

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

**Serum High Sensitivity C-Reactive Protein Poorly Predicts Bone Mineral Density: A NHANES
2017-2020 Analysis**

Sarah E. Little-Letsinger*

Dept. of Evolutionary Anthropology, Duke University, Durham, NC, USA

*Corresponding Author: sarah.little11@gmail.com

27 **Abstract**

28 A reliable, widely available method to detect osteoporosis prior to fracture is needed. Serum levels of C-
29 reactive protein may independently predict low bone mineral density (BMD) and high fracture risk. Existing
30 empirical data focus on sexually and/or racially homogenous populations. This study tests the hypotheses that:
31 C-reactive protein (1) negatively correlates with BMD and (2) fracture history, and (3) independently predicts
32 BMD and fracture history in a diverse population. NHANES 2017-2020 pre-pandemic cycle data were
33 analyzed in R studio. Strength and direction of relationships (-1 to +1) between variables were determined
34 using Kendall's rank correlation coefficient (τ). Linear models were optimized to predict femoral neck or
35 lumbar spine BMD. C-reactive protein positively correlated with femoral ($\tau=0.09$, $p<0.0001$) and spine BMD
36 ($\tau=0.10$, $p<0.0001$). Individuals identifying as female demonstrated more robust, but still weak, correlations
37 between C-reactive protein and femoral neck ($\tau=0.15$, $p<0.0001$; male, $\tau=0.06$, $p=0.051$) and spine BMD
38 ($\tau=0.16$, $p<0.0001$; male, $\tau=0.06$, $p=0.04$). C-reactive protein positively correlated with fracture history
39 ($\tau=0.083$, $p=0.0009$). C-reactive protein significantly predicted femoral neck ($R^2=0.022$, $p=0.0001$) and spine
40 BMD ($R^2=0.028$, $p<0.0001$) and fracture history ($R^2=0.015$, $p<0.0001$). Exploratory analyses identified weight
41 was the single best predictor for femoral neck ($R^2=0.24$, $p<0.0001$) and spine BMD ($R^2=0.21$, $p<0.0001$). In
42 sum, C-reactive protein statistically correlates with and predicts femoral neck and spine BMD, but the
43 magnitude is too low to be biologically meaningful. While weight is a more robust predictor, individuals who
44 are overweight or obese account for nearly half of all osteoporotic fractures, limiting the predictive power of
45 this variable at identifying individuals at risk for osteoporosis. Identification of a robust predictor of fracture
46 risk in a diverse population and across of range of body weights and compositions is needed.

47

48 **Introduction**

49 Osteoporosis is a bone disorder characterized by low bone mass and mineral density and impaired
50 bone microarchitecture. Osteoporosis carries a significant economic burden, with annual costs expected to
51 exceed 25 billion dollars by 2025 in the United States alone (1–3). Approximately half of women and one
52 quarter of men over the age of 50 will experience at least one osteoporotic fracture in their lifetime (1).
53 Osteoporotic fracture is associated with substantial mortality and morbidity. For example, within one year

54 following an osteoporotic hip fracture, approximately one quarter of patients are deceased and over half never
55 regain full function or independence (1). Osteoporosis is a silent disease, meaning it is typically not detected
56 before the first fracture. Thus, there is a critical need to detect osteoporosis prior to fracture.

57 Dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry (DXA) scanning to quantify bone mineral density is the gold
58 standard diagnostic tool for osteoporosis. Established diagnostic criteria define osteopenia as a T-score
59 between -1 and -2.5 and osteoporosis as a T-score of -2.5 or lower (4). However, currently DXA scanning is
60 minimally covered by medical insurance. In fact, organizations like the American Society for Bone and
61 Mineral Research advocate at the congressional level to improve medical coverage of DXA scanning as a
62 means to improve early detection. In tandem with these efforts, there is an apparent need to develop and/or
63 identify a reliable and widely available method to detect osteoporosis risk earlier.

64 Serum high-sensitivity C-reactive protein (hsCRP), a marker of immune activation, is widely viewed
65 as a significant and independent predictor of low bone mineral density and fracture risk. The highest tertile of
66 hsCRP has been linked to low BMD, elevated bone resorption, bone loss, and increased fracture risk (5–9). In
67 a meta-analysis on studies investigating the relationship of hsCRP and fracture risk, Mun *et al.* report risk
68 ratios of 1.54-1.57 for individuals with the highest tertile of hsCRP (10). Mun and colleague's conclusion
69 supports the general view of hsCRP as a predictor of fracture risk. Population-level analysis indicates higher
70 incidence of osteoporotic fracture in non-Hispanic white women (11). However, studies investigating the
71 relationship between hsCRP and fracture risk/incidence predominantly use racially (i.e., Korean, Caucasian)
72 and/or sexually homogenous populations. Further, studies to date have focused on correlations and hazard or
73 relative risk ratios, rather than predictive modeling, calling into question the physiological utility of statistical
74 associations with hsCRP. So, the question remains: can hsCRP levels predict fracture risk, assessed via BMD
75 and/or history of fracture?

