



Dietary protein and bone health across the life-course: an updated systematic review and meta-analysis over 40 years

A. L. Darling¹ · R. J. F. Manders¹ · S. Sahni^{2,3} · K. Zhu^{4,5} · C. E. Hewitt⁶ · R. L. Prince^{4,5} · D. J. Millward¹ · S. A. Lanham-New¹

Received: 27 October 2018 / Accepted: 4 March 2019 / Published online: 21 March 2019
© International Osteoporosis Foundation and National Osteoporosis Foundation 2019

Abstract

We undertook a systematic review and meta-analysis of published papers assessing dietary protein and bone health. We found little benefit of increasing protein intake for bone health in healthy adults but no indication of any detrimental effect, at least within the protein intakes of the populations studied. This systematic review and meta-analysis analysed the relationship between dietary protein and bone health across the life-course. The PubMed database was searched for all relevant human studies from the 1st January 1976 to 22nd January 2016, including all bone outcomes except calcium metabolism. The searches identified 127 papers for inclusion, including 74 correlational studies, 23 fracture or osteoporosis risk studies and 30 supplementation trials. Protein intake accounted for 0–4% of areal BMC and areal BMD variance in adults and 0–14% of areal BMC variance in children and adolescents. However, when confounder adjusted (5 studies) adult lumbar spine and femoral neck BMD associations were not statistically significant. There was no association between protein intake and relative risk (RR) of osteoporotic fractures for total ($RR_{(random)} = 0.94$; 0.72 to 1.23, $I^2 = 32\%$), animal ($RR_{(random)} = 0.98$; 0.76 to 1.27, $I^2 = 46\%$) or vegetable protein ($RR_{(fixed)} = 0.97$ (0.89 to 1.09, $I^2 = 15\%$). In total protein supplementation studies, pooled effect sizes were not statistically significant for LSBMD (total $n = 255$, $MD_{(fixed)} = 0.04$ g/cm² (0.00 to 0.08, $P = 0.07$), $I^2 = 0\%$) or FNBMD (total $n = 435$, $MD_{(random)} = 0.01$ g/cm² (−0.03 to 0.05, $P = 0.59$), $I^2 = 68\%$). There appears to be little benefit of increasing protein intake for bone health in healthy adults but there is also clearly no indication of any detrimental effect, at least within the protein intakes of the populations studied (around 0.8–1.3 g/Kg/day). More studies are urgently required on the association between protein intake and bone health in children and adolescents.

Keywords Ageing · Diet · Epidemiology · IGF-1 · Nutrition · Osteoporosis

Introduction

The association between dietary protein intake and bone health has been debated worldwide for decades. It is

unclear as to whether dietary protein exerts a positive or detrimental influence on bone and there are competing theories as to the effects of dietary protein on bone health. Proponents of a positive link between protein intake and

Electronic supplementary material The online version of this article (<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-019-04933-8>) contains supplementary material, which is available to authorized users.

✉ A. L. Darling
a.l.darling@surrey.ac.uk

¹ Department of Nutritional Sciences, School of Biosciences and Medicine, Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Surrey, Guildford GU2 7XH, UK

² Hinda and Arthur Marcus Institute for Aging Research, Hebrew SeniorLife, 1200 Centre St, Boston, MA 02131, USA

³ Department of Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, 330 Brookline Ave, Boston, MA 02215, USA

⁴ Department of Endocrinology and Diabetes, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Nedlands, Western Australia, Australia

⁵ Medical School, University of Western Australia, Crawley, Western Australia, Australia

⁶ York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK

bone health cite the known anabolic effects of dietary protein on bone, via dietary protein's known ability to increase secretion of insulin-like growth factor 1 (IGF-1). Dietary protein may also increase calcium absorption from the gut [1], which is likely to be beneficial for bone mineralisation.

On the other hand, proponents of a detrimental association between protein intake and bone argue that high protein intakes may be bad for bone health. This is on the basis of known *in vitro* increased osteoclast activity with increasing body acidity [2] and predicted subsequent bone demineralisation. However, it is important to consider dietary protein type as only proteins that are rich in sulphur amino acids are likely to increase net physiological acid production. Also, protein is consumed in the diet with other components which may modify the overall net acid concentration (e.g. fruits and vegetables which have an alkalizing effect, soy isoflavones which have estrogenic effects, and dairy products which contain calcium). These nutrients may modify the association between protein intake and bone health [3, 4].

A previous systematic review and meta-analysis published in 2009, covering published papers from January 1966 to July 2008 [5], showed a small beneficial effect of dietary protein supplementation on areal bone mineral density (aBMD) in human adults, as well as showing that nearly all published cross-sectional studies demonstrate a positive association between dietary protein intake and bone health. However, there was no association between dietary protein intake and fracture risk in cohort studies, and much of the findings of the cross-sectional studies may be due to inadequate controlling for confounding factors. Also, the previous systematic review and meta-analysis did not assess dietary protein and bone health in children and adolescents, which is an important area of research due to the known importance of obtaining peak bone mass at this time of life.

Since the publication of the dietary protein and bone health systematic review and meta-analysis in 2009 [5] the number of relevant articles on the topic of dietary protein and bone health has doubled. This highlights the need for an updated systematic review of this topic, including consideration of peak bone mass development in children and adolescents, as well as bone health in adults. Further systematic reviews have been conducted on the topic since 2009 [6–10], but none to date have included all study designs (cross-sectional, longitudinal and randomised control trials) and included both adults and children. Our objective was to perform a systematic review and meta-analysis of the evidence published over the last 40 years assessing dietary protein intake and all indices of bone health across the human life-course, including all relevant observational and intervention studies examining intakes of all types of protein.

Materials and methods

Search strategy

The PUBMED databases, as well as reference lists of relevant journal papers, were searched to ensure broad coverage. The search phrase used for the electronic search was “(protein intake OR dietary protein OR protein supplement OR protein consumption) AND (bone OR fracture OR BMD OR bone turnover)” limited to human studies, in any language, from 1st January 1976 to 22nd January 2016. Two of the authors (ALD, SLN) identified potential studies for inclusion by first screening titles and abstracts, and then looking at the full version of papers if necessary. Any disagreements were resolved by consensus and deferred to a third party if required.

Study design and criteria

Papers assessing relevant bone outcomes (specifically BMD or BMC, bone turnover markers and/or fracture risk) in healthy human adults, adolescents or children were considered for inclusion. Studies investigating subjects with a pre-existing medical condition affecting bone or calcium metabolism, or studying animals, infants, and pregnant or lactating women were excluded as were studies involving only calcium balance or calcium metabolism.

All cross-sectional, longitudinal and intervention studies were eligible for inclusion, including intervention studies of any design. However, due to problems of statistically combining crossover and parallel intervention designs, crossover studies were not included in the meta-analysis and were discussed in the systematic review only. Studies were excluded if they were published before 1975, were weight loss studies, did not have usable protein or bone data, were not on the relevant topic, were review articles or correspondence, or only had data on dietary patterns. They were also excluded if they had confounders present in the central study design (e.g. differing exercise levels in the intervention and control groups as part of the intervention, for example protein and exercise as intervention vs. no protein and exercise). All bone sites in the body were eligible for inclusion in the review, as were all markers of bone metabolism.

Soy protein studies were excluded if they did not have data on isoflavone devoid soy protein isolate. Studies on whole dietary measures (e.g. meat intake, frequency of high protein meals) were also excluded due to the confounding potential of other dietary constituents (such as isoflavones in soy protein; fat or iron in meat). However, whole diet intervention studies were included as long as the nutritional contents of the diets were shown in the paper and the diets had been designed to minimise the impact of confounders (e.g. ensuring high and low protein diets were isocaloric, similar in dietary calcium

etc.). No ethical approval was required as the analysis was conducted only on already published data.

Data synthesis

See [Online Resource](#) for full details of the data extraction process. In the meta-analyses, two sided tests with an alpha value of 5% were used, and Bonferroni adjustment for multiple testing was applied when necessary.

The systematic review included all eligible studies, but only studies with data suitable for meta-analysis were analysed quantitatively. The R software (version 3.1.2) [11] add-on packages ‘metacor’ [12], ‘meta’ [13], ‘metafor’ [14] and ‘metagen’ [15] were used to pool correlation coefficients, intervention and fracture risk data for meta-analysis, as well as creating all plots. For cross-sectional and longitudinal data, multivariate adjusted analyses were used wherever possible, rather than unadjusted or age adjusted measures. Linear and non-linear modelling was undertaken to assess whether there was an association between correlation coefficients or actual BMD values with the following: calcium: protein ratio (mg/g/day); protein dose (g/kg/day) and calcium dose (mg/kg/day).

It was planned a priori to run a combined analysis of hip and non-hip fracture data as all fracture outcome first, then a subsequent analysis of hip fracture data only. Unfortunately the calcium: protein ratios (calcium mg/protein g) in the fracture risk studies were too constant (10–12 mg/g/day) to be able to perform an assessment of calcium: protein ratio vs. fracture risk. Also, there were too few studies within the same protein type to be able to plot protein or calcium dose against fracture risk.

The intervention trials meta-analysis examined the main effects of protein supplementation (all protein types but excluding studies specifically looking at soy protein isolate and milk basic protein (MBP)) on BMD, BMC and bone turnover markers, based on mean differences. The decision was made a priori to also perform a separate analysis for MBP trials as this type of protein is highly concentrated and is supplemented in very high doses. Similarly, experience from the previous meta-analysis suggested that soy protein studies need to be analysed separately than non-soy studies, as soy studies usually assess the effect of soy protein vs. another protein type (hence the actual protein intake is the same, just different protein type). Conversely, studies of mixed protein supplementation usually compare higher with lower doses of protein (or have another type of control, e.g. maltodextrin); hence, the protein intake varies in each arm of the study.

Finally, due to the differences in skeletal biology between early life and in older age, as well as differences in nutritional requirements, children and adults were analysed separately in all meta-analyses. Also, all adult groups were broken down into gender and life stage specific analyses wherever there was

enough data to do so. Only for the cross-sectional studies were there enough data to perform a meta-analysis in children.

Heterogeneity, sensitivity and publication bias—meta-analysis

It was pre-specified that the I^2 statistic was to be used to assess heterogeneity between studies as this is recommended for analyses with smaller numbers of studies [16]. I^2 values of 25%, 50% and 75% were considered low, moderate and high, respectively [16]. Random-effects (heterogeneous comparisons) and fixed effects (homogenous comparisons) models were used accordingly, with the decision based on size of I^2 (%), rather than the $P_{(\text{heterogeneity})}$ value from the Q test, as number of studies in the meta-analyses were predicted to be small. It was also pre-specified that funnel plots were used to assess possible biases in meta-analyses containing 10 or more studies [17]. Sensitivity analyses were also planned to assess the impact of removal of each study in turn on the pooled effect size.


Quality analysis

Intervention study quality analysis was undertaken at the study level. This was conducted independently by 2 authors (AD, SLN) using the Jadad Scale [18]. Due to the extensive number of observational studies, only one author (AD) assessed quality for these papers, using the Newcastle-Ottawa adapted scales [19] for cohort and case-control study designs as appropriate. Cross-sectional studies were not assessed for study quality due to the very large number of papers included in the review. For all study types, due to the small predicted numbers of potential studies for the fracture and intervention study meta-analyses, we decided a priori that the quality analysis information was to be used to guide result interpretation rather than to exclude studies per se.

Results

Figure 1 shows the Quality of Reporting of Meta-analyses (QUOROM) flow diagram [20] illustrating the search and selection process. The systematic review included 127 studies, including 74 studies reporting correlation or regression coefficients (Table 1). These included either just cross-sectional data (55 studies), just longitudinal change data (4 studies) or both (9 studies). These also included 2 studies reporting both longitudinal change in BMD data and fracture data and 4 studies reporting cross-sectional data and odds of low BMD or osteoporosis diagnosis (Table 2). In addition, there were 23 studies reporting only fracture or osteoporosis risk (Table 3), and 30 intervention studies (Table 4). Due to the extensive number of studies to be discussed here, see the [Online](#)

Fig. 1 PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses) flow diagram to illustrate search results



Resource for the systematic review and the study quality assessments.

Resource Tables S2-S3, Online Resource Material Text). Heterogeneity was highly variable with values ranging from 0 to 74% depending on population subgroup.

