivariable model:	SB: unclear
			Radiotherapy:	(site NR)	BMD Z-score <-1: female sex OR	AB: low risk
			CRT 36%		1.64, 95%CI 0.80-3.35, p=0.18	DB: unclear
			<u>SCT</u> : 0%			CF: unclear
van Atteveld	2032 adult	Median time	Chemotherapy:	LS and/or TB BMD Z-score	Multivariable model:	SB: low risk
2019 <sup>a</sup>	CCS	since cancer dx:	Alkylating agent 56.6%	≤-1: 51.5% (LS 25.1%, TB	LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1:	AB: low risk
		21.6 yrs (range	MTX 53.9%	48.0%)	male sex β 1.12 (SE 0.14), OR 3.07,	DB: low risk
		10.4-40.6)	GCs 53.9%	LS and/or TB BMD Z-score	95%CI 2.35-4.02	CF: low risk
			Radiotherapy:	≤-2: 20.2%	LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2:	
			Cranial 33.9%		male sex β 1.19 (SE 0.17), OR 3.28,	
			Abdominal 21.7%		95%CI 2.37-4.54	
			<u>SCT</u> : NR			

#### **GRADE** assessment (outcome low and very low BMD):

**Study design:** +4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

Study limitations: 0 No important limitations: Selection bias low in 7/13, unclear in 3/13, high in 3/13; Attrition bias low in 11/13, high in 2/13; Detection bias low in 10/13, unclear in

2/11, high in 1/11; Confounding low in 6/13, unclear in 3/11, high in 4/11

Consistency: -1 Important inconsistency: five studies show a significant effect for males, one study shows a significant effect for females and seven studies show no significant

effect of sex

<u>Directness:</u> 0 Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable <u>Precision:</u> 0 No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

Effect size: +1 Large magnitude of effect

Dose-response: 0 NA

**Plausible** 0 No plausible confounding

confounding:

Quality of evidence:  $\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus HIGH$ 

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of low BMD (Z-score  $\leq$ -1 or  $\leq$ -2) for male CAYA cancer survivors.

(5 studies significant effect, 1 study significant effect in opposite direction, 7 studies no significant effect; 6,309 participants)

#### **GRADE** assessment (outcome very low BMD):

**Study design:** +4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

Study limitations: -1 Some limitations: Selection bias low in 3/3; Attrition bias low in 3/3; Detection bias low in 3/3; Confounding low in 1/3, unclear in 1/3, high in 1/3

Consistency: -1 Important inconsistency: two studies show a significant effect for males, and one study shows no significant effect of sex

<u>Directness:</u>
0 Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable

Precision:
0 No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events

Publication bias: 0 Unlikely

Effect size: +1 Large magnitude of effect

**Dose-response:** 0 NA

<u>Plausible</u> 0 No plausible confounding

confounding:

Quality of evidence:  $\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus \ominus \bigcirc$  MODERATE

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) for male CAYA cancer survivors.

(2 studies significant effect, 1 study no significant effect; 2,737 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

### 1e. What is the risk of lower BMD in male versus female CAYA cancer survivors?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.e. Risk lower BMD for sex (n=10 studies)	Benmiloud 2010	89 ALL and NHL survivors	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 15.0 ± 4.5 years	Chemotherapy: Prednisolone 100% Dexamethasone 52.8% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy RT at any site: 53.9% CNS RT 36% CRT 32.6% CSRT 3.4% TBI 18.0% SCT_18.0%	BMD Z-score ≤-1.0: At any site: 59.1%; At the LS: 50.5% At the FN: 25.8%; At the Hip: 31.5% BMD Z-score ≤-2: At any site: 10.1%; At the LS: 10.1% At the FN: 2.2%; At the Hip: 2.2%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): male gender (p<0.001, β NR) FN and hip BMD Z-score (cont.): NS	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): male gender β=-0.34; se=0.13, p=0.007 TB BMD Z-score (cont.): male gender NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Hobush 2014	56 Ewing and PNET survivors	Minimum FU 5 years after treatment; Mean FU 15 years (5-48 years)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agents (ifosfamide/cyclophosphamide) 100% Radiotherapy: Local radiation 64% SCT: NR	LS and/or Hip BMD T- score <-1: 55% LS and/or Hip BMD T- score <-2.5 (or Z-score <-2 in adolescents): 13%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): sex NS FN BMD Z-score (cont.): sex NS Hip BMD Z-score (cont.): sex NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Jones 2008 <sup>a</sup>	309 ALL survivors	At least 4 years of continuous remission	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Prednisone 100% Radiotherapy: NR SCT: NR	Mean QCT LS BMD Z-score (SD): -0.47 (1.26)	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score (cont.): male sex p=0.005	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Kaste 2006a <sup>a</sup>	320 CCS	NR	NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score: <-2: n=96 (30%) QCT LS BMD Z-score median: -1.43 range: -5.96 to 3.2	Multivariable model: LS BMD (cont.): sex NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: unclear

				DXA LS BMD Z-score <-2: n=89 (27.8%) DXA LS BMD Z-score median: -1.30 (-5.5 to 2.8)		
Kaste 2014 <sup>a</sup>	424 ALL survivors	Median 8.4 yrs (4.6-19.1) from completion of ALL therapy to entry into study	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 36.1% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score <-1: 48.9% QCT LS BMD Z-score <-2: 6.8%	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score (cont.): male sex $\beta$ 0.38 (0.15, 0.6) P=0.001	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
Le Meignen 2011	159 ALL and AML survivors	Mean time from diagnosis to DXA 14.66 ± 0.44 yrs	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 86.2% Other chemotherapy NR Radiotherapy: CRT 18.9% TBI 40.4% of HSCT recipients SCT: 34%	BMD Z-score <-2: FN 3.2%; LS 3.8%	Multivariable model: BMD Z-scores (cont.): female sex FN: $\beta$ 0.18, P=0.03; LS: $\beta$ -0.01, p=0.91	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: high risk CF: high risk
Muszynska- Roslan 2009	114 CCS	Mean time from end of therapy ALL: 2.4 ±1.9 yrs HL: 2.8 ±2.1 yrs Solid tumor: 3.7 ±4.6 yrs	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroids 68.4% Methotrexate 37.7% Radiotherapy: CRT 24.6% Abdominal XRT 36% SCT: NR	LS or TB BMD Z-score <-2: ALL: 10.5% HL: 6.9% Solid Tumor: 30.5%	Multivariable model: TB BMD Z-scores (cont.): female sex p=0.021 LS BMD Z-scores (cont.): female sex p=0.03	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: unclear
Nysom 1998	95 ALL survivors	Median 10.7 yrs after diagnosis (3.4-23.4) Median 7.6 yrs after off- therapy (1.2- 18.3)	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Corticosteroids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 41.1% SCT: 0%	Mean TB BMC/area Z- score - 0.17 (- 2.90-2.80) Mean TB BMC Z-score - 0.37 (- 3.33-2.64) Mean TB BMD Z-score - 0.39 (- 3.18-2.44) Mean LS BMD Z-score - 0.55*(- 2.99-1.84)	TB BMC/Bone area Z-score (cont.): females β 0.41 (95%CI -0.06 to 0.88) LS BMD Z-score (cont.): male sex β 0.37 (95%CI, -0.03 to 0.76).	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
Ruza 2006	95 (63 had DXA) osteosarcoma and Ewing's sarcoma survivors	Mean duration of remission was 6.12 years (SD 3.67) in patients with osteosarcomas and 6.11 years (SD 3.73) for Ewing's sarcoma patients	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: NR SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 43.6% FN BMD Z-score <-1: 42.9% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9.7% FN BMD Z-score <-2: 17.5%	Multivariable model: LS BMD (cont.): male sex p< 0.002 for areal BMD, p=0.12 for BMD Z- scores FN BMD (cont.): male sex NS	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
1		p =				

**GRADE** assessment:

Study design:

+4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

**Study limitations:** 

-1 Some limitations: Selection bias low in 4/10, high in 6/10; Attrition bias low in 6/10, high in 4/10; Detection bias low in 9/10, high in 1/10; Confounding low in 6/10, unclear in 2/10, high in 2/10

Consistency:	-1	Important inconsistency: five studies show a significant effect for males, two studies show a significant effect for females and three studies show no significant effect of sex
Directness:	0	Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable
Precision:	0	No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect
Dose-response:	0	NA NA
<u>Plausible</u>	0	No plausible confounding
confounding:		
Quality of evidence:		$\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus$ LOW
Conclusion:		Increased risk of lower BMD for male CAYA cancer survivors.
		(5 studies significant effect, 2 studies significant effect in opposite direction, 3 studies no significant effect; 2,007 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBl=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

#### 1f. What is the risk of fractures in male versus female CAYA cancer survivors?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.f. Risk fracture for sex (n=3 studies)	van Santen 2020	177 craniopharyngioma survivors	Median 16 years (range 1- 62)	Chemotherapy: 0% Radiotherapy: CRT: 51% 90Yttrium brachytherapy: 13% SCT: None	Fractures: 18% over time (5.8 fractures per 1000 person-years)	Multivariable model: Fractures: female sex OR 0.3, 95%CI 0.1-0.7, p=0.004	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: high risk CF: high risk
	Fiscaletti 202	1 251 ALL survivors	Median 15.1 years (range 5.4 to 28.2 years) since cancer diagnosis	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 59% SCT: None	Frequency of fractures: Vertebral fractures: 23% Non-vertebral fractures: 31%	Multivariable model: Vertebral fractures: male sex RR 1.94, 95%CI 1.16-3.24, p=0.01	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Kaste 2006a <sup>a</sup>	320 CCS	NR	NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score: <-2: n=96 (30%) QCT LS BMD Z-score median: -1.43 range: - 5.96 to 3.2 DXA LS BMD Z-score <-2: n=89 (27.8%) DXA LS BMD Z-score median: -1.30 (-5.5 to 2.8)	Multivariable model: Fractures: male sex OR 2.22, 95%CI 1.001-4.902, p=0.0499	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: unclear
GRADE assessmen	t:						
Study design:	+4 (	Cross-sectional cohort stu	dy				
Study limitations:	ι	inclear in 1/3, high in 1/3				low in 1/3, high in 2/3; Confounding	low in 1/3,
Consistency:				a significant association between	male sex and fractures		
Directness:		Results are direct, populat					
Precision: Publication bias:		No important imprecision, Jnlikely	nign total number	or patients and events			
Effect size:		Mo large magnitude of effe	ect				
Dose-response:		NA					
Plausible confound	ding: 0	No plausible confounding					
Quality of evidence		⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE					
Conclusion:	I	ncreased risk of fractures	for male CAYA cand	cer survivors.			
	(	3 studies significant effec	t; 748 participants)				

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-

ectode deviati	dermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultra ation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.	rasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard

# 1g. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors who were younger versus older at cancer diagnosis?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.g. Risk low BMD for age at cancer diagnosis (n=7 studies)	Bloomhardt 2020	542 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 17.2% LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: age at diagnosis (years) 0-4: reference, 5-9: OR 1.6, 95%CI 0.8-3.1, 10-14: OR 2.6, 95%CI 1.4-5.1, 15-19: OR 3.9, 95%CI 1.8-8.3, p<0.01	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Choi 2013	78 ALL, AML and CML survivors	Mean time from cancer dx: 4.42±2.47 in males, 5.36±3.2 years in females	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids for chemotherapy 42% Glucocorticoids for GVHD 53% Radiotherapy: 62% SCT: 64%	LS BMD Z-score <-2: 25.7% FN BMD Z-score <-2: 24.4%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-2: age at dx: OR 1.21, 95%CI 0.998 to 1.496, p=0.053	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: age at diagnosis (<12 y vs. >12) OR= 2.3, 95%CI 1.1–4.8 TB BMD Z-score <-1: age at diagnosis (<12 y vs. >12) OR= 0.8, 95%CI 0.4–1.5	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Latoch 2021	326 CCS	Median (range) 6.12 (4.0-22.0) years since end of treatment	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 71.2% Methotrexate 50.9% Radiotherapy: CRT 25.5% TBI 4% Abdominal RT 16.7% SCT: 7%	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 20% TB BMD Z-score <-1: 24% LS and/or TB BMD Z-score <-2: 8%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: age at diagnosis (increase per one year) OR 0.94, 95%CI 0.88–1.01, p=0.175 TB BMD Z-score <-1: age at diagnosis (increase per 1 year) OR 0.97, 95%CI 0.91–1.04, p=0.439	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Siegel 2017	475 CCS	Mean (±SD) time after Rx 5.4 ± 4.3 years	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> Corticosteroid 83.4% Methotrexate 77.1%	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–1: 29.3% (LS 22.8%, TB 21.9%)	Multivariable model:	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk

				Radiotherapy: Cranial / craniospinal 13.3% TBI 9.9% SCT: 17.9%	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: 8.2% (LS 7.4%, TB 4.0%)	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: age at diagnosis 10+, OR 2.7, 95% CI, 0.9-8.4	CF: high risk		
9	Sloof 2019	253 CCS	NR	Chemotherapy: NR Radiotherapy: CRT 36% SCT: 0%	BMD Z-score <-1: 25.4% (site NR)	Multivariable model: BMD Z-score <-1: age at diagnosis <10 years: OR 1.39, 95%CI 0.68–2.82, p=0.37	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: unclear		
	van Atteveld 201	2032 adult CCS	Median time since cancer dx: 21.6 yrs (range 10.4-40.6)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agent 56.6% MTX 53.9% GCs 53.9% Radiotherapy: Cranial 33.9% Abdominal 21.7% SCT: NR	LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: 51.5% (LS 25.1%, TB 48.0%) LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: 20.2%	Multivariable model: LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤- 1: age at dx NS LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤- 2: age at dx NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk		
GRADE assessment:									
Study design:		ectional cohort st							
Study limitations:		Some limitations: Selection bias low in 2/7, unclear in 2/7, high in 3/7; Attrition bias low in 7/7; Detection bias low in 6/7, unclear in 1/7; Confounding low in 4/7							
				clear in 2/7, high in 3/7; Attrition b	ilas low in 7/7; Detection blas lov	v in 6/7, unclear in 1/7; Confound	ling low in 4//		
<u>.                                      </u>	unclea	in 1/7, high in 2/	7						
	unclea -1 Impor	in 1/7, high in 2/ ant inconsistency:	7 one study shows a sig	gnificant effect for younger age at					
Consistency:	unclea -1 Impor and fiv	in 1/7, high in 2/ ant inconsistency: e studies show no	7 one study shows a sig significant effect of ag	gnificant effect for younger age at oge at diagnosis					
Consistency: Directness:	unclea -1 Import and fiv 0 Result	in 1/7, high in 2/ ant inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula	7 one study shows a sig significant effect of ag ation and outcomes br	gnificant effect for younger age at oge at diagnosis roadly generalizable					
Consistency: Directness: Precision:	unclea -1 Import and fiv 0 Result 0 No im	in 1/7, high in 2/ ant inconsistency: a studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision	7 one study shows a sig significant effect of ag	gnificant effect for younger age at oge at diagnosis roadly generalizable					
Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias:	unclea -1 Import and fix 0 Result 0 No import 0 Unlike	in 1/7, high in 2/ ant inconsistency: a studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision	7 one study shows a sig significant effect of ag ation and outcomes br n, high total number o	gnificant effect for younger age at oge at diagnosis roadly generalizable					
Consistency:  Directness:  Precision:  Publication bias:  Effect size:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No im 0 Unlike 0 No lar	in 1/7, high in 2/ ant inconsistency: a studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision	7 one study shows a sig significant effect of ag ation and outcomes br n, high total number o	gnificant effect for younger age at oge at diagnosis roadly generalizable					
Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No im 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA	in 1/7, high in 2/ ant inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of ef	7 one study shows a sig significant effect of ag ation and outcomes br n, high total number o	gnificant effect for younger age at oge at diagnosis roadly generalizable					
Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No im 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA	in 1/7, high in 2/ ant inconsistency: a studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision	7 one study shows a sig significant effect of ag ation and outcomes br n, high total number o	gnificant effect for younger age at oge at diagnosis roadly generalizable					
Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No im 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla	in 1/7, high in 2/ ant inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of ef	7 one study shows a sig significant effect of ag ation and outcomes br n, high total number o	gnificant effect for younger age at oge at diagnosis roadly generalizable					
Consistency:  Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding: Quality of evidence:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No imp 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla	in 1/7, high in 2/int inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision ye magnitude of efusible confounding   LOW ificant effect of ag	one study shows a significant effect of agation and outcomes brown, high total number offect	gnificant effect for younger age at oge at diagnosis roadly generalizable of patients and events	cancer diagnosis, one study shov	vs a significant effect for older ag			
Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding: Quality of evidence: Conclusion:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No imp 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla	in 1/7, high in 2/int inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision ye magnitude of efusible confounding   LOW ificant effect of ag	one study shows a significant effect of agation and outcomes brown, high total number offect	gnificant effect for younger age at oge at diagnosis roadly generalizable of patients and events	cancer diagnosis, one study shov	vs a significant effect for older ag			
Consistency:  Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding: Quality of evidence: Conclusion:  GRADE assessment:	unclea -1 Impor and fiv 0 Result 0 No im 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla	in 1/7, high in 2/cant inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision of e magnitude of efusible confounding   LOW ificant effect of agy significant effect	one study shows a significant effect of agation and outcomes brown, high total number offect  g  ge at diagnosis on the t, 1 study significant effect	gnificant effect for younger age at oge at diagnosis roadly generalizable of patients and events	cancer diagnosis, one study shov	vs a significant effect for older ag			
Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding: Quality of evidence: Conclusion: GRADE assessment: Study design:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No im 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla	in 1/7, high in 2/int inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of efficient effect of agy significant effect ectional cohort st	one study shows a significant effect of agation and outcomes bring high total number of agation and state of the state of	gnificant effect for younger age at orge at diagnosis roadly generalizable of patients and events  risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2 ffect in the opposite direction, 5 st	cancer diagnosis, one study show  2) in CAYA cancer survivors.  udies no significant effect; 4,052	vs a significant effect for older ag			
Consistency:  Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding: Quality of evidence: Conclusion: GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No im 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla	in 1/7, high in 2/int inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of efficient effect of agy significant effect ectional cohort stations: Selection	one study shows a significant effect of agation and outcomes bring, high total number offect  g  ge at diagnosis on the t, 1 study significant effudies bias low in 2/3, unclear	gnificant effect for younger age at orge at diagnosis roadly generalizable of patients and events  risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2 ffect in the opposite direction, 5 st ar in 1/3; Attrition bias low in 3/3;	cancer diagnosis, one study show  2) in CAYA cancer survivors.  udies no significant effect; 4,052	vs a significant effect for older ag			
Consistency:  Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding: Quality of evidence: Conclusion: GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No im 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla  Uncleat  Cross- 0 No lim 0 No incleat	in 1/7, high in 2/int inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of effect confounding  LOW ifficant effect of agy significant effect or stations: Selection onsistency: all studies.	one study shows a significant effect of agation and outcomes bring, high total number offect  g  ge at diagnosis on the t, 1 study significant effudies bias low in 2/3, uncleadies show no significant	gnificant effect for younger age at orge at diagnosis roadly generalizable of patients and events  risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2 ffect in the opposite direction, 5 st ar in 1/3; Attrition bias low in 3/3; at effect of age at diagnosis	cancer diagnosis, one study show  2) in CAYA cancer survivors.  udies no significant effect; 4,052	vs a significant effect for older ag			
Consistency:  Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding: Quality of evidence: Conclusion: GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No imp 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla  Uncleat  Cross- 0 No lim 0 No inc 0 Result	in 1/7, high in 2/int inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of ef usible confounding  LOW ificant effect of ag y significant effect ectional cohort st tations: Selection onsistency: all stud are direct, popula	one study shows a significant effect of agation and outcomes brown, high total number offect  ge at diagnosis on the t, 1 study significant effudies bias low in 2/3, uncleadies show no significant ation and outcomes brown as significant and out	gnificant effect for younger age at or ge at diagnosis roadly generalizable of patients and events  risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2 offect in the opposite direction, 5 star in 1/3; Attrition bias low in 3/3; at effect of age at diagnosis roadly generalizable	cancer diagnosis, one study show  2) in CAYA cancer survivors.  udies no significant effect; 4,052	vs a significant effect for older ag			
Consistency:  Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding: Quality of evidence: Conclusion: GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No imp 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla  Uncleat  Cross- 0 No lim 0 No inc 0 Result	in 1/7, high in 2/int inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of effective confounding.  LOW ifficant effect of agy significant effect ectional cohort stations: Selection onsistency: all studier are direct, popula ortant imprecision.	one study shows a significant effect of agation and outcomes bring, high total number offect  g  ge at diagnosis on the t, 1 study significant effudies bias low in 2/3, uncleadies show no significant	gnificant effect for younger age at or ge at diagnosis roadly generalizable of patients and events  risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2 offect in the opposite direction, 5 star in 1/3; Attrition bias low in 3/3; at effect of age at diagnosis roadly generalizable	cancer diagnosis, one study show  2) in CAYA cancer survivors.  udies no significant effect; 4,052	vs a significant effect for older ag			
Consistency:  Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding: Quality of evidence: Conclusion: GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No imp 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla	in 1/7, high in 2/int inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of effective confounding.  LOW ifficant effect of agy significant effect ectional cohort stations: Selection onsistency: all studier are direct, popula ortant imprecision.	one study shows a significant effect of agation and outcomes bring, high total number offect  ge at diagnosis on the t, 1 study significant effect udies bias low in 2/3, uncleadies show no significant ation and outcomes bring, high total number of the significant effect.	gnificant effect for younger age at or ge at diagnosis roadly generalizable of patients and events  risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2 offect in the opposite direction, 5 star in 1/3; Attrition bias low in 3/3; at effect of age at diagnosis roadly generalizable	cancer diagnosis, one study show  2) in CAYA cancer survivors.  udies no significant effect; 4,052	vs a significant effect for older ag			
Consistency:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No imp 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla	in 1/7, high in 2/int inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of ef usible confounding  LOW ificant effect of ag y significant effect ectional cohort st tations: Selection onsistency: all stud are direct, popula ortant imprecision y	one study shows a significant effect of agation and outcomes bring, high total number offect  ge at diagnosis on the t, 1 study significant effect udies bias low in 2/3, uncleadies show no significant ation and outcomes bring, high total number of the significant effect.	gnificant effect for younger age at or ge at diagnosis roadly generalizable of patients and events  risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2 offect in the opposite direction, 5 star in 1/3; Attrition bias low in 3/3; at effect of age at diagnosis roadly generalizable	cancer diagnosis, one study show  2) in CAYA cancer survivors.  udies no significant effect; 4,052	vs a significant effect for older ag			
Consistency:  Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding: Quality of evidence: Conclusion:  GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No imp 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla	in 1/7, high in 2/int inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of ef usible confounding  LOW ificant effect of ag y significant effect ectional cohort st tations: Selection onsistency: all stud are direct, popula ortant imprecision y	one study shows a significant effect of agation and outcomes bring, high total number offect  ge at diagnosis on the t, 1 study significant effect oldes bias low in 2/3, uncleadies show no significant ation and outcomes bring, high total number offect	gnificant effect for younger age at or ge at diagnosis roadly generalizable of patients and events  risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2 offect in the opposite direction, 5 star in 1/3; Attrition bias low in 3/3; at effect of age at diagnosis roadly generalizable	cancer diagnosis, one study show  2) in CAYA cancer survivors.  udies no significant effect; 4,052	vs a significant effect for older ag			
Consistency:  Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding: Quality of evidence: Conclusion:  GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response:	unclea -1 Impor and fix 0 Result 0 No imp 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 NA 0 No pla	in 1/7, high in 2/int inconsistency: e studies show no are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of effusible confounding    LOW ifficant effect of agy significant effect ectional cohort stations: Selection insistency: all studier are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of effusive effects of effusive effects are direct, popula ortant imprecision y e magnitude of effusive estations of effusive effects en	one study shows a significant effect of agation and outcomes bring, high total number offect  ge at diagnosis on the t, 1 study significant effect oldes bias low in 2/3, uncleadies show no significant ation and outcomes bring, high total number offect	gnificant effect for younger age at or ge at diagnosis roadly generalizable of patients and events  risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2 offect in the opposite direction, 5 star in 1/3; Attrition bias low in 3/3; at effect of age at diagnosis roadly generalizable	cancer diagnosis, one study show  2) in CAYA cancer survivors.  udies no significant effect; 4,052	vs a significant effect for older ag			

Conclusion:	No significant effect of age at diagnosis on the risk of very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) in CAYA cancer survivors.
	(3 studies no significant effect; 2,585 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# 1h. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors who were younger versus older at cancer diagnosis?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.h. Risk lower BMD for age at cancer diagnosis (n=7 studies)	Alikasifoglu 2005	59 ALL survivors	Mean 3.40 (1.77) years after cessation of therapy	Chemotherapy: Conventional dose prednisolone 51% Megadose methylprednisolone 49% Cyclophosphamide 100% HD-MTX 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 76% SCT: 0%	Mean (SD) LS BMD Z-score Total cohort: -1.73 (0.84)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): age at diagnosis: t=0.461, P=0.646	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Benmiloud 2010	89 ALL and NHL survivors	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 15.0 ± 4.5 years	Chemotherapy: Prednisolone 100% Dexamethasone 52.8% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy RT at any site: 53.9% CNS RT 36% CRT 32.6% CSRT 3.4% TBI 18.0% SCT 18.0%	BMD Z-score ≤-1.0: At any site: 59.1%; At the LS: 50.5% At the FN: 25.8%; At the Hip: 31.5% BMD Z-score ≤-2: At any site: 10.1%; At the LS: 10.1% At the FN: 2.2%; At the Hip: 2.2%	Multivariable model: LS, FN and hip BMD Z-score (cont.): NS	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	De Matteo 2019	72 ALL survivors	Mean (±SD) time since treatment 41.2 ±37.8 months (95% CI: 49.9, 32.5)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 100% Dexamethasone 100% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: 3 (4%) SCT: 0%	Proximal phalanx (QUS) Ad-SoS Z-score below –2 SD: 10/72 (13.8%)	Multivariable model: Ad-SoS Z-score (cont.): Age at ALL diagnosis: R2=0.0351, P=0.01 (negative correlation)	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: low risk
	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): β=-0.16; se=0.14; p=0.26 TB BMD Z-score (cont.): NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk

	Hobush 2	2014 56 Ewing and PNET survivors	Minimum FU 5 years after treatment; Mean FU 15 years (5-48 years)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agents (ifosfamide/cyclophosphamide) 100% Radiotherapy: Local radiation 64% SCT: NR	LS and/or Hip BMD T-score <-1: 55% LS and/or Hip BMD T-score <-2.5 (or Z-score <-2 in adolescents): 13%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): older age at surgery NS FN BMD Z-score (cont.): older age at surgery p=0.023 Hip BMD Z-score (cont.): older age at surgery NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Le Meign	en 2011 159 ALL and AML survivors	Mean time from diagnosis to DXA 14.66 ± 0.44 yrs	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 86.2% Other chemotherapy NR Radiotherapy: CRT 18.9% TBI 40.4% of HSCT recipients SCT: 34%	BMD Z-score <-2: FN 3.2%; LS 3.8%	Multivariable model: BMD Z-scores (cont.): age at dx FN: β -0.005, P=0.96; LS: β 0.06, p=0.57	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: high risk CF: high risk
	Ruza 200	95 (63 had DXA) osteosarcoma and Ewing's sarcoma survivors	Mean duration of remission was 6.12 years (SD 3.67) in patients with osteosarcomas and 6.11 years (SD 3.73) for Ewing's sarcoma patients	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: NR SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 43.6% FN BMD Z-score <-1: 42.9% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9.7% FN BMD Z-score <-2: 17.5%	Multivariable model: LS BMD (cont.): younger age at dx p=0.035 for areal BMD, BMD Z-scores NS FN BMD (cont.): younger age at dx NS	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
GRADE assessment	:						
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectional cohort st	udies				
Study limitations:	-2	Some limitations: Selection Confounding low in 6/7, I		ear in 1/7, high in 4/7; Attrition bia	s low in 3/7, high in 4/7; Detec	tion bias low in 5/7, unclear in 1/	7, high in 1/7;
Consistency:	-1	and four studies show no	significant effect of ag		er diagnosis, one study shows	a significant effect for younger aફ	ge at diagnosis,
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are direct, popula					
Precision:	0	No important imprecision	n, high total number of	patients and events			
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely					
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of ef	fect				
Dose-response:	0	NA					
<u>Plausible</u>	0	No plausible confounding	S				
confounding:							
Quality of evidence	2:	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW					
Conclusion:		There is conflicting evide	nce for the association	of age at diagnosis and lower BMD	in CAYA cancer survivors.		