76 Here, I utilize the NHANES 2017-2020 Pre-Pandemic cycle data, which includes a racially and
77 sexually diverse population, to test associations and predictive power between hsCRP and several metrics
78 relating to osteoporosis. I hypothesize that: (1) HSCRP negatively correlates with femoral neck and lumbar
79 spine BMD and (2) history of fracture, and (3) HSCRP is an independent predictor of BMD and fracture in a
80 diverse population.

81 **Methods**

82 Datasets from the NHANES 2017-2020 Pre-Pandemic cycle were downloaded from the CDC website.
83 Participants were sampled from 2017 to March 2020. Downloaded datasets include: P_BODMEAS (n=10000),
84 P_DEMO (n=10000), P_DXXFEM (n=4593), P_DXXSPN (n=4593), P_HSCRP (n=10000), P_OSQ
85 ((n=4987), and P_PAQ (n=9693). Data were uploaded to R Studio (v2022.07.2+576) and individually
86 processed. Data coded as unanswered, incomplete, and/or invalid were excluded [# excluded per dataset:
87 P_BODMEAS (n=1370), P_DEMO (n=452), P_DXXFEM (n=1048), P_DXXSPN (n=2472), P_HSCRP
88 (n=2010), P_OSQ ((n=419), and P_PAQ (n=91)]. Per NHANES Analysis Standard Procedures, individuals
89 aged 80+ were grouped and coded as age 80; these individuals were excluded (n=77). Data were then pooled
90 into one spreadsheet by respondent number and analyzed (n=954); only individuals with data in all seven
91 datasets with complete and valid data were included. Code used in data processing, analysis, and graphing can
92 be found in the supplemental materials.

93

94 ***Statistical Analysis***

95 Kendall's rank correlation coefficient (τ), a non-parametric version of Pearson's correlation, was used to assess
96 the strength and direction of correlative relationships (-1 to +1) between variables. Generalized linear models
97 were optimized to predict femoral neck (FN) or lumbar spine (SP) BMD and fracture history. For statistical
98 comparison by sex, non-parametric, unpaired, two-tailed t-tests were used. For comparison by race, non-
99 parametric one-way ANOVA was used, followed by Wilcoxon signed rank test with adjustment for false
100 discovery rate. Code used for statistical analysis can be found in the supplemental materials.

101

102 ***NHANES Data Collection Methods***

103 Demographics All demographic data, including age, sex, race, etc., were collected by self-reporting.

104 Individuals were interviewed in their preferred language and/or through an interpreter if requested. Age was
105 calculated using reported date of birth. Sex was self-selected from a provided list: 1) male or 2) female. Race
106 was self-selected from a provided list: 1) Mexican American or Hispanic, 2) non-Hispanic white, 3) non-
107 Hispanic black, 4) non-Hispanic Asian, or 5) non-Hispanic multiracial.

108

109 Body Measures Body weight and height were collected by trained staff. Body mass index was
110 calculated as the weight in kilograms divided by height in meters squared, then rounded to one decimal place.

111

112 Bone Mineral Density Dual-energy x-ray absorptiometry (DXA) is the primary method to evaluate bone
113 mineral density and osteoporosis risk clinically. A Hologic DXA scanner was used for all scans (Hologic, Inc.,
114 Bedford, MA). Quality control phantoms were scanned daily to ensure accurate calibration of the DXA
115 scanner. For the femoral neck, the left hip was scanned unless the participant self-reported a prior left hip
116 fracture, replacement, or a surgical pin. Participants were excluded if the right hip could not be scanned. For
117 the lumbar spine (L1-L4), patients were excluded from the spine scan if they self-reported a rod in the spine.

118

119 C-reactive Protein Serum specimens were collected and analyzed for levels of C-reactive protein (CRP) using
120 a two-reagent immunoturbidimetric system. Briefly, the specimen is first combined with Tris buffer, then latex
121 particles coated with mouse anti-human CRP antibodies are added. When human CRP is present in the
122 specimen, complexes are formed that cause an increase in light scattering proportional to CRP concentration.
123 Light absorbance is read against a standard CRP curve to determine CRP serum levels.

124

125 History of Osteoporosis or Fracture Participants were asked to self-report history, number, and site of prior
126 fracture. Interviews were conducted in the preferred language of the participant or using an interpreter.

127

128 Physical Activity Time spent participating in moderate or vigorous physical activity or time spent sedentary
129 was self-reported. Participants were asked to estimate how many minutes were spent in each physical activity
130 zone on a typical day. Interviews were conducted in the preferred language of the participant or using an
131 interpreter.

