Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2025) 15(6), 1820-1821 | ISSN:2251-6727

Bridging More Than Cortices: Teriparatide and the Quest for Functional Healing

Dr. Dinesh Kumar R[1], Dr. L.Y. Sathyanarayana[2], Dr. Harish S.[3], Dr. A Jeevan Kishor[4]*, Dr. M. Sharan Sakthivel[5], Dr. M. Sundaramurthy[6], Dr. C. Tamizarasu[7], Dr. Srijan Roy Chowdhury[8], Dr. Anantha Padmanabhan B[9], Dr. F. Abdul Khader[10]

[1]1st year Post Graduate, Department of Orthopaedics, Shri Sathya Sai Medical College and Research Institute under Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth, Ammapettai, Chengalpattu District, Tamil Nadu, 603108 India.

[2]Professor, Department of Orthopaedics, Shri Sathya Sai Medical College & Research Institute, Ammapettai, Chengalpattu District, Tamil Nadu, India.

[3]Assistant Professor, Department of Orthopaedics, Shri Sathya Sai Medical College and Research Institute under Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth, Ammapettai, Chengalpattu District, Tamil Nadu, 603108, India.

[4]Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, Shri Sathya Sai Medical College and Research Institute under Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth, Ammapettai, Chengalpattu District, Tamil Nadu, 603108, India

[5]Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, Shri Sathya Sai Medical College and Research Institute under Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth, Ammapettai, Chengalpattu District, Tamil Nadu, 603108, India

[6]Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, Shri Sathya Sai Medical College and Research Institute under Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth, Ammapettai, Chengalpattu District, Tamil Nadu, 603108, India

[7]Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, Shri Sathya Sai Medical College and Research Institute under Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth, Ammapettai, Chengalpattu District, Tamil Nadu, 603108, India

[8]Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, Shri Sathya Sai Medical College and Research Institute under Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth, Ammapettai, Chengalpattu District, Tamil Nadu, 603108, India

[9]Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, Shri Sathya Sai Medical College and Research Institute under Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth, Ammapettai, Chengalpattu District, Tamil Nadu, 603108, India

[10]Professor, Department of Orthopaedics, Shri Sathya Sai Medical College and Research Institute under Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth, Ammapettai, Chengalpattu District, Tamil Nadu, 603108, India.

Corresponding Author: Dr A Jeevan Kishor, Senior Resident, Department of Orthopaedics, Shri Sathya Sai Medical College and Research Institute under Sri Balaji Vidyapeeth, Ammapettai, Chengalpattu District, Tamil Nadu, 603108, India.

Received Date: 15/09/2025 ***Revised Date: 16/10/2025*** ***Accepted Date: 23/11/2025***

KEYWORDS:

Functional Healing

ABSTRACT:

Res. 2010;25:404–414) remains a seminal contribution to the field of translational orthopedics. Their investigation was among the earliest attempts to test whether a pharmacologic agent could accelerate the biological process of fracture repair. Fifteen years later, however, the paradoxical finding that the 20 μg dose appeared more effective than the 40 μg dose continues to invite scrutiny.

Although the authors demonstrated scientific rigor and transparency, several aspects of the trial design and interpretation merit reconsideration. The statistical hierarchy prioritized comparison of the 40 μg dose against placebo as the primary hypothesis. Once this comparison failed to achieve significance, the study design precluded drawing formal inferences about the 20 μg group—ironically the arm that demonstrated the most clinically meaningful and statistically significant reduction in healing time. The post hoc analyses presented by the authors support the lower dose's potential benefit, yet by nature such findings warrant cautious interpretation.

Journal of Chemical Health Risks

www.jchr.org

JCHR (2025) 15(6), 1820-1821 | ISSN:2251-6727

INTRODUCTION

Asperberg and colleagues' randomized, placebo-controlled trial evaluating teriparatide for fracture healing (J Bone Miner Res. 2010;25:404–414) remains a seminal contribution to the field of translational orthopedics. Their investigation was among the earliest attempts to test whether a pharmacologic agent could accelerate the biological process of fracture repair. Fifteen years later, however, the paradoxical finding that the 20 μg dose appeared more effective than the 40 μg dose continues to invite scrutiny.

Although the authors demonstrated scientific rigor and transparency, several aspects of the trial design and interpretation merit reconsideration. The statistical hierarchy prioritized comparison of the 40 μg dose against placebo as the primary hypothesis. Once this comparison failed to achieve significance, the study design precluded drawing formal inferences about the 20 μg group—ironically the arm that demonstrated the most clinically meaningful and statistically significant reduction in healing time. The post hoc analyses presented by the authors support the lower dose's potential benefit, yet by nature such findings warrant cautious interpretation.

Contemporary trial methodology offers strategies that may avoid these constraints. Adaptive or hierarchical designs allow investigators to confirm emerging biologically coherent signals without violating statistical rigor. Such approaches are particularly well suited for exploratory dose-ranging contexts, where the expected dose–response relationship is uncertain. In future studies, these designs may prevent biologically plausible effects from being overshadowed by rigid sequential testing frameworks.

The study's reliance on radiographic cortical bridging as the sole primary endpoint also highlights an enduring limitation in fracture-healing trials. Radiographs confirm mineralized continuity but do not address whether the fracture has regained mechanical integrity or whether the patient's function has improved. Incorporating biomechanical measures (such as load-bearing capacity) or validated functional outcomes (pain-free mobility, PRWE scores, or grip-strength milestones) would substantially increase the translational relevance of such research.

Taken together, these issues emphasize a broader methodological lesson. Trials evaluating pharmacologic modulation of fracture healing must align biologic plausibility with clinically meaningful endpoints. When assessments are limited to radiographic criteria, important functional improvements may be overlooked. Conversely, when key conclusions rely on post hoc analyses, the evidentiary strength is inherently constrained. A multidimensional endpoint framework—spanning biochemical, radiologic, biomechanical, and patient-reported domains—supported by adaptive statistical designs, would provide a more coherent and clinically useful evaluation.

In summary, the study by Aspenberg et al. represents an important first step but not a definitive statement. Its paradoxical findings highlight the complexities of applying anabolic bone biology to fracture treatment. Refining trial designs and clarifying outcome priorities may yet reveal that teriparatide's true value is not limited to promoting radiographic bridging, but extends to restoring strength, function, and independence in patients vulnerable to long-term skeletal disability.

Conflict of Interest: None declared.

Author Information:

Dr. Dinesh Kumar

Junior Resident (MS Orthopaedics)

Shri Sathya Sai Medical College and Research Institute, India

Keywords: Teriparatide; fracture healing; parathyroid hormone; dose–response; cortical bridging; radiographic endpoints; adaptive trial design; skeletal regeneration; osteoporosis.

REFERENCES

1. Aspenberg P, et al. Teriparatide for acceleration of fracture repair in humans. J Bone Miner Res. 2010;25(2):404–414.
2. Goldhahn J, et al. Clinical evaluation of medicinal products for acceleration of fracture healing in osteoporosis. Bone. 2008;43:343–347.
3. Dmitrienko A, et al. Gatekeeping procedures with clinical trial applications. Pharm Stat. 2007;6:171–180.
4. Gardner MJ, et al. Role of parathyroid hormone in the mechanosensitivity of fracture healing. J Orthop Res. 2007;25:1474–1480.
5. Skripitz R, Aspenberg P. Parathyroid hormone: a drug for orthopedic surgery? Acta Orthop Scand. 2004;75:654–662.