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-

ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

### 1i. What is the risk of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors who were younger versus older at cancer diagnosis?

PICO	Study	No. o parti	of cipants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.i. Risk fracture for age at diagnosis (n=2 studies)	Fiscalett	2021 251 A surviv		Median 15.1 years (range 5.4 to 28.2 years) since cancer diagnosis	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 59% SCT: None	Frequency of fractures: Vertebral fractures: 23% Non-vertebral fractures: 31%	Multivariable model: Vertebral fractures: age at diagnosis (yr) RR 1.01, 95%CI 0.96- 1.06, p=0.784	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Wilson 2	012 7414	CCS	Median length of follow-up was 22.7 years (range, 15.6-34.2 years)	Chemotherapy: Methotrexate 43.6% Steroids 47% Radiotherapy: CRT 32% Pelvic RT 13% SCT: 0%	Proportion of participants with fractures <u>over their lifetime</u> Survivors: 34.8% Siblings: 38.9%	Multivariable model: Fracture: Males: age at diagnosis 0-4 yrs prevalence ratio (PR), 1.0 (ref); 5-9 yrs PR 0.93, 95%CI 0.83-1.05, p=0.25; 10-14 yrs PR 1.02, 95%CI 0.89-1.16, p=0.82; 15-19 yrs PR 0.98, 95%CI 0.84-1.15, p=0.81. Females: age at diagnosis 0-4 yrs prevalence ratio (PR), 1.0 (ref); 5-9 yrs PR 1.11, 95%CI 0.96-1.29, p=0.16; 10-14 yrs PR 1.10, 95%CI 0.92-1.30, p=0.29; 15-19 yrs PR 0.96, 95%CI 0.79-1.19, p=0.72.	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: high risk
GRADE assessment: Study design:	+4	Retrospective of	cohort stu	udy				
Study limitations:	-2				igh in 1/2; Attrition bias low i	n 2/2; Detection bias low in 1/2, I	high in 1/2; Confounding low in 1/2, hig	h in 1/2
Consistency:	0		•		ficant effect of age at diagnos	sis		
Directness:	0				broadly generalizable			
Precision:	0	•	mprecision	on, high total number	of patients and events			
Publication bias:	0 0	Unlikely	itudo of a	effect				
Effect size: Dose-response:	0	No large magni NA	itude of e	enect				
Plausible confoundir		No plausible co	onfoundir	าฮ				
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW		·o				
Conclusion:		No significant e	effect of a	age at diagnosis on th effect; 7,665 particip	e risk of fractures in CAYA car ants)	ncer survivors.		

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBl=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# 1j. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with different ethnicities?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.j. Risk low BMD for ethnicity (n=5 studies)	Bhandari 2021	446 CCS	Median 14.2 years (range 2–65 years) since completing therapy	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 57.5% Methotrexate 40.4% Radiotherapy: CRT NR TBI ± 24% SCT: 40.8% (30.9% allogeneic)	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 33.9%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: race/ethnicity NS	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Bloomhardt 2020	542 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 17.2% LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: white race OR 2.5, 95%Cl 1.1-5.4, p=0.02	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Kaste 2006a <sup>a</sup>	320 CCS	NR	NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score: <-2: n=96 (30%) QCT LS BMD Z-score median: -1.43 range: -5.96 to 3.2 DXA LS BMD Z-score <-2: n=89 (27.8%) DXA LS BMD Z-score median: -1.30 (-5.5 to 2.8)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-2: by DXA, non- white patients OR 2.60, 95%CI 1.34-5.03, p=0.0046; by QCT, white patients OR 2.97, 95%CI 1.21-7.31, p=0.018	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: unclear
	Kaste 2006b <sup>a</sup>	study I n=141, study II n=57 ALL survivors	Study I: >4 years after therapy (mean time after dx 11.7 yrs) Study II: 2-5 years after study I (mean time after dx 16.1 yrs)	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Prednisone 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 37% of 57; percentage of 141 NR SCT: 0%	Study I: LS BMD Z-score <-1 10.5%; LS BMD Z-score <-2 1.5% Study II: LS BMD Z-score <-1 19.3%; LS BMD Z-score <-2 0%	Multivariable model: LS 'low' BMD (Z-score cut-point NR, presumably <-1): study I Caucasian race P=0.003, study II P<0.0001	SB: unclear AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: unclear
	Polgreen 2012	319 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SE) 10.1 ± 0.2 years (range 4.3-17.8)	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid: 42.0% Radiotherapy: 23.2% Cranial (CNS) 9.7%, other 13.5% SCT: 0%	TB BMD Z-score <-1: 11% LS BMD Z-score <-1: 23% TB BMD Z-score <-2: 2.3% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: TB BMD Z-score <-1: ethnicity (white non-Hispanic vs. other), OR 1.7, 95%Cl 0.5-6.9, p=0.420	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk

LS BMD Z-score <-1: ethnicity (white non-Hispanic vs. other), OR 2.6, 95%CI 0.9-9.1, p=0.104

**GRADE** assessment (outcome low and very low BMD):

Study design: +4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

Study limitations: -1 Some limitations: Selection bias low in 3/5, unclear in 1/5, high in 1/5; Attrition bias low in 3/5, high in 2/5; Detection bias low in 5/5; Confounding low in 2/5,

unclear in 2/5, high in 1/5

<u>Consistency:</u> 0 No important inconsistency, all studies show (when BMD was compared to an non-race specific database to generate Z-scores) an association between white

ethnic descent and low BMD (3 studies significant)

<u>Directness:</u>
0 Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable

Precision:
0 No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

**Effect size:** 0 No large magnitude of effect

**Dose-response:** 0 NA

<u>Plausible confounding:</u> 0 No plausible confounding

Quality of evidence:  $\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus \ominus \Box$  MODERATE

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2) for white CAYA cancer survivors.

(3 studies significant effect, 2 studies no significant effect; 1,768 participants)

**GRADE** assessment (outcome very low BMD):

**Study design:** +4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

Study limitations: -1 Some limitations: Selection bias low in 1/1; Attrition bias low in 1/1; Detection bias low in 1/1; Confounding unclear in 1/1

**Consistency:** NA Only one study available

**Directness:** 0 Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable

Precision: -2 Important imprecision, low total number of patients and events and only one study available

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

**Effect size:** 0 No large magnitude of effect

**Dose-response:** 0 NA

<u>Plausible confounding:</u> 0 No plausible confounding

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) for white CAYA cancer survivors.

(1 study significant effect; 320 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

#### 1k. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with different ethnicities?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
BMD for ethnicity (n=2 studies)	Kaste 2006	ia <sup>a</sup> 320 CCS	NR	NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score: <-2: n=96 (30%) QCT LS BMD Z-score median: -1.43 range: -5.96 to 3.2 DXA LS BMD Z-score <-2: n=89 (27.8%) DXA LS BMD Z-score median: -1.30 (-5.5 to 2.8)	Multivariable model: LS BMD (cont.): non-white race was associated with higher BMD by DXA in L1 (P=0.0221) and in L2 (P=0.0370) and by QCT (P<0.0001).	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: unclear
	Kaste 2014	a 424 ALL survivors	Median 8.4 yrs (4.6-19.1) from completion of ALL therapy to entry into study	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 36.1% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score <-1: 48.9% QCT LS BMD Z-score <-2: 6.8%	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score (cont.): non- White vs. White β 0.58 (0.28, 0.89) P=0.0002 (whites had lower BMD Z- scores)	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding	-1 So O N O R O N O U O N O N O N O N O N O N O N N O N N O N	o important inconsisto esults are direct, popu	tion bias low in 1/2, hency, both studies should be shou	ow a significant association be	in 1/2, high in 1/2; Detection bias etween white ethnic descent and	low in 2/2; Confounding low in 1/2, un lower BMD	clear in 1/2
Quality of evidence: Conclusion:	Ir	分野サ台 MODERATE ncreased risk of lower 2 studies significant ef					

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.l. Risk fracture	Wilson 2	012 7414 CCS	Median length of	Chemotherapy:	Proportion of participants	Multivariable model:	SB: high risk
for ethnicity			follow-up was 22.7 years (range,	Methotrexate 43.6% Steroids 47%	with fractures <u>over their</u> lifetime	Fracture: male survivors of non- white ethnic descent prevalence	AB: low risk DB: high risk
(n=1 study)			15.6-34.2 years)	Radiotherapy: CRT 32% Pelvic RT 13% SCT: 0%	Survivors: 34.8% Siblings: 38.9%	ratio, 0.78; 95% CI, 0.66- 0.92; P= .004	CF: high risk
GRADE assessment:	:						
Study design:	+4	Retrospective cohort st	udy				
Study limitations:	-3	Some limitations: Selec	tion bias high in 1/1;	Attrition bias low in 1/1; Dete	ection bias high in 1/1; Confound	ding high in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA	Only one study available	e				
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are direct, popu	lation and outcomes	broadly generalizable			
Precision:	-1	Important imprecision:	high total number of	patients and events but only	one study available		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely					
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of	effect				
Dose-response:	0	NA					
Plausible confoundi	<b>ing:</b> 0	No plausible confoundi	ng				
Quality of evidence	:	$\oplus\ominus\ominus\ominus$ VERY LOW					
Conclusion:		Decreased risk of fractu	ires for male non-whi	te CAYA cancer survivors.			
		(1 study significant effe	ct; 7,414 participants	)			

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

## 1m. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with lower versus higher BMI, body weight, and/or lean mass?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.m. Risk low BMD for lower vs. higher BMI/body weight (n=10 studies)	Bloomhardt 2020	542 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 17.2% LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: BMI: underweight OR 3.5, 95%CI 1.1- 11.5, normal reference, overweight OR 0.3, 95%CI 0.1- 0.6, obese OR 0.3, 95%CI 0.2- 0.6, p<0.01	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Choi 2013	78 ALL, AML and CML survivors	Mean time from cancer dx: 4.42±2.47 in males, 5.36±3.2 years in females	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids for chemotherapy 42% Glucocorticoids for GVHD 53% Radiotherapy: 62% SCT: 64%	LS BMD Z-score <-2: 25.7% FN BMD Z-score <-2: 24.4%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-2: BMI SDS: OR 0.586, CI 0.362-0.948, p=0.03	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: BMI (cont.) OR 0.9, 95%CI 0.8–0.9; BMI (<18.5 vs. 18.5–25) OR= 3.7, 95%CI 1.3–10.5; BMI (>25 vs. 18.5–25), OR= 0.5, 95%CI 0.3– 1.1 TB BMD Z-score <-1: BMI (cont.) OR 0.8, 95%CI 0.8-0.9; BMI (<18.5 vs. 18.5–25), OR= 4.0, 95%CI 1.4–11.1; BMI (>25 vs. 18.5–25), OR= 0.3–0.9	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Kaste 2006b <sup>a</sup>	study I n=141, study II n=57 ALL survivors	Study I: >4 years after therapy (mean time after dx 11.7 yrs) Study II: 2-5 years after study I (mean time after dx 16.1 yrs)	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Prednisone 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 37% of 57; percentage of 141 NR SCT: 0%	Study I: LS BMD Z-score <-1 10.5%; LS BMD Z-score <-2 1.5% Study II: LS BMD Z-score <-1 19.3%; LS BMD Z-score <-2 0%	Multivariable model: LS 'low' BMD (Z-score cut-point NR, presumably <-1): study I not overweight P=0.067, study II NS	SB: unclear AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: unclear
	Kaste 2009 <sup>a</sup>	109 HL survivors	Median 7.5 yrs (5.8-20.7 yrs) from diagnosis to QCT	Chemotherapy: Cyclophosphamide 67.9% Methotrexate 69% Prednisone 65%	QCT LS BMD Z-score <-1.5: 14.7% QCT LS BMD Z-score <-2.0: 7.3%	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score <-1.5: BMI (kg/m2) normal + underweight vs. overweight + obesity: OR	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: low risk

			Radiotherapy: LS RT 28.4% Pelvic RT 6% SCT: NR		2.76 (95% CI:0.87–8.76), p=0.086	
Latoch 2021	326 CCS	Median (range) 6.12 (4.0-22.0) years since end of treatment	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 71.2% Methotrexate 50.9% Radiotherapy: CRT 25.5% TBI 4% Abdominal RT 16.7% SCT: 7%	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 20% TB BMD Z-score <-1: 24% LS and/or TB BMD Z-score <-2: 8%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: BMI OR 3.57, 95%CI 1.24–10.23, p=0.004 TB BMD Z-score <-1: BMI OR 3.16, 95%CI 1.1–9.07, p=0.032	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
Polgreen 2012	319 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SE) 10.1 ± 0.2 years (range 4.3-17.8)	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid: 42.0% Radiotherapy: 23.2% Cranial (CNS) 9.7%, other 13.5% SCT: 0%	TB BMD Z-score <-1: 11% LS BMD Z-score <-1: 23% TB BMD Z-score <-2: 2.3% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: TB BMD Z-score <-1: Percent body fat (1% increase), OR 0.95, 95%CI 0.9-1.0, p=0.070; Lean body mass (1kg increase), OR 0.85, 95%CI 0.8-0.9, p<0.001 LS BMD Z-score <-1: Percent body fat (1% increase), OR 0.97, 95%CI 0.94-1.0, p=0.088 Lean body mass (≤35kg vs. >35kg), OR 4.1, 95%CI 1.8-9.6, p<0.001	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
Siegel 2017	475 CCS	Mean (±SD) time after Rx 5.4 ± 4.3 years	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid 83.4% Methotrexate 77.1% Radiotherapy: Cranial / craniospinal 13.3% TBI 9.9% SCT: 17.9%	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–1: 29.3% (LS 22.8%, TB 21.9%) TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: 8.2% (LS 7.4%, TB 4.0%)	Multivariable model: TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: overweight or obese, OR 0.5, 95% CI, 0.2-1.2	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
Sloof 2019	253 CCS	NR	Chemotherapy: NR Radiotherapy: CRT 36% SCT: 0%	BMD Z-score <-1: 25.4% (site NR)	Multivariable model: BMD Z-score <-1: ideal BMI OR 2.62, 95%CI 1.22–5.62, p=0.01	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: unclear
van Atteveld 2019 <sup>a</sup>	2032 adult CCS	Median time since cancer dx: 21.6 yrs (range 10.4-40.6)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agent 56.6% MTX 53.9% GCs 53.9% Radiotherapy: Cranial 33.9% Abdominal 21.7% SCT: NR	LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: 51.5% (LS 25.1%, TB 48.0%) LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: 20.2%	Multivariable model: LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: weight $\beta$ -0.02 (SE <0.01), OR 0.98, 95%CI 0.97-0.98 LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: weight $\beta$ -0.03 (SE <0.01), OR 0.97, 95%CI 0.96-0.98	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk

Study limitations: 5 lection bias low in 4/10, unclear in 3/10, high in 3/10; Attrition bias low in 9/10, high in 1/10; Detection bias low in 8/10, unclear in 1/10, high

in 1/10; Confounding low in 6/10, unclear in 2/10, high in 2/10

Consistency: 0 No important inconsistency, all show an association between lower body weight, BMI or lean mass and low BMD (7 studies significant)

Directness:0Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizablePrecision:0No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

Effect size: +1 Large magnitude of effect

Dose-response: 0 Dose response unclear

Plausible confounding: 0 No plausible confounding

Quality of evidence:  $\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus HIGH$ 

Conclusion: Increased risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2) for CAYA cancer survivors with low body weight, BMI or lean body mass.

(7 studies significant effect, 3 studies no significant effect; 4,621 participants)

**GRADE** assessment (outcome very low BMD):

**Study design:** +4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

Study limitations: 0 No important limitations: Selection bias low in 2/3, unclear in 1/3; Attrition bias low in 3/3; Detection bias low in 3/3; Confounding low in 2/3, high in 1/3

Consistency: 0 No important inconsistency, all show an association between lower body weight or BMI and low BMD (2 studies significant)

<u>Directness:</u> 0 Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable <u>Precision:</u> 0 No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

Effect size: 0 No large magnitude of effect

Dose-response: 0 Dose response unclear

Plausible confounding: 0 No plausible confounding

Quality of evidence:  $\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus HIGH$ 

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) for CAYA cancer survivors with low body weight or BMI.

(2 studies significant effect, 1 study no significant effect; 2,585 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

### 1n. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with lower versus higher BMI, body weight, and/or lean mass?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.n. Risk lower BMD for lower vs. higher BMI/body weight (n=10 studies)	Alikasifoglu 2005 <sup>a</sup>	59 ALL survivors	Mean 3.40 (1.77) years after cessation of therapy	Chemotherapy: Conventional dose prednisolone 51% Megadose methylprednisolone 49% Cyclophosphamide 100% HD-MTX 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 76% SCT: 0%	Mean (SD) LS BMD Z-score Total cohort: -1.73 (0.84)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): BMI Z- score: t=0.457, P=0.648	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): BMI (cont.) $\beta$ =0.06, se=0.01, p<0.001 TB BMD Z-score (cont.): BMI (cont.) $\beta$ =0.10; se=0.01; p<0.001	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Henderson 1996	60 CCS	At least 12 months post chemotherapy Mean time since treatment: 4.3 yrs range 12mths-14.5 yrs	Chemotherapy: Ifofosfamide 3% Glucocorticoids 75% MTX 62% Radiotherapy: CRT 25% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-scores <-2: 5/60 (8.3%) LS BMD Z-score <-1.0: 14/60 (23.3%)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): lower weight Z-score R <sup>2</sup> = 0.33, p=0.0001	SB: unclear AB: unclear DB: low risk CF: unclear
	Hobush 2014	56 Ewing and PNET survivors	Minimum FU 5 years after treatment; Mean FU 15 years (5-48 years)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agents (ifosfamide/cyclophosphamide) 100% Radiotherapy: Local radiation 64% SCT: NR	LS and/or Hip BMD T-score <-1: 55% LS and/or Hip BMD T-score <-2.5 (or Z-score <-2 in adolescents): 13%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): low BMI NS FN BMD Z-score (cont.): low BMI p=0.002 (p=0.014 after Bonferroni correction) Hip BMD Z-score (cont.): low BMI p<0.001 (p=0.002 after Bonferroni correction)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Holzer 2003	48 malignant osteosarcoma survivors	Mean 16±2.2 years follow-up	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> HD-MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100%	LS and/or Hip BMD T-score <-1: 65%	Multivariable (?) model: LS and/or Hip BMD T-score (cont.): positive correlation with	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk

			Ifosfamide 100% <u>Radiotherapy:</u> 2% <u>SCT</u> :NA	LS and/or Hip BMD T-score <-2.5: 21%	body weight (p=0.03, r not reported), BMI NS.	CF: high risk
Jones 2008 <sup>a</sup>	309 ALL survivors	At least 4 years of continuous remission	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Prednisone 100% Radiotherapy: NR SCT: NR	Mean QCT LS BMD Z-score (SD): -0.47 (1.26)	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score (cont.): lower BMI p=0.0003	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
Kaste 2014 <sup>a</sup>	424 ALL survivors	Median 8.4 yrs (4.6-19.1) from completion of ALL therapy to entry into study	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 36.1% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score <-1: 48.9% QCT LS BMD Z-score <-2: 6.8%	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score (cont.): BMI (kg/m2) β 0.05 (0.03, 0.07) P<0.0001	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
Muszynska- Roslan 2007	68 CCS	Mean time since end of Rx ranged from 5.5 -21.4 years (8.1 ± 2.9 years for males, 7.5 ± 3.4 years for females)	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid 85.3% Radiotherapy: CRT 38.2% Abdominal RT 29.4% SCT: NR	NR	Multivariable model: TB BMC values (cont.): lean mass males R2=0.80, p<0.0001; females R2=0.64, p<0.001 LS BMC values (cont.): lean mass males R2=0.75, p<0.0001; females R2=0.40, p<0.001 "Similar associations for fat mass"	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
Remes 2018	74 brain tumor survivors	Mean time since cessation of tumor therapy (±SD): 18.9 ± 6.1 years	Chemotherapy: 63.5% Radiotherapy: Local irradiation: 52.7% Craniospinal with local boost to the tumor bed: 40.5% Cranial with local boost to the tumor bed: 4.1% Stereotactic: 2.7% SCT:NR	LS BMD and/or FN BMD and/or Total Hip Z-score ≤- 2: 23.6%	Multivariable model: BMD Z-scores (cont.): BMI, right FN $\beta$ 0.07 (95% CI 0.04-0.11), p<0.001; left FN $\beta$ 0.08 (95% CI 0.04-0.12), p<0.001; right total hip: $\beta$ 0.09 (95% CI 0.05-0.13), p<0.001; left total hip: $\beta$ 0.10 (95% CI 0.06-0.15), p<0.001; LS $\beta$ 0.07 (95% CI 0.02-0.11), p=0.006	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: low risk
Ruza 2006	95 (63 had DXA) osteosarcoma and Ewing's sarcoma survivors	Mean duration of remission was 6.12 years (SD 3.67) in patients with osteosarcomas and 6.11 years (SD 3.73) for Ewing's sarcoma patients	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: NR SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 43.6% FN BMD Z-score <-1: 42.9% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9.7% FN BMD Z-score <-2: 17.5%	Multivariable model: LS BMD (cont.): lower weight p=0.016 for areal BMD, BMD Z- score NS; BMI areal BMD NS, p=0.038 for BMD Z-score FN BMD (cont.): lower weight p=0.001 for areal BMD, BMD Z- score NS; BMI areal BMD NS, p=0.001 for BMD Z-score	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk

assessment:

+4 Cross-sectional cohort studies Study design:

Study limitations:	-1	Some limitations: Selection bias unclear in 1/10, high in 9/10; Attrition bias low in 6/10, unclear in 1/10, high in 3/10; Detection bias low in 9/10, unclear in 1/10; Confounding low in 8/10, unclear in 1/10, high in 1/10
Consistency:	0	No important inconsistency, all studies show an association between lower body weight, BMI or lean mass and low BMD (9 studies significant)
Directness:	0	Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable
Precision:	0	No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect
Dose-response:	0	Dose response unclear
<u>Plausible</u>	0	No plausible confounding
confounding:		
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE
Conclusion:		Increased risk of lower BMD for CAYA cancer survivors with low body weight, BMI or lean body mass.
		(9 studies significant effect, 1 study no significant effect; 1,539 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBl=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

### 10. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with a positive family history and/or genetic polymorphisms?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias			
for familial factors	Aaron 20	242 ALL survivors	Mean time since treatment is 13.1 years (range 4-29 years)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 59%	BMD Z-score ≤-1.0: LS 25.2%, TB 25.2% BMD Z-score ≤-2: LS 5.8%, TB 5.8%	Multivariable model: BMD Z-score ≤-1.0: no SNPs significantly associated BMD Z-score ≤-2: no SNPs	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk			
(n=1 study)				SCT: 0%		significantly associated				
GRADE assessment:										
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectional cohort	•		5	11. 1				
Study limitations:	-1			1; Attrition bias low in 1/1;	Detection bias low in 1/1; Confo	unding low in 1/1				
Consistency:	NA	Only one study available								
<u>Directness:</u> Precision:	0 -2	Results are direct, popu			y ana study available					
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely	ortant imprecision, low total number of patients and events and only one study available							
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of								
Dose-response:	0	NA NA								
Plausible confoundin		No plausible confoundi	ng							
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW	<u> </u>							
Conclusion:			SNPs on low BMD (Z-s	core ≤-1 or ≤-2) in CAYA ca	ncer survivors.					
		(1 study no significant e		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
GRADE assessment:										
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectional cohort	study							
Study limitations:	-1	Some limitations: Selec	tion bias unclear in 1/	1; Attrition bias low in 1/1;	Detection bias low in 1/1; Confo	unding low in 1/1				
Consistency:	NA	Only one study available								
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are direct, popu								
Precision:	-2		low total number of p	atients and events and onl	y one study available					
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely								
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of	effect							
Dose-response:	0	NA								
Plausible confoundin	<b>g:</b> 0	No plausible confoundi	ng							
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW		. (=						
Conclusion:				) (Z-score ≤-2) in CAYA cand	cer survivors.					
		(1 study no significant of	effect; 242 participant	5)						

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# 1p. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with a positive family history and/or genetic polymorphisms?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.p. Risk lower BMD for familial factors (n=4 studies)	Den Hoed 2016	334 adult CCS	Median follow up time 18 yrs (range 5-40 yrs)	Chemotherapy: Cyclophosphamide 46% Ifosfamide 3% Methotrexate 95% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 17% Total body 4% Brain Tumor 4% Abdominal 3% SCT: 4.2%	Mean BMDLS Z-score -0.27 (SD: 1.03) Mean BMDTB Z-score -0.47 (SD: 1.10)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): rs2504063 ESR1 (G/G vs. A/A-A/G) -0.83 (0.29) vs0.58 (0.27), p=0.07; rs599083 LRP5 (G/G vs. T/T-T/G) -0.95 (0.31) vs0.46 (0.27), p=0.01 TB BMD Z-score (cont.): rs2504063 ESR1 (G/G vs. A/A-A/G) -1.16 (0.27) vs0.82 (0.25), p=0.01; rs599083 LRP5 (G/G vs. T/T-T/G) -1.20 (0.29) vs0.78 (0.25), p=0.02 Other candidate SNPs NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Im 2018 <sup>a</sup>	856 ALL survivors	NA (± 25 yrs)	Chemotherapy: Methotrexate 100% Glucocorticoid 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 59% SCT: NR	Median QCT LS BMD Z-score (range): -0.4 (-3.5, 5.4)	Of the six regulatory 3-SNP interactions identified as candidate interactions (P < 3.5 x 10–11) among cancer survivors exposed to treatments, five SNPs (1. rs901466: C>G + rs7569568: G>A + rs91319: T>C; 2. rs1020745: G>A + rs2110167: A>G + rs10444471: G>T; 3. rs1894331: G>T + rs10773093: T>C + rs4768783: C>T; 4. rs7321815: C>A + rs9315069: T>C + rs913071: C>T; 5. rs887890: T>G + rs7142110: G>A + rs1884632: C>G) were replicated in an independent cohort of survivors (N = 1428) as modifiers of treatment effects on QCT LS BMD Z-score (P < 0.05).	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Jones 2008 <sup>a</sup>	309 ALL survivors	At least 4 years of continuous remission	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Prednisone 100% Radiotherapy: NR SCT: NR	Mean QCT LS BMD Z-score (SD): -0.47 (1.26)	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score (cont.): The G allele at the rs1876828 SNP was associated with lower z scores (P=.02) in males but tended to have the opposite association in females (P=.09)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Sawicka- Zukowska 2013	74 ALL and lymphoma survivors	Not specifically stated, but the average time at the time of	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> NR <u>Radiotherapy:</u> CRT 21.6% <u>SCT</u> : NR	Mean TB BMD Z-score - 0.0132 Mean LS BMD Z-score - 0.2610	Q223R polymorphism of leptin receptor not associated with BMD: TB BMD Z-score (cont.): p=0.423 LS BMD Z-score (cont.): p=0.457	SB: unclear AB: unclear DB: low risk CF: low risk

		analysis post	Mean TB BMC Z-score					
		treatment	0.3244					
		completion would						
		be 6.6 years						
GRADE assessment:								
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectional cohort studies						
Study limitations:	-1	Some limitations: Selection bias unclear in 1/4, high in 3/4; Attrition bia	s low in 3/4, unclear in 1/4; Detection bias low in 4/4; Confounding low in 3/4, high in 1/4					
Consistency:	NA All studies assessed different candidate SNPs							
<u>Directness:</u>	0 Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable							
Precision:	-1	Important imprecision, high total number of patients and events but all	studies assessed different candidate SNPs					
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely						
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect						
Dose-response:	0	NA						
Plausible confounding:	0	No plausible confounding						
Quality of evidence:		$\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus$ LOW						
Conclusion:		Increased risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with SNPs on rs25	504063, rs599083, and rs1876828 (in males), or certain combination of SNPs ( 1. rs901466:					
		C>G + rs7569568: G>A + rs921319: T>C; 2. rs1020745: G>A + rs2110167	rs1020745: G>A + rs2110167: A>G + rs10444471: G>T; 3. rs1894331: G>T + rs10773093: T>C + rs4768783: C>T; 4.					
		rs7321815: C>A + rs9315069: T>C + rs913071: C>T; 5. rs887890: T>G +	rs7142110: G>A + rs1884632: C>G).					
		(3 studies significant effect, 1 study no significant effect; 44,439 participation)	pants)					

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

1q. What is the risk of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors with a positive family history and/or genetic polymorphisms?