132

133 **Results**

Table 1. Respondent Demographics

	<i>All</i>	<i>Male</i>	<i>Female</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>	<i>NH white</i>	<i>NH black</i>	<i>NH Asian</i>	<i>Multiracial</i>
Sex or Race # (%)		446 (46.8%)	508 (53.2%)	233 (24.4%)	310 (32.5%)	233 (24.4%)	151 (15.8%)	27 (2.8%)
Age (yrs) Mean (IQR)	61.4 (55-67)	61.0 (55-66)	61.6 (55-67)	60.3 (55-65)	63.1 (57-69)	61.4 (56-65)	59.2 (53-63)	61.3 (54-69)
Weight (kg)	79.0	85.7	73.1	77.7	82.5	84.4	65.4	78.9
Mean (IQR)	(65.5-89.8)	(71.6-95.7)	(61.0-83.2)	(67.3-86.2)	(69.2-93.3)	(69.3-96)	(57-71.3)	(69.4-88.9)
BMI (kg/m²)	28.9	28.7	28.1	29.4	29.4	30.3	24.2	27.2
Mean (IQR)	(25.0-32.0)	(25.1-31.6)	(24.7-32.5)	(26-32)	(25.1-32.7)	(25.4-34.4)	(22.5-27.3)	(24.7-29.5)
FN BMD (g/cm²)	0.77 ± 0.14	0.81 ± 0.13	0.73 ± 0.13	0.77 ± 0.12	0.74 ± 0.14	0.82 ± 0.14	0.72 ± 0.11	0.82 ± 0.13
Mean (SD)								
SPN BMD (g/cm²)	1.0 ± 0.16	1.06 ± 0.16	0.95 ± 0.15	0.97 ± 0.15	1.01 ± 0.15	1.05 ± 0.17	0.93 ± 0.16	1.09 ± 0.21
Mean (SD)								
hsCRP (mg/L)	1.78 ± 3.11	1.75 ± 2.85	1.84 ± 3.33	1.86 ± 2.65	2.04 ± 3.14	2.19 ± 3.66	0.97 ± 2.55	1.90 ± 2.97
Median (SD)								
History of Fx	118/835	60/385	58/450	23/210	63/247	17/216	8/142	7/20
Y/N (%)	(12.3%)	(13.5%)	(11.4%)	(9.9%)	(20.3%)	(7.3%)	(5.3%)	(25.9%)
Hip Fx	13/940	4/441	9/499	2/231	8/302	1/232	1/149	1/26
Y/N (%)	(1.4%)	(0.9%)	(1.8%)	(0.9%)	(2.6%)	(0.4%)	(0.7%)	(3.7%)
Wrist Fx	91/861	51/393	40/468	17/216	48/261	14/219	6/144	6/21
Y/N (%)	(9.6%)	(11.5%)	(7.9%)	(7.3%)	(15.5%)	(6.0%)	(4.0%)	(22.2%)
Spine Fx	23/930	10/435	13/495	6/227	13/297	2/231	2/148	0/27
Y/N (%)	(2.4%)	(2.2%)	(2.6%)	(2.6%)	(4.2%)	(0.9%)	(1.3%)	(0%)
No Fx # (%)	836 (87.6%)	386 (86.5%)	450 (88.6%)	210 (90.1%)	247 (79.7%)	216 (92.7%)	143 (94.7%)	20 (74.1%)
1 Fx # (%)	93 (9.7%)	46 (10.3%)	47 (9.3%)	19 (8.2%)	46 (14.8%)	16 (6.9%)	7 (4.6%)	5 (18.5%)
2 Fx # (%)	17 (1.8%)	11 (2.5%)	6 (1.2%)	3 (1.3%)	11 (3.5%)	1 (0.4%)	1 (0.7%)	1 (3.7%)
3 Fx # (%)	5 (0.5%)	1 (0.2%)	4 (0.8%)	1 (0.4%)	3 (0.9%)			1 (3.7%)
4 Fx # (%)	3 (0.3%)	2 (0.4%)	1 (0.2%)		3 (0.9%)			

135 The sample population achieved sexual and racial diversity. Descriptive statistics by sex and race for
136 all variables included in this study can be found in **Table 1**. FN BMD varied significantly ($p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$; **Fig. 1A**,
137 **2A**) between males ($0.81 \pm 0.13 \text{ g/cm}^2$) and females ($0.73 \pm 0.13 \text{ g/cm}^2$). This can be seen in **Fig. 1A**, where
138 the histogram for males demonstrates a right-ward shift. Individuals identifying as non-Hispanic (NH) black
139 ($0.82 \pm 0.14 \text{ g/cm}^2$) demonstrated significantly greater FN BMD (**Fig. 2B**) than individuals identifying as
140 Hispanic ($p = 1.2 \times 10^{-4}$; $0.77 \pm 0.12 \text{ g/cm}^2$), NH white ($p = 5.7 \times 10^{-10}$; $0.74 \pm 0.14 \text{ g/cm}^2$), or NH Asian ($p = 1.1 \times 10^{-11}$; 0.72
141 $\pm 0.11 \text{ g/cm}^2$). Likewise, individuals identifying as multiracial ($0.82 \pm 0.13 \text{ g/cm}^2$) demonstrated greater FN
142 BMD compared to those identifying as Hispanic ($p = 0.037$), NH white ($p = 0.003$), or NH Asian ($p = 2 \times 10^{-4}$). No
143 significant differences were found between individuals identifying as NH black and multiracial ($p = 0.85$).
144 Individuals identifying as Hispanic demonstrated significantly greater FN BMD than individuals identifying as
145 NH white ($p = 0.012$; $0.74 \pm 0.14 \text{ g/cm}^2$) or NH Asian ($p = 1.2 \times 10^{-4}$; $0.72 \pm 0.11 \text{ g/cm}^2$). Individuals identifying as
146 NH white and NH Asian did not differ significantly ($p = 0.11$).