Pooling of studies reporting correlation or regression coefficients

By population subgroup

See Table 1 (and Online Resource Table S1) for details of the studies reporting correlation or regression coefficients. Of these 74 studies, 30 studies in adults [23, 29, 33–35, 37, 40, 43, 44, 46, 48, 50, 54, 58, 60–62, 64, 67, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 80–82, 85, 86, 89] and 5 studies in children [26, 31, 38, 53, 59] gave cross-sectional R correlation coefficients suitable for pooling. Of note, only 5 of these studies [29, 34, 35, 49, 62] reported adjusted data, so the majority ($n = 30$) were non-adjusted for confounders. When pooling by population subgroup, the R^2 values suggested that < 1–8% of adult bone BMD or BMC (depending on age and biological sex) as well as 10% of child BMC was explained by protein intake (Online

By bone parameter

For adults, Online Resource Figs. 1 and 2 illustrate the pooled effect size for FNBMD and LSBMD. FNBMD (total $n = 4786$) showed $r_{(fixed)} = 0.07$ (0.04 to 0.09) $R^2 = 0.005$ (0.5%) $P < 0.0001$, $I^2 = 26\%$ $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.15$. LSBMD (total $n = 4257$) showed $r_{(random)} = 0.09$ (0.04 to 0.14) $R^2 = 0.008$ (0.8%) $P < 0.001$, $I^2 = 58\%$ $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.001$. Of note, when only studies reporting multivariate adjusted data were shown, the pooled effect sizes for FNBMD (total $n = 1169$, $r_{(random)} = 0.04$ (–0.05 to 0.12) $R^2 = 0.0016$ (0.2%) $P = 0.37$, $I^2 = 45\%$ $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.14$), and for LSBMD (total $n = 728$, $r_{(fixed)} = 0.0$ (–0.07 to 0.07), $R^2 = 0$ (0%) $P = 0.97$, $I^2 = 0\%$ $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.61$) were no longer statistically significant. Other bone outcomes ranged in R^2 value from 0 to 10% (including unadjusted data). See Online Resource

Table 1 Characteristics of 74 cross-sectional and/or longitudinal correlational studies

Study	Design	Mean protein ***	Method	Population	n	Outcomes measured
Alexy et al., 2005, Germany [21]	CS	1.4–2.0 ± 0.3 g/Kg/day	pQCT	Prepubescent and pubescent boys and girls	229	Periosteal Circumference, Cortical Area, BMC, Polar SSI
Alissa et al., 2011, Saudi Arabia [22]	CS	1.03 g/Kg/day	DXA	Postmenopausal women aged 46–70 years old	122	BMD
Alissa et al., 2014, Saudi Arabia [23]	CS	71.4 ± 1.55 g/day	DXA	Postmenopausal women, aged 46–88 years	300	BMD
Beasley et al. 2010, USA [24]	CS	TP: 5.7–27.6% energy AP:45 g/day, VP:19 g/day	DXA	Premenopausal women	560	BMD
Beasley et al. 2014, USA [25]	LS	15% total energy	DXA	Postmenopausal women 50–79 years	144,580	BMD
Bounds et al., 2005, USA [26]	CS	55 g/day (1.9 g/Kg/day)	DXA	6–8 year old children, 25 Boys and 27 Girls	52	BMD/BMC
Budek et al. 2007a, Denmark [27]	CS	2.67 g/Kg/day	BTM	Pubertal boys	81	OC, BAP, CTX
Budek et al. 2007b, Denmark [28]	CS	TP: 1.2 (Girls), 1.3 (Boys), AP: 0.4 (Girls), 0.5 (Boys), DP: 0.4 (Both Girls and Boys) g/Kg/day	DXA	17-year-olds: 63 girls and 46 boys	109	BMC
Chan et al., 2009, Hong Kong/Beijing [29]	CS	65.4–77.5 g/day	DXA	Premenopausal women	441	BMD
Chan et al. 2011, Hong Kong [30]	LS	1.3 g/Kg/day	DXA	Older men and women	2217	BMD
Chevalley et al. 2008, Switzerland [31]	CS	47.3 g/day, 1.78 g/Kg/day	DXA	Pre-pubertal boys	232	BMC
Chevalley et al. 2014, Switzerland [32]	LS	Age 7: 1.8; Age 15: 1.1 (g/Kg/day)	DXA; High resolution pQCT	Adolescent boys	176	BMC/BMD/Area at 7.4 and 15.2 years, HR-pQCT distal tibia microstructure and strength
Chiu et al., 1997, Taiwan [33]	CS	1.09 g/Kg/day	DPA (BMD)	Older post F	258	BMD
Coin et al., Italy, 2008 [34]	CS	1.02 g/Kg/day	DXA	Males, mean age 73.9±5.6 years	136	BMD
Cooper et al., 1996, USA [35]	CS	72 g/day	DPA SPA	Pre (72) and post (218) F	290	BMD, HPO, OC
Dawson-Hughes et al., 2002, USA [36]	CS	79 g/day	DXA	184 men and women (>= 65 years old) in placebo (inactive) arm of calcium supplementation trial	184	BMD, OC, NTX
Devine et al., 2005, AUS [37]	CS	1.2 g/Kg/day	DXA, QUS	Elderly F, mean age 75 years±3 years Caucasian	1077	BMD, BUA calcaneus
Ekbote et al., 2011, India [38]	CS	18.6 g/day-normal and malnourished children combined	DXA	2–3-year-old children	71	BMC, BA
Fairweather-Tait et al., 2011, UK [39]	CS	81.3 g/day	DXA	Postmenopausal female twin pairs (Monozygotic or dizygotic twins)	2464 pairs	BMD
Freudenheim et al., 1986, USA [40]	CS	1.02 g/Kg/day	SPA	Pre and post F, 35–65 year, Caucasian	84	BMC
Geinoz et al., 1993, Switzerland [41]	CS	Mean Intake in g/day by group: 37.8–59.4 g/day	DXA	Elderly M and F	74	BMD
Genaro et al., 2015, Brazil [42]	CS	66 g/day	DXA	Mean age 82 years (F); 80 years (M)	200	BMC, BMD
Gregg et al., 1999, USA [43]	CS	0.9 g/Kg/day	QUS	Women over 65 years old Middle aged (premenopausal) F- mean age = 45.5 years	393	BUA Calcaneus, BMD

Table 1 (continued)

Study	Design	Mean protein ***	Method	Population	n	Outcomes measured
Gunn et al., 2014, New Zealand [44]	CS	79 g/day	BTM, DXA	Postmenopausal women, 60 years of age	142	BMD, CTX, PINP
Hannan et al. 2000, USA [45]	LS	68 g/day (16% of total energy) 0.97 g/kg/day	DXA	224 older men and 391 older women	615	BMD
Henderson et al., 1995, AUS [46]	CS	1.0 g/Kg/day	DXA	Pre F- mean age = 18 years	115	BMD
Hernandezavila et al., 1993, USA [47]	CS	76 g/day	SPA	Women (50–60 years old)	281	BMD
Hirota et al., 1992, Japan [48]	CS	1.13 g/Kg/day	SPA (BMD)	Young PRE women: 19–25 years	161	BMD
Ho et al., 2003, China [49]	CS	1.01 g/Kg/day SP	DXA	< 12 years POST women (48–62 years), Asian	454	BMC, BMD
Ho et al., 2008, China [50]	CS	5.2g/day SP 48.6 g/day TP	DXA	Pre and perimenopausal women 45–55 years old	438	BMC, BMD
Ho-Pham et al., 2009, Vietnam [51]	CS	TP: 35.4–62.6 g/day	DXA	105 Post F	210	BMD
Ho-Pham et al. 2012, Vietnam [52]	CS/LS	49 g/day; 0.92 g/kg/day	DXA, BTM	Buddhist vegan Nuns and 105 omnivorous women 62± 10 years old	210	BMD, CTX, PINP
Hoppe et al. 2000, Denmark [53]	CS	73–82 g/day	DXA	Postmenopausal Buddhist Nuns	105	BMC, BA
Horiuchi et al., 2000, Japan [54]	CS	TP: 62.5 g/day	DXA	10-year-old children	85	BMD, OC, BAP, PYD, DPYD
Hu et al., 2014, USA [55]	CS	SP: 12.6 g/day TP: 11.6–20.4% energy	DXA, QCT	Post F, 52–83 years	1658	BMD
Ilich et al., 2003, USA [56]	CS	TP: 11.6–20.4% energy	DXA	801 women and 857 men (age 62 ± 10 years)	136	BMD, BMC
Iuliano-Burns et al., 2005, AUS [57]	CS	1.04 g/kg/day	DXA	Older F, > 5 post, 68.7 ± 7.1 years	56	BMC, CT, PW, EW
Jaime et al., 2006, Brazil [58]	CS	76 g/day	DXA	7–20-year-old Male twins (Monozygotic n = 30) and Dizygotic (n = 26)	277	BMD
Jones et al. 2001, Tasmania [59]	CS	1.2 g/kg/day	DXA	Men- Over 50 years	330	BMD
Knurtek et al. 2015, USA [60]	CS	83 g/day	DXA	Boys and Girls Aged 8 years old	81	BMD
Kumar et al., 2010, India [61]	CS	69–97 g/day	DXA	Adult men and women, 18–50 years	225	BMD
Lacey et al., 1991, Japan [62]	CS	45.7 g/day	DXA	Women aged 20–69 years	178	BMC
Langsetmo et al., 2015 Canada [63]	LS	1.35 g/kg/day	SPA	Asian pre F (35–40 years) and post F (55–60 years)	6510	BMD
Lau et al., 1998, China [64]	CS	0.79 g/Kg/day	DXA	Men and women aged over 25 years old	76	BMD
Libuda et al. 2008, Germany [65]	CS	0.65 g/kg/day	DXA	Vegetarian Post F, 70–89 years	107	BMC, Cortical Area
Libuda et al. 2011, Germany [66]	CS	1.3 g/Kg/day	pQCT	228 Children and adolescents 8–14 years old	27	BMD, BMC
Loennekke et al. 2010, USA [67]	CS	42.7–46.1 g/day	pQCT	Pre-pubertal children	5119	PYD, DPYD, BMD
MacDonald et al., 2005, UK [68]	CS	72–91 g/day	DXA	Males and Females, 22 ± 3 years	862	BMC
Meng et al. 2009 AUS [69]	LS	79.4g/day	BTM, DXA	45–54 years women	38	BMD, BMC
Metz et al., 1993, USA [70]	CS	80.6 g/day, 1.2 g/kg/day	DXA	Community-dwelling premenopausal women aged 75 ± 3 years old	175	BMD, OC
Michaelsson et al., 1995, Sweden [71]	CS	1.24 g/kd/day	DXA	Pre F Caucasian (24–28 years)	43	OC, BAP, DPYD, NTX
Nakamura et al., 2004, Japan [72]	CS	59 g/day	BTM	F 28–74 years, Caucasian	443	BMD
Neville et al., 2002, UK [73]	CS	1.29 g/kg/day	DXA	Elderly post F, mean age = 68.3 years, range 43–79		
		66–98 g/day		238 M and 205 F, at both 15 and 20–25 years		

Table 1 (continued)