PICO	Study	No. of	Follow up	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
		participants	(median/mean,				
			range) vr				

1.q. Risk fracture	Im 2021	2453	At least 5 years	Chemotherapy:	Fracture frequency (any type	Multivariable model:	SB: high risk
for familial		(discovery)	Discovery:	Glucocorticoids 47.2%	post diagnosis)	Fracture: SNP replicated (only in	AB: low risk
factors		1417	Approximately 37	discovery, 48.3%	Discovery: 37.9%	females) is rs1406815 (HAGHL	DB: high risk
		(replication)	years	replication	Replication: 46.0%	gene), HR 1.43, p=8.2 × 10−9	CF: unclear
(n=1 study)		CCS	Replication:	IV MTX 18.5% discovery,		Treatment-stratified analysis of this	
			Approximately 25	29.2% replication		SNP in females:	
			years	IT MTX 38.4% discovery,		No head/neck RT: HR 1.22, 95%CI	
				38.3% replication		0.95-1.57, p=0.11	
				Radiotherapy:		Any RT: HR=1.88, 95%CI 1.54-2.28,	
				CRT 45.9% discovery,		p=2.4 × 10-10	
				38.5% replication		>36 Gray only: HR 3.79, 95%CI	
				SCT: 0% (exclusion		1.95–7.34, p=8.2 × 10−5	
				criterion)		_	
GRADE assessment:							
Study design:	+4	Retrospective cohort stu	•				
Study limitations:	-2	Some limitations: Select	tion bias high in 1/1; A	Attrition bias low in 1/1; Dete	ction bias high in 1/1; Confoundi	ng unclear in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA	Only one study available	e				
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are direct, popu	lation and outcomes	broadly generalizable			
Precision:	-1	Important imprecision:	high total number of	patients and events but only	one study available		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely					
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of e	effect				
Dose-response:	0	NA					
Plausible confounding	<b>ig:</b> 0	No plausible confoundir	ng				
Quality of evidence:		$\oplus \ominus \ominus \ominus$ VERY LOW					
Conclusion:		Increased risk of fractur	es in female CAYA car	ncer survivors with a SNP on	rs1406815, especially in those tre	eated with (cranial) radiotherapy.	
		(1 study significant effect	ct; 3,870 participants)				

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

### 1r. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with corticosteroids as anti-cancer treatment?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.r. Risk low BMD	Bloomhardt 2020	542 CCS	Mean time	Chemotherapy:	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 17.2%	Multivariable model:	SB: high risk
for			since treatment	Dexamethasone 59.6%	LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 3.5%	LS BMD Z-score <-1:	AB: low risk
corticosteroids			(±SD) 6.0±5.0	Prednisone 35.4%		dexamethasone (y/n) OR 1.4,	DB: low risk
			years (range	Any glucocorticoid 95%		95%CI 0.8-2.5, p=0.22	CF: high risk
(n=5 studies)			2.0-35.1)	Cyclophosphamide 85.1%			

			High-dose methotrexate 25.8% <u>Radiotherapy:</u> CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% <u>SCT</u> : NR			
Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z- score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: prednisone (yes vs. no) OR 1.5, 95%CI 0.8— 2.6; dexamethasone (yes vs. no) OR 1.5, 95%CI 0.8—2.9 TB BMD Z-score <-1: prednisone (yes vs. no) OR=1.8, 95%CI 1.0— 3.1, p<0.05; dexamethasone (yes vs. no) OR=1.1, 95%CI 0.6—1.9	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
Polgreen 2012	319 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SE) 10.1 ± 0.2 years (range 4.3-17.8)	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid: 42.0% Radiotherapy: 23.2% Cranial (CNS) 9.7%, other 13.5% SCT: 0%	TB BMD Z-score <-1: 11% LS BMD Z-score <-1: 23% TB BMD Z-score <-2: 2.3% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: TB BMD Z-score <-1: steroid exposure (yes vs. no) NS LS BMD Z-score <-1: steroid exposure (yes vs. no), OR 1.9, 95%CI 1.0-3.5, p=0.042	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
Siegel 2017	475 CCS	Mean (±SD) time after Rx 5.4 ± 4.3 years	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid 83.4% Methotrexate 77.1% Radiotherapy: Cranial / craniospinal 13.3% TBI 9.9% SCT: 17.9%	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–1: 29.3% (LS 22.8%, TB 21.9%) TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: 8.2% (LS 7.4%, TB 4.0%)	Multivariable model: TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: steroid exposure, OR 2.7, 95% CI, 0.8-8.6	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risl
van Atteveld 2019	2032 adult CCS	Median time since cancer dx: 21.6 yrs (range 10.4-40.6)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agent 56.6% MTX 53.9% GCs 53.9% Radiotherapy: Cranial 33.9% Abdominal 21.7% SCT: NR	LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤- 1: 51.5% (LS 25.1%, TB 48.0%) LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤- 2: 20.2%	Multivariable model: LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: GCs (yes vs. no) NS LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: GCs (yes vs. no) NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk

#### GRADE assessment (outcome low and very low BMD):

**Study design:** +4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

Study limitations: 0 No important limitations: Selection bias low in 3/5, high in 2/5; Attrition bias low in 5/5; Detection bias low in 5/5; Confounding low in 3/5, high in 2/5

Consistency: -1 Some inconsistency, only two studies showed a significant effect of corticosteroids and the other 3 showed no significant effect

Directness:0Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizablePrecision:0No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

**Effect size:** 0 No large magnitude of effect

<u>Dose-response:</u> 0 Unclear if there is a dose response in both studies that showed a significant effect

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2) after corticosteroids in CAYA cancer survivors.

(2 studies significant effect, 3 studies no significant effect; 3,714 participants)

**GRADE** assessment (outcome very low BMD):

**Study design:** +4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

Study limitations: -1 Some limitations: Selection bias low in 2/2; Attrition bias low in 2/2; Detection bias low in 2/2; Confounding low in 1/2, high in 1/2

**Consistency:** 0 No important inconsistency, both studies showed no significant effect of corticosteroids

Directness:0Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizablePrecision:0No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

**Effect size:** 0 No large magnitude of effect

<u>Dose-response:</u> 0 Unclear if there is a dose response in both studies that showed a significant effect

**Conclusion:** No significant effect of corticosteroids on very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) in CAYA cancer survivors.

(2 studies no significant effect; 2,507 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

### 1s. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with corticosteroids as anti-cancer treatment?

PICO	Study		No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias		
1.s. Risk lower BMD for corticosteroids (n=3 studies)	Den Hoe	d 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z- score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): prednisone (yes vs. no) NS; dexamethasone (yes vs. no) NS TB BMD Z-score (cont.): prednisone (yes vs. no) $\beta$ =-0.25; se=0.12; p=0.03; dexamethasone (yes vs. no) NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk		
	Isaksson 2020 125		125 CCS	Mean (SD) follow-up 24.3 years (7.1)	Chemotherapy: GCs 19 (15%) Alkylating agents 16 (13%) Median cyclophosphamide equivalent dose 4854 mg/m² MTX 17 (14%) Median methotrexate dose 11 g/m² Radiotherapy: CRT 26% SCT: 2%	Survivors: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 21% Controls: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 28% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22%	Multivariable model: LS BMD (cont.): difference GCs (yes vs. controls) 0.036 95%CI -0.034 to 0.105, p=0.31 TH BMD (cont.): difference GCs (yes vs. controls) 0.050, 95%CI - 0.025 to 0.125, p=0.19	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk		
	Le Meignen 2011 159 ALL and AML survivors		Mean time from diagnosis to DXA 14.66 ± 0.44 yrs	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 86.2% Other chemotherapy NR Radiotherapy: CRT 18.9% TBI 40.4% of HSCT recipients SCT: 34%	BMD Z-score <-2: FN 3.2%; LS 3.8%	Multivariable model: BMD Z-scores (cont.): GCs treatment (yes vs. no) FN: β 0.14, P=0.35; LS: β 0.19, p=0.23	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: high risk CF: high risk			
GRADE assessment:						·				
Study design:			onal cohort stu							
Study limitations:		high in 2/3								
Consistency:						id treatment and two studies sho	ow no significant effect			
Directness:					broadly generalizable					
Precision: Publication bias:		Unlikely	ant imprecision	, mgn total number	of patients and events					
Effect size:		,	agnitude of eff	ect						
Dose-response:		_	_		dy that showed a significant effo	ect				

<u>Plausible confounding:</u> 0 No plausible confounding

Quality of evidence:  $\bigoplus \ominus \ominus \ominus \lor \mathsf{VERY} \mathsf{LOW}$ 

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of lower BMD after corticosteroids in CAYA cancer survivors.

(1 study significant effect, 2 studies no significant effect; 630 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

#### 1t. What is the risk of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors treated with corticosteroids as anti-cancer treatment?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.t. Risk fracture for corticosteroids (n=2 studies)	Im 2021a 2453 (discovery 1417 (replication CCS		At least 5 years Discovery: Approximately 37 years Replication: Approximately 25 years	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 47.2% discovery, 48.3% replication IV MTX 18.5% discovery, 29.2% replication IT MTX 38.4% discovery, 38.3% replication Radiotherapy: CRT 45.9% discovery, 38.5% replication SCT: 0% (exclusion criterion)	Fracture frequency (any type post diagnosis) Discovery: 37.9% Replication: 46.0%	Multivariable model (discovery cohort): Fracture: corticosteroids (any vs. none) HR 1.13, 95%CI 0.96-1.32, p=0.14	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: unclear
	Wilson 20	12 <sup>a</sup> 7414 CCS	Median length of follow-up was 22.7 years (range, 15.6-34.2 years)	Chemotherapy: Methotrexate 43.6% Steroids 47% Radiotherapy: CRT 32% Pelvic RT 13% SCT: 0%	Proportion of participants with fractures <u>over their</u> <u>lifetime</u> Survivors: 34.8% Siblings: 38.9%	Multivariable model: Fracture: Males: glucocorticoid (yes vs. no) prevalence ratio (PR), 1.07, 95%CI 0.96-1.19, p=0.19. Females: NR (p>0.2 in univariable analysis)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: high risk
GRADE assessment:					-		-
Study design:	+4	Retrospective cohort st	•				
Study limitations:					ection bias high in 2/2; Confound	ing unclear in 1/2, high in 1/1	
Consistency:	0	•	* *	owed no significant effect of	corticosteroias		
<u>Directness:</u> Precision:	0 0	Results are direct, popu No important imprecisi					
Publication bias:		Unlikely	on, mgn total number	or patients and events			
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of	effect				
Dose-response:		NA					
Plausible confoundi	ing: 0	No plausible confoundi	ng				
Quality of evidence:	:	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW					
Conclusion:		No significant effect of (2 studies no significant		e risk of fractures in CAYA car pants)	ncer survivors.		

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMl=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.



# 1u. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with higher vs. lower doses corticosteroids?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.u. Risk low BMD for corticosteroid dose (n=3 studies)	Choi 2013	78 ALL, AML and CML survivors	Mean time from cancer dx: 4.42±2.47 in males, 5.36±3.2 years in females	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids for chemotherapy 42% Glucocorticoids for GVHD 53% Radiotherapy: 62%	LS BMD Z-score <-2: 25.7% FN BMD Z-score <-2: 24.4%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-2: Longer duration of glucocorticoids for GvHD: OR 1.124, 95%CI 1.052 to 1.2, p=0.001	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Gurney 2014	845 adult ALL survivors	>10 years after diagnosis	SCT: 64%  Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide % NR Radiotherapy: CRT: 61.3% CRT + spinalRT or TBI 12.5% SCT: 2.5%	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 5.7% QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 29.5%	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: cumulative prednisone equivalents OR 1.00, 95%CI 0.96— 1.04, p=0.95	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Mandel 2004	106 ALL survivors	Average time since diagnosis 10.1 years (range 5.5 to 15.4 years)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy: 47% SCT: 0%	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 23% FN BMD less than 89% of the healthy average: 20%	Multivariable model: FN BMD < 89% of the healthy average: GCs dose OR 2.81, p = 0.049	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: high risk
GRADE assessment Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundi Quality of evidence	+4 Cross-se -2 Some lir 0 No impo 0 Results a 0 No impo 0 Unlikely 0 No large +1 Dose res	ctional cohort stu nitations: Selection ortant inconsisten are direct, popula ortant imprecision magnitude of eff	on bias unclear in 2/ cy, 2 studies show a tion and outcomes n, high total number fect ip as higher doses a	a significant effect of higher vs. broadly generalizable of patients and events		3, high in 1/3; Confounding low in 1/3 1 study shows no significant effect s	, high in 2/3
Conclusion:	Increase			) after higher versus lower dose cant effect; 1,029 participants)	es corticosteroids in CAYA cancei	r survivors.	
GRADE assessment Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias:	+4 Cross-se -1 Some lir NA Only one 0 Results a	ctional cohort stu nitations: Selectic e study available are direct, popula nt imprecision, lo	on bias unclear in 1/	1; Attrition bias low in 1/1; Det broadly generalizable patients and events and only on	ection bias low in 1/1; Confound e study available	ing low in 1/1	

<u>Dose-response:</u> 0 Dose response relationship as higher doses are associated with an increased risk as compared to lower doses, but only assessed in one study

<u>Plausible confounding:</u> 0 No plausible confounding

Quality of evidence:  $\bigoplus \ominus \ominus \ominus \cup \bigvee$  VERY LOW

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) after higher versus lower doses corticosteroids in CAYA cancer survivors.

(1 study significant effect; 78 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# 1v. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with higher vs. lower doses corticosteroids?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.v. Risk lower BMD for corticosteroid dose (n=5 studies)	Alikasifoglu 2005 <sup>a</sup>	59 ALL survivors	Mean 3.40 (1.77) years after cessation of therapy	Chemotherapy: Conventional dose prednisolone 51% Megadose methylprednisolone 49% Cyclophosphamide 100% HD-MTX 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 76% SCT: 0%	Mean (SD) LS BMD Z-score Total cohort: -1.73 (0.84)	LS BMD Z-score: Group 1 (conventional dose prednisolone) vs. Group 2 (megadose methylprednisolone): -1.75 (0.83) vs1.66 (1.21), P = 0.736.	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Benmiloud 2010	89 ALL and NHL survivors	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 15.0 ± 4.5 years	Chemotherapy: Prednisolone 100% Dexamethasone 52.8% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy RT at any site: 53.9% CNS RT 36% CRT 32.6% CSRT 3.4% TBI 18.0% SCT 18.0%	BMD Z-score ≤-1.0: At any site: 59.1%; At the LS: 50.5% At the FN: 25.8%; At the Hip: 31.5% BMD Z-score ≤-2: At any site: 10.1%; At the LS: 10.1% At the FN: 2.2%; At the Hip: 2.2%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): NS FN and Hip BMD Z-score (cont.): additional cumulative DEXA dose p=0.014, β not reported (negative effect)	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	De Matteo 2019	72 ALL survivors	Mean (±SD) time since treatment 41.2 ±37.8 months (95% CI: 49.9, 32.5)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 100% Dexamethasone 100% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: 4% SCT: 0%	Proximal phalanx (QUS) Ad- SoS Z-score below –2 SD: 13.8%	Multivariable model: Ad-SoS Z-score (cont.): cumulative dose of steroids NS	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: low risk
	Jones 2008 <sup>a</sup>	309 ALL survivors	At least 4 years of continuous remission	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Prednisone 100% Radiotherapy: NR SCT: NR	Mean QCT LS BMD Z-score (SD): -0.47 (1.26)	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score (cont.): Protocol group (high antimetabolite + high GCs [mean Z-score -0.95] vs. low antimetabolite + high GCs [mean Z-score -0.49] vs. high antimetabolite + low GCs [mean Z-score -0.06]), p<0.001	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Kaste 2014 <sup>a</sup>	424 ALL survivors	Median 8.4 yrs (4.6-19.1) from completion of	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide 100%	QCT LS BMD Z-score <-1: 48.9% QCT LS BMD Z-score <-2: 6.8%	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score (cont.): GCs dose (mg/m2): <5,000 vs. ≥5,000 β 0.72 (0.29, 1.14) P=0.001	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk

		ALL therapy to Radiotherapy: CRT 36.1%
		entry into study <u>SCT</u> : NR
GRADE assessment:		
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectional cohort studies
Study limitations:	-2	Some limitations: Selection bias low in 1/5, unclear in 1/5, high in 3/5; Attrition bias low in 2/5, high in 3/5; Detection bias low in 4/5, unclear in 1/5; Confounding
		low in 5/5
Consistency:	0	No important inconsistency, three studies show a significant effect of higher vs. lower doses corticosteroids and two studies show no significant effect
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable
Precision:	0	No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect
Dose-response:	+1	Dose response relationship as higher doses are associated with an increased risk as compared to lower doses
Plausible confounding	<u>:</u> 0	No plausible confounding
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE
Conclusion:		Increased risk of lower BMD after higher versus lower doses corticosteroids in CAYA cancer survivors.
		(3 studies significant effect, 2 studies no significant effect; 953 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

### 1w.What is the risk of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors treated with higher vs. lower doses corticosteroids?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
	Fiscalett		Median 15.1	Chemotherapy:	Frequency of fractures:	Multivariable model:	SB: low risk
for corticosteroid dose		survivors	years (range 5.4 to 28.2 years)	Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100%	Vertebral fractures: 23% Non-vertebral fractures: 31%	Vertebral fractures: prednisone equivalent dose (per 1000 mg/m2):	AB: low risk DB: low risk
			since cancer	Radiotherapy: CRT 59%	11011 101100141 1140041 001 017	RR 1.05, 95%CI 1.00-1.10, p=0.03	CF: low risk
(n=1 study)			diagnosis	SCT: None			
GRADE assessment:							
Study design:	+4	Retrospective cohort st	udy				
Study limitations:	0	No important limitation	s: Selection bias low i	n 1/1; Attrition bias low in 1/	1; Detection bias low in 1/1; Conf	founding low in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA	Only one study available	9				
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are direct, popu	lation and outcomes	broadly generalizable			
Precision:	-2	Important imprecision:	low total number of p	patients and events and only of	one study available		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely					
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of e	effect				
Dose-response:	0	NA					
Plausible confoundin	ng: 0	No plausible confoundir	ng				
Quality of evidence:		$\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus$ LOW					
Conclusion:		Increased risk of verteb	ral fractures after hig	her versus lower doses cortic	osteroids in CAYA cancer survivor	·S.	
		(1 study significant effe	ct; 251 participants)				

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

### 1x. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with dexamethasone vs. prednisone?

PICO	Study		o. of articipants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.x. Risk lower BMD for dexa vs.	Van Bee		O ALL urvivors	Mean 12.7 yrs after dx (2.0-	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> Prednisone 52.2%	NR	Multivariable model: LS, TB BM(A)D Z-score (cont.):	SB: unclear AB: low risk
pred				29.7)	Dexamethasone 47.8%		dexa vs. pred NS	DB: low risk
(n=1 study)					MTX 71.1% Radiotherapy: CRT 21.1% SCT: 0%			CF: low risk
GRADE assessment:		•			<u> </u>			
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectiona	al cohort stud	ly				
Study limitations:	-1	Some limitatio	ons: Selection	bias unclear in 1/1	; Attrition bias low in 1/1; Dete	ection bias low in 1/1; Confoundi	ng low in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA	Only one study	y available					
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are dire	rect, populati	on and outcomes b	roadly generalizable			
Precision:	-2	Important imp	orecision, low	total number of pa	atients, number of events NR a	nd only one study available		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely						
Effect size:	0	No large magn	nitude of effe	ct				
Dose-response:	0	NA						
Plausible confoundi	<b>ing:</b> 0	No plausible co	onfounding					
Quality of evidence	:	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VER'						
Conclusion:		No significant of	effect of trea	atment with dexam	ethasone versus prednisone or	n lower BMD in CAYA cancer surv	ivors.	
		(1 study no sig	gnificant effe	ct; 90 participants)				

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

### 1y. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with methotrexate?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
L.y. Risk low BMD for methotrexate n=4 studies)	Bloomhardt 2020	542 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 17.2% LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: high-dose methotrexate (y/n) OR 0.9, 95%CI 0.5-1.6, p=0.79	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: methotrexate (yes vs. no) OR 1.3, 95%CI 0.7–2.4 TB BMD Z-score <-1 methotrexate (yes vs. no) OR 1.4, 95%CI 0.8–2.5	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Siegel 2017	475 CCS	Mean (±SD) time after Rx 5.4 ± 4.3 years	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid 83.4% Methotrexate 77.1% Radiotherapy: Cranial / craniospinal 13.3% TBI 9.9% SCT: 17.9%	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-1: 29.3% (LS 22.8%, TB 21.9%) TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-2: 8.2% (LS 7.4%, TB 4.0%)	Multivariable model: TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: MTX (yes vs. no) NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	van Atteveld 2019	2032 adult CCS	Median time since cancer dx: 21.6 yrs (range 10.4-40.6)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agent 56.6% MTX 53.9% GCs 53.9% Radiotherapy: Cranial 33.9% Abdominal 21.7% SCT: NR	LS and/or TB BMD Z- score ≤-1: 51.5% (LS 25.1%, TB 48.0%) LS and/or TB BMD Z- score ≤-2: 20.2%	Multivariable model: LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: MTX (yes vs. no) NS LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: MTX (yes vs. no) NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk

Consistency:	0	No important inconsistency, all studies show no significant effect of MTX treatment
Directness:	0	Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable
Precision:	0	No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect
Dose-response:	0	No dose response relationship of higher doses MTX and low BMD
Plausible confounding:	0	No plausible confounding
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE
Conclusion:		No significant effect of methotrexate on low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2) in CAYA cancer survivors.
		(4 studies no significant effect; 3,395 participants)
GRADE assessment:		
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectional cohort studies
Study limitations:	-1	Some limitations: Selection bias low in 2/2; Attrition bias low in 2/2; Detection bias low in 2/2; Confounding low in 1/2, high in 1/2
Consistency:	0	No important inconsistency, all studies show no significant effect of MTX treatment
Directness:	0	Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable
Precision:	0	No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect
Dose-response:	0	No dose response relationship of higher doses MTX and low BMD
Plausible confounding:	0	No plausible confounding
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE
Conclusion:		No significant effect of methotrexate on very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) in CAYA cancer survivors.
		(2 studies no significant effect; 2,507 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

### 1z. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with methotrexate?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.z. Risk lower BMD for methotrexate (n=2 studies)	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): methotrexate (yes vs. no) NS TB BMD Z-score (cont.): methotrexate (yes vs. no) NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Isaksson 2020	125 CCS	Mean (SD) follow-up 24.3 years (7.1)	SCT: 4.9%  Chemotherapy: GCs 19 (15%) Alkylating agents 16 (13%) Median cyclophosphamide equivalent dose 4854 mg/m² MTX 17 (14%) Median methotrexate dose 11 g/m² Radiotherapy: CRT 26% SCT: 2%	Survivors: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 21% Controls: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 28% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22%	Multivariable model: LS BMD (cont.): difference MTX (yes vs. controls) 0.047, 95%CI -0.025 to 0.119, p=0.20 TH BMD (cont.): difference MTX (yes vs. controls) 0.033, 95%CI -0.044 to 0.110, p=0.40	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundi Quality of evidence: Conclusion:	+4 Cross2 Some 0 No im 0 Result 0 No im 0 Unlike 0 No lar 0 No do ng: 0 No pla :	portant inconsistency ts are direct, population portant imprecision, lely tge magnitude of effects ausible confounding COUNTY LOW	bias high in 2/2; At y, both studies show on and outcomes bi high total number o ct hip of higher doses hotrexate on lower	of patients and events  MTX and low BMD  BMD in CAYA cancer survivors.		ng low in 1/2, high in 1/2	

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray

absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

#### 1aa. What is the risk of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors treated with methotrexate?

PICO	Study		No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.aa. Risk fracture for methotrexate (n=2 studies)	Fiscalett	i 2021	251 ALL survivors	Median 15.1 years (range 5.4 to 28.2 years) since cancer diagnosis	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 59% SCT: None	Frequency of fractures: Vertebral fractures: 23% Non-vertebral fractures: 31%	Multivariable model: Vertebral fractures: MTX NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Wilson 2	2012	7414 CCS	Median length of follow-up was 22.7 years (range, 15.6- 34.2 years)	Chemotherapy: Methotrexate 43.6% Steroids 47% Radiotherapy: CRT 32% Pelvic RT 13% SCT: 0%	Proportion of participants with fractures <u>over their lifetime</u> Survivors: 34.8% Siblings: 38.9%	Multivariable model: Fracture: female survivors treated with MTX vs. no MTX, prevalence ratio, 1.15; 95% Cl, 1.03-1.27; P=0.001 Male survivors treated with MTX vs. no MTX, prevalence ratio, 1.07; 95% Cl, 0.96-1.18; P=0.22	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: high risk
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundi	+4 -2 -1 0 0 0 0 0	Some limit Important Results are No import Unlikely No large m Dose response plausib	inconsistency: on e direct, population ant imprecision, has nagnitude of effect onse relationship le confounding VERY LOW	bias low in 1/2, high e study shows a sig n and outcomes bro igh total number of t of higher MTX dose	nificant effect of MTX treatmen badly generalizable patients and events s and fracture not assessed		high in 1/2; Confounding low in 1/2, higi rvivors) and one no significant effect	h in 1/2
Conclusion:		Increased	risk of fracture aft		female CAYA cancer survivors. effect; 7,665 participants)			

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

### 1bb. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with higher vs. lower doses methotrexate?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.bb. Risk low BMD for methotrexate dose (n=1 study)	Gurney 2014	845 adult ALL survivors	>10 years after diagnosis	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide % NR Radiotherapy: CRT: 61.3% CRT + spinal RT or TBI 12.5% SCT: 2.5%	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 29.5% QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 5.7%	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: cumulative MTX dose per 1,000 mg/m² units OR 1.00, 95%CI 0.97–1.02, p=0.97	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
GRADE assessment Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confound	+4 Cross -1 Some NA Only 0 Resul -1 Impo 0 Unlik 0 No la 0 No do ing: 0 No pl	one study available ts are direct, populati tant imprecision, higl ely ge magnitude of effe use response relations ausible confounding	bias unclear in 1/1; on and outcomes br n total number of pa	atients and events but only one		nding high in 1/2	
Quality of evidence Conclusion:	No si	→ LOW pnificant effect of high dy no significant effec		ses methotrexate on low BMD (Z	Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2) in CAYA c	ancer survivors.	