147
148 **Figure 1. Femoral neck and spine BMD, but not C-reactive protein, differ by sex.** Distribution of
149 **A**) femoral neck BMD (g/cm^2), **B**) spine BMD (g/cm^2), and **C**) C-reactive protein (mg/L) in the
150 sample population. Individuals identifying as male are coded in blue, as female in red, and the overlap
151 in purple. Bin size was optimized for each variable using the Freedman-Diaconis method.

152
153 **Figure 2. Variation in BMD and C-reactive protein by sex and race.** Femoral neck BMD (g/cm^2)
154 by **A**) sex and **B**) race. Spine BMD (g/cm^2) by **C**) sex and **D**) race. C-reactive protein (mg/L) by **E**)
155 sex and **F**) race. Boxplots denote the 1st, 2nd (median), and 3rd quartiles, with all data points plotted.
156 For statistical comparison by sex, non-parametric, unpaired, two-tailed t-tests were used. For
157 comparison by race, non-parametric one-way ANOVA was used, followed by Wilcoxon signed rank
158 test with adjustment for false discovery rate.

159
160 SPN BMD was differed significantly ($p < 2.2 \times 10^{-16}$; **Fig. 1B**, **2C**) between males ($1.06 \pm 0.16 \text{ g/cm}^2$) and
161 females ($0.95 \pm 0.15 \text{ g/cm}^2$). This can be seen in **Fig. 1B**, where the histogram for males demonstrates a right-

ward shift. Individuals identifying as NH black ($1.05 \pm 1.7 \text{ g/cm}^2$) demonstrated significantly greater FN BMD (Fig. 2D) than individuals identifying as Hispanic ($p=8.1e^{-4}$; $0.97 \pm 0.15 \text{ g/cm}^2$), NH white ($p=0.011$; $1.01 \pm 0.15 \text{ g/cm}^2$), or NH Asian ($p=1.8e^{-11}$; $0.93 \pm 0.16 \text{ g/cm}^2$). Likewise, individuals identifying as multiracial ($1.09 \pm 0.21 \text{ g/cm}^2$) demonstrated greater FN BMD compared to those identifying as Hispanic ($p=0.0012$), NH white ($p=0.049$), or NH Asian ($p=1.1e^{-4}$). Individuals identifying as NH black and multiracial did not differ significantly ($p=0.33$).

hsCRP did not differ significantly ($p=0.073$; Fig. 1C, 2E) between males ($2.7 \pm 2.8 \text{ g/cm}^2$) and females ($3.06 \pm 3.32 \text{ g/cm}^2$). This is demonstrated in the histogram in Fig. 1C, where the male and female histograms largely overlap. Individuals identifying as NH Asian ($1.9 \pm 2.5 \text{ g/cm}^2$) demonstrated significantly lower (Fig. 2F) hsCRP compared to those identifying as Hispanic ($p=1.5e^{-6}$; $2.7 \pm 2.7 \text{ g/cm}^2$), NH white ($p=1.5e^{-6}$; $3.0 \pm 3.1 \text{ g/cm}^2$), NH black ($p=8.8e^{-10}$; $3.5 \pm 3.7 \text{ g/cm}^2$), or multiracial ($p=0.013$; $3.0 \pm 3.0 \text{ g/cm}^2$).

hsCRP and FN BMD were weakly, positively correlated ($\tau=0.1022$, $p=2.41e^{-6}$; Fig. 3A). hsCRP correlates more robustly with FN BMD in females ($\tau=0.1609$, $p=6.27e^{-8}$; Fig. 3C), but does not correlate in males ($\tau=0.0551$, $p=0.08$; Fig. 3E). hsCRP does not correlate with FN BMD in individuals identifying as Hispanic ($\tau=0.0489$, $p=0.27$; Fig. 4A), NH Asian ($\tau=0.0344$, $p=0.53$; Fig. 4D), or multiracial ($\tau=0.0456$, $p=0.74$; Fig. 4E). hsCRP is weakly positively correlated with FN BMD in individuals identifying as NH white ($\tau=0.1117$, $p=0.0034$; Fig. 4B) and NH black ($\tau=0.0874$, $p=0.0476$; Fig. 4C).

Figure 3. Correlation between C-reactive protein and BMD by sex. Correlation between C-reactive protein and femoral neck BMD among A) all respondents, B) females, and C) males. Correlation between C-reactive protein and spine BMD among D) all respondents, E) females, and F) males. Plotted line indicates trendline, with slope of Kendall's tau. Correlations assessed using non-parametric Kendall's rank correlation test.

Figure 4. Correlation between C-reactive protein and femoral neck BMD by race. Correlation

189 between C-reactive protein and femoral neck BMD among individuals identifying as **A)** Hispanic, **B)**
190 non-Hispanic (NH) white, **C)** NH black, **D)** NH Asian, or **E)** multiracial (multi). Plotted line indicates
191 trendline, with slope of Kendall's tau. Correlations assessed using non-parametric Kendall's rank
192 correlation test.