Study	Design	Mean protein ***	Method	Population	n	Outcomes measured
New et al., 1997, UK [74]	CS	81 ± 22 g/day	DXA	Women aged 44–50 years (Premenopausal)	994	BMD
Oh et al., 2013, Korea [75]	CS	TP 45.0–52.3 g/day	QUS	Men and POM F aged 50–70 years	3330	Calcaneal Bone Stiffness Index
Orozco et al., 1998, Spain [76]	CS	TP: 73.4(17.9) g/day	DXA	Premenopausal women aged 42 years old	76	BMD
Orwoll et al., 1987, USA [77]	CS	–	CT,SPA	Men	154	BMC
Pearce et al., 2010, UK [78]	CS	Median: 87.7 g/day	Bone Markers	Men aged 49–52 years	412	CTX
Promislow et al., 2002 USA [79]	CS	72.5 g/day	DXA	M/F 55–92 years; 572F 388M	960	BMD
Quintas et al., 2003, Spain [80]	CS	1.4–1.7 g/day	DPA	Pre F	164	BMD
Rapuri et al., 2003, USA [81]	CS	53.7–71.2 g/day	DXA	Post F- 65–77 years	473	BMD, NTX, OC
Rubiniacci et al., 1992, Italy [82]	CS	68–83 g/day	SPA	Post F	120	BMC
Sahni et al., 2013, USA [83]	CS/LS	81 g/day (Men) 77 g/day (Women)	DXA	1280 men and 1639 women	2919	BMD
Tanaka et al., 2001, Japan [84]	CS	1.3 g/Kg/day	QUS	Pre F- 18–22 years	965	Stiffness Index Calcaneus
Teegarden et al., 1998, USA [85]	CS	1.21 g/Kg/day	DXA	Young pre F	215	BMC, BMD
Thorpe et al., 2008, USA [86]	CS	74.7g/day	DXA	Postmenopausal women mean age 68 ± 6 years	161	BMD
Tylavsky and Anderson, 1988, USA [87]	CS	1.01 g/Kg/day	SPA	60–98 years elderly F	375	BMC, BMD
Vatamparast et al., 2007, Canada [88]	CS	20–25 years: 68–119 g/day	DXA	Young adults (59 males, 74 females)	133	BMC, BMD
Wang et al., 1997, USA [89]	CS	0.97 g/Kg/day	DXA	Older post F	125	BMD, BMC
Wang et al. 1999, USA [90]	CS	1.05 g/Kg/day	QUS	63 18–18-year-old women	63	BUS, SOS
Weikert et al., 2005, Germany [91]	CS	67.9g/day	QUS	F 35–67 years	8178	Os calcis
Whiting et al., 2002, Canada [92]	CS	1.15 g/Kg/day	DXA	M 39–42 years	57	BMD
Yazdenpanah et al., 2007, The Netherlands [93]	CS	81.3g/day, 1.1 g/Kg/day	DXA	Men and Women aged 55 years and over	5304	BMD
Zhang et al. 2010, China [94]	LS	1.7 g/Kg/day	DXA	757 Girls (Mean age 10 years)	757	BMC

AP, animal protein; BA, bone area; BAP, bone alkaline phosphatase; BMC, bone mineral content; BMD, bone mineral density; BTM, bone turnover markers; BUA, broadband ultrasound attenuation; CS, cross-sectional study; CT, computer tomography; DPA, dual photon absorptiometry; DPYD, deoxypyridinoline; DXA, dual energy X-ray absorptiometry; EW, endosteal width; HPO, hydroxyproline; HR-pQCT, high-resolution peripheral computed tomography; LS, longitudinal study; NTX, N-terminal telopeptide of collagen; pQCT, peripheral quantitative computer tomography; OC, osteocalcin; P1NP, procollagen type 1 N-terminal propeptide; PW, periosteal width; PYD, pyridinoline; QUS, quantitative ultrasound; SOS, speed of sound; SP, soy protein; SPA, single photon absorptiometry; SSI, strength-strain index; TP, total protein; VP, vegetable protein

Table 2 Characteristics of the 29 studies reporting fracture or osteoporosis diagnosis data (6 of which also in Table 1): Cohort and cross-cultural studies

Study ^a	Mean Protein	Population	Length	Total <i>n</i>	Fracture/ BMD site	Protein type	Parameter	Confounder adjustments
Abelow et al., 1992, USA cross cultural [95]	10.4 g/day–77.8 g/day AP	F aged over 50 years	–	34 studies, 16 countries	Hip fracture	AP	Fracture Incidence	Age
Beasley et al. 2014, USA [25]	< 13.3% to ≥ 15.6% of energy intake from protein	Women aged 50–79 years at baseline	6y	144,580	Any, Hip, Spine, Forearm	TP	HR	Age, BMI, race-ethnicity, calibrated energy intake, general health, physical activity, history of fracture at age 55 y, history of parental fracture, current smoking, corticosteroid use, glucocorticoid use, treated diabetes, rheumatoid arthritis, and hormone use
Dargent-Molina et al., 2008, France [96]	TP:46(7.5) g/day, AP:29 (8.8) g/day, VP:12(3.0) g/day	POM women	8.37 years	36,217 (2408 with fracture)	Any low impact fracture	TP AP VP	RR	Adjusted for BMI, physical activity, parity, maternal history of hip fracture, HT use, smoking status, and alcohol intake
Feskanich et al., 1996, USA [97]	79.6 g/day median	F, 35–59 years	12 years	85,900	Forearm, Hip, Fracture	AP TP VP	RR	Age, BMI, vigorous activity per week; menopausal status, use of postmenopausal hormones; cigarette smoking; use of thyroid hormone medication, thiazide diuretics and alcohol/caffeine.
Frassetto et al., 2000, USA cross cultural [98]	48 to 110.9 g/day	F aged over 50 years		33 countries	Hip fracture	TP AP VP	Hip Fracture Incidence	–
Gunn et al., 2014, New Zealand [44]	79 g/day	POM women, 60 years of age DXA	Cross-sectional	142	Osteoporosis diagnosis	TP	Protein intake (g) by BMD diagnosis	–
Key et al., 2007, UK [99]	Women: 73.1 (21.6) g/day 77.8(22.6) g/day	Men and Women aged 20–89 years	5.2 years	26,749 women and 7947 men	All sites, fractures (including high trauma)	TP	Incident Rate Ratio	Method of recruitment and adjusted for age, smoking, intakes of energy and each other nutrient, alcohol consumption, body mass index, walking, cycling, vigorous exercise, other exercise, physical activity at work, marital status and, for women, parity and use of hormone replacement therapy
Langsetmo et al., 2015, Canada [63]	TP: 0.79(0.60–1.03). AP:17.6(12.8–23) g/day VP:24.3(18.8–31.0) g/day	M and F, aged 25–49 and ≥ 50 years	5 years	6510	Fragility fracture: <i>n</i> = 4543 Main fracture: <i>n</i> = 4570	TP	HR	Age, height, TEI, centre (women only), education, smoking, alcohol intake, physical activity, sedentary hours, calcium and vitamin D supplement use, hormone therapy (women only), bisphosphonate use (women only), and diagnosis of osteoporosis (women only)
Meyer et al., 1997, Norway [100]	0.8	M/F (mean age 47.1 years)	11.4 years	19,752 F 20035 M	HF-F HF-M	AP	RR	Age at screening, body height, body mass index, self-reported physical activity at work and during leisure

Table 2 (continued)

Study ^a	Mean Protein	Population	Length	Total <i>n</i>	Fracture/ BMD site	Protein type	Parameter	Confounder adjustments
Misra et al., 2011, USA [101]	64 g/day (energy adjusted)	M/F mean age = 75 years	11.6y	946 (<i>n</i> = 100 HF)	HF	TP	HR	time, diabetes, disability pension, marital status, and smoking
Munger et al., 1999, USA [102]	1.2 units g/Kg/day	Postmenopausal F (55–69 years)	1–3 years	32,050	HF	AP, TP, VP	RR	Age, sex, weight, height and total energy intake Age, body mass index, number of pregnancies, smoking, alcohol use, oestrogen use, and physical activity.
Mussolino et al., 1998, USA [103]	< 56 g/day → > 98 g/day	Caucasian M (45–74 years)	22 years	2879	HF	TP	RR	BMI, previous fracture, smoker, physical activity, alcohol, chronic health condition, calcium intake, weight loss.
Sahmi et al., 2010, USA [104]	Men TP: 75–79.0g/day AP: 52–54 g/day, VP: 23–25 g/day	Men and women aged mean = 55 (9.9)years	7 to 14 years	3656	HF	TP, AP VP, AP:VP ratio	HR	Sex and menopause status (group 1: men; group 2: premenopausal women; group 3: postmenopausal women), age(years), weight at baseline (kg), height at baseline (m), physical activity index, intake of energy (MJ/day) and total vitamin D (IU/day), and smoking status (current versus former/never) and calcium intake
Sellmeyer et al., 2001, USA [105]	49.8 g/day	F > 65 years old	7.0 years ± 1.5 years	1035	HF	VP, AP, AP:VP	RR	Age and body weight
Zhong et al., 2009 USA [106]	Mean(SE) = 61 ± 0.8 g/day	POM women 50+ years old	< 7 years	2006	All fragility fractures	TP	OR	Age, race, body mass index (underweight/normal, overweight, obese), physical activity level, smoking status, alcohol use (heavy, moderate/none), hormone use, general health status, osteoporosis, arthritis, vision impairment, and stroke.
Zhang 2005 [107]	SP: 9.6g/day Non Soy: 134 g/day	Women aged 40–70 years old	4.5 years	24,403	All fractures	SP	RR	Age, body mass index, hours of exercise per week, cigarette smoking, alcohol consumption, history of diabetes mellitus, level of education, family income, season of recruitment, and intakes of total calories, calcium, non-soy protein, fruits, and vegetables

^a All studies are cohorts unless otherwise stated. AP, animal protein; BMD, bone mineral density; HR, hazard ratio; OR, odds ratio; POM, postmenopausal; RR, relative risk; SP, soy protein; TEI, total energy intake; TP, total protein; VP, vegetable protein

Table 3 Characteristics of the 29 studies reporting fracture or osteoporosis diagnosis data (6 of which also in Table 1): 13 Case-control studies

Study	Protein intake	Measure	n	Group/outcome	Confounder adjustments
Alissa et al., 2011, Saudi Arabia, Non-Prospective [22]	77 g/day	DXA	122 POM Women, aged 50–60 years	Normal BMD vs. Osteopenic	Non-adjusted for confounders
Chevalley et al. 2011, Switzerland Prospective [108]	47–63 g/day	DXA	176 boys- measured during pre-puberty and adolescence	Fracture vs. No Fracture	Non-adjusted for confounders
Chiu et al., 1997, Taiwan Non-Prospective [33]	1.09 g/Kg/day	DPA (BMD)	258 Older post F	OR for Osteopenia diagnosis: LS and FN	Age, BMI, physical activity, calcium intake, non-protein energy intake, long term vegan/vegetarianism BMI
Coin et al., Italy, 2008 Non-Prospective [34]	1.02 g/Kg/day	DXA	136 Males, mean age 73.9±5.6 years	OR for low THBMD	Unadjusted
Farrin et al. 2008, Iran Non-prospective [109]	81.4 g/day	DXA	58 POM women	LSBMD based diagnosis: Normal/Osteoporotic/ Osteoporotic vs. Non-Osteoporotic	Age, smoking, alcohol drinking, BMI, exercise, family history of osteoporosis, and energy intakes
Kim et al., 2008, Korea Non-prospective [110]	TP = 60 g/day, AP = 19 g/day, VP = 40 g/day	DXA	271 POM women: 134 cases and 137 controls	TP, AP, VP	Age, sex, energy intake, vegetable protein intake or animal protein intake, serum vitamin C, calcium intake, underlying chronic disease, home access, Katz's index, physical activity, HDL cholesterol and MUFA/PUFA intake.
Martinez-Ramirez et al., 2012, Spain Non-Prospective [111]	TP:105 (1.0) g/day, AP:66–70 (1.3) g/day, VP: 38 (0.63) g/day,	Aged 65 years or over, cases	167 cases and 167 controls	OR: All low energy fractures, TP, AP, VP, AP:VP ratio	Hospital, age, BMI, oestrogen use, chronic disease status
Nieves et al., 1992, USA Non-prospective [112]	<24 g/day to > 55 g/day	F 50 to 103 years	329 (161 cases, 168 controls)	OR Hip fracture	Non-adjusted
Park et al., 2014, Korea Non-prospective [113]	81.93±52.31 g/day	DXA	1157 PRE women	Z-Score ≥ 0, Z-score < 0	
Perez-Durillo et al., 2011, Spain Non-prospective [114]	Cases 60 (19) g/day; controls 94 (19) g/day	Women >65 years	44 cases and 42 controls	TP, Hip fracture c	BMI, carbohydrate intake and calcium intake
Preisinger et al., 1995, Austria Non-prospective [115]	15% total energy, 45–96 g/day	Osteoporosis	23 POM women 50–70 years old	TP, AP, VP, Osteoporotic vs. Non-Osteoporotic	Not required as just intake data
Samieri et al., 2013, France Prospective [116]	70–76 g/day	Men and women > 65 years	1482	Incident fracture of hip, spine or wrist	Not adjusted for confounders
Wengreen et al., 2004, USA Non-prospective [117]	1.2 g/Kg/day	50–89y M/F	2501 (1157 cases, 1334 controls)	Cases Controls, Hip (OR), TPAP VP	BMI, smoking, alcohol, physical activity, oestrogen use, gender, total Calcium and Vitamin D intakes (diet and supplements), potassium intake, age, AP model also adjusted for VP intake, VP model also adjusted for AP intake.