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

### 1cc. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with higher vs. lower doses methotrexate?

PICO	Study		No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.cc. Risk lower BMD for methotrexate dose	De Mati	eo 2019	72 ALL survivors	Mean (±SD) time since treatment 41.2 ±37.8 months (95% CI: 49.9,	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 100% Dexamethasone 100% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100%	Proximal phalanx (QUS) Ad-SoS Z-score below –2 SD: 10/72 (13.8%)	Multivariable model: Ad-SoS Z-score (cont.): cumulative dose of MTX NS	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: low risk
(n=1 study)				32.5)	Radiotherapy: 3 (4%) SCT: 0%			
GRADE assessment:								
Study design:	+4	Cross-sect	ional cohort studi	es				
Study limitations:	-1	Some limit	tations: Selection	bias unclear in 1/1;	Attrition bias low in 1/1; Detect	tion bias unclear in 1/1; Con	founding low in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA	Only one s	tudy available					
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are	e direct, population	n and outcomes bro	oadly generalizable			
Precision:	-2	Important	imprecision, low	total number of pat	ients and events and only one s	study available		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely						
Effect size:	0		nagnitude of effec					
Dose-response:	0	No dose re	esponse relationsh	nip of higher doses I	MTX and lower BMD			
Plausible confoundi	<b>ng:</b> 0	No plausib	le confounding					
Quality of evidence:	:	0000	VERY LOW					
Conclusion:		No signific	ant effect of high	er versus lower dose	es methotrexate on lower BMD	in CAYA cancer survivors.		
		(1 study no	o significant effect	t; 72 participants)				

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

### 1dd. What is the risk of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors treated with higher vs. lower doses methotrexate?

PICO S	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.dd. Risk fracture for methotrexate dose (n=1 study)	m 2021	2453 (discovery) 1417 (replication) CCS	At least 5 years Discovery: Approximately 37 years Replication: Approximately 25 years	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 47.2% discovery, 48.3% replication IV MTX 18.5% discovery, 29.2% replication IT MTX 38.4% discovery, 38.3% replication Radiotherapy: CRT 45.9% discovery, 38.5% replication SCT: 0% (exclusion criterion)	Fracture frequency (any type post diagnosis) Discovery: 37.9% Replication: 46.0%	Multivariable (sex-combined) model (discovery cohort): Fracture: IV methotrexate dose (100 g/m2): HR 1.20, 95%CI 1.00- 1.45, p=0.05 IT methotrexate dose (100 mg/m2): HR=1.07, 95%CI 0.99-1.15, p=0.08  Females: IV methotrexate dose (100 g/m2): HR=1.02, 95%CI 0.76-1.37, p=0.90 IT methotrexate dose (100 mg/m2): HR=0.99, 95%CI 0.88-1.12, p=0.89  Males: IV methotrexate dose (100 g/m2): HR=1.46, 95%CI 1.15-1.85, p=1.8x10-3 IT methotrexate dose (100 mg/m2): HR=1.11, 95%CI 1.02-1.22, p=0.02	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: unclear
GRADE assessment: Study design:	+4	Retrospective cohort st	udv			· '	
Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response:	-2 NA 0 -1 0 0	Only one study available Results are direct, popul	e llation and outcomes high total number of		ection bias high in 1/1; Confoundi one study available	ng unclear in 1/1	
Plausible confounding Quality of evidence: Conclusion:	<u>:</u> 0	No plausible confoundin  ⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW  Increased risk of fractur (1 study significant effe	e after higher versus		male CAYA cancer survivors.		

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray

absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

## 1ee. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with ifosfamide?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.ee. Risk low BMD for ifosfamide (n=2 studies)	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z- score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z- score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: ifosfamide (yes vs. no) OR 1.1, 95%CI 0.5–2.4 TB BMD Z-score <-1 ifosfamide (yes vs. no) OR 0.8, 95%CI 0.3–1.9	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	van Atteveld 2019 2032 adu CCS		Median time since cancer dx: 21.6 yrs (range 10.4-40.6)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agent 56.6% MTX 53.9% GCs 53.9% Radiotherapy: Cranial 33.9% Abdominal 21.7% SCT: NR	LS and/or TB BMD Z- score ≤-1: 51.5% (LS 25.1%, TB 48.0%) LS and/or TB BMD Z- score ≤-2: 20.2%	Multivariable model: LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: alkylating agent (ifosfamide/cyclophosphamide, yes vs. no) NS LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: alkylating agent (ifosfamide/cyclophosphamide, yes vs. no) NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
GRADE assessment Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding:	+4 Cross-se -1 Some lir 0 No impo 0 Results 0 No impo 0 Unlikely 0 No large 0 Dose res	ortant inconsisten are direct, popula ortant imprecision e magnitude of eff	on bias low in 1/2, high cy, both studies show in tion and outcomes broat, high total number of fect ip of higher ifosfamide		ide treatment	; Confounding low in 2/2	
Quality of evidence Conclusion:	No signi		osfamide on low BMD ( ffect; 2,378 participant	Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2) in CAYA car :s)	ncer survivors.		
GRADE assessment Study design: Study limitations: Consistency:	+4 Cross-se 0 No limit	ectional cohort stu ations: Selection e study available		n bias low in 1/1; Detection bia	as low in 1/1; Confounding	low in 1/1	

<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable
Precision:	-1	Important imprecision, high total number of patients and events, but only one study available
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect
Dose-response:	0	Dose response relationship of higher ifosfamide doses and low BMD not assessed
<u>Plausible</u>	0	No plausible confounding
confounding:		
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE
Conclusion:		No significant effect of ifosfamide on very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) in CAYA cancer survivors.
		(1 study no significant effect; 2,032 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

#### 1ff.What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with ifosfamide?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.ff. Risk lower BMD for ifosfamide (n=1 study)	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z- score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z- score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): ifosfamide (yes vs. no) NS TB BMD Z-score (cont.): ifosfamide (yes vs. no) NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
GRADE assessment:			•	<u>SCT</u> : 4.9%		•	
Study design:		-sectional cohort stu	ıdv				
Study limitations:			•	rition bias low in 1/1; Detection	n bias low in 1/1; Confound	ing low in 1/1	
Consistency:		one study available	0 , ,	, ,	• •	· ·	
Directness:	0 Result	ts are direct, popula	tion and outcomes bro	oadly generalizable			
Precision:				ients and events but only one	study available		
Publication bias:	0 Unlike	ely					
Effect size:	0 No lai	rge magnitude of ef	fect				
Dose-response:	0 Dose	response relationsh	ip of higher ifosfamide	doses and low BMD not assess	sed		
<u>Plausible</u>		ausible confounding	-				
confounding:							
Quality of evidence:	:	∋⊖ LOW					
Conclusion:	No sig	gnificant effect of ifo	osfamide on lower BMD	o in CAYA cancer survivors.			
	(1 stu	dy no significant eff	ect; 346 participants)				

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# 1gg.What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with cyclophosphamide?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.gg. Risk low BMD for cyclophosphamide (n=3 studies)	Bloomhardt 2020	542 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 17.2% LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: cyclophosphamide equivalent dose, 0: Reference 1-8000: OR 0.8, 95%CI 0.4-1.6, >8000: OR 1.1, 95%CI 0.4-2.9, p=0.67	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z- score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z- score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: cyclophosphamide (yes vs. no) OR 1.7 95%CI 0.9–2.9 TB BMD Z-score <-1 cyclophosphamide (yes vs. no) OR 1.5, 95%CI 0.9–2.6	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	van Atteveld 2019	2032 adult CCS	Median time since cancer dx: 21.6 yrs (range 10.4-40.6)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agent 56.6% MTX 53.9% GCs 53.9% Radiotherapy: Cranial 33.9% Abdominal 21.7% SCT: NR	LS and/or TB BMD Z- score ≤-1: 51.5% (LS 25.1%, TB 48.0%) LS and/or TB BMD Z- score ≤-2: 20.2%	Multivariable model: LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: alkylating agent (ifosfamide/cyclophosphamide, yes vs. no) NS LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: alkylating agent (ifosfamide/cyclophosphamide, yes vs. no) NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response:	+4 Cross-se -1 Some lin 0 No impo 0 Results a 0 No impo 0 Unlikely 0 No large	rtant inconsisten are direct, popula rtant imprecision magnitude of eff	n bias low in 1/3, high cy, all studies show no tion and outcomes bro, high total number of	significant effect of cyclophos adly generalizable	phamide treatment	3; Confounding low in 2/3, high in 1/3	

Plausible confounding:	0	No plausible confounding
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE
Conclusion:		No significant effect of cyclophosphamide on low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2) in CAYA cancer survivors.
		(3 studies no significant effect; 2,920 participants)
GRADE assessment:		
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectional cohort studies
Study limitations:	0	No limitations: Selection bias low in 1/1; Attrition bias low in 1/1; Detection bias low in 1/1; Confounding low in 1/1
Consistency:	NA	Only one study available
Directness:	0	Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable
Precision:	-1	Important imprecision, high total number of patients and events, but only one study available
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect
Dose-response:	0	No dose response relationship of higher cyclophosphamide doses and low BMD
Plausible confounding:	0	No plausible confounding
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE
Conclusion:		No significant effect of cyclophosphamide on very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) in CAYA cancer survivors.
		(1 study no significant effect; 2,032 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

## 1hh. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with cyclophosphamide?

PICO	Study		No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.hh. Risk lower BMD for cyclophosphamide (n=1 study)	Den Hoe	ed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): cyclophosphamide (yes vs. no) NS TB BMD Z-score (cont.): cyclophosphamide (yes vs. no) NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
GRADE assessment:								
Study design:	+4	Cross-se	ctional cohort s	study				
Study limitations:	-1	Some lin	nitations: Select	tion bias high in 1/1; At	trition bias low in 1/1; Detection	n bias low in 1/1; Confoundir	ng low in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA	Only one	study available	e				
Directness:	0	Results a	are direct, popu	lation and outcomes b	roadly generalizable			
Precision:	-1	Importar	nt imprecision,	high total number of p	atients and events but only one	study available		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely						
Effect size:	0	No large	magnitude of e	effect				
Dose-response:	0	No dose	response relati	onship of higher cyclop	phosphamide doses and low BM	D		
Plausible confoundir	<b>ng:</b> 0	No plaus	ible confoundir	ng				
Quality of evidence: Conclusion:		_	ficant effect of o	cyclophosphamide on l ffect; 346 participants)	ower BMD in CAYA cancer surviv	vors.		

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

## 1ii. What is the risk of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors treated with alkylating agents?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.ii. Risk fracture	Wilson	2012 7414 CCS	Median length of	Chemotherapy:	Proportion of participants	Multivariable model:	SB: high risk
for alkylating			follow-up was	Methotrexate 43.6%	with fractures over their	Fracture: Males: alkylating agent	AB: low risk
agents			22.7 years (range,	Steroids 47%	<u>lifetime</u>	(yes vs. no) prevalence ratio (PR),	DB: high risk
			15.6-34.2 years)	Radiotherapy: CRT 32%	Survivors: 34.8%	1.08, 95%CI 0.99-1.17, p=0.10.	CF: high risk
(n=1 study)				Pelvic RT 13%	Siblings: 38.9%	<u>Females</u> : NR (p>0.2 in univariable	
				<u>SCT</u> : 0%		analysis)	
GRADE assessment:							
Study design:	+4	Retrospective cohort st	udy				
Study limitations:	-3	Important limitations: S	Selection bias high in	1/1; Attrition bias low in 1/1	; Detection bias high in 1/1; Con	founding high in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA	Only one study availabl	е				
Directness:	0	Results are direct, popu	ulation and outcomes	broadly generalizable			
Precision:	-1	Important imprecision:	high total number of	patients and events but only	y one study available		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely					
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of	effect				
Dose-response:	0	NA					
Plausible confoundir	<b>ng:</b> 0	No plausible confoundi	ng				
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW					
Conclusion:		No significant effect of	alkylating agents on t	he risk of fractures in CAYA	cancer survivors.		
		(1 study no significant e					

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

1jj. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with higher vs. lower doses cyclophosphamide?

PICO	Study	No. of participant	Follow up s (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.jj. Risk lower BMD for cyclophosphamide dose (n=2 studies)	Bloomhard 2020	t 542 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 17.2% LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: cyclophosphamide equivalent dose, 0: Reference 1-8000: OR 0.8, 95%CI 0.4-1.6, >8000: OR 1.1, 95%CI 0.4-2.9, p=0.67	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	De Matteo	2019 72 ALL survivors	Mean (±SD) time since treatment 41.2 ±37.8 months (95% CI: 49.9, 32.5)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 100% Dexamethasone 100% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: 3 (4%) SCT: 0%	Proximal phalanx (QUS) Ad-SoS Z-score below –2 SD: 10/72 (13.8%)	Multivariable model: Ad-SoS Z-score (cont.): cumulative dose of cyclophosphamide NS	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: low risk
GRADE assessment:	ı			<del></del>			
Study design:	+4 R	etrospective cohort s	tudies				
Study limitations:		•		gh in 1/2: Attrition hias low i	n 2/2: Detection bias low in	1/2, unclear in 1/2; Confounding low in	1/2, high in 1/2
Consistency:				no significant effect of cycloph		-, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -, -	-, -,
Directness:		•	ulation and outcomes bro		,		
Precision:			ion, high total number of				
Publication bias:		nlikely	'				
Effect size:	0 N	o large magnitude of	effect				
Dose-response:				osphamide doses and lower B	MD		
Plausible confoundir		o plausible confound					
Quality of evidence:		D⊕⊖⊖ LOW					
Conclusion:	N	o significant effect of	higher versus lower dosest effect; 614 participants)	s cyclophosphamide on lower	BMD in CAYA cancer survive	ors.	

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

1kk. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with higher vs. lower doses 6-mercaptopurine?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.kk. Risk lower BMD for 6-MP dose (n=1 study)	De Matteo 201	9 72 ALL survivors	Mean (±SD) time since treatment 41.2 ±37.8 months (95% CI: 49.9, 32.5)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 100% Dexamethasone 100% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: 3 (4%)	Proximal phalanx (QUS) Ad-SoS Z-score below -2 SD: 10/72 (13.8%)	Multivariable model: Ad-SoS Z-score (cont.): cumulative dose of 6-MP NS	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: low risk
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding	+4 Cross-sectional cohort study -1 Some limitations: Selection bias unclear in 1/1; Attrition bias low in 1/1; Detection bias unclear in 1/1; Confounding low in 1/1 NA Only one study available 0 Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable -2 Important imprecision, low total number of patients and only one study available 0 Unlikely 0 No large magnitude of effect 0 No dose response relationship of higher 6-MP doses and lower BMD						
Quality of evidence: Conclusion:	No sig	→ VERY LOW  nificant effect of hig  dy no significant effe		6-mercaptopurine on lower	BMD in CAYA cancer surviv	/ors.	

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMl=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# 1ll. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with cranial or craniospinal irradiation?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.II. Risk low BMD for CRT/CSRT  (n=8 studies)	Bloomhardt 2020	542 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 17.2% LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: cranial radiation (y/n) OR 1.1, 95%CI 0.6-1.9, p=0.86	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: Cranial/cranial-spinal (yes vs. no) NA TB BMD Z-score <-1: Cranial/cranial-spinal (yes vs. no) OR 2.5, 95%CI 1.2–5.2	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Gurney 2014 <sup>a</sup>	845 adult ALL survivors	>10 years after diagnosis	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide % NR Radiotherapy: CRT: 61.3% CRT + spinalRT or TBI 12.5% SCT: 2.5%	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 5.7% QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 29.5%	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: CRT dose <24Gy vs. 0 Gy OR 1.11, 95%CI 0.67-1.82, p=0.69; CRT dose ≥24Gy vs. 0 Gy OR 2.05, 95%CI 1.21-3.46, p=0.007; Craniospinal irradiation OR 1.88, 95% CI 1.05-3.37, p=0.033	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Isaksson 2020	125 CCS	Mean (SD) follow- up 24.3 years (7.1)	Chemotherapy: GCs 19 (15%) Alkylating agents 16 (13%) Median cyclophosphamide equivalent dose 4854 mg/m² MTX 17 (14%) Median methotrexate dose 11 g/m² Radiotherapy: CRT 26% SCT: 2%	Survivors: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 21% Controls: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 28% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: CRT (yes vs. control group) OR 1.5, 95%CI 0.69-3.5, p=0.29 TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: CRT (yes vs. control group) OR 1.5, 95%CI 0.65-3.7, p=0.33	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk

Latoch 2021	326 CCS	Median (range) 6.12 (4.0-22.0) years since end of	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> Glucocorticoids 71.2% Methotrexate 50.9%	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 20% TB BMD Z-score <-1: 24% LS and/or TB BMD Z-score <-2:	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: Radiotherapy to the head	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
		treatment	Radiotherapy: CRT 25.5% TBI 4% Abdominal RT 16.7% SCT: 7%	8%	and neck OR 2.54, 95%CI 1.32–4.90, p=0.016 TB BMD Z-score <-1: Radiotherapy to the head and neck OR 1.74, 95%CI 0.92–3.32, p=0.089	CF: low risk
Polgreen 2012	319 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SE) 10.1 ± 0.2 years (range 4.3-17.8)	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid: 42.0% Radiotherapy: 23.2%) Cranial (CNS) 9.7%, other 13.5% SCT: 0%	TB BMD Z-score <-1: 11% LS BMD Z-score <-1: 23% TB BMD Z-score <-2: 2.3% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: TB BMD Z-score <-1: radiation exposure (CNS vs. none), OR 7.9; 95%CI 3.0- 20.8, p<0.001 LS BMD Z-score <-1: radiation exposure (CNS vs. none), OR 2.5; 95%CI 1.0-5.7, p=0.040	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
Siegel 2017	475 CCS	Mean (±SD) time after Rx 5.4 ± 4.3 years	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid 83.4% Methotrexate 77.1% Radiotherapy: Cranial / craniospinal 13.3% TBI 9.9% SCT: 17.9%	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤−1: 29.3% (LS 22.8%, TB 21.9%) TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤−2: 8.2% (LS 7.4%, TB 4.0%)	Multivariable model: TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: TBI, cranial, or craniospinal radiation OR 5.2, 95% CI, 1.8–14.9	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
van Atteveld 2019 <sup>a</sup>	2032 adult CCS	Median time since cancer dx: 21.6 yrs (range 10.4-40.6)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agent 56.6% MTX 53.9% GCs 53.9% Radiotherapy: Cranial 33.9% Abdominal 21.7% SCT: NR	LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: 51.5% (LS 25.1%, TB 48.0%) LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: 20.2%	Multivariable model: LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤- 1: cranial irradiation β 0.75 (SE 0.11), OR 2.11, 95%CI 1.69-2.63 LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤- 2: cranial irradiation β 0.73 (SE 0.13), OR 2.07, 95%CI 1.59-2.68	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk

## GRADE assessment (outcome low and very low BMD):

Study design: +4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

Study limitations: 5 leection bias low in 3/8, unclear in 1/8, high in 4/8; Attrition bias low in 8/8; Detection bias low in 8/8; Confounding bias low in 5/8, high in 3/8

Consistency: 0 No important inconsistency, all studies show an effect of C(S)RT (6 significant)

**Directness:**0 Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable **Precision:**0 No important inconsistency, an studies show an effect of C(5/K) (6 sign)

One of the following shows an effect of C(5/K) (6 sign)

One of the following shows an effect of C(5/K) (6 sign)

One of the following shows an effect of C(5/K) (6 sign)

One of the following shows an effect of C(5/K) (6 sign)

One of the following shows an effect of C(5/K) (6 sign)

One of the following shows an effect of C(5/K) (6 sign)

One of the following shows an effect of C(5/K) (6 sign)

One of the following shows an effect of C(5/K) (6 sign)

One of the following shows an effect of C(5/K) (6 sign)

One of the following shows an effect of C(5/K) (6 sign)

One of the following shows a finite shows a

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

Effect size: +1 Large magnitude of effect

**Dose-response:** 0 Dose response relationship as higher doses are associated with an increased risk as compared to lower doses, but only assessed in one study

<u>Plausible</u> 0 No plausible confounding

confounding:

Quality of evidence:  $\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus HIGH$ 

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2) after cranial irradiation in CAYA cancer survivors.

(6 studies significant effect, 2 studies no significant effect; 5,010 participants)

**GRADE** assessment (outcome very low BMD):

**Study design:** +4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

Study limitations: -1 Some limitations: Selection bias low in 2/2; Attrition bias low in 2/2; Detection bias low in 2/2; Confounding bias low in 1/2, high in 1/2

Consistency: 0 No important inconsistency, both studies show a significant effect of C(S)RT

<u>Directness:</u>
 <u>Precision:</u>
 Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable
 No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

Effect size: +1 Large magnitude of effect

<u>Dose-response:</u> 0 Dose response relationship as higher doses are associated with an increased risk as compared to lower doses, but only assessed in one study

**Plausible** 0 No plausible confounding

confounding:

Quality of evidence:  $\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus HIGH$ 

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) after cranial irradiation in CAYA cancer survivors.

(2 studies significant effect; 2,507 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

\*(possible) overlap in included patients.