193
194 hsCRP and SPN BMD were weakly, positively correlated ($\tau=0.1037$, $p=1.69e^{-6}$; **Fig. 3B**). hsCRP
195 correlates more robustly with SPN BMD in females ($\tau=0.1709$, $p=8.99e^{-9}$; **Fig. 3D**), but does not correlate in
196 males ($\tau=0.0512$, $p=0.11$; **Fig. 3F**). hsCRP does not correlate with SPN BMD in individuals identifying as
197 Hispanic ($\tau=0.0496$, $p=0.26$; **Fig. 5A**), NH black ($\tau=0.0683$, $p=0.12$; **Fig. 5C**), NH Asian ($\tau=0.0137$, $p=0.80$;
198 **Fig. 5D**), or multiracial ($\tau= -0.2079$, $p=0.13$; **Fig. 5E**). hsCRP is weakly positively correlated with SPN BMD
199 in individuals identifying as NH white ($\tau=0.1416$, $p=2e^{-4}$; **Fig. 5B**).

200
201 **Figure 5. Correlation between C-reactive protein and spine BMD by race.** Correlation between C-
202 reactive protein and spine BMD among individuals identifying as **A)** Hispanic, **B)** non-Hispanic (NH)
203 white, **C)** NH black, **D)** NH Asian, or **E)** multiracial (multi). Plotted line indicates trendline, with
204 slope of Kendall's tau. Correlations assessed using non-parametric Kendall's rank correlation test.

205
206 History of Frx, ranging from 0-4 prior fractures, and the distribution across sex and race is in **Table 1**.
207 hsCRP and history of Frx were weakly, positively correlated ($\tau=0.0919$, $p=4.52e^{-4}$; **Fig. 6A**). History of Frx
208 was weakly, negatively correlated with FN ($\tau= -0.0526$, $p=0.045$; **Fig. 6B**) BMD, but not SPN BMD ($\tau= -$
209 0.0297 , $p=0.26$; **Fig. 6C**).

210
211 **Figure 6. Correlation between Frx history and C-reactive protein or BMD.** Correlation of Frx
212 history with **A)** C-reactive protein, **B)** femoral neck BMD, and **C)** spine BMD. Correlations assessed
213 using non-parametric Kendall's rank correlation test.

214

215 Linear modeling was performed on the whole dataset to determine if hsCRP remains a significant
 216 predictor of FN and SPN BMD and history of Frx in a racially and sexually diverse population (**Table 2**). Log
 217 transformation of hsCRP, which was non-normally distributed, yielded a more robust model. hsCRP is a very
 218 weak predictor of FN BMD ($R^2_{adj}=0.028$, $p=1.21e^{-7}$), SPN BMD ($R^2_{adj}=0.022$, $p=2.14e^{-6}$) and history of Frx
 219 ($R^2_{adj}=0.015$, $p=1.08e^{-4}$). Exploratory modeling was performed to identify a more robust independent predictor
 220 of FN and SPN BMD and history of Frx using the variables in the dataset (**Table 3**). The best model was
 221 selected by minimizing AIC. Weight was the best predictor of FN BMD ($R^2_{adj}=0.24$, $p<2.2e^{-16}$) and SPN BMD
 222 ($R^2_{adj}=0.21$, $p<2.2e^{-16}$). Weight demonstrates a ~10-fold increase in model accuracy, or goodness-of-fit, as
 223 assessed by R^2_{adj} , to predict FN and SPN BMD. The best predictor of history of Frx was race (AIC = 1062.3,
 224 race $p=0.143$); however, the model failed to reach statistical significance indicating is not a strong predictor.

Table 2. Modeling to Predict BMD and History of Frx from C0

Model Outputs	Linear Models with raw hsCRP		Linear Models with ln(hsCRP)	
<i>FN BMD</i>	df=952, RSE=0.1337, F=21.5, $R^2_{adj}=0.021$, $p=3.97e^{-6}$		df=952, RSE=0.1333, F=28.4, $R^2_{adj}=0.028$, $p=1.21e^{-7}$	
Intercept	0.757	$p<1e^{-16}$	0.753	$p<1e^{-16}$
hsCRP	0.00645	$p<1e^{-6}$	0.0229	$p<1e^{-7}$
<i>SPN BMD</i>	df=952, RSE=0.1662, F=14.1, $R^2_{adj}=0.014$, $p=1.88e^{-4}$		df=952, RSE=0.1615, F=22.8, $R^2_{adj}=0.022$, $p=2.14e^{-6}$	
Intercept	0.983	$p<1e^{-10}$	0.987	$p<1e^{-16}$
hsCRP	0.00633	$p<0.01$	0.0249	$p<1e^{-6}$
<i>History of Frx</i>	df=952, RSE=0.4891, F=5.71, $R^2_{adj}=0.005$, $p=0.017$		df=952, RSE=0.4868, F=15.1, $R^2_{adj}=0.015$, $p=1.08e^{-4}$	
Intercept	0.126	$p<1e^{-9}$	0.126	$p<1e^{-12}$
hsCRP	0.0122	$p<0.05$	0.0612	$p<1e^{-4}$

225
 226
 227
 228
 229
 230
 231

Table 3. Modeling to Identify Best Predictor of BMD

Model Outputs	Model Summary	
<i>FN BMD</i>	df=952, RSE=0.1178, F=302.7, $R^2_{adj}=0.24$, $p<2.2e^{-16}$	
Intercept	0.493	$p<1e^{-16}$
Weight	0.00346	$p<1e^{-16}$
<i>SPN BMD</i>	df=952, RSE=0.145, F=258.2, $R^2_{adj}=0.21$, $p<2.2e^{-16}$	
Intercept	0.691	$p<1e^{-16}$
Weight	0.00393	$p<1e^{-16}$
<i>History of Frx</i>	df=952, AIC=1062.3, Residual Deviance=1058.3	
Intercept	1.092	$p<1e^{-16}$
Race	0.262	$p=0.143$

