

Enhancing the Predictive Utility of MHR for Senile Osteoporosis: Unaddressed Considerations and Future Directions [Letter]

Shulin Dou, Wei Fang, Wei Wang, Hailiang Wang

Traditional Chinese Medicine Hospital of Meishan, Affiliated Meishan Hospital of Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Meishan, People's Republic of China

Correspondence: Hailiang Wang, Traditional Chinese Medicine Hospital of Meishan, Affiliated Meishan Hospital of Chengdu University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Meishan, People's Republic of China, Email 13778853099@139.com

Dear editor

We have read with great interest the article by Lin et al discussing the predictive value of the monocyte-to-high-density lipoprotein cholesterol ratio (MHR) for senile osteoporosis.¹ The study is timely and provides valuable insights into a cost-effective biomarker with potential applications in primary healthcare settings. However, I would like to highlight some additional limitations and offer suggestions for future research directions that may enhance the robustness of the findings.

First, the study's reliance on a single biomarker, the MHR, may limit its predictive utility for osteoporosis in older adults. While the results demonstrated a statistically significant association, the sensitivity and specificity reported (73.5% and 59.9%, respectively) suggest that MHR alone may not be sufficient for clinical decision-making. A composite biomarker panel incorporating other inflammatory or metabolic markers, such as C-reactive protein or vitamin D levels, might improve diagnostic accuracy. Future studies could explore such multidimensional approaches to refine risk prediction models.

Second, although the authors adjusted for various confounders, the role of lifestyle factors such as physical activity, diet, smoking, and alcohol consumption was not addressed.²⁻⁴ These factors are well-established contributors to bone health and could influence both MHR levels and osteoporosis risk. Including these variables in future analyses may provide a more comprehensive understanding of the relationship between MHR and bone density.

Another consideration is the potential variability in MHR cut-off values across populations with different genetic, dietary, or environmental backgrounds. The cut-off value identified in this study ($0.308 \times 10^{-3} \text{ mmol}$) may not generalize to other demographic groups. Multi-center and cross-population studies are necessary to validate and standardize MHR thresholds for broader clinical application.

Moreover, while the study focused on bone mineral density (BMD) as the primary diagnostic criterion for osteoporosis, other parameters such as bone microarchitecture or bone turnover markers could provide additional insight into the disease's progression.⁵ Dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry (DXA), though widely used, does not fully capture bone quality. Incorporating advanced imaging techniques like high-resolution peripheral quantitative computed tomography (HR-pQCT) in future studies could offer a more nuanced assessment of bone health.

Finally, the inclusion of centenarians is a commendable feature of this study, yet it also raises the question of survivorship bias. Individuals reaching advanced age may have inherently different biological profiles, potentially confounding the relationship between MHR and osteoporosis. Stratified analyses by age group or frailty index could mitigate this limitation.

In conclusion, while Lin et al's study provides an important foundation for MHR as a predictor of senile osteoporosis, addressing these additional aspects will further enhance the clinical relevance and generalizability of their findings. We look forward to future research that builds upon these promising initial results.

Funding

No fundings were received for this research.

Disclosure

The authors declare no conflicts of interest that pertain to this communication.

References

1. Lin N, Li D, Lin S, et al. The monocyte-to-high-density lipoprotein cholesterol ratio as a novel predictor of the prevalence of senile osteoporosis. *CIA*. 2024;19:1773–1788. doi:10.2147/CIA.S478461
2. Aibar-Almazán A, Voltes-Martínez A, Castellote-Caballero Y, et al. Current status of the diagnosis and management of osteoporosis. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2022;23:9465. doi:10.3390/ijms23169465
3. Kopiczko A, Czapla M, Kubiela G, Uchmanowicz B. Determinants of bone mineral density in various regions of the skeleton among smokers and non-smokers: the role of physical activity. *Front Physiol*. 2024;15:1403102. doi:10.3389/fphys.2024.1403102
4. Cheraghi Z, Doosti-Irani A, Almasi-Hashiani A, et al. The effect of alcohol on osteoporosis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Drug Alcohol Depend*. 2019;197:197–202. doi:10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2019.01.025
5. Garnerio P. The utility of biomarkers in osteoporosis management. *Mol Diagn Ther*. 2017;21:401–418. doi:10.1007/s40291-017-0272-1

Dove Medical Press encourages responsible, free and frank academic debate. The content of the Clinical Interventions in Aging 'letters to the editor' section does not necessarily represent the views of Dove Medical Press, its officers, agents, employees, related entities or the Clinical Interventions in Aging editors. While all reasonable steps have been taken to confirm the content of each letter, Dove Medical Press accepts no liability in respect of the content of any letter, nor is it responsible for the content and accuracy of any letter to the editor.

Clinical Interventions in Aging

Dovepress

Publish your work in this journal

Clinical Interventions in Aging is an international, peer-reviewed journal focusing on evidence-based reports on the value or lack thereof of treatments intended to prevent or delay the onset of maladaptive correlates of aging in human beings. This journal is indexed on PubMed Central, MedLine, CAS, Scopus and the Elsevier Bibliographic databases. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system, which is all easy to use. Visit <http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php> to read real quotes from published authors.

Submit your manuscript here: <https://www.dovepress.com/clinical-interventions-in-aging-journal>

<https://doi.org/10.2147/CIA.S506960>