# 1mm. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with cranial or craniospinal irradiation?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.mm. Risk lower BMD for CRT/CSRT (n=8 studies)	Alikasifoglu 2005	59 ALL survivors	Mean 3.40 (1.77) years after cessation of therapy	Chemotherapy: Conventional dose prednisolone 51% Megadose methylprednisolone 49% Cyclophosphamide 100% HD-MTX 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 76% Group 1: 63.3% SCT: 0%	Mean (SD) LS BMD Z-score Total cohort: -1.73 (0.84)	LS BMD Z-score: Group 1: CRT vs. no CRT, -1.85 (0.86) vs1.58 (0.79), p=0.404 Multivariable model: CRT: t=0.613, P=0.542	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Benmiloud 2010	89 ALL and NHL survivors	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 15.0 ± 4.5 years	Chemotherapy: Prednisolone 100% Dexamethasone 52.8% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy RT at any site: 53.9% CNS RT 36% CRT 32.6% CSRT 3.4% TBI 18.0% SCT 18.0%	BMD Z-score ≤-1.0: At any site: 59.1%; At the LS: 50.5% At the FN: 25.8%; At the Hip: 31.5% BMD Z-score ≤-2: At any site: 10.1%; At the LS: 10.1% At the FN: 2.2%; At the Hip: 2.2%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): NS FN and Hip BMD Z-score (cont.): therapeutic regimen (chemo [mean Z-score -0.28] vs. chemo+CRT [mean Z- score -0.96] vs. chemo+BMT/TBI [mean Z- score -0.69]) p=0.01, β not reported	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): Cranial/cranial-spinal (yes vs. no) NA TB BMD Z-score (cont.): Cranial/cranial-spinal (yes vs. no) $\beta$ =-0.53; se=0.19; p<0.001	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Henderson 1996	60 CCS	> 12 months post Rx Mean time since treatment: 4.3 yrs range 12mths-14.5 yrs	Chemotherapy: Ifofosfamide 3% Glucocorticoids 75% MTX 62% Radiotherapy: CRT 25% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-scores <-2: 8.3% LS BMD Z-score <-1.0: 23.3%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): lower weight SDS R2=0.33; low Ca intake <u>cumulative</u> R2=0.42; lower height SDS <u>cumulative</u> R2=0.49; CRT <u>cumulative</u> R2=0.51, p=0.15	SB: unclear AB: unclear DB: low risk CF: unclear

	Isaksson 2020	125 CCS	Mean (SD) follow- up 24.3 years (7.1)	Chemotherapy: GCs 19 (15%) Alkylating agents 16 (13%) Median cyclophosphamide equivalent dose 4854 mg/m² MTX 17 (14%) Median methotrexate dose 11 g/m² Radiotherapy: CRT 26% SCT: 2%	Survivors: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 21% Controls: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 28% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22%	Multivariable model: LS BMD (cont.): difference CRT (yes vs. control group) -0.071, 95%CI -0.124 to -0.018, p=0.009 TH BMD (cont.): difference CRT (yes vs. control group) -0.076, 95%CI -0.133 to -0.019, p=0.009	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Pietila 2006	52 brain tumor survivors	Mean 6.4 yrs (range 1.4-14.8 y) after off-therapy	Chemotherapy: 24% Steroids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 21.7% Craniospinal 11.1% Combination of CRT and chemotherapy 19.6% SCT: 0%	TB BMD Z-score <-2: 33%	Multivariable model: TB BMD Z-score (cont.): CRT, R <sup>2</sup> NR, p=0.100; CSRT, R <sup>2</sup> NR, p=0.034	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Remes 2018	74 brain tumor survivors	Mean time since cessation of tumor therapy (±SD): 18.9 ± 6.1 years	Chemotherapy: 63.5% Radiotherapy: Local irradiation: 52.7% Craniospinal with local boost to the tumor bed: 40.5% Cranial with local boost to the tumor bed: 4.1% Stereotactic: 2.7% SCT:NR	LS BMD and/or FN BMD and/or Total Hip Z-score ≤-2: 23.6%	Multivariable model: BMD Z-scores (cont.): CRT NS for all sites; CSRT NS for all sites	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: low risk
	Van Beek 2006	90 ALL survivors	Mean 12.7 yrs after dx (2.0-29.7)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 52.2% Dexamethasone 47.8% MTX 71.1% Radiotherapy: CRT 21.1% SCT: 0%	NR	Multivariable model: LS, TB BM(A)D Z-score (cont.): CRT NS	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations:  Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible	-1 Some lin 1/8; Con -1 Importal 0 Results a 0 No impo 0 Unlikely 0 No large 0 Unclear	founding bias Int inconsistence are direct, popurtant imprecision	tion bias low in 1/8, ur ow in 6/8, unclear in 1 y, four studies show a ulation and outcomes b on, high total number effect se response in the stud	nclear in 2/8, high in 5/8; Attrition b ./8, high in 1/8 significant effect of C(S)RT and fou	r studies show no significant effec		3, unclear in

Conclusion:	Increased risk of lower BMD after cranial irradiation in CAYA cancer survivors
	(4 studies significant effect, 4 studies no significant effect; 895 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

## 1nn. What is the risk of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors treated with cranial or craniospinal irradiation?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
	Fiscalett	ti 2021 251 ALL	Median 15.1	Chemotherapy:	Frequency of fractures:	Multivariable model:	SB: low risk
for CRT/CSRT		survivors	years (range 5.4	Glucocorticoids 100%	Vertebral fractures: 23%	Vertebral fractures: CRT NS	AB: low risk
/m=1 atrudus			to 28.2 years)	Methotrexate 100%	Non-vertebral fractures: 31%		DB: low risk
(n=1 study)			since cancer diagnosis	Radiotherapy: CRT 59% SCT: None			CF: low risk
GRADE assessment:							
Study design:	+4	Retrospective cohort st	udy				
Study limitations:	0	No important limitation	s: Selection bias low	in 1/1; Attrition bias low in 1,	1; Detection bias low in 1/1; Con	founding low in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA	Only one study availabl	e				
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are direct, popu	llation and outcomes	broadly generalizable			
Precision:	-2	Important imprecision:	low total number of	patients and events and only	one study available		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely					
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of	effect				
Dose-response:	0	NA					
Plausible confoundin	ng: 0	No plausible confoundi	ng				
Quality of evidence:		$\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus$ LOW					
Conclusion:		No significant effect of	cranial irradiation on	the risk of vertebral fractures	s in CAYA cancer survivors.		
		(1 study significant effe	ct; 251 participants)				

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMl=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

## 100. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with higher vs. lower doses cranial or craniospinal irradiation?

PICO	Study	No. part	of ticipants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.00. Risk low	Gurney	2014 845	adult	>10 years after	Chemotherapy:	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 5.7%	Multivariable model:	SB: unclear
BMD for cranial		ALL		diagnosis	Glucocorticoids 100%	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-1:	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: CRT	AB: low risk
irradiation dose		surv	vivors		Methotrexate 100%	29.5%	dose <24Gy vs. 0 Gy OR 1.11,	DB: low risk
					Cyclophosphamide % NR		95%CI 0.67-1.82, p=0.69;	CF: high risk
(n=1 study)					Radiotherapy: CRT: 61.3%		CRT dose ≥24Gy vs. 0 Gy OR	
					CRT + spinalRT or TBI 12.5%		2.05, 95%CI 1.21-3.46,	
					<u>SCT</u> : 2.5%		p=0.007	
GRADE assessment	:							
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectiona	al cohort st	udy				
Study limitations:	-1	Some limitation	ons: Selecti	on bias unclear in 1/1	.; Attrition bias low in 1/1; Detectio	n bias low in 1/1; Confounding bia	as high in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA	Only one stud	y available					
Directness:	0	Results are dir	rect, popula	ation and outcomes b	roadly generalizable			
Precision:	-1	Important imp	orecision, h	igh total number of p	atients and events but only one stu	ıdy available		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely						
Effect size:	0	Large magnitu	ide of effec	t, but only one study				
Dose-response:	0	Dose response	e relationsh	nip as higher doses ar	e associated with an increased risk	as compared to lower doses, but	only one study	
<u>Plausible</u>	0	No plausible c	onfounding	g				
confounding:								
Quality of evidence	:	$\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus$ LOV	V					
Conclusion:				D (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2) t; 845 participants)	after higher versus lower doses cra	anial irradiation in CAYA cancer su	rvivors.	

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

1pp. What is the risk of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors treated with higher vs. lower doses cranial or craniospinal irradiation?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.pp. Risk fracture for cranial irradiation dose (n=1 study)	Im 2021	2453 (discovery) 1417 (replication) CCS	At least 5 years Discovery: Approximately 37 years Replication: Approximately 25 years	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 47.2% discovery, 48.3% replication IV MTX 18.5% discovery, 29.2% replication IT MTX 38.4% discovery, 38.3% replication Radiotherapy: CRT 45.9% discovery, 38.5% replication SCT: 0% (exclusion criterion)	Fracture frequency (any type post diagnosis) Discovery: 37.9% Replication: 46.0%	Multivariable (sex-combined) model (discovery cohort): Fracture: radiation dosimetry dose (10 Gy) HR 0.99, 95%CI 0.95-1.03, p=0.58	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: unclear
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundir Quality of evidence:		Only one study availabl Results are direct, popu	tion bias high in 1/1; are land and outcomes high total number of effect		ection bias high in 1/1; Confoundi one study available	ng unclear in 1/1	
Conclusion:		~ ~ ~ ~			e risk of fractures in CAYA cancer	survivors.	

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuroectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBl=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

1qq. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with hematopoietic stem cell transplantation?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.qq. Risk low BMD for HSCT	Den Hoed 20	.5 346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: HSCT (yes vs. no) OR 1.3, 95%CI 0.4-4.1	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
(n=2 studies)			of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	TB BMD Z-score <-1: HSCT (yes vs. no) OR 1.3, 95%CI 0.4-3.8	CF: low risk
	Siegel 2017	475 CCS	Mean (±SD) time after Rx 5.4 ± 4.3 years	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid 83.4% Methotrexate 77.1% Radiotherapy: Cranial / craniospinal 13.3% TBI 9.9%	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-1: 29.3% (LS 22.8%, TB 21.9%) TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-2: 8.2% (LS 7.4%, TB 4.0%)	Multivariable model: TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: HSCT OR 0.2, 95% CI, 0.1-0.9	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
				SCT: 17.9%			
GRADE assessment:				<u>SCT</u> : 17.9%			
GRADE assessment: Study design:		s-sectional cohort stud	lies	<u>SCT</u> : 17.9%			
	+4 Cros				w in 2/2; Detection bias low in 2/2;	Confounding low in 1/2, high in 1/	/2
Study design:	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i	ortant limitations: Selemportant inconsistency	ction bias low in 1/2 y, 1 study shows no	., high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and	w in 2/2; Detection bias low in 2/2; d 1 study shows a decreased risk af		<b>'</b> 2
Study design: Study limitations:	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res	ortant limitations: Selections of the montant inconsistency alts are direct, populati	ction bias low in 1/2 y, 1 study shows no on and outcomes bi	e, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable			2
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency:	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i	ortant limitations: Selemportant inconsistency	ction bias low in 1/2 y, 1 study shows no on and outcomes bi	e, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable			<b>'</b> 2
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias:	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli	ortant limitations: Selections of the montant inconsistency alts are direct, population of the montant imprecision, kely	ction bias low in 1/2	e, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable			<b>'</b> 2
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size:	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli	ortant limitations: Select mportant inconsistency alts are direct, populati mportant imprecision,	ction bias low in 1/2	e, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable			<b>'</b> 2
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response:	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli 0 No l 0 NA	ortant limitations: Select mportant inconsistency alts are direct, populati mportant imprecision, kely arge magnitude of effe	ction bias low in 1/2	e, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable			2
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundin	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli 0 No I 0 NA	ortant limitations: Selection properties of the consistency of the con	ction bias low in 1/2	e, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable			72
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundin Quality of evidence:	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli 0 No I 0 NA	ortant limitations: Selection properties of the consistency of the con	ction bias low in 1/2 y, 1 study shows no on and outcomes bi high total number c	e, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable of patients and events	d 1 study shows a decreased risk af		72
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundin	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli 0 No   0 NA ng: 0 No   No s	ortant limitations: Selectoriant limitations: Selectorians are direct, population important imprecision, kely arge magnitude of effectorians in the confounding the confounding arginificant effect of HSC	ction bias low in 1/2 y, 1 study shows no on and outcomes bi high total number o	e, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable of patients and events BMD (Z-score ≤-1 and ≤-2) in	d 1 study shows a decreased risk af		72
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundin Quality of evidence: Conclusion:	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli 0 No l 0 NA ng: 0 No l No s (1 s'	ortant limitations: Selectoriant limitations: Selectorians are direct, population important imprecision, kely arge magnitude of effectorians in the confounding the confounding arginificant effect of HSC	ction bias low in 1/2 y, 1 study shows no on and outcomes bi high total number o	e, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable of patients and events	d 1 study shows a decreased risk af		72
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundin Quality of evidence: Conclusion: GRADE assessment:	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli 0 No i 0 NA ng: 0 No i (1 s	ortant limitations: Selection properties are direct, population protection, which is a properties and the protection of	ction bias low in 1/2 y, 1 study shows no on and outcomes bi high total number o  ct  T on the risk of low ct, 1 study significan	e, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable of patients and events BMD (Z-score ≤-1 and ≤-2) in	d 1 study shows a decreased risk af		72
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundin Quality of evidence: Conclusion: GRADE assessment: Study design:	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli 0 No I 0 NA ng: 0 No i (1 s	ortant limitations: Selection properties are direct, population protection, in the protection protection protection, in the protection protecti	ction bias low in 1/2 y, 1 study shows no on and outcomes bi high total number o  ct  T on the risk of low ct, 1 study significan	P, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable of patients and events BMD (Z-score ≤-1 and ≤-2) in t effect in opposite direction;	CAYA cancer survivors.	ter HSCT	72
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundin Quality of evidence: Conclusion: GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations:	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli 0 No I 0 NA ng: 0 No i No s (1 s	ortant limitations: Selection properties are direct, population properties are direct. All properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties. The properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties. The properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties. The properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties. The properties are direct properties. The properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties. The properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties. The properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties are direct properties. The properties are direct properties. The properties are direct properties. The properties are direct properties are dire	ction bias low in 1/2 y, 1 study shows no on and outcomes bi high total number o  ct  T on the risk of low ct, 1 study significan	P, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable of patients and events BMD (Z-score ≤-1 and ≤-2) in t effect in opposite direction;	d 1 study shows a decreased risk af	ter HSCT	72
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundin Quality of evidence: Conclusion: GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency:	+4 Cros -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli 0 No i 0 NA ng: 0 No i No s (1 s'	ortant limitations: Selection properties are direct, population properties are direct. As a sectional cohort study are study available properties are directed as a section properties are directed properties.	ction bias low in 1/2 y, 1 study shows no on and outcomes bi high total number o  ct  T on the risk of low ct, 1 study significan lies bias low in 1/1; Att	P, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable of patients and events  BMD (Z-score ≤-1 and ≤-2) in the effect in opposite direction;	CAYA cancer survivors.	ter HSCT	2
Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundin Quality of evidence: Conclusion: GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations:	+4 Crost -2 Imp 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli 0 No i 0 NA ng: 0 No i No s (1 s) +4 Crost -1 Som NA Onli 0 Res	ortant limitations: Selections are direct, population important imprecision, kely arge magnitude of effect of LOW ignificant effect of HSC udy no significant effect of e limitations: Selection one study available ults are direct, population	ction bias low in 1/2 y, 1 study shows no on and outcomes bi high total number o  ct  T on the risk of low ct, 1 study significan lies bias low in 1/1; Att on and outcomes bi	P, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lo significant effect of HSCT, and roadly generalizable of patients and events  BMD (Z-score ≤-1 and ≤-2) in the effect in opposite direction;	CAYA cancer survivors. 821 participants) on bias low in 1/1; Confounding hig	ter HSCT	72

**Effect size:** 0 No large magnitude of effect

Dose-response: 0 NA

<u>Plausible confounding:</u> 0 No plausible confounding

Quality of evidence:  $\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus \sqcup$  LOW

**Conclusion:** No increased risk of very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) after HSCT in CAYA cancer survivors.

(1 study significant effect in opposite direction; 475 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

## 1rr. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with hematopoietic stem cell transplantation without total body irradiation?

PICO	Study		No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.rr. Risk lower BMD for HSCT (n=2 studies)	Den Hoed 2015		346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): HSCT NS TB BMD Z-score (cont.): HSCT NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Le Meig	nen 2011	159 ALL and AML survivors	Mean time from diagnosis to DXA 14.66 ± 0.44 yrs	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 86.2% Other chemotherapy NR Radiotherapy: CRT 18.9% TBI 40.4% of HSCT recipients SCT: 34%	BMD Z-score <-2: FN 3.2%; LS 3.8%	Multivariable model: BMD Z-scores (cont.): SCT FN: $\beta$ -0.24, P=0.006; LS: $\beta$ 0.05, p=0.56	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: high risk CF: high risk
GRADE assessment:			-			•		
Study design:	+4	Cross-secti	onal cohort studi	es				
Study limitations:	-3	Important high in 1/2		tion bias low in 1/2	, high in 1/2; Attrition bias lov	w in 1/2, high in 1/2; Detection bias	low in 1/2, high in 1/2; Confoundir	ng low in 1/2,
Consistency:	-1					ıdy shows no significant effect		
<u>Directness:</u>	0				oadly generalizable			
Precision:	0	•	ant imprecision, h	nigh total number o	f patients and events			
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely						
Effect size:	0	_	agnitude of effec	t				
Dose-response: Plausible confoundi	0 ng: 0	NA No plausib	le confounding					
Quality of evidence:								
Conclusion:				after HSCT in CAYA	A cancer survivors			
Conclusion.					t effect; 505 participants)			
		(I Study SI	siinicani eneci, I	study no significant	terrect, 303 participants)			

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant;

OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# 1ss. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with hematopoietic stem cell transplantation and total body irradiation?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.ss. Risk low BMD for TBI (n=5 studies)	Bhandari 2021	446 CCS	Median 14.2 years (range 2– 65 years) since completing therapy	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 57.5% Methotrexate 40.4% Radiotherapy: CRT NR TBI ± 24% SCT: 40.8% (30.9% allogeneic)	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 33.9%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: HCT (allogeneic [majority had TBI] vs. no or autologous): OR 2.63, 95%CI 1.17-5.91, p=0.02	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: TBI (yes vs. no) NA TB BMD Z-score <-1: TBI (yes vs. no) OR 0.9, 95%CI 0.3-3.4	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Latoch 2021	326 CCS	Median (range) 6.12 (4.0-22.0) years since end of treatment	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 71.2% Methotrexate 50.9% Radiotherapy: CRT 25.5% TBI 4% Abdominal RT 16.7% SCT: 7%	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 20% TB BMD Z-score <-1: 24% LS and/or TB BMD Z-score <-2: 8%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: not included in the multivariable model TB BMD Z-score <-1: stem cell transplantation (majority had TBI): OR 3.13, 95%CI 1.02–9.63, p=0.046	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Leung 2007	155 SCT survivors	Median 9 yrs from HSCT (range 3 to 10 years)	Chemotherapy: Alkylator-based conditioning pre-HSCT in 21% Radiotherapy: TBI-based conditioning in 79% SCT: yes (100%)	QCT BMD Z-score <-1: 39% (site NR, presumably LS)	Multivariable model: QCT BMD Z-score <-1: TBI HR 1.96; 95% CI 1.1-3.07, p=0.022	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: high risk
	Siegel 2017	475 CCS	Mean (±SD) time after Rx 5.4 ± 4.3 years	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid 83.4% Methotrexate 77.1% Radiotherapy:	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-1: 29.3% (LS 22.8%, TB 21.9%) TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-2: 8.2% (LS 7.4%, TB 4.0%)	Univariable model: TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤−1: TBI 42.6% vs. no TBI 27.8%, p=0.03 TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤−2: TBI 12.8% vs. no TBI 7.7%, p=0.13	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk

Cranial / craniospinal 13.3%

TBI 9.9% SCT: 17.9% Multivariable model:

TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-2: TBI,

cranial, or craniospinal radiation OR 5.2, 95% CI, 1.8–

14.9

**GRADE** assessment:

**Study design:** +4 Cross-sectional cohort studies

Study limitations: 0 No important limitations: Selection bias low in 3/5, high in 2/5; Attrition bias low in 4/5, high in 1/5; Detection bias low in 4/5, unclear in 1/5; Confounding low in

3/5, high in 2/5

Consistency: 0 No important inconsistency: 4 studies show a significant effect of HSCT + TBI and 1 study shows no significant effect

<u>Directness:</u> 0 Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable Precision: 0 No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

Effect size: +1 Large magnitude of effect

**Dose-response:** 0 Dose response relationship of higher TBI doses and low BMD not assessed

**Plausible confounding:** 0 No plausible confounding

Quality of evidence:  $\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus HIGH$ 

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2) after TBI in CAYA cancer survivors.

(4 studies significant effect, 1 study no significant effect; 1748 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# 1tt. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with total body irradiation?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.tt. Risk lower BMD for TBI (n=4 studies)	Benmiloud 2010	89 ALL and NHL survivors	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 15.0 ± 4.5 years	Chemotherapy: Prednisolone 100% Dexamethasone 52.8% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy RT at any site: 53.9% CNS RT 36% CRT 32.6% CSRT 3.4% TBI 18.0% SCT 18.0%	BMD Z-score ≤-1.0: At any site: 59.1%; At the LS: 50.5% At the FN: 25.8%; At the Hip: 31.5% BMD Z-score ≤-2: At any site: 10.1%; At the LS: 10.1% At the FN: 2.2%; At the Hip: 2.2%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): NS FN and Hip BMD Z-score (cont.): therapeutic regimen (chemo [mean Z-score -0.28] vs. chemo+CRT [mean Z-score -0.96] vs. chemo+BMT/TBI [mean Z-score -0.69]) p=0.01, β not reported	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): TBI NS TB BMD Z-score (cont.): TBI NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Le Meignen 2011	159 ALL and AML survivors	Mean time from diagnosis to DXA 14.66 ± 0.44 yrs	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 86.2% Other chemotherapy NR Radiotherapy: CRT 18.9% TBI 40.4% of HSCT recipients SCT: 34%	BMD Z-score <-2: FN 3.2%; LS 3.8%	Multivariable model: BMD Z-scores (cont.): TBI FN: β -0.14, P=0.31; LS: β 0.23, p=0.12	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: high risk CF: high risk
	Mostoufi-Moab 2012	55 SCT survivors	At least a 3 year interval from alloHST (median 6.8 years, range 3.0 to 16.4)	Chemotherapy: Conditioning regimen: Cyclophosphamide + thiotepa (69%) Busulfan + cyclophosphamide (unknown %) Busulfan + Cytoxan ± melphelan or fludarabine (unknown %)	Trabecular vBMD Z-score -1.05 (-1.33 to -0.78) Cortical vBMD Z-score -0.20 (- 0.48 to 0.08)	Multivariable model: Lower trabecular vBMD Z- scores: TBI -1.30 ± 1.40 versus no TBI -0.49 ± 0.88; p=0.01 Lower cortical vBMD Z-scores: NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk

		Radiotherapy: TBI 69%
		<u>SCT</u> : 100%
GRADE assessment:		
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectional cohort studies
Study limitations:	-1	Some limitations: Selection bias low in 3/4, high in 1/4; Attrition bias low in 2/4, high in 2/4; Detection bias low in 3/4, high in 1/4; Confounding low in 3/4, high in
		1/4
Consistency:	-1	Important inconsistency, 2 studies show a significant effect of TBI and 2 studies show no significant effect
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable
Precision:	0	No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect
Dose-response:	0	Dose response relationship of higher TBI doses and low BMD not assessed
Plausible confounding	<b>ig:</b> 0	No plausible confounding
Quality of evidence:		$\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus Low$
Conclusion:		Increased risk of lower BMD after TBI in CAYA cancer survivors.
		(2 studies significant effect, 2 studies no significant effect; 649 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# 1uu. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with abdominal/pelvic irradiation?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.uu. Risk low BMD for abdominal/pelvic RT (n=2 studies)	Den Hoed 2015 346 adult CCS		Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z- score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: abdominal irradiation (yes vs. no) NR TB BMD Z-score <-1 abdominal irradiation (yes vs. no) OR=3.0, 95%CI 0.6–14.5 TB BMD Z-score (cont.): NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	van Atteveld 2019	2032 adult CCS	Median time since cancer dx: 21.6 yrs (range 10.4-40.6)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agent 56.6% MTX 53.9% GCs 53.9% Radiotherapy: Cranial 33.9% Abdominal 21.7% SCT: NR	LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤- 1: 51.5% (LS 25.1%, TB 48.0%) LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤- 2: 20.2%	Multivariable model: LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: abdominal irradiation NS LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: abdominal irradiation β 0.48 (SE 0.14), OR 1.61, 95%CI 1.23-2.11	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding:	+4 Cross-s -1 Some I 0 No imp 0 Results -1 No imp 0 Unlike 0 No larg 0 Dose r	oortant inconsiste s are direct, popu portant imprecisio y ge magnitude of e	ion bias low in 1/2, hi ency, all show effect o lation and outcomes l on, high total number effect hip of higher abdomi	gh in 1/2; Attrition bias low in 2/2; f abdominal/pelvic irradiation (1 siporoadly generalizable of patients and events, although onal/pelvic irradiation doses and lov	gnificant) nly one study showed a significan	-	
Quality of evidence Conclusion:	Increas		•	after abdominal/pelvic irradiation at effect; 2,378 participants)	in CAYA cancer survivors.		
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision:	+4 Cross-s 0 No lim NA Only o 0 Results	ne study available are direct, popu	n bias low in 1/1; Attri e lation and outcomes l	tion bias low in 1/1; Detection bias proadly generalizable patients and events, but only one s		/1	

Publication bias:	0	Unlikely
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect
Dose-response:	0	Dose response relationship of higher abdominal/pelvic irradiation doses and low BMD not assessed
<u>Plausible</u>	0	No plausible confounding
confounding:		
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE
Conclusion:		Increased risk of very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) after abdominal/pelvic irradiation in CAYA cancer survivors.
		(1 study significant effect; 2,032 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBl=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

## 1vv. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors treated with abdominal/pelvic irradiation?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.vv. Risk lower BMD for abdominal/pelvic RT (n=1 study)	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z- score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): abdominal irradiation (yes vs. no) NR TB BMD Z-score (cont.): abdominal irradiation (yes vs. no) NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
GRADE assessment:							
Study design:	+4 Cross-s	sectional cohort s	tudy				
Study limitations:	-1 Import	ant limitations: S	election bias high in 1	/1; Attrition bias low in 1/1; Detec	tion bias low in 1/1; Confounding	low in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA Only o	ne study available	e				
<u>Directness:</u>	0 Results	are direct, popu	lation and outcomes I	oroadly generalizable			
Precision:	-1 Import	ant imprecision,	high total number of <sub>ا</sub>	patients and events but only one st	tudy available		
Publication bias:	0 Unlikel	У					
Effect size:	0 No larg	ge magnitude of e	effect				
Dose-response:	0 Dose r	esponse relations	ship of higher abdomi	nal/pelvic irradiation doses and lov	v BMD not assessed		
<u>Plausible</u>	0 No pla	usible confoundir	ng				
confounding:							
Quality of evidence:	000	⊖ LOW					
Conclusion:	No sigr	nificant effect of a	abdominal/pelvic irrad	diation on lower BMD in CAYA cand	cer survivors.		
	(1 stud	y no significant e	ffect; 346 participants	5)			

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMl=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

## 1ww.What is the risk of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors treated with abdominal/pelvic irradiation?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.ww. Risk fracture for abdominal/pelvic irradiation	Wilson 2	2012 7414 CCS	Median length of follow-up was 22.7 years (range, 15.6-34.2 years)	Chemotherapy: Methotrexate 43.6% Steroids 47% Radiotherapy: CRT 32% Pelvic RT 13%	Proportion of participants with fractures <u>over their</u> <u>lifetime</u> Survivors: 34.8% Siblings: 38.9%	Multivariable model: Fracture: Males: pelvic irradiation (yes vs. no) prevalence ratio (PR), 1.07, 95%CI 1.00-1.19, p=0.25. Females: NR (p>0.2 in univariable	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: high risk
(n=1 study)				<u>SCT</u> : 0%		analysis)	
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundir	+4 -3 NA 0 -1 0 0 0	Only one study availab Results are direct, popul Important imprecision: Unlikely No large magnitude of NA No plausible confoundi	Selection bias high in 2 e ulation and outcomes high total number of effect		Detection bias high in 1/1; Confo	ounding high in 1/1	
Quality of evidence: Conclusion:		⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW  No significant effect of  (1 study no significant of		diation on the risk of fracture	es in CAYA cancer survivors.		