232

233 To explore the relationship between weight and hsCRP, FN BMD, and SPN BMD, exploratory
 234 correlation analyses were performed. Weight was positively correlated with hsCRP ($\tau=0.2456$, $p<2.2e^{-16}$; **Fig.**
 235 **7D**), FN BMD ($\tau=0.3376$, $p<2.2e^{-16}$; **Fig. 7E**), and SPN BMD ($\tau=0.3424$, $p<2.2e^{-16}$; **Fig. 7F**). Weight varied
 236 significantly ($p<2.2e^{-16}$; **Fig. 7A,B**) between males (85.7 ± 19.5 kg) and females (73.1 ± 16.9 kg). This can be
 237 seen in **Fig. 7A**, where the histogram for males demonstrates a right-ward shift. It is possible that weight
 238 correlates more strongly with FN and SPN BMD than hsCRP because, unlike hsCRP it follows the same
 239 distribution pattern as FN and SPN BMD (**Fig. 1A,B**). Individuals identifying as Hispanic (77.7 ± 16.4 kg)
 240 demonstrated significantly reduced weight (**Fig. 7C**) than individuals identifying as NH white ($p=0.012$; 82.5
 241 ± 19.5 kg), NH black ($p=0.002$; 84.4 ± 21.0 kg), or NH Asian ($p=4.6e^{-15}$; 65.4 ± 12.8 kg). Individuals
 242 identifying as NH Asian demonstrated significantly reduced weight compared to those identifying as
 243 Hispanic($p=4.6e^{-15}$), NH white ($p<2.2e^{-16}$), NH black ($p<2.2e^{-16}$), or multiracial ($p=2.6e^{-5}$; 78.9 ± 15.2 kg).
 244 Weight and history of Frx are weakly positively correlated ($\tau=0.0857$, $p=1.07e^{-3}$; *not shown*).

245

246 **Figure 7. Weight varies by sex and race, and positively correlates with C-reactive protein and**
 247 **BMD.** Distribution of **A**) weight (kg) in the sample population. Individuals identifying as male are
 248 coded in blue, as female in red, and the overlap in purple. Bin size was optimized for each variable

249 using the Freedman-Diaconis method. Weight by **B)** sex and **C)** race. Boxplots denote the 1st, 2nd
250 (median), and 3rd quartiles, with all data points plotted. For statistical comparison by sex, non-
251 parametric, unpaired, two-tailed t-tests were used. For comparison by race, non-parametric one-way
252 ANOVA was used, followed by Wilcoxon signed rank test with adjustment for false discovery rate.
253 Correlation between weight and **D)** C-reactive protein, **E)** femoral neck BMD, and **F)** spine BMD
254 among all respondents. Plotted line indicates trendline, with slope of Kendall's tau. Correlations
255 assessed using non-parametric Kendall's rank correlation test.

256

257 **Discussion**

258 Contrary to predictions, hsCRP was weakly and positively associated with BMD at the FN and SPN.
259 hsCRP remained a significant independent predictor of FN and SPN BMD and fracture history in a racially
260 and sexually diverse population; however, the R^2 was too low to be biologically meaningful or exert any effect
261 predictive power. Exploratory analyses suggest weight as a better independent predictor of FN and SPN BMD
262 and fracture history, with a 10-fold improvement on R^2 and predictive power; however, these metrics remain
263 relatively low, limiting their utility.

264

265 Demographic data of FN and SPN BMD were generally as expected. Skeletal sexual dimorphism is
266 well documented, with males maintaining higher BMD at both sites and total-body than females on average.
267 Differences in BMD based on racial identity have, likewise, been previously reported. Individuals identifying
268 as NH white have long been viewed as being at greater risk of osteoporosis due to lower average BMD scores
269 compared to individuals identifying as NH black (11,12). Some studies have reported individuals identifying
270 as NH Asian to be at a greater or similar risk of osteoporosis as those identifying as NH white, though limited
271 data exist (11,12). It is unlikely that such differences reflect genetic differences, as far greater variation exists
272 within than between race. While speculative, it is more likely that these differences are indicative of cultural
273 practices encompassing a range of behavioral and lifestyle factors, including physical activity and
274 diet/nutrition, among others, and may reflect differences in reference weight and stature ranges across racial
275 groups.

276

277 hsCRP did not differ by sex or race. In the few studies that compared hsCRP levels across sex in a
278 healthy population demonstrate mixed results, with some concluding no significant differences between sexes
279 (13,14); those that do find that females have greater hsCRP levels than males, on average (15,16). In a meta-
280 analysis examining associations between race/ethnicity and serum CRP levels, Nazmi & Victora report 14 of
281 the 15 included studies detected significant racial differences in CRP levels (17). Individuals identifying as NH
282 white demonstrated the lowest CRP levels, while those identifying as Hispanic, NH black, or South Asian had
283 the highest CRP levels (17). Here, we found individuals identifying as NH Asian demonstrate the lowest mean
284 hsCRP levels relative to those identifying as Hispanic, NH white, NH black, and multiracial. That the testing
285 method is slightly different (*i.e.* CRP versus hsCRP) and the countries sampled included USA, the UK,
286 Finland, Greece, Germany, Canada, Italy, Turkey, and New Zealand rather than the USA alone may be
287 contributing factors. Likewise, the difference in relationships between hsCRP and race found in our sample
288 compared to others may explain the reduced predictive power of hsCRP for BMD. Most studies in the meta-
289 analysis attribute CRP differences to socioeconomic factors (17), which may influence BMD and fracture risk
290 as well.