AP, animal protein; BMD, bone mineral density; DPA, dual photon absorptiometry; DXA, dual X-ray absorptiometry; LSBMD, lumbar spine bone mineral density; OR, odds ratio; POM, postmenopausal; PRE, premenopausal; THBMD, total hip bone mineral density; TP, total protein; VP, vegetable protein

Table 4 Characteristics of the 30 intervention studies reporting randomised control trials of dietary protein supplementation on bone health outcomes

Study, Country, Duration	Baseline protein intake	Supplement vs control	Change in protein intake	Subject Total n	Outcomes Measured
Alekel et al., 2000, USA, 24 weeks [118]	No information in paper	40 g/day Soy vs Whey	+ 40 g/day	N = 24 SPI+; N = 24 SPI-, N = 21 whey protein (control) PERI F	BMC, BMD, BAP
Aoe et al., 2001, Japan [119]	No information in paper	40 mg/day MBP vs Placebo	+ 40 mg/day (MBP)	32 PRE F	% change data only: Calcaneal BMD
Aoe et al. 2005, Japan, 6 months [120]	No information in paper	40 mg/day MBP vs Inactive placebo	+ 40 mg/day (MBP)	27 PERI F	NTX, OC, BMD
Arjmandi et al., 2003, USA, 3 months [121]	Mean (SE): Soy group – 60(6)g/day, MBP group (75(9) g/day	40 g/day Soy protein vs MBP	+ 40 g/day	42 POM F	BAP, DPYD
Cao et al., 2011, USA Crossover study 14 weeks (7 weeks each arm) [1]	No information in paper	61 g/day diet ('lower protein control- US daily recommendation) vs. 118 g/day ('higher protein' group) diet	± 57 g/day	N = 16 40–75-year-old POM F,	NTX, DPYD
Ceglia et al., 2009 Crossover study 41 days [122]	Mean (SD): 69.1 (22.1) g/day	Mean (SD)2.1(2.02) Low vs. 96.7(5.7) High	- 37.0 g/day (low) + 27.6 g/day (high)	M/F 54–82 years old N = 10	OC, NTX
Cunéo et al., 2010, Brazil [123]	Mean (SD): 67(18.8) g/day (placebo), 61.9(24) g/day (collagen)	Hydrolysed collagen (10 g/day protein) vs. maltodextrin placebo	+ 10 g/day	N = 36 collagen, N = 35 placebo, 45–65-year-old POM F	BAP, CTX, OC
Dalais et al., 2003, AUS, 3 months [124]	109(7) g/day Soy group, 112(6)g/day Placebo	40 g Soy protein vs casein placebo	+ 40 g/day	106 POM F 50–75 years	PYD, DPYD
Dawson-Hughes et al. 2004, USA, 63 days [125]	No information in g (17–18% of total energy)	Mean(SD): High: 57.6(8.2) g/day protein, Low: 2.8(0.5) g/day protein	No baseline data in grams	32 Elderly M/F	NTX, OC
Evans et al., 2007, USA Crossover study, 9 months [126]	No information in paper	25.6g Soy protein isolate (I) vs. Milk protein isolate (p), exercise counterbalanced across groups (1/2 in each group exercise, ½ in each group no exercise)	+ 25.6 g/day	Postmenopausal women N = 22, Mean age 63 years	BMD, BAP, CTX
Hunt et al., 2009, USA, 7 weeks Cross over study [127]	63 (15) g/day LC 69 (17) g/day HC	Protein g/day: LCLP 58, LCHP 112, HCLP 59, HCHP 115	LCLP – 5 g/day, LCHP + 49 g/day, HCLP -10 g/day, HCHP + 46 g/day - 0 .2 g/Kg/day	N = 13 in two LC arms, n = 14 in two HC arms Post F 39 Pre F, 22–39 years	DPYD, OC, BAP, TRAP
Ince et al. 2004, USA, 2 weeks Crossover study [128]	1.1 g/kg/day	Change to low (0 .8 g/Kg/day) protein diet	+ 78 g/day	20 Middle aged M/F	NTX, BAP
Jenkins et al., 2003, USA, 2 months Crossover study [129]	No information in g (18% of total energy)	Vegetable diet: 189 g/day protein, (16% total energy) vs Control diet: 111 g/day protein (27% total energy)	+ 78 g/day		
Kenny et al., 2009, USA, 1 year [130]	Mean +/-SD: Soy group- 62.5 (13.7) g/day, Mixed control group- 57.0(21.9)	18 g Soy protein (I) vs. 18 g Mixed control protein (Casein, Whey and Egg) (p). No isoflavones in these two study arms	+ 18 g/day	Women over 60 years old (mean = 71 years)	BMD, BAP, NTX
Kerstetter et al., 1999, USA, 4 days Crossover study [131]	1 .0g/Kg/day	High (2 .1g/kg/day)vs low (0 .7g/kg/day) protein	+ 1 .1 g/Kg/day High - 0 .3 g/Kg/day Low	16 Pre F, 20–40 g	OC,BAP,NTX
Kersisetter et al., 2015, USA, 18 months [132]		45 g Whey protein or Isocaloric maltodextrin	+ 45 g/day		BMD, P1NP, CTX, OC

Table 4 (continued)

Study, Country, Duration	Baseline protein intake	Supplement vs control	Change in protein intake	Subject Total n	Outcomes Measured
Khalil et al., 2002, US, 3 months [133]	Mean (SEM): 72.9(1.8) Maltodextrin Group, 73.9(1.9) Whey Group No information in paper	Soy vs Milk protein (40 g)	+ 40 g/day	Men over 70 years and women over 60 years, n = 121 64 M, 59.2± 17.6 years	BAP, DPYD
Lampl et al. 1978, New Guinea, 8 months [134]	11 g/day	Normal diet (11 g/day) vs. normal diet plus 20 g/day milk protein supplement	31 g/day	7–13 year old Bundi children, male and female, with low protein intakes	Periosteal breadth, Endosteal breadth, Compact bone
Martin-Bautista et al. 2011, Spain, 4 months [135]	Mean(SD): 34.1(26.0) g/day Collagen, 33.0(18.1) g/day Placebo No information in paper	Drink containing partially hydrolysed collagen vs. placebo drink	+ 4. 25 g/day	60 children aged 6–11 years	BAP, OC, TRAP, CTX
Roughead et al., 2003, USA, 8 weeks	No information in paper	High meat diet: 117 g/day (20% of energy) versus low meat diet: 68 g/day (12% of energy)	+ 49 g/day	15 POM F	HPO, OC, NTX, BAP
Cross over study [136]	Mean (SD) 45.0 (15.2) g/day protein group vs. 51.0 (19.0) g/day control group	Total protein (20 g/day) vs placebo	+ 20 g/day	82 Elderly M/F 80.7 years± 7.4	%Change data only: DPYD, FSBMD, OC, PFBMD, PYD, BMD
Schurch et al., 1998 Switzerland, 6 months [137]	0.99 g/Kg/day (no information in g)	LPHC(0. 44 g/Kg/day protein, p) vs. HPHC (2. 71 g/kg/day, l) Calcium in both groups = 1600 mg/day Soy protein isolate without isoflavones diet (96 g/day) vs. casein-whey protein diet (91 g/day)	- 0.55 g/Kg/day Low + 1. 70 g/Kg/day High	21–42-year-old males and females	HPO
Spence et al., 2005, USA, crossover study 28 days per phase [139]	No information in paper	Soy protein isolate without isoflavones diet (96 g/day) vs. casein-whey protein diet (91 g/day)	+ 0 (as comparing protein type not dose, although 5 g/day difference in actuality) + 20.4 g/day	N = 15 Post F	BAP, OC, NTX
Tkatch et al., 1992, Switzerland, 38 days [140]	No information in paper	20.4 g/day Protein in nutritional supplement vs. the same nutritional supplement without protein	+ 20.4 g/day	62 M/F elderly, mean age 82 years	BMD, OC
Toba et al. 2001, Japan, 16 days [141]	No information in paper	MBP (300 mg/day) vs inactive placebo	+ 300 mg/day MBP	30 M, 36.2 years± 8.5	NTX, OC
Uenishi et al., 2007, Japan, 6 months [142]	No information in paper	40 mg/day MBP vs inactive placebo	+ 40 mg/day MBP	35 Pre F	BMD
Vupadhyahula et al., 2009, USA [143]	Mean (SD): 62.9 (1.9) Soy protein group, 61.3 (1.6) Milk Protein group	25 g soy protein (no isoflavones), 25 g milk (casein, whey) protein	+ 25 g/day	203 Post F Mean (SE) age 64 (0.6) years	BMD, NTX
Yamamura et al., 2002, Japan [144]	No information in paper	MBP(40 mg) vs inactive placebo	+ 40 mg/day MBP	33 Pre F	BMD
Zhu et al., 2011, AUS, 2 years [145]	Mean(SD): 76 (18) g/day High protein group, 76 (16) Low protein placebo group No information in paper	High protein drink 30 g vs. low protein drink (placebo) 2 .1g	+ 27.9 g/day	219 70–80-year-old women	vBMD, BMD
Zou et al. 2009, China, 8 months	No information in paper	Milk with 40 mg MBP vs. Milk without MBP	+ 40 mg/day MBP	57 women, 20 years old	BMD

AUS, Australia; BAP, bone alkaline phosphatase; BMC, bone mineral content; CTX, C-terminal peptide of collagen; DPYD, deoxypyridinoline; FSBMD, femoral shaft bone mineral density; HCHP, high calcium high protein; HCLP, high calcium low protein; HPO, hydroxyproline; LCHP, low calcium high protein; LCLP, low calcium low protein; MBP, milk basic protein; NTX, N-terminal peptide of collagen; OC, osteocalcin; P/NP, procollagen type 1 N-terminal propeptide; PERI, perimenopausal; PFBMD, proximal femoral bone mineral density; POM, postmenopausal; PRE, premenopausal; PYD, pyridinoline; SFI, soy protein isolate; TRAP, tartrate resistant alkaline phosphatase; vBMD, volumetric bone mineral density

Material for full results of pooling for other bone sites in adults. Heterogeneity was highly variable with values ranging from 0 to 94% depending on adult bone site.

In children and adolescents, the R^2 values suggested that 0–14% of child/adolescent BMC and 21% child/adolescent total body bone area (TBBA) were explained by protein intake (all unadjusted data). Heterogeneity was 0% (All BMC and total body bone mineral content (TBBMC)), 79% (TBBA) and 87% total body bone mineral density (TBBMD)). See [Online Resource Material](#) for further details of all the above correlational analyses including sensitivity analyses and funnel plots, as well as associations with protein and calcium dose, and calcium: protein ratio (Online Resource Table S4).

Fracture risk meta-analysis

See Table 3 and Online Resource Table S5 for details of all studies presenting fracture or osteoporosis risk data. Of 29 studies (6 of which have already appeared in correlational section of review), 5 studies were pooled in the meta-analysis for cohort studies assessing relative risk of fracture [96, 97, 100, 102, 103] (Fig. 2), all of which provided multivariate adjusted risk estimates. No statistically significant association was found between total protein intake and relative risk (RR) of all fractures ($RR_{(random)} = 0.94$ (0.72 to 1.23, $P = 0.55$, $n = 4$ studies, $I^2 = 32\%$, $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.30$). Similar results were seen for animal protein intake, $RR_{(random)} = 0.98$ (0.76 to 1.27, $P = 0.87$, $n = 4$ studies, $I^2 = 46\%$, $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.13$) and vegetable protein intake: $RR_{(fixed)} = 0.97$ (0.89 to 1.09, $P = 0.61$, $n = 3$ studies, $I^2 = 15\%$, $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.31$). For three cohort studies reporting hazard ratios (HR) (Online Resource Fig. S3) [63, 101, 104], no significant association was found between total protein intake and HR for all fractures ($HR_{(random)} = 0.82$ (0.59 to 1.14, $P = 0.24$), $n = 4$ studies (5 data points as 2 studies had independent subgroups which can both be entered), $I^2 = 35\%$, $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.19$). Of note, removal of the Sahni (Low calcium) data [104] led to a reduced risk of fracture with increased protein intake ($HR_{(fixed)} = 0.79$ (0.64 to 0.97, $P = 0.02$), $n = 4$ studies, $I^2 = 0\%$, $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.66$), which would be of borderline statistical significance after adjustment for multiple testing (using a cut-off of 0.02 for 3 fracture meta-analyses). For three case-control studies reporting odds ratio (OR) for fracture [111, 112, 117] (Online Resource Fig. S4), there was no significant association between total protein intake and odds of fracture: ($OR_{(random)} = 0.69$ (0.30 to 1.58, $P = 0.38$), $n = 4$ studies (4 data points as 1 study had independent subgroups which can both be entered) $I^2 = 65\%$, $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.03$). See [Online Resource Material](#) for details of relevant sensitivity analyses.