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# 1xx. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with growth hormone deficiency?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Treated with GH (%)	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.xx. Risk low BMD for GHD (n=6 studies)	Bloomhardt 2020	542 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 17.2% LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 3.5%	NR	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: GHD (y/n) OR 2.1, 95%CI 0.8- 5.1, p=0.12	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Chemaitilly 2015 <sup>a</sup>	748 adult CCS exposed to CRT	Mean age since primary cancer diagnosis 27.3 years (range 10.8 to 47.7)	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> NR <u>Radiotherapy:</u> CRT 58% <u>SCT</u> : NR	Untreated GHD vs. no GHD Low QCT LS BMD (Z-score ≤- 2): 10.3% vs. 5.8%	0%	Multivariable low QCT LS BMD model: Untreated GHD: OR 1.78, 95% CI 0.99 to 3.18, p=0.05	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Siegel 2017	475 CCS	Mean (±SD) time after Rx 5.4 ± 4.3 years	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid 83.4% Methotrexate 77.1% Radiotherapy: Cranial / craniospinal 13.3% TBI 9.9% SCT: 17.9%	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-1: 29.3% (LS 22.8%, TB 21.9%) TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤-2: 8.2% (LS 7.4%, TB 4.0%)	70%	Multivariable model: TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤— 2: GHD, OR 0.6, 95% CI, 0.1-5.1	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	van Iersel 2019 <sup>a</sup>	3141 CCS	Mean time since treatment 24.1 (range 6.8 to 51.1) years	Chemotherapy: Any 85.2% Alkylating agents 58.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 34.6% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-scores <-2: 25.6%	NR	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: GHD OR 2.16, 95%CI 1.68 to 2.78, p=0.0001	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: unclear
	van Iersel 2020 <sup>a</sup>	355 ependymo ma and low- grade glioma survivors	Median duration since RT 10.1 (range, 0.1-19.6) years	Chemotherapy: Yes 35% Alkylating agents 16% Radiotherapy: C(S)RT 100% SCT: 0%	NR	63.3%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-scores ≤−2: GHD OR 3.47, 95%CI 1.16- 10.40, p=0.03	SB: low risk AB: unclear DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Wilson 2016 <sup>a</sup>	862 adult ALL survivors	Median duration between diagnosis and follow-up was	Chemotherapy: HD Methotrexate 60.7% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Glucocorticoids 100%	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤ -1: 39.4% for men, 20.9% for women	1%	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤ -1: men with GHD OR, 1.59; 95% CI, 1.02 to 2.49;	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: unclear

			25.1 years (range, 10.5 to 47.7 years)	Radiotherapy: CRT 48.5% CRT+CS or TBI 12.4% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤ -2.5: 2.8% for men, 0.7% for women	women with GHD OR, 2.18; 95% CI, 1.26 to 3.78
GRADE assessment:						
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectional cohort s				
Study limitations:	-2	Important limitations: So Confounding unclear in		/6, high in 4/6; Attrition bias lo	ow in 4/6, unclear in 1/6, high in 1/6; D	etection bias low in 5/6, unclear in 1/6;
Consistency:	0	No important inconsiste	ncy, three studies rep	port a significant effect of GHI	and three studies reportnon-signification	ant effects
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are direct, popul		, <del>-</del>		
Precision:	0	No important imprecision	n, high total number	of patients and events		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely				
Effect size:	+1	Large magnitude of effe	ct			
Dose-response:	0	NA				
Plausible confounding:	0	No plausible confoundin	g			
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE				
Conclusion:			•		th growth hormone deficiency.	
					ts; In 3 studies, 1%, 63%, and 70% of su	urvivors with GHD had been treated with GH
		replacement therapy [in	2 studies this propor	rtion was not reported])		
GRADE assessment:						
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectional cohort s				
Study limitations:	-2	Important limitations: So 1/4, high in 3/4	election bias low in 2,	/4, high in 2/4; Attrition bias lo	ow in 2/4, unclear in 1/4, high in 1/4; D	etection bias low in 4/4; Confounding unclear in
Consistency:	0	No important inconsiste	ncy, two studies repo	ort a significant effect of GHD,	and two studies report non-significant	effects
Directness:	0	Results are direct, popul			·	
Precision:	0	No important imprecision		. •		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely	•			
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of e	ffect			
Dose-response:	0	NA				
Plausible confounding:	0	No plausible confoundin	g			
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW				
Conclusion:		Increased risk of very lov	w BMD (Z-score ≤-2) 1	for CAYA cancer survivors with	growth hormone deficiency.	
		(2 studies significant effe	ect, 2 studies no signi	ificant effect; 4,719 participan	ts; In 2 studies, 63% and 70% of surviv	ors with GHD had been treated with GH
		replacement therapy [in	the other study this	proportion was not reported]		

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

1yy. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with growth hormone deficiency?

PICO S	tudy	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Treated with GH (%)	Effect size	Risk of bias
,,	enmiloud 010	89 ALL and NHL survivors	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 15.0 ± 4.5 years	Chemotherapy: Prednisolone 100% Dexamethasone 52.8% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy RT at any site: 53.9% CNS RT 36% CRT 32.6% CSRT 3.4% TBI 18.0% SCT 18.0%	BMD Z-score ≤-1.0: At any site: 59.1%; At the LS: 50.5% At the FN: 25.8%; At the Hip: 31.5% BMD Z-score ≤-2: At any site: 10.1%; At the LS: 10.1% At the FN: 2.2%; At the Hip: 2.2%	10%	Multivariable model: LS, FN and Hip BMD Z-score (cont.): GHD NS	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Aostoufi-Moab 012	55 SCT survivors	At least a 3 year interval from alloHST (median 6.8 years, range 3.0 to 16.4)	Chemotherapy: Conditioning regimen: Cyclophosphamide + thiotepa (69%) Busulfan + cyclophosphamide (unknown %) Busulfan + Cytoxan ± melphelan or fludarabine (unknown %) Radiotherapy: TBI 69% SCT: 100%	Trabecular vBMD Z-score - 1.05 (-1.33 to -0.78) Cortical vBMD Z-score -0.20 (- 0.48 to 0.08)	50%	Multivariable model: Lower trabecular vBMD Z-scores (cont.): GHD -1.56 ± 1.62 versus -0.84 ± 1.12; p=0.07 Lower cortical vBMD Z-scores (cont.): NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding Quality of evidence: Conclusion:	-1 Some lin 0 No impo 0 Results -1 Importa 0 Unlikely 0 No large 0 NA <u>:</u> 0 No plau	ortant inconsisted are direct, populant imprecision, or the magnitude of a sible confoundi but the body but the confoundi but the body but the	tion bias low in 2/2; A ency, both studies shallation and outcomes low total number of effect	ow no significant effect of GHD broadly generalizable	1/2; Detection bias low in 2/2; Co	onfounding lo	ow in 2/2	

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray

absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# 1zz. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with hypogonadism?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Treated with sex steroids (%)	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.zz. Risk low BMD for hypogonadism (n=8 studies)	Bloomhardt 2020	542 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 17.2% LS BMD Z-score ≤-2: 3.5%	NR	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: hypogonadism (y/n) OR 0.9, 95%CI 0.3-2.4, p=0.83	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Chemaitilly 2015 <sup>a</sup>	748 adult CCS exposed to CRT	Mean age since primary cancer diagnosis 27.3 years (range 10.8 to 47.7)	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> NR <u>Radiotherapy:</u> CRT 58% <u>SCT</u> : NR	Untreated LH/FSHD vs. no LH/FSHD Low QCT LS BMD (Z- score ≤-2): 16.4% vs. 7.1%	0%	Multivariable low QCT LS BMD model: Untreated LH/FSHD: OR 2.42, 95% CI 1.10 to 5.30, p=0.03	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Chemaitilly 2017 <sup>a</sup>	921 adult CCS	Median 24 years after cancer diagnosis (range 10.2 to 48.1)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agents 58.8% Radiotherapy: Pelvic RT 13.3% Ovarian RT 21.7% Hypothalamic/pituitary radiation 31.6% SCT: NR	POI vs. no POI Low QCT LS BMD (Z- score ≤-2): 14.1% vs. 2.4%	0%	Multivariable low QCT LS BMD model: Primary ovarian insufficiency: OR 5.07, 95% CI 1.97 to 13.05	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Isaksson 2020	125 CCS	Mean (SD) follow- up 24.3 years (7.1)	Chemotherapy: GCs 19 (15%) Alkylating agents 16 (13%) Median cyclophosphamide equivalent dose 4854 mg/m² MTX 17 (14%) Median methotrexate dose 11 g/m² Radiotherapy: CRT 26% SCT: 2%	Survivors: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 21% Controls: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 28% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22%	0%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: untreated hypogonadism vs. eugonadal OR 1.5, 95%CI 0.46-5.1, p= 0.48 TH BMD Z-score <-1: untreated hypogonadism vs. eugonadal OR 4.1, 96%CI 1.3-14, p=0.02	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Polgreen 2012	319 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SE) 10.1 ± 0.2 years (range 4.3-17.8)	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid: 42.0% Radiotherapy: 23.2%)	TB BMD Z-score <-1: 11% LS BMD Z-score <-1: 23%	NR	Multivariable model: TB BMD Z-score <-1: hypogonadism OR 11.2, 95%Cl 3.7-35.8, p<0.001	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk

				Cranial (CNS) 9.7%, other 13.5% <u>SCT</u> : 0%	TB BMD Z-score <-2: 2.3% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 3.5%		LS BMD Z-score <-1: hypogonadism OR 4.3, 95%CI 1.6-11.8, p=0.003	
	Siegel 2017	475 CCS	Mean (±SD) time after Rx 5.4 ± 4.3 years	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid 83.4% Methotrexate 77.1% Radiotherapy: Cranial / craniospinal 13.3% TBI 9.9% SCT: 17.9%	TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–1: 29.3% (LS 22.8%, TB 21.9%) TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: 8.2% (LS 7.4%, TB 4.0%)	NR	Multivariable model: TB or LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: gonadal dysfunction OR 4.3, 95%CI, 1.4–13.0	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	van Iersel 20	019ª 3141 CCS	Mean time since treatment 24.1 (range 6.8 to 51.1) years	Chemotherapy: Any 85.2% Alkylating agents 58.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 34.6% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-scores <-2: 25.6%	0%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-scores ≤–2: untreated LH/FSHD OR 2.4 95%CI 1.35 to 4.26, p=0.003	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: unclear
	Wilson 2016	5 <sup>a</sup> 862 adult ALL survivors	Median duration between diagnosis and follow-up was 25.1 years (range, 10.5 to 47.7 years)	Chemotherapy: HD Methotrexate 60.7% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Glucocorticoids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 48.5% CRT+CS or TBI 12.4% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤ - 1: 39.4% for men, 20.9% for women QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤ - 2.5: 2.8% for men, 0.7% for women	Women 21%; men 34%	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤ -1: men with insufficient/deficient testosterone status OR 0.67, 95% CI 0.39 to 1.13; women with POI OR 1.61; 95% CI, 0.76 to 3.39	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: unclear
GRADE assessment:	:			· <del></del>		•		-
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectional coho						
Study limitations:	-2	3/8, unclear in 2/8, h	igh in 3/8	2/8, high in 6/8; Attrition bias				_
Consistency:	-1			n effect of hypogonadism (6 sign	nificant), but one study sho	ws an effect	in the opposite direction (not s	ignificant)
<u>Directness:</u>	0	the state of the s	•	es broadly generalizable				
Precision:	0		cision, high total numb	er of patients and events				
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely	_					
Effect size:	+1	Large magnitude of e	effect					
<u>Dose-response:</u>	0	NA						
<u>Plausible</u>	0	No plausible confour	nding					
confounding:								
Quality of evidence: Conclusion:	:	(6 studies significant	effect, 2 studies no sig	-2) in CAYA cancer survivors wi gnificant effect; 7,133 participal py [in 3 studies this proportion	nts; In 1 study, 21% of fema	ale and 34% c	of male survivors with hypogon	adism had been
GRADE assessment: Study design:	: +4	Cross-sectional coho	rt studies					

Study limitations:	-2	Important limitations: Selection bias low in 1/2, high in 1/2; Attrition bias low in 1/2, high in 1/2; Detection bias low in 2/2; Confounding unclear in 1/2, high in 1/2
Consistency:	0	No important inconsistency, both studies show a significant effect of hypogonadism
Directness:	0	Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable
Precision:	0	No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely
Effect size:	+1	Large magnitude of effect
Dose-response:	0	NA NA
<u>Plausible</u>	0	No plausible confounding
confounding:		
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE
Conclusion:		Increased risk of very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) in CAYA cancer survivors with hypogonadism.
		(2 studies significant effect; 3,616 participants; The proportion of survivors with hypogonadism that had been treated with sex steroid replacement therapy was
		0% in one study and not reported in the other study)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMl=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBl=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

# 1aaa. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with hypogonadism?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Treated with sex steroids (%)	Effect size	Risk of bias
BMD for hypogonadism (n=2 studies)	Benmiloud 2010	89 ALL and NHL survivors	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 15.0 ± 4.5 years	Chemotherapy: Prednisolone 100% Dexamethasone 52.8% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy RT at any site: 53.9% CNS RT 36% CRT 32.6% CSRT 3.4% TBI 18.0% SCT 18.0%	BMD Z-score ≤-1.0: At any site: 59.1%; At the LS: 50.5% At the FN: 25.8%; At the Hip: 31.5% BMD Z-score ≤-2: At any site: 10.1%; At the LS: 10.1% At the FN: 2.2%; At the Hip: 2.2%	Women 13% (64% OCP); men 18%	Multivariable model: LS, FN and Hip BMD Z- score (cont.): hypogonadism NS	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Isaksson 20	020 125 CCS	Mean (SD) follow- up 24.3 years (7.1)	Chemotherapy: GCs 19 (15%) Alkylating agents 16 (13%) Median cyclophosphamide equivalent dose 4854 mg/m² MTX 17 (14%) Median methotrexate dose 11 g/m² Radiotherapy: CRT 26% SCT: 2%	Survivors: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 21% Controls: LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 28% TH BMD Z-score ≤-1: 22%	0%	Multivariable model: LS BMD (cont.): difference untreated hypogonadism vs. eugonadal –0.102, 95%CI –0.174 to -0.030, p=0.006 TH BMD (cont.): difference untreated hypogonadism vs. eugonadal –0.139, 95%CI –0.210 to –0.067, p<0.001	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confoundir	-2 Si -1 Si 0 R -1 Ir 0 U 0 N 0 N 1g: 0 N	ome inconsistency, on esults are direct, popu mportant imprecision, Inlikely Io large magnitude of o IA	tion bias low in 1/2, he study shows a signiulation and outcomes low total number of perfect	ficant effect of hypogonadism b broadly generalizable	1/2, high in 1/2; Detection bias lout one study shows no significar			1/2
Quality of evidence: Conclusion:	lr (1	1 study significant effe	ct, 1 study no significa		L study, 13% of female and 18% on nadism were using oral contrace		ors with hypogonadism had	been treated

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OCP=oral contraceptive pill; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

## 1bbb. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with endocrine dysfunction?

PICO	Study		No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.bbb. Risk low BMD for endocrine dysfunction (n=1 study)	Woo Ha	n 2015	108	Mean duration since cancer treatment 9.2 yrs ± 5.4 yrs	Chemotherapy: 98.2%, type NR Radiotherapy: 55.6% Head and neck radiation: 45% (assuming this is 49 out of the 60 who had radiotherapy but this is not explicit) SCT: 16.7%	BMD Z-score <-1: 52.7% at any site (39.6% LS, 39.2% FN, 38.7% TH) BMD Z-score <-2: 16.7% at any site (13.2% LS, 13.7% FN, 13.9% TH)	Multivariable model: BMD Z-score <-1: endocrine dysfunction* LS OR 3.6, 95% IC 1.51–9.60, p 0.004; FN OR 2.72, 95% IC 1.15–6.47, p=0.023; TH OR 4.2, 95% IC(1.69–10.52, p=0.002  *Endocrine dysfunction was defined as either GHD, hypogonadism or thyroid dysfunction CTCAE grade 2 or higher	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
GRADE assessment:	+4	Cross sost	tional cohort stud					
Study design: Study limitations:	+4 -2				ition bias low in 1/1; Detection	on hias low in 1/1: Confoundi	ng high in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA		study available	1 0103 111611 111 1/1, 71001	ition blas low in 1/1, beteetie	in blas low in 1/1, comounar	16 11611 111 ±/ ±	
Directness:	0	•	•	on and outcomes bro	adly generalizable			
Precision:	-2				icipants AND only one study a	available		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely		·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Effect size:	0	Large mag	gnitude of effect,	but only one study				
Dose-response:	0	NA						
Plausible confounding	ng: 0	No plausik	ole confounding					
Quality of evidence: Conclusion:		Increased	VERY LOW risk of low BMD ignificant effect; 1	•	CAYA cancer survivors with e	endocrine dysfunction.		

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

1ccc. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with an inadequate intake of vitamin D (and/or calcium) or biochemical deficiencies?

PICO S	itudy		No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.ccc. Risk low BMD for inadequate Ca/Vit D intake or biochemical deficiencies  (n=2 studies)	Bhandar	i 2021	446 CCS	Median 14.2 years (range 2–65 years) since completing therapy	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 57.5% Methotrexate 40.4% Radiotherapy: CRT NR TBI ± 24% SCT: 40.8% (30.9% allogeneic)	LS BMD Z-score ≤-1: 33.9%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: VDD (250HD <20 ng/ml) OR 3.58, 95%CI 1.33-9.59, p=0.01	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
•	olgreen	2012	319 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SE) 10.1 ± 0.2 years (range 4.3-17.8)	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid: 42.0% Radiotherapy: 23.2% Cranial (CNS) 9.7%, other 13.5% SCT: 0%	TB BMD Z-score <-1: 11% LS BMD Z-score <-1: 23% TB BMD Z-score <-2: 2.3% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model: TB BMD Z-score <-1: dietary vitamin D and calcium, NS LS BMD Z-score <-1: dietary vitamin D and calcium, NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding Quality of evidence:	+4 0 NA 0 -1 0 0 0	No important Only one sturn Results are confident in Unlikely No large may NA No plausible	udy available direct, populat mprecision, hig gnitude of effor econfounding IODERATE	Selection bias low in 1, tion and outcomes broath the total number of pati ect	adly generalizable ents and events but only o	·		
Conclusion:				dequate dietary vitam ect; 319 participants)	in D and calcium intake on	low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2)	in CAYA cancer survivors.	
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding	+4 -1 NA 0 -1 0 0	Some limitat Only one stu Results are c Important in Unlikely No large man	udy available direct, populat	n bias low in 1/1; Attriticion and outcomes broath total number of pati		tion bias low in 1/1; Confound	ding low in 1/1	
Quality of evidence:		ФФӨӨ LC						

#### (1 study significant effect; 446 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

1ddd. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with an inadequate intake of calcium or biochemical deficiencies?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.ddd. Risk lower	Henderson	1996 60 CCS	At least 12 months	Chemotherapy:	LS BMD Z-scores <-2:	Multivariable model:	SB: unclear
BMD for			post chemotherapy	Ifofosfamide 3%	8.3%	LS BMD Z-score (cont.): lower weight	AB: unclear
inadequate			Mean time since	Glucocorticoids 75%	LS BMD Z-score <-1.0:	R2=0.33; low Ca intake <u>cumulative</u>	DB: low risk
Ca/Vit D intake			treatment:	MTX 62%	23.3%	R2=0.42, p=0.004	CF: unclear
			4.3 yrs range	Radiotherapy: CRT 25%			
(n=1 study)			12mths-14.5 yrs	SCT: NR			
GRADE assessment:							
Study design:	+4	Cross-sectional cohort st	udy				
<b>Study limitations:</b>	-2	Important limitations: Se	election bias unclear in 1	L/1; Attrition bias unclear in	n 1/1; Detection bias low in	1/1; Confounding unclear in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA	Only one study available					
Directness:	0	Results are direct, popul	ation and outcomes bro	adly generalizable			
Precision:	-2	Important imprecision, le	ow total number of pati	ents and events and only o	ne study available		
<b>Publication bias:</b>	0	Unlikely					
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of e	ffect				
Dose-response:	0	NA					
Plausible confoundi	<b>ng:</b> 0	No plausible confoundin	g				
Quality of evidence:		⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW					
Conclusion:		Increased risk of lower B	MD in CAYA cancer surv	vivors with inadequate diet	ary intake of calcium.		
		(1 study significant effec					

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMl=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

## 1eee. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with a lack of physical activity?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
BMD for lack of physical activity (n=4 studies)	Kaste 2006b	study I n=141, study II n=57 ALL survivors	Study I: >4 years after therapy (mean time after dx 11.7 yrs) Study II: 2-5 years after study I (mean time after dx 16.1 yrs)	Chemotherapy: MTX 100% Prednisone 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 37% of 57; percentage of 141 NR SCT: 0%	Study I: LS BMD Z-score <-1 10.5%; LS BMD Z-score <-2 1.5% Study II: LS BMD Z-score <-1 19.3%; LS BMD Z-score <-2 0%	Multivariable model: LS 'low' BMD (Z-score cut-point NR, presumably <-1): study I exercise/week P=0.051, study II NS	SB: unclear AB: high risk DB: low risk CF: unclear
	Lemay 2019	246 ALL survivors	Median time since diagnosis 15.2 (range 5.4-28.2) years	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 98% Methotrexate 98% Radiotherapy: CRT 40.2% SCT: 0%	LS BMD Z-score <-1: 22%	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: physical activity (≥150 min moderate-to- vigorous leisure physical activities per week) adjusted preventive fraction 0.60, 95%CI 0.20-0.80, p<0.01	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Polgreen 2012	319 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SE) 10.1 ± 0.2 years (range 4.3-17.8)	Chemotherapy: Corticosteroid: 42.0% Radiotherapy: 23.2% Cranial (CNS) 9.7%, other 13.5% SCT: 0%	TB BMD Z-score <-1: 11% LS BMD Z-score <-1: 23% TB BMD Z-score <-2: 2.3% LS BMD Z-score <-2: 3.5%	Multivariable model:  TB BMD Z-score <-1: screen time ( ≥2h/day vs. 0-1h/day), OR 4.1, 95%CI 1.3-18.6, p=0.033  Physical activity score, NS LS BMD Z-score <-1: screen time, NS; physical activity score (1U increase), OR 0.99, 95%CI 0.99- 1.0, p=0.042	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Sloof 2019	253 CCS	NR	Chemotherapy: NR Radiotherapy: CRT 36% SCT: 0%	BMD Z-score <-1: 25.4% (site NR)	Multivariable model: BMD Z-score <-1: Any physical activity OR 0.38, 95%CI 0.16– 0.88, p=0.03	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: unclear
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations:  Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias:	+4 Cros -1 Som unc 0 No i 0 Res 0 No i 0 Unli	ear in 2/4 mportant inconsister ults are direct, popula	on bias low in 1/4, uncle	ear in 3/4; Attrition bias low in ect of a lack of physical activited by generalizable		s low in 3/4, unclear in 1/4; Confound	
Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding Quality of evidence:	0 NA <b>ng:</b> 0 No I	arge magnitude of ef					

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of low BMD (Z-score  $\le$ -1 or  $\le$ -2) in CAYA cancer survivors with a lack of physical activity. (3 studies significant effect, 1 study no significant effect; 959 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# 1fff. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with a lack of physical activity?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.fff. Risk lower BMD for lack of physical activity (n=2 studies)	Joyce 2011	493 ALL survivors	12.7 to 46.5 years from diagnosis of childhood ALL (median, 27.2y)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 70% SCT: NR	Mean LS BMD Z-scores: -0.3±1.2 LS BMD Z-scores < -2.5: 3% LS BMD Z- scores between -1.0 and -2.5: 26%	Associations between BMD and muscle strength in lower extremities (R2 range, 0.33–0.40, P-value range <0.001 to 0.11) and strong, significant associations in upper extremities (left-side R2=0.558; right-side R2=0.560, P<0.001)	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Zürcher 2020	150 CCS	Median 22.2 years since diagnosis (IQR 16.0; 29.1)	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids: 61% Radiotherapy: CRT 17% SCT: NR	LS, TH and/or FN BMD Z-score <-1 measured by pQCT or DXA: females: 56%, males: 70% Any pQCT site: females 34.3%, males 55.7% Any DXA site: females 41.7%, males 50.0%	Multivariable model:  Total vBMD: IPD mid vs. low, beta 6.6 (95%CI -8,64 to 21,84), p=0.40; high vs. low beta 11.62 (95%CI -4,16 to 27,40), p=0.15  Trabecular vBMD: IPD mid vs. low, beta 6,16 (95%CI -7,59 to 19,91), p=0.38; high vs. low beta 14.43 (95%CI -0,19 to 28,67), p=0.049  Cortical vBMD: IPD mid vs. low, beta -11,51 (95%CI -19,94 to -3,07), p=0.008; high vs. low beta -8.77 (95%CI -17,48 to -0,07), p=0.050  FN BMD Z-score: IPD mid vs. low, beta 0.2 (95%CI -0,2 to 0,5), p=0.36; high vs. low beta 0.4 (95%CI 0 to 0.8), p=0.044  TH BMD Z-score: IPD mid vs. low, beta 0.1 (95%CI -0,2 to 0,4), p=0.47; high vs. low beta 0.4 (95%CI 0.06 to 0.7), p=0.022  LS BMD Z-score: IPD mid vs. low, beta 0.08 (95%CI -0,4 to 0,5), p=0.73; high vs. low beta 0.14 (95%CI -0.3 to 0.6), p=0.54	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
GRADE assessment Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness:	+4 Cro -1 So 0 No	important inconsister	on bias unclear in 1/2, h	nigh in 1/2; Attrition bias low a significant effect of a lack of ht be a consequence of a lack		2; Confounding low in 2/2	

**Precision:** 0 No important imprecision, high total number of patients and events

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

**Effect size:** 0 No large magnitude of effect

**Dose-response:** 0 NA

<u>Plausible confounding:</u> 0 No plausible confounding

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors with a lack of physical activity.