291

292 History of fracture weakly, positively correlated with hsCRP levels and weakly, negatively correlated
293 FN and SPN BMD. Several studies have reported significantly increased relative risk, odds ratios, or hazard
294 ratios for individuals with hsCRP levels in the highest tertile (5,7–10), suggesting a negative correlation
295 between hsCRP and fracture. Of these studies that evaluated BMD, there was no significant association
296 between BMD and hsCRP, though hsCRP did correlate with serum markers of bone resorption (7). Ding and
297 colleagues found a significant negative association with BMD and hsCRP, as well as inflammatory makers IL-
298 6 and TNF α (6); other inflammatory cytokines and circulating markers of immune activation may have greater
299 predictive power than hsCRP and should be evaluated. The demographic pool used in this study had a
300 relatively low proportion of individuals experiencing a fracture (~12.4%) and very low levels of multiple
301 fractures (~2.6%), which may have masked more robust associations.

302

303 In contrast to prior published studies on the relationship between hsCRP and BMD or history of
304 fracture, here we show weak, positive correlations between hsCRP and FN BMD, SPN BMD, and history of
305 fracture. One potential explanation for these differences may be our usage of a racially and sexually diverse
306 sample population, especially given known sexual and racial differences in BMD and fracture history. We
307 identify weight as a more robust predictor of FN and SPN BMD, considering the variables identified in **Table**
308 **1**. The relatively small predictor variable pool is a limitation of this work and future research should employ a
309 machine learning approach to more robustly identify predictors and a prediction equation. That weight is the
310 best predictor of FN and SPN BMD is not surprising. However, given that nearly half of all osteoporotic
311 fractures occur in individuals who are overweight or obese restrains the predictive power of this variable (18).
312 Indeed, obese and overweight individuals fracture despite high BMD; while the precise biological
313 underpinnings of this are yet to be identified, it may be related to impair bone quality – *e.g.* through increased
314 cortical porosity – which impairs bone strength and leads to fractures not traditionally associated with
315 osteoporosis (19–22). The complex multivariable etiology of osteoporotic fractures will certainly complicate
316 the search for a single robust predictor. More research is needed to identify a robust predictor of low BMD and
317 high fracture risk, not only in a sexually and racially diverse population, but across of range of body weights
318 and compositions.

319

320 **Acknowledgements**

321 The author would like to thank Dr. Ayland Letsinger, Dr. Daniel Schmitt, and the Animal Locomotion Lab at
322 Duke University for the much-appreciated conversations, feedback, and support. The authors salary is
323 supported by Duke University School of Medicine.

324


325 **References**

- 326 1. International Osteoporosis Foundation. Osteoporosis Incidence and Burden. 2017.
- 327 2. Johnell O, Kanis JA. An estimate of the worldwide prevalence and disability associated with osteoporotic
328 fractures. *Osteoporos Int* [Internet]. 2006 Dec [cited 2022 Sep 14];17(12):1726–33. Available from:
329 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/16983459/>

- 330 3. Kemmak AR, Rezapour A, Jahangiri R, Nikjoo S, Farabi H, Soleimanpour S. Economic burden of
331 osteoporosis in the world: A systematic review. *Med J Islam Repub Iran* [Internet]. 2020 [cited 2022 Sep
332 14];34(1):154. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC7787041/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/347787041/)
- 333 4. Kanis JA, McCloskey E V., Johansson H, Oden A, Melton LJ, Khaltav N. A reference standard for the
334 description of osteoporosis. *Bone* [Internet]. 2008 Mar [cited 2023 Feb 23];42(3):467–75. Available from:
335 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18180210/>
- 336 5. Pasco JA, Kotowicz MA, Henry MJ, Nicholson GC, Spilsbury HJ, Box JD, et al. High-Sensitivity C-
337 Reactive Protein and Fracture Risk in Elderly Women. *JAMA* [Internet]. 2006 Sep 20 [cited 2023 Feb
338 23];296(11):1349–55. Available from: <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jama/fullarticle/203377>
- 339 6. Ding C, Parameswaran V, Udayan R, Burgess J, Jones G. Circulating Levels of Inflammatory Markers
340 Predict Change in Bone Mineral Density and Resorption in Older Adults: A Longitudinal Study. *J Clin
341 Endocrinol Metab* [Internet]. 2008 May 1 [cited 2023 Feb 23];93(5):1952–8. Available from:
342 <https://academic.oup.com/jcem/article/93/5/1952/2599027>
- 343 7. Schett G, Kiechl S, Weger S, Pederiva A, Mayr A, Petrangeli M, et al. High-sensitivity C-reactive protein
344 and risk of nontraumatic fractures in the Bruneck study. *Arch Intern Med* [Internet]. 2006 Dec 11 [cited
345 2022 Aug 23];166(22):2495–501. Available from: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17159016/>
- 346 8. Eriksson AL, Movérare-Skrtic S, Ljunggren Ö, Karlsson M, Mellström D, Ohlsson C. High-Sensitivity CRP
347 Is an Independent Risk Factor for All Fractures and Vertebral Fractures in Elderly Men: The MrOS Sweden
348 Study. *J Bone Miner Res* [Internet]. 2014 Feb 1 [cited 2023 Feb 23];29(2):418–23. Available from:
349 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/jbmr.2037>
- 350 9. Dahl K, Ahmed LA, Joakimsen RM, Jørgensen L, Eggen AE, Eriksen EF, et al. High-sensitivity C-reactive
351 protein is an independent risk factor for non-vertebral fractures in women and men: The Tromsø Study.
352 *Bone* [Internet]. 2015 Mar 1 [cited 2023 Feb 23];72:65–70. Available from:
353 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25460573/>
- 354 10. Mun H, Liu B, Pham THA, Wu Q. C-reactive protein and fracture risk: an updated systematic review and
355 meta-analysis of cohort studies through the use of both frequentist and Bayesian approaches. *Osteoporos Int*
356 [Internet]. 2021 Mar 1 [cited 2022 Aug 31];32(3):425–35. Available from:
357 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00198-020-05623-6>