Intervention studies meta-analysis

Thirty papers were intervention studies (Table 4, Online Resource Table S6). See [Online Resource Material](#) for details of study quality assessment for these studies as well as systematic review of intervention studies.

Meta-analysis—summary of included studies

Nine of the 30 intervention studies [118, 120, 130, 132, 140, 142, 143, 145, 146] were suitable for meta-analysis. The other 20 studies were excluded due to missing data [144], cross over design study with no report of data prior to crossover [1, 122, 126, 127, 129, 131, 136, 138, 139], and not having data that is compatible with other studies to allow meta-analysis [121, 123–125, 133–135, 141], being a food-based intervention [128] or presenting data for change in bone indices only [119, 137].

Total protein intake


The pooled effect size for protein supplementation on LSBMD [132, 140] showed no statistically significant effect ($P = 0.07$) (total $n = 255$, $MD_{(fixed)} = 0.04$ (0.00 to 0.08, $P = 0.07$), $I^2 = 0\%$, $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.47$; Online Resource Fig. S5) Equivalent data for FNBMD (3 studies) [132, 140, 145], were also not statistically significant (total $n = 435$, $MD_{(random)} = 0.01$ (–0.03 to 0.05, $P = 0.59$) $I^2 = 68\%$, $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.04$) (Online Resource Fig. S6).

MBP and soy protein

For MBP studies, comparing MBP supplementation with a nutrient matched drink [120, 142] or no control [146], the pooled effects sizes were as follows: LSBMD Mean Difference (MD)_(fixed) = 0.02 (0.00–0.04, $P = 0.08$), $I^2 = 0\%$, $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.87$, 3 studies) (Online Resource Fig. S7). For soy protein studies no statistically significant effect was found for LSBMD ($MD_{(random)} = -0.01$ (–0.07 to 0.06, $P = 0.82$), $I^2 = 51\%$, $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.13$), FNBMD ($MD_{(random)} = 0.01$ (–0.06 to 0.07, $P = 0.87$), $I^2 = 74\%$, $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.05$) or BAP ($MD_{(random)} = -1.75$ (–10.50 to 7.01, $P = 0.70$), $I^2 = 91\%$, $P_{(heterogeneity)} = 0.0009$). There were not enough studies with compatible data to assess any other bone sites or bone markers for soy protein or MBP supplementation.

Overall heterogeneity was low for the influence of MBP on LSBMD at $I^2 = 0\%$ but high for soy protein LSBMD, FNBMD and BAP ($I^2 = 51\%$, 71% and 91% respectively). For both MBP and soy protein sensitivity analyses showed that removal of each study in turn had no effect on the pooled effect sizes (see [Online Resource Material](#)). The results for the soy and MBP subgroup analyses are unlikely to remain statistically significant after Bonferroni adjustment for multiple testing.

Fig. 2 Protein intake and all low trauma fractures (lowest intake category: RR = 1) animal (top), vegetable (middle), and total protein (bottom)



Discussion

This systematic review and meta-analysis reviewed evidence, published over the last 40 years, assessing the association between dietary protein and bone health across the life-course. Dietary protein intake explained 0 to 4% of adult BMD, BMC and bone markers, as well as 0–14% of child/adolescent BMC and 21% child/adolescent TBBA. However, when only studies adjusted for confounders (5 studies) were included in the adult analyses for FNBM and LSBMD these effects did not remain statistically significant, suggesting the effect sizes seen could be caused by potential confounding. The larger pooled effect sizes for the children and adolescents suggest a stronger relationship between protein and bone health at this life stage than in later life. Indeed, nutritional requirements for skeletal growth in childhood and adolescence are different to those for reducing senescence related bone loss, as the cellular mechanisms involved differ at these two life stages. Protein intake may have a strong relationship with bone health in childhood

due to the involvement of amino acids in endochondral ossification during bone growth. However, this finding of a stronger association between protein intake and bone health in children may also be an artefact of the smaller number of participants included in the pooled effect sizes in the child and adolescent analyses compared with adults.

In adults, neither calcium: protein ratio [calcium (mg)/protein (g/day)] nor protein (g/kg/day) or calcium (mg/kg/day) dose was associated with strength of effect for the association between protein intake and bone health. As seen in the previous 2009 systematic review and meta-analysis, there was no association between dietary protein intake and fracture risk in cohort and case-control studies, for total protein, animal or vegetable protein. In intervention studies, no statistically significant effects of total protein supplementation (excluding MBP and soy protein) were seen for FNBM and LSBMD, or for higher vs. lower soy protein supplementation.

The lack of an effect of dietary protein on bone seen in the above fracture risk and supplementation trials may be for a

variety of reasons. It could be that the opposing anabolic and catabolic actions of dietary protein cancel each other out to some extent. Alternatively dietary protein, at the protein intakes seen in the populations in this review, may not affect bone health and it may be that there is a small window whereby very low protein intakes are detrimental to bone, due to low IGF-1 production and dietary calcium absorption from the gut. Few studies in the review contained populations with low population intakes, with most studies reporting intakes of over 0.75 g/Kg/day–0.84 g/Kg/day which is considered adequate by western countries such as Australia [147], Europe [148] and the USA [149]. Some studies that contained older people or Buddhist Nuns had intakes nearer to, or slightly lower than, 0.75 g/Kg/day [41, 51, 75, 112, 137]. Twelve of the trials had no baseline protein intake data which makes it difficult to fully assess the degree of sufficiency. However, observational studies included this information with only one observational study not reporting overall protein intake [77]. In only 2 of the childhood studies was there a deficient protein intake [38, 134], and these were studies of malnourished children so this is as would be expected. However, none of the other child or adolescent studies showed deficient protein intakes.

Equally, other aspects of the diet that the authors of the original studies did not control for in the analysis (e.g. calcium intake) may be affecting the results. Of note, the study by Sahni et al. (2010) [104] showed a higher risk of hip fracture with higher protein intake when calcium intake was low (< 800 mg/day) but conversely a lower risk of fracture with higher protein intake when calcium was higher (\geq 800 mg/day). Failure to control for calcium intake in the fracture analyses could therefore obscure any relationship between protein intake and fracture risk. Of importance, the meta-analysis for cohort studies reporting hazard ratios was borderline statistically significant for a reduced risk of fracture with increasing protein intake, when the low calcium arm of the study by Sahni et al. 2010 [104] was removed, suggesting this study arm may be masking an association between protein intake and fracture which was evident when only the high calcium arm was included. Moreover, the meta-analysis result for the case-control studies (hazard ratios, see Online Resource Fig. 4) would have been statistically significant if using fixed models, which were not used due to heterogeneity present in our analysis. This may explain some of the differing results of our study from other meta-analyses, in that other analyses have combined data from cohort and case-control studies, which we did not, and the results of other meta-analyses may only be significant because of the inclusion of case-control data.

Since the publication of our original meta-analysis in 2009 [5], there have been a series of meta-analyses published on the subject of dietary protein and bone [6–9]. However, these differ from our meta-analysis in significant ways. Wu et al. (2015) [7] only assessed fracture risk, and Wallace and

Frankenfeld (2017) [8] did not assess cross-sectional studies. Santesso et al. (2012) [9] only included bone data from weight loss trials and Shams-White et al. (2017) [6] included a mixture of weight loss and non-weight loss trials, which may partially explain their finding of a protective effect of higher protein intake against LSBMD loss. Moreover, only one study in the latter review's change in LSBMD meta-analysis showed a positive effect, so the analysis was reliant on this one study for the significant result. The most recent meta-analysis, Shams-White (2018) [10] included only studies on animal protein vs. soy protein with isoflavones, so differs substantially from our current review. Finally, none of these meta-analyses assessed data from children and adolescents.

There have also been 13 relevant protein and bone health papers [150–162] published since our electronic searches were completed. All of these studies have found either a positive association, or no association of protein take with bone health, except for one study which found poorer bone health with increased protein intake [154]. All these studies were of observational study design except for two randomised control trials; one of soy protein in children which found no effect on bone marker concentration [157] and one of collagen supplementation in postmenopausal women which found a positive effect of supplementation on aBMD [155]. Overall, our current meta-analysis reported here is the most comprehensive to date on the subject and the inclusion of studies published since 2016 are unlikely to have significantly changed our results. As stated above, the separation of cohort and case-control studies may explain differences from our study to that of other meta-analyses.

The strengths of this analysis include the fact that we included papers published in both English and non-English languages, and from both observational and intervention studies. Moreover, inclusive coverage both in terms of timescale (i.e. 1975 to the present day; 40 years), topic area (all types of protein, BMD, BMC, BA and bone turnover markers) and population age subgroups (children, adolescents, adults, older adults) was achieved. This makes this analysis a comprehensive overview of dietary protein and bone health across the life-course, using data from the last 40 years. This makes the work novel and of importance to scientists, public health providers and clinicians alike.

However, the review was limited by the following factors. First, studies did not vary enough in calcium intake, as well as too few studies, to be able to assess whether the association between dietary protein and fracture risk varies by calcium intake. Second, there were concerns due to the low methodological quality of some intervention and cross-sectional studies. Many cross-sectional studies did not report any multivariate adjusted correlation coefficients in the paper (only unadjusted *r* values). Third, there is a clear lack of intervention studies, particularly parallel trials and cross-over studies reporting data from before the cross-over point, so effect sizes

in the intervention meta-analysis are likely to have been underpowered due to a small number of studies with a small number of participants.

Fourth, the diets of the populations represented in this analysis generally showed protein intakes that meet (and usually slightly exceed) protein intake recommendations. Results of the analysis could differ if persons with a low protein intake (or very high protein intake) were included. Indeed, as discussed above, few studies had populations with inadequate intake and more research is required into bone health in these populations. Moreover, it is also difficult to answer the question as to whether there is a threshold whereby protein intake becomes so high that is detrimental to bone due to the lack of data in persons with high intakes. Fifth, the Newcastle Ottawa tool was not always a good fit to the studies, especially for nested case-control studies where it is not clear whether they should be scored on the case-control or cohort scales. Therefore, the results of the quality analysis should be seen as a general guide to study quality, rather than a definitive and accurate score. Finally, the funnel plots for the correlation studies showed some evidence of publication bias in terms of a lack of small to medium studies showing negative associations between protein intake and bone health.

Future research needs to include larger-scale intervention studies, particularly in understudied population sub-groups such as children and adolescents and persons with very low protein and calcium intakes (e.g. the frail elderly) or very high protein and calcium intakes. Fracture risk studies need to be undertaken in the elderly, followed up to increased age (e.g. 80s) to truly see the effect of increased protein intake on long term fracture risk.

Overall, this systematic review and meta-analysis of the association between dietary protein and bone health across the life-course assessed evidence from the last 40 years. A positive cross-sectional association was shown between protein intake and bone health in most pooled analyses of r values in adults. However, these associations disappeared when only covariate adjusted data were used and there was no association between fracture risk and intake of any protein type in the fracture risk meta-analysis. There was no effect of any form of protein supplementation on any indices of bone health. The public health and clinical implications of this work are that there may be little benefit of increasing protein intake for bone health in healthy adults with an adequate protein intake but there is clearly no indication of any detrimental effect.

Acknowledgements The authors are grateful to Dr. Helen Lambert for her help with translation of papers.

Awards ALD received a Young Investigator Travel Award from the 10th International Symposium on the Nutritional Aspects of Osteoporosis Conference in Hong Kong, 28th November to 1st December 2017 for this work.

Compliance with ethical standards

Conflicts of interest SS has received institutional grants from Dairy Management Inc. and she serves as a member of the National Dairy Council's Nutrition Research Scientific Advisory Committee. SLN has received consultancy fees from the following companies/organisations: National Dairy Council UK, Yoplait, Kelloggs, Danone, Nestle. All other authors have nothing to declare.