(2 studies significant effect; 643 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IPD=impact peak duration; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

1ggg. What is the risk of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors with a lack of physical activity?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.ggg. Risk fracture for lack of physical activity (n=2 studies)	Lemay 2	2019 246 ALL survivors	Median time since diagnosis 15.2 (range 5.4- 28.2) years	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 98% Methotrexate 98% Radiotherapy: CRT 40.2% SCT: 0%	Presence of vertebral fracture (VF, on X-ray): 23.2%	Multivariable model:  VF: physical activity (≥150 min moderate-to-vigorous leisure physical activities per week) adjusted preventive fraction −0.05, 95%CI −1.01 to 0.45, NS	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
·	Wilson 2	2012 7414 CCS	Median length of follow-up was 22.7 years (range, 15.6-34.2 years)	Chemotherapy: Methotrexate 43.6% Steroids 47% Radiotherapy: CRT 32% Pelvic RT 13% SCT: 0%	Proportion of participants with fractures <u>over their</u> <u>lifetime</u> Survivors: 34.8% Siblings: 38.9%	Multivariable model: Fracture: Males: meets guidelines for physical activity (yes vs. no) prevalence ratio (PR), 1.08, 95%CI 1.00-1.17, p=0.07. Females: limitation to activity (yes vs. no) prevalence ratio (PR), 1.08, 95%CI 0.96-1.22, p=0.20.	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: high risk
GRADE assessment	:		•				-
Study design:	+4	Retrospective cohort st					
Study limitations:	-2		·	, ,		/2, high in 1/2; Confounding low in 1/2	!, high in 1/2
Consistency:	0			ow no significant effect of a la	ick of physical activity		
Directness:	0	Results are direct, popu		. —			
Precision:	0		on, nigh total number	of patients and events			
Publication bias:	0 0	Unlikely  No large magnitude of	offoct				
Effect size: Dose-response:	0	NA NA	enect				
Plausible confound	~	No plausible confoundi	ng				
Quality of evidence		⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	116				
Conclusion:				ry on the risk of fractures in C pants)	AYA cancer survivors.		

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

1hhh. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors who smoke?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.hhh. Risk low BMD for smoking (n=4 studies)	Den Hoed 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment 16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Chemotherapy: Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0% Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS, 20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z-score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score <-1: current smoking (yes vs. no) OR 1.5 95%CI 0.8–2.8 TB BMD Z-score <-1 current smoking (yes vs. no) OR 1.1 95%CI 0.6–2.1	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Sloof 2019	253 CCS	NR	Chemotherapy: NR Radiotherapy: CRT 36% SCT: 0%	BMD Z-score <-1: 25.4% (site NR)	Multivariable model: BMD Z-score <-1: no smoking OR 0.60, 95%CI 0.21–1.69, p=0.34	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: unclear
	van Atteveld 2019 <sup>a</sup>	2032 adult CCS	Median time since cancer dx: 21.6 yrs (range 10.4-40.6)	Chemotherapy: Alkylating agent 56.6% MTX 53.9% GCs 53.9% Radiotherapy: Cranial 33.9% Abdominal 21.7% SCT: NR	LS and/or TB BMD Z- score ≤-1: 51.5% (LS 25.1%, TB 48.0%) LS and/or TB BMD Z- score ≤-2: 20.2%	Multivariable model: LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-1: current smoking β 0.39 (SE 0.11), OR 1.48, 95%CI 1.19-1.85 LS and/or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: current smoking NS	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	Wilson 2016 <sup>a</sup> 862 adult ALL survivors		Median duration between diagnosis and follow-up was 25.1 years (range, 10.5 to 47.7 years)	Chemotherapy: HD Methotrexate 60.7% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Glucocorticoids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 48.5% CRT+CS or TBI 12.4% SCT: NR	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤ -1: 39.4% for men, 20.9% for women QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤ - 2.5: 2.8% for men, 0.7% for women	Multivariable model: QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤ -1: current smoking men OR 1.71, 95% CI 1.02 to 2.85; Current smoking women OR 1.14, 95% CI 0.59 to 2.20;	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: unclear
GRADE assessment			· •				
Study design: Study limitations:	-1 Some lii unclear	in 2/4	bias low in 1/4, und			n bias low in 2/4, unclear in 2/4; Confoun	ding low in 2/4,
Consistency: Directness: Precision:	0 Results	are direct, populati	on and outcomes b	n effect of smoking (2 signific roadly generalizable of patients and events	ant)		

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

**Effect size:** 0 No large magnitude of effect

**Dose-response:** 0 NA

<u>Plausible confounding:</u> 0 No plausible confounding

Quality of evidence:  $\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus \ominus \Box$  MODERATE

**Conclusion:** Increased risk of low BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2) in CAYA cancer survivors who are currently smoking.

(2 studies significant effect, 2 studies no significant effect; 3,493 participants)

**GRADE** assessment (outcome very low BMD):

Study design: +4 Cross-sectional cohort study

Study limitations: 0 No limitations: Selection bias low in 1/1; Attrition bias low in 1/1; Detection bias low in 1/1; Confounding low in 1/1

**Consistency:** NA Only one study available

<u>Directness:</u> 0 Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable

Precision: -1 Important imprecision, high total number of patients and events but only one study available

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

**Effect size:** 0 No large magnitude of effect

**Dose-response:** 0 NA

<u>Plausible confounding:</u> 0 No plausible confounding

Quality of evidence:  $\bigoplus \bigoplus \bigoplus \bigoplus$  MODERATE

**Conclusion:** No significant effect of current smoking on very low BMD (Z-score ≤-2) in CAYA cancer survivors.

(1 study no significant effect; 2,032 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

<sup>a</sup>(possible) overlap in included patients.

#### 1iii. What is the risk of lower BMD in CAYA cancer survivors who smoke?

PICO	Study		No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.iii. Risk lower BMD for smoking	Den Hoe	d 2015	346 adult CCS	Median time after cessation of treatment	<u>Chemotherapy:</u> Prednisone 63.6% Dexamethasone 37.0%	TB BMD or LS BMD Z- score <-1: 45% of the CCS. 38% TB, 27% LS,	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score (cont.): current smoking (yes vs. no) NS	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk
(n=1 study)				16.7 years (IQR 12.4–23.0)	Cyclophosphamide 49.7% Methotrexate 64.9% Ifosfamide 10.8% Radiotherapy: Cranial-spinal 16.5% Total body 3.8 % CRT 4.3% Abdominal 2.3% SCT: 4.9%	20% at both TB and LS. TB BMD or LS BMD Z- score <-2: 9% (TB), 3% (LS)	TB BMD Z-score (cont.): current smoking (yes vs. no) NS	CF: low risk
GRADE assessment:								
Study design:	+4		ctional cohort studi					
Study limitations:	-1			bias high in 1/1; Att	rition bias low in 1/1; Detect	ion bias low in 1/1; Confound	ling low in 1/1	
Consistency:	NA	•	study available					
<u>Directness:</u>	0				oadly generalizable			
Precision:	-1	•	nt imprecision, high	total number of pa	tients and events but only or	ie study available		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely						
Effect size:	0	Ū	magnitude of effec	t				
Dose-response:	0	NA	6 1.					
Plausible confoundin	<b>g:</b> 0		ible confounding					
Quality of evidence:		<b>ФФО</b>			D14D: 04V4			
Conclusion:		_			er BMD in CAYA cancer surviv	ors.		
		(1 study	no significant effec	t; 346 participants)				

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMl=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

## 1jjj. What is the risk of fractures in CAYA cancer survivors who smoke?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias			
1.jjj. Risk low BMD for smoking (n=1 study)	Wilson 2	2012 7414 CCS	Median length of follow-up was 22.7 years (range, 15.6- 34.2 years)	Chemotherapy: Methotrexate 43.6% Steroids 47% Radiotherapy: CRT 32% Pelvic RT 13% SCT: 0%	Proportion of participants with fractures <u>over their lifetime</u> Survivors: 34.8% Siblings: 38.9%	Multivariable model: Fracture: male survivors with prior smoking history, prevalence ratio, 1.24; 95% CI, 1.14-1.34; P < .001; female survivors with prior smoking history, prevalence ratio, 1.09; 95%	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: high risk CF: high risk			
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations:	+4	Cross-sectional cohort stud	•	trition bias low in 1/1; Detect	ion bias high in 1/1: Confo	CI, 0.98-1.21; P=0.12				
Consistency: Directness: Precision:	NA 0 -1	Only one study available Results are direct, populat	ion and outcomes br	oadly generalizable	Ç	<b></b>				
Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response:	0 0 0	Unlikely	No large magnitude of effect							
Plausible confoundi Quality of evidence: Conclusion:		No plausible confounding  ⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW	for male CAYA cance	er survivors with prior smokir	ng history.					
		(1 study significant effect;	7,414 participants)							

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; Cl=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBI=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

1kkk. What is the risk of low and very low BMD in CAYA cancer survivors who drink alcohol?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
1.kkk. Risk low BMD for alcohol (n=1 study)	Wilson 2016	862 adult ALL survivors	Median duration between diagnosis and follow-up was 25.1 years (range, 10.5 to 47.7 years)	Chemotherapy: HD Methotrexate 60.7% MTX 100% Cyclophosphamide 100% Glucocorticoids 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 48.5% CRT+CS or TBI 12.4% SCT: NR	LS BMD Z-score ≤ -1: 39.4% for men, 20.9% for women LS BMD Z-score ≤ -2.5: 2.8% for men, 0.7% for women	Multivariable model: LS BMD Z-score ≤ -1: Women: moderate alcohol consumption vs. never OR 2.09, 95% CI 1.14 to 3.83; risky alcohol consumption vs. never OR 2.03, 95% CI 0.97 to 4.24. Men: moderate alcohol consumption vs. never OR 0.98, 05% CI 0.60 to 1.60; risky alcohol	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: unclear CF: unclear
						95% CI 0.60 to 1.60; risky alcohol consumption vs. never OR 0.65, 95% CI 0.37 to 1.13.	
GRADE assessment:			I				
Study design: Study limitations:		trospective cohort stud	•	ition hiss low in 1/1: Detection	bias unclear in 1/1; Confoundi	ng unclear in 1/1	
Consistency:		ly one study available	ni bias iligii ili 1/1, Attii	ition bias low in 1/1, Detection	bias difclear in 1/1, comodita	ng unclear in 1/1	
Directness:		•	tion and outcomes broa	adly generalizable			
Precision:				ients and events, but one study	y available		
Publication bias:	0 Un	likely		·			
Effect size:	0 Lar	ge magnitude of effec	t, but only one study				
Dose-response:	0 NA						
Plausible confoundi	ing: 0 No	plausible confounding					
Quality of evidence		⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW					
Conclusion:				of alcohol consumption and lov	w BMD (Z-score ≤-1 or ≤-2) in C	AYA cancer survivors.	
	(1	study conflicting result	s; 862 participants)				

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; AD-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; CI=confidence interval; CML=chronic myeloid leukemia; cont.=continuous; β=regression coefficient; BMC= bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; BMI=body mass index; CCS=childhood cancer survivor; CNS=central nervous system; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; CSRT=craniospinal radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; DEXA=dexamethasone; DXA=dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry; FN=femoral neck; FU=follow-up; GCs=glucocorticoids; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; GVHD=graft versus host disease; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; HR=hazard ratio; IQR=interquartile range; LS=lumbar spine; MTX=methotrexate; NA=not applicable; NBL=neuroblastoma; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; NS=not significant; OR=odds ratio; PNET=primitive neuro-ectodermal tumor; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RT=radiotherapy; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SE=standard error; SD=standard deviation; TB=total body; TBl=total body irradiation; TH=total hip.

# What surveillance modality should be used?

2a. What is the diagnostic value of QCT compared to DXA in CAYA cancer survivors?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Diagnostic tests	Outcome definition	Diagnostic values Agreement between the tests	Risk of bias
2.a. Diagnostic value of QCT vs. DXA for detecting low BMD (n=2 studies)	Kaste 2006	320 survivors of childhood cancer	Time since stop therapy not specified.	-QCT at LS - DXA at lumbar spine in anterior projections of L1–L4 and lateral projections of L2–L4	NA	No diagnostic values of QCT compared to DXA presented.  Significant linear relationship between average BMD of the L1–L2 as measured by DXA and QCT (Pearson correlation coefficient 0.52, P < 0.0001).  Correlation between DXA-derived BMAD and QCT BMD (Pearson correlation coefficient 0.60, P<0.0001).  Significant linear relationship between DXA and QCT Z-scores (Pearson correlation coefficient 0.64, P < 0.0001.  Agreement of QCT and DXA with diagnosis of Z score <-2 was fair K=0.32.	SB: unclear IB: unclear RB: unclear VB: low risk AB: low risk
	Brennan 1999	31 survivors of childhood ALL	Participants were at least 2 years from completion of cancer therapy 6.8 till 28.6 years after cranial radiation (median 17.8 years)	- QCT: T12 to L3 - DXA: Integral (mixed cortical and trabecular) bone of L2 to L4 and right femoral neck	NA	No diagnostic values of QCT compared to DXA presented.  No significant correlation between QCT and DXA spine: 0.33; p=0.08  Significant correlation between QCT and DXA femoral neck: 0.53; p=0.004	SB: unclear IB: low risk RB: low risk VB: unclear AB: unclear
GRADE assessi Study design: Study limitatio Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bia Effect size: Dose-response Plausible confe Quality of evid Conclusion:	+4 ons: -1  -1 0 0 0 as: 0 0 ounding: 0	unclear in 1/2; Inconsistency of Results are directly No important in Unlikely No large magni NA No plausible co	ns: Selection bias unclo Attrition bias low in 1, of the correlation between, population and ou mprecision, high total tude of effect infounding V uated the diagnostic	/2, unclear in 1/2 veen DXA and QCT of the tcomes broadly generaliz	lumbar spine across table		pias low in 1/2,

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; BMD=bone mineral density; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; DXA=Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry; IB=index t	test
bias; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; RB=reference test bias; SB=selection bias; VB=verification bias.	

## 2b. What is the diagnostic value of QUS compared to DXA in CAYA cancer survivors?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mea n, range) yr	Diagnostic tests	Outcome definition	Diagnostic values Agreement between the tests	Risk of bias
2.b. Diagnostic	Azcona 2003	36 survivors	Mean	-QUS of the distal metaphysis	Osteopenia:	QUS vs. DXA	SB: unclear
value of QUS		of malignant	disease-free	of the proximal phalanxes of	Z-score ≤-1	Sensitivity: 36.4% (range 12.8%-66.4%)	IB: unclear
vs. DXA for		bone tumor	survival 4.97	the last four fingers of the		Specificity: 80.0% (range 61.1-92.3%)	RB: unclear
detecting low			years (range	nondominant hand		PPV: 44.4% (range 20.9%-70.8%)	VB: unclear
BMD			3.6-6.3)	-DXA of the lumbar spine (L1-		NPV: 74.1% (range 63.7%-82.3%)	AB: low risk
(m=1 atuals)				L4)		Diagnostic accuracy: 66.7% (range 50.2%-80.5%)	
(n=1 study)						Correlation QUS (Ad-SOS; m/s) and DXA (g/cm²): r	
						=0.44, p= 0.008	
GRADE assessmer							
Study design:	+4	Cohort study					
Study limitations:	-1	Some limitations: S low in 1/1	Selection bias uncl	ear in 1/1; Index test bias unclear	in 1/1; Reference	e test bias unclear in 1/1; Verification bias unclear in 1/1	; Attrition bias
Consistency:	NA	Only one study ava					
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are direct,	population and ou	tcomes broadly generalizable			
Precision:	-2	Low total number	of participants ANI	O only one study available			
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely					
Effect size:	0	No large magnitud	e of effect				
Dose-response:	NA	NA					
Plausible confour	nding: 0	No plausible confo	unding				
Quality of eviden	ce:	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LO	OW.				
Conclusion:		The diagnostic valuaccuracy 66.7%).	ue of QUS to detec	t low BMD is moderate as compa	red to DXA (sensi	tivity 36.4%, specificity 80.0%, PPV 44.4%, NPV 74.1%, d	iagnostic
		(1 study; 36 partici	pants)				

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; Ad-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; BMD=bone mineral density; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; DXA=Dual-Energy X-Ray Absorptiometry; IB=index test bias; QUS=quantitative ultrasound; RB=reference test bias; SB=selection bias; VB=verification bias.

## Recommendations in existing clinical practice guidelines in other populations (2 childhood cancer guidelines, 1 general pediatric guideline)

## What surveillance modality should be used?

*Kuhlen et al.* Guidance to Bone Morbidity in Children and Adolescents Undergoing Allogeneic Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2020 Feb;26(2):e27-e37.

Recommendation <sup>1</sup>	Level of evidence <sup>2</sup>
Yearly screening by DXA scan of the lumbar spine (L1 to L4) and whole body should be performed before and 12 months after HSCT.	Level 2
Yearly screening for vertebral fractures using either DXA VFA or lateral spine X-rays should be performed and assessed by a pediatric radiologist using the Genant score.	Level 2

Abbreviations: DXA=dual energy X-ray absorptiometry; HSCT=hematopoietic stem cell transplantation; VFA=vertebral fracture assessment.

#### <sup>1</sup> Grades of recommendation

Not provided in the manuscript

#### <sup>2</sup> Level of evidence

- 1: evidence from at least 1 randomized trial
- 2: evidence from cohort studies, case-control studies, and time series
- 3: opinions of respected authorities based on clinical experience, descriptive studies, or reports of expert committees, and provide our practice whenever no evidence is available

## What surveillance modality should be used?

*Marcucci et al.* Bone Health in Childhood Cancer: Review of the Literature and Recommendations for the Management of Bone Health in Childhood Cancer Survivors. Ann Oncol. 2019 Jun 1;30(6):908-920.

Recommendation <sup>1</sup>	Level of evidence <sup>2</sup>
We recommend the use of DEXA at the spine and femur, based on age, to diagnose and monitor BMD changes in these	Moderate
patients.	
The use of QCT should be avoided because of the higher radiation dose applied.	Very low
In the future, imaging methods based on magnetic resonance imaging or bone densitometer using ultrasound, such as	Very low
the recent radiofrequency echography multi-spectrometry technique, may be considered, especially in the pediatric	
population, to closely monitor quantity and quality of the trabecular and cortical bone tissue. However, such techniques	
must still be validated and standardized in the pediatric population.	

Abbreviations: BMD=bone mineral density; DEXA=dual energy X-ray absorptiometry; QCT=quantitative computed tomography.

#### <sup>1</sup> Grades of recommendation

Not provided in the manuscript

#### <sup>2</sup> Level of evidence according to GRADE

**High:** further research is unlikely to change the confidence in the estimate of effect.

Moderate: further research is likely to have an important impact on the confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

Low: further research is very likely to have an important impact on the confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Very low:** any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

## What surveillance modality should be used?

Gordon et al. 2013 Pediatric Position Development Conference: Executive Summary and Reflections. J Clin Densitom. 2014 Apr-Jun;17(2):219-24.

Recommendation <sup>1</sup>	Level of evidence <sup>2</sup>
Modality	
A: DXA is the preferred method for assessing BMC and areal BMD (aBMD).	Good
C: There is no preferred method for QCT for clinical application in children and adolescents.	Fair
B: QCT, peripheral QCT, and high-resolution peripheral QCT are primarily the research techniques used to characterize	Fair
bone deficits in children. They can be used clinically in children where appropriate reference data and expertise are	
available.	
Site	
<b>B:</b> The posteroanterior spine and total body less head (TBLH) are the preferred skeletal sites for performed BMC and	Fair
aBMD measurements in most pediatric subjects. Other sites may be useful depending on the clinic need.	
<b>B:</b> The hip is not a preferred measurement site in growing children because of variability in skeletal development.	Fair
Update 2019: Proximal femur DXA measurements can be used, if reference data are available, for assessing children with	Not reported
reduced weight bearing and mechanical loading of the lower extremities or in children at-risk for bone fragility who would	Notreported
benefit from continuity of DXA measurements through the transition into adulthood.	
B: Soft tissue measures in conjunction with whole-body scans may be helpful in evaluating patients with chronic	Fair
conditions associated malnutrition or with muscle and skeletal deficits.	
Normative values	
A: An appropriate data set must include a sample of healthy representatives of the general population sufficiently large	Good
to capture variability in bone measures that takes into consideration gender, age, and race/ethnicity.	
<b>B:</b> In children with short stature or growth delay, spine and TBLH BMC and aBMD results should be adjusted. For the	Fair
spine, adjust either BMD or the height Z-score. For TBLH, adjust using the height Z-score.	
A: T-scores should not appear in pediatric DXA reports.	Good
Nomenclature	
C: "Low bone mass or bone mineral density" is the preferred term for pediatric DXA reports when BMC or aBMD	Poor
Z-scores are less than or equal to -2.0 standard deviation.	
<b>B:</b> The term "osteoporosis" should not appear in pediatric DXA reports without a clinically significant fracture history.	Good
C: The term "osteopenia" should not appear in pediatric DXA reports.	Fair/Poor
Osteoporosis diagnosis	
C: The diagnosis of osteoporosis in children and adolescents should not be made on the basis of densitometric criteria	Poor
alone.	
C: In the absence of vertebral compression (crush) fractures, the diagnosis of osteoporosis is indicated by the presence of	Poor
both a clinically significant fracture history and BMD Z-score of -2.0 or lower. A clinically significant fracture history is one	
or more of the following: (1) 2 or more long-bone fractures by the age of 10 yr; (2) 3 or more long-bone fractures at any	

age up to age 19 yr. A bone mineral content (BMC)/BMD Z-score higher than -2.0 does not preclude the possibility of	
skeletal fragility and increased fracture risk.	
Update 2019: DXA VFA may be used as a substitute for spine radiography in the identification of symptomatic and	Not reported
asymptomatic VF.	
Update 2019: The Genant semiquantitative method should be used for VFA in children.	Not reported

Abbreviations: BMC=bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; DXA=dual energy X-ray absorptiometry; QCT=quantitative computed tomography; TBLH=total body less head; VFA=vertebral fracture assessment.

#### <sup>1</sup> Grades of recommendation

A: strong recommendation supported by the evidence

**B:** supported by some evidence

C: supported primarily by expert opinion

#### <sup>2</sup> Level of evidence

Good: evidence included consistent results from well-designed, well-conducted studies in representative populations

Fair: evidence is sufficient to determine effects on outcomes, but the strength of the evidence is limited by the number, quality, or consistency of the individual studies

**Poor:** evidence is insufficient to assess the effects on outcomes because of limited number or power of studies, important flaws in their design or conduct, gaps in the chain of evidence, or lack of information

## Summary:

Recommendations in existing clinical practice guidelines in other populations (2 childhood cancer guidelines, 1 general pediatric guideline)						
DXA is the preferred method for BMD surveillance	Evidence-based guidelines					
The lumbar spine (L1-L4) and total body less head (children) or total hip (adolescents and adults) are the preferred skeletal sites to	Evidence-based guidelines					
measure BMD						
The use of QCT should be avoided	Evidence-based guidelines					

# When should surveillance be initiated and at what frequency should it be performed?

2.c What is the likelihood of change (improvement or deterioration) of BMD over time in CAYA cancer survivors? What is the timing of such change?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	1 <sup>st</sup> evaluation	2 <sup>nd</sup> evaluation	Change over time	Risk of bias
2.c. Risk over time of low BMD (n=9 studies)	Demirkaya 2011	66 children treated for lymphoma or solid tumors	First evaluation: mean 2.62 ± 1.44 years after completion of treatment Second evaluation: mean 6.55 ± 1.71 years	-Normal: 23 (34.8%) -Osteopenia: 26 (39.4%) -Osteoporosis: 17 (25.8%)  Mean LS BMD Z-score - 1.26 ± 1.12 (range -4.3 to 2.0)	-Normal: 46 (69.6%) -Osteopenia: 13 (19.7%) -Osteoporosis: 7 (10.6%)  Mean LS BMD Z-score -0.48 ± 1.25 (range - 3.30 to 3.40)	Significant recovery was observed in LS BMD Z-scores at second evaluation (p=0.001)  No significant correlation was detected between follow-up duration and LS BMD Z-score.	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk
	Kaste 2006b	57 survivors of childhood ALL (study I 141, study II 57)	First evaluation: (study I): >4 years after therapy (mean time after dx 11.7 yrs) Second evaluation: (study II): 2-5 years after study I (mean time after dx 16.1 yrs)	QCT LS BMD Z-score below the mean (<0) 57.9%, QCT LS BMD Z-score <- 1: 10.5%	QCT LS BMD Z-score below the mean 59.6%, QCT LS BMD Z-score <- 1: 19.3%	Increase in trabecular BMD of 9.3 mg/cc (p=0.003) and an increase of mean BMD Z-score of 0.21 (P=0.04). Cortical BMD (38 survivors) increased significantly between the two studies (P<0.001). Cortical BMD had a significantly greater gain than trabecular BMD (P=0.045).	SB: unclear AB: high risk DB: low risk
	Latoch 2021	326 CCS (123 had 2 DXA scans)	Mean time between the second (DXA2) and first (DXA1) densitometry was 5.54 years (mean age, 17.11 ± 3.67 vs. 11.57 ± 4.03 years	Mean LS BMD Z-score: -0.277 LS BMD Z-score <-2: n=9 LS BMD Z-score <-1 and ≥ -2: n=28 Mean TB BMD Z-score: -0.176 TB BMD Z-score <-2: n=18 TB BMD Z-score <-1 and ≥ -2: n=23	Mean LS BMD Z-score: -0.180 LS BMD Z-score <-2: n=6 LS BMD Z-score <-1 and ≥ -2: n=14 Mean TB BMD Z-score: -0.262 TB BMD Z-score <-2: n=6 TB BMD Z-score <-1 and ≥ -2: n=19	Mean LS BMD Z-scores between DXA1 and DXA2 increased, mean TB BMD Z-scores decreased, both not significant (p=0.842 and p=0.293)  The number of patients with LS and TB BMD Z-scores <-2 and <-1 decreased over time (significance unclear)	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk
	Marinovic 2005	37 survivors of childhood ALL 74 controls matched by age, sex and pubertal stage from a large, healthy	First evaluation: median 2.2 years (range: 0.1–3.1 years) after completion of treatment	Median TB BMD: slightly non- significantly reduced in ALL survivors vs. controls (p=0.06)	No difference from control subjects was found in TB BMD (p=0.23)	Both groups showed an annual increment in BMD measurements  TB BMD (but not LS BMD) demonstrated a significantly higher increase in ALL patients vs. controls (p=0.01)	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk

	group of 266 white children who were longitudinally investigated for BMD	Second evaluation: 1 year after first evaluation	Median LS BMD: significantly lower in ALL survivors vs. controls (p=0.04)	LS BMD slightly, but not significantly reduced (p=0.06)	TB BMD: Patients change: 0.034 (0023; 0044); Control change: 0.025 (0014; 0031)  LS BMD: Patients change: 0.039 (0022; 0074); Control change: 0.034 (0006; 0053)  LS BMAD: Patients change: 0.004 (0002; 0008); Control change:	
Gurney 2014	400 survivors of childhood ALL	First evaluation: Median 8.5 years before second evaluation Second evaluation: not specified; at least 10 years post- diagnosis	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤- 2: 61 (15.2%)	QCT LS BMD Z-score ≤- 2: 28 (7.0%)	0.002 (0004; 0008)  367 (91.8%) either improved their LS BMD Z-score category or remained stable over the follow- up period – 67% of those who previously had a LS BMD Z-score of ≤-2 improved by 1 or more categories at second evaluation	SB: unclear AB: low risk DB: low risk
Pluijm 2015	188 adult childhood cancer survivors	Median period between DXA scans was 3.2 years (range 0.9-10.9 years)	NR	TB BMD at 2 <sup>nd</sup> evaluation: mean Z- score 0.08 increase (p>0.01)  LS BMD at 2 <sup>nd</sup> evaluation: mean Z- score 0.06 increase (p=0.03)	Significant increase in TB and LS BMD Z-scores between 1st and 2nd evaluation (p<0.01 and p=0.03)  TB BMD increased significantly over time in AML, NHL and renal tumor survivors, and LS BMD in AML, but not in ALL survivors. Analyzed by gender, TB BMD and LS BMD improved significantly only in males.  Peak bone mass for LS BMD seemed to be reached at about age 23; TB BMD tended to increase until age 26/27	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk
Pluskiewicz 2004	38 survivors of childhood ALL 1402 controls who were healthy pupils randomly selected from schools in the same urban region of Poland.	First evaluation: 2 years before second evaluation Second evaluation: mean 5.7 ± 2.9 years after completion of treatment	Mean Ad-SoS values in the whole group of survivors and in boys not significantly different from controls; girls significantly higher Mean Ad-SoS value	Ad-SoS in patients was significantly higher than in controls; Same trends were observed in both genders, but without significance  Mean Ad-SoS value	Mean Ad-SoS in survivors increased (p <0.001 boys; p<0.001 girls) compared with baseline  Survivors: Ad-SoS increased in 37 (97.4%) Ad-SoS increased more than the least significant change in 31 (81.6%)	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: unclear