- 358 11. Noel SE, Santos MP, Wright NC. Racial and Ethnic Disparities in Bone Health and Outcomes in the United
359 States. *J Bone Miner Res* [Internet]. 2021 Oct 1 [cited 2023 Feb 23];36(10):1881–905. Available from:
360 <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34338355/>
- 361 12. Cauley JA. Defining ethnic and racial differences in osteoporosis and fragility fractures. *Clin Orthop Relat*
362 *Res* [Internet]. 2011 Mar 23 [cited 2023 May 9];469(7):1891–9. Available from:
363 <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11999-011-1863-5>
- 364 13. Rifai N, Ridker PM. Population distributions of C-reactive protein in apparently healthy men and women in
365 the United States: Implication for clinical interpretation. *Clin Chem*. 2003;49(4):666–9.
- 366 14. Imhof A, Fröhlich M, Loewel H, Helbecque N, Woodward M, Amouyel P, et al. Distributions of C-reactive
367 protein measured by high-sensitivity assays in apparently healthy men and women from different
368 populations in Europe. *Clin Chem*. 2003;49(4):669–72.
- 369 15. Ford ES, Giles WH, Mokdad AH, Myers GL. Distribution and Correlates of C-Reactive Protein
370 Concentrations among Adult US Women. *Clin Chem* [Internet]. 2004 Mar 1 [cited 2023 Apr 19];50(3):574–
371 81. Available from: <https://academic.oup.com/clinchem/article/50/3/574/5639802>
- 372 16. Khera A, McGuire DK, Murphy SA, Stanek HG, Das SR, Vongpatanasin W, et al. Race and Gender
373 Differences in C-Reactive Protein Levels. *J Am Coll Cardiol* [Internet]. 2005 Aug 2 [cited 2023 May
374 9];46(3):464–9. Available from: <https://www.jacc.org/doi/10.1016/j.jacc.2005.04.051>
- 375 17. Nazmi A, Victora CG. Socioeconomic and racial/ethnic differentials of C-reactive protein levels: a
376 systematic review of population-based studies. *BMC Public Health* [Internet]. 2007 [cited 2023 Apr
377 19];7:212. Available from: [/pmc/articles/PMC2018719/](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/17111119/)
- 378 18. Nielson CM, Marshall LM, Adams AL, Leblanc ES, Cawthon PM, Ensrud K, et al. BMI and fracture risk in
379 older men: The osteoporotic fractures in men study (MrOS). *J Bone Miner Res*. 2011;26(3):496–502.
- 380 19. Compston JE, Watts NB, Chapurlat R, Cooper C, Boonen S, Greenspan S, et al. Obesity is not protective
381 against fracture in postmenopausal women: Glow. *Am J Med* [Internet]. 2011;124(11):1043–50. Available
382 from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2011.06.013>
- 383 20. Premaor MO, Pilbrow L, Tonkin C, Parker RA, Compston J. Obesity and Fractures in Postmenopausal
384 Women. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2010;25(2):292–7.
- 385 21. Shapses SA, Pop LC, Wang Y. Obesity is a concern for bone health with aging. *Nutr Res* [Internet].

- 386 2017;39:1–13. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nutres.2016.12.010>
- 387 22. Sukumar D, Schlüssel Y, Riedt CS, Gordon C, Stahl T, Shapses SA. Obesity alters cortical and trabecular
- 388 bone density and geometry in women. *Osteoporos Int.* 2011;22(2):635–45.
- 389



medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.06.22.23291785>; this version posted June 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a [CC-BY 4.0 International license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).





Figure 1










Figure 2

A C-Reactive Protein vs. Femoral Neck BMD**B C-Reactive Protein vs. Spine BMD****C****D****E****F****Figure 3**




Figure 4






Figure 5

A Frx History vs. C-Reactive Protein



B Frx History vs. Femoral Neck BMD



C Frx History vs. Spine BMD




Figure 6




Figure 7