References

- Cao JJ, Johnson LK, Hunt JR (2011) A diet high in meat protein and potential renal acid load increases fractional calcium absorption and urinary calcium excretion without affecting markers of bone resorption or formation in postmenopausal women. *J Nutr* 141:391–397
- Arnett TR, Dempster DW (1986) Effect of pH on bone resorption by rat osteoclasts in vitro. *Endocrinology* 119:119–124
- Mangano KM, Walsh SJ, Kenny AM, Insogna KL, Kerstetter JE (2014) Dietary acid load is associated with lower bone mineral density in men with low intake of dietary calcium. *J Bone Miner Res* 29:500–506
- Massey LK (2003) Dietary animal and plant protein and human bone health: a whole foods approach. *J Nutr* 133:862S–865S
- Darling AL, Millward DJ, Torgerson DJ, Hewitt CE, Lanham-New SA (2009) Dietary protein and bone health: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr* 90:1674–1692
- Shams-White MM, Chung M, Du M et al (2017) Dietary protein and bone health: a systematic review and meta-analysis from the National Osteoporosis Foundation. *Am J Clin Nutr* 105:1528–1543
- Wu AM, Sun XL, Lv QB, Zhou Y, Xia DD, Xu HZ, Huang QS, Chi YL (2015) The relationship between dietary protein consumption and risk of fracture: a subgroup and dose-response meta-analysis of prospective cohort studies. *Sci Rep* 5:9151
- Wallace TC, Frankenfeld CL (2017) Dietary protein intake above the current RDA and bone health: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Am Coll Nutr*:1–16
- Santesso N, Akl EA, Bianchi M, Mente A, Mustafa R, Heels-Ansdell D, Schunemann HJ (2012) Effects of higher- versus lower-protein diets on health outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 66:780–788
- Shams-White MM, Chung M, Fu Z, Insogna KL, Karlson MC, LeBoff MS, Shapses SA, Sackey J, Shi J, Wallace TC, Weaver CM (2018) Animal versus plant protein and adult bone health: a systematic review and meta-analysis from the National Osteoporosis Foundation. *PLoS One* 13:e0192459
- Team RC (2014) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. . 3.1.2 edn
- Laliberté E (2011) Metacor: Meta-analysis of correlation coefficients, R package version 1.0–2. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=metacor>. Accessed 10 April 2017
- Schwarzer G (2007) Meta: an R package for meta-analysis. *R News* 7:40–45
- Viechtbauer W (2010) Conducting Meta-analyses in R with the metafor package. *J Stat Softw* 36:1–48
- Möbius TWD (2014) Metagen: inference in Meta analysis and Meta regression. R package version 1.0. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=metagen>. Accessed 10 April 2017
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG (2003) Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. *BMJ* 327:557–560

17. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C (1997) Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 315:629–634
18. Jadad AR, Moore RA, Carroll D, Jenkinson C, Reynolds DJ, Gavaghan DJ, McQuay HJ (1996) Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: is blinding necessary? *Control Clin Trials* 17:1–12
19. Wells GA, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson J, Welch V, Losos M, Tugwell P (2014) The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analyses. http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp. Accessed 11 April 2017
20. Moher D, Cook DJ, Eastwood S, Olkin I, Rennie D, Stroup DF (1999) Improving the quality of reports of meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials: the QUOROM statement. Quality of Reporting of Meta-analyses. *Lancet* 354:1896–1900
21. Alexy U, Remer T, Manz F, Neu CM, Schoenau E (2005) Long-term protein intake and dietary potential renal acid load are associated with bone modeling and remodeling at the proximal radius in healthy children. *Am J Clin Nutr* 82:1107–1114
22. Alissa EM, Qadi SG, Alhujaili NA, Alshehri AM, Ferns GA (2011) Effect of diet and lifestyle factors on bone health in postmenopausal women. *J Bone Miner Metab* 29:725–735
23. Alissa EM, Alnahdi WA, Alama N, Ferns GA (2014) Relationship between nutritional profile, measures of adiposity, and bone mineral density in postmenopausal Saudi women. *J Am Coll Nutr* 33:206–214
24. Beasley JM, Ichikawa LE, Ange BA, Spangler L, LaCroix AZ, Ott SM, Scholes D (2010) Is protein intake associated with bone mineral density in young women? *Am J Clin Nutr* 91:1311–1316
25. Beasley JM, LaCroix AZ, Larson JC et al (2014) Biomarker-calibrated protein intake and bone health in the Women's Health Initiative clinical trials and observational study. *Am J Clin Nutr* 99:934–940
26. Bounds W, Skinner J, Carruth BR, Ziegler P (2005) Current research - the relationship of dietary and lifestyle factors to bone mineral indexes in children. *J Am Diet Assoc* 105:735–741
27. Budek AZ, Hoppe C, Michaelsen KE, Bugel S, Molgaard C (2007) Associations of total, dairy, and meat protein with markers for bone turnover in healthy, prepubertal boys. *J Nutr* 137:930–934
28. Budek AZ, Hoppe C, Ingstrup H, Michaelsen KF, Bugel S, Molgaard C (2007) Dietary protein intake and bone mineral content in adolescents—the Copenhagen cohort study. *Osteoporos Int* 18:1661–1667
29. Chan R, Woo J, Lau W, Leung J, Xu L, Zhao XH, Yu W, Lau E, Pocock N (2009) Effects of lifestyle and diet on bone health in young adult Chinese women living in Hong Kong and Beijing. *Food Nutr Bull* 30:370–378
30. Chan R, Woo J, Leung J (2011) Effects of food groups and dietary nutrients on bone loss in elderly Chinese population. *J Nutr Health Aging* 15:287–294
31. Chevalley T, Bonjour JP, Ferrari S, Rizzoli R (2008) High-protein intake enhances the positive impact of physical activity on BMC in prepubertal boys. *J Bone Miner Res* 23:131–142
32. Chevalley T, Bonjour JP, van Rietbergen B, Ferrari S, Rizzoli R (2014) Tracking of environmental determinants of bone structure and strength development in healthy boys: an eight-year follow up study on the positive interaction between physical activity and protein intake from prepuberty to mid-late adolescence. *J Bone Miner Res* 29:2182–2192
33. Chiu JF, Lan SJ, Yang CY, Wang PW, Yao WJ, Su LH, Hsieh CC (1997) Long-term vegetarian diet and bone mineral density in postmenopausal Taiwanese women. *Calcif Tissue Int* 60:245–249
34. Coin A, Perissinotto E, Enzi G, Zamboni M, Inelmen EM, Frigo AC, Manzato E, Busetto L, Buja A, Sergi G (2008) Predictors of low bone mineral density in the elderly: the role of dietary intake, nutritional status and sarcopenia. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 62:802–809
35. Cooper C, Atkinson EJ, Hensrud DD, Wahner HW, O'Fallon WM, Riggs BL, Melton LJ 3rd (1996) Dietary protein intake and bone mass in women. *Calcif Tissue Int* 58:320–325
36. Dawson-Hughes B, Harris SS (2002) Calcium intake influences the association of protein intake with rates of bone loss in elderly men and women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 75:773–779
37. Devine A, Dick IM, Islam AFM, Dhaliwal SS, Prince RL (2005) Protein consumption is an important predictor of lower limb bone mass in elderly women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 81:1423–1428
38. Ekbote VH, Khadilkar AV, Chiplokar SA, Khadilkar VV (2011) Determinants of bone mineral content and bone area in Indian preschool children. *J Bone Miner Metab* 29:334–341
39. Fairweather-Tait SJ, Skinner J, Guile GR, Cassidy A, Spector TD, MacGregor AJ (2011) Diet and bone mineral density study in postmenopausal women from the TwinsUK registry shows a negative association with a traditional English dietary pattern and a positive association with wine. *Am J Clin Nutr* 94:1371–1375
40. Freudenheim JL, Johnson NE, Smith EL (1986) Relationships between usual nutrient intake and bone-mineral content of women 35–65 years of age—longitudinal and cross-sectional analysis. *Am J Clin Nutr* 44:863–876
41. Geinoz G, Rapin CH, Rizzoli R, Kraemer R, Buchs B, Slosman D, Michel JP, Bonjour JP (1993) Relationship between bone-mineral density and dietary intakes in the elderly. *Osteoporos Int* 3:242–248
42. Genaro PD, Pinheiro MD, Szejnfeld VL, Martini LA (2015) Dietary protein intake in elderly women: association with muscle and bone mass. *Nutr Clin Pract* 30:283–289
43. Gregg EW, Kriska AM, Salamone LM, Wolf RL, Roberts MM, Ferrell RE, Anderson SJ, Kuller LH, Cauley JA (1999) Correlates of quantitative ultrasound in the women's healthy lifestyle project. *Osteoporosis Int* 10:416–424
44. Gunn CA, Weber JL, Kruger MC (2014) Diet, weight, cytokines and bone health in postmenopausal women. *J Nutr Health Aging* 18:479–486
45. Hannan MT, Tucker KL, Dawson-Hughes B, Cupples LA, Felson DT, Kiel DP (2000) Effect of dietary protein on bone loss in elderly men and women: the Framingham osteoporosis study. *J Bone Miner Res* 15:2504–2512
46. Henderson NK, Price RI, Cole JH, Gutteridge DH, Bhagat CI (1995) Bone-density in young-women is associated with body-weight and muscle strength but not dietary intakes. *J Bone Miner Res* 10:384–393
47. Hernandezavila M, Stampfer MJ, Ravnkar VA, Willett WC, Schiff I, Francis M, Longscope C, Mckinlay SM (1993) Caffeine and other predictors of bone-density among premenopausal and perimenopausal women. *Epidemiology* 4:128–134
48. Hirota T, Nara M, Ohguri M, Manago E, Hirota K (1992) Effect of diet and lifestyle on bone mass in Asian young women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 55:1168–1173
49. Ho SC, Woo J, Lam S, Chen Y, Sham A, Lau J (2003) Soy protein consumption and bone mass in early postmenopausal Chinese women. *Osteoporosis Int* 14:835–842
50. Ho SC, Chan SG, Yip YB, Chan CSY, Woo JLF, Sham A (2008) Change in bone mineral density and its determinants in pre- and perimenopausal Chinese women: the Hong Kong perimenopausal women osteoporosis study. *Osteoporosis Int* 19:1785–1796
51. Ho-Pham LT, Nguyen PLT, Le TTT, Doan TAT, Tran NT, Le TA, Nguyen TV (2009) Veganism, bone mineral density, and body composition: a study in Buddhist nuns. *Osteoporos Int* 20:2087–2093
52. Ho-Pham LT, Vu BQ, Lai TQ, Nguyen ND, Nguyen TV (2012) Vegetarianism, bone loss, fracture and vitamin D: a longitudinal study in Asian vegans and non-vegans. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 66:75–82