	The control group consisted of different subjects at baseline and follow-up.		1990 <u>±</u> 76 m/s in survivors vs. 1973 <u>+</u> 64 m/s in controls	2045 <u>+</u> 86 m/s in survivors vs. 2016 <u>+</u> 86 m/s in controls	Controls: NR	
Muszynska- Roslan 2009	114 survivors of childhood cancer	First evaluation: Mean years from completion of treatment ALL: 2.4±1.9 years HL: 2.8±2.1 years Solid tumor: 3.7±4.6 years Second evaluation: Mean years from completion of treatment ALL: 5.8±3.4 years HL: 6.3±2.9 years Solid tumor: 6.9±4.6 years	LS or TB BMD Z-score <-2: ALL: 10.5% HL: 6.9% Solid Tumor: 30.5%  Median TB BMD Z-score: ALL: 0.26±1.7 HL: 0.11±0.9 Solid Tumor: -1.14±1.2  Median LS BMD Z-score: ALL: 0.23±1.3 HL: 0.23±1.1 Solid Tumor: -1.13±1.1	LS or TB BMD Z-score ≤-2: ALL: 8.7% HL: 6.9% Solid Tumor: 16.6%  Median TB BMD Z- score: ALL:0.12±1.5 HL: -0.09±1.2 Solid Tumor: -0.40±0.6  Median LS BMD Z- score: ALL: 0.15±1.6 HL: -0.09±0.8 Solid Tumor: -0.40±0.8	No conclusions reported regarding the change of BMD Z-scores between the first and second evaluation.  Increasing age was independently associated with higher Z-scores of TB BMD (p=0.021) and LS BMD (p=0.03)	SB: high ris AB: low ris DB: low ris
Tabone 2021	89 leukemia survivors	First evaluation: Mean (± SD) interval from diagnosis 7.0 ± 4.7 yrs Second evaluation: Mean (± SD) interval from diagnosis 11.7 ± 5.2 yrs	Proportion of survivors with a BMD Z-score ≤-2 LS: 15.7% FN: 14.5% TH: 14.5% TB: 7%	Proportion of survivors with a BMD Z-score ≤-2 LS: 14.6% FN: 4.3% TH: 7.2% TB: 9.3%  Mean difference in BMD Z-score between the first and second scan: LS: +0.11, 95%CI −0.05 to 0.28, p=0.170 FN: +0.21, 95%CI 0.02−0.40, p=0.033 TH: +0.19, 95%CI 0.01-0.38, p=0.036 TB: +0.03, 95%CI −0.19 to 0.25, p=0.815	Significant increase in mean FN and TH BMD Z-scores between 1 <sup>st</sup> and 2 <sup>nd</sup> evaluation (p=0.033 and p=0.036)  Significant decrease in the proportion of survivors with a FN BMD Z-score ≤-2 (p=0.04)  Changes in mean BMD Z-score and Z-score ≤-2 at other skeletal sites were not significant	SB: high ris AB: low risl DB: low risl

Study limitations:	-1	Some limitations: Selection bias low in 1/9, unclear in 3/9, high in 5/9; Attrition bias low in 5/9, high in 4/9; Detection bias low in 8/9, unclear in 1/9
Consistency:	0	No important inconsistency, all studies show an increase of BMD at follow-up
Directness:	0	Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable
Precision:	0	No important imprecision, high total number of patients
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect
Dose-response:	0	NA.
Plausible confounding	<u>:</u> 0	No plausible confounding
Quality of evidence:		$\oplus \oplus \ominus$ moderate
Conclusion:		BMD Z-scores increase over time from 2 years until at least 10 years since end of cancer treatment in CAYA cancer survivors.
		(7 studies significant effect, 1 study significance unclear, 1 study non-significant increase; 1112 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; Ad-SoS=amplitude-dependent speed of sound; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; AML=acute myeloid leukemia; BMD=bone mineral density; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; CF=confounding; DB=detection bias; dx=diagnosis; DXA=Dual-energy X-Ray Absorptiometry; HL=Hodgkin's lymphoma; IB=index test bias; LS=lumbar spine; NA=not applicable; NHL=non-Hodgkin lymphoma; NR=not reported; SB=selection bias; TB=total body.

# 2.d What is the association between low and very low BMD and fractures in CAYA cancer survivors? (Does surveillance of impaired BMD lead to less fractures in CAYA cancer survivors?)

PICO	Study		No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Treatment (% treated)	Events	Effect size	Risk of bias
2.d. Risk fractures for low BMD (n=3 studies)	Bloomhai	rdt 2020	542 CCS	Mean time since treatment (±SD) 6.0±5.0 years (range 2.0-35.1)	Chemotherapy: Dexamethasone 59.6% Prednisone 35.4% Any glucocorticoid 95% Cyclophosphamide 85.1% High-dose methotrexate 25.8% Radiotherapy: CRT 20.7% TBI 8.1% SCT: NR	Non-digit (1 or more post- treatment) fracture: 21.4% Upper extremity long bone (includes wrist): 12.2% Lower extremity long bone (includes ankle): 5.4%	Univariable model: Any nondigit post-therapy fracture: Z-score <-1 (y/n) OR 2.2, 95% CI 1.3-3.7, Long bone fracture: Z-score <-1 (y/n) OR 2.7, 95% CI 1.5- 4.7	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: high risk
	Fiscaletti	2021	251 ALL survivors	Median 15.1 years (range 5.4 to 28.2 years) since cancer diagnosis	Chemotherapy: Glucocorticoids 100% Methotrexate 100% Radiotherapy: CRT 59% SCT: None	Vertebral fractures: 23% Non-vertebral fractures: 31%	Multivariable model: Vertebral fractures: LS BMD Z-score: RR 0.91, 95%CI 0.75-1.11, p=0.350	SB: low risk AB: low risk DB: low risk CF: low risk
	van Sante	en 2020	177 craniopharyngioma survivors	Median 16 years (range 1-62)	Chemotherapy: 0% Radiotherapy: CRT: 51% 90Yttrium brachytherapy: 13% SCT: None	Fractures: 18% over time (5.8 fractures per 1000 person-years)	Univariable model: Fractures: osteopenia (y/n) OR 2.6, 95%CI 0.9-7.7, p=0.09; osteoporosis (y/n) OR 2.1, 95%CI 0.7-6.4, p=0.21	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: high risk CF: high risk
GRADE assessment Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confound	+4 -3 0 0 0 0 0 0 +1 0	Some limi No impor Results ar No impor Unlikely Large mag NA No plausi	tant inconsistency, both re direct, population and tant imprecision, high t gnitude of effect ble confounding	n studies show an ass d outcomes broadly	sociation between low BMD a generalizable	etection bias low in 1/2, high ir and fractures (1 significant)	n 1/2; Confounding high in 2/2	
Quality of evidence Conclusion:	e: 				ore ≤-1 or ≤-2) and fractures i t; 719 participants)	n CAYA cancer survivors.		
GRADE assessment Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness:	t: +4 0 NA 0	No import Only one	tional cohort studies tant limitations: Selection study available re direct, population and			tion bias low in 1/1; Confoundi	ng low in 1/1	

Precision:	-2	Important imprecision: low total number of patients and events and only one study available
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect
Dose-response:	0	NA NA
Plausible confounding:	0	No plausible confounding
Quality of evidence:		$\oplus \oplus \ominus \ominus$ LOW
Conclusion:		No significant association between lower BMD Z-scores (continuous) and fractures in CAYA cancer survivors.
		(1 study no significant effect; 251 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; BMD=bone mineral density; CCS=childhood cancer survivors; CF=confounding bias; CRT=cranial radiotherapy; DB=detection bias; NA=not applicable; NR=not reported; OR=odds ratio; SB=selection bias; SCT=stem cell transplantation; SD=standard deviation; TBI=total body irradiation.

## What should be done when abnormalities are identified?

3a. Does assurance of a minimum daily intake of vitamin D or vitamin D supplements improve BMD and/or prevent fractures in CAYA cancer survivors? Does assurance of a minimum daily intake of calcium or calcium supplements improve BMD and/or prevent fractures in CAYA cancer survivors?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Intervention	Controls	Effect intervention	Risk of bias		
3.a. Effect of vitamin D / calcium supplementation on BMD	Kaste 20	214 424 survivors of childhood ALL Intervention group: 275 with BMD Z-score <0 Control group:	Median time since treatment 8.4 yrs (range 4.6-19.1) 24 months of follow-up from	Nutritional counseling to encourage recommended daily intake of calcium and cholecalciferol	Nutritional counseling to encourage recommended daily intake of calcium and cholecalciferol	LS BMD Z-score change supplement vs. placebo β 0.03, 95%CI -0.13-0.19, p=0.70	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: low risk PB: low risk		
(n=1 study)		134 with a LS BMD Z-score > 0	start intervention	Once daily calcium carbonate (1,000 mg) and cholecalciferol (800 IU) during 24 months	Placebo				
GRADE assessment:									
Study design:	+4	Randomized controlled trial							
Study limitations:	-2	Limitations: Selection bias hig	h in 1/1; Attrition bias h	igh in 1/1; Detection bias lo	w in 1/1; Performance bias	low in 1/1			
Consistency:	NA	Only one study available							
<u>Directness:</u>	0	Results are direct, population	, ,						
Precision:	-2		ants, but only one study	available AND confidence ir	nterval includes possible be	enefit from vitamin D supplementation	n		
Publication bias:	0	Unlikely							
Effect size:	0	No large magnitude of effect							
Dose-response:	0	Dose-response relationship be	etween vitamin D doses	and BMD change not assess	sed				
Plausible confoundi		No plausible confounding							
Quality of evidence:	Quality of evidence:		⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW						
Conclusion:		No significant effect of calcium (1 study no significant effect;		nentation on BMD in CAYA o	cancer survivors.				

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; Cl=confidence interval; β=regression coefficient; BMD=bone mineral density; DB=detection bias; LS=lumbar spine; NA=not applicable; PB=performance bias; SB=selection bias.

## 3b. Does physical exercise improve BMD and/or prevent fractures in CAYA cancer survivors?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Intervention	Controls	Effect intervention	Risk of bias
3.b. Effect of physical exercise on BMD	Dubnov-Raz	2015 33 survivors of childhood cancer Intervention group: 21	Median time since treatment 3.0 yrs (range 0.9-5.5)	"Go active" gym provided a three time supervised group-based exercise session per	Maintain current lifestyle	Intervention vs. control group: Lumber BMD Z-score: p=0.90 Lumber BMD g/cm2: p=0.13 Total body BMC (g) p=0.70	SB: high risk AB: unclear DB: high risk PB: high risk
(n=1 study)		Control group: 12	6 months of follow-up from start intervention	week during six months that included 15 minutes of aerobic warm-up, 30 minutes of strengthening/cardiac conditioning activities using bands, balls, games, free weights, and 10-15 minutes of active cool down with walking and stretching.		Total body BMD (g/cm²) p=0.39 Femoral head BMD (g/cm²) p=0.18 (No effect measures reported)	Ü
GRADE assessment:							
Study design:		on-randomized controlled tria					
Study limitations:		nitations: Selection bias high i	n 1/1; Attrition bias u	nclear in 1/1; Detection bias	high in 1/1; Performance	bias high in 1/1	
Consistency:		nly one study available					
<u>Directness:</u>		sults are direct, population ar					
Precision:		w total number of participant	s AND only one study	available			
Publication bias:		nlikely					
Effect size:		agnitude of effect not describ					
Dose-response:		lationship between higher ex	posure to exercise and	BMD change not assessed			
Plausible confoundi		plausible confounding					
Quality of evidence:	$\mathbf{v}$	O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O O					
Conclusion:		significant effect of physical		AYA cancer survivors.			
	(1	study no significant effect; 21	participants)				

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; BMD=bone mineral density; DB=detection bias; NA=not applicable; PB=performance bias; SB=selection bias.

## 3c. Does treatment with a vibrating plate improve BMD and/or prevent fractures in CAYA cancer survivors?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Intervention	Controls	Effect intervention	Risk of bias
3.c. Effect of vibrating plate on BMD (n=1 study)	Mogil 2016	65 survivors of childhood cancer Intervention group: 32 Control group: 33	> 5 years from cancer diagnosis  1 year of follow-up from start intervention	Low-magnitude (<1.0g), high frequency mechanical stimulation (LMS) device used at home, 10 minutes twice daily for 1 year. Calcium (800-1200mg/d) and vitamin D supplements (cholecalciferol, 400 IU/d)	The placebo group stood on a device identical in appearance to the active platform. The placebo device emitted a 500-Hz audible hum but did not deliver the signal. Calcium (800-1200mg/d) and vitamin D supplements (cholecalciferol, 400 IU/d)	Difference total-body BMD mean (SD) Z-scores (intention to treat analysis) Intervention group (n=22): 0.25 (0.78) (95% CI -0.09 to 0.59); Control group (n=26): -0.19 (0.79) (95% CI -0.51 to 0.12); Intervention vs. control p=0.05  Difference L1, L2 BMD Z-score (intention to treat analysis): Intervention group (n=22): 0.08 (0.51) (95% CI -0.13 to 0.30); Control group (n=26): 0.14 (0.51) (95% CI -0.06 to 0.35); Intervention vs. control p=0.68  Tibial trabecular bone among participants completing 70% or more of the prescribed sessions increased by a mean of 11.2% (95%CI, 5.2 to 17.2%); Tibial trabecular bone among participants completing less than 70% who decreased by a mean of -1.3% (95%CI, -7.3 to 4.7%); P = 0.02	SB: low risk AB: high risk DB: low risk PB: low risk
GRADE assessment: Study design: Study limitations: Consistency: Directness: Precision: Publication bias: Effect size: Dose-response: Plausible confounding Quality of evidence:	-1 NA 0 -2 0 0 0 0 5 0 0 5	Limitations: Selection bias low in 1/1; Attrition bias high in 1/1; Detection bias low in 1/1; Performance bias low in 1/1  NA Only one study available  Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable  Reasonable total number of participants, but confidence interval includes possible decrease in BMD in the intervention group AND only one study available  Unlikely  No large magnitude of effect  Significant relationship between higher exposure to the vibrating plate (>70% completed sessions vs. <70%) and BMD change					

Conclusion:	No significant effect of twice daily treatment with a vibrating plate on total body BMD Z-score in CAYA cancer survivors in an intention-to-treat analysis
	(p=0.05), although there was a significant improvement of tibial trabecular bone content among participants completing 70% or more of the prescribed
	sessions.
	(1 study no significant effect in the intention-to-treat analysis, significant effect in the per-protocol analysis; 65 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; BMD=bone mineral density; DB=detection bias; IU=international units; NA=not applicable; PB=performance bias; SB=selection bias; SD=standard deviation.

# 3d. Does growth hormone replacement therapy improve BMD and/or prevent fractures in CAYA cancer survivors?

PICO	Study	No. of participants	Follow up (median/mean, range) yr	Intervention	Controls	Effect intervention	Risk of bias
3.d. Effect of growth hormone replacement therapy on BMD (n=3 studies)	Van den Heijkant 2011	20 survivors of childhood ALL with low BMD (<- 1 SD) at the LS or femoral sites and/or low IGF-1 (<-1 SD)	Mean time since treatment completion 20.7±3.2 years 2 years of follow- up from start intervention	Human Growth hormone (Eli Lilly penfill system) given subcutaneously for 2 years. The initial dose was 0.1 mg/m² of body surface. The dose was increased every 2 weeks by 0.1 mg/m² until IGF-1 rose above the mean of a reference group in all 20 participants (both with and without GHD).	-	After 24 months of GH treatment: -Significant increase in crude total body BMD measurements (g/cm2) (p=0.005); -No significant effect on other skeletal sites or total body BMC (Kg); Significant increase in FN BMD Z-score (p=0.02)Increase in total body BMD significantly higher in GHD survivors vs. non-GHD survivors (p=0.004).  Effect size NR for all findings.	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: high risk PB: high risk
	Follin 2011	31 survivors of ALL with GHD: GH treatment (n=18), and no GH treatment (n=13)  Control group: 28 matched population controls (similar in sex, age, residence and smoking habits)	Years since treatment completion GH group: 21 (8-27) No GH group: 19 (9-27) 5 years of follow- up from start intervention	GH treatment: 0.5 mg/day for women and men (Humantrope Eli Lilly) for 5 years.	Survivor controls: untreated GHD who had regular contact with a doctor or nurse for 5 years.  Population controls: no information.	No significant difference in BMD and BMAD after 5 years at any site in GH treated survivors vs. non-GH treated survivors and controls  Median net difference femoral Z-scores GH-treated vs. non-GH-treated survivors: -0.20 vs0.25  Median net difference Z-scores at L2–L4 levels GH-treated vs. non-GH-treated survivors: -0.10 vs0.25	SB: high risk AB: low risk DB: unclear PB: high risk
	Cohen 2012	36 survivors of childhood brain tumor 29 with GHD; 20 treated for GHD, 9 untreated GHD 7 without GHD	8.5 ± 3.6 years  1 year of follow- up from start intervention	rhGH	No growth hormone replacement	Among patients with GHD (n=29), those treated (n=20) with rhGH for >1 year had significantly higher BMD and BMD Z-scores of the hip (BMD 0.970±0.032 vs. 0.803±0.045, p=0.006; BMD Z-scores -0.365±0.259 vs1.533±0.460, p=0.03), spine (BMD 0.978±0.027 vs. 0.779±0.036, p<0.0001; BMD Z-scores -0.115±0.255 vs2.067±0.429, p<0.0001) and femoral neck (BMD 0.878±0.033 vs. 0.725±0.034, p=0.01; BMD Z-scores -0.385±0.273 vs	SB: high risk AB: high risk DB: high risk PB: high risk

1.378±0.342, p=0.043) compared to those untreated (n=9)

Significantly higher BMAD and BMAD Z-scores of the spine (BMAD 0.150±0.004 vs. 0.131±0.007, p=0.02; BMAD Z-scores 0.248±0.264 vs. - 1.368±0.418, p=0.002) but not of the femoral neck (BMAD 0.168±0.006 vs. 0.157±0.009, p=0.33; BMAD Z-scores - 0.130±0.255 vs. -0.706±0.393, p=0.22) among GH treated survivors vs. non-GH treated survivors

**GRADE** assessment:

Study design: +2 One uncontrolled single arm trial, two retrospective observational studies

Study limitations: -3 Limitations: Selection bias high in 3/3; Attrition bias low in 1/3, high in 2/3; Detection bias unclear in 1/3, high in 2/3; Performance bias high in 3/3

Consistency:-1Inconsistency of the effect of the intervention across the studiesDirectness:0Results are direct, population and outcomes broadly generalizable

<u>Precision:</u> -1 Small total number of participants

**Publication bias:** 0 Unlikely

**Effect size:** 0 Magnitude of effect not described

<u>Dose-response:</u> 0 Dose-response relationship between GH doses and BMD change not assessed

**<u>Plausible confounding:</u>** 0 No plausible confounding

Quality of evidence:

**Conclusion:** Significant effect of growth hormone replacement therapy in GH deficient survivors to increase BMD in CAYA cancer survivors.

(2 significant effect, 1 no significant effect; 80 participants)

Abbreviations: AB=attrition bias; ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; CAYA=childhood, adolescent and young adult; BMAD=bone mineral apparent density; BMC=bone mineral content; BMD=bone mineral density; DB=detection bias; GH=growth hormone; GHD=growth hormone deficiency; LS=lumbar spine; NR=not reported; PB=performance bias; rhGH=recombinant human growth hormone; SB=selection bias; SD=standard deviation.

## Recommendations in existing clinical practice guidelines in other populations (2 childhood cancer guidelines)

## What should be done when abnormalities are identified?

*Kuhlen et al.* Guidance to Bone Morbidity in Children and Adolescents Undergoing Allogeneic Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation. Biol Blood Marrow Transplant. 2020 Feb;26(2):e27-e37.

Block Wallow Transplant: 2020 Feb,20(2):227 C57.	
Recommendation <sup>1</sup>	Level of evidence <sup>2</sup>
Adequate calcium and vitamin D intake are important for preventing osteomalacia and rickets but will not prevent or	Level 1
treat OP. The minimum intakes known to prevent rickets are ≥500 mg/d of calcium and 10 μg (400 IU)/d of vitamin D; higher	
vitamin D intakes (12.5 to 25 μg or 500 to 1000 IU) have been recommended for children and adolescents at risk of vitamin D	
deficiency due to factors and conditions that reduce synthesis or intake (e.g., restricted exposure to sun,	
high latitude during winter/spring season, and low dietary calcium intake). Target 25(OH)D levels should be above 50 nmol/L.	
There is no benefit in higher 25(OH)D levels from vitamin D supplementation.	
Pubertal delay due to hypogonadism and other endocrinopathies need to be assessed on a regular basis and if necessary	Level 2
pediatric endocrinologists consulted	
Muscle force enhances bone accrual. Thus, promoting physical activity and exercise during and after HSCT is of particular	Level 2
importance, within the limits of illness.	
Basically, diagnosis and treatment of OP in children and adolescents should follow the ISCD guidance of pediatric OP. Therein,	Level 2
BP treatment is reserved for older patients with overt bone fragility and low potential for BMD restitution and vertebral body	
reshaping.	
In case of significant functional impairment limiting QoL, age becomes less important and treatment may be initiated.	Level 2
However, the ISCD guidance only provides recommendations for children with standard ALL. As in children and adolescents	Level 3
with ALL undergoing HSCT, more complications and poor outcome are probably more likely. BP therapy may be used in younger	
patients with serious complications, bone pain, and therefore less potential for recovery, as long as ISCD criteria of OP are	
fulfilled.	

Abbreviations: ALL=acute lymphoblastic leukemia; BMD=bone mineral density; BP=bisphosphonate; OP=osteoporosis; HSCT=hematopoietic stem cell transplantation; ISCD=international society of clinical densitometry; QoL=quality of life.

#### <sup>1</sup> Grades of recommendation

Not provided in the manuscript

#### <sup>2</sup> Level of evidence

- 1: evidence from at least 1 randomized trial
- 2: evidence from cohort studies, case-control studies, and time series
- 3: opinions of respected authorities based on clinical experience, descriptive studies, or reports of expert committees, and provide our practice whenever no evidence is available

## What should be done when abnormalities are identified?

*Marcucci et al.* Bone Health in Childhood Cancer: Review of the Literature and Recommendations for the Management of Bone Health in Childhood Cancer Survivors. Ann Oncol. 2019 Jun 1;30(6):908-920.

Recommendation <sup>1</sup>	Level of evidence <sup>2</sup>
When low BMD (juvenile osteoporosis) is reported, Z-score ≤2 or T-score ≤2.5 (based on age, pubertal development, and	Childhood/adolescent/young adult
growth process), and/or fragility fractures, and/or chronic use of glucocorticoids, antiresorptive treatments (bisphosphonate)	age: low
should be taken into consideration.	Adulthood: moderate
Recommendations regarding adequate calcium (or diet intake) and vitamin D supplementations, in case of deficit, in addition to	Low
adequate physical activity, to avoid negative lifestyles, should always be given, irrespective of BMD, as recommended in the	
general population.	
It is important to counsel survivors to avoid smoking, alcohol, cannabis, and excessive use of caffeine.	Not reported
If necessary, correction of endocrine alterations or other modifiable risk factors of impaired bone quantity/quality should be	Low
evaluated	

Abbreviations: BMD=bone mineral density.

#### <sup>1</sup> Grades of recommendation

Not provided in the manuscript

## <sup>2</sup> Level of evidence according to GRADE

**High:** further research is unlikely to change the confidence in the estimate of effect.

Moderate: further research is likely to have an important impact on the confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate.

Low: further research is very likely to have an important impact on the confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.

**Very low:** any estimate of effect is very uncertain.

## **Summary:**

Recommendations in existing clinical practice guidelines in other populations (2 childhood cancer guidelines)				
In patients with severe bone fragility and low potential for BMD restitution, bisphosphonate treatment should be considered	Evidence-based guidelines			
Adequate calcium and vitamin D intake is important. Only in case of deficit, supplementation is warranted	Evidence-based guidelines			
Negative lifestyles such as smoking and alcohol use should be avoided	Evidence-based guideline			
Adequate physical activity is important and should be promoted.	Evidence-based guidelines			
The presence of endocrinopathies such as hypogonadism should be evaluated and corrected if necessary	Evidence-based guidelines			