53. Hoppe C, Molgaard C, Michaelsen KF (2000) Bone size and bone mass in 10-year-old Danish children: effect of current diet. *Osteoporos Int* 11:1024–1030
54. Horiuchi T, Onouchi T, Takahashi M, Ito H, Orimo H (2000) Effect of soy protein on bone metabolism in postmenopausal Japanese women. *Osteoporos Int* 11:721–724
55. Hu T, Rianon NJ, Nettleton JA, Hyder JA, He J, Steffen LM, Jacobs DR, Criqui MH, Bazzano LA (2014) Protein intake and lumbar bone density: the multi-ethnic study of atherosclerosis (MESA). *Brit J Nutr* 112:1384–1392
56. Ilich JZ, Brownbill RA, Tamborini L (2003) Bone and nutrition in elderly women: protein, energy, and calcium as main determinants of bone mineral density. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 57:554–565
57. Iuliano-Burns S, Stone J, Hopper JL, Seeman E (2005) Diet and exercise during growth have site-specific skeletal effects: a co-twin control study. *Osteoporos Int* 16:1225–1232
58. Jaime PC, Latorre Mdo R, Florindo AA, Tanaka T, Zerbini CA (2006) Dietary intake of Brazilian black and white men and its relationship to the bone mineral density of the femoral neck. *Sao Paulo Med J* 124:267–270
59. Jones G, Riley MD, Whiting S (2001) Association between urinary potassium, urinary sodium, current diet, and bone density in prepubertal children. *Am J Clin Nutr* 73:839–844
60. Knurick JR, Johnston CS, Wherry SJ, Aguayo I (2015) Comparison of correlates of bone mineral density in individuals adhering to lacto-Ovo, vegan, or omnivore diets: a cross-sectional investigation. *Nutrients* 7:3416–3426
61. Kumar A, Mittal S, Orito S, Ishitani K, Ohta H (2010) Impact of dietary intake, education, and physical activity on bone mineral density among north Indian women. *J Bone Miner Metab* 28:192–201
62. Lacey JM, Anderson JJB, Fujita T, Yoshimoto Y, Fukase M, Tsuchie S, Koch GG (1991) Correlates of cortical bone mass among premenopausal and postmenopausal Japanese women. *J Bone Miner Res* 6:651–659
63. Langsetmo L, Barr SI, Berger C et al (2015) Associations of protein intake and protein source with bone mineral density and fracture risk: a population-based cohort study. *J Nutr Health Aging* 19:861–868
64. Lau EMC, Kwok T, Woo J, Ho SC (1998) Bone mineral density in Chinese elderly female vegetarians, vegans, lacto-vegetarians and omnivores. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 52:60–64
65. Libuda L, Alexy U, Remer T, Stehle P, Schoenau E, Kersting M (2008) Association between long-term consumption of soft drinks and variables of bone modeling and remodeling in a sample of healthy German children and adolescents. *Am J Clin Nutr* 88:1670–1677
66. Libuda L, Wudy SA, Schoenau E, Remer T (2011) Comparison of the effects of dietary protein, androstenediol and forearm muscle area on radial bone variables in healthy prepubertal children. *Br J Nutr* 105:428–435
67. Loenneke JP, Balapur A, Thrower AD, Syler G, Timlin M, Pujol TJ (2010) Short report: relationship between quality protein, lean mass and bone health. *Ann Nutr Metab* 57:219–220
68. Macdonald HM, New SA, Fraser WD, Campbell MK, Reid DM (2005) Low dietary potassium intakes and high dietary estimates of net endogenous acid production are associated with low bone mineral density in premenopausal women and increased markers of bone resorption in postmenopausal women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 81:923–933
69. Meng X, Zhu K, Devine A, Kerr DA, Binns CW, Prince RL (2009) A 5-year cohort study of the effects of high protein intake on lean mass and BMC in elderly postmenopausal women. *J Bone Miner Res* 24:1827–1834
70. Metz JA, Anderson JJ, Gallagher PN Jr (1993) Intakes of calcium, phosphorus, and protein, and physical-activity level are related to radial bone mass in young adult women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 58:537–542
71. Michaelsson K, Holmberg L, Mallmin H, Wolk A, Bergstrom R, Ljunghall S (1995) Diet, bone mass, and osteocalcin: a cross-sectional study. *Calcif Tissue Int* 57:86–93
72. Nakamura K, Hori Y, Nashimoto M, Okuda Y, Miyazaki H, Kasai Y, Yamamoto M (2004) Dietary calcium, sodium, phosphorus, and protein and bone metabolism in elderly Japanese women: a pilot study using the duplicate portion sampling method. *Nutrition* 20:340–345
73. Neville CE, Robson PJ, Murray LJ, Strain JJ, Twisk J, Gallagher AM, McGuinness M, Cran GW, Ralston SH, Boreham CAG (2002) The effect of nutrient intake on bone mineral status in young adults: the Northern Ireland young hearts project. *Calcif Tissue Int* 70:89–98
74. New SA, BoltonSmith C, Grubb DA, Reid DM (1997) Nutritional influences on bone mineral density: a cross-sectional study in premenopausal women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 65:1831–1839
75. Oh SM, Kim HC, Rhee Y, Park SJ, Lee HJ, Suh I, Feskanich D (2013) Dietary protein in relation to bone stiffness index and fat-free mass in a population consuming relatively low protein diets. *J Bone Miner Metab* 31:433–441
76. Orozco Lopez P, Ruiz Gil E, Nolla Sole JM (1998) Are food intake and life styles related with bone mass in fertile women? *An Med Interna* 15:63–69
77. Orwoll ES, Weigel RM, Oviatt SK, Meier DE, McClung MR (1987) Serum protein concentrations and bone mineral content in aging normal men. *Am J Clin Nutr* 46:614–621
78. Pearce MS, Relton CL, Groom A, Peaston RT, Francis RM (2010) A lifecourse study of bone resorption in men ages 49-51 years: the Newcastle thousand families cohort study. *Bone* 46:952–956
79. Promislow JH, Goodman-Gruen D, Slymen DJ, Barrett-Connor E (2002) Protein consumption and bone mineral density in the elderly: the rancho Bernardo study. *Am J Epidemiol* 155:636–644
80. Quintas ME, Ortega RM, Lopez-Sobaler AM, Garrido G, Requejo AM (2003) Influence of dietetic and anthropometric factors and of the type of sport practised on bone density in different groups of women. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 57(Suppl 1):S58–S62
81. Rapuri PB, Gallagher JC, Haynatzka V (2003) Protein intake: effects on bone mineral density and the rate of bone loss in elderly women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 77:1517–1525
82. Rubinacci A, Porrini M, Sirtori P, Galli L, Tessari L (1992) Nutrients, anthropometric characteristics and osteoporosis in women in the recent and late postmenopausal period. *Minerva Med* 83:497–506
83. Sahni S, Broe KE, Tucker KL, McLean RR, Kiel DP, Cupples LA, Hannan MT (2014) Association of total protein intake with bone mineral density and bone loss in men and women from the Framingham offspring study. *Public Health Nutr* 17:2570–2576
84. Tanaka M, Itoh K, Abe S, Imai K, Masuda T, Koga R, Itoh H, Kinukawa N, Matsuyama T, Nakamura M (2001) Relationship between nutrient factors and osteo-sono assessment index in calcaneus of young Japanese women. *Nutr Res* 21:1475–1482
85. Teegarden D, Lyle RM, McCabe GP, McCabe LD, Proulx WR, Michon K, Knight AP, Johnston CC, Weaver CM (1998) Dietary calcium, protein, and phosphorus are related to bone mineral density and content in young women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 68:749–754
86. Thorpe M, Mojtahedi MC, Chapman-Novakofski K, McAuley E, Evans EM (2008) A positive association of lumbar spine bone mineral density with dietary protein is suppressed by a negative association with protein sulfur. *J Nutr* 138:80–85
87. Tylavsky FA, Anderson JJ (1988) Dietary factors in bone health of elderly lactoovovegetarian and omnivorous women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 48:842–849
88. Vatanparast H, Bailey DA, Baxter-Jones ADG, Whiting SJ (2007) The effects of dietary protein on bone mineral mass in young

- adults may be modulated by adolescent calcium intake. *J Nutr* 137:2674–2679
89. Wang MC, Villa ML, Marcus R, Kelsey JL (1997) Associations of vitamin C, calcium and protein with bone mass in postmenopausal Mexican American women. *Osteoporosis Int* 7:533–538
 90. Wang MC, Moore EC, Crawford PB, Hudes M, Sabry ZI, Marcus R, Bachrach LK (1999) Influence of pre-adolescent diet on quantitative ultrasound measurements of the calcaneus in young adult women. *Osteoporos Int* 9:532–535
 91. Weikert C, Walter D, Hoffmann K, Kroke A, Bergmann MM, Boeing H (2005) The relation between dietary protein, calcium and bone health in women: results from the EPIC-Potsdam cohort. *Ann Nutr Metab* 49:312–318
 92. Whiting SJ, Boyle JL, Thompson A, Mirwald RL, Faulkner RA (2002) Dietary protein, phosphorus and potassium are beneficial to bone mineral density in adult men consuming adequate dietary calcium. *J Am Coll Nutr* 21:402–409
 93. Yazdanpanah N, Zillikens MC, Rivadeneira F, De Jong R, Lindemans J, Uitterlinden AG, Pols HAP, Van Meurs JBJ (2007) Effect of dietary B vitamins on BMD and risk of fracture in elderly men and women: the Rotterdam study. *Bone* 41:987–994
 94. Zhang Q, Ma GS, Greenfield H, Zhu K, Du XQ, Foo LH, Hu XQ, Fraser DR (2010) The association between dietary protein intake and bone mass accretion in pubertal girls with low calcium intakes. *Brit J Nutr* 103:714–723
 95. Abelow BJ, Holford TR, Insogna KL (1992) Cross-cultural association between dietary animal protein and hip fracture: a hypothesis. *Calcif Tissue Int* 50:14–18
 96. Dargent-Molina P, Sabia S, Touvier M, Kesse E, Breart G, Clavel-Chapelon F, Boutron-Ruault MC (2008) Proteins, dietary acid load, and calcium and risk of postmenopausal fractures in the E3N French women prospective study. *J Bone Miner Res* 23:1915–1922
 97. Feskanich D, Willett WC, Stampfer MJ, Colditz GA (1996) Protein consumption and bone fractures in women. *Am J Epidemiol* 143:472–479
 98. Frassetto LA, Todd KM, Morris RC Jr, Sebastian A (2000) Worldwide incidence of hip fracture in elderly women: relation to consumption of animal and vegetable foods. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci* 55:M585–M592
 99. Key TJ, Appleby PN, Spencer EA, Roddam AW, Neale RE, Allen NE (2007) Calcium, diet and fracture risk: a prospective study of 1898 incident fractures among 34 696 British women and men. *Public Health Nutr* 10:1314–1320
 100. Meyer HE, Pedersen JJ, Loken EB, Tverdal A (1997) Dietary factors and the incidence of hip fracture in middle-aged Norwegians. A prospective study. *Am J Epidemiol* 145:117–123
 101. Misra D, Berry SD, Broe KE, McLean RR, Cupples LA, Tucker KL, Kiel DP, Hannan MT (2011) Does dietary protein reduce hip fracture risk in elders? The Framingham osteoporosis study. *Osteoporosis Int* 22:345–349
 102. Munger RG, Cerhan JR, Chiu BC (1999) Prospective study of dietary protein intake and risk of hip fracture in postmenopausal women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 69:147–152
 103. Mussolino ME, Looker AC, Madans JH, Langlois JA, Orwoll ES (1998) Risk factors for hip fracture in white men: the NHANES I epidemiologic follow-up study. *J Bone Miner Res* 13:918–924
 104. Sahni S, Cupples LA, McLean RR, Tucker KL, Broe KE, Kiel DP, Hannan MT (2010) Protective effect of high protein and calcium intake on the risk of hip fracture in the Framingham offspring cohort. *J Bone Miner Res* 25:2770–2776
 105. Sellmeyer DE, Stone KL, Sebastian A, Cummings SR (2001) A high ratio of dietary animal to vegetable protein increases the rate of bone loss and the risk of fracture in postmenopausal women. Study of osteoporotic fractures research group. *Am J Clin Nutr* 73:118–122
 106. Zhong Y, Okoro CA, Balluz LS (2009) Association of total calcium and dietary protein intakes with fracture risk in postmenopausal women: the 1999–2002 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES). *Nutrition* 25:647–654
 107. Zhang X, Shu XO, Li H, Yang G, Li Q, Gao YT, Zheng W (2005) Prospective cohort study of soy food consumption and risk of bone fracture among postmenopausal women. *Arch Intern Med* 165:1890–1895
 108. Chevalley T, Bonjour JP, van Rietbergen B, Ferrari S, Rizzoli R (2011) Fractures during childhood and adolescence in healthy boys: relation with bone mass, microstructure, and strength. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 96:3134–3142
 109. Farrin N, Ostadrahimi AR, Mahboob SA, Kolahi S, Ghavami M (2008) Dietary intake and serum bone related chemistry and their correlations in postmenopausal Iranian women. *Saudi Med J* 29:1643–1648
 110. Kim J, Lim SY, Kim JH (2008) Nutrient intake risk factors of osteoporosis in postmenopausal women. *Asia Pac J Clin Nutr* 17:270–275
 111. Martinez-Ramirez MJ, Delgado-Martinez AD, Ruiz-Bailen M, de la Fuente C, Martinez-Gonzalez MA, Delgado-Rodriguez M (2012) Protein intake and fracture risk in elderly people: a case-control study. *Clin Nutr* 31:391–395
 112. Nieves JW, Grisso JA, Kelsey JL (1992) A case-control study of hip fracture—evaluation of selected dietary variables and teenage physical-activity. *Osteoporosis Int* 2:122–127
 113. Park YJ, Lee SJ, Shin NM, Shin H, Kim YK, Cho Y, Jeon S, Cho I (2014) Bone mineral density, biochemical bone turnover markers and factors associated with bone health in young Korean women. *J Korean Acad Nurs* 44:504–514
 114. Perez Durillo FT, Torio Durantez J, Villarejo Villar AB, Sanchez Vico AB, Cueto Camarero Mdel M, Durillo JP (2011) Comparative study of dietary intake and nutritional status in elderly women with and without hip fracture. *Aten Primaria* 43:362–368
 115. Preisinger E, Leitner G, Uher E, Alacamlioglu Y, Seidl G, Marktl W, Resch KL (1995) Nutrition and osteoporosis: a nutritional analysis of women in postmenopause. *Wien Klin Wochenschr* 107:418–422
 116. Samieri C, Ginder Coupez V, Lorrain S, Letenneur L, Alles B, Feart C, Paineau D, Barberger-Gateau P (2013) Nutrient patterns and risk of fracture in older subjects: results from the Three-City study. *Osteoporos Int* 24:1295–1305
 117. Wengreen HJ, Munger RG, West NA, Cutler DR, Corcoran CD, Zhang J, Sassano NE (2004) Dietary protein intake and risk of osteoporotic hip fracture in elderly residents of Utah. *J Bone Miner Res* 19:537–545
 118. Alekel DL, St Germain A, Pererson CT, Hanson KB, Stewart JW, Toda T (2000) Isoflavone-rich soy protein isolate attenuates bone loss in the lumbar spine of perimenopausal women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 72:844–852
 119. Aoe S, Toba Y, Yamamura J, Kawakami H, Yahiro M, Kumegawa M, Itabashi A, Takada Y (2001) Controlled trial of the effects of milk basic protein (MBP) supplementation on bone metabolism in healthy adult women. *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem* 65:913–918
 120. Aoe S, Koyama T, Toba Y, Itabashi A, Takada Y (2005) A controlled trial of the effect of milk basic protein (MBP) supplementation on bone metabolism in healthy menopausal women. *Osteoporosis Int* 16:2123–2128
 121. Arjmandi BH, Khalil DA, Smith BJ, Lucas EA, Juma S, Payton ME, Wild RA (2003) Soy protein has a greater effect on bone in postmenopausal women not on hormone replacement therapy, as evidenced by reducing bone resorption and urinary calcium excretion. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 88:1048–1054

122. Ceglia L, Harris SS, Abrams SA, Rasmussen HM, Dallal GE, Dawson-Hughes B (2009) Potassium bicarbonate attenuates the urinary nitrogen excretion that accompanies an increase in dietary protein and may promote calcium absorption. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 94:645–653
123. Cuneo F, Costa-Paiva L, Pinto-Neto AM, Morais SS, Amaya-Farfan J (2010) Effect of dietary supplementation with collagen hydrolysates on bone metabolism of postmenopausal women with low mineral density. *Maturitas* 65:253–257
124. Dalais FS, Ebeling PR, Kotsopoulos D, McGrath BP, Teede HJ (2003) The effects of soy protein containing isoflavones on lipids and indices of bone resorption in postmenopausal women. *Clin Endocrinol* 58:704–709
125. Dawson-Hughes B, Harris SS, Rasmussen H, Song LY, Dallal GE (2004) Effect of dietary protein supplements on calcium excretion in healthy older men and women. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 89:1169–1173
126. Evans EM, Racette SB, Van Pelt RE, Peterson LR, Villareal DT (2007) Effects of soy protein isolate and moderate exercise on bone turnover and bone mineral density in postmenopausal women. *Menopause* 14:481–488
127. Hunt JR, Johnson LK, Fariba Roughead ZK (2009) Dietary protein and calcium interact to influence calcium retention: a controlled feeding study. *Am J Clin Nutr* 89:1357–1365
128. Ince BA, Anderson EJ, Neer RM (2004) Lowering dietary protein to U.S. recommended dietary allowance levels reduces urinary calcium excretion and bone resorption in young women. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 89:3801–3807
129. Jenkins DJ, Kendall CW, Vidgen E, Augustin LS, Parker T, Faulkner D, Vieth R, Vandenbroucke AC, Josse RG (2003) Effect of high vegetable protein diets on urinary calcium loss in middle-aged men and women. *Eur J Clin Nutr* 57:376–382
130. Kenny AM, Mangano KM, Abourizk RH, Bruno RS, Anamani DE, Kleppinger A, Walsh SJ, Prestwood KM, Kerstetter JE (2009) Soy proteins and isoflavones affect bone mineral density in older women: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Clin Nutr* 90:234–242
131. Kerstetter JE, Mitnick ME, Gundberg CM, Caseria DM, Ellison AF, Carpenter TO, Insogna KL (1999) Changes in bone turnover in young women consuming different levels of dietary protein. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 84:1052–1055
132. Kerstetter JE, Bihuniak JD, Brindisi J, Sullivan RR, Mangano KM, Larocque S, Kotler BM, Simpson CA, Cusano AM, Gaffney-Stomberg E, Kleppinger A, Reynolds J, Dziura J, Kenny AM, Insogna KL (2015) The effect of a whey protein supplement on bone mass in older Caucasian adults. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 100:2214–2222
133. Khalil DA, Lucas EA, Juma S, Smith BJ, Payton ME, Arjmandi BH (2002) Soy protein supplementation increases serum insulin-like growth factor-I in young and old men but does not affect markers of bone metabolism. *J Nutr* 132:2605–2608
134. Lampl M, Johnston FE (1978) The effects of protein supplementation on the growth and skeletal maturation of New Guinean school children. *Ann Hum Biol* 5:219–227
135. Martin-Bautista E, Martin-Matillas M, Martin-Lagos JA, Miranda-Leon MT, Munoz-Torres M, Ruiz-Requena E, Rivero M, Quer J, Puigdueta I, Campoy C (2011) A nutritional intervention study with hydrolyzed collagen in pre-pubertal spanish children: influence on bone modeling biomarkers. *J Pediatr Endocrinol Metab* 24:147–153
136. Roughead ZK, Johnson LK, Lykken GI, Hunt JR (2003) Controlled high meat diets do not affect calcium retention or indices of bone status in healthy postmenopausal women. *J Nutr* 133:1020–1026
137. Schurch MA, Rizzoli R, Slosman D, Vadas L, Vergnaud P, Bonjour JP (1998) Protein supplements increase serum insulin-like growth factor-I levels and attenuate proximal femur bone loss in patients with recent hip fracture. A randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Ann Intern Med* 128:801–809
138. Shapses SA, Robins SP, Schwartz EI, Chowdhury H (1995) Short-term changes in calcium but not protein intake alter the rate of bone resorption in healthy subjects as assessed by urinary pyridinium cross-link excretion. *J Nutr* 125:2814–2821
139. Spence LA, Lipscomb ER, Cadogan J, Martin B, Wastney ME, Peacock M, Weaver CM (2005) The effect of soy protein and soy isoflavones on calcium metabolism in postmenopausal women: a randomized crossover study. *Am J Clin Nutr* 81:916–922
140. Tkatch L, Rapin CH, Rizzoli R, Slosman D, Nydegger V, Vasey H, Bonjour JP (1992) Benefits of oral protein supplementation in elderly patients with fracture of the proximal femur. *J Am Coll Nutr* 11:519–525
141. Toba Y, Takada Y, Matsuoka Y et al (2001) Milk basic protein promotes bone formation and suppresses bone resorption in healthy adult men. *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem* 65:1353–1357
142. Uenishi K, Ishida H, Toba Y, Aoe S, Itabashi A, Takada Y (2007) Milk basic protein increases bone mineral density and improves bone metabolism in healthy young women. *Osteoporos Int* 18:385–390
143. Vupadhyayula PM, Gallagher JC, Templin T, Logsdon SM, Smith LM (2009) Effects of soy protein isolate on bone mineral density and physical performance indices in postmenopausal women—a 2-year randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. *Menopause* 16:320–328
144. Yamamura J, Aoe S, Toba Y, Motouri M, Kawakami H, Kumegawa M, Itabashi A, Takada Y (2002) Milk basic protein (MBP) increases radial bone mineral density in healthy adult women. *Biosci Biotechnol Biochem* 66:702–704
145. Zhu K, Meng X, Kerr DA, Devine A, Solah V, Binns CW, Prince RL (2011) The effects of a two-year randomized, controlled trial of whey protein supplementation on bone structure, IGF-1, and urinary calcium excretion in older postmenopausal women. *J Bone Miner Res* 26:2298–2306
146. Zou ZY, Lin XM, Xu XR, Xu R, Ma L, Li Y, Wang MF (2009) Evaluation of milk basic protein supplementation on bone density and bone metabolism in Chinese young women. *Eur J Nutr* 48:301–306
147. Ministry of Health (2014) Nutrient reference values for Australia and New Zealand: Nutrients, Protein. <https://www.nrv.gov.au/nutrients/protein>. Accessed 22nd February 2019
148. EFSA (2012) Scientific opinion on dietary reference values for protein. *EFSA J* 10:2557
149. IOM (2005) Dietary reference intakes for energy, carbohydrate, fiber, fat, fatty acids, cholesterol, protein and amino acids. The National Academies Press, Washington D.C
150. Fung TT, Meyer HE, Willett WC, Feskanich D (2017) Protein intake and risk of hip fractures in postmenopausal women and men age 50 and older. *Osteoporos Int* 28:1401–1411
151. Langsetmo L, Shikany JM, Cawthon PM, Cauley JA, Taylor BC, Vo TN, Bauer DC, Orwoll ES, Schousboe JT, Ensrud KE, for the Osteoporotic Fractures in Men (MrOS) Research Group (2017) The association between protein intake by source and osteoporotic fracture in older men: a prospective cohort study. *J Bone Miner Res* 32:592–600
152. Durosier-Izart C, Biver E, Merminod F, van Rietbergen B, Chevalley T, Herrmann FR, Ferrari SL, Rizzoli R (2017) Peripheral skeleton bone strength is positively correlated with total and dairy protein intakes in healthy postmenopausal women. *Am J Clin Nutr* 105:513–525
153. Chevalley T, Bonjour JP, Audet MC, Merminod F, van Rietbergen B, Rizzoli R, Ferrari S (2017) Prepubertal impact of protein intake and physical activity on weight-bearing peak bone mass and strength in males. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 102:157–166

154. Isanejad M, Sirola J, Mursu J, Kroger H, Tuppurainen M, Erkkila AT (2017) Association of protein intake with bone mineral density and bone mineral content among elderly women: the OSTPRE fracture prevention study. *J Nutr Health Aging* 21:622–630
155. König D, Oesser S, Scharla S, Zdzieblik D, Gollhofer A (2018) Specific collagen peptides improve bone mineral density and bone markers in postmenopausal women—a randomized controlled study. *Nutrients* 10
156. Steell L, Sillars A, Welsh P, Iliodromiti S, Wong SC, Pell JP, Sattar N, Gill JMR, Celis-Morales CA, Gray SR (2018) Associations of dietary protein intake with bone mineral density: an observational study in 70,215 UK biobank participants. *Bone* 120:38–43
157. Mejia W, Cordoba D, Duran P, Chacon Y, Rosselli D (2018) Effect of daily exposure to an isolated soy protein supplement on body composition, energy and macronutrient intake, bone formation markers, and lipid profile in children in Colombia. *J Diet Suppl* 1-13
158. Langsetmo L, Shikany JM, Burghardt AJ et al (2018) High dairy protein intake is associated with greater bone strength parameters at the distal radius and tibia in older men: a cross-sectional study. *Osteoporos Int* 29:69–77
159. Johansson J, Hult A, Morseth B, Nordstrom A, Nordstrom P (2018) Self-reported protein intake and properties of bone in community-dwelling older individuals. *Arch Osteoporos* 13:10
160. Kim BJ, Lee SH, Isales CM, Koh JM, Hamrick MW (2018) The positive association of total protein intake with femoral neck strength (KNHANES IV). *Osteoporos Int* 29:1397–1405
161. Cauley JA, Cawthon PM, Peters KE, Cummings SR, Ensrud KE, Bauer DC, Taylor BC, Shikany JM, Hoffman AR, Lane NE, Kado DM, Stefanick ML, Orwoll ES, for the Osteoporotic Fractures in Men (MrOS) Study Research Group (2016) Risk factors for hip fracture in older men: the osteoporotic fractures in men study (MrOS). *J Bone Miner Res* 31:1810–1819
162. Mangano KM, Sahni S, Kiel DP, Tucker KL, Dufour AB, Hannan MT (2017) Dietary protein is associated with musculoskeletal health independently of dietary pattern: the Framingham third generation study. *Am J Clin Nutr* 105:714–722

Publisher's